COGNITIVE MODELS OF EMOTIVE PHRASEOLOGY IN ENGLISH, RUSSIAN AND TAJIK

Sultonova Orzu Tursunovna
assistant of the department of Foreign Languages and Intercultural Relations
at the International University of Tourism and Entrepreneurship
of Tajikistan, Dushanbe, Republic of Tajikistan
Tel.: +992 903670880;;**sot_ayni@yahoo.com**
ORCID: 0009-0007-7767-0570

Abstract: This study examines cognitive models of emotive phraseology in English, Russian, and Tajik within a cognitive-linguistic framework. Based on a corpus of approximately 180 phraseological units, it identifies universal conceptual metaphors and culturally specific patterns in the representation of basic emotions. The findings highlight the dominant role of somatic and spatial models, as well as the distinctive "emotion ingestion" model in Tajik. The study contributes to cross-linguistic research and cognitive linguistics.

Keywords: somatic code, conceptual metaphor, cognitive models, emotional semantics, source domains, cultural variation, phraseological units, cross-linguistic analysis

КОГНИТИВНЫЕ МОДЕЛИ ЭМОТИВНОЙ ФРАЗЕОЛОГИИ В АНГЛИЙСКОМ, РУССКОМ И ТАДЖИКСКОМ ЯЗЫКАХ

Султонова Орзу Турсуновна
ассистент кафедры иностранных языков и межкультурных отношений
Международного университета туризма и предпринимательства Таджикистана, г.
Душанбе, Республика Таджикистан
Tel.: +992 903670880; E-mail: sot_ayni@yahoo.com
ORCID: 0009-0007-7767-0570

Аннотация: Статья посвящена анализу когнитивных моделей эмотивной фразеологии английского, русского и таджикского языков. На материале около 180 фразеологических единиц выявляются универсальные концептуальные метафоры и культурно-специфические особенности репрезентации базовых эмоций. Установлена ведущая роль соматических и пространственных моделей, а также выделена специфическая модель «поглощения эмоции» в таджикском языке. Результаты имеют значение для когнитивной и сопоставительной лингвистики.

Ключевые слова: соматический код, концептуальная метафора, когнитивные модели, семантика эмоций, источниковые домены, культурная вариативность, фразеологические единицы, сопоставительный анализ

Introduction

Emotive phraseology plays a significant role in the study of figurative language, as it reflects the interaction between cognition, culture, and linguistic expression. Rather than functioning as simple lexical substitutes, phraseological units expressing emotions can be viewed

as culturally shaped constructions that integrate conceptual metaphors, embodied experience, and evaluative meanings.

Recent research approaches this domain from complementary perspectives. Within cognitive linguistics, emotional concepts are grounded in shared human experience but shaped by culture-specific semantic patterns [7, p. 20].

At the same time, corpus-based studies reveal recurring metaphorical models in actual language use [3, p. 10].

Together, these approaches allow emotive phraseology to be interpreted as both a linguistic and a cognitive-cultural phenomenon.In discourse, emotively marked phraseological units function as markers that structure communication through oppositions such as *«friend/stranger»* and *«threat/protection»* [6, p. 62].

In digital contexts, they also serve as efficient means of encoding complex emotional states [5, p. 110].

Thus, their relevance extends across both traditional and online communication.

Despite growing scholarship, systematic trilingual comparisons of genetically unrelated languages remain limited. This study addresses this gap by examining emotive phraseology in English, Russian, and Tajik across four emotional micro-fields.

The aim is to identify universal cognitive patterns alongside culturally specific features of emotional conceptualization.

The novelty of the study lies in its integrated comparative approach, combining structural-semantic and cognitive methods. It identifies key conceptual models — spatial, somatic, and thermodynamic — and explores their variation across linguocultures. Particular attention is given to the *«emotion ingestion»* metaphor in Tajik.

The study also proposes a typology of cross-linguistic equivalence (full, partial, and non-equivalent), with implications for translation and intercultural communication.

Materials and methods

The empirical corpus of the study consists of approximately 180 phraseological units expressing emotional states, distributed across four emotional micro-fields and three languages.The units were selected through continuous sampling from authoritative phraseological dictionaries and subsequently verified using corpus data to ensure their relevance in contemporary usage. The selection was based on several criteria, including the semantic primacy of emotional content, structural stability, figurative meaning, and lexicographic attestation. Units with only context-dependent emotional meanings were excluded in order to maintain the homogeneity of the dataset.

The study employs a comparative-contrastive approach as its primary methodological framework, allowing for systematic analysis of phraseological units at formal-structural, semantic, and pragmatic levels. This makes it possible to distinguish full, partial, and culturally specific equivalents across the three languages.

In addition, structural-semantic analysis is used to examine the internal organization of phraseological units and to trace the transformation from literal to figurative meaning. Particular attention is given to identifying source domains and typical structural patterns, such as nominal, verbal, and clausal constructions [1, p. 729].

The cognitive approach, based on conceptual metaphor theory, provides a broader interpretive framework. From this perspective, phraseological units are viewed as realizations of underlying conceptual metaphors and metonymies, while cross-linguistic comparison focuses on

shared conceptual mappings rather than surface forms [3, p. 28]. This allows both universal cognitive patterns and culturally specific features to be identified [2, p. 5; 7, p. 12].

Finally, corpus methods play a supporting role by providing contextual evidence and helping to assess the productivity of phraseological models, particularly in digital discourse [5, p. 110]. The analysis proceeds in four main stages: classification of units by emotional micro-field, structural-semantic analysis, cognitive interpretation, and cross-linguistic comparison.

Results

The analysis of the corpus reveals a clear organization of emotive phraseological units into four main emotional micro-fields: joy, anger, fear, and sadness, corresponding to widely recognized basic emotions [4, p. 826]. Within each group, the units vary in intensity, duration, and evaluative orientation, while structurally they include verbal, nominal, adjectival, and clausal forms, with verbal constructions predominating.

Across all three languages, somatic vocabulary emerges as the most productive source domain. References to the heart, blood, and other body-related elements are consistently used to express emotions, although their frequency and connotations vary. In addition, several recurring conceptual metaphors can be identified, including *EMOTIONS ARE PHYSICAL FORCES*, *EMOTIONS ARE SPATIAL LOCATIONS*, and *EMOTIONAL AROUSAL IS HEAT*. These patterns suggest that emotional conceptualization is grounded in shared embodied experience, while allowing for cultural variation.

Turning to specific micro-fields, the representation of joy is largely based on upward spatial metaphors and somatic imagery. In English, expressions such as *on cloud nine* and *over the moon* illustrate the metaphor *HAPPINESS IS UP*. Russian shows similar patterns in *на седьмом небе* and *душа поёт*, while Tajik expressions like *аз шодӣ парвоз кардан* (*to fly with joy / to soar with joy*) emphasize elevation and expansion. Despite language-specific imagery, the underlying conceptual model remains consistent.

The encoding of anger, in contrast, is typically structured around the metaphor *ANGER IS HEAT* or pressure within a container. English idioms such as *see red* and *blow one's top* highlight loss of control and physiological intensity. Russian expressions like *кровь кипит* (*'blood boils'*) and *выйти из себя* (*'to lose control'*) reflect similar patterns, while Tajik units such as *оташ гирифтан* (*'to catch fire'*) and *чашмон хун гирифтан* (*'blood rushing to the eyes'*) demonstrate culturally specific somatic elaborations. Overall, anger is conceptualized through heat, pressure, and bodily reactions across all three languages.

A different pattern is observed in the micro-field of fear, where downward spatial metaphors and coldness imagery dominate. English expressions such as *one's heart sinks* and *blood runs cold* illustrate fear as physical decline or cooling. Russian idioms, including *душа в пятки ушла*, and Tajik equivalents such as *дил аз хонааш баромадан* (*'the heart leaves its place/home'*), reflect a similar conceptualization of downward or displaced emotional movement. In addition, trembling and pallor function as common somatic indicators of fear across all three languages.

Finally, sadness is conceptualized through metaphors of weight, downward movement, and loss of vitality. English expressions such as *heavy heart* and *down in the dumps* emphasize emotional burden and decline. Russian phraseology, for example *камень на душе — санге дар дил* (*'a stone on the soul'*), reinforces this pattern through the culturally significant concept of the soul. In Tajik, however, a distinctive feature emerges: sadness is often represented through

ingestion, as in *ғам хӯрдан* (*'to eat sorrow'*). This suggests a culturally specific extension of the general metaphor *EMOTIONS ARE SUBSTANCES*.

Overall, the results demonstrate that emotive phraseology across English, Russian, and Tajik combines universal conceptual patterns with culturally specific realizations. While spatial, somatic, and thermal metaphors are shared across languages, their linguistic expression reflects differences in cultural models and communicative traditions.

Discussion

The findings suggest that emotive phraseology in English, Russian, and Tajik is largely grounded in shared patterns of embodied experience. Spatial oppositions, somatic references, and thermal models play a key role in structuring emotional meaning, which may be explained by the close link between emotions and bodily perception. At the same time, these universal patterns are realized differently across linguistic and cultural contexts.

In particular, Russian phraseology emphasizes the concept of the *«soul»* as a central locus of emotional experience, while English shows a stronger tendency toward color metaphors and mechanistic models. Tajik, in turn, demonstrates culturally specific patterns, including the metaphor of *«emotion ingestion»* and the prominence of certain somatic domains. These differences indicate that shared cognitive mechanisms are shaped by cultural models and value systems.

More specifically, each language displays distinctive features within the general cognitive framework. Russian relies heavily on the concept of *душа* as a mobile emotional center, generating expressions without direct equivalents in other languages. English develops a relatively systematic use of color and pressure metaphors, whereas Tajik highlights culturally specific conceptualizations, such as the ingestion model of sadness and the role of the eyes in expressing emotional states.

From a cognitive perspective, emotive phraseology is organized around two main mechanisms: conceptual metaphor and conceptual metonymy. Metaphors map concrete source domains onto abstract emotional meanings, while metonymies link physiological symptoms — such as trembling or pallor — to emotional states. In many cases, these mechanisms interact, increasing the expressive and semantic complexity of phraseological units.

Overall, the results confirm that emotive phraseology reflects both universal cognitive patterns and culturally specific realizations. The cognitive-linguistic approach, therefore, provides an effective framework for identifying shared structures while accounting for cross-cultural variation.

Conclusion

The study demonstrates that emotive phraseology in English, Russian, and Tajik reflects both universal cognitive mechanisms and culturally specific patterns. While emotional experience is embodied, its linguistic expression varies across cultures.

These findings have theoretical value for cognitive linguistics and practical relevance for translation and intercultural communication. The main limitation is the size of the corpus and the focus on four emotions. Future research should expand the dataset and apply corpus-based and psycholinguistic methods.

Literature

1. Болотбекова А. Б., Батанова М. К. Семантическая классификация фразеологических единиц, обозначающих эмоции // Вестник Кыргызского государственного университета

имени И. Арабаева. — 2025. — № 2/3. — С. 727–734. — DOI: 10.33514/1694-7851-2025-2/3-727-734. — EDN: XCZOEI.

2. Демьянков В. З. *Studia Linguistica Cognitiva* — призыв к сотрудничеству // *Studia Linguistica Cognitiva*: ежегодный межвузовский сборник научных трудов. — М.: Гнозис, 2006. — С. 5–7. — EDN: TUBORX.

3. Charteris-Black J. *Corpus approaches to critical metaphor analysis*. — London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004. — 263 p. — DOI: 10.1057/9780230000612.

4. Deigh J. Cognitivism in the theory of emotions: survey article // *Ethics*. — 1994. — Vol. 104, No. 4. — P. 824–854.

5. Султонова О. Т. Фразеосемантика устойчивости эмоций в цифровом дискурсе английского, русского и таджикского языков // *Наука. Практика. Человек*: сборник трудов Всероссийской научно-практической конференции с международным участием (Москва, 16 июля 2025 г.). — М.: Издательство «Мир науки», 2025. — С. 108–113. — EDN: ZNHCUK.

6. Султонова О. Т. Фразеология эмоций как инструмент когнитивного моделирования политического дискурса // *Наука. Практика. Человек*: сборник трудов II Всероссийской научно-практической конференции с международным участием (Москва, 16 октября 2025 г.). — М.: Издательство «Мир науки», 2025. — С. 61–64. — EDN: RVXWKN.

7. Wierzbicka A. *Emotions across languages and cultures: diversity and universals*. — Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999. — 349 p.