



## GLUTTONIC (GASTRONOMIC) DISCOURSE: CLASSIFICATION OF GASTRONOMIC TERMS AND THEIR DIFFICULTIES IN TRANSLATION

*Azzamov Yusufjon*

*Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages*

*Teacher of the Department of Translation Theory and Practice*

*Independent researcher*

[Shahram.aslonov@mail.ru](mailto:Shahram.aslonov@mail.ru)

+998915329255

2464

### Abstract.

The article examines discourse as a phenomenon that includes an extremely wide cultural sphere. The phenomenon of "gastronomic communication" is described, and attention is also paid to the key aspect of gastronomic discourse - communication. This article describes the classification of gastronomic terms, their specific aspects. How to translate gastronomic terms, their use in the translation process in transformations, how the menu and its content are cross-cultural. A theoretical answer to such questions can be found in the article.

**Key words:** media, communication, gastronomic discourse, semantic border, linguistic sign, gluttonic terms, menu, recipes, two-core and three-core terms, names of dishes, transcription, transliteration, transformation.

**DOI Number:** 10.14704/nq.2022.20.11.NQ66245

**NeuroQuantology 2022; 20(11): 2464-2470**

### Introduction.

Gluttonic (gastronomic) discourse can be resolutely placed in the forefront of other well-known discourses, since nutrition is of paramount importance in a person's life. Today, one of the most important places is occupied by communication, in one way or another related to food, its properties, the process of nutrition, methods of preparation and consumption. Thus, a system of linguacultural signs is being built that define the system of gluttonia.

Gastronomic discourse as such began to be studied relatively recently, although food issues have been dealt with from time immemorial. Interest in the field of nutrition as a cultural and linguistic phenomenon in the ethnographic and linguistic sciences arises in the 19th century.

Special attention was paid to gastronomic culture, as well as the study of the nutrition

sector, manifested in the 1960s - 1970s. and receives development in the works of such researchers as R. Barth and M. Douglas. Nutrition is beginning to be seen as a specific cultural code.

Currently, the issue of the peculiarities of the gastronomic discourse has not received sufficient coverage. Among domestic researchers, A.V. Olyanich, who called this phenomenon "gluttonic" (from Lat. Gluttonare - "to eat, absorb food"). The scientist notes that the linguistic signs of the gluttonic discourse form an aggregate, which in turn is dismembered into frames. They are stored in the human mind in the form of menus, recipes, rules of conduct and rituals. "Food (food) and the associated discourse are a sign system in which "cultural capital", national self-identification, personal identification and subjective attitude (taste), gender and social



(class) characteristics are concentrated” [13, 502].

**Methods:** To solve the set tasks, the following methods were used: descriptive method, interpretation method, elements of cross-cultural analysis, method of linguistic semiotic modeling, method of conceptual analysis, method of thematic systematization.

**Research results:** As a result, we came to the conclusion that the translation of gastronomic texts requires the specialization of a translator in the field of culinary, knowledge of the traditions of writing gastronomic texts, their structural and functional features.

A serious omission in the translation of texts related to gastronomic discourse is ignorance of culinary traditions, nuances of culinary art, realities, which often leads to inaccuracies, as well as gross errors of grammatical, stylistic, lexical and semantic nature. The quality largely depends on the translator's level of understanding of the subtleties of the original. Along with this, most of the texts lack editorial work, which undoubtedly makes an unfavorable impression on the recipient.

**Discussion.** Currently, in connection with the rapid development of intercultural contacts, including professional ones, the interpenetration of gastronomic traditions is increasingly manifested, entailing the emergence of a huge number of new concepts and, consequently, the terminological vocabulary denoting them, which requires competent translation and represents a large interest. In addition, the development of modern culinary concepts and new cooking techniques increasingly involves the use of a scientific approach, therefore, the language of gastronomic texts is increasingly saturated with scientific terminology, which also needs adequate translation.

Before proceeding with the analysis of the translation of terms in gastronomy texts, it is necessary to study the very concept of the term and consider the existing classifications of terms.

Well-known specialist in the field of translation theory and translation studies Barkhudarov L.S. a term means "a word or phrase associated with a concept belonging to any area of knowledge or activity" [8]. Russian linguist Reformatsky A.A. gives the following definition of the term: "terms are special words, limited by their special purpose; words striving to be unambiguous as an accurate expression of concepts and naming of things. It is necessary in science, technology, politics and diplomacy" [15]. Another well-known linguist V.N. believes that the terms are "words and phrases denoting specific objects and concepts that are used by specialists in a particular field of science or technology" [11]. These definitions make it possible to single out three integral components of any term that need to be preserved during translation: accuracy, limited use and striving for unambiguity.

By "gastronomic discourse" is meant a special type of verbal-social discourse, the structure of which is characterized by "Socio-cultural, religious-ethnic, linguo-philosophical properties, the purpose of which is to achieve gastronomic communication" [16, 44].

The menu is a special type of text of the gastronomic discourse, where the recipient, immersed in the gastronomic discourse, is the person familiarizing with the menu, while the addressee is an employee of a cafe, restaurant or bar. Gastronomic terms are used in menu texts - words and phrases denoting specific objects and concepts that are used in the field of nutrition. The lexical and semantic features of the menu text include the use of thematically conditioned vocabulary, within which one can single out: names of dishes; names of ingredients, seasonings; cooking methods; types of dishes.

As shown by the statistical processing of research materials, the names of ingredients and spices prevail in menu texts among gastronomic terms. They make up 57% of the total number of gastronomic terms selected from menu texts. The names of dishes are also quite common in menu texts (29%). And the



terms denoting the methods of preparation and types of dishes are quite rare in such texts.

There are many classifications of terms according to a number of characteristics: by content (observation terms and theoretical terms), by fields of knowledge (science, technology, production, etc.), by the logical category of a concept (terms of objects, processes, signs, properties, quantities and their units), other. However, for this study, it is of interest to classify terms according to their formal structure, since often the preservation of the structural component of terms entails difficulties in translation. So, from the point of view of the form, terms are divided into word terms (one-word terms) and word combinations (terminological phrases). Terms-words, in turn, are divided into root, the stem of which coincides with the root, affix, the stem of which contains the root and affixes, and complex, the stem of which contains several root morphemes [9, 106]. Since the morphology of the English language is somewhat different from the morphology of the Russian language, this classification can be simplified by dividing the terms into simple (one-word), complex (consisting of two or more words written together or with a hyphen), and phrases. Here are examples of terms from gastronomic texts according to this classification: simple - dehydration, aeration, fermentation, starches, ragout, enzymes, acids; complex -  $\alpha$ -amylase, pandan-infused 1,4-linked- $\beta$ -D-mannuronic  $\alpha$ -L-guluronic; word combinations - magnetic stirrer, gelled alginate matrix, binomial diffusion equation, humid environment conditions, vacuum sealer, blast freezer, etc.

Also of interest is the classification of terms by motivation / non-motivation, which shows that there are terms whose meaning may or may not be explained by the meaning of the elements of their structure. The distinction here is between the terms fully motivated (site-specific flavor, flexible axes), partially motivated (modified tapioca starch) and completely unmotivated (Epoisses, pandan, sous vide).

Gastronomic terms within each identified thematic group were subjected to a structural analysis by the number of components. Having examined the thematic group "Names of dishes", we were able to identify that two-component terms prevail and make up 62% of the total (English Breakfast). In the group "Names of ingredients, spices," one-component terms prevail over others, they constituted 59% of the sample (mushrooms, paprika, honey, oregano...). As for the group "Cooking methods", it should be noted that all terms here are one-component (fried, stewed, boiled, grilled ...). In the thematic group "Types of dishes", single-component terms account for 66% of the sample (Sides, starters ...) Thus, the belonging of a gastronomic term to a certain thematic group is reflected in its structural specificity in terms of the number of components.

The analysis of the semantic structure of the gastronomic terms of the menu texts also revealed the connection between the belonging of such a term to the thematic group and its semantic specifics. Most of thematic groups are characterized by the predominance of single-core terms. In the "Names of ingredients, spices" mononuclear terms prevailed significantly - 66%. Looking at the terms in the "Preparation Methods" group, we found that 98% of such terms are single-core. In the "Types of dishes" group, 70% of gastronomic terms are single-core. Standing apart here is the "Names of Dish" group, in which most of them are single-core terms with a periphery (83%), for example, Kentish pie [12].

Two-core and three-core terms were found only among the terms "Names of dishes", which indicates the greatest seed variety of terms in this group and distinguishes it from others.

For all the simplicity of the presentation of this type of gastronomic discourse, the translation of its texts can cause difficulties. It is enough to familiarize yourself with numerous Internet blogs to make sure that the general reader is not satisfied with translated texts in



this direction. Of course, these critics are mostly far from the art of translation. However, this assessment is not accidental. To translate recipes is by no means enough to have a good command of the target language. The main factor is knowledge of cooking, as well as culture and realities, without which sometimes the simplest recipe cannot be successfully translated.

When translating culinary recipes, the translator can rely on the following criteria: follow the accepted style of writing culinary recipes in the translated language; follow the style of the original.

This section examines the problem of translating recipes into Uzbek. As mentioned earlier, four types of constructions are inherent in Uzbek recipes: infinitive, indefinite personal, imperative, constructions using the 1st person plural verb. The presence of such a large number of constructions is due to the popularity of translated cookbooks, where the translator immediately copies the style and syntax of the original.

When translating recipes into Uzbek, permutations are quite frequent. Permutations are very rarely subject to "algorithms of action", as this can lead to improper preparation of the dish, but they can be observed in the listing of ingredients.

Permutations within sentences are frequent. For example, in English, the structure of a sentence assumes direct word order. First, a verb is used to indicate what to do with a product, followed by a noun that implies the product itself. In the Uzbek translation, this construction changes. The emphasis is on the product, the object with which you need to work or the method of preparing the dish, and then on the action performed with them.

Frequency of permutations in the names of ingredients at the level of subject / addition - definition. In English, attributive nouns often play the role of definitions in recipes. In English, they precede the word that defines them. In Uzbek, such nouns are transmitted by nouns in the role of an object.

Along with permutations, additions and omissions are some of the most common techniques for translating culinary recipes. These techniques are used to add specifics to the recipe, omit unnecessary details, or to follow the norms of the Uzbek language. Omissions are also widely used in the introductory block. They can relate to the names of ingredients, their quantity, special qualities.

Along with additions, when translating recipes, omissions are often used. This technique is used to eliminate redundancy during translation. It is also carried out if the translator considers some information to be superfluous.

Particular attention should be paid to the difficulties that the translator may encounter. Despite the existing norms for the design of culinary recipes, translators often fall into the trap of translation, forgetting about these norms. We will pay special attention to the violation of the norms of the genre.

A significant difficulty in translating culinary texts is the translation of lexical units. The main problems that translators can face are: translation of titles; ingredients; parts / quantities of an ingredient; reductions; devices, utensils; culinary lexemes (culinary verbs, nouns denoting a cooking method, which are absent in Uzbek);

The headline is the first element that the reader and translator draw attention to. It is with him that the perception of the entire text begins. Further reading of the recipe depends on the successful translation of the title. The heading, as a rule, stands out from the body text and is a summary of the recipe.

Translating the names of dishes may seem like a simple task, but it is not: the translation title should have the same informative, aesthetic focus as its original. Despite the fact that the titles in cookbooks, as a rule, are more sophisticated than the names of dishes used in everyday life, nevertheless, they can be attributed to realities, lexemes reflecting the life and customs of peoples. It is



the names of the food that give the culinary recipes their national flavor. Such realities are usually considered untranslatable, but they are the ones the translator has to deal with in the first place when working with recipes.

Particular difficulties arise when translating terms, phrases and complex terms. According to Pronina R.F. there are the following basic techniques for translating terms and phrases [14]:

Calculation: *binomial diffusion equation* – *биномиальное диффузное уравнение* – *binomial diffuziya tenglamasi*.

Translation using the genitive case: *concentration gradient* – *градиент концентрации* – *konsentratsiya gradyani*

Translation using various prepositions: *Tapioca Maltodextrin sablee* – *песочное тесто из патоки и крахмальной муки* – *rekmez va kraxmal unidan tayyorlangan qandolat pishirig'i*.

Translation of one of the members of the phrase with a group of explanatory words: *low acyl gellan* – *геллан с низким содержанием ацила* – *past navdagi low acyl gellan*.

Translation with reordering of the components of the attribute group: *humid environment conditions* – *условиями влажной среды* - *nam muhit sharoitlari*.

Kovalenko A.Ya. highlights the following techniques for translating terms [10]:

Descriptive technique, i.e. translation of one or more components of a term-phrase using an extended explanation of the meaning of the English word: *sous vide* – *технология приготовления пищи «под вакуумом»*.

Translation using the genitive case: *controlled stress oscillatory sweep* – *контролируемая нагрузка колебательной развертки* – *boshqariladigan tebranish yuki*.

Calculation: *diffusion-limited reactions* – *диффузионно-ограниченные реакции* – *cheklangan diffusion reaksiyalar*.

Transcription:  *$\alpha$ -amylase* – *альфа-амилаза* – *alfa-amilaza*.

Transliteration: *hydrocolloid Gellan* – *гидроколлойд геллан* – *gellan gidrokolloid*.

Translation using different prepositions: *crosshatched stainless-steel spindle* – *заштрихованный шпindelь из нержавеющей стали* - *zanglamaydigan po'latdan yasalgan mil*.

Difficulties in translating menus can be comparable to those in translating culinary recipes. When working with the menu, the translator takes into account its two main functions: the transmission of information and the function of influence. Each menu is designed in such a way that the reader wants to purchase the dishes it offers. The specialization of the restaurant is of great importance, as translation strategies will also depend on it.

When speaking about the translation of the menu, we will take the denotative translation model as a basis, since the translator, first of all, operates with the gastronomic texture. The choice of this model is due to the fact that the main function of the menu is more likely to convey information, rather than artistic and aesthetic impact.

The complexity of the translation depends on the use of one or another type of dish name and its description. The translator's appeal to the subject situation is especially clearly traced in the event that the ingredient mentioned in the menu or the dish itself does not exist in the target language.

Full transcription is used in cases where the ingredients are listed separately from the name, there is a description.

A more common technique is partial transcription. This includes cases in which the translator, conveying the reality in transcription, then, using another technique (explanation or adaptation), writes its meaning in brackets. This technique is usually used in short menus, where the list of ingredients that make up the dish may not be listed. This method is also often used when translating menus in Uzbek restaurants abroad.

Another variation of the transcription that is used both in menu texts and in recipes is transcription with the translation of ingredients or individual parts of the name.



All other techniques are less common, but they are found in most of the menus we study. These techniques are used in cases where the use of transcription or transliteration is inappropriate, as well as when the compiler of the menu seeks to convey the meaning of the name of the dish to the visitor.

When compared with the recipe, when translating such descriptions in the menu, more omissions are made. Since the menu does not require a strict sequence compared to the recipe text, there is a lot of freedom here. As far as syntax is concerned, sentence splitting can also be used when translating description names. This technique is used to facilitate the perception of the text by the reader.

When translating a menu, the translator faces the same set of problems as when translating recipes, but in this case he is given a lot of freedom of action. A particular difficulty is little-used, professional or non-equivalent vocabulary. These include: translation of the name of the ingredient; parts of an ingredient; measures of measurement; culinary vocabulary (culinary verbs and participles derived from them; adjectives denoting culinary realities).

Unlike the text of the recipe, there may be fewer ingredients on the menu, since only basic concepts are important here, additional ingredients can be the chef's secret. The menu usually mentions ingredients that are available only in the locality of their preparation, so unfamiliar, exotic concepts are much less common than in recipes.

The main problem for translation is the names of ingredients that do not exist in other cultures, which may include herbs, sauces, cheeses, etc. Such exotic ingredients are usually transliterated and transcribed according to the norms of the language from which they originated.

Another problem is the translation of a part of the ingredient, since these designations may not be known in the target language. Unlike the recipe text, there are few of them. It is rather difficult to convey the names of a part of the carcass when cutting, which can be found

both in the listing of dishes and in the names. Despite the fact that the difficulties in translating this vocabulary in the menu can be similar, as in translating recipes, they are solved in different ways.

Not knowing the ingredients can also lead to mistakes.

Ridiculous translations can arise due to the translator's ignorance of the dish he is describing.

Errors can also occur at the grammar level.

A high frequency of grammatical errors when translating from a foreign language into Uzbek, performed by a non-native speaker: this may relate to misspelling, the use of words, the use of an incorrect case.

**Abstract.** The relevance of this work is due to the active functioning of the texts of the gastronomic discourse in social communication and insufficient knowledge of gastronomic terms and the specifics of their translation in the framework of the process of intercultural communication. The aim of the work is to analyze the lexical specifics of menu texts, as well as strategies for translating gastronomic terms from English into Uzbek. By gluttonic (gastronomic) discourse, we mean a special type of verbal-social discourse, the purpose of which is to achieve gluttonic communication. Gastronomic discourse includes textual structures related to the nutritional process, which takes into account the participants, conditions, methods of communication, the environment in which the conversation takes place, the place and time of communication, goals and motives, as well as the genre and style of speech.

Gastronomic discourse is the main type of communication, acts as a basic element in everyday communication, and also has an individual and even status character. First of all, when describing the gastronomic discourse, its heterogeneous structure was noted. Within this discourse, various genres can be distinguished, which differ from each other in functional purpose: texts of menus, recipes, culinary



guides, gastronomic fragments in literary texts, gastronomic advertisements, culinary programs, instructions for preparing dishes on packages, etc. These texts are united by a common theme, are characterized by the selection of common vocabulary and linguistic means, and can be considered as texts belonging to one type of discourse.

The analysis of the translation of menus and recipes has shown that translation decisions are determined by the genre of gastronomic discourse. The text of the recipe is instructive in nature, which determines the translator's strategic approach to this type of text. When translating recipes, the use of nominative constructions was noted to preserve the norms of the Russian language. Permutations, additions and omissions were widely used. These techniques were used to add specificity to the recipe or omit unnecessary details, as well as to comply with the norms of the Uzbek language.

#### References:

1. Fisher M. F. K. *The Anatomy of a Recipe // With Bold Knife and Fork*. Berkeley: Counterpoint, 1983.
2. Gee J. P. Literacy, discourse, and linguistics: introduction // *The Journal of Education*. 2015. 171:1. 176 p.
3. Grzega J., Schöner M. *English and General Historical Lexicology: Materials for Onomasiology Seminars*. Katholische Universitat Eichstatt-Ingolstadt, 2007. 73 p.
4. Harris Z. *Discourse analysis // Language*. 1952. 28:1. 130 p.
5. Hegarty J. A., O'Mahony G.B. *Gastronomy: a phenomenon of cultural expressionism and an aesthetic for living // Hospitality Management*. 2001.
6. Morris C.W. *Signs, Language and Behavior*. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1946. 365 p.
7. Stubbs M. *Discourse Analysis: The Sociolinguistic Analysis of Natural Language*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1983. 272 p.
8. Бархударов Л.С. *Язык и перевод. Вопросы общей и частной теории переводов*. М.: ,1975. – 239 с.
9. Гринев С.В. *Введение в терминоведение*. - М.: Московский лицей, 1993 – 309 с.
10. Коваленко, А.Я. *Общий курс научно-технического перевода / А.Я.Коваленко*. – Киев: ИНКОС, 2004. – 313 с
11. Комиссаров В.Н. *Теория перевода (лингвистические аспекты): Учеб. для ин-тов и фак. иностр. яз.* – М.: Высш. шк., 1990. – 253 с.
12. Овеян. Я.О. *Структурно-семантическая классификация и способы перевода англоязычных гастрономических терминов (на материалах текстов меню) 2017*. – 115 с.
13. Олянич А. В. *О 120 Презентационная теория дискурса: Монография*. – Волгоград: Парадигма, 2004. – 507 с.
14. Пронина Р. Ф. *Перевод английской научно-технической литературы*. М.: Высшая школа, 1986. – 176 с
15. Реформатский А.А. *Введение в языковедение / Под ред. В.А. Виноградова*. – М.: Аспект Пресс, 1996. – 536 с.
16. Ундрицова М.В. *Глюттонический дискурс: лингвокультурологические, когнитивно-прагматические и переводческие аспекты (на материале рус-ского, английского, французского и греческого языков): автореф. дисс. ... канд. филол. наук*. М., 2015

