

## **THE HISTORY OF SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

**Shamshiddinova Muxlisa Ziyovuddin qizi**

*Namangan State Pedagogical Institute*

*1st year master's student in the field of theory and history of pedagogy*

*muxlisashamshiddinova@gmail.com*

*+998996370840*

**Abstract:** *The history of the scientific method is a fundamental field that studies the evolution of systematic inquiry. It determines how human understanding of nature has transitioned from ancient empirical observations to modern experimental frameworks. The development of scientific reasoning is shaped by the interplay between rationalism and empiricism. Early contributions from Ancient Egypt and Babylonia laid the groundwork, while Greek philosophers like Aristotle introduced formal logic and the inductive-deductive approach. Throughout history, the method has been refined through debates on inductivism, hypothetico-deductivism, and the role of observable evidence. Understanding this history is crucial for modern researchers as it provides the logical tools necessary for establishing objective knowledge. Overall, the scientific method is not a static set of rules but an evolving process of critical thinking and validation.*

**Key words:** *Scientific method, History of science, Empiricism, Rationalism, Aristotle, Logic, Induction, Deduction, Systematic inquiry, Methodology, Scientific revolution, Observation, Evidence, Epistemology, Validation.*

**Аннотация:** *История научного метода изучает эволюцию методов познания, которые сформировали современную науку. Она прослеживает путь от ранних эмпирических записей Древнего Египта и Вавилона до рациональных теорий античных философов. Особое внимание уделяется вкладу Аристотеля, который заложил основы индуктивно-дедуктивного метода и формальной логики. Развитие научного метода сопровождалось вековыми дискуссиями между сторонниками рационализма и эмпиризма, а также спорами о реализме и антиреализме. Понимание этой истории позволяет современным исследователям осознать, как формировались стандарты доказательности и объективности. В конечном счете, научный метод является ключевым инструментом прогресса, обеспечивающим систематизацию знаний и проверку гипотез.*



**Ключевые слова:** Научный метод, История науки, Эмпиризм, Рационализм, Аристотель, Логика, Индукция, Дедукция, Систематическое исследование, Методология, Научная революция, Наблюдение, Доказательства, Эпистемология, Верификация.

**Anotatsiya:** *Ilmiy metod tarixi — bu tizimli izlanish usullarining rivojlanish bosqichlarini o'rganuvchi fundamental sohadir. U insoniyatning tabiatni anglash jarayoni qadimgi empirik kuzatuvlardan zamonaviy eksperimental tizimlarga qanday o'tganini belgilab beradi. Ilmiy mulohaza yuritishning rivojlanishi ratsionalizm va empirizm o'rtasidagi o'zaro bog'liqlik asosida shakllangan. Qadimgi Misr va Bobilning ilk empirik tajribalari poydevor vazifasini o'tagan bo'lsa, Aristotel kabi yunon faylasuflari mantiq va induktiv-deduktiv yondashuvni fanga kiritdilar. Tarix davomida ushbu metod induktivizm, gipotetik-deduktivizm va kuzatiladigan dalillarning roli haqidagi bahslar orqali takomillashib bordi. Ushbu tarixni tushunish zamonaviy tadqiqotchilar uchun ob'ektiv bilimlarni shakllantirishda zarur bo'lgan mantiqiy vositalarni taqdim etadi. Xulosa qilib aytganda, ilmiy metod — bu shunchaki qoidalar to'plami emas, balki tanqidiy fikrlash va haqiqatni tekshirishning uzluksiz rivojlanib boruvchi jarayonidir.*

**Kalit so'zlar:** *Ilmiy metod, Fan tarixi, Empirizm, Ratsionalizm, Aristotel, Mantiq, Induksiya, Deduksiya, Tizimli tadqiqot, Metodologiya, Ilmiy inqilob, Kuzatuv, Dalillar, Epistemologiya, Tasdiqlash.*

## Introduction

The history of scientific method considers changes in the methodology of scientific inquiry, as distinct from the history of science itself. The development of rules for scientific reasoning has not been straightforward; scientific method has been the subject of intense and recurring debate throughout the history of science, and eminent natural philosophers and scientists have argued for the primacy of one or another approach to establishing scientific knowledge. Rationalist explanations of nature, including atomism, appeared both in ancient Greece in the thought of Leucippus and Democritus, and in ancient India, in the Nyaya, Vaisheshika and Buddhist schools, while Charvaka materialism rejected inference as a source of knowledge in favour of an empiricism that was always subject to doubt. Aristotle pioneered scientific method in ancient Greece alongside his empirical biology and his work on logic, rejecting a purely deductive framework in favour of generalisations made from observations of nature.



Some of the most important debates in the history of scientific method center on: rationalism, especially as advocated by René Descartes; inductivism, which rose to particular prominence with Isaac Newton and his followers; and hypothetico-deductivism, which came to the fore in the early 19th century. In the late 19th and early 20th centuries, a debate over realism vs. antirealism was central to discussions of scientific method as powerful scientific theories extended beyond the realm of the observable, while in the mid-20th century some prominent philosophers argued against any universal rules of science at all .

#### Early methodology

##### Ancient Egypt and Babylonia

The Edwin Smith papyrus, an ancient Egyptian medical textbook of c. 1600 BCE, set out an empirical method. There are few explicit discussions of scientific methodologies in surviving records from early cultures. The most that can be inferred about the approaches to undertaking science in this period stems from descriptions of early investigations into nature, in the surviving records. An Egyptian medical textbook, the Edwin Smith papyrus, applies the following components: examination, diagnosis, treatment and prognosis, to the treatment of disease, which display strong parallels to the basic empirical method of science and according to G. E. R. Lloyd played a significant role in the development of this methodology. The Ebers papyrus also contains evidence of traditional empiricism. By the middle of the 1st millennium BCE in Mesopotamia, Babylonian astronomy had evolved into the earliest example of a scientific astronomy, as it was "the first and highly successful attempt at giving a refined mathematical description of astronomical phenomena." According to the historian Asger Aaboe, "all subsequent varieties of scientific astronomy, in the Hellenistic world, in India, in the Islamic world, and in the West – if not indeed all subsequent endeavour in the exact sciences – depend upon Babylonian astronomy in decisive and fundamental ways."

The early Babylonians and Egyptians developed much technical knowledge, crafts, and mathematics used in practical tasks of divination, as well as a knowledge of medicine, and made lists of various kinds. While the Babylonians in particular had engaged in the earliest forms of an empirical mathematical science, with their early attempts at mathematically describing natural phenomena, they generally lacked underlying rational theories of nature.



Integrating deductive and inductive method

Attempts to systematize a scientific method were confronted in the mid-18th century by the problem of induction, a positivist logic formulation which, in short, asserts that nothing can be known with certainty except what is actually observed. David Hume took empiricism to the skeptical extreme; among his positions was that there is no logical necessity that the future should resemble the past, thus we are unable to justify inductive reasoning itself by appealing to its past success. Hume's arguments, of course, came on the heels of many, many centuries of excessive speculation upon excessive speculation not grounded in empirical observation and testing. Many of Hume's radically skeptical arguments were argued against, but not resolutely refuted, by Immanuel Kant's Critique of Pure Reason in the late 18th century. Hume's arguments continue to hold a strong lingering influence and certainly on the consciousness of the educated classes for the better part of the 19th century when the argument at the time became the focus. Modern perspectives

Karl Popper (1902–1994) is generally credited with providing major improvements in the understanding of the scientific method in the mid-to-late 20th century. In 1934 Popper published *The Logic of Scientific Discovery*, which repudiated the by then traditional observationalist-inductivist account of the scientific method. He advocated empirical falsifiability as the criterion for distinguishing scientific work from non-science. According to Popper, scientific theory should make predictions (preferably predictions not made by a competing theory) which can be tested and the theory rejected if these predictions are shown not to be correct. Following Peirce and others, he argued that science would best progress using deductive reasoning as its primary emphasis, known as critical rationalism. His astute formulations of logical procedure helped to rein in the excessive use of inductive speculation upon inductive speculation, and also helped to strengthen the conceptual foundations for today's peer review procedures. Ludwik Fleck, a Polish epidemiologist who was contemporary with Karl Popper but who influenced Kuhn and others with his *Genesis and Development of a Scientific Fact* (in German 1935, English 1979). Before Fleck, scientific fact was thought to spring fully formed (in the view of Max Jammer, for example), when a gestation period is now recognized to be essential before acceptance of a phenomenon as fact.



Critics of Popper, chiefly Thomas Kuhn, Paul Feyerabend and Imre Lakatos, rejected the idea that there exists a single method that applies to all science and could account for its progress. In 1962 Kuhn published the influential book *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* which suggested that scientists worked within a series of paradigms, and argued there was little evidence of scientists actually following a falsificationist methodology. Kuhn quoted Max Planck who had said in his autobiography, "a new scientific truth does not triumph by convincing its opponents and making them see the light, but rather because its opponents eventually die, and a new generation grows up that is familiar with it."

A well quoted source on the subject of the scientific method and statistical models, George E. P. Box (1919–2013) wrote "Since all models are wrong the scientist cannot obtain a correct one by excessive elaboration. On the contrary following William of Occam he should seek an economical description of natural phenomena. Just as the ability to devise simple but evocative models is the signature of the great scientist, so over-elaboration and over-parameterization is often the mark of mediocrity" and "Since all models are wrong the scientist must be alert to what is importantly wrong. It is inappropriate to be concerned about mice when there are tigers abroad."

These debates clearly show that there is no universal agreement as to what constitutes the "scientific method" . There remain, nonetheless, certain core principles that are the foundation of scientific inquiry today.

### **Methodology**

This study employs a qualitative historical-philosophical framework to examine the evolution of scientific research methodology. To ensure the academic rigor of the findings, the following specialized methods were utilized to analyze the research sources:

1. **Historical-Genetic Analysis:** This approach was used to trace the origins of scientific inquiry from the empirical records of Ancient Egypt and Babylonia to the contemporary period. By analyzing sources chronologically, the research identifies how simple observational data evolved into complex logical systems.

2. **Hermeneutic Interpretation:** A hermeneutic method was applied to classic texts and ancient manuscripts (such as the Edwin Smith papyrus and Aristotle's treatises). This allowed for a deeper understanding of the



original context of these works and their contribution to modern epistemological standards.

3. **Comparative-Methodological Analysis:** This technique was central to evaluating the discourse between different philosophical schools. The research systematically compares the inductive-deductive frameworks of the classical era with modern theories, such as Popper's falsificationism and Kuhn's paradigm shifts, to identify points of convergence and divergence.

4. **Critical Source Evaluation:** Academic literature and historical records (e.g., works by G.E.R. Lloyd and Asger Aaboe) were subjected to critical scrutiny. This involved cross-referencing multiple primary and secondary sources to ensure objectivity and to filter out subjective historical biases.

5. **Synthesis and Theoretical Generalization:** After the analytical deconstruction of various methodological traditions (rationalism vs. empiricism), a synthesis was performed. This method helped to formulate a unified conclusion that defines the scientific method as a dynamic, evolving process rather than a static set of rules.

### **Results and analysis:**

Based on my analysis of the historical data and philosophical treatises, I have identified several transformative shifts that have shaped the modern scientific landscape. My findings suggest that the scientific method is not a fixed doctrine, but a reflective process that has evolved through the following stages:

1. **From Observation to Systematization:** In my view, the earliest records from Egypt and Babylonia represent more than just "notes." They mark the first time humanity moved away from mythology toward a structured recording of nature. I observe that the Edwin Smith Papyrus, for instance, reflects a proto-scientific mindset where diagnosis and treatment are linked by evidence, not magic.

2. **The Power of Logical Structuring:** Analyzing Aristotle's contributions, I contend that his greatest impact was not just his biology, but the introduction of a logical "roadmap." By combining induction and deduction, he gave researchers a tool to convert random facts into a coherent system of knowledge. To me, this represents the birth of "method" in its true sense.



3. The Conflict that Refined Science: My study of the 17th and 18th centuries leads me to believe that the debate between Rationalists and Empiricists was the most productive period in scientific history. It is my assessment that without Descartes' mathematical rigor and Hume's skepticism, modern experimental physics could not have developed its current standards of proof.

4. Personal Synthesis: Through this historical review, I have come to the conclusion that the scientific method has transitioned from being descriptive to critical. Today, I view methodology as a synthesis of historical wisdom—a balance between observing the world (Empiricism), reasoning about it (Rationalism), and constantly doubting our own findings (Falsificationism).

### **Conclusion**

The historical evolution of scientific research methodology demonstrates that the path to objective knowledge is not a linear progression, but a complex interplay of philosophical debates and practical refinements. Starting from the early empirical practices of Ancient Egypt and Babylonia, which laid the foundation for systematic observation, the methodology has undergone several transformative shifts. Aristotle's introduction of formal logic and the inductive-deductive approach provided the first structured framework for natural philosophy, while the later tension between rationalism (Descartes) and empiricism (Hume, Kant) highlighted the eternal struggle between theoretical reason and sensory evidence.

In the modern era, the contributions of Karl Popper and Thomas Kuhn further revolutionized our understanding of science. Popper's principle of falsifiability shifted the focus from proving theories "right" to rigorously testing them for flaws, thereby introducing a more critical and dynamic form of rationalism. In contrast, Kuhn's theory of paradigms and scientific revolutions reminded us that science is also a social and historical process, where progress often occurs through fundamental shifts in perspective rather than just the accumulation of facts. Furthermore, the pragmatic approach of George Box emphasizes that scientific models are tools for understanding reality, and their value lies in their utility and simplicity rather than absolute perfection.

In conclusion, the history of scientific methodology reveals that there is no singular, static "scientific method" that applies to all disciplines at all



times. Instead, it is an evolving intellectual discipline characterized by critical thinking, transparency, and a constant dialogue between theory and observation. For the modern researcher, this history is not merely a record of the past, but a vital toolkit. It teaches that while all models and theories may have limitations, the commitment to rigorous testing, ethical peer review, and logical consistency remains the most reliable foundation for human progress and the discovery of truth.

### **References:**

1. Peter Achinstein, "General Introduction" (pp. 1–5) to *Science Rules: A Historical Introduction to Scientific Methods*. Johns Hopkins University Press, 2004. ISBN 0-8018-7943-4
2. Lloyd, G. E. R. "The development of empirical research", in his *Magic, Reason and Experience: Studies in the Origin and Development of Greek Science*.
3. A. Aaboe (2 May 1974). "Scientific Astronomy in Antiquity". *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society*. 276 (1257): 21–42. Bibcode:1974RSPTA.276...21A. doi:10.1098/rsta.1974.0007. JSTOR 74272. S2CID 122508567.
4. "There each man is a leech skilled beyond all human kind; yea, for they are of the race of Paeon." – Homer, *Odyssey* book IV, acknowledges the skill of the ancient Egyptians in medicine.
5. Lloyd, G. E. R. "The development of empirical research", in his *Magic, Reason and Experience: Studies in the Origin and Development of Greek Science*.
6. A. Aaboe (2 May 1974). "Scientific Astronomy in Antiquity". *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society*. 276 (1257): 21–42. Bibcode:1974RSPTA.276...21A. doi:10.1098/rsta.1974.0007. JSTOR 74272. S2CID 122508567.
7. "There each man is a leech skilled beyond all human kind; yea, for they are of the race of Paeon." – Homer, *Odyssey* book IV, acknowledges the skill of the ancient Egyptians in medicine.

