opción

Categoriality as a form of expressiveness: expressive speech in Tatar and French

Alsu F. Valeeva[1]

[1]Institute of Philology and Intercultural Communication, Kazan (Volga) Federal University (Kazan, st. The Kremlin, 18, St. Leytenanta Schmidt, 48 – 42, Russia)
alsval@mail.ru

Albina K. Gizatullina[2]

[2]Institute of Philology and Intercultural Communication, Kazan (Volga) Federal University (Kazan, St. the Kremlin, 18, St. Leytenanta Schmidt, 48 – 42, Russia)
agizatullina@mail.ru

Rauchania R. Mingazova[3]

[3]Institute of Philology and Intercultural Communication, Kazan (Volga) Federal University (Kazan, St. the Kremlin, 18, St. Leytenanta Schmidt, 48 – 42, Russia)
rushaniyam@mail.ru

Abstract

The purpose of this research is to compare expressive sentences in Tatar and French. Linguistic methods and techniques (comparative-typological, universal-differential and descriptive) were applied to analyze the actual material in accordance with the research goal and objectives. As a result, confidence and readiness to defend one's position are the reason for making many speech genres (ordering, stating, reproaching, etc.) more expressive. As a conclusion, this research revealed similar typological features indicating a certain similarity of the Tatar and French languages belonging to different language families.

Keywords: expressive, syntax, sentence, comparative, categorical.

La categorialidad como forma de expresividad: expresión expresiva en tártaro y francés

Resumen

El propósito de esta investigación es comparar oraciones expresivas en tártaro y en francés. Se aplicaron métodos y técnicas lingüísticas (comparativo-tipológico, universal-diferencial y descriptivo) para analizar el material real de acuerdo con la meta y los objetivos de la investigación. Como resultado, la confianza y la disposición para defender la posición de uno son la razón para hacer que muchos géneros del habla (ordenar, declarar, reprochar, etc.) sean más expresivos. Como conclusión, esta investigación reveló características tipológicas similares que indican una cierta similitud de las lenguas tártaras y francesas que pertenecen a familias de diferentes idiomas.

Palabras clave: expresivo, sintaxis, oración, comparativo, categórico.

1. INTRODUCTION

Current stage of linguistics development is characterized by an intense interest to the problem of language comparison. It is the subject of national and international linguistic researching Gizatullina (2014) due to a number of reasons. These are communications arising from social, philosophical and cultural rapprochement of peoples; desire to improve language teaching and learning; growing role of national languages (in particular, the Tatar language) in our country; and the need in considering peculiarities of the native language while teaching the non-native one. Research and cultural interaction, as well as cooperation, is the key aspect of society development in modern world.

At the same time, linguistic and general cultural qualifications of such interactors acting within the multicultural and multilingual space are taken on greater significance. In linguistics, any problem will involve the expressive factor (EF) in one way or another (Ermakova, 2010). The EF as a significant part of denotative field, associated with a man, has been out of interest for many decades. It is still little studied. In traditional linguistics, its validity was not denied, but it was excluded from the linguistic analysis when it came to different fields as one not related to the science of language (Malinovich, 1989). The objective reason for such a treatment lies in the complexity of the problem itself – it is the point where the issues of linguistics, psychology, philosophy, logic, pedagogy, medicine and other sciences overlap. Each thereof has its own terminology and classification of emotions. This naturally brings up certain difficulties when it comes to studying this problem (Abdullina et al., 2015). The subjective reason is that linguistic literature views the emotional breadth with skepticism as something impressionistic, elusive and destructive to language structure. In contrast, a number of linguists argue that they [emotions] generate structures typical for colloquial speech by destroying the written speech structure [...] (Galieva and Nagumanova, 2014). Our research revealed that these structures are powerful sentences generated constantly.

We cannot leave aside the following problem, which is not conductive to a comprehensive research on EF in language. According to Osipov (1970), such linguists as V.A. Zvegintsev, E. Sepir and I.P. Susov still place the EF outside the linguistic problems as an extra-

linguistic fact. According to Arutyunova (1988), such an attitude can
be explained only through the lens of the general syntactic theory,
aimed at a constructive representation of syntactic units in statics.
There is no doubt that expressiveness has extra-linguistic forms, but as
part of the semantic structure of linguistic units, it is part of linguistic
content. Many linguists hold this view (Lakoff, 2006; Langlotz, 2006).
Besides, kinetic units are designed to follow verbal language
(Karazhaev and Dzhusoeva, 1987). The EF problem is one of the most
interesting and easily recognizable, but at the same time it is one of the
most complex ones and requires detailed study. Since the 1960s, the
following terms have been applied: *expressive syntax* Alexandrova
(1984), Henry (1977), emotive syntax Shigarevskaya (1973), affective
syntax Ushakova (1985) and dynamic syntax. However, there is also
an opinion, when no specific affective syntax exists. The famous
Turkic scholar M.Z. Zakiev considers expressive sentences in Tatar
naming them exclamatory sentences (Zakiev, 1971). Many Tatar
linguists point that emotions can be expressed with infinitive and
nominative sentences (Yusupov, 1980). Gak (1981) considers affective
sentences in French through the lens of structural characteristics and
divides them into two types: sentences with a specific structure and
sentences that coincide in structure with neutral ones, but differ in
intonation. The capacity of certain nominative sentences of the French
language to convey speaker's emotions was highlighted by many
linguists (Sofiyskaya, 1972). Many French linguists are interested in
the means of expression. This issue was partly reflected by Henry
(1960). The series Que sais-je? Reveal that French affective language
serves to express speaker's feelings: Le francais émotif ou expressif

met en jeu la sensibilité de l'auteur qui juge, qualifie, s'engage, s'implique. Le langage est fortement "chargé". La vie affective déborde du message. On est en présence ici du "je" permanent" (emotional or expressive French language impresses emotional intensity of an author judging, qualifying, engaging or jumping into something. The language is heavily loaded. The emotional life is beyond any meaning content. At this point, we stay face to face with author's permanent identity) (Bellenger, 1993). There is another area for studying expressive constructions. It is associated with the name of V.V. Vinogradov. The specific features of certain syntactic constructions was brought into light earlier (Blokh, 1987). However, he puts forward the concept of subjectively expressive syntax as a means of expressive representation (Henry, 1960). In the last decade, expressive syntax has been supported by significant studies on a number of units existing in different languages (Gulyaeva, 1997). Our research material involves original literary works of well-known Tatar and French writers of the 20th century (Bayanov, 1993; Boulanger, 1983).

2. METHODOLOGY

This research is conducted by means of linguistic methods and techniques intended for analyzing the actual material. The leading method – comparative analysis – allows identifying similarities and differences between two languages, as well as features standing behind them. This method also allows identifying systemic correspondences

and disparity between the languages being compared. Comparative interpretation is based on parallel learning allowing us to detect the common and specific features of compared languages. Their denotative difference is clarified through structural and stylistic interpretation. Comparison techniques and the typological research model are applied to determine linguistic universals.

3. RESULTS

Comparative linguistics has taken a firm place among a number of linguistic disciplines. In our opinion, comparative study of two or more languages is well-expressed with in the following words: language comparison revealing the relationship between the universal and distinctive sides of languages helps to more fully and deeply comprehend typical phenomena and categories of each language; there are theoretical grounds for typological interpretation of language phenomena (Blokh, 1987). Many years of world experience in comparing languages has shown that English is often chosen as the language of interethnic communication. There are various linguistic levels of language analyzed and compared: morphological, lexical, phraseological and syntactic. We believe that studying and analyzing linguistic means of expression will reveal the beauty, emotionality and relevance of such languages as French and Tatar. Studying the expressive syntactic means will allow bringing up the range of feelings and emotions expressed and experienced by the characters of Tatar and French literature. We hope that comparative study of French, Tatar and

other languages will allow us to understand their linguistic levels more deeply, and at the same time, will preserve the purity of each. In our opinion, the category of expression is a multifaceted phenomenon involving emotionality, evaluativity, sincerity, interest and vividness waiting for their discovery and detailed research. Expression and its components are subject and will be the subject of our further research. We chose this topic as an object of our comparative research for the following objective reasons. Firstly, expressive sentences occupy an important place in Tatar and French colloquial speech. They are used constantly and studied little. Secondly, expressive sentences are of great variety both in structural terms and in terms of semantic relations. Thirdly, studying expressive sentences in Tatar and French is beneficial because of theoretical and practical requirements.

Categoriality is one of the interpretive categories that allows the speaker to express his/her opinion in a strict or diplomatic manner. Shakhovsky (2010) includes categoriality into social meta-aspect of the mode of utterance, which characterizes the relations between communicants. Pragmatic orientation narrows the distance between categoriality and expressiveness, making, thereby, the first one the key method of speech impact (Shakhovsky, 2010). Categoriality as a form of expressiveness put out into expressive sentences in Tatar and French depends on the subject's involvement into communicative situation, namely – on how important it is for the speaker to factor in feelings, opinion and behavior of the other partner in conversation. There different reasons indicated for the amplification of categoriality and, consequently, for the intensification of utterance expressiveness[14].

Categoriality is introduced as speaker's confidence in his/her rightness. Confidence and readiness to defend one's position are the reason for making many speech genres (ordering, stating, reproaching, etc.) more expressive. This brings up the question of drawing a line between the categoriality of formal and slangy genres (friendly conversation).

1. In formal communication, communication tasks are to force the other partner to act in a certain way, and to plant the feeling of guilt. In a categorical manner, author claims his/her right to speak in a certain genre, for example, as if he/she is giving advice or calls over the coals. He/she emphasizes his/her responsibility and ring of authority. In Tatar and French, such expressive sentences express categorical judgment and establish unequal roles in the dialogue. In fact, the dialogue turns into a monologue. Such a transformation is against the principle of communication.

3.1. Convincing about Something

Минме? Китче! Бер дә дөньяга чыкканың юкмыни? Өлкән оператор булып эшлим бит (Bayanov, 1993). Me you say? Screw you! You never been out in the world or what? I am the senior supervisor, you know. Шаулама, имеш! Keep quite they say! Allons, allons donc, mon cher! (Bosquet, 1978). Come with me, darling, come

on! Eh bien, partez donc, partez, au nom du ciel! (Boulanger, 1983). For God sakes, go already!

3.2. Demanding for Something

И! шаярмачы! (Bayanov, 1993). Hey! Do stop fooling around! Касыймов әле һаман көлә иде. Җамалый агайга бу ошамады: - Көлмә әле син! Күп көлгән елар диләр! (Gyl'yev, 1994). Kasyimov is still laughing. Grandpa was not pleased with that: - Stop the laugh now! They say you will cry a lot if be laughing that much! Fred! Laissez-le! Ne le touchez pas! Venez! (Bosquet, 1978). Fred! Leave him! Let him be! Take yourselves out of here! Est-ce vrai, monsieur Bonacieux? Répondez! (Boulanger, 1983). Is that true, Mr. Bonacieux? Answer!

3.3. Giving orders

Гордов аны сугып екты. Аннары якасыннан тартып торгызды. – Сөйлә, эттән туган нәрсә! (Gyl'yev, 1994). Gordov let him down hitting. And collared up after. – Answer, you bastard! Сез миннән нәмәкәй көтәсез? Нәмәкәй?! Көтегез! Мин сезгә бер нәрсә дә бирәчәк түгелмен! (Gulyaeva, 1997). What is that you are you waiting from me? What? Go ahead! I am giving you nothing! C'est moi! Je suis là! J'existe! Faites-moi de la place! (Bosquet, 1978). It is

me! I am over here! I am real! Give me some room! Ah! Résistez! -
s'écria Jussac (Boulanger, 1983). Ouch! Fight them back! – Jussac
cried out.

Thus, expressive macro-intensity is expressed by verbal
imperative sentences of the Tatar and French languages. The Tatar
imperative mood has a four-side paradigm based on the following class
features. The first feature is associated with the number of parties
taking part in conversation – whether there is one person speaking or
several. In its terms, бар and барсын forms are contrasted with
барыгыз and барсыннар. The second feature is associated with the
addressee – whether the partner in conversation actually takes part or
does not takes part in this conversation participation. In its terms, бар
and барыгыз forms are contrasted with барсын and барсыннар.

The French imperative mood has a three-side paradigm based
on the following class features. The first feature is associated with the
addressee – whether the partner in conversation actually takes part or
does not takes part in this conversation participation. In its terms,
regarde and regerdez forms are contrasted with regardons. The second
feature is associated with the number of parties taking part in
conversation – whether there is one person speaking or several. In its
terms, regarde form is contrasted with regardez. The regardons form
can be addressed to both one and several persons, including the
speaker himself. Hence, this form is not marked in relation to the
number of participants. The Tatar imperative mood allows using the
pronominal subject in sentences, while the French imperative

sentences are always subjectless. G.A. Ter-Avakyan writes on this issue that one-member sentences are represented in French language only by one major type – by sentences with an imperative verb (Ter-Avakyan, 1967).

> 2. In the situation of getting into an argument, the speaker gives out a personal opinion for the common one in order to take a foothold, as the latter opinion is difficult to argue with because of its universality and anonymity. This form of categoriality interacts with an expressive interpretive category of intensity ensuring the effect of globality (Matveeva, 1986). At this point, categorical expressive sentences in Tatar and French are based on a desire to protect one another from trouble, to bring to one's senses. The partner in conversation does not criticize while calling down. Non-judgmentalness is a very important condition for the success of slangy genres. Acceptance (empathy) is the most valuable side in open communication. Under the cloak of categoriality, there are open harts hiding. A friendly conversation gives way for evaluating the partner negatively.

3.4. Speaking Highly of Something

Аңа укытучы булырга! (Gyl'yev, 1994). He is going to be a teacher! Ничек кенә коткардык әле! Берсенә бер кагылырга өлгерә алмый калды аклар (Gyl'yev, 1994). What a rescue! No man even

moved. Que je suis contente! (Boulanger, 1983). I am so glad! Oh! quelle excellente femme tu es! - s'écria-t-il (Bosquet, 1978). Oh! Quite a woman you are! - he called out.

3.5.   Giving Advices

Нинди дөнья белгән кешеләр! Буыннан буынга бер hөнәрне электереп алганнар да, әйдә полный ход! Нәсел-нәселдән аптекчылар. Дөрес эшлиләр! Нигә дисәң, тыныч та, рәхәт тә, өстә фатир, аста аптек (Bayanov, 1993). What a life do prominents have! They learnt one field and now live in full swing! They have been drugstore owners from generation to generation. Rightly done I say! Ask me why and I tell yea I am feeling move safe and comfortable having my apartment above the drugstore. Сыер савучыларның куллары хирург кулыдай пөхтә, йомшак булырга тиеш, - ди. Дөрес әйтә! (Bayanov, 1993). Mink maids like surgeons must keep their hands clean and soft I say. That is right! Ah! Si nous pouvions être ainsi! (Bosquet, 1978). Hegh! Which we could act this way! Je tremblais. [...] Daniel m'avait dit souvent que c'était moi qui étais fou... Agir! Maintenant il fallait agir! (Boulanger, 1983). I was trembling. […] Daniel often remembered me how mad I was … Do something! Now I have to do something!

3.6. Saying Good-Bye

Кит аннан! Кит, кит, кит! Без андый паганый маллар белән сату итмибез (Bayanov, 1993). Get out of here! Screw! We do not sell such a shit. Ай, үзеңне харап итәсең. Атма, зинһар! Атма дим, Хәлил! Ташла жиргә аны! Ташла, зинһар, ташла! (Gyl'yev, 1994). Man, you will hurt yourself. Do not shoot, begging you! I said do not, Khalil! Threw it down! Come on, threw it! Emmenez cet imbécile, emmenez! (Bosquet, 1978). Take this idiot away, quickly! Tu es complètement fou! (Boulanger, 1983). Damn you are crazy!

3.7.   Talking Somebody into Doing Something

Ай! - дип каушап кычкырып җибәрде Кәрим. Ычкын, ычкын! (Gyl'yev, 1994). Wow! – Karim cried out in excitement. You better run! Ah, Мөнирә, Мөнирә, аз гына түзә алсаң!.. Тагы бер биш-ун минут кына шулай көтеп утырган булсаң, әтиеңне беренче каршылаган булыр идең син (Gyl'yev, 1994). Hegh, Munira, Munira, if you could only wait for a little longer! Five-ten minutes at least and you could net your daddy first. N'oubliez pas cette soirée, n'oubliez pas cette promesse! (Bosquet, 1978). Remember this night, remember the promise! Eh quoi! Je serai assez heureux pour lui être bon à quelque chose! Parlez vite! Parlez! (Boulanger, 1983). Well, then! I will be happy enough if he turns to be good at least at something! Try arguing me at this! Say it!

3.8. Giving a Warning

Кыланышы! Үләрсең! (Bayanov, 1993). What faces she makes! You will die if see! Ну, әгәр минем кулга тагын эләксәң ... (Gyl'yev, 1994). I will see you again and you going down… Bébé, si tu savais ce qu'il m'arrive! (Bosquet, 1978). Kiddo, if you know what is going on! Une haine intense brilla dans son regard bleu: - Je vais vous tuer, mon joli! Et si tu savais ce que ca va me faire plaisir! (Boulanger, 1983). Hate lit his eyes: - I will kill you, handsome! If you could only imagine what a delight it will be!

3.9. Blaming for Something

Штурман, ат, ат миңа тизрәк! Йә, нәрсә калтырыйсың? Ат!.. (Bayanov, 1993). Shturman, do the killing me part faster! Why so scared? Shoot!.. Тик кенә тор да мине тыңла! - диде ул, пышылдап кына, ләкин бик җитди итеп30. Keep quiet and listen! – he whispered patiently. Il avait rencontré un grand maitre qui lui avait donné cette-lecon: - La politique d'attente ne paie pas. Tu entends? se dit-il. La politique d'attente ne paie pas. Allons! Debout! Lève-toi, habille-toi et travaille! (Bosquet, 1978). He met a great teacher, who taught him a lesson: - The waiting policy does not pay. You following? - he reminded himself. The waiting policy does not pay. Come on, now! Get up! Get up, get dressed and work! Oh! marier ma fille et mourir!.. dit la malheureuse femme qui perdit la tête (Boulanger,

1983). Oh! Marry my doughter and die!.. the unhappy woman said losing her head.

3.10.   Saying No

Һай, нәгъләт, ташла тәмәкеңне, ташла! Ташла дим, нәгъләт, ташла! Һи, оятсыз! (Gyl'yev, 1994). Oh damn, drop the cigarette, drop it! I said to drop it, damn you, throw it away! Bastard! Бар, үзең дә, малаең да хәзер үк күземнән югалыгыз! Минем өйдә бүтән эзегез булмасын! (Bayanov, 1993). Go, you and your son just go in fade! Do not return step into my house anymore! M'assoir par terre devant elle! (Boulanger, 1983). Just hit the ground in front of her!

Thus, expressive verbal sentences are typical for and widely used both in Tatar and in French languages. In imperative sentences in Tatar, as well as in other sentences that we considered, various means of intensification are often side-by-side. The amplifying role of emotional content is taken by interjection, particle, imperative verb and a chain of one-member sentences.

4. Discussion

In this paragraph, we considered statements, which expressiveness is achieved through the amplification of categoriality. It

is revealed that categoricality in the semantic sense Categoriality was found to be vary by semantics: it can express confidence, assurance, resoluteness or opinionatedness. Categoriality is amplified depending on the emotional state of the speaker, on his/her desire to factor in the opinion and behavior of the partner, and on the communication goals and tasks. Many scientists have studied the linguistic units of different levels: lexical semantics of expressive sentences, infinitive and imperative sentences, and quasi-primitive sentences (Langlotz, 2006; Bellenger, 1993). Comparative study of expressive sentences, as well as the reproduction of these linguistic units in contemporary French and Tatar literature, allows assuming that there is a system of linguistic means – an expressive syntax – designed to express human emotions and feelings. In other words, modern linguistics is focused on semantics orientation. We believe that this article is indicative of this trend.

5. CONCLUSIONS

Thus, this research is a comparative-typological study of expressive sentences in Tatar and French. Practical relevance of the research is that its results are of practical importance for teaching Tatar and French languages. We compared the structural and semantic organization of expressive sentences in Tatar and French, and came to a conclusion that they are organized by certain means of expression, namely by: 1. substantive sentences in Tatar and French that are the most widespread. In substantive expressive sentences of the French

language, constant intensification is realized by a definite article, while in Tatar language – by a possessive affix. 2. In both languages, emotional state is expressed by adjective and adverbial sentences. Sentences with interjections and adverbs are adjective expressive sentences typical for both languages. 3. Verbal sentences are introduced in two languages in an uneven manner. Imperative and infinitive sentences are common for both of them. In the Tatar language, verbal sentences have a principal part expressed by a personal and impersonal form of the verb. Subjectless sentences are not typical for the French language. Even if there are any, they are always incomplete. The research revealed similar typological features indicating a certain similarity of the Tatar and French languages belonging to different language families. The differences were found mainly in the sentence structure, but when it comes to semantics, these sentences have many similarities, as people generally think in a common manner.

6. ACKNOWLEDGMENT

REFERENCES

ABDULLINA, L., GIZATULLINA, A., MIGAZOVA, R. 2015. **Lexical and semantic potential of emotionally expressive**

sentences in the Tatar and French languages. Journal of Language and Literature. Vol. 6 N° 2: 276-278. USA.

ALEXANDROVA, O. 1984. **Problem side of expressive syntax.** Vysshaya Shkola Publishing House. p. 211. Moscow. Russia.

ARUTYUNOVA, N. 1988. **Types of linguistic meanings. Evaluation. Event. Fact.** Moscow: Nauka Publishing House, p. 339. Russia.

BAYANOV, A. 1993. Expanded Earrings: Episodes. Tatar Book Publishing House. Vol. 2. Kazan. p. 463. Russia.

BELLENGER, L. 1993. **Que sais-je? Collection encyclopédique.** T. 1785: L'expression orale. p. 128. France.

BLOKH, M. 1987. **Universal and unique features in comparative study of languages. Comparative linguistics and teaching non-native language.** Nauka Publishing House. pp. 73-83. Moscow. Russia.

BOSQUET, A. 1978. **Une mère russe.** Bernard Grosset. p. 348. Paris. France.

BOULANGER, D. 1983. **Les jeux du tour de ville. Saint-Amand**: Gallimard. p. 314. Belgium.

Conservatism. Online Etymology Dictionary. http://www.etymonline.com/index.php?allowed_in_frame=0&search=conservatism&searchmode=none. USA.

ERMAKOVA, E. 2010. **Implicitness in the literary text** (psychological and fantastic prose fiction in Russian and English): abstract of Dlitt thesis. p. 46. Saratov. Russia.

GAK, V. 1981. **Theoretical Grammar of the French Language.** Syntax. Vysshaya Shkola Publishing House. p. 208. Moscow. Russia.

GALIEVA, A., & NAGUMANOVA, E. 2014. **An Integrated Analysis of Translations of Tatar Prose into Russian: The Methodology and General Principles.** Middle-East Journal of Scientific Research. Vol. 21 N° 1: 263-267. UAE.

GIZATULLINA, A. 2014. **Sincerity as a form of expressiveness: expressive sentences in Tatar and French: Philological**

Sciences. Issues of Theory and Practice. Tambov: Gramota Publishing House. Vol. 4 N° 2: 79-82. Russia.

GULYAEVA, T. 1997**. Syntactic expressive means in literary works by Hervé Bazin.** Issues of Applied Linguistics: Collection of seminar proceedings. Penza State Pedagogical University. pp. 47-50. Russia.

GYL'YEV, A. 1994. **Povestlar. Әсәрләр: in 4 Volumes.** Tatar Book Publishing House. Vol. 3. p. 567. Kazan. Russia.

HENRY, A. 1960. **Études de syntaxe expressive: Ancien français et français moderne. Presse universitaires de France**. pp. 176. Paris. France.

HENRY, A. 1977. **Études de syntaxe expressive: Ancien français et français moderne**. Ed. De l'université de Bruxelles. p. 244. Bruxelles. Belgium.

KARAZHAEV, Y., & DZHUSOEVA, K. 1987. **Pragmatic orientation of syntactic expression. Issues of expressive stylistics (in Russian).** Rostov-on-Don: Publishing House of the Southern Federal University. pp. 18-23. Rostov. Russia.

LAKOFF, G. 2006. **Conceptual Metaphor. Cognitive Linguistics: Basic Readings.** pp. 185-239. Berlin. Germany.

LANGLOTZ, A. 2006. **Idiomatic Creativity.** A Cognitive-linguistic model of idiom-representation and idiom-variation in English. Basel: University of Basel. p. 325. Switzerland.

MALINOVICH, Y. 1989. **Expression and meaning of the sentence. Issues of expressive syntax (in Russian).** Irkutsk University Publishing House. p. 214. Russia.

MATVEEVA, T. 1986. **Lexical expressiveness in the language: Textbook**. The Ural State University. p. 92. Russia.

OSIPOV, Y. 1970. **Emotional intensity as a linguistic term. Bulletin of the Moscow state pedagogical institute.** English Syntax 422. pp. 116-127. Russia.

SHAKHOVSKY, V. 2010. **Emotions: prelinguistics, linguistics, linguoculturology.** LIBROKOM Publishers. p. 128. Moscow. Russia.

SHIGAREVSKAYA, N. 1973. **Relationship between linguistic means of subjective modality expression (French language case study).** Theory and practice of linguistic description of colloquial speech. Bulletin of the Gorky Pedagogical Institute of Foreign Languages. Vol. 4. N° 55: 146-151. Russia.

SOFIYSKAYA, I. 1972. **Typology of infinitive sentences in modern French.** Modern French Syntax: collection of papers. Vol. 22. pp. 48-62. Russia.

TER-AVAKYAN, G. 1967. Structural-semantic types of sentences with less or more than two members in modern French: abstract of PhD thesis in Philology. p. 12. Moscow. Russia.

USHAKOVA, T.M. 1985. **Systemic organization of the French affective syntax.** Theory and history of Romanic languages: Interuniversity Collection, Issue 3. Publishing House of the Leningrad University. p. 159. Leningrad. Russia.

YUSUPOV, R. 1980. **Lexical and phraseological means of Russian and Tatar languages.** Tatar Book Publishing House. p. 255. Kazan. Russia.

ZAKIEV, M. 1971. **Modern Tatar literary language. Syntax.** Nauka Publishing House. p. 311. Moscow. Russia.