CONTRASTIVE ANALYSIS OF CANOLA OIL IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK LANGUAGES

INGLIZ VA O'ZBEK TILLARIDA KOLZA YOG'INING QIYOSIY TAHLILI

СРАВНИТЕЛЬНЫЙ АНАЛИЗ МАСЛА КАНОЛЫ В АНГЛИЙСКОМ И УЗБЕКСКОМ ЯЗЫКАХ

Mamataliyeva Navbakhor
Teacher of Termez State University
Khayitmurodova Mokhira Abdikhofiz kizi
Student of Termez State University

Abstract: This article presents a contrastive linguistic analysis comparing the terminology and discourse related to canola oil in English and Uzbek. Methods included compiling parallel corpora of texts discussing canola oil in both languages, analyzing key terms and collocations, and contrasting semantic and pragmatic features. The results show that while the core terminology is quite similar, reflecting the status of English as the global language of science, there are notable differences in usage patterns, idiomatic expressions, and cultural connotations surrounding canola oil in these two languages.

Keywords: contrastive linguistics, terminology, corpus analysis, English, Uzbek, canola oil

Annotatsiya: Ushbu maqolada ingliz va o'zbek tillarida kolza yog'i bilan bog'liq terminologiya va nutqni taqqoslaydigan kontrastli lingvistik tahlil keltirilgan. Usullarga ikkala tilda kolza yog'ini muhokama qiladigan matnlarning parallel korpuslarini tuzish, asosiy atamalar va kollokatsiyalarni tahlil qilish, semantik va pragmatik xususiyatlarni qarama-qarshi qilish kiradi. Natijalar shuni ko'rsatadiki, asosiy terminologiya juda o'xshash bo'lsa-da, ingliz tilining global fan tili maqomini aks ettiradi, bu ikki tilda kolza yog'i atrofidagi foydalanish naqshlari, idiomatik iboralar va madaniy ma'nolarda sezilarli farqlar mavjud.

Kalit so'zlar: kontrastli tilshunoslik, terminologiya, korpus tahlili, ingliz, o'zbek, kanola yog'i

Аннотация: В данной статье представлен сравнительный лингвистический анализ терминологии и дискурса, связанных с маслом канолы, в английском и узбекском языках. Методы исследования включали составление параллельных корпусов текстов, посвященных маслу канолы, на обоих языках, анализ ключевых терминов и словосочетаний, а также сопоставление семантических и прагматических особенностей. Результаты показывают, что, хотя основная

терминология довольно схожа, что отражает статус английского языка как глобального языка науки, существуют заметные различия в моделях использования, идиоматических выражениях и культурных коннотациях, связанных с маслом канолы в этих двух языках.

Ключевые слова: контрастивная лингвистика, терминология, корпусный анализ, английский, узбекский, рапсовое масло

INTRODUCTION

Contrastive linguistic analysis involves comparing two or more languages to identify similarities and differences at various levels, from phonology and morphology to syntax, semantics, and pragmatics [1]. Such analysis provides valuable insights into the unique characteristics of each language, as well as universal patterns. It also has important applications in fields such as translation, language teaching, and intercultural communication [2].

While English has been extensively compared with many languages, Uzbek has received relatively little attention in contrastive linguistics research. As the state language of Uzbekistan and a member of the Turkic language family spoken by over 27 million people [3], Uzbek merits further study, particularly in comparison with global languages like English.

METHODS AND LITERATURE REVIEW

Corpus Compilation. The primary method employed in this study was corpus analysis. Two comparable corpora were compiled, one consisting of English texts discussing canola oil and the other containing Uzbek texts on the same topic. Texts were selected from a range of genres and sources, including agricultural reports, nutritional guides, news articles, and cooking blogs.

Analysis Procedures. The corpora were analyzed using AntConc, a freeware corpus analysis toolkit [4]. First, a keyword analysis was conducted to identify terms that were particularly frequent or salient in each corpus. Next, concordance lines were examined to study the collocations and context of key terms. Particular attention was paid to idiomatic expressions and metaphorical language.

The Uzbek corpus was also compared to an Uzbek reference corpus to identify terms and usages that were specific to the canola oil domain. Semantic and pragmatic features were analyzed, such as connotations, register, and cultural associations.

Contrastive analysis has a long history in linguistics, dating back to the work of Robert Lado in the 1950s [5]. Early approaches focused on predicting errors in second language acquisition based on differences between the learner's native language and the target language [6]. However, more recent research has expanded the scope of contrastive analysis to include a wider range of linguistic features and communicative contexts [7].

Several studies have compared English and Uzbek from different perspectives. Islamov [8] examined syntactic differences between the two languages, while Djumabaeva [9] analyzed the translation of English metaphors into Uzbek. However, to the best of our knowledge, no previous study has focused specifically on the domain of canola oil terminology.

RESULTS

The keyword analysis revealed a high degree of overlap between the top content words in the English and Uzbek corpora. Terms such as canola, oil, seed, and fatty acids were among the most frequent in both languages. This reflects the fact that much of the core terminology surrounding canola oil has been borrowed from English into Uzbek.

However, some differences emerged in the lower-frequency keywords. The English corpus contained more terms related to health and nutrition, such as cholesterol, omega-3, and antioxidants. The Uzbek corpus, on the other hand, featured more terms related to agriculture and processing, such as hectare, tons, and refinement.

Examining collocations and idiomatic expressions revealed some interesting contrasts between English and Uzbek. In the English corpus, canola oil frequently occurred in combinations such as "heart-healthy," "all-purpose," and "high heat." These collocations reflect the marketing of canola oil as a versatile and nutritious cooking oil in English-speaking countries.

In the Uzbek corpus, canola oil was often described using expressions that evoked purity, such as "toza" (clean) and "tabiiy" (natural). There were also more collocations related to traditional Uzbek cuisine, such as "qovurma" (fried dish) and "somsa" (meat pastry).

In Uzbek, canola oil is commonly referred to as "kanola moyi" or "kolza moyi." The term "kanola" is a direct borrowing from English, while "kolza" comes from the Russian word "кольза" (kol'za), which refers to rapeseed, the plant from which canola oil is derived.

The Uzbek language also uses descriptive phrases to highlight the characteristics of canola oil. For example:
- "Kanola moyi tarkibidagi yog' kislotalari" (fatty acids in canola oil)
- "Kanola moyi terini yumshatadi va parvarish qiladi" (canola oil softens and nourishes the skin)
- "Kanola moyi yog' kislotalariga, jumladan olein, linolein, alfa-linolen va palmitik kislotalarga boy" (canola oil is rich in fatty acids, including oleic, linoleic, alpha-linolenic, and palmitic acids)

These phrases emphasize the nutritional and cosmetic benefits of canola oil, focusing on its fatty acid composition and its ability to moisturize and nourish the skin.

In English, the primary term for this oil is "canola oil." The word "canola" is a blend of "Canada" and "ola," referring to the oil's origin and its low acid content. Canola was developed through traditional plant breeding from rapeseed in Canada during the 1970s.

Other terms used in English to describe canola oil include:

▪ "Low erucic acid rapeseed (LEAR) oil"
▪ "Double zero (00) rapeseed oil"
▪ "Rapeseed 00 oil"

These terms highlight the low levels of erucic acid and glucosinolates in canola oil, which distinguish it from traditional rapeseed oil.

DISCUSSION

The results of this contrastive analysis suggest that while the core terminology surrounding canola oil is quite similar in English and Uzbek, there are notable differences in usage patterns, idiomatic expressions, and cultural associations. These differences reflect the unique linguistic and cultural contexts in which canola oil is discussed and consumed.

The greater emphasis on health and nutrition in the English corpus may be due to the longer history of health-conscious marketing in English-speaking countries. The Uzbek focus on purity and tradition, on the other hand, could reflect a cultural preference for natural, locally sourced products.

These findings highlight the importance of considering linguistic and cultural factors when translating or communicating about specialized topics like canola oil across languages. Translators and writers should be aware of the different connotations and associations that terms may carry in each language and culture.

CONCLUSION

This contrastive analysis of canola oil terminology in English and Uzbek has revealed similarities in core vocabulary but differences in usage patterns, idioms, and cultural associations. These findings contribute to our understanding of how specialized language varies across linguistic and cultural contexts. The study helps fill a gap in research on Uzbek-English contrastive linguistics and has potential applications in translation, language teaching, and intercultural communication related to food and agriculture. Future research could expand the analysis to include a wider range of text types or compare Uzbek to other languages.

REFERENCES

1. Johansson, S. (2008). Contrastive analysis and learner language: A corpus-based approach. University of Oslo.
2. Lado, R. (1957). Linguistics across cultures: Applied linguistics for language teachers. University of Michigan Press.

3. Ethnologue. (2021). Uzbek. Retrieved from https://www.ethnologue.com/language/uzb

4. Anthony, L. (2019). AntConc (Version 3.5.8) [Computer software]. Tokyo, Japan: Waseda University.

5. Lado, R. (1957). Linguistics across cultures: Applied linguistics for language teachers. University of Michigan Press.

6. Fries, C. C. (1945). Teaching and learning English as a foreign language. University of Michigan Press.

7. James, C. (1980). Contrastive analysis. Longman.

8. Islamov, O. (2020). Syntactic differences between English and Uzbek languages. International Journal of Psychosocial Rehabilitation, 24(06), 3782-3791.

9. Djumabaeva, J. S. (2016). Peculiarities of translation of English metaphors into Uzbek. Philology Matters, 2016(1), 136-140.