CONCEPT *HATRED* AND ITS VERBALIZATION IN THE UKRAINIAN AND ENGLISH LITERARY DISCOURSE

Oksana Rohach,
PhD in Philology,
Professor of Applied Linguistics Department
Lesya Ukrainka Volyn National University
Lutsk, Ukraine
oksanarog@vnu.edu.ua
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5304-0837

Olha Lipych,
Master of Applied Linguistics
Lesya Ukrainka Volyn National University
Lutsk, Ukraine
unicorn17ola@gmail.com

Abstract

This paper investigates the concept of HATRED and its verbalization in the Ukrainian and English literary discourses, focusing on the structural-semantic peculiarities and cultural-specific features of this emotional concept. HATRED, as a universal yet culturally shaped emotion, reflects deep societal and interpersonal conflicts that is why its study adopts a multidisciplinary approach, integrating methods from cognitive linguistics, comparative analysis, and corpus linguistics. It identifies and compares linguistic lexical and syntactic means (lexemes, idioms, metaphors, syntactic constructions), used to express HATRED in both Ukrainian and English texts. The obtained experimental data highlight differences in the associative meanings of HATRED, providing insights into how language encapsulates cultural values and emotional frameworks. In the English literary discourse, HATRED is more often linked to internal conflicts and moral dilemmas, focusing on psychological aspects and how HATRED shapes characters' values and worldview. It is frequently connected with other emotions such as love or fear, leading to complex internal struggles. HATRED in the English texts is often portrayed as a response to personal experiences, such as betrayal or loss, with characters reflecting on or rationalizing their feelings. In the Ukrainian literary discourse, HATRED is often portrayed as a reaction to personal or societal offenses, influenced by conflicts, war, or historical traumas. It is depicted as a destructive force, impacting characters' emotions and interactions, with the words associated with HATRED often evoking intense feelings

This research contributes to a deeper understanding of cross-cultural emotional language and offers important implications for translation studies, linguistic theory, and intercultural communication.

Key words: concept, hatred, emotions, verbalization, associative meanings, Ukrainian literary discourse, English literary discourse.

Introduction

The concept of HATRED belongs to the universal ones, so it has been studied by various scholars in many countries. Thus, N. Tatsenko (Tatsenko 2008), N. Shevchenko (Shevchenko 2020), O. Vorobyova (Vorobyova 2019), a well-known Ukrainian conceptologist, analyzed the appearance of conceptology in Ukraine and the problems of its evolution, O. Shevcheko (Shevchenko 2020) studied the relationship of this concept with related ones and its cognitive-linguistic status. In the international context, the concept of HATRED and its verbalization have been studied by such authors as A. Wierzbicka (Wierzbicka 1985), V. Evans (Evans 2009) whose conceptual metaphorical theory provided a new approach to understanding emotional concepts, and J. Lakoff, who studied metaphorical processes in the linguistic picture of the world. A significant contribution to the study of the cognitive approach to conceptual analysis was also made by Jerich, who emphasized the importance of discursive analysis in the study of emotional concepts.

The anthropocentric approach to the language study plays a pivotal role in deepening our understanding of how language influences our cognitive processes. By placing humans at the center of linguistic exploration, this approach provides valuable insights into how we store, process, and use the information through a language. It also sheds light on the profound ways in which a language shapes and molds our worldview. Through this perspective, researchers can uncover the intricate connections between linguistic practices and cognitive structures, revealing that a language is far more than just a tool for communication; it is a mechanism that actively contributes to the formation of our cognitive frameworks. Thus, understanding linguistic elements is intrinsically tied to our cognitive abilities, as language and cognition are deeply intertwined processes (GRAC).

A key notion that has emerged within this field of study is the term "concept" itself. This term has become a central focus across a variety of scientific disciplines, including cognitive science, linguistics, and philosophy. In these fields, the use of concepts enables scholars to unravel meanings conveyed through linguistic expressions, providing a foundation for understanding how humans interpret and categorize their experiences. Concepts play a critical role in shaping our perception of the world, serving as tools for classifying, organizing, and evaluating the vast amounts of information we encounter. Furthermore, the adaptability of concepts allows them to be applied within diverse scientific methodologies, underscoring their flexibility and importance in the interdisciplinary researches.

Research methods

In order to collect, analyze, compare and classify the obtained language data we applied the following linguistic methods for our analysis: descriptive, cognitive, conceptual, and comparative.

Concept and its distinctive features

Cognitive linguistics, as a branch of linguistics, delves deeply into the relationship between language and cognitive processes within the human brain. This field focuses on how individuals structure linguistic information and construct meaning through their use of language. The primary aim of cognitive linguistics is to explore the intricate interactions between language and thought, examining how these two facets of human experience influence one another. Language, in this context, is not merely a medium for communication but a fundamental tool for organizing thoughts and experiences, making it indispensable in the study of cognition (Tatsenko 2008).

Within cognitive linguistics, linguistic forms are seen as expressions of various underlying concepts. These concepts act as mental structures that shape how individuals perceive and interpret reality. Actually, they function as cognitive frameworks that guide our understanding of the world around us. By influencing the way we classify and evaluate information, concepts significantly impact both our thinking patterns and our communicative practices. The mental processes embodied within these concepts find their reflection in linguistic expressions, emphasizing an active role of a language in shaping conceptual structures.

Moreover, a concept in cognitive linguistics is considered to be the basic unit of meaning and understanding. These units do not exist in isolation, on the contrary, they interact with other concepts to form intricate networks of connections. This interconnectedness allows for the creation of complex cognitive and linguistic structures that reflect the dynamic nature of human thought and language. These networks enable individuals to navigate their environments effectively, facilitating both the interpretation of new experiences and the communication of ideas (Slovnyk synonimiv).

So, the anthropocentric approach to the language study underscores the vital role a language plays in shaping human cognition. By exploring the connections between linguistic practices and cognitive structures, this approach reveals that a language is both a reflection of and a contributor to our mental processes. Concepts, as fundamental units within cognitive linguistics, provide a bridge between linguistic expressions and cognitive frameworks, enabling a deeper understanding of how humans perceive, interpret, and communicate their experiences. This interplay between language, concepts, and cognition highlights the profound impact of language on human thought and the importance of studying it from an anthropocentric perspective.

According to V. Evans (Evans 2009), concepts can be understood as intricate structures composed of three primary components: sensory image, informational content, and interpretive field. These components work together to create a multi-faceted framework for understanding and interacting with the world around us. The "sensory image" originates from our perceptions, shaped through direct interaction with the physical world. These images, derived from sensory input, play a foundational role in how we construct a metaphorical understanding of reality, enabling abstract thought to be grounded in tangible experiences.

Cognitive classifiers are integral to the structuring of concepts. They bridge perceptual, informational, and interpretive elements, organizing them into coherent

frameworks. These classifiers vary between individuals, influenced by personal experiences, cultural background, and context. As a result, the perception and interpretation of concepts are highly individualistic, reflecting the dynamic interplay between external reality and internal cognition（Collins dictionary.

The internal structure of a concept is composed of two main zones: the core/nucleus and the periphery. The *core* contains the most essential and universally recognized associations related to the concept. These core elements are generally shared by most language users and form the stable, central aspect of the concept. On the other hand, the *periphery* consists of less significant and more subjective associations. These peripheral elements often vary widely among individuals and are influenced by specific contexts, cultural nuances, and personal experiences. This dual-layered structure ensures both stability and flexibility in how concepts are understood and used within a linguistic and cognitive framework.

Concepts are realized in human consciousness through various linguistic means, including lexical units, idioms, phrases, sentences, and even larger textual constructs. This diversity of expression reflects the flexibility and adaptability of concepts in different communicative contexts. Moreover, the dynamic nature of concepts allows them to change depending on the context, ensuring that they can be integrated seamlessly into broader conceptual spheres. This adaptability is essential for effectively navigating complex cognitive and linguistic landscapes.

A concept serves as more than just a repository of meaning; it encompasses the mental characteristics of events and experiences. It interacts closely with speech and thought, functioning as a bridge that helps individuals make sense of reality. Concepts, when organized into sets, form a person's "conceptual sphere", which represents their worldview and shapes how they interpret and engage with the world. Language plays a crucial role in expressing these concepts, providing a window into an individual's consciousness and conceptual domain (Majevska and Anisimova 2023).

In contemporary linguistics, there are two primary approaches to understanding the structure of a concept. The first approach focuses on the three components, outlined by V. Evans (Evans 2009): *sensory image, informational content,* and *interpretive field*. This perspective emphasizes the interplay between perception, knowledge, and interpretation, highlighting how these elements combine to form a cohesive conceptual framework.

The second approach involves the "field representation" of a concept. This method examines how the core and additional cognitive traits of a concept interact within a structural network. Field representation provides a more dynamic view of concepts, illustrating how core elements interact with peripheral layers to form a hierarchical structure. This representation allows for a nuanced understanding of how concepts evolve and overlap with other cognitive elements over time.

Concepts are frequently expressed and understood through "metaphors", which serve as cognitive tools for structuring and interpreting linguistic units. Metaphors enable individuals to relate abstract ideas to familiar experiences, making complex concepts more accessible. For instance, metaphorical expressions often draw on sensory images to convey abstract notions, linking tangible experiences with intangible ideas. This process highlights the interconnectedness of language, cognition, and perception in shaping our understanding of the world.

The structure of a concept is inherently "dynamic", evolving as new information and experiences reshape its core and peripheral elements. Concepts are not static entities; they continuously adapt, overlap, and interact with other cognitive and linguistic elements. This dynamic nature ensures that concepts remain relevant and applicable in diverse contexts, reflecting the ever-changing nature of human thought and communication.

Research suggests that concepts can be represented as hierarchical structures with multiple layers. At the core of this hierarchy there are the most fundamental and universally recognized elements of the concept. Surrounding the core there are peripheral layers that incorporate additional, context-specific traits. This multi-layered structure allows for the analysis of concepts at various levels, ranging from simple, concrete aspects to more abstract, complex dimensions (Nikonova 2008).

Models of conceptual structures offer valuable opportunities for exploring the interplay between linguistic forms and cognitive processes. By studying the structure of concepts, researchers can gain deeper insights into how language organizes human thought and how this organization is reflected in our perception of reality. Concepts serve as a bridge between language and cognition, revealing how linguistic expressions shape and are shaped by cognitive frameworks.

Furthermore, understanding the structure and dynamics of concepts can enhance our comprehension of cultural and individual differences in the language use. Since concepts are influenced by personal experiences, cultural backgrounds, and contextual factors, they provide a rich source of information about the diversity of human thought and communication. This makes the study of concepts an essential area of inquiry in cognitive linguistics and related fields.

Therefore, concepts are complex cognitive structures that play a central role in shaping our understanding of reality. Composed of sensory images, informational content, and interpretive fields, they provide a framework for organizing and interpreting experiences. The dual-layered structure of concepts, with its core and periphery, ensures both stability and flexibility, enabling concepts to adapt to changing contexts and integrate into broader conceptual spheres.

Through the use of metaphors and dynamic interactions within hierarchical structures, concepts facilitate the expression and communication of ideas. They act as a bridge between language and thought, reflecting the intricate relationship between linguistic forms and cognitive processes. By studying the structure and dynamics of concepts, linguists and cognitive scientists can uncover the fundamental mechanisms through which language shapes human cognition and perception. This research not only enhances our understanding of language and thought but also provides valuable insights into the diversity and complexity of human communication and worldview formation.

In academic circles, the study and classification of concepts remain challenging due to the absence of a universally accepted framework. This lack of consensus stems from the inherently complex and dynamic organization of concepts, which are characterized by diverse and fluid connections. Concepts do not adhere to a fixed hierarchy, and their interrelations can shift depending on context, perspective, or cultural framework. These complexities make it difficult to define, analyze, and classify concepts systematically. Consequently, this ambiguity can hinder the effectiveness of theoretical research and limit the practical application of findings, particularly in the social and humanitarian sciences (Wierzbicka 1985).

According to O. Shevchenko (Shevchenko 2020), a concept can be described as an abstract idea or mental symbol that serves as a cornerstone for understanding the world. Concepts are inherently multidimensional, existing across various contexts, which adds layers of complexity to their study and classification. Their structure and function are influenced by a variety of factors, including cultural, linguistic, and cognitive dimensions. The classification of concepts often depends on which aspects of their structure or functions are deemed most fundamental in a given analysis.

Principal approaches to the study of concepts and their classification

Modern cognitive linguistics and lingua conceptology have identified five principal approaches to the study of concepts. These frameworks offer distinct perspectives and methodologies, reflecting the multifaceted nature of concepts:

1. The Linguistic-Cognitive Approach.

This approach views concepts as intricate mental structures that encompass three primary aspects: figurative, conceptual, and value-based. Figurative aspects relate to sensory and perceptual imagery, conceptual aspects address the core abstract meaning, and value-based aspects reflect cultural or personal significance. By combining these dimensions, this approach provides a holistic view of how concepts function cognitively and linguistically.

2. The Linguistic-Cultural Approach.

Here, concepts are treated as fundamental units of culture that encapsulate the linguistic and cultural representations of a particular community. This approach highlights the role of language in transmitting cultural values and shared understandings, making it especially relevant in cross-cultural studies and intercultural communication.

3. The Logical Approach.

From a logical perspective, concepts are regarded as abstract categories that can exist independently of linguistic forms. This approach focuses on the universal and rational aspects of concepts, often employing formal logic to analyze their structure and relationships.

4. The Semantic-Cognitive Approach.

This method emphasizes the semantics of linguistic units that express concepts. By analyzing meanings embedded in words, phrases, and sentences, this approach seeks to uncover the cognitive processes underlying linguistic expressions of concepts.

5. The Philosophical-Semiotic Approach.

Concepts are examined as sign systems within this framework, with particular attention to their cognitive and semiotic foundations. This approach explores how concepts function as symbols, connecting mental representations to linguistic and cultural signs (Shevchenko 2021).

The classification of concepts has been a subject of extensive debate, and various scholars have proposed different frameworks. Among the most notable contributions is the work by A. Wierzbicka (Wierzbicka 1985), who introduced a two-tiered classification system:

1. Concept-Minimum.

This represents the basic level of understanding that is accessible to all language users. It includes the essential meanings and associations tied to a word, making it a fundamental building block for communication and comprehension.

2. Concept-Maximum.

This encompasses a more nuanced and comprehensive understanding of a concept, often extending into specialized or academic domains. It reflects deeper layers of meaning and associations, which may not be universally shared but are crucial for expert knowledge or cultural depth (Vocabulary.com).

O. Shevchenko further categorizes concepts based on several criteria:

1. By Content:

– scientific concepts that are rooted in formalized, evidence-based knowledge and reflect structured, systematic understandings of the world.

– everyday concepts that are derived from naive or intuitive perceptions, reflecting common sense or experiential knowledge.

2. By Mode of Expression:

– cognitive concepts that are abstract and often tied to rational thought processes.

– artistic concepts that are imaginative and creative, often expressed through literature, art, or other aesthetic mediums.

3. By Origin:

– primary concepts that arise from direct sensory experiences or fundamental cognitive processes.

– secondary concepts that are derived from abstract reasoning or complex cultural and linguistic developments.

4. By Representation in Language:

– lexical concepts that are expressed through individual words or terms.

– phraseological concepts that are represented through idiomatic expressions or set phrases.

– grammatical concepts that are embedded in the structural features of language, such as tense, aspect, or modality.

The classification of concepts is fraught with challenges due to their fluid and evolving nature. Concepts are not static; they adapt and transform as they interact with new cultural, social, and cognitive influences. This dynamism makes it difficult to establish rigid categories or hierarchies. Moreover, the contextual variability of concepts means that their meanings and associations can shift depending on the situation, the speaker, and the audience. These factors underscore the need for flexible and multidimensional approaches to conceptual analysis.

Another challenge lies in the interdisciplinary nature of concept studies. Concepts are analyzed in fields as diverse as philosophy, linguistics, cognitive science, and cultural studies, each bringing its own theoretical perspectives and methodological tools. While this diversity enriches the study of concepts, it also complicates efforts to create a unified framework.

Despite these challenges, the study and classification of concepts have significant practical implications. In linguistics and cognitive science, understanding concepts helps elucidate how a language structures thought and how individuals and communities organize their knowledge of the world. This understanding can inform

such fields as education, where conceptual clarity is essential for effective teaching and learning.

In the social sciences and humanities, concepts serve as analytical tools for exploring cultural, social, and historical phenomena. They provide a lens through which it is possible to examine the shared beliefs, values, and practices of a community, offering insights into the collective worldview. Furthermore, the ability to classify and analyze concepts has practical applications in artificial intelligence and computational linguistics, where the modeling of human cognition and language is essential for developing advanced systems.

The study of concepts is a cornerstone of modern linguistics and cognitive science, yet it remains a complex and evolving field. The lack of a universally accepted classification system reflects the multifaceted nature of concepts and the challenges inherent in their analysis. Approaches such as the linguistic-cognitive, linguistic-cultural, logical, semantic-cognitive, and philosophical-semiotic perspectives offer valuable insights into the structure and function of concepts, each highlighting different dimensions of this intricate phenomenon.

Classifications proposed by such scholars as A. Wierzbicka and O. Shevchenko provide useful frameworks for organizing concepts based on criteria such as content, mode of expression, origin, and linguistic representation. However, the fluidity and contextual variability of concepts call for adaptable and interdisciplinary methods of study.

Ultimately, the analysis of concepts is essential for understanding how humans perceive, interpret, and communicate their experiences. By shedding light on the interplay between language, cognition, and culture, concept studies contribute to a deeper understanding of human thought and the diverse ways in which it is expressed and shared. This makes the ongoing exploration of concepts a vital area of inquiry in the quest to understand the complexities of language and the human mind.

Concept of HATRED, its structure and meaning

Language not only reflects our perception of social reality but also actively shapes it, with emotional concepts such as HATRED having a profound impact on interpersonal and social relations. The analysis of linguistic tools through which these concepts become visible allows for a better understanding of the mechanisms of emotional influence and their role in speech practices. The first stage of our research involves studying the dictionary definitions of the word "*hatred*" in the authoritative Ukrainian dictionaries (Словник української мови, Горох – українські словники, Великий тлумачний словник) and English dictionaries (Cambridge Dictionary, Merriam-Webster, Dictionary.com, Collins Dictionary, Vocabulary.com). This will help identify the core semantic components that shape these concepts and determine which synonyms and antonyms are associated with them in both languages. This approach provides a deeper understanding of the emotional coloring and meanings carried by these concepts, as well as how this affects their usage in the spoken and written language. The analysis of the lexeme "hatred" in three different Ukrainian dictionaries revealed both common and unique

aspects of this concept. This shows that not all dictionaries contain the same semantic components, and each interprets the concept in its own way, emphasizing different aspects of its semantic structure. The semantic component "*почуття великої неприхильності, ворожості*" appears in such Ukrainian dictionaries as Словник синонімів Караванського and Горох – українські словники, emphasizing the general understanding of hatred as deep hostility. This indicates a widespread recognition of this characteristic of hatred in the Ukrainian language. The semantic component "*почуття ворожості, сильної злості*" also appears in both sources, emphasizing the association of hatred with anger and emotional intensity. The semantic component "*вороже ставлення*" appears only in the dictionary Великий тлумачний словник сучасної мови, which may suggest a broader approach to defining the concept HATRED. The semantic component "*нелюбов, ворожість, ворожнеча*" is found in the dictionary Словник української мови, adding a broader range of meanings to the concept of HATRED. This analysis shows the universality of HATRED, expressed through negative emotions, but also highlights the variety of interpretations depending on the dictionary. The analysis of synonyms for the word "hatred" reveals a wide range of semantic variations describing different aspects of this complex emotional state. Synonyms such as "*hostility*" and "*antagonism*" emphasize the aggressive and conflictual nature of HATRED. "*Dislike*" reflects a passive dimension of hatred, indicating a lack of affection but not necessarily aggression. "*Detestation*" describes the process of moving from a less intense negative attitude to deep hatred. Synonyms like "*antagonism*" and "*antipathy*" usually describe stable relationships of animosity. "*Unfriendliness*" and "*dislike*" may not be as intense, but still reflect negative attitudes. Metaphorical synonyms such as "*отрута*"(poison) and "*злість*" (anger) add an emotionally coloured dimension to hatred.

In the English dictionaries, the lexeme "*hatred*" is consistently associated with extreme revulsion. This feeling is portrayed as *intense antipathy* that demands a response. The Cambridge Dictionary supports all aspects of this meaning, emphasizing both emotional and behavioral responses to hatred. Merriam-Webster and Dictionary.com also emphasize strong dislike that requires action. Definitions in Collins Dictionary and Vocabulary.com are limited to strong emotional dissatisfaction. Synonyms for "hatred" include terms expressing deep antipathy and revulsion, such as "*abhorrence*" and "*loathing*". Words such as "*misogynist*" and "*misanthrope*" point to cultural manifestations of hatred, targeted at specific social groups.

Results and discussions

The analysis of the concept HATRED in the contemporary Ukrainian literary discourse reveals its multifaceted nature and emotional depth. Literary works, as reflections of cultural and personal experiences, provide valuable material for studying the linguistic expression of human emotions. For this study, we selected the HRAC corpus, focusing on contemporary Ukrainian literature. The use of the Concordance function allows for a detailed examination of the contexts in which the word "*hatred*" and its synonyms are used in literary texts. This method not only allows for the analysis

of the frequency of lexeme usage but also makes it possible to reveal the nuances of their usage in various contexts. This contributes to a deeper understanding of how literary language can shape an emotional perception of a text by a reader. In the Ukrainian literary discourse, *НЕНАВИСТЬ* (hatred) is often depicted as a complex emotional state that affects the inner world of characters and their relationships with the surrounding world. This concept can manifest through direct actions of characters, their reflections on social events, as well as their internal psychological states. One interesting aspect is the coexistence of hatred with love, which is often seen not simply as opposites, but as two emotions that complement each other. *Hatred* sometimes emerges in contexts of betrayal or disappointment, as in the phrase: "*Вони розрізають душу на дві частини – любов та ненависть*)". This shows the inner conflict caused by the struggle between the most powerful emotions: love and hatred. Sometimes, characters feel both love and hatred simultaneously, leading to complexity in their relationships, as in the phrase: "*Любов і ненависть до неї й самого себе сплелися в тугий густий клубок*". Such combination of emotions emphasizes how hatred can be both a destructive and motivating force in the characters' lives. Hatred can arise from disappointment or loss when characters feel betrayed or let down by unmet expectations. As in the example: "*Ненависть від того, що він не прагнув повернутися до мене*", where hatred is a response to betrayal. Hatred can also serve as a means of self-identification in social or political conflicts. For example, in the expression: "*Олексій це теж чудово розумів, тому його шпигуни вправно підбурювали простих козаків, хитро сіючи ненависть до старшини за невиплачене жалування*". This shows the use of hatred as a political tool for manipulation. Hatred is often depicted through the physiological reactions of characters, such as pain or high body temperature. For example: "*Іван безпристрасно вислухав ці факти, а Яків, пошарпаний і блідий після тортур, дивився на нього з невимовною ненавистю*" (HRAC).

Hatred can also cause a moral or ethical rift, which is reflected in the characters' behaviour. Characters, acting under the influence of hatred, often commit immoral or contradictory acts. For example, "*Але страшним був його погляд – погляд зацькованого звіра, в якому вигадливо змішалися дика ненависть, лють і страх перед невідомим майбутнім.*" In the Ukrainian literary discourse, hatred is often depicted as a destructive force, deeply rooted in personal conflicts. This emotion can motivate characters to act, but also manifests in a passive destruction or self-destruction.

An important feature of hatred is its impact on the interpersonal relationships, often leading to alienation and the destruction of empathy. For example, in the phrase: "*Він стільки часу був вороже налаштований, а цей згорток усе ще не боїться його, не почуває ненависті до того, хто чинив звірства, бо така його сутність.*" Hatred often becomes a triggering mechanism for revenge or retaliation. As in the phrase: "*І не відступить – якби ти тільки бачив, скільки у нього ненависті було в обличчі на раді в Корсуні, то зрозумів би, що його треба тільки вбити!*" Hatred can also be used as a social or political manipulation, as in the example: "*Олексій це теж чудово розумів, тому його шпигуни вправно підбурювали простих козаків, хитро сіючи ненависть до старшини за невиплачене жалування.*" In some cases, hatred serves as a metaphor for social struggles or historical traumas. For example, in the phrase: "*Шовінізм – ідеологія і політична практика, яка проявляється в ненависті до інших народів, намаганні їх асимілювати, "воз'єднати", приєднати, втручатися в їхнє національне життя, намагання нав'язати іншим народам власну релігію,*

церкву, мову і культуру." Hatred can be portrayed as a reaction to personal losses or betrayals. Considering hatred as an emotional state helps understand how it shapes personality and interpersonal relationships (HRAC).

The study of the concept of *hatred* in the English literary discourse is based on the analysis of texts from the British National Corpus (BNC). This source is significant because it contains over 100 million words of contemporary English and covers a wide range of genres, including literary works. The selection of literary texts allows for a deeper exploration of how literature uses emotionally coloured words to express feelings, ideas, and cultural contexts. In the English literary discourse, *hatred* is often portrayed as a powerful emotion that arises from personal grievances or as a reaction to social turmoil. *Hatred* can lead characters to various actions, from self-defense to aggression. *Hatred* in literature can be depicted as an emotion that almost physically overwhelms a person, as seen in the scene where the character "*glared at Sophie, her eyes filled with hatred as she was about to say more.*" Psychological portraits of hatred often include introspection and inner conflict, especially in the descriptions where hatred emerges as a result of long-standing grievances, as seen in the phrase: "*His lifelong ambitions thwarted again and again, driving him to drink and gambling and unreasoning rage.*" Hatred is often portrayed as a destructive force that affects not only personal relationships but also social structures, as in the case where the character uses hatred for manipulation: "*Her green eyes gleamed with hatred as she threw the Metro southwards.*" The coexistence of hatred with other emotions, such as love or fear, adds complexity to literary portrayals, as in the example: "*With a passion, she realized now as every defence she had ever had fell away from her, and she felt the hatred swing round to reveal the love, deep and very passionate indeed.*" Characters may use hatred as a mechanism for manipulation or self-defense, as seen in the fragment where the character acts aggressively due to the feeling of hatred: "*In a fury of hatred and jealousy he thrashed his stick about Kemp's head while Kemp himself tried to extricate himself from the twisted sheets, to get out of the bed, and to defend himself – but he didn't make it.*" Hatred, as depicted in literature, often grows through life circumstances, such as social inequalities, shaping the character's identity. This is seen in the description: "*By the time he was reunited with them – for good, if he so chose – he viewed his parents with an indifference that probably masked hatred.*" Hatred can also be portrayed as a response to deep personal betrayals: "*The other intelligence services also proliferated, and there were dark tales in the clubs and messes of rivalry and hatred.*" Hatred becomes a mirror of internal conflicts and moral dilemmas, as shown in the statement: "*This part of me is still quite strong, though of course I know there is no logical reason for race hatred.*" Hatred in literary discourse is often portrayed as a dominant motif influencing social interactions and historical events, as seen in the historical context: "*Yet there was also a genuine upsurge of religious feeling, of anger and hatred towards the infidels who had dared seize back the 'holy earth' so dearly bought with the blood of the First Crusade.*" Hatred can arise as a result of social or political grievances, often portrayed in the context of social injustice, as in the phrase: "*The climate had worsened significantly for the remaining Jews in Germany following the invasion of the Soviet Union, in a period of stepped-up hatred towards the 'Jewish-Bolshevik' arch-enemy and heightened tension, as Party activists agitated with renewed pressure for action in the 'Jewish Question'* (British National Corpus)."

The concordance function in the corpus studies allows for detailed analysis of the contexts in which the word "hatred" and its synonyms are used, enabling a deeper understanding of how hatred is formed in texts and influences the perception of readers. Hatred can provoke not only physical conflicts but also deep moral questions, forcing characters to reconsider their beliefs and values. This is evident in the example: "*And among a minority of the non-Jewish population, though a growing one which after 1933 came to occupy positions of power, dislike of Jews became vicious and violent hatred*." Hatred in literature can be depicted as an internal conflict that hinders a personal growth or stimulates cruelty, as seen in the situation: "*He began again to give some fight, so acquiescent, afraid till then; a new hot rage and hatred*." Hatred as a social reaction can be represented through historical or cultural conflicts, where it becomes a part of broader social issues, as in the example: "*But for many cities jealousy of Milan was as powerful as hatred of the emperor's control, and a rival faction formed under Pavia which was for a time loyal to Frederick – a map of the two teams shows in a fascinating way how difficult it was to love one's neighbour in this world of riotous freedom and traditional internecine feuds*." Hatred can be used as a form of social critique, highlighting injustice or systemic inequalities, as seen in the context: "*'When incitement to racial hatred was first criminalized in 1965, the legislation made it a requirement that an intention to incite racial hatred be proved*." Literary analysis of hatred portrays it as a complex emotion with many shades and dimensions, influencing the moral choices of characters, as seen in the example: "*'An incidental effect was that more subtle forms of propaganda began to appear, from which it was difficult for a jury to infer that the defendant intended to stir up racial hatred*" (British National Corpus).

In order to find out the associative meaning of the core lexemes of the concept HATRED in both languages we applied a method of an associative experiment. We conducted an experimental study with 50 students to explore the associative meanings of HATRED in the Ukrainian language. The study revealed a range of emotional responses linked to hatred, including *"злість", "агресія", "неприязнь", "гнів", "відраза",* and *"страх"*. *"Злість"* was the most common, followed by *"агресія"*, highlighting the connection between hatred and aggression. *"Гнів"* and *"відраза"* indicated deep emotional undercurrents, while *"страх"* and *"неприязнь"* suggested defensive reactions.

The findings show that HATRED can manifest both internally, as emotional turmoil, and externally, through actions. For example, *"страх"* may reflect concerns about the consequences of hatred. *Anger* and *rage* can drive aggression, while *disgust* and *dislike* signify a desire to distance from the object of hatred. Students also noted how *hatred* and *fear* are interconnected, reflecting the complexity of emotional responses to conflict.

We also conducted a study with 37 native English speakers, revealing similar associations with "*anger*", "*disgust*", and "*aggression*". *Fear* and *disgust* were common, indicating that hatred is perceived as a negative emotion linked to threat and repulsion. *Anger* and *aggression* reflect active responses, often leading to conflict, while resentment and dislike are passive reactions to unresolved conflicts.

The comparative analysis of English and Ukrainian responses showed common associations such as *anger* and *aggression* but also cultural differences. Ukrainians linked *hatred* more to personal relationships, while English speakers associated it with social and political contexts. These findings emphasize the

importance of cultural context in understanding emotions like hatred, which influences interpersonal dynamics and societal interactions.

A comparative analysis of the concepts of HATRED in the Ukrainian and English literary discourse reveals both similarities and differences in how this emotion is expressed across cultural contexts. In both cases, hatred is a powerful emotional state that affects relationships, behavior, and, consequently, a plot development. However, cultural and psychological factors lead to different expressions of hatred in each type of the literary discourse.

In the Ukrainian literary discourse, HATRED is often portrayed as a reaction to personal or societal offenses, influenced by conflicts, war, or historical traumas. It is depicted as a destructive force, impacting characters' emotions and interactions, with the words associated with HATRED often evoking intense feelings. For example, characters may be described as the ones that express hatred − "*випромінюють ненависть*" or are overwhelmed with hatred − "*переповнюються лютгю*", highlighting the emotional depth of this feeling.

In the English literary discourse, HATRED is more often linked to internal conflicts and moral dilemmas, focusing on psychological aspects and how HATRED shapes characters' values and worldview. It is frequently connected with other emotions such as love or fear, leading to complex internal struggles. HATRED in the English texts is often portrayed as a response to personal experiences, such as betrayal or loss, with characters reflecting on or rationalizing their feelings.

The key difference is that English literary discourse often portrays HATRED as an irrational emotion arising from internal conflicts or societal issues, driven by personal trauma. In contrast, Ukrainian literary discourse depicts HATRED as a response to collective social or historical events, where it becomes a tool for manipulation or power struggles.

While Ukrainian literary discourse shows HATRED more expressively through direct conflict or actions, English literary discourse portrays it more subtly through introspection and internal struggles. Both discourses emphasize hatred's destructive nature and its role in shaping personal and social dynamics. In both cases, HATRED is often intertwined with other emotions like fear, betrayal, and love, which further complicate character interactions.

Ultimately, HATRED in both Ukrainian and English literary discourses is shown as a powerful force that deeply impacts individuals and a society, but cultural contexts shape how it is expressed and understood.

Conclusions

The conducted research focused on the comprehensive analysis of the concept HATRED in both Ukrainian and English literary discourse, exploring its verbalization in these two linguistic systems. The study clarified the nature of concept and its structure, revealing the concept of HATRED as a cognitive and linguistic unit. Various theoretical approaches, such as conceptual method and semantic analysis, helped uncover the multi-dimensional nature of HATRED as it reflects both emotional and social experiences. The core of the concept includes

universal emotional traits, while its periphery includes culturally-specific elements, which are shaped by historical, social, and individual factors.

HATRED is often presented in the Ukrainian literary discourse as a response to personal or collective injustices, involving direct actions or reflections on social issues. It is expressed through strong imagery and emotional tension. In the English literary discourse, HATRED tends to be depicted as an internal, psychological conflict, focusing on personal dilemmas or betrayal, and is expressed through subtle psychological metaphors. This shows a more individualistic representation of HATRED in English, compared to the more collective and socially-oriented expression of the same emotion in Ukrainian.

The analysis of linguistic tools in both languages reveals similarities, such as the use of semantically strong terms for hostility and disgust, but also highlights cultural differences. English discourse often uses terms with religious or social connotations, while Ukrainian discourse emphasizes personal or social conflicts. The experimental study on the associative meanings of HATRED revealed that, while both cultures associate HATRED with intense negative emotions, Ukrainian respondents more frequently mentioned personal hostility and injustice, whereas English speakers linked it to social and political conflicts.

Overall, the comparison between Ukrainian and English literary discourses showed that, while HATRED shares some common emotional traits, its cultural interpretation and verbalization vary. The Ukrainian literary discourse emphasizes collective struggles, while English literature portrays individual psychological battles.

References

Velykyi tlumachnyi slovnyk suchasnoii movy. Slovnyk.me. URL: https://surl.li/kfgeqs

Horokh – Ukrainski slovyky. URL: https://surl.lu/bvlcca .

Vorobyova, Olha. 2019. Concept studies in Ukraine: gains, goals, and gaps. URL: http://Концептологія в Україні: здобутки, проблеми, прорахунки.

Генеральний регіонально анотований корпус української мови (ГРАК/GRAC) / М. Шведова, Р. фон Вальденфельс, С. Яригін, А. Рисін, В. Старко, Т. Ніколаєнко та ін. Київ, Львів, Єна, 2017–2025. URL: uacorpus.org.

Kocherhan, Mykhailo. 2003. *Zahalne movoznavstvo*. URL: https://litmisto.org.ua/?page_id=14989

Majevska, Kateryna, Anisimova, Alla, 2023. "Kontsept" u suchasnii linhvistytsi." *International scientific journal «Grail of Science»*, 34 : 236–237. DOI: https://doi.org/10.36074/grail-of-science.08.12.2023.52

Nikonova, Vira, 2008. *Kontseptualnyi prostir trahichnoho v pjesakh Shekspira: poetyko-kohnityvnyi analiz*. Kyiv : KNLU.

Slovnyk synonimiv Karavanskoho. Slovnyk. me. URL: https://surl.li/sipjqs.

Stavchuk, Natalia. *Kontsept jak bazove poniattia kohnityvnoii linhvistyky*. Mode of access: URL: https://surl.gd/uulsib.

Tatsenko, Natalia, 2008. "Kontsept" jak kliuchove poniattia kohnityvnoii linhvistyky." *Visnyk SumDU*, 1: 105–110.

Shevchenko, Olena, Shevchenko, Nataliia, 2020. "Metody doslidzhennia

kontseptiv." *Modem Science: Problems And Innovations*: Materialy V Mizhnarodnoii naukovo-praktychnoii conferentsii. Stokholm.

Shevchenko, Olena, 2021. "Poniattia kontseptu v suchasnii perekladoznavchii paradyhmi." *Naukovyi visnyk Mizhnarodnoho humanitarnoho universytetu*, 48: 128–131.

British National Corpus (BNC) search | Sketch Engine. Sketch Engine. URL: https://www.sketchengine.eu/british-national-corpus-bnc/.

Cambridge Dictionary | English Dictionary, Translations & Thesaurus. URL: https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/hatred#google_vignette.

Collins Dictionary. URL: https://surl.li/zasgei.

Evans, Vyvyan. 2009. *How Words Mean.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Merriam-Webster: America's Most Trusted Dictionary. URL: https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/hatred.

Vocabulary.com. URL: https://www.vocabulary.com/dictionary/hatred.

Wierzbicka, Anna. 1985. *Lexicography and Conceptual Analysis*. Ann Arbor: Karoma Publishers, Inc.