Colloquium Area "Contemporary Research in Mass-Media Translation and Interpretation"

THE QUESTIONING TOOLKIT IN THE PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES. TRANSLATION ASPECTS



Galina PETREA, MA, PhD Student
(Free International University of Moldova (ULIM))

gpetrea@ulim.md, https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4784-7260

Received: January 9th, 2026 | Reviewed: January 9th, 2026 | Accepted: January 9th, 2026
UDC 81`25 | https://doi.org/10.62413/cqm.2026.35

Abstract

The present article reviews the existent taxonomies and classifications as a toolkit for analysis of the questions and answers dynamic and dialectical exchange. The basic unit / sequence for analysis is the adjacency pair and the pragmatic unit. Pragmatically the question explores the illocutionary force, characterized by intonational contour and falls into the category of directive speech acts. The pragmatic dimension brings into play the context and the socio-pragmatic factors such as power dynamics, cultural norms. The discourse reception side applies the principle of pragmatic adequacy of the answer or relevance, truthfulness, being correlated with several factors like knowledge and beliefs of both interlocutors. The discourse of interest is the political discourse in general, its sub-genre – the parliamentary discourse: situated, institutionalized, protocol-bound interaction between discourse agents – politicians, Members of Parliament in different status and task-roles within the framework of different discoursive events. The case studies are covering the same topic, a red thread that ties all of them – hybrid security threats on the international arena.

Keywords: *Q&A adjacency pairs; pragmatic adequacy of the answer, pragmatic unit, intonational contour (IC), degree of constraint and coerciveness, response elicitation, confirmation eliciting, pragma-dialectical model, adversarial nature, answerhood conditions*

The present article proceeds from the existent taxonomies and classifications as a toolkit for analysis of response elicitation dialectical- pragmatic *argumentative orientation* of questions and their uptake in replies in a dynamic and dialectical exchange. The basic unit/sequence for analysis is Q & A adjacency pairs. The fundamental function of a question is to require information, pragmatically it explores the illocutionary acts force and falls into the directive speech acts according to the speech acts theory (SAT). An area which has received much attention lately is namely the form-function matching and correlation, deriving the pragmatic significance based on the prosodic factors, and the situation involved in the respec-

tive discoursive event. The pragmatic dimension brings into play beside the context, the socio-pragmatic factors such as power dynamics, social distance, degree of imposition, cultural norms. The discourse reception side applies the principle of pragmatic adequacy of the answer which should be an integral part of the questioning process, being correlated with several factors like relevance, as well as knowledge and beliefs of both interlocutors. The type of discourse of interest, to which we apply the findings, the questioning toolkit is the political discourse in general, and in particular its sub-genre: the parliamentary discourse – which is situated, institutionalized, protocol-bound interactions between discourse agents – Members of Parliament in different status and task-roles within the framework of different discoursive events.

The terminological multifunctionality of the concept of *question* refers to three distinct kinds of aspects:

a) Grammatical (syntax and phonology + prosody), declarative sentences of interrogative form;

b) Semantic, a semantic object - the content /meaning of a question;

c) Pragmatic, identified with the speech act of question.

Beyond the well-thought and well-articulated question, we need to also screen the reply, the answer given to identify the pragmatic effects meant, embedded in the question but also the affordability it gives to the responder.

Heike Wiese postulates that Wh-pronouns are not purely "interrogative". These "are underspecified elements; and due to this underspecification, Wh-words can form a constitutive part of a wide range of sentence types not only of interrogative, but also of exclamative and declarative clauses" (Wiese, 2002, p. 1). Consequently, the interrogatives have to be specified for interpretation. Moreover, the Wh-pronouns are not the only characteristic feature of interrogatives, besides this there are the interrogative particles, the syntactic word order, position of constituents in a sentence at the forefront, the reversed order of the subject and the predicate plus the auxiliary with the dummy meaning functioning as tense indicator, not to forget the prosodic feature – the intonational contour (IC).

Heike Wiese graphically represents the intonational contour identifying a speech act, being specified at the pragmatic level of the discourse as follows: IC(u(sC)) = QUESTION. Punctuated by the question mark "?", the elements of the formula in abbreviation stand for IC – intonational contour; u(s) – utterance of a sentence s] (*ibidem*, p. 9).

According to the empirical study conducted by Russel Ultan (1978), intonation is by far the most widespread strategy of differentiating the interrogative speech act and can be found in nearly all languages of his sample. More exactly, the intonation contour most widely employed for polar interrogatives, and interrogatives in general, is a rising one (72% of the languages from the sample) with the rise usually being placed towards the end of the contour, according to Peter Siemund (2001, pp. 1010-1028).

The traditional view classifies questions from the theory of speech acts as directives (requests for information or opinion, reflection). Questions are said to have

answerhood conditions, while requests (for verbal or nonverbal action) have compliance conditions. A question may, consequently, be addressed without the expectation of an answer or, any other action in return, as is the case with rhetorical and unanswerable questions. Regarding the pragmatic meanings derived from questions, an interesting research unfolded by Shehdeh Fareh (2008, pp. 145-163), on the basis of a linguistic literary corpus consisting of three authentic plays, have identified more than 35 pragmatic functions performed by questions in context.

Questions can be analysed as a class of speech acts separately from directives. Paraphrasing John Lyons (1979, p. 756), we may explain the illocutionary act performed in this case as "posing" a question, "expressing doubt/lack of ability to assign a truth value to a particular state of affairs". John Lyons emphasizes that "Not all the utterances we produce are statements; questions, commands, requests, exclamations, will contain a certain amount of nondescriptive information, which may be characterized, broadly, as expressive (or indexical) and social" (*ibidem*, p. 725). Regarding the deictic coordinates John Lyons adds that every utterance is spacio-temporally unique, being spoken or written at a particular place and at a particular time; on the condition that there is some standard system for identifying points in space and time, the spatiotemporal situation of any utterance-act can be specified by giving its spatiotemporal co-ordinates (*ibidem*, p. 570).

There is a class of questions called *x-questions*, while the yes-no questions are polar questions. In x-questions "we have an unknown quantity x, exactly as in an algebraic equation" and "the linguistic expression for this x is an interrogative pronoun or pronominal adverb". Since the interrogative pronouns and adverbs in English typically begin with wh- (who, what, when, where, etc.), x-questions are commonly referred to as wh-questions.

The classification of questions in syntactic terms based on type of answer they elicit, gives us the general or yes/no questions, the special questions or wh-questions and the alternative questions.

A further syntactic-semantic classification according to Gavin E. Oxburgh, Tim Grant, Trond Myklebust (2010, pp. 45-46) on the basis of a research of questions in police interviews, takes into consideration two criteria, the respondent's answering options and the question's degree of constraint and coerciveness (the closed and open questions). Closed questions are considered the type used in question-based institutional interactions, being coercive, biased towards a confirmative answer, while the wh-questions offer at least a limited possibility to digress.

In contrast to the questions pursuing the aim of information-seeking, and engagement-seeking in an exchange, the *rhetorical questions* require no answer, but even if they do the information channel is empty. Which means that, in contradistinction with the requesting information questions, they minimize the emphasis on the information channel and stress the social relationships involved (Athanasiadou, 1991, p. 30).

Another basis for classifying questions is in terms of the intentions of their speakers, taking into consideration contextual or pragmatic information. Different modes of questioning indicate the relationship that exists between the questioner

and the respondent (intimacy, social distance, authority). From the pragmatic perspective, questions can be standard and non-standard.

An aspect that is definitely worth mentioning and can be found in Cornelia Ilie (2015, p. 5) is the principle of pragmatic adequacy of answers applied for questions classifications. The principle starts from the premise that the varying degrees of answer adequacy should be a part of the question. The pragmatic factors correlated with answer adequacy could be: an assessment of the degree of knowledge and beliefs of both interlocutors, their identities and roles, the power relation, the questioner's explicit or implicit goals; the informative value of the answer; and the relevance of the answer to both (*ibidem*, 2015, p. 5). The *response elicitation* (the kind of response expected and/or required by the question), results according to this researcher's approach in three main categories of questions: answer-eliciting questions; action-eliciting questions; and mental response-eliciting questions.

Cornelia Ilie (2015) an outstanding linguist of Romanian origin, has a remarkable and consistent flow of research and publications in the domain of EU Parliamentary discourse, which is anchored internationally. Cornelia Ilie (2022) in a relatively recent publication, refers to the parliamentary sub-genre the Q&A as "institutionalized established practices of overseeing and control for holding the executive accountable". By asking questions, Members of Parliament are challenging government members, exposing inaction or ineffective policies and venting public discontent, a confrontational "agonistic struggle", which she quotes is "the very condition of a vibrant democracy", which we absolutely agree with. The author emphasizes the role of the prototypical category of questions asked by MPs, and namely the follow-up questions "which allow to negotiate and re-negotiate not only issues and policies under debate, but also their status, role and power positions" (Ilie, 2023, p. 2).

In terms of argumentative orientation, a classification of non-standard questions is proposed by Frans H. van Eemeren (2015), according to which three main types of argumentative questions can be distinguished, namely *argument-eliciting* questions (interlocutor-oriented), *argument-prefacing* questions (interlocutor- and audience-oriented), and *argumentative* questions (message- and audience-oriented).

Within the framework of pragmatics, Cornelia Ilie (*ibidem*, p. 5) distinguishes between standard and non-standard questions, the latter being strategically used by speakers to perform a range of activities, such as conveying a challenge, proposal, reproach, complaint, warning, threat, objection, protest or accusation. Typical examples of non-standard questions are *rhetorical questions, leading questions, hypothetical questions, expository questions and echo questions*. Depending on the discursive and situational context, non-standard questions can be multi-functional, being contextually able to elicit different types of answers and/or responses, such as speech acts of permission-granting, suggestion, acceptance, retraction, disclaiming.

There are different theoretical orientations that study the question-answer sequence, for example the conversation analysis, the exchange unit is called the question – answer Q-A adjacency pair sequence. For the present study the Q-A adjacency pair is the unit of analysis. Emanuel Schegloff (2007) offers a characteri-

zation that adjacency pairs are sequences of two utterances that are produced by different speakers in turn and ordered as a first part and a second part so that a particular first part requires a particular second (Schegloff, 2007, p. 16).

Hu Junfei and Liesbeth Degand propose an operationalisation for segmenting spoken discourse into a sequence of *conversational discourse units* (CDUs) (Junfei & Degand, 2023, p. 85). CDUs are examined as a three-fold combination of syntactic, prosodic and pragmatic segments that are mapped onto one another in different configurations, with an emphasis on the turn-taking system in sequence organization, which is not complete but waiting to be elicited.

These researchers try to additionally touch upon another sensitive aspect: identification of the *pragmatic unit* (PU) in communication/conversation. They make reference to Ford and Thompson (1996) as producing the first study that directly tries to segment speech into pragmatic units. They proceed from the claim that the units in conversation must be understood as usable for the construction of joint activities, not merely as packages of information to be parsed. They suggest that the PU has "to be interpretable as a complete conversational action within its specific sequential context" (Ford, 1996, p. 150) with a distinct boundary after which no further content is expected to follow. PUs are expected to end in a final intonation contour.

Their approach to determining consists in agreeing that a complete PU should be intact in meaning-expression and action-conduction (*ibidem,* p. 9).

However, Junfei Hu considers that the identification of the pragmatic unit does not rely on the response of the addressee. A single pragmatic unit may be interpreted as having more than one illocutionary act.

Questions asking – questioning is a staple of the journalistic activity. The *Question–Answer* format of news interviews is central to their structure and crucial to analyzing their dynamics. One important rule is the cautioning to refrain from "*stepping over the line of what is just intelligent professionalism" by moving "outside the role of reporter and … into the role of judge*" – not to transgress the boundaries. In a journalistic interview *objectivity* is an umbrella concept that encompasses a range of journalistic values, including: factual accuracy, balance between opposing views, neutrality in presentation.

When it comes about the Parliamentary legislatures, these fulfill seven classic functions: representation, legislation, deliberation, scrutiny, budget setting, making and breaking governments, and redress of grievances (Coghill *et alii*, 2012, p. 56).

Parliamentary questions (PQ) *help elected politicians accomplish their representative roles while also providing the legislature with a tool to monitor and hold accountable the executive* (*ibidem*, p. 55).

The research question RQ for the present study is to determine the semantic types of questions but also their pragmatic effects produced additionally, as well as the correlation with relevance in the answer, the strategic maneuvering of answering. This is not a corpus-based study, although we intend to undertake one in the extended research from which this article is a part of.

The present research is a case study based on the debate of current security issues on the international arena, war and defense.

The first case study is selected from the Prime Minister Questions session in the British Parliament. Kemi Badenoch (leader of the opposition party) opened Prime Minister's Questions with Sir Keir Starmer over Greenland. January 21, 2026:

Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister and I agree. The future of Greenland should only be decided by the people of Greenland. When the Prime Minister made this point to President Trump on Monday, *did the president agree or disagree*? #Prime Minister. Well, Mr. Speaker, *I'm engaging* constructively on international security matters hugely, particularly when it comes to security in the Arctic. And that's the context in which this discussion is going on in relation to Greenland. As *we engage constructively*, I have made my position clear on our principles and values. *The first of those is that the future of Greenland is for the people of Greenland and the Kingdom of Denmark alone*. The second is that threats of tariffs to pressurize allies are completely wrong. But I do want to be clear with the House. I will not yield. Britain will not yield on our principles and values about the future of Greenland under threats of tariffs. And that is my clear position. Given that that was his expressed purpose, I'm surprised the leader of the opposition has jumped on the bandwagon. I had understood her position.	→ Move 1: Courtesy to the Speaker of the House of Commons, Observing subordination Prefacing expressing agreement with his affirmed opinion on a matter of international and regional security ❑ Making a statement - assertive or declarative SA ❑ *Argument-eliciting* question (interlocutor-oriented). Addressing a specific – closed, alternative question → Move 2. Relation maxim hedge to establish connection Courtesy to the Speaker of the House of Commons Positioning. Assurance of his commitment to his duties *I'm engaging constructively → We engage constructively* Repetition for emphasis, retraction from I – We (collectively the Government, on behalf of the country) Clarification of position taken on the matter in relation with the President of the US *Audience-directed framing of the argumentative moves* ❑ Official Declaration of position ❑ Dynamic, dialectical change of topic Declarative SA 1: Statement, Affirmation of Resistance to pressure Declarative SA 2: Refusal, opposing resistance, stylistic marking, repetition with retraction for emphasis Argumentation invoking values and principles ❑ *Counter Argument* interlocutor-oriented Accusing the leader of the opposition of opportunism (stylistically expressed by an idiom)

Pragmatic-cultural aspects

I would like to focus on the cultural aspects that we can notice in this adjacency pair sequence, selected from the Parliamentary Questions session, more exactly the Prime Minister Questions. We cannot fail in observing both the strict protocol

and rules-bound interaction on one side, but also the manifestation of affect, reflection of ideology and values commitment; on the other side the opponent addressing the question was pursuing implied partisanship aims, beside the obvious, legitimate objective of requiring information, debriefing, confirming allegiance.

Argumentation structuring

This example could be a perfect one to follow the strategic maneuvering moves. There is a harmonious weaving of:

A *stringent topic* under discussion, object of international debate: the threat of acquisition or annexation by force of Greenland by the US, to which EU, GB as well are categorically opposing, and expressing their resistance to potential coercive tax imposition as punishment (bazooka – anti-coercion instrument).

The pragma-dialectical moves of the argumentation are addressed to the House of Commons but also to the larger audience of the British public and in general to the international community.

Translation aspects

> Eng. "The first of those is that the future of Greenland is for the people of Greenland and the Kingdom of Denmark *alone*" - Ro. "Prima (luare de poziție) este că viitorul Groenlandei este *doar* a poporului Groenlandei și a Regatului Danemarcei".

In this declarative speech act we have several phenomena interesting for a translator. Namely, the discourse marker of consequtivity and structuring (*the first/primul*).

From the stylistic point of view, there is an emphatic structure, expressed by the repetition of the denomination of the island-country, but also the Kingdom of Denmark is invoked, as Greenland is juridically an autonomous territory under the Kingdom of Denmark. Both geographical and political entities have an adapted translation omologue in Romanian.

The House – metonymy, refers to the House of Commons of the British Parliament and is translated with the conventional accepted term *Palata/Camera Comunelor.*

> Idiom: Eng. *Has jumped on the bandwagon* – Ro. *A sărit în trenul succesului (s-a alăturat oportunist la trenul succesului).*

A second example is from the Greenland Press Conference: Ursula Von der Leyen and Antonio Costa Stand Firm on Greenland Amid U.S. Pressure. 23 Jan. 2026. As we can notice the press conference on the EU Parliament's reaction on the problem of Greenland, took a couple of days apart. One Italian journalist asked the question, Antonio Costa took it to answer.

Mattia Boli National Italian News Agency: "One (question) is on Greenland because if you remember Greenland *decided to vote out* from what it was at that time the European Economic Community (EEC). So, going forward with this big package that you just mentioned with Greenland, *do you think that it is proper to clarify the position with regarding Greenland*? *Would you welcome Greenland back in the European Union if she decided to do so?* And secondly, on the MERCOSUR. *Following the European Parliament votes, will you temporarily apply the agreement with Mercosur?"*

The preliminaries to the proper question brings some historical background about the once Greenland having left the EU. This controversial decision taken in the by Greenland, the journalist is referring to with a metaphor *this big package* like an instance of resistance, betrayal even. The polar indirect question is ambivalent: *do you think that it is proper to clarify the position with regarding Greenland*? Clarify the position, could imply that EU leaders could want to see whether Greenland would like maybe to re-adhere to the EU, or reaffirm their status as a component part of Denmark, or reconsider whatever option is the USA proposing to them, as it is not the direct business of EU now. As we understand the pragmatic implication of the question is impolite, challenging, almost like a reproach. Because further on the journalist passes to another question which should be of real concern for the EU leaders – regarding the MERCOSUR agreement, which was initially received with serious demonstrations and revolt on the part of farmers from different EU countries. The three questions in one intervention are closed-ended, polar questions semantically:

1. *Do you think that it is proper to clarify the position with regarding Greenland*? (Pragmatic meaning – Asking for clarification)
2. *Would you welcome Greenland back in the European Union if she decided to do so?* (Pragmatic meaning – Hypothetical situation)
3. *Following the European Parliament votes, will you temporarily apply the agreement with Mercosur?* (Pragmatic meaning – Asking about implementation of a controversial agreement)

Pragmatically, the first two are on the topic of Greenland, reproachful, blaming Greenland for their decision in past of opting out from the common EU security and protection umbrella. Here we remark the journalist strategically asking the third question, probably knowing that the MERCOSUR agreement had already been urgently signed, despite the discontent. So, the pragmatic effect of the third question is of a strategic challenge to the EU leaders, if they do not have more urgent and relevant matters of their own, rather than involve in Greenland's matter.

The intervention was not addressed to any of the leaders in particular, so that Antonio Costa took the questions on himself. He, also strategically started to answer with the last question. The first argument was to confirm that the MERCOSUR agreement was voted, signed adopted, so that there is not any problem related to that matter. The second argument is a directive speech act, as the verb *invite* addressed indirectly to the EU Commission to use the provisory application and implement the agreement. Actually, the word **invite** is not a simple polite invitation but an order to already implement the law.

Regarding Greenland, the first argument goes that he appreciated reminding that historic fact that Greenland decided "*to opt out*" from EU in the past. What follows is a piece of propaganda that this a EU value to let member states decide their destiny, and how they proceeded in the past, they have the right now again to make any decision for themselves, even if it were a morally controversial one, like accepting a payment in exchange for becoming a US component. The EU high dignitary made emphasis on the EU values of free choice, free decision-making

regarding the security and sovereignty matters of states. I think that through this intelligent move by the journalist tying together questions on different topics, actually, opposing ones, he subtly pushed the high EU dignitary to remind himself the democratic EU commitments and apply them impartially in both cases.

The third case is selected from the World Economic Forum panel session in Davos featuring NATO's Mark Rutte, Polish President Karol Nawrocki and Finland's President Alexander Stubb, on January 21, 2026. This was a panel with 2 presidents of EU and NATO member states, the NATO Secretary General, a banker and a medical supplies mogul. The panel had an anchor to address questions and direct the discussion, additionally they accepted several questions from the audience. The member of audience addressed the question to President Karol Nawrocki. The preliminary information is about the topic of the Ukraine war having been discussed previously, as being a constantly concerning one as they are the Eastern flank countries (strong argument):

1. *Do you think, you know, in all of this talk, in all of this conversation over Greenland, is Ukraine the casualty here?*
2. *Do we run that risk*?

Both questions are closed-ended, diverging question, general, pressing for an answer. Pragmatically the implication is that the panelists should distinguish between a really serious urgent matter as a threatening to spread war and a controversial scandalous dilemma. The pragmatic function of the first question is to provoke reflection and give an opinion whether the newly emerged conflict related to Greenland is not a digression and redirection of the world's attention from a really gruesome and prolonged war to a distractor. The second question is to solidify the first one by refining the question, whether this was the risk. Additional pragmatic effects of the questions are expressing doubts, expressing concern. After the Polish President deflected the answer, said he did not understand the question, the question addresser reformulated reframed the initial question which was too subtle and indirect:

3. *And now where is the attention on Ukraine?* (Special open-ended question with the pragmatic meaning of requiring clarification)
4. *What could this potentially mean for?* (open-ended, pragmatic implication of requiring to make some calculation, prediction.)
5. *What could it mean for the resources that they need so desperately in order to maintain this fight on the European continent*? (open-ended, special question, with the pragmatic implications of pressure to think of the implications of distracting the attention from the bigger problem and potential consequences). The battery of questions is accusing of misdirection, diverting of discussion and attention.

Finland's President Alexander Stubb intervened to add and actually address the pressing questions. The first argument was reassuring the audience that the Ukraine war problem is not ignored, they are working, and even if they are moving slowly, they are focusing on a long-lasting peace. He expressed his reassurance that discussing the Greenland problem, they would not forget about the

Ukraine problem, or the Russian threat, as they are still Eastern Europe. Alexander Stubb's conclusion is a confirmation that indeed the Greenland conflict is a mix-up, "the composition of military force information, disinformation, propaganda and we are nowadays in the middle of hybrid war in the European Union".

In argumentation theory this is also called the red herring fallacy to digress and distract the public debate, and latter strong argument confirms the diversion of the adding up the Greenland conflict to distract from the Ukrainian urgent problem.

The fourth case is a question addressed to Naaja H. Nathanielsen Minister for Business, Mineral Resources, Energy, Justice and Gender Equality of Greenland, regarding Donald Trump's claims on Denmark Territory, on January 13, 2026. The journalist addressing the question brings some context, the preliminary to the question is some background information implying the security concern related to the adversary presence in the region which is relevant for the American security as well.

Trump's central claim is that Russia and China are "flexing their muscles" in that part of the region. Do you accept that? (Closed-ended question; pragmatic effects are: pressing for a confirmation or information if the invoked motive for invading Greenland is valid). The stylistic effect of the metaphor *flexing their muscles* – demonstrating, manifesting their power, intimidating, or collecting information, that might be used for an eventual attack.

And is there any scope for more US presence on Greenland to deter that threat? (Close-ended, expansion, probing question, pragmatic inference: asking for elaboration).

The response is a denial that there were any real threats at the moment. The elaboration by the first argument is an agreement that Russia and China have interests in that region. The second argument is contradictory to the initial denial that they, Greenland had called for more monitoring of the Arctic, and the Minister expressed contentment that now they are going to somehow have that; a type of conformity, acceptance.

The last concluding argument sounds ambivalent or dissonant: "*We don't detect an actual threat, but we have no problem "being more aware of what is going on" around Greenland and think it makes a lot of sense*". The formulation that they would not be against "*being more aware of what is going on"* is stylistically a litotes, an understatement for monitorization, or protection from the side of the NATO Allied Countries.

The last case is an example of amalgame. A definition of amalgame as and argumentation concept is brought from Marianne Doury (2005), as an *accusation* made when criticizing and rejecting various argumentative devices such as causal correlations, inductive reasoning, analogies, comparisons.

Case study number five

UK Prime Minister Keir Starmer and European Commission President Ursula von der Leyen took part in the discussion "Principled and Pragmatic: Wielding Power in a World in Disarray" at the Munich Security Conference. The discussion was moderated by Christiane Amanpour, Chief International Anchor, Cable News Network, London on February 14, 2026. Christiane Amanpour brought some

preliminary, background information about the EU having a strained relationship with the US, wanting to embrace them, but bringing into discussion the demolition politics, politics of destruction, and US being possibly a predatory power as Russia is. The anchor is provocatively anchoring the idea of conflict, so as to land the challenging question.

Europe is called caught between a predatory Russia and a potentially predatory United States. 1. Have you internalized that? 2. And is that where you are right now in terms of these fighting words that you've just delivered about pretty much total independence? 3. Do you believe that you are between two predatory powers?

All three questions are closed-ended, pressing for an answer. The first one is asking to reflect on the controversial, provoking question. The second question is expanding with more information asking for elaboration. The last question is blatantly controversial and challenging. The answer is by Ursula von der Leyen is relevant, she immediately detected the trap question and the amalgame the mix up of concepts allies, like-minded partners and adversary, threats; qualification, evaluation of events and situations.

To conclude we could not emphasize enough the role of well – thought, formulated and articulated questions for the pragma-dialectical argumentation of discourse and for a dynamic interaction in political discourse events on urgent themes. The article is based on the research of questions asked during discoursive situations in different formats: 1. British Parliament Q&A session with the Prime Minister; 2. Press conference with the EU leaders; 3. Discussion panel of state leaders, question from the audience; 4. Interview of politician by journalists; 5. Discussion Panel with question from moderator. Although, the format of discussion, the titles and roles of the interviewers and interviewees differ; the degree of imposition, the social ranking and distance vary, we can observe how apparently syntactically simply organized questions can have a rich pallet of implications and pragmatic effects. The question toolbox is indeed the driver of a qualitative, effective communication and dialectic argumentation. In the parliamentary debates the Q&A sessions represent the supervision mechanism, the reporting, activity review and follow-up on the previously discussed situations for evaluation and collective planning.

References

Athanasiadou, A. (1991). Discourse Functions of Questions. *Pragmatics*, 1/1. http://DOI.org:10.1075/prag.1.1.02ath.

Coghill, K., Holland, P., Kinyondo, A., Lewis, C., Steinack, K. (2012). The functions of Parliament: reality challenges tradition. In: *Australasian Parliamentary Review*, 27(2), 55–70.

Doury, M. (2005). The Accusation of Amalgame as a Metaargumentative Refutation. In: Eemeren, F. H. van et alii. (Eds). *Argumentation in Practice* (pp. 145-161). John Benjamins.

Eemeren, F. H. van, Jackson, S. (2015). Argumentation. In: *Argumentation Library*, 27, 3-25, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-20955-5_1.

Fareh, S., Moussa, M. bin. (2008). Pragmatic Functions of Interrogative Sentences in English: A Corpus-based Study. In: *International Journal of Arabic-English Studies,* 9, pp. 145-163.

Ford, C., Thompson, S. (1996). Interactional units in conversation: syntactic, intonational, and pragmatic resources for the projection of turn completion. In: Ochs, E. et alii (eds). *Interaction and Grammar* (pp. 135–184). CUP.

Ilie, C. (2015). Questions and Questioning. In: Tracy, K. et alii (eds). *The International Encyclopedia of Language and Social Interaction.* John Wiley. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118611463.wbielsi202.

Ilie, C. (2022). How to Argue with Questions and Answers: Argumentation Strategies in Parliamentary Deliberation. *Languages*, 2/7, https://doi.org/10.3390/languages7030205.

Junfei, H., Degand, L. (2023). The conversational discourse unit: Identification and its role in conversational turn-taking management. *Dialogue & Discourse*, 14/2, 83–112. http://doi:.org/10.5210/dad.2023.203.

Lyons, J. (1979). *Semantics*. Cambridge University Press.

Oxburgh, G. E., Grant, T., Myklebust, T. (2010). The question of question types in police interviews: a review of the literature from a psychological and linguistic perspective. *The International Journal of Speech, Language and the Law*, 17(1), 45-46.

Schegloff, E. (2007). *Sequence Organization in Interaction*. Cambridge University Press.

Siemund, P. (2001). Interrogative constructions. In: Haspelmath, M. et alii. *Language Typology and Language Universals* (pp. 1010-1028). Walter de Gruyter.

Ultan, R. (1978). Some general characteristics of interrogative systems. In: J. Greenberg (Ed.). *Universal of human language*. Stanford University Press.

Wiese, H. (2002). Wh-words are not "interrogative" pronouns: The derivation of interrogative interpretations for constituent questions. Humboldt University Press.