

LINGUISTIC WORLD VIEW AND NATIONAL GASTRONOMY

Arkadiy Petrovich Sedykh¹, Larissa Robertovna Ermakova²,
Nelia Leonidovna Krivchikova³, Margarita Viktorovna Naydenova⁴

¹Doctor of Philology, Professor, ^{2,3,4}Candidate of Philology, Associate Professor,
Belgorod State University, 85 Pobedy St., Belgorod 308015 (RUSSIA)

E-mails: sedykh@bsu.edu.ru, ermakova@bsu.edu.ru, krivchikova@bsu.edu.ru, naidenova@bsu.edu.ru

DOI: 10.7813/jll.2015/6-2/61

Received: 06 Feb, 2015

Accepted: 18 Mar, 2015

ABSTRACT

The paper deals with the problems of correlations of linguistic and gustative continuum in line with linguistic and cultural approach to the analysis with linguistic phenomena. Language and national gastronomy are considered as a certain type of language identity, functioning in specific communicative ways of information exchange. Universal and ethno cultural ways of gastronomic's verbalizing are related to the specific type of categorization of reality. Prospects for research of gustative's verbalizing preferences are seen as part of cognitive-communication techniques to identify sensory parameters of linguistic identity.

Key words: lingual culture, linguistic and gastronomic world view, linguistic identity, gastronomic metaphor, semiotics, cognition and communication

1. INTRODUCTION

Modern scientific paradigms of philology actively use not only anthropocentric, but also ethnocentric methods of approach to the analysis of linguistic phenomena. In this connection, the language semantics is interpreted within the correlation between the conceptual links and categorization of objectively existing objects and phenomena in the light of national mentality and national culture.

One of the key trends of the last decades is the search for semantic and language dominant in national cultures to model linguistic world view and construct a specific lingvocultural communication algorithm. Linguistic world view and national gastronomy have specific features for each culture in common.

As it is known, the term "linguistic world view" (sprachliches Weltbild) was brought into science by Leo Weisgerber (1899-1985), but the term goes back to the thoughts of V. von Humboldt on the internal form of language and further – to the ideas of the American ethno-linguistics and linguistic relativity hypothesis by Sapir-Whorf. According to this doctrine, language world view in general is a "system of surrounding world analysis" [1, p. 190]. The following excerpts from the writings of Edward Sapir, in our opinion, very accurately characterize this notion, although they do not call it: "The world of linguistic forms, taken within a given language, there is a complete system of signs... The transition from one language to another is psychologically similar to transition from one geometric reference system to another" [2, p. 252]; "Each language has completed its kind and psychologically satisfactory formal-term orientation, but this orientation lies deep in the sub consciousness of native speakers" [2, p. 254]; "Languages are essentially cultural repositories of vast and self-sufficient network of mental processes" [2, p. 255]. As you can see, a figurative, subconscious, almost mathematical component of this concept is at objectively occurring in human consciousness processes and is a self-sufficing essence.

2. THEORY AND METHODOLOGY OF THE STUDY

In the science of our country, the term is still under development and the definition of epistemological and methodological limits of its use. Like this, Yu L. Vorotnikov writes: "Language world view in recent years is becoming one of the most "fashionable" themes in native linguistics. And at the same time as often to be widely distributed signs are still not a fairly clear idea of what exactly the meaning of this concept by writers and how, in fact, it should be construed by readers?" [3].

The definition given by some scientists is of great importance for our study: "Every natural language reflects a certain way of perception and organizations (conceptualization) of the world. Expressed in its meanings form a certain single system of views, a kind of collective philosophy, which is presented as binding for all native speakers. Inherent to given language this way of conceptualizing is really kind of universal, but also the national-specific one, so that the native speakers of different languages can see the world slightly differently, in the light of their language" [4].

We share the idea of the majority of domestic philologists that linguistic world view gives a representative from each linguistic culture approved and based in the word "conceptual configuration" [5], which defines the semantic prioritization of the utterance.

Linguistic world view is directly linked to the national specificity of the word, which is according to N.F. Alefirenko predetermined by two factors: objective and subjective, "they single out by comparing of languages.

The objective factor refers to the value and semantic importance of the natural and cultural realities defining the uniqueness of living space of either nation. The subjective factor is characterized by the ability to select the sign symbols of the same realities that are differently represented by various ethno-linguistic communities' mentality" [6, p. 68-69].

The world around us is mediated by language; the person operates by notions, representations, cognitive images, the models supplied by the national languages. Consequently, the concept of "linguistic world view" is related to the definite type of conceptualization of reality which is formed by language structures in the communication process. In our case, we are talking about the gastronomic linguistic world view.

E. Dobrenko uses the term “culinary world view” [7]. We believe that is a more accurate the term “gastronomic world view”, which is in essence treated as follows: a conceptual model of gastronomic predilection and gluttonic priorities that is reflected in the specificity of the national category of food. It is clear that this definition does not reflect all-embracing characteristics of this phenomenon and, therefore, can be considered as a working definition, relevant for the research objectives of the study.

The central figure of the linguistic world view, in particular gastronomic, there is a person who is, on the one hand, the source of gastronomic discourse. On the other hand, the language itself often uses as the basic signs “human” feature names to name such as gustatory or composite properties of foods (soulful borsch; café allongé – lit. 'Lying coffee = weak coffee with lots of water; The European – lit. 'european' = a cocktail consisting of 1/3 of Russian vodka and French wine; honest food – lit. 'honest food' = simple, unpretentious, and unsophisticated, with no gimmicks (simple, modest and uncomplicated, without tricks)).

Gastronomy and linguistic world view correlate primarily at the level of nominative fund in national languages. That specificity of gluttonic nomination forms the typical for each nation store of linguistic resources in which the spirit of the nation is reflected. This phenomenon is clearly seen, for example, at the level of motivated pragmatonyms, designating important for national cultures consumers' products: Russian. chocolate “Chime”, “Pokrov”, “Rus-troika”, beer “Tsar Cannon”, chocolate “Light Easter!”, vodka “Enjoy Your Bath!”, “Let's go!”, Eng. chicken “Poularde Edouard VII” – lit. 'Fowl Edward VII', tea “Earl Grey Tea” – lit. 'Earl Grey Tea', puddings “Humboldt Pudding” – lit. 'Pudding of Humboldt', “Yorkshire Pudding” – lit. 'Yorkshire Pudding', apples “Lord Lambourne Apple” – lit. 'Apple of Lord Lamburne', “Lord Nelson Apple” – lit. 'Apple of Lord Nelson'.

This type of nomination is clearly the most productive in any case for the Russian language, as it is considered by national consumer as a symbol of authenticity and unity, as well as a kind of “proof” for the existence of national identity, integral part of which is the national character.

As a specific feature of the gastronomic linguistic world view states the presence in the language of the nomination of the very process and the time of meal or beverage consumption. In Russian it is breakfast, lunch and dinner (afternoon snack for children). Common name for consumption of meal – food. For the Russian there is a term snack, which is in one of its modern “incarnation” refers to a certain amount of food taking after drinking. Historically, the term had a broader semantic meaning and meant “cold dishes for light food” [8, p. 735].

For the English the following nominations are relevant: *breakfast, lunch and supper (or dinner)* – lit. 'breakfast, lunch and dinner (or lunch)'. “Common name for food consumption – *meal*. In contrast to the meal, the term snack (lit. 'snack') refers to eating / eaten products between meals. For special occasions for meals are used the names *feasts* (lit. 'feasts' festivals) or *banquets* (lit. 'banquets, dinner parties'). For a meal of several dishes, the dishes as a rule are named according to the chronology of their serving. In English it is the first serve, which is called the *appetizer* (lit. 'snack' (dish serving before hot courses = *starter or hors d'oeuvre*)), then the main dish (*entrée*), and, finally, the dessert (*dessert*). Although many English culinary terms are loan-words from French, as a rule, borrowings undergo small semantic changes. The same thing happened with the word *entrée*. Traditional French formal dinners usually consisted of five dishes: first, *the hors d'oeuvre* – starter (lit. 'off the job', often a *soup – soup or pâté – paste*); then *entrée* – the basic dish, usually fish; further *the plat principal (plat de résistance, pièce de résistance)* – the main dish; then *fromage (cheese)* – cheese; and finally, *dessert* – dessert.

To gastronomic component of linguistic world view can also be attributed specificity of experts' names for the preparation and methods of cooking food: Russian. cook, ship's cook, kasha cook, kuhmister, chef, culinary expert, obs. kuhar, colloquial. cook woman, kuharka; Eng. baker – baker, baker; chef – chef; culinarian – culinary specialist; hash slinger – barman; servant – maidservant, servant; sous chef – salting food chef.

Synonymic number of tokens “to cook” is as follows: Russian. cook, cook; simple. kuharnichat; (methods of preparation), boil, fry, steam. Here's how scrupulously and “linguistically” describes V.V. Pokhlebkina in his book “Amusing cooking” the verbs of different ways of processing food: “In the Russian language to designate different ways of heating food is used a dozen of verbs: steam, boil, seethe, bake, oven, broil, stew, simmer, but they have not fully express the diversity of ways and degrees for heating cooking techniques. Therefore, the cooks have to borrow additional terms from other languages, mostly from French. For example, to Russian professional culinary language the words “blanch”, “sauté”, “griller”, “braiser”, “flambé” got in to refer to those degrees and ways of cooking with fire, that do not have corresponding determination in the Russian language.”

But such borrowing in most cases is insufficient – to accurately describe all the nuances of the heat process the using only verbs is not enough. We have to use them in combination with a variety of prefixes and additional nouns, make up entire phrases, word groups, designating one or another action, such as “boil under steam, or in steaming of water – bath”, “bake in an open air”, “bake in foil”, “bake in manty-Kaskan” “roast grilled”, “fry in deep fat”. Typically, these expressions are used to describe such intermediate degrees of heating, which are less coarse and less dramatic than those denoted by only the verbs. Therefore, such terms always include references to sources of heat or on specific dishes and conditions, by which heating can largely be shaded in [9, p. 18].

As we see, Russian denominations of thermal food processing are a quaint mixture of borrowings and phrases that refer to objects of kitchen utensils. This fact manifests an attentive attitude of the Russians to food processing procedure as a result of the culinary arts.

In English, *to cook* (to cook food) is nominated by the following linguistic units: *french fry* – fry in French; *bake* – oven, bake; *barbecue* – cook meat on grill; *blanch* – blanch; *boil* – boil; *braise* – stew; *brew* – brew (beer), make (tea); *broil* – broil; *brown* – brown; *burn* – much grilled; *coddle* – scald with boiling water; *curry* – cook dish with curry; *decoct* – cook the decoction infuse; *deep fry* – deep broil; *devil* – cook pungent meat or fish dish; (*mar. slang.*) *doctor* – fake food, wine; *escallop* – bake (oysters) in the shell; *fix* – thicken; *fricassee* – prepare fricassee; *fry* – fry; *griddle* – to prepare in frying pan with a handle; *grill* – grill on gridiron, grilled; *heat* – warm up; *imbue* – steep; *melt* – melt; *microwave* – be cooked by microwaves; *mull* – heat the wine with spices; *panfry* – frying; *parboil* – slightly boil; *parch* – slightly roast, dry; *percolate* – strain, filter; *poach* – cook (eggs) without shells in boiling water; *pressure-cook* – prepare in pressure cooker; *reduce* – to deoxidize; *roast* – fry; *ruin* – go bad; *scald* – scald, pasteurize; *scorch* – singe; *sear* – cauterize, singe; *seethe* – boil; *simmer* – boil at low heat; *sizzle* – burn, fry up hiss; *spoil* – mar, go bad (of products); *steam* – cook under steam; *steep* – imbue; *stew* – braise; *toast* – roast, brown on the fire; *warm up* – heat; *concoct* – cook up; *cook* – cook food; *infuse* – brewing, make (tea, herbs); *soak* – steep, ret (trans. author) [10].

An important element of the linguistic gastronomy view acts genotypic and paremic fund of national linguistic culture. Thus, the thematic potential of speech figures in different languages of the world reflects the specificity of gluttonic nation. In the Russian language is: *a deep file (terty kalach)*, *eat the bread of affliction (hlebnut ogurchika)*, *kitchen democracy*; *Empty-handed*; *A heavy welcome is the best dish on the table*; *I have not seen as you ate, show (dialect, the host)*; *Lots of beer strong, sweet honey, young wine, just not eat it all not drink*. In English language: *to bring home the bacon* (to succeed); *to cook someone's goose* (deal with someone, destroy someone); *in the soup* (in difficulty, in trouble); *Good talk saves the food* (≈ during a good meal conversation is also good); *God gives every bird its food* (≈ God gives food to everyone); *Eyes are bigger than your belly* (lit. 'Eyes are bigger than belly' ≈ to eat with eyes); *I'll put the kettle on* (Let me make You a cup of tea) (lit. 'Boil the kettle (Let me offer you a cup of tea)'); *Do you want a brew?* (*Do you want some tea?*) (lit. 'Do you want me to make tea? (Would you like some tea?)).

Gluttonic metaphor is used to refer to various forms of figurative forms and objects of human existence:

1. Sex: "*I want a little sugar / in my bowl / I want a little sweetness / down in my soul / I could stand some lovin' / Oh so bad / I feel so funny and I feel so sad*" ≈ "I want a little sugar / in my cup / I want a little love / in my soul / Oh, I feel so bad / I feel so strange and sad" (trans. author) ("*I Want A Little Sugar In My Bowl*", Nina Simone); "*Squeeze me, babe, till the juice runs down my legs / Do, squeeze, squeeze me, baby, until the juice runs down my legs / The way you squeeze my lemon / I'm gonna fall right outta bed*" ≈ "Squeeze me baby, so much so that the juice flowed down my legs / Come on, squeeze me baby, that the juice flowed down my legs / How you press a lemon / I want falling out of bed" (trans. author) ("*The Lemon Song*", Led Zeppelin);

2. Attractive woman: *candy*; *cheesecake* ('cheesecake, sweet curd tart'); *tart* ('fruit cake'); *lollipop* ('sugar candy on a stick'); *peach* ('peach');

3. Attractive man: *woman's crumpet* ('female pancake'); minion of women; sex symbol;

4. Man, boy: *pretzel*; *capsicum*; *fruit-cake*;

5. Mental qualities of a man: *neither fish nor fowl*; *business-like sausage*.

3. CONCLUSION

All levels of language and discourse organization (vocabulary, syntax, lexicography, phraseological reserve, proverbs, and aphoristic, artistic texts) within the scope of gluttonic themes have semiotic potential to model the national character features. Studying of the culinary sources allows talking about the importance of gastronomic perception, which includes the basic functions of ethno cultural vector.

Dynamic interpenetration of linguistic gastronomy and linguistic world view is manifested in the national psychology and character traits of native speakers. Linguistic world view and gastronomy are in dynamic interaction and are the integral components of the national culture. For all that the nominees of gluttonic phenomena reflect those relations of native speakers to these phenomena. In this type of relations not only historical signs of gastronomy are manifested, but also national psychology, national character. Psychology of the nation to a large extent is built on the basis of the fundamental archetypes, which in food culture contribute to the formation of taste diversity of the nation, its culinary variability and recipes. Thus, Frenchman or Englishman has no problems without black bread, while Japanese man or Madagascar man cannot live without rice even a day.

Linguistic phenomena are studied not only from anthropocentric, but also ethnocentric point of view. Linguistic world view and national gastronomy are interconnected with the system of categorical relations caused by the national world view. In this sense we can speak of gastronomic linguistic world view for each particular linguistic culture. An important component of linguistic world view is gluttonic metaphor that reflects essential aspects of national mentality.

REFERENCES

1. Whorf B.L., 1960. The standards of behavior and thinking to language. In: Zvegintsev V.A. (ed.) *Istoriya yazykoznaniiya 19 i 20 vekov v ocherkakh i izvlecheniyakh*. V 2-kh ch. [History of Linguistics of the 19th and 20th centuries in essays and extracts. In 2 pts.]. Moscow: Uchpedgiz Publ., Pt. 2, pp: 255-281.
2. Sapir E., 1993. Selected works on linguistic and cultural studies. Moscow: Progress: Univers, pp: 654p.
3. Vorotnikov Y.L. "Linguistic world view": the interpretation of the concept [Electronic source] / Y.L. Vorotnikov // Knowledge. Understanding. Skill: inform. humanity. portal / Mosc. humanity, Rus. humanity scientific center. – M., 2006 – 2010. – Access mode: <http://www.zpu-journal.ru/gum/new/>. (In Russian).
4. The new large English–Russian dictionary [Electronic resource] / edited under the general supervision by E.M. Mednikova // Dictionaries for Lingvo / authors of the site I. Aleksandrov. – M., 2004 – 2010.
5. Zaliznyak A.A., Shmelev A.D., 2005. Time of the day and activities // Key ideas of russian linguistic world view. – M.: Languages of Slavic culture, 2005. – C. 42 – 43. (In Russian).
6. Alefirenko N.F. 2009. "Lively" word: the problems of functional lexicology. Moscow: Flinta: Nauka, pp: 344. (In Russian).
7. Dobrenko E. Gastronomic communism: delicious vs healthy [Electronic resource] / E. Dobrenko // Reserved funds: debates on politics and culture. – 2009. – № 2. – P. 155 – 173 – Access mode: <http://magazines.russ.ru/nz/2009/2/do9-pr.html>. (In Russian).
8. Barkhudarov S.G. Russian language dictionary: in 4 vol. / S.G. Barkhudarov; Acad. of Sciences of the USSR, Institute of Linguistics. – M.: State. publ. house of foreign and national dictionaries, 1957 – 1961. – 4 vols. (In Russian).
9. Pohlebkina V.V. 2003. Amusing cooking: tips and tricks world-known chef. Moscow: Tsentrpoligraf, pp: 236. (In Russian).
10. Dictionary.com, LLC. Copyright©2012: URL: <http://thesaurus.com/browse/cook>.