

PAPER

CONCEPTUALIZING ANGER ACROSS LANGUAGES: A CORPUS-BASED COGNITIVE AND CULTURAL ANALYSIS OF ENGLISH, RUSSIAN, AND UZBEK

Umarova Nargiza Rustamovna^{1,*} and Ashurbayeva Sarvinoz Xolmirza²

¹Farg'ona davlat universiteti professori

²Qo'qon davlat universiteti

* sarvinozashurbaeva@gmail.com

Abstract

This study explores the metaphorical conceptualization of anger in English, Russian, and Uzbek within the framework of Cognitive Linguistics and Conceptual Metaphor Theory. By combining qualitative metaphor analysis with corpus-informed frequency data, the research identifies dominant conceptual metaphors and examines their cross-linguistic variation. Results show that anger is primarily structured through HEAT, PRESSURE, ANIMALITY, and CONFLICT domains. While these metaphors appear universally, their frequency and pragmatic distribution differ significantly across languages, reflecting culturally embedded cognitive patterns. The study contributes to metaphor theory by incorporating Uzbek as an underrepresented language and by strengthening the empirical basis of cross-linguistic cognitive research.

Key words: anger; conceptual metaphor; cognitive linguistics; corpus linguistics; cross-linguistic analysis; Uzbek language

Introduction

Emotions are central to human cognition and communication. Within modern linguistic theory, they are not merely expressed through language but structured by underlying conceptual systems. Among emotional categories, anger is one of the most fundamental and universally experienced.

According to George Lakoff and Mark Johnson, metaphor is not a linguistic ornament but a cognitive mechanism that shapes human thought (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980). Their work laid the foundation for Conceptual Metaphor Theory, which explains how abstract domains are structured via embodied experience. Despite extensive research on anger metaphors in English and Russian, Uzbek

Compiled on: April 15, 2026.

Copyright: ©2026 by the authors. Submitted to *Advances in Science and Humanities* for possible open access publication under the terms and conditions of the [Creative Commons Attribution \(CC BY\) 4.0 license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

remains underrepresented in global linguistic studies. This creates a gap in understanding whether metaphorical structures are truly universal or culturally specific. The present study addresses this gap by analyzing anger metaphors in English, Russian, and Uzbek using a corpus-informed cognitive approach.

Literature Review

Conceptual Metaphor Theory posits that abstract emotions are understood via concrete bodily experiences. One of the most cited metaphors is ANGER IS HEAT.

Lakoff (1987) states:

“Anger is conceptualized as a hot fluid in a container.”

Zoltán Kövecses argues that while metaphorical structures are largely universal due to shared physiology, their linguistic realizations vary across cultures (Kövecses, 2000). Similarly, Anna Wierzbicka emphasizes the role of cultural scripts in shaping emotional expression. However, previous studies have limitations:

- lack of Uzbek data
 - insufficient corpus-based evidence
 - weak integration of quantitative and qualitative methods
- This study fills these gaps.

Methodology

Data Sources

English: COCA (Corpus of Contemporary American English)

Russian: Russian National Corpus

Uzbek: literary texts, media discourse, spoken samples

A mixed-method approach was used:

1. Metaphor Identification Procedure (MIP)
2. Conceptual categorization
3. Frequency-based comparison

Analytical Framework: Four metaphorical domains were identified:

HEAT

PRESSURE

ANIMALITY

CONFLICT

Results

Quantitative Distribution

Table 1. Frequency Distribution of Anger Metaphors

| <u>Metaphorical Model</u> | <u>English</u> | <u>Russian</u> | <u>Uzbek</u> | <u>Total</u> | <u>%</u> |
|---------------------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|
| HEAT | 145 | 132 | 98 | 375 | 37% |
| PRESSURE | 110 | 95 | 120 | 325 | 32% |
| ANIMALITY | 65 | 88 | 54 | 207 | 20% |
| CONFLICT | 72 | 69 | 60 | 201 | 19% |
| <u>Total</u> | <u>392</u> | <u>384</u> | <u>332</u> | <u>1108</u> | <u>100%</u> |

The HEAT metaphor is the most dominant across all languages (37%), confirming its universality. PRESSURE ranks second, with Uzbek showing the highest frequency, indicating emotional suppression tendencies.

ANIMALITY is more frequent in Russian, reflecting expressive intensity, while CONFLICT is evenly distributed across languages.

Qualitative Analysis

HEAT

EN: boiling with anger

RU: кипит от злости

UZ: ichidan qaynamoq

PRESSURE

EN: blow one's top

RU: накопело

UZ: ichiga yutmoq

ANIMALITY

EN: go wild

RU: озвереть

UZ: yovvoyilashmoq

CONFLICT

EN: fight anger

RU: бороться с гневом

UZ: g'azabni yengmoq

Discussion

Table 2. Cultural Interpretation

| <u>Language</u> | <u>Dominant Pattern</u> | <u>Cultural Orientation</u> |
|-----------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------|
| <u>English</u> | HEAT | <u>Emotional control</u> |
| <u>Russian</u> | HEAT/ANIMALITY | <u>Expressiveness</u> |
| <u>Uzbek</u> | PRESSURE | <u>Emotional restraint</u> |

The findings support Conceptual Metaphor Theory by confirming universal embodied cognition. However, cultural variation strongly influences metaphor usage. English emphasizes regulation, Russian highlights intensity, and Uzbek reflects internalization and restraint.

Theoretical Contribution : This study contributes to Cognitive Linguistics by:

- expanding cross-linguistic metaphor data
- integrating Uzbek into global research
- combining corpus and cognitive approaches
- supporting a hybrid model of universality + cultural variation

In conclusion, Anger is universally structured through HEAT, PRESSURE, ANIMALITY, and CONFLICT metaphors. However, linguistic realization varies across cultures. The study confirms that metaphor is both cognitively grounded and culturally shaped.

Future research should include:

- larger corpora
- statistical modeling (Chi-square, regression)
- more languages for comparison

This study has examined the metaphorical conceptualization of anger in English, Russian, and Uzbek within the framework of Cognitive Linguistics and Conceptual Metaphor Theory. The findings demonstrate that anger is systematically structured through recurring metaphorical domains, including HEAT, PRESSURE, ANIMALITY, and CONFLICT. The quantitative and qualitative analyses confirm that these metaphors are not randomly distributed but reflect stable cognitive patterns grounded in embodied human experience.

At the same time, significant cross-linguistic variation in frequency and pragmatic usage indicates the strong influence of cultural models on emotional conceptualization. In particular, English tends to emphasize regulation and control of anger, Russian highlights emotional intensity and expressive dynamism, while Uzbek demonstrates a stronger orientation toward emotional restraint and internalization. These differences suggest that although the underlying cognitive mechanisms may be universal, their linguistic realization is culturally shaped.

Furthermore, the inclusion of Uzbek as a less-represented language contributes to expanding

the empirical scope of cross-linguistic metaphor research and challenges the Eurocentric bias present in much of the existing literature. This study therefore supports a hybrid theoretical model in which universal embodied cognition interacts dynamically with culture-specific linguistic practices.

From a broader theoretical perspective, the results reinforce the claim that metaphor is not merely a linguistic phenomenon but a fundamental cognitive mechanism through which abstract emotional experience is structured and communicated. Future research should extend this analysis by incorporating larger corpora, additional Turkic languages, and advanced statistical modeling techniques such as cluster analysis or regression-based metaphor profiling. Overall, the study contributes to a more inclusive and empirically grounded understanding of emotional metaphorization across languages and cultures.

References

1. Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors We Live By*. University of Chicago Press.
2. Lakoff, G. (1987). *Women, Fire, and Dangerous Things*. University of Chicago Press.
3. Kövecses, Z. (2015). *Where Metaphors Come From*. Oxford University Press.
4. Wierzbicka, A. (1999). *Emotions Across Languages and Cultures*. Cambridge University Press.
5. Gibbs, R. W. (2006). *Embodiment and Cognitive Science*. Cambridge University Press.
6. Ashurbaeva, S. K. (2026). Emotional concept in the worldview of diverse linguistic systems: A comparative study of metaphorical and metonymic models of “anger”. *American Journal of Philological Sciences*, 111–115.
7. Rustamov, F. R., Jumayev, B. T., & Nishonova, S. S. (2025).
8. Conceptualization of emotion in English and Uzbek: A cognitive-semantic typology. *Innovative Publication Journal of Philology*.

9. Pulatova, K. G. (2025). Phraseological units expressing emotions in English and Uzbek: A contrastive study. *Shokh Library Journal*.
10. Khamidova, S., & Akhmedov, O. (2025). Conceptual metaphor and cultural models in English and Uzbek phraseology. *Tadqiqotlar Journal*.
11. Khudayberganova, D. S. (2023). Linguistic and cognitive characteristics of metaphors in the Uzbek language. *American Journal of Philological Sciences*, 33–40.
12. Kurbanboeva, A. O. (2025). The power of metaphor: A cognitive and linguistic perspective. *Lingvospetr Journal*.
13. Karimjonova, S. R. (2024). Cognitive linguistics: Basic approaches and concepts in English and Uzbek languages. *Web of Humanities Journal*.