DOI: https://doi.org/10.37547/supsci-ojp-06-07-17 Pages: 163-172

Oriental Journal of Philology

ORIENTAL JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

journal homepage:
http://www.supportscience.uz/index.php/ojp/about

A CONTRASTIVE ANALYSIS OF ANGER METAPHORS IN UZBEK AND ENGLISH BASED ON THE MIP AND MIPVU METHODS

Shahrizoda Mansurovna Omonova
2nd-year student of the Faculty of Humanities
Turon University
E-mail: shaxrizodaomonova2@gmail.com
Karshi, Uzbekistan

ABOUT ARTICLE

Key words: conceptual metaphor, anger, MIP, MIPVU, metaphor-related word, source domain, lexical unit, contrastive linguistics.

Received: 05.11.2026
Accepted: 06.11.2026
Published: 07.11.2026

Abstract: The article presents a contrastive analysis of anger metaphors in Uzbek and English based on the Metaphor Identification Procedure (MIP) proposed by the Pragglejaz Group and its refined version, MIPVU. The study considers how the identification criteria apply to the typological features of both languages: phrasal verbs and multi-word units in English, and agglutinative word forms and auxiliary-verb constructions in Uzbek. Examples selected from explanatory dictionaries are grouped according to the source domains of heat and boiling fluid, pressure and explosion, fire, upward movement, and control. The analysis shows that the two languages share the core conceptual model of anger but differ considerably in its lexical realisation, inner form and cultural interpretation. The paper argues that comparing two structurally different languages within a single procedure requires defining lexical unit boundaries by the same principle in both languages, relying on dictionaries of comparable structure and coverage, and distinguishing metaphor from metonymic expressions of the physiological effects of anger.

MIP VA MIPVU METODLARI ASOSIDA O‘ZBEK VA INGLIZ TILLARIDAGI G‘AZAB METAFORALARINING CHOG‘ISHTIRMA TAHLILI

Shahrizoda Mansurovna Omonova
Turon universiteti
Gumanitar fanlar fakulteti 2-bosqich talabasi
E-mail: shaxrizodaomonova2@gmail.com
Qarshi, O‘zbekiston

MAQOLA HAQIDA

Kalit so‘zlar: konseptual metafora, g‘azab konsepti, MIP, MIPVU, metaforaga aloqador so‘z, manba soha, leksik birlik, chog‘ishtirma tilshunoslik.

Annotatsiya: Maqolada o‘zbek va ingliz tillarida g‘azab hissini ifodalovchi metaforik birliklar Pragglejaz Group ishlab chiqqan MIP protsedurasi va uning takomillashgan shakli – MIPVU asosida chog‘ishtirma tahlil qilinadi. Metaforani aniqlash mezonlarining ikki tilning tipologik xususiyatlariga – ingliz tilidagi frazal fe’llar va ko‘p so‘zli birliklarga hamda o‘zbek tilidagi agglutinativ so‘z shakllari va ko‘makchi fe’lli qurilmalarga – qanday tatbiq etilishi ko‘rib chiqiladi. Izohli lug‘atlar asosida tanlangan namunalar issiqlik va qaynayotgan suyuqlik, bosim va portlash, olov, yuqoriga harakat hamda nazorat manba sohalari bo‘yicha guruhlanadi. Tahlil ikki tilda g‘azabning tayanch konseptual modeli umumiy ekanini, biroq uning leksik ifodasi, ichki shakli va madaniy talqinida sezilarli farqlar borligini ko‘rsatadi. Tuzilishi turlicha bo‘lgan ikki tilni yagona protsedura asosida qiyoslash uchun leksik birlik chegarasini har ikki tilda bir xil tamoyil bilan belgilash, tuzilishi va to‘liqligi jihatidan qiyoslanadigan lug‘atlarga tayanish hamda g‘azabning fiziologik belgilarini bildiruvchi metonimik ifodalarni metaforadan farqlash zarurligi asoslanadi.

СОПОСТАВИТЕЛЬНЫЙ АНАЛИЗ МЕТАФОР ГНЕВА В УЗБЕКСКОМ И АНГЛИЙСКОМ ЯЗЫКАХ НА ОСНОВЕ МЕТОДОВ MIP И MIPVU

Шахризода Мансуровна Омонова
Студентка 2-го курса факультета гуманитарных наук
Университета Турон
Карши, Узбекистан

О СТАТЬЕ

Ключевые слова: концептуальная метафора, концепт «гнев», MIP, MIPVU, слово, связанное с метафорой, сфера-источник, лексическая единица, сопоставительное языкознание.

Аннотация: В статье на основе процедуры идентификации метафоры MIP, предложенной группой Pragglejaz, и её усовершенствованной версии MIPVU проводится сопоставительный анализ метафорических единиц, выражающих гнев в узбекском и английском языках.

Рассматривается применение критериев выявления метафоры с учётом типологических особенностей обоих языков – фразовых глаголов и многословных единиц в английском языке, агглютинативных словоформ и конструкций со вспомогательными глаголами в узбекском. Примеры, отобранные по толковым словарям, сгруппированы по сферам-источникам «тепло и кипящая жидкость», «давление и взрыв», «огонь», «движение вверх» и «контроль». Анализ показывает, что базовая концептуальная модель гнева в обоих языках общая, однако её лексическое воплощение, внутренняя форма и культурная интерпретация существенно различаются. Обосновывается, что для сопоставления двух разноструктурных языков в рамках единой процедуры необходимо определять границы лексической единицы в обоих языках по единому принципу, опираться на сопоставимые по структуре и полноте словари, а также отграничивать от метафоры метонимические обозначения физиологических проявлений гнева.

Introduction. Since the early 1980s, metaphor has been studied not only as a feature of literary style but also as a phenomenon of thought and cognition. In Lakoff and Johnson's formulation, the essence of metaphor is understanding and experiencing one kind of thing in terms of another [1]. From this perspective, expressions such as Uzbek qoni qaynadi (lit. 'his blood boiled') and English boiling with anger are not wordplay. They are linguistic traces of a stable correspondence between a source domain (heat, fluid, pressure) and a target domain (anger). Among emotion concepts, anger holds a special place. It has clear physiological correlates, such as body heat and agitation, which provide a rich experiential basis for metaphorical expression [2]. At the same time, the ways in which anger is talked about vary from language to language. Anger metaphors are therefore convenient material for observing both what is shared and what is language-specific in emotion concepts [3].

In Uzbek linguistics, the theoretical foundations of the cognitive approach were set out by Sh. Safarov [4], and the link between metaphor, metonymy and national ways of thinking has since been examined separately [5]. Yet emotion metaphors in Uzbek are still usually identified on the basis of the researcher's linguistic intuition: whether a given word is used metaphorically is rarely

checked against explicit criteria. This makes it difficult to compare the conclusions of different studies. Formal identification procedures, MIP [6] and MIPVU [7], were designed precisely to address this problem. The relevance of the present study lies in the need to apply these procedures to Uzbek data in comparison with English.

The aim of the study is to identify anger metaphors in Uzbek and English using MIP and MIPVU criteria, to compare them by source domain, and to describe the methodological difficulties specific to Uzbek material. The objectives are: 1) to review the theoretical literature on the topic; 2) to clarify the principles for applying MIP and MIPVU to Uzbek; 3) to group anger metaphors in the two languages by source domain and by stage of the anger scenario, and to show what they share and where they differ.

Literature review. The theoretical basis of the study is conceptual metaphor theory, according to which metaphorical expressions in language reflect systematic mappings between conceptual domains [1]. The cognitive study of anger metaphors goes back to Lakoff and Kövecses's analysis of American English [2]. They showed that idioms such as lose one's cool and make one's blood boil, which at first sight seem unrelated, reflect a coherent cognitive model. At its centre is the metaphor ANGER IS THE HEAT OF A FLUID IN A CONTAINER, together with folk beliefs about the physiological effects of anger: body heat, internal pressure and redness. The authors also described a prototypical anger scenario in five stages: offending event, anger, attempt at control, loss of control, and act of retribution [2]. In his monograph Metaphor and Emotion, Kövecses developed this model further. He argued that emotion metaphors are motivated by bodily experience but are realised differently in different languages and cultures, so that a contrastive study has to look both at the shared conceptual core and at its language-specific elaboration [3]. This position underlies the comparison of Uzbek and English undertaken here.

In Uzbek linguistics, Sh. Safarov's monograph set out the theoretical foundations of cognitive linguistics [4]. M. Hakimova and F. Rahmatova examined the role of national worldview in the formation of metaphor and metonymy in Uzbek [5]; their approach is relevant to the present study because the comparison of anger expressions also has to take the cultural background of Uzbek figurative units into account.

Most studies of emotion metaphors, however, select metaphorical expressions intuitively. MIP, proposed by the Pragglejaz Group [6], and MIPVU, developed from it by Steen and colleagues [7], turned this selection into a sequence of verifiable steps. Experience in adapting MIPVU to different languages is summarised in the volume edited by Nacey and colleagues [8]; the chapter by S. G. Kaya in that volume deals with Uzbek and discusses how to define lexical units and which dictionary to use [9]. So far, these procedures have not been applied to a

contrastive study of anger metaphors in Uzbek and English. The present article seeks to partly fill this gap.

Research methodology. Uzbek anger expressions were selected from the Explanatory Dictionary of the Uzbek Language [10], and English expressions from the Macmillan and Longman dictionaries used in MIPVU [7]. The sample includes verbs, nouns and idioms denoting anger. The sentences cited are illustrative: they were chosen to demonstrate the steps of the procedure and are not intended to support quantitative conclusions. The study combines contrastive, componential and cognitive analysis.

MIP consists of four steps [6, p. 3]. The analyst first reads the whole text to establish its general meaning and then divides it into lexical units. For each unit, the contextual meaning is determined, and the analyst checks whether the word has a more basic meaning in other contexts. A more basic meaning is typically more concrete (easier to imagine, see, hear, feel), related to bodily action, more precise and historically older; it is not necessarily the most frequent meaning [6, p. 3]. If the contextual meaning contrasts with the basic meaning but can be understood in comparison with it, the unit is marked as metaphorically used.

MIPVU refines and extends these steps [7]. First, it defines the lexical unit strictly: phrasal verbs, some compounds and fixed multi-word units (polywords) such as of course are treated as single units. Second, the output of the analysis is called a metaphor-related word (MRW), and several types are distinguished: indirect metaphor (a contrast between contextual and basic meaning), direct metaphor (the source domain is expressed explicitly, as in a simile) and implicit metaphor (reference back to a metaphor through a pronoun or ellipsis). Signal words such as like, as if, Uzbek xuddi and go‘yo are marked separately as MFlags. Third, the category WIDLII (When in doubt, leave it in) is used for borderline cases. Fourth, unlike MIP, MIPVU establishes meanings on the basis of contemporary synchronic dictionaries and disregards etymology [7]. In contrastive research, therefore, choosing dictionaries of comparable structure and coverage for both languages becomes one of the most delicate points of the procedure [8].

To apply a procedure tested on English to Uzbek, the following rules were adopted. First, because Uzbek is agglutinative, forms such as qaynayotgan edi (‘was boiling’) or portlab ketganidan (‘because [he] had exploded’) gather several grammatical markers around a single stem. The dictionary headword form was therefore taken as the lexical unit, and inflectional affixes were treated as grammatical markers that do not affect metaphoricity [9]. The words jahl and g‘azab (‘anger’) name the target domain directly and are not MRWs.

Second, in constructions such as qaynab ketdi and portlab ketdi, the verb ketmoq is used not in its basic sense ‘to go away’ but in an aspectual function, marking the action as complete and abrupt. Just as the auxiliaries be and have are not marked as metaphorical in English, the Uzbek

auxiliary verb was treated as a grammaticalised element, and metaphoricity was assessed on the lexical verb. This decision is open to discussion, since auxiliary verbs differ in their degree of grammaticalisation; criteria for each of them remain to be developed.

Third, MIPVU analyses idioms word by word unless they appear on the polyword list [7]. In sabr kosasi to‘ldi (lit. ‘the bowl of patience filled up’), both kosa (‘bowl’) and to‘lmoq (‘to fill’) are marked as MRWs. The fact that a figurative sense is listed separately in the dictionary, that is, that the metaphor is conventionalised, does not cancel its metaphoricity. Fourth, expressions describing the physiological signs of anger, such as yuzi qizardi (‘his face reddened’), red with anger and tremble with rage, rest on the metonymy PHYSIOLOGICAL EFFECT FOR EMOTION [2; 3]. Since their verbs and adjectives are used in their basic senses, they are not marked as MRWs.

Analysis and results. A sample analysis carried out according to these rules is presented in Table 1, and the grouping of the identified MRWs by source domain in Table 2.

Table 1. Sample analysis according to MIPVU

Sentence and lexical unit	Contextual meaning	Basic meaning	Decision
Qonim qaynab ketdi (‘My blood boiled’) → *qaynamoq*	anger rises sharply	(of liquid) heat up and bubble	MRW (indirect metaphor)
Qonim qaynab ketdi → *ketmoq*	completeness and abruptness of the action	go away	auxiliary verb; excluded from analysis
Qonim qaynab ketdi → *qon* (‘blood’)	blood	blood	not an MRW: referent unchanged
Jahli chiqdi (‘He got angry’) → *chiqmoq*	become angry	move from inside to outside	MRW (conventional metaphor)
His words made my blood boil → *boil*	become very angry	(of liquid) reach the temperature at which it bubbles	MRW (indirect metaphor)
He blew up at me → *blow up*	suddenly become very angry	explode, be destroyed by an explosion	phrasal verb, one lexical unit; MRW
Xuddi qozondek qaynardi (‘He was boiling just like a cauldron’) → *xuddi*; *qozon*	simile signal; source domain	–	*xuddi* – MFlag; *qozon* – direct metaphor

Sentence and lexical unit	Contextual meaning	Basic meaning	Decision
Yuzi qizardi (‘His face reddened’) → *qizarmoq*	turn red	turn red	not an MRW; metonymic basis

Table 2. Source domains of anger metaphors in Uzbek and English

Source domain	Uzbek	English
Heat, boiling fluid	*qoni qaynadi, ichi qaynadi*	*boil, seethe, simmer, make one’s blood boil, hot under the collar*
Overflowing container	*g‘azabi toshdi, sabr kosasi to‘ldi*	*boil over, be filled with anger*
Pressure, explosion	*portlab ketdi, jahlini bosdi, g‘azabini ichiga yutdi*	*explode, blow up, blow one’s top, bottle up, swallow one’s anger*
Fire	*g‘azab o‘ti, g‘azabi alangalandi*	*flare up, smoulder, fiery temper*
Upward movement	*jahli chiqdi*	*anger rose*
Control, opponent, animal	*jahli tutdi, jahlini jilovladi*	*lose / keep one’s temper, be seized with rage, rein in one’s anger*

Heat and boiling fluid. This group is central in both languages and corresponds to the model described by Lakoff and Kövecses [2]. The means of expression, however, differ. English grades the intensity of anger lexically: simmer – seethe – boil – boil over. In the Uzbek sample the same verb qaynamoq (‘to boil’) is used throughout, and intensity is conveyed by auxiliary verbs (qaynab ketdi, qaynab toshdi, lit. ‘boiled away’, ‘boiled over’). In other words, a distinction that English draws lexically, Uzbek draws grammatically. A further point is that qoni qaynamoq can also denote zeal and enthusiasm (yoshlik qoni qaynaydi, ‘young blood is boiling’). The same expression thus serves more than one emotional state, and the anger reading is fixed only by context; this is exactly why MIP requires each unit to be assessed in context [6].

Pressure, explosion and overflow. The container metaphor continues from heating to rising pressure and finally to ‘explosion’ [2]. Uzbek portlab ketdi and English blow up and explode render this stage in almost the same way. Uzbek jahlini bosmoq (‘to press one’s anger down’) and g‘azabini ichiga yutmoq (‘to swallow one’s anger inside’) are close in meaning to English bottle up and swallow one’s anger. In sabr kosasi to‘ldi, by contrast, the container is patience rather than anger itself: anger begins once the ‘bowl’ of patience is full. No English expression with the same structure was found in the sample.

Fire. In the Uzbek genitive phrase g‘azab o‘ti (‘the fire of anger’), o‘t is marked as an indirect metaphor, since its contextual meaning is ‘intense anger’ and its basic meaning is ‘fire’; the same applies to alangalanmoq (‘to blaze up’) in g‘azabi alangalandi. In English this domain is

represented by flare up, smoulder and fiery temper. In both languages fire metaphors are closely connected with the heat metaphor, since both rely on the experience of rising body temperature [2].

Upward movement and control. In Uzbek, the most ordinary, neutral way of saying ‘to get angry’, jahli chiqmoq (lit. ‘one’s anger comes out/up’), contains an MRW, whereas the neutral English adjective angry is non-metaphorical and metaphorical units belong mainly to the expressive register. In the domain of control, English lose / keep one’s temper presents anger as a possession to be managed, while be seized with rage presents it as a force that takes hold of the person. Uzbek jahli tutdi (lit. ‘anger seized him’) is close to the second model, and jahlini jilovladi (‘he reined in his anger’) presents anger as an animal to be bridled; English rein in one’s anger rests on the same image.

Language-specific features. In Uzbek, ich (‘inside’) frequently appears as the container of anger (ichi qaynadi, ‘his insides boiled’; ichiga yutdi, ‘swallowed it inside’), whereas English expressions usually leave the container implicit or refer to the whole person (he exploded). The image of patience as a vessel (sabr kosasi) is another feature of the Uzbek data. Such differences support the view that the shared model is filled with language-specific content related to the speakers’ worldview [3; 5].

Distribution across the anger scenario. The five-stage scenario described by Lakoff and Kövecses [2] can also be traced in Uzbek: the cause of anger – jahlini chiqardi (‘made him angry’); the onset of anger – jahli chiqdi, qoni qaynadi; the attempt at control – jahlini bosdi, ichiga yutdi; the loss of control – portlab ketdi, o‘zini tutolmadi (‘could not hold himself’). In the material analysed, the retribution stage is expressed by literal rather than metaphorical units in both languages.

Conclusion and recommendations. Anger metaphors in Uzbek and English rest on the same core model, that of a heated fluid in a container. In both languages this model covers the stages of heat, pressure, explosion and control. The shared model is expressed differently. English tends to distinguish degrees of anger by lexical means, whereas in Uzbek this function is often performed by auxiliary verbs. The neutral Uzbek expression for getting angry (jahli chiqmoq) itself contains a metaphor-related word, which shows how deeply this metaphor is entrenched in everyday Uzbek. Expressions such as sabr kosasi to‘ldi, ichi qaynadi and ichiga yutmoq show a language-specific elaboration of the container model in Uzbek. Applying MIPVU to Uzbek requires several clarifications: taking the dictionary headword form as the lexical unit, assessing auxiliary verbs separately, analysing idioms word by word and distinguishing metonymic expressions from MRWs. Without them, results obtained for the two languages cannot be compared reliably.

On the basis of these findings, the following recommendations are made. First, an Uzbek corpus annotated according to MIPVU rules should be created, and the agreement between several annotators should be tested statistically. Second, the reliability of metaphor identification in Uzbek would increase with a corpus-based electronic explanatory dictionary in which senses are ordered consistently. Third, the results can be used in teaching English to Uzbek learners and in Uzbek–English translation, where the conceptual basis of anger idioms helps explain why literal translation often fails.

References:

1. Lakoff G., Johnson M. Metaphors we live by. – Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980. – 242 p.

2. Lakoff G., Kövecses Z. The cognitive model of anger inherent in American English // Holland D., Quinn N. (Eds.). Cultural models in language and thought. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987. – P. 195–221.

3. Kövecses Z. Metaphor and emotion: Language, culture, and body in human feeling. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000. – xvi + 223 p.

4. Safarov Sh. Kognitiv tilshunoslik. – Jizzax: Sangzor, 2006.

5. Hakimova M., Rahmatova F. O‘zbek tilida metafora va metonimiya shakllanishida milliy tafakkurning o‘rni [The role of national worldview in the formation of metaphor and metonymy in the Uzbek language] // O‘zbekiston: til va madaniyat (Uzbekistan: Language and Culture). – Vol. 4. – 2025. – P. 6–22. https://doi.org/10.52773/tsuull.uzlc.2025.4/DSYH9832

6. Pragglejaz Group. MIP: A method for identifying metaphorically used words in discourse // Metaphor and Symbol. – Vol. 22. – 2007. – No. 1. – P. 1–39. https://doi.org/10.1080/10926480709336752

7. Steen G. J., Dorst A. G., Herrmann J. B., Kaal A. A., Krennmayr T., Pasma T. A method for linguistic metaphor identification: From MIP to MIPVU. – Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2010. – 238 p. https://doi.org/10.1075/celcr.14

8. Nacey S., Dorst A. G., Krennmayr T., Reijnierse W. G. (Eds.). Metaphor identification in multiple languages: MIPVU around the world. – Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2019. – vi + 330 p. https://doi.org/10.1075/celcr.22

9. Kaya S. G. Linguistic metaphor identification in Uzbek // Nacey S., Dorst A. G., Krennmayr T., Reijnierse W. G. (Eds.). Metaphor identification in multiple languages: MIPVU around the world. – Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2019. – P. 227–245. https://doi.org/10.1075/celcr.22.11kay

10. O‘zbek tilining izohli lug‘ati [Explanatory dictionary of the Uzbek language]: in 5 vols. / Ed. by A. Madvaliyev. – Tashkent: O‘zbekiston milliy ensiklopediyasi, 2006–2008.