RESEARCH ARTICLE   **Open Access**

THE STUDY OF THE CONCEPT OF ALOGISM IN A CHRONOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVE

Zulxumor Q. Samatova
PhD student of Andijan State Foreign Languages Institute, Andijan, Uzbekistan

Abstract
This article delves into data related to one of the most pivotal branches of stylistics in terms of "alogism".

Keywords Stylistics, alogism, logical difficulties, tropes.

INTRODUCTION

The term "alogism" is actively used in linguistics and literary studies, but it originally entered from philosophical terminology, denoting not only a logical error or violation of logical laws but also the negation of logical thinking and even the denial of logic itself. To fully comprehend this phenomenon, it's essential to view it from a philosophical perspective and subsequently from the stance of other disciplines that branched out from philosophy. It's necessary to ascertain what has been known about this term historically and what innovations were made in science during the 20th and 21st centuries. This article is dedicated to illuminating the chronological development of the concept of alogism.

The Concept of Alogism in Ancient Philosophy

The issue of alogism has been addressed in philosophy since ancient times, although the term was only introduced in the 6th century AD by Cassiodorus. Aristotle had a term that directly contradicted logic: in "Poetics", he discusses statements that do not comply with logic (άλογα), from which the term "alogism" later derived.

Sometimes, Aristotle used άτοπον (absurd) synonymously for άλογα.

Aristotle developed the theory of syllogisms (Syllogism (Greek syllogismos) means "I reckon", "I conclude", a type of deductive reasoning where a new, definitive proposition results from two logically connected premises) and raised the issue of alogism, understanding it as "if something is assumed, a different thing necessarily follows, given the assumption is true."

Essentially, a syllogism is a conclusion based on three attributive statements, incorporating premises: "a statement affirming or denying something about another thing". The philosopher not only identified types of syllogisms, differentiating them by figures and modes later developed by scholastics (theologians seeking theoretical foundations for religious worldviews), but also addressed possible errors in reasoning. B. Russell indicated that Aristotle's system was the beginning of formal logic, which was not typical for ancient philosophy in general, analyzing logical categories as a result of language and speech manifestation. In "Metaphysics", Aristotle

develops a more general theory of principles, based on which errors arise. He formulated three logical laws, analyzing them from various perspectives. The law was interpreted formally in his works as follows: "...contradictory things cannot be true about the same thing at the same time..." and "...it is not possible to assert and deny the same thing about the same thing at the same time...". Aristotle gave an ontological interpretation to this law, presenting it as a universal principle of being: "There is such a beginning of being that cannot err, – it always forces the opposite, i.e., to speak the truth, i.e., the same thing cannot be and not be at the same time..."

Aristotle's legal position that there cannot be any middle ground between two contradictory claims regarding the same thing is expressed as follows: "Regarding something, there can be no intermediate state, and it is necessary that a judgment about something must either affirm or deny it." This idea of Aristotle has turned into the famous Latin phrase: "Tertium non datur" or "There is no third."

Such meanings are also conveyed by other logical laws, many of which have historically formed. In particular, the law of double negation and Peirce's law are considered equivalent to the law of excluded middle in intuitionist logic. The law of sufficient reason, expressed by Leibniz as the fourth law of logic, was recognized, although this law had been contemplated earlier in many systems of logic (for instance, by Leucippus or Aristotle). In his work "Monadology", Leibniz formulated this "principle" as follows: "no phenomenon can be true or real, no statement can be just, – without sufficient reason why things are so and not otherwise, although these reasons in most cases cannot be known to us". The fundamental logical laws were developed well before the beginning of the use of rich

mathematical tools and complex calculations, many of which showed their relative character. However, already in antiquity, a philosophical revision of accumulated logical ideas began, and logical laws came under criticism. Zeno of Elea (circa 490 – circa 430 BC), an ancient Greek philosopher, a disciple of Parmenides, attempted to prove the impossibility of motion, space, and multitude.

The article discusses the use of paradoxes (from Greek ἀπορία, meaning "no way out, desperate situation") as arguments, highlighting contradictions in concepts of motion, space, and time—generally difficult and insoluble problems, and insurmountable logical difficulties. In other words, paradoxes inherently include illogicality. The paradox "On the plurality of things" discusses the possibility of conceiving things as a plurality, with a relative contradiction given to Zeno: just as a third thing is needed to separate two things, everything can be conceived as an infinite plurality. However, in this case, despite being apparent, if the components have volume, they must have infinite volumes; or, if the components are not such, they must not have volume at all. The "Dichotomy" paradox states that for a body in motion to traverse an entire path, it must first cross half the distance, then a quarter, and so on; due to the process of infinite division, the body can never start moving (or the motion can never be completed). The "Achilles" paradox: Achilles must run an infinite number of segments in succession to catch up with a tortoise, resulting in the time required being infinite, and thus, he can never catch up with the tortoise. The "Arrow" paradox: if space, time, and motion consist of indivisible elements, a body (for example, an arrow) cannot move during an indivisible moment of time (otherwise, the "indivisible" would have been divided), and since "a sum of rests cannot produce motion," motion is, therefore, impossible, even though we observe it at every turn. These motion

paradoxes have been examined by mathematicians (D. Hilbert, P. Bernays, R. Courant, H. Robbins, as well as a group of French mathematicians writing under the pseudonym Nicolas Bourbaki), philosophers, and logicians (Aristotle, Alexander of Aphrodisias, Pierre Bayle, I. Kant, G.W.F. Hegel) at various times. They were interested in the essence of Zeno's paradoxes, which at first glance seem logically impeccable but contradict reality.

The article discusses the perceptions of illogicality during the Middle Ages. With the advent of Christianity, both the status of philosophy and its logical aspects underwent changes, coinciding with periods in Arab countries and cultures where logic maintained its independent status (Al-Farabi, Avicenna, Averroes, and others). Al-Farabi, in his work on the classification of scholars, presents logic as an important tool for knowledge and evaluation, leading "man to the path of truth." In Europe, theocentric views slowed the development of logic as an independent discipline. Anselm of Canterbury proposed the thesis that philosophical positions should conform to church dogmas, and reason should be subordinate to faith. Thomas Aquinas, building on Aristotle's works adapted to Christian doctrine, expressed a similar idea: "philosophy is the handmaiden of theology."

Thus, ancient philosophy was Christianized, and its teachings served as a supportive base for the development of scholasticism, which is considered a blend of religious philosophy, theology, and logic. A.L. Subbotin identifies several distinctive features of scholastic logic. Firstly, there was a "tendency to view logical methods of thinking from a logical-grammatical standpoint." Secondly, scholastic logic was characterized by "the dominance of technical, fully formal elements and methods of interpretation." Logic became a significant methodological aid for other sciences (theology, jurisprudence, medicine, arithmetic, geometry, astronomy, and music). Hence, for the medieval

preacher, knowledge of rhetoric, logic, and its laws was essential for constructing well-substantiated speeches. The main goal of logic in the Middle Ages was "to distinguish truth from falsehood through the most delicate considerations." Therefore, what we call illogicality, meaning a mistake leading to an incorrect concept or conclusion, was primarily studied to prevent it, even though the inherent illogic of religious texts (illustrated by Tertullian's maxim "I believe because it is absurd") remained unchallenged. A formal-logical approach reveals numerous contradictions in religious works, detailed in the works of authors like Pierre Abélard, Léo Taxil, A.I. Oizerman, L.E. Blashchuk, David Hume, and M.M. Kublanov. L.I. Balashchuk cites examples of the violation of logical laws in the Bible: "God forgives everything, yet creates hell where the souls of sinners suffer eternally. And yet these sins occurred by the will of God, without whom 'not a single hair can fall from the head'" (a violation of the law of excluded middle). The issue of whether we can deprive religious texts of their symbolic and metaphorical meanings by eliminating contradictions within them is debatable. Logic subordinate to theology did not have an independent scientific status during the Middle Ages (mainly from the 13th century until the beginning of the Modern era). The science of logic was aimed at proving the integrity of religious doctrine and its freedom from errors. However, it would be incorrect to say that science was in a state of crisis during this period, as evidenced by the debate about universals, which was equally important for both logic and theology. The issue of general concepts led to the emergence of three philosophical streams: realism, nominalism, and conceptualism. Since the realistic viewpoint was more compatible with Christian dogmatics, nominalism and conceptualism remained informal currents. The prolonged opposition of these philosophical directions indicates the development of scientific thought. During this

period, the relationships between species and genera and the concept of concepts began to be understood, demanding a reassessment of the subject of logic: the Scottish conceptualist philosopher John Duns Scotus saw logic's subject as concepts created by mental activity. According to Scotus, logic studies the thought being, in other words, the concepts of the human mind. The conceptualist Pierre Abelard sees logic more broadly: "logic is the science of assessing and distinguishing arguments based on their truth or falsity. He views logic as the science of speech, that is, expressing thought with words. He sees physics as conditional for logic, because physics studies things, while logic studies the correct use of words."

The phenomenon of illogicality, which we are interested in, did not receive fundamentally new interpretations during the Middle Ages, but scientific views establishing the connections between language and logic helped to understand this phenomenon more deeply. At the beginning of the New Era, Francis Bacon and René Descartes strongly opposed Aristotle's logic, which had been adapted to scholasticism. This opposition is symbolized by Bacon's work "Novum Organum," which, according to the author, should replace Aristotle's "Organon" and become the new basis for scientific knowledge. According to Bacon, the logical doctrine laid down in Aristotle's work cannot meet the demands of modern science and is "useless for scientific discoveries." Bacon describes the sharp differences from the "old" logic as follows: "The sharp difference between them lies mainly in three things: in their objectives, in the order of arguments, and in the principles of investigation". By denying the method of syllogism, he laid the foundation for new methods of establishing cause-and-effect relationships in objective truth. With the development of rationalism, the classical system of logic was re-examined. Baruch Spinoza introduces intuition as

a higher order of knowledge. This represents the highest manifestation of human rational capabilities. It is based on the "fourth method of acceptance," which involves understanding a thing either through its essence or by knowing its closest cause.

One of the important places in the history of science is occupied by the "Port-Royal General Rational Grammar," which shaped a new linguistic concept, incorporating innovations relevant to neighboring fields in grammar, philology, philosophy. Subsequently, the "Port-Royal Logic" was published. The main idea of this work is based on Descartes' thoughts about intuition, recognizing it as the highest form of intellectual recognition, more reliable than deduction. Focusing on the problem of knowledge, Antoine Arnauld and Pierre Nicole devote almost a quarter of the book to Aristotle's theory of syllogism. They argue that Aristotle's ten categories are of little use and only slightly aid in developing the ability to judge, often even hindering it. Rationalism transforms from a theory into a method of acquaintance, prompting scholars to reconsider the possibilities of perfect proof methods. The authors of "The Logic of Port-Royal" worked based on the ideas of Blaise Pascal, who proposed five requirements that must be observed in the process of proof: 1) never leave any illogical or vague term without a description; 2) use only well-known or already explained terms in definitions; 3) accept only absolutely clear concepts as axioms; 4) in proving somewhat vague concepts, use only previous definitions, accepted axioms, or already proven concepts; 5) not be deceived by the ambiguity of terms and instead mentally replace them with definitions that limit and explain them. The rules stated by Blaise Pascal explain how to avoid illogicality in the process of reasoning. In creating the book, Antoine Arnauld and Pierre Nicole addressed the task set by Descartes: to distinguish the "good and correct" rules of logic from the "harmful and superfluous"

ones. The work includes an analysis of sophisms (the authors have used the term paralogism as a synonym for sophism), which are categorized. The types of sophisms known from the times of Aristotle are repeated in the book, but the researchers' approach is innovative. In the chapter on "self-love, personal interest, or passion sophisms," paralogisms are presented not from the standpoint of formal logic but from that of human psychology: "If it is necessary to understand why people support one idea more than another, it is found that it is not their knowledge of the truth or the strength of the arguments, but their self-love, personal interest, or emotional attachments. This is the weight that tilts the scale and, usually, determines our choices in a state of indecision; it is the main thing that guides us in making judgments and reinforces our opinions. We judge things not for what they are, but for how they relate to us; truth and utility are the same for us." That is, a person's judgments can be influenced by interests, leading to a possible misinterpretation of surrounding events and errors in conclusions. The authors emphasize the illogicality of believing in something based on one's interests or self-love: "I dislike him, therefore, this person is worthless." One significant change in the meaning of the term illogicality (paralogism) was made by Immanuel Kant, who distinguished logical paralogism (which he defined as incorrect conclusions by their logical form) from transcendental paralogism, which has a "transcendental basis for conclusions that are incorrect in form." Kant called it a logical-philosophical error because the simplicity in abstraction differs fundamentally from the simplicity in an object, and "I," in the first sense, does not include any plurality, while in the second sense, when it denotes the soul, it can be a very complex concept, i.e., it can encompass and represent many things. Starting with Kant, there is a trend in logic to move away from psychology, to exclude any psychological principles presented in

"The Logic of Port-Royal" from the content of logic, presenting it as teaching "pure thought." This development was significantly contributed to by figures like G.W.F. Hegel, the author of the doctrine of dialectical contradictions. He opposed his dialectical logic to Aristotle's formal logic. Contradictions are not just a logical error inherent to limited thinking but demonstrate their general and objective character, criticizing this point of view: "There is no subject in which contradictions, i.e., opposing certainties, cannot be found, because a non-contradictory subject is the pure abstraction of reason, which forcibly retains an ambiguity and tries to darken and destroy the consciousness of another certainty present in the first certainty."

In the 19th and 20th centuries, critical views against the laws of logic intensified. Hegel emphasized that the laws of contradiction and the excluded middle cannot always be applied. He presented the latter in the form of, for example, "The spirit is either green or not green," and poses the "uncomfortable" question: which of these two claims is true? However, the answer to this question is not difficult. Both claims, "The spirit is green" and "The spirit is not green," are false because both are meaningless. The law of the excluded middle applies only to meaningful statements. Hegel's ideas expressed in "The Science of Logic" do not reject formal logic but aim to develop the understanding of logic to a speculative level according to the philosopher's plan. Formal-logical matters inadequately represent the life of the Idea in a rational, deficient manner. Only speculative logic, where formal-logical (rational) aspects are dialectically overcome, is true logic. Hegel's critical views against formal logic became widespread. At the end of the 19th and the beginning of the 20th centuries, a scientific revolution in logic occurred, fundamentally changing the face of the discipline. However, the significant achievements in logic also could not completely eliminate the traditions

started by Hegel. The German logic historian H. Scholz has written that Hegel's critique of formal logic is still considered a monumental misfortune that is difficult to reevaluate. In 1908, the Dutch mathematician and philosopher L.E.J. Brouwer published an article titled "On the unreliability of logical principles," in which he seriously criticized the law of the excluded middle. Shortly after, the Russian logician N.A. Vasiliev and the Polish logician Jan Łukasiewicz independently, yet simultaneously, criticized the law of contradiction. These unconventional perspectives towards the long-developing logical system were related to the development of mathematical ideas. Brouwer discovered paradoxes in set theory, which formed the basis of his critical ideas. The attitude towards logical laws varies across different disciplines. E.D. Smirnova notes: "The intensive development of modern logic, resulting from its application in the philosophy of mathematics, methodology of sciences, computing technology, programming, informatics, and logical analysis of natural languages, led to the emergence of various types of logical systems." Accordingly, each logical system has its set of logical laws. For example, the law of commutativity might be important and acceptable for mathematical logic: A and B = B and A. However, this law cannot be applied to the linguistic-speech system: for instance, the order of components in M.Yu. Lermontov's sentence "It was dark at night, nobody could see" cannot be changed. In the 19th century, representatives of the psychological direction in linguistics (H. Steinthal, W. Wundt, M. Deichsel, M.A. Kulov, F.F. Fortunatov) advanced the idea of language's illogicality. Scholars demonstrated the impossibility of analyzing linguistic phenomena from logical positions, preferring to view language through psychological processes. G.V. Kolshanskiy, comparing the main directions, emphasizes that both the logical approach, which equates logic and grammar, and the psychological approach are

extremes in studying the problems of logic and the structure of language. Despite scientific criticism, new logical laws have not lost their relevance in many fields. For example, in linguistics, these laws are discussed within the context of speech's communicative properties, stylistics of language, speech culture, and rhetoric. Alongside this, the errors resulting from violating these mentioned laws are also analyzed. In various disciplines, violations of logical laws (the law of contradiction, the law of excluded middle, the law of sufficient reason) are considered phenomena of illogicality.

CONCLUSION

A scientific exploration into the history of illogicality in logic and linguistics shows that this phenomenon has always sparked scientific interest. With the development of scientific thought, the concept of illogicality as a philosophical principle of cognition also evolves. The emergence of ideas rejecting traditional concepts as components of logic highlights the gnoseological significance of this phenomenon. The history of science has shown that not only logical laws and rules assist in recognizing truth but also highlights the necessity to consider phenomena not related to logic: intuition, creative feeling.

The appearance of various logical and philosophical systems has necessitated researchers' attention to deviations from logic. It is important to note that in the history of science, illogicality has almost always been analyzed from the position of language: Aristotle's rejection of sophisms was performed from the language position, and in the Modern era, errors in conclusions were analyzed from the perspective of linguistic logic. With the emergence of various logical systems, modern logic has distanced itself from language, yet linguistics continues to consider the fundamental logical laws and rules.

REFRENCES

1. Philosophical Encyclopedic Dictionary 1983.

2. Popov. "Poetics" 1974

3. Aristotle "The Ethics" Penguin books.1976

4. Gottfried Wilhelm Freiherr von Leibniz "Manodology" 1982

5. Al-Farabiy.1970

6. А.АРНО и П.НИКОЛЬ "Логика, или Искусство мыслить" 1991

7. Isidore Seville "The Etymologies" 2006. Cambridge University Press

8. Francis Bacon "The New Organon" 1977

9. Спиноза Бенедикт "Избранные произведения в двух томах". Том 2

10. Immanuel Kant "The Philosophy of Kant" 1994

11. Philosophical Encyclopedia 1962

12. "Ivan" 1998 Австралия короткометражка, драма Morgan Read

13. E.D. Smirnova "Logic and Philosophy" 1996

14. Садовников Сергей Аркадьевич АЛОГИЗМ РЕЧИ КАК ХУДОЖЕСТВЕННЫЙ ПРИЁМ В ТВОРЧЕСТВЕ А.П. ПЛАТОНОВ. Диссертация на соискание ученой степени кандидата филологических наук.