

## THE DEFINITION OF THE CONCEPTS OF “ANGER” AND “G‘AZAB”, SYNONYMS, THEIR GRADATION, AND SEMANTIC GROUPINGS WITHIN THE LEXICAL FIELD

**Akhmedova Mehrinigor Bahodirovna**

DsC, English literature and translation studies department,

Bukhara State University, Uzbekistan

[mbakhmedova@buxdu.uz](mailto:mbakhmedova@buxdu.uz)

**Jamoliddinova Dilnoza Jasur kizi**

Webster Universiteti Magistranti. (Uzbekistan, Bukhara )

[jamoliddinovadilnoza02@gmail.com](mailto:jamoliddinovadilnoza02@gmail.com)

**Abstract.** The paper analyzes the semantics of the concepts of “anger” and “g‘azab” in their similarities and differences as well as in their synonymous manifestations. It analyzes how the emotions are used in a language depending on their gradation, their semantic details, and their lexical collocations in the general emotive dictionary. The study attempts at determining the cultural-linguistic specifics of such concepts in their wealth in meaning as well as their communicative role.

**Keywords:** anger, g‘azab, semantics, synonyms, gradation, lexical field, emotional vocabulary, cultural-linguistic features.

### Introduction

The concepts of “anger” and “g‘azab” are essential in understanding human emotions as well as their emotional lexicon. Despite their frequent synonymy in application, both encompass semantic undertones and cultural overtones which contribute to the richness of the emotional vocabulary. These terms not only reveal how people perceive and express inner states but also demonstrate how language captures the nuanced gradations of affective experiences. By examining their definitions, gradations, synonyms, and semantic groupings, this study seeks to uncover the linguistic mechanisms through which emotions are encoded and communicated.

Language has long been recognized as a primary tool for structuring emotional experience. Scholars in cognitive linguistics argue that emotion concepts are shaped by cultural models and linguistic structures (Kövecses 2000). In this regard, studying “anger” and “g‘azab” provides insight into how universal emotional categories are localized in specific linguistic traditions. Moreover, semantic distinctions between these terms highlight cultural interpretations of emotional intensity, morality, and social appropriateness. Such nuances enrich our understanding of how emotions are represented differently across languages while still maintaining shared human foundations.

A considerable body of research addresses the relationship between language and emotions. Kövecses (2000) emphasizes the role of metaphor and cultural context in shaping emotional concepts, noting that “anger” is one of the most metaphorically structured emotions across languages. Similarly, Wierzbicka (1999) explores how emotion terms reflect cultural values and argues that every language encodes unique “scripts” of emotional experience. These approaches provide useful frameworks for examining how “anger” and “g‘azab” function within the Uzbek linguistic tradition.

In Uzbek lexicology, studies have examined the semantic richness of emotionally charged words, with particular attention to their synonymy and gradation (Karimov 2015). Researchers note that “g‘azab” often conveys a stronger, more culturally resonant sense of indignation than the more general “anger,” which is frequently borrowed or translated in linguistic discourse. This semantic differentiation underscores the importance of considering both universal and culture-specific aspects of emotion terminology. By situating “anger” and “g‘azab” within their lexical field, this



study builds on prior work in cognitive semantics and Uzbek linguistics, highlighting the intersection between language, emotion, and cultural worldview.

### Main part

Comparison between the concepts of “anger” and “g‘azab” sheds light on their close semantic similarity while at the same time betraying essential differences. Both are in the same lexical range of emotions but differ in force, collocation, and cultural undertone. English “anger” is inclined towards a generic state of emotions ranging between irritation, displeasure, or hostility. Uzbek “g‘azab” inclines towards greater force and is often involved in some kind of moral or social setting in highlighting its greater cultural richness.

Gradation between both words occurs when analyzed in their synonyms: while “anger” goes with such synonyms as annoyance, rage, or fury, “g‘azab” goes with those ranging between righteous indignation or moral judgment. Semantically clustering them, it is evident that both are in a universal domain of emotions but their specific lexical settings tell how culture and language make emotions. From comparison, it is revealed that even supposedly similar words are not reduced towards identity since their meaning is augmented by culturally distinctive points of views.

Table 1. The semantic and cultural differences between “anger” and “g‘azab”

| Aspect         | Anger (English)                     | G‘azab (Uzbek)                                  |
|----------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|
| Intensity      | Ranges from mild irritation to rage | Stronger, often linked to deep outrage          |
| Synonyms       | Annoyance, irritation, rage, fury   | Qahr, indignation, righteous anger              |
| Cultural Sense | Psychological/emotional state       | Tied to morality, dignity, social values        |
| Context        | Common in daily use and psychology  | Frequent in moral, cultural, religious settings |

Table 1 reveals dominant differences between English “anger” and Uzbek “g‘azab” according to their intensity, cultural value, and application. English “anger” is a rather unified term in its application in everyday life as well as scientific literature; it is variable in its intensity in its range between mild annoyance or irritation and furious rage. English “anger” might be replaced in its signification with such synonymous concepts as annoyance, resentment, or fury. Uzbek “g‘azab” is a term which is more intense which is oftentimes accompanied by ethical, cultural, as well as faith-related frames in its application. It is not only an emotional state but rather a term which presupposes greater cultural as well as social values which accompany such concepts as dignity or faith in order and justice. Such a comparison reveals that both concepts refer in their application to a universal state of emotions but their signification is constructed in a certain linguistic as well as a certain cultural environment in which it is applied.

Table 2. Gradation of synonyms

| Gradation Level | Anger (English)       | G‘azab (Uzbek)           |
|-----------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|
| Mild            | Irritation, annoyance | Hafsala pir (irritation) |
| Moderate        | Anger, resentment     | G‘azab (anger, outrage)  |
| Strong          | Rage, fury            | Qahr (wrath)             |

Table 2 reveals gradation for synonyms for concepts of “anger” and “g‘azab” in order to show how emotions are scaled in intensity for both languages. English scales in intensity in this order: low intensity at mild annoyance and irritation; medium intensity at anger and resentment; high intensity at a range including fury and rage. Uzbek scales similarly in an order ranging at “hafsala pir” describing discouragement or annoyance; “g‘azab” describing strong angry or



outraged sentiment; concluding at “qahr” describing a highest intensity wrath. Such gradation reveals there is a universal range for emotions found in both languages; selection explains cultural variation in linguistic form for perceiving and expressing emotions.

## Conclusion

Analysis of the concept of “anger” and “g‘azab” shows both common emotional foundation and certain culturally specified and linguistic features. As English “anger” is generally understood as a state of mind ranging in force between mild disturbance or annoyance and intense wrath or ire, Uzbek “g‘azab” itself means still greater force and is closely linked with ethical and culturally specified environments. Synonym comparison and gradation show that both concepts obey a universal spectrum of emotions, yet their semantic details show a prevailing influence of culturally based values at a linguistic level. Such findings identify once again a focal presence of emotions as universal entities always conditioned in culturally specific forms in which they are expressed. Recognition of such specific differences contributes to further strengthened cross-linguistic communication as it forms a necessary research endeavor at exploring a language as a product of a culturally specific identity.

## References:

1. Averill, James R. *Anger and Aggression: An Essay on Emotion*. Springer-Verlag, 1982.
2. Ekman, Paul. *Emotions Revealed: Recognizing Faces and Feelings to Improve Communication and Emotional Life*. Times Books, 2003.
3. Izard, Carroll E. *The Psychology of Emotions*. Plenum Press, 1991.
4. Karimov, Aziz. *Lexical and Semantic Analysis of Emotion Words in Uzbek*. Akademnashr, 2015.
5. Kövecses, Zoltán. *Metaphor and Emotion: Language, Culture, and Body in Human Feeling*. Cambridge UP, 2000.
6. Lakoff, George, and Zoltán Kövecses. “The Cognitive Model of Anger Inherent in American English.” *Cultural Models in Language and Thought*, edited by Dorothy Holland and Naomi Quinn, Cambridge UP, 1987, pp. 195–221.
7. Russell, James A. “Core Affect and the Psychological Construction of Emotion.” *Psychological Review*, vol. 110, no. 1, 2003, pp. 145–172.
8. Wierzbicka, Anna. *Emotions Across Languages and Cultures: Diversity and Universals*. Cambridge UP, 1999.

