STRUCTURE, LINGUISTIC STRUCTURE OF DISCUSSION SPEECH

A. Dadajonov

Teacher (PhD) of the Department of Linguistics

Fergana State University

Abstract

The article analyzes the interpretations of the concept of "structure" in linguistics and the formation of structural linguistics, with particular emphasis on the linguistic structure of argumentative discourse. Based on the theoretical views of I.A. Baudouin de Courtenay and F. de Saussure, the importance of the structural approach in revealing internal relations between language elements is highlighted. The study examines the compositional structure of argumentative discourse, including thesis, argumentation, and conclusion, as well as linguistic means used to express cause-and-effect relations. The research substantiates that argumentative discourse is not only a logical category but also a linguistic one with a specific semantic and structural organization.

Keywords: Structure, structuralism, argumentative discourse, types of speech, thesis, argumentation, conclusion, cause-and-effect relations.

Introduction

The notion of structure occupies a central position in linguistic theory and has played a decisive role in shaping modern linguistic thought. The emergence of structural linguistics at the beginning of the twentieth century marked a fundamental shift in the understanding of language as an internally organized system rather than a mere collection of isolated elements. This paradigm shift was largely influenced by the scientific ideas of I. A. Baudouin de Courtenay and, most prominently, Ferdinand de Saussure, whose theoretical framework laid the foundations for structural approaches to language analysis.

Within linguistics, the term structure has been interpreted in multiple ways. On the one hand, it is understood as an integral whole composed of interrelated

_____

elements functioning within conditioned relationships. On the other hand, structure is viewed as a system of abstract forms and relations detached from concrete usage. These interpretations have given rise to various branches of structural linguistics, including functional linguistics, glossematics, and descriptive linguistics, each characterized by distinct research principles and methodologies.

In this context, the present article focuses on the linguistic structure of argumentative (discussion-type) speech, which reflects not only logical relations but also specific semantic and linguistic patterns. The study aims to examine argumentative speech as a structured linguistic category, emphasizing its internal organization, compositional elements, and the role of linguistic means in establishing logical and semantic coherence.

Literature Review

The theoretical foundations of structural linguistics are rooted in the works of early twentieth-century linguists. F. de Saussure conceptualized language as a system of signs defined by relations rather than by isolated meanings, thereby introducing a structural perspective that profoundly influenced subsequent linguistic theories. Similarly, I. A. Baudouin de Courtenay emphasized the systemic nature of language and its internal organization.

The concept of structure has been further elaborated in later linguistic scholarship. Nurmonov (2012) defines structuralism as a linguistic direction aimed at revealing internal relationships and interdependencies among language components, highlighting the structural aspect of language organization. According to this view, different branches of structural linguistics apply diverse analytical methods while sharing a common focus on internal linguistic relations. A. Hojiyev (1995), in his Explanatory Dictionary of Linguistic Terms, interprets structure as the architectural organization of language or its individual units, such as words, sentences, and word-formation patterns. This definition underscores the applicability of structural analysis at multiple linguistic levels.

The relationship between sentence structure and discourse structure has been addressed by N. I. Kondakov (1964), who argues that while grammar traditionally focuses on the sentence, discursive reasoning extends beyond sentence

_____

boundaries. He emphasizes that sentences in argumentative discourse are interconnected through logical and semantic relations, thereby forming a higher-level linguistic structure that merits independent linguistic investigation.

Research by Yu. N. Saltanova (2008) further contributes to this discussion by analyzing the specificity of reasoning in texts. She demonstrates that argumentative discourse relies on a system of linguistic means designed to establish the truth or validity of a thesis. These include hypothetical modality, logical connectors, introductory constructions, and the strategic use of scientific terminology.

Collectively, these studies provide a theoretical framework for analyzing argumentative speech as a structured linguistic phenomenon, integrating logical, semantic, and pragmatic dimensions.

Research Methods

The present study employs a qualitative linguistic analysis grounded in structural, semantic, and discourse-oriented approaches. The research methodology includes: **Structural analysis**, aimed at identifying the compositional elements of argumentative speech and examining their interrelations. **Semantic analysis**, used to explore the meaning structures underlying argumentative discourse and the role of modality, causality, and generalization. **Discourse analysis**, focusing on the organization of arguments, the use of logical connectors, and the progression from thesis to conclusion. **Textual analysis**, based on examples drawn from journalistic and scholarly texts, which serve to illustrate theoretical claims with empirical evidence.

By combining these methods, the study investigates argumentative speech as a linguistic category characterized by a specific structural organization and a set of recurrent linguistic devices that ensure coherence and logical consistency.

The Main Part

The term "structure" in linguistics, the study and formation of this direction, have many linguists' opinions. However, the emergence of structural linguistics was based on the scientific views of I.A. Baudouin de Courtenay and F. de Saussure.

_____

The term structure is interpreted in various ways in linguistics. The most common of them are two:

First, structure is understood as a whole consisting of elements that are interconnected and in conditioned relationships. This approach to structure requires revealing the internal connections and connections between the object under study and the elements that make it up.

In the second direction, structure is understood as pure forms and pure relations. The form is interpreted as disconnected from concrete use.

From this, various branches of structural linguistics were born. They are functional linguistics, glossematics, and descriptive linguistics. These branches of structural linguistics also differ from each other in that they use different research methods[1]. So, the term structure began to appear at the beginning of the 20th century. "Structuralism. A direction in linguistics, the main goal of which is to illuminate the internal relationships, interdependencies of language components, and the structural aspect of language"[2].

The linguistic structure of the discussion type of speech also refers to the internal relationships of speech components, interrelated aspects, in a word, the structural side of the language.

A. Hojiyev in his book "Explanatory Dictionary of Linguistic Terms" defines the term structure as follows. "Structure. The architectural structure of the language or individual language units (words, sentences, etc.): The structure of the sentence. Semantic structure. The structure of word formation. Linguistic structure"[3].

Linguist N.I. Kondakov "emphasizes that the subject of grammar is the sentence and its structure, and the structure of the discourse of discussion goes beyond the scope of the sentence, therefore it is not a grammatical unit. However, at the same time, N.I. Kondakov says that in thinking, sentences are connected to each other. The question arises: how are the sentences in the discussion connected to each other? On what logical-semantic basis is this connection carried out, and what

---

[1] Nurmonov A. Tanlangan asarlar. Uch jildlik. 1-jild – Toshkent: Akademnashr, 2012. – B. 56.

[2] Nurmonov A. Tanlangan asarlar. Uch jildlik. 1-jild – Toshkent: Akademnashr, 2012. – B. 56.

[3] Hojiyev. A. Lingvistik terminlarning izohli lug'ati. – Toshkent, 1995, – B. 80.

_____

linguistic units and structures are formed in this case? This, of course, is a problem of linguistics"[4].

The structure and language form of the argumentative speech are also influenced by the meaning expressed by the conclusion. Behind the meaning of the resulting judgment in the conclusion are certain semantic types and variants of the discussion. In our opinion, the argumentative speech is not only a logical category, but also a semantic unit of speech of a certain structure, that is, a linguistic category.

"To formalize the arguments, a system of linguistic means is used that is necessary to achieve the goal of establishing the truth of the expressed judgment. The thesis serves the purpose of establishing a hypothetical statement within the framework of the general structure of the argument. The statement of the thesis is characterized by a hypothetical modality and a large concentration of scientific terms and the use of vocabulary. The nature of the logical connection is clearly indicated when formulating the thesis as a complex judgment"[5].

As Y.N. Saltanova noted, in the linguistic structure of the discussion speech, each of the parts of the compositional construction is expanded and supplemented from the linguistic side.

In the discussion speech type, it serves as an introduction to present theoretical or empirical generalizations of the thesis, to show the real connection of events. This is expressed through linguistic means such as "if", "so", "then", "assuming", "if", which are used in presenting arguments, and also by using first-person plural verbs, which form the argument in terms of language and provide a logical connection with the conclusion.

The conclusion forms the basis of the discussion speech. Because the idea expressed in the discussion speech is reflected in the conclusion. Therefore, in the discussion speech, the conclusion is the most important part of the speech structure. Language means are of decisive importance in forming an opinion. The idea expressed based on the arguments in the text is usually characterized by a

---

[4] Кондаков. Н.И. Логика. – М. АН СССР. 1964. – С. 9.
[5] Салтанова Ю.Н. Специфика рассуждения в художественном тексте: Дисс. …канд. филол. наук. – М: 2008. – С. 72.

_____

general modality. This is expressed by means of the above-mentioned conjunctions.

In the discussion speech texts, there are always cause-and-effect relationships, the following linguistic means are used to create such relationships. To explain the cause-and-effect relationships, connecting and auxiliary devices such as: therefore, therefore, because of this, why, because, so are used.

The discussion speech type has its own unique features that are repeated in any speech. In any discussion speech, a problem is posed, it is described, and a judgment is made at the end of the speech. The judgment can consist of one sentence. For example: Mother is a trustworthy person. However, this judgment is not a speech type. It is a judgment at the sentence level. It has not reached the level of a speech type. For a discussion speech, which is formed as a monologue speech type, as we noted above, there must be a cause-and-effect relationship in the form of at least two sentences. A sentence consisting of one sentence cannot be a discussion. The problem posed in a discussion speech is solved in a cause-and-effect sequence. In such a solution, the idea about the thing itself, not its appearance, or history, comes to the fore. Information about it is listed. In this case, introductory words are of particular importance. The conclusion that the introductory words give here represents the sequence of grounds for the judgment: "Today, our life cannot be imagined without cars. It makes our distant journeys close and our difficult ones easy, but the smoke emitted by cars is poisoning the environment in large quantities. In order to prevent this poisoning, scientists are inventing cars that run on electricity. These cars are less harmful to people and nature than ordinary cars. Firstly, electricity is much cheaper than gasoline, and secondly, it is much less harmful to the ecology and the environment. That is why the market for electric cars is very dynamic today"[6].

So, in the speech expression of the discussion speech, the topic is first presented and its essence is revealed. In the conclusion, the conclusion is made as a result of the discussion using introductory words (firstly, secondly) and auxiliary devices (therefore). For example: "Therefore, today the market for electric cars is developing very rapidly". When talking about the linguistic structure of the

_____

[6] Yaypan ovozi. 2022.04.18, 7-son.

_____

discussion speech, it is also worth noting that the participation and role of speech units in the speech process is important in it, which differs from other types of speech. In particular, since the signs of the subject are listed in the image speech type, it does not use cause-and-effect conjunctions, introductory constructions, goal and causal conjunctions. If such constructions are used, the speech is not formed as an image. Because in texts with such a structure, the sign of the thing or the message about it is relegated to the second place, and the idea about it comes to the fore.

Conclusion

The analysis demonstrates that argumentative (discussion-type) speech should be regarded not merely as a logical form of reasoning but as a distinct linguistic category with its own structural, semantic, and pragmatic features. The structure of argumentative speech is shaped by the interaction of its core components—thesis, arguments, and conclusion—which are linguistically realized through a system of connectors, introductory words, modal constructions, and causal relations.

The conclusion plays a central role in argumentative discourse, as it encapsulates the idea developed throughout the reasoning process. Linguistic means such as causal conjunctions (therefore, because, thus), sequencing markers (firstly, secondly), and hypothetical constructions contribute to the coherence and persuasiveness of the discourse.

Furthermore, the study confirms that a single sentence, despite expressing a judgment, cannot constitute argumentative speech. Argumentation requires at least two interconnected sentences forming a cause-and-effect sequence. Unlike descriptive or narrative speech types, argumentative discourse foregrounds the essence of the subject rather than its external characteristics or historical background.

In sum, the linguistic structure of argumentative speech reflects the systemic nature of language itself, reinforcing the relevance of structural linguistic principles in discourse analysis and contributing to a deeper understanding of language as a complex, organized, and meaning-driven system.

_____

References

1. Салтанова Ю.Н. Специфика рассуждения в художественном тексте. Дисс. канд. фил. наук. – Москва: 2008. – С. 72

2. Kasimova M. Artistic speech Linguistic features of individuality.- Andijan , NDA.

3. Dadajonov, A., & Xojaliyev, I. (2024). MUHOKAMA NUTQ TIPINING TIL TIZIMIDA TUTGAN O 'RNI. Farg'ona davlat universiteti, (6), 158-158.

4. Dadajonov, A. (2025). MUHOKAMA NUTQ TIPINING ILMIY USLUBDAGI O 'RNI. " Issues of Turkish Philology", 1(1).

5. Semino, E. & Culpeper, J. (2011). Stylistics. In J.-O. Östman & J. Verschueren (eds.), Pragmatics in Practice. John Benjamins. – "Stylistics is the study of style in language… Its focus is the way in which language varies under the influence of factors such as context, purpose, author and period" researchgate.net.

6. Galperin, I.R. (1977). Stylistics. Moscow. – "Functional Style is a system of interrelated language means serving a definite aim in communication. It is the coordination of the language means and stylistic devices which shapes the distinctive features style"dinintohead.blogspot.com. of each

7. Dadajonov A. About monological types of speech //Modern Science and Research. – 2023. – Т. 2. – №. 6. – С. 1236-1239.

8. Dadajonov A. MUHOKAMA NUTQINING KOMPOZITSION QURILISHI //Farg'ona davlat universiteti. – 2024. – №. 3. – С. 539-539.