MINISTRY OF EDUCATION AND SCIENCE OF UKRAINE

KYIV NATIONAL LINGUISTIC UNIVERSITY

Department of Germanic Philology

Master's Qualification Paper

ARGUMENTATION AS A SPEECH ACT ATTESTING THE VALIDITY OF THE MESSAGE: STRUCTURAL, SEMANTIC AND DISCURSIVE FEATURES IN MODERN ENGLISH AND UKRAINIAN

OLENA BOROZNIUK

Group MLa 57-23

Germanic Philology and Translation Faculty

Research Adviser

Assoc. Prof. **Victoriia M. Berezenko**

PhD (Linguistics)

Kyiv – 2024

МІНІСТЕРСТВО ОСВІТИ І НАУКИ УКРАЇНИ

КИЇВСЬКИЙ НАЦІОНАЛЬНИЙ ЛІНГВІСТИЧНИЙ УНІВЕРСИТЕТ

Кафедра германської філології

**Кваліфікаційна робота магістра з лінгвістики
на тему:**

« АРГУМЕНТАЦІЯ ЯК МОВЛЕННЄВИЙ АКТ ДОКАЗУ ІСТИННОСТІ ПОВІДОМЛЕННЯ: СТРУКТУРНО-СЕМАНТИЧНІ ТА ДИСКУРСИВНІ ОЗНАКИ В СУЧАСНИХ АНГЛІЙСЬКІЙ І УКРАЇНСЬКІЙ МОВАХ»

Допущено до захисту

«___» _____   року

Завідувач кафедри
Шутова М.О.

студентки групи МЛа 57-23
факультету германської філології і перекладу
освітньо-професійної програми
сучасні філологічні студії (англійська мова і друга іноземна мова): лінгвістика та перекладознавство
за спеціальністю 035 Філологія
спеціалізація 035.041 Германські мови та літератури (переклад включно), перша – англійська
Борознюк Олени Павлівни

Науковий керівник:
канд. філол. наук, доц. Березенко В.М.

_____   Національна шкала _____
    (підпис)   (ПІБ)   Кількість балів _____
                                          Оцінка ЄКТС _____

КИЇВ – 2024

CONTENTS

CHAPTER III. DISCURSIVE PROPERTIES OF ARGUMENTATION AS A SPEECH ACT ATTESTING THE VALIDITY OF THE MESSAGE IN MODERN ENGLISH AND UKRAINIAN

INTRODUCTION

The relevance of the topic lies in the fact that in today's information society, where access to information is widespread, argumentation skills in speech become crucial for critical thinking and information analysis. Investigating the structural-semantic and discursive features of argumentation can make a significant contribution to understanding and improving these skills. In highly specialized academic communication, where clear and persuasive argumentation is important, researching these features in the context of academic discourse can contribute to the enhancement of quality communication in the field of linguistics and related sciences.

Comparing argumentative strategies in English and Ukrainian languages can reveal differences in cultural approaches to expressing and justifying the truth of statements, which will be useful for linguistic understanding of cultural contexts and improvement of intercultural communication. The growing interest in the pragmatics of speech and discourse analysis in modern linguistics is also notable, so the investigation of structural-semantic and discursive features of argumentation can influence the development of these directions in linguistics.

Thus, the chosen topic not only addresses contemporary challenges and needs of linguistic research but also has the potential to make a significant contribution to the development of theoretical and practical aspects of speech argumentation in English and Ukrainian languages.

In recent linguistic works, discourse is considered as a multidimensional phenomenon (Arutyunova, 1998; Bakhtin, 1996; Batsevich, 2003; LES, 1990; Pocheptsov, 1999; Brown, 1996), taking into account cognitive (Kravchenko, 2007; Krasnykh, 1998; Selivanova, 2004; Shevchenko, 2005; Fairclough, 1992), ethnopsychological (Karasik, 2002; Krasnykh, 2003; Popova, Sternin, 2003), cultural (Ter-Minasova, 2000; Wierzbicka, 1994), social (Gorelov, 2001; Sedov, 2004; Hymes, 1972), political (Makarov, 2003; Sheigal, 2000), and other factors.

The **focus** of the study in this topic is argumentation as a speech act serving to prove the truth of a statement.

The **object** of investigation is argumentation as a speech act aimed at demonstrating the validity of a statement.

The **subject** of investigation is structural-semantic and discursive features of argumentation as a speech act aimed at demonstrating the validity of a statement in Modern English and Ukrainian.

The research **aims** to explore the structural-semantic and discursive features of this speech act in modern English and Ukrainian. Specifically, the analysis includes elements shaping the argumentative structure of expression and specific characteristics defining the discursive context of argumentation usage in both languages.

The research **tasks** are as follows:

1. To examine theoretical concepts of argumentation in linguistics and research approaches to its study. Define key concepts and classifications of argumentation for further use in the research.

2. To investigate the structure of speech acts in the English language that contain markers of argumentation. Analyze lexical means of expressing argumentation in English. Study grammatical structures characterizing argumentative acts in contemporary English.

3. To study the structure of speech acts in the Ukrainian language with elements of argumentation. Analyze lexical features of expressing argumentation in Ukrainian. Explore grammatical constructions used for argumentation in Ukrainian speech.

4. To compare lexical and grammatical means of expressing argumentation in English and Ukrainian languages. Identify differences and similarities in the structural-semantic features of argumentation between both languages.

5. To examine factors influencing argumentative discourse. Analyze psycholinguistic parameters of the argumentative communicative process and

the typology of linguistic personality. Investigate the use of argumentation in various types of discourse: conversational, political, media, etc.

6. To draw conclusions regarding the structural-semantic and discursive features of argumentation in English and Ukrainian languages. Summarize the overall findings and their significance for linguistics and the practice of speech interaction.

To achieve the set objectives in the research, various **methods** were employed to conduct a thorough analysis of the structural-semantic and discursive features of argumentation in modern English and Ukrainian languages, including:

1. **Literature Review.** A systematic review of theoretical works and scientific articles in linguistics, argumentation theory, and linguistics was conducted to identify key concepts and theories.

2. **Content Analysis.** The method of content analysis was applied to investigate the structural and semantic characteristics of argumentation in texts in both English and Ukrainian.

3. **Linguistic Text Analysis.** A detailed linguistic analysis of argumentative expressions was carried out, encompassing the study of lexical units, grammatical structures, and their roles in argumentation construction.

4. **Contrastive Analysis.** A comparative analysis of lexical and grammatical means of argumentation in English and Ukrainian languages was performed to identify differences and similarities.

5. **Discourse Analysis.** The discourse analysis method was used to explore various aspects of argumentative discourse, including the influence of factors, psycholinguistic parameters, and the role of argumentation in different types of discourse.

6. **Empirical Research.** Empirical methods, such as surveys, were employed to gather primary data on the use of argumentation in specific contexts of speech interaction.

The **scientific novelty** of the research lies in the first-ever comprehensive analysis of argumentation as a speech act that substantiates the truth of a statement,

taking into account the structural-semantic and discursive features in modern English and Ukrainian languages. The study is distinguished by the following scientific innovations: it considers argumentation as a speech act on two interconnected levels - structural-semantic and discursive. This enables a deeper understanding of verbal communication as an active element in the interaction between the speaker and the audience, involving contrastive analysis of languages, a focus on various contexts of argumentation use, including conversational, political, and media discourse. This contributes to the exploration of different aspects of verbal practices, examining the impact of speech acts on the perception of the truth of statements, introducing a new dimension to the understanding of the communicative effectiveness of argumentation

This work holds **practical significance** in several aspects. Firstly, it contributes to the development of students' communicative skills by uncovering the principles of effective argumentation and proving the truth of statements. The analysis of structural-semantic and discursive features of argumentation in modern English and Ukrainian languages enhances students' linguistic competence and deepens their understanding of speech acts.

The research allows us to analyze argumentation in various speech practices, which will be beneficial for preparing students for verbal situations in their future professional lives. Furthermore, studying argumentation in both languages contributes to maintaining language standards in contemporary discourse.

Through these aspects, the student's thesis can make a significant contribution to linguistic and discursive science, helping expand the understanding of argumentation as a speech act and defining its role in modern speech communities. Thus, the practical significance of the work manifests in the acquisition of new skills and knowledge by the student, application in future professional activities, and the promotion of linguistic and communicative competence development.

CHAPTER I. THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS OF ARGUMENTATION RESEARCH IN LINGUISTICS

1.1 The concept of argumentation in linguistics

The theory of argumentation represents an interdisciplinary direction and delineates fundamental aspects of research across various fields, such as linguistics, logic, semantics, pragmatics, rhetoric, artificial intelligence, cognitive psychology, and philosophy. The formalization and analysis of various types and methods of argumentation functioning in texts of diverse genres are of significant interest to the humanities, contributing to an enhanced understanding of this phenomenon.

In contemporary argumentation theory, aligned with rhetorical tradition, rational persuasion methods and emotional influence are combined, effectively complementing each other (Аристотель, 2000, с. 220; Касьянова, 2008, с. 158; Knape, 2013; Grootendorst, Eemeren, Snoeck, 2002; Walton, Reed, Macagno, 2008). Argumentation, in itself, is associated with a contentious position, previously referred to as quaestio in rhetoric. Therefore, when constructing a proof, proponents and opponents must be aware of what is controversial in the situation and what can serve as a basis for agreement.

A pivotal element in modern argumentation theory is the concept of proof as a speech act aimed at persuading the interlocutor/reader to support the proponent/orator's position or a specific course of action. The functional understanding of argumentation has its roots in ancient rhetoric. For instance, Quintilian, while contemplating the categorization of rhetoric as a scientific discipline, noted: 'Rhetoric can be classified among the sciences involving action, for it achieves its goal through activity' (Квінтіліан, с.161).

The pragmatic model of argumentation is based on the concept of the burden of proof assumed by participants in a dialogue/debate. Obligations are understood as propositions or statements that the speaker has independently or jointly formulated/expressed and publicly committed to defending. Thus, each participant in the dialogue has their own set of obligations, so when a proponent asks and an

opponent responds, obligations are either included in the symbolic set of the participant in the dialogue or excluded from it. The inclusion or exclusion of obligations from the set is determined by the communicative move, which takes the form of a speech act.

A model based on dialogue obligations does not take into account the psychological reality of those who are speaking (Walton, 2013).

Under the influence of cognitive psychology principles, a model has been developed within the theory of argumentation, based on beliefs, desires, and intentions. This model describes situations of solving practical tasks based on goals associated with intentions and perceptions, which, in turn, influence beliefs. In this model, each individual possesses a set of beliefs that constantly change due to sensory perception of the surrounding environment and a set of desires evaluated as desirable/undesirable and achievable/unachievable, subsequently forming intentions. The model, grounded in beliefs, desires, and intentions, takes into account the internal psychological reality of the speaker/writer (Walton, 2013).

The emergence of pragmalinguistics and the theory of speech acts has led to a new approach in the study of argumentation. The initial steps in this direction were taken by representatives of the Amsterdam School, particularly F. H. van Eemeren and R. Grootendorst. The significant contribution of Dutch scholars, who formulated the conceptual principles of pragma-dialectical theory, lies in understanding argumentation as a complex linguistic act that includes a series of simple linguistic acts and is aimed at justifying or refuting an opinion expressed during critical (polemical) discussion to persuade acceptance of that opinion (Емерен, 1994). Dutch researchers have made a substantial contribution to the study of argumentation, specifically argumentative dialogue as a form of linguistic interaction. They developed a typology of arguments, taking into account the nature of conflicting opinions, the roles of discussion participants, and the argumentative structure. Assessing critical discussion as a parameter of pragmatic effectiveness, proponents of the pragma-dialectical approach established rules for conducting this type of discussion, described procedures for substantiation and refutation, identified

stages of argumentation, and highlighted two categories of errors: violations of communication rules and violations of rules for conducting critical discussion.

The concept of French scholars J.-K. Ancimer and O. Ducro represents a distinct direction in the study of argumentation. In their research works, they analyze the argumentative function of language (Anscombre, 1983; Ducrot, 1982, c. 83-89). According to J.-K. Ancimer and O. Ducro, language can be considered argumentative when "statement A (or several statements A and B) is formulated in such a way as to lead the addressee to another statement C, i.e., to a conclusion that can be implicit or explicit" (Anscombre, 1983, c. 8). Since the primary purpose of statement A is to serve as an argument for conclusion C, this statement must possess argumentative orientation, signaled by various argumentative markers. These markers are necessary for the addressee to correctly interpret statements A and C or, using the terminology of French scholars, to provide the addressee with instructions (argumentative instructions) on how to understand these statements (Anscombre, 1983).

During the formulation of the theory of argumentation, J.-K. Ancombre and O. Ducro identified a series of key concepts that are crucial for the study of argumentation in the semantic dimension, such as "argumentative markers", "connectors," and "operators." In their scientific inquiries, numerous valuable observations are encountered, addressing various nuances of meaning related to different operators and connectors. The presented concepts significantly influence subsequent scholarly investigations into argumentation. An analysis of domestic research allows for the identification of two prevailing approaches associated with contemporary linguistic trends: cognitive and functional, or communicative-pragmatic.

Adapting the scientific context of argumentation concepts oriented towards linguistics and considering the communicative-pragmatic aspect, we follow the path of distinguished scholars such as L. G. Vasilyev, A. I. Migunov, O. V. Kulikova, N. A. Oshchepkova, V. S. Grigorieva (Касьянова, 2008, c. 24-26).

In accordance with the principles of speech act theory, argumentation within this approach is described using the concept of "illocutionary" act and is viewed as a distinct macro-type of speech act or, more precisely, a complex speech act realized through more elementary acts or micro-acts. Linguists, in analyzing argumentation, operate within the conceptual framework of speech act theory. In their research, they explore defining the boundaries of the speech act of argumentation, its illocutionary function, conditions of success, and also examine elementary types of speech acts (SAs) that function as theses or arguments. For instance, O. V. Kulikova includes among speech acts introducing a thesis such acts as assertives, indirect assertives, declaratives, and evaluative speech acts (Куликова, 2011). V. S. Grigorieva, treating argumentation as an illocutionary type of speech interaction, focuses on speech acts constituting argumentative expressions, such as representatives and regulatives, encompassing propositions, advice, requests, demands, warnings, and threats (Григор'єва, 2007).

It is important to note that the application of speech act theory to the analysis of argumentation has expanded the linguistic possibilities for studying it. The introduction of the concept of "macro-act" has significantly enriched this theory, expanding the taxonomy of SAs and, simultaneously, raising new challenges such as identifying the functioning of indirect speech acts in the macro-act of argumentation and discerning linguistic indicators of the illocutionary function of the argumentative macro-act.

1.2. The definition and classification of argumentation

Argumentation is defined as a distinctive form of communication aimed at influencing the consciousness of the addressee through speech expressions organized in accordance with the principles of persuasion accepted in a given culture. The goal of argumentation is to shape conviction or belief in the truth of a specific thesis, and this goal is considered unattained until the addressee of the argumentation forms a certain truth-based assessment of the thesis.

From the perspective of pragmalinguistics, argumentation constitutes a complex speech act that incorporates less complex illocutionary acts (Голубєв, 2002, с.89). Since an argument rarely consists of a single sentence, the term "speech macroact of argumentation" is appropriate in this context. Argumentation is a complex speech act because it functions not only at the level of individual sentences but also at a higher textual level (Еемерен, 2006, с.31–32). In scientific literature, there is no unanimous opinion on the functions of argumentation; however, there is consensus that argumentation serves a dual function: proof/refutation and persuasion, justification, and persuasion, resolving contradictions through justification or refutation, and persuasion.

Argumentation is one of the essential speech acts in scientific discourse. Therefore, scientific discursive discourse is considered a specific form of argumentative discourse. Argumentation is widely employed both in oral and written forms of scientific discussion, as it reflects one of the key pragmatic goals of the discussion - to influence the addressee and persuade them through logical arguments.

In structural terms, argumentation can take a simple form, where the argument consists of only one statement, or a complex form that includes at least three recognized types (Хенкеманс, 2006, с.123):

1. Sequential reasoning, or subordinate argumentation;

2. Interconnected judgments, or coordinate argumentation;

3. Convergent reasoning, or multiple argumentation.

Based on this classification, we identify four main types of argumentation: singular, subordinate, coordinate, and multiple argumentation.

Sequential reasoning, where one evidence supports another, requires the use of markers of subordinate argumentation, such as *"as long as," "for since," "because," "after all since," "therefore," "then,"* etc., as well as complex sentences with corresponding subordinate clauses.

Discursive segments with coordinate argumentation constitute coherent reasoning, where each piece of evidence directly relates to the starting point of view.

All pieces of evidence are interconnected, and only together do they effectively support this point of view. Markers of complex-coordinate argumentation include words and phrases such as *"the main reason is," "a secondary reason is," "all the more so since," "(but even) more importantly," "besides."*

In the case of multiple argumentation, judgments exhibit a convergent nature, indicating that each argument, in isolation, substantiates a particular perspective. Expressions signaling multiple argumentation may include phrases such as *"needless to say," "not to mention the fact that," "not just because, but also because," "plus," "if only because,"* and so on. Complex argumentation may also combine or integrate all three discussed types of argumentative structures.

The speech act of explanation is widely employed in live discussions. The need for explanation arises from the necessity to shed additional light on a specific phenomenon, clarify reasons and characteristics. Lexical units indicating explanation include *"to explain," "to clarify," "to demonstrate," "to illustrate,"* and phrasal markers such as *"just to clarify," "let me make that clear," "to put in other way/terms," "I mean," "that is to say."* The meaning of explanation can also be implicitly expressed without lexical markers.

The speech act of exemplification, as one of the types of explanation, involves elucidating something through specific examples (Селіванова, 2006, с.178). The primary function of exemplification lies in illustrating and specifying the author's position, contributing to the optimization of argumentation perception. Speech acts of exemplification are often expressed through markers such as *"for example," "for instance," "in fact," "such as," "like," "to give an example,"* etc.

In critical discourse, the speech act of confirmation plays a significant role, particularly when discussing hypotheses and propositions that have not yet received final confirmation. When the truth of a statement is fully substantiated, it becomes evidence, but in the case of confirmation, only partial justification is used. The purpose of confirmation is to persuade the addressee of the likelihood of the expressed hypothesis. Lexical means of argumentation-confirmation include verbs such as *"to support," "to lend support," "to attest to," "to bear out," "to*

substantiate," "to confirm," and so on. Persuasion also arises from the structural features of discourse fragments, where the sequence of speech acts is designed for a persuasive impact on the addressee.

The assertive discursive segment, which highlights the author's position, constitutes the core of the discourse fragment. The discursive context introducing or justifying the author's viewpoint is considered a subordinate part, positioned either before or after the assertive statement. The pre-assertive context creates conditions for introducing the author's position, while the post-assertive context serves to convince the reader of the fairness of the author's assertion.

In scientific discourse, rational means, such as speech acts of argumentation and justification, play a crucial role in persuading the addressee and eliciting a positive response. The structure of discussion fragments, representing hierarchical formations, helps realize the communicative-pragmatic component of the text and achieve the perlocutionary effect of convincing the addressee.

1.3. Theories of argumentation

The theory of argumentation deeply examines various ways to influence the convictions of opponents, addressees, and even the audience through diverse linguistic techniques and an extensive array of tools. According to O. Ivin, altering the beliefs of listeners can occur not only through verbal arguments but also by utilizing various other means such as gestures, mimics, visual images, and so forth. Paradoxically, silence, in certain situations, can prove to be a compelling argument, capable of prompting the listener to contemplate the received information or even a brief message. These aspects are studied within the realms of psychology and art theory, although they may diverge somewhat from the conceptual foundations of the theory of argumentation.

Certainly, there are other methods of influencing convictions, such as violence, hypnosis, subconscious stimulation, medicinal substances, and narcotics. However, these methods predominantly fall within the domain of psychologists' expertise and extend beyond the scope of the theory of argumentation. In the

formulation of the core ideas of a new theory of argumentation, the significant contributions of eminent scholars like H. Perelman, G. Dickinson, F. van Eemeren, R. Grootendorst, and others play a crucial role. Nevertheless, to date, the theory of argumentation has not reached a consensus on a unified paradigm or even several competing paradigms that could represent diverse perspectives on the subject of the theory, its key issues, and developmental prospects. The primary object of investigation in this theory is unquestionably argumentation, which philosophers interpret as the process of justifying a specific position by a person (addresser, subject, etc.) with the aim of convincing its truth, validity, appropriateness, and, therefore, the importance and necessity of perception. In the theory of argumentation, this process is examined from three different positions that are somewhat interconnected and complementary: from the perspective of thinking, the individual and society, and the historical standpoint. (Шинкарук В. I., 2002 с. 378, 350, 255, 621).

If philosophers consider argumentation as the process of substantiating a certain position (statement, hypothesis, concept) with the aim of convincing of its truth and validity (Шинкарук, 2002, с. 36), then O. Ivyn views argumentation as presenting evidence with the intention of changing the beliefs of the other party and the audience (Івін A. A. 1977, с 59), which is defined by the literal meaning of the term (from Latin argumentati – presenting arguments). Another definition, provided by I. Khomenko, the author of textbooks on eristics and logic for lawyers, is close to the first one: "Argumentation in the broadest sense of the word is the process of justifying a certain position (statement, hypothesis, concept) with the aim of convincing of its truth and justice" (Хоменко I. B. 2008 c.155). On the other hand, V. Gladunsky's definition correlates with the second one: "The process of presenting arguments for the complete or partial justification of a certain statement (hypotheses, concepts, etc.) is called argumentation" (Гладунський В. Н. 2004 c.282).

Among various definitions found in the literature, we find particularly intriguing the one elaborated by L. Sumarokova in her textbook on the fundamentals of logic. Deserving recognition, she accurately considers argumentation as a form

of communication and intellectual activity. The author provides the following interpretation of this concept: "Argumentation is the process of justifying knowledge or action within the limits of knowledge, primarily justified by its truth; moreover, it can justify its importance (theoretical or practical). In action, the choice of goal, the selection of means to achieve the goal, and the result are justified, along with the interrelation of these three components (effectiveness, optimality of action)" (Сумарокова, 2011, с. 223). According to the researcher, the general essence of the term "argumentation" can be conveyed by the words "justification" and "vindication." Argumentation is usually expressed by two or more communicants.

From these definitions, one can formulate an understanding of the essence of argumentation. To this, philosophical reflections of O. Ivin are added: "Argumentation is a speech act that justifies a thought, targeting the reasoning of individuals who can accept or reject it. It is always expressed in language, either spoken or written, and focuses on the relationships between statements, not the underlying thoughts or motives. As a purposeful and social activity, argumentation aims to influence others' convictions through dialogue and rational consideration of arguments. Its goal is to persuade the audience of the fairness of a position and possibly prompt action" (Івін, 1977, с. 58).

Additionally, in argumentation, references to experience may intentionally be unreliable, contradicting the essence of the confirmation concept. Both empirical argumentation and its specific form, empirical confirmations, are applicable only in the case of descriptive statements. Evaluations, norms, declarations, promises, and other expressions with an evaluative nature do not allow for empirical confirmation and are justified by means other than referring to experience. The use of empirical argumentation with the intention to persuade someone of the acceptability of certain evaluations, norms, etc., is considered an unethical tactic in argumentation.

Deductive (logical) argumentation involves deriving a substantiated proposition from previously accepted premises. It doesn't render this proposition absolutely unambiguous or irrefutable, but fully conveys the degree of certainty

associated with deductive reasoning. Deductive argumentation proves to be universal, spanning all domains of reasoning and audiences.

Systemic argumentation justifies a proposition by incorporating it as a component into an already well-substantiated system of statements or theory. The confirmation of consequences arising from the theory simultaneously supports the theory itself. On the other hand, the theory provides impetus and strength to already formulated positions based on it, aiding their justification. A proposition that becomes part of a theory relies not only on individual facts but also on a broad spectrum of phenomena explained by the theory, predicting new, previously unknown effects and connections with other theories.

Another approach in argumentation theory is the analysis of a proposition from the standpoint of its empirical confirmation and refutation possibilities. Scientific propositions must allow the possibility of refutation and anticipate procedures for their confirmation. A proposition which fundamentally disallows both refutation and confirmation goes beyond the realm of constructive criticism, failing to indicate specific paths for further research.

Methodological argumentation justifies a specific proposition or concept by referencing an undoubtedly reliable method through which the proposition or concept was obtained. The enumeration of argumentation methods is by no means exhaustive (Івін, 1977, с. 62–63).

Multiple argumentation is a sophisticated strategy in which arguments interact with each other and carry equal weight in justifying a particular position. In literature, this type of argumentation is also known as convergent reasoning. Theoretically, it can be argued that each of the arguments in multiple argumentation is sufficiently powerful to substantiate a certain perspective. However, for reliability and persuasiveness, additional arguments are often introduced.

The structure of argumentation can have varying levels of complexity, depending on the quantity and interrelationships among the arguments used to support a particular stance. The number of arguments depends on the depth of disparities in views between the proponent and opponent. In cases of significant

differences, a single argument is usually insufficient, leading to the use of complex argumentation.

The complexity of argumentation is also driven by the need to address possible objections during a discussion. If the proponent anticipates specific objections from the opponent or if the opponent raises them during the discourse, the proponent must present new arguments, creating subordinate argumentation. Criticism from the opponent may also relate to the inadequacy of the presented arguments for persuasion. In such cases, the proponent needs to augment the initial argumentation with new evidence, forming superordinate argumentation.

Therefore, the theory of argumentation explores diverse strategies that can influence the formation or alteration of beliefs in the process of communication. These strategies depend on the specific field of knowledge, the audience, social groups, and society as a whole, as well as the uniqueness of the culture or civilization within which they arise and are applied. Despite the myriad cases that are impossible to enumerate and even practically consider, the fundamental concept remains the notion of argumentation.

1.4 Types of arguments: logical, emotional, authoritative, factual etc.

Historically, three disciplines have focused on the analysis of arguments: logic, dialectic, and rhetoric. Initially, their distinctions were not only based on the subject matter but also on their respective interests: logic centered around the examination of reasoning, dialectic around discourse, and rhetoric around the art of crafting speeches.

In the realm of argument analysis, valid deductive arguments stand out as those in which the truth of the premises inherently guarantees the truth of the conclusion. Such arguments, possessing this characteristic, are termed deductively valid. When the premises are not only valid but also true, the argument is deemed sound. Classic examples of valid deductive arguments include well-known syllogisms like: *All humans are living beings. All living beings are mortal. Therefore, all humans are mortal.*

Within a deductively valid argument, the conclusion holds true in all scenarios where the premises are true, leaving no room for exceptions. A more nuanced interpretation of this concept asserts that, in every conceivable situation where the premises hold, the conclusion will also hold. This implies that if the premises of a deductively valid argument are known to be true in a given scenario, one can confidently assert the truth of the conclusion in that situation. A noteworthy feature commonly associated with deductive arguments, distinguishing them from inductive and abductive arguments, is monotonicity. In the context of deductive validity, the addition of any arbitrary premise does not invalidate the argument if premises A and B deductively imply conclusion C. Essentially, if the argument "A and B; therefore C" is deductively valid, the argument "A, B, and D; therefore C" is equally valid.

Deductive arguments fall under the purview of established logical systems, including classical propositional and predicate logic, as well as subclassical systems like intuitionistic and relevant logics. These logical systems were originally designed to encapsulate mathematical arguments, a tradition dating back to the work of Frege, Russell, Hilbert, Gentzen, and others. The paradigm, rooted in ancient Greek mathematics and exemplified by Euclid's Elements, mandates that argumentative steps in mathematical proofs exhibit the property of necessary truth preservation. This paradigm has significantly influenced the classical conception of mathematical proof, despite the diverse practices within the field.

Despite the historical influence of this perspective, some philosophers argue that deductive validity and necessary truth preservation can be disentangled. Logical paradoxes, such as the Liar or Curry's paradox, have motivated this viewpoint. Additionally, the notion of contingent logical truths challenges the concept of necessary truth preservation. Some suggest that deductive arguments preserve warrant or assertibility rather than truth, while others propose that the preservation in deductive arguments pertains to the coherence or incoherence of a set of premises.

Philosophical inquiries into the justification of deduction grapple with issues such as the nature of necessity in deduction and the possibility of providing a non-circular foundation for deduction. Furthermore, concerns are raised about the

potentially limited informativeness of deductive arguments due to their non-ampliative nature, termed "the scandal of deduction."

Despite these discussions, deductive arguments have held a prominent place in philosophy and the sciences since Aristotle introduced the first comprehensive theory of deductive argumentation. The appeal of deductive arguments lies in their promise of certainty and indubitability. However, an overemphasis on deductive arguments, to the detriment of other types, has led some to critique the skewed focus in the study of argumentation.

In recent years, the perspective that everyday reasoning and argumentation predominantly deviate from the canons of deductive argumentation has gained traction. Scholars argue that human reasoning, especially in natural settings, is fundamentally probabilistic and aligns with Bayesian probabilities. The study of non-monotonic reasoning and defeasible argumentation has gained prominence, acknowledging the inherent defeasibility of human reasoning in various contexts.

In this light, deductive argumentation may be viewed as an exception rather than the rule in the broader landscape of human argumentative practices. Nonetheless, some philosophers contend that deductive reasoning and argumentation are widespread and extend beyond specialized niches (Gilbert, 1997).

Inductive arguments involve drawing conclusions about future instances and general principles based on observations of past instances and regularities. For instance, observing the consistent sunrise in the east every day leads to the conclusion that it will happen again tomorrow, forming the general principle *"the sun always rises in the east."* Inductive arguments typically rely on statistical frequencies, extending generalizations from observed cases to unobserved ones. In a cogent inductive argument, the truth of the premises lends some degree of support to the conclusion. Unlike deductively valid arguments, the support in inductive arguments is never maximal, allowing for the possibility of the conclusion being false despite true premises. Analogously, in a deductively valid argument, the conclusion holds in all possible worlds where the premises hold, while in a robust

inductive argument, the conclusion holds in a significant proportion of those worlds. This proportion serves as a measure of the strength of support for the conclusion.

Inductive reasoning has been integral to science and daily life for centuries. Aristotle, recognizing induction as a progression from particulars to a universal, incorporated it into his scientific method. However, the dominance of deductivism persisted in Aristotelian traditions until the early modern scientific revolution, marked by the emphasis on experiments and individual case observations, notably championed by Francis Bacon.

Inductive inferences are pervasive and often reliable, rooted in the observed statistical regularities of the world, known as the "Uniformity Principle." Generalizing from observed frequencies is considered a fundamental principle of human cognition. Nevertheless, the problem of induction, famously articulated by Hume, questions the justification of inductive inferences. Hume contends that the Uniformity Principle, crucial for induction, cannot be established by rational argument, leaving induction unjustified.

Harman's critique further challenges the validity of enumerative induction, suggesting it may not always be warranted or may simply be an uninteresting special case of inference to the best explanation. Harman contends that induction should not be considered a justified form of inference in its own right.

Despite these challenges, induction remains central to scientific practice, prompting various responses to the problem of induction, including Norton's material theory. The ongoing use of induction, particularly in employing statistical frequencies for drawing conclusions in social contexts, has sparked debates reminiscent of Hume's problem, now extending to the realm of social rather than natural phenomena (González, 2019, p. 349-364).

 Abductive reasoning involves drawing a conclusion regarding the possible explanation of observed facts based on a few relevant observations. Abduction is considered prevalent in science, daily life, and specific domains like law, medical diagnosis, and explainable artificial intelligence. An illustrative example is a prosecutor's closing argument in court, where, after presenting evidence, the most

plausible explanation for the observed facts is proposed, implicating the defendant in the crime.

In contrast to deduction and similar to induction, abduction does not guarantee truth preservation. In the aforementioned legal scenario, the defendant might still be innocent, and unforeseen factors could have influenced the evidence. However, abduction differs significantly from induction as it often looks backward to explain past events rather than generalize observations for prediction. The essence lies in connecting seemingly independent phenomena or events as causally or explanatorily linked, a feature absent in purely inductive arguments relying solely on observed frequencies. Cognitively, abduction taps into the human inclination to seek causal explanations for phenomena.

While deduction and induction have long been recognized as crucial argument classes, the concept of abduction is relatively recent. Introduced by Peirce as a distinct form of inference, abduction involves forming explanatory hypotheses, leading to the development of new ideas and concepts. Modernly, abduction is understood as inference to the best explanation, though some scholars argue for distinguishing the two concepts.

Despite the seemingly straightforward nature of abduction, precisely elucidating its workings is intricate. Questions about the reliability and cogency of abductive arguments arise, considering human tendencies to seek causal explanations, sometimes inappropriately. Philosophical concerns regarding the justification of abduction, especially in scientific contexts, have been raised. Van Fraassen's critique questions the connection between explanatory superiority and truth. Defenders of abduction often rely on empirical arguments to demonstrate its reliability as a rule of inference, aligning it with induction in terms of widespread use, grounding in basic cognitive tendencies, and the emergence of challenging philosophical issues (Сумарокова, 2011).

Arguments by analogy rest on the notion that if two entities share similarities, what holds true for one is likely to hold true for the other. Analogical arguments find broad application in various human domains, including legal contexts, where

precedent and analogy play pivotal roles in legal reasoning. For instance, consider an argument against farming non-human animals for food consumption: if it would be deemed wrong for an extraterrestrial species to farm humans for sustenance, then, by analogy, it is morally wrong for humans to farm non-human animals for food. The underlying concept is encapsulated in the following schema (adapted from the entry on analogy and analogical reasoning; where S is the source domain and T is the target domain of the analogy):

1. *S is similar to T in certain (known) respects.*

2. *S has some further feature Q.*

3. *Therefore, T also has the feature Q, or some feature Q* similar to Q.*

The first premise establishes the analogy between two situations or phenomena, while the second asserts that the source domain possesses a specific property. The conclusion posits that the target domain also possesses this property or a corresponding counterpart. Although informative, this schema fails to distinguish between good and bad analogical arguments, particularly in clarifying the basis for analogical arguments. Contentious cases often revolve around the first premise, specifically whether S and T are adequately similar in a relevant aspect for possessing or lacking feature Q.

Analogical arguments have deep roots in various philosophical traditions, including Greek, Chinese, and Indian traditions. Greek philosophical texts, such as Plato's dialogues, abound with analogies. Aristotle extensively discussed analogy in Prior Analytics and in the Topics. Analogies were crucial in ancient Chinese philosophy, especially for Mohist thinkers. In the Latin medieval tradition, analogy received sustained attention, particularly in logic, theology, and metaphysics.

In contemporary philosophical discussions, analogical arguments continue to hold a central position, featuring prominently in prominent arguments like Jarvis Thomson's violinist argument on abortion permissibility and Searle's Chinese Room argument critiquing computer understanding. These arguments, often described as thought experiments, highlight the Achilles' heel of analogical arguments: criticism

often centers on the adequacy of the purported similarity between the source and target domains to extrapolate properties.

While analogical arguments may impart a lesser degree of conviction compared to other argument types, they are widely employed in both professional and everyday contexts. Scholars across disciplines have rightfully dedicated attention to studying analogical arguments, underscoring their continued importance (González, 2019; Gurevych, 2017).

One of the extensively explored categories of arguments over the centuries surprisingly revolves around those that appear valid but are not, commonly referred to as fallacious arguments. Early on, the investigation into such arguments held a prominent position in Aristotelian logical traditions, particularly influenced by his work Sophistical Refutations. The underlying idea is that, for effective argumentation, it is insufficient merely to generate and identify sound arguments. Equally, if not more crucial, is the ability to discern flawed arguments presented by others and to steer clear of producing such fallacious arguments oneself, particularly in the challenging cases where arguments seem valid but are, in fact, fallacies.

Various well-known fallacies include:

- The fallacy of equivocation arises when an arguer exploits the ambiguity of a term or phrase used at least twice in an argument to derive an unwarranted conclusion.

- The fallacy of begging the question occurs when one of the premises and the conclusion of an argument are the same proposition, albeit formulated differently.

- The fallacy of appeal to authority takes place when a claim is supported by referencing an authority rather than providing reasons for its support.

- The ad hominem fallacy involves highlighting negative aspects of an arguer or their situation to argue against the view they are presenting.

- The fallacy of faulty analogy emerges when an analogy is employed as an argument, but there is insufficient relevant similarity between the source domain and the target domain.

Beyond their potential utility in instructing argumentative skills, the literature on fallacies triggers significant philosophical discussions, including inquiries into what determines when an argument is fallacious as opposed to legitimate. It also delves into the causative factors behind certain arguments being fallacious and questions the overall effectiveness of focusing on fallacies as an approach to studying arguments (Massey 1981). Despite occasional criticisms, the concept of fallacies maintains a central position in the examination of arguments and argumentation. (Massey, 1981; Walton, 2008; Rahwan & Simari, 2009)

In argumentation, the concept of truth is fundamental to ensuring both the validity and soundness of an argument. Truth in deductive reasoning is especially crucial because it defines the relationship between premises and conclusions. When the premises of an argument are true, and the reasoning follows valid logical principles, the conclusion is necessarily true, thus preserving what can be referred to as the "truth component" (Russell, 1912). The structure of deductive arguments inherently guarantees the truth of the conclusion based on the premises' truthfulness (Frege, 1879).

To fully establish truth in an argument, it is important to differentiate between **deductive validity** and **soundness**. While deductive validity refers to the logical form of the argument – where the truth of the premises ensures the truth of the conclusion – soundness requires that the premises themselves are factually accurate. Only when the premises align with real-world facts can an argument be considered sound, thereby preserving the truth component throughout the reasoning process (Aristotle, *Prior Analytics*). This distinction is critical in evaluating deductive arguments, where logical structure alone does not suffice if the premises are not grounded in truth.

Revealing the truth component in argumentation necessitates that the premises be not only logically coherent but also based on verifiable facts. This is particularly important when distinguishing deductive arguments from inductive or abductive reasoning, which do not guarantee truth in the same manner. While inductive reasoning allows for the possibility of true premises leading to a probable, though

not certain, conclusion (Hume, 1748), deductive reasoning solidifies the truth of the conclusion as long as the premises are indeed true.

In this context, uncovering the truth component involves critically evaluating both the factual accuracy of the premises and the logical structure connecting them. The use of empirical evidence, reliable sources, or established observations ensures that the premises are verifiable. When these premises are demonstrably true, they provide a robust foundation for the truth of the conclusion (Russell, 1912). Thus, the truth component plays an essential role in sustaining the overall strength and validity of deductive arguments.

1.5. Speech acts attesting the validity of the message and their influence on the speakers

While any instance of meaningful word utterance constitutes an act of speech, the term "speech act" carries a specialized meaning. In a broad sense, speech acts are actions that one can perform by stating that one is doing so, encompassing actions like resigning, promising, asserting, and asking. However, this inclusive conception raises issues, as it deems actions like convincing, insulting, and growing six inches as speech acts, which is not ideal. A more precise understanding draws from Grice's concept of speaker meaning, emphasizing the intention behind an act.

Therefore, a speech act is an action performed by signifying the intention to do so through speaker meaning. This refined definition retains actions like resigning, promising, asserting, and asking as speech acts, excluding actions such as convincing, insulting, and whispering. Importantly, this definition allows for speech acts to be executed without verbal expression or without explicitly stating the intent.

It is essential to distinguish speech acts from performatives. A "performative" initially refers to a specific type of sentence – one that is in the first person, present tense, indicative mood, active voice, describing the speaker as performing a speech act. However, one can perform a speech act without uttering a performative sentence, and conversely, uttering a performative does not guarantee the

performance of a speech act. For example, talking in one's sleep and saying, "*I hereby promise to climb the Eiffel Tower,*" does not constitute a promise.

The terms "speech act" and "illocution" are used interchangeably, with the latter introduced by Austin to denote a dimension of communicative acts. "Illocutionary force" refers to this dimension. When examining acts, their communicative significance may not be fully determined by observable behavior or spoken words. The term "force" captures the interpretive aspect, asking how the meaning is to be taken – as a threat, prediction, or command.

However, some challenges arise, such as Cohen's argument that the concept of illocutionary force is redundant if we already understand sentence meaning. Cohen suggests that for performative sentences, the meaning inherently guarantees the performance of a speech act. Yet, this reasoning assumes that any utterance of a performative sentence fulfills the corresponding speech act, overlooking cases like talking in one's sleep. Searle similarly contends that some locutionary acts are also illocutionary acts, but this doesn't imply that locutionary meaning determines illocutionary force.

In summary, understanding speech acts involves recognizing actions performed through speaker meaning, distinguishing them from performatives, and acknowledging the interpretive dimension encapsulated by illocutionary force. The relationship between locutionary acts and illocutionary acts requires careful consideration, especially concerning the autonomy of linguistic meaning (Alston, 2000, p. 27-49).

In certain instances, we have the ability to actualize a situation by verbally declaring it. Unfortunately, I cannot shed ten pounds merely by proclaiming that I am doing so, nor can I sway your belief in a statement by asserting that I am doing so. Conversely, I can pledge to meet you tomorrow by expressing the words, "*I promise to meet you tomorrow,*" and, if granted the authority, I can even designate you to a position by stating, *"I hereby appoint you."* (Alternatively, I might appoint you without explicitly stating the force of my action, like saying, "*You are now Treasurer of the Corporation*"). Specific authoritative figures, speaking at the

appropriate time and place, are the only ones capable of christening a ship, pronouncing a couple married, appointing someone to an administrative post, declaring proceedings open, or rescinding an offer. In "How to Do Things With Words," Austin meticulously outlines the prerequisites for the successful performance of a given speech act.

Instances of unsuccessful felicity fall into two categories: misfires and abuses. The former refers to cases where the intended speech act fails to be executed altogether. For instance, if I proclaim before the QEII, "I declare this ship the Noam Chomsky," I have not successfully named anything due to lacking the authority to do so. Such an act misfires, representing a spoken act but not a speech act. Other attempts at speech acts might misfire if the recipient fails to respond appropriately: I cannot bet you $100 on the election outcome unless you accept the bet. If you decline, my attempt to bet fails to materialize.

Certain speech acts can occur without misfiring but still fall short of being felicitous. For instance, I might promise to meet you for lunch tomorrow without any intention of keeping that promise. While I have technically promised, the act lacks felicity because it lacks sincerity. Such an act is more accurately described as an abuse, as it constitutes a speech act that fails to meet the expected standards for acts of its kind. Sincerity stands out as a pivotal condition for the felicity of speech acts. Austin envisioned an extensive research program delving into the detailed study of thousands of speech act types, elucidating felicity conditions for each.

As noted by Sbisà in 2007, not only can I execute a speech act by expressing the intention to do so, but I can also subsequently revoke that act. While I cannot alter the past, I can, on Wednesday, rescind a claim made on Monday. Unlike physical actions such as a punch or a burp, which cannot be taken back, I can apologize or make amends for such infractions. Moreover, in the case of assertions and promises, I am not bound by commitments engendered by past speech acts under the right conditions. Just as one can perform a speech act by intending to do so, one can, under suitable conditions, retract that very speech act (Sbisà, 2007).

In an effort to organize and enhance Austin's framework, Searle and Vanderveken (1985) make a distinction between illocutionary forces employed within a specific linguistic community and the complete set of potential illocutionary forces. Although a particular linguistic community might not utilize forces like conjecturing or appointing, these forces are part of the comprehensive set of possibilities. Searle and Vanderveken proceed to delineate illocutionary force based on seven features:

1. **Illocutionary point:** The characteristic aim of each speech act type. For example, an assertion aims to describe reality and potentially instill belief in the addressee; a promise aims to commit the speaker to a future course of action.

2. **Degree of strength of the illocutionary point:** Similar illocutions may differ in strength. For instance, requesting and insisting both aim to prompt the addressee to do something, but the latter is stronger than the former.

3. **Mode of achievement:** The unique way, if any, in which the illocutionary point must be realized. Testifying and asserting both aim to describe reality, but testifying involves invoking one's authority as a witness, unlike asserting.

4. **Content conditions:** Certain illocutions necessitate specific propositional content. For instance, promises can only pertain to the future and actions under the speaker's control.

5. **Preparatory conditions:** Other conditions that must be met to avoid misfiring, often related to the social status of interlocutors. For example, one cannot bequeath an object without owning it or having power of attorney.

6. **Sincerity conditions:** Many speech acts involve expressing a psychological state, and sincerity depends on the speaker genuinely experiencing that state.

7. **Degree of strength of the sincerity conditions:** Similar speech acts may differ in the strength of the expressed psychological state. For instance, requesting and imploring both express desires, but imploring conveys a stronger desire.

Searle and Vanderveken propose that each illocutionary force can be defined as a septuple of values, each representing a "setting" within one of the seven

characteristics. Accordingly, two illocutionary forces (F1 and F2) are deemed identical if they correspond to the same septuple (Searle, 1968; Furberg, 1971).

In argumentation, the concept of truth plays a pivotal role in determining the validity and strength of speech acts, particularly when evaluating whether a message attests to the truth of its content. Speech acts, as outlined by Austin (1962) and further developed by Searle (1969), are communicative actions that convey intentions and elicit responses, but their effectiveness often hinges on the truthfulness of the content they deliver. The truth component in speech acts refers to the extent to which the information being communicated accurately reflects reality. In the context of argumentation, this truth component is crucial for establishing credibility and fostering belief in the message.

To uncover the truth in speech acts, it is necessary to focus on the alignment between the propositional content and factual reality. In an assertion, for example, the illocutionary force aims to describe a state of affairs, and the truth component is preserved when the described reality matches the actual state of affairs. If the speaker asserts *"The sun rises in the east"* and this is factually accurate, the truth component of the speech act is maintained, reinforcing the validity of the argument (Searle, 1969). However, if the speaker makes a false assertion, the speech act fails to achieve its intended purpose, diminishing its persuasive force.

One of the key elements for ensuring the truth component in speech acts is the speaker's sincerity condition, as identified by Searle (1969). Sincerity requires that the speaker genuinely believes the propositional content of their speech act. Without sincerity, even if the content is factually true, the speech act may lack credibility and persuasive power. For example, if someone makes a promise with no intention of fulfilling it, the promise fails to satisfy the truth component, leading to a breakdown in trust between the speaker and the listener.

Moreover, the felicity conditions of speech acts, as introduced by Austin (1962), emphasize that for a speech act to be successful, it must meet certain criteria, including truthfulness and appropriateness to the context. Misfires occur when speech acts fail to meet these conditions, such as when a speaker lacks the authority

to perform the act they are attempting, or when the content does not correspond to reality. A statement like *"I appoint you president"* is only valid if the speaker has the necessary authority to make such an appointment; otherwise, the speech act misfires and fails to establish truth (Austin, 1962).

Additionally, it is important to recognize the interpretive aspect of speech acts, particularly in how listeners perceive and interpret the truth of the message. The illocutionary force of a speech act – its intended function, such as asserting, promising, or commanding plays a significant role in how the truth component is conveyed and received. The listener must interpret the illocutionary force correctly for the speech act to achieve its intended effect, ensuring that the truth of the message is communicated effectively (Searle, 1969).

In conclusion, the truth component in speech acts is integral to the successful execution of communicative intentions in argumentation. By ensuring that the propositional content of speech acts aligns with factual reality, that the speaker maintains sincerity, and that the felicity conditions are met, the truth component can be preserved, thus enhancing the argument's overall credibility and impact.

Conclusions to Chapter I

In this qualifying work, we have explored a wide range of topics, from the foundational aspects of deductive and inductive reasoning to the intricate nuances of abductive reasoning, analogical arguments, and the nature of fallacies. A key addition to our analysis is the concept of truth in argumentation, which plays a pivotal role in establishing the validity of both arguments and speech acts.

One of the core insights that emerged is the fundamental importance of truth in reasoning. Deductive arguments, as we examined, stand out for their ability to preserve the truth from premises to conclusion. In these arguments, when the premises are true, the conclusion must necessarily be true, highlighting the "truth component" as the cornerstone of sound reasoning. This contrasts with inductive arguments, where conclusions are drawn from patterns of observation, and while

these can be persuasive, they do not guarantee truth in the same way as deductive arguments.

The exploration of abductive reasoning also revealed how truth plays a role in explaining past occurrences. Although abduction does not always guarantee the truth of conclusions, it remains an important process in making sense of observed phenomena. Similarly, in analogical arguments, the truth component hinges on the relevance and accuracy of the parallels drawn between the source and target domains. These arguments, while often compelling, require careful scrutiny to ensure that the analogies drawn uphold the truth in reasoning.

The discussion of fallacious arguments further underscored the role of truth, as these arguments may appear valid but fail to preserve the truth component, leading to deceptive conclusions. Recognizing and avoiding fallacies are crucial to maintaining the integrity of reasoning and ensuring sound argumentation.

In the realm of speech acts, we explored Austin's and Searle's frameworks, where the concept of truth is equally critical. The truth of the propositional content, sincerity, and the fulfillment of felicity conditions are essential for the success of a speech act. When these elements align, speech acts can effectively convey meaning and influence the listener, preserving the truth in communication.

In conclusion, the concept of truth serves as a central thread that weaves through the various forms of reasoning and communication discussed in this work. From deductive logic to speech acts, truth not only guarantees the validity of conclusions but also ensures the effectiveness and credibility of communicative acts. The multifaceted nature of argumentation, reasoning, and speech acts highlights the depth and complexity of human communication, reinforcing the indispensable role of truth in constructing and conveying meaning.

CHAPTER II. STRUCTURAL AND SEMANTIC FEATURES OF ARGUMENTATION AS A SPEECH ACT ATTESTING THE VALIDITY OF THE MESSAGE IN MODERN ENGLISH AND UKRAINIAN

2.1. Argumentation in English

2.1.1. The structure of the English speech acts with markers of argumentation. The study of speech acts is a crucial aspect of pragmatics, a subfield of linguistics that examines how context contributes to meaning. Speech acts are communicative acts that convey intention and achieve specific functions in communication, such as requesting, apologizing, or arguing. This section explores the structure of English speech acts with a particular focus on markers of argumentation.

Speech acts consist of three main components: the locutionary act (the actual utterance and its literal meaning), the illocutionary act (the intended meaning behind the utterance), and the perlocutionary act (the effect the utterance has on the listener) (Austin, 1962). In argumentation, the illocutionary force is of particular interest as it reveals the speaker's intent to persuade or convince the listener.

Markers of argumentation are linguistic elements that signal the presence of argumentative intent and structure within a speech act. These markers include words and phrases such as *"because," "therefore," "since," "hence," and "thus"*, which help to connect premises with conclusions and indicate reasoning processes (Fraser, 1999). Argumentative markers serve to make the structure of the argument explicit, guiding the listener through the logical progression of the speaker's reasoning.

The structure of argumentative speech acts typically involves several key components as outlined by Toulmin:

1. The statement or proposition that the speaker is trying to prove (Claim).
2. The data or reasons provided to support the claim (Evidence).
3. The logical connection between the evidence and the claim (Warrant).
4. Additional support for the warrant (Backing).
5. An indication of the strength of the claim *("probably," "certainly")* (Qualifier).

6. Potential counter-arguments and responses to them (Rebuttal) (Fraser, 1999).

Argumentative markers perform various pragmatic functions beyond structuring the argument. They:

1. Emphasize Commitment. Indicate the speaker's commitment to the truth or importance of the proposition.

2. Manage Discourse Flow. Help organize the discourse, making the argument easier to follow.

3. Signal Argumentative Strategies. Indicate shifts in the argument, such as introducing a new point, countering an objection, or drawing a conclusion. (Toulmin S. 2003)

For instance, the use of *"because"* introduces a cause or reason, while *"therefore"* signals a conclusion based on previous statements. *"However"* introduces a contrast or exception, guiding the listener through the argumentative landscape.

Argumentative speech acts can be classified based on their functions and structures:

1. Deductive Arguments. Where the conclusion necessarily follows from the premises. These often use markers such as *"therefore"* and *"thus"*.

2. Inductive Arguments. Where the conclusion is likely based on the premises. These can include markers like *"probably"* or *"likely"*.

3. Abductive Arguments. Where the conclusion is the best explanation for the premises. Markers might include *"best explained by"* or *"suggests that"*.

The structure of English speech acts with markers of argumentation involves a sophisticated interplay of linguistic elements that guide the listener through the speaker's reasoning process. By examining the components and functions of these markers, we gain deeper insights into how arguments are constructed and conveyed in English discourse. Understanding these structures is essential for analyzing and improving argumentative communication in various contexts, including academic, professional, and everyday interactions.

2.1.2. Lexical items for conveying argumentation in English. In the realm of academic writing and discourse, the ability to effectively convey arguments is paramount. Argumentation, which refers to the process of presenting reasons to support or refute a proposition, relies heavily on the strategic use of lexical items. These lexical items serve as linguistic tools that enable writers and speakers to construct, present, and support their arguments coherently and persuasively. This section delves into the various lexical items used in English to convey argumentation, examining their roles, functions, and the nuances they bring to argumentative discourse.

Connectives and conjunctions are fundamental in the construction of logical relationships within arguments. These lexical items facilitate the flow of ideas and provide coherence to the argument. For instance, causal connectives such as *"because," "since," and "therefore"* explicitly indicate a cause-and-effect relationship. According to Hyland, the use of causal connectives helps in structuring arguments in a way that the rationale behind a claim becomes clear to the reader (Hyland, 1996).

Contrastive conjunctions like *"however", "nevertheless"* and *"on the other hand"* play a crucial role in presenting counter arguments or contrasting ideas. They enable the writer to acknowledge opposing viewpoints while reinforcing the primary argument. Schiffrin (1987) notes that these conjunctions are essential in creating a balanced and critical discussion within argumentative texts.

Modal verbs, such as *"must," "should," "might," and "could"* are instrumental in expressing the degree of certainty and obligation in arguments. These verbs help in modulating the strength of the claims being made. For instance, *"must"* conveys a high level of necessity or certainty, whereas *"might"* indicates possibility and tentativeness. Hyland emphasizes that the judicious use of modal verbs can enhance the persuasive power of an argument by aligning the strength of the claims with the available evidence (Hyland K. 1996).

Hedging, which involves the use of cautious language to avoid making definitive statements, is another critical aspect of argumentative discourse. Lexical

items such as *"possibly," "probably," "seems," and "appears"* serve to mitigate the force of an assertion, thereby making it more palatable to the audience. Lakoff argues that hedging is a pragmatic strategy that allows writers to present their arguments in a less confrontational manner, thereby increasing their acceptance (Lakoff, 1973).

Evaluative language encompasses lexical items that express judgment, appraisal, and stance. Adjectives and adverbs like *"important," "significant," "unfortunately," and "remarkably"* imbue arguments with an evaluative dimension, highlighting the writer's stance on the issues being discussed. Martin and White propose that evaluative language not only conveys the writer's attitude but also helps in aligning the reader with the writer's perspective (Martin).

Moreover, evaluative verbs such as *"demonstrate," "prove," "suggest," and "argue"* are pivotal in framing the nature of the evidence and claims being presented. These verbs indicate the writer's level of confidence in the information and the expected reception by the audience. As noted by Crismore & Farnsworth, the choice of evaluative verbs can significantly impact the persuasiveness of an argument by signaling the strength of the evidence and the writer's conviction (Crismore; Farnsworth, 1990).

Rhetorical questions and emphatic expressions are powerful lexical tools in argumentative discourse. Rhetorical questions, such as *"Isn't it obvious that...?" or "How can we ignore...?"* serve to engage the audience and emphasize the writer's point. They function as persuasive devices that prompt the audience to consider the argument more deeply. According to Ilie, rhetorical questions can effectively lead the audience towards a particular conclusion by framing the issue in a way that suggests an inevitable answer (Ilie, 1994).

Emphatic expressions, including phrases like *"undoubtedly," "clearly," and "without a doubt"* are used to reinforce the certainty and importance of the argument. These expressions convey a strong conviction and are often employed to leave a lasting impact on the reader. As per Crismore and Farnsworth, the use of

emphatics can enhance the persuasiveness of an argument by underscoring the writer's confidence and authority.

2.1.3. Grammatical means of argumentation in English. The effectiveness of argumentation in English is not only determined by lexical choices but also by the grammatical structures employed. These structures provide the framework within which arguments are presented, supporting the logical flow and clarity necessary for persuasive discourse. This section explores the various grammatical means of argumentation in English, examining their functions and contributions to the coherence and persuasiveness of argumentative texts.

Complex sentences, which involve the use of subordination, are fundamental in constructing detailed and nuanced arguments. Subordinate clauses, introduced by subordinating conjunctions such as *"because," "although," "since," and "if,"* allow writers to provide additional information, establish conditions, and illustrate causal relationships. Quirk R argues that the use of complex sentences facilitates the expression of complex ideas and the connections between them, thereby enhancing the depth of the argument (Quirk et al., 1985).

For example, consider the sentence: *"Although the study presents compelling data, further research is needed to confirm the findings."* The subordinate clause *"Although the study presents compelling data"* acknowledges the strength of the data while the main clause *"further research is needed to confirm the findings"* introduces a counterpoint, creating a balanced and sophisticated argument.

The passive voice is another grammatical structure frequently employed in argumentative writing. It shifts the focus from the subject performing the action to the action itself or the object of the action. This can be particularly useful in emphasizing results, processes, or the information presented, rather than the agent. Biber et al. (1999) note that the passive voice is prevalent in academic writing because it allows for an objective tone and helps in foregrounding the content rather than the researcher (Biber D. 1999).

For instance, in the sentence *"The hypothesis was supported by the experimental data"* the passive construction highlights the support for the hypothesis without focusing on who performed the experiment. This can lend an air of impartiality and objectivity to the argument, which is crucial in academic discourse.

Conditional sentences, which are used to discuss hypothetical situations and their potential outcomes, are vital in argumentation. These sentences often employ the conjunctions *"if," "unless," "provided that,"* and *"as long as"*. Conditionals enable writers to speculate, propose scenarios, and outline the consequences of certain actions or events. According to Celce-Murcia and Larsen-Freeman, the use of conditionals is essential in persuasive writing as it allows for the exploration of possibilities and the establishment of logical consequences (Celce-Murcia, 1999).

Nominalization, the process of converting verbs and adjectives into nouns, is a grammatical strategy that contributes to the formal tone and density of academic writing. By using nominalized forms, writers can create more abstract and generalized statements, which can make the argument appear more objective and authoritative. Halliday and Martin argue that nominalization allows for the condensation of information and the focusing of arguments on key concepts (Halliday, 1993).

Parallelism, the use of similar grammatical structures in corresponding phrases or clauses, is a stylistic device that enhances the clarity and persuasiveness of arguments. It creates rhythm and balance, making the argument more coherent and easier to follow. According to Corbett and Connors, parallelism not only aids in the readability of the text but also emphasizes the equivalence of ideas, thereby reinforcing the argument (Corbett, 1999).

Grammatical structures play a crucial role in the effectiveness of argumentation in English. Complex sentences and subordination provide depth and detail, while the passive voice ensures objectivity and emphasis on content. Conditional sentences explore possibilities and logical consequences, nominalization enhances formality and abstraction, and parallelism contributes to

coherence and persuasiveness. Mastery of these grammatical means is essential for constructing clear, logical, and compelling arguments in academic writing.

2.2. Argumentation in Ukrainian

2.2.1. The structure of the Ukrainian speech acts with markers of argumentation. Argumentation is a fundamental aspect of communication, enabling speakers to present, justify, and defend their positions. In Ukrainian, as in many languages, argumentation relies on specific speech acts and linguistic markers that structure discourse and guide interlocutors through the logical progression of ideas. This section explores the structure of Ukrainian speech acts that incorporate markers of argumentation, examining how these elements function to construct coherent and persuasive arguments.

Speech acts, as defined by Searle, are communicative actions performed via utterances, encompassing a wide range of functions such as asserting, questioning, commanding, and promising. In the context of argumentation, certain speech acts are particularly relevant, including assertions, counterarguments, and concessions. These acts are marked by specific linguistic elements that signal the speaker's intent and guide the listener's interpretation of the discourse (Searle, 1969).

Markers of argumentation in Ukrainian serve to connect, contrast, and emphasize different parts of the argument, thereby structuring the discourse. These markers can be categorized into several types, including causal, adversative, concessive, and additive.

Causal markers in Ukrainian, such as *"тому що" (because), "оскільки" (since), and "через те що" (due to the fact that)*, are used to introduce reasons and justifications. They play a crucial role in establishing the rationale behind a claim, thereby strengthening the argument.

For example: *"Ми повинні інвестувати в освіту, тому що це сприяє економічному зростанню."* (We must invest in education because it promotes economic growth).

In this sentence, the causal marker *"тому що"* links the necessity of investing in education to the positive outcome of economic growth, providing a clear justification for the claim.

Adversative markers, such as *"але" (but), "однак" (however),* and *"проте" (nevertheless),* introduce contrast or opposition, allowing speakers to acknowledge counter arguments or conflicting evidence. These markers are essential for presenting a balanced argument and demonstrating critical engagement with the topic.

For instance: *"Освіта є важливою, але без належного фінансування вона не зможе виконувати свою функцію"* (Education is important, but without proper funding, it cannot fulfill its function).

Here, the adversative marker *"але"* introduces a counterpoint that tempers the initial assertion, highlighting the complexity of the issue.

Concessive markers, such as *"хоча" (although), "незважаючи на" (despite), and "дарма що" (even though),* are used to concede a point while still maintaining the overall argument. These markers demonstrate the speaker's ability to recognize and incorporate opposing viewpoints, which can enhance the persuasiveness of the argument.

Additive markers, such as *"також" (also), "крім того" (in addition), and "більше того" (moreover)* are employed to introduce additional information that supports the main argument. These markers help to build a cumulative case by adding layers of supporting evidence or reasoning.

The effective use of these markers contributes to the overall structure and coherence of Ukrainian argumentative discourse. Coherence, as noted by Halliday and Hasan, is achieved when the discourse elements are logically connected and contribute to a unified argument. In Ukrainian, the strategic placement of argumentation markers ensures that the argument progresses logically and persuasively, guiding the listener through the reasoning process.

Moreover, the hierarchical organization of speech acts and markers allows for complex arguments to be presented in a clear and accessible manner. This

hierarchical structure often begins with an assertion, followed by supporting reasons introduced by causal markers, counterarguments introduced by adversative markers, concessions introduced by concessive markers, and additional supporting points introduced by additive markers (Hasan, 1976).

The structure of Ukrainian speech acts with markers of argumentation is pivotal in constructing coherent and persuasive discourse. Causal, adversative, concessive, and additive markers each play distinct roles in signaling relationships between ideas, acknowledging counterarguments, and reinforcing the main points. Mastery of these markers enhances the clarity and effectiveness of argumentative speech acts, contributing to more compelling and logically structured arguments.

2.2.2. Lexical features of argumentation in the Ukrainian language. Connectives and discourse markers are essential lexical tools in Ukrainian argumentation. These words and phrases link ideas, signal logical relationships, and guide the listener through the discourse. Common connectives include *"тому що" (because), "отже" (therefore), and "оскільки" (since),* which are used to introduce reasons and conclusions. According to Halliday and Hasan, such markers are crucial for creating coherence in discourse by making explicit the logical connections between statements.

Modality and hedging are lexical features that modulate the certainty and force of statements, allowing speakers to express varying degrees of confidence and caution. Modal verbs and adverbs, such as *"може" (might), "повинен" (should), and "ймовірно" (probably)*, play a critical role in argumentative discourse. They enable speakers to present claims tentatively, acknowledge potential objections, and align the strength of their assertions with the available evidence. Hyland highlights that hedging is a pragmatic strategy that enhances the persuasiveness of arguments by making them appear more nuanced and less dogmatic.

Evaluative language encompasses adjectives, adverbs, and verbs that express judgment, appraisal, and stance. In Ukrainian argumentation, evaluative terms such as *"важливий" (important), "позитивно" (positively),* and *"доводити" (to prove)*

are employed to convey the speaker's attitude towards the subject matter and to highlight the significance of their claims. Evaluative language not only conveys the speaker's stance but also serves to engage the audience emotionally and intellectually (Lakoff G 1973).

Rhetorical devices, such as rhetorical questions, repetition, and parallelism, are powerful lexical features that enhance the persuasiveness of arguments. Rhetorical questions, like *"Хіба можна ігнорувати вплив освіти на суспільство?"* (Can the impact of education on society be ignored?), engage the audience and prompt them to consider the argument more deeply. Ilie notes that rhetorical questions are effective in leading the audience towards a particular conclusion by framing the issue in a way that suggests an inevitable answer (Ilie C. 1994).

Concessive language involves acknowledging opposing viewpoints or potential objections while reinforcing the main argument. Lexical items such as *"хоча" (although), "незважаючи на" (despite), and "однак" (however)* are used to introduce concessions. These terms demonstrate the speaker's critical engagement with different perspectives and enhance the credibility of the argument by presenting it as balanced and well-considered. As noted by Lakoff, concessive language is a strategic rhetorical tool that can make arguments more persuasive by showing the speaker's openness to other views.

2.2.3. Grammatical structures of argumentation in the Ukrainian language. Grammatical structures are fundamental to the efficacy of argumentative discourse, providing the syntactic framework that supports the logical flow and clarity of arguments. In Ukrainian, as in other languages, certain grammatical constructions are particularly conducive to the development and presentation of arguments. This section examines the key grammatical structures used in Ukrainian argumentation, exploring their roles and how they contribute to the overall persuasiveness and coherence of discourse.

Complex sentences, characterized by the use of subordinate clauses, are essential for elaborating detailed and nuanced arguments in Ukrainian.

Subordination allows speakers to present conditions, reasons, contrasts, and other relationships within a single sentence, thereby enhancing the logical structure and depth of the argument. Subordinating conjunctions such as *"тому що" (because), "якщо" (if), "хоча" (although), and "оскільки" (since)* are commonly used to introduce these clauses.

The passive voice is a grammatical construction that shifts the focus from the agent performing the action to the action itself or the object of the action. In Ukrainian argumentative discourse, the passive voice is used to emphasize results and processes rather than the agents involved, contributing to a more objective and impersonal tone. This can be particularly useful in academic and formal contexts, where neutrality and objectivity are valued.

Conditional sentences are crucial in argumentative discourse as they allow speakers to speculate on hypothetical scenarios and their potential outcomes. These sentences typically involve the use of *"якщо" (if)* to introduce a condition, followed by a main clause that outlines the consequence. Conditional constructions are instrumental in presenting logical relationships and exploring the implications of certain actions or decisions.

Nominalization, the process of converting verbs and adjectives into nouns, is a grammatical strategy that enhances the formality and abstraction of argumentative discourse. By using nominalized forms, speakers can focus on the concepts and processes rather than actions and agents, contributing to a more academic tone. Nominalization often involves transforming verbs like *"рішення" (decision)* from *"вирішити" (to decide)* or *"обґрунтування" (justification)* from *"обґрунтовувати" (to justify).*

Parallelism, the use of similar grammatical structures in corresponding phrases or clauses, enhances the readability and persuasiveness of arguments. By creating symmetry and rhythm, parallelism ensures that the argument is presented in a coherent and balanced manner. This rhetorical device is particularly effective in emphasizing the equivalence of ideas and reinforcing key points.

Relative clauses, introduced by relative pronouns such as "який" (which), "що" (that), and "де" (where), provide additional information about a noun without starting a new sentence. These clauses are crucial for adding specificity and detail to arguments, allowing speakers to elaborate on key points while maintaining sentence flow.

Grammatical structures play a pivotal role in shaping the effectiveness of argumentation in the Ukrainian language. Complex sentences and subordination provide depth and nuance, the passive voice emphasizes objectivity, conditional sentences explore hypothetical scenarios, nominalization enhances formality, parallelism ensures coherence and emphasis, and relative clauses add specificity and detail. Mastery of these grammatical constructions is essential for crafting clear, logical, and persuasive arguments, contributing significantly to the overall coherence and impact of Ukrainian argumentative discourse.

2.3. Contrastive analysis of lexical and grammatical means of argumentation in English and Ukrainian

Connectives and discourse markers are essential in linking ideas and ensuring coherence in argumentation. In both English and Ukrainian, these lexical items serve to signal logical relationships and guide the listener through the discourse. However, there are some differences in their usage and forms.

In English, common connectives include *"because," "therefore," "since," "however," and "moreover"*. These markers are straightforward and often directly correspond to specific logical functions. For instance:

- *"We should invest in education because it promotes economic growth."*
- *"The policy is effective; however, it needs more public support."*

In Ukrainian, similar connectives are used, such as *"тому що" (because), "отже" (therefore), "оскільки" (since), "однак" (however), and "крім того" (moreover)*. For example:

- *"Ми повинні інвестувати в освіту, тому що це сприяє економічному зростанню."*

- *"Політика ефективна, однак їй потрібна більша підтримка громадськості."*

The Ukrainian connectives tend to be more syntactically flexible, allowing for varied placement within sentences, which can affect the flow and emphasis of arguments.

Both English and Ukrainian use modality and hedging to express degrees of certainty and caution, but there are some nuances in their application. In English, modal verbs such as *"might," "should," and "could" and adverbs like "probably" and "possibly"* are common hedging devices. For instance:

- *"Educational reforms might improve the quality of learning."*
- *"It is probably true that more funding is needed."*

Ukrainian employs similar modal verbs and adverbs, including "*може" (might), "повинен" (should), and "ймовірно" (probably).* For example:

- *"Реформи в освіті можуть підвищити якість навчання."*
- *"Ймовірно, потрібно більше фінансування."*

However, Ukrainian often combines modal verbs with other particles to add nuance, such as "можливо" (possibly), enhancing the speaker's ability to convey subtleties of doubt or probability.

Evaluative language, used to express judgments and attitudes, is crucial in both languages, though there are stylistic differences. English frequently uses adjectives like *"important," "significant," and "beneficial"* to evaluate arguments:

- *"It is important to invest in education for future growth".*

In Ukrainian, similar evaluative adjectives such as *"важливий" (important), "значний" (significant), and "корисний" (beneficial)* are used:

- *"Важливо інвестувати в освіту для майбутнього зростання."*

Ukrainian evaluative language often involves a higher degree of nominalization, contributing to a more formal tone, which is typical of Slavic academic styles.

Both English and Ukrainian heavily rely on complex sentences and subordination to elaborate arguments. Subordination in both languages involves similar conjunctions, but their syntactic behavior can differ.

English complex sentences often use subordinating conjunctions like *"because," "although," "if," and "since"*:

- *"Although the policy is effective, it needs more support."*

Ukrainian similarly uses *"тому що" (because), "хоча" (although), "якщо" (if), and "оскільки" (since)*:

- *"Хоча політика ефективна, їй потрібна більша підтримка."*

However, Ukrainian subordinate clauses can be more flexible in their placement within sentences, allowing for varied emphasis and focus depending on their position.

The passive voice is a common feature in both English and Ukrainian, used to emphasize the action or result rather than the agent.

In English, the passive construction is straightforward:

- *"The decision was made to increase funding."*

In Ukrainian, the passive voice is often formed using reflexive verbs or impersonal constructions:

- *"Було прийнято рішення збільшити фінансування."*
- *"Рішення про збільшення фінансування було прийнято."*

The Ukrainian passive voice can sound more formal and is frequently used in academic and official discourse.

Conditional sentences in both languages are crucial for discussing hypothetical scenarios and their outcomes.

English uses *"if"* to introduce conditions:

- *"If we increase funding, education quality will improve."*

Ukrainian also uses *"якщо"* (if) and sometimes *"коли"* (when) for similar purposes:

- *"Якщо ми збільшимо фінансування, якість освіти покращиться."*

Ukrainian conditional sentences often allow for more varied syntactic structures, contributing to a flexible presentation of hypothetical arguments.

Nominalization is a key strategy in both English and Ukrainian for creating abstract, formal arguments.

In English:

- *"The decision to increase funding was necessary."*

In Ukrainian:

- *"Прийняття рішення про збільшення фінансування було необхідним."*

Ukrainian often utilizes more complex nominal phrases, enhancing the formal tone and density of academic texts.

The lexical and grammatical means of argumentation in English and Ukrainian share many similarities, reflecting common strategies in constructing logical and persuasive discourse. However, there are notable differences in syntactic flexibility, formality, and the use of specific lexical items. Understanding these contrasts is essential for effective cross-linguistic communication, translation, and the development of comparative linguistic studies.

CHAPTER III. DISCURSIVE PROPERTIES OF ARGUMENTATION AS A SPEECH ACT ATTESTING THE VALIDITY OF THE MESSAGE IN MODERN ENGLISH AND UKRAINIAN

3.1. Factors influencing argumentative discourse

Argumentative discourse, as a complex form of communication, is influenced by a range of factors including linguistic, cultural, contextual, and psychological elements. Understanding these factors helps in analyzing how arguments are constructed and perceived in both English and Ukrainian contexts.

Linguistic elements such as syntax, semantics, and pragmatics are critical in shaping argumentative discourse. For example:

In English: An academic argument might use formal language and structured reasoning. Consider the following argument: *"Given the recent advancements in renewable energy technologies, it is essential for governments to invest in green energy to mitigate climate change. Studies show that renewable energy sources have significantly lower carbon footprints compared to fossil fuels"* (Hartmann, 2018, c. 806-821).

In Ukrainian: A political debate might incorporate rhetorical questions and emotive language. For example: *"Чи можемо ми ігнорувати проблеми екології, коли наше майбутнє залежить від чистоти повітря? Розвинені країни вже інвестують у відновлювальні джерела енергії, і нам слід зробити те ж саме"* (Сумарокова, 2011).

Cultural norms and values influence how arguments are presented and what is expected in discourse. For example:

In English-speaking cultures directness is highly valued. A lawyer in court might state: *"The evidence clearly supports the defendant's claim. The eyewitnesses have consistently confirmed the defendant's account, demonstrating that the case is straightforward."*

In Ukrainian contexts: Indirectness and politeness are often preferred. A public speaker might say: *"Although opinions on this issue vary, we should consider*

all perspectives to achieve a consensus that respects everyone's views"(Gilbert, 1997, c. 95-113).

The setting and relationship between participants impact argumentative discourse: In academic settings (English): Arguments are often structured and evidence-based. For example: *"According to recent research published in the Journal of Environmental Science, the data demonstrates a clear link between urbanization and increased air pollution levels."*

In casual settings (Ukrainian): Arguments may be more fluid and context-dependent. An argument in a family discussion might be: *"I think we should all contribute to the household chores equally. After all, it's fair for everyone to share the responsibilities"* (González; Julder; Mariantonia, 2018, c.349-364).

Psychological traits influence how arguments are presented and received:

In English we use an individual with a cognitive style favoring analytical reasoning might argue: *"The statistical analysis presented in the report shows a significant correlation between educational attainment and income levels, supporting the need for educational reforms."*

In Ukrainian we use someone with an emotional reasoning style who might argue: *"Our community has always valued helping those in need. By supporting this charity, we uphold our tradition of compassion and solidarity."*

3.2. Psycholinguistic parameters of the argumentative communicative process: typology of linguistic personality

The study of psycholinguistic parameters in argumentative discourse involves examining how individual psychological traits and cognitive styles influence communication. The typology of linguistic personality is a key aspect in understanding these dynamics. Linguistic personality refers to the set of linguistic behaviors and preferences that characterize an individual's style of communication.

Linguistic personality can be categorized into different types based on various psychological and cognitive factors. These include:

1. Analytical Linguistic Personality;

2. Emotional Linguistic Personality;

3. Pragmatic Linguistic Personality;

4. Narrative Linguistic Personality (Gurevych; Habernal, 2017, с.125-179).

Individuals with an analytical linguistic personality tend to favor logical structure and evidence-based arguments. They prefer clarity, precision, and systematic reasoning. This type is often seen in academic and professional settings.

In English: *"According to recent studies, implementing renewable energy sources can reduce greenhouse gas emissions by up to 40%. This data, published by the International Energy Agency, underscores the urgent need for policy change."*

In Ukrainian: *"Відповідно до останніх досліджень, використання відновлювальних джерел енергії може знизити викиди парникових газів до 40%. Ці дані, опубліковані Міжнародним енергетичним агентством, підкреслюють нагальну потребу в зміні політики."*

Those with an emotional linguistic personality rely heavily on affective language and persuasive strategies that appeal to the audience's emotions. This style is prevalent in political speeches, advertising, and personal narratives.

In English: *"Imagine a world where our children can breathe clean air and live healthy lives. By embracing green energy today, we can secure a brighter future for the next generation."*

In Ukrainian: *"Уявіть собі світ, де наші діти можуть дихати чистим повітрям і жити здоровим життям. Прийнявши відновлювальні джерела енергії сьогодні, ми можемо забезпечити світле майбутнє для наступного покоління."*

Individuals with a narrative linguistic personality often use storytelling and personal anecdotes to convey their messages. This type is common in journalism, literature, and public speaking.

In English: *"When I was a child, my family struggled with asthma due to the polluted air in our city. Transitioning to renewable energy is not just a policy issue for me; it's a deeply personal mission to ensure healthier lives for others."*

In Ukrainian: *"Коли я був дитиною, моя сім'я страждала від астми через забруднене повітря в нашому місті. Перехід на відновлювані джерела енергії для мене – це не лише питання політики, а й глибоко особиста місія забезпечити здорове життя для інших."*

The typology of linguistic personality is instrumental in understanding the psycholinguistic parameters that influence argumentative discourse. By recognizing the different types — analytical, emotional, pragmatic, and narrative — researchers and communicators can better tailor their arguments to their audiences in both English and Ukrainian contexts. This understanding enhances the effectiveness of argumentation as a speech act attesting the validity of the message.

3.3. Argumentation in conversational discourse

In conversational discourse, argumentation plays a crucial role in shaping everyday communication, as it reflects the spontaneous, dynamic, and context-dependent nature of interactions. Unlike formal argumentative contexts, conversational discourse relies heavily on shared knowledge, personal experiences, and immediate situational factors, making it an ideal context to explore the role of *truth* in argumentation. The concept of truth within conversational argumentation becomes central to assessing the validity and persuasive power of the arguments being presented in both English and Ukrainian.

The key characteristic that differentiates conversational argumentation from formal argumentation is its less structured and informal nature. Conversations are typically relaxed, with speakers using colloquialisms, idiomatic expressions, and informal language. However, despite this relaxed style, the truth component of an argument remains essential in ensuring the argument's credibility and effectiveness. Arguments in everyday conversations often gain strength when participants can demonstrate that their claims align with shared truths or facts that are grounded in reality.

Another notable feature of conversational argumentation is its strong dependency on context. Arguments are often crafted and interpreted based on the

immediate situation, background knowledge, and relationships between the speakers. The *truth component* in this context is heavily reliant on how well the speaker can align their statements with mutually understood facts or experiences. If the speaker's claims resonate with the listeners' shared knowledge or perceived reality, the argument is perceived as more credible and persuasive.

Conversational argumentation is inherently dialogic, with participants engaging in a back-and-forth exchange where they co-construct the argument. In this process, participants must be able to recognize and respond to each other's claims in ways that support or challenge the truth of the assertions being made. The interactive nature of conversational discourse requires participants to engage with the *truth* of the statements, often by correcting, confirming, or expanding on what has been said. The truth component here plays a central role in determining whether an argument holds up under scrutiny or counter-arguments.

To effectively reveal the truth in conversational discourse, arguers employ a variety of strategies designed to strengthen their points and make them more relatable. These strategies may include the use of anecdotes, examples, rhetorical questions, and appeals to emotions. While these techniques can engage listeners, the persuasiveness of the argument ultimately depends on its truthfulness. For instance, an argument that incorporates factual anecdotes or concrete examples is more likely to resonate with listeners than one based on hypothetical or exaggerated claims.

One of the key strategies in maintaining the truth component is ensuring that all participants have an opportunity to contribute. Active listening allows speakers to address inaccuracies or expand on truths within the conversation. This balanced exchange helps ensure that the flow of the discussion remains grounded in reality.

Repeating or rephrasing key points helps reinforce the truth of an argument, especially when the initial point might not have been fully understood. This strategy allows participants to clarify or bolster their arguments by reiterating their alignment with facts or shared knowledge.

A highly effective way to make an argument persuasive is by appealing to shared values, beliefs, or experiences. When arguers can connect their points to

commonly accepted truths, they increase the chances of their argument being perceived as credible and compelling. The alignment with established truths reinforces the argument's validity.

While emotional appeals can enhance engagement, they are most effective when rooted in facts. For example, appealing to empathy or shared experiences, while simultaneously presenting true facts, can make the argument both emotionally and intellectually compelling.

Example in English	*Example in Ukrainian*
Person A: *I've been thinking about going vegan. It's supposed to be really good for your health, you know?* **Person B**: *Yeah, I've read that too. Plus, it's better for the environment. Cutting out meat can significantly reduce your carbon footprint.* **Person A**: *Exactly! And there are so many delicious plant-based recipes out there now. It doesn't have to be boring or tasteless.* **Person B**: *True, but it's hard to give up cheese. I don't think I could do it.* **Person A**: *I get that, but there are some great vegan cheese alternatives. Maybe you could try those first and see how you like them.*	**Колега А**: *Я думаю, що вивчення англійської мови є важливим для кар'єрного зростання.* **Колега В**: *Так, але це потребує багато часу і зусиль. Чи справді це того варте?* **Колега А**: *Звичайно! Багато міжнародних компаній вимагають знання англійської. Це відкриває більше можливостей для роботи за кордоном.* **Колега В**: *Можливо, але в нашій сфері не так багато англомовних клієнтів.* **Колега А**: *Це поки що. Ринок змінюється, і знання англійської може стати великою перевагою у майбутньому.*

Here, the argument is built on the truth of market trends and career opportunities related to English proficiency. ***Колега А*** strengthened their argument by grounding it in factual statements about job requirements and future prospects.

The concept of truth is essential in conversational argumentation as it ensures the credibility and effectiveness of the arguments. While informal and dynamic, conversational discourse relies heavily on the participants' ability to ground their arguments in factual content, shared knowledge, and reality, making the truth component a fundamental aspect of effective communication.

3.4. Argumentation in political discourse

Political discourse is characterized by its strategic nature, where the concept of *truth* plays a fundamental role in shaping the effectiveness and credibility of arguments. Politicians, in their quest to influence, inform, and garner public support, must navigate complex social dynamics while maintaining a narrative that resonates with the audience. This chapter will explore how truth is embedded in political argumentation, focusing on the techniques politicians employ to assert the validity of their claims and win public trust in both English and Ukrainian contexts.

At the heart of political argumentation lies the goal of persuasion. Politicians craft arguments that must be perceived as credible and grounded in truth to be effective. The incorporation of facts, logic, and shared realities forms the backbone of these arguments, allowing them to withstand public scrutiny. In political discourse, the truth is not simply about the factual accuracy of claims but also about their alignment with the audience's perceptions, values, and lived experiences. Without this foundation in truth, political arguments risk being seen as deceptive or manipulative, undermining the politician's authority and public trust.

Political arguments are typically well-organized, presenting clear claims supported by logical reasoning and evidence. This structure serves not only to convey authority but also to establish the truthfulness of the politician's position. Politicians frequently rely on data, expert opinions, and statistics to lend weight to their arguments, presenting their policies as fact-based and aligned with objective

reality. However, the truth in political discourse is not limited to empirical evidence; it also includes how well the argument resonates with the audience's sense of what is true, both emotionally and contextually.

For example, emotional appeals, although not always directly related to factual truth, play a significant role in political argumentation. Politicians often invoke feelings of patriotism, hope, or fear to connect with the audience on a deeper level. These emotional appeals are successful when they align with widely held societal truths or beliefs. By combining factual evidence with emotional resonance, politicians create arguments that are perceived as both truthful and meaningful to their audience.

One of the primary tools used by politicians to influence public perception is *framing*. Through framing, politicians highlight specific aspects of an issue while downplaying others, shaping how the public interprets the truth of the matter. This technique allows them to guide the audience toward a particular understanding of the issue, emphasizing certain truths—such as economic benefits or moral imperatives—while possibly omitting inconvenient details. This selective representation of facts raises questions about the completeness of the truth being presented, but it remains a powerful tool for political persuasion.

Agenda-setting is another critical aspect of political discourse, where politicians steer public attention toward particular issues that align with their political goals. By focusing on these topics, they not only make their arguments seem more relevant but also imbue them with a sense of truth. Politicians like Ukrainian President Volodymyr Zelensky and U.S. President Joe Biden effectively use agenda-setting to address issues that resonate with their constituencies, framing these topics in ways that appeal to shared values and established truths.

For this comparison, we will examine the political speeches of two well-known politicians: Ukrainian President Volodymyr Zelensky and U.S. President Joe Biden. These speeches illustrate the differences and similarities in style, structure, and rhetorical strategies.

Speech by Volodymyr Zelensky at the "Ukraine 30. Culture. Media. Tourism."
forum (July 5, 2021).

1. *Emotional Appeals:* Zelensky often uses emotional appeals to create a connection with the audience. He appeals to patriotic feelings and national pride.

2. *Conversational Format:* The speech has a less formal, conversational tone, making it more accessible to a broad audience.

3. *Focus on National Issues:* Zelensky emphasizes issues of culture, media, and tourism, highlighting their importance for national identity and economic development.

Example: *"We must remember that our culture is our wealth, our unique heritage. It should be the foundation for the development of tourism, which will help boost our economy and promote Ukraine on the world stage."* (Joe Biden's Inaugural Address. January 20, 2021).

1. *Structured:* Biden's speech is well-structured with clearly defined sections covering various aspects of his political agenda.

2. *Rhetorical Devices:* Biden actively uses rhetorical devices such as metaphors, analogies, and repetition to strengthen his arguments and make the speech more persuasive.

3. *Call for Unity:* A significant portion of the speech is dedicated to calls for unity and cooperation to overcome national divisions and challenges.

Example: "We must end this uncivil war that pits red against blue, rural versus urban, conservative versus liberal. We can do this if we open our souls instead of hardening our hearts."

Zelensky's speech has a less formal, conversational tone, making it more accessible to a broad audience. In contrast, Biden follows a more formal and structured format, typical for inaugural speeches. Zelensky's speech has a less formal, conversational tone, making it more accessible to a broad audience. In contrast, Biden follows a more formal and structured format, typical for inaugural speeches. Zelensky focuses on national issues of culture, media, and tourism,

emphasizing their importance for national identity. Biden emphasizes unity and collective efforts to overcome the challenges facing the country.

3.5. Argumentation in mass media

Argumentation in mass media serves a vital function in shaping public perception, influencing opinions, and providing information on a wide array of issues. Media platforms—including television, print, radio, and digital outlets—use various strategies to present arguments that are intended to inform, persuade, or provoke action. The concept of truth in media argumentation is of paramount importance, as the audience's trust and the credibility of the message largely hinge on the perceived truthfulness of the content. This section focuses on how truth is utilized and maintained in media argumentation, examining the different tactics employed by English and Ukrainian media outlets.

At the core of media argumentation is the need to persuade the audience while maintaining a foundation of credibility and factual accuracy. Media organizations use a combination of facts, expert opinions, and rhetorical devices to construct arguments that seem grounded in truth. However, the truth component in mass media is multifaceted. It is not only about the accuracy of the facts presented but also about how these facts are framed and interpreted. The credibility of the source, the transparency of the argument, and the alignment of the content with audience expectations all contribute to the perception of truth in media argumentation.

One of the primary techniques mass media uses to influence public opinion is framing. Through selective presentation, media outlets emphasize certain elements of a story while downplaying or excluding others. This process effectively guides the audience toward a particular interpretation of the truth. For instance, when reporting on political issues, media organizations may highlight specific facts or opinions that align with their editorial stance, subtly steering the audience's perception of reality. In this way, framing not only shapes the truth but also directs the focus of public discourse.

Agenda-setting is another strategy by which media outlets control the narrative. By choosing which stories to cover and which to omit, media organizations can influence which issues gain prominence in public discussions. This selective focus impacts how audiences perceive the importance and truthfulness of the issues presented. In both English and Ukrainian media, agenda-setting is a powerful tool that can elevate certain topics, such as climate change or judicial reform, to the forefront of public attention, thereby shaping the truth that the public engages with.

While factual accuracy is critical in media argumentation, emotional appeals are often used to enhance the truth component of a message. Emotional connections with the audience can reinforce the perceived truthfulness of a story by engaging feelings such as empathy, fear, or patriotism. Stories that evoke strong emotional responses are more likely to be remembered and shared, which in turn amplifies their impact. However, the truth in these emotional appeals depends heavily on whether the emotions are rooted in factual and credible information.

For example, an editorial on climate change in The New York Times may combine scientific facts with an emotional plea for action, stating: *"The scientific consensus is clear: Climate change is real, and human activities are its primary cause. To mitigate the worst effects, we must take immediate and decisive action. Reducing carbon emissions, investing in renewable energy, and implementing sustainable practices are essential steps. Failure to act now will have devastating consequences for future generations."* In this instance, the truth component is maintained through a combination of factual evidence and emotional urgency, compelling the audience to view the argument as both credible and significant.

To bolster the truthfulness of their arguments, media outlets frequently cite experts, statistics, and research studies. These references lend authority to the claims being made and provide a broader perspective on the issues discussed. By aligning their arguments with credible sources, media organizations enhance the truth component of their content, making it more persuasive to their audience.

In the Ukrainian media, for instance, an article from 'Українська Правда' on judicial reform might state:

"Судова реформа в Україні є необхідною умовою для забезпечення верховенства права та захисту прав громадян. Без незалежної та ефективної судової системи неможливо досягти стабільного розвитку та залучення іноземних інвестицій. Громадяни мають право на справедливий суд, і саме реформа допоможе подолати корупцію та забезпечити довіру до судової влади." Here, the argument is supported by references to fundamental legal principles and the long-term benefits of judicial reform, which reinforce the truth component by grounding the argument in well-established facts and widely accepted societal values.

The concept of truth is integral to the effectiveness of argumentation in mass media. Media outlets must carefully balance factual accuracy, framing, emotional appeal, and expert testimony to construct arguments that are both credible and persuasive. In both English and Ukrainian contexts, the truth component is shaped not only by the facts presented but also by how these facts are framed and the emotional resonance they carry. Through agenda-setting, selective framing, and appeals to authority, media organizations play a key role in shaping public perception and guiding how truth is understood in the broader societal discourse. By maintaining the integrity of the truth component, mass media can effectively influence public opinion and contribute to informed, rational debate.

Conclusions to Chapter III

We have explored the discursive properties of argumentation as a speech act aimed at attesting the validity of a message in modern English and Ukrainian languages. Our investigation covered various dimensions, including factors influencing argumentative discourse, psycholinguistic parameters, and the application of argumentation in conversational, political, and mass media contexts. The following conclusions can be drawn from this chapter:

In mass media, truth is intricately woven into the construction of arguments through the careful use of framing, agenda-setting, and appeals to authority. Media outlets, whether through digital platforms or traditional mediums like television and print, shape public perception by selectively highlighting facts and guiding audience interpretation. The truth component in media argumentation is not just about factual accuracy but also about how information is presented and the emotional resonance it creates. By using expert testimony and verifiable data, media outlets aim to reinforce the perceived truthfulness of their narratives, ensuring that their arguments maintain credibility and persuasive appeal.

In the realm of political discourse, the role of truth becomes even more pronounced as politicians craft arguments designed to influence public opinion, secure trust, and mobilize support. Political figures, like those examined in the speeches of Volodymyr Zelensky and Joe Biden, must balance the presentation of facts with emotional and rhetorical strategies that resonate with their constituents. In political argumentation, the truth component is not only about presenting objective facts but also about aligning these facts with societal values, shared experiences, and the emotional landscape of the audience. By doing so, politicians enhance the persuasiveness of their messages and bolster the credibility of their positions.

Conversational discourse presents a more fluid and dynamic form of argumentation, where truth is often constructed collaboratively through interaction. Unlike the more formalized structures of media and political arguments, conversational argumentation relies on shared knowledge, personal experiences, and context-dependent strategies. Here, the truth is shaped by the participants' ability to align their arguments with commonly understood facts and experiences. The dialogic nature of conversation requires speakers to continually engage with and respond to the perceived truths of others, co-constructing a shared understanding through their exchanges.

In conclusion, across mass media, political, and conversational discourse, truth remains a core element in the construction and reception of effective arguments. Whether in the strategic framing of news stories, the emotionally charged

rhetoric of political speeches, or the fluid back-and-forth of everyday conversations, the truth component serves as the backbone of persuasive communication. Understanding how truth operates within these different contexts not only highlights the power of argumentation but also underscores the importance of maintaining integrity and factual accuracy in discourse. By navigating the complex interplay between truth, emotion, and persuasion, communicators across all these domains can craft arguments that are not only compelling but also trustworthy and impactful.

GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

The research on "Argumentation as a Speech Act Attesting the Validity of the Message: Structural, Semantic, and Discursive Features in Modern English and Ukrainian" has provided deep insights into the multifaceted nature of argumentation within these two linguistic contexts. The study's analysis of structural, semantic, and discursive elements reveals several important conclusions.

Firstly, argumentation is characterized by intricate structural and semantic components that vary according to linguistic and cultural contexts. Both English and Ukrainian employ a range of linguistic devices, such as logical connectors, rhetorical questions, and diverse forms of evidence, to create coherent and persuasive arguments. The structural organization of arguments comprising introductions, developments and conclusions follows distinct patterns influenced by cultural norms. Additionally, the semantic choices, including vocabulary and phrasing, play a critical role in enhancing the persuasive power of arguments.

The discursive properties of argumentation are largely determined by the context in which they occur. Whether in conversational, political, or mass media settings, argumentation adapts to the specific demands and expectations of the audience and medium. In conversational discourse, argumentation tends to be more spontaneous and interactive, requiring speakers to be flexible and context-sensitive. Political discourse, on the other hand, is typically more formal and strategic, aiming to persuade and mobilize the audience towards specific goals. Mass media discourse uses techniques such as framing, agenda setting, and emotional appeals to shape public opinion and influence the audience's perception of issues.

The psycholinguistic parameters of argumentation highlight the complex interplay between cognitive processes and linguistic expression. Different linguistic personalities approach argumentation in unique ways, influenced by their cognitive styles, emotional intelligence, and communicative competence. Understanding these typologies provides valuable insights into how individuals construct and perceive

arguments, which in turn reveals the effectiveness of various argumentative strategies.

Cultural and contextual factors significantly impact the nature of argumentation in both English and Ukrainian. Cultural norms, values, and communicative practices shape how arguments are formulated and understood, resulting in distinct argumentative styles in each language. Additionally, contextual factors, such as the socio-political environment and specific issues being addressed, play a crucial role in shaping the form and content of arguments.

Effective argumentation requires a balance of logical coherence, persuasive rhetoric, and emotional appeal. In both English and Ukrainian, successful arguments are those that present clear and logical claims supported by credible evidence and enhanced by compelling rhetorical techniques. The ability to adapt argumentative strategies to different contexts and audiences is essential for achieving the desired communicative outcomes.

The study underscores the importance of developing linguistic and communicative competence in argumentation. A thorough understanding of the structural, semantic, and discursive features of argumentation enables individuals to engage more effectively in various forms of discourse. Enhancing argumentative skills contributes to better critical thinking, persuasive communication, and active participation in both public and private discussions.

In conclusion, the examination of argumentation as a speech act of proving the truth of an utterance reveals the intricate structural-semantic and discursive features present in modern English and Ukrainian languages. This research provides a deeper understanding of the mechanisms and strategies underlying effective argumentation, offering valuable insights for linguists, communicators, and anyone engaged in the art of persuasion.

RÉSUMÉ

Актуальність теми полягає в тому, що в сучасному інформаційному просторі, де доступ до інформації є широким, навички аргументації в мовленні стають надзвичайно важливими для критичного мислення та аналізу інформації.

Предметом дослідження є структурно-семантичні та дискурсивні особливості в сучасній англійській та українській мовах. Метою дослідження є вивчення структурно-семантичних і дискурсивних особливостей цього мовленнєвого акту в сучасних англійській та українській мовах. Зокрема, аналіз включає елементи, що формують аргументативну структуру висловлювання, і специфічні характеристики, що визначають дискурсивний контекст використання аргументації в обох мовах.

Дослідження вирізняється такими науковими інноваціями: розглядається аргументація як мовленнєвий акт на двох взаємопов'язаних рівнях – структурно-семантичному та дискурсивному. Це дозволяє глибше розуміти вербальну комунікацію як активний елемент взаємодії між мовцем та аудиторією, включаючи контрастивний аналіз мов, фокус на різних контекстах використання аргументації, включаючи розмовний, політичний та медійний дискурс. Дослідження висвітлює різні аспекти вербальних практик, описує вплив мовленнєвих актів на сприйняття істинності висловлювань, вводячи новий вимір у розуміння комунікативної ефективності аргументації.

В практичному плані дане дослідження сприятиме розвитку комунікативних навичок, опануванню принципів ефективної аргументації та обґрунтування істинності висловлювань з метою розвитку лінгвістичної та комунікативної компетентності. Окрім того, вивчення аргументації в обох мовах сприятиме підтриманню мовних стандартів у сучасному дискурсі.

Ключові слова: argumentation, speech act, validity, structural-semantic and discursive features.

LITERATURE CITED

Аристотель. Риторика. Поетика / Аристотель, 2000. – 220 с.

Grootendorst V. R. Argumentation: analysis, evaluation, presentation. / V. R. Grootendorst, F. H. Eemeren, A. F. Snoeck. – Mahwah, New Jersey, London, 2002. – 497 c. – (Lawrence Erlbaum Associates).

Knape J. Modern Rhetoric in Culture, Arts, and Media 13 Essays [Електронний ресурс] / Joachim Knape // University of Tübingen. – 2013. – Режим доступу до ресурсу: https://www.degruyter.com/document/doi/10.1515/9783110292503/html?lang=en.

Квінтіліан М. Ф. Ч. I–II. Ч. I. Книга 2 / Марк Фабій Квінтіліан // Дванадцять книг риторичних настанов / Марк Фабій Квінтіліан. – СПб: Типографія Імператорської Академії, 1834. – С. 78–174.

Емерен Ф. Х. Мовленнєві акти в аргументативних дискусіях / Ф. Х. Емерен, В. Р. Гроотендорст. – СПб: Нотабене, 1994. – 239 с.

Ottmers C. Rhetorik 2. Aufl / Clemens Ottmers. – Stuttgart: Weimar: J.B. Metzler. – 239 c. – (2007).

Касьянова Ю. І. Структурно-семантичний аналіз аргументації в монологічному тексті : автореф. дис. на здобуття наук. ступеня канд. філ. наук : спец. 10.02.19 "Теорія мови" / Касьянова Юлія Іванівна, 2008. – 158 с..

Walton D. Argumentation Schemes [Електронний ресурс] / D. Walton, C. Reed, F. Macagno // Cambridge University Press. – 2008. – Режим доступу до ресурсу: https://www.cambridge.org/us/universitypress/subjects/philosophy/logic/argument ation-schemes?format=PB&isbn=9780521723749.

Walton D. Methods of Argumentation [Електронний ресурс] / Douglas Walton // Cambridge University Press. – 2013. – Режим доступу до ресурсу: https://www.cambridge.org/us/universitypress/subjects/philosophy/logic/methods-argumentation?format=HB&isbn=9781107039308.

Anscombre J. L'argumentation dans la langue [Електронний ресурс] / J. Anscombre, O. Ducrot // Bruxelles: Mardaga. – 1983. – Режим доступу до ресурсу:

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/250283640_L\'Argumentation_dans_la_langue.

Ducrot O. Opérateurs argumentatifs et visée argumentative / Ducrot – Genève, 1982. – C. 83–89.

Голубєв В. Ю. Аргументація, інтерпретація, риторика [Електронний ресурс] / Вадим Юрійович Голубєв // Випуск 2. – 2002. – Режим доступу до ресурсу: argumentation.ru/2002_1/papers/1_2002p3.html.

ван Еемерен Ф. Х. Помилки в аргументації. Найважливіші концепції теорії аргументації. / Ф. Х. ван Еемерен, Р. Гроотендорст – СПб: Філологічний факультет СПБГУ, 2006. – (наук. ред. А. И. Мігунов, пер. с англ. В. Ю. Голубєва, С. А. Чахоян, К. В. Гудкової). – С. 162–195.

Хенкеманс Ф. С. Структури аргументації / Франсіс Снук Хенкеманс // Найважливіші концепції теорії аргументації / Франсіс Снук Хенкеманс. – СПб.: Філологічний факультет, 2006. – С. 123–132.

Григор'єва В. С. Дискурс як елемент комунікативного процесу: прагмалінгвістичний та когнітивний аспекти [Електронний ресурс] / В. С. Григор'єва // ТГТУ. – 2007. – Режим доступу до ресурсу: http://www.tstu.ru/book/elib/pdf/2007/k_Grigoreva.pdf.

Селіванова О. О. Сучасна лінгвістика: термінологічна енциклопедія / Олена Олександрівна Селіванова. – Полтава: Довкілля, 2006. – 716 с.

Івін А. А. Теорія аргументації. Аргументація. Контекстуальна аргументація. Теоретична аргументація. Емпірична аргументація [Електронний ресурс] / А. А. Івін // Гуманітарний видавничий центр ВЛАДОС. – 1977. – Режим доступу до ресурсу: https://library.nlu.edu.ua/POLN_TEXT/KNIGI-2013/ivin_osnovy_teorii_argumentacii.pdf.

Шинкарук В. І. Філософський енциклопедичний словник / В. І. Шинкарук. – Київ: Абрис, 2002. – 744 с.

Куликова О. В. Лінгвопрагматичні основи теорії аргументації (на матеріалі англійської мови) : автореф. дис. на здобуття наук. ступеня докт. філ. наук : спец. 10.02.04 "Германські мови та література" / Куликова О. В., 2011. – 377 с.

Мігунов А. І. Семантика аргументативного мовленнєвого акту [Електронний ресурс] / А. І. Мігунов – Режим доступу до ресурсу: http://www.spho.ru/media/pdf/_original/5/4_migunov_myisl-6pdf.pdf.

Хоменко І. В. Еристика [Електронний ресурс] / І. В. Хоменко // Київ, Центр учбової літератури. – 2008. – Режим доступу до ресурсу: https://shron1.chtyvo.org.ua/Khomenko_Iryna/Erystyka.pdf.

Гладунський В. Н. Логіка: навчальний посібник / В. Н. Гладунський. – Львів: Афіша, 2004. – 359 с. – (2).

Gilbert M. A. Feminism, Argumentation and Coalescence” / Michael A. Gilbert // Informal Logic / Michael A. Gilbert., 1997. – C. 95–113.

Сумарокова Л. М. Основи логіки : навч. посіб. для юрид. вузів / Л. М. Сумарокова. – Одеса: Фенікс, 2011. – 236 с.

González G. Theoretical Considerations for the Articulation of Emotion and Argumentation in the Arguer: A Proposal for Emotion Regulation in Deliberation / G. González, G. Julder, L. Mariantonia // Argumentation / G. González, G. Julder, L. Mariantonia., 2019. – C. 349–364.

Hartmann S. Bayesian Argumentation and the Value of Logical Validity / S. Hartmann, E. Hartmann, B. Hartmann // Psychological Review / S. Hartmann, E. Hartmann, B. Hartmann., 2018. – C. 806–821.

Gurevych I. Argumentation Mining in User-Generated Web Discourse / I. Gurevych, I. Habernal // Computational Linguistics / I. Gurevych, I. Habernal., 2017. – (43(1)). – C. 125–179.

Massey G. J. The Fallacy behind Fallacies / Gerald J. Massey // Midwest Studies in Philosophy / Gerald J. Massey., 1981. – C. 489–500.

Walton D. N., Reed C., Macagno F. Argumentation Schemes / D. N. Walton, C. Reed, F. Macagno. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.

Rahwan I., Simari G. (eds.) Argumentation in Artificial Intelligence / I. Rahwan, G. Simari (eds.). – Boston, MA: Springer US, 2009.

Alston W. Illocutionary acts and sentence meaning / W. Alston. – Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2000. — Illocutionary acts and linguistic meaning /

W. Alston // in Tsohatzidis (ed.), 1994. – C. 29–49.

Sbisà M. How to read Austin / M. Sbisà // Pragmatics / M. Sbisà., 2007. – C. 461–473.

Bird A. Illocutionary silencing / A. Bird // Pacific Philosophical Quarterly / A. Bird., 2002. – C. 1–15.

Searle J. Austin on locutionary and illocutionary acts / J. Searle // The Philosophical Review / J. Searle., 1968. – C. 405–424.

Austin and "locutionary meaning" / J. Searle // in G. Warnock (ed.), Essays on J. L. Austin / G. Warnock (ed.). – Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1973. – C. 46–68.

Furberg M. Saying and Meaning: A Main Theme in J. L. Austin's Philosophy / M. Furberg. – Oxford: Blackwell, 1971.

Austin J. L. How to Do Things with Words / J. L. Austin. – Clarendon Press, 1962.

Fraser B. What are discourse markers? / B. Fraser // Journal of Pragmatics / B. Fraser., 1999. – (31(7)). – C. 931–952.

Toulmin S. The Uses of Argument / S. Toulmin. – Cambridge University Press, 2003.

Crismore A., Farnsworth R. Metadiscourse in popular and professional science discourse / A. Crismore, R. Farnsworth // Writing Communication / A. Crismore, R. Farnsworth., 1990. – (7(3)). – C. 231–258.

Hyland K. Writing without conviction? Hedging in science research articles / K. Hyland // Applied Linguistics / K. Hyland., 1996. – (17(4)). – C. 433–454.

Ilie C. What else can I tell you?: A pragmatic study of English rhetorical questions as discursive and argumentative acts / C. Ilie // Language & Communication / C. Ilie., 1994. – (14(3)). – C. 291–315.

Lakoff G. Hedges: A study in meaning criteria and the logic of fuzzy concepts / G. Lakoff // Journal of Philosophical Logic / G. Lakoff., 1973. – (2(4)). – C. 458–508.

Martin J. R., White P. R. The language of evaluation: Appraisal in English / J. R. Martin, P. R. White. – Palgrave Macmillan, 2005.

Schiffrin D. Discourse markers / D. Schiffrin. – Cambridge University Press, 1987.

Biber D., Johansson S., Leech G., Conrad S., Finegan E. Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English / D. Biber, S. Johansson, G. Leech, S. Conrad, E. Finegan. – Longman, 1999.

Celce-Murcia M., Larsen-Freeman D. The Grammar Book: An ESL/EFL Teacher's Course / M. Celce-Murcia, D. Larsen-Freeman. – Heinle & Heinle, 1999.

Corbett E. P. J., Connors R. J. Classical Rhetoric for the Modern Student / E. P. J. Corbett, R. J. Connors. – Oxford University Press, 1999.

Halliday M. A. K., Martin J. R. Writing Science: Literacy and Discursive Power / M. A. K. Halliday, J. R. Martin. – Falmer Press, 1993.

Quirk R., Greenbaum S., Leech G., Svartvik J. A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language / R. Quirk, S. Greenbaum, G. Leech, J. Svartvik. – Longman, 1985.

Halliday M. A. K., Hasan R. Cohesion in English / M. A. K. Halliday, R. Hasan. – Longman, 1976.

Searle J. R. Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language / J. R. Searle. – Cambridge University Press, 1969