

Міністерство освіти і науки України
Київський національний лінгвістичний університет
Кафедра германської та фіно-угорської філології

Курсова робота
на тему: КОМУНІКАТИВНІ ФУНКЦІЇ ПИТАЛЬНИХ
ВИСЛОВЛЕНЬ

Студентки групи Мла 06-20
факультету германської філології і перекладу
денної форми здобуття освіти
спеціальності 035.041 філологія
Петруняк Вероніки Олексіївни

Науковий керівник:
кандидат філологічних наук
професор Волкова Лідія Михайлівна

Національна шкала _____

Кількість балів _____

Оцінка ЄКТС _____

Київ 2024

Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine
Kyiv National Linguistic University
Chair of Germanic and Finno-Ugrian Philology

Term paper
COMMUNICATIVE FUNCTIONS OF INTERROGATIVE
UTTERANCES

Veronika Petruniak
Group 06-20
Germanic Philology and Translation Department

Research Adviser
Prof. L.M. Volkova
PhD (Linguistics)

Kyiv 2024

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....	4
CHAPTER ONE. THEORETICAL BASICS OF THE STUDY OF COMMUNICATIVE TYPES OF SENTENCES IN THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND THEIR FUNCTIONS.....	6
1.1. Communicative types of English sentences and their functions.....	6
1.2. Typology of interrogative sentences in English.....	8
Conclusions to Chapter One.....	10
CHAPTER TWO. INTERPRETATION AND FUNCTIONS OF INTERROGATIVE UTTERANCES.....	11
2.1. Interpretation of English interrogatives during translation into the Ukrainian language.....	11
2.2. Functions of interrogative sentences in scientific and critical discourse.....	14
Conclusions to Chapter Two.....	17
CONCLUSIONS.....	19
RESUME.....	21
LIST OF REFERENCE MATERIALS.....	22
LIST OF ILLUSTRATION MATERIALS.....	24

INTRODUCTION

For modern linguistics, the study of various types of sentences, including interrogatives, from the point of view of the communicative content realized in the process of communication is quite relevant. Despite the fact that interrogative sentences have repeatedly been the subject of linguistic analysis, they have not received sufficient coverage in this aspect. Their semantics and functional direction in the process of translation have not been sufficiently studied, which determined **the relevance of the topic** of this study.

Interrogative sentences have been the object of study and definition by scholars such as Beekman and Callow (1976), Cuddon (1979), Quirk, Greenbaum, Leech, and Svartvick (1985), Richards, Platt, and Weber (1990), Wales (1991), and Yankach (1994), who considered a rhetorical question, which is structurally similar to any other question, but is not intended to receive an answer (Савчук, 2018: 94).

The aim of this study is to determine the functions of interrogative sentences.

The objectives of the Course Paper are:

- to determine communicative types of English sentences and their functions;
- to investigate the typology of interrogative sentences in English;
- characterize the interpretation of English interrogatives during translation into Ukrainian;
- to analyze the functions of interrogative sentences in scientific and critical discourse.

The object of the CoursePaper are interrogative utterances.

The subject of the Course Paper is investigating functional characteristics of interrogative utterances.

During writing of the work, the following **methods** were used: content analysis of scientific literature and periodicals; the method of contextual analysis to determine the functions of interrogative sentences and the descriptive method.

The material of the study are interrogative sentences used in the works by David Lodge, an English speaking author.

The theoretical significance of the study is that it enriches English linguistics and communicative linguistics with new ideas, serves as a basis for further scientific studies in discourse science and linguistic stylistics.

The practical value of the Course Paper lies in the fact that its material and results can be used in teaching syntax of the English language, special courses on the problems of text linguistics, for writing school and academic textbooks on grammar, as material for teaching methods.

CHAPTER ONE. THEORETICAL BASICS OF THE STUDY OF COMMUNICATIVE TYPES OF SENTENCES IN THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND THEIR FUNCTIONS

1.1 Communicative types of English sentences and their functions

Most of the sentences as communicative units of language first of all are characterized by the fact that they include a message that is expressed by the speaker with a certain purpose. The specific goals of communication are quite diverse, but they are reduced to the three most general criteria – messages, questions, incentives, in accordance with which, as a custom, narrative, interrogative, and persuasive sentences are distinguished. The main target instructions of these sentences are: a message about some actual fact, phenomenon, event, etc.; prompting the listener (reader) to answer related to the content of this sentence; and prompting the listener to some action, respectively.

In addition to narrative, interrogative, and persuasive sentences, some authors distinguish exclamatory sentences as an independent type (Poustma, 1928: 379), Kruisinga (Kruisinga, 1931: 520). Circumstantiality, however, should be legitimately considered not as a dominant feature of sentences of a separate communicative type, but as an optional feature that can be characteristic of each of the three named communicative types of sentences – narrative (constative), persuasive (imperative) and interrogative sentences (interrogative), which as a result, can be in two versions – exclamatory (intensive) and non-exclamatory (non-intensive).

The question of selecting optative sentences, that is, sentences expressing wishes, is also debatable. However, not all researchers accept the traditional three-member classification of communicative sentence types, based on the fact that they are opposed to each other according to different principles: narrative and interrogative sentences are distinguished by a functional feature, while persuasive

sentences are not purely functional – persuasion belongs to the field of modal meanings (Сітко, 2004).

There is a classification of sentences, which is based on the substantive basis without taking into account their grammatical form. Yes, all sentences are divided into two main categories, depending on whether the speaker wants to influence the will of the listener with his speech or not. The first category includes ordinary affirmative sentences, various exclamatory sentences, as well as wishes such as *God save the king*. And other. In the second category, the purpose of statements is to influence the will of the listener, that is, to encourage him to do something. This category includes interrogative sentences and various requests: from rude orders to timid humiliating pleas (Гедз, 1998).

Some linguists include narrative sentences in one group with optative and persuasive sentences, since all three types of sentences have the meaning of a message, on the basis of which they are opposed to interrogative sentences, the meaning of which is to search for "necessary information". However, the inclusion of constatives, imperatives and optatives in one group only on the basis of the presence of a message value in them does not seem entirely successful, since every sentence is characterized by the fact that it has a certain informativeness. Even an "interrogative sentence" is not "purely a question", but always also carries some positive information. Sentences *Why do you ask that?* contains a hidden message: *You ask that* (Чайка, 1998: 10-11).

As we can see, the attempt of linguists to reduce the classification of communicative sentence types to a dichotomous system did not have an unambiguous solution. Constatives, interrogatives, imperatives and optatives have a number of specific features (structural and semantic) and therefore reducing these communicative types to a dichotomy is hardly possible to consider expedient.

The most acceptable, in our opinion, is the four-part classification, according to which the narrative, interrogative, persuasive and optative sentences are distinguished. As is known, there are points of contact between sentences of different communicative types: interrogative sentences are closer to narrative and

optative sentences in connection with the transmission of information; they are united with inductive ones by the moment of incitement to some action addressed to the interlocutor (Сітко). However, there are differences between them: optative sentences, unlike persuasive ones, are not related to influencing the addressee's will; interrogative and imperative sentences, in contrast to optative ones, assume a reaction on the part of the addressee: a verbal (answer) or a reaction in the form of an action.

Thus, it is legitimate to talk about the mobility of the boundaries between narrative, interrogative, persuasive and optative sentences, or about the absence of a rigid relationship between the selected communicative types and their functions.

1.2 Typology of interrogative sentences in English

An interrogative sentence is a modal type of a sentence, with the help of which the speaker, using special means, primarily intonation and lexical-grammatical means, asks about something in order to obtain information (Сітко, 2011). Unlike a question, which is a form of speech activity, an interrogative sentence is a form of thought fixation. Interrogative sentences and interrogative expressions attracted the attention of such researchers as T. Alisova, L. Berdnyk, G. Valimova, A. Vizgina, A. Zagnitko, N. Ryabtseva, etc., who submitted a classification of interrogative sentences, according to which interrogative sentences in the English language divided into general, alternative, partition and special (Гедз, 2015).

1. General questions require a short answer. We put them when we want to find out general information. Such questions require a short form of answer, such as "yes" or "no":

Has anything escaped me?

Would you have any objection to my running my finger along your parietal fissure?

Don't you find it interesting?

Sometimes general questions are used as rhetorical questions, that is, such questions that have no answers or are not important. Such questions express certain emotions of the speaker.

2. Special questions require a specific answer. We put them when we want to find out specific information, such as what? where? when?:

When would his friends unite to give him a pledge of their good will?

What was the use?

Where do you think that I have been?

3. Alternative question is a question that gives a choice between several options. The parts of the alternative question are connected by the conjunction *or*:

So that to reach the Yew Alley one either has to come down it from the house or else to enter it by the Moorgate?

Do you mean danger from this family fiend or do you mean danger from human beings?

Was he the agent of others or had he some sinister design of his own?

4. Sectional questions require confirmation of certain information:

It seems natural, doesn't it?

The devil's agents may be of flesh and blood, may they not?

You could easily recognize it, could you not? (Жеребило, 2022: 254).

The variety of communicative intentions is so rich that in individual speech acts the interrogative form can convey an expressive statement or denial, encouragement, authorized assessment, emotions. According to S.T. Shabbat identification and interpretation of communicative intent becomes possible only in a certain context, which is an important factor that reveals the nature of the linguistic phenomenon in terms of content (Шабат, 2000).

An English divided interrogative sentence can carry the meaning of an emotional comment, a reaction to the previous context, or can act as a request, order or push to perform a certain action. A certain structure of an alternative interrogative sentence will express impatience, while a question with a direct word order can show the emotional coloring of the sentence, expressing surprise or for

confirmation, although the addressee is sure of the answer. Rhetorical questions are always emotionally colored and have the function of attracting attention to the situation (most often negative, when a negative answer will be obvious) (Шабаг, 2000).

Interrogative sentences of the English language have a greater communicative potential, because they are used to clarify information. Interrogative components do not name persons and objects, but indicate them in the form of a question. The variety of communicative functions expressed by questions testifies to their great informativeness and appeal.

Conclusions to Chapter One

The attempt of linguists to reduce the classification of communicative sentence types to a dichotomous system did not have an unambiguous solution. Constatives, interrogatives, imperatives and optatives have a number of specific features (structural and semantic) and therefore reducing these communicative types to a dichotomy is hardly possible to consider expedient.

The most acceptable, in our opinion, is the four-part classification, according to which the narrative, interrogative, persuasive and optative sentences are distinguished.

Thus, it is legitimate to talk about the mobility of the boundaries between narrative, interrogative, persuasive and optative sentences, or about the absence of a rigid relationship between the selected communicative types and their functions.

Interrogative sentences in the English language divided into general, alternative, partition and special.

Interrogative sentences of the English language have a greater communicative potential, because they are used to clarify information. Interrogative components do not name persons and objects, but indicate them in the form of a question. The variety of communicative functions expressed by questions testifies to their great informativeness and appeal.

CHAPTER TWO. INTERPRETATION AND FUNCTIONS OF INTERROGATIVE UTTERANCES

2.1 Interpretation of English interrogatives during translation into the Ukrainian language

The communicative approach to the consideration of sentences allows us to assert that in a communication situation all communicative types of sentences (narrative, interrogative, persuasive) can convey an infinite number of variations and shades of communicative intentions depending on the purpose and specifics of a specific communication situation. The structural and grammatical structure of the question, as a rule, is determined by the communicative intention of the addressee. However, there is an ambiguous correspondence between the intention and the formal organization of the interrogative sentence, which explains the existence of syntactic homonymy and ambiguity of syntactic constructions (Сітко, 2007: 157). The communicative intention of the addressee determines the connotation of the question, affects the possible expected answer. A question, like any other speech unit, can reproduce the internal state in which the addressee is, for example, *“Wouldn't it be better to pretend that he had a headache, and couldn't go up to the Six Pine Trees this morning?”* (A. Milne). All kinds of additional nuances and nuances that are not directly related to the question can be superimposed on the question conveying the question: when asking, the addressee is guided by specific intentions, namely, to encourage the interlocutor to enter into a situation of speech communication, that is, to answer a question, to provide the addressee with one or another information about the problem that interests him, to confirm his point of view, etc. But at the same time, the addressee is assigned differently to the expected answer, which is reflected in the form of the interrogative sentence.

The interrogative sentence is considered in the communicative aspect as an intentional means of speech communication, used by the speaker in order to realize his communicative intentions. In this regard, L.V. Chaika and some other linguists

consider it necessary to study interrogative statements as a component of the addressee's speech strategy, i.e. "as a series of speech tactics aimed at achieving a communicative goal" (Чайка, 1998: 14). The use of interrogative constructions to express non-interrogative values is carried out due to the leveling of the interrogative value, which recedes into the background, since interrogative sentences can be used to reproduce a wide range of communicative functions. The interrogative meaning does not disappear completely due to the fact that it is fixed in the structure of the sentence. The variety of communicative intentions is so great that in some cases the interrogative form of a sentence, regardless of how the meaning of interrogativeness is conveyed in it – by the order of words, the presence of interrogative intonation or lexeme – conveys not a question, but a statement. Therefore, the identification and interpretation of communicative intent becomes possible only when taking into account many components that create a broad context. Even the most obvious communicative intentions, such as motivation, become clear only in the general context of the communication situation:

“Coming to see me have my bath?” – «Ты придешь удивиться, як я купаюся?»

Translation is determined by the idea of correspondence and accuracy – a completely perfect reproduction, the creation of a duplicate that can perform all the same functions of communication as the original. But since we are talking about the initial difference of the material, it is impossible to achieve perfect similarity.

We will consider interrogatives according to their expression of secondary functions and their translation.

1. Expression of request. There are many different ways to express commands and requests, from the simple form of the imperative to various forms of politeness. For example:

"May I depend on you to stand by me and my daughters, then, Deerslayer?" demanded the old man, with a father's anxiety in his countenance" (Cooper, 1862: 33).

«Отже я можу сподіватися, Звіробою, що ви залишитеся біля мене й моїх дочок? – спитав старий з виразом батьківського неспокою на обличчі» (Купер, 1968: 40).

2. Expression of advice. Most often, the following forms can serve as a direct expression of advice, regardless of the type of sentence:

1. performative verbs *advise, recommend*;
2. syntactic construction *you'd better*;
3. modal verbs *can, could, should, ought* in combination with the infinitive;
4. modal verb *might* in interrogative constructions;
5. complex conditional sentence with conditional mood forms.

As an example, let's analyze a sentence with the syntactic structure:

"Had we not better give up the attempt, and find some other means of releasing the prisoners?" (Cooper, 1862: 127).

«Чи не краще відмовитись од цієї спроби і придумати інший спосіб визволити бранців?» (Купер, 1968: 134).

3. Expression of irony, irritation. In some cases, repetition and lines of greeting express an expressive reaction to the interlocutor's words or actions, giving an interrogative shade of irony or irritation. Example:

"You think this Delaware can be depended on, Deerslayer?" demanded the girl, thoughtfully" (Cooper, 1862: 86).

«Отже ви вважаєте, що на вашого Делавара можна покластися, Звіробою? – спитала дівчина замислено» (Купер, 1968: 88).

4. Expression of surprise. The pragmatic meaning of an interrogative can sometimes be reduced to an expression of surprise, while this meaning depends on the situation of the speech act, or is determined by factors that are outside the sentence. For example:

"Did you never see Judith? demanded the girl, with quick earnestness; "if you never have, go at once and look at her!" (Cooper, 1862: 41).

«Невже ви ніколи не бачили Джудіт? – спитала дівчина з раптовою серйозністю. – Якщо ні, негайно йдіть і подивіться на неї!» (Купер, 1968: 45).

5. Expression of doubt. An interrogative can contain the implication of doubt. When asking such a question, the speaker relies on knowledge of previous data and reaches certain conclusions, but he certainly expects their confirmation from the interlocutor. For example:

"Ay, ay, Deerslayer, you mean well enough, but what can you do?" (Cooper, 1862: 67).

«Гай-гай, Звіробю, наміри твої чудові, та що ти здатен зробити?» (Купер, 1968: 69).

Therefore, the interrogative meaning does not completely disappear in the translation due to the fact that it is fixed in the structure of the sentence itself. The diversity of communicative intentions is so great that in some cases the interrogative form of a sentence, regardless of whether it conveys the meaning of questioning – the presence of a questioning intonation or lexeme, word order – conveys not a question, but a statement. That is why the identification and interpretation of communicative intent is possible only when taking into account many components that create a broad context.

2.2 Functions of interrogative sentences in scientific and critical discourse

Studies of scientific and critical discourse illustrate David Lodge's extensive use of expressive syntactic structures. An important place here is occupied by interrogative constructions.

David Lodge uses rhetorical questions in headlines, for example:

What is Postmodernism? (Lodge, 2013); *What is an Author?* (Lodge, 2013); *What is Literature?* (Lodge, 2015); *What is Realism?* (Lodge, 2015).

The use of a rhetorical question in such a position performs primarily the function of attracting attention and activating the perception of information.

The following seems to be an equally interesting rhetorical question:

*"If, in assessing literary texts, we are not assessing the appropriateness of symbolization to experience, what **are** we assessing?"* (Lodge, 2002: 63)

The rhetorical question here serves the purpose of stimulating the reader's opinion by actualizing the meaning of certain parts of the statement, which in this case is the word *are*, highlighted graphically.

Often, David Lodge uses rhetorical questions not as questions but as statements:

"Does not the intensity of the language in this paragraph encourage us to read it as symbolic action?" (Lodge, 2002: 181).

"But is it true that Wells intends no irony?" (Lodge, 2002: 242)

Here, rhetorical questions perform the function of affirming and expressing the author's assessment, and also allow to raise the general emotional tone of the statement, in order to strengthen its pragmatic effect.

The next interrogative construction in the works of David Lodge is a hypophora, which is a segment of monologic speech that combines a rhetorical question and an answer to it.

A hypophora can perform the function of presenting a topic, as in this example:

"... it always boils down to the questions: 'What do you mean by bad writing?' and 'How much bad writing and you willing to accept?'" (Lodge, 2002: 27)

A hypophora often performs an evaluative function, when the author introduces new evaluative information in response to his question or gives an interpretation and implicit evaluation of already known information:

"And why Marion? Perhaps because she is a 'maid' whose innocence and virtue Robyn (cf. Robin Hood) in anxious to protect, perhaps because the young, as it were potential, George Eliot (who figures prominently in Robyn's teaching) was

called Marian Evans. I say 'perhaps' because authors are not always conscious of their motivation in these matters." (Lodge, 1992: 38)

Another feature of this interrogative construction is the fact that David Lodge in his works asks and gives answers to questions not only on his own behalf, but also on behalf of famous scientists:

"'When will Modern Period end?' Ihab Hassan has asked. 'Has ever a period waited so long? When will modernism cease and what comes thereafter?' One answer is that ..." (Lodge, 1971: 68)

Let's consider another example:

"My problem is simple? What Charles wants is clear?" (Lodge, 1971: 144)

This question structure is used to increase the emotional tone of the statement, which confirms the thesis about the emphatic emphasis of question constructions. In addition, the question serves as an effective way of appealing to the reader, attracting his attention. Despite this, the author himself answers the question: "It is indeed" (Lodge, 1971: 144).

So, there is an emotional enhancement function here, when the author asks several questions, the answer to which is very short.

Also an interesting example is:

"So what is he trying to achieve by drawing attention to the gap between Margaret's experience and his narration of it?" (Lodge, 1992: 12)

The answer to such questions is the following part, which in form can be from one sentence to several paragraphs:

"I suggest that, by making a playful, self-deprecating reference to his own rhetorical function, he obtains permission, as it were, to indulge in those high-flown authorial disquisitions about history and metaphysics (like the vision of England from the Purbeck hills)" (Lodge, 1992: 12)

The answer to the question is an affirmative statement, which, when directly affecting the reader, performs an argumentative function.

So, interrogative sentences are quite widely used in the scientific and critical works of David Lodge. Their purpose is to draw attention to one or another

phenomenon. The peculiarity of a rhetorical question is that its syntactic form does not correspond to the logical content. In a scientific and critical text, this type of question is perceived as an emotional proposal that realizes two syntactic meanings – the meaning of the question and the meaning of the statement.

The specificity of the hypophora is that the author himself answers the question, although sometimes the question is addressed to the reader and presupposes his answer. And the second with the help of hypophora imitates the immediacy of creativity, demonstrates the course of his thoughts, reflections, attracting readers to them, activating their attention, forcing them to look for answers to the questions posed together with him.

Conclusions to Chapter Two

During the reproduction of the text, it is impossible to avoid interpretation, i.e. completion of meanings, introduction of new elements into the text. Interpretation differs from a simple act of perception and requires additional efforts; it follows that it is always dynamic and involves the activity of the interpreter. Therefore, interpretation is always the introduction of something new that was not in the text, but it appears in the text – the subject of interpretation, and the source of this new thing is the consciousness of the interpreter, his experience, his culture. Interpreter and translator are different cultural roles, but the translator needs to convey the meaning of the interrogative sentence in the most appropriate way.

The identification and interpretation of communicative intent is possible only when taking into account many components that create a broad context.

This section analyzes the functions of interrogative sentences in scientific and critical discourse based on the works of David Lodge. Such groups of interrogative constructions as rhetorical question and hypophora were identified, their structure and the nature of the relationship with the answer were studied in view of the functions they perform.

CONCLUSIONS

With the help of this research, we:

1. Determined communicative types of English sentences and their functions and found out that there is no single common classification, but we are inclined to the four-part classification, according to which the narrative, interrogative, persuasive and optative sentences are distinguished.

Thus, it is legitimate to talk about the mobility of the boundaries between narrative, interrogative, persuasive and optative sentences, or about the absence of a rigid relationship between the selected communicative types and their functions.

2. Determined that interrogative sentences are called sentences in which the speaker's desire to find out something or to make sure of something is expressed by special linguistic means. In the text, such sentences perform a variety of functions, but they usually act as a starting point. In this way, interrogative sentences inform about what the speaker wants to know.

Interrogative sentences in the English language divided into general, alternative, partition and special.

3. Found out that during the reproduction of the text, it is impossible to avoid interpretation, i.e. completion of meanings, introduction of new elements into the text. Interpretation differs from a simple act of perception and requires additional efforts; it follows that it is always dynamic and involves the activity of the interpreter. Therefore, interpretation is always the introduction of something new that was not in the text, but it appears in the text – the subject of interpretation, and the source of this new thing is the consciousness of the interpreter, his experience, his culture. Interpreter and translator are different cultural roles, but the translator needs to convey the meaning of the interrogative sentence in the most appropriate way.

The identification and interpretation of communicative intent is possible only when taking into account many components that create a broad context.

4. Analyzed the functions of interrogative sentences in scientific and critical discourse based on the works of David Lodge. Such groups of interrogative constructions as rhetorical question and hypophora were identified, their structure

and the nature of the relationship with the answer were studied in view of the functions they perform.

Investigated that interrogative sentences are combined on the basis of primary and secondary functions.

The primary function of a question is to ask for specific information. The secondary functions of an interrogative sentence are emotional expressiveness, evaluation, expression of affirmation or denial, maintaining contact, expressing one's own position, etc.

The communicative functions of interrogative sentences require further study on the materials of various discourses.

RESUME

Курсова робота на тему: Комунікативні функції питальних висловлювань

Виконана Петруняк В.О.

Курсова робота складається зі вступу, двох розділів, висновків до розділів та загальних висновків, резюме та списку використаних джерел. У теоретичному розділі ми визначили комунікативні типи англійських речень та типологію питальних речень в англійській мові. У практичному розділі нами було досліджено інтерпретацію англійських інтерогативів при перекладі українською мовою на матеріалі роману Дж. Купера «Звіробій» та його українського перекладу, а також ми проаналізували функції питальних речень на матеріалі сучасного дискурсу, а саме – творів Девіда Лоджа, англомовного автора.

Ключові слова: питальні висловлення, комунікативні функції, інтерогатив, науково-критичний дискурс.

У даній курсовій:

Сторінок – 24;

Використаних джерел – 18.

LIST OF REFERENCE MATERIALS

1. Гедз, С.Ф. (1998). *Комунікативно-прагматичні особливості висловлювань з інтерогативним значенням у сучасній англійській мові*: автореф. дис... канд.. філолог. наук. 18 с.
2. Гедз, С. Ф. (2015). Риторичні запитання в сучасній англійській мові: комунікативно-функціональний аспект. *Актуальні питання іноземної філології*, 3. 35-41.
3. Жеребило, Н. С. (2022). Типологія питальних речень в англійській та українській мовах. *МЦНД. Розвиток наукової думки постіндустріального суспільства: сучасний дискурс*. 253-255.
4. Савчук, А. Я. (2018). Функції питальних речень в науково-критичному дискурсі. *Науковий журнал Львівського державного університету безпеки життєдіяльності «Львівський філологічний часопис»*, 4. 94-98.
5. Сітко, А.В. (2011). *Відтворення комунікативної семантики англійських інтерогативних конструкцій у перекладі*: автореф. дис. на здобуття наук. ступеня канд. філол. наук. 19 с.
6. Сітко, А. В., Журавльова, О. М. (2007). Інтерпретація англійських інтерогативів під час перекладу українською мовою. *Вісник СумДУ. Серія Філологія*, 1 (2). 155-159.
7. Сітко, А. (2004). Комунікативні типи англійських речень та їх функції. *Філологічні студії*.
8. Чайка, Л.В. (1998). *Питальні висловлювання у комунікативному аспекті (на мат-лі англ. мови)*: автореф. дис. канд.. філолог. наук. 16 с.
9. Шабат, С.Т. (2000). *Категорія питальної модальності в сучасній українській мові*: автореф. дис. на здобуття наук. ступеня. канд. філол. наук; Прикарпатський держ. ун-т ім. Василя Стефаника. 19 с.
10. Kruisinga, E.A. (1931). *Handbook of Present Day English*. English Accidence and Syntax. 550 p.
11. Poustma, H.A. (1928). *Grammar of Late Modern English*. Part I. The Sentence. 540 p.

LIST OF ILLUSTRATION MATERIALS

12. Купер, Д.Ф. (1968). *Звіробій: Роман* / Пер. з англ. Л. Солонько, О. Терех. К. : Веселка. 122 с.
13. Cooper, James (1862). *The Deerslayer*. London: Routledge. 381 p.
14. Lodge, D. (2002). *Language of Fiction*. Essays in Criticism and Verbal Analysis of the English novel.
15. Lodge, D. (2013). *Modern Criticism and Theory: A Reader*. London: Routledge.
16. Lodge, D. (1992). *The Art of Fiction*.
17. Lodge, D. (2015). *The Modes of Modern Writing*. London, New York: Bloomsbury.
18. Lodge, D. (1971). *Working with Structuralism*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.