

This thesis deals with semantic coherence of an opinion and arguments in its support. It concerns some pragmatic and syntactic aspects, as well, the author studies the argumentation in the capacity of speech act realized in natural language with the intention to persuade an auditorium about the acceptability / plausibility of the opinion presented.

The author of this thesis also gives some basic characterization on the semantics of the argumentation from the viewpoint of formal logic, which he proposes to be completed with linguistic semantics. He tries to define some fundamental terms too.

The semantic consistence of ethical argumentation is understood there as the first essential precondition to its acceptability. The author considers the argumentation to be consistent, if there exists a causal interpropositional coherence between an opinion and the arguments. By studying the semantic structure of the argumentation he concluded that the argumentation can be expressed by different illocutive acts in the discourse.

In this thesis the author is inspired by Aristoteles, as well. He chooses the examples of the argumentation from legal discourse and from accessible literature.

Key words:

acceptability, argument, argumentation, auditorium, illocutive act, natural language, proposition