

Conceptual and Methodological Approach in the Study of the Philosophical and Gniseological Status of the Culture of the Disput

Turabova Sevara Kattaqulovna, Ph.D

Associate Professor of Economics and Service at Termez University, doctor of philosophy on philosophical sciences,
turobova.sevara@mail.ru

Abstract. The article analyzes the approach to conducting debates in modern logic and epistemology, examining the process of knowledge acquisition in debates, the practical aspects of conducting scientific discussions, especially in formulating and solving scientific problems, based on the analysis of scientific sources.

Key words: debate, culture, polemics, arguments, dialectical debate, eristic debate, sophistic debate, apodeictic debate, proof, argument.

INTRODUCTION

The process of conducting academic debates among students is complex and multifaceted, involving various components, perspectives, and factors that contribute to its development. Simply put, debates are discussions aimed at exploring a specific topic, its unique characteristics, and the factors that influence its development. In other words, it involves seeking answers to questions such as "What are debates?" "What are its distinguishing features?" and "What important aspects should be taken into account?" First and foremost, the goal is to define the concept of "debates" and its conceptual structure in the field of studying the characteristics and peculiarities of debates. Possible definitions of the term "debates" are defined in the "Etymological Dictionary of the Uzbek Language" and the "Pedagogical Encyclopedia": "Debates" (Arabic word **بحث** - discussion; research; debate) is an organized discussion of circumstances, exploring ways of finding solutions, and involving different, sometimes opposing, viewpoints in order to find a problem solution.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

According to the opinion of the renowned logician A.A. Ivinni, "Debate is a form of exchanging ideas or opinions, where participants support the correctness of their own arguments with evidence and critique unfounded claims." The Doctor of Philosophy, Professor Q. Nazarov, explains the essence of this concept as follows: "Debate is a prominent example of practical logic, which serves to enhance the culture of argumentation, improve understanding between interlocutors, and utilize the techniques necessary for

effective communication." According to V. Alimasov, "Debate is a methodological approach aimed at clarifying and refining arguments, as well as addressing existing viewpoints." The study of debate began with the investigations of logicians in terms of methodology.

For example, when it comes to matters related to international debates, there are numerous publications that primarily focus on the strategies and tactics employed to achieve success in debates, along with practical applications that can be utilized in various aspects of life. These publications draw attention to various effective techniques that can be applied in real-life situations to excel in debates. Especially, in his work "The Uses of Argument," S. Toulmin critically examines the formal structure of discussion and argumentation, highlighting the necessity of generating new approaches within the theory of argumentation. S. Toulmin advances the idea of bringing logic closer to epistemology, emphasizing the need to broaden the scope of logical inquiry to encompass valuable processes that occur in various contexts of human activity.

Belgian researchers Chaim Perelman and L. Olbrechts-Tyteca [16. 216] jointly explored the methods and rules of argumentation and debate extensively employed by lawyers, politicians, sociologists, and representatives in the field of humanities. In their work "The New Rhetoric," they developed a unique collection of rules for argumentation used in public discourse and to engage the audience effectively. E. M. Barth and E. V. Krabbe, prominent representatives of formal dialectics, developed the system of "formal dialectics" based on general principles or points of view acceptance in their 1982 book "From Axiom to Dialogue" [16.]. In this work, they established a set of specific rules for conducting critical dialogues between a proponent and an opponent.

In modern theory, the pragmatic dialectics of argumentation has been developed by European scholars. Specifically, representatives of the Amsterdam School, including F. van Eemeren, R. Grootendorst, E. Feteris, P. Houtlosser, A. F. Snoeck Henkemans, and others, proposed the concept of pragmatic argumentation. Pragmatic dialectics considers the interactive nature of argumentation between logical and rhetorical aspects.

Dutch scholars, in the process of developing this concept, have integrated the advantages of both directions in an advanced manner. In this regard, argumentation in pragmatic dialectics responds to the requirements of both pragmatism and the dialectical nature of debate. The most important aspect of pragmatic dialectics is the establishment of a set of rules aimed at rationalizing the actions of the participants in the discussion. The models of argumentation in pragmatic dialectics are primarily used in situations that require adherence to regulations, such as in legal and judicial systems.

If we look at the majority of research work on discourse in Commonwealth of Independent States, it is mainly of a logical-functional nature, with more emphasis on theoretical foundations. For example, we can pay attention to the following idea put forward by A.A. Ivanov: "Although the study of argumentation as a phenomenon requires attention to both formal logic and rhetoric, it is primarily based on the dialectical principle of 'correct argumentation'. However, in practice, this principle is often limited, and at times, the understanding of argumentation is more psychological than logical" [13, p. 232]. This concept is supported by numerous modern studies. In particular, the typology of discourse in any course on the science of Logic, its implementation and proof methods, sophisticated

paralogisms, logical fallacies, "tricks"- "stratagems", and techniques aimed at manipulating the opponent [Blazhevich N.V. 2005[3.], Ivanov AA. 2002; Pavlova LG. 1991[13.], Piri M. 2013[14.], Pavarnin SI. 1996 [15.]] can be mentioned in this section.

In Commonwealth of Independent States, the work "Discourse Art" by S.I. Povarnin has been recognized for its methodological significance. According to Povarnin, the main part of this work is devoted to syllogistic rules (such as argument quality, deduction and induction rules, etc.), and he identifies the following five main types of arguments: 1) argument with the aim of verifying the truth, 2) argument with the aim of persuasion, 3) argument with the aim of achieving victory, 4) argument with the aim of demonstrating power, and 5) argument-as-a-game. G.I. Ruzavin also notes the presence of various types and classifications of argumentation and debate, as well as the importance of the debate's purpose, the character of the argument used, and the logical and emotional-psychological means of persuasion [19, p. 122].

It can be understood from the above that the center of attention in scientific debate is the establishment and refutation. If we approach the debate from a logical-epistemic perspective, real scientific discussions always rely on a rational basis, meaning that their effectiveness is determined by the logical connection and foundation of the arguments presented. The evidence and proofs used in this regard provide the participants in the debate with the possibility of reaching the truth in an objective manner.

By systematizing other characteristics of the debate and shaping the concept of the nature of the debate, we can establish a classification of debate that allows for a comprehensive understanding.

According to the purpose of the debate, it can be classified into three types: apodictic (Greek: apodeiktikos - proven, reliable, irrefutable), eristic (Greek: eristika - the art of argumentation), and sophistic (Greek: sophisma - superficial conclusion).

Note: The translation provided is a general rendition of the requested text and should not be considered a certified translation.

"Apodictic (dialectic) argumentation aims to achieve truth" [12.43]. Therefore, in apodictic argumentation, particular attention is given to logical forms of substantiating proof. In other words, in such arguments, the thesis is formulated clearly, the main evidence is involved, contradictions are avoided between judgments, and the presence of a foundation is required. Apodictic argumentation arises when a certain objective problem is identified and can be resolved through various approaches. This type of argumentation focuses on the clear formulation of the thesis, the existence of the main evidence that connects the chain of conclusions, the absence of contradictions among developing assumptions, and the reliability and sufficiency of the evidence. The argumentation in apodictic discussion is based on logical laws and rules.

This type of argumentation requires the consideration that the presented problems are formulated clearly, the presence of credible evidence, and the essence of the discussed issues is understood by the recipients. To successfully use apodictic argumentation, the following factors must be taken into account: competency in the issue, constructive communication, attention specifically focused on the problem, intellectual competence, and readiness to control personal ambitions and emotions in the pursuit of truth.

The psychological aspect of the argument states that the "ultimate goal is objective truth for everyone". In such a debate, it is expected that there is a requirement for objective validity, just as Aristotle stated: "Plato is my friend, but truth is more important." Apodictic debate activities in educational institutions are very beneficial, as participants present their theses, strive to prove them, understand each other's points of view, listen to the opponent's arguments, find their own evidence, and create opportunities to overcome personal selfishness.

The eristic form of argumentation is a type of debate that is conducted with the aim of achieving victory and "the main goal is to convince the opponent". According to G. Gauthier, Protagoras is considered the primary advocate of the eristic method who introduced it into practice and vividly described the famous trial with his student Euthydemus. The eristic method is often used in polemical discussions, where the subject of the debate is known to the debater and unclear to the opponent. However, the manipulative aspect of this method is not highly regarded, as the debate circle for the opponent may be very deceptive and interesting, but for the debater, it may be familiar.

Overall, the eristic method of argumentation can be intriguing and engaging for the audience, but it may not always be a reliable and honest method for achieving a true understanding of the subject matter.

The art of argumentation and refutation in ancient Greece, known as Eristic Dialectics, is currently not given the importance it deserves. In order to protect one's viewpoint and effectively counter the opponent's arguments, it is necessary for an individual to possess certain skills, such as the ability to identify logical fallacies in the opponent's reasoning, use sophistry and psychological tactics, and employ effective strategies in a debate or a polemical discourse. "It is possible to learn the art of eristic as a means of protecting one's position and refuting the opponent's arguments by studying various psychological manipulations and sophisms in the history of eristic" (source [24. 27]).

Arthur Schopenhauer, the author of the book "Eristic Dialectics or the Art of Argumentation", emphasizes the importance of eristic in constantly asserting one's position (source [25. 618]). This concept is explained as "per fas et nefas" (by any means necessary) (source [26. 12]). Arthur Schopenhauer attributes eristic temperament to the psychological and emotional nature of the disputant. According to Schopenhauer's viewpoint, "the real dialectic (dialogical) mechanism is only possible in an argument. However, subjective factors inherent in human nature not only allow for reaching the truth through argumentation, but also make it impossible to achieve truth in practice" (source [27. 52]).

Arthur Schopenhauer did not clearly distinguish between eristic, sophistry, and dialectics. At first, he even wanted to name his work "Dialectics". Schopenhauer, like Kant, considered dialectics as the "art of discussion or conversation". According to his view, the subject of investigation in dialectics is "the cooperative activity of two rational beings in mutual thinking, if, in general, the very conditions of their cooperation do not prevent them from reaching mutual understanding, which without doubt, leads to a debate." According to him, the purpose of debate is not only to make the opponent believe in the correctness of one's own thoughts, but also to reach the truth.

DISCUSSION

Indeed, without a thorough and deep understanding, it is not possible to achieve such a goal. However, in order to analyze the errors that need to be avoided in the debate and to anticipate the possibilities of easily overcoming the opponent in complex and difficult situations, Schopenhauer learned and developed specific techniques and rules in his works, which he called "Eristic Dialectic".

The sophisticated form of debate is described as egocentric and manipulative, associated with deceptive rhetoric. Unlike apodictic argumentation, sophisticated debate mainly focuses on undermining the opponent. Sophisticated disputes lack any axiological significance and the main goal is considered to be achieving victory at any cost. The sophist is not concerned with discovering the truth through rationality, nor does he have any interest in convincing his opponent of anything.

In ancient literature, there is often no clear distinction between sophisticated and eristic debates. For example, D. Walton states that in various types of conversations, eristic dialogue is characterized by competitiveness and confrontation, as "each participant tries to create an impression of being the most intelligent and capable." This kind of conversation also indicates its nature. According to the scholar, "such a conversation often creates chaos." D. Walton distinguishes between six main types of dialogue, based on the individual aims and collective main goal of the participants, which are: "persuasion dialogue, negotiation dialogue, eristic dialogue, inquiry dialogue, deliberation dialogue, and information-seeking dialogue." Additionally, D. Walton often refers to eristic dialogue as sophisticated dialogue in his works.

Walton D., in his work, characterizes eristic dialogue as a form of communication characterized by competitiveness and confrontational behavior, where each participant tries to create an impression of being the most intelligent and capable. As a result, such conversations often lead to chaos, as stated by D. Walton.

In summary, the main characteristics of eristic dialogue can be summarized as follows: firstly, it involves participants engaging in active and critical exchange of opinions in a debate format. Secondly, the nature of eristic communication always tends to prioritize winning the argument at all costs. Various tactics and strategies may be employed in these discussions.

It should be noted that in real-life, the significance of debates and discussions is often given more attention in terms of their meaning, so one of its important requirements is to determine the type of discussion (such as discourse, debate, or polemics) based on specific conditions or criteria.

First and foremost, it should be noted that the common understanding of the terms "discussion, debate, polemics, and disputes" does not fully convey their specific meanings. In most scientific literature related to fields such as pedagogy, philology, and even logic, the unique characteristics of these forms of argumentation and their differences from each other are not thoroughly analyzed. However, in practice, it is necessary to consider the specific manifestations of argumentation, such as dispute, discussion, debate, and polemics, as synonyms, or rather as specific forms of argumentation with their own distinctive features.

Therefore, the analysis of the nature and differences of these terms, as well as their relations

to each other, becomes essential.

A dispute is considered one of the specific forms of debate. When a dispute takes place, it refers to the process of open discussion and argumentation among colleagues and like-minded individuals regarding scholarly work written for obtaining an academic degree [9. 288] (Pedagogy: Encyclopedia). In today's context, when discussing disputes, the collective argumentation of moral, political, literary, scientific, professional, and other issues that have not yet reached a definite solution is usually considered. During a dispute, participants express and evaluate various opinions and viewpoints on specific events or issues and assess them. Dispute is referred to as a collective debate on topics that have both scientific and social importance. The uniqueness of a dispute is seen in the following aspects:

Firstly, a dispute is constantly taking place amongst the public in a different manner compared to other types of debates.

Secondly, the subject of the dispute serves as important matters or scientific problems for society.

Thirdly, a dispute takes place in a wide range of discussion formats, such as defending theses publicly, conducting monographs, etc.

Fourthly, unlike a discussion, a dispute does not seek to clarify the issue itself, but rather clearly positions the parties involved in the discussion. These characteristics are considered essential in a dispute.

Discussion (Lat. *discussio* - debate, investigation) is a public debate that takes place in the press or scientific circles in order to correctly resolve a certain issue; "debate" is considered a type of discussion. The purpose of a discussion is to clarify various points of view, compare them, and ultimately arrive at a correct resolution on the subject under discussion. One of the important means of investigating the development of the laws of science and shaping innovative thinking, discussion is of great importance. I.M. Sidorov draws attention to the importance of discussion in this regard and expresses the following opinion: "Discussion, by raising various positions and arguments to the general public, enables the resolution of scientific problems, contributes to the objectivity of scientific research, the comprehensive verification of obtained results, and the active development of hypotheses and theories in the field of debate." G.I. Ruzavin considers discussion differently from other forms of debate, especially from polemics, emphasizing "its argumentation, goal orientation, and the means it uses" [19. 124].

N.V. Solovyeva states in her essay, "The main characteristics of an academic discussion should be its aim to not only seek the truth but also to generate new knowledge, and furthermore, to be in accordance with scientific methods, including the use of scholarly principles" [22. 132].

O.N. Chalova describes the nature of an academic discussion as "manifesting in terms of cognitive and epistemological (creating a single objective text) and competitiveness (encouraging participants to protect and confirm their positions in the scientific debate)" [29].

While a discussion differs from a polemic, in a polemic, opposing parties do not strive to come to an agreement. On the contrary, the main goal of opposing sides is to confirm their

own positions and criticize the opinions of their opponents on specific issues. In a discussion, on the other hand, the collective nature of creative activity is emphasized. It serves as an effective means of communication with certain members of the academic community. Such communication ensures the objectivity of research, critical evaluation of obtained results, comprehensive examination of scientific norms and theories, and their development.

Discussion and debate, in its essence, create a foundation for the emergence of scholarly discussions and topics. However, not every debate can be considered as an academic discussion. The value of information exchange between participants in scholarly discussions depends on the level of significance. The importance of knowledge is measured by its proximity to the truth.

The term "polemika" is derived from the ancient Greek word "polemikos", which means "military work, art of war", "adversary, combatant, enemy, attack". Russian logician L. G. Pavlova characterizes polemics as follows: "Polemics is a labor of conviction. It aims to strengthen the idea with convincing and irrefutable evidence, especially scientific evidence." V.I. Popov defines scholarly polemics as a confrontational debate in which arguments, ideas, and perspectives are confronted. In other words, the polemicist strengthens their position with scientific evidence but does not adhere to a single goal. Thus, polemics involve a confrontation and opposition between sides, arguments, and speech.

V.I. Kosmodemyanskaya describes the essence of polemics as follows: "Polemic is a confrontation based on the clash of opposing views on a specific issue, where each side defends its point of view and strives to strengthen and protect it, while also discrediting the opponent's opinion" [7. 101]. However, when polemics are conducted with respect for universal values and human rights, and when a sense of community is being formed, it is considered significant. Many researchers recognize the difference between polemics and scientific discussion in its higher degree of competitiveness, while discussion focuses on generating rational solutions and finding consensus on scientific issues. Therefore, polemics can be considered separate from discussion and debate because of its clear purpose. The participants of discussion and debate express their opposing views to challenge each other and contribute to the overall understanding, in order to advance the general understanding and establish the truth. The purpose of polemics, on the other hand, is different, namely to defeat the opponent, protect and confirm one's position. However, in some cases, for example, in scientific polemics, it is necessary to consider not only the goal of achieving victory but also avoiding one-sidedness.

Participants in the debate, taking into account their positions, successfully resolved important social issues, all of which affect the development of society in various aspects. The debate has the following distinctive features:

Firstly, the main task of the participants entering the debate is considered to be the presentation of their positions.

Secondly, in choosing strategies and tactics for participation in the debate, the participants take into account the freedom of discussion when it comes to the selection of discussion tools. During the debate, several methods are used, in particular: "taking initiative, drawing attention to existing evidence without resorting to insults, using reasoning" [7. 102]. In addition, in order to take control of the scenario in the debate, the use of psychological

evidence is also allowed. Debate and discussion are interconnected in several aspects, and the clarity of the subject matter, conformity of the content, openness to the evidence of the other side, consistency of the participants' speeches, adherence to moral standards, and avoidance of incorrect logical and psychological methods are taken into account.

Debate, which is derived from the French word "debat" meaning discussion or exchange of ideas, refers to a regulated method of discussion in which different parties express their opinions on various issues with the aim of convincing a third party (audience, judges, etc.) to believe in their position [21. 113]. U.I. Inoyatov, on the other hand, explains the essence of this concept as follows: "Debate" (taken from the French word "debattere", which means "to discuss") is a technique used in meetings or gatherings where participants engage in a mutual discussion on a specific topic, aiming to facilitate the exchange of their ideas" [6. 131].

H. Limmerman describes the nature of debate as follows: "A debater is someone who has formulated their own opinion and at the same time strives to present and convince others of that opinion and to gain their confidence" [8. 34]. For example, the debate between an attorney and a prosecutor in a courtroom or the arguments between presidential candidates can serve as examples of this.

CONCLUSIONS

Debate is considered as one of the ancient forms of democracy in the United States, through which laws proposed by politicians are discussed, and the advantages and disadvantages of those laws are debated, with the aim of protecting the rights and freedoms of citizens. The next stage of the development of debates took place in the middle centuries of Europe, with the emergence of parliamentarism in a direct relationship. The main purpose of debates during this period was to validate the proposed law project, by either agreeing or disagreeing with the parliament. In the middle of the 19th century, debates began not only in parliament, but also in university auditoriums, especially in leading universities in Great Britain and the United States, where debate clubs were organized. Nowadays, debates have become a common teaching method in high educational institutions worldwide. The variant of this method that best suited the general conditions was first described by the American sociologist Karl Popper. The essential characteristics of the intellectual debate are the presence of rules that ensure the exchange of opposite points of view, the development of cognitive and oral abilities, empathy and tolerance towards various opinions, teamwork, development of logical and critical thinking, and building confidence in oneself.

Currently, debates are widely recognized as engaging educational activities that promote the development of critical thinking skills and effective argumentation, with the aim of protecting one's point of view using evidence. In this regard, Conti explains that debates serve as a "pedagogy of empowerment," contributing to the enhancement of thinking skills [5.199]. For example, the game "Parliamentary Debates" can serve as an example of this, where roles are assigned and various debates and selections are conducted in this format. Regular championships are held in national and international formats. Among the most popular formats are the American format of Parliamentary Debates and the British format of Parliamentary Debates [38]. Karl Popper's Debating format (KPD) can serve as an example.

The American format of Parliamentary Debates is a high-level intellectual competition that focuses on developing students' logical thinking, eloquence, and note-taking skills. In this

format, participants are given significant attention to their ability to present a strong evidence-based argument quickly and effectively.

In a nutshell, the phenomenon of debate and its potential can be seen from a logical-epistemological perspective, which is of particular importance for both scientific and practical purposes. The main task of scientific debate is to find solutions to problems by discussing and collaborating between opposing parties in order to reach a consensus and achieve its essence. Based on the ideas mentioned above, we can define scientific debate as a systematic and organized process of discussing scientific issues based on its epistemological nature, with the goal of discovering the truth through reasoning and argumentation. In scientific debate, unlike other simple forms of argumentation, the constant search for evidence, verification or rejection, and the selection of valid arguments play an important role for both sides.

REFERENCES:

1. Алемасов В., Мамадалиев Ш.О. Илмий тадқиқот: методология, методика, ижодиёт. Катта илмий ходимлар-изланувчилар ва мустақил изланувчилар учун қўлланма. II қисм. – Т.: Ўзбекистон Республикаси ИИВ Академияси, 2016. – 52 б.
2. Barth E.M., Krabbe E.C.W. From Axiom to Dialogue a philosopher. Study of logics and argumentation - Berlin; New York :de Gruyter, 1982
3. Блажевич, Н.В. Судебная эристика: монография / Н. В. Блажевич. Тюменский юридический ин-т. – Тюмень : Тюменский юридический ин-т МВД РФ, 2005. – 111 с.
4. Gauthier, G. Le cadre éristique du débat argumentatif / G. Gauthier // Communication. Vol. 30/2 , 2012. – URL: <http://journals.openedition.org/communication/3570>
5. Conti, de M. Fallacy Selection Criteria for Effective Debate Training / M. de Conti // Sellami, A.L. (Ed.), Argumentation, Rhetoric, Debate and Pedagogy: Proceedings of the 2013 4th International Conference on Argumentation, Rhetoric, Debate, and Pedagogy. – Doha, January 11–13, 2013. – P. 199–214.
6. Иноятлов У.И., Муслимов Н .А., Рузиева Д.И, Усмонбоева М .Х,.. Педагогика: но педагогик олий таълим муассасалари учун мўлжалланган дарслик. - Тошкент: Низомий номпадаги ТДПУ, 2013 . - 256 бет.
7. Космодемьянская В. И. Стратегии и тактики в аргументативном полемическом дискурсе // Политическая лингвистика. – 2016. – №. 1. – С. 102.
8. Леммерман Х. Уроки риторики и дебатов – М.: “Уникум Пресс”, 2002. – С. 34.
9. Педагогика: энциклопедия. – Т.: “Ўзбекистон миллий энциклопедияси”, 2015. – Б.129.
10. Ивин, А.А. Логика учебник для гуманитарных факультетов / А.А. Ивин – М.: ФАИР-ПРЕСС, 2002. – 2 гл.
11. Ивин А., Никифоров А.Л. Словарь по логике. –М.: Гуманит.изд.центр ВЛАДОС, 1997.—С.21, 370

12. Коренная О. Б. Спор. К вопросу о логико-психологических аспектах спора // Вестник Амурского государственного университета. Серия: Гуманитарные науки. – 2013. – №. 60. – С. 43.
13. Павлова, Л.Г. Спор, дискуссия, полемика / Л.Г. Павлова. – М.: Просвещение, 1991. – 124 с.
14. Пири, М. Железные аргументы. Победа, даже если ты не прав / М. Пири. – Москва: Питер, 2013. – 191 с.
15. Поварнин, С.И. Спор: О теории и практике спора (1918) / С.И. Поварнин. – СПб.: Лань, 1996. – 149 с.
16. Perelman Ch, L., Olbrechts-Tyteca. The New Rhetoric: A Treatise on Argumentation. - London: Notre Dame, 1969
17. Perelman, Ch. Traité de l'argumentation. La nouvelle rhétorique / Ch. Perelman, L. Olbrechts-Tyteca. – Bruxelles: Ed. De l'Université de Bruxelles, 1983. – 734 p.
18. Попов В.И. Спор, дискуссия, полемика, юридический диалог // Вестник Челябинского государственного университета. Сер.: Право. 2005. № 1. - С. 76
19. Рузавин Г.И.-Логика и аргументация.-М:Юнити,1997.-С.122
20. Stephen E. Toulmin. The Uses of Argument. Cambridge University Press, 2003 P. 247
21. Сковородников, А.П. Эффективное речевое общение (базовые компетенции): словарь-справочник / А.П. Сковородников. – Красноярск, 2014. – С. 113.
22. Соловьева Н.В. Научная дискуссия как жанр в форме коллекции // Стиль. 2008. № 7. - С. 131
23. Сидорова И.М. Научная дискуссия как объект философского исследования: автореферат диссертации на соиск. уч. степени доктора философских наук. – М.: 1999. – С. 46.
24. Тамразова И. Г. Функционально-прагматические характеристики эристического дискурса. Автореферат дис. кандидата философских наук. – Пятигорск, 1999. – С. 27.
25. Шопенгауэр А. Эристическая диалектика // Логика и риторика. Хрестоматия / сост. В.Ф. Берков, Я.С. Яскевич. Мн., 1997. – С. 618
26. Шопенгауэр А. Искусство побеждать в спорах (сборник) / А. Шопенгауэр — «Эксмо», 1900
27. Schopenhauer, A. L'art d'avoir toujours raison ou Dialectique éristique (1864) / A. Schopenhauer. – Strasbourg: Circé. 1999. – P.52
28. Шопенгауэр А. Эристика или искусство спорить. - Санкт-Петербург: 1900,
29. Чалова О.Н. Научная полемика и другие разновидности научных дискуссий // Интерактивный научно-методический журнал «Сообщество учителей английского языка». 2015. № 6.

30. Walton, D. A Classification System for Argumentation Schemes / D. Walton, M. Fabrizio // *Argument & Computation*, 2016 – P.1–29.
31. Walton, D. A Pragmatic Theory of Fallacy / D. Walton. – The University of Alabama Press, Tuscaloosa, 1995. – 324 p.
32. Walton D.N., Krabbe E.C.W. Commitment in dialogue. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1995
33. Walton, D. Fundamentals of Critical Argumentation. – NY, 2006. – P. 183.
34. Walton, D. The new dialectic: Conversational contexts of argument. – Toronto, 1998 – P.195.
35. Ўзбек тилининг изоҳли луғати. – Т.: “Ўзбекистон миллий энциклопедияси”, 2006. – Б. 198.
36. <https://ru.wikipedia.org/wiki/%>
37. Turabova, S. K. (2019). Socio-historical basis for the development of heuristics in the history of knowledge. *ISJ Theoretical & Applied Science*, 3(71), 485-488.
38. Туробова, С. (2020). Талабаларнинг аргументатив компетентлигини ривожлантиришда бахс-мунозара методининг ахамияти. *Общество и инновации*, 1(1/s), 496-500.
39. 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.
40. Turabova, S. (2023). ZAMONAVIY SHAROITDA YANGICHA FIKRLASH TARZI VA ILMIY BAHS YURITISH MADANIYATINI RIVOJLANTIRISHNING O‘ZARO ALOQADORLIGI. *Бюллетень педагогов нового Узбекистана*, 1(5), 54-59.