

## HPEPA 2019

### Humanistic Practice in Education in a Postmodern Age 2019

# THE REPRESENTATION OF VERBAL AGGRESSION IN TATAR LINGUISTIC CULTURE

Guzel Nabiullina (a)\*, Alfiya Yusupova (b), Rasim Khusnutdinov (c), Nuriya Khaliullina (d)  
\*Corresponding author

(a) Kazan Federal University, 18, Kremlevskaya st., Kazan, the Russian Federation, GuzelNab2@yandex.ru

(b) Kazan Federal University, ul. Kremlevskaya, 18, Kazan, the Russian Federation, alyusupova@yandex.ru

(c) Kazan Federal University, ul. Kremlevskaya, 18, Kazan, the Russian Federation, knikazan@gmail.ru

(d) Bashkir State Pedagogical University n. a. M. Akmulla, ul. Oktyabrskoj revoljucii, 3-a, Ufa, RB, the Russian Federation, nurkha@yandex.ru

### *Abstract*

Linguistic research devoted to the issues of communicative culture of Turkic peoples is very important in modern linguistics. The purpose of this article is to study the means of expressing verbal aggression in Tatar linguistic culture. The research material is lexical-semantic and paremiological units with the meaning of speech aggression. It is proposed to use descriptive and stylistic methods to solve the tasks of the research. The descriptive method is represented by such techniques as the continuous sampling method, processing, interpretation method, as well as lexical and semantic analysis. The lexical-semantic methods and features of the expression of speech aggression in the Tatar language are revealed. It has been established that in the corpus of lexemes a special place is occupied by the use of colloquial offensive vocabulary, metaphors, epithets expressing insult, humiliation, nonsense, threat and the aggressive emotional state of the individual. The evil-wishing (“kargysh”) is one of the idiomatic expressions of aggression directed against a person. The meaning of aggression is often accompanied by interjections, introductory words, particles. The analysis shows that in the Tatar linguistic culture aggression is presented as a form of verbal behavior, which is a negative emotional response of a linguistic personality. Excessive use of speech aggression in the colloquial and journalistic spheres of communication and the language of fiction negatively affects speech culture.

2357-1330 © 2020 Published by European Publisher.

**Keywords:** Linguistic culture, phraseological units, proverbs, speech behavior, speech aggression, Tatar language.



This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 Unported License, permitting all non-commercial use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

## 1. Introduction

Of particular interest are the studies of the speech influence and the rules and norms of human speech activity, since the problem of a speech etiquette in the communicative process is becoming more and more relevant in the context of socio-psychological tension, a change in value orientations in modern society (Nabiullina, Denmukhametova, & Mugtasimova, 2014; Yusupova, Nabiullina, & Galimova, 2018).

The spiritual and moral formation of a person largely depends on the space of verbal communication, which is currently oversaturated with negative information (Filippova, 2009). Unfortunately, aggressiveness has become an integral component of modern culture. Linguists note, that modern speech is characterized by increased aggressiveness, including the active use of appropriate strategies and tactics of speech behavior: threats, ignoring, discrediting, abuse, lying, labeling, insulting, etc. More often, speech aggression occurs in the colloquial and journalistic spheres of communication and gets its expression in the language of fiction.

## 2. Problem Statement

In its original sense, the term “aggression” from the Latin word “aggression” means "attack." In linguistics, there are different points of view according to the definition of the term “verbal aggression” and the variety of interpretations of this concept. The terms “verbal aggression”, “speech aggression”, “language violence”, “language demagogy”, “language manipulation” are used in different contexts and, often, their meanings are synonymous (Berkovits, 2001).

The problems of speech aggression in different directions and aspects are studied in the works of Russian and foreign linguists, psychologists, sociologists, lawyers. In linguistic science, speech aggression is considered as a method of speech exposure and relates to the field of communicative activity, communicative behavior. The theoretical basis for studying this problem is reflected in the works (Filippova, 2009; Glukhova, 2017; Kopylova, 2010; Koshkarova, 2009; Marzan, 2017; Mesropyan, 2013; Petrova & Ratsiburskaya, 2011; Shcherbinina, 2012; Prostakishina, 2014; Ufimtseva, 2010, and others). Theoretical studies on this issue show that in linguistic science, speech aggression is considered mainly as a psycholinguistic phenomenon. In defining the concept of verbal aggression, we choose the definition of Shcherbinina (2012), who characterizes verbal aggression as “offensive communication, verbal expression of negative emotion feelings and intend in an insulting gross form unacceptable in this speech situation” (p.27).

From the point of view of psychology, the very concept of aggression has different interpretations. Some people believe that aggression is an innate reaction, initially aimed at protecting the territory of the subject of aggression. Other scientists argue that it is not primarily biological, but more social origin: it expresses a desire for power in this society. It is also believed that “the verbal expression of aggression leads to temporary relief, resulting in a psychological balance and a weakening of readiness for a new aggressive act” (Fomin & Yakimova, 2012, p.197).

As a result of the analysis of theoretical literature, we came to the conclusion that one of the most important directions in the study of the problem of aggression is the study of the means of expressing verbal aggression in the communicative behavior and linguistic consciousness of people. Many linguists

(Filippova, 2009; Kopylova, 2010; Mayers, 1999; Mesropyan, 2013; Ufimtseva, 2010) consider speech aggression in terms of communicative behavior and associate it with its psychological state. Petrova and Ratsiburskaya (2011) think that speech aggression is “a harsh expression of a negative emotional and evaluative attitude towards someone, something that violates the idea of ethical and aesthetic norms, as well as a glut of text with verbalized negative information, causing a painful impression on the recipient” (Petrova & Ratsiburskaya, 2011, p. 24). In some works verbal aggression is considered from the point of view of pedagogical discourse (Shcherbinina 2012). There is also a number of works devoted to the expression of speech aggression in the media discourse, in political and artistic discourse (Glukhova, 2017; Koshkarova, 2009; Marzan, 2017; Petrova & Ratsiburskaya, 2011). We believe, that studying the features of the formation and manifestation of verbal aggression in Tatar linguistic culture will reveal speech strategies and linguistic means of expressing negative emotions of a linguistic personality. The relevance of the study is due to the fact that the study of the speech act of aggression of the Tatar people allows to rethink communicative culture in a modern context and to identify typical and specific characteristics of communicative behavior of the Tatar people.

### **3. Research Questions**

For analysis, we selected lexemes, phraseological units, epithets, metaphors, proverbs, sayings and cliched sayings with negative emotional coloring, that is, in which you can see verbal aggression and destructive behavior of a linguistic personality. To implement the research plan, a corpus of lexical and idiomatic units was compiled, the number of which exceeded 1000 units in the Tatar language. Various dictionaries of the Tatar language (a dictionary of proverbs and sayings, dictionaries with definitions and phraseological dictionaries), literary and journalistic texts served as material for the study, as well as our own observations of oral speech and written communication on the Tatar-speaking Internet. The information base for the study is the following sources: dictionary with definitions of the Tatar language of F. Ganiev (as cited in Tatar telenen anlatmaly suzlege, 2005), the Tatar-Russian phraseological dictionary of Safiullina (2001), the dictionary of Tatar proverbs and sayings of Isenbet (2010) and the written corpus of the Tatar language (Pis'mennyy korpus ..., 2010).

### **4. Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this article is to study the means of expressing speech aggression in Tatar linguistic culture.

The tasks therefore are:

- 1) to select and systematize lexical and idiomatic units showing speech aggression;
- 2) to study lexical and semantic ways of expressing verbal behavior of aggression;
- 3) to identify the peculiarities of speech behavior of aggression in the Tatar linguistic culture.

### **5. Research Methods**

The methodological basis of the study is the theoretical provisions and approaches to the study of the national specifics of speech behavior, ethnocultural features of speech communication, presented in the

works of leading foreign and Russian scientists. It is proposed to use a descriptive and stylistic method in order to solve the tasks. The descriptive method is represented by such techniques as the continuous sampling method, processing, interpretation method, as well as lexical and semantic analysis. The methods and approaches used in the work are determined by the complex nature of the study.

## 6. Findings

Speech aggression violates the etiquette of communicative norms and harmonious communication. Speech aggression negatively affects the verbal communication of people in different means of communication. It can be directed both at a direct insult to the interlocutor, and in relation to others. Some linguists determine that speech aggression can also be directed towards the formation of negative audience relations. In this regard, active and passive forms of direct and indirect aggressions are distinguished in the study of speech aggression. Consequently, with the help of verbal actions various negative relations are expressed: threat, insult, humiliation, reproaches and accusations, insulting and insulting jokes, negative wishes, disappointment, abuse, screaming, roaring, critical remarks.

We believe, that we can identify conceptualization and the cultural and national specifics of the aggressive behavior of a linguistic personality by studying the problem of verbal aggression in Tatar linguistic culture. In works on the study of the national identity of a person, it is established that the basis of the conflict behavior of the Tatars is the deep self-esteem of the people (Zamaletdinov, Karabulatova, Yarmakeev, & Ermakova, 2014). Saraeva (2010) says, that

Persons of the Tatar nationality have aggressiveness and its forms (physical aggression, indirect aggression, verbal aggression) have a close inverse relationship with such a quality as conscientiousness. A sense of responsibility, commitment and integrity, accuracy and thoroughness, compliance with the rules are qualities that reduce the aggressiveness of the Tatars. (p.167)

There is the Tatar wise folk saying: in a word you can hurt and kill a person. In Tatar paremias, speech aggression is revealed through communicative behaviors such as lies, gossip, quarrel and resentment: “*Ызгыш - дошманлыкның башы*” – “Quarrel is the beginning of hostility”. Tatar proverbs and sayings encourage not to get into quarrels, but to avoid them, condemn lies and gossip: “*Гафу үтенгәнче, ызгышмау яхшы*” – “It is better not to quarrel than to apologize later”; “*Ачулансаң да, соңгысын әйтмә*” – “Even if you are angry, do not say the last words”; “*Гайбәтченең теле - мең колач*” – “Gossip's tongue - thousands of kilometers”, etc. (Isenbet, 2010). Tatar proverbs and sayings claim, that in the Tatar linguistic culture, conflict, discord, quarrel, falsehood are negative categories of communicative behavior for both the speaker and the listener and always cause negative emotions and feelings.

The meaning of verbal attack, rude speech behavior, insult and threat in the Tatar linguistic consciousness is expressed by the following phraseological units: *ачы телләнү* – to say biting words, *бәхәскә керү* – to get into quarrel, *әлпән уыкты* – to scold, *авызыңны ябу* – to shup up, *каты бәрелү* – to respond rudely, *каты әйтү* – to warn strictly, *кара ягу* – to blacken the name, *конфликтка керү* – to conflict, *кырыс сөйләшү* – to talk rudely, *шәрран яру* – to express freely, *ду килү // ду кубу // ду кубару* – to make a fuss, *ду кубып кычкыру//шырыйлап кычкыру //шыр ярып кычкыру* – to scream at the top of

smb's lungs, *чәнчен алу, чәнчен сөйләү (әйтү), тешилән алу* – to scold, *пыр туздыру // буран туздыру // йонын очыру // тетмәсен* – to make a mess, to make it hot for smb, to give smb. hell, to give smb. a hard time.

The components of Tatar phraseological units with the meaning of an aggressive emotional state are often the following lexemes:

**ачу** – anger: *ачу алу* - to let out one's anger, *ачу кайтару* – to settle the score, *ачу белән//ачу итен//үч итен* – in revenge, *ачу катыш, ачу кабару, ачу кайнау, ачу килү, ачу чыгу, ачу кубу, ачу утында яну, ачу бәрән чыгу, ачу эчкә сыймау, ачудан кара коелу, ачудан йөзе кыйшаю, ачу чыгару, ачу китерү* – in anger, *ачу саклап йөрү, үч саклау* - to remember the evil;

**сүз** – a word: *яман сүз әйтү* - to say a bad word, *сүзгә килү* – to get into quarrel, *чәнчүле (чәнчекеле) сүз әйтү, зәһәр чәчү, зәһәрле сүз әйтү* – to scold;

**тавыш** - voice: *тавыш күтәрү* – to raise voice, *тавыш чыгару* – to make some noise, *тавыш зурга китү* - quarrel starts.

The most common means of verbal aggression directed at active impact on the recipient, are negative expressive-evaluative lexemes, i.e. lexical units with a clearly negative connotation (Glukhova, 2017). Rude vocabulary and phraseology shows a certain attitude - intellectual and emotional primitivism, malevolence, aggressiveness.

Verbs with destructive semantics are actively used to denote insult, humiliation, nonsense, threat and aggressive appeal. These are verbs with a common meaning of destructive action (*тешиләргә* – to bite, *сугарга* – to beat, etc.); verbs of destruction (*сугарга* – to slaughter, *үтерергә* – to kill); verbs of damage (*яраларга* - to hurt, *тырнарга* - to scratch, etc.). Among the verbs denoting aggressive speech behavior, the following can be distinguished: *кычкыру, кычкырышу* – to scream, *әрләшү, ызгышу, талашу* – to argue, *акыру* – to scream, *сүгү* – to swear, *каты бәрелү, тавышлану* – to row, *сатулашу* – to howl, *дулау* – to rage, *хур итү* – to shame, *куркыту* - to threaten, *янау* – to blackmail, etc.

Of particular interest is the use of colloquial insulting vocabulary, rude, colloquial expressions, including obscene words and elements with negative expressive coloring.

Injective use, i.e. insulting vocabulary causes negative emotions towards something or anyone: (*жүләр* - fool, stupid, *надан* – stupid, *азгын* - depraved, lustful, *ахмак, аңгыра* - stupid, *кабәхәт, бәдбәхәт, мәлгунь, хәшәрәт* – bastard, *убыр* - glutton, *аждаһа* - monster, *албасты* - the villain, *дивана* - goofy, *ерткыч* – beast, *хәерсез* – wretch.

For example, - *Телеңәт төерчыккыры, убыр, - диде дә, кырт борылып ихатага таба юнәлде (V. Иманов) – Bite your tongue, you're such glutton, - he said suddenly turning and headed towards the yard; Берча надан куып төшергәннәр иде, икенчесенә барып ябышты, мөгезле шайтан, сансыз, һайт, мәлгунь! (A.Gilzyaev) - They drove out of one of sleds, and he climbed into another one, such a bastard! 'Юньсез, ахмак! (A.Gilzyaev) - 'Stupid, fool!'; Жирбит икәнсең, абау (A.Gilzyaev) - 'Wow, how shameless are you' (Pis'mennyu korpus..., 2010).*

In the Tatar language there are words with special colloquial meanings from the Russian language. This includes jargon and vulgarisms, i.e. swearing. Apresyan (1997) notes, that “the introduction of jargon and colloquial words in the sphere of the generally significant public communication” (p. 34). For example, *дылда* - Lofty, *шушера* - scum, *рожа* - mug, *падла, подлец, подонок* – bastard, etc.

*Кулны пычратас ыкилми инде, жэллим мин сине, падла,— диде дэ китеп барды. (M.Mahdiev)-  
I do not want to get my hands dirty, I feel soory you, bastard;*

*Мин синең ише негодяйларны бик күп акылга утырткан. (T.Gyzzat) - I showed their places to  
bastards like you many times(Pis'mennyu korpus..., 2010).*

Based on these examples, we can claim that the use of rude colloquial vocabulary in speech has a clear intention to humiliate a person, to express an emotionally charged negative attitude towards someone. Swear words, jargons and generally stylistically reduced vocabulary are a very effective means of expressing the text, its appraisal, "intimization", and intensification of aggression.

The main means of expressing aggressive behavior in the Tatar linguistic consciousness is a metaphor. In the Tatar language idiom, the aggressive person himself is characterized by metaphors as *усал телле // әрем тел – wicked tongue, чәнечкеле телле, ачы телле // зәһәр телле – to be rude, каты сүзле – sharp tongue, ачу саклаучан// кинә тотучан // кара эчле //эче кара // күңеле кара - vindictive.*

Among the metaphorical expressions used in a figurative meaning, the active link is a zoomorphic metaphor with **эм** (dog) component. For example, *эт жән, эттән туган // эттән туган нәмәстә - scumbag, эт нәрсә - bullshit, этлек эшләү // этлек кылу // этлек итү - to play a dirty trick on, эт итү//эт итеп сүгү – to swear like a trooper, эттән алып эткә салу //эттән алып дуңгызга салу – to make it hot.*

Names of animals that are used as zoomorphic metaphors give a negative assessment to humans. For example, using names of animals *хайван - animal, дуңгыз - pig, елан - snake, төлке - fox, сарык - sheep, сыер - cow, аю - bear, бозау - calf, ишәк - donkey, тавык – hen*, etc. you can characterize different sides of a person: characteristics of appearance, temperament; character traits of a person; behavior; the social status of a person, and his place in society.

In the Tatar literary language and speech **epithets** expressing insult, humiliation of a person are widespread: *карт тәре, таи бәгырь, күзле бүкән, акылга таман, тәребаганасы - jackass, чукынганнәрсә, бәдбәхетнәрсә, юләрсә - bastard, күзең чыккан нәрсә – don't you have eyes, кулың черегән нәрсә – to have a dead arm, etc.* For example, *Менә халык алдында жавап бир, бәдбәхет нәрсә... (A. Alish) - Now answer the people, bastard; Тәк что, выжст итеп урыныннан очып төшәчәк азгын нәрсә! (A. Vergazov) - I showed their places to bastards like you many times (Pis'mennyu korpus..., 2010).*

A threat can be expressed using the interrogative pronouns *нәрсә - what, ниемә хәҗәт // нәстәгә – for what, why, нипычагыма – what the hell.* For example, *Нәрсә, күз төбеңдәге бер фонарь гына җитмәгәнмени?(A.Timergalin) – What, one black eye wasn't enough for you?; Нәстәгә миңа ир, нипычагыма? (N. Gumatdinova) - Why do I need a husband, what the hell; Башыма тай тупкән мәллә минем?! (N. Gumatdinova) - I'm not stupid to do this?!; Нигә ул хәтле шашасың соң? (A. Alish) - Why are you so crazy? (Pis'mennyu korpus..., 2010).*

Rude colloquial vocabulary can be used in a combination of auxiliary words that reinforce the meaning of aggression and create the effect of tension and irritation. The following units appear in the role of auxiliary words:

1) interjection: *абау - wow, ах, уф - oh, әстәгы – oh my God.* Например, *Абау, хәерсез, син мени әле бу? (A.Ahmetgalieva) - Oh, it's you, bastard; Ах, ерткычлар, ни эшләмәкче булалар соң?(A.Alish)‘*

*Ah, what are these bastards going to do?; — Әстәгы, каян алыым мин сиңа? (A.Ahmetgalieva) ‘ Oh my god, where should I get this?; Уф—уф...малай актыгы, урман җене Чытырмай, сиңа ничә мәртәбә әйтәргә була?! (A.Gadel) ‘Oh, you jerk, how many times should I repeat that to you?! (Pis'mennyu korpus..., 2010).*

2) introductory words *миңа димәгәе – what the hell, давай – come on, в конце концов// конца да концов //концедаконцов - finally, нүжәли // неужели – don't you see, really, панимаешь – you see, вообще – so, ызначит - well then, кәнишине – of course, etc.* also reinforce the meaning of aggression. For example, *Миңа димәгәе ник чукынышып бетмисез! (A.Gylazhev) – I don't care if you will disappear completely from the face of the world; Берсендә кызганмыйм, миңа димәгәе,чукынышып катсыннар (Vakyty matbugat) ‘I didn't regret for anything, you know I want them to disappear from the face of the world; Давай, давай, йә түлә, йә чыгытычкын! Кондуктор хатын, сиңең ишеләр белән шулай гына сөйләшеп була дигәндәй, башы белән ишеккә ымлады (A.Ahmetgalieva) - **Oh, come on, either pay or get out! The conductor pointed her head at the door, as if to say that's the only way to talk to people like you; Неужели аңламыйсың, аның белән бер өйдә тору миңа бик кыен (G. Apsalyatov) - Don't you see that living under the same roof with him is a burden to me?'; Нүжәли бердәгарьләнәбелмисеңсин? (A.Vergazov) - Do you really have no shame?; "Соңгысыбулсын, панимаеш, соңгысы (Vakyty matbugat) - Let it be the first and last time. (Pis'mennyu korpus..., 2010).***

The main means of expressing aggression, negative wishes in the Tatar language consciousness are idioms, i.e, mode of speech. The evil-wishing (“kargysh”) is one of the idiomatic expressions of aggression directed against a person. Examples of the curse genre, recorded orally and in writing, are widely known to the folklore of many ethnic groups. As a rule, similar paremias, based on belief in the magical power of a word, were used with a malicious purpose (Makhmutov, 2012). Such a life attitude of curses was reflected in the popular sayings: *Алкыш алган — аман, каргыш алган — тәмам - The one who received benevolence receives a long life, the one who received the curse - the end; Сөйгәнгә алкыш, сөймәгәнгә каргыш - Beloved receives happiness, unloved – curse, etc.*

In Tatar linguistic folklore, curses are a system of cliched sayings. Kh. Makhmutov, famous folklorist, claimed that pronouncing curses is harmful, the reason for pronouncing is offense (Makhmutov, 2012). Kryukova (2010) says that “the main purpose of such statements is to express negative attitudes towards a person by wishing him a curse” (p. 9-10). The main means of expressing a curse speech act are optative statements with the form of command and desirable moods.

For example, *башың беркере //чукынып киткере, җык сыккыры /җык кере, мур кыргыры//үләт кыргыры (яугыры) – to get lost, бирәне тыгылгыры/ бирәне ертылгыры, эче ертылгыры, нәләт суккыры (төшкере, яугыры), өне тыгылгыры - to split open, бугазы ертылгыры – to stuck in smb's throat, каһәр суккыры – cursed be, чәнчелеп киткере - drop dead, кулың коргыры – to have a dead arm, пычак кере//эчең пычак кере – a lusty heart, муены астына килгере // муены чыккыры – to break neck, шайтан алгыры//җен суккыры//җен алгыры – what the hell. As it can be seen from the examples, in these optative statements, the verbs formed with the help of archaic affixes – *гыры/-гере, -кыры\кере* express a curse, evil-wishing. Verbs can also be used in the form of the desirable mood of the 3rd person on –*сын/-сен*. For example, *күземә күренмәсен - no sight for smb's eyes, бугазына**

аркылы килсен // тамагына таш булып утырсын - *to stuck in smb's throat*, көн яктысы күрмәсен//дөнъя йөзе күрмәсен - *let smb not see the white light*, каберең якын булмасын - *God forbid to deal with him*, яшем төшсен - *let my tears pour out to you*, ләгънәт төшсен – *cursed be*, токымың корысын – *to wish smb's family disappearing*, хәерчелектән башың чыкмасын - *to wish smb to be poor*, чәчрәп китсен – *to get lost*, телең корысын – *to wish to have a dead tongue*, күзе чәчрәп чыксын - *let your eyes burst*. Verbs can be used in the form of the imperative mood of 2nd person: *Күземнән югал! Күземә күренәсе булма! Күземә күренәсе булма! – out if sight. Күрсәтәм мин сиңа күрмәгәнеңне! Бирдем кирәген! - to make things very unpleasant for smb; Эзең булмасын! Чукынып кит! Шайтаныма олак! – to get off, etc.* (Safiullina, 2001).

Examples of the speech act of the evil-wishing are found in the language of fiction: *Иаягыңкоргыры!намусымызнытаптадың (G.Tukai) – Get out of here! You dishonored us; Телегезгәтилчәтөшкәннәрсәләр! (G.Kamal) - Gossips; Телләрегезкоргыры! (G.Kamal) – I wish you to have a dead tongue; — Эсин,пычагымкергере,ниемәдипактыкөндөйдәутырасың?— диптиктомалданачуынаңакүчерде. (В. Имамов) - And you bastard, why are you sitting at home on such a sunny day? - For no reason, she directed her anger at him (Pis'mennyu korpus..., 2010).*

After analyzing the corpus of collected units, we can conclude that invective vocabulary, metaphors, epithets that express insult, humiliation, nonsense, threat and aggressive emotional state of the individual occupy a special place in Tatar linguistic culture. The lexical-semantic design of aggression is often accompanied by interrogative pronouns, interjections, introductory words and particles.

## 7. Conclusion

The analysis shows that in the Tatar linguistic culture aggression is presented as a form of speech behavior, which is a negative emotional response of a linguistic personality. The following lexical-semantic units are the means of expressing speech aggression: colloquial insulting vocabulary and elements with negative emotionally expressive coloring (*жүләр* - fool, stupid, *надан* – stupid, *азгын* - depraved, lustful, *ахмак*, *аңгыра* - stupid, etc.; vulgarisms, i.e. curse words from Russian language (*дылда* - lofty, *шушера* - scum, *рожа* - mug, *падла*, *подлец*, *подонок* – bastard, etc.); zoomorphic metaphor (*дуңгыз* – a pig, *елан* – a snake, *төлке* – a fox, *сарык* – a sheep, *сыер* – a cow, *аю* – a bear, *бозау* – a calf, etc.); (*күзле бүкән* – jackass; interrogative pronouns, interjections, particles, introductory words enhance the meaning of aggression (*миңа димәгәе, житмәсә, алай булгач*); optative speech expressions with evil-wishing component.

Thus, the verbal expressions of aggression reflect the national picture of the world, the stereotypes of linguistic personality thinking and personality traits of the Tatar people. The excessive use of speech aggression in the colloquial and journalistic spheres of communication and in the language of fiction negatively affects the speech culture of the linguistic personality.

## References

- Apresyan, R. G. (1997). Sila i nasilie slova [The strength and the violence of a word]. *Chelovek*, 5, 7-13.  
Berkovits, L. (2001). Agressiya: prichiny, posledstviya i kontrol' [Aggression: causes, consequences and control]. Spb.: Praym — EVGO — ZNAK: Neva; M.: OLMA — Press.



- Filippova, I. Yu. (2009). Verbal'naya agressiya i rechevoe nasilie v informatsionno-kommunikativnom protsesse [Verbal aggression and verbal violence in the communication process]. *Yazyk. Tekst. Diskurs*, 7, 153-158.
- Fomin, A. G., & Yakimova, N. S. (2012). Taktiki i markery verbal'noy agressii v kommunikativnom povedenii rossiyan i amerikantsev (po materialam rechesituativnogo issledovaniya) [Tactics and markers of verbal aggression in the communicative behavior of Russians and Americans (based on materials of a verbal case study)]. *Sibirskiy filologicheskij zhurnal*, 2, 197-207.
- Glukhova, I. V. (2017). Leksiko-semanticheskie sposoby vyrazheniya rechevoy agressii (na materiale angloyazychnykh pechatnykh SMI) [Lexical and semantic ways of expressing verbal aggression (based on the material of the English-language mass media)]. *Vestnik Chelyabinskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta. Filologicheskie nauki*, 110, 12(408), 62 – 70.
- Isenbet, N. (2010). Tatar khalyk mekal'lere: mekal'ler gyelmasy [Tatar folk proverbs]. Kazan: Tatar. kit. neshr.
- Kopylova, V. E. (2010). Rechevoe manipulirovanie i rechevaya agressiya [Verbal manipulation and verbal aggression]. *Linguistica Juvenis*, 12, 94-100.
- Koshkarova, N. N. (2009). Lingvisticheskie mekhanizmy rechevoy agressii v SMI [Linguistic mechanisms of verbal aggression in mass media]. *Vestnik Chelyabinskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta*, 10, 148.
- Kryukova, I. V. (2010). Yazykovye formy vyrazheniya "proklyatiya" v grammaticheskom aspekte [Grammatical aspects of the concept «curse»]. *V mire nauchnykh otkrytiy*, 4-7(10), 9-11.
- Makhmutov, Kh. Sh. (2012). Tatarskiy fol'klor: tayny drevnykh izrecheniy [Tatar folklore: secrets of ancient sayings]. *Filologicheskie nauki. Voprosy teorii i praktiki*, 7-2(18). 113-117.
- Marzan, M. A. (2017). Rechevaya agressiya v yazyke SMI [Verbal aggression in the language of mass media]. *Vestnik Voronezhskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta. Seriya: Filologiya. Zhurnalistika*, 2, 96-99.
- Mayers, D. (1999). Sotsial'naya psikhologiya [Social Psychology]. SPb.: Piterkom.
- Mesropyan, L. M. (2013). Rechevaya manipulyativnaya agressiya kak kontaminirovannyi vid rechevogo vozdeystviya [Verbal manipulative aggression as a contaminated form of linguistic persuasion]. *Gumanitarnye i sotsial'no-ekonomicheskie nauki*, 3(70), 63-67.
- Nabiullina, G. A., Denmukhametova, E. N., & Mugtasimova, G. R. (2014). The linguistic characteristics of Tatar Paroemiae [Linguistic characteristics of Tatar proverbs]. *Life Science Journal*, 11(5), 559-562.
- Petrova, N. E., & Ratsiburskaya, L. V. (2011). Yazyk sovremennykh SMI: sredstva rechevoy agressii [The language of modern mass media: forms of verbal aggression]. Moscow: Flinta; Nauka.
- Pis'mennyy korpus tatarskogo yazyka [Written Corpora of the Tatar language]. (2010). Retrieved from: <https://www.corpus.tatar>
- Safiullina, F. S. (2001). Tatarcha-ruscha frazeologiksuzlek [Tatar-Russian phraseological dictionary]. Kazan: Megarif.
- Saraeva, E. V. (2010). Osobennosti agressivnosti u predstaviteley razlichnykh natsional'nostey [Characteristics of aggression in various nationalities]. *Vestnik Vyatskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta*, 3-1, 165-168.
- Shcherbinina, Yu. V. (2012). Rechevaya agressiya. Territoriya vrazhdy [Verbal aggression. The territory of hostility]. Moskva.
- Tatar telenen anlatmaly suzlege [Tatar explanatory dictionary] (2005). Kazan: Matbugat yorti neshriyati.
- Ufimtseva, N. V. (2010). Problemy akkul'turatsii novykh grazhdan Rossii [The problems of acculturation of new citizens of Russia]. *Voprosy psikholingvistiki*, 12, 71-75.
- Yusupova, A. Sh., Nabiullina, G. A., & Galimova, G. N. (2018). Rechevye stereotipy v yazykovom etikete tatarskoy i turetskoy etnokul'tur [Speech stereotypes in the language etiquette of Tatar and Turkish ethnocultures]. *Vestnik Chuvashskogo gosudarstvennogo pedagogicheskogo universiteta im. I.Ya. Yakovleva*, 4(100), 328-336.
- Zamaletdinov, R. R., Karabulatova, I. S., Yarmakeev, I. E., & Ermakova, E. N. (2014). Linguo-propaedeutics of ethnic conflicts as a basis for stability in complex polyethnic regions. *AsianSocialScience*, 10(20), 164-173.