

GLUTTONIC NOMINATION IN RUSSIAN AND BRITISH LINGUISTIC CULTURES

Arkady Petrovich Sedykh, Larisa Robertovna Ermakova

Federal State Autonomous Educational Institution of Higher Professional Education
"The Belgorod State National Research University" (NRU "BELSU")
85, Pobedy St. Belgorod, 308015 (RUSSIA)

DOI: 10.7813/jll.2014/5-3/57

Received: 14 Feb, 2014

Accepted: 15 Aug, 2014

ABSTRACT

In the article universal and ethnocultural ways of the gluttonic nomination in Russian and British linguistic culture are described. Linguistic-cultural correlations of foodstuff names and national character are chosen as an object of research. At the same time, national character is considered as set of the steadiest features of emotional sensory perception of world around and forms of reactions to it for this national community. It is confirmed that national character, being expressed in emotions, feelings, moods, is manifested in existing language forms. Language possesses the ability to influence formation and development of national culture, which is positioned as the personality. Need of aspect of relevance in studying of language, culture and the personality interaction is postulated.

Key words: gluttonym, nomination, gluttonic picture of the world, linguistic culture, national character, language personality

1. INTRODUCTION

In the last decades, the cross-cultural communication, which is showing in specifics of interlingual communication, becomes the integral element of daily existence of the person. In the light of current trends of society globalization not only a role of foreign languages increases, but also a role of constructive perception of national cultures [1, 2, 3].

In the course of interlanguage contacts, a person faces perception of other cultures, need of replenishment of knowledge about the concrete national culture from a set of sources – sciences about humankind and society, such as history, psychology, art criticism, philosophy and some others. In addition, of course, our knowledge of culture is got from the ordinary life consisting of various needs of a person: physiological, social, personal.

One of fundamental physiological needs of a person is nutriance need. According to the American psychologist A. Maslow, the need in food represents a basic level of the physiological constitution of a person [4, 15-16]. The humankind cannot live without food; however, representatives of each nation have their own package of gustatory preferences, which are embodied in the corresponding language and text material: gastronomic terminology, recipes of ethnic cuisine, menu, culinary articles and so forth. Each given lexical or text material from this human activity area represents itself an inexhaustible source to identify the ways of verbalization of prepotent features of national character.

2. TECHNIQUE

For the solution of problems to identify the universal and ethnocultural signs of the gluttonic nomination are used: descriptive and interpretative methods, as well as the elements of the cross-cultural analysis. The technique of peculiarities of national mentality detection is based on the principal proposition that the language form of the human personality is an integral part of national perception and communication structure. Consumption of food acts as one of the types of communicative activity. Integrative part of this type communication is the nutritional discourse within which national character

functions are demonstrated. Specific features of a characterologic continuum are marked out within conceptual typology and axiological aspect of gluttonymia [5].

3. MAIN BODY

Names of foodstuff can possess both universal, and ethnocultural characteristics. The equivalents available in various languages and corresponding to an identical receipt of cooking can be attributed to universal names, existing either in the form of transliterated units, or in the form of the specific national nominators which aren't demanding additional explications for autochthonic user: омлет (fr. *omelet*, engl. *omelet*, sp. *tortilla*, ital. *frittata*, ger. 1) *verquirlte Eier*, 2) *Eierkuchen*; 3) *Omelett*; 4) *Schmarren*, port. *omeleta*, turk. *omlet*, ukr. *омлет*, bel. *omelet*, pol. *omlet*, lit. *omletas*, hun. *omlett*, mal. *telur dadar*, rom. *omletă*, finn. *munakas*). In the aspect of the nomination mechanisms, these names possess the national signs dictated by structure of national languages. Though lexemes also coincide on semantic signs, but differ from the point of view of a form therefore they are of an interest for researchers of national characters in a mirror of the sign that has been assumed as a basis of the nomination.

Ethnocultural pragmatonyms are motivated (both from the point of view of morphology, and in respect of semantic and connotative characteristics) for representatives of the separate nation while for another linguistic culture they are often represented as lacunary formations: “борщ”, “pudding”, “kaneloni” (ital. large and hollow spaghettis), “gohan” (jap. boiled rice).

In the onomasiological and the toponomastical works devoted to the analysis of regularities of naming in various groups of lexicon, there is gradually a concept of “motivation signs” [6] in respect of their contents allocated in a theme group of words and characterizing the separate parties of a class expressed by this group of subjects [7]. The term “principle” of nomination is assigned to this concept (sometimes: “way”, “motive”, “category”).

Gustatory culture demands to differentiate two types of food: food and drinks. This division is conditional (for example, “milk” belongs both to food, and to food liquids), but it fully meets research priorities of the thesis.

For the nominations of food it is offered to allocate five motivation signs:

- 1) origin (animal or vegetable);
- 2) consistence (firm, free-flowing, fluid);
- 3) temperature (hot, warm, cold);
- 4) taste (sour, sweet, bitter and salty);
- 5) combinatory (insipidity, astringency, spice, pungency).

Drinks are traditionally divided into alcoholic and nonalcoholic ones. In our work, we consider generally alcoholic beverages, as the ways of their naming possess the greatest number of signs for allocation of national character features. For the nomination of alcoholic beverages, it is offered to allocate three motivation signs:

- 1) strength;
- 2) initial product (grain, fruit, vegetables, plants, honey and so forth);
- 3) proportions and consumption temperature.

Taking into account given above motivation signs and their combination theory in national languages [8] will form an empirical and explication basis for allocation of characteristics of psychology, mentality, Russians and British character. Gustatory component of the nomination characterizes not only language, but also national mentality.

Gluttonic nomination, as well as any kind of the nomination, submits to the universal nominative mechanisms the functioning of which is connected with this human activity.

In the lexico-semantic parameters the gluttonic nomination is close to the alternative nomination about which E.S. Kubryakova writes: “studying of alternative forms of the description of one object or one situation (as proofs of the opportunity “to turn” the same judgment about them into different structures) – is a very perspective way of real semantic research of all these forms with very delicate nuances of their meaning” [9, 21]. In respect to lingvo-semiotic, names the gluttonic denotations often corresponds to alternative representations of one of categories of objects in gastronomic subject. So, in Russian language there is a number of lexemes for designation of traditional first course: borsches – *Борщ запорожский, Борщ украинский, Борщ белорусский, Борщ с грудинкой или корейкой, Борщ по-чешски, Борщ на хлебном квасе по-польски*; *soljankas* – *Солянка из свинины, Солянка из кислой капусты с мясом, Солянка украинская*; Russian cabbage soup – *Щи кислые с бобами, Щи с ячневой крупой, Щи из тушеной капусты, фасоли и ячневой крупы со свининой* and so forth.

Specifics of national and cultural perception of gastronomic realities are reflected in the ways of their naming having historical roots [10].

Russia.

The Russian names of dishes are divided into a number of categories. First, these are the words which etymology is unknown or vague: *щи, уха, каша, хлеб, кулага, калья* and so forth. Therefore, “once the word “fish soup” had a bit different meaning, than in modern Russian. Ancient fish soup is in general any (not necessarily fish) soup, a fat. Fish soup designated both pea soup, and meat, and fish soup, and even that now we call compote. In the ancient time, the word “fish soup” usually had at itself specification from what this food was prepared: ukr. “Уха курячья пріятя растение творить доброй крови”; “Уха гороховая здорова и сильна есть”. <...>; In paper trails of the XI-XVII centuries you can find egg fish soup, rivifinovy fish soup (*ривифь* – a kind of peas) etc. <...>; “с велика дни въ мясоедъ” are recommended: “лебеди, потрохъ лебязий, журавли, чапли ... уха курочки”. <...>; “Аще сливы обрашутся, сварать и ты... и почерпають и тхъ оухоу”. Уха из слив? Но это уже скорее компот!

Less ancient names which can be interpreted thanks to analogs in modern Russian belong to the second category: *pirog, kissel, vareniki, okroshka, pastila, rassstegay*, etc. Similar names are coming into being all over Europe up to the XVI century and reflect either a way of preparation, or a consistence or a sign of ware in which the product is served. They can be treated as motivated from the point of view of the modern national language medium.

Known historic fact is a broad expansion of French cuisine in all European countries, since XVII century. This phenomenon affected Russia and opened new ways of the nomination, in particular – with the reference to raw materials (*говядина, баранина, рыба, крабы, овощи, яйца*), to the part of raw materials or its quality (*грудинка, окорок, вырезка / свежий, молодой, молочный*), to a way of cooking (*жаркое, отварное, запеченное, тушёное*).

Adoptions belong to the following type of the gluttonic nomination (in the form of a transliteration or semantic loan-translating): *mashed potatoes, steak, languet, vinaigrette, cutlet, soup, salad, mousse, compote, veal brisket, a saddle of a lamb, cherry jelly with tokay wine*.

Since the XIX century there are nominators-anthroponyms in Russia, that is the gluttonic nomination uses surnames of dishes founders, legendary persons' names, surnames of the known people ordering this or that viand: *гурьевская каша, гурьевские блины, пожарские котлеты, рахмановские щи*.

By the beginning of the XX century there is a tendency to give dishes quasinational names. So appeared *баранина по-турецки, суп-пюре по-гамбургски, плов по-бухарски, цыплята по-провансальски, биточки по-казацки, борщ по-литовски* which had a little the general with the actual structure and way of preparation in the spirit of this or that ethnic cuisine, but were as a whole tasty dishes.

During the Soviet period of development, the culinary repertoire of names underwent radical changes. The emergence of private and public dining rooms promoted the simplified compound principle of names: *chicken noodles (chicken noodles soup), potato soup, Russian cabbage soup, boiled beef, buckwheat cereal with butter, cranberry kissel, tea with jam and a lemon, compote from dried fruits*.

It was also the stage of “names on a casual sign”, not connected with the real maintenance of a dish: “After World War II in a number of restaurants under the guise of “new”, but to be exact “firm” dishes the far-fetched names which characteristic sign there was always the use of any “loud” name began to appear. <...>; So, for example, a beefsteak from the cutting, fried not in an oven, but on a frying pan (that is it is wrong), began to call “мясо по-суворовски” though Suvorov didn't eat or cook such dish, and the name was given because the restaurant was situated in Suvorovsky Boulevard. Similar names only distorted the idea of this or that dish. <...>; The history of dishes naming is evidence that once being born, this or that dish then was attributed and, eventually, this or that name was assigned to it” by.

In the seventies of the last century the prevalence of meat dishes in the menu of public catering and fixing of the West European names is noted: “As the Russian ethnic cuisine actually doesn't have meat second courses, the menu of dining rooms and restaurants strongly included the West European dishes: *cutlets, languets, escalopes, beefsteaks, hamburgers, schnitzels, rolls* and other products with the forcemeat, become for the last 30-40 years “Russians”. That is why modern generation does not connect any more exclusively fish and mushroom dishes with the concept “Russian table”.

It should be noted the gluttonic adoptions that have entered the different periods of the Russian repertoire of culinary names from others, except French, languages.

English: Бифштекс – *Beefsteaks* (it is formed from the words *beef* – говядина and *steak* – кусок, ломоть); Кекс – *Cakes* (sweet products from dough); Ливер – *Liver* (печенка, легкие,

потроха; the same root, as a noun of *life* (жизнь) and a verb *to live* (жить)); Грейпфрут – *Grape-fruit* (*grape* (гроздь винограда) and *fruit* (плод)); Ростбиф – *Roastbeef* (fried meat loin on a spit); Пудинг – *Pudding* (an unsweetened dish from mix of a flour, fats and other ingredients, with a meat stuffing); Бигмак – *Big Mac* (the multilayered closed firm sandwich in snack bars of the American type); Кетчуп – *Ketchup* (dense tomato sauce in which different seasonings can be used); Киви – *Kiwi* (a fruit of a subtropical plant); Крекер – *Cracker* (dry, fragile porous cookies from yeast dough); Ромштекс – *Rump-steaks* (the piece of beef roasted in crackers); Барбекю – *Barbecue* (the meat prepared on a grid, inserted into special capacity).

German: Бутерброд – *Butterbrod* (letter. “bread and butter”); Картофель – *Kartoffel*; Вафля – *Waffel*; Шницель – *Schnitzel*.

Fino-ugorsky languages: *Pelmeni* (letter. “grain ear”). Hungarian language: Гуляш – *Hulas* (letter. “meat which is eaten by the shepherds grazing cattle”). Turkic languages: *Shish kebab*, *Watermelon* (letter. “asinine cucumber”), etc.

Great Britain.

English traditions of the gluttonic nomination also demonstrate national and cultural peculiarities. Nominators of this type are subdivided into some categories:

1. Words of an unknown origin: *Raspberry* (малина); *Syllabub* (drink from cream or milk with wine, cider and sugar); *Toffee* (toffee = candy like an iris).

2. Protoindio-European names: *Water* (Russian вода); *Mead* – мёд (sanskrit. madhu [honey]); *Barley* – ячмень (lat. far [emmer wheat]); *Milk* – молоко (lat. mulgere [to milk an animal]); *Bake* – выпекать (Greek phogein); *Brew* – варено, напиток; *Broth* – похлёбка (Greek broutos [a kind of beer/ вид пива]).

3. Protogerman names: *Meat* – мясо; *Bread* – хлеб (German *Brot*); *Honey* – мёд; *Eel* – угорь (German *Aal*); *Egg* – яйцо (German *Ei*).

4. Names of a Latin origin: *Cheese* – сыр (from Latin *caseus*); *Wine* – вино (from Latin *vinum*); *Plum* – слива (from Latin *prunum*); *Fennel* – фенхель (from Latin *feniculum*).

5. The names which have become current in the period of a Norman conquest of 1066: *Pear* – груша (French *poire*); *Chestnut* – каштан (French *châtaigne*; originally from ancient Greek *kastanea*); *Salmon* – лосось (French *saumon*); *Sausage* – колбаса (French *saucisse*); *Fry* – жарить (French *frir*); *Boil* – варить, кипятить (French *bouillir*).

One of the features of the British cuisine is its openness for adoptions as recipes, and nominators: *Steak* – бифштекс (from old icelandic language, language of Vikings); *Lozenge* – пастилка, леденец (лекарственный), таблетка (обычно сосательная) (from the Arabic language, through Old French); *Pickle* – солёные или маринованные огурцы (from the Netherlands language); *Tomato* – помидор; *Chocolate* – шоколад; *Chili* – чили (красный стручковый перец) (from language Nahuatl, Aztec language). During the modern period of globalization of the gluttonic processes the British English borrows the nominations more often than in days of old times: *Curry* – кэрри (приправа) (from the southern India); *Toddy* – тодди, пунш (from Hindi); *Pasta* – паста, макаронные изделия; *Pizza* – пицца (from Italian); *Marzipan* – марципан (from German (the word has the Italian roots)); *Blini* – блины (from Russia); *Tofu* – тофу (from Japanese [the word of the Chinese origin]).

The British cooks and restaurateurs often give the name to a dish that directly indicates the country of origin by the kept initial spelling: *Coq au vin* (“the rooster prepared in wine”); *Tripes à la mode de Caen* (“a hem with carrots, onions in cider or white wine”, a dish of French cuisine).

As English extended worldwide, the same word can designate different denotations in relation to the different countries (it often concerns also Great Britain). The word *Cider* (сидр) in the American language means “apple juice”, and in British “alcoholic drink from apples”. *Corn* in the American English is “corn”, and in Great Britain means “bread, grain bread” (in England – wheat; in Scotland and Northern Ireland – oats).

4. COMPLETION

Therefore, universal signs of the gluttonic nomination are global commons (or, at least, of the European mentalities) whereas national and cultural parameters are generated by history, culture, economy, language of concrete lingvocultural community.

5. CONCLUSIONS

The gastronomic world language picture represents the set of certain components where gustatory ideas, gluttonic terms, gastronomic concepts join. Being verbalized, these components form a difficult structural and semantic model. The gastronomic world language picture is formed because of a proper perspective activity of human mentality in the course of cognitive reality researching.

Typological characteristics pragmatonyms are structured on specifics of the nomination, a symbolical component, morphology, cognitive parameters, a gender element, stylistics and so forth. Quantitative parameters of this typology can be used for an additional illustration of national character features.

Both universal and ethnocultural types of pragmatonyms are allocated. Universal pragmatonyms belong to common cultural memory of the personality, and ethnocultural are motivated and clear to national language mediums without additional explications. The culinary repertoire of names for various cultures has historically developed regularities of formation and replenishment: primordial national lexicon, the borrowed nominators, adapted units.

REFERENCES

1. Sternberg R.J., 1999. Cognitive psychology, New York, Harcourt Brace.
2. Triandis H.C., Gelfand M.J., 2012. A Theory of Individualism and Collectivism. In V. Van Lange A. Kruglanski & E.T. Higgins (Eds.) Handbook of Theories in Social Psychology. New York.
3. Whorf B.L., 1956. Language, thought and reality, Cambridge, MA, MIT, Press.
4. Maslow A.H., 1987. Motivation and Personality, New York: 3d edition, Harper and Row, 293 p.
5. Krzeszowski, Tomasz. P., 1990. "The axiological aspect of idealized cognitive models". In J.Tomaszczyk and B. Lewandoska (eds.) Meaning and Lexicography. Amsterdam: Benjamins: pp: 135-165.
6. Cruse, Alan., 2006. A Glossary of Semantics and Pragmatics. Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press.
7. Kovalyov G.F., 1996. Instruktsia po sobiraniu regionalnogo onomasticheskogo materiala. Kray Voronejsky: historia i traditsii, Voronej: pp: 64-65.
8. Culicover P., 1997. Principles and Parameters: An Introduction to Syntactic Theory, Oxford University Press.
9. Kubryakova E.S., 2000. Slovoobrazovanie i drugie sfery iazykovoy sistemy v structure nominativnogo akta. Wortbildung: interaktiv im Sprachsystem – interdisziplinär als Forschungsgegenstand: materialien der 3. Konferenz der Kommission für slawische Wortbildung beim Internationalen Slawistenkomitee, Innsbruck, 28.9. – 1.10.1999: Igor' Stepanovic Uluchanov zum 65. Geburtstag / International Committee of Slavists; hrsg. I. Ohnheiser. – Innsbruck: pp: 13-26.
10. Kristeva J., 1980. Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art, New York. Columbia University Press, 305 p.