rejection of statistical inference as a valid methodological tool in a specific field of study [Twining W. Narrative and generalizations in argumentation about questions of fact / W. Twinning //S. Tex. L. Rev. – 1999. – T. 40. – C. 351; Mass, H. Economic methodology: a historical introduction / H. Mass. – London: Routledge., 2014. – c. 30-37]. This tendency is routine in public debates on issues where expertise in social sciences is valued, as well as in matters related to environmental sciences.

The ease with which results of quantitative research are doubted in public debates contrasts with a respectable position they hold in many social sciences. Nevertheless, on a practical level, doubts on the acceptability of evidence that is based on quantitative research appear to be an inevitability as the physical and temporary restraints of live argumentation processes limit the degree of scrutiny which can be invested in investigating claims and counterclaims on the acceptability of every particular piece of quantitative evidence.

Nataliia Kolotilova
Associate Professor, Department of Logic,
Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv (Kyiv, Ukraine)
E-mail: n_kolotilova@ukr.net
ORCID: 0000-0002-7450-2981

FORMAL AND INFORMAL APPROACHES TO ARGUMENTATION RESEARCH IN THE BEGINNING OF THE TWENTY-FIRST CENTURY

At the present stage of the development of the argumentation theory we observe the integration of formal and informal approaches of the argumentative issues. Although the period of formation of an informal approach in the middle of the last century was characterized by the opposition between "working logic" (Toulmin), "new rhetoric" (Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca) and the formal constructions in logic (classical logic, modal logic and others).

To date, the interaction of formal and informal approaches is quite clearly manifested in the development of the general AI and AI & law (for example, ASPIS+), in the argument mining. They actively use the concept of an argument schemes as the abstract patterns of reasoning, which represent the link between the argument (premise) and the standpoint (conclusion) in the single argumentation. In general, this notion was developed in the informal approach of argumentation theory, but is used both for formal reconstructions of practical reasoning, in particular by demonstrating the positive and negative consequences of decisions on actions in the AI & law (for example, works of Bench-Capon, Macagno, Prakken, Reed, Walton and others) and for taking into account the argumentative component of rhetorical figures in the argument mining (for example, works of Handschuh, Mitrović, Mladeno-

vić, O'Reilly and others). Such an analysis of rhetorical figures makes it possible to better understand the cognitive basis of persuasive communication. Moreover, persuasion and argumentation are related, although this correlation needs to be clarified (for example, works of O'Keefe and others).

Thus, the notion of the argument scheme is one of those concepts, which combines formal and informal approaches in the argumentation theory itself, or rather in its applications in contemporary developments of the AI and AI & law, argument mining, rhetorical figure modelling.

Larysa Komakha
Vice Dean of the Faculty of Philosophy,
Doctor of Philosophical Sciences, Professor
Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv (Kyiv, Ukraine)
E-mail: l_komakha@ukr.net
ORCID: 0000-0002-8474-372X

THE FEATURES OF ARGUMENTATION IN PHILOSOPHY

In my report, I will speak about the peculiarities of argumentation in philosophy in terms of modern logic.

I will prove that one of the central points in philosophical argumentation is the notion of "problem". The argument is always one of the potential responses to an explicit or implicit problem, one of its possible solutions. The specific nature of the argument also depends significantly on the problem situation in which it unfolds. The analysis of the dependence of argumentation on the type of discussed problem is an important aspect of the logical study of argumentation in Philosophy. Statement and analysis of problems are the central points of argumentation. An incorrectly understood problem can make all the further argumentation that is meant to clarify and solve the problem.

In addition, in my report, I will elaborate on the idea that argumentation in philosophy can be assessed as correct if its process does not violate the requirements existing in a particular area. The argumentation is incorrect, when the requirements relating to the procedures of justification, to the procedures of communication, are not followed. The boundary between correct and incorrect argumentation is quite conditional and it varies from one area of argumentation to another.