

GRAMMAR IN ARGUMENTATIVE DISCOURSE

Türkan Ali Hasanli

Lecturer at Nakhchivan State University

Doctoral Candidate, Khazar University

ORCID: 0009-0006-9255-452X

Abstract. *This article examines the grammatical means that contribute to the verbalization of argumentation within the framework of modern linguistics. The study is primarily based on John Lyons' Introduction to Theoretical Linguistics, which provides a comprehensive theoretical foundation for analyzing the structural, semantic, and grammatical features of language. The research focuses on how argumentation is not only a semantic process but also a structurally organized grammatical phenomenon.*

Particular attention is paid to the role of syntactic hierarchy, immediate constituents, and phrase-structure relations in constructing coherent and logically structured arguments. The analysis demonstrates that argumentation relies on the internal organization of sentence structure, where grammatical relations ensure clarity, coherence, and logical progression. In this context, syntagmatic relations are shown to play a key role in expressing cause-effect, contrast, and other logical connections within discourse.

Furthermore, the study explores the significance of tense and mood categories in shaping argumentation. Tense is analyzed as a deictic category that situates arguments in relation to the time of utterance, thereby influencing their factual or hypothetical status. Mood, on the other hand, determines the communicative function of the argument, including declarative, interrogative, and imperative forms, each contributing differently to the expression of certainty, obligation, or inquiry.

The findings indicate that grammatical structures significantly influence the strength, clarity, and persuasiveness of arguments. Thus, argumentation is not merely a matter of content but also a result of the systematic use of grammatical resources. This study contributes to a deeper understanding of the interaction between grammar and discourse, offering insights into both theoretical linguistics and practical language use.

Key words: *argumentation, grammatical means, tense category, modality, argument structure, syntactic structure, deictic categories, sentence structure, phrase-structure grammar, hierarchical relations*

Introduction

In contemporary linguistics, the study of how argumentation is verbalized is closely linked to the grammatical and semantic potential of language. Language functions not only as a medium for conveying information, but also as a key instrument for reasoning, justification, and the coherent presentation of ideas. From this viewpoint, grammatical means used in argumentation play a crucial role, as they help organize thought and ensure its clear and effective communication to the audience.

The work *Introduction to Theoretical Linguistics* (1968) by John Lyons is considered one of the fundamental sources that systematically presents the main directions of modern linguistics [6]. In order to reveal the significance of argumentation through analysis, a linguistic examination of this book has been conducted, as it provides a comprehensive and theoretically grounded explanation of the grammatical structure of language, syntactic relations, and semantic features. Owing to these characteristics, the

work has been selected as a reliable and appropriate source for investigating the grammatical means that verbalize argumentation. In English linguistics, the issue of argumentation holds particular significance, since in academic and scientific discourse the logical, clear, and structured expression of ideas is a primary requirement, ensured directly through the accurate and purposeful use of grammatical means.

In the section entitled “Immediate constituents,” it is emphasized that a sentence is not merely a linear sequence but possesses a hierarchical structure described as “layers of immediate constituents.” The key point in this approach is the step-by-step organization of the internal structure of the sentence. The author demonstrates that each sentence can be divided into smaller units, which function as components of a larger structure. From the perspective of the verbalization of argumentation, this indicates that an argument is not a random collection of words but a structured and organized grammatical system. Thus, the clarity and logical coherence of an argument depend on this hierarchical organization. Examples:

- *The results indicate a clear pattern.*
- *Scientific evidence supports this claim [6, p.210].*

In the same section, the statement that “the immediate constituents of Poor John ran away are the two forms poor John and ran away” shows that the sentence is divided into two main parts. The noteworthy aspect here is the division of the sentence into its fundamental components, namely the subject and the predicate. This division plays a central structural role in argumentation, as every argument is constructed around a particular subject (topic) and a statement made about that subject (predicate). Without this structure, the argument would appear vague and weak. Examples:

- *The data supports the hypothesis.*
- *The experiment confirms the theory [6, p.210].*

Another important point in the book is the presentation of relationships between elements within a sentence as “syntagmatic relations.” These relations determine the sequence and interdependence of elements. Notably, such relations enable the construction of logical sequencing in argumentation. That is, cause–effect, contrast, and other logical relations are expressed precisely through these grammatical connections. Examples:

- *Therefore, the theory must be revised.*
- *However, the results do not support the claim [6, p.211].*

It is also noted that in the structural analysis of sentences, the grammatical categories to which words belong, or traditional categories such as “subject” and “predicate,” are not always explicitly indicated. This point is noteworthy because the focus here shifts from function to structural relations. This demonstrates that in the verbalization of argumentation, formal structure comes to the forefront. In other words, the strength of an argument depends not only on its meaning but also on how it is constructed. Examples:

- *The findings strongly suggest a new approach.*
- *The analysis clearly indicates a significant result [6, p.211].*

Finally, it is noted that sentences can be represented by means of tree diagrams or brackets. This form of representation visually illustrates the internal structure of the sentence. The key point here is that an argument, similarly, has a hierarchical and systematic structure. This approach enables argumentation to be presented in a clearer, more logical, and scientifically grounded manner. Examples:

- *Although the evidence is limited, it suggests a clear trend.*
- *Because the data is consistent, the conclusion is reliable [6, p.211].*

The author also emphasizes the distinction between stative and non-stative categories. Verbs and adjectives are compared in this respect. For example, the verb run can be used in the form is running, indicating an ongoing action. However, stative verbs such as know do not typically occur in this form (is knowing is incorrect). Adjectives are generally stative: Mary is beautiful is acceptable, whereas Mary is being beautiful can only be used in specific contexts. This demonstrates that stativity is not a rigid boundary between categories but rather reflects typical characteristics [6, p.225].

This section focuses on how verbs structure argumentation through the categories of tense and mood. The statement “The essential characteristic of the category of tense is that it relates the time of the action... to the time of utterance” shows that the tense form of the verb determines the situational and discursive framework of the argument. In this respect, tense does not merely indicate time but also establishes the connection of the argument with reality, thereby situating it logically. For example, the form They jumped presents the argument as a past event, which alters its factual status [6, p.304].

It is further emphasized that “tense is a deictic category,” meaning that it is linked to the “time of utterance.” This feature plays an important role in argumentation, as the presentation of an argument is always connected to a particular reference point—the notion of “now.” This shows that argumentation is verbalized not only through content but also through temporal and spatial coordinates. Thus, tense forms function as means of placing the argument within real or hypothetical discourse [6, p.305].

The analysis of “the opposition of past and non-past” demonstrates that the tense system does not always conform to the classical tripartite division (past–present–future). This indicates the flexibility of grammatical forms in the verbalization of argumentation. In other words, the same grammatical form can present an argument with different temporal and semantic nuances, allowing for multiple interpretations within language.

The category of mood is also presented as another important grammatical means of argumentation. It is noted that “Simple declarative sentences... are, strictly speaking, non-modal (‘unmarked’ for mood).” This implies that declarative sentences constitute the primary form of argumentation, as they present facts in a neutral manner. In such cases, the argument is expressed explicitly, and the speaker’s attitude is minimized. Thus, the indicative mood represents the most “objective” form of argumentation [6, p.307].

At the same time, the statement “imperative sentences... express commands or instructions” shows that the imperative mood directs argumentation toward action. Here, the argument is not only presented but also aims to influence the listener. This demonstrates that argumentation serves not only to convey information but also to guide behavior. Therefore, imperative forms represent the prescriptive (normative) type of argumentation [6, p.308].

Interrogative sentences can also be viewed as a distinct form of argumentation. The idea that they differ from declarative sentences suggests that questions do not fully articulate an argument; instead, they leave it open-ended and invite a response from the interlocutor. This emphasizes the inherently dialogic character of argumentation. In such cases, the argument is only partially expressed and is completed through the reaction of the other participant, illustrating how argumentation emerges through interactive grammatical structures [6, p.309].

It is also noted that the forms will and shall possess not only tense but also modal functions. This means that future reference is not purely a temporal category but is also expressed within a modal framework. This activates semantic components such as probability, intention, and prediction in argumentation. Thus, modal forms of the verb determine the degree of probability and uncertainty within the argument [6, p.310].

The concept of “modal scales,” including notions such as necessity, possibility, and certainty, is presented as a grammatical means that strengthens the logical force of argumentation. For instance, the sentence He must be here presents the argument as a strong probability, whereas He may be here expresses a weaker probability. This distinction alters the degree of persuasiveness of the argument, demonstrating how grammatical means can strengthen or weaken argumentation [6, p.313].

In conclusion, this section of the book demonstrates that the categories of tense and mood constitute the principal grammatical means for the verbalization of argumentation. Tense situates the argument temporally and deictically, while mood determines its communicative purpose (fact, command, question, probability). Together, these two categories shape both the structure and the logical force of argumentation and determine how arguments are presented within the grammatical system of language.

Scientific Novelty

The article analyzes the verbalization of argumentation on the basis of the systematic integration of grammatical means, particularly the categories of tense and mood, syntactic hierarchy, and the principle of immediate constituents. In contrast to traditional approaches, it substantiates that argumentation is formed not only at the semantic level but also at the level of deep grammatical structure. From this perspective, the way in which an argument is constructed within language is explained within a new theoretical framework.

Relevance

The topic is of particular relevance in contemporary linguistics and discourse analysis, as academic and scientific communication increasingly relies on structured and argumentative approaches. The study of the role of grammatical means in the process of argumentation allows for a deeper understanding of the functional capacities of language. At the same time, this research contributes to the development of both the theoretical and applied aspects of linguistics.

Conclusion

The analysis shows that the verbalization of argumentation is a complex and systematically organized process within the grammatical framework of language. In this context, the verb serves not only to express action but also plays a key role in structuring arguments and positioning them within the sentence. Grammatical categories such as tense and mood shape how an argument is conveyed in terms of temporality, likelihood, and communicative intent. Furthermore, phrase-structure rules and syntactic hierarchy regulate the ordering and relationships between arguments. Therefore, argumentation should be viewed not only as a semantic aspect of language, but also as a structural phenomenon that emerges through the coordinated use of grammatical means.

References

1. Dowty, David R. “Thematic Proto-Roles and Argument Selection.” *Language* 67, no. 3 (1991): 547–619, 72 pages.
2. Grimshaw, Jane. *Argument Structure*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1990, 160 pages.
3. Hale, Kenneth, and Samuel Jay Keyser. *Prolegomenon to a Theory of Argument Structure*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2002, 240 pages.
4. Jackendoff, Ray. *Semantics and Cognition*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1983, 310 pages.
5. Levin, Beth. *English Verb Classes and Alternations: A Preliminary Investigation*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993, 348 pages.
6. Lyons, John. *Introduction to Theoretical Linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1968, 519 pages.