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Introduction

It is well known that language and speech systems differ from each other. Language has abstract, social, general, obligatory features. Speech, on the other hand, has clear, individual, private, voluntary signs. Therefore, in the analysis of speech and speech products (text), its main features are divided into two. The first are extralinguistic signs, which refer to signs of speech that are not related to language units. The second, and most important, are the linguistic features of speech, which imply its lexical-semantic, morphological and syntactic features (signs). From this point of view, when the discussion also refers to the linguistic features of the type of speech, it refers to these three features (lexical-semantic, morphological and syntactic).

The main part

In speech - in communication, people not only tell a story or describe something, not only ask, but also prove, substantiate, express their opinion about something. In this process, the speaker, while expressing his opinion in the process of communication, compares and contrasts one thing-event with another thing-event, identifies similarities and differences, good and bad sides. In this process, substantiation and proof play an important role. Evidence is used primarily in scientific discourse. For example, anyone who has taken a school course in mathematics is familiar with the proofs of theorems in geometry. Evidence is also widely used in other disciplines. In particular, in literary criticism, truths are also not accepted on the basis of belief, unless they really refer to facts such as the years of the writer’s life or his undeniable authorship that are not in need of proof.

One such type of speech that combines clear conclusions, thoughts, and opinions is discussion speech. The following requirements are set for the discussion:

- not to deviate from the topic of discussion;
- express ideas in a concise, simple, effective way;
- not giving in to excessive lyrical retreats;
- to present clear and concise arguments and proofs;
- not to repeat the opinions expressed by others;
- to respect the opinion of others during the expression of opinion, to deny inappropriate opinions without touching the person;

Not to get excited while expressing an opinion, to behave seriously.

If these requirements are met, the discussion will be much smoother and more effective. Violation of the above requirements may impair the full form of the discussion speech.

In addition to the terminological meaning of discussion as a type of speech, it also means the discussion of a topic by several individuals. In this sense, discussion does not manifest itself as a type of
speech. Of course, the type of discussion speech is also used during the discussion.

An argument is a debate about the truth, in which only the right methods of discussion are used. The discussion allows: - to clarify things that are not convincingly substantiated before the conflict begins; - gain a better understanding; - reducing the level of subjective perception of the subject of the conflict. Contestants must follow the chosen topic, argue with themselves, and reasonably reject the statements of others, as well as follow the rules. They may use different types of speech during the discussion, but the judgment will refer to the discussion speech in drawing its conclusion.

It is common to think of a discourse as a logical form of constructing evidence only for a particular logical category. Therefore, in the process of thinking, the available evidence on the topic is analyzed and described.

NI Kondakov writes that thinking is a field of logic, not grammar: "In any oral or written article other than a report, we argue, and reasoning means not only words in a sentence, but also sentences."

From a content-semantic point of view, reasoning is a specific type of speech, not a "method" or "style" of thought. The way or style of presenting ideas is a technique that can only vary depending on the subject and style of the speaker, but the type of speech does not depend on these external factors. The choice of the type of speech is determined by the object of thought and the purpose, intention, motive and nature of the speaker. If, for example, it is necessary to express a cause-and-effect relationship in order to evaluate events, then no matter how we change the way we express ideas, it remains in the mind and becomes neither an image nor a narrative.

The truth is one, and the ways and levels of achieving it are different. It all depends on finding the most appropriate and convenient way to achieve this reality. To do this, the writer must find the most appropriate plot-composition solution to convey the content, which requires a great deal of potential and labor. Leo Tolstoy's research on the novel "Resurrection" is a good example of this. As he begins to write the work, L. Tolstoy tries to focus on the mental anguish of the noble young man, who regrets his actions. However, the writer cannot find a plot and compositional solution that vividly expresses the problem that plagued him. Finally, the focus shifts from Nexlyudov's remorse to Katuzha Maslova. The fact that Nekhlyudov and Katuzsha could get married falsifies the tragedy that has become a public accusation. That is why in his diaries, written in early 1897, Tolstoy noted that the current version of the "Resurrection" is nothing but a fabrication. By 1899, the writer had resumed his work on the Resurrection. In this version, Katuzha will not marry Nexlyudov. Thus, Tolstoy wrote nine versions of this novel over a period of ten years (1889-1899). However, the author was not satisfied with the last version of the work. Because even the current solution of the work cannot be said to be perfect. (A. Rahimov "Roman art").

The above passage is an example of a discussion speech. All the ideas given in this passage are quoted and compared to substantiate the conclusion at the end of the text (Because the current solution of the work is also not perfect).

In a discussion speech, an idea can be expressed in a biblical style in the form of a logically constructed conclusion.

"If a man is brave and proud and not afraid of danger, then he is a wolf. This man is brave, proud and not afraid of danger. That's why he's a wolf."

What do lexical-semantic features of conversational speech include? Here we will see which of the homonyms, synonyms, paronyms, idioms, dialect words, etc., used in the discussion speech are used effectively.

When we talk about the lexical-semantic features of discussion speech, we first focus on the semantic structure of the words used in the discussion speech, ie what words can be attributed to this type of speech: explicit words or abstract words; whether emotionally colored words or emotionally colorless words; whether singular or plural nouns, if plural nouns are used, which of their meanings takes precedence: their own (head) meaning or their nominal meaning. In this chapter, we will think about these issues.

It is well known that "a word is the most important nominative unit of language because it names things in existence, abstract concepts imagined as objects, action-state, color, taste, volume-quantity, character: tree (object name), mind (abstract concept name), work (action name), white (color-color name), sweet (taste-name), large (volume name), five (quantity name). Such words in the vocabulary of the language are considered lexical units. Defining and disclosing the function of these lexical units in the discussion speech type allows to determine its lexical-semantic features.

In this article, we will look at the number of explicit and implicit words used in discussion speech examples, which one is used the most. First, we will focus on what words with clear and abstract meanings should be.

**Clear words** - things that we can feel through our senses are called clear words. Our senses are made up of hearing, sight, touch, taste, and smell. For example: sound (through the ear), sweet (through taste), warm (through skin sensation), rectangular (through sight), and so on.

**Abstract words** are words that a person can know by thinking, reasoning, thinking. Or words that cannot be understood by our five senses. For example: friendship, love, affection, kindness.

In the example of the text of the discussion below, we will determine the amount of words that have a clear and abstract meaning.
Dunyoni qizg‘anma mendan, azizim,
Men sening ko‘changdan o‘mnasman zinhor.
Mening bu olamda o‘z aytar so‘zim
Va ozim siginar mozorlarim bor.

Dunyoni qizg‘anma mendan, azizim,
Sen ichgan buloqdan ichmasman aslo.
Sen yurgan tog‘larda qolmagay izim,
Sen kechgan daryodan kechmasman aslo.

Dunyoni qizg‘anma mendan, azizim,
Qalbingni yoqmasin odamlar va so‘roq,
Men o‘zga manzilga tikkan ko‘zim,
U sening kulbangdan juda ham yiroq.
(Abdulla Oripov “Dunyoni qizg‘onma mendan azizim!”)

In the poem written by Abdulla Aripov, there are 33 words with definite information and 17 words with abstract meaning.

When the frequency of use of explicit and implicit words in a discourse is determined, it becomes clear that the lexical-semantic meaning of a typologically formed word of speech cannot be a determining factor. Because words serve to make a sentence. Speech types consist of at least two sentences. Speech types are formed at the level of a higher unit of speech - the text. The functionality of words in the syntactic device remains within the scope of the sentence.

In addition to the results and abstract information in the study of lexical-semantic payments of words in the text of the discussion, monosyllabic and ambiguous meanings also have their own and figurative meanings, as well as problems of speech support. It has its own characteristics. Because the characters are counted in the image, the dynamics of action in the narrative are leadership, the main idea in the discussion speech, the logic, the stability of the proofs. This in turn is a cumulative effect on the lexical-semantic features of the word and the lexical-semantic structure of the word is also involved in the formation of speech types. The location and frequency of words used do not drastically change the functional characteristics of the discussed speech, but the semantic structure of the sound is reflected in the semantic plan of the speech type:

Sahar turdim, quyoshni kutdim,
Shudringlarda choydim yuzimmi.
Buloqlarga labimni tutdim,
Va borliqda ko‘rdim o‘zimmi.

Ko‘zlarimdan toshdi ongim,
Tolib ketdi bagringa yangi.
Mangilikday tuyuldi unrim,
Mangilikday tuydu dunyo...
(Shavkat Rahmon. “Shahar turdim, quyoshni kutdim”)

In this poem by Shavkat Rahmon, the text of the discussion is formed in a unique way. The author waits for the sun in the morning, washes his face in the dew, and drinks water from springs. As a result, consciousness fills his eyes, his heart is filled with melody, and his life, the world, seems to be eternal, consciousness seems to live forever. It is judged that living with a sense of existence is eternal.

A total of 25 independent words participated in the example. Of these, 18 (72%) are words with their own meaning, and 7 (28%) are words with a figurative meaning. In poetic speech, especially in poetic speech, the frequency of use of portable meanings takes precedence over ordinary speech. This stems from the demand for poetic speech. But when speech is shaped by discussion, this ratio changes significantly. Because the discussion is led by the flow of thought, not by a sign of reality or object.

The use of polysemous, figurative words in conversational speech, the expression of words in metaphorical meaning is not excluded. Even a whole text can be constructed by means of metaphorical meanings, but even in this case the metaphorical meaning moves conditionally instead of the real, existing thing. This conditionality only indicates that the naming has changed. In fact, the nominative meaning at the base of the transferred meaning appears to be a different nomination of reality:

A man called destiny has no equal in intelligence, he has a smart and beautiful daughter. Fate looked at her daughter and said, "There are three people coming: Aql, Davlat, Umid. Which one do you agree with?" He asked. Then the girl said, "Dad, intelligence is the greatest virtue in a human being. But the mind can confuse a person with a guilt and lead them down dangerous paths. The state is both a businessman and a ruler. But the state will never, ever be loyal to anyone. I prefer hope. Because hope never betrays man, it never leaves him. The whole world is interested in it. " We, too, like the wise daughter of that Destiny, will not go astray if we choose Hope. (Tohir Malik)

The above text belongs to Tahir Malik and is a discussion text. A total of 75 words with independent meanings were included in this text. Of these (excluding repetition), 4 (5.3%) portable mani words and 71 (94.7%) self-mani words were used. Although the general content of the text has a metaphorical meaning, it expresses a simple sentence in real reality. Wealth, the state is unfaithful, hope does not leave man. In other words, an artistic interpretation of the wisdom that the hopeless devil is given.

In linguistics, it is clear in the context of which text the words used in their own and in the figurative sense are used. There is a scope for the use of these words. Portable words are often used a lot in a literary text. One-word words are mostly used in a scientific style. In the text of the discussion above, on the contrary, (given the repetitions) the difference
between them does not seem to be very great, giving the impression that monosemantic words are used more than polysematic words. This occurs under the influence of the metaphorical content of the text.

It is said that a man was walking along the river when he found a large yombi. He took the nut from his lamb and tried to light it, but the yambi split into several pieces. "It's shiny, but it's worthless," he said sadly, and shot her, he had smashed his nut with one of the ordinary stones left on the shore, and, having reached his destination, set out on his way. (Excerpt from Isajon Sultani's Genetics).

In this passage, too, there are a total of 44 independent manoli words, of which portable meanings are never used, and single meaning words make up 44 (100%). Verb semantics predominates in this course. The course of events prevails over thought. Therefore, in this text, too, the discussion speech seems to exist as a metaphor, but the text is structured in the form of a narrative.

**Conclusion**

In conclusion, we can say that the lexical-semantic features of words in the text of the discussion are quite diverse. We have considered this through our examples above. Through our texts, we have found that in the text of discussion, words with definite meanings are used more than words with abstract meanings, and words with their own meanings take precedence over words with portable meanings. We have also seen that the semantic structure of monosemantic and polysematic words in the discussion text does not affect the typological features of the text.
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