

# PARTICULARITIES OF PARTIAL INTERROGATIVES IN THE WRITTEN DIDACTIC DISCOURSE

Constantin-Georgel STOICA,  
“Ovidius” University of Constanța  
constantingeorgel\_stoica@yahoo.com

## Abstract

*Partial interrogatives (PIs)* are very well highlighted at morphological level and are marked by the occurrence of the interrogative word. Therefore, they are best represented in the didactic discourse. Among them, those formulated by means of the interrogative words *ce?* ‘what’, *care?* ‘who/which/what’ and *cum?* ‘how’ stand out, as they account for more than 90% of such occurrences. The *partial interrogatives* identified in the written didactic discourse are mainly remarkable through the particular cases they describe in Romanian, such as those with “non-prototypical thematization”, the elliptical ones or those in association with other PIs or with various interrogative structures.

## Key words

Partial interrogative, didactic discourse, interrogative word, emphatic stress, epistemic values.

## 1. Defining features of PIs

Partial interrogative structures are those interrogative structures by means of which the locutor requests that the allocutor produce an answer meant to specify a variable which is explicit in the question. In this regard, the interrogative word, which is the distinctive element of partial interrogations, is of great importance.

At the morphological level, partial interrogations are marked<sup>1</sup> by the occurrence of interrogative pronouns or pronominal adjectives such as *cine?* ‘who’, *ce?* ‘what’, *care?* ‘which/who/what’, *câți?* ‘how many’, *al câtelea?* ‘which (number)’. Alongside of these, there is also a significant series of

---

<sup>1</sup> GAR, vol. II, p. 37.

adverbs with interrogative value: *unde?* ‘where’, *când?* ‘when’, *cum?* ‘how’, *cât?* ‘how much’. The adverbial phrase *de ce?* ‘why’ is another important occurrence in the text corpus analysed.

Unlike total interrogatives, which may expect a single correct answer, partial interrogations are known as *open-ended questions*. But, even in PIs, there may be formulations which are constraints of the interrogation, which, at the semantic-pragmatic level of interrogations, corresponds to an unexpected answer, thus they are *closed-ended answers*. This class of partial interrogatives includes those formulated by means of *cine?*, *ce?*, *care?*, *unde?*, *când?*, because the correct reply the allocutor may offer is restricted to a unique context.

In other words, an important feature of PIs is that, through the interrogative word, the answer is semantically restricted and, depending on the locutor’s intention, any sentence constituent may be considered.

Another characteristic of these structures is the standard word order, with the occurrence of interrogative elements in initial position, which leads to an intonational matrix with a descending line<sup>2</sup>. If the locutor wants to add an affective mark to it, the interrogative word is placed at the end of the partial interrogative structure.

Although the typical PI pattern is that of syntactic structures constructed with a single interrogative word, the analysed text corpus also includes deviations from this model. These are the multiple interrogatives, built by means of two juxtaposed or copulative coordinate interrogative words.

## **2. Statistical considerations**

Partial interrogatives come first in our text corpus in terms of the number of occurrences, perhaps also because they are the most clearly defined as a specific typology, given the typical “interrogative words” and, obviously, their thematized placement, in most cases.

More specifically, there are 572 PIs out of the total of 799 interrogatives, which represents 70.33% of the selected corpus. We should

---

<sup>2</sup> GALR, vol. II, p. 33.

say that we have also included the few examples of indirect interrogative structures (4 occurrences) and the quite wealthy series of structures with non-interrogative syntax, represented by 103 items, i.e. 18.10% of the total. They are actually assertions, even though within the written didactic discourse we have studied, namely in textbooks, they almost invariably occur in the “Questions” section. Therefore, the number of interrogations proper should be reduced to 468 units.

Of the initially selected total, 212 occurrences, i.e. 37.06%, contain the interrogative pronoun *ce*, bearer of interrogative emphasis and indicator of the constituent that needs to express the element identified in the expected answer. Naturally, we have included simple formulas here as well as those preceded by various prepositions (*cu* ‘with’, *de* which combined with *ce* means ‘why’, *în* ‘in’, *la* ‘at’, *pentru* ‘for’, *prin* ‘through’ and so on).

Then there are the partial interrogations with the key element *care*. These structures total 160 partial interrogative units, including the forms preceded by prepositions (*cu*, *despre* ‘about’, *la*, *pentru* etc.). When the time comes, we will show that some of these constructions fall into the abovementioned subtypes only formally, for those particular pronouns are actually part of constructions and syntagms that make up phrases or compound prepositions belonging to a completely different semantic-morphological area: *în ce fel?* ‘in what way’ is, in fact, the phrasal correspondent of *cum?* ‘how’, so it should come under the category of adverbs (interrogative-relative adverbial phrases, in our case), whereas *în ce măsură* ‘to what extent’ may be the logico-semantic equivalent of the adverbs *cât?* and *cum?*, with equal chances of discursive-pragmatic confirmation.

The following types of “interrogative words” – defining for PI structures – are less represented in the text we have researched. The interrogative pronoun/adjective *cine?* occurs only 12 times, 8 of which in the Nominative, having the syntactic function of Subject, and 5 – in the Dative (*cui?* ‘to whom’), functioning as Indirect Object, naturally. Statistically, they represent 3% of the total of questions in our texts, 1.7% in the Nominative, 1.3% in the Dative.

Among the “interrogative words” that can be referred to as fertile in the organisation of PIs, we can mention only the interrogative adverb *cum*, used 141 times, i.e. 26.1% of the total of PIs, followed by *cât?*, merely 1.28%. Other interrogative markers of PIs, such as the adverbs *unde?*, *când?*, or the adverbial phrase *de ce?* as well as various inflectional forms of relative pronouns/adverbs (*al cătelea?* etc.) represent, each, below 1% of all structures inventoried here.

From a statistical-quantitative perspective, double and triple occurrences, which are relatively frequent in the type of discourse we are investigating, are worth mentioning. We have not split them into separate units and, consequently, we have not calculated them separately, so we might say that the total number of PI prototypical structures is somewhat larger than aforementioned. We shall discuss several such examples at the appropriate moment.

Quantitatively, our attention has been drawn by the preponderance of questions with such interrogative terms as *care?* and *ce?*, with their inflectional and phrasal variants, to the detriment of those built by means of *cine?*, which are extremely poorly distributed. Given their semantic-pragmatic role of directing the nature of answers and of generally configuring the framework of interpretations for which those particular questions are asked, we might say that the authors of those texts are more interested in “things” than in “people”

The questions concerning phenomena, processes, *realia* data, stimulate, it is true, the development of personal judgements about *what happens* in the studied universe, about the parameters *in which* daily real and fictional life takes place, and less about *who* represents a human type, *who* behaves in a certain manner, *who* solves or complicates an existential problem and so on and so forth.

On the other hand, we must admit that the number of “closed-ended” questions, typical of old didactic texts, which required simple, precisely configured information, irrelevant in the process of thinking stimulation and in the formation of feelings and attitudes of young receivers, has greatly decreased. Questions such as *Când s-a născut Ion Creangă?* (“When was

Ion Creangă born?’), “*Unde a învățat carte?*” (‘Where did he study?’) are fortunately very rare in texts nowadays. This explains the small number of questions starting with *când?* (1) and *unde?* (2). When they occur, they regard an issue that involves a personal interpretative response (“*Unde a greșit fiecare [personaj]?*” ‘**Where** did each [character] go wrong?’; “*Când se declanșează criza de conștiință și cu ce consecințe?*” ‘**When** does the conscience crisis start and **with what** consequences?’).

### **3. Variables in identifying the constituent in PI formulation**

The term ‘identification’ seems to be the pivot of analysis of some partial interrogatives since their purpose is to select, on the syntagmatic axis, an element carrying a charge determinant in the formulation of the answer. Unlike total interrogatives, which are solely materialised in the verbal/nominal predicate, even when there is thematization of other constituents (Subject, Object, Adverbial etc.), PI structures contain a variety of possibilities, equal to the syntactic functions codified in descriptive grammars, except the syntactic Predicate. However, the latter may occur in some cases and in certain topically and emphatically well marked circumstances, in privileged position and main role in answer formation.

#### **3.1. Pronouns and pronominal adjectives**

The raison d’être of interrogative pronouns is exclusively that of lexico-grammatical markers of an interrogation<sup>3</sup>. Forming a lexico-grammatical class with a relatively small inventory of units in Romanian, they function as variables<sup>4</sup>, in that, the referent to which they refer may change from one situation to another, producing superpositions of “animate/non-animate” categories, for example, and aiming, in the formulated answer, the singular and the plural by the same form and with the same function. This behaviour is explained by the discursive reality, in that, an utterance built with prototypical interrogatives does not render, by substitution, the entity targeted

---

<sup>3</sup> Cf. GALR, I, p. 273; II, p. 36; GBLR, pp. 159 și 606; GLRG, p. 138.

<sup>4</sup> “...and never as deictics or anaphors”, cf. GBLR, p. 159.

(which is also valid for indefinite pronouns), but requests information about them. Regardless of whether or not the emitter knows the answer, the use of interrogatives with typical pronouns/adjectives places the dialogue in the sphere of “unknown/known” exchanges.

Semantically, they require a qualitative assessment (*cine?, ce?, care?*) and a quantitative one (*cât?, câtă? câți? câte?; al câtelea?, a câta?*).

### *3.1.1. The interrogative pronoun and adjective “care?”*

The most frequent of the anticipators characterising partial interrogatives in the written didactic discourse, as it appears in our statistics, is a qualitative assessment which is discursively bound in the structure it belongs to and valid for “± animate” references.

The vast majority (about 97%) of the 160 PI occurrences constructed by means of the pronoun *care?* use it as centre of a mono-member group, which means that it functions as subject, anticipating a subject in the assertive answer expected. Basically, most of the interrogative structures of this kind comply with the scheme:

*Care* + copulative verb + predicative (+ attributes, adverbials etc.).

In such situations, the nominal in the predicative group has an anaphoric role, repeating some preceding information, because, otherwise, the interrogation would not make any sense:

(1) “**Care** este finalitatea reală urmărită de aceste personaje?” (L12, 223) (‘**What** is the real goal pursued by these characters?’)

There is also a marker of presupposition in this question, as the attribute “reală” points out that there may be/there is a seeming one, stated as such by those particular characters, in the text in discussion. On the other hand, we should assume that an assertion that precedes the question is about the “goals” of actions/discussions in which the characters are involved.

The answer will be formulated in a standard, expected form, by an inversion of syntactic functions:

[*Finalitatea reală este x.*] (‘The real goal is x.’),

where *x* replaces *care* logically and semantically but changes places with *finalitatea*, which is thematised. Naturally, the answer may also be formulated without this thematising movement:

[*X este finalitatea reală.*] (‘*X* is the real goal.’)

Sometimes, between the subject *Care* and the nominal predicate, another verb, a predicative one this time, is inserted. It belongs to the class of *verba dubitandi*, which are frequent in interrogative structures, as we have already shown:

(2) “*Care*<sup>1</sup>/ *credeți*<sup>2</sup>/ *că este metafora centrală a textului?*<sup>1/</sup>” (N12, 31)  
(‘**Which**<sup>1</sup>/ do you think<sup>2</sup>/ is the central metaphor of the text?’)

Here we are dealing with a partial interrogative in a complex sentence, in which the “phenomenon of intertwining the subordinate with the main clause” has occurred<sup>5</sup>. The interrogative word *care* moves from the subordinate to the beginning of the sentence, as a marker of the entire utterance, but it still functions as subject of the subordinate clause.

There are many such examples whose common feature is that the governing verb, which is often the only constituent of the main clause, belongs to the semantic-pragmatic category of “weak” verbs – *verba declarandi* (*a zice* ‘say’, *a spune* ‘tell’, *a afirma* ‘state’ etc.), *verba sentiendi* (*a vedea* ‘see’, *a auzi* ‘hear’, *a simți* ‘feel’) and so on. In our corpus, it is the modal verbs (mainly *a putea* ‘can’) and some verbs of thinking (*a crede* think, *a considera* ‘consider’ etc.) that are more frequent in this position.

(3) “*Care*<sup>1</sup>/ *credeți*<sup>2</sup>/ *că este semnificația acestei «depersonalizări»?*<sup>1/</sup>” (L12, 228) (‘**Which** do you think is the meaning of this *depersonalisation*?’)

(4) “*Care consideri că este motivul acestei transformări?*” (C11, 166)  
(‘**What** do you consider to be the reason for this transformation?’)

Sometimes, the interrogative pronoun *care?* forms a complex group:

(5) “*Care dintre cele două variante ți s-a părut mai realizată?*” (C11, 89) (‘**Which of the two** versions did you find more accomplished?’)

(6) “*Care dintre următoarele cuvinte au o dublă accentuare?*” (L12, 68) (‘**Which of the following** words has a double emphasis?’)

---

<sup>5</sup> Cf. GALR, II, p. 34.

There are situations in which the interrogative structure is reduced to the minimum number of constituents, which means it is still correct logically and grammatically, but is discursively elliptical. Naturally, such constructions are possible only in association with an assertive utterance that precedes or follows the PI structure:

(7) “*Care este aceasta?*” (C10, 71) (‘**Which** one is that?’)

Indeed, the context contains not one, but two complex assertive utterances, by which the recipient of the question is reminded that *aceasta* refers to the “desire/intention” of a certain character to enter into an advantageous marriage at any cost.

*Modalisation* also occurs in this type of questions, sometimes directly, be means of the verb *a putea* ‘can/may’, which thus becomes the governor of an object clause (more rarely of a subject clause), hence – a partial interrogation within a complex sentence:

(8) “*Care ar putea să fie aceasta?*” (C10, 159) (‘**Which** one **might** that be?’)

Obviously, the interrogative word belongs to the subordinate clause. In other words, it transfers its interrogative function to the entire sentence.

In other cases, modalisation occurs in the subordinate clause, by means of the same epistemic verb:

(9) “*Care<sup>1</sup>/ consideri<sup>2</sup>/ că ar putea fi rostul ei?*” (C11, 88) (‘**What<sup>1</sup>** do you think<sup>2</sup>/ **might be** the point of it?’)

As regards the “complex predicate” *a putea + a fi* in various types of interrogations, it should be mentioned that the referent in the expected answer might be the “boastfulness” in Master Manole’s reckless speech to the question asked by Prince Negru-Vodă.

More simply, modalisation occurs in grammatical categories, more specifically, by using the presumptive or conditional for the verb-predicate of the sentence:

(10) “*Care ar fi consecințele pe Terra?*” (C11, 139) (‘**What would be** the consequences on Earth?’)

(11) “*Care ar fi «treptele» acesteia?*” (S12, 109) (‘**What would be** its stages?’)



In PI concatenations, the marker *care* occurs in different cases, hence with different syntactic functions, but sometimes the associations include other “interrogative words” as well:

(12) “**Care** crezi că este motivul **pentru care** autorul a procedat astfel?” (C11, 98) (‘**What** do you think is the reason **why** the author did so?’)

(13) “**Care** este motivul **pentru care** iadul este descris astfel și **cui** crezi că îi este el hărăzit?” (C11, 44) (‘**What** do you think is the reason **why** hell is described in this way and **for whom** do you think it is meant?’)

We are dealing here with a doubling of the interrogative marker (Subject, Prep. Obj.) and in (13) with a coordination with a clause introduced by *cine* in thematic position, although it is an Indirect Object.

- As a pronominal adjective, *care* occurs quite infrequently:

(14) “**Care** «*vițiu radical*» este identificat de Maiorescu în cultura timpului său?” (C11, 107) (‘**What radical vice** is identified by Maiorescu in the culture of his time?’)

(15) “**Care evenimente** au condus spre finalul piesei?” (L12, 228) (‘**What events** led to the ending of the play’)

(16) “**Care soluție** este mai greu de urmat?” (N12, 129) (‘**What solution** is more difficult to follow?’)

- In terms of case oppositions, the pronoun has only Nominative/Accusative and Genitive/Dative forms, therefore specific situations are formally rare. Apart from repetitions such as those in the abovementioned examples, in associated PI constructions, in which we have encountered the nominative (*care*) and accusative (prep. + *care*), there are very few different inflectional situations.

(17) “**Căror** colegi le-ai propune rolurile lui Pampon, Crăcănel și al Miței?” (C9, 119) (‘**To which** colleagues would you propose the roles of Pampon, Crăcănel and Mița?’)

(18) “Dacă ar trebui să alegi un număr limitat de poezii eminesciene..., **la care** te-ai opri?” (C11, 157) (‘If you had to choose a limited number of Eminescu’s poems..., **which** would you consider?’)

As can be seen, (17) contains an interrogative pronominal adjective.

The frequency of constructions employing the interrogative pronoun and adjective *care* reflects its ability to request answers with a concrete and abstract referent (*Care sunt personajele?* ‘Which are the characters?’ vs. *Care sunt ideile?* ‘Which are the ideas?’), i.e. closed-ended and/or open-ended answers, for situations which can facilitate Socratic dialogues, with a great formative load.

### 3.1.2. *The interrogative pronoun and adjective “ce?”*

Expressing a qualitative assessment, *ce* is characterised by the seme “- discursively bound” and the seme “- animate”<sup>6</sup>. Its unique form lends itself to a wide variety of referents, regardless of gender opposition, but the inventory is rather reduced due to the quasi-generalised absence of Genitive-Dative forms. As we have seen so far in other interrogative words, these forms are not very used either.

In our corpus of 160 units, there are a lot of ‘prep. + *ce*’ structures which are typical of the Accusative, but not one which should illustrate the analytical construction of oblique cases, such as prep. + Genitive with *-a* + Accusative *ce*:

(19) “*Împotriva a ce te ridici tu acum?*” (GALR, I, 275) (‘**What** are you up **against** now?’)

The simple pronoun in the Nominative functioning as subject occupies just over half of the corpus selected to illustrate this marker:

(20) “*Ce a determinat [schimbarea de atitudine]?*” (C10, 17) (‘**What** caused [the change in attitude]?’)

(21) “*Ce îți evocă substantivul respectiv?*” (C10, 96) (‘**What** does this particular noun evoke in you?’)

(22) “*Ce înțelege Allan prin «dragoste mistică»?*” (C10, 101) (‘**What** does Allan understand by *mystical love*?’)

This time, the constructions with the verb *a fi* + *predicative* are much rarer:

---

<sup>6</sup> However, descriptive grammars mention situations in which there are discrepancies between the predication of the locutor who formulates the question and the reality of the answer received, in that, the latter may contain a “+animate” referent corresponding to the interrogative “ce”: “– *Ce vezi? – Un copil.*” (‘What do you see?’ ‘A child.’), cf. GALR, I, p. 273.

(23) “*Ce este adevărul?*” (S12, 231) (‘**What** is the truth?’)

The question is continued by another somewhat similar PI structure, but with a predicative verb and the use of *ce* as a pronominal adjective:

(24) “... [*și*] **ce rol joacă recunoașterea acestuia?**” (S12, 231 bis) (‘...[and] **what role** does it play in its acknowledgment?’)

Actually, we should note that *ce* is used, in the overwhelming majority of cases, in adjectival position:

(25) “*Ce explicație dai acestui fapt?*” (C11, 195) (‘**What explanation** do you give for this?’)

(26) “*Ce divinitate este absentă din acest univers...?*” (N12, 43) (‘**What divinity** is absent from this universe...?’)

There are many questions in which the adjectives of the interrogative under discussion are repeated with a noun governor such as “rol” (8 occurrences) or “semnificație” (17 occurrences):

(27) “*Ce rol atribui verbului «trebuie»?*” (C12, 201) (‘**What role** do you assign to the verb *trebuie*?’)

(28) “*Ce semnificație dobândește... negrul bacovian?*” (N12, 20) (‘**What significance** does Bacovia’s black acquire?’)

Here, too, the syntagmatic forms (phrases, compound words, inflectional forms with preposition) are quite frequent:

(29) “*Ce fel de «școală» consideri că îi oferă călătoria unui tânăr?*” (C9, 139) (‘**What kind of school** do you think the journey offers a youth?’)

(30) “*Din ce se naște poezia, așadar?*” (C12, 18) (‘**From what** does poetry arise then?’)

(31) “*Din ce etape ale creației barbiene face parte fiecare din poeziile de mai sus?*” (N12, 74) (‘**What stages** of Barbu’s creation does each of the above poems belong to?’)

Two of the three utterances use *ce* as pronominal adjective.

Questions with *de ce* as prepositional phrase with various roles are also frequent:

(32) “*De ce mare poet amintește?*” (L12, 164) (‘**What** great writer does he mention?’)

Perhaps the more correct formulation would have been:

(33) [*“De care mare poet amintește?”*]

(34) *“De ce boală suferă soțul lui Suzy?”* (L12, 196) (‘**What** disease does Suzy’s husband suffer **from**?’)

The following questions contain adverbial phrases (mostly used colloquially, although we have identified them in normative texts):

(35) *“De ce are el voie să spună și să facă orice?”* (S12, 118) (‘**Why** is he allowed to say and do anything?’)

(36) *„De ce credeți că apar atât de multe predicate în textul liric?”* (S12, 100) (‘**Why** do you think so many predicates occur in the lyric text?’)

Forms with the preposition *despre* occur in prepositional structures or in complex sentences, with a pronoun or a pronominal adjective:

(37) *“Despre ce se vorbește în text?”* (C10, 168) (‘**What** is the text **about**?’)

(38) *“Despre ce «inspirațiune» crezi că e vorba?”* (C11, 181) (‘**What inspiration** do you think is this **about**?’)

(39) *“Despre ce fel de lume este vorba?”* (C12, 128) (‘**What kind of world** is this all **about**?’)

Accompanied by the preposition *în*, the pronoun/adjective *ce* occurs in simple or complex sentences, often with epistemic modalising adverbs:

(40) *“În ce constă argumentele aduse în sprijinul ideii de «mixtură»?”* (C11, 16) (‘**What** are the arguments which support the idea of *mixture*?’)

(41) *“În ce categorie estetică credeți că s-ar putea include textul?”* (L12, 229) (‘**In what** aesthetic **category** do you think this text may be included?’)

(42) *“În ce anume constă eroarea pe care o semnalează criticul?”* (C11, 106) (‘**What exactly** is the error that the critic points out?’)

There are many situations in which the verb *a consta* ‘to lie/consist in’ is the predicate centre of the structure *în + ce*. Example (30) is found in about 12 relatively similar occurrences. When associated with a noun, the latter is *context* ‘context’, *tip* ‘type’ etc.:

(43) *“În ce context este utilizat termenul «testament»?”* (C12, 18) (‘**In what context** is the term *testament* used?’)

(44) *“În ce tip de lirism se încadrează textul?”* (N12, 28 and 147) (‘**What type** of lyricism does the text fall **into**?’)

We have already mentioned structures such as *În ce măsură?* ‘To what extent?’. Logico-semantically, they may be replaced by *cât?*. But the answers may repeat the construction in the same manner:

(45) “**În ce măsură** o cronică literară poate influența citirea unei cărți?” (C12, 216) (“**To what extent** can a literary review influence the reading of a book?”)

By paraphrasing, the question may be rephrased as:

[*Cât de mult* poate influența o cronică literară citirea unei cărți?]<sup>7</sup>  
(‘*How much* can a literary review influence the reading of a book?’)

The answer would be:

[Într-o măsură (destul de) mare.] (‘To a (quite) large extent.’)

To some degree, the same limited series may include the phrase *în ce fel* ‘in what way’, which we might consider to be an adverbial phrase, because it may be the equivalent of the adverb *cum* ‘how’, and sometimes of *cât* ‘how much’, both with a relative-interrogative value:

(46) “**În ce fel** credeți că se produce această conversie la Cristian Popescu?” (S12, 127) (“**In what way** do you think this change occurs in Cristian Popescu?”)

[*Cum* credeți că se produce această conversie...?] (‘*How* do you think this change...?’)

Other prepositional variants, with *la*, *prin*, *spre*, *sub*, *spre* etc., may be almost exclusively signalled by the adjectival use of *ce*:

(47) “**La ce aspecte** se referă?” (C12, 42) (“**What aspects** does it refer to?”)

(48) “**La ce concluzie** ajunge Maiorescu în finalul textului?” (C11, 107) (“**What conclusion** does Maiorescu come to at the end of the text?”)

(49) “**Prin ce gest** este întărită «plânsoarea» juzilor?” (C11, 211) (“**By what gesture** is the mayors’ complaint enforced?”)

(50) “**Spre ce descoperire** conduc ele [întrebările]?” (C12, 101) (“**To what discovery** do they [the questions] lead?”)

---

<sup>7</sup> Paraphrasing helps us propose an interpretation for that particular interrogative phrase. Because the noun *măsură* can no longer activate its inflectional variations (# *În aceleași măsuri*) and no longer allows the combination with other words in subordinate position, we consider this group to be a prepositional phrase, cf. GLRG, p. 203.

(51) “**Sub ce semn** situează poetul și filosoful acest amestec de trăsături ale românilor?” (X11, 16) (‘**Under what sign** does the poet and philosopher place this mixture of Romanian features?’)

In our corpus we have come across only one example of *ce* used pronominally preceded by such prepositions, modalized by the adverb *anume* ‘exactly’:

(52) “**Prin ce anume** un autor poate fi înscris într-o generație literară?” (S12, 128) (‘**How exactly** can an author be included in a literary generation?’)

Finally, a syntagmatic use, i.e. as phrase, is to be found in the following question:

(53) “**În funcție de ce** alt criteriu decât al cronologiei ai putea grupa citatele?” (C11, 118) (‘**According to what** criterion other than chronology could you group the quotations?’)

Here we also believe that the adverb *cum* can be equally used without losing too much of the meaning of the question.

Therefore, it is precisely due to its formal – phonetic and inflectional – simplicity, which frees it from paradigmatic constraints, that the pronoun and adjective *ce* has a wide range of action as a marker of partial interrogative structures, able to identify a component of the assertion-answer.

### 3.1.3. Other interrogative pronouns and adjectives

• *Cine* (alongside of its variants with prepositions) is the first form of qualitative assessment recorded in descriptive grammatical treatises, but in terms of actual realisations, it accounts for only 3% of all PIs in our corpus, namely 8 occurrences with Nom.-Acc. forms (with/without preposition) and 5 occurrences with Gen.-Dat. Forms (with/without possessive-genitival articles or prepositions). Discursively unbound, *cine* is, in principle, “+animate”, but is sometimes used with a “-animate” referent in questions in which there is a discrepancy between “predication and the actual situation”:

(54) “– *Cine* a căzut?

– *Cartea.*” (GALR, I, p. 273) (‘Who fell?’ ‘The book’)

Nominative forms functioning as subject occur in simple or complex sentences; in the former they follow the pattern *cine + a fi*, which leads to a “closed-ended question”, as the referent is precisely a character in the dialogic context:

(55) “**Cine** este Iustin Comănescu?” (L12, 196) (‘**Who** is Iustin Comănescu?’)

(56) ”**Cine** este vinovat de acest gest?” (N12, 117) (‘**Who** is guilty of this gesture?’)

It occurs less frequently with predicative verbs in simple or complex sentences:

(57) “**Cine** rostește cuvintele acestea și în **ce** împrejurare?” (L12, 196) (‘**Who** says these words and under **what** circumstances?’)

In complex sentences, *cine* and its variants occur with the usual verbal governor of the type *a crede* ‘think/believe’, *a considera* ‘consider’, *a aprecia* ‘reckon’:

(58) “**Cine**<sup>1/</sup>*credeți*<sup>2/</sup> că este «tu» în aceste versuri?<sup>1/</sup>” (N12, 43) (‘**Who**<sup>1/</sup> do you think<sup>2/</sup> is you in these verses?’)

As regards the structures with prepositions, there are only a few examples:

(59) “**La cine** se referă vorbitorul?” (C10, 182) (‘**Who** does the speaker refer to?’)

(60) “**Pe cine** exprimă persoana I...?” (S12, 91) (‘**Who** does the first person express...?’)

(61) “**Pe cine**<sup>1/</sup> ai vrea<sup>2/</sup> să întâlnești<sup>3/</sup> și **ce întrebări** i-ai pune<sup>4/</sup>?” (C9, 173) (**Whom**<sup>1/</sup> would you like<sup>2/</sup> to meet<sup>3/</sup> and **what questions** would you ask them?<sup>4/</sup>)

Example (61) illustrates a complex sentence in which the governor is a verb from a different semantic category than commonly used in these texts (*verbum voluntatis*, in this case) and, furthermore, the compound sentence is made by coordination with another PI structure, which includes the pronominal adjective *ce*.

As regards the Genitive-Dative, as we have previously shown, there are only five questions, one of which represents the Genitive form of *cine*:

(62) “**A cui** «voce» se aude acum...?” (C11, 44) (‘**Whose** voice can now be heard...?’)

The others are the usual Dative forms, functioning as Indirect Object by thematised placement, a movement which is common in interrogations:

(63) “**Cui** îi aparține vocea narativă?” (C12, 143) (‘**To whom** does the narrative voice belong?’)

(64) “**Cui** îi este dedicat «romanțul»?” (C10, 63) (‘**To whom** is the *romance* dedicated?’)

As is known, the pronoun *cine* does not allow adjectival realisations in any of the inflectional concretisations, which might explain the reduced number of occurrences inventoried here.

No uses in complex sentences have been recorded either, although the syntactic-morphological configuration would not exclude them from ordinary speech. A structure such as:

(65) [*“Cine credeți că ar fi meritat recompensa?”*] (‘Who do you think would have deserved the reward?’)

is not at all unusual in any kind of discourse.

• In the text we have analysed, we have not come across pronouns and adjectives for quantitative assessment either. The uncountable variants, with the *cât/câtă?* gender opposition, as well as the countable ones with the same oppositions, *câți/câte?*; *al câtelea/a câta?*, are almost completely missing in our text corpus.

They occur only in four questions, built by means of the structure *cât de*, which demands an answer formulated in the form of an assessment under the category of the intensive:

(66) *“Cât de importantă vi se pare receptarea unui scriitor tânăr?”* (S12, 128) (‘**How important** do you think it is the reception of a young writer?’)

(67) *“Cât de modern este peisajul «ciocnirii» erotice din poemul lui M. Cărtărescu?”* (S12, 124) (‘**How modern** is the landscape of the erotic *clash* in M. Cărtărescu’s poem?’)

The answers would consist in subjective uncountable assessments:

[*Mult; Foarte mult; Deloc*] (‘Much; Very much; Not at all’)

Both the first subcategory mentioned here (countable with the numeric specification – *câți/câte?*) and those in the second group (countable by establishing order in an ascending series *al câtelea, a câta?*) are interrogatives which would entail precise answers, containing some actual, concrete, quantifiable information, in the narrowest sense of the word. But it seems that these questions are no longer considered by the modern authors of texts belonging to the category selected here, which, in our opinion, is not too great a loss.

Anyway, even without the latter, partial interrogative (PI) structures with interrogative pronouns and adjectives are well represented in the written didactic discourse, in a fairly wide variety of forms.



### **3.2. Adverbs and adverbial phrases**

Of the adverbial markers (*unde?* ‘where’, *când?* ‘when’, *cum?* ‘how’, *cât<sub>2</sub>?* ‘how much’), only *cum?* is well represented, with 141 occurrences, which account for 26.1% of all PIs.

*Unde?*, *când?* and *cât<sub>2</sub>?* are present in less than 1% of the examples:

(68) “**Cum** s-a format cuvântul «strămoș»?” (C9, 13) (‘**How** was the word *strămoș* formed?’)

(69) “**Cum** reacționează Ion Micu la telefonul lui Petrini?” (L12, 196) (‘**How** does Ion Micu react to Petrini’s phone call?’)

(70) “**Cum** se explică faptul că apar aceste vietăți?” (S12, 125) (‘**How** may the appearance of these creatures be explained?’)

It is clear that, in principle, *cum?* generates open-ended questions that lend themselves to personal interpretations. Example (68) is one of the few exceptions in this respect. Thus, similarly, *unde?* and *când?* demand answers with concrete circumstantial configuration, less suitable for dialogues with formative purposes.

## **4. Particular cases of PIs**

### **4.1. PIs with non-prototypical thematization**

Very rare and with less obvious topicalization than in spoken language, such as

(71) “*Ați fost – unde?*” (GBLR, 608) (‘You have been – where?’), such structures occur with interrogative pronoun or adjective in a different case than the Nominative and the subject repeated by a partial synonymy:

(72) “*Dintre poeziile lui Eminescu, pentru o listă scurtă, te-ai opri – la care?*” (C11, 157) (‘Of Eminescu’s poems, for a short list, you would choose – which?’)

As in all such situations, when the thematized word is not the interrogative word, which is not the subject of the utterance, there are other markers of the structure. First of all, in our case, the interrogative word is in the Accusative, which excludes it from the prototypical position of Subject. Secondly, that particular interrogative word, though not functioning as Object and having lost its status of thematized element, remains the bearer of the emphatic stress of the intonational line. Furthermore, it is additionally emphasised by a preceding rhetorical pause, a suprasegmental sign of the topical-syntactic displacement.

Modern Romanian grammars do not rule out the possibility of linguistic calques<sup>8</sup> in such rare situations.

#### **4.2. Associations of two or more partial interrogatives**

We have already mentioned several types of associations between interrogatives – of the same type or of different types – in more complex sentences, formed by copulative coordination, cf. *supra*.

Firstly, there are the situations in which the interrogative word is repeated in a rhetorical symmetry, with ascending discursive relevance, though:

(73) “**Unde** greșește mereu poetul **și unde** ar trebui să-l căutăm pe Dumnezeu?” (S12, 15) (‘**Where** does the poet always err and **where** should one look for God?’)

(74) “... **cine** este, în acest moment, povestitorul **și cine** este cel ce se pregătește să asculte?” (C10, 34) (‘... **who** is the narrator at this moment and **who** is the one preparing to listen?’)

Then, there are the situations in which the nature of the introductory word changes, as coordination is an association of the type “interrogative adverb/pronoun/pronominal adjective”, which require a more detailed answer, obviously composed of at least two statements addressing two different aspects of the topic discussed in that particular exchange of discursive acts:

(75) “**Unde** a greșit fiecare **și cu ce** urmări imediate și de perspectivă?” (S12, 162) (‘**Where** did everyone go wrong and **with what** immediate and future consequences?’)

The repetition of the interrogative morphosyntactic element sometimes leads, in such cases, regardless of their nature, to the ellipsis of the predicate, of the subject or of any other constituent – especially in the secondary component of the sentence made by coordination.

Other times, the construction merely links two different partial interrogatives, each properly graphically marked:

(76) “**Ce** rol are, în economia fragmentului, replica femeii? **De ce** a introdus-o prozatorul în scena respectivă?” (S12, 131) (‘**What** role does the woman’s reply play in the economy of the fragment? **Why** did the writer introduce her in that scene?’)

In our opinion, the two PIs refer to the same referent, i.e. a possible unique answer.

---

<sup>8</sup> Cf. GBLR, p. 608.

Sometimes, the change of interrogative element (*ce?/care?*) – in the same lexicomorphological class, demands, however, different answers:

(77) “*Ce figură de stil este prezentă în titlu? Care este semnificația ei?*” (N12, 114) (‘**What** figure of speech is present in the title? **What** is its meaning?’)

The utterances arranged in paratactic succession suggest complementary answers which address the same subject of the “question/answer” diptych, which may be developed independently, the former creating the logical and informational basis for the latter. Basically, the first interrogative structure aims at knowing the definition, therefore a prior theoretical, informational acquisition, whereas the second addresses the respondent’s power of interpretation.

#### **4.3. Associations of different interrogative structures**

The association of different types of direct interrogative constructions is even more frequent than those of the same kind, placed in copulative coordination. Discursively, it is clear that the total interrogative (TI) is that which requires a more general answer, with a broader framework of reference, while partial and alternative interrogatives demand answers with a narrower referential area, specifically addressing the subject, i.e. the actant of the utterance: predication, i.e. the action per se, in its progress or – even more frequently – the circumstances of a process, phenomenon etc.:

(78) “*Ce reproș îi aduce [mașinii de scris]? Găsești o explicație pentru dorința poetului?*” (C12, 167) (‘**What** reproach does he bring [on the typewriter]? Can you find an explanation for the poet’s desire?’)

Here, in the paratactic structure – in fact, a succession of interrogations – there are two different types of interrogatives, PI + TI. As in the case of a previous association (succession, actually), which illustrates the repetition of the same direct interrogative type, here, the two different interrogations seem to direct a unique answer or, in any case, some little detailing, in the second, of the identifying answer to the first interrogation.

Sometimes, the referents referred to are undoubtedly different, complementary, although the second structure is elliptical, because a part of it identifies with that in the first structure. Moreover, such associations rely on an adversative, not copulative coordination relation, as is usually the case:

(79) “*Ce impresie ți-ar produce azi vederea unei mașini de scris? [Dar] persoana care ar folosi-o?*” (C12, pp.164-165) (‘**What** impression would the sight of a typewriter give you today? [But/what about] the person who would use it?’)

#### **4.4. Elliptical PI structures**

In example (79), we have noted that the question is again a succession of interrogative utterances and not an association with the usual syntactic elements of the sentence. At the very least, the punctuation in the spelling (the incipit of the second interrogation written with a capital letter) would argue for it. However, the two utterances are closely related grammatically. The incipit, an adversative coordinating conjunction, clearly points to this relation, although it is written with a capital. It marks only a rhetorical pause, a cumulative repetition of interrogation, an emphasis on the thematised element – *the person*. On the other hand, the two questions share one element, namely the structure that is not repeated in the second one, which thus becomes elliptical:

[*Ce impresie ți-ar produce...? Dar persoana?*] (‘**What** impression would...give you? But the person?’)

#### **5. PI structures with assertive/imperative/directive values**

In our text corpus, partial interrogatives with other characteristics than those marked by the ascending/descending intonation and the graphic sign of interrogation occur only in literary texts, which provide the theoretical explanatory support in those particular bibliographical references:

(80) “*Cine să-i mai caute?*” (C10, 66) (‘**Who** else will look for them?’)

It is a reply in the form of an interrogation given by Dinu Păturică in a dialogue in which he is informed of the possibility of returning some properties he has fraudulently appropriated. In fact, it is an assertion:

[*Nu o să-i mai caute nimeni, desigur.*] (‘No one will look for them, of course.’)

#### **6. PIs with non-interrogative structure**

We have had the opportunity to show that the texts selected contain many sentences which formally do not comply with the grammatical and suprasegmental (intonational line) conditions of any particular type of direct interrogation. They would not have made the object of our research if they had not been included in the sections entitled “Questions and tasks” or simply “Questions”. In fact, most of them are only imperative/directive statements, with governing verbs such as *a arăta* ‘show’, *a preciza* ‘specify’, *a explica* ‘explain’, *a determina* ‘determine’, *a identifica* ‘identify’, *a observa* ‘observe’ etc. (we have inventoried a total of 18 such verbs). In our initial

corpus we included 103 such statements which, by paraphrasing, may be interrogations, because they actually elicit various types of identification. Syntactically, they are all complex sentences:

(81) “*Arată<sup>1</sup>/care sunt argumentele tale pentru a susține această afirmație?<sup>2/</sup>” (C12, 27) (‘Show<sup>1</sup>/ **which** are the arguments supporting this statement?’)*

(82) “*Explică<sup>1</sup>/ ce urmărește personajul prin aceasta?<sup>2/</sup>” (C10, 117) (‘Explain<sup>1</sup>/ **what** the character intends by this?<sup>2/</sup>’)*

(83) “*Arătați<sup>1</sup>/ cum se realizează intenția parodică la nivelul frazei?<sup>2/</sup>” (L12, 173) (‘Show<sup>1</sup>/ **how** parodical intention is realised in the sentence?<sup>2/</sup>’)*

What is very clear in these sentences is the relative value that the former “interrogative words” acquire, so that both interrogative pronouns or adjectives and interrogative adverbs become relative, having a dual function, as connector in a hypotactic relation within the complex sentence (governing Main Clause + Object Direct Clause) and Subject, Adverbial, respectively, in the subordinate clause. They are not interrogatives formulated in Indirect Speech, because they do not report what someone else has said, and do not include the verb *a întreba* ‘ask’ in the main clause, but a directive, action verb.

It is a more categorical manner to stimulate the recipients’ memory effort and thinking, but we are not sure if it is a more efficient one.

## **7. Conclusions on partial interrogatives**

PI constructions are, in our opinion, the most clearly formally outlined in the entire range of direct interrogatives, because they are very well marked not only intonationally and, accordingly, by means of the specific sign (the question mark ‘?’), but also by specific interrogative words – interrogative pronouns or pronominal adjectives (*cine?*, *ce?*, *care? cât<sub>1</sub>?*) or interrogative adverbs (*unde?*, *când?*, *cum?*, *cât<sub>2</sub>?*). Their status as very common interrogative structures is also evident at the statistical level, for they form the overwhelming majority of the representative examples in our corpus, 70.33% of all the selected interrogatives.

Of great diversity, given first and foremost by the inventory of “interrogative words” and by the term bearing the phrastic accent – which moves from the Subject to the Predicate and, from here, to adverbials or attributes, to the predicative –, PI structures expand their area of use through numerous particular cases, such as associations – in coordination with connectors or paratactic coordination, through structures with non-interrogative syntax and so on.

All are speech acts with great discursive impact in the type of verbal communication we have analysed in this study.

## **Bibliography**

### **1. Sources**

COSTACHE, Adrian; IONIȚĂ Florin, LASCĂR Marilena, SĂVOIU Adrian, 2009, *Limba și literatura română: manual pentru clasa a IX-a (C9)*, București: Editura Grup Editorial Art.

COSTACHE, Adrian; IONIȚĂ Florin, SĂVOIU Adrian, 2008, *Limba și literatura română: manual pentru clasa a X-a (C10)*, București: Editura Art.

COSTACHE, Adrian; IONIȚĂ, Florin; LASCĂR, Marilena; SĂVOIU, Adrian, 2007, *Limba și literatura română: manual pentru clasa a XI-a (C11)*, București: Art.

COSTACHE, Adrian; IONIȚĂ, Florin; LASCĂR, Marilena; SĂVOIU, Adrian, 2007, *Limba și literatura română: manual pentru clasa a XII-a (C12)*, București: Editorial Art Group.

### **2. References**

GRAUR, Al. et alii (coord.), 1963, 1966, 1969, *Gramatica limbii române (GAR)*, Vol. I: *Morfologia*. Vol. II: *Sintaxa*, București: Editura Academiei.

GUȚU-ROMALO, Valeria (coord.), 2005/2010, *Gramatica limbii române (GALR)*, Vol. I. *Cuvântul*, Vol. al II-lea: *Enunțul*, București: Editura Academiei Române.

LIȘMAN, Victor, 2007, *Limba și literatura română. Manual pentru clasa a 12-a (L12)*, București: Editura ALL Educational.

NEGRICI, Eugen (coord.), 2007, *Limba și literatura română. Manual pentru clasa a XII-a (N12)*, București: Editura Niculescu ABC.

PANĂ DINDELEGAN, Gabriela (coord.), 2010/2016, *Gramatica de bază a limbii române (GBLR)*, București: Univers Enciclopedic Gold.

PANĂ DINDELEGAN, Gabriela (coord.), 2019, *Gramatica limbii române pentru gimnaziu (GLRG)*, București: Univers Enciclopedic Gold.

SIMION, Eugen (coord.), 2007, *Limba și literatura română. Manual pentru clasa a XII-a (S12)*, București: Corint.

ȘERBĂNESCU, Andra, 2002, *Întrebarea – teorie și practică*, Iași: Editura Polirom.