ISSN:3030-332X
Impact factor: 9,493
International journal of scientific researchers

COMPARING THE CONCEPTS OF "HOPE" AND "UMID" IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK LANGUAGES

Obidova Firuza Jumayevna
E-mail: obidovafiruza3@gmail.com
G-Phone: +998907306105
https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.21781298

Abstract. This article compares the cognitive-semantic and linguocultural structures of English "hope" and Uzbek "umid." It examines their grammatical forms, semantic components, collocations, metaphors, pragmatic functions, and translation correspondences. Both concepts combine desire, future orientation, uncertainty, and belief in a favorable possibility. However, English hope functions freely as a noun and a verb, while Uzbek umid is mainly nominal and forms analytic constructions such as umid qilmoq and umid bog'lamoq. English often foregrounds personal stance and agency; Uzbek frequently emphasizes patience, relational trust, and moral endurance. The two units are therefore close, but not fully identical, equivalents.
Keywords: hope, umid, concept, cognitive semantics, linguoculture, conceptual metaphor, contrastive analysis, translation equivalence.

Аннотация. В статье сопоставляются когнитивно-семантические и лингвокультурные структуры английского "hope" и узбекского "umid." Анализируются их грамматические формы, семантические компоненты, сочетаемость, метафоры, прагматические функции и переводческие соответствия. Оба концепта выражают желание, направленность в будущее, неопределённость и веру в благоприятную возможность. Однако hope свободно функционирует как существительное и глагол, тогда как umid преимущественно является существительным и образует аналитические конструкции. Английские употребления чаще выдвигают личную позицию и активность, а узбекские — терпение, межличностное доверие и нравственную устойчивость. Следовательно, данные единицы близки, но не полностью тождественны.
Ключевые слова: hope, umid, концепт, когнитивная семантика, лингвокультура, концептуальная метафора, сопоставительный анализ, переводческая эквивалентность.

Annotatsiya. Maqolada ingliz tilidagi "hope" va o'zbek tilidagi "umid" konseptlarining kognitiv-semantik hamda lingvomadaniy tuzilishi qiyoslanadi. Ularning grammatik shakllari, semantik tarkibi, birikuvchanligi, metaforalari, pragmatik vazifalari va tarjimadagi muqobilligi tahlil qilinadi. Har ikki konsept istak, kelajakka yo'nalganlik, noaniqlik va ijobiy imkoniyatga ishonchni ifodalaydi. Biroq hope ot va fe'l sifatida erkin qo'llanadi, umid esa asosan ot bo'lib, umid qilmoq va umid bog'lamoq kabi analitik birikmalarni hosil qiladi. Inglizcha qo'llanishlarda shaxsiy munosabat va faollik, o'zbekcha ifodalarda esa sabr, insonlararo ishonch va ma'naviy bardoshlilik ko'proq namoyon bo'ladi. Shu sababli ular yaqin, ammo to'liq aynan bo'lmagan muqobillardir.
Kalit so'zlar: hope, umid, konsept, kognitiv semantika, lingvomadaniyat, konseptual metafora, qiyosiy tahlil, tarjima muqobilligi.

Introduction

Abstract emotional concepts are difficult to compare because their dictionary meanings are compact, whereas their grammatical and cultural structures are extensive. Hope is not merely a wish: it combines a desirable future, perceived possibility, uncertainty, and emotional investment. It therefore lies between desire, belief, expectation, intention, and trust.

The comparison of English hope and Uzbek umid is relevant to cognitive semantics, linguoculturology, translation, and language teaching. Sh.Safarov connects linguistic meaning with

conceptualization and the cognitive organization of experience[1]. The study aims to identify the common semantic core of the two concepts and to explain differences in grammar, collocation, metaphor, pragmatic force, and translation.

Literature Review

A.Wierzbicka argues that emotion words are not transparent universal labels: languages package desire, evaluation, knowledge, and culturally shaped scenarios differently[2]. Her approach permits hope to be described through simpler components: "I want this," "I think this can happen," "I do not know that it will happen," and "I feel something good because of this." C.J.Fillmore's frame semantics similarly treats a word as activating a structured scene with an experiencer, a desired future event, uncertainty, a basis for possibility, and an emotional consequence[3].

G.Lakoff and M.Johnson describe conceptual metaphor as a regular mechanism through which abstract experience is organized[4]. Z.Kövecses applies this principle to emotion language and shows that shared embodied metaphors may coexist with culture-specific conventional patterns[5]. These approaches explain parallels such as English "a ray of hope" and Uzbek "umid nuri," as well as differences such as "raise hopes" and "umid bog'lamoq."

C.R.Snyder defines hope through goal-directed agency and the perceived availability of pathways toward a goal[6]. This distinction separates active hope from passive wishing. F.A.Burxoniy and F.M.Mamatova also conclude that hope/umid combines a universal emotional structure with culture-specific semantic patterns[7]. The present study extends this comparison by focusing on grammatical asymmetry, pragmatic usage, metaphorical models, and translation choices.

Methods

The study uses contrastive semantic analysis, componential analysis, frame analysis, conceptual-metaphor analysis, and contextual-pragmatic interpretation. The Uzbek definitional basis was checked against "O'zbek tilining izohli lug'ati," where umid includes belief in the realization of a desire, confident expectation, aspiration, and the constructions umid qilmoq and umid bog'lamoq[8]. The analytical examples are constructed or normalized to represent standard patterns; the conclusions describe qualitative tendencies rather than frequency statistics.

Results and Analysis

The first result concerns the shared conceptual nucleus. Both hope and umid encode four necessary components: a desirable future situation, the perceived possibility of that situation, uncertainty about its realization, and a positive emotional orientation. Thus, the English sentence *"I hope the examination goes well"* and the Uzbek sentence *"Imtihon yaxshi o'tishiga umid qilaman"* describe a desired event that is considered possible but not guaranteed. In both examples, certainty would make hope unnecessary, while impossibility would normally replace hope with wish, regret, or despair.

The major grammatical difference is that English hope is both a noun and a verb without additional derivational marking. Compare *"Hope remained"* and *"They hope to return"*. Uzbek umid is primarily a noun. Verbal meaning is usually expressed analytically: *"Umid qildik"*, *"Umid bog'ladik"*, *"Umidvor bo'ldik"*, or morphologically through *"umidlandik"*. This distinction affects sentence structure and style. English easily personalizes the mental state through a finite verb, while Uzbek often presents hope as something possessed, directed, maintained, or attached.

English allows several productive complementation patterns. In *"I hope to complete the article today"*, the subject controls the action in the infinitive. In *"I hope that the article will be accepted"*, the

[1] Sh.Safarov. Kognitiv tilshunoslik. – Jizzax: Sangzor, 2006. – B. 17–33.
[2] A.Wierzbicka. Talking about Emotions: Semantics, Culture, and Cognition // Cognition and Emotion. – 1992. – Vol. 6, No. 3–4. – P. 285–291.
[3] C.J.Fillmore. Frame Semantics // Linguistics in the Morning Calm / ed. by the Linguistic Society of Korea. – Seoul: Hanshin Publishing, 1982. – P. 111–137.
[4] G.Lakoff, M.Johnson. Metaphors We Live By. – Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980. – P. 3–6.
[5] Z.Kövecses. Metaphor and Emotion: Language, Culture, and Body in Human Feeling. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000. – P. 20–35.
[6] C.R.Snyder. Hope Theory: Rainbows in the Mind // Psychological Inquiry. – 2002. – Vol. 13, No. 4. – P. 249–251.
[7] F.A.Burxoniy, F.M.Mamatova. From Lexeme to Worldview: Constructing Cultural Meaning Through the Semantic Field of Hope/Umid // American Journal of Philological Sciences. – 2025. – Vol. 5, No. 5. – P. 24–28.
[8] O'zbek tilining izohli lug'ati: 5 jildli. 4-jild. Tartibli–Shukr / A.Madvaliyev tahriri ostida. – Toshkent: O'zbekiston milliy ensiklopediyasi, 2008. – B. 283–284.

desired event may depend on other agents. In *"We hope for peace"*, the noun phrase names the desired outcome. Uzbek distributes these meanings among different constructions: *"Maqolani bugun tugatishga umid qilaman"*, *"Maqola qabul qilinishiga umid qilaman"*, and *"Tinchlikdan umidvormiz"*. Literal word-for-word transfer is not always natural; the translator must select the construction that best represents control, source, and expected outcome.

The second result is that hope and umid must be distinguished from wish/orzu, expectation/kutish, trust/ishonch, and intention/niyat. Hope combines desire with possibility. Wish can refer to an unreal or counterfactual state: *"I wish I could change the past"* is natural, but *"I hope I can change the past"* is semantically contradictory unless the speaker believes such change is possible. Uzbek similarly contrasts *"O'tmishni o'zgartira olsam edi"* with *"Vaziyatni yaxshilashga umid qilaman"*. Orzu often represents a broader, cherished aspiration, whereas umid usually contains a more immediate evaluation of possibility.

Expectation differs because it can be neutral or negative and is based more strongly on evidence. *"I expect the train to be late"* does not imply that lateness is desired. By contrast, *"I hope the train is not late"* explicitly evaluates punctuality as preferable. Uzbek *"Poyezd kechikadi, deb kutyapman"* and *"Poyezd kechikmasligiga umid qilaman"* likewise separate predictive expectation from desired possibility. The translation of hope as kutmoq is therefore correct only in contexts where waiting and hopeful expectation overlap.

Trust is stronger in relation to a person or source. In *"I trust her to keep the promise"* the speaker expresses confidence in the person. In *"I hope she keeps the promise"* the speaker foregrounds the desired event and retains uncertainty. Uzbek *"U va'dasida turishiga ishonaman"* is more certain than *"U va'dasida turishiga umid qilaman"*. However, constructions such as *"Sizdan umidimiz katta"* bring umid close to trust, expectation, and social evaluation. The object is not merely a future event but a person viewed as a potential source of good action.

The English lexical family includes hope, hopeful, hopefully, hopeless, hopelessness, and the less frequent hoper. The Uzbek family includes umid, umidli, umidsiz, umidsizlik, umidvor, umidvorlik, umidbaxsh, umidlanmoq, umidlantirmoq, and noumid. The Uzbek system is morphologically and analytically rich: *"umidbaxsh xabar"* focuses on something that gives hope; *"umidvor nigoh"* describes the experiencer's state; *"umidsiz vaziyat"* evaluates the situation; and *"umidsizlikka tushmoq"* presents hopelessness as a state entered by a person. English uses comparable forms—*"hopeful news," "a hopeful look," "a hopeless situation," "fall into hopelessness"*—but their distributions are not mechanically identical.

Both languages conceptualize hope as light. English expressions include *"a ray of hope"*, *"a glimmer of hope"*, and *"a beacon of hope"*. Uzbek uses *"umid nuri"*, *"umid uchquni"*, and *"umid chirog'i"*. The source domain LIGHT structures hope as something that makes an uncertain future cognitively visible. In *"The new treatment offered a glimmer of hope"* and *"Yangi natijalar umid uchqunini uyg'otdi"*, a small amount of light corresponds to a limited but meaningful positive possibility. A.Wierzbicka's work on emotion concepts supports this type of decomposition into evaluation, thought, and culturally conventional imagery[9].

Hope is also conceptualized as a possession or object. English speakers *"have hope," "lose hope," "give up hope,"* or *"hold on to hope"*. Uzbek speakers say *"umidi bor," "umidini yo'qotmoq," "umidini uzmoq,"* and *"umidini saqlamoq"*. The object metaphor permits hope to be acquired, maintained, transferred, or lost. Yet *"umidini uzmoq"* literally profiles the breaking or cutting of a connection. This connects with another Uzbek model, HOPE IS A BOND: *"unga umid bog'lamoq"* presents the experiencer as attaching expectation to a person or outcome. English *"pin one's hopes on someone"* is close, but it is stylistically more marked.

Vertical and fragile-object metaphors are especially productive in English. *"Her hopes rose"*, *"Do not raise their hopes"*, *"The decision dashed our hopes"* and *"His hopes were shattered"* map positive possibility onto upward movement and disappointment onto violent damage. Uzbek has natural counterparts: *"umidi ortdi"*, *"uni umidlantirib qo'ymang"*, *"umidi puchga chiqdi"* and *"barcha umidlari*

[9] A.Wierzbicka. Defining Emotion Concepts // Cognitive Science. – 1992. – Vol. 16, No. 4. – P. 539–548.

chilparchin bo‘ldi”. G.Lakoff and M.Johnson explain that orientational and ontological metaphors systematically organize abstract experience through spatial and material schemas[10].

English I hope frequently functions as an interpersonal softener. In *“I hope you do not mind”*, the speaker does more than express a future desire; the phrase reduces the force of an imposition and anticipates the listener’s reaction. A literal Uzbek rendering—*“Umid qilamanki, qarshi emassiz”*—is possible but comparatively formal. Depending on context, *“Qarshi emassiz, degan umiddaman”*, *“Xafa bo‘lmaysiz, deb o‘ylayman”* or a direct politeness formula may sound more natural. Thus, pragmatic equivalence can require a construction that does not contain umid at all.

Uzbek umid can carry a socially evaluative meaning that English hope may weaken. *“Sizdan umidimiz katta”* means not only *“We have great hopes for you”* but also signals trust, responsibility, and collective expectation. In family or educational discourse, the Uzbek phrase may position the addressee within a network of obligations. The English translation is accurate, yet the relational pressure may need contextual reinforcement: *“We place great trust in you and expect you to do well”*. V.I.Karasik’s linguocultural approach is relevant here because concepts function not only as cognitive categories but also as value-bearing units of discourse[11].

The analysis confirms three principal translation relations. First, direct equivalence occurs in ordinary future-oriented statements: *“We hope for better results”* — *“Yaxshiroq natijalarga umid qilamiz.”* Second, structural transformation is required when English verbal hope corresponds to an Uzbek nominal or analytic construction: *“She hopes to recover”* — *“U sog‘ayib ketishiga umid qilmoqda.”* Third, pragmatic substitution is necessary when hope performs a politeness or discourse-organizing function: *“I hope you understand”* — *“Meni to‘g‘ri tushunasiz, deb o‘ylayman.”* These relations show that conceptual comparison must move beyond dictionary substitution.

Interpersonal formulas require even closer attention to pragmatic intention. In *“I hope you are feeling better”*, hope can express sympathy and a wish for the addressee’s recovery. A direct Uzbek equivalent is *“O‘zingizni yaxshiroq his qilayotganingizga umid qilaman,”* but natural conversation may prefer *“O‘zingizni yaxshiroq his qilyapsizmi?”* or *“Tezroq sog‘ayib keting.”* Similarly, *“I hope this is not inconvenient”* may be rendered formally as *“Bu sizga noqulaylik tug‘dirmaydi, degan umiddaman,”* whereas *“Noqulay bo‘lmasa kerak”* is more conversational. The translator must preserve the politeness function rather than merely reproduce the lexical item.

Narrative and evaluative contexts reveal additional metaphorical profiles. English *“Hope kept him alive”* and Uzbek *“Umid uni yashashga undadi”* conceptualize hope as a sustaining force, while *“She clung to hope”* and *“U umidiga mahkam yopishdi”* present it as an object of physical attachment. In *“He was their last hope”* — *“U ularning so‘nggi umidi edi,”* a person becomes the final source of a favorable outcome. The English idiom *“hope against hope”* has no equally compact Uzbek equivalent and may require an explanatory form such as *“hech qanday asos qolmagan bo‘lsa-da, umid qilishda davom etmoq.”* These cases show that equivalence may be lexical, constructional, or descriptive.

Negative and derivative forms are particularly sensitive to context. English *“I hope not”* can correspond to *“Unday bo‘lmasin,” “Unday emas, deb umid qilaman,”* or a shorter contextual response. *“Do not get your hopes up”* may be translated as *“Ko‘p umid bog‘lamang”* or *“Ortiqcha umidlanmang.”* The adjective hopeless also requires semantic disambiguation. In *“The situation is hopeless,”* Uzbek *“Vaziyat umidsiz”* is appropriate; in *“He is hopeless at mathematics,”* the literal *“U matematikadan umidsiz”* is unnatural, and *“U matematikadan juda qiynaladi”* better conveys incompetence. Such examples confirm that conceptual comparison must account for polysemy and discourse function.

Discussion

The findings show that hope and umid share a universal structure: a person wants a good event, believes it can happen, knows that it may not happen, and experiences a positive orientation toward it. This structure explains their contrast with certainty, impossibility, neutral prediction, and counterfactual wishing. It also accounts for shared LIGHT, POSSESSION, LIFE, and VERTICALITY metaphors.

[10] G.Lakoff, M.Johnson. Metaphors We Live By. – Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980. – P. 14–21.
[11] V.I.Karasik. Yazykovoy krug: lichnost, kontsepty, diskurs. – Volgograd: Peremena, 2002. – P. 91–108.

The principal asymmetry is grammatical. English uses a productive noun-verb pair and readily combines hope with infinitives, clauses, and discourse formulas. Uzbek uses a predominantly nominal lexeme with auxiliaries, derivation, possessive marking, and case-governed relations. These resources specify how hope is possessed, attached, directed, strengthened, or lost, while English more easily foregrounds the experiencer as the subject of a finite verb.

A second asymmetry concerns agency and relationality. English examples frequently place the hoping individual in subject position: *"I hope to succeed," "She hopes to change the situation."* Such forms naturally foreground personal stance and potential action. Uzbek has direct counterparts, but conventional expressions also foreground the source or object of reliance: *"Sizdan umidim katta," "Unga umid bog'ladik."* These constructions highlight interpersonal trust and shared responsibility. This difference should not be reduced to a rigid opposition between "individualistic English" and "collectivist Uzbek." It is more accurate to say that each language makes certain dimensions easier and more conventional to express.

The metaphorical evidence combines universality with cultural selection. Both languages use light and possession because future possibility can be imagined as visibility and hope as an internal resource. Uzbek "umid bog'lamoq" foregrounds attachment and reliance, whereas English "high hopes" and "raise hopes" strongly develop the vertical scale of intensity. English "shattered hopes" and Uzbek "umidi puchga chiqdi" describe disappointment through different material images, influencing emotional tone and translation choice.

Conclusion

The comparison demonstrates that "hope" and "umid" are close but non-identical concepts. Their shared core includes desire, future orientation, perceived possibility, uncertainty, and positive evaluation. Differences arise from grammar, derivation, collocation, metaphor, and pragmatic function. English readily foregrounds the individual experiencer; Uzbek analytic, possessive, and case-marked constructions often emphasize reliance, patience, relational trust, and moral endurance. Direct equivalence is reliable in neutral contexts, while other contexts require structural or pragmatic transformation.

References:

1. F.A.Burxoniy, F.M.Mamatova. From Lexeme to Worldview: Constructing Cultural Meaning Through the Semantic Field of Hope/Umid // American Journal of Philological Sciences. – 2025. – Vol. 5, No. 5. – P. 24–28.
2. C.J.Fillmore. Frame Semantics // Linguistics in the Morning Calm / ed. by the Linguistic Society of Korea. – Seoul: Hanshin Publishing, 1982. – P. 111–137.
3. V.I.Karasik. Yazykovoy krug: lichnost, kontsepty, diskurs. – Volgograd: Peremena, 2002. – 477 p.
4. Z.Kövecses. Metaphor and Emotion: Language, Culture, and Body in Human Feeling. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000. – 223 p.
5. G.Lakoff, M.Johnson. Metaphors We Live By. – Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980. – 242 p.
6. O'zbek tilining izohli lug'ati: 5 jildli. 4-jild. Tartibli–Shukr / A.Madvaliyev tahriri ostida. – Toshkent: O'zbekiston milliy ensiklopediyasi, 2008. – 608 b.
7. Sh.Safarov. Kognitiv tilshunoslik. – Jizzax: Sangzor, 2006. – 92 b.
8. C.R.Snyder. Hope Theory: Rainbows in the Mind // Psychological Inquiry. – 2002. – Vol. 13, No. 4. – P. 249–275.
9. A.Wierzbicka. Defining Emotion Concepts // Cognitive Science. – 1992. – Vol. 16, No. 4. – P. 539–581.
10. A.Wierzbicka. Talking about Emotions: Semantics, Culture, and Cognition // Cognition and Emotion. – 1992. – Vol. 6, No. 3–4. – P. 285–319.