

Myroslava Fabian,
Doctor of Philology, Professor,
Professor of English Philology Department,
Uzhhorod National University
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3351-1275>
Uzhhorod, Ukraine

Anger emotion verbalization in English and Ukrainian ethnocultures

Вербалізація емоції гніву в англійській та українській етнокультурах

Summary. Contemporary linguistics is characterized by a thorough study of human emotions, which are inseparably connected with our everyday lives as well as our everyday activities. Anger belongs to one of the basic human emotions, and with the emergence of a new humanistic anthropocentric linguistic paradigm that pays more attention to the speaker and his/her psychology, linguists began to refer to the emotions in their works more often and started having a particular interest in them. Although lexical units remain the main means of anger verbalization, in both English and Ukrainian there are many other ways to express the emotion of anger. Each language has its own specific patterns of anger expression, developed due to the peculiarities of culture, etiquette and mentality of different ethnic groups. The present paper focuses on anger emotion verbalization by means of direct nomination, invectives, curses, exclamations, irony and sarcasm in both English and Ukrainian ethnocultures, depending on its components, types, causes and consequences, which differ, but also possess certain common characteristics in the languages under study. The main common feature of anger is that it is a strong, negative emotion, often having destructive consequences both for the one to whom it is directed, and for the one who feels it. It is natural for humans to express their emotions regardless of their nationality, age, sex, educational background, etc. However, the very forms of doing so, their meaning and direction have notable features and specificities in each individual culture. Representatives of different ethnicities do not always feel the same emotions in similar circumstances and situations, and as a result, emotional reactions and conditions that are natural to one nation may seem strange to the other one. This cultural peculiarity also affects communication.

Metaphors, idioms and phraseological units are often used in both English and Ukrainian to express various kinds of anger. The author dwells on all possible expressive means and stylistic devices to highlight their both role and function in anger emotion verbalization. The abovementioned language units are used in English and Ukrainian by their language bearers to pay regard to the external manifestations of internal experiences, to their assessment in terms of

nonverbal communication as well as observing norms and rules of behaviour in corresponding societies. At the physiological level, the central organ associated with feelings is the heart, which on the spiritual level corresponds to the human soul. Negative and positive emotions are represented metaphorically by their comparison with the animal world, everyday realities and, especially in Ukrainian culture, with religious and demonic images. In this respect, much attention is paid to the analysis of different ways of anger emotion verbalization in English and Ukrainian and, correspondingly, in English and Ukrainian ethnocultures.

Key words: *anger emotion, verbalization, English and Ukrainian, ethnoculture, anthropocentric paradigm, common and distinctive characteristics, comparison.*

Анотація. Сучасна лінгвістика характеризується посиленням дослідженням людських емоцій, що невід'ємно пов'язані з нашим повсякденним життям та діяльністю. Гнів належить до однієї з основних емоцій людини та з появою антропоцентричної мовної парадигми, яка приділяє значну увагу мовою та його/її психології, лінгвісти почали частіше звертатися до вивчення емоцій та виявляти більший інтерес до розробки цієї проблематики. Хоча лексичні одиниці залишаються головним способом вербалізації емоції гніву, в англійській та українській мовах існують і інші шляхи передачі емоції гніву. Кожна мова має свої особливі засоби відтворення гніву, що розвивалися в поєднанні з культурою, етикетом та менталітетом різних етнічних груп. Ця стаття торкається вербалізації емоції гніву за допомогою прямої номінації, лексики неофіційного стилю, іронії, сарказму тощо в англійській та українській лінгвокультурах, беручи до уваги її компоненти, типи, причини й наслідки, які в досліджуваних мовах відрізняються, але й мають спільні характеристики. Основна спільна риса гніву – це сильна негативна емоція, що часто призводить до деструктивних наслідків для того, на кого вона направлена, а також для того, хто її відчуває. Природним для людей виступає прояв емоції незалежно від їхньої національності, віку, статі, рівня освіченості тощо. Проте форми цього вираження, їхнє призначення та спрямування суттєво відрізняються та набувають специфічних рис у кожній окремо взятій культурі. Представники різних етносів не завжди однаково проявляють одні й ті ж емоції в подібних ситуаціях та обставинах, і як результат, реакції на емоції та умови, за яких вони відбуваються, для однієї нації можуть видатися зрозумілими, звичайними, тоді як для іншої – дивними, незрозумілими. Ця особливість культури впливає на процес спілкування.

Метафори, ідіоми та фразеологічні одиниці часто вживаються в англійській та українській мовах для прояву різних типів гніву. Автор розглядає усі можливі засоби їхнього вираження й стилістичні прийоми, щоб висвітлити їхню роль і функції для вербалізації емоції гніву. Указані мовні засоби вживаються в досліджуваних мовах їхніми носіями, щоб звернути увагу на зовнішні прояви внутрішнього досвіду, їхньої оцінки з точки зору комунікації, так само, як і отримання норм і правил поведінки у відповідних соціумах. На рівні фізіології, центральним органом, що поєднується з емоціями, виступає серце, котрому на духовному рівні відповідає душа людини. Негативні й позитивні емоції відображаються

метафорично в зіставленні з тваринним світом, реаліями сьогодення, а в українській культурі ще й з релігійними та демонічними образами. У цьому зв'язку, значна увага приділяється аналізу відмінних засобів вербалізації емоції гніву в англійській та українській мовах і, відповідно, англійській та українській етнокультурах.

Ключові слова: емоція гніву, вербалізація, англійська та українська, етнокультура, антропоцентрична парадигма, спільні та відмінні характеристики, зіставлення.

Introduction. World humanitarian science has accumulated a wealth of knowledge about the emotional world of humankind. There is no doubt that emotions are part of the structure of human consciousness and thinking, and that they are related to cognitive processes. Each emotion has its own characteristics, the catalogue of which forms the semiotics of human emotions. The latter are part of the natural development of the human race, and, for the most part, are universal and recognizable in all cultures.

Anger is considered to be one of the basic human emotions, and accordingly, a considerable number of research is devoted to the problem of verbal as well as non-verbal anger expression. However, in recent decades, not many scholars have studied the linguistic aspects of emotions in general, not to mention such an important emotional state as *anger*. Until recently, linguists paid attention only to the rational side of language, neglecting the fact that emotions influence our perception of the world, hence our verbal response to external stimuli. Some scholars recognize the existence of basic "core" emotions, others believe that every person constructs emotions from his/her life experience, thus emotion is a product of culture, socialization and learning.

The linguistic study of emotions emerged from a long-standing dispute between a group of linguists, namely Michel Bréal, Karl Bühler, Edward Sapir, Gustave Guillaume, Charles Bally, Jacobus van Ginneken and others. Scholars have disagreed on whether linguistics should focus on the emotional component of human verbal and non-verbal communication. Some of them (K. Bühler, E. Sapir, G. Guillaume) believed that cognitive function of language is the dominant one, for the most important and paramount task of any language is the exchange of relevant information between two speakers. Therefore, they excluded the study of the emotional component from language studies. Others (Ch. Bally, J. van Ginneken, M. Bréal) considered expression of emotions the main function of language.

Indeed, language is primarily used as a means of sharing relevant information and ideas, the rational processing of information and its subsequent use. However, all these processes cannot be realized without various kinds of feelings and emotions. Emotions, in one way or another, have

a huge impact on a person, and especially on his/her thinking, behaviour and verbal responses. Thus, emotion study cannot be a missing dimension of linguistics. This opinion was supported by Ch. Bally and D. Goleman.

Until the mid-seventies of the twentieth century, the problem of conceptualization, verbalization, and categorization of emotions was considered irrelevant. Its research had aroused more rejection than interest. Oxford University professor Jean Aitchison states that linguists are afraid of emotions and write almost nothing about them.

With the emergence of a new humanistic anthropocentric linguistic paradigm that paid more attention to the speaker and his/her psychology, linguists began to refer to the emotions in their works more often and started having a particular interest in such questions as: where did our emotions come from? Do they come from language, or from the speaker himself/herself? Do they exist in the form of concepts in the language itself, or are they concealed in the mind of the individual? Do they depend on the circumstances in which the act of communication takes place or on the situation?

Over the last few decades, more and more scholars have begun to attach considerable importance to the study of emotionality in language and speech. This change arises from the development of cognitive-communicative linguistics and anthropocentric approach to the analysis of linguistic phenomena.

Methodology/Methods. From the times of Ferdinand de Saussure and up to the present-day linguistics, in the analysis of vocabulary, the system-oriented approach was considered the most relevant, since language is a system with a certain structure, where all components are interconnected. In Merriam-Webster's Dictionary, a system is defined as a group of interacting or interrelated elements that act according to a set of rules to form a unified whole [11]. However, language is not an isolated system. To conduct a relevant and adequate research, one is to take into account extralinguistic factors, which influence the language. Any complex system contains elements with specific properties that are not characteristic of the system as a whole, but can be explained by culture, historical context or other aspects.

Moreover, lexical units cannot be analyzed without taking into account their relations with other lexical units, especially those which belong to the same group. Since the relations of the words partially influence and, in a way, determine the meaning of the word, semantic analysis aims to represent the meaning of each word not separately, but within the linguistic system, showing how the meanings of words in the language system are interconnected. Some of the most reliable methods that give the most valid results are componential and contrastive analyses. In componential

analysis the focus is directed at individual meanings of lexical units. The method presupposes analysis of the components of a word's meaning. Furthermore, it reveals the culturally important semantic features by which speakers of the language distinguish different words in one category. Contrastive analysis implies a detailed comparison of the structures of both related and non-related languages to reveal the features of sameness and difference in lexical units of two or more different languages. The main part of words denoting *anger* consists of emotional expressions. Emotional expressions (emotives) are “an effort by the speaker to offer an interpretation of something that is observable to no other actor” [5, p. 331]. If emotions are feelings caused by something, emotives are the expressions of the feelings through the use of language, specifically through constructions that explicitly describe emotional states or attitudes. To carry out the present research, the language material has been collected from different lexicographical sources [9–16], then thoroughly studied, analyzed and classified.

Results and Discussion. *Anger* is one of the most common and basic emotions. Yet, the feeling of anger has its peculiarities for every person and, most importantly, for every linguoculture. Various factors influence the development of certain patterns in expressing the emotion of *anger*, such as religion, climate conditions, geographical location, mentality and national character.

Undoubtedly, emotions are most dependent on individual perception. However, Anna Wierzbicka addresses the issue of the relationship between lexical units and cultural scripts [8]. In it, the author disagrees with the definition of an «anger scenario» proposed by M. Bemberg: «*Someone causes someone else to become angry*». She believes that such a characteristic of the emotional situation is based on the English cultural-specific term *angry*, which in other cultures may acquire other contextual colours, so it is not suitable for cross-cultural comparisons.

A. Wierzbicka believes that the «anger scenario» and the «sadness scenario» should be developed using the most neutral universal semantic primitives. Instead, she offers the following characteristic:

A. Someone did something bad to me

I felt something bad because of this

I wanted to do something to this person because of this

B. I did something (bad?) to someone else

this person felt something bad because of this

this person wanted to do something bad to me because of this

C. Something bad happened to me

I felt something bad because of this.

Ethnoculture contains the most significant results of the communicative experience of certain ethnicities and presents itself with a set

of material and spiritual values. As an important component of society existence, ethnoculture has a universal character, significantly influences social consciousness and the formation of social relations, and is reflected in speech [1, p. 296]. It is natural for humans to express their emotions regardless of their nationality, age, sex, educational background, etc. However, the very forms of doing so, their meaning and direction have notable features and specificity in each individual culture. Representatives of different ethnicities do not always feel the same emotions in similar circumstances and situations, and as a result, emotional reactions and conditions that are natural to one nation may seem strange to the other one. This cultural specificity also affects communication.

Although lexical units remain the main way of *anger* verbalization, in both English and Ukrainian there are many other ways of revealing it. Each language has its own specific patterns of *anger* expression, developed due to the peculiarities of culture, etiquette and mentality of different ethnic groups.

Metaphors are an essential part of human communication in any culture. A thorough study of anger metaphors has been carried out by Z. Kövecses, G. Lakoff and R. Gibbs. A summary of the conceptual metaphors associated with anger has been given by Z. Kövecses [3].

Idiomatic and phraseological units highlight the cause of *anger*, its intensity and duration, danger to others, etc.

The experience of human emotions is accompanied by physical changes, which are recorded in phraseological layer of vocabulary as a certain malfunction of the body parts, such as pause in work (*заціпеніти від обурення; be stupefied with rage*), performance impairment (*to see red; скрипіти зубами*) and abnormal functioning of organs or appearance (*почервоніти від люті; to explode with rage*).

Blood has a number of functions that are central to survival, including supplying oxygen to cells and tissues, providing essential nutrients to cells. This substance, a symbol of human life, is directly related to the changes in human behaviour and psychology, therefore it is often used to express various human emotions. Deviations from the norms of blood circulation reflect the peculiar manifestations of feelings (*кров застигає в жилах; to burst a blood vessel*).

The strength of the influence of unpleasant stimuli causes a certain duration of emotion, which is characterized by the corresponding external representation of emotion (*to burn with a low blue flame; відійти серцем*).

Metaphors, idioms and phraseological units are actively used in both English and Ukrainian to express various kinds of *anger*. Phraseological units, metaphors and idioms testify that for both English and Ukrainian

ethnicities it is common to pay regard to the external manifestations of internal experiences, to their assessment in terms of the functioning of organs or parts of the body [2, p. 130]. At the physiological level, the central organ associated with feelings is the heart, which on the spiritual level corresponds to the human soul. Negative and positive emotions are represented metaphorically by comparison with the animal world, everyday realities and, especially in Ukrainian culture, with religious and demonic images.

The «*anger is heat*» metaphor is based on the folk theory of its physiological effects, according to which increased body heat is its major effect. The folk theory also maintains that agitation is an important part of the insanity model. According to this view, people who are insane are unduly agitated – they go wild, start raving, flail their arms, foam at the mouth, etc. Correspondingly, these physiological effects can stand, metonymically, for insanity. One can indicate that someone is insane by describing him as foaming at the mouth, raving, going wild, etc.» [3, p. 20].

In English, it is common for responsibilities to be metaphorized as burdens. «There are two kinds of responsibilities involved in the folk model of anger that has emerged so far. The first is a responsibility to control one's anger. In cases of extreme anger, this may place a considerable burden on one's 'inner resources'. The second comes from the model of retributive justice that is built into our concept of anger; it is the responsibility to seek vengeance. What is particularly interesting is that these two responsibilities are in conflict in the case of angry retribution: If you take out your anger on someone, you are not meeting your responsibility to control your anger, and if you don't take out your anger on someone, you are not meeting your responsibility to provide retribution» [3, p. 27].

Our language material analysis has shown that there are general metaphors, idioms and phraseological units that apply to *anger* as well as to some other emotions, which are commonly used in comprehending and speaking about the emotion under study:

– *Anger is a hot fluid in a container, physical annoyance (to be filled with anger; to be full of ire; to contain anger; to burst a blood vessel; gathering exasperation; to be flooded with fury; to explode/blew up with rage; fury bubbles/boils up inside smb to blow off steam; to keep it in; to bottle one's anger up, to be trapped in a cage of anger; to put smb. in a cage of anger; to go too far in one's anger; to take up a position of antagonism; to stand in antagonism; to fly into a rage; to be in a state of anger; he's a pain in the neck; smth.)*. In Ukrainian, these are *кров закупає в жилах; сповнитись/переповнитись люттю; тримати в собі зло; важким духом дихати; вогнем дихати; вогнем плюватися; парадим*

з вух іде; набратися злості; луснути зі злості (з серця); надутись, як півтора нещастя; по парі пізнати, чим серце кипить; захлинатись/утопати від злоби; кипіти від люті; налитись/сповнитись люттю, впасти в гнів; впасти в ярість; зайти за межу; діяти/довести до краю; довести до сказу/люті; виводити з рівноваги; виводити з терпцю; зводити з розуму.

– *Anger is fire (to fuel anger; to stir up rage; anger fades; to spit fire; to get hot under the collar; to do a slow burn; to be burning with ire; to be lit with fury; fury burns inside smb.; more heat than light; to burn with a low blue flame; to kindle wrath; to be consumed with anger; to go red with rage; a heated argument; hothead/fire spitter).* In Ukrainian, *спалах гніву; погарячкувати; зробити щось згарячу; потрапити під гарячу руку; розпекти душу/серце; гнів спалахує; гнів вищує; пекучий/огненний гнів; погасити полум'я люті; спалахнути/зайнятися люттю; роздмухати (в комусь) лобу.*

– *Anger is insanity (to get mad; insane rage; to calm smb's irritation; to be apoplectic with fury; senseless rage; to not see straight; to have a con-
nption; to drive one up a wall; to be blind with rage; to see red; to purge
choler; to throw a tantrum; to get hysterical; to drive smb. crazy; fit to be
tied; to be foaming at the mouth; to go berserk; to go out of one's mind;
to go bonkers with anger).* In Ukrainian, angry person as well as his/her
deeds is described as *безтямний/божевільний/шалений/ гнів; сказитись/
обезуміти/оскаженити від люті; скреготати зубами; рвати й метати;
не тямити себе; бути не в собі; напад роздратування; аж піна з рота.*

– *Anger is an opponent in a struggle (to quell ire; to struggle with
anger; to surrender to smb's anger; to appease anger; to repress vexa-
tion; to be hit by fury; to brave smb's wrath; to flee from smb's wrath;
rage pierces smb.).* To overcome it, in Ukrainian we use *побороти
гнів; стримати/приборкати/подолати гнів; контролювати гнів,
пересилити злість; стримувати сказ.*

– *Anger is a dangerous animal, or angry person's behaviour resem-
bles the one of a dangerous animal (to bread resentment; to provoke
indignation; to howl with rage; to control anger; insatiable anger; like
a red flag to a bull; to get smb's hackles up; to unleash anger; to smooth
someone's ruffled feathers; all bark and no bite; to arouse anger; unre-
strained fury; to be torn by rage; to be like a bear with a sore head; to
be as mad as a hornet; to be out for blood; to jump down one's throat).*
Angry person's behaviour is revealed in Ukrainian by means of phrases *не
клади в рот руки, бо відкусить; ледве від сімох віддавкався; птичка
невеличка, та пазурі гострі; гадюка як не вкусить, то засичить;
злий як собака; колеться, як їжак; беззуба лють; скажена лють;
хижа лють; лють находить/нападає на когось).*

– *Anger is a burden (to bear resentment; to carry your anger around with you; to feel the weight of smb's displeasure; to be a chip in one's shoulder; to be free from outrage; to let anger out; to release anger; to get it off one's chest).* The corresponding meanings in Ukrainian are: *носити зло на серці/в душі/в умі; бути охопленим несамовитістю; гнів/зло лежить на серці/на душі).*

Some minor metaphors associated with *anger* include:

– *Anger as a natural force, a feature of everyday reality and divine force (to storm into the room; a tide of anger and retribution will spill out into the night; a storm is brewing; a wave of indignation spread throughout the empire; stop awakening the volcano from its dormant state).* In Ukrainian, *кидати/вергати/метати громами; метати блискавки; шквал/хвиля обурення, у сердитого і коліна гострі; серце з перцем, а душа з часником; показати, де раки зимують; злий як чорт/дідько; гнівити бога; праведний/божий гнів; Ірод лютий; з пекла родом; бісом дивитися; біситься).*

– An angry person as a (mal)functioning machine (*sparks went from her eyes; it really got him going; to fly off the handle; to blow a gasket; to bent out of shape*). It corresponds to *іскри з очей летять; з'їхати з катушок; труситись від (з) гніву; труситись/дрижати від (з) пересердя; вибухати гнівом/люттям* in Ukrainian.

According to the basic ethnocultural model of *anger*, injustice leads to it, and finally to revenge, which is a tool of *anger* prevention. *Anger* is aimed at getting revenge. Furthermore, warnings and threats are also considered to be expressions of *anger* in both English and Ukrainian (*If I get mad, watch out! Don't get me angry, or you'll be sorry. You are a dead man. I'll tell my mom on you! Don't look at me like that unless you want a thick ear. Ти пошкодуєш, що зв'язався зі мною. Я тобі зараз покажу, де раки зимують! Ну, начувайся! Ти в мене ще отримаєш!*).

Depending on who the *anger* is aimed at, it can be expressed with the use of obscene language, invective vocabulary, exclamations, euphemisms. The use of words and expressions implicating in their semantics the intention of the speaker to humiliate the addressee or a third party already contains a certain component of retribution. Invective is abusive, reproachful, or venomous language used to express blame or censure; a form of rude expression or discourse intended to offend or hurt. The most common invectives in English and Ukrainian ethnocultures are:

– Zoonyms (*pig, mother-hen, chicken-liver, filthy animal, bitch; свинота, півень обскубаний, худобина, скотина, пацюк, гадюка, заяча душа, свиняче рило, кнур*).

– Family related and demonic insults (*bastard, whoreson, son of a bitch, bantling; сучий син, байстрюк, дідько/чорт/біс лисий, потерча,*

чорт, гаспид, біс, антипко, антихрист, лізе поперед батька в пекло, трясця твоїй матері, іди до сраки).

– Sexual insults (*adulterer, whore, harlot, cuckold; гімнюк, засранець, гімно собаче*).

– Intellectual insults (*idiot, half-wit, moron, brainless; дурень, бовдур, недоумок, вар'ят, дурило, клепки немає*).

Exclamations in English and Ukrainian are most often used for expressing *anger* and irritation caused not by someone in particular, but by circumstances or destiny itself, for instance *gosh!* (euphemism for *God*) *Heaven! Heck!* (euphemism for *hell*) *Argh!*; *дідько, чорт, що за чорт, лишенько, якого біса, до дідька, чорт забирай*.

In English, subjunctive mood can serve for *anger* expression aimed both at a particular person or group of people, and at life, destiny as well as circumstances in general (*Curse be on him! Damn! God damn it! God curse him! May he die miserably!*).

Irony and sarcasm are one of the most characteristic features of both English and Ukrainian ethnoculture forms of *anger* expression. They enable the speaker to express it indirectly, since the direct expression of negative emotions is described as a sign of weakness, egoism, tactlessness, and ignorance. For irony, intonation is often more important than verbal representation of the thought. The ironic tone of voice is typically characterized by a strong intonation, slow tempo, and falling intonation. The expression of *anger* through curses is typical of Ukrainian culture, creating a stereotype of speech behaviour and reflecting the specific nature of national consciousness. The most common components of curses include:

– Wishes of untimely, prolonged, dishonourable or painful death (*щоб вас лиха година ще до вечора забрала; щоб ти в пекельному вогні конав; бодай би тебе вовки з'їли; щоб над тобою круки крякали; щоб ти зозулі не чув; щоб тебе земля з вогнем і димом проковтнула; щоб тебе земля по смерті із гробу викинула; щоб тебе домовина взяла; щоб тебе вперед п'ятами понесли; черви б тебе поїли; нехай тебе кров нагла залл'є; щоб над тобою сонце не сходило; щоб ти на Страшній Суд не встав*).

– Wishes of long life with various illnesses and misfortunes (*дай ти Боже вік, а здоров'я – ніт; довгого тобі життя і страшнішого від смерті; щоб на тебе хвороби та стогнати; хай тебе хиндя (лихоманка) потрясе; щоб тебе трясця вхопила; тисячу болячок тобі в печінку*).

– Wishes of physical destruction of the interlocutor (*щоб ти лопнув; щоб ти скис; спух би с як бубен; щоб тобі повикручувало*).

– Curses associated with gods, demons, spirits or forces of nature, associated in folk culture with divine or demonic punishment (*бодай*

тебе буря вивернула; щоб тебе блискавка запалила; щоб ти в росі втопився; щоб тебе громом убило, а вітром попіл розвіяло; щоб ти крізь сонце пройшов; Перун би тя трафив; щоб на тебе Див прийшов; чорти б тебе взяли).

– Wishes of bad luck, misery, misfortune (*щоб за тобою лиха доля зналась; щоб доброї не знали долі; гонило би тобою, як вітер лихом; хай поб'є тебе нагла година; щоб ти не знав ні вдень, ні вночі покою*).

– Wishes of poverty, bankruptcy, destruction or damage to the property (*щоб тобі ні кола, ні двора; бодай тобі пусто було; нужда би тя побила*).

Pseudo-curses (*щоб тобі руки лопатками назад повикручувало; щоб тобі голову назад потилицею вивернуло; щоб тебе кров не гріла*) and curses with the negative particle "не" (*щоб тебе чорти не взяли*) diminutive suffixes (*шлячок би тебе трафив; най на тебе годинонька лиха найде*) and words (*хай тебе холера ясна візьме; шляк би тебе ясний трафив*) are also common in the Ukrainian language. They enable the speaker to unload without causing damage to the interlocutor.

Another way to relieve emotional tension is to replace the second person with a third person pronoun. Thus, negative wishes are directed not at the interlocutor, but at the object, action or situation related to him/her (*кров би залила ту вашу правду*).

Conclusions. In our study, *anger* as one of the basic human emotions is revealed and verbalized by various means, such as direct nomination, invectives, curses, exclamations, irony and sarcasm in both Ukrainian and English ethnocultures, depending on its components, types, causes and consequences, which differ, but also possess certain common characteristics. The main common feature of *anger* is that it is a strong, negative emotion, often having destructive consequences both for the one to whom it is directed, and for the one who feels it. Yet, the prevailing ways of conveying the *anger* emotion in two languages are different.

In the English language, there are more lexical units for direct nomination of anger emotion. With the help of lexical units in the English language, one can express more elements of the semantic concept of anger, their types and subtypes, and characteristics. The element of retribution in the English notion of anger is much more important than in the Ukrainian one. Representatives of the English ethnoculture are much more inclined to express *anger* indirectly than the ones of the Ukrainian ethnoculture. One of the peculiarities of the English language is the usage of subjunctive mood for *anger* expression in the form of curses and wishes of bad luck, poor health or death. For the English ethnoculture, it is more common to direct *anger* at a particular person or group of people. The relatively free use of profanity is characteristic of the entire English-speaking world. Numerous facts indicate that the English, Irish, Australians, Americans

quite freely use swear words (*hell, bloody hell, bastard, shit, and even fuck* together with its derivatives – *fucker, fucking, fuck off, fuck about, fuck over, fuck-up*, etc.), in a friendly communication of equal interlocutors, often regardless of their educational level, social status, age or sex. In the English culture, the positive properties of *anger* such as the triumph of justice are manifested much more often than in the Ukrainian one.

In the vocabulary of the Ukrainian language there are less lexical means of *anger* manifestation. Different degrees of emotion intensity are often expressed by diminutive and augmentative suffixes (*роздратування – роздратуваннячко; гнів – гнівщице, гнівисько*). Derivatives with various affixes can also reflect different peculiarities and components of *anger*, such as completeness or incompleteness of an action, duration and motivation of feeling. It is more common for the Ukrainians to express *anger* in more direct ways, such as direct nomination, exclamations and invectives, curses. The Ukrainian ethnoculture is characterized by a higher degree of emotionality, which, especially in the case of *anger* emotion, is more or less openly expressed by all kinds of people. Thus, representatives of the Ukrainian ethnoculture are more sensitive to the usage of the profanities and invectives. The use of obscene language is still considered to be a manifestation of ignorance and bad manners, although under the influence of globalization, culture is developing rapidly, and this indicator is constantly changing. In addition, there are gender stereotypes, according to which women are much less likely to use profanities. The element of revenge is practically absent from official definitions of *anger*. However, it is still present in the cultural tradition of the Ukrainians. Often revenge is expected not from a wronged person, but from mystical, divine or demonic essences and spirits of nature. This is shown in one of the peculiarities of the Ukrainian *anger* expression called curses.

Anger emotion verbalization gives possibilities for getting acquainted with both means and functions of language units within the system and structure organization of English and Ukrainian as well as their practical application by the language and at the same time culture bearers.

The prospect for further study lies in the necessity to highlight how *anger* emotion may express itself in some other both related and unrelated languages as well as corresponding ethnocultures.

REFERENCES

1. Вечірко Р. М. Українська та зарубіжна культура: навч.-метод. посіб. / Р. М. Вечірко, О. М. Семашко та ін. К.: КНЕУ, 2003. 367 с.
2. Дюська А. Фразеологізми на позначення емоцій як засіб вираження українського менталітету/ *Наукові записки Вінницького державного педагогічного університету імені Михайла Коцюбинського*. Серія : Філологія (мовознавство). 2012. Вип. 16. С. 128–131.

3. Kövecses Z. *Metaphors of Anger, Pride, and Love: A Lexical Approach to the Structure of Concepts*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 1986. 147 p.
4. Lakoff G., Johnson M. *Metaphors we live by*. London: The University of Chicago Press, 2003. 276 p.
5. Reddy W.M. *Against Constructionism: The Historical Ethnography of Emotions*. *Current Anthropology*, 1997. P. 327–351.
6. Russell J. A., Fernández-Dols J. M., Wellenkamp J. S. *Everyday Conceptions of Emotion: An Introduction to the Psychology, Anthropology and Linguistics of Emotion*. Almagro: Springer Science & Business Media, 2013. 585 p.
7. Wierzbicka A. *Semantics, Culture and Cognition. Universal Human Concepts in Culture Specific Configurations*. N. Y.: Oxford University Press, 1992. 487 p.
8. Wierzbicka A. *A response to Michael Bamberg // The Language of Emotions. Conceptualization, Expression, and Theoretical Foundation*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 1997. P. 227–232.

LEXICOGRAPHICAL SOURCES

9. Cambridge Dictionary Online – [Електронний ресурс] – Режим доступу: <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/>
10. Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English Online – [Електронний ресурс] – Режим доступу: <https://www.ldoceonline.com/>
11. Merriam-Webster's Learner's Dictionary – [Електронний ресурс] – Режим доступу: <https://learnersdictionary.com/>
12. Oxford Dictionary Online – [Електронний ресурс] – Режим доступу: <http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/>
13. *Shakespeare's Insults: A Pragmatic Dictionary* / Nathalie Vienne-Guerrin. – London: Bloomsbury Publishing, 2016. 512 p.
14. *The Oxford Thesaurus: An A-Z Dictionary of Synonyms* / Laurence Urdang. – Oxford University Press 1991. 1042 p.
15. Академічний тлумачний словник української мови – [Електронний ресурс] – Режим доступу: <http://sum.in.ua/>
16. *Фразеологічний словник української мови* [уклад. В. М. Білоноженко]. К. : Наук, думка, 1993. 984 с.