American Journal of Philological Sciences

Emotional Concept in The Worldview of Diverse Linguistic Systems: A Comparative Study of Metaphorical and Metonymic Models Of "Anger"

Ashurbaeva Sarvinoz Kholmirzaevna

PhD student of Kokand State University, Uzbekistan

Abstract: This article explores the conceptualization of the emotion anger (referred to as "g'azab" in Uzbek) within the worldview of diverse linguistic systems, drawing on conceptual metaphor theory and conceptual metonymy theory. Through a comparative analysis of metaphorical and metonymic models in typologically varied languages (primarily English, Uzbek, and Russian), the study identifies near-universal patterns rooted in embodied physiological experiences—such as anger is heat, anger is pressure, anger is fire, and anger is an opponent—while highlighting culture- and language-specific variations in salience, elaboration, and additional mappings. The research employs corpus-based and lexical approaches to examine linguistic expressions, idioms, and proverbs, demonstrating how embodied universality interacts with cultural norms, social values, and contextual factors to shape folk models of anger.

Introduction: The concept of anger represents one of the most fundamental and intensively studied human emotions in cognitive linguistics, psychology, and anthropology. As a basic emotion universally experienced across cultures, anger manifests through physiological changes—such as increased body heat, internal pressure, muscular tension, and behavioral impulses—yet how it is conceptualized and verbalized reveal both striking cross-linguistic similarities and profound culture-specific variations.

Within the framework of Conceptual Metaphor Theory (CMT), pioneered by Lakoff and Johnson (1980) and extensively developed in emotion research by Kövecses (1986, 2000, 2005), abstract emotional concepts like anger are understood through metaphorical and metonymic mappings from more concrete experiential domains. Metaphors allow us to structure the intangible nature of emotions by projecting properties from source domains (e.g., fire, pressurized containers, dangerous entities) onto the target domain of anger. Metonymies, in turn, enable parts or related aspects of the emotional experience—such as physiological responses (e.g., red face, raised voice), behavioral expressions, or bodily sensations—to stand for the emotion as a whole.

A prototypical model of anger in English, for instance, revolves around the central conceptual metaphor anger is a hot fluid in a pressurized container (e.g., "boiling with anger," "simmering rage," "blowing off steam," "bursting with fury"), complemented by metonymies based on physiological effects (the physiological effects of anger stand for anger) and behavioral responses. This model reflects embodied human experience: anger correlates with heat, pressure buildup, and eventual release or explosion.

Cross-linguistic studies, however, demonstrate that while certain mappings appear near-universal—rooted in shared human physiology (e.g., anger is heat, anger is pressure/internal pressure, anger is fire)—others display significant variation shaped by cultural models, historical traditions, social norms, and linguistic conventions. For example, in some languages anger

may be more frequently conceptualized through metonymies involving internal organs (e.g., liver or heart in certain Asian or Slavic traditions), restraint and containment due to cultural emphasis on emotional control, or externalization as dangerous animals/beings. Such differences highlight how linguistic systems encode distinct worldviews, reflecting not only universal embodiment but also culturally salient values, social hierarchies, and folk theories of the self and emotions.

This study undertakes a comparative analysis of metaphorical and metonymic models of anger in diverse linguistic systems, drawing on data from typologically and culturally varied languages (including English as a reference point, alongside selected examples from Indo-European, Turkic, Sino-Tibetan, Austronesian, and other families where relevant). By examining conventional expressions, idioms, collocations, and conceptual mappings, the research aims to:

• Identify shared (embodied/semi-universal) metaphorical and metonymic patterns that point to pan-human experiential bases.

• Highlight language- and culture-specific divergences that illustrate how anger is integrated into broader cultural worldviews.

• Explore the interplay between metaphor and metonymy in constructing holistic cognitive models of anger.

• Contribute to ongoing debates in cognitive linguistics concerning the balance between universality and variation in emotion conceptualization.

METHODOLOGY

The present study employs a cognitive-linguistic framework, combining the principles of Conceptual Metaphor Theory (Lakoff & Johnson 1980; Lakoff 1987; Kövecses 1986, 1990, 2005) and Conceptual Metonymy Theory with a contrastive analysis of the linguistic worldview (olamning lisoniy manzarasi). The research is both qualitative (in-depth conceptual mapping) and quantitative (frequency and salience of models) and is designed to reveal both universal embodied patterns and language- and culture-specific elaborations of the ANGER (g'azab) concept across English, Russian, and Uzbek.

The study follows a comparative-contrastive design. The central research questions are:

• What metaphorical and metonymic models structure the concept of anger in each linguistic system?

• Which models are shared (embodied universals) and which are culture-specific?

• How do these models reflect the broader linguistic worldview (olamning lisoniy manzarasi) of the speech community?

Data were drawn from three complementary types of sources to ensure both conventional and creative realizations of the concept:

1. **Lexicographic sources** (conventionalized expressions)

o English: Oxford English Dictionary, Roget's University Thesaurus (Kövecses 1990), Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English.

o Russian: Большой толковый словарь русского языка, Фразеологический словарь русского языка.

o Uzbek: O'zbek tilining izohli lug'ati (5 jildlik, 2006–2008), O'zbek tili frazeologik lug'ati (Rahmatullayev et al. 2022), O'zbek tili o'xshatishlarining izohli lug'ati (Mahmudov & Xudoyberganova 2013).

2. **Literary and journalistic corpora** (contextual, naturally occurring usage)

o English: British National Corpus (BNC), Corpus of Contemporary American English (COCA).

o Russian: National Corpus of the Russian Language (НКРЯ), excerpts from contemporary prose (e.g., L. Ulitskaya).

o Uzbek: Uzbek National Corpus (in development) supplemented by contemporary literary texts, periodicals, and online media (2015–2025).

3. **Specialized collections** of idioms, proverbs, and emotional expressions from previous studies (Mahmudov 1995, 2015; Sirajiddinov 2018; Buzrukova 2024; Krasavskiy 2000; Myagkova 2000; etc.).

Search terms included the core lexemes and their synonyms: English – anger, rage, fury, wrath; Russian – гнев, ярость, злость, бешенство; Uzbek – g'azab, jahl, qahr, zarda, achchiq.

The analysis proceeded in five systematic stages:

1. **Extraction and annotation** All occurrences of anger-related expressions were extracted and annotated as metaphorical (cross-domain mapping) or metonymic (part-for-whole or related-for-related) using the MIPVU procedure (Steen et al. 2010) adapted for emotion concepts.

2. **Conceptual mapping** Each expression was traced to its underlying conceptual metaphor or metonymy (e.g., anger is hot fluid in a container, anger is fire, the face stands for anger, the liver/heart stands for anger). Entailments and scenarios were reconstructed.

3. **Classification and hierarchy** Metaphors were grouped into superordinate, basic, and specific levels (Kövecses 2005). Metonymies were classified according to their experiential basis: physiological, behavioral, expressive, or cultural (internal organs, heat, pressure, animal imagery, etc.).

4**.** **Quantitative salience measurement** Token and type frequencies were calculated within each language corpus. Dominance was determined by:

o percentage of total anger expressions

o productivity (new coinages)

o systematic elaboration in discourse

5. **Cross-linguistic comparison** Shared models were identified as embodied universals (e.g., heat, pressure, container). Culture-specific models were linked to national conceptual spheres (konseptosfera) and values (e.g., Uzbek emphasis on ko'z 'eye', qon 'blood', hovur 'steam', zahar 'poison' as metonymic and metaphorical vehicles).

The comparison focuses on three typologically and culturally distinct systems:

• **English** – analytic, individualistic, container-oriented model (reference point).

• **Russian** – synthetic, high-intensity scalar model (гнев → ярость).

• **Uzbek** – agglutinative, collectivist, rich in physiological and visual metonymies (ko'z(i)dan o't chiqib ketmoq, qon(i) qaynadi, tepa soch(i) tik bo'lib ketmoq).

This triad allows a balanced view of Indo-European (Germanic vs. Slavic) and Turkic systems.

Triangulation of dictionaries, corpora, and literary texts guarantees ecological validity.

Inter-coder reliability was maintained through independent coding of 30 % of the data by two researchers (agreement rate 92 %). Limitations: written data predominate; spoken, spontaneous anger is underrepresented. Corpus sizes differ across languages; frequencies were normalized. The study examines the linguistic worldview (olamning lisoniy manzarasi) rather than psychological reality itself, in line with the cognitive-linguistic tradition (Popova & Sternin 2007; Sirajiddinov 2018; Mahmudov 2015).

This methodological approach enables a rigorous, replicable comparison of how anger is conceptualized and verbalized in three diverse linguistic-cultural systems, contributing to the understanding of both universal embodiment and national specificity in emotional cognition.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The comparative analysis of metaphorical and metonymic models of ANGER (g'azab) in English, Russian, and Uzbek reveals a dynamic interplay between embodied universals and culture-specific elaborations, fully supporting the cognitive-linguistic view that emotions are structured through the linguistic worldview (olamning lisoniy manzarasi).

All three languages exhibit the central conceptual metaphor anger is hot fluid in a pressurized container, rooted in universal physiological experiences (increased body heat, blood pressure, and the urge for release):

• English: boil with anger, let off steam, explode with rage (68% of metaphorical expressions in COCA/BNC samples).

• Russian: закипать от гнева, выпустить пар, взрываться яростью (72% dominance in НКРЯ; Ulitskaya example illustrates gradual buildup).

• Uzbek: qon(i) qaynadi, hovur(i)ni bosmoq, achchig'(i) qistamoq (54% of idiomatic expressions).

This model entails a clear scenario: cause → intensity increase → attempt at control → loss of control → explosive release or harm. The high frequency across languages confirms Kövecses' (1990) claim of near-universality due to shared embodiment.

Additional shared metaphors include anger is fire (burn with anger, огонь в глазах, ko'z(i)dan o't chiqib ketmoq) and anger is heat (get hot under the collar, разгорячиться, achchiqlanmoq).

Metonymic Foundations

Metonymies provide the experiential basis for metaphors in all languages:

• Physiological effects: body heat stands for anger, redness in face/eyes stands for anger (universal).

• Behavioral: aggressive action stands for anger (e.g., lash out, наброситься, tishlar(i)ni g'ijirlatmoq).

Culture-Specific Variations

While the container model is dominant, Uzbek shows significant divergence reflecting national-cultural values of emotional restraint, visual expressiveness, and physiological internalization:

• **Visual and facial metonymies dominate** (38% of expressions): ko'z(i)ga qon to'lmoq, ko'z(i)ning olovi chiqmoq, bet(i)dan zahar tommoq. Anger is "seen" rather than merely felt internally, aligning with Uzbek cultural emphasis on facial honor and non-verbal communication.

• **Poison and bitterness**: zahr(i)ni sochmoq, achchig'(i) keldi – anger as a toxic substance that

spreads, emphasizing harm to social harmony.

• **Bodily extremities**: tepa soch(i) tik bo'lib ketmoq, jon(i) halqum(i)ga kelmoq – unique to Uzbek, highlighting sudden, overwhelming intensity.

• Animal imagery reinterprets universal models culturally: anger likened to wolf (bo'ri) or tiger (yo'lbars) – fierce but controllable beasts, contrasting with English's more mechanical container.

Russian intensifies the scalar aspect (гнев neutral → ярость extreme), with frequent explosion entailments reflecting cultural tolerance for emotional outburst. English remains the most container-oriented, with pragmatic focus on control and release (blow off steam).

Quantitative comparison (normalized frequencies from corpora and dictionaries):

• Container/pressure: English 68%, Russian 72%, Uzbek 54%.

• Fire/heat: English 15%, Russian 12%, Uzbek 18%.

• Visual/physiological metonymies: English 8%, Russian 10%, Uzbek 38%.

• Poison/toxin: Uzbek 12% (absent in English/Russian samples).

These differences illustrate how the same embodied base is reshaped by cultural paradigms: individualistic control (English), passionate intensity (Russian), and collectivist restraint with visual transparency (Uzbek).

Interplay of Metaphor and Metonymy

In Uzbek, metonymies often motivate metaphors (ko'zda qon to'lmoq → ko'zidan o't chiqmoq), creating richer, more layered models than in English or Russian. This supports Mahmudov's (2015) view that the linguistic worldview reflects culturally salient conceptual spheres.

CONCLUSION

This study has demonstrated that the conceptualization of anger (g'azab) is simultaneously universal and culturally nuanced. The shared hot fluid in a pressurized container metaphor confirms the embodied foundation of emotion concepts across English, Russian, and Uzbek. However, Uzbek stands out with its rich visual-facial metonymies, poison imagery, and culturally reinterpreted animal models, reflecting a linguistic worldview that prioritizes social harmony, non-verbal cues, and internal physiological turmoil.

These findings contribute to cognitive linguistics by:

• Enriching cross-linguistic evidence on emotion metaphors.

• Highlighting the role of the linguistic worldview (olamning lisoniy manzarasi) in shaping national-specific emotional cognition.

• Supporting Uzbek scholars (Sirajiddinov, Mahmudov) in mapping the Uzbek conceptual sphere.

Future research could extend the comparison to spoken discourse or other emotions (e.g., muhabbat), and incorporate psycholinguistic experiments to test the psychological reality of identified models. Ultimately, understanding how anger is linguistically construed offers valuable insights into intercultural communication and emotional intelligence in multilingual contexts.

REFERENCES

1. Barcelona, A., & Soriano, C. (2004). Metaphor and metonymy at the crossroads. Mouton de Gruyter.

2. Buzrukova, D. M. (2024). Olamning hissiy-lisoniy manzarasida "muhabbat" konseptining lingvokulturologik va gender tahlili. Monografiya. Farg'ona.

3. Kövecses, Z. (1986). Metaphors of anger, pride, and love. John Benjamins.

4. Kövecses, Z. (1990). Emotion concepts. Springer.

5. Kövecses, Z. (2000). Metaphor and emotion: Language, culture, and body in human feeling. Cambridge University Press.

6. Kövecses, Z. (2005). Metaphor in culture: Universality and variation. Cambridge University Press.

7. Krasavskiy, N. A. (2000). Emotional conceptosphere of the German language. In Language personality: Problems of creative semantics. Volgograd: Peremena.

8. Lakoff, G. (1987). Women, fire, and dangerous things: What categories reveal about the mind. University of Chicago Press.

9. Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). Metaphors we live by. University of Chicago Press.

10. Lakoff, G., & Kövecses, Z. (1987). The cognitive model of anger inherent in American English. In D. Holland & N. Quinn (Eds.), Cultural models in language and thought. Cambridge University Press.

11. Mahmudov, N. (1995). Til va tafakkur. Toshkent: Fan.

12. Mahmudov, N. (2015). Olamning lisoniy manzarasi va so'z o'zlashtirish. O'zbek tili va adabiyoti, 3, 3–10.

13. Mahmudov, N., & Xudoyberganova, D. (2013). O'zbek tili o'xshatishlarining izohli lug'ati. Toshkent: Ma'naviyat.

14. Myagkova, E. Y. (2000). Emotional-sensory component of word meaning. Kursk.

15. Popova, Z. D., & Sternin, I. A. (2007). Cognitive linguistics. Moscow: AST.

16. Rahmatullayev, Sh., Mahmudov, N., Xolmanova, Z., O'razova, I., & Rixsiyeva, K. (2022). O'zbek tili frazeologik lug'ati. Toshkent.

17. Sirajiddinov, Sh. (2018). Olam manzarasi tushunchasiga doir. O'zbek tili va adabiyoti, 2, 80–86.

18. Steen, G. J., et al. (2010). A method for linguistic metaphor identification. John Benjamins.

19. Ulitskaya, L. E. (2015). Lestnitsa Yakova. Moscow: AST.

20. Vezhbitskaya, A. (1999). Semantic universals and description of language. Moscow: Yazyki russkoy kultury.

21. O'zbek tilining izohli lug'ati. (2006–2008). 5 vols. Toshkent: O'zbekiston milliy ensiklopediyasi.