



IJTIMOYIY-GUMANITAR SOHADA ILMIY-INNOVATSION TADQIQOTLAR

ILMIY METODIK JURNALI

ISSN 3060-5059



VOL.3 № 5

2026

RUS VA INGLIZ DUNYOQARASHLARIDA “G‘AZAB” EMOTSIYASINING METAFORIK KONSEPTUALLASHTIRILISHI

Ashurbaeva Sarvinoz Kholmiraevna
Qo‘qon davlat universiteti, PhD talaba

Annotatsiya

Ushbu maqolada “g‘azab” emotsiyasining rus va ingliz tilidagi lingvistik dunyoqarashlarda metaforik konseptuallashtirilishi tahlil qilinadi. Tadqiqot kognitiv lingvistika, xususan, konseptual metafora nazariyasiga tayanib, g‘azabning har ikki tilda qanday metaforik modellar orqali ifodalanishini o‘rganadi. Tahlil natijalari g‘azab ko‘pincha issiqlik, olov, bosim va portlash kabi manba sohalari orqali tushuntirilishini, bu esa umumiy jismoniy tajribalar bilan bog‘liqligini ko‘rsatadi. Shu bilan birga, madaniy va tilga xos farqlar ham aniqlanadi: ingliz tilida g‘azab ko‘proq “idishdagi qizigan suyuqlik” sifatida talqin qilinib, nazorat va chiqarish jihatlari urg‘ulanadi, rus tilida esa ichki intensivlik va axloqiy baholash ustuvorlik qiladi. Tadqiqot metaforaning emotsional idrok va ifodani shakllantiruvchi kognitiv vosita ekanligini ko‘rsatadi hamda qiyosiy lingvistika, tarjimashunoslik va emotsional kognitsiya sohalariga hissa qo‘shadi.

Kalit so‘zlar: g‘azab, konseptual metafora, kognitiv lingvistika, rus tili, ingliz tili, dunyoqarash, emotsiya konseptuallashtirilishi, metaforik modellar, qiyosiy tahlil.

МЕТАФОРИЧЕСКАЯ КОНЦЕПТУАЛИЗАЦИЯ ЭМОЦИИ «ГНЕВ» В РУССКОЙ И АНГЛИЙСКОЙ КАРТИНАХ МИРА

Ашурбаева Сарвиноз Холмираевна
Кокандский государственный университет, PhD-студент

Аннотация

В статье рассматривается метафорическая концептуализация эмоции «гнев» в русской и английской языковых картинах мира. Исследование опирается на теорию концептуальной метафоры в рамках когнитивной лингвистики и анализирует метафорические модели репрезентации гнева в обоих языках. Результаты показывают, что гнев часто осмысливается через такие источниковые домены, как тепло, огонь, давление и взрыв, что отражает универсальный телесный опыт. Вместе с тем выявлены существенные культурные и языковые различия: в английском языке гнев нередко представлен как «нагретая жидкость в контейнере», акцентируя контроль и выпуск, тогда как в русском языке преобладают метафоры внутренней интенсивности и моральной оценки. Работа демонстрирует, что метафора выступает когнитивным инструментом формирования эмоционального восприятия и выражения.

Ключевые слова: гнев, концептуальная метафора, когнитивная лингвистика, русский язык, английский язык, картина мира, концептуализация эмоций, метафорические модели, межкультурный анализ.

METAPHORICAL CONCEPTUALIZATION OF THE EMOTION “ANGER” IN RUSSIAN AND ENGLISH WORLDVIEWS

Ashurbaeva Sarvinoz Kholmiraevna
Kokand State University, PhD Student

Abstract

This article explores the metaphorical conceptualization of the emotion “anger” within Russian and English linguistic worldviews. Drawing on the framework of cognitive linguistics, particularly conceptual metaphor theory, the study examines how anger is represented through metaphorical models in both languages. The analysis reveals that anger is commonly understood via source domains such as heat, fire, pressure, and explosion, reflecting universal embodied experiences. However, significant cultural and linguistic differences are also identified. In English, anger is frequently conceptualized as a heated fluid in a container, emphasizing control and release, whereas in Russian, metaphors often highlight internal intensity and moral evaluation. The comparative approach demonstrates how metaphor serves as a cognitive tool that shapes emotional perception and expression across cultures. The findings contribute to cross-cultural linguistics, translation studies, and the understanding of emotional cognition.

Keywords: anger, conceptual metaphor, cognitive linguistics, Russian language, English language, worldview, emotion conceptualization, metaphorical models, cross-cultural analysis.

Anger is one of the most intensively represented emotions in language, since it is connected with strong physiological reactions, social evaluation, and culturally regulated forms of expression. In cognitive linguistics, anger is usually viewed not only as a psychological state but also as a conceptual structure that is expressed through metaphorical models. Conceptual Metaphor Theory, developed by Lakoff and Johnson, explains that abstract emotional experiences are often understood through concrete bodily and physical domains such as heat, fire, pressure, explosion, and containment. Although anger metaphors have been studied in different languages, the comparative analysis of Russian and English still requires more systematic attention. Existing studies often emphasize universal metaphorical patterns, especially ANGER IS HEAT or ANGER IS FIRE, but they do not always clearly show how these models differ in Russian and English linguistic worldviews. In particular, the cultural contrast between internal emotional intensity in Russian and emotional control or release in English needs further clarification. The aim of this study is to analyze the metaphorical conceptualization of the emotion “anger” in Russian and English and to identify both universal and culture-specific metaphorical models. The research focuses on metaphorical expressions related to heat, fire, pressure, container, explosion, and animal imagery. Special attention is paid to how these models reflect different cultural attitudes toward emotional experience, control, and expression [1]. The relevance of the study lies in the fact that anger metaphors reveal the interaction between language, cognition, and culture. A contrastive analysis of Russian and English metaphorical models can contribute to cognitive linguistics, intercultural communication, and translation studies by showing how the same emotion may be conceptualized through similar bodily experience but interpreted differently within different linguistic cultures.

A key theoretical basis for this research is Conceptual Metaphor Theory, which explains abstract concepts through embodied experience [2]. According to this theory, anger is often conceptualized through metaphors such as ANGER IS FIRE, ANGER IS A DANGEROUS ANIMAL, and ANGER IS A PRESSURIZED CONTAINER, reflecting both physiological and cognitive processes [2, 3].

Previous studies show that while many metaphors of anger are universal, their linguistic realization differs across cultures [3]. In Russian, anger (“gnev”) is often associated with uncontrolled force and emotional intensity, as well as attempts at containment [3]. In English, however, anger is frequently conceptualized in terms of control, regulation, and external expression, reflecting different cultural attitudes toward emotional display [4].

These differences highlight the importance of contrastive linguistic analysis in understanding the interaction between universal cognitive mechanisms and culture-specific models [5]. For example, Russian metaphorical models often associate anger with the “heart” and “soul,” whereas English commonly links it to the “head” and “mind,” indicating different embodied representations of emotion [10].

Therefore, a comparative approach is essential for analyzing both shared and divergent features of anger metaphors in different languages [7]. This study applies type-based and token-based analysis methods to examine metaphorical patterns in Russian and English [3]. Data from dictionaries and linguistic corpora are used to identify conceptual structures and their cultural variations [3, 11].

Ultimately, this research contributes to understanding the relationship between language, culture, and cognition, showing how universal emotions are shaped by specific cultural frameworks [8, 9]. Such findings are significant for translation studies and intercultural communication [11].

LITERATURE REVIEW

A comprehensive review of existing literature on anger metaphors reveals diverse methodological approaches, including lexical, corpus-based, and psycholinguistic studies [12]. These approaches are used to examine cross-linguistic and cross-cultural variations in anger conceptualization.

Several studies based on Conceptual Metaphor Theory show that anger is commonly conceptualized as ANGER IS HEAT across languages [13]. This is expressed through metaphors such as ANGER IS FIRE and ANGER IS A HOT FLUID IN A CONTAINER [3, 13]. These patterns are observed in multiple linguistic contexts and are considered partly universal due to shared bodily experience [3].

However, methodological comparisons show differences between lexical and corpus-based results, especially in metaphor frequency and ranking [12]. This suggests that integrating multiple methods provides a more complete understanding of emotion metaphors.

Cross-cultural research shows that although ANGER IS A HOT SUBSTANCE is widely shared,

its interpretation differs across cultures [14]. For example, Hungarian uses pressurized substance metaphors, while Arabic and Chinese prefer fire or gas metaphors [15]. Similarly, Indonesian frequently uses heated fluid metaphors [16].

The metaphor *ANGER IS FIRE* extends the basic heat model and emphasizes destructiveness and intensity. Other source domains such as *INSANITY* and *OBJECT* are also used in emotional discourse, showing diversity beyond heat-based metaphors.

These findings indicate that metaphor analysis must go beyond lexical similarity to reveal deeper cognitive and cultural structures [8, 9]. Metaphors reflect shared cultural expectations about emotional experience [10].

Although anger as heat is considered quasi-universal, the degree of emotional control varies across languages [8, 10]. For example, Hindi and Tamil often describe anger as boiling or burning, while Chinese shows a lower frequency of such metaphors compared to English.

In Chinese, the concept of “nu” (anger) is closely linked to “qi,” a life-energy concept in traditional philosophy. This shows that emotional metaphors are influenced by cultural, philosophical, and physiological frameworks.

Overall, research demonstrates that anger metaphors are shaped by both universal embodied cognition and culture-specific conceptual systems [12].

METHODOLOGY

This study uses a comparative cognitive-linguistic approach to analyze the metaphorical conceptualization of the emotion “anger” in Russian and English. The research is based on Conceptual Metaphor Theory, according to which abstract emotions are understood through concrete physical and bodily experiences. The material for the analysis consists of anger-related metaphorical expressions taken from English and Russian dictionaries, phraseological sources, and examples used in previous studies on emotion metaphors. The selected expressions include such models as *ANGER IS HEAT*, *ANGER IS FIRE*, *ANGER IS PRESSURE*, *ANGER IS A CONTAINER*, *ANGER IS AN EXPLOSION*, and *ANGER IS AN ANIMAL*. The analysis was carried out in three stages. First, metaphorical expressions connected with anger were identified in both languages. Second, these expressions were classified according to their main conceptual models. Third, Russian and English examples were compared in order to determine their common and different features. The main attention was given not to statistical frequency, but to the semantic and cultural meaning of metaphorical expressions. Therefore, the study focuses on how anger is represented in each language and what cultural attitudes toward emotional control, intensity, and expression are reflected in these metaphors. This methodology makes it possible to reveal both universal embodied patterns and language-specific features of anger conceptualization in Russian and English. [8].

RESULTS. The analysis shows that the emotion “anger” is metaphorically conceptualized in both English and Russian through several common cognitive models. The most frequent and meaningful models are connected with heat, fire, pressure, containment, explosion, and animal imagery. These models demonstrate that anger is understood not only as an inner psychological state, but also as a physical and bodily experience. In both languages, one of the central models is *ANGER IS HEAT*. In English, this model is expressed through such phrases as to be boiling with anger, to get heated, hot temper. In Russian, similar meanings are found in expressions such as кипеть от гнева, кровь закипает, горячий характер. These examples show that anger is associated with increased temperature and inner emotional tension. The similarity between the two languages proves that the metaphor of heat is based on universal human bodily experience. Another important model is *ANGER IS FIRE*. In English, anger may be described through expressions such as flaming anger, burning with rage, his anger flared up. In Russian, similar metaphorical expressions include пылать гневом, вспыхнуть от злости, огонь гнева. In both languages, fire represents the destructive, intensive, and uncontrollable nature of anger. However, in Russian this model often sounds more emotionally dramatic and is closely connected with inner suffering and moral evaluation.

The model *ANGER IS PRESSURE* is also found in both linguistic systems. English uses expressions such as to be under pressure, to explode with anger, to let off steam. Russian examples include сдерживать гнев, взорваться от злости, накопившееся раздражение. These expressions show that anger is imagined as a force that grows inside a person and may be released suddenly. In English, this model is more often connected with the idea of emotional regulation and release, while in Russian it emphasizes the difficulty of controlling strong inner feelings.

The model *ANGER IS A CONTAINER* is especially clear in English. Phrases such as to bottle up anger, to be filled with anger, to vent anger represent anger as a substance inside the human body or mind.

Russian also has similar expressions, for example *держат гнев в себе, переполниться злостью, выплеснуть раздражение*. However, in English this model is more systematic and often connected with the idea that anger should be controlled, managed, or released in a socially acceptable way.

The model *ANGER IS AN EXPLOSION* is used in both languages to describe the sudden and uncontrolled expression of anger. English examples include *to blow up, an outburst of anger, to explode with rage*. Russian equivalents include *взорваться от гнева, вспышка злости, разразиться гневом*. This model shows anger as an emotional energy that can no longer be contained. The difference is that English often focuses on the moment of release, while Russian tends to emphasize the strength and emotional depth of the experience.

Animal imagery also plays a role in the metaphorical conceptualization of anger. In English, examples such as *wild rage, furious like a beast, to roar with anger* present anger as a loss of rational control. In Russian, expressions such as *разъярённый зверь, звериная ярость, рычать от злости* show a similar idea. However, this model appears more expressive in Russian, where anger is often associated with uncontrolled force and emotional intensity.

The comparative analysis reveals both similarities and differences. The main similarity is that English and Russian use the same basic source domains: heat, fire, pressure, container, explosion, and animal imagery. This confirms that anger metaphors are partly grounded in shared bodily experience. At the same time, the differences are connected with cultural interpretation. English metaphors more often emphasize control, regulation, and external release of anger, while Russian metaphors more strongly express inner intensity, emotional depth, and moral evaluation.

Thus, the results show that anger is conceptualized through universal metaphorical patterns in both languages, but each language develops these patterns in its own way. English tends to represent anger as an emotion that can be controlled and released, whereas Russian often presents anger as a deep internal force that affects the whole emotional and moral state of a person.

CONCLUSION. This study shows that the emotion “**anger**” is metaphorically conceptualized in both English and Russian through similar cognitive models, especially **heat, fire, pressure, container, explosion, and animal imagery**. These metaphorical models are based on common human bodily experience, because anger is usually accompanied by inner tension, increased temperature, pressure, and loss of emotional balance. At the same time, the analysis reveals important differences between the two languages. In English, anger is often represented as an emotion that can be controlled, managed, released, or reduced. This is clearly seen in expressions such as *to let off steam, to bottle up anger, and to vent anger*. In Russian, anger is more often associated with deep inner intensity, emotional force, moral evaluation, and loss of self-control, as reflected in expressions such as *кипеть от гнева, взорваться от злости, and звериная ярость*. Thus, the metaphorical representation of anger combines both universal and culture-specific features. Universal features are connected with shared physiological experience, while culture-specific features are reflected in the ways each language interprets emotional control, intensity, and expression. The English linguistic worldview tends to emphasize regulation and external expression of anger, whereas the Russian linguistic worldview gives more attention to internal emotional depth and moral-psychological experience. The findings of the study are significant for cognitive linguistics, contrastive linguistics, translation studies, and intercultural communication. They show that anger metaphors should not be translated only literally, because the same metaphorical model may carry different cultural and emotional meanings in different languages. Therefore, understanding metaphorical conceptualization helps to interpret emotional expressions more accurately and to avoid cultural misunderstanding in communication and translation.

REFERENCES

1. Lakoff G., Johnson M. *Metaphors We Live By*. — Chicago; London: University of Chicago Press, 1980. — 242 p.
2. Kövecses Z. *Metaphor and Emotion: Language, Culture, and Body in Human Feeling*. — Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000. — 223 p.
3. Kövecses Z. *Metaphors of Anger, Pride and Love: A Lexical Approach to the Structure of Concepts*. — Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 1986. — 147 p.
4. Lakoff G. *Women, Fire, and Dangerous Things: What Categories Reveal about the Mind*. — Chicago; London: University of Chicago Press, 1987. — 614 p.

5. Yu N. Metaphorical Expressions of Anger and Happiness in English and Chinese // *Metaphor and Symbolic Activity*. — 1995. — Vol. 10, № 2. — P. 59–92.
6. Kövecses Z., Szelid V., Nucz E., Blanco-Carrión O., Akkök E., Szabó R. Anger Metaphors across Languages: A Cognitive Linguistic Perspective // *Bilingual Figurative Language Processing* / ed. by R. Heredia, A. B. Cieślicka. — Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015. — P. 341–367.
7. Ogarkova A., Soriano C. Variation within Universals: The Metaphorical Profile Approach and Anger Concepts in English, Russian and Spanish // *Metaphor in Intercultural Communication* / ed. by A. Musolff, F. MacArthur, G. Pagani. — London: Continuum, 2014. — P. 93–116.
8. Ogarkova A., Soriano C. Emotion and the Body: A Corpus-Driven Investigation of Metaphorical Containers of Anger across Languages // *International Journal of Cognitive Linguistics*. — 2014. — Vol. 5, № 2. — P. 147–179.
9. Ogarkova A., Soriano C., Gladkova A. Methodological Triangulation in the Study of Emotion: The Case of “Anger” in Three Language Groups // *Review of Cognitive Linguistics*. — 2016. — Vol. 14, № 1. — P. 73–101.
10. Soriano C. Conceptual Metaphor Theory and the GRID Paradigm in the Study of Anger in English and Spanish // *Components of Emotional Meaning: A Sourcebook* / ed. by J. Fontaine, K. R. Scherer, C. Soriano. — Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013. — P. 410–424.
11. Soriano C., Fontaine J., Ogarkova A., Mejia C., Volkova Y., Ionova S., Shakhovskyy V. Semantic Types of Anger in Spanish and Russian // *Components of Emotional Meaning: A Sourcebook* / ed. by J. Fontaine, K. R. Scherer, C. Soriano. — Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013. — P. 339–352.
12. Stefanowitsch A. Words and Their Metaphors: A Corpus-Based Approach // *Corpus-Based Approaches to Metaphor and Metonymy* / ed. by A. Stefanowitsch, S. T. Gries. — Berlin; New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 2006. — P. 61–105.
13. Taylor J. R., Mbense T. G. Red Dogs and Rotten Mealies: How Zulus Talk about Anger // *Speaking of Emotions: Conceptualisation and Expression* / ed. by A. Athanasiadou, E. Tabakowska. — Berlin; New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 1998. — P. 191–226.
14. Ponsonnet M. *The Language of Emotions: The Case of Dalabon*. — Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2014.
15. Kövecses Z., Benczes R., Szelid V., Nucz E., Blanco-Carrión O., Akkök E. et al. Universality versus Variation in the Conceptualization of Emotions // *Russian Journal of Linguistics*. — 2024. — Vol. 28, № 1. — P. 55–79.
16. Ortony A., Clore G. L., Collins A. *The Cognitive Structure of Emotions*. — Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988. — 207 p.