

МІНІСТЕРСТВО ОСВІТИ І НАУКИ УКРАЇНИ
КИЇВСЬКИЙ НАЦІОНАЛЬНИЙ ЛІНГВІСТИЧНИЙ УНІВЕРСИТЕТ
Кафедра германської і фіно-угорської філології

Кваліфікаційна робота магістра з лінгвістики
на тему: «ПИТАННЯ-ПЕРЕПИТИ ЯК ЗАСІБ ЕМОЦІЙНОЇ
КОМУНІКАЦІЇ (НА МАТЕРІАЛІ СУЧАСНОГО АНГЛОМОВНОГО
ДІАЛОГІЧНОГО ДИСКУРСУ)»

Допущено до захисту

«__» _____ року

студентки групи МЛа 57-21

факультету германської філології і

перекладу

освітньо-професійної програми

Сучасні філологічні студії (англійська

мова і друга іноземна мова): лінгвістика та

перекладознавство

за спеціальністю 035 Філологія

Акутіної Надії Олегівни

Завідувач кафедри

германської і фіно-угорської

філології

_____ *Шутова М.О.*

(підпис)

(ПІБ)

Науковий керівник:

Кандидат філологічних наук, професор

Волкова Лідія Михайлівна

Національна шкала _____

Кількість балів _____

Оцінка ЄКТС _____

КИЇВ –2022

**MINISTRY OF EDUCATION AND SCIENCE OF UKRAINE KYIV NATIONAL
LINGUISTIC UNIVERSITY**

Chair of Germanic and Finno-Ugrian Philology

Master's Qualification Paper

**ECHO-QUESTIONS AS A MEANS OF EMOTIONAL COMMUNICATION
(A STUDY OF MODERN ENGLISH DIALOGICAL DISCOURSE)**

Nadiia Akutina
Group MLa 57-21
Department of Germanic
Philology and Translation

Research Adviser
Professor
LIDIYA M. VOLKOVA
(Ph.D. Linguistics)

Kyiv –2022

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	5
CHAPTER ONE. THEORETICAL BASIS OF STUDYING QUESTIONS IN MODERN LINGUISTICS	8
1.1 Echo-questions in the English language system	8
1.2 Terminological aspect of echo-questions	10
1.3 Echo-questions as a special type of questions	17
1.4 Criteria for distinguishing echo-questions and their types	20
1.5 Structural and semantic characteristics of echo-questions	22
Conclusions to Chapter 1	26
CHAPTER TWO. METHODS AND STAGES OF STUDYING FUNCTIONING OF ECHO-QUESTIONS IN THE ENGLISH DIALOGICAL DISCOURSE	27
2.1 Dialogical discourse as a field of implementation of echo questions	27
2.2 Cognitive-communicative approach to the study of questions	30
2.3 Methodology for researching functioning of echo questions in dialogical discourse	32
Conclusions to Chapter 2	35
CHAPTER THREE. COGNITIVE-COMMUNICATIVE, PSYCHOLOGICAL AND EMOTIONAL FACTORS OF GENERATION ECHO-QUESTIONS IN THE ENGLISH DIALOGICAL DISCOURSE	36
3.1 Mental models	36
3.2 Echo-questions from the point of view of coherence of dialogical discourse	39
3.3 Cognition and emotions	44
Conclusions to Chapter 3	47
CHAPTER FOUR. PRAGMATIC-DISCURSIVE ASPECTS OF THE FUNCTIONING OF ECHO-QUESTIONS IN THE ENGLISH DIALOGICAL DISCOURSE	49
4.1 Echo-question in the system of speech acts	49
4.2 Echo-question-reaction as a sequence of speech actions	53
4.3 Echo-questions from the addressee's point of view	59

Conclusions to Chapter 4	61
GENERAL CONCLUSIONS.....	63
RESUME.....	65
LIST OF REFERENCE LITERATURE.....	67
LIST OF ILLUSTRATION MATERIALS	75

INTRODUCTION

Echo questions, numerous in dialogical discourse, are often defined on the basis of their functional characteristics (to ask a question, express emotions, realize a lie, check one's understanding of the interlocutor's message, make further inquiries or to establish relations between speakers) as well as structural and semantic relation with the preceding utterance.

In this study, we will primarily pay attention to the process of dialogue development and will analyze and categorize different examples of echo-questions in dialogues, concentrating on modern TV series and films.

The topicality of this Master's Paper lies in the fact that it deals with echo-questions in accordance with their pragmatic and functional value.

The object of the Paper is echo-questions in Modern English dialogical discourse.

The subject of the present study is cognitive, communicative, pragmatic and semantic peculiarities of echo-questions.

The material used in this investigation is represented by numerous dialogical fragments taken from the British and American TV series and films.

Theoretical value of the Master's Paper lies in the fact that it is one of the few attempts to research echo-questions in natural dialogical discourse, particularly based on the study of American and English TV series and films.

Practical value of the results gained in the study is the possibility of their application in the course of theoretical grammar of the Modern English language (sections "Discourse analysis", "Cognitive linguistics", "Psycholinguistics"); in oral speech practice classes for the formation of students' grammatical competence and improvement of communication culture in accordance with the communicative standards of the Modern English language, taking into account the register and communication situation, as well as for writing course, diploma, master's and dissertation works on English philology.

The aim of this work is to investigate echo-questions in the dialogical discourse, identify the types of speech acts performed by echo questions as well as specify their felicity conditions.

The aim of this study is achieved by the following **tasks**:

- to identify the status and clarify the definition of echo-questions in the English language system;
- to analyze the semantic features of echo-questions in dialogical discourse;
- to determine the cognitive processes which are the basis of the production of echo-questions;
- to develop a classification of survey questions based on cognitive and pragmatic characteristics;
- to find out which speech acts are performed using echo-questions and their function in dialogical discourse;
- to highlight the role of context in the functioning of echo-questions.

Methodology:

In the process of writing the Paper several research methods were applied. Structural-semantic analysis was used to determine the structural characteristics of echo-questions and develop their classification; cognitive analysis to identify cognitive mechanisms and processes underlying the production of echo-questions; speech act analysis to determine the illocutionary force of speech acts; conversational analysis for researching the perlocutionary effect of echo-questions, their role in maintaining and developing the topic of conversation, changing communicative roles; the method of discourse analysis to determine strategies implemented using echo-questions;

The novelty of the Master's Paper is revealed in the investigation of echo-questions by applying comprehensive analysis of cognitive-communicative and pragmatic-semantic features of echo-questions in modern English-language dialogical discourse.

Compositionally, the Paper consists of the Introduction, four Chapters, conclusions to each Chapter and general conclusions to the whole Paper, the list of references and the list of illustrative material;

In the **Introduction** the Paper presents the choice of the topic, its relevance, the object and the subject of the investigation, methods and material of the study, underlines the topicality of the problem under study, mentions the novelty of the gained results, sets the main aim and the tasks by which it is achieved, considers the methods of research used in the paper, theoretical and practical value and discusses the content of each chapter separately.

Chapter One presents general theoretical aspects of echo-questions in dialogical discourse from the point of view of cognitive pragmatics, the approaches to the study of echo-questions as a linguistic and speech phenomenon, the definition of echo-questions taking into account syntactic, semantic and functional factors.

Chapter Two considers the general methodology of a research: a comprehensive approach to the analysis of cognitive-communicative and pragmatic-semantic features of echo-questions, methods and criteria.

Chapter Three is devoted to the role of echo-questions in dialogical discourse through the concept of mental model and coherence, psycho-emotional factors outlying the echo-questions.

Chapter Four defines types of speech acts implemented by echo-questions, their conditions of success at the illocutionary/perlocutionary acts, typology of strategies and tactics based on cognitive-pragmatic factors.

General Conclusions sum up the results obtained in the Paper and outline the perspectives of further research in the area.

CHAPTER ONE. THEORETICAL BASIS OF STUDYING QUESTIONS IN MODERN LINGUISTICS

1.1 Echo-questions in the English language system

The study of echo-questions involves the clarification of the criteria (formal, semantic, functional) set out for questions in general. Traditionally, the researchers (Quirk R., Greenbaum S., Leech) distinguish four types of simple sentences, associated with four sentence types: statements, questions, directives and exclamations (25, p. 803). The statements are characterized by the presence of the subject that generally precedes the verb. According to the formal criterion, interrogative sentences are divided into a) general (yes–no interrogatives), in which the auxiliary verb is placed before the subject, and b) special (wh-interrogatives), where the question word is in the initial position. Directives are characterized by the absence of the explicitly expressed grammatical subject and the use of a predicate verb in the initial form. For exclamatory sentences, the presence of the words how or what in the initial position and the direct order of the words (25, p. 803).

For the accuracy of the syntactic description, P. Collins suggests using the term "clause type" instead of the term "sentence type", because, according to the researcher, the clause type can be used to analyze both subordinate and main sentences. With this approach, P. Collins considers the types of clauses (declarative, interrogative, imperative, exclamative (39, p. 531–544)) to be mutually exclusive, and echo-questions are not considered as a part of system of clauses, since they ask information about a certain element from the previous replica and according to its structure can correspond to any type of clause. Consider the following examples:

(1) (A): *We were all chatting and I made a joke, a really dumb joke and Craig the idiot took it seriously.* (Jan looks at Michael)

(B): *You made a joke?* (The Office s.2, ep.16).

In the example (1) the echo-question of the speaker B structurally corresponds to the declarative type of the clause (41, p. 180–181).

(2) (A): Forget the parties.

(B): *Forget the parties?* What a nerd (The Big Bang Theory s.1, ep. 9).

In examples (1) and (2) the echo-question of the speaker B structurally corresponds to the declarative type of the clause (41, p. 180–181).

An echo-question repeats a previous utterance and amounts to a request for the repetition of the utterance (or at least of part of it). Echo-questions are used because the interlocuter did not fully hear or understand what was said, or because its content is too surprising to be believed" (100, p. 35).

According to J. Leech, an echo-question is "a question that repeats a previous statement (stimulus, according to J. McCauley (73, p. 561)) and is equivalent to a request to repeat this statement. U. Chafe has the similar point of view, he considers echo-question as "the repetition of the sentences spoken by the interlocutor, which immediately precede and are used mainly to check the correctness of perception" or to request information that was not perceived (22, p. 396).

So, on the one hand, the echo-question is a reactive response (of a logical or emotional nature), and on the other hand, it is initiative (a request to provide information).

In particular, in situation (1), the echo-question "*You made a joke?*" indicates the surprise of the speaker (A) at the just-heard remark, the intensity of which is emphasized by a non-verbal marker ("look"), as well as by the lexeme amazement, and prompts the interlocutor (B) to explain in more detail what the joke was about.

In situation (2), the echo-question "*Forget the parties?*" repeats the previous utterance and is followed by replica "What a nerd." that shows emotional attitude to the speaker (A) and to the situation.

1.2 Terminological aspect of echo-questions

In linguistics, the echo-question has numerous names: перепит (2; 21; 22), питання-повтор (15, p. 323), echo (66, p. 376–377), echo question (25; 30; 39; 43; 55; 71; 80; 87; 100; 101), repeat question (55, p. 76), metalinguistic question (65, p. 381). P. Collins uses such words as echo and echo question (41, p. 186). In Ukrainian: перепит (99, с. 765).

The repeated question is "a question asked by the speaker twice or several times, which preserves the communicative type of the primary question, despite possible changes in the lexical composition, syntactic structure and intonation, reflecting the emotional and volitional state of the speaker" (2, p. 4). Echo questions are also considered as questions of the second order (O. Jespersen's term) (15, p. 323, 68 p.304).

R. Quirk and co-authors call echo-questions "questions about questions" and distinguish four structural subtypes:

1) general question about general question:

(3) (A): *Well, is that really a priority?*

(B): *Is it a priority? Oh I don't know, um, what if there is a tornado, Pam? People's legs are crushed under rubble.*

(C): *Please, would you be so kind as to call my wife?*

(B): *No, I can't because we don't have any emergency contact information because Pam said it wasn't a priority" (The Office, s.2, ep.6).*

2) a general question about a special question:

(4) (A) "Hulloa! what's that for?" (B) "What's that for? Why –"

(Jerome, TMBt, 47).

3) a special question about a general question:

(5) (A): *Can I borrow it tomorrow?*

(B): *You want to borrow my car?*

(A): *Just for a couple of hours (Desperate Housewives s.1, ep.6).*

4) a special question about a special question (25, p. 836–837):

(6) (A): *Now, how do you propose I get home?*

(B): *How did you get here in the first place? (The Big Bang Theory s.2, ep. 2)*

From the point of view of its content, the echo question is considered as "a special communicative type of sentence" (2, p. 13); "a type of sentence used to ask a question about what was just said by the interlocutor (often with a tone of disbelief), and repeats all utterance or most of what was just said" (80, p. 383); "speech action associated with the interlocutor's mental reaction to the content of the previous utterance" (21, p. 83); "repetition of the previous remark" (22, p. 396), that has definite functions in the dialogue. For instance, checking the correctness of perception and understanding of the interlocutor's statement, asking to repeat what was said or asking for additional information to clarify (often associated with misunderstanding, which can be real or pretended (87)), expressing an emotional and evaluative attitude (surprise, distrust, condemnation, anger) (22; 87). In the dictionary an echo question is defined as "an interrogative sentence that answers a question by reformulating and repeating it" (101, p. 348).

In some studies, the formal characteristics of repeat questions are emphasized, in particular, the connection with the previous utterance. In particular, E. Radford divides interrogative sentences into echo questions and nonecho questions, regardless of whether they are general or special (81, p. 463). Interrogative questions "repeat the speech of the interlocutor" and "according to their morphological and syntactic features, have more in common with the types of sentences they repeat than with corresponding questions that are not repeat questions" (81, p. 463–464).

(7) (A): *I think we should go to the police and tell...*

(B): ***And tell them what?** We don't even have the note anymore. We gave it to Paul (Desperate Housewives s.1, ep.5).*

Consider example (7), where the interrogative question refers to the narrative sentence and repeats its structure, and the question word replaces the element that causes misunderstanding.

According to Radford, the distinguishing features of a special interrogative sentence that is not an interrogative are (1) the inversion of the auxiliary verb and the subject, as well as (2) the movement of the question word what to the initial position (What should we tell them?) (80, p. 20).

Santorini and Kroch differentiate echo questions somewhat different. Researchers single out informative questions, which can be used at the beginning of a conversation, and "echo questions" or "reprise questions", which have a reactive focus and "signal a misunderstanding of the previous speech course." In terms of form, interrogative questions may coincide with informational questions, differing from them in a specific intonation, and the lack of movement of the interrogative word to the initial position is considered as "an additional sign of the special discursive function of interrogative questions" (87).

As R. Artstein points out, the use of the interrogative word "in-situ" in special interrogative questions is not decisive for their semantics, since a variant with the interrogative word in the initial position, pronounced with the interrogative intonation, is possible (30, p. 101).

It is worth mentioning that the importance of intonation in determining the echo questions is assessed differently by researchers. According to Reis M., rising intonation "is not a constitutive feature of special echo questions" and as such cannot determine their pragmatic specificity (83, p. 219).

Analyzing the functions of special questions and special echo questions in discourse, M. Selting points out the lack of a systematic connection between intonation and the grammatical type of the sentence. According to the researcher, intonation is an "autonomous signal system" that, together with the syntactic structure and semantic

relation to the previous speech course, determines the speech actions performed with the help of questions (92, p. 244).

In M. Selting's typology there is a distinction between "unrestricted conversational questions" and "restricted conversational questions" on the basis of semantic connections with the previous replica. The thematic focus (the requested information referred to in the sentence (86, p. 185) of "open" or "unrestricted" questions is new in relation to the previous discourse; while "limited" or "restricted" questions are characterized by the preservation of the previous thematic focus and its detailing (request for additional information, checking or clarification of one's own understanding of the previous speech course or conclusions made (92) or an explicit indication of a communicative failure, which is carried out through "refocusing on the previous thematic focus and suspending further thematic development of the conversation." When overcoming a communicative failure, the accuracy of the reproduction of the previous line and the prosodic structure of the question depends on the character causes of failure, namely: "problems of understanding" (acoustic, referential, semantic) and "problems of expectation" (91, p. 249, 318–320).

According to M. Selting, communicative failures of an acoustic nature are characterized by the use of the interrogative word "what?" with a rising intonation, which refers to the entire previous line or replaces an element that was not heard. And to overcome them, it is enough to repeat the part of the message that the interlocutor did not understand (91, p. 332).

In the case of referential problems, a special echo question is pronounced with a falling intonation on the question word, which replaces the referential expression that caused difficulties (91, p. 330). To eliminate misunderstanding (caused by a "short-term problem of recall or interpretation"), the interlocutor needs to use another referential expression without providing additional information (91, p. 330–331):

(8) (A) *It's been pretty tough.*

(B) *Yeah, I could only imagine.*

(A) *I mean, not knowing why Mary Alice...*

(B): *Why what?*

(A) *Why she did it* (Desperate Housewives s.1, ep.3).

In the example (8) a communicative failure associated with difficulties in semantic interpretation is accompanied by the repetition of a part of the previous line with a falling terminal tone and an emphasis on the component that caused misunderstanding (91, p. 327); to overcome it, the interlocutor must provide additional information (91, p. 331).

Selting divides "problems of expectation" with respect to the last turn can be signalled either by questions with the question-word *wieso* ('why'), or by a so-called 'astonished' version of other question types (91, p. 333). In the signalling and treatment of problems of expectation, interlocutors generally seem to infer a contradiction between their own and the interlocutor's expectations. Appropriate problem treatment activities contribute to the clarification of the contradiction, in most cases by providing background information. Their general interpretation seems to be 'astonishment' or 'surprise', and they are used to signal problems of expectation (91, p. 337).

In contrast to "*problems of expectation*", which are related to certain elements of the previous utterance, "*anticipation problems*" concern the level of meaning. When correlating what the interlocutor said with the cognitive system of the speaker, cognitive dissonance arises in the latter - the presence of contradictions "between individual elements in the system of knowledge (views, beliefs)" of the individual, which relate to "the surrounding world, oneself, one's own behavior" (19, p. 18). This state, as a rule, is associated with psychological discomfort, so the individual tries to reduce dissonance by finding additional consonant elements or changing existing cognitive elements and harmonizing them with each other (29, p. 2–3).

The following communicative exchange takes place in the office before local basketball competition where leaders choose players for their teams. (A) Starts with

(B), because he is an Afro-American and (A) has a stereotypical mindset that all Afro-Americans play basketball well and (B) will help (A) to win.

(9) (A): *OK, so, let's put together a starting line-up, shall we? Stanley **of course**.*"

(B): *I'm sorry?*

(A): *Um, what do you play? Center?*

(B): *"Why **'of course'**?"*

(A): *Uh...* (The Office s.1, ep.4)

The speaker (B) is on the one hand shocked with the utterance (misunderstanding and reasonable request to clarify). On the other hand, there is dissonant element because of the status-role factor, because (A) is a chief of the office and (B) is an ordinary office worker, who sees colour discrimination at work place. Whereas (A) considers (B)'s complexion as a benefit, (B) understands as a race discrimination.

Feedback (or to use Allwood's term, interactive communication management) can then be seen as exchange of information about any of these requirements (see Allwood et al., 1992). This definition of feedback includes acknowledgements, gestures and so on, but also encompasses clarification: CRs perform negative feedback actions at one or more levels, indicating lack of ability to perceive (or understand etc.) the message. The existence of these different levels of grounding can then give some insight into what the various meanings of CRs might be: some might give feedback about the perception level (e.g. "What did you say?/ Pardon?"); some at the understanding level (e.g. "What? / What do you mean?"); and some at the level of acceptance/rejection (e.g. "Really? / Bo?"). These insights therefore take us a step further in that they can give some idea of the various possible functions or meanings of CRs, and correspondingly some idea of what causes of CRs might be, but still do not afford any way of extracting specific meanings from individual utterances.

For this we must look to linguistic and grammatical theory.

Some linguists consider clarification request is *feedback* (or to use Allwood's term, *interactive communication management*). This definition of feedback includes

acknowledgements, gestures and so on. but also encompasses clarification. Clarification requests perform negative feedback actions at one or more levels, indicating lack of ability to perceive (or understand etc.) the message. The existence of these different levels of grounding can then give some insight into what the various meanings of clarification requests might be:

some might give a feedback about the perception level and can be correlated with acoustic problems in the terminology of M. Selting (e.g. "What did you say? /Pardon?"):

(10) (A): *Jeez, relax, Mom.*

(B): *What did you say?*

(A): *I said, Jeez, relax, Mon* (Friends, s.5, ep.5).

some at the understanding level (e.g. "What? / What do you mean?"):

(11) (A): *Can you sing Soft Kitty?*

(B): *What?*

(A): *My mom used to sing it to me when I was sick* (Big Bang Theory s.1, ep.11).

and some at the level of acceptance/of rejection (e.g. "Really?/Bo?") (79, p. 24):

(12) (A): *She poisons herself with arsenic.*

(B): *Really?*

(A): *You didn't read until the end?*

(B): *I stopped after page 50* (Desperate Housewives s.1, ep.7).

Noh claims that echo questions, as a variety of echoic use are used to express the echoer's questioning attitude to a prior utterance or more generally, an existing contextual assumption. The grounds on which the attitude is expressed can include non-truth-conditional aspects of the echoed utterance as well as its truth-conditional meaning. This is very similar to metalinguistic negation, which is discussed in the next section (74, p. 122–126).

So, the ratio of formal, semantic and functional features of echo-questions, which serve as the basis for their identification by researchers, allow us to define an echo

question as a reactive-initiative interrogative expression of a logical or emotional nature, which can completely or partially repeat the previous utterance paraphrased.

1.3 Echo-questions as a special type of questions

According to the form, interrogative sentences are divided into general (13), in which the auxiliary verb is placed before the subject, and special (14) with the question word in the initial position (25, p. 803).

(13) "Are you okay?" (Desperate Housewives s1, ep.1)

(14) "Why are we doing this?" (Desperate Housewives s1, ep.1)

According to the type of the expected answer R. Quirk and co-authors distinguish three main classes of questions (94, p. 90):

1) general questions that require an affirmative or negative answer, for example:

(15) "Am I ever gonna walk again?" (B) "Yes. Of course" (Good Doctor, s.1, ep.2).

2) special questions, which involve choosing an answer from an open set:

(16) "How long will this be?"

"Seven minutes" (Good Doctor, s.1, ep.2).

3) alternative, the answer to which is chosen from one, two or more alternatives available in the question (25, p. 806):

(17) So what do you think about color? Red or blue? (Desperate Housewives, s.8, ep.20).

According to the form general questions (inversion of the auxiliary verb and subject) are divided into inverted and non-inverted (which are also called narrative or confirmatory (25, p. 807). According to the degree of influence on the expected answer, general questions can be neutral (18) (they include non-assertive forms such as any, ever), or biased (conducive) in favor of an affirmative (19) or negative (20) (25, p. 807–808):

(18) "Any ideas Raj?" (He just looks at her with a worried expression.) (The Big Bang Theory s.1, ep.1).

(19) "Have you got some sort of job?" (The Big Bang Theory s.1, ep.1).

(20) " Excuse me. When Frodo left the Shire to take the one ring to Mordor, didn't Samwise, Pippin and Merry go with him?" (The Big Bang Theory s.2, ep.14).

Tag questions as a subtype of general questions are characterized by the greatest degree of influence on the expected answer (affirmative (21) and negative (22)) (25, p. 810). From the point of view of the grammatical structure, the main constituent (narrative, exclamatory, exclamatory or interrogative sentence) and the interrogative constituent. The interrogative constituent (which is considered as a shortened sentence (10, p. 6)) consists of an auxiliary verb (to which the enclitic n't can be joined) and a subject (25, p. 810):

(21) Mom just sent you here to spy on me, didn't she? (The Big Bang Theory s.1, ep.15)

(22) You didn't read the bio, did you? (The Big Bang Theory s.1, ep.10)

Let's consider how general, special and alternative questions correlate with echo questions:

(23) A: Of course not, I got a buddy of mine at NORAD to have a spy drone fly over.

(B): NORAD? You're using military aircraft? (The Big Bang Theory s.2, ep.7)

In this communicative situation, the cue-stimulus is represented by a narrative sentence, and the interrogative question according to the received answer (Yes) is a general question. However, speaker (B) perceives the interrogative question not only as a request to confirm his previous statement (the use of military aircraft), but also speaker (B) is surprised and wants explanation, because it is impossible to have a access to military aircraft. Here is one more question with the affirmative word order that shows speaker's surprise and disbelief. The question is used to check the correctness of the conclusion from what the said.

Special questions are characterized by the presence of a question word (who/whom/whose, what, which, when, where, how, why) at the beginning of the sentence (24). Sometimes the order of words in a special question can be the same as in a narrative sentence (25); such sentences are used during interrogations and interviews (25, p. 817).

(24) (A) Who's ready to play some vintage video games? (The Big Bang Theory s.4, ep.17)

(25) (A) Please, please, I don't have a lot of time. Look, Ramona finally dozed off, and I need you to help me get rid of her.

(B) Get rid of her how?

(A) I don't know, but apparently I'm in some kind of relationship, and you seem to be an expert at ending them. (The Big Bang Theory s.2, ep.6)

The completeness of the reproduction of the stimulus in a special interrogative question undergoes variations: the interrogative word what can replace a full-meaning word from the previous cue, which caused the speaker to be surprised, and indicate the need to repeat or to explain what was said again (26):

(26) Hey, look, it's Doctor Stud! Doctor what? (The Big Bang Theory s.1, ep.9)

In situation (27), the echo-question In the what? indicates misunderstanding of the information expressed by the speaker (A):

(27) (A) Yes, it tells us that you participate in the mass cultural delusion that the Sun's apparent position relative to arbitrarily defined constellations and the time of your birth somehow effects your personality.

(B) Participate in the what? (The Big Bang Theory s.1, ep.1)

In situation (28) structurally partially repeats the previous statement See what, and the interrogative word what indicates which element needs clarification (the pronoun that, the antecedent of which was not named).

(28) (A) Whoa! Did you see that?

(B) See what?

(A) That chick, she smiled at me (The Big Bang Theory s.3, ep.6).

A request to repeat can generally be expressed by a special question-interrogation *What did you say?* which is sometimes shortened to *What?* (acceptable only in informal communication) (25, p. 836). For example, in situation (29) – dialogue between two friends– *What?* expresses surprise at the unexpected utterance and is accompanied by a confirmation of what was said.

(29) (A) Go apologize to Penny.

(B) What?

(A) Right now would be good (The Big Bang Theory s.3, ep.7).

The illustrative material shows that the specifics of the implementation of the answer to the question-interrogation depends on a number of contextual factors.

1.4 Criteria for distinguishing echo-questions and their types

Realization of the most important formal features characterizing interrogative sentences (interrogative intonation, inverted word order, presence of interrogative pronouns (8, p. 177)) largely depends on the functions that interrogative questions perform in discourse. Accordingly, the authors of the collective monograph R. Quirk, S. Greenbaum, G. Leech and others distinguish *recapitulatory* and *explanatory* echo-questions.

Recapitulatory echo-question "repeats part or all of a message, as a way of having its content confirmed" (25, c. 835). Structurally, a recapitulatory echo-question can be general or special. A *general echo-question* repeats the previous utterance with rising intonation (high rising tone (43, p. 92)), for example:

(30) (A): (crosses fingers) *We'll see. This is why the whole downsizing thing just doesn't bother me.*

(B): ***Downsizing?*** (The Office s.1, ep. 1)

(31) (A) Some hiney would be nice, too.

(B) Hiney?

(A) Honey. (The Big Bang Theory s.2, ep.10)

A question word in special echo-question indicates which part of the previous utterance the speaker did not hear or did not understand (25, c. 835):

(32) (A): *It won't be out of my hands Stanley, OK. I promise you that.* (B): **Can you promise that?** (C): *On his mother's grave.* (A): *No.* (D): **What?** (The office s.1, ep.1)

Ascending intonation is a characteristic of special echo-questions, and the nucleus of the terminal tone is actualized on the question word, for example, (32) (25, p. 835).

Explicatory echo-questions are used more to explain rather than to repeat what has been said. These are special questions, which pronounced with a falling tone on the question word (25, p. 837). Another distinguishing feature of explicatory questions is that the element to which the question word relates was not named in the stimulus replica (22, p. 391).

For instance:

(33) (A): *Did you get your tickets?*

(B): *To **what**?*

(A): *The gun show.* (Rolls up his sleeve and kisses his bicep) (The Office s.1, ep.4)

(34) (A): *They said this afternoon. They're waiting on a second opinion.*

(B): *Oh, okay.*

(C): *Second opinion on **what**?*

(A): *Um, I might have skin cancer* (The Office s.1 ep.5).

In situations (33) and (34) echo-question is used to eliminate the ambiguity of interpretations of the cue-stimulus and to clarify what exactly is meant.

(35) (A): *You solved it?*

(B): *Solved **what**?* (The Office s.1, ep.5)

In situation (35) the stimulus contains personal pronoun *it*, the reference of which is unclear from the immediate verbal context and requires clarification for the successful continuation of the conversation.

Echo questions have the following typical characteristics: they relate to a previous utterance, and are similar to it in form and meaning (hence the term “echo”); they inform the interlocutor that the speaker has misperceived part of the previous utterance or refuses to accept it; and they have a particular intonation, consisting of a rising pitch accent. The echo questions that are the most prominent in the linguistic literature are those that have a *wh*-phrase but do not display the familiar syntax of questions (30, p. 101).

1.5 Structural and semantic characteristics of echo-questions

The degree of reproduction of the replica-stimulus in the question-over-examination can vary (from complete to repetition of one word or part of a sentence). According to L.P. Chakhoyan, the complete semantic structure of a question-interrogation consists of the "locative predicate *say*" in the form of the past tense and "the repeated nomination of that fragment of the semantic structure of the previous statement, which caused the mental reaction of the interlocutor (surprise, disbelief)" (21, p. 83). An explicit request to repeat can be expressed using the words "Did you say...?" at the beginning of the general question-interrogation or by adding at the end of the question-interrogation the invariant part of the dividing question "(did) you say?" (25, p. 835):

(36) (A) Where did he pop the question?

(B) What did you say? (The Big Bang Theory s.5, ep.24)

In the situation below, the interrogative question structurally corresponds to the subjunctive part from the previous complex sentence (stimulus), while the word order

is preserved, and the personal pronoun you changes to I in accordance to speaker change.

(37) (A) Would you like me to sponsor you?

(B) Would I? Oh, my god. (Desperate Housewives s.1, ep.7)

Here are some examples:

(38) (A) You seem like a really sweet guy in an interesting line of work, but I am not really available.

(B) Oh. You have a boyfriend? (Desperate Housewives s.1, ep.5)

In the exchange of lines (38), speaker B uses echo-question taking into account his observations, that is unclear. At the same time, not really available is interpreted as she has a boyfriend.

(39) (Raj) (entering): Hello. Sorry I'm late. But I was in the hallway, chatting up Penny.

(Howard): Really? You? Rajesh Koothrapali, spoke to Penny? (The Big Bang Theory s.1, ep.2)

From the point of view of the lexical content of survey questions, it is worth noting the possibility of using synonyms. Chat up is replaced with spoke to. There is also one connotation of chatting up that is more casual, but taking into account that Raj has never talked to female more formal word speak is used.

(40) (A): Would you like to help me with a special project?

(B): I would love to. (The Office s.1, ep. 6)

In the situation (40) like is changed into love to emphasize on the situation and show attitude with great desire.

Among the examples of substitution ("the use of words with a generalized structural meaning that were previously mentioned in speech" (8, p. 229)) it is worth noting the use of the personal pronoun her instead of a name or noun (41), the personal pronoun they:

(41) (A): "The boys refuse to be separated."

(B) "They refuse?" (Desperate Housewives s.1, ep. 4)

In this case, "clarification occurs due to the addition of new features", due to a different nomination (17, p. 113). So, example (42) shows specification of proper name.

(42) (A): Is it the waitress?

(B) Penny? What about her? (The Big Bang Theory s.1, ep.5)

Given the structural heterogeneity of interrogative questions of non-sentence structure, it is advisable to pay attention to their syntactic features. According to the ability to connect with other syntactic units, D. Baiber and co-authors divide non-clausal elements into (a) syntactic non-clausal units and (b) inserts - a group of words that are used independently, can join another structure with the help of intonation, but, as a rule, are not related to it syntactically (for example, exclamations, discursive markers, feedback signals) (71, p. 1082–1089).

Examples of syntactic non-sentential units are echo-questions in situations (43) and (44), since their structure and lexical content can be reconstructed with the help of a stimulus cue, and situations (45), (46) and (47) illustrate echo-questions expressed by exclamations (inserts).

(43) (A): Sheldon, you are a smart guy, you must know...

(B): Smart? I'd have to lose 60 IQ points to be classified as smart. (The Big Bang Theory s.2, ep.2)

(44) (A): Sorry, it's not part of my heartwarming and personal narrative, in which a humble boy from New Delhi overcame poverty and prejudice and journeyed to America to reach for the stars.

(B): Poverty? Your father's a gynaecologist, he drives a Bentley.

(A): It's a lease! (The Big Bang Theory s.2, ep.4)

(45) (A): Okay, y'know how you told me I should do whatever it takes to fix my marriage?

(B): Yeah, I told you to give Emily whatever she wants.

(A): And while that was good advice, you should know that what-what she wants...

(B): Yeah?

(A): ...is for me not to see you anymore. (Friends s.5, ep.5)

The echo-question Yeah? fills the silence and makes (A) go on talking.

(46) (A): You don't have any secrets!

(B): Oh yeah? Well, you don't know about Hugsy, my bedtime penguin pal. (Joey shies away.) (The Friends s.9, ep.17)

Echo-question Oh yeah? is close in form to part of the stimulus cue Are you sure? And is used to cause doubt in what the interlocutor (A) said, prompting him to reassure.

(47) (A): What is the best number? By the way, there's only one correct answer.

(B): Five million, three hundred eighteen thousand and eight?

(A): Wrong. The best number is 73. You're probably wondering why.

(C): No.

(A): 73 is the 21st prime number. Its mirror, 37, is the 12th, and its mirror, 21, is the product of multiplying, hang on to your hats, seven and three. Eh? Eh? Did I lie? (The Big Bang Theory s.4, ep.10)

In terms of its structure, the question Eh? in situation (47) is different from a replica-stimulus, but its functions in this communicative situation (namely, an indication of supporting on the part of the interlocutor (A)).

Conclusions to Chapter 1

1. The echo-question is a reactive-initiative interrogative statement of a rational-logical or emotional nature, which can completely or partially repeat the previous reply in a verbal or paraphrased form and is related to it semantically and/or structurally.

2. Structural and functional types of echo-questions belong to the language system, and specific situational actualizations of potentially possible models belong to speech. Predication as a general correlation of the statement with reality is realized in questions-surveys through the categories of time, person and modality. Modal categories (updating, qualifying and social) in survey questions are an expression of the speaker's subjectivity or a question of correct understanding of the interlocutor's subjectivity.

3. According to the criterion of the requested answer, interrogative questions demonstrate the signs of rhetorical questions, serving as a means of arguing the speaker's point of view. In the dialogic discourse, questions-interrogations perform the functions of a request for confirmation, a request for agreement, a request for repetition and a request for an explanation, signaling / overcoming a communicative failure.

CHAPTER TWO. METHODS AND STAGES OF STUDYING FUNCTIONING OF ECHO-QUESTIONS IN THE ENGLISH DIALOGICAL DISCOURSE

2.1 Dialogical discourse as a field of implementation of echo questions

An approach to communication allows us to consider a dialogue not only as "a conversation in which there is a direct exchange of statements", and as a "social creation" used to coordinate the joint activities of speakers. As G. Clark notes, the structure of the dialogue is not predetermined, but is gradually agreed upon by the speakers in terms of content, participants, roles, time, place and obligations, according to the stages of joint activity (40, p. 2747).

Discourse is understood as "a type of communicative activity, an interactive phenomenon, a speech stream that has various forms of expression (oral, written, para-lingual), takes place within a specific communication channel, is regulated by the strategies and tactics of the participants; a synthesis of cognitive, linguistic and non-linguistic (social, mental, psychological, etc.) factors that are determined by a specific circle of "forms of life" depending on the topic of communication, results in the formation of various genres" (1, p. 138).

Dialogic discourse is dynamic and the communicative contributions of interlocutors "acquire significance in its global structure" (34, p. 63). B. Bara considers cooperation (discursive and behavioral (34, p. 66)), emotional and cognitive mental states (attention, beliefs, knowledge, consciousness (34, p. 67)), intentionality to be relevant aspects of discourse research from the point of view of cognitive pragmatics, communicative and substantive organization of dialogue, cultural norms (34, p. 51–53). B. Grose and K. Sidner distinguish three components of discourse:

language structure (utterance);

intentional structure (intentions and connections between them);

the state of attention ("abstraction of the focus of attention" of communicators, which ensures the processing of statements based on a concise representation of previously provided information and "contains information about objects, properties, relations and discursive intentions that are most salient at any given moment") (63, p. 177). In cognitive studies of discourse, the focus of the interlocutor's attention is considered in connection with the peculiarities of the use of referential expressions (82, p. 7–8).

The success of communication requires a certain level of cooperation from communicators, which is expressed a) at the level of conducting a conversation (due to compliance with P. Grice's Principle of Cooperation) for the coordination of joint actions and the most effective exchange of information (151, p. 28) and/or b) in the presence of a common non-speech goal, the achievement of which the speakers strive (105, p. 206–207). The presence/absence of a conflict of interests of speakers can be correlated with the degree of observance of the Principle of Cooperation (and the maxims of quantity, quality, relevance and manner (62, p. 26)) at the verbal level (72).

When considering mental states, beliefs play an important role: individual, common (common / mutual) and shared (shared) (34, p. 71). Investigating the success of communication from the perspective of psycholinguistics, G. Clark introduces the concept of common ground (common ground, which includes "common knowledge, beliefs and assumptions of speakers", which they "deduce on the basis of previous communication, common perceptual experience, as well as belonging to cultural communities" (40, p. 2746). The distinction between shared and shared beliefs is possible by taking into account the speaker's reflexivity. Shared beliefs objectively belong to a certain group of people; in the case of shared beliefs, each communicator knows that they belong to all others (34, p. 72). The mutual agreement of knowledge and beliefs of communicants ensures mutual understanding based on the recognition of each other's communicative intentions and is ensured by the action of mostly

subconscious processes of understanding, while their inconsistencies can be the cause of misunderstanding and communication failures (59, p. 142).

In B. Bar's opinion, the integrity and complexity of dialogic discourse is not an obstacle to distinguishing units of analysis and presentation of the process of generation and perception of speech (speech act). The researcher singles out five successive stages that reflect the mental processes of processing the utterance of speaker A by speaker B:

1) the expression act, during which B reconstructs the mental state of A, starting with the locutionary act;

2) the speaker meaning, when B reconstructs the communicative intentions of A, including cases of indirect speech acts;

3) communicative effect, which consists of two processes:

(a) attribution, whereby B attributes to A individual mental states, such as beliefs and intentions and (b) adjustment, which refers to a possible change in mental states of B under the influence of speaker A's utterance;

4) reaction (B produces intentions that will be communicated in his response);

5) an explicit response given by the speaker B.

Schlangen offers a detailed model of speech perception (on the basis of requests to explain in the dialogue system a person - a person), distinguishing four levels:

1. establishment of contact;

2. speech recognition;

3. a) parsing: recognition of all words, determination of syntactic structure, determination of a unique syntactic structure (determining a unique syntactic structure);

b) resolving underspecification, which includes reference, time, scope, presuppositions, lexical ambiguity, etc.;

c) contextual relevance, determination of rhetorical connection (expression with previous context);

4. recognition of the speaker's intentions; evaluating resulting discourse structure (89).

In our study, echo-questioning is considered as a) a signal and/or a means of overcoming a communicative failure that occurs at the appropriate level of processing the interlocutor's statement (A); b) as a strategic means of achieving the speaker's goals (B) and expressing his communicative intent.

When considering the cognitive aspect of the functioning of echo questions, we rely on the communication models of B. Bar and D. Schlangen, as well as research in the field of psychology, in particular the theory of common ground by H. Clark, the theory of cognitive dissonance by L. Festinger, the socio-cognitive theory of processing and production of T. van Dijk's discourse.

2.2 Cognitive-communicative approach to the study of questions

In the dialogical discourse, communicators carry out "mental construction of the context" (35, p. 472). Within the socio-cognitive theory of discourse by T. van Dijk (47, p. 15–24) the contexts of each communicator are considered subjective, unique and different from each other; contain universal categories that enable communication (time, place, communicators, goals, knowledge); are based on "shared social cognitions": knowledge, norms, values, etc.; ensure the correspondence of the speaker's statement to the communication situation (in terms of "intonation, vocabulary selection, syntax, indexical expressions, topics, speech acts, change of communicative roles, etc." (47, p. 21)). The context as "a mental interface subjectively represents relevant aspects of the communicative situation, and, at the same time, is a cognitive structure capable of controlling the production and understanding of discourse" (47, p. 22).

Thus, context influences speech interaction and message framing. Accordingly, the study of the cognitive-discursive characteristics of echo-questions involves consideration of their use to clarify the components of the context, communicative failures that may occur in this case, the role of psycho-emotional factors

According to J. Austin, expression as a speech act includes locutionary, illocutionary and perlocutionary acts (31, p. 94–103), and perlocution is defined as the next action of the interlocutor (93, p. 49), "the intended result of an illocutionary act" (70, p. 203).

The study of the illocutionary component is carried out with the help of speech act analysis (the types of speech acts implemented by echo questions and their success conditions are determined). Since the assignment of a speech act to a certain type sometimes depends on the following replicas (97, p. 311), and "an adequate description of perlocution requires a discourse approach" (12, p. 82), "question-interrogation - reaction" are considered from the standpoint of conversational analysis, which examines the "sequential organization of speech acts" in discourse (57, p. 186) and, in particular, adjacent pairs are established combinations of speech acts (97, p. 294–295). "Addressability of communicative meanings" (20, p. 19) updates the consideration of the communicative sequence "stimulus - question – echo question - reaction" in accordance with the features of the implementation of the addressee/listener category.

The study of functioning of echo-questions in dialogic discourse is carried out on the material of English-language literature and films/series in accordance with the practice of domestic and foreign researchers (5, p. 44; 24, p. 28; 16, p. 37; 9, p. 53; 26, p. 1744; 37, p. 154–155; 53, p. 29; 88, p. 453).

Film discourse is "ideal for linguistic analysis", and the communication of speakers is similar to real life, and "the nature of communicative interaction and the roles of communicators performed by characters (as well as their intentions) are usually more understandable than in the case of natural discourse (53, p. 29). Similarly, "realistic representation of dialogic discourse in literary prose" allows reliable results to be obtained in the study of communication (88, p. 453). In our study, an important factor when referring to films and series the description of the context of communication and the non-verbal aspect, which allows you to analyze the peculiarities

of the manifestation of mental processes and emotions accompanying the implementation of survey questions.

2.3 Methodology for researching functioning of echo questions in dialogical discourse

The criteria for selecting echo questions cover both formal and substantive aspects. The syntactic structure of the question completely or partially repeats the cue-stimulus, differences in the direction of complication or compression are related to the action of syntactic processes, paraphrasing and the use of synonyms are also possible. Interrogative questions are contextually related to the previous remark as a request for repetition/explanation/clarification of (elements) of the sentence expressed by it.

From the point of view of the content, there is a repetition of the entire sentence of the cue-stimulus (and its truth is asked), its elements (which are referentially or semantically ambiguous or were not perceived due to inattention or acoustic problems in the communication situation), summarizing the cue- stimulus for checking one's own understanding (the scope of the latter can be 2 or more sentences), as well as adding information of a modal nature. Clarifying the content of the cue-stimulus is carried out by asking for additional details (formally implemented through the syntactic process of unfolding, sometimes together with omission).

In addition to the presence of common syntactic elements (clause, sentence member or its part) and their modifications under the influence of syntactic processes, the connection of the question-interrogation with the replica-stimulus can be actualized through coreference, modus categories, synonymous paraphrasing or contextually conditioned assumptions / inferences.

In cases where the stimulus cue is incomplete, echo questions are used to continue the interlocutor's opinion, provide their version of the explanation, express a

hypothesis, or encourage speaker A to continue speaking (as a rule, this function uses Yes? Well? But? Hm? And? What? What is it?). Consider the example (48):

(48) (A) Okay, um, well, look, it's just that things between you and me have been going pretty quick.

(B) And?

(A) It's just a little scary.

(B) Well, yeah, but scary good, right? (The Big Bang Theory s.2, ep.10)

The comprehensive study of echo-questions involves the following stages:

1) review of the series, analysis of approaches to the definition and criteria for identifying echo-questions, definition of an echo question as a reactive-initiative interrogative statement of a rational-logical or emotional nature, which can fully or partially repeat the previous utterance in a paraphrased form, etc. related to it semantically and/or structurally;

2) collection of factual material by the method of continuous sampling of echo statements from scripts of films and TV series;

3) systematization of echo questions according to the type of expected answer (general (inverted/non-inverted/sectional), special, alternative);

4) cognitive and contextual analysis of question-questions based on the socio-cognitive theory of T. van Dijk, which involves consideration of question as a means of updating the mental model (of the context or the past event in question);

5) the study of echo questions in the aspect of the coherence of the dialogic discourse (its mental model), covering the overcoming of communicative failures of various nature;

5) speech act (pragma-semantic) analysis, which involves establishing the types of speech acts implemented by echo-questions and their distinctive characteristics/success conditions; conversational analysis for the study of adjacent pairs and the sequence of speech actions (question-interrogation-reaction), as well as

functional variants of the addressing of the replica-stimulus and the question-interrogation in dialogic discourse;

6) discourse analysis in order to determine the types of strategies and tactics according to the functions of interrogative questions in dialogic discourse.

Conclusions to Chapter 2

1. Cognitive-discursive research of survey questions involves the analysis of the actual statement and context. T. van Dijk's socio-cognitive theory of discourse research states that the context is understood as a mental structure that affects the processes of perception and production of discourse in terms of communicative appropriateness, characterized by subjectivity and individuality.

2. The cognitive aspect of the research is related to the role of echo questions in the process of constructing the context (methods of cognitive and contextual analysis are applied), and the pragmatic aspect involves clarifying the influence of the context on the pragmatic features of echo questions (their success at the level of illocution/perlocution, as well as the implementation strategies and tactics) with the involvement of act speech, conversational and discourse analysis methods.

CHAPTER THREE. COGNITIVE-COMMUNICATIVE, PSYCHOLOGICAL AND EMOTIONAL FACTORS OF GENERATION ECHO-QUESTIONS IN THE ENGLISH DIALOGICAL DISCOURSE

3.1 Mental models

The study of echo questions as a cognitive-discursive phenomenon involves clarifying their role in the processes of cognition and information processing in communication. According to T. van Dijk, a key role in understanding and generating speech is played by mental models - "subjective representations of events or situations in which a person participates at a certain moment in time in a certain place with other participants (with changes in identity and social roles), performing a certain action and having certain goals" (48, p. 588).

The object of a mental model can be both the speaker's personal experience and discourse (for example, a story or news). In addition, an important role in the creation of a mental model is played by more general knowledge and beliefs belonging to members of a certain linguistic and cultural community, which enable mutual understanding. So, the mental model combines explicitly expressed verbal information and inferences (98, p. 163). In the process of speech perception, speaker B reconstructs the mental model of the discourse (or intentions) of speaker A. In turn, "planning a discourse or action involves creating a mental model for a given communicative verbal action" (48, p. 588–589).

Characterizing the types of mental models, T. van Dijk distinguishes between the situation model, which represents the situation or events discussed in the discourse, and the dynamic pragmatic model of the context of the communicative situation in which the speakers take part (48, p. 588–589).

Context models play an important role in explaining the connection between mental models of events and the discourse (47, p. 59), which are characterized as

"subjective constructs" of speakers that "represent relevant characteristics of the communicative environment (as well as verbal interaction (47, p. 25)) in episodic (autobiographical) memory and constantly control the processes of production and understanding of speech (discourse production and comprehension)" (47, p. 16).

Context model is characterized by "a special selection or reconstruction of the situation model" (47, p. 24). Context models ensure the pragmatic appropriateness of speech (discourse) due to its correspondence to the communicative situation and, as a rule, include information about speakers according to communicative roles (speaker, recipient, author, etc.), social roles or identities (teacher, correspondent), social categories (gender), class, age, etc.), relationships (friendly, hostile), goals, intentions, knowledge of communicators at each stage of communication (48, p. 589).

Context models can also characterize the communication situation in terms of time, place, and circumstances; events; speech acts, genres; cognition in rational and emotional aspects (46, p. 131). T. van Dijk notes that the influence of context models on the course of communication is, as a rule, hidden and manifests itself only in the case of communication failures (47, p. 19).

Analysing the illustrative material, echo questions in dialogic discourse (except in cases of infelicitous communication or communication failures) can also be used to update/build context models that affect the course of the actual communicative event and models of situations of past events that are discussed in the conversation through a request repetition (explanation/clarification) of relevant elements of a previous statement or discourse. In addition, interrogative questions function as verbalizers of implicit information, appearing in the form of inferences and assumptions expressed by speaker B (producer of the echo question) when creating a mental model (situation/context).

The typology of inferences and their role in the processes of understanding are developed in studies of psycholinguistics, psychology, and neurocognitive science (60, 61; 75) mainly on the material of the verbal printed text. At the same time, data from

brain scans show that higher-level cognitive processes (for example, inferences) are amodal (36, p. 111–112; 58, p. 165), and therefore it is possible to extrapolate the results of studies of inferences when reading to dialogic discourse.

Graesser and co-authors distinguish thirteen classes of inferences that are potentially possible when reading a text or watching series and require the involvement of relevant background knowledge: special (representations in the memory of a certain experience, other texts, previous fragments) and general (schemas, scripts, frames, stereotypes, narrative structures, etc.) (60, p. 374).

- 1) Referential (a word or phrase refers to a previously mentioned element);
- 2) Assignment of case role (agent, recipient, object, locative, tense) to the noun phrase;
- 3) Casual antecedent;
- 4) Superordinate goal;
- 5) Thematic;
- 6) Emotional reaction;
- 7) Casual consequence;
- 8) Instantiation of a noun category;
- 9) Instrument;
- 10) Subordinate goal or action;
- 11) State;
- 12) Reader's emotion;
- 13) Author's intention.

The considered classes of inferences are actualized both when creating situation models and context models. When building a context model, interrogative questions are used to clarify the components of the communicative situation, such as the person of the interlocutor, his status and role, subject of conversation/topic of communication, knowledge, beliefs, expectations, intentions, desires, plans, attitudes, emotions.

3.2 Echo-questions from the point of view of coherence of dialogical discourse

Considering the echo questioning as an indicator of the degree of understanding of the interlocutor's previous statement, we proceed from the statement that understanding the discourse involves the creation of a coherent mental model (48, p. 589). It is about understanding both the reference situation ("that segment of objective reality with which the referential content of the statement can be correlated" (6, p. 39)) of the past event or communicative interaction, as well as the verbal message and subsequent response under the influence of the created context model.

In psycholinguistics, the processes of understanding a message are studied at the level of vocabulary, syntax, and discourse/message (56, p. 241). The organization of the speech stream is carried out by referring to the mental lexicon, which contains information about the spelling of the word, its normative pronunciation, part-language affiliation, and meaning (56, p. 241–242). The identification of individual words/word forms is accompanied by their syntactic analysis: combining them into word combinations and sentences and determining thematic roles (56, p. 243–245).

The analysis of the peculiarities of the use of echo questions shows that difficulties in segmenting the speech stream may be associated with speaker A (i.e. unclear pronunciation of the stimulus cue), speaker B (who does not perceive/understand the interlocutor's statement due to hearing impairment or his psycho-emotional state) and characteristics of the communication environment (for example, noise). Factors causing lexical difficulties include not knowing the word (due to the level of lexical competence or the lexical unit belonging to a certain register) and the ambiguity of the interlocutor's statement, associated with polysemy. In the situation (49) speaker (B) doesn't know the word 'semiotics' and due to the lack of lexical competence:

(49) (A) I need your opinion on a matter of semiotics.

(B) I'm sorry?

(A) Semiotics. The study of signs and symbols, it's a branch of philosophy related to linguistics (The Big Bang Theory s.1, ep.5).

Example (49) shows speaker's (B) lack of slang vocabulary:

(50) (A) Oh, snap.

(B) Snap what? (The Big Bang Theory s.2, ep.8)

At the discourse level research focuses on determining the relationships between statements, in particular, coreference relations (the functioning of anaphoric expressions) and semantic relationships between sentences (temporal, causal, etc.) (56, p. 246). At the same time, the process of understanding speech is based simultaneously on the analysis of the interlocutor's statement and its semantics (bottomup processing) and own knowledge/expectations (topdown processing), which together allow the communicator to assume what was meant at the pragmatic level (50, p. 12).

From the point of view of speech production, utterance can be considered at the level of a locutionary act, which includes a phonetic act (uttering certain sounds), a phatic act (uttering words as part of a certain lexical system according to the rules of the appropriate grammar) and a rhetorical act ("performing the act of using these words with certain meaning and reference", which constitutes "meaning" (31, p. 93-95)), illocutionary act ("utterance with a certain (conventional) force" (31, p. 108)) and perlocutionary act/perlocution (following action interlocutor (93, p. 49)) (109, p. 94–107). The illocutionary act, according to J. Searle, includes propositional content (reference and predication) and illocutionary force (90, p. 5–6).

If we consider the speech act (replica-stimulus) from the point of view of its perception, the cross-examination question can indicate difficulties in understanding the replica-stimulus at different levels.

Determining noun/pronoun reference can be a problem in cases where anaphoric personal pronoun is used in the absence/ambiguity of an antecedent or refers to an exophoric referent:

(51) (A): Wait, wait, Sheldon, come back, you forgot something.

(B): What?

(A): This plasma grenade. (Explosion.) Ha! Look, it's raining you! (The Big Bang Theory s.1, ep.7)

Predication is "the process and result of linguistic attribution of properties to people, animals, objects, events, actions and social phenomena", their characterization "in relation to quality, quantity, space, time, etc." (84, p. 54) can also be the object of echo questions. Misunderstanding or surprise is caused by the characteristics of events, the emotional state of the interlocutor, a past action (performed by or against the interlocutor/other person), status-role relations. Let's consider an example.

(52) (A): Oh, are you here to see Leonard?

(B): No, Dr. Cooper.

(A): Dr. Sheldon Cooper?

(B): We're having dinner.

(A): Sheldon Cooper? Tall, thin, looks a little like a giant praying mantis?

(B): He is cute, isn't he?

(A): Sheldon Cooper? (The Big Bang Theory s.2, ep.6)

In the situation (52) speaker (A) uses echo-questions in order to make sure that they are talking about the same person. After naming him, speaker (A) adds some more details describing his appearance Sheldon Cooper? Tall, thin, looks a little like a giant praying mantis? to make sure she hasn't misunderstood or that speaker (B) is aware of who she is looking for.

The illocutionary force of the interlocutor's statement is determined on the basis of its meaning and common contextual beliefs of the communicators (32, p. 6), which

can be considered as a component of the context model. For instance, situation (52) shows shock and misunderstanding that's why speaker (A) uses echo-questions.

For example,

(53) (A) I still look at Lizzie like she's a 12-year-old girl.

(B) I do that, too.

(A) I beg your pardon?

(B) No! I don't see her as a 12-year-old girl. I mean, I have a son who's, um, 6, and I still think of him as a baby. (Friends s.6, ep.21)

In this case, the reason for misunderstanding is illocutionary force of statement, which correlates with the degree of confidence in what is said. The inability to recognize the communicative intention of the interlocutor and to determine the relationship between locution/illocution can acquire the following expression options: What do you mean (by this/that)? What are you saying? What are you suggesting? What are you talking about? I beg your pardon?

Difficulties in understanding may be related to the conditions for the success of a speech act (31, p. 12–47), in particular, the sincerity of the interlocutor when expressing a certain statement or promise (90, p. 12): No kidding?, Are you kidding?, Is it a joke?, Are you being funny?, Seriously? and his right to perform a speech act (ask, assert, order) (31, p. 132–146; 134, p. 200–201).

(54) (A) Leonard: Um, if you don't have any other plans, do you want to join us for Thai food and a Superman movie marathon?

Penny: A marathon? Wow, how many Superman movies are there?

Sheldon: You're kidding, right? (The Big Bang Theory s.1, ep.2)

For a (possible) violation of the condition of sincerity, interrogative questions express doubt, mistrust, hesitation, while the evaluation of the interlocutor's statement in terms of the ratio of "status, position and power" (51, p. 200) and contextual ideas about his rights can cause an emotional reaction of indignation (How dare you?),

rejection (Who says you make conditions?, Is there any reason why I should?, Can't? Who on earth do you think you're talking to?) or misunderstanding.

(55) (A) If I had created a website with these many problems, I'd kill myself.

(B) Do you have a question?

(A) Yes, I have a lot of questions. Number one: how dare you? (The Office s.4, ep.11)

Speaker (A) is not satisfied with new website at her workplace. The IT specialist promises, but doesn't make it easier to use, that's why the workers have a misunderstanding.

In addition to the explicit message, misunderstanding can be caused by information that remains implicit ("content that is not directly embodied in the usual lexical and grammatical meanings of linguistic units that make up an utterance, but can be obtained from the latter during its perception" (6, p. 37)), including presuppositions and implications (49, p. 53).

Since the success of communication is connected with compliance with P. Grice's Principle of Cooperation (62, p. 30), violation of maxims of quantity, quality, relation/relevance and method (62, p. 26) can also cause misunderstanding. Violation of the maxim of quantity is manifested in the insufficient informativeness of the replica-stimulus, which can be combined with formal redundancy (repetitions, tautologies).

(56) (A): Alright, alright. Well, uh, nevertheless, I have one now and I would appreciate it if you would, you know, make yourself scarce.

(B): Leonard, I am a published theoretical physicist with two doctorates and an IQ which can't be accurately measured by normal tests, how much scarcer could I be?

(A): You know what I mean, could you just give us a little privacy?

(B): You want me to leave the apartment?

(A): Yes.

(B): You mean just go someplace else and be... someplace else?

(A): Yes. (The Big Bang Theory s.2, ep.2)

So, echo questions in dialogical discourse, on the one hand, indicate a violation of coherence, and on the other hand, it is used to increase it by encouraging the interlocutor to eliminate the cause of misunderstanding.

3.3 Cognition and emotions

Psychological and neurocognitive studies of the brain testify to the close interaction of cognition and emotions, as well as their combination in influencing human behavior (37, p. 148). According to F. Danesh, there is a complex relationship between cognitive and emotional activity in dialogical discourse: "cognition causes emotion, and emotion affects cognition" (44, p. 25–26);

E. Weigand points to the integration of emotions with rationality and learning and their constant presence (95 p. 10). "Assessment of the significance of daily events" and interlocutors gives emotions "a central role in a person's life in a world that is not completely predictable" (76, p. 134). Accordingly, it can be argued that building a context model (clarification of its elements with the help of echo questions) as a rational activity can be combined with emotional response, therefore it is worth considering echo questions as an indicator of the emotional state of the speaker.

Emotion is defined as a "reaction to personally significant events", which includes "biological, cognitive and behavioral reactions, as well as subjective feelings of satisfaction/dissatisfaction" (77, p. 376). The components of emotion are appraisal, physiological change, subjective experience/sensation, expression (for example, facial expression) and action (in response) (76, p. 134).

The types of emotions distinguished by researchers include positive ones: interest, joy/satisfaction (67, p. 264), happiness, pride (35, p. 621; 85, p. 438), hope, relief, love (85, p. 438), gratitude, sympathy (42; 69, p. 244–248), negative: antipathy (85, p. 438) rage/hot anger, irritation/cold anger, fear/horror, sadness/depression, grief/despair, excitement/anxiety, boredom/indifference, disgust, contempt/contempt,

envy, shame/guilt (42, p. 22), disappointment (96, p. 5314) and neutral: surprise (44, p. 27).

Communication with memory is implemented both at the level of processes (memorization, reproduction, forgetting) and types of memory (arbitrary mechanical/logical, sensory/short-term/long-term), as well as in the form of stimulation of the interlocutor's cognitive activity. The process of attention during the functioning of interrogative questions is revealed due to the inattention of the speaker at the level of perception/memory (memorization), as well as due to difficulties associated with the distribution of attention.

As noted by I.I. Seryakova, a person's intellectual and emotional experience is revealed through his non-verbal behavior (16, p. 60), the components of which (look, voice, smile, posture, gesture, distance (16, p. 103)) are described in the discourse with the help of linguistic means (nominative units) (16, p. 37).

In the analyzed factual material, emotional response in echo questions is expressed through acting non-verbal behaviour. The description of the emotions of the speaker (producer of the question-interrogation) can be carried out on behalf of the interlocutor/observer (narrator in the case of fiction), and also be the result of introspection. Let's consider example:

(57) (A) You must just want to kiss him all over.

(B) That would be nice.

(C) Nice? Pfft. (rolls her eyes)

(A) Pardon?

(C) Nothing. Just a little extra air in my mouth. Pfft. (Friends s.1, ep.5)

In this communicative situation, the dynamics of the emotional state of the (C) is described. Reluctance to continue communication and disagreement with previous utterance is expressed through the description of non-verbals (16, p. 35) (facial expression, look), indicating attention, and the use of interrogative questions. Speaker's

(C) statement is accompanied with sound marker Pfft (interjection) that also shows disagreement. (3 p. 95).

The assessment of the interlocutor's statement according to the current model of the context in terms of its significance, compliance with the goals, knowledge and beliefs of the speaker affects the features of the expression of an emotional reaction (question-re-questioning). Expressing positive, negative and neutral emotions, question-requests appear in the following functional options:

echo question as an emotional reaction to the story/message of the interlocutor;

echo-question as a request for important details when creating a context model - evaluation of information - reaction;

questioning as a means of building relationships/continuing the conversation (empathetic reaction);

echo-question as an indicator of misunderstanding of the interlocutor's statement and an emotional reaction (surprise, irritation, etc.).

So, the realization of emotions using echo questions is, on the one hand, the result of a cognitive assessment of the interlocutor's message according to the context model, and on the other hand, it affects the mental processes that take place during the construction of the context model.

Conclusions to Chapter 3

1. Analysis of echo questions using the concept of a mental model allows us to consider them as a means of updating the model of the context of a communicative situation (with their help, the person of the interlocutor, his status and role, the subject of conversation/topic of communication, knowledge, beliefs, expectations, intentions, desires, plans, attitudes, emotions), as well as models of the situation of the past event (the time, place of actions/events, persons, their characteristics and behavior, attitudes, desires and motives are clarified).

2. The echo question can be considered as a linguistic indicator of the action of mental processes related to the perception and processing of the interlocutor's statement. The analysis of the actual material shows that the question-requests indicate communicative failures at the level of feeling and perception; accompany the thinking process, giving the speaker additional time for reflection or clarifying important details, as well as presenting the results of reflection in the form of inferences.

3. Understanding speech of the interlocutor involves the creation of a coherent mental model, and cross-examination questions indicate the difficulties that arise in doing so: at the level of organizing the speech flow, vocabulary (not knowing the word), syntactic structure and discourse. Understanding at the discourse level involves analyzing the interlocutor's utterances and knowledge. Misunderstanding of an utterance (replica-stimulus) may be related to its reference, predication, illocutionary force, conditions of success (sincerity of the interlocutor and his right to perform the speech act), implicit information (presupposition, logical follow-up), violation of the Principle of Cooperation.

4. The expression of emotions that accompany cognitive processes occurs through the description of the speaker's nonverbal behavior, the naming of emotions, and emotionally colored vocabulary. A rational assessment of the interlocutor's message may be accompanied by the manifestation of positive and negative emotions; at the same time, emotions influence mental processes (thinking, memory, recall).

Several emotions can be expressed simultaneously or change sequentially under the influence of the current context model and the constant evaluation of the interlocutor's message.

CHAPTER FOUR. PRAGMATIC-DISCURSIVE ASPECTS OF THE FUNCTIONING OF ECHO-QUESTIONS IN THE ENGLISH DIALOGICAL DISCOURSE

4.1 Echo-question in the system of speech acts

The pragmatic aspect of the study of echo-questions is related to their communicative and functional purpose (8, p. 269) in dialogical discourse. Differentiation of echo questions by types of speech acts (7, p. 97–103; 13; 18, p. 124–125; 31; 32; 70, p. 207–226; 90; 97, p. 297–298) is possible due to the definition of their communicative intention - "a sentence's inherent focus on solving a certain language task of communication" (8, p. 269).

Summarizing the results of the studies devoted to the classification of speech acts, I.S. Shevchenko offers a typology of speech acts relevant to the diachronic study of the English interrogative sentence based on the ideas of J. Serle and H.G. Pocheptsova (24, p. 47–51), distinguishing the quesitive, which carries out "a request for new, significantly important information to fill an information gap"; directives (injunctive – prompting-command and requestive – prompting-request); expressive, used to express emotions and assessments; metacommunicative (speech acts preceding the establishment of contact, MA of contact prolongation, MA of opening speech contact); stated that it provides "notification of new, significantly important information"; commissive (menasive – threat, warning; promissive – promise, offer) (24, p. 50).

The actualization of the illocutionary force of the quesitive takes place when interrogative questions are used to clarify/explain/repeat elements of the interlocutor's statement, check an inference/assumption, request confirmation, or request commitment. Example (58) demonstrates the implementation of specifying and requesting a commitment:

(58) Michael: It is Friday morning and it is another beautiful day in Scranton, Pennsylvania, (sees man in a turban outside) Oh my God. Ohhh. (dials phone number) Pick up, pick up, pick up, pick up. Oh, we have a serious problem here, (goes out onto office floor) Alright everybody, lock the doors, turn off the lights. Pretend you're not here.

Jim: Are we in danger?

Michael: There's no time to think about if this is real. Just, shh, everybody, (knock at the front door)

Kevin: Michael, should I call the... (Michael waves his hands) What? (The Office s.2, ep.9)

If the peculiarity of the question (quesitive) is that the speaker does not know the answer (11, p. 362–363), then for echo questions in the function of the quesitive, the conditions of success can be formulated as follows (the conditions for the successful implementation of a directive speech act are taken as a basis (20, p. 80)):

perlocutionary condition – the addressee is going to receive an answer;

preconditions – the addressee is able to provide an answer, the addressee has the right to ask and the addressee is not sure of receiving an answer in the normal course of events: please clarify: ignorance of the answer (details) by speaker B; a request to explain: ignorance of the answer by speaker B (due to misunderstanding); a request to repeat: ignorance of the answer by speaker B (due to various problems when perceiving the utterance of speaker A); verification of an inference/assumption: the need to confirm its truth by speaker A; request for confirmation: the presence of uncertainty/doubt about the statement of speaker A on the part of B; obligation request: speaker B wants A to behave in a certain way/perform a certain action in the future; a commitment request from B is necessary for speaker A to perform an action;

the condition of the propositional content is the future action of the addressee (providing the requested answer);

the condition of sincerity – the addressee (B) wants the addressee (A) to provide an answer;

essential conditions – the addressee's attempt to receive a response from the addressee;

individualized conditions – an element of the interlocutor's statement that needs clarification/explanation/repetition/confirmation is indicated.

The ratio of formal and functional features of the expression is characterized by a certain flexibility, which allows the quesitive to additionally acquire the illocutionary force of other speech acts (8, p. 278–280). The directive can be implemented in the form of an injunctive, which refers to the actions/behavior/attitude of the interlocutor (59) or features of the course of joint communicative activity (the need to discuss the topic at a certain time, the truthfulness of the interlocutor's message, the urge to provide information).

(59) Why don't you take a couple of hours? (The Office s.2, ep.4)

(60) Why don't you give me your contact information to start with, ok, what's your cell? (The Office s.2, ep.5)

Echo-questions are used as metacommunicatives in the function of maintaining speech contact through the expression of empathy and interest. Demonstrating attention to the interlocutor's message can also be accompanied by an incentive to continue the conversation and provide more information:

(61) (A) (clears throat) Kermie.

(B) Uh, yes, Miss Piggy?

(A) I just want to thank you for letting me do this. (The Muppet Show s.3, ep.1)

The illocutionary goal of the constative is affirmation (8, p. 272), at the same time, according to I.S. Shevchenko, indirect constatives implement at least two illocutionary forces: message and request (24, p. 117):

(62) (A) Does this letter look familiar?

(B) Yes. I wrote it.

(A) It's a suicide note, isn't it?

(B) Yes. (Desperate Housewives s.8, ep.21)

(63) (A): What? I have seven Catholic sisters. I've taken care of hundreds of kids. Come on, we wanna do it, don't we? (Friends s.2, ep.6)

Affirmative constative includes rhetorical questions (54, p. 76–77). Unlike quesitives, they are not a request for new information, since the answer is known to both speakers (can be provided by one of them) and is part of a common basis. The purpose of a rhetorical question is not to increase the amount of common knowledge, but to draw the interlocutor's attention to a certain element of common ground, which is the answer to a rhetorical question (38, p. 131).

In the following fragment, speaker B wants a friend, but not a pet, because he thinks all pets are primitive. Using the rhetorical question who has time shows that he doesn't have enough time to take care of the pet.

(64) (A) You want to breed a new friend?

(B) That's one option, but who has the time? But consider this, the Japanese, they're doing some wonderful work with artificial intelligence, now, you combine that with some animatronics from the imagineers over at Disney, next thing you know, we're playing Halo with a multi-lingual Abraham Lincoln. (The Big Bang Theory s.2, ep.4)

Echo-questions as indirect commissives can function as a request/request for instructions in the case of behavioral cooperation and agreement on joint activity (Is there anything I can do?; Any instructions, sir?) and refusal (14, p. 5) during confrontation (Who says you make conditions?). In situations of conflict, interrogative questions can also acquire the function of a menasive in combination with disagreement (expressive):

(65) (A): Give me a sense of how illegal this is.

(B): Who says it's illegal?

(A): Well, why is it a secret?

(B): Okay, it's illegal. (Young Sheldon s.5, ep.5)

The success of the indirect speech act of a commission/instruction request requires the fulfillment of a number of conditions: a perlocutionary condition – the addressee (B) is going to perform a certain action and needs the permission/consent of the interlocutor; preconditions – the addressee is able and ready to perform the action; the addressee cannot perform the action without obtaining permission; the addressee is not sure of the necessity/appropriateness of the action; performance of the future action does not conflict with the interests of A according to the context of communication; the condition of the propositional content is the future action of the addressee; the condition of sincerity – the addressee wants the addressee to agree to perform the future action by the addressee/specify what exactly needs to be done; essential conditions – the addressee's attempt to obtain consent from the addressee to perform the action; individualized conditions – the action that the addressee wishes to perform is specified.

Indirect commission-refusal is characterized by the reluctance of the addressee to perform a certain action (including a verbal one); a conflict of speakers' goals; the doubt of the addressee (B) regarding the right of the addressee (A) to demand the performance of a certain (communicative) action, expressing orders/wishes or requesting information.

(66) (A): They're saying that guy you sh*t wasn't sick.

(B): Who said that? Who said he wasn't sick? Madison?

(A): She's worried about you. (Fear the Walking Dead s.2, ep.6)

(67) (A): Could it be that you've decided to trust Sherlock Holmes of all people?

(B): Who says I trust him? (Sherlock s.1, ep.1)

So, echo questions in dialogic discourse can function as direct speech acts (quesitives), and also combine several illocutionary forces, acting as indirect directives, expressives, metacommunicatives, constatives, and commissives.

4.2 Echo-question - reaction as a sequence of speech actions

The success of the speech act at the level of illocution is ensured by the recognition of the speaker's communicative intention, while the success of the perlocutionary act requires subsequent actions or a change in the interlocutor's beliefs (51, p. 198–200; 45, p. 54). Perlocution (perlocutionary act/effect) is defined as "the listener's act, which is a direct consequence of his understanding of the illocutionary goal of the speaker, which is determined by the context of the utterance" "the result of the influence of the speech act". (28, p. 11). Let's see how the above provisions are implemented on the example of echo- questions (68) and (69):

(68): (A): Can we please talk about my dream?

(B): Ok. So, you're in the delivery room, and you ask to see your baby.

(A): Yes, and then the nurse says, "don't you mean babies?" Plural. Then she wheels out this bassinet full of—

(B): kittens. Kittens. How did you know that?

(A): 'Cause it's a totally typical pregnant woman dream. Sometimes its puppies, but either way, there's usually paws involved. (Ghost Whisperer s.4, ep.23)

In situation (68) speaker B is surprised with A's answer and the communicative intent is to specify the source of information obtained by B, and the perlocutionary effect is to obtain the interlocutor's answer to the question posed.

(69) (A): We are Rock Hall.

(B): What song is this? La, la, la, la, la, la, la. (Singing a song) You don't know? Well, how dare you call yourselves a Rock and Roll Hall of Fame? (The Big Bang Theory s.9, ep.10)

In fragment (69), the echo-question realizes several illocutionary forces: disagreement and an expressive that combines the evaluation of A's knowledge and the expression of emotion (indignation) and the quesitive.

The study of dialogical discourse and the peculiarities of the functioning of echo question from the standpoint of conversational analysis covers the following aspects:

(1) the definition of a speech act, which is realized by a certain statement;

- (2) the analysis of subsequent replicas that indicate its understanding;
- (3) the explanation of the causal relationship between the statement and the reaction to it (64, p. 121).

Accordingly, consideration of echo-questions as a speech act involves the correlation of types of speech acts and replica-reactions (their interaction, which can be a perlocutionary effect of varying degrees of success (32, p. 82) according to the context (in particular, the degree of coincidence of goals, interests and knowledge/beliefs of the speakers, their psycho-emotional state, status-role factors, linguistic design of the speech act (52, p. 128–132)).

The perlocutionary effect of the quesitive is to receive an answer. In situation (70), the general echo-questions function as a request for confirmation and expresses the A's surprise by the fact that the gardener gave A a rose and A acts suspiciously. The answer is confirmation in a mild form, because this information is socially undesirable.

(70) (A): That is a beautiful Rose. Where did you get it?

(B) Oh, John gave it to me.

(A) John? Your gardener? He gave you a Rose?

(B) Yes. I am having some new bushes planted outside, and he gave me that as a color palette. (Desperate Housewives s.1, ep.3)

Checking the inference based on the frame (correspondence) is accompanied by an implicit confirmation and correction of the interlocutor:

(71): (A): "I hate Susan Mayer. Every time I see those big doe eyes of hers, I swear to God, I just want to go out and shoot a deer."

(B): (eyes light up) "What has she done this time?"

(A): "She is out there throwing herself at Mike Delfino. Again."

(B): "Susan likes Mike?" (Desperate Housewives s.1, ep.4)

As a means of testing the assumption, a split question with an ambiguous answer-doubt can act:

(72) (A) OK, Michael, um... Both my parents were born in Mexico.

(B): Oh, yeah...

(A): And, uh, they moved to the United States a year before I was born. So I grew up in the United States.

(B) Wow.

(A): My parents were Mexican.

(B): Michael: Wow. That is... That is a great story. That's the American Dream right there, right?

(A): Thank... Yeah... (The Office s.1, ep.2)

A special echo question serves to clarify/explain important details of the interlocutor's line, in particular the reference of the personal pronoun (73), the place/locative implied by the demonstrative pronoun with the meaning of proximity (74), establishing the identity of the person in question (75):

(73) (A): Urn, just something somebody wrote.

(B): Who? Dave Barry? (The Office s.1, ep.2)

(74) (A): Oh. That's Anais, none of the other girls in the house like her.

(B): House? What house?

(A): They all live in a house together.

(B): A house, where?

(A): I don't know. Somewhere in L.A.

(B): Wait a minute, you're telling me that I'm within driving distance of a house filled with aspiring supermodels?

(A): Yeah, I guess. (The Big Bang Theory s.2, ep.7)

(75) (A): So, what's the joke? You're not perfect either.

(B): We're not laughing at you, Dwight.

(A): So who are we laughing at? (The Office s.1, ep.2)

It should be noted that in situation (76), a general echo question indicates an unclear element, and a special one serves to specify it; while the answer providing the requested information is preceded by an indication of the interlocutor's inattention.

Question word *what?* can generally indicate the need to explain, joining the previous remark of the interlocutor:

(76) (A) Well, we're going to go apologise to Raj and invite him out to dinner.

(B): Apologise, for what? (The Big Bang Theory s.2, ep.4)

The answer to the echo-question (76) has the form of an imperative (request). The need to explain an unclear element in the case where the speaker assumes what it is about.

The implementation of answers to echo questions in the function of the quesitive, attested in the actual material, undergoes variations according to the features of the echo question (completeness/incompleteness) or the peculiarities of its perception:

understanding/misunderstanding of the question-question (on the verbal/non-verbal level);

explanation of information unclear to the producer of the question-interrogation/explanation of what, according to the addressee of the question-interrogation, is unclear in his previous reply (but is not actually the cause of misunderstanding);

confidence/uncertainty in the reliability of one's own answer;

the degree of informativeness of the answer;

providing an answer/explanation of the relevance of your previous question/statement;

lack of answer due to ignorance/unwillingness to answer or indication of its obviousness.

the presence of an emotional color (neutral, positive, negative reaction to a cross-examination question), expression of attitude towards the interlocutor (positive, negative, unexpressed).

The emotional reaction to the question-request can be both positive and negative. Positive emotions can arise when not knowing the answer to an echo-question, as well as when feeling one's own intellectual superiority over the interlocutor and being able

to demonstrate it by giving an answer (eyes light up (71)) Such echo questions refer to previous statements or stories of the interlocutor: The identified reasons for the negative reaction to the survey question cover the following aspects:

- the complexity of the question and the impossibility of answering;
- linguistic design of the interrogative question;
- a clarification request when the speaker believes that his answer (in the previous speech) was sufficiently informative;
- question-clarification refers to the peculiarities of conducting a conversation:
 - a) interrupts the interlocutor's story or asks about aspects he considers irrelevant;
 - b) clarification question addressed to another speaker;
- peculiarities of the use of interrogative question related to its producer:
- presence of questioning due to misunderstanding (intellectual characteristics of the interlocutor);
- lack of right to ask or assert something: Barker grew paler, and his great, strong hands were clasped convulsively together.

questioning due to inattention;

questioning negatively characterizes its producer in the eyes of the interlocutor.

The function of echo questions functioning as meta-communicatives is to encourage the interlocutor to continue communication:

(77) (A) Well, Peri. What do you think? Hm?

(B): It's terrible. (Doctor Who s.21, ep.21)

(78) (A) Any chance of a lift to court, John?

(B) Hm?

(A) Jury service, remember? (Midsomer Murders s.15, ep.2)

The reaction to meta-communicative can be to continue the conversation (77), prepare for its end (78), or move on to discuss other issues that concern the speaker:

(79) (A): Mr Carson thought it best.

(B): Did he, indeed? I wonder how that came about. And if you are learning how to do your job, you should never open a shirt in a room like this where it might be marked, let alone put studs in it. Do that in a dressing room and nowhere else.(Downtown Abbey s.3, ep.2)

Analysis of illustrative material shows that one-word echo-questions (Oh? Yes? Well? Eh? Huh?), which are usually considered as metacommunicatives (24, p. 116; 23, p. 23), can also perform the functions of quasitives, which is manifested in the peculiarity of the replica-reaction. Consider examples:

(80) (A) Excuse me, but I have some concerns about these questions.

(B) Look at that sign up there.

(A) Yes?

(B) Does it say I give a damn?

(A) No.

(B) That's because I don't. (The Big Bang Theory s.2, ep.5)

(81) (A) Well he's the gibbet.

(B) Eh?

(A) He's been took over, Tom...by the spirit of his master. (Doctor Who s.4, ep.2)

So the correctness of determining the illocutionary force of a question-interrogation and its perlocutionary success are revealed when turning to the analysis of a replica-reaction.

4.3 Echo-questions from the addressee's point of view

An important factor in the study of speech as a speech act is the consideration of speakers - the producer of the speech and its addressee ("the person or group of persons to whom/to whom the speaker's speech is intended") (15, p. 449), as well as the listener who can be present in acts of communication (15, p. 455). The distinction between message recipients (addressee/listener) depends on the process of changing communicative roles (53, p. 30). In the case of echo questions, it is about the specifics

of the ratio of addressing the replica-stimulus, its perception by the interlocutor/interlocutors, and the addressing of the interrogative question itself.

The basic unit for analysis is "replica-stimulus-echo-question-reaction", when speaker A's replica is addressed to B - replica B is addressed to A - speaker A gives an answer, in the actual material it undergoes variations in the aspects of addressability and representation of these components. In addition to waiting for an answer from the interlocutor, the echo question can accompany the speaker's thinking:

(82): Michael: (playing Jan's message) "I guess I missed you."

A: I guess I missed you. So, she misses me?

B: She missed you.

A: But then she goes on to say "that will be our only topic of discussion". That doesn't mean anything, those are just words.

B: I have one idea of what it means.

A: Ok. Yeah, what, wha?

B: Well I don't think you're gonna be very happy with this. (The Office s.2, ep.8)

Speakers are discussing the message left and possible meanings of utterance. The speaker A repeats the utterance and use echo-question as a rhetorical question, but after B's utterance wants to clarify and to approve his thoughts.

An attempt to recall, which is not addressed to the interlocutor, can be considered by him as a confirmation request, accompanied by an answer and preparation to communicate further details if necessary:

(83) (A): Botox injection.

(B): Botox?

(A): Botox is a diluted form of botulinum. Among other things, Raoul de Santos was employed to give Connie her regular facial injections. My contact at the Home Office gave me the complete records of Raoul's Internet purchases. He's been bulk ordering Botox for months. (Sherlock s.1, ep.3)

The mismatch between the addressing of the replica-stimulus and echo-question in a polylogue (triad) has the following implementation options. The stimulus is (formally) addressed to speaker B, speaker B asks C:

(84) (A): Consider well, Doctor. Won't you join us, like your other companion?

(B): Who's he talking about?

(C): Can't even count on this planet.

(A): The boy will be the first of the Chosen Ones.

(C): Boy? What boy?

(A): He came here looking for you. The name he used was Adric.

(C): Adric?

(B): Adric? (Doctor Who s.18, ep. 15)

A and B talk to each other, focusing on a common basis, C joins the conversation with the help of an echo-question:

(85) (A) Still poring over those old scientific records?

(B): No, something new. Look.

(C): Oh, you've improved the picture. What's that, more history?

(A): Not history, Veros, the present. We're scanning the surrounding countryside.

(Doctor Who s.18, ep. 15)

In this communicative situation, A's statement is addressed to the speaker B, but is heard by C, which allows the speaker C to turn to get involved in the conversation.

Thus, despite the variability of the addressing of echo questions and the number of communicators, their functions (types of speech acts) remain invariant.

Conclusions to Chapter 4

1. Echo questions in a dialogic discourse can function as direct speech acts - questives (request to clarify/explain/repeat, check an inference/assumption, request for confirmation, request for commitment), as well as additionally realize the illocutionary

force of indirect speech acts: a directive (injunctive, requisitive, disagreement-directive); expressive, metacommunicative, constative (disagreement-constative), commissive (promissive/request of instruction, refusal, menasive).

2. The success of illocution of a speech act involves recognizing the speaker's communicative intention, and the success of perlocution is ensured by the performance of certain actions or a change in the interlocutor's beliefs. The degree of success of speech acts implemented with the help of echo-questions.

3. According to the specifics of addressability, the question-interrogation can a) be directed to the producer of the replica-stimulus, another communicator (addressing shift), indirect or collective addressee; b) accompany the speaker's thinking.

GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

The Master's Paper is devoted to the study of cognitive, communicative and pragmatic-semantic features of functioning of echo-questions in dialogical discourse.

Summing up the approaches to defining a question-interrogation, we understand it as a reactive-initiative interrogative statement of a rational-logical or emotional nature, which can completely or partially repeat the previous reply in a verbatim or paraphrased form and is related to it semantically and/or structurally. Correlation of echo-questions with the types of questions distinguished in grammar studies according to various criteria made it possible to find out that, according to the form, interrogative questions can be general or special; according to the type of expected answer – general, special and alternative. According to the criterion of the requested answer, interrogative questions reveal signs of rhetorical questions, serving as a means of arguing the speaker's point of view.

The theory of mental models was used to explain the cognitive features of the survey questions. Questioning is considered as a means of updating/building a model of the context of the communication situation and serves to determine the person of the interlocutor, his status and role, subject of conversation/topic of communication, knowledge, beliefs, expectations, intentions, desires, plans, attitudes and emotions.

Examination of echo-questions as a linguistic indicator of mental processes accompanying the perception and processing of the interlocutor's speech showed that echo-questions indicate communicative failures at the level of sensation and perception; accompany the thinking process, giving the speaker additional time for reflection or clarifying important details, as well as presenting the results of reflection in the form of inferences.

In addition to verbalizing the action of mental processes when perceiving the interlocutor's statement, echo questions can indicate difficulties that arise when creating a mental model based on the interlocutor's statement and different types of knowledge

(general, culturally specific, personal, as well as when activating frames/scripts/scenarios with elements statement of the interlocutor).

A rational assessment of the interlocutor's message may be accompanied by the manifestation of positive and negative emotions; at the same time, emotions influence mental processes (thinking, memory, recall). The expression of emotions that accompany cognitive processes occurs through the description of the speaker's nonverbal behavior, the naming of emotions, and emotionally colored vocabulary.

As a result of the analysis of the pragmatic-semantic features of the echo questions, it was found that they implement quesitive speech acts (request to clarify/explain/repeat, check an inference/assumption, request for confirmation, request for an obligation), as well as indirect directives (injunctive, requests and disagreements-directives), expressives, meta-communicatives, constatives and commissives (promisive/request for instructions, refusal, menacive).

To reveal the degree of success of the speech act, the peculiarities of the implementation of the replica-reaction to the question-interrogation were considered and it was established that the success of the question-interrogation at the level of illocution (recognition of the communicative intention of the interlocutor) and perlocution (performance of actions or change of beliefs) is determined by the mental models of the context of the speakers (in particular , the degree of coincidence of goals, interests and knowledge/beliefs of the speakers, their psycho-emotional state, status-role factors, linguistic design of the speech act).

The process of producing and perceiving interrogative questions is determined by the model of the context of communicators. Depending on the speaker's goal, the echo question can serve to clarify the elements of the constantly updated context model, increase its coherence (if necessary) and realize its goals under the influence of the current context model. To create a model of the context (speaker or interlocutor), the tactics of informational and cognitive.

RESUME

Об'єктом кваліфікаційної роботи є питання-перепит або ехо-питання в сучасному англomовному діалогічному дискурсі. Предметом дослідження є когнітивні, комунікативні, прагматичні та семантичні особливості ехо-питань. Когнітивно-комунікативні характеристики питань-перепитів пов'язані з їх роллю в побудові/оновленні ментальної моделі контексту комунікативної ситуації, подоланні комунікативних збоїв, вербалізації психічних процесів та емоцій, а функціонування – з реалізацією мовленнєвих актів, а також комунікативних стратегій і тактик.

Теоретична цінність магістерської роботи полягає в тому, що це одна з небагатьох спроб дослідження ехо-питань у природному діалогічному дискурсі, зокрема на основі вивчення англomовних серіалів і фільмів.

Метою даної роботи є дослідження ехо-питань у діалогічному дискурсі, виявлення типів мовленнєвих дій, які виконуються ехо-питаннями, а також уточнення умов їхньої вдалості.

У процесі написання роботи було застосовано декілька методів дослідження. За допомогою структурно-семантичного аналізу визначено структурні характеристики ехопитань та розроблено їх класифікацію; когнітивний аналіз для виявлення когнітивних механізмів і процесів, що лежать в основі формування ехо-питань; аналіз мовленнєвих актів для визначення ілокутивної сили мовленнєвих актів; розмовний аналіз для дослідження перлокутивного ефекту ехопитань, їх ролі в підтриманні та розвитку теми розмови, зміні комунікативних ролей; метод аналізу дискурсу для визначення стратегій, реалізованих за допомогою ехо-питань;

Композиційно магістерська робота складається зі вступу, чотирьох розділів, висновків до кожного розділу та загальних висновків до всієї статті, списку використаної літератури та списку ілюстративного матеріалу;

У вступі статті висвітлюється вибір теми, її актуальність, об'єкт і предмет дослідження, методика і матеріал дослідження, підкреслюється актуальність досліджуваної проблеми, зазначається про новизну отриманих результатів, встановлюється головна мета та завдання, якими вона досягається, розглянуто використані в роботі методи дослідження, теоретичне та практичне значення та розглянуто зміст кожного розділу окремо.

У першому розділі представлено загальнотеоретичні аспекти ехо-питань в діалогічному дискурсі з точки зору когнітивної прагматики, підходи до дослідження ехо-питання як мовного та мовленнєвого феномену, визначення ехо-питання з урахуванням синтаксичних, семантичних і функціональних факторів.

У другому розділі розглядається загальна методологія дослідження: комплексний підхід до аналізу когнітивно-комунікативних і прагматично-семантичних особливостей ехо-питань,

Розділ третій присвячено ролі ехо-запитань у діалогічному дискурсі. Дослідження проведено на підставі концепції ментальної моделі.

У четвертому розділі визначено типи мовленнєвих дій, що реалізуються за допомогою ехо-запитань, умови їх успішності в ілокутивних/перлокутивних актах, типологію стратегій і тактик на основі когнітивно-прагматичних факторів.

При написанні дипломної роботи використано 101 джерело. Матеріал, використаний у аналізі, представлений численними діалогічними фрагментами з британських та американських серіалів і фільмів та налічують 85 прикладів.

Ключові слова: питання-перепит, ехо-запитання, концепція ментальної моделі, когнітивно-прагматичний фактор, іллокутивний акт, діалогічний дискурс.

LIST OF REFERENCE LITERATURE

1. Бацевич, Ф. С. (2004) *Основи комунікативної лінгвістики*. Київ: Академія.
2. Близниченко, Л. А. (1956) *Интонация переспроса в современном английском языке* (Автореферат диссертации кандидата филологических наук) Москва.
3. Волкова, Л. М. (2012) *Службові слова у мові та мовленні: Секрети успішної комунікації: навч. посіб.* Київ: КАФЕДРА.
4. Гладуш, Н. Ф. (2005) *Прагматичні аспекти висловлення і дискурсу* Київ: Вид. центр КНЛУ.
5. Гнезділова, Я. В. (2007) *Емоційність та емотивність англомовного дискурсу: структурний, семантичний і прагматичний аспекти*. (Автореферат дисертації кандидата філологічних наук) Київ.
6. Долинин, К. А. (1983) *Имплицитное содержание высказывания / К. А. Долинин // Вопросы языкознания*. Москва.
7. Зернецкий, П. В. (1992) *Речевое общение на английском языке (коммуникативно-функциональный анализ дискурса)* Киев: Лыбидь.
8. Иванова, И. П. (1981) *Теоретическая грамматика современного английского языка* Москва: Высш. школа.
9. Киселюк, Н. П. (2009) *Вербальні та невербальні засоби актуалізації емоційного стану радості в художньому дискурсі (на матеріалі англомовної прози XX – XXI століть)* (Автореферат дисертації кандидата філологічних наук) Київ.
10. Ковбаско, Ю. Г. (2011) *Структура, семантика, прагматика розділового запитання: синхронно-діахронний аспект* (Автореферат дисертації кандидата філологічних наук) Київ.
11. Конрад, Р. (1985) *Вопросительные предложения как косвенные речевые акты* СПб.

12. Криворучко, С. И. (2004) *Аналитический обзор концепций перлокутивного акта* Харків.
13. Медведєва, Л. М. (1989) *До типології мовленнєвих актів*. Київ.
14. Осовська, І. М. (2003) *Висловлювання-відмова: структурно-семантичний та комунікативно-прагматичний аспекти (на матеріалі сучасної німецької мови)* (Автореферат дисертації кандидата філологічних наук) Київ.
15. Почепцов, Г. Г. (2009) *Избранные труды: монография*. Харьков: ХНУ имени В. Н. Каразина.
16. Серякова, И. И. (2012) *Невербальный знак коммуникации в англоязычных дискурсивных практиках*. Киев: Изд. центр КНЛУ.
17. Студенец, Г. И. (1997) *Структурно-семантические особенности конструкций расширения (на материале именных конструкций в современном английском языке)* (Автореферат дисертації кандидата філологічних наук) Київ..
18. Сусов, И. П. (2009) *Лингвистическая прагматика*. Винница: Нова Книга.
19. Фестингер, Л. (1999) *Теория когнитивного диссонанса*. СПб: Ювента.
20. Формановская, Я. И. (1986) *О коммуникативно-семантических группах и интенциональной семантике их единиц* Калининград: Калинин. гос. ун-т.
21. Чахоян, Л. П. (1979) *Синтаксис диалогической речи современного английского языка*. Москва: Высш. школа.
22. Чейф, У. Л. (1975) *Значение и структура языка*. Москва: Прогресс.
23. Чхетиани, Т. Д. (1987) *Лингвистические аспекты фатической метакоммуникации* (Автореферат дисертації кандидата філологічних наук) Київ.
24. Шевченко, И. С. (1998) *Историческая динамика прагматики предложения: английское вопросительное предложение 16-20 вв.* Харьков: Константа.
25. Quirk R. et al., (1985) *A comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London: Longman.
26. Aijmer K., et al. (2005) *Approaches to spoken interaction*. Journal of Pragmatics.

27. G. Airenti, et al. (1993) *Conversation and Behavior Games in the Pragmatics of Dialogue*. *Cognitive Science*.
28. Akhimien, P. E. (2010) *Perlocution: Healing the "Achilles' Heel" of Speech Act Theory*. California Linguistic Notes.
29. Aronson, E. (1969) *The theory of cognitive dissonance: A current perspective / Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*. New York: Academic Press.
30. Artstein, R. A. (2002) *Focus semantics for echo questions*. Stuttgart.
31. Austin, J. L. (1962) *How to do things with words*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
32. Bach, K. (1979) *Meaning, Speech Acts and Communication*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press.
33. Banse, R. (1996) *Acoustic Profiles in Vocal Emotion Expression*. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. Vol. 70, No. 3.
34. Bara, B. G. (2010) *Cognitive Pragmatics: The Mental Processes of Communication*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.
35. Bosco, F. M. (2004) *The fundamental context categories in understanding communicative intention*. *Journal of Pragmatics*.
36. Buchweitz, et al. (2009) *Brain activation for reading and listening comprehension: An fMRI study of modality effects and individual differences in language comprehension*. Vol. 2, No. 2. Retrieved from URL <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3081613/>
37. Bublitz ,W. (1999) *Coherence in Spoken and Written Discourse: how to create it and how to describe it*. Selected papers from the International Workshop on Coherence, Augsburg.
38. Caponigro, I. (2007) *Rhetorical questions as questions*. *Proceedings of Sinn und Bedeutung*. Barcelona: Universitat Pompeu Fabra.
39. Carter, R. (2006) *Cambridge grammar of English*. Cambridge University Press.

40. Clark, H. H. (2001) *International Encyclopedia of Social and Behavioral Sciences*. London: Elsevier.
41. Collins, P. (2006) *Clause Types. The Handbook of English Linguistics*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
42. Cowie, R. (2003) *Describing the emotional states that are expressed in speech. Speech Communication*. Vol. 40.
43. Cruttenden, A. (1986) *Intonation*. Cambridge University Press.
44. Daneš, F. (2004) *Universality vs, Culture-Specificity of Emotion. Emotion in Dialogic Interaction: Advances in the Complex*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
45. Davis, S. (1980) *Perlocutions. Speech Act Theory and Pragmatics*. Dordrecht: Reidel Publishing Company.
46. Dijk, T. A. van (1999) *Context Models in Discourse Processing. The Construction of Mental Representations During Reading*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
47. Dijk T. A. van (2008) *Discourse and Context: A sociocognitive approach*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
48. Dijk, T. A. van (2012) *Discourse and knowledge. The Routledge Handbook of Discourse Analysis*. London: Routledge.
49. Dijk, T. A. van (2014) *Discourse and Knowledge: A Sociocognitive Approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
50. Dijk, T. A. van (1983) *Strategies of Discourse Comprehension*. New York: Academic Press.
51. Dijk, T. A. van (1977) *Text and Context: Explorations in the semantics and pragmatics of discourse*. New York: Longman.
52. Dijk, T. A. van (1981) *Towards an Empirical Pragmatics: Some social psychological conditions of speech acts*. *Philosophica* – Vol. 27, No. 1.

53. Dynel, M. (2014) *On the Part of Ratified Participants: Ratified Listeners in Multi-party Interactions*. Brno Studies in English.
54. Egg M., (2007) *Meaning and use of rhetorical questions*. Proceedings of the 16th Amsterdam Colloquium. Universiteit van Amsterdam.
55. Fiengo, R. (2007) *Asking questions. Using meaningful structures to imply ignorance*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
56. Garnham, A. (2005) *Language Comprehension. Handbook of Cognition*. London: Sage Publications.
57. Geis, M. L. (1995) *Speech acts and conversational interaction*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
58. Gernsbacher, M. A. (2005) *Watching the Brain Comprehend Discourse. Experimental cognitive psychology and its applications*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
59. Gibbs R. W. Jr. (1999) *Intentions in the Experience of Meaning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
60. Graesser, A. C. (1994) *Constructing Inferences During Narrative Text Comprehension*. Psychological Review.
61. Graesser, A. C. (1997) *Discourse Comprehension. Annual Review of Psychology*.
62. Grice, P. (1989) *Studies in the Way of Words*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
63. Grosz, B. J. (1986) *Attention, Intentions, and the Structure of Discourse. Computational Linguistics*.
64. Have, P. (2007) *Doing Conversation Analysis*. London: Sage Publications.
65. Horn, L. R. (2001) *A Natural History of Negation*. Stanford: CSLI Publications.
66. Huddleston, R. (1984) *Introduction to the Grammar of English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

67. Izard, C. E. (2007) *Basic Emotions, Natural Kinds, Emotion Schemas, and a New Paradigm. Perspectives on Psychological Science*.
68. Jespersen, O. (1958) *The Philosophy of Grammar*. London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd.
69. Lazarus, R. S. (1999) *Stress and Emotion: A New Synthesis*. New York: Springer Publishing Company.
70. Leech, G. N. (1983) *Principles of pragmatics*. London: Longman.
71. Longman grammar of spoken and written English (1999) G. Leech et al. London: Longman, 1999. – 1204 p.
72. Lumsden, D. (2008) *Kinds of Conversational Cooperation*. Journal of Pragmatics.
73. McCawley, J. D. (1998) *The Syntactic Phenomena of English*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
74. Noh, E.-J. (1995) *A pragmatic approach to echo questions*. UCL Working Papers in Linguistics.
75. Noordman, L. (1999) *Discourse Comprehension. Language Comprehension: A Biological Perspective*. Berlin: Springer-Verlag.
76. Oatley, K. (2014) *Cognitive approaches to emotions. Trends in Cognitive Sciences*.
77. Parrott, W. G. (2001) *The Nature of Emotion. Blackwell Handbook of Social Psychology: Intraindividual Processes*. Oxford / Malden: Blackwell Publishers.
78. Pessoa, L. (2008) *On the relationship between emotion and cognition. Nature Reviews Neuroscience*.
79. Purver, M. (2004) *The Theory and Use of Clarification Requests in Dialogue. [Electronic resource]*. London. Retrieved from URL <http://www.eecs.qmul.ac.uk/~mpurver/papers/purver04thesis.pdf>
80. Radford, A. (2009) *An Introduction to English Sentence Structure*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

81. Radford, A. (1988) *Transformational Grammar: A First Course*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
82. Reference: (2008) *Interdisciplinary Perspectives*. New York: Oxford University Press.
83. Reis, M. (1992) *Zur Grammatik und Pragmatik von Echo-w-Fragen. Satz und Illokution. Band 1*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag.
84. Reisigl, M. (2001) *Discourse and Discrimination: Rhetorics of racism and antisemitism*. London and New York: Routledge.
85. Roseman, I. J. (2011) *Emotional Behaviors, Emotivational Goals, Emotion Strategies: Multiple Levels of Organization Integrate Variable and Consistent Responses*. *Emotion Review*.
86. Sadock, J. M. (1985) *Speech act distinctions in syntax*. *Language Typology and Syntactic Description*.
87. Santorini, B. (2007) *The syntax of natural language: An online introduction using the Trees program [Electronic resource]*. Retrieved from URL <http://www.ling.upenn.edu/~beatrice/syntax-textbook>.
88. Schaffer, D. (2005) *Can rhetorical questions function as retorts? Is the Pope Catholic?* *Journal of Pragmatics*.
89. Schlangen, D. (2004) *Causes and strategies for requesting clarification in dialogue*. *Workshop on Discourse and Dialogue*. – Boston Association for Computational Linguistics. Retrieved from URL <http://pub.unibielefeld.de/luur/download?func=downloadFile&recordOID=1992176&fileOID=2265628>
90. Searle, J. (1965) *What is a Speech Act? Philosophy in America*. London: Allen and Unwin.
91. Selting, M. (1992) *Prosody in conversational questions*. *Journal of Pragmatics*.

92. Selting, M. (1992) *Question intonation revisited: the intonation of conversational questions. Phonologica: proceedings of the 7th International Phonology Meeting*. Torino: Rosenberg & Sellier.
93. Thomas, J. (2013) *Meaning in Interaction: An Introduction to Pragmatics*. New York: Routledge.
94. Tsui, A. (1992) *A functional description of questions. Advances in Spoken Discourse Analysis*. London: Routledge.
95. Weigand, E. (2004) *Emotions: The simple and the complex. Emotion in Dialogic Interaction: Advances in the Complex*. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
96. What a neural net needs to know about emotion words (1999) / R. Cowie et al. *Computational Intelligence and Applications*.
97. Wunderlich, D. (1980) *Methodological Remarks on Speech Act Theory. Speech Act Theory and Pragmatics*. Dordrecht: Reidel Publishing Company.
98. Zwaan, R. A. (1998) *Situation Models in Language Comprehension and Psychological Bulletin*.
99. Український словник (2003) І. О. Анніна, Г. Н. Горюшина, І. С. Гнатюк та ін. – Київ: Абрис.
100. Leech, G. (2006) *A Glossary of English Grammar*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
101. *Routledge Dictionary of Language and Linguistics* (1996) London: Routledge.

LIST OF ILLUSTRATION MATERIAL

1. Cherry, M. (Director). (2004, October 3), [Television series episode], *Desperate Housewives* ABC Studios and Cherry Production.
2. Crane, D. & Kauffman, M. (1984, September 22). [Television series episode] *Friends* NBC Television Studios.
3. Daniels, G., Gervais, R. & Merchant, S. (Directors and writers). (2005, March 24). [Television series episode], *The Office* NBS Television Network.
4. Fellowes, J., Stephenson, S., & Pepler, T. (2010, September 26). [Television series episode], *Downton Abbey* ITV.
5. Gray, J., Snow, M., & Beyer, D., (2005, September 23). [Television series episode], *Ghost Whisperer* CBS Television Studios.
6. Henson, J., (1976, September 5). [Television series episode], *The Muppet Show* ITC Entertainment and Henson Associates.
7. Horowitz, A., & Watkinson, D. (based on Chief Inspector Barnaby by Graham, C), (1997, March 23). [Television series episode] *Midsomer Murders* ITV.
8. Kirkman, R., & Erickson, D. (2015, August 23). [Television series episode], *Fear the Walking Dead* AMC Networks.
9. Lorre, C., & Molaro, S. (2017, September 25). [Television series episode], *Young Sheldon* CBS Television Studios.
10. Moffat, S., & Gatiss, M., (based on Sherlock Holmes by Sir Arthur Conan Doyle), (2010, July 25). [Television series episode], *Sherlock* PBS Studio.
11. Newman, S., Webber, C.E. & Wilson, D. (1963). [Television series episode], *Doctor Who* BBC.
12. Rich, A. (Director), & Prady, B., Kaplan, E., & Reynolds, J. (Writers). (2014, April 3). [Television series episode], *The Big Bang Theory* Los Angeles, CA: Warner Brothers.
13. Shore, D., (based on Good Doctor by Jae-bum P.), (2017, September 25) [Television series episode] *The Good Doctor* ABC Signature, Sony Pictures.