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Abstract: This paper deals with the description of types of verbal behavior of the participants of scholarly disputes based on their strategic and tactical preferences. According to the author’s communicative aim - “cooperation”, “competition” and “ideological attitude” three types of verbal behavior have been determined within a scholarly dispute. They are constructive, ideological and polemical types. The participants of the dispute, focused on constructive type of verbal behavior, use strategies and tactics of communicative cooperation. A polemical type of verbal behavior is characterized by attitude to a noncooperative interaction, resulting in strategies and tactics discrediting the opponent. When the conditions of verbal interaction are complicated by the influence of factor of political ideology, there is a special - ideological - type of verbal behavior.
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INTRODUCTION

Formulation of the typology of linguistic personalities is one of the central approaches of modern anthropocentric linguistics. Some difficulties in studying this problem arise when choosing typological parameters since their number can be infinite due to inexhaustible profundity of the concept of “linguistic personality”.

The researchers distinguish three approaches in creating typological concepts, which are based on the relevant parameters of the classifications. Firstly, these are level typologies, for instance, a typology where linguistic personalities are differentiated according to the realization of orthographic capacity [1]. Secondly, these are aspectual typologies, where the parameters are represented by aspects of occurrence of linguistic personality: local [2], professional [3], etc. Thirdly, these are functional-verbal typologies: for instance, there is a well-known typology of sub-national linguistic cultures [4], where linguistic personalities are differentiated according to a method of realization of discursive activity.

Technique: Types of verbal behavior of linguistic personalities of the scientists in scholarly disputes, discussed in this paper, have been considered under the third approach, applying the discursive and stylistic approaches, which involve simultaneously the study of the text from the standpoint of the discursive and functional-stylistic analysis.

A functional-stylistic component of the approach used is associated with qualification material selected for the study. The author refers to the analysis of certain type of texts such as written scientific discussions, which have a scientific-cognitive activity of scientists fixed by scientific functional style. The discursive component focuses on the consideration of the effect of extralinguistic factors on the formation of text [5, 6, 7]. The nature of discourse determines the specificity of verbal interaction between subjects, as well as the nature of aims, realized by them [8, 9], which is embodied in the relevant communication strategies and speech and behavior tactics. Communicative and cognitive activity, implemented by the authors of discussion texts, has been subordinated to the aims of denial and assertion: it is associated with the expression of evaluative attitude toward the opponent’s ideas and the approval of the author's point of view in the reader's mind.

For defining and describing the types of verbal behavior of the participants of scholarly disputes the following parameters have been set: 1) character of expression of communicative aims of the participants of scholarly disputes; 2) character of the communicative
strategies and tactics, implemented by the authors; 3) communication tonality and communicative interest; 4) relation to the matter of discussion and the content of a statement made by the opponent; and 5) productivity of the dispute.

**Major Part:** According to K.F. Sedov, the verbal behavior of linguistic personality within the genre is predetermined by strategies of sub-genre verbal interaction, the choice of which depends on the individual properties of the linguistic personalities of communication parties and influences "on the tactical preferences of a speaker" [10]. Methods of forming the social interaction within the sub-genre verbal interaction (strategic and tactical preferences) can serve as a basis for the classification of linguistic personalities. It should be noted that K.F. Sedov analyzed verbal behavior of the participants of conversational discourse. However, the behavior of linguistic personality (politician) based on strategic preferences has been also studied in political discourse [11]. Therefore, it is possible to use the proposed analysis model in the scholarly disputes, since they also represent the epitome of communicative strategies and tactics of the participants of the discussion process, i.e. specific language personalities. As a result of applying the approach to the analyses of verbal interaction between the scientists, proposed by K.F. Sedov, three types of verbal behavior - constructive, polemical and ideological - have been defined and described in the disputes.

It should be stressed that this paper considers types of verbal behavior of linguistic personalities only with reference to the discussion situation (a situation of conflict, dispute) and the behavior of speaking personality of the scientist has not been analyzed out of the dispute.

Constructive type of verbal behavior of linguistic personality demonstrates the attitude to another one, the respect for the opponent, the desire to understand and comprehend his/her position, which is expressed in the use of cooperative strategies and tactics (e.g., negative evaluation mitigation tactics, reduction of illocutionary force of incentive statement, invitation to joint consideration, etc.), explicating interest in communicative cooperation [12, 13]. As a result of such consideration the dispute turns into constructive dialogue aimed at acquisition and development of new knowledge.

The cooperative verbal interaction presupposes no compulsory identity of semantic positions of the communicants. They may disagree a little with each other and even accentuate the differences of opinions, but the critical remarks shall be expressed in the correct form and accompanied by a scrupulous analysis. For example: It appears to us that Yu.S. Sorokin has made two serious mistakes deciding the issue of linguistic styles - a logical and factual. We shall briefly dwell upon the first mistake and analyze the second in details... [To comply with correctness no names are given when quoting. - N.S.].

Otherwise, the polemical type of verbal behavior is characterized by negative attitude to the content of speech or personal characteristics of the opponent, which is caused by the desire to see him as a competitor. Scientific relations between the knowers are confrontational in nature, the participants do not accept the opinions of opposing parties as well as not interested in communicative cooperation. Therefore, a polemicist resorts to such tactics, which are intended to "neutralize" the opponent's position (e.g., ironic exaggeration tactics, appeals to authorities, “labeling”, etc.). For example: This accusation is quite ridiculous and characterizes only the N’s style and techniques of controversy. In fact, the above situation, which meaning has completely distorted, highlights the complete independence of the existence of matter of human consciousness. As a result, a scholarly dispute is replaced by controversy, where no consensus is reached, hence there is no increment of new knowledge.

Studying the texts of scholarly disputes in terms of verbal interaction there has been defined a type of verbal behavior, which corresponds neither to constructive nor to polemical one, since ideological attitudes are demonstrated. Verbal behavior of the ideologist is characterized by journalistic manner of presentation (slogantry), expression of naked hostility (sometimes aggressive) towards the opponents (tactics of aggression and attack on the opponent) and tendency towards the semantic contrast between "us" and "them" (polarization tactics, creation of the enemy image etc.). According to V.A. Legler “any ideology always bears the risk of being declared illegal. This implies a unique attitude of ideology to the opponent. In this case the opponent is an enemy, whose appearance and existence threaten the very existence of ideology, rather than a respectable interlocutor able to discuss any problems with you, like in any kind of the dispute” [14]. It is natural for such verbal behavior to be estimated as a conflict one (sometimes aggressive).

**Here Are Some of Examples:** Veland, the propagandist of machism, who suppresses Soviet efforts and completely ignores the theory of chemical structure by A.M. Butlerov and distorts the history of theoretical organic chemistry, is praised by Prof. Syrkin to high heaven.
CONCLUSION

Thus, three types of verbal behavior - constructive, polemical and ideological, associated with the types of the author’s personality, have been defined in the scholarly dispute according to the communicative aims of researchers.

Summary: Discursive analysis of texts of scholarly disputes has defined and described the communication strategies and tactics of the participants as well as explained the differences in verbal behavior of scientists. Specificity of verbal interaction between the communicants is based on the factors such as communicative aim of the researcher, which is reflected in the type of verbal behavior; political ideology: author’s personality.

The communicative aim such as “cooperation” is realized by cooperative speech strategies and tactics. The participants of discussion process, convincing each other, seek to establish the truth and obtain new knowledge. The communicants demonstrate a mutual tonality of communication (discussion has a correct character) and interest in the subject matter, as well as in the content of a statement made by the opponent.

The communicative aim such as “competition” is expressed through the conflict (non-cooperative) speech strategies and tactics. The participants of discussion process, convincing each other, seek to establish the truth and obtain new knowledge. The communicants demonstrate a mutual tonality of communication (discussion has a correct character) and interest in the subject matter, as well as in the content of a statement made by the opponent.

It seems that the formulation of a typology of verbal behavior of linguistic personalities within the scholarly disputes can be interesting for comparing individual styles of authors.
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