

SOCIO-HISTORICAL AND LOGICAL-GNOSEOLOGICAL ANALYSIS OF THE ART OF DISPUTE IN THE HISTORY OF KNOWLEDGE

Turabova Sevara

Associate Professor of Economics and Service at Termez University,
doctor of philosophy (PhD) on philosophical sciences

E-mail: turobova.sevara@mail.ru

[ORCID - 0000-0001-9028-6943](https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9028-6943)

ABSTRACT

this article analyzes the functional aspects of the dispute phenomenon as a developing intellectual phenomenon passing through the stages of its emergence, formation and development. Accordingly, the dispute as a source of research and a process of gradual development requires historical analysis. Because the study of the multifaceted problems of discussion culture based on diachronic approaches makes it possible to obtain important heuristic results.

Key words: Dispute-discussion, eristics, sophistry, dialectics, problem, theory and practice, truth, progress, criticism, argument.

INTRODUCTION

"Discussion is a battle of thoughts".¹ Therefore, since ancient times, it was believed that the nature of knowledge consists of contradictions and dialogue in the case where the existence of opposing grounds is assumed in the context of any phenomenon.

As a developing intellectual phenomenon, debate is going through the stages of its emergence, formation and change. Accordingly, it experienced the processes of gradual and revolutionary renewal. Naturally, researching the essence of the debate requires analyzing its diachrony, that is, its historical development as a source of research. Because researching the multifaceted problems of debating culture on the basis of diachronic approaches provides an opportunity to obtain important heuristic results.

The art of arguing was formed in the ancient world under the demands of certain socio-historical conditions, which later served as the basis for a special teaching called "eristics". The concept of "eristics" (Greek: eridzo-I argue, eristike techne - the art of

¹ Davronov Z. Barkamollikka da'vat maktublar. –T.: "Tamaddun", 2017. – P. 60.

disputing) means "the art of disputing"¹, this art is named after the Greek goddess Eris², the creator of arguments and disputes.

At first, "eristics" was understood as a set of methods used to win in the debate process, today the meaning of this term has changed a little, i.e., "eristics" includes various descriptions of the debate (moral, rhetorical, logical, pedagogic, semiotic, psychological, etc.) is understood as the direction of research aimed at learning. There are also views that "the emergence of eristics as a method of searching for the truth through debate occurred before the division of the art of rhetoric into dialectics and sophistry."³ At first, eristics undoubtedly reflected the heuristic possibilities of searching for the truth through a constructive argument in accordance with its meaning, but later it moved away from dialectics (F. Hegel and others).

Thus, the research object of eristics is debate. When it comes to controversy, it should be noted that its historical roots go back a long way. The theory and practice of debate has a long tradition and an interesting history. Even ancient thinkers paid special attention to the place and role of debate in personal communication. They tried to study different methods of debates, to determine the basic rules for conducting them, to identify mistakes and tricks that occur in it.

Searching for the truth with the help of arguments and public discussions is one of the features that characterize the civilizations of Ancient India, China and Greece, and at the same time, it is a phenomenon that arose from the social and political demands of the life of that time. In particular, it is based on popular elections and court appearances (Greece), struggles between temples and schools to support the authorities (India, China).

Some philosophical ideas about the debate can also be found in the literary monuments of Ancient Egypt and Ancient Babylon. In particular, in the Egyptian written sources of that time, "The Harpist's Song"⁴⁵, which is the oldest surviving monument of religious superstition expressed in the form of doubt about the existence of the afterlife, "Conversation (argument) of a person who is disappointed in his life

¹ Хоменко І.В. Еристика: Підручник. – К.: Центр учбової літератури, 2008. – С. 9

² According to ancient Greek mythology, Erida was the goddess of strife and strife, the daughter of the night goddess Nikta, the granddaughter of Chaos, and the mother of Limes, the goddess of hunger. Erida is considered not only the goddess of dispute, dispute, struggle, competition, but also the goddess of pleasure. According to Hesiod's poem "Theogony" (Greek - Theogonía) 10, 11, Erida is a goddess with two qualities, one of them benefited people by inviting them to a cocktail, and the other caused enmity and hatred, causing wars and quarrels. Erida also caused the conflict between the most beautiful goddesses, Athena, Hera and Aphrodite, which eventually led to the Trojan War.

³ Блажевич, Н.В., Селиванов Ф.А. Эристика / Н.В. Блажевич, Ф.А. Селиванов. Курс лекций. – Тюмень: Тюменский юридический институт МВД РФ, 1999. – 224 с.

⁴ Nothing is eternal on earth, everything passes away, even the gods on earth, who settle in their pyramids. pharaohs too. However, just as everything built by man falls, even the pyramids fall. Only the words of the wise will remain, but their graves will disappear.

⁵ Синило Галина. История мировой литературы. Древний Ближний Восток. — Минск: Вышэйшая школа, 2017. — С. 44

with his soul", "The master and his slave about the meaning of life" Fragments related to the debate in inscriptions such as "Sahbarati" can be a clear example of this. Also, in the book "Avesta", which is one of the most ancient spiritual monuments of our ancestors, which is called "Guide to Life", "one can find ideas reflecting the mutual struggle between opposites, order and chaos"¹. It vividly shows the debate and struggle between the forces of light and darkness, goodness and evil. But even if these philosophical views influenced the further development of the science and thought of the ancient world, due to historical reasons, they could not rise to the level of separate discussion as the object of special examination of the problems of creating integrated philosophical schools.

Public and philosophical debates were common in the social life of Ancient India. In ancient India, the terms of a dispute were sometimes very cruel to the disputing parties and attracted many interested parties. V. P. Vasilev, a famous orientalist and researcher of Buddhism, expresses his opinion about the debates in Ancient India: "In ancient India, the state of society and power being permanently united and solidified by a single idea or religion is rarely observed. For them, only those religions whose priests were able to show and prove the priority of their idea had priority and were recognized"². That is, if someone comes and promotes ideas that are unknown until now, he is not persecuted. On the contrary, if the propagandist could satisfactorily answer all the objections and reject the old ideas, they were ready to accept his idea. In such cases, special arenas of competition were established, referees were appointed, and the contest was constantly conducted according to requirements clearly defined in the testimony of kings, nobles and the public.

Later, we will see that the debates are not limited to interpersonal conversations. For example, schools and synagogues, despite their long-term existence, could end up being closed as schools or synagogues if they were to lose the battle. Because the existence and prosperity of schools and synagogues depended on these disputes. For in India the right of eloquence and logical argument was so inalienable that no one had the right to exclude himself from being called to debate.

Akshapada Goautama, who is considered the founder of Indian dialectic, describes several types and different methods of debate in "Nyaya-sutra"³. The debate theorist and excellent polemicist Dharmakirti's book "Guidelines for Scientific Programs" pays special attention to the culture of debating and gives recommendations on how to participate in discussions and debates. Such sources testify that among the important traditions of the ancient Indian art of argumentation were respectful

¹Ergasheva M. "Avesto"da tartib va tartibsizlik o'rtasidagi kurash g'oyasi //Imom al-Buxoriy saboqlari. 2012, 3-son. – B. 217.

²Васильев В. П. Буддизм, его догматы, история и литература. – С. Пб.: 1857, Ч. I. – С. 67.

approach to the opponent's views, the thesis he had previously asked, listening to the opponent's arguments, not denying them without understanding and thinking deeply, and similar teachings.

Another notable aspect of ancient Indian discourse was that philosophical texts here differed from religious texts, which were based on purely logical principles. Indian scientist to Lysenko's confession "according to the rule. first the thesis is advanced and then the opponent expresses his point of view (purvapaksha) accordingly. After that, the negation is stated, and at the end of the argument, a conclusion (siddhanta) is given that confirms the thesis"¹.

According to A. Makovelsky², as positive traditions of the ancient Indian debate, it is possible to point out aspects such as: treating the opponent's ideas seriously and carefully, trying to understand the essence of the opponent's point of view well and correctly before rejecting the opponent.

Russian Indologist S.E. Kryuchkova³ specifically admits that representatives of Buddhist schools (of which there were about 30 in total) were considered very dangerous opponents in traditional disputes, because they were able to effectively use the logical methods of the Nyaya school. It is known that the Nyaya school itself is considered the oldest philosophical school that emerged in the process of generalizing the methods and techniques of debate.

In conclusion, it should be noted that although there was traditionalism characteristic of the Eastern peoples in ancient Indian philosophical thought, dogmatic hardening is not observed much. Therefore, there is no unanimity even in the attitude towards the sacred sources, that is, some schools recognized the sacredness of the Vedas, while others did not. Most importantly, most of them tried to justify their relationship with rational arguments.

It can be observed that many issues related to argumentation were studied in ancient Chinese culture as well. In particular, the conditions, methods, and psychological aspects of arguing are well researched. In particular, the views of the ancient Chinese philosopher Mo-Zi (Mo Di) (480-400 AD) were collected in the book "Mo-bian" (Reflections of Mo-zi), collected by his students, and in this work, opinions on controversial issues it can be observed that recommendations for exchange are written. According to representatives of this school, "a dispute arises only when there is a conflict between different opinions on the same subject. If the subject of the dispute is different, then it will not be possible to conduct a debate and come to a conclusion.

¹ Лысенко В.Г. Как я понимаю индийскую философию // Философский журнал. – 2010. – № 1. – С. 5-17.

² *Маковельский А. О.* История логики. — М.: Недра, 1967. — С. 5-30.

³ Крючкова С.Е. Институт Древнеиндийского диспута: нормативный аспект. // Вестник университета (Московский государственный университет управления) – № 11.М. 2014.–С.282.

The debate ends with the victory of the one who defends the true point of view. An argument can only be infinite in one case: if both propositions in it are false”¹.

In "Mo-byan" serious attention is paid to the issues of proving the thesis and reasoning, drawing conclusions, analogies, and the rules of conducting debates. According to the treatise, there are three sources of true knowledge: 1) "qingji" (direct knowledge), which includes the individual experience of each person; 2) "wenchji" (hearsay knowledge) knowledge obtained indirectly from other people; 3) "shochu" (mental knowledge), expressed in concepts, judgments and conclusions”².

It should be noted that the ancient Chinese logic existed under the influence of the strong pressure of various political doctrines and spiritual-ethical concepts. Pan Shimo, author of the article "Ancient Chinese Logic", also notes that "though logical concepts in ancient China developed much earlier than those in Ancient Greece, this development faded away after the early Qing period." He explains this by the fact that until the first and last stage of the Qing period, only Confucianism was officially recognized, and all other representatives of the "hundred schools" in Ancient China were unjustifiably rejected.

It can be observed that the interpretation of the nature and status of debate in ancient Greek philosophy has changed slightly compared to ancient Eastern philosophy. Changes began, first of all, from religious problems to secular problems, that is, focused on limiting the divine essence in nature and human life. Later, various philosophical schools began to appear on this basis. The dialogues began to move from the collegial method between schools composed of a small number of followers and even to private debates typical of Socrates.

any historical sources testify that "the dialogue was first introduced by Zenon of Elea and Protagoras of Abder³." Zenon used methods of direct proof in his dialogues and developed a method of conducting discussions by posing questions to the interlocutor, for which Aristotle called him the "inventor of dialectics". Zeno developed a method of conducting discussions by posing questions to the interlocutor. He also gave a list of sophistical questions that could be asked to force the opponent to admit the obvious absurdities of the argument. He developed famous aporias (Greek aporia - impossible situation) and logos (proofs) related to controversial reasoning, such as "Dichotomy", "Achilles and the Tortoise", "Arrow", "Stadium", "General Proof".

¹ Быков Ф., Ян Хиншун Китайская философия // Философская энциклопедия. -М.: Советская энциклопедия. - Т.2.-1962.-С.80

² Пан Шимо. Логика Древнего Китая // Философские науки. — 1991. — №11. —С. 174-178

³ Лурье С.Я. Очерки по истории античной диалектики.-М. :Госполитиздат, 1947.- С.66

It should be said that in Athens, the art of debate was valued as one of the most prestigious activities and served as the main means of democratic resolution of social conflicts. The ability to succeed in intellectual contests has often been an important factor in determining the nature of judicial and political decisions. The example of argument for the goal of victory was provided by the sophists of ancient Greece, who believed that any absurd position could be proved by the art of argumentation.

At the school of the sophists, at first young people were trained in various knowledge and oratory skills, but later the skill of oratory became a self-interested form of proving any case regardless of its truth. In particular, Protagoras saw contradictions in things, and although he was able to reveal their dialectic, he drew the following conclusion: "two opposing theses can be put in relation to any thing and event"; "Man is the measure of everything."¹ He used the essence of this conclusion to establish the groundlessness of the claims related to a certain person as follows: "The way things appear to me, they are true for me, and the way they are for you, they are for you."

For the Sophists, all methods were good that only led to victory in the debate. As a result, the argument began to serve not for truth, but for victory. They recognized only subjective truth. Therefore, the sophists taught their young students to confidently defend any opinion that was of interest to them. Argumentative exercises organized among students served as the basis of the educational strategy of the Sophists, since the future activity of school graduates in the form of finding solutions to disputes in the court or parliament was their main profession. Such debates were significantly different from the axiological criteria accepted by Coqrat. The reason is that the focus of attention of the participants of the Socratic dialectical debate is not only the attempt to express their thoughts, but also the pursuit of true knowledge. The sophists' dispute was deprived of any axiological significance, and the main goal was to achieve victory at any cost.

The sophists wanted to turn the method of debate into education, their aim was not to use truth, but to use the art of words to achieve formal or legal victory, and to convince them that any argument, no matter what the subject, could be won. For this purpose, the students of this school performed the following exercise: a collection of two-way speech was created, in which a list of mutually exclusive pairs of statements was formed. The purpose of creating such a collection was to form the ability to quickly give an affirmative or negative answer on any issue. According to them, since every argument has its counter-argument, every opposing position has its own basis, and therefore it is possible to fight from their side. For this reason, the most important thing for students in the schools of sophistry was to be able to give weight and importance

¹Diels H. Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker. – Bd. I. – Berlin, 1907. –S. 74.

to any position in the process of discussion and to be able to challenge any position. The sophists developed a tactic to make even a weak argument sound strong in the course of an argument. It seems that they were trying to teach their students only the practical skills of argumentation. Therefore, A.P. Krasnopolskaya: "sophism is an intellectual fraud, in which there is an activity aimed at justifying an opinion whose absurdity is obvious in advance"¹. The entire rhetoric of the sophists is evaluated as nonsense.

Socrates (470-399), who made a great contribution to the spiritual change at the basis of debates, puts forward a dialectical debate that serves to determine the truth against eristics and sophistry, and believes that the most correct way to the truth is to identify contradictions in opposing arguments. "The presence of contradictions in the understanding of the subject indicates the falsity of this knowledge. These errors are resolved only when the conflict of opinion is revealed. But in order to determine which one of the opponents is right, it is necessary to compare their opinions with the general concept of truth, because it is unchangeable and eternal in the same form for all people in true knowledge.

Sokol S.F. In contrast to the eristics of the sophists, he admits that "Socrates' method is essentially heuristic, aiming to know universal truth in a modern, consistent and new 'discovery'". According to Plato, Socrates created an "art of verbal argumentation" that was separated from the usual arguments of the sophists, who worked with "verbal phantoms".

Plato's dialectic also has a special meaning, and according to his doctrine, dialectic is "a means of verbal conversation, question-and-answer, proof, escape from emotional knowledge, and deeper knowledge of the world of ideas through contemplation." In this way, Plato saw dialectic as the knowledge of questioning and answering. "Those who know how to ask questions and can answer them, he says, we call dialecticians."²

In addition to Socrates, Platon and the Sophists, Aristotle also paid special attention to the study of debate in Ancient Greece. For the first time in his work, the debate gained a theoretical-fundamental basis. His works "Topika" and "On Sophistic Refutation" included in the collection "Organon" are one of the first attempts to provide a systematic analysis of the principles of the theory and practice of debate.

In the first part of his work "Topics", Aristotle writes that dialectic is "the true art of debate" and that "dialectic is useful for three kinds of things: exercise,

¹ Краснопольская А.П. //Эпистемологический анализ софистики. Автореферат диссертации на соискание ученой степени кандидата философских наук. Москва 2005.

² Платон. Собрание сочинений в 4 т. Т. 1. – М.: "Мысль". 1990. – С.88.

communication and philosophical knowledge." He even criticized Socrates for "only asking questions and not answering."

Aristotle strongly opposed sophistic and eristic debates, calling sophists "false sages." He was the first to develop methods of refuting sophistic arguments, and to expose the tricks and methods of the sophists, he created his own logical system.

According to Aristotle, the goal of sophistical debate was false wisdom, while the goal of eristic debate was merely to win. These two types of argument were always criticized by Aristotle. In his writings, Aristotle studied in detail the common methods of the sophists, such as "using words with different meanings, combining many questions into one, changing the thesis, providing premises in advance, mixing absolutes and relativities", and as a result, he developed tactical methods of combating tricks. For example, in a court hearing, Aristotle recommended that the parties first present their points of view, and then evaluate the reasons given by the opposing side, and in the dialogue where there is a lot of confrontation, it is recommended to first deny the arguments of the opponent, and only after that to state their judgments. The words of the debater, the philosopher said, should always "clear the place for the next speech."¹

In his work "Rhetoric", the author raised many other theoretical problems of the "technology of debate" and they remain relevant today. The most important of them is to clearly define the topic of the discussion and strictly adhere to it during the discussion, to be able to use the concepts and considerations used in the discussion in their place and correctly according to their content.

By the Middle Ages, the technology of debate was further refined. Within the framework of theology, patristics, apologetics and the science of the word, various methods of argumentation and critical methods were developed, and new strategies and tactics of debate began to be introduced. It should be recognized that there were specific procedures for conducting debates during this period. In particular, as an example, the method of debate in the form of "attack-defense" has been the most popular of the long-standing debates between Jews, Christians, and Monists.

Criticism and debating, the spirit of the Islamic world, occupied a central place in the early stages. Accordingly, in the Qur'an we can also encounter information about the moral principles of debate. For example, in verse 46 of Surah "Ankabut" it is said: "(O believers), argue with the People of the Book only in the most beautiful way"², and

¹ Аристотель. О софистических опровержениях. Сочинения: В 4-х т. – М., 1978. – Т. 2. – С. 556.

² Abdulaziz Mansur. Qur'oni Karim ma'nolarining tarjimasini. – T.: "Tosh-kent islom universiteti" nashriyoti, 2012. ("Ankabut" surasi, 46-oyat) – B. 281.

in verse 125 of Surah "Nahl" it says ".They (who argue with you) fight with others) in the most beautiful way"¹, it is said.

Also, it is known from the biography of our Prophet Muhammad that the important strategic decisions he made took place in collaboration with critical debates.

The knowledge created from the sum of actions and words of our Prophet Muhammad, peace be upon him, is based on a critical-analytical and innovative method to a certain extent. In particular, it has always been widely recognized by many scholars that argumentation, argument, evidence, philological-textological and scientific criticism are considered to be a unique and important sign of classical Islamic civilization.

Unlike the medieval West, Eastern Renaissance thinkers highly valued human intelligence and scientific knowledge. After all, it can be said that the rationalist way of thinking in the teachings of the thinkers of the Middle Ages Muslim East served as a conceptual and theoretical ground for the scientific revolution of the European Renaissance.

The ideas put forward in the work "Al-adab al-kabir" by Abu Muhammad Abdullah ibn al-Muqaffa, a scientist, political scientist and translator who had a place in Islamic science and philosophy and worked during the 8th century Arab caliphate, are one of such unique works in terms of their essence. . In this work, special attention is paid to the importance of public speaking. In particular, the following ideas can be found in the work:

منك "فإذا أردت أن يُقبل قولك، فصَحَّ رأيك و لا تشوبته بشيءٍ من الهوي . فإنَّ الرأْي الصحيح يقبله العدو، و الهوي يردّه عليك الولد و الصديق ².

"If you want your word to be accepted, then correct your thinking and do not confuse it with strange and airy things. If your opinion is correct and free from defects, it will be accepted by your enemy, and if it is the opposite, it will be rejected by your child and your friend"³.

"Philosopher Abu Nasr ibn Muhammad Farabi, who made a great contribution to the scientific development of the issue of controversy in medieval Eastern philosophy. According to Abu Nasr Farabi, the term "Al-Jadal", that is, dialectic, was used by the ancient Greek philosophers Socrates and Plato, and according to its meaning, it means to reach the truth by disputing the contradictions in the mind of the disputant"⁴.

¹ Abdulaziz Mansur. "Qur'oni Karim ma'nolarining tarjimasini". – T.: "Tosh-kent islom universiteti" nashriyoti, 2012. ("Nahl" surasi, 125-oyat). – B. 402.

² بن المقفع عبد الله الأديب الكبير. بيروت، دار ابن حزم، ١٩٩٤.

//Ибн ал-Мукаффа Абдуллох. Ал-адаб ал-кабир. – Байрут, 1994. – Б. 43.

³ Saidov S. "Al-adab al-kabir" asaridagi ijtimoiy-siyosiy g'oyalari//Falsafa va huquq. 2019/1 (№13).

⁴ Аль-Фараби. Диалектика Историко-философские трактаты. Алма-Ата: "Наука", 1985, – С. 405.

"A person - writes Farabi - can reach the truth or philosophy only through dialectical debate."¹ Farabi considers dialectic to be an "art of training" necessary to win an argument, to prepare a person to engage in theoretical science based on concrete knowledge, and to make correct decisions in everyday life. Farabi writes that "the first goal of a dialectical debate is to refute, and to prove is its second goal." The dialectical method of proof, according to Farabi, "is not only a method of question and answer, but also a strategy and tactic of arguing, as a result of which victory over the opponent is achieved."²

As a vivid example of the scientific debate in the Middle Ages, it is possible to point out the disputes between scientists in the field of computational mathematics. It is known from the history of mathematics that Al-Khorazmi created a new direction of calculation that contradicted the existing "Abacus" method of calculation in his time. "In the 10th-12th centuries, this scientific struggle between the arithmetic of Abacus and the arithmetic of calculation associated with the name of Al-Khwarizmi played an important role in the development of mathematics in Western Europe."³ A prominent representative of the Abacists, the Abacist, was the French scientist, Pope Herbert Oriyyaksky, later known as Sylvester II"⁴.

A prominent representative of the Abacists, the Abacist, was the French scientist, Pope Herbert Oriyyaksky, later known as Sylvester II. It is worth noting that algorists (followers of al-Khwarizmi) always prevailed over Abacists (followers of Abacus) in scientific debates because Khorezmi arithmetic was able to provide experts with a convenient and accurate mathematical apparatus. As a result, Abak loses his authority. The direction of algorists later in the second half of the 20th century led to the widespread use and development of computational mathematics and techniques in various fields of the economy, including science.

Correspondence and question-and-answer between Ibn Sina and Beruni in the Middle Ages is also a bright example of scientific debate. Currently, this correspondence is an important source that reveals the scientific and philosophical views of these two scholars. This correspondence contains Beruni's 10 questions regarding Aristotle's "Book of Heaven", 8 regarding his "Metaphysics" and Ibn Sina's answers to these questions. Later, Beruni wrote his refutation of Ibn Sina's answers. These correspondences testify to Beruni's interest in natural philosophy and physics.

¹ Аль-Фараби. Диалектика Историко-философские трактаты. Алма-Ата: "Наука", 1985, – С. 405.

² Fayzixo'jayeva D. Abu Nasr al-Forobiy va Abu Ali Ibn Sino mantiqiy isbotlash haqida. – Т.: "Nishon-Noshir", 2013. – В.104.

³ Файзуллаев А. Ф. Возникновение и развитие понятия "алгоритм" В кн: Классическая наука в Средней Азии и современная мировая цивилизация. – Т.: "Фан", 2000. – С. 58.

⁴ Боголюбов А.Н. Ал Хорезми и вычислительная арифметика. Ўзбекистонда ижтимоий фанлар. № 7, 1983 йил.- Б.29

In the questions and answers, the two scientists argue about space, the spread of heat, the expansion of bodies from heat and water during freezing, the return and refraction of light. From the contents of the questions and answers, it is known that Beruni opposed the conclusions made by Aristotle through observation and experience, and Ibn Sina defended Aristotle.

Important issues of philosophy, physics and astronomy were discussed in these correspondences. In particular, Beruni tried to prove his position based on his own experiences in the way of "putting empirical science against nonsense", while Ibn Sina assessed that Beruni's ideas about other worlds and planets lead to a logical conclusion confirming the existence of countless worlds, which is nonsense. Against this, Beruni answered Ibn Sina as follows: "If the name of liars is given to them for this reason, then I will not refuse to receive this name."¹ In our opinion, Beruni's hypothetical assumption about the existence of other worlds and planets is one of his scientific achievements.

Because if we put together the wide-ranging hypotheses of science and the extrapolational scientific methods of modern cosmology, the idea of the multiplicity and diversity of worlds is gradually proven.

Also, Beruni disagrees with the opinion of the scholars who preceded him on several issues, for example, we show the following issue:

1) is the speed of the sun in the zodiac constant? To this Ptolemy answered in the affirmative, Beruni answered in the negative;

2) from the lunar movement of the year, therefore, can it be determined by the unit of the month? Beruni disagrees with Hipparchus and Ptolemy's conclusion. At the same time, Beruni also researched scientific debates between other scientists who lived in different eras.

It can be seen that although Beruni's natural-scientific research was at the level of innovation for its time, it later served as a successor to the classical scientific way of thinking and the heliocentric concept of the universe. Also, Beruni's natural-scientific heritage, the problems he raised in specific sciences created a general picture of the world in his time and became important in the development of philosophical thinking.

If we pay attention to Ibn Sina's answers in the correspondence of these two scholars, it is commendable that Ibn Sina, despite his youth, not only had the depth of his reasoning, but also defended his position boldly and firmly. After all, in the field of science, Ibn Sina was a supporter of scientific rationality based on experimental

¹ Шарипов А. Малоизвестные страницы переписки между Беруни и Ибн Синой // Общественные науки в Узбекистане, 1965, № 11, – С. 39.

research and the principle of determinism. The philosopher deeply studied the issues of description, explanation, proof, causality, which are the conceptual components of scientific thinking. Thus, Ibn Sina managed to strengthen the pre-classical scientific way of thinking with the norms of rationality and give them a new meaning.

Abu Hamid al-Ghazali's comments on the art of debate are extremely valuable scientifically. Ghazali is a great philosopher and scholar who "was one of the first to understand the necessity of finding a common "sensus" (conciliation) path, the middle age East, Arab Muslim philosophy, Sufism, Sharia and Islam, and showed serious efforts in implementing this path¹." Part 1 of his treatise "Ihyou-ulumid din" ("Revival of the Sciences of Religion") "The Book of Science" consists of 7 chapters, of which 4 chapters are devoted only to the procedures and conditions of debate.

As an orthodox Islamic theorist, Ghazali interprets the reasons and nature of the controversy from a theological perspective. Nevertheless, his views about the rules and moral norms that the parties should follow in the debate have not lost their importance from the point of view of modern epistemology.

One of the scholars of Central Asia who continued the research of the great scholars of the East mentioned above is Sa'duddin Mas'ud bin Umar Taftazani. If we pay attention to Taftazani's work, it is worth noting that Umar Taftazani actively participated in scientific debates held regularly in the presence of Amir Temur. In his opinion, arguing is not only a tool to get rid of errors in thinking, but also a ground for generating new knowledge. "Sa'duddin Taftazani made a great contribution to the development of theology as a science by applying logical conclusions to Islamic philosophy - kalam."

Sayyid Sharif Jurjani, another scholar of the East, who scientifically expressed his opinions on the debate, expressed important opinions about the logical mechanisms of the debate in his work entitled "Odob ul-munozara" ("Treatise on the Rules of Conducting a Debate") dedicated to the topic of the debate. The book "Sharhe mawofiq fi ilm al-kalam" ("Commentary on the addresses in the science of the word") written by Jurjani as a commentary on the work "Mawaqif fi ilm al-kalam" ("Addresses in the science of the word") by the 14th century philosopher Eziddin Abdurrahman al-Ijii consists of 1018 pages. , in this work, Jurjani criticized some views of mutakallims.

In conclusion, it should be recognized that the Middle Ages are defined by the formation of the scientific way of thinking in the philosophy and science of the Muslim East, the development of the norms of scientific rationality and their application in

¹ O'rta asr Sharq allomalari va mutafakkirlari ensiklopediyasi. – Samarqand.: "Imom Buxoriy xalqaro markazi" nashriyoti, 2016. – B. 518.

research. The philosophy and theology of this period was rich in many important scientific and creative ideas consisting of critical and analytical analysis.

In particular, the debates between Jabari and Qadari, Khawarij and Murji, Mutakallim and Mu'tazilites, Khorezmi and Abak, Ibn Sina and Beruni, Ghazali and Ibn Rushd were considered normal in the medieval Islamic world. However, it is interesting to note that, apart from a very small number of some reformist scholars, for some reason, the spirit of scientific debate and criticism is almost absent in the Muslim world today. In this regard, Professor Sh. Madaeva's opinion that "the entire Muslim world, in particular, the science of Central Asia, literally lost its scientific paradigmatic system after the Renaissance of the XIV-XV centuries."¹

The reasons for the fading of critical-scientific thinking in the modern Muslim world can be explained in various ways. Perhaps this situation can be justified by the fact that the countries of the East have long been colonized by the West. Perhaps, under the influence of European colonization in the Muslim world, the diversity of opinions and critical thinking skills were purposefully stifled and extinguished by the authorities. Such explanations of the reasons for the decline or disappearance of the critical spirit in Muslim civilization remain incomplete and abstract.

However, in our opinion, today it is more urgent to take action in a scientific and practical way than to research the reasons for the decline of critical thinking in Muslim civilization. Because the lack of a critical spirit, the blocking of the ways of birth of new and original ideas, the shortage of writers and politicians, philosophers and theologians who can argue with orthodox views, creates the ground for free rooting of vices such as bigotry, extremism and terrorism in Muslim societies.

REFERENCES:

1. Abdulaziz Mansur. Qur'oni Karim ma'nolarining tarjimasini. – T.: "Toshkent islom universiteti" nashriyoti, 2012. ("Ankabut" surasi, 46-oyat) – B. 281
2. Abdurauf Fitrat. Hind sayyohining qissasi. //Sharq yulduzi jurnali. 1991 yil №8. – B. 31
3. Аль-Фараби. Диалектика Историко-философские трактаты. Алма-Ата: "Наука", 1985, – С. 364.
4. Аристотель. Топика. Т. 2 – М.: "Мысль". 1978. – С. 350-351.
5. Аристотель. О софистических опровержениях/ Аристотель //Аристотель. Сочинения в четырех томах. Т.2. – М. : Наука, 1978б. – С.535-593.
6. Behbudiy. Bayoni qariqat //«Ulug' Turkiston», 1917 yil, 12 iyun.

¹ Мадаева Ш. Ориентализм Шарк ва Ғарб диалоги тадқиқининг методи сифатида /Фалсафий маданиятлар мулоқоти(илмий мақолалар тўплам) – Т.: "НИШОН-НОШИР". 2014. – Б. 14.

7. Блажевич, Н.В., Селиванов Ф.А. Эристика / Н.В. Блажевич, Ф.А. Селиванов. Курс лекций. – Тюмень: Тюменский юридический институт МВД РФ, 1999. – 224 с.
8. Боголюбов А.Н. Ал Хорезми и вычислительная арифметика. Ўзбекистонда ижтимоий фанлар. № 7, 1983 йил.-Б.29
9. Davronov Z. Barkamollikka da'vat maktublar. –Т.: “Tamaddun”, 2017. – В. 60.
10. Diels H. Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker. – Bd. I. – Berlin, 1907. –S. 74.
11. Jurjoniyy. Sharhe mavofiq fi ilm al-kalom. – Stambul: “Dor ulmatbatul Omera” bosmaxonasi. 1267 h. y.
12. Кондаков Н. И. Логический словарь-справочник. — М.: Наука, 1971.С.560
13. Краснопольская А.П. //Эпистемологический анализ софистики. Автореферат диссертации на соискание ученой степени кандидата философских наук.Москва 2005
14. Крючкова С.Е. Институт Древнеиндийского диспута:нормативный аспект.// Вестник университета (Московский государственный университет управления) – № 11.М. 2014.–С.282.
15. Лурье С.Я. Очерки по истории античной диалектики.-М. :Госполитиздат, 1947.- С.66
16. Лысенко В.Г. Как я понимаю индийскую философию // Философский журнал. – 2010. – № 1. – С. 5-17.
17. Madayeva Sh. Oriyentalizm Sharq va G'arb dialogi tadqiqining metodi sifatida /Falsafiy madaniyatlar muloqoti(ilmiy maqolalar to'plam) – Т.: “NISHON-NOSHIR”. 2014. – В. 14.
18. Пань Шимо. Логика Древнего Китая // Философские науки. — 1991. — №11. —С. 174-178.
19. Платон. Собрание сочинений в 4 т. Т. 1. – М.: “Мысль”. 1990. – С.88.
20. Saidov S. “Al-adab al-kabir” asaridagi ijtimoiy-siyosiy g'oyalar//Falsafa va huquq. 2019/1 (№13).
21. Синило Галина. История мировой литературы. Древний Ближний Восток. — Минск: Вышэйшая школа, 2017. — С. 44
22. Сокол С.Ф.//Риторика:учебное пособие. Минск; 2008.-164.
23. O'rta asr Sharq allomalari va mutafakkirlari ensiklopediyasi. – Samarqand.: Imom Vuhoriy xalqaro markazi nashriyoti, 2016. – В. 373.
24. Шарипов А.Малоизвестные страницы переписки между Беруни и Ибн Синой //Общественные науки в Узбекистане, 1965, № 11, – С. 39.
25. Fayzixo'jayeva D. Abu Nasr al-Forobiy va Abu Ali Ibn Sino mantiqiy isbotlash haqida. – Т.: “Nishon-Noshir”, 2013. – В.104.

26. Файзуллаев А. Ф. Возникновение и развитие понятия “алгоритм” В кн: Классическая наука в Средней Азии и современная мировая цивилизация. – Т.: “Фан”, 2000. – С. 58.
27. ۱۹۹۴، دارابن حزم، بيروت، الأدب الكبير. //Ибн ал-Мукаффа Абдуллоҳ. Ал-адаб ал-кабир. – Байрут, 1994. – Б. 43.
28. Хоменко І.В. Еристика: Підручник. – К.: Центр учбової літератури, 2008.
29. Ergasheva M. “Avesto”da tartib va tartibsizlik o‘rtasidagi kurash g‘oyasi //Imom al-Buxoriy saboqlari. 2012, 3-son. – В. 217
30. Turabova, S. K. (2019). Socio-historical basis for the development of euristics in the history of knowledge. ISJ Theoretical & Applied Science, 3(71), 485-488.
31. Туробова, С. (2020). Талабаларнинг аргументатив компетентлигини ривожлантиришда бахс-мунозара методининг ахамияти. Общество и инновации, 1(1/s), 496-500.
32. Turabova, S. (2023). INTERRELATION OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF A NEW WAY OF THINKING AND A CULTURE OF SCIENTIFIC DISCUSSION IN MODERN CONDITIONS. American Journal of Pedagogical and Educational Research, 12, 51-56.