

This is the ‘author accepted manuscript’ of
DOI: [10.1075/clu.10.01ger](https://doi.org/10.1075/clu.10.01ger)

The article is under copyright and the publisher has to be contacted for
permission to re-use or reprint the material in any form.

Please cite as:

Gerhardt, Cornelia. 2013. “Language and Food - Food and Language”. In:
Cornelia Gerhardt, Maximiliane Frobenius & Susanne Ley (eds.), *Culinary
linguistics: The Chef’s Special* (Culture and Language Use: Studies in
Anthropological Linguistics 10), 3-50, 319-344. Amsterdam et al.: John
Benjamins.

Ich esse selbst täglich.
(Loriot)

Dis-moi ce que tu manges, je te dirai ce que tu es.
(Jean-Anthelme Brillat-Savarin)

I will not dwell upon ragouts or roasts,
Albeit all human history attests
That happiness for man – the hungry sinner! –
Since Eve ate apples, much depends on dinner.
(Lord Byron)

Food and language – language and food

Cornelia Gerhardt
Saarland University

1. Introduction

Eating and talking are universal human traits. Every healthy human being eats and talks; every society or group eats and talks. Both language and food are culturally dependent and vary according to factors such as gender, age, or situational context, or even lifestyle. There are vast differences both in the food-related behavior of different cultures as well as in the languages of the world. There is nothing natural or inevitable about food preferences or syntactic structures. “Food is a bridge between nature and culture” (Fischler 1988 in Germov & Williams 2008: 1)¹ and so is language. Brillat-Savarin, one of the earliest food writers, claimed: “Tell me what you eat, I will tell you what you are” (1825: 3). Again, linguists and other social scientists have shown that identity is constructed through language. Hence, “every coherent social group has its own unique foodways” (Counihan 1999: 6) and its own unique language use. You are different or you are the same depending on what you eat and how you speak. “If we are to understand women’s gender roles..., we need to study food” (Inness 2001a: 4) and, the linguist adds, language. “If there is one issue as deeply personal as food it is language and dialect” (Delamont 1995: 193).

¹ All references in the introductory chapter can be found in the bibliography *Dolci* at the end of this volume.

Both food and language are used to maintain and create human relationships. The dinner table is a rich site for socialization and language acquisition. Eating and talking are used to construct social hierarchies, class, ethnicity, caste, the difference between rich and poor. The way we speak and what we eat is not based on individual choice only, but also on the society we live in and the place in society we occupy or wish to occupy. Both food and language have an intricate connection to power: in the world at large (the distribution of meat, of land) as well as in smaller groups (*Father gets served first!*). Because of this interconnectedness on so many plains, both eating and talking can only be grasped in their context. “Foodways can only be understood holistically” (Anderson 2005: 7), and so can language.

Food is not only sustenance and language not only a tool to transmit information. Only humans flavor their food and create unique dishes and food styles, such as sandwiches and banquets, Chicken Tikka Masala or French cuisine. Similarly, only humans have created a communication system that allows for international treaties and scribbled shopping lists, for haikus and email. National foods and national languages are claimed to construct national identity (Peckham 1998: 174). Since both do more than cater for bare necessities, they represent perfect sites for social studies.

In Proust’s *A la recherche du temps perdu*, a madeleine soaked in tea evokes long-lost childhood memories (cf. Sutton 2001). The taste of this cake brings forth chains of associations connected to the protagonist’s early years. Words can have the same magic. In a current column of the German weekly *Die Zeit* entitled *Mein Wortschatz* (‘my lexicon’, literally ‘my word treasure’) readers can send in their favorite words. Often words are suggested which have a slightly archaic ring to them, such as *Augenweide* or *Fremdenzimmer*. According to the readers of the newspaper, these words also bring back fond childhood memories.

While food enters the body through the mouth, language leaves the body through the same cavity in its primary, spoken form. This physical proximity may produce a need for complementariness, to a certain extent as a necessity (Swadesh 1971: 9), but also as a culturally constructed norm: either you eat or you speak (Elias 1939, Visser 1993).

Both food and language are fabricated by building larger units out of smaller entities: ingredients make dishes make meals; sounds make words make utterances make texts (cf. Halliday’s analogy between the categories of eating like daily menus, meals, courses, helpings, mouthfuls and categories of grammar like sentences, clauses, groups/phrases, words, morphemes 1961, cf. also Lévi-Strauss below). Both depend on the social context and their actual use by people at a specific moment for their meaning: a bun as such is devoid of meaning, a bun served in bed on a Sunday morning together with other breakfast ingredients is a meaningful act. The 1st person pronoun *I* is unclear unless used by a specific speaker in a social context *I care*.

Furthermore, food consumption and language use together often characterize settings, speech events or space. At a Western birthday party, the verbal act of congratulating as well as a cake as food choice constitute core elements. In a transcendental setting like the Eucharist, the body and blood of Christ are consumed while a set of specific words are pronounced. The German word *Kaffeeklatsch* denotes a specific type of meal ‘coffee and cake in the afternoon’ with the help of the accompanying verbal activity ‘klatschen’, i.e. ‘gossiping’. Beer gardens, pubs, or coffee shops evoke certain food items and specific verbal activities (Oldenburg 1989, Laurier 2005).

This volume attempts to describe the connection between these two fundamental human social acts: eating and using language. This introduction will start by sketching the interdisciplinary study of food in various disciplines. The main part will consist of an overview of studies about language and food.

2. The study of food

Because of its centrality to human kind, food has been discovered as a fruitful topic by a number of disciplines, especially in the second half and at the end of the 20th century. As we will see, the study of food often reflects current paradigms such as behaviorism, structuralism or functionalism, and the interdisciplinary nature of food studies soon becomes evident. Many great thinkers, be they philosophers, sociologists or anthropologists, have encountered questions about food in their general work about human nature, as the following section will illustrate.

2.1 Classic early literature

Already in 1798, Kant described the limits of different sense experiences as part of his general interest in the human capacity to understand and gain knowledge, *Erkenntnisvermögen* (Kant 2000). The French lawyer and politician Brillat-Savarin is considered one of the founding fathers of gastronomic writing (Mennell 2005: 240). The great gourmand lay down his experiences and experiments in his *Physiologie du goût* in 1825. Early works in sociology include Veblen. In 1899, his influential idea of *conspicuous consumption* depicted food choice as a means of publically displaying social power and prestige. Furthermore, Simmel claimed in 1910 that a meal is worthy of sociological enquiry:

because the shared meal elevates an event of physiological primitiveness and inevitable generality into the sphere of social interaction, and hence of supra-personal significance, it has acquired in some earlier epochs an immense social value... (Simmel [1910] 1997: 131)

One “of the lesser deities in the sociological pantheon” (Mennell et al. 1992: 2) concerned with food was Norbert Elias with his work on table manners (1939). Bourdieu’s description of the social stratification of French society explaining preferences in food choice (1979) came 6th place as *Book of the Century* (the 20th) by a members’ vote of the International Sociological Association. His work is still influential in studies on food discourse in present day Western societies: for instance, Johnston and Baumann show that exoticism and authenticity in food choice are the current features of distinction in gourmet food writing (2007). However, most of the classic sociological literature was more concerned with food as a symbol or an indicator of something else rather than with food in its own right (Mennell et al. 1992: 2, 4-5)².

In contrast, anthropology, which together with sociology represents a natural place for food studies, traditionally included the description of practices around food preparation and consumption (Counihan & Van Esterik 1997: 2). Morgan, the so-called “father of anthropology,” was concerned with “modes of livelihood” (1877). Cushing, the first participant observer, lived with the Zuni of New Mexico for more than four years in the 1880s and also described their foodways (1920). Boas published a collection of Kwakwaka’wakw recipes (of British Columbia) (1921). Malinowski also included the study of food in his ethnographic work (e.g. 1922, 1935). His student, Richards, continued the functional approach to the study of food with a specific focus on nutrition (1932, 1937, 1939). She is often seen as the main representative of functionalism in anthropological food studies (Mennell et al. 1992: 7): “*Land, Labour, and Diet in Northern Rhodesia* (...) is quite simply the best monograph on the anthropology of food ever written” (Mintz 2000: 174). Mead was one of the first to acknowledge the centrality of food for humans (1943). By the 1960s, nutritional anthropology was firmly established (Fitzgerald 1977, Freedman 1981, Messer 1984), which was “oriented not only toward understanding foodways, but also toward coping with malnutrition worldwide” (Anderson 2005: 238).

Nevertheless, what may first come to mind with regard to anthropological work on food, especially in a volume focusing on its connection to language, is Lévi-Strauss’ structuralist approach. Throughout his works, Lévi-Strauss draws on analogies between language and culture (e.g. 1964 in *The raw and the cooked* and 1968 in *The origins of table manners* esp. *A short treatise on culinary anthropology* in his *Mythologiques*).

² Warde and Hetherington point out that even in Mennell’s et al. literature survey for *The Sociology of Food* (1992) mainly anthropological and historical work is cited (1994: 758).

Thus we can hope to discover how, in any particular society, cooking is a language through which that society unconsciously reveals its structure, unless – just as unconsciously – it resigns itself to using the medium to express its contradictions. ([1968] 1979: 495)

In the culinary triangle (1965), he compares cooking and phonology by devising binary oppositions such as culture versus nature and elaborated versus unelaborated in parallel to Jakobson's phonemic triangles (1963)³. This analogy has shortcomings on many levels and lacks empirical support (cf. also his revised formulation in 1968). As Shankman writes:

Lévi-Strauss' exclusive focus on the roasted and boiled has been spoiled by the natives who have discovered a veritable smorgasbord of ways of preparing people. (1969: 61)⁴

Still, the merit of Lévi-Strauss' work lies in stressing that food has a meaning and a symbolic value. Structuralist work in the realm of food studies has been continued, most notably by Douglas (1966 on Jewish dietary prohibitions, 1972 and 1974 (together with Nicod) on the constitution of a British meal). She shows that meals are ordered, throughout the year, the week and the day, each finding its significance in the ordered patterns through the omission or the addition of different food items:

The meaning of a meal is found in a system of repeated analogies. Each meal carries something of the meaning of the other meals; each meal is a structured social event which structures others in its own image. (Douglas 1972: 69, cf. de Saussure's *valeur*)

She grounds Jewish dietary laws in symbolism (cf. also Barthes below), which is rejected by functional approaches (Harris 1987).

In philosophy, Barthes' semiotic work on food symbolism, the preference people have for different food items, also had a structuralist influence on the research of food (1957, 1961): By eating the 'right' food people can accumulate symbolic capital and demonstrate their social status. Barthes also inspired cross-cultural work: for instance, the decadence or gourmand eating of Ancient Rome was compared to that of the United States, finding that the semiological systems

³ For a molecular gastronomist referring to classic anthropological literature in his understanding of modern cuisine, cf. Roosth 2013.

⁴ With regard to this volume, Shankman also cautions: "The defects in Lévi-Strauss' theory that lead to his failure in prediction do not require the abandonment of a search for parallels between language and cooking or the examination of the relationship of cooking to social structure, but they do at least remind us to be cautious." (1968: 65)

are quite different (Edmunds 1980). Generally, however, in philosophy, food has long not been considered a proper subject for inquiry (Curtin & Heldke 1992: XIII, also ‘taste’, Korsmeyer 1999: 1f.).

In contrast, history has a long tradition in food studies. The French *Annales* school set out to study the entirety of the human experience. In France, food was then an obvious choice of study considering the *Annales* school’s emphasis on enduring patterns (Braudel et al. 1961, 1979, Forster & Ranum 1979, cf. Pilcher 2012 for an overview). This work is still continued: Gabaccia studied the making of a Creole cuisine in America (1998), or more generally, Levenstein eating in America (2003). The meal as a form of representation has been studied interdisciplinarily in historical perspective (Kolmer & Rohr 2000). Culinary histories were written (Flandrin et al. 1999): Parasecoli and Scholliers offer a historical tour from 800 BC until 2000 AD in their 6 volume edition (2012). (National) identity and food continue to be a topic in history (Scholliers 2001) and, in general, in the humanities and the social sciences concerned with food (for a recent overview, cf. Campanini et al. 2011, see also many of the works below). Thus Brillat-Savarin’s statement continues to be elaborated, the question being which type of foodstuff indicates which type(s) of identity(/ies) in how strong a fashion and in which type of interplay with other cultural artifacts or other semiotic systems (clothes, language, religion, ...) Food items are not endowed with equal significance for identity construction. Often, we eat or witness others eating without assigning any social significance to this act (Warde 1997). Consequently, Brillat-Savarin’s simplistic statement has been questioned, “Are we what we eat?” (Belasco 2008: 15) or “If we are what we eat, who are we?” (Gabaccia 1998: 9), and reformulated, “We are what we ate” (Belasco 2008: 32) or “We are where we eat” (Bell & Valentine 1997: ii), “You eat what you are” (Willettts & Keane 1995: 43) or “Why we eat what we eat” (Capaldi 1996).

2.2 *Second half of the 20th Century till today*

Since the 1980s, work on food has flourished in many disciplines. In anthropology, Farb and Armelagos delimited the field (1980). Goody’s study of West Africa (labeled comparative sociology) criticizes structuralist accounts and focuses on changes in culinary practices (1982). In the same vein, Mennell offers a developmental perspective on Britain and France (1985), or Mintz concentrates on one product, sugar, and discusses its history and meaning for the working classes in Europe (1985). Concurrently, sociologists continued their work in the field of food studies (Murcott 1982, 1983 and Kerr et al. 1986 on women in Britain). Fischler’s work (1990) has been seen as the end-point of structuralist dominance in France (Menell et al. 1992: 13, more recently Fischler & Masson 2008 in cross-cultural perspective).

The growing interest of sociology since the 1980s is not only based on the increasing awareness of world hunger (cf. McIntosh 1996 below), of eating disorders in some societies, and the professionalization in nutrition, but also a rising concern with a 'sociology of culture' which allows the study of trivial matters such as food (Menell et al. 1992: 5). For instance, the role of waitresses (Paules 1991) or the 'I am so fat' discourse in the US has been studied, albeit anthropologically (Nichter 2000). A connection has been drawn between food and morality, especially with regard to body size (Lupton 1996). In Britain a major research program was started *The Nation's diet* (Murcott 1998, Kaplan 1997, for Britain, cf. also Warde & Martens 2000 on eating out). Besides increased government funding, the 'obesity epidemic' and the neoliberal impact on food supply have led to the growing interest by sociologists (McMillan & Coveney 2010). Since *The Sociology of Food: Eating, Diet and Culture* (Menell et al. 1992), the explanatory value of classic social variables like class, gender and age have been questioned with regard to food and identity (Sneijder & te Molder 2006: 113). Moving away from cultural concerns, for example McIntosh puts the emphasis on nutrition, in the light of world hunger stressing again that food is not only meaning, but in the first place sustenance (1996). The nature of food and nutrition as social problems has been emphasized (Maurer & Sobal 1995), again including body size (Sobal & Maurer 1999a, Sobal & Maurer 1999b). By choosing the title *Appetites and identities for An introduction to the social anthropology of Western Europe* (Delamont 1995), the author claims the central importance of food in anthropology (cf. Counihan & van Esterik 2008 or Mintz & Du Bois 2002 for recent overviews on food and culture, Menell et al. 1992, Beardsworth & Keil 1997 for an overview on sociological work, Delaney 2011 and Koç et al. 2012 for textbooks).

Another discipline to consider is psychology (for general introductions in the field of food, cf. Logue 1991, Lyman 1989). After the behavioristic and mechanistic phase where hunger was seen or searched as the stimulus for food intake, psychology considered learning and experience as important factors in the study of eating behavior (Capaldi 1996). Feeding represents the very first step in a human's relationship to food (Capaldi & Powley 1990). Social psychology examines factors influencing food choice and food preferences such as stress or food commercials (Conner & Armitage 2002). In the framework of the theory of planned behavior (Ajzen 1991), attitudes toward food were measured (cf. Wiggins 2001 for an overview) with the help of questionnaires or rating scales. Mainly, psychology relies on survey or laboratory studies concentrating on taste and smell, food preferences and attitudes (Smith 2002, cf. discursive psychology below though, cf. Rappoport 2003 for a popularly written introduction to the psychology of food).

To continue with more text-based studies such as American or other literary/cultural studies or philology, Brown published a seminal work on the symbolic

use of food in nineteenth century French literature (1984, also Appelbaum 2006 for early modern literature, Van Gelder 2000 for Classical Arabic literature). In her groundbreaking article, Leonardi describes how recipes are framed in the *Joy of Cooking* and how recipes serve as embedded narratives in literary texts (1989). Topics are diverse and cannot be subsumed under a single heading here: Belasco focuses on the 1960s in the US (1989), Bordo on the female body and eating (1993), or Mannur (2010) on food in the South Asian diaspora (cf. also the indologist Doniger 1999, Döring et al. 2003 on the poetics and politics of food, Scapp and Seitz 1998 or Ashley et al. 2004 with a focus on cultural studies including a chapter on food writing, Skubal 2002 with a psychoanalytic approach to orality in literature, or Rosenblum 2010 on early rabbinic Judaism, also Fellner this volume). The importance of space and place in food consumption has been stressed in cultural studies by geographers (Bell & Valentine 1997, cf. also ‘foodscapes’ below). In communication or media studies, the role of the television has often been in focus (Kaufman 1980, Dickinson 2005). Furthermore, the meaning of food in film (e.g. Ferry 2003, Keller 2006) or, generally, in popular culture (Parasecoli 2008) has been studied intensively.

Since activities including food have often been shown to be gendered (cf. also above), gender studies have recognized the importance of studying food production and consumption (Avakian & Haber 2005, cf. also Fuller et al., this volume). At the same time, the recognition of food as an important subject by feminism and women’s studies has also been one of the causes for the wealth of publications about food in the last decades (Counihan & Van Esterik 2008: 1-2). For instance, Cline offers a feminist account based on self-reflexive interviews (1990), DeVault concentrates on women feeding the family (1991), or Croegaert is concerned with coffee drinking as a practice of Bosnian women in the U.S. (2011, cf. Counihan & Kaplan 1998 for an overview, Counihan 1999 on Italy and the US, 2004 on Florence, Italy, Inness 2001a on the US in the 20th century). Furthermore, gender and ethnicity often pattern with food such as in *Building houses out of chicken legs: Black women, food, and power* (Williams-Forson 2006). In critical theory, feminism and vegetarianism have been linked to dismantle the connections between meat eating and male dominance (Adams 1990). In an interesting study, Deutsch describes how firemen cope with being primary providers of food in their fire house by resorting to different versions of masculinity (Deutsch 2005, 2004, for boy scouts cooking, cf. Mechling 2005).

Other fields working at the intersection of food and language include economics or marketing, such as when testing consumer responses to brand names (Yorkston et al. 2004 for phonetics, Pantli 2009 for linguistics and consumer research). Furthermore, enology is an obvious field with regard to the vocabulary of wine-tasting (Gawel 1997, Lehrer 2009 with a linguistic inquiry). It has been

shown, for instance, that visual information (color) overrules olfactory perception when wine is described (Morrot et al. 2001). Archaeology has been concerned with the reconstruction of feasts (Dietler & Hayden 2001) or household consumption through the study of pottery (Bray 2003), human excrements, cooking sites or texts (Gosden & Hather 1999, Twiss 2007). Food preferences have been researched by linking archaeological studies to texts (Smith 2006). In addition, the imprint of food on architecture has been studied (Franck 2003, Horwitz & Singley 2006). There has been an increasing interest in material culture and objects (Miller & Deutsch 2010). The many disciplines concerned with physiological or biological questions such as medicine or nutrition studies, agriculture or home economics have largely been disregarded here. However, most works, also for instance, the popular books by Nestle, a nutritionist, on food politics and food movements (2010, 2013, Nestle & Nesheim 2012) illustrate that disciplinary boundaries are not clear-cut (cf. for instance Coveney 2006 who works in the field of Public Health at a School of Medicine in a Foucauldian framework on nutrition and morals).

This sketchy tour strongly manifests the interdisciplinary nature of the study of food. Different disciplines need to provide answers from their perspectives to describe and analyze the functions and values of food in the lives of humans (cf. the multidisciplinary volumes by Fürst et al. 1991, Wiessner & Schiefenhövel 1996, Griffiths & Wallace 1998, Scholliers 2001, Bower 2004, Lien & Nerlich 2004, Nestle 2013 or the *Encyclopedia of Food and Culture* Katz & Weaver 2002). Food studies is now a discipline with journals such as *Food and Foodways*, *Gastronomica*, *Appetite*, *Anthropology of Food*, *Petits Propos Culinaires*, *Food and History*, or *Food, Culture & Society*⁵ using methodologies from various traditions, both quantitative and qualitative (Miller & Deutsch 2009, cf. also the annual Oxford Symposium on Food and Cookery, e.g. Walker 2003). Current topics include the notions of foodscapes (e.g. Cummins & Macintyre 2002, Yasmeen 2006), food porn (McBride 2010, Wong 1993), trash food (Plotnicov 2008), food voice (Hauck-Lawson 2004), foodies and gourmets (Johnston & Baumann 2010), food safety (Blay-Palmer 2008, Nestle 2010), the ethics of food choice (Singer & Mason 2006, Lemke 2007, Barlett 2011), the globalization of food (Inglis & Gimlin 2009, Watson & Caldwell 2005), and the agrofood system (Wright & Middendorf 2008). The next section will concentrate on those studies which focus on language.

⁵ The *British Food Journal* however (now an interdisciplinary research journal) started publishing in 1899: “It is necessary that the power of the press should be brought to bear in order that a check may be established on adulteration and fraudulent trading which shall be thoroughly effective, and capable of application to immediate public needs.” (1899: 1)

3. Food and language – an overview

With such a wealth of studies it seems questionable to edit yet another book on food. However, when it comes to the relation between language and food, there does not seem to be any publication fathoming the work at this intersection. Linguistic anthropology seems one obvious field to consider with regard to the relation between language and food. However, a special issue of the *Journal of linguistic anthropology* (Duranti 1999) on contemporary research in the field encompasses entries on a plethora of subjects as diverse as agency, body, color, deaf, dreams, gesture, healing, humor, music, plagiarism, prayer, repetition, signing, theater, translation, or vision (to name a random selection) from renowned scholars. Although contributors not only from linguistic anthropology, but also from “folklore, linguistics, philosophy of language, psychology, sociology, ethnomusicology, conversation analysis, biological anthropology, and medical anthropology” (Duranti 1999:4) contributed, food is only mentioned in passing in four of the articles (in brain, category, iconicity and socialization). Such an encyclopedic publication will necessarily not be able to cover the entirety of the field. However, with regard to the centrality of food to human kind, both as a biological necessity as well as a meaningful cultural act, this is astounding. From the opposite perspective, the encyclopedic 990 page small print large size *Oxford Companion to Food* lists entries under poetry and food, television and food, gender/sex and food, or gardening and food, but language is not a key term.

One edited volume in linguistics, however, does focus on the study of food: Lavric and Konzett’s *Food and Language: Sprache und Essen* (2009). Just like this volume, it offers a range of papers on different discourses of food and drinking. Furthermore, there is also a linguistic blog on *The language of food* (Jurafsky 2011, for food blogs, cf. also Diemer & Frobenius, this volume). Still, no attempt has been made to bring together research at the intersection of language and food in an overview. This will be the aim in the remainder of this introduction.

When two of the most important factors in the life of humans are discussed, it is only natural that many scientific disciplines have important contributions to make. However, a single edited volume cannot do justice to all of these different fields, even if purely for reasons of space. In addition, I will not be able to do justice to all of these different fields because of my academic and general biography. There will certainly be a strong bias to the English language and English language publications because of my affiliation. Also, German publications were easily accessible. A certain blindness to some results and subjectivity is unavoidable. Hence, what may seem less central to me will probably represent core matters to others.

Besides limitation and selection, the writing of this chapter has also been accompanied by the difficulty of finding a system for classifying the various earlier works on the topic. While it is often straightforward to discuss scholarly strands in their chronological order, i.e. different research traditions and their development, this may not always be profitable in this case. Some works are quite independent from the perspective of the connection between language and food since they themselves stand in a tradition with either no relation to language or to food, or to both. Still, these works in themselves may make a contribution at this intersection, for instance, because of the data used. Sometimes a focus on one specific researcher may be the best choice if this person has been influential in the field and their work quite independent. Also, a classification based on the different types of data used, such as discourse genres (recipes, TV shows on cooking), focus group discussions, or participant observation (Ross 1995) could help illuminate the different findings in a telling way. However, this may separate different contributions which may best be discussed adjacently. Some strands such as the important contributions based on family dinner talk may also seem in between: although *family dinner talk research* will probably not be thought of as a field or subdiscipline of linguistics, anthropology or psychology, many of these works can also not be said to be merely based on a superficial incidental identicalness of data type. On the contrary, most of this work is intricately interwoven and builds on the same premises and beliefs. Finally, food itself could be used as a structuring principle: for instance, research on food preparation could be discussed in one section and food consumption in another. Research on eating disorders, for instance, would potentially profit from being discussed in one place, regardless of methodology or research tradition. Faced with these difficulties which made one overarching structuring principle seem counter-productive, this chapter will classify previous research according to different frames which will hopefully become clear in the course of the individual subsections.

This introduction has been written from the perspective of linguistics, the assumption being that readers will have a general knowledge of the field. For this reason, it opened with an introduction to the interdisciplinary study of food. However, it will not feature an introduction to language studies. To strive for comprehensiveness quickly proved presumptuous at this crossroad. A list of the research disregarded here would greatly excel the references at the end of this volume. With regard to the linguistic portion of language and food, however, no specific approach or sub-field was neglected *a priori*. For instance, there will be work from pragmatics, discourse analysis, interactional studies, conversation analysis, historical linguistics, lexicology, and cognitive linguistics.

Turning to the culinary side of this volume, on the other hand, important work on food will be disregarded here simply because too many disciplines are

concerned with human nutrition, physically, biologically, medically, but also socially, psychologically or culturally. For obvious reasons, studies concerned with the biology or physics of food consumption such as digestion or edibility were disregarded. Also, experimental or correlational studies e.g. on meal sizes or snacking were disregarded. However, we are interested in actual real life practices of eating since these have been shown to be intricately interwoven with interactional linguistic practices (cf. Erickson 1982, Mondada 2009, or the studies by Wiggins and by Laurier).

To my regret, also studies using language data or texts as the basis for their research had to be disregarded in many cases. To give an impression of the wide array of topic, Charles and Kerr interviewed women about their food practices (1988, also Warde & Hetherington 1994) and Appadurai describes how Indian cookbooks establish a national cuisine (1988) (also, Renne 2007 on West African food products sold in the US, Johnston et al. 2009 on the websites of organic food companies incorporating ideas of food democracy, Dusselier 2001 on candy ads, Klumbtyé 2010 on Soviet sausages in Post-Soviet Lithuania, Kaufman 1980 on food on television, Dickinson 2005 on television reception, also Minuchin et al. 1978 on the interactions of families with anorexic daughters, or Mannur 2010 on cookbooks as narratives of adaptation (Chapter 6)). For reasons of space, it proved impossible to report on all these studies concentrating on discourses surrounding food production and consumption unless the language use itself was in focus (rather than the content of those discourses). Furthermore, literature looking at the symbolic value of food will in the main not be discussed further in this chapter (e.g. Douglas 1987 on drinking, Lehrer 1991 with a semiotic account of food and drink, Counihan 1999 on gender and power). Finally, also methodological issues emerged. For instance, the food-centered life histories giving a voice to women by Counihan (2004) are an example of a study in which the anthropologist translated and edited her subjects' spoken narratives by

eliminating repetition; deleting unnecessary expressions like "I don't know," ... and sometimes changing the order of sentences... to construct a more logical progression of ideas. (Counihan 2004: 3)

This tempering, however, makes her contribution questionable with regard to linguistics or narrative studies since, in that way, her data do not represent authentic language use from Florence.

3.1 Comparative linguistics

In line with the development of linguistics, comparative studies will open this chapter. Languages reflect the needs and behavior of their speakers. Since eating

is a biological necessity, every language will invariably contain food terminology. Furthermore, in a given region, cultures depend on the same food items for climatic and historical reasons: some plants are endemic; others are brought to places at a certain point in time following historical events. For this reason, in historical comparative linguistics, especially for prehistoric studies, a comparison of cognates for food items has been shown to be fruitful. For instance, in 1926, Childe, linking archaeology and philology for the study of Indo-European, notes e.g. the common word for *laks* ‘salmon’ across the Indo-European languages (1926: 82-85 on Indo-European food terms). Buck’s dictionary of Indo-European synonyms includes a list of food related words (1949: 326ff.), which, he suggests, allow tracing the history of ideas (1949: v). Roughly at the same point in time, Swadesh proposed a list of basic vocabulary for cross-linguistic comparison to discuss Salish internal relationships, which also includes items such as *to eat* or *meat* (1950). Finally, the recent *Intercontinental Dictionary Series* (IDS) (Key & Comrie 2012, modeled on Buck 1949), which has been compiled to allow comparison across continents, has one section on food, kitchen utensils and ways of eating (Chapter 5).

The evolution of dishes has been likened to the evolution of languages (Whitfield 2005): Similar dishes may indicate cultural contact or common ancestry; such is the case with similar words or grammatical structures. Hence, borrowings of words denoting food items can be seen as proof of cultural contact, such as Russian loans in Alaskan Eskimo (Anttila 1972:162). More recently, for instance Fowler (1994) and Hill (2001a) studied food terms and food distribution for the classification of Uto-Aztecan, or Adelaar discussed the name of the sweet potato, which has been considered a cognate in Polynesian and Quechua supporting a common genetic origin, a suggestion Adelaar ultimately rejects (1998, cf. also Lavric & Konzett 2009, Section II, on food names and language contact in and around Croatia).

From the opposite perspective, linguistic studies of traditional local names of fruits can help explain the domestication of plants. “A cultivated plant often migrates with its name, and when this plant is culturally innovative, its name is often retained in the receiving language.” (Perrier et al. 2011: 5) For instance, the dating of the bean in Mesoamerica has been challenged by linguistic data (Brown 2006). Hence, disciplines like botany or archaeology can profit from linguistic enquiry in that way.

Generally, a link has been drawn between the history of a language and the subsistence mode of their people: Hunter-gatherer or forager societies have been linked to a single, mutually intelligible language with regional dialect variation (Hill 1978). Such a dialect continuum is maintained through intermarriage (incest taboo) and the support between different local groups in times of scarcity so that a

long-distance area network of communication and mutual support is created which does not presuppose face-to-face interaction between its members (Kosse 1990). In anthropological dialectology, migration is only one possible mechanism to account for the spread of language features (Hill 2001b). The assumption is that language variability allows people to lay claims on natural resources. If you believe you own a resource, your language reflects this ownership with the help of dialect features (Hill 2001b: 261): If you speak in a certain way, you belong and have a right. On the other hand, in a distributed strategy, sociolinguistic variables are spread since speakers incorporate features from other dialects (Hill 2001b: 261). Hence a link is drawn between food and linguistic variation. In the farming/language dispersal hypothesis (Bellwood & Renfrew 2002), the reach of the world's most wide-spread language families such as Indo-European or Bantu is linked to the shift from forage to agriculture (cf. also Ross 2006). The many linguistic, archaeological and biological arguments pertaining to different regions of the world cannot be reported here (cf. for instance Bellwood 2011 for a recent publication on the pacific region).⁶

3.2 Morphology and word formation

The most important word formation processes with regard to the denomination of food items are borrowing, compounding (including toponyms) and eponyms. Language histories such as the *Cambridge history of the English language* are a fine source to study the borrowing of food terminology. For instance, in English, the first non-Germanic food terms were already introduced before the Anglo-Saxons even migrated to England. Out of the estimated 170 borrowings from Latin during the continental period when Germanic tribes mingled with the Roman army roughly 20% denote food items and another 30% plants and animals (most of which may also be eaten) (Kastovsky 1992: 302). Two examples from that period, *butter* and *cheese*, can be seen as representatives here for the wealth of borrowings in different situations of language contact described in general language histories. In addition, major dictionaries which include etymological information such as the *Oxford English Dictionary* (OED) are important sources to consider when studying word formation processes with regard to food items.⁷ While some more

⁶ For the evolution of Language (not languages) and the role of food in this process, cf. Parker (1985), who links shared references to food hidden from competitors and human Language in a social-technological model.

⁷ Many mid-twentieth century articles on the etymology of certain food terms, e.g. the Portuguese *iguaría* 'tasty food', 'dainty dish' (Malkiel 1944, Spitzer 1945, Spitzer 1946), do not reflect on their nature as food terms per se. For this reason, they will generally not be reported here.

recently spread words like *camembert* (first attested in English in 1878 according to the OED) or *spaghetti* (1845) still index their (sometimes supposed) place of origin, older international food terms such as *maize* (1544) from Taino are less transparent.

Turning to studies dealing explicitly with denominations for food items (cf. also popular books on the etymology of food terms such as Morton 2000 or Jacobs 1995, for winemaking terminology Nedlinko 2006), it soon becomes apparent that borrowings often spread internationally, an example being *coffee* (cf. Puttaswamy 2009 for *curry*). The words wander around the globe together with the food items. Often borrowed words take on local phonetic and graphic conventions so that German compounds like *Kaffeeklatsch* or *Kaffeekränzchen* ('an informal get-together in the afternoon with coffee and cake, the kind of talk found there, or groups of people who (would) do this') can represent a prototypical German pastime. The Arabic origin both of the word *qahwah* and the bean is usually not present in the minds of German speakers. These borrowings are also often integrated into the morphological system: for English, e.g. *pizza* (sg.) to *pizzas* (pl.) instead of *pizze* (Italian) (cf. also Metcalf & Doviak 1981 on *pizza* and *pie* as synonyms) or *schnitzel* (sg.) to *schnitzels* (pl.) instead of *Schnitzel* (German, sg. and pl.) (Mühleisen 2003: 83). Furthermore, since the morphology of the source language is not always transparent, this has also led to re-interpretations like in the famous case of the *burger*. *Hamburger* is etymologically a derivation of *Hamburg* (the German city) plus *-er* suffix which was then reanalyzed as *ham* 'type of meat' plus *burger* 'type of sandwich' (Williams 1939). The reinterpretation of *burger* as a free morpheme then led to a number of new compounds such as *cheese burger* which have found continuous interest. For instance, in the journal *American Speech* only, in 1968, already 17 publications about *burger* had appeared, some by eminent linguists like Bolinger (Soudek 1968).

As far as language for special purposes or the cooking register is concerned, professional cooks all over the world still use loanwords from French, e.g. to differentiate between different types of cooks such as *saucier* or very specific kinds of intermediate products like *demiglace* (Riley-Köhn 1999: 395). One strategy to upgrade food is the use of (sometimes invented) original denominations (cf. also Serwe et al., this volume). For instance, *escargot* sounds more sophisticated than snails, or *chop-suey*, a derivation from a Cantonese dialect meaning 'mixed pieces', is an American innovation, similar to *Mulligatawny soup* (not Indian, but English) or *Döner* (not Turkish, but German). One example that has recently attracted attention is *Chicken Tikka Masala*, which the British Foreign Secretary Robin Cook hailed "a true British national dish" (Buettner 2008). False references to other places (e.g. *zuppa inglese* originating from Ferrara, Italy) may simply indicate the use of one specific ingredient (see above) or a visual analogy (e.g. the

Italian *Messicano* which resemble Mexican *taco*). They may also be used to index exoticism (Giani 2009: 50), or the basis may simply be an error (e.g. the *Jerusalem artichoke*) (Giani 2009: 52). Because of this abundance of borrowings, knowledge of culinary terminology from French, Italian, Spanish, Chinese, Japanese, Hindi, or Thai may be required to read an American menu nowadays (Lakoff 2006). Lakoff advocates that the proliferation of new terms for food in the U.S. over the last quarter century indexes the rising significance assigned to food as a marker of identity (2006: 150, cf. also below).

Besides borrowing, another common word formation process used for food terminology is compounding with toponyms, as in some of the examples above (cf. Giani 2009 on 'geo-food names' in eight Germanic and Romance languages). The locality then stands metonymically for a certain spice or ingredient: *Pizza Hawaii*, for instance, indicates the use of pineapple or *Lamb Provençal* garlic and certain spices. Conversely, Mühleisen argues that the spice or ingredient in the dish metonymically indicates far-away places to exoticize food (2003: 80). She points out that it is not necessarily the original ingredients or original taste that transports authenticity, but the name itself (2003: 82, for genuineness in such naming practices cf. also Riley 1996). In noun-noun compounds including food terms and place names, there is a bias to interpret these as meaning 'originates in' rather than 'recipe from' or even less frequent, 'reminds of' (Zlatev et al. 2010). Often, geo-food names are only used outside of the place of origin (Giani 2009: 47). In community cookbooks with which local charities raise money, names like *Spanish noodles* or *El Paso beans* are used to gain authority and trust for the recipes by non-professional cooks (Tomlinson 1986: 206). Note that quite a number of names for foods denoting origin by the use of geographical indications, be it *Roquefort* (a borrowing in English) or *Asiago cheese* (a compound with a toponym), may be protected under different trade laws so that for instance sparkling wine cannot be called *Champagne* in commerce unless it comes from that very region.

Benczes draws attention to the short lived American neologism *freedom fries* with its double metonymy with *fries*, the older part found already in *French fries*, being METHOD OF PRODUCTION FOR PRODUCT and freedom as DEFINING PROPERTY FOR CATEGORY, where the category is the U.S. (2006: 6-7). A number of similar examples are cited: *sauerkraut* to *liberty cabbage* in similar hyperbolic fashion, *French loaves* to *Kiwi loaves* in New Zealand, when the French tested nuclear weapons in the Pacific, or *Danish pastries* were substituted by *Roses of the Prophet Muhammad* in Iran after the cartoon controversy (Benczes 2006: FN 4). That denominations for food are often the target of such political thrusts is not accidental since the origin or supposed origin of food is often transparent through the terms used, such as in the cases above, through compounds with a premodifying adjective denoting the country of origin or

through borrowing the word used from the language of the country of origin (for food and politics, cf. also Orwenjo 2009 for the use of proverbs, also on food, in political campaigns in Africa).

Food can be brought to countries and their languages (for European terms for *maize*, cf. Franconie 2000, also *potato* and *turkey*), but languages can also be brought to new countries and their food. In colonial encounters, the newly discovered plants are often likened to prototypical fruit, such as, in Europe, the apple: *alligator apple* or *cashew apple* are examples from Caribbean English with *malus*, the European apple, then called *English apple* (Mühleisen 2003: 74). Hence, compounding and meaning extension are frequent strategies to name unknown plants. However, the Caribbean with its diversity of cultural origins also exemplifies narrowing of meaning; such is the case with *Musaceae*, the banana family of plants, which splits into *bananas* (a borrowing from Bantu/Wolof via Portuguese, English, French), *plantain* (from Spanish *plátano*), and *figs* (elliptical for *figo da India* via Indo-Portuguese and French-related Creoles) (Mühleisen 2003: 76, Blank 1997).

Regarding words for dishes, a common practice is to name them after a person. One of the least transparent eponyms is probably *sandwich* meaning ‘slices of bread with fillings’ with the surname being for the most part unknown. Other examples include *Chateaubriand* (a beef dish named after the French author) or *carpaccio* (cold cut beef after the Italian painter). While, for instance, *Chateaubriand* maintains its capital letter (according to the OED), the others have lost this sign of their origin. Eponymic dishes are usually created by famous chefs to honor a certain person (Mühleisen 2003: 80) (cf. also the section on cook books and the section on restaurant menus for naming practices for dishes).

The *Journal of recreational linguistics* published an article about word formation in food terminology (Smith 1986), an indication that the study of food-related language use is often seen as trivial (cf. also the jocular pieces in *American Speech*). Smith notes that food terms on hand-written signs, employee-typed menus and local advertising flyers have often lost the past participle suffix -ed (*canned food* to *can food* or *iced tea* to *ice tea*, historically also *roast beef* from *roasted beef* or *hash brown potatoes* from *hashed browned potatoes*) indicating a preparation/production method and the adverb suffix -ly in premodifying position in adjective phrases (*lightly battered fish* to *light battered fish*) (Smith 1986). Many small scale studies or research notes exist about specific words for food and their origin (e.g. Fifield 1964 on *macaroni*), specific dishes (and their denomination) (Cohen 1950 on *the poor boy*), or specific word formation processes: In Greek, for instance, diminutives are conventionally added to nouns denoting food, drinks, or tableware etc. as mitigating devices (Sifianou 1992: 163f). They cannot all be reported here, the assumption also being that these findings have entered more general reference works like etymological dictionaries or grammars.

3.3 Syntax and grammar

With regard to syntax in the sense ‘word order in a sentence’, for two reasons, this will be a rather short section in comparison. On the one hand, word order does not usually depend on topic choice as strongly as other levels of language, such as, most obviously, lexis (cf. below though). Consequently, from the outset we will not expect much syntactic variation which can be linked to food. However, the ‘field of discourse,’ i.e. “the type of activity engaged in through language” (e.g. ‘instructional language’, ‘legal documents’ or ‘newspaper headlines’) does correlate with grammar (Quirk et al. 1985: 23-4). Hence, when looking at different genres, registers, or text types in the context of food production or consumption, specific syntactic constructions become important features (cf. Babel & Spitz, this volume). For instance, the recipe has a clear syntactic structure and, also, for this reason, it has often been used as a prototypical example of genre. Objects are often left out in recipes, a syntactic pattern which has been linked to middle and tough constructions (Massam 1987, cf. below though). However, these types of conventions are best discussed in their context, i.e. together with the accompanying variation on other levels of meaning-generation. Hence, syntactic structures depending on situational factors or typical of genre conventions will be discussed in the sections below dealing with different types of language use. Turning to grammar in the sense ‘syntax and morphology’, the latter has been treated in the section on word formation above.

Moving to grammatical frameworks, some approaches such as construction grammar, cognitive linguistics, pattern grammar or research in corpus linguistics stress the inseparable nature of syntax and lexis. Both are interrelated and, hence, words also determine syntactic choices. As seen above, there are a number of words closely associated with the domain of food. Verbs typically denote ways of eating or food preparation, and nouns often represent different food items (dishes, ingredients) or kitchen utensils. For instance, the verb ‘to eat’, the unmarked member of the class of verbs denoting food consumption in English, is transitive since one necessarily eats something, namely food. *Eat* and *drink* are often seen as some of the most prototypical members of the class of transitive verbs (Næss 2009, 2011). However, sentences such as *Mike ate* are also possible (Levin 1993). Crosslinguistic comparison indicates that these verbs show some features of intransitive verbs. This seems possible since verbs of indigestion, but also verbs of food preparation (e.g. *bake*), are “understood to have as object something that qualifies as a typical object of the verb” (Levin 1993: 33). In other words, the object can get deleted because of its obviousness in the process of food consumption or production. Furthermore, these verbs have an “affected agent participant” (Næss 2009: 27) (the food), which means “the participants [are not] maximally semantically distinct in

terms of the roles they play in the event,” (Næss 2009: 27) another indication that *eat* is not the most prototypical member of the class of transitive verbs.

3.4 Words and meaning

Not many of the following works would be classified as stemming from the subfield of linguistics called semantics. However, all of this research is concerned with words belonging to the realm of food and their meanings in the widest possible sense. For instance, Lehrer (1972) compared words for cooking in different languages to test the postulated universal claim of Lévi-Strauss’ *Culinary triangle* (1965). This section will include work in lexicography, anthropology, cognitive linguistics, or ethnobotany, to name a few. With regard to words from the domain of eating, one should again note that any major general language dictionary such as the *Oxford Dictionary of English* (OED) can be used as a treasure trove to study the meaning (and etymology) of food terms.⁸

Early work on food in linguistics is often lexicological and consists of lists of vocabulary mainly capturing specific jargons in the field.⁹ In 1959, Shulman lists American English names of dishes which were currently not included in major dictionaries, and their sources. There is early lexicological work on the expressions used in different restaurants or bars. In 1943, Bailey listed terms used by waiters or waitresses in East Texas and western Louisiana (cf. also Morrison 1952 on Gainesville, Florida) and Jones lists calls used in the ordering process in a specific café in Kansas (1967). The dialectal distribution of *sauce* meaning ‘canned fruit’ is studied (Shuy 1966). Cason ridiculed the use of *apple sauce* or *banana oil* referring to ‘nonsense’ (1928). Jocular pieces seem common such as “Linguistic concoctions of the soda jerker” (Bentley 1936) on the etymology and use of expressions peculiar to soda fountain-lunch rooms (also Darwin 1978). The idiomatic use of food-related expressions such as *to butter someone up* is also the topic of a jocular piece in *Gastronomica*, a magazine straddling glossy food-writing with scientific inquiry (Morton 2005, cf. also his other quarterly columns in this publication). These articles seem to suggest that food discourse in its ordinariness is not always considered worthy of serious scientific enquiry.

⁸ For instance, the articles about food related topics in the *Journal of linguistic studies* 1(2) all use dictionaries as their main resource (Groszler 2008, Holliefield et al. 2008, Perković et al. 2008, Perković & Ratã 2008, Ratã & Perković 2008) (also Becker 1992 on German loanwords in, most notably, American English).

⁹ The signs used by Benedictines for communication during their periods of silence have also been listed with a focus on food terms (Romeo 1979).

Similar to the well-known work on basic color terms (Berlin & Kay 1969), the classification of plants and animals in different languages and cultures has been studied in cognitive anthropology or ethnobotany (Berlin 1992, Berlin et al. 1974, Carlson & Maffi 2004). With regard to the connection between language and food, this approach asks the very basic question what is considered food and which term is used for it (e.g. Williamson 1970 for edible plants in the Niger delta). Biologists stress that classification into food and non-food is a task vital to all animals, including humans (Panchen 1992: 1). However, to give an example from English, a dog may be edible, but it is generally not considered food (cf. Leach 1964 in his philological essay). Hence the word *dog* would not appear in an ethnoclassification of food items by English speakers. Just like any other part of language, these classifications also change through time: *Pferd* ('horse') was a traditional part of German food classification used for instance in the popular *Rheinischer Sauerbraten*. However, it is not considered a food item any longer by the vast majority of Germans. To give another example, the Shipibo added *tapir* to their diet at one point, probably with the advent of the shotgun, which facilitated the killing of larger animals (Behrens 1986). Consequently, younger Shipibo mention *tapir* as a food item, while many elderly do not (Behrens 1986: 649). With regard to changes in food habits, euphemisms seem to be used in times of scarcity to make unusual food match previous concepts of edibility. For instance, *mountain chicken* is used for frogs in Caribbean English or *country rabbits* for cats during WWII in Europe (Mühleisen 2003: 78). Differences in food preferences are often called upon to mark the otherness of neighboring cultures by choosing real or imagined food choices such as *Frogs* for the French or *Krauts* for the Germans as denominations for the people (Fischler 1988: 280, cf. also Møller 2010 for the use of membership categorization devices in a restaurant setting). In self-descriptions, American Jews have creatively used *rye* or *whole-wheat*, in contrast to *white* (bread), to mark their ethnicity (Modan 2001). Furthermore, 2nd generation immigrants have been shown to use food preferences as markers to distance themselves from recent immigrants of their own ethnicity: *Is dat dog you're eating?* (Hiramoto 2011)

Another finding with regard to the classification of food items is that biological categories may not always faithfully represent local schemata. For instance, some plants are not recognized as one and the same species depending on the season or their use. In the mountains of Castilla-La Mancha in Spain, one plant is considered food by the end of winter as *pan de pastor*, but in the summer its stems are collected for broom making under the denomination *escobas de amargos* (Rivera et al. 2007). In addition, the shoots and fruits of one plant may be considered two different food items with two different denominations and no relation according to the local people (Rivera et al. 2007). Furthermore, what

may have one family denomination only in most languages, can have further classifications in other languages: For instance, *banana* is differentiated into different types in Caribbean Creoles not only by botanists, but by people in general. *Pòyò*, for instance, is green, when harvested, and destined for exportation. The same fruit is called *fig* or *fig-jón* when yellow and eaten raw (Blank 1997, for other terms used see also above). This research stresses that food is not a given, but a cultural construct which can be analyzed by looking at language. Different language communities conceptualize the world differently, depending on their cultural needs. Our biology or physiology may determine what is not edible. What is edible, however, and how we categorize food items cannot be identified by the natural sciences. It is not a function of the body, but a function of the mind. Hence, the dichotomy *nature* and *culture* cannot be maintained from this perspective since humans have shaped their environment from the very beginning (Carlson & Maffi 2004, Gosden 1999).

Turning to one of the most central words from this field, the Maricopa (of Scottsdale, Arizona) have two different verbs, one for ‘eating’ in general *maum* and one for ‘consuming something with water’ *čakaum* (for fruit and vegetables) (Frisch 1968). In his componential analysis, Frisch analyzes their food taxonomy as consisting of two classes of food items depending on the verb used (1968: 19). In reverse fashion, Landar describes different words for eating in Navajo depending on what food items can follow (1964, for Tzeltal cf. Berlin 1967, for Tojolabal Maya cf. Furbee 1974, or for Jicarilla Apache Landar 1976). Lehrer provides a structuralist feature analysis of the field of cooking for English (1969). In *The Linguistics of Eating and Drinking* (Newman 2009), a number of cross-linguistic studies reveal different syntactical, semantic or cognitive properties for those two verbs (for Dogon verbs of eating, cf. also Heath & McPherson 2009). Wierzbicka points out that *eat* and *drink* are not linguistic universals (in contrast to *live* and *die*). Accordingly, even though arguably everybody eats and drinks, not everybody conceives themselves as beings that *eat* and *drink* (2009). These two ideas of eating and drinking cannot even be expressed separately in all languages (Wierzbicka 2009: 65).¹⁰ In a cognitive framework, Szawerna (1997) describes different verbs for eating as elaborating the bases of the English prototypical member of the class *to eat* and the Polish prototypical member *jeść*: either personal sphere is highlighted (*Have a sandwich!*), since the food must be close by to be eaten; or the [out]-[in] relation between the container (the human being) and the contained (the food), between the trajector and the landmark, is emphasized (e.g. *to stuff, bold (down)*);

¹⁰ For why you can say *have a drink*, but not *have an eat**, see Wierzbicka 1982 in the framework of natural semantics.

or the domain of disintegration is stressed, namely, that the food undergoes a radical change in the process (e.g. *to polish (off)*, *to demolish*) (1997: 42-43), to give some examples from English. Thus eating is a process with three different stages: First, the food is close by; then it is located within the eater; finally, it is completely assimilated.

Reversely, expressions from the domain of eating are often used as metaphors: IDEAS ARE FOOD e.g. *food for thought*, *a voracious reader* or *to spoon-feed students* (Lakoff & Johnson 1980: 46-47, 147-148). Since food here defines ideas (and not vice versa), the food terms used are typically very simple. For this reason, “we may have *raw facts* and *half-baked ideas*, but there are no *sautéed*, *broiled*, or *poached ideas*” (Lakoff & Johnson 1980: 109). Hence, words from the lexical field food are used to talk about something abstract like ideas because they are mundane and concrete. In Chinese, also WORDS ARE FOOD (Zing-Schmidt 2008). Furthermore, DESIRE IS HUNGER, a metaphor found in different languages, points to the embodied nature of metaphorical thinking (Gibbs et al. 2004, cf. also SEXUAL DESIRE IS APPETITE Kövecses 2002). Gender studies have drawn attention to the metaphor WOMEN ARE DESSERTS e.g. as *tarts*, but also in the embodied form of women jumping out of cakes (Hines 1999).

There are also a number of studies focusing on the lexis and semantics of different food items or cuisines. Lehrer studied the vocabulary of wine from different angles, semantically (based on publications about wine) or experimentally with different wine tastings (2009, 1975). Her many findings can be subsumed under the general notion that humans (experts and laypersons) have difficulties pinpointing taste or aroma with language (cf. also Lavric & Konzett 2009, Section III, on wine and taste, cf. also Ankerstein & Pereira, this volume). Backhouse offers a thorough description of the semantics of taste terms in Japanese (1994).

Since food is a commodity, its denominations are also subject to trade regulations and laws. In contrast to the research above, which is concerned with everyday uses of terms, the following works represent expert knowledge. The database LanguaL which lists 35,000 food items from all over the world recognizes some general issues in the compilation of multilingual glossaries:

One problem concerning multilingual thesauri is the multiplicity of natural languages: corresponding terms of different languages are not always semantically equivalent. It was chosen to render LanguaL language-independent, to be used in the USA and Europe for numeric data banks on food composition (nutrients and contaminants), food consumption and legislation. Each descriptor is identified by a unique code pointing to equivalent terms in different languages. (LanguaL 2012)

Examples of descriptors include (a) *product types* such as *dairy products* or *confectionaries*, which are again based on the food classifications of different

organizations like the European Community, (b) *food sources* such as *animals, plants* or *chemical food sources*, (c) *cooking or preservation method*, or (d) *packing medium*, to give some examples (LanguaL 2012). The authors of an article on data management in this domain write that codes make “these systems language independent (but not necessarily culturally independent),” (Schlotke et al. 2000: 712) a claim that, unfortunately, is not explained any further. Another initiative, the INFOODS classification concerned with nutritional information, recognizes differences in regional and other varieties of English and maintains that “different scripts and many languages may be smaller obstacles than inconsistent terminology of English speakers” (Truswell 1991: 19). While different scripts may in the main represent a technical problem, it is unclear why the dialectal situation of English is foregrounded in this respect. After all, similar variation can be found in other languages. The Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations offer the AGROVOC thesaurus with more than 40,000 concepts in 22 languages. That the international exchange of information regarding food represents an unsolved problem in food studies and an ongoing debate amongst food experts (Schlotke et al. 2000) again points to the fundamental nature of food as a cultural construct rather than a chemical, biological substance. These difficulties become the more acute in literary translation where connotations and identity construction are relevant (cf. Lavric & Konzett 2009, section VIII, on food in translation).

Similarly, words for taste, like *sweet* or *salty*, have been shown to be culturally dependent and the existence of four (or five) primary tastes doubted:

It may be conjectured that, historically, Western scientists took their idea of primacy from the predominant labels in their language, themselves probably dependent on local cuisine. (O’Mahony et al. 1986: 171)

Even though there seem to be specific receptors on the tongue for these different tastes, as lexical items they are not necessarily present (Goddard 2001). For instance, in Japanese, the term *amai* ‘sweet’ can also be used for ‘bland’ tastes (Backhouse 1994 in Goddard 2001, cf. also Ankerstein & Pereira, this volume). Gustatory psychophysicists, psychologists or food scientists elicited taste words by actual tasting solutions for example with sodium chloride under experimental conditions (e.g. O’Mahony et al. 1980). In enological studies, also, the lexicon is investigated by actual wine tasting (the original thrust being in the opposite direction, namely to investigate taste via its description). One important finding is that our senses do not work independently: Hence, based on its odor, a white wine colored red with the help of an odorless dye gets assigned the descriptors typically associated with red wine (Morrot et al. 2001). Taste and its brother smell are intricately interwoven with culture (Korsmeyer 2005). For instance, the Jahai language, but also other Austroasiatic languages, has an elaborate system of olfactory terms challenging the idea that smell is vestigial in humans (Burenhult & Majid 2011).

More cross-cultural studies are called for to account for the relation between language, culture and the senses (Majid & Levinson 2011).

Finally, focusing on attitudes towards word meaning, it is interesting to note that with regard to the discourse surrounding genetic modification crop science and food technology (Cook et al.: 2004), scientists discuss word choice with regard to denotation rather than connotation. They felt words were meaningless unless they could be defined by a semantic feature analysis (rather than e.g. prototype theory; Rosch 1977), and context-dependency and variability were not tolerated. For instance, the words *natural* and *unnatural* were considered evaluative and fuzzy, hence meaningless (Cook et al. 2004: 443).¹¹ In government documents about GM food and crops (from New Zealand), the word *sustainable* was used with various meanings creating ambiguity strategically to include different perspectives that are *au fond* incompatible (Leitch & Davenport 2007, for more on biotechnology, cf. below).

Words from the domain of food have been researched for their cultural and their semantic meaning by scholars and scientists from multiple disciplines with a multitude of findings: On the one hand, especially in language-studies, such work has often been framed as an entertaining spare-time endeavor or hobby-horse. On the other hand, the fundamental significance of food for human kind, for culture and identity has been claimed. In addition, quite practically, its culture and language boundedness poses ongoing difficulties for translation and international trade. Food does not easily match biological or chemical descriptions, be it with regard to words for taste, dishes or even plants.

3.5 Spoken discourse

Food has been talked about before the advent of the first script. In addition, the domain food is clearly part of languages with no writing systems. Furthermore, communication about food is part of our life before we learn to read and write. For these reasons, spoken discourse about food will be discussed before the written genres which may come to mind more readily.

The first part of this section is a long account on conversations by families having dinner together since these studies represent a considerable part of the literature at the cross-section between language and food. It is important to note that this section clearly has a cultural bias with its focus on nuclear families and dinner tables, which should not imply that other cultures lack similar concurrences, also with regard to child socialization. Schieffelin's account of the language socialization of Kaluli children (Papua New Guinea) (1990) will act as one representative here

¹¹ For a discussion about *natural* and *unnatural* food, cf. also Knight (2012) on their use in low carb diet manuals.

for the many works describing similar interplays between actual language use and food intake recorded or observed by anthropologists (cf. e.g. Cohen 1961 for food sharing). For once, there are a number of food taboos for mothers and children (but also fathers) that must be followed to ensure the healthy birth and upbringing of the children (Schieffelin 1990: 65ff). Furthermore, an important part of Kaluli socialization is to teach the sharing and non-sharing of food items (and other objects) to maintain social relations (cf. also Keating 2000 below). This sharing is negotiated through talk and a lot of energy is devoted to teach the children the appropriate practices of giving and refusing to give (Schieffelin 1990: 136ff.) Another example for the coming-together of food and talk besides at dinner tables is narratives at a Native American hunting camp told next to the fire under the kitchen tarp: Careful talk about pursuing moose (food animals) is used as allegories on interpersonal relations (McIlwraith 2008). In sum, when humans gather, food and talk are often intertwined for the fulfillment of a variety of human needs such as bonding or socialization.

3.5.1 Analyzing dinner talk

One of the most fruitful fields in the relation between language and food has been the analysis of dinner talk based on transcriptions of (video-)taped, naturally occurring interactions in families (Blum-Kulka 1997, for recent overviews, cf. Laurier & Wiggins 2011, Larson et al. 2006, the table of corpora in Pan et al. 1999: 207). Having meals together is a core practice in families used by parents to socialize their children into value systems about language related and food related behavior, as well as any other aspect of life which may come up as a topic (Schieffelin & Ochs 1986). By sharing meals, families create opportunity spaces for joint activities (Ochs et al. 1989), be it play, prayer or narration. There is a plethora of studies from discursive psychologists, conversation analysts, linguists and anthropologists focusing on different aspects of dinner talk in a variety of languages and cultures. The focus is often on family dinner, even though other constellations may be just as meaningful, such as groups of friends having lunch or coffee (Tannen 1984, Leung 2009, Eriksson 2009, Escalera 2009). Many of the findings based on talk at the dinner table are of general interest (e.g. for language acquisition cf. Johansen 2010 or for methodological issues concerning the relation between interaction and culture Gardner 2012, Schegloff 2005). However, only a smaller number of studies deal with the relation between food and language specifically since often talk directly related to the setting is disregarded:

Excluded from this analysis were turns focused on instrumental dinner talk (e.g., “pass the salt, please”), such talk being considered by definition “nontopical” and hence subject to a different set of discourse norms for those operating for topical talk. (Blum-Kulka 1994: 9, cf. Blum-Kulka 1994: 32-33 and below though)

These here-and-now anchored themes, which are the most frequent kind of talk during mealtimes in both cultures, have not been analyzed in this study. (Aukrust & Snow 1998: 227)

In our case, with food being the topic, it is exactly those turns and those discourse norms that would be of interest. As a general background to this volume, however, it is important to note the wealth of findings around dinner talk indicating that meals facilitate so much more than the biological need for an intake of edibles. While some of the following studies rely on the coding and quantification of verbal behavior at the dinner table (e.g. Tingley et al. 1994), work in conversation analysis and discursive psychology analyzes the in-situ negotiations of meaning (e.g. the work by Wiggins). The following paragraph lists the works mainly in the order of their publication.

Quite early, Shultz et al. describe turn-taking patterns and role differentiation in the dinner talk of an Italian-American family (1982). By coding interactions between different family members during dinner, Lewis and Feiring (1982) show that research on socialization ought to study the child as a member of a social system, the family, rather than focus on the mother-child dyad only. Their studies indicate that children are exposed to a number of norms which are enacted by the families: “sex and age roles, communication rules and manners” (Feiring & Lewis 1987: 387). An analysis of narratives at the dinner table (cf. also below) indicates that coherence across stories (told predominantly by Italian-American males while having dinner) is maintained by continuity of protagonist/narrator and keying, displaying family values for the children (Erickson 1988). In a linguistic analysis, the employment of positive and negative politeness formula can be observed by children (Snow et al. 1990). American-Israeli families allowed insight into code-switching and -mixing in a bilingual context (Olshtain & Blum-Kulka 1989). The specific politeness strategies in different families were also used to further politeness research with regard to directness and mitigation (Blum-Kulka 1990). The function of nick-naming has been studied in cross-cultural perspective (Blum-Kulka & Katriel 1991). In child development studies, the family dinner has been described as a rich site for observational data, one important reason being that children can also observe their parents’ behavior towards one another (Lewis & Feiring 1992). The dinner table provides children with opportunities to listen to stories told by adults, to become co-narrators as well as to attempt telling their own stories (Ochs et al. 1989, Blum-Kulka et al. 1992). These joint narrative activities are also used by families to construct gender asymmetries *Father knows best* (Ochs & Taylor 1992b, 1995) and socialize children into critical thinking (Ochs & Taylor 1992c, Ochs et al. 1992). Cultural differences are to be expected: While American families like to exchange stories about their day, Israelis share narratives about their homes

(i.e. close in space), but further away in time: “The proposition unique to the Americans seems to be “Let me tell our story”; for the Israelis, it is “Let us (all) listen to your (singular) story.” (Blum-Kulka 1993: 397) In contrast to Bernstein’s beliefs (1972), explanatory talk, which is used to predict cognitive or linguistic learning, is relatively frequent in low-income American families during their meals (Beals 1993). Narratives and explanatory talk have about equal share with explanations being shorter and more frequent (Beals & Snow 1994). Again in cross-cultural perspective, Italian families differ from American families with regard to the roles of the father, and the mother and children concerning the problematization of past events at the dinner table (Pontecorvo & Fasulo 1997, in contrast, Ochs & Taylor 1992a, 1992b). Children are encultured according to their sex to perform certain duties like helping serve or clean (Grieshaber 1997). A cross-cultural study indicates that Norwegian middle class families produce more narrative activities (in relation to explanatory talk) than their U.S. counterparts (Aukrust & Snow 1998). This focus on social norms could also be found in the Swedish families of a cross-linguistic study including Estonians and Finns (De Geer 2004, cf. also Tulviste et al. 2003, Tryggvason 2006 for the concept of ‘the silent Finn’, Tryggvason et al. 2002, Tryggvason 2004, for more Nordic cross-linguistic comparison). Besides narrative, another genre regularly cultivated by American families and transmitted to their children is saying grace (Capps et al. 2002, Goodwin 2007: 101ff.). The children’s imperfections in this genre can be seen as “evidence of the routine interpenetrations of genres in everyday life” (Capps et al. 2002: 54). Bilingual parents teach language rules regarding politeness or turn taking which are situated in between the languages they use (Blum-Kulka et al. 1993). Mothers of children with Down syndrome use a less varied vocabulary and less inner state verbs as well as shorter utterances than mothers with non-handicapped children during their dinners (Tingley et al. 1994). Since coming together to eat food is considered “making a family,” (DeVault 1991: 78) the positioning of the stepmother in these situations can give insight into her integration into the family (Dedaić 2001). In the framework of discursive psychology, Pontecorvo and Fasulo discuss how an Italian family negotiates what would be considered a typical Italian meal in a foreign country (Austria) while eating hamburgers (1999). They show how the family produces ‘cultural typicality’ in its interaction with regard to their different roles e.g. as mother and provider of food and the impact this has on child socialization. While deconstructing Italian cuisine, by discussing the cultural norms and the daily practices, they concurrently try to live up to this idea of typicality (cf. also Miller & Berry 1999). Sterponi uses family dinner talk to study account episodes in a conversation analytic framework (2003). With regard to food, she discusses the interactional construction of the use of salt (by children) as excessive and morally accountable behavior (Sterponi 2003: 87ff). Paugh shows the importance of

work related discourse in family dinner talk (2005). Not only do children ask for basic information when their parents talk about work-related subjects, they also witness evaluations of different behavior in work-related settings when listening to their parents' conversational narratives (Norrick 2000). Hence, these middle-class dual-earner American families socialize their children into work settings with their expectations and roles long before the children actually enter work life themselves (Paugh 2005). A lack of this socialization practice may be one factor in the "hereditariness" of unemployment. The use of reported speech by mothers and fathers (Ely et al. 2009) and the multimodal enactment of reporting (Niemelä 2010, cf. also below for multimodality) in conversational storytelling has also been studied in dinner table discourse (cf. also Perregaard 2010 for the construction of moral order in narrative). Finally, the interactional functions of linguistic forms can be studied *in situ*, such as the Icelandic particle *nú* as a marker of affective stance (Hilmisdóttir 2011) or the formula *I'm not X, I want/just want Y* to curtail following challenges (Childs 2012).

Taken together, these studies emphasize that having meals together serves more than the simple intake of sustenance. Instead, children are taught appropriate behavior, not only with regard to the dinner setting (see below), but through displacement, one of the defining properties of human language, about settings outside the immediate family realm. Morality, understandings of the world, and socialization are produced with mealtimes as vehicles of culture (Ochs & Shohet 2006). It is for this reason that many of the authors in this section advocate studying natural settings rather than researching food consumption (or socialization, or other human behavior or social endeavors) through laboratory experiments or questionnaires.

Turning to those studies which do take dinner-related talk into account, Blum-Kulka (1994) describes the underlying tension between the instrumental talk about dinner-related activities and the general socializing goals of dinner conversation, which is resolved by constant frame-shifting:

These frames in turn evoke different genres: the highly contextualized, regulatory discourse of the instrumental task of having dinner; the spatiotemporally here-and-now anchored discourse of immediate family concerns, which assigns topical relevance by family membership and is highly sensitive to socializing goals; and finally, the discourse of nonimmediate topics that unfolds in the most sociable, ordinary conversation-like manner, accepting with equal respect contributions from all participants, regardless of role in family. (Blum-Kulka 1994: 44)

Kendall assigns different frames and positions with, for example, head chef, host, or director of clean-up in the dinner frame, and facilitator or comedian in the conversational frame (2008). In the socializing frame, she also describes an

etiquette monitor to enforce appropriate behavior at the dinner table (Kendall 2008: 553).

Dinner related talk has been studied from a number of perspectives: Blum-Kulka's research on politeness indicates that the highest number of directives at the dinner table is requests for action or requests to stop an action. With regard to the parents' utterances only, the portion even rises to 85%. This is an indication both of the asymmetrical relation as well as of the need perceived by the parents to control their children at the table (Blum-Kulka 1990). Narratives and food distribution are interspersed (e.g. transcript 19 in Ochs & Taylor 1992a). Ochs shows how the present act of eating is intertwined with past eating experiences through narrative: current eating may occasion story-telling about past eating or an event from a story about eating may happen again during the dinner (1994). In a cross-cultural Italian-US American comparison, Ochs et al. show differences in the socialization of children at the dinner table (1996). While Americans stressed eating the right food as a moral obligation (with dessert used as a reward for compliance), Italian families reveled in taste as pleasure. In Italy, children were regarded as persons with individual preferences whereas the Caucasian American families stressed the difference between children's and adults' tastes. In both these middle class cultures, children were taught that they should not waste food (Ochs et al. 1996, cf. also DuFon 2006 on how students learn about local taste in a study-abroad context, again in informal dinner talk with their host families). A qualitative analysis of Italian dinner talk highlights the shifting participation frameworks (Goffman 1981) in family interaction: with regard to dinner behavior, the burping of a young child was used by the father to put the child into the role of an overhearer (Goffman 1981) allowing him to turn his behavior into a face-saving comical performance (Fatigante et al. 1998). Junefeld and Tulviste show that there are sociocultural differences between the uses of the sentence types (declarative, imperative, interrogative) with regard to Estonian and American mothers regulating children (with Swedish mothers being in between) (1998). While the former prefer to concentrate on the task at hand (having dinner), the Americans seem to foster verbal activities during mealtimes (Junefeld & Tulviste 1998: 146). With regard to the regulation of teenagers, however, American and Estonian mothers do not seem to differ in the amount of regulatory speech at the dinner table (Tulviste 2000: 550). It is mainly mothers (in a sample of Estonian, Finnish and Swedish families) who regulate the table manners of children, especially younger children (De Geer et al. 2002). Estonian mothers comment more frequently on the immediate task of having dinner; also they use more imperatives than all other mothers (De Geer et al. 2002: 1777). In contrast, Swedish early adolescents comment more often when perceiving failures to comply to moral rules than Estonians or Finns (Tulviste et al. 2002). In one Caucasian-American family, the father initiated local, dinner related topics only, whereas the

mother's topics were unrelated to the setting (Abu-Akel 2002). Metacommunicative comments are used in (Italian) food talk to coerce children to eat more or stop them from eating more (Fatigante et al. 2004). Generally, with children present, regulatory talk seems more direct in Swedish families than non-instrumental talk (Brumark 2006b), but there is also a tendency for fathers to use irony and sarcasm to regulate younger children (Brumark 2006a). In addition, with younger children there tends to be more negotiation around dinner-related behavior (Brumark 2008). During meal times, parents often use directives (in contrast to requests) since their children's willingness to comply is not of interest to them and since they do not doubt their own entitlement to control their children's actions (Craven & Potter 2010). Interaction between children, peer talk, is an important contribution to the development of adequate language skills (Blum-Kulka et al. 2004). An older brother may also at times position himself as caretaker in trying to coerce his younger sibling to finish his food, again in a Swedish family (Aronsson & Gottzén 2011). Furthermore, compliance to directives at the dinner table is exercised in different manners using an array of embodied and verbal resources (Kent 2012). In the case of a child with special dietary requirements, references to pleasure are used to normalize the diet and construct a practice shared by the whole family (Veen et al. 2012).

Taken together, these studies illustrate cross-cultural differences on various planes and the enactment of distinct family roles according to gender, age and position in the family (e.g. elder brother). Furthermore, just like in the sections above, food is again shown to be constructed through language. In addition, the importance of studying language and food in their natural habitats becomes reinforced. The complexity of the setting "dinner table" or "having meals together" will become even more pronounced in this final section with studies focusing on the inseparability of language from the physical context of its use, hence in our case, from the dinner setting. Here, the actual food on the table is also taken into account.

In his lectures, Sacks draws attention to the position someone occupies who can say "bring out the herring," a position typically associated with a dinner frame including guests (1995: 328). Similarly, an offer for a plate can be heard as displaying membership as 'host' (Butler & Fitzgerald 2010). Offering food to guests includes referring to the food on the table. This is achieved by using summonses, demonstratives, and bodily practices like pointing to, fetching or holding up objects (Eriksson 2009). Generally, entertaining guests adds another dimension to dinners. For instance, toasting is an important convention and a traditional spoken genre in many cultures (cf. Kotthoff, this volume). Speech acts concerned with the offering of food or drinks to guests are strongly dependent on cultural norms: e.g. in Polish, the guest's expressed desires are typically dismissed (Wierzbicka 1985).

Ultimately this leads to questioning the universality of politeness phenomena (cf. the work on Chinese food offerings (Chen 1996)). All of these phenomena can only be truly explicated when both talk and food are taken into account.

In a more minute analysis regarding objects in conversation, Erickson (1982) shows how the food and dinner utensils on the table can be used as resources for conversation: after the mother declares that everything on the table is home grown, her son starts listing things like lasagne and napkins. He uses the location of the utensils on the table as a means of generating a list by following their order on the table in counter-clockwise fashion (Erickson 1982: 61). By using the laid table as a local resource, the boy can quickly generate a topical list of items which allows him to contribute to the talk. Furthermore, Erickson points out that in his data an offer of food (to a guest) is reciprocated by a compliment about the food.¹² Hence an offer of a 'food item' is reciprocated by a 'talk item' while concurrently food consumption is backgrounded ('main course is over') and conversational work foregrounded ('small talk begins') (Erickson 1982: 60). This study illustrates food used as a resource for talk-in-interaction, and, more importantly, as on-a-par siblings in the dinner setting, language being exchanged against food and food against language.

With different methodologies and data, but similar findings, Keating describes how different semiotic resources are used to create rank in Pohnpei, Micronesia (2000). Their language has different verbs of motion or state, and forms of address depending on the status of a person. Concurrently, food is used during the frequent feasts to index hierarchies: higher ranking persons come first; also the quality and quantity of the food will decrease throughout the distributions. These are often the topic of subsequent discussions (Keating 2000: 310). Whereas language offers a limited choice of linguistic forms (e.g. pronouns) or grammatical constructions only (high-status, low-status, no status-marking), food offers more subtle variation, so that who may be in one group language-wise can be differentiated with regard to food practices. The different semiotic systems can add meaning unto another, or they can send oppositional meanings to create a complex set of hierarchies (Keating 2000: 311).

Wiggins et al. have worked on eating practices in the framework of discursive psychology (2001). They show that even the very nature of food is jointly constructed and negotiated (Wiggins et al. 2001: 9) and that inner states such as hunger are open to discussion in family talk (Wiggins et al. 2001: 10). Wiggins (2001) shows that evaluations of food are interactionally constructed in family

¹² cf. also Ochs and Taylor 1992a transcripts 14 and, foremostly, 18 for the use of compliments about food in identity and role construction in families.

conversation, even to the point that the identity of the food has to be first clarified. Evaluations of food items occur to compliment the cook, and they are often taken as requests for more. Evaluations can also be used to justify not eating one's food. Finally, evaluating food is also a claim of being experienced. This bound nature and action orientation questions the many questionnaire based studies on food evaluation (Wiggins 2001: 446) which were in the main disregarded in this introduction. In talk, people differentiate between 'subjective' and 'objective' evaluations, i.e. personal preferences and qualities of the food item, and between categories and items, i.e. a specific piece of food and a piece of food as representative of its kind (Wiggins & Potter 2003). Again, these distinctions are obscured in attitudinal studies (Wiggins & Potter 2003).

In addition, Wiggins describes the function of the gustatory *mmm*, which is often followed by an evaluation, as an interactional activity (2002: 318, for challenges to evaluations of food items cf. Wiggins 2004b). It can be used by speakers as physical proof for bodily sensations linked to food to embody verbal claims of pleasure (Wiggins 2002: 330). Furthermore, the interactional construction of food as healthy or unhealthy has been a concern: it is closely interwoven with other concurrent activities such as justifying meal choice (Wiggins 2004a).

Mondada, in her conversation analytic account of food assessments in dinner talk, shows that these are intricately interwoven with both food related as well as interactional activities (2009). Her paper can be seen as a strong argument in support of such a volume as this one: It is only by looking both at the meal activities as well as the interactions that she discovers the functions of assessments in this context. For once, assessments often occur when the arrival of new food is announced at the table: Assessment sequences are then relevant, projected second pair parts. Furthermore, they do not occur randomly in dinner conversation, but they are usually inserted after the closing of a sequence or a topic. Hence, "talking about food can be a powerful resource for relaunching conversation" (Mondada 2009:10). This nature of food assessments can also be used in 'delicate' situations by the diners to close controversial topics and initiate new ones. In sum, food assessments occur in specific slots both with regard to the conversations as well as with regard to the dining itself.

Laurier, in a similar vein, is concerned with "Drinking up endings" (2008). Drink is here used as a resource in the closing sequence of a casual conversation between two co-workers in a café.¹³ After having ended her story with *at the end*

¹³ This is for obvious reasons not dinner talk. However, the study by Laurier nicely complements Mondada and Wiggins with its focus on the use of objects as resources in talk.

of the day, B finishes her coffee with “that extra tilt... which while mechanically necessary also makes it visibly the last sip.” (Laurier 2008: 172) This makes the completion of the coffee-break possible since both talk and drink are done. However, the other woman (F) still has half a glass of coke. B’s setting down the cup on the saucer with a hearable ‘clunk’ happens at the turn completion of her colleague’s turn. After a few utterances both women glance at their wrist watches. This then causes F to take a markedly quicker drink from her coke than in her previous behavior. In doing so she makes an attempt at aligning the time of her finishing the drink with the time they still have according to their watches. Although she is not done, she pushes the glass away from her after having set it down: “a charming and classic gesture of having finished even though the glass is not empty.” (Laurier 2008: 175) Again, a possible moment for leaving the café and the conversation has come. However, the two women seem reluctant to leave their moment of gossiping about co-workers. Now B uses a half-filled glass of tap-water which was sitting next to her cup of coffee as a reserve resource: Her picking it up projects forward more time for the conversation to continue. The final move that leads into them getting up in perfect synchrony is signaled again not only verbally, but through a sequence of actions: F drinks up, puts the glass down forcefully with a ‘clunk’, slaps her thigh and reaches for her handbag (Laurier 2008: 177). The analysis of this sequence indicates that not every attempt at closing is necessarily taken up. This is in parallel to classic pieces of conversation analytic research about telephone calls (Schegloff & Sacks 1973). It is also a strong argument in favor of analyzing every possible resource for making meaning in conversation, including drinks and food. Schegloff and Sacks have already drawn the analogy between the uses of food and language in their seminal paper:

the possible need for preparing [closings], has to do with the OCCASION’S ending, and it is a part of conversation that the occasion may be ended. It is by way of the use of closing the conversation for ending the occasion that the use of a section to end the conversation may be appreciated, in a way similar to our appreciation of the use of a snack to end an evening or a get-together. (Schegloff & Sacks 1973: 326)

Just like conversation here is used to end a phone-call, in Laurier’s data it is drinks and conversation (and other means) which are used to end the coffee-break (Laurier 2008: 170-171).

With regard to young children in affluent societies, however, it is not always clear when the end of dinner has been reached. Parents elicit completion statements “Are you done?” and disregard claims from their children that they are full (Laurier & Wiggins 2011). Dessert is used as a resource by parents to check satiety with those children who are old enough to have acquired general dinner

rules. Furthermore, family equality or the nutritional value of food are evoked in the negotiation of adequate and fair food portions for children in mundane dinner settings. Hence, appetite, hunger, and satiety are not psychological states, but interactionally negotiated practices in families. For this reason, research on eating disorders and obesity should take such findings into account (Laurier & Wiggins 2011).

In US society, health is often depicted as a state to be achieved through correct eating practices (Paugh & Izquierdo 2009, also e.g. Meneley 2007 on the discourse surrounding one product, namely olive oil). With regard to children, these practices also reflect whether someone is a good or bad parent. Since everyday practices do not always match the perceived knowledge about healthy eating, conflicts arise between parents and children during dinner while they negotiate food choice and quantity in the context of issues such as individual preferences or sibling fairness through family interaction (Paugh & Izquierdo 2009). In addition, Wiggins and Hepburn study how the amount of food eaten by the children, their appetite, and satiety are managed in everyday family interaction (2007).

Having food together in a group is presumably one of the oldest social acts in the history of human kind. The studies above indicate its primordial importance in bonding and group constitution, in the transmission of language and culture, and in the constitution of identities and roles. While constructing one's behavior as meaningful and orderly, both food and language are used as resources in everyday situations.

3.5.2 *Other spoken discourses*

Talk about food is common in everyday interaction between relatives, friends or other social groups (e.g. in a paper on offers of assistance Curl 2006). Norrick shows that it can be used as a means of bonding, even if participants often take an expert footing for example in conversational recipe tellings (2011). Conversational recipes consist of a sequence of turns with a discernable opening and closing. The use of the first person past tense links them to conversational stories (Norrick 2000), while the use of imperatives indicates their instructional nature (Norrick 2011). In Greek, diminutives are often added to the ingredients in spoken recipes, indicating involvement and concern (Sifianou 1992: 163).

Not many studies seem to exist which focus on language use during food preparation. Achiba illustrates the acquisition of interactional competence by an L2 speaker during the course of three cooking sessions with L1 speakers (2012). For instance, the 8-year-old Japanese girl starts using the expression *it says...*, *so...* which has been used by the native English speakers to refer to instructions in the recipe and their in-situ application (Achiba 2012: 22).

In an ethnographic account of Israeli children's ritual sharing of snacks, Katriel describes the bonding nature of this communicative act that involves both food consumption as well as specific verbal negotiations (1987). For instance, by quickly stating *bli xibùdim* 'without sharing', the future buyer of snacks can suspend the rules. However, if the other children first utter *bexibùdim! bexibùdim!* in a chant-like manner, this option is no longer available so that the treat would have to be shared with the other children by letting them have bites or licks (Katriel 1987: 305). Mishler describes how children exchange food items during break time in a first grade classroom focusing on the act of trading (1979, cf. also Schieffelin 1990). Looking at spoken language in the kindergarden, teachers see majority culture food as a natural choice, inadvertently putting pressure on minority culture children (Karrebæk 2012, 2013). Meaning to put the focus on healthy eating, teachers advocated rye bread or oats for breakfast so that newly arrived students will also be discouraged by their fellow pupils to bring pita bread to school (Karrebæk 2012: 8ff, cf. also Allison 2008, about lunch-boxes in Japan).

The service encounter remains understudied (Kuroshima 2010). For Quito (Ecuador) the importance of phatic communion (Malinowski 1972) in corner shops is attested (Placencia 2004). Merritt draws attention to questions by customers which may sometimes be reciprocated by questions from the service personnel orienting to the status of the first as either requests for information or a requests for service (1976). Expansions of the request-registration sequence indicate attenuated trust in the correct outcome of the ordering sequence, which may be relevant in a cross-linguistic setting (Kuroshima 2010). Buying food at markets or shops is usually studied under buying and selling and does not have a focus on food as the object of the transaction (for example Orr 2008 for buying e.g. fruit at a Chinese market).

However, the doings of customers e.g. at coffee shops also encompass entering, ordering, seat-selecting, meeting people, and a number of other activities which usually go unnoticed because of their ordinariness (Laurier 2005). People are usually discernable as regulars in cafés, groups that meet, or lone customers. It is through the use of talk, gestures, gaze, movement in space, use of books or newspapers, and other resources that we manage these mundane activities and make sense out of them (Laurier 2005, Laurier et al. 2001 for an overview about ethnographic studies in this field, cf. Møller 2010 for the use of membership categorization devices used in a restaurant situation).

In her ethnographic study, Lindquest shows how the patrons of a restaurant lounge in which she worked as a bar tender, create an identity of White working class through their talk (2004, 2002, cf. her bibliographies for more (ethnographic) studies of bar life). While arguing, mainly about politics, the regulars at the bar may disalign from each other; however, concurrently this allows the discursive

constitution of a group identity (Lindquest 2002: 171). Even though they feel they are not being properly represented by political and other institutions, they still believe they can move upwards within a society governed by these structures. Their identity is based on the common belief that “street smartness” is better than “book learning” (Lindquest 2002: 117-118). The stylized performances of the bar patrons are interpreted as resolving “tensions that exist not only between group solidarity and individual difference, but also between lived experience and the claims of the American myth of unfettered social mobility.” (Lindquist 2004: 312) The socio-political as well as material context of coffeetalk at Starbucks in the U.S., which may appear casual and based on equality, has been shown to reinforce social segregation (Gaudio 2003, for racial stereotyping by servers, cf. also Mallinson & Brewster 2005).

Barrett discusses the use of Spanish at a Mexican restaurant in Texas. Anglo managers often use mock Spanish for communication without questioning its success as a communicative tool. Instead, results of miscommunication are mostly explained with racial stereotypes of the Spanish-speaking workers as being lazy or stupid. Amongst the workforce, however, Spanish is used to show solidarity and resistance (Barrett 2006).¹⁴

Similarly, Tate, in her discourse analytic study, describes how Black British women from Caribbean descent reproduce and delimit their identities through talk about food, while also criticizing this reduction of their culture to “rice an peas on a Sunday an a piece ah chicken” (2003: 96). As pointed out above, “terms for food and dishes [...] frequently come to stand metonymically for a particular culture (spaghetti, kraut, curry, doner kebab, etc.)” (Mühleisen 2003: 72)

Based on a recorded conversation between a grandmother who is a trained nurse and her granddaughter, Beach shows how the denial of “a problem” with bulimia and the grandmother’s concern are interactionally constructed between the two women (1996). Wiggins et al. are concerned with calls to a helpline where food habits are discussed as either appropriate or evidence of abuse (2007, cf. also Hepburn & Wiggins 2005, for comments on body-size as a resource in conversation, see Guendouzi 2004). The authors demonstrate that discursive psychology can provide information for health professionals in this field that would help them understand actual food practices more thoroughly (Wiggins et al. 2007: 279-280, for studies on eating disorders, cf. also below). Similarly, based on observations of meetings between overweight (Danish) children, their parents and a dietician, Koustrup et al. point out that only medical and parental views were present whereas

¹⁴ The high number of Hispanic workers in US American kitchens has also led to courses in Hotel/Restaurant Spanish in community colleges (Flouton 1991).

the child's perspective was lacking (2012). They suggest that interventions might be more lasting if the 'food worlds' of the obese children were taken into account.

Animal feed or pet food will for the most part be ignored in this volume. However, food is often used as a prompt in studies with animals to test their cognitive or communicative skills. It is interesting to note that dogs have the ability to understand human communicative cues such as pointing or gaze in their attempts to locate food, in contrast for instance to primates or wolves, an ability which must have evolved during their domestication (cf. Bräuer et al. 2006: 38-39 for a recent summary).

To sum up, besides the dinner table, a number of public places are also associated with the consumption and, hence, production of edibles, and talk: restaurant lounges, bars, restaurants, coffee shops etc. Also, foods need to be bought first. Depending on the context, food or references to food take on different meanings (cf. also Holmes et al., this volume). However, most studies from these settings do not focus on language. Apart from research on families having meals at the dinner table, there is a relative dearth of linguistically-informed or language-based studies concentrating on spoken discourses around food.

3.6 Food writing

Written discourses around food as well as the mediated ones in the following section are often connected today in that celebrity chefs as brands represent the most successful actors across these different markets (Ashley et al. 2004: 172ff, cf. also Chiaro, this volume). They publish their own lines of cookery books, run restaurants, sell products under their name and work different media channels (television, internet...) Jamie Oliver's *School Dinners*, for instance, consisted of a reality TV programme and an online petition, which subsequently found wide media coverage and provoked governmental action (Mayr 2009). In that sense, these genres must nowadays not be seen separately, but as cross-fertile and as different realizations of the same discourse of lifestyle and distinction (Ashley et al. 2004: 177ff, cf. Coveney 2006).

Food writing is often distinguished into two forms: gastronomic literature and cookery books (Mennell 1996, Ashley et al. 2004). The genre defining example of the first is Brillat-Savarin's *Physiologie du gout* (cf. above). While the advent of food essays as literary genre and guides to eating has been described (Mennell 2005), a linguistically oriented discourse analytic account seems missing (cf. Van den Berghe 2009 for restaurant reviews in Brussels though). However, also other, smaller genres which may not be as obvious have established themselves. For once, written lists are an important part of food discourse: besides recipes which are concerned with the preparation of food, there are also shopping lists and menus

(Goody 2008: 83). While cookery books and recipes as well as menus have found some attention, the shopping list less so. Goody points out that it is more than a mere list of required items, but “a way of constructing the future schedule... in space and time” (2008: 83) e.g. by grouping certain products. Moreover, wine tasting notes have been described which usually follow the order of the tasting experience itself (color, smell, taste) and are of special interest because of the amount of metaphorical language use found in them (Caballero 2007). For instance, WINE IS A PERSON is a common metaphor in French (Amoraritei 2002, cf. Gluck 2003 for a critical account of ‘winespeak’). Food and healthy eating are also the topic of a burgeoning number of self-help books and diet manuals which tend to quantify, fragmentize and pathologize food (Marko 2009). The genre which has found the most attention by linguists, however, is the recipe.

3.6.1 Cookery books and recipes

The earliest documentation of written recipes consists of tablets from the northern Semitic city of Mari (located on the west bank of the Euphrates) from the earlier part of the second millennium BC (Goody 2008: 85). The first cookery book to be printed is claimed to be “Martino of Como’s *Liber de arte coquinaria*, which is embedded in Platina’s *De honesta voluptate* of around 1470” (Albala 2007: x) or, alternatively, the Nuremberg *Küchenmeisterei* (Ehlert 2010 [1485]). Recipes traveled from one European country to the next, both as medieval manuscripts and in print, allowing for a common style of cuisine in upper classes across Europe (Mennell 1996: 50). In England, the first cookery books (around 1500) were more general in scope, often called books of secrets, which also included receipts for medicine, cleaning agents, distillation, or perfumes (cf. Riley-Köhn 1999 for a diachronic study of the English recipe, cf. Hödl 1999 for a diachronic cross-linguistic study, cf. Arendholz et al., this volume, cf. Diemer, this volume). In France, until the 19th century, cookery books were exclusively written by male, mostly professional cooks (Davidson 2006: 319-320). Take note that, until the 17th century, German cookery books “were more numerous and impressive than French ones” (Davidson 2006: 336), their compilations associated with Southern German monasteries (Schumacher-Voelker 1980) (cf. Davidson 2006 for a history of the cookery book in other European countries, Ashley et al. 2004 for a recent discussion of the literature). It is claimed that only in 1887 with the appearance of *The Boston Cookbook* the conventional bipartite recipe (list of ingredients plus instructions) emerged (Aresty 1964 in Cotter 1997).

The history of the (English) cookery book allows tracing the implementation of husbandry and housewifery as a gender based division of domestic labor (Davidson 2006: 276-280), cookery books having a female domestic audience (Mennell 1996: 200). In the U.S., after WWII, cookery books reaffirmed the

domesticity of the women, after many women had entered the workforce during the war years (Horner 2000). Interestingly, not only did cookbooks, beginning in the early twentieth century continuing into the 1960s, instruct women and girls how to get and keep a man: “the good-looking girl who is also a ‘good-cooking girl’ stands more of a chance of sniffing orange blossoms,” (quoted in Inness 2001a: 37) also, in marital sex manuals of the same years, women were instructed how to cook and keep a house: “If you want your husband to love you romantically in the years to come, don’t be romantic about yourself or about him. Think of his stomach.” (Borden 1933 in Neuhaus 2001: 101) In juvenile cookbooks, girls and boys are not only instructed that they must like different kinds of food, but also that their outlook on food is different: Whereas girls are supposedly concerned with the appearance and presentation of food, boys look for taste only. Likewise, cooking (simple) dishes is presented as an option to boys, whereas girls are taught that to them cooking will be a joy and a sacred responsibility in the future (Inness 2001b). Not only gender issues, but also representation of class and national identity can be traced in cookery books. Victorian authors of cookbooks often connect a nation’s diet to its fate likening the head of the household to a leader of a nation (Zlotnick 1996: 60-61). Community cookbooks are put together, mostly by women, to raise funds for local projects reflecting the worldviews and values of those communities (Bower 1997).

Recipes are ways of encoding dishes, “a culturally defined complex of food items” (Goode et al. 1984: 147). Even though recipes for one particular dish may vary from cookery book to cookery book or from cook to cook, their basic structure is a “group-shared, socially transmitted pattern” (Goode et al. 1984: 147). On the one hand, it is the food items and, on the other hand, the modes of preparation which constitute a dish, with the latter being more important for the differentiation of different social groups/ethnicities (Goode et al. 1984: 148). A case in point may be the attempt to provide Hamburgers to the American troops in WWII, even though the usual meat could not be provided (cf. *gazelleburgers* or *caraburgers* made out of caraboa ‘water buffalo’ Meredith 1944). In regional cooking, however, the ingredients are more constant, and the procedures flexible (Goody 2008).

The genre recipe has a number of characteristics on different linguistic levels which make it such an obvious case of specialized written use of language that it seems to represent the single most used example when exemplifying this technical term or when teaching genre writing in school (cf. also Spitz & Bubel, this volume). Recipes usually consist of two parts: a list (of ingredients) and instructions. Often, recipes are also accompanied by external instructions or comments, sometimes in extra-boxes, e.g. information about some ingredient or how to serve the dish (Tomlinson 1986: 204). They are also headed by a title, the name of the recipe. These may include labels like *Shirley’s dip* or *Mother’s pumpkin pie* implying that

“the reader should trust the author” (Tomlinson 1986: 206). Moreover, some titles are rather uninformative, but strongly evaluative *Best ever cookies* or *Dream bar*, or, informative only regarding preparational details: *Tupperware sugar cookies* or *Microwave manicotti* (Tomlinson 1986: 206) (cf. also the section on word formation and restaurant menus for names of dishes in this introduction). Vital is also the information on the number of portions a recipe will make (Fisher 1969: 23).

The first major part of recipes, the list, may include the ingredients, but indispensable components like kitchen machines that may be required, pots, measuring cups, cutting boards etc. are not itemized (in contrast to laboratory manuals which list these) (Norrick 1983a, cf. also Ribeiro et al. 2006 and their ontology for a dialog system for *The House of the Future*). Likewise, some foodstuffs such as salt or water are not enumerated; or e.g. flour for rolling out dough is not added as an extra amount (Norrick 1983a). Moreover, often the list presupposes some earlier preparation stage *2 eggs, separated* or *sifted flour* by adding past participle verbs (Tomlinson 1986: 206). Finally, *pinch* or *slice* and abbreviations like *tsp* or *c.* may be hard to understand and put into action. In short, the list of ingredients is “incomplete, inexact and inconsistent” (Norrick 1983b: 174). Hence, expertise in cooking is required, even to understand the list of ingredients and its implications or presuppositions.

The instructions are “directly directive object-oriented schedules of procedures” (Norrick 1983a: 121; cf. also Wharton 2010). *Object oriented* pertains to the objective of recipes, namely to produce some dish. Instead of the word *schedule*, the Labovian narrative has also been used to describe the order of the instructions (Cotter 1994, Labov 1972). Even though the steps are given chronologically, prereading is often necessary: *Boil liquor in which meat marinated* for instance presupposes keeping the marinade (Norrick 1983a). Moreover, the instructions are necessarily always incomplete, and reading recipes means understanding the level of incompleteness (Tomlinson 1986: 207). The number of steps describing the preparation of the same dish in two different cook books may vary enormously catering for different audiences (Lakoff 2006: 162, cf. also Fischer, this volume). While English uses imperatives, e.g. German uses infinitives introduced by objects *Pfifferlinge putzen* (Gläser 1979 in Norrick 1983a: 126). Syntactically, they have been described as “recipe context English null object constructions”, e.g. *Mix well and beat for five minutes* (Massam & Roberge 1989: 135, cf. also Massam 1992, for a formal representation of cooking recipes). While historically less frequent, zero anaphora is now primarily a question of style (Culy 1996, for a syntactical analysis cf. also Bender 1999). These elliptical constructions often represent “intermediate products, as one completes the procedures, and these are henceforth treated as ingredients proper” (Norrick 1983a: 125). Non-elliptically, “once sautéed, the *celery*, *carrot*, and *onion* [...] become the *vegetables* [...]; combined with vinegar

and water, they constitute the *first mixture....*” (Norrick 1983a: 125). Again, the coherence of this text type relies on the knowledge of the cook. Non-imperative clauses have a descriptive or evaluative function only and often serve to differentiate versions of a particular recipe for the same dish (Cotter 1994). Because of the scalar nature of many of the descriptive clauses, e.g. *extra-thick* or *regular crust*, again prior knowledge about the genre and cooking seems presupposed (Cotter 1994). The complex nature of recipes comes into view when studying the cooking instructions given in a radio phone-in show which does indeed allow the reader/hearer to ask back (Goldberg 1975).

Cooking instructions printed on convenience food (Rathmayr 2006a, 2006b) are similar to recipes in many respects because of their shared global function. However, the lack of space, the smaller range and less complicated nature of the “cooking” activities, the ready-made mixtures as well as the context on the packages (e.g. recycling instructions) also make them specific text types. As to be expected, cross-cultural differences can be found: Russian texts, for instance, are much less explicit than German ones, their vague formulations catering for more experienced cooks (Rathmayr 2006a, 2006b).

Recipes are not simple, straight-forward step-by-step instructions that can be successfully used by any novice, but they represent a register containing presuppositions on many levels, necessary incompleteness in the steps of preparations or sets of instructions, assumptions about cultural knowledge, practical skills, and technical equipments evoking a complex set of practices. Successful cooks need to be able to time their steps, to understand the ever-changing nature of the product as they produce it while putting the text into action.

3.6.2 *Restaurant menus*

Menus are minimally lists of food names with prices. Restaurant owners face the difficulty of having to give information about their dishes and to advertise them in a relatively small space (Zwicky & Zwicky 1980). The genre convention of brevity holds even when the actual size of the menu would permit more information. In contrast, it may be flouted when the advertisement motive is strong (Zwicky & Zwicky 1980). In (American) English, past participle constructions are prevalent because the preparation is completed at the time of serving. Tasty, but rather uninformative adjectives such as *fresh* are common. The most basic taste words, however, are generally absent (Zwicky & Zwicky 1980: 89). Furthermore, indexing connoisseurship by the use of French kitchen terminology and language play such as alliteration or rhyme are recurring features in American menus (Zwicky & Zwicky 1980: 84-86).

Since French is often considered the language of the finest cooking, it can also be used to index quality and skill through the names of dishes in restaurants,

such as “*onion au gratin a la Japanese ... Small matter that the average diner can neither understand nor pronounce them*” (Teller 1969: 92). In American menus, the French function words *le* and *au* are used irrespective of French grammar rules such as in *Le salad* or *Au gratin potatoes* (Zwicky & Zwicky 1980, cf. also Serwe et al., this volume). Besides the frequently used French forms and the Italian *alla* and *all'*, a new form *ala* has been devised for menu-upgrading (Teller 1969). The expression *a la mode* has lost its original meaning (and its accent) in American English and indicates that some food item is prepared with ice cream. Furthermore, dish names often follow French or romance word order patters such as *Clambs Larry* (all Zwicky & Zwicky 1980). This has been lamented early on: “Languages are often freely mixed and confused: ... *ragout of beef tenderloin a la Deutsch*” (Teller 1969).

In recent years, there has been an increase in so-called fusion cuisine, i.e. the mixing of different Eastern and Western culinary worlds. The menus of these restaurants are an amalgam of international food terms such as *bouillabaisse with pak soi* or *won ton filled with tomato and mozzarella* with all their distinct etymologies (Mühleisen 2003: 83, cf. also above). Furthermore, with the rising interest in food safety and ecologically sound production methods, even the exact origin of a product may be mentioned (e.g. *Paine Farm squab*) indexing the patrons ecological sensitivity (Lakoff 2006: 152). Menus generally reflect a restaurant’s orientation, both in word-choice as well as in lay-out (and pricing) (Lakoff 2006: 157). Longer names usually reflect higher prices and vice versa (Lavric 2009, cf. also for naming practices in German, French and Spanish). Because of this range of different meaningful practices, there seems of be “something like a stylistic of dish names.” (Lavric 2009: 29)

Menus for banquets have a specific build up, page 1 mentioning the special occasion, page 2 listing the wines, and page 3 the food. In the case of political visits, the denominations (and food choice) on the menu have been shown to mirror regional social contexts (e.g. for an American visit to Belgium during the inter-war years) (Van den Eeckhout & Scholliers 2003). While the wine to be served during formal dining is often mentioned on the menu, other beverages which may be taken instead are omitted (Goody 2008: 81). In formal dining like at St. John’s college, Cambridge, a “dining list” is also on the table, putting those present at the dinner in a distinct hierarchical order (Goody 2008: 79f.).

3.6.3 Labeling food products

Food items like flour or milk only become individual products through packaging and labeling. Labeling, however, is more often part of economic studies, marketing, than language studies. Furthermore, a number of legal regulations apply to naming (e.g. protected geographical indications) or packaging (e.g. obligatory information

about nutritional values). In linguistics, in language for special purposes, an obvious field here, Rathmayr studied the labeling of Russian food items. She found that, for instance, for chocolate, first names (to individualize the product) or references to fairy tales are common (Rathmayr 2004). However, Freedman & Jurafsky's study on class distinction in potato chip advertising illustrates that the texts on food products provide an interesting site for analysis for other fields of linguistics also (2011).

In their sociolinguistic inquiry, Freedman and Jurafsky analyze the language on twelve more or less expensive bags of potato chips (2011). The expensive bags feature overall more complex language and more words. Moreover, the words used were less common (e.g. *fluorescent* or *flair* versus *fresh* and *light*), and there were more health claims on the expensive food than the less expensive (Freedman & Jurafsky 2011: 48). Furthermore, claims at distinction (Bourdieu 1979), linguistically realized as comparatives or negation, were used five times more frequently on expensive chips (Freedman & Jurafsky 2011: 49). While naturalness and ingredients/production process were often mentioned on the expensive bags, historicity and locality were stressed on the cheaper ones, in both cases to claim authenticity for the products (Freedman & Jurafsky 2011: 51). Hence, socioeconomic status reflects in the marketing of a product like potato chips.

In her analysis of the textual material in U.S. American whole food markets, Johnston shows that despite a depiction of the company in terms of ethical consumption (protection of the environment, support of local farmers, organic farming,...), the choice of food available, both in terms of range and type (e.g. 129 types of cereal or ice cubes in plastic wrapping), sends a contradictory message (2008: 251). In addition, while the in-store pamphlets may be called "Take action," they mainly treat individual health concerns (Johnston 2008: 270). Ultimately, "vote with your dollar" – consume to preserve, is interpreted as representing "the privatization of social and ecological concerns, as the neo-liberal state distances itself from responsibility" (Johnston 2008: 262, for consumer activism cf. also Terragni et al. 2009).

Nilsen also ventured into a supermarket for her analysis of the gender on the names of food products in comparison to restaurant names (1995). It was not only male names for products presumably bought by men, and female names for women, but often cross-gender appeal was used to attract buyers (Nilsen 1995: 33). Restaurant names are more often male than female and also often marked for ethnicity, probably to indicate the cuisine offered (e.g. *Jean-Claude's Petit Café* or *Pepe's Tacos*) (Nilsen 1995: 35, cf. also Serwe et al., this volume).¹⁵

¹⁵ Research from economics or marketing is disregarded here (cf. also below for work on (television) advertisements).

3.7 Mediated food discourse

In discourses about food in media contexts such as advertisements for food products or television commercials, the focus has generally not been the language used. For instance, because of general health concerns, Britain has seen a number of debates about the role of television in food choice, mainly with regard to advertising (Hastings et al. 2003, Livingstone 2004). In Sweden, for example, food commercials typically contain health claims (Prell et al. 2011). Food is presented as a solution to health problems which must not necessarily be true, but credible (Gracia Arnaiz 2001). With regard to the U.S., television has been shown to portray mainly fit and healthy people eating unhealthy food, so that the viewer may deduce that this has no consequences (Kaufman 1980). Furthermore, the advent of celebrity chefs and cookery shows on television in the 1990s has been studied (Ashley et al. 2004), also, men's health magazines and their portrayal of masculine food practices (Parasecoli 2005, cf. also Fuller et al., this volume) or the enactment of masculine hegemony in Japanese cooking shows (Holden 2005). For reasons of space, research not concentrating on language use in a narrow sense or using "authentic" language data (that exist irrespective of the study) will be disregarded in the following. This section will encompass both classic mass media as well as computer-mediated communication.

In an early study, Eames and Robboy researched the dialectal distribution of the *submarine sandwich* by looking at the advertisements in classified telephone directories (1967). In addition, they searched for alternative names by interviewing students: "It should be noted that these interviews continued throughout the entire study and the authors are still continuing their search for additional names" (Eames & Robboy 1967: 280). Interestingly, a Wikipedia page ('Submarine sandwich') seems to be continuing this endeavor until the present day. Hence, a study on mediated discourse (advertisements in telephone directories) about food has now found a place in computer-mediated communication, potentially reflecting the general interest of the public in dialectal variation and etymology.

One recurrent theme in studies of press reports in the field of food is genetic engineering. In the biotechnology debate in Denmark, for instance, the press created predominantly negative metaphors (Faustian or Frankensteinian) for the process of genetic food modification (Holmgren 2008: 107). Moreover, GM corn is portrayed as a dangerous person that needs to be monitored or, alternatively, as a contaminating substance. Health is a recurrent metaphor that can be used both by supporters and contesters (Holmgren 2008: 110ff). Concentrating on the industries' perspective (in New Zealand), critical discourse analysis shows how New Zealand businesses draw on a variety of identities and rhetorics such as

environmental integrity, competitiveness or rationality (Henderson et al. 2007, cf. also Doolin 2007 for biotechnology discourse).

In a cross-linguistic study of television commercials (Strauss 2005), differences were found with regard to the description of the advertised food items: While in Japan it was often sufficient to label something generically as *oishii* ‘good tasting’, in the U.S. and Korea the reason for the good taste was given e.g. *because it is flame broiled*. Besides, more intensification, hyperboles and exclamations were used in Korea and Japan. Furthermore, the description of the texture of the food items was also utilized differently in this corpus. In Japan only softness and fluffiness were evoked and in the U.S. creaminess and richness mainly, whereas the Korean advertisements were much more varied. Generally, these findings suggest that a dichotomy between Western and (East) Asian cultures is oversimplified (Strauss 2005: 1432). Gerhardt’s work shows that food represents such a mundane and basic topic that even in television football commentary references to food are used (2009). During color commentary and at the beginning of games, they seem to be used to close the co-presence gap between the television commentators and the viewers. By referring to the eating of *bacon and eggs* (by the viewers), the commentators concurrently construct an image of the English as pork-eaters reinforcing hegemonic world-views (Gerhardt 2009).

Moving from the television to the radio, the cooking instructions given in phone-in shows indicate that instructions are usually broken down into smaller units which are actively received by the one being instructed proposing an Instruct-Receipt-sequence (Goldberg 1975). A feature of the setting is the stretching out of receipts to mark the time needed for writing down the instructions given by the radio host (Goldberg 1975: 275).

In Chinese online entertainment news, the playful use of food metaphors can be witnessed (Han 2011). The term *fěnsī* meaning ‘dry noodles made from bean or potato starch’ has been adopted as a transliteration of the English term *fans*. This playful use originated in online discourse about a specific television talent show, and it has given rise to a FANS ARE FOOD ITEMS metaphor in entertainment news and fans’ online discourse triggering a number of creative neologisms (Han 2011). In contrast to most other studies on food metaphors, in these cases, no correspondence between the two items is posited. Rather, these are examples of language play indexing the endearment of the fans towards their idols.

With regard to veganism, Sneijder and te Molder show how, in a vegan online forum, health problems are constructed as being at the responsibility of the individual rather than inherent in a vegan life style (2004, 2005). The formula *if... then...* plus modality (e.g. *If you ensure that you get enough calcium... it’s impossible for a problem to occur*) is used to implicitly put the blame on the behavior

of those seeking advice in the forum (Sneijder & te Molder 2004: 605). Although vegans and vegetarians claim to choose their life style because it is healthier, the discursive constructions in this forum suggest that vegans are more concerned with avoiding health problems through eating practices than with improving their health (Sneijder & te Molder 2004: 607). Likewise, vegan lifestyle is constructed as simple, and even taking pills against vitamin deficiencies is portrayed as routine practice (Sneijder & te Molder 2009). Similarly, Stommel and Koole draw attention to the difficulty of joining an online support group on eating disorders (2010). Even though this service is generally regarded as having a low threshold, it becomes apparent that membership requires accepting certain norms, among them not being ‘pro-ana’. The task of understanding and accepting the requirements of this ‘community of practice’ (Lave & Wenger 1991) may discourage those to whom the site originally addresses itself (Stommel & Koole 2010: 375).

Finally, in an online discussion forum on food pleasure, users construct themselves as ‘gourmets’ for instance by using objective evaluations or physical experiences with food as “proof” (Sneijder & te Molder 2006, cf. also Diemer & Frobenius, this volume, cf. also Wiggins 2002).

To sum up, studies on food in mediated contexts, especially in computer-mediated communication (CMC), promise interesting future insights into human understandings of food. Regarding long-standing genres such as recipes, it is interesting to see current developments in different media environments. While the introduction here summarizes work on conversational recipe tellings (Norrick 2011), i.e. oral recipes, on the earliest records of written recipes and on modern cookery books, in the main part of this volume the future of the recipe, food blogs (Diemer & Frobenius, this volume) and celebrity chef’s websites (Arendholz et al., this volume), will come into focus. All of these cater for the need to transmit culture knowledge about food production, from oral to written to CMC.

4 Conclusion

This introduction shows that there is a plethora of studies at the intersection of language and food. Still, it becomes clear that there are many unexplored fields for linguistics and other disciplines studying language with regard to food studies. Since food is one central element of human lives, its study profits from an interdisciplinary approach with multiple perspectives on food. Language is the primary means humans use to transmit meaning. For this reason, a focus on language and its use could be beneficial with regard to many pressing current debates or present-day research fields in other disciplines.

To name a few, the study of eating disorders and its relation to socialization has mostly been studied with a disregard to actual language use and actual eating practices based on questionnaires, rating scales or experiments (e.g. Bruch 1966, Birch et al. 1987, Hill et al. 1998, Birch et al. 2001, Neumark-Sztainer et al. 2003, Videon & Manning 2003, Taveras et al. 2005, cf. Gremillion 2003 for fieldwork in a treatment center though). When actual dining was filmed (sometimes in laboratories, e.g. Drucker et al. 1999), it was used to code children's mealtime behavior (e.g. Cooper et al. 2004). If actual interactions between mothers with eating disorders and their children are taken into account, the interactions are coded as to whether the mothers express negative or positive emotions or exert verbal control (e.g. Stein et al. 1994). The same applies to the study of feeding in general (cf. Wiggins et al. 2007: 2064 for an overview, Faith et al. 2004 for a review study in medicine). From the point of view of interactional studies, it would have been interesting to see the actual rating of e.g. "intrusiveness: actions which inappropriately cut across, took over or disrupted the infant's activities" (Stein et al. 1994: 737). A number of questions arise, such as what counts as an activity or an action here (verbal or non-verbal behavior, speech acts or events, (sequences of) turns; which modalities or modes exactly were regarded ('the words', intonation, facial expressions, gestures, etc), or who judges whether something is appropriate or not (the scientist, the mother, or the child?). Hence, an enormous amount of research is concerned with eating disorders on both sides of the scale, i.e. obesity as well as anorexia nervosa or bulimia. Disregarding medical or biological research, bulimia, for instance, has mainly been studied with the help of self-report data such as interviews or questionnaires (e.g. Carper et al. 2000, cf. Beach 1996: 7ff, see also above). Enquiries into the sociocultural contexts of these illnesses, however, could well profit from approaches focusing on real family practices, interactions naturally occurring in the lives of those suffering from eating disorders. Again, interdisciplinarity is called for so that e.g. the coding of practices with which parents influence their children's eating during dinner could go beyond a superficial semantic level (such as in Orrell-Valente et al. 2007, or the extended version of BATMAN 'Bob's and Tom's method for assessing nutrition', the coding scheme for meal time behavior in Koivisto et al. 1994).

This volume represents a first attempt at delimiting the field of culinary linguistics. More was left unsaid than said. We, the editors, hope that the many aspects at the crossroads of language and food that we were not able to grasp will be interpreted as enticements by readers from other disciplines or other branches of linguistics to complement this volume with publications from their perspectives. With regard to the body of this volume, it now only remains for us to say *Guten Appetit!*

Dolci

Bibliography: Food and language

- Abarca, Meredith E. 2006. *Voices in the Kitchen: Views of Food and the World from Working-Class Mexican and Mexican American Women*. College Station: Texas A&M University Press.
- Abu-Akel, Ahmad. 2002. The psychological and social dynamics of topic performance in family dinnertime conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics* 34(12): 1787-1806.
- Achiba, Machiko. 2012. Development of interactional competence: Changes in participation over cooking sessions. *Pragmatics and Society* 3(1): 1-30.
- Adams, Carol. 1990. *The Sexual Politics of Meat: A Feminist-Vegetarian Critical Theory*. New York: Continuum.
- Adelaar, Willem F. H. 1998. The name of the sweet potato: A case of pre-conquest contact between South America and the Pacific. In *Productivity and Creativity. Studies in General and Descriptive Linguistics in Honor of E. M. Uhlenbeck*, Mark Janse (ed), 403-411. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Ajzen, Icek. 1991. The theory of planned behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes* 50: 179-211.
- Albala, Ken 2007. *The Banquet: Dining in the Great Courts of Late Renaissance Europe*. Champaign: University of Illinois Press.
- Allison, Anne. 2008. Japanese mothers and the obentos: The lunch-box as ideological state apparatus. In *Food and Culture: A Reader*, Carol Counihan & Penny van Esterik (eds), 221-239. London: Routledge.
- Ambjörnsson, Fanny. 2005. Talk. In *Fat: The Anthropology of an Obsession*, Don Kulick & Anne Meneley (eds), 109-120. New York: Jeremy P. Tarcher/Penguin.
- Amorarietei, Loredana, 2002. La métaphore en oenologie. *Metaphorik.de* 3: 1-12. <www.metaphorik.de/03/amorarietei.htm>
- Anderson, Eugene N. 2005. *Everyone Eats: Understanding Food and Culture*. New York: New York University Press.
- Anderson, Jay A. 1971. Scholarship on contemporary American folk foodways. *Ethnologia Europaea: Revue Internationale d'Ethnologie Européenne* 5: 56-62.
- Anttila, Raimo. 1972. *An Introduction to Comparative and Historical Linguistics*. New York: MacMillan.
- Appadurai, Arjun. 1988. How to make a national cuisine: Cookbooks in contemporary India. *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 30(1): 3-24.
- Appelbaum, Robert. 2006. *Aguecheek's Beef, Belch's Hiccup, and Other Gastronomic Interjections: Literature, Culture, and Food Among the Early Moderns*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Aresty, Esther B. 1964. *The Delectable Past*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Aronsson, Karin & Gottzén, Lucas. 2011. Generational positions at family dinner: Food morality and social order. *Language in Society* 40(4): 405-426.
- Ashley, Bob, Hollows, Joanne, Jones, Steve & Taylor, Ben. 2004. *Food and Cultural Studies*. London: Routledge.
- Aue, Daniela & Halstrick, Sigrun. 2007. Man ist, wie man isst. *Praxis Englisch* 1: 16-20.
- Aukrust, Vibeke G. & Snow, Catherine E. 1998. Narratives and explanations during mealtime conversations in Norway and the US. *Language in Society* 27(2): 221-246.

- Austin, Thomas (ed). 1888. *Two Fifteenth-Century Cookery Books. Harleian MS. 279 (ab. 1430), & Harl. MS. 4016 (ab. 1450), with extracts from Ashmole MS. 1429, Laud MS. 553, & Douce MS. 55.* London: Trübner.
- Avakian, Arlene Voski & Haber, Barbara (eds). 2005. *From Betty Crocker to Feminist Food Studies: Critical Perspectives on Women and Food.* Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press.
- Backhouse, Anthony E. 1994. *The Lexical Field of Taste: A Semantic Study of Japanese Taste Terms.* Cambridge: CUP.
- Bailey, Oran B. 1943. A glossary of café terms. *American Speech* 18(4): 307-308.
- Barlett, Peggy F. 2011. Campus sustainable food projects: Critique and engagement. *American Anthropologist* 113(1): 101-115.
- Barrett, Rusty. 2006. Language ideology and racial inequality: Competing functions of Spanish in an Anglo-owned Mexican restaurant. *Language in Society* 35(2): 163-204.
- Barthes, Roland. 1997. Toward a psychosociology of contemporary food consumption. In *Food and Culture: A Reader*, Carole Counihan & Penny Van Esterik (eds), 20-27. New York: Routledge.
- Barthes, Roland. 1961. Vers une psycho-sociologie de l'alimentation contemporaine. *Annales* 5:977-986.
- Barthes, Roland. 1957. *Mythologies.* Paris: de Seuil.
- Beach, Wayne A. 1996. *Conversations about Illness: Family Preoccupations with Bulimia.* New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Beals, Diane. 1993. Explanatory talk in low-income families' mealtime conversations. *Applied Psycholinguistics* 14(4): 489-514.
- Beals, Diane & Snow, Catherine E. 1994. 'Thunder is when the angels are upstairs bowling': Narratives and explanations at the dinner table. *Journal of Narrative and Life History* 4(4): 331-352.
- Beardsworth, Alan & Keil, Teresa (eds). 1997. *Sociology on the Menu: An Invitation to the Study of Food and Society.* London: Routledge.
- Beauman, Fran. 2005. *The Pineapple: King of Fruits.* London: Chatto and Windus.
- Becker, Gerhard. 1992. German loanwords related to foods and drinks. *Die Unterrichtspraxis/Teaching German* 25(2): 198-207.
- Behrens, Clifford A. 1986. Shipibo food categorization and preference: Relationships between indigenous and Western dietary concepts. *American Anthropologist* 88(3): 647-658.
- Belasco, Warren. 2008. *Food: The Key Concepts.* Oxford: Berg.
- Belasco, Warren. 1989. *Appetite for Change: How the Counterculture Took On the Food Industry.* New York: Pantheon.
- Bell, David & Valentine, Gill. 1997. *Consuming Geographies: We Are Where We Eat.* London: Routledge.
- Bellwood, Peter. 2011. Holocene population history in the Pacific region as a model for worldwide food producer dispersals. *Current Anthropology* 52(S4): S363-S378.
- Bellwood, Peter S. & Renfrew, Colin (eds). 2002. *Examining the Farming/Language Dispersal Hypothesis.* Cambridge: McDonald Institute for Archaeological Research.
- Benczes, Réka. 2006. Analysing metonymical noun-noun compounds: The case of freedom fries. In *The Metaphors of Sixty: Papers Presented on the Occasion of the 60th Birthday of Zoltán Kövecses*, Réka Benczes & Szilvia Csábi (eds), 46-54. Budapest: Eötvös Loránd Tudományegyetem.

- Bender, Emily. 1999. Constituting context: Null objects in English recipes revisited. *U. Penn Working Papers in Linguistics* 6(1): 53-68.
- Bentley, Harold W. 1936. Linguistic concoctions of the soda jerker. *American Speech* 11(1): 37-45.
- Berlin, Brent. 1992. *Ethnobiological Classification: Principles of Categorization of Plants and Animals in Traditional Societies*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Berlin, Brent. 1967. Categories of eating in Tzeltal and Navaho. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 33: 1-6.
- Berlin, Brent, Breedlove, Dennis E. & Raven, Peter H. 1974. *Principles of Tzeltal Plant Classification: An Introduction to Botanical Ethnography of a Mayan-Speaking People of Highland Chiapas*. New York: Academic.
- Berlin, Brent & Kay, Paul. 1969. *Basic Color Terms: Their Universality and Evolution*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Bernstein, Basil. 1972. Social class, language and socialization. In *Language and Social Context*, Pier Paolo Giglioli (ed), 157-178. Harmondsworth: Viking Penguin.
- Bevan, David. 1988. *Literary Gastronomy*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Birch, Leann L., Fisher, Jennifer O., Grimm-Thomas, Karen, Markey, Charlotte N., Sawyer, R. & Johnson, Susan L. 2001. Confirmatory factor analysis of the child feeding questionnaire: A measure of parental attitudes, beliefs and practices about child feeding and obesity proneness. *Appetite* 36(3): 201-210.
- Birch, Leann L., McPhee, Linda, Shoba, B. C., Steinberg, Lois & Krehbiel, Ruth. 1987. Clean up your plate: Effects of child feeding practices on the development of intake regulation. *Learning and Motivation* 18(3): 301-317.
- Blank, Andreas. 1997. Nenn' nie Banane nur Banane! Zur Bezeichnungsgeschichte einer Frucht im Portugiesischen, im Spanischen sowie in Kreols mit französischer lexikalischer Basis. *Philologie im Netz* 1: 2-16. <<http://web.fu-berlin.de/phin/phin1/p1t1.htm>>
- Blay-Palmer, Alison. 2008. *Food Fears: From Industrial to Sustainable Food Systems*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Blum-Kulka, Shoshana. 1997. *Dinner Talk: Cultural Patterns of Sociability and Socialization in Family Discourse*. Mahwah: Erlbaum.
- Blum-Kulka, Shoshana. 1994. The dynamics of family dinner talk: Cultural contexts for children's passages to adult discourse. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 27(1), 1-50.
- Blum-Kulka, Shoshana. 1993. 'You gotta know how to tell a story': Telling, tales, and tellers in American and Israeli narrative events at dinner. *Language in Society* 22(3): 361-402.
- Blum-Kulka, Shoshana. 1990. 'You don't touch lettuce with your fingers': Parental politeness in family discourse. *Journal of Pragmatics* 14(2): 259-289.
- Blum-Kulka, Shoshana, Huck-Taglicht, Deborah & Avni, Hanna. 2004. The social and discursive spectrum of peer talk. *Discourse Studies* 6(3): 307-328.
- Blum-Kulka, Shoshana & Katriel, Tamar. 1991. Nicknaming practices in families: A cross-cultural perspective. In *Cross-Cultural Interpersonal Communication*, Stella Ting-Toomey & Felipe Korzenny (eds), 58-77. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Blum-Kulka, Shoshana & Sheffer, Haddas. 1993. The metapragmatic discourse of American-Israeli families at dinner. In *Interlanguage Pragmatics*, Gabriele

- Kasper & Shoshana Blum-Kulka (eds). 196-223. New York & Oxford: OUP.
- Blum-Kulka, Shoshana & Snow, Catherine E. 1992. Developing autonomy for tellers, tales, and telling in family narrative events. *Journal of Narrative and Life History* 2(3): 187-217.
- Boas, Franz. 1921. *Ethnology of the Kwakiutl, Based on Data Collected by George Hunt*. Washington: Bureau of American Ethnology.
- Borden, Mary. 1933. *The Technique of Marriage*. Garden City: Doubleday.
- Bordo, Susan. 1993. *Unbearable Weight: Feminism, Western Culture, and the Body*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. 1979. *La Distinction : Critique Sociale du Jugement*. Paris: Minuit.
- Bower, Anne L. 2004. *Reel Food: Essays on Food and Film*. New York: Routledge.
- Bower, Anne L. (ed). 1997. *Recipes for Reading: Community Cookbooks, Stories, Histories*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press.
- Bräuer, Juliane, Kaminski, Juliane, Riedel, Julia, Call, Josep & Tomasello, Michael. 2006. Making inferences about the location of hidden food: Social dog, causal ape. *Journal of Comparative Psychology* 120(1): 38-47.
- Braudel, Fernand. 1979. *Civilisation Matérielle, Économie et Capitalisme, XV^e-XVIII^e*. Paris: Armand Colin.
- Braudel, Fernand, Philippe, Robert, Hemardinquer, J. J. & Spooner, Frank. 1961. Vie matérielle et comportements biologiques: Bulletin N° 1, *Annales. Histoire, Sciences Sociales* 16(3): 545-574.
- Bray, Tamara (ed). 2003. *The Archeology and Politics of Food and Feasting in Early States and Empires*. New York: Kluwer/Plenum.
- Brillat-Savarin, Jean-Anthelme. 1925. *The Physiology of Taste or Meditations on Transcendental Gastronomy*. London: Davies and New York: Doubleday.
- Brillat-Savarin, Jean-Anthelme. 1825. *La Physiologie du Gout ou Méditations de Gastronomie Transcendante*. Paris: Sautelet.
- British Food Journal*. 1899. Introduction. *British Food Journal* 1(1): 1.
- British library. *Books for cooks: Learning*. <<http://www.bl.uk/learning/langlit/booksforcooks/booksforcooks.html>> (02 February 2012)
- Brown, Alton. 2002. *I'm Just Here for the Food: Food + Heat = Cooking*. New York: Abrams.
- Brown, Cecil H. 2006. Prehistoric chronology of the common bean in the New World: The linguistic evidence. *American Anthropologist* 108(3): 507-516.
- Brown, James. 1984. *Fictional Meals and their Function in the French Novel, 1789-1848*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Brown, Linda K. & Mussell, Kay (eds). 1984. *Ethnic and Regional Foodways in the U.S.: The Performance of Group Identity*. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press.
- Bruch, Hilde. 1966. Anorexia nervosa and its differential diagnosis. *Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease* 141(5): 555-566.
- Brumark, Åsa. 2008. 'Eat your Hamburger!' – 'No, I don't want to!': Argumentation and argumentative development in the context of dinner conversation in twenty Swedish families. *Argumentation* 22(2): 251-271.
- Brumark, Åsa. 2006a. Non-observance of Gricean maxims in family dinner table conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics* 38(8): 1206-1238.
- Brumark, Åsa. 2006b. Regulatory talk and politeness at the family dinner table. *Pragmatics* 16(2-3): 171-211.

- Buck, Carl D. 1949. *A Dictionary of Selected Synonyms in the Principal Indo-European Languages: A Contribution to the History of Ideas*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Buettner, Elizabeth. 2008. 'Going for an Indian': South Asian restaurants and the limits of multiculturalism in Britain. *The Journal of Modern History* 80(4): 865-901.
- Burenhult, Niclas & Majid, Asifa. 2011. Olfaction in Aslian ideology and language. *The Senses and Society* 6(1): 19-29.
- Butler, Carly W. & Fitzgerald, Richard. 2010. Membership-in-action: Operative identities in a family meal. *Journal of Pragmatics* 42(9): 2462-2474.
- Caballero, Rosario. 2007. Manner-of-motion verbs in wine description. *Journal of Pragmatics* 39(12): 2095-2114.
- Campanini, Antonella, Scholliers, Peter & Williot, Jean-Pierre (eds). 2011. *Manger en Europe: Patrimoines, Échanges, Identités*. Brussels: Peter Lang.
- Capaldi, Elizabeth D. (ed). 1996. *Why We Eat What We Eat: The Psychology of Eating*. Washington: American Psychological Association.
- Capaldi, Elizabeth D. & Powley, Terry L. 1990. *Taste, Experience and Feeding*. Washington: American Psychological Association.
- Caplan, Pat (ed). 1997. *Food, Health and Identity*. London: Routledge.
- Capps, Lisa & Ochs, Elinor. 2002. Cultivating prayer. In *The Language of Turn and Sequence*, Cecilia Ford, Barbara Fox & Sandra Thompson (eds), 39-55. New York: OUP.
- Carlson, Thomas J. S. & Maffi, Luisa (eds). 2004. *Ethnobotany and Conversation of Biocultural Diversity*. Bronx: New York Botanical Gardens Press.
- Carper, J. L., Fisher, Jennifer Orlet & Birch, Leann L. 2000. Young girls' emerging dietary restraint and disinhibition are related to parental control in child feeding. *Appetite* 35(2): 121-129.
- Cason, Clarence E. 1928. 'Horsefeathers': A synthesis. *American Speech* 4(2): 98-99.
- Charles, Nickie & Kerr, Marion. 1988. *Women, Food and Families*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Chen, Rong. 1996. Food-plying and Chinese politeness. *Journal of Asian Pacific Communication* 7(3/4): 143-155.
- Childe, Gordon V. 1926. *The Aryans: A Study of Indo-European Origins*. London: Kegan.
- Childs, Carrie. 2012. 'I'm not X, I just want Y': Formulating 'wants' in interaction. *Discourse Studies* 14(2): 181-196.
- Cline, Sally. 1990. *Just Desserts: Women and Food*. London: Deutsch.
- Cockaigne, Thomas. 1864. *Leechdoms, Wortcunning, and Starcraft of Early England. Being a Collection of Documents, for the Most Part Never Before Printed, Illustrating the History of Science in this Country Before the Norman Conquest*. London: Longman.
- Cohen, Hennig. 1950. The history of 'poor boy,' the New Orleans bargain sandwich. *American Speech* 25(1): 67-69.
- Cohen, Yehudi A. 1961. Food and its vicissitudes: A cross-cultural study of sharing and nonsharing. In *Social Structure and Personality: A Casebook*, Yehudi A. Cohen (ed), 312-50. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

- Conn, Helen. 1992. 'Umami': The fifth basic taste. *Nutrition and Food Science* 2: 21-23.
- Conner, Marc & Armitage, Christopher J. 2002. *The Social Psychology of Food*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Cook, Guy, Pieri, Elisa & Robbins, Peter T. 2004. 'The scientists think and the public feels': Expert perceptions of the discourse of GM food. *Discourse & Society* 15(4): 433-449.
- Cooper, Peter J., Whelan, Elizabeth, Woolgar, Matthew, Morrell, Julian & Murray, Lynne. 2004. Association between childhood feeding problems and maternal eating disorder: Role of the family environment. *British Journal of Psychiatry* 184(3): 210-215.
- Cotter, Colleen. 1997. Claiming a piece of the pie: How the language of recipes defines community. In *Recipes for Reading: Community Cookbooks, Stories, Histories*, Anne L. Bower (ed), 51-72. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press.
- Cotter, Colleen. 1994. The cook, the community, and the other: How recipes organize affiliation. In *Cultural Performances: Proceedings of the Third Berkeley Women and Language Conference*, Mary Bucholtz, A. C. Liang, Laurel A. Sutton & Caitlin Hines (eds), 133-143. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Counihan, Carole. 2004. *Around the Tuscan Table: Food, Family and Gender in Twentieth-Century Florence*. New York: Routledge.
- Counihan, Carole. 1999. *The Anthropology of Food and Body: Gender, Meaning and Power*. New York: Routledge.
- Counihan, Carole. 1992. Food rules in the United States. *Anthropological Quarterly* 65(2): 55-66.
- Counihan, Carole & Kaplan, Steven (eds). 1998. *Food and Gender: Identity and Power*. London: Routledge.
- Counihan, Carole & Van Esterik, Penny (eds). 2008. *Food and Culture: A Reader*. 2nd ed. New York: Routledge.
- Counihan, Carole & Van Esterik, Penny (eds). 1997. *Food and Culture: A Reader*. New York: Routledge.
- Coveney, John. 2006. *Food, Morals and Meaning: The Pleasures and Anxiety of Eating*. London: Sage.
- Craven, Alexandra & Potter, Johanthan. 2010. Directives: Entitlement and contingency in action. *Discourse Studies* 12(4): 419-442.
- Croegaert, Ana. 2011. Who has time for Čejf? Postsocialist migration and slow coffee in neoliberal Chicago. *American Anthropologist* 113(3): 463-477.
- Culy, Christopher. 1996. Null objects in English recipes. *Language Variation and Change* 8(1): 91-124.
- Cummins, Steven & Macintyre, Sally. 2002. A systematic study of an urban foodscape: The price and availability of food in Greater Glasgow. *Urban Studies* 39: 2115-2130.
- Curl, Traci S. 2006. Offers of assistance: Constraints on syntactic design. *Journal of Pragmatics* 38(8): 1257-1280.
- Curtin, Deane W. & Heldke, Lisa M. (eds). 1992. *Cooking, Eating and Thinking: Transformative Philosophies of Food*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Cushing, Frank Hamilton. 1920. *Zuni Breadstuff*. New York: Museum of the American Indian, Heye Foundation.

- Darwin, M. B. 1978. Of peanuts and politicians. *American Speech* 53(2): 166-168.
- Davidson, Alan. 2006. *The Oxford Companion to Food*. Oxford: OUP.
- Dedaić, Mirjana N. 2001. Stepmother as electron: Positioning the stepmother in a family dinner conversation. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 5(3): 372-400.
- De Geer, Boel. 2004. 'Don't say it's disgusting!' Comments on socio-moral behavior in Swedish families. *Journal of Pragmatics* 36(9): 1705-1725.
- De Geer, Boel, Tulviste, Tiia, Mizera, Luule & Tryggvason, Marja-Terttu. 2002. Socialization in communication: Pragmatic socialization during dinnertime in Estonian, Finnish and Swedish families. *Journal of Pragmatics* 34(12): 1757-1786.
- Delamont, Sara. 1995. *Appetites and Identities: An Introduction to the Social Anthropology of Western Europe*. London: Routledge.
- Delaney, Carol. 2011. *Investigating Culture: An Experiential Introduction to Anthropology (with Deborah Kaspin)*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Delwiche, Jeannine. 1996. Are there basic tastes? *Trends in Food Science and Technology* 7: 411-415.
- Deutsch, Jonathan. 2005. 'Please pass the chicken tits': Rethinking men and cooking at an urban firehouse. *Food and Foodways* 13(1-2): 91-114.
- Deutsch, Jonathan. 2004. 'Eat me up': Spoken voice and food voice in an urban firehouse. *Food, Culture & Society* 7(1): 27-36.
- DeVault, Marjorie L. 1991. *Feeding the Family: The Social Organization of Caring as Gendered Work*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Dickinson, Roger. 2005. Food on British television: Multiple messages, multiple meanings. *Discussion Papers in Communication* 2. <<http://hdl.handle.net/2381/306>>
- Dietler, Michael & Hayden, Brian (eds). 2001. *Archeological and Ethnographic Perspectives on Food, Politics, and Power*. Washington: Smithsonian.
- Döring, Tobias, Heide, Markus & Mühleisen, Susanne (eds). 2003. *Eating Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Food*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Doniger, Wendy. 1999. Eating karma in classic South Asian texts. *Social Research* 66(1): 151-165.
- Doolin, Bill (ed). 2007. Biotechnology discourse. Special issue. *Disourse Studies* 9(1): 5-8.
- Douglas, Mary. 1987. *Constructive Drinking: Perspectives on Drink from Anthropology*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Douglas, Mary. 1972. Deciphering a meal. *Daedalus* 101(1): 61-81.
- Douglas, Mary. 1966. *Purity and Danger: An Analysis of the Concepts of Pollution and Taboo*. London: Routledge & Keegan.
- Douglas, Mary & Nicod, Michael. 1974. Taking the biscuit: The structure of British meals. *New Society* 33: 744-747.
- Drucker, Robin R., Hammer, Lawrence D., Agras, Stewart W., & Bryson, Susan. 1999. Can mothers influence their child's eating behavior? *Journal of Developmental and Behavioral Pediatrics* 20(2): 88-92.
- DuFon, Margaret A. 2006. The socialization of taste during study abroad in Indonesia. In *Language Learners in Study Abroad Contexts*, Margaret A. DuFon & Eton Churchill (eds), 91-119. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Duranti, Alessandro. 1999. Preface. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 9(1-2): 4-5.
- Dusselier, Jan. 2001. Bonbons, lemon drops, and oh Henry! Bars: Candy, consumer culture, and the construction of gender, 1895-1920. In *Kitchen Culture in*

- America: Popular Representations of Food, Gender, and Race*, Sherrie Inness (ed), 13-49. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Eames, Edwin & Robboy, Howard. 1967. The submarine sandwich: Lexical variations in a cultural context. *American Speech* 42(4): 179-288.
- Edmunds, Lowell. 1980. Ancient Roman and modern American food: A comparative sketch of two semiological systems. *Comparative Civilizations Review* 5: 52-69.
- Ehlert, Trude (ed). 2010 [1485]. *Küchenmeisterei: Edition, Übersetzung und Kommentar zweier Kochbuch-Handschriften des 15. Jahrhunderts*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang.
- Elias, Norbert. 1939. *Über den Prozess der Zivilisation: Soziogenetische und psychogenetische Untersuchungen, Band 1: Wandlungen des Verhaltens in den weltlichen Oberschichten des Abendlandes*. Basel: Haus zum Falken.
- Ely, Richard, Berko Gleason, Jean, Narasimhan, Bhuvanewari & McCabe, Allyssa. 2009. Family talk about talk: Mothers lead the way. *Discourse Processes* 19(2): 201-218.
- Erickson, Frederick. 1988. Discourse coherence, participation structure, and personal display in family dinner table conversation. *Working Papers in Educational Linguistics* 4(1): 1-26.
- Erickson, Frederick. 1982. Money tree, lasagne bush, salt and pepper: Social construction of topical cohesion in a conversation among Italian-Americans. In *Analyzing Discourse: Text and Talk*, Deborah Tannen (ed), 43-70. Washington: Georgetown University Press.
- Erickson, Robert P. 2008. A study of the science of taste: On the origins and influence of the core ideas. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences* 31: 59-105.
- Erickson, Robert P. & Covey, Ellen. 1980. On the singularity of taste sensations: What is a taste primary?" *Physiology and Behavior* 25: 527-533.
- Eriksson, Mats. 2009. Referring as interaction: On the interplay between linguistic and bodily practices. *Journal of Pragmatics* 41(2): 240-262.
- Escalera, Elena Andrea. 2009. Gender differences in children's use of discourse markers: Separate worlds or different contexts? *Journal of Pragmatics* 41(12): 2479-2495.
- Faith, Myles S., Scanlon, Kelley S., Birch, Leann L., Francis, Lori A. & Sherry, Bettylou. 2004. Parent-child feeding strategies and their relationships to child eating and weight status. *Obesity* 12(11): 1711-1722.
- Farb, Peter & Armelagos, George. 1980. *Consuming Passions: The Anthropology of Eating*. New York: Washington Square Press.
- Fatigante, Marilena, Fasulo, Alessandro & Pontecorvo, Clotilde. 1998. Life with the alien: Role casting and face-saving techniques in family conversations with young children. *Issues in Applied Linguistics* 9(2): 97-121.
- Fatigante, Marilena, Fasulo, Alessandro & Pontecorvo, Clotilde. 2004. 'This is not a dinner': Metacommunication in family dinnertime conversation. In *Communication and Metacommunication in Human Development*, Angela Uchoa Branco & Jaan Valsiner (eds), 33-81. Charlotte: Information Age.
- Feiring, Candace & Lewis, Michael. 1987. The ecology of some middle-class families at dinner. *International Journal of Behavioral Development* 10(3): 377-390.
- Ferry, Jane. 2003. *Food in Film: A Culinary Performance of Communication*. New York: Routledge.

- Fifield, Merle. 1964. The etymology of 'macarone, macaroon'. *American Speech* 39(1): 75-77.
- Fischler, Claude. 1990. *L'omnivore: Le goût, la cuisine et le corps*. Paris: Odile Jacob.
- Fischler, Claude. 1988. Food, self and identity. *Social Science Information* 27(2): 275-292.
- Fischler, Claude & Masson, Estelle. 2008. *Manger: Français, Européens et Américains face à l'alimentation*. Paris: Odile Jacob.
- Fisher, M. F. K. 1969. *With Bold Knife and Fork*. New York: Perigee.
- Fitzgerald, Thomas K. (ed). 1977. *Nutrition and Anthropology in Action*. Assen & Amsterdam: van Gorcum.
- Flandrin, Jean-Louis, Montanari, Massimo & Sonnenfeld, Albert (eds). 1999. *Food: A Culinary History from Antiquity to the Present*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Flouton, Deanne K. 1991. Hotel/restaurant Spanish. *Hispania* 74(1): 194-196.
- Forster, Robert & Ranum, Orest A. (ed). 1979. *Food and Drink in History: Selections from the Annales, Economies, Sociétés, Civilisations, vol 5*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Fowler, Catherine S. 1994. Corn, beans and squash: Some linguistic perspectives from Uto-Aztecan. In *Corn and Culture in the Prehistoric New World*, Sissel Johannessen & Christine A. Hastorf (eds), 445-467. Boulder: Westview Press.
- Franck, Karen A. 2003. *Food and Architecture*. Chichester: John Wiley.
- Franconie, Hélène. 2000. Things from the New World in the European dialects. *Food and Foodways* 9: 21-58.
- Freedman, Joshua & Jurafsky, Dan. 2011. Authenticity in America: Class distinctions in potato chip advertising. *Gastronomica* 11(4): 46-54.
- Freedman, Robert L. 1981. *Human Food Uses: A Cross-Cultural, Comprehensive Annotated Bibliography, vol 1*. Westport: Greenwood.
- Frisch, Jack A. 1968. Maricopa foods: A native taxonomic system. *American Speech* 34(1): 16-20.
- Fürst, Elisabeth L., Prättälä, Ritva, Ekström, Marianne, Holm, Lotte & Kjaernes, Unni (eds), 1991. *Palatable Worlds: Sociocultural Food Studies*. Oslo: Solum.
- Furbee, Louanna N. 1974. Identity in gapping and the lexical insertion of verbs. *Linguistic Inquiry* 5(2): 299-304.
- Furnivall, Frederick James (ed). 1868. *The babes book, Aristotle's A B C, Urbanitatis, Stans puer ad mensam, The lvtille childrenes lvtill boke, The bokes of nurture of Hugh Rhodes and John Russell, Wynkyn de Worde's Boke of keruyng, The booke of demeanor, The boke of curtasye, Seager's Schoole of vertue, &c. &c. with some French and latin poems on like subjects, and some forewords on education in early England*. London: Trübner.
- Gabaccia, Donna R. 1998. *We Are What We Eat: Ethnic Food and the Making of Americans*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Gaudio, Rudolf P. 2003. Coffeetalk: Starbucks™ and the commercialization of casual conversation. *Language in Society* 32(5): 659-691.
- Gawel, Richard. 1997. The use of language by trained and untrained wine tasters. *Journal of Sensory Studies* 12: 267-284.
- Gerhardt, Cornelia. 2009. 'You could leave the bacon and eggs for just a couple of hours': References to food in British football commentary. In *Food and*

- Language: Sprache und Essen*, Eva Lavric & Carmen Konzett (eds), 315-326. Frankfurt: Lang.
- Germov, John & Williams, Lauren (eds). 2008. *A Sociology of Food and Nutrition: The Social Appetite*. Oxford: OUP.
- Gibbs, Raymond W. Jr., Lenz, Paula, Lima, Costa & Francozo, Edson. 2004. Metaphor is grounded in embodied experience. *Journal of Pragmatics* 36(7): 1189-1210.
- Giani, Marco. 2009. Geo-food names: A linguistic enquiry about some “geographical” food names. In *Food and Language: Sprache und Essen*, Eva Lavric & Carmen Konzett (eds), 43-56. Frankfurt: Lang.
- Gläser, Rosemarie. 1979. *Fachstile des Englischen*. Leipzig: Verlag Enzyklopädie Leipzig.
- Glasse, Hannah. 1774. *The art of cookery*, 2nd revised edition. London: Strahan et al.
- Gluck, Malcolm, 2003. Wine language: Useful idiom or idiot-speak? In *New Media Language*, Jean Aitchison & Diana M. Lewis (eds), 107-115. London: Routledge.
- Goddard, Cliff. 2001. Universal units in the lexicon. In *Language Typology and Language Universals: An International Handbook, vol 2*, Martin Haspelmath, Ekkehard König, Wulf Oesterreicher & Wolfgang Raible (eds), 1190-1203. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Görlach, Manfred. 2004. Text types and language history: The cooking recipe. In *Text Types and the History of English*, Manfred Görlach (ed), 121-140. Berlin/New York: de Gruyter.
- Görlach, Manfred. 1992. Text-types and language history: The cookery recipe. In *History of Englishes – New Methods and Interpretations in Historical Linguistics*, Matti Rissanen, Ossi Ihalainen, Terttu Nevalainen & Irma Taavitsainen (eds), 736-761. Berlin/New York: de Gruyter.
- Goffman, Erving. 1981. *Forms of Talk*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Goldberg, Jo Ann, 1975. A system for the transfer of instructions in natural settings. *Semiotica* 14(3): 269-296.
- Goode, Judith G., Curtis, Karen & Theophano, Janet. 1984. Meal formats, meal cycles and menu negotiation in the maintenance of an Italian-American community. In *Food and the Social Order: Studies of Food and Festivities in Three American Communities*, Mary Douglas (ed), 143-218. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Goodwin, Marjorie Harness. 2007. Occasioned knowledge exploration in family interaction. *Discourse & Society* 18(1): 93-110.
- Goody, Jack. 2008. The recipe, the prescription and the experiment. In *Food and Culture: A Reader*, Carole Counihan & Penny Van Esterik (eds), 76-90. New York: Routledge.
- Goody, Jack. 1982. *Cooking, Cuisine, and Class: A Study in Comparative Sociology*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Gosden, Chris. 1999. Introduction. In *The Prehistory of Food: Appetites for Change*, Chris Gosden & Jon G. Hather (eds), 1-9. London: Routledge.
- Gosden, Chris & Hather, Jon G. (eds). 1999. *The Prehistory of Food: Appetites for Change*. London: Routledge.
- Gracia Arnaiz, Mabel. 2001. Nutritional discourse in food advertising: Between persuasion and cacophony. *Anthropology of Food* 0. <<http://aof.revues.org/989>>

- Gremillion, Helen. 2003. *Feeding Anorexia: Gender and Power at a Treatment Center*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Grieshaber, Susan. 1997. Mealtime rituals: Power and resistance in the construction of mealtime rules. *British Journal of Sociology* 48(4): 649-666.
- Griffiths, Sian & Wallace, Jennifer (eds). 1998. *Consuming Passions: Food in the Age of Anxiety*. London: Mandolin.
- Groszler, Astrid-Simone. 2008. Spices: An etymological approach. *Journal of Linguistic Studies* 1(2): 29-34.
- Guendouzi, Jackie. 2004. 'She's very slim': Talking about body-size in all-female interactions. *Journal of Pragmatics* 36(9): 1635-1653.
- Halliday, M. A. K. 1961. Categories of the theory of grammar. *Word* 17(3): 241-291.
- Han, Chong. 2011. Reading Chinese online entertainment news: Metaphor and language play. *Journal of Pragmatics* 43(14): 3473-3488.
- Hanig, David P. 1901. Zur Psychophysik des Geschmackssinnes. *Philosophische Studien* 17: 576-623.
- Harris, Marvin. 1987. *The Sacred Cow and the Abominable Pig: Riddles of Food and Culture*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Harriss-White, Barbara & Hoffenberg, Raymond (eds). 1994. *Food: Multidisciplinary Perspectives*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Hastings, Gerard, Stead, Martine, McDermott, Laura, Forsyth, Alasdair, MacKintosh, Anne Marie, Rayner, Mike, Godfrey, Christine, Caraher, Martin & Angus, Kathryn. 2003. Review of research on the effects of food promotion to children: Final Report, prepared for the Food Standards Agency. Glasgow: University of Strathclyde, Centre for Social Marketing, <<http://www.food.gov.uk/multimedia/pdfs/foodpromotiontochildren1.pdf>> (10 March 2013).
- Hauck-Lawson, Annie. 2004. Introduction, special issue on food voice. *Food, Culture & Society* 7(1): 24-25.
- Heath, Jeffrey & McPherson, Laura. 2009. Cognitive set and lexicalization strategy in Dogon action verbs. *Anthropological linguistics* 51(1): 38-63.
- Henderson, Alison, Weaver, Kay C. & Cheney, George. 2007. Talking 'facts': Identity and rationality in industry perspectives on genetic modification. *Discourse Studies* 9(1): 9-41.
- Hepburn, Alexa & Wiggins, Sally. 2005. Size matters: Constructing accountable bodies in NSPCC helpline interaction. *Discourse & Society* 16(5): 625-645.
- Hess, Karen (ed). 1996. *American Cookery, by Amelia Simmons*. [Reprint of the 1798 edition]. Carlyle: Applewood Books.
- Hieatt, Constance B. & Butler, Sharon. (eds). 1985. *Curye on Inglysch. English Culinary Manuscripts of the Fourteenth Century*. London: OUP (EETS).
- Hieatt, Constance B., Hosington, Brendan & Butler, Sharon. 1976. *Pleyn Delit. Medieval cookery for modern cooks*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Hieatt, Constance B. & Jones, Robin F. 1986. Two Anglo-Norman culinary collections, edited from British Library manuscripts, additional 32085 and Royal 12.C.xii. *Speculum* 61(4): 859-882.
- Hill, Andrew J. & Franklin, Julie A. 1998. Mothers, daughters and dieting: Investigating the transmission of weight control. *British Journal of Clinical Psychology* 37(1): 3-13.
- Hill, Jane H. 2001a. Proto-Uto-Aztecan: A community of cultivators in Central Mexico? *American Anthropologist* 103(4): 913-934.

- Hill, Jane H. 2001b. Language on the land: Towards an anthropological dialectology. In *Archaeology, Language, and History: Essays on Culture and Ethnicity*, John E. Terrell (ed), 257-282. Westport: Bergin & Garvey.
- Hill, Jane H. 1978. Language contact systems and human adaptations. *Journal of Anthropological Research* 34: 1-26.
- Hilmisdóttir, Helga. 2011. Giving a tone of determination: The interactional functions of nú as a tone particle in Icelandic conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics* 43(1): 261-287.
- Hines, Caitlin. 1999. Rebaking the Pie: The WOMAN AS DESSERT metaphor. In *Reinventing Identities: The Gendered Self in Discourse*, Mary Bucholtz, Anita C. Liang & Laurel A. Sutton (eds), 145-162. Oxford: OUP.
- Hiramoto, Mie. 2011. 'Is dat dog you're eating?' Mock Filipino, Hawai'i creole, and local elitism. *Pragmatics* 21(3): 341-371.
- Ho, Jennifer Ann. 2005. *Consumption and Identity in Asian American Coming-of-Age Novels*. New York: Routledge.
- Hödl, Nicola. 1999. Vertextungskonventionen des Kochrezepts vom Mittelalter bis in die Moderne (D/E/F/S). In *Kontrastive Textologie*, Eva Martha Eckkammer, Nicola Hödl & Wolfgang Pöckl (eds), 47-76. Vienna: Praesens.
- Holden, T. J. M. 2005. The overcooked and underdone: Masculinities in Japanese food programming. *Food and Foodways* 13(1-2): 39-65.
- Hollifield, Scott, Petroman, Cornelia & Petroman, Ioan. 2008. Romanian cuisine terminology: An etymological approach. *Journal of Linguistic Studies* 1(2): 35-46.
- Holmgreen, Lise-Lotte. 2008. Biotech as 'biothreat': Metaphorical constructions in discourse. *Discourse & Society* 19: 99-119.
- Horner, Jennifer R. 2000. Betty Crocker's Picture Cookbook: A gendered ritual response to social crises of the postwar era. *Journal of Communication Inquiry* 24(3): 332-345.
- Horwitz, Jamie & Singley, Paulette. 2006. *Eating Architecture*. Cambridge: Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press.
- Howells, Coral Ann. 2002. 'Identities always in process': Stories by South Asian women writing in Canada. In *Reconfigurations: Canadian Literatures and Postcolonial Identities / Littératures canadiennes et identités postcoloniales*, Marc Maufort & Franca Bellarsi (eds), 143-157. Brüssel: Lang.
- Inglis, David & Gimlin, Debra (eds). 2009. *The Globalization of Food*. New York: Berg
- Inness, Sherrie A. (ed). 2001a. *Kitchen Culture in America: Popular Representations of Food, Gender, and Race*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Inness, Sherrie A. 2001b. 'The Enchantment of Mixing-Spoons': Cooking lessons for girls and boys. In *Kitchen Culture in America: Popular Representations of Food, Gender, and Race*, Sherrie A. Inness (ed), 119-138. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press,
- Jacobs, Jay. 1995. *The Eaten Word: The Language of Food, the Food in Our Language*. New York: Citadel.
- Jakobson, Roman. 1963. *Essais de linguistique générale*. Paris: Editions de minuit.
- Jatzkowskaja, Galina. 1994. Russisch-deutsche Tischgespräche und Essgewohnheiten. In *Dialog und Divergenz: Interkulturelle Studien zu Selbst- und Fremdbildern*, Richard Brütting & Günter Trautmann (eds), 235-242. Frankfurt: Peter Lang.

- Johansen, Marianne. 2010. Participation through imitative repetitions. *Discourse Studies* 12(6): 763-783.
- Johnston, Josée. 2008. The citizen-consumer hybrid: Ideological tensions and the case of Whole Foods Market. *Theory and Society* 37(3): 229-270.
- Johnston, Josée & Baumann, Shyon. 2010. *Foodies: Democracy and Distinction in the Gourmet Foodscape*. New York: Routledge.
- Johnston, Josée & Baumann, Shyon. 2007. Democracy versus distinction: A study of omnivorousness in gourmet food writing. *American Journal of Sociology* 113(1): 165-204.
- Johnston, Josée, Biro, Andrew, & MacKendrick, Norah. 2009. Lost in the supermarket: The corporate organic foodscape and the struggle for food democracy. *Antipode* 41(3): 509-532.
- Jones, Michael Owen. 1967. Soda-fountain, restaurant and tavern calls. *American Speech* 42(1): 58-64.
- Junefelt, Karin, & Tulviste, Tiia, 1998. American, Estonian and Swedish mothers' regulation of their children's discourse construction. In *Construction of Psychological Processes in Interpersonal Communication*, Maan Lyra & Jaan Valsiner (eds), 137-154. Stamford: Ablex.
- Jurafsky, Dan. 2011. The Language of Food. <<http://languageoffood.blog.spot.de/> (29 July 2012).
- Kalcik, Susan. 1984. Ethnic foodways in America: Symbol and the performance of identity. In *Ethnic and Regional Foodways in the United States: The Performance of Group Identity*, Linda Keller Brown & Kay Mussell (eds), 37-65. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press.
- Kant, Immanuel. 2000 [1798]. *Anthropologie in pragmatischer Hinsicht*. Hamburg: Meiner.
- Kaplan, Pat (ed). 1997. *Food, Health and Identity*. London: Routledge.
- Karrebæk, Martha Sif. 2013. Lasagna for breakfast: The respectable child and cultural norms of eating practices in a Danish kindergarten classroom. *Food, Culture & Society* 16(1): 85-106.
- Karrebæk, Martha Sif. 2012. 'What's in your lunch box today?': Health, respectability, and ethnicity in the primary classroom. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 22(1): 1-22.
- Kastovsky, Dieter. 1992. Semantics and vocabulary. In *The Cambridge History of the English Language, I: The Beginnings to 1066*, Richard M. Hogg (ed), 290-408. Cambridge: CUP.
- Katriel, Tamar. 1987. 'Bexibùdim!': Ritualized sharing among Israeli children. *Language in Society* 16(3): 305-320.
- Katz, Salomon H. & Weaver, William Woys. 2002. *Encyclopedia of Food and Culture*. New York: Scribner.
- Kaufman, Lois. 1980. Prime time nutrition. *Journal of Communication* 30(3): 37-46.
- Keating, Elizabeth. 2000. Moments of hierarchy: Constructing social stratification by means of language, food, space, and the body in Pohnpei, Micronesia. *American Anthropologist* 102(2): 305-320.
- Keller, James R. 2006. *Food, Film and Culture: A Genre Study*. Jefferson: McFarland.
- Kendall, Shari. 2008. The balancing act: Framing gendered parental identities at dinnertime. *Language in Society* 37(4): 539-568.
- Kent, Alexandra. 2012. Compliance, resistance and incipient compliance when responding to directives. *Discourse Studies* 14(6): 711-730.

- Kerr, Marion & Charles, Nicola. 1986. Servers and providers: The distribution of food within the family. *Sociological Review* 34(1): 115-157.
- Key, Mary Ritchie & Comrie, Bernard (eds). 2012. The Intercontinental Dictionary Series, <<http://lingweb.eva.mpg.de/ids/>> (20 July 2012).
- Khader, Jamil. 2003. Subaltern cosmopolitanism: Community and transnational mobility in Caribbean postcolonial feminist writings. *Feminist Studies* 29(1): 63-82.
- Kittler, Pamela Goyan & Sucher, Kathryn P. 2008. *Food and Culture*. Belmont: Thomson Wadsworth.
- Klumbyté, Neringa. 2010. The Soviet sausage renaissance. *American Anthropologist* 112(1): 22-37.
- Knight, Christine. 2012. 'An alliance with mother nature': Natural food, health, and morality in low-carbohydrate diet books. *Food and foodways* 20(2): 102-122.
- Koç, Mustafa, Sumner, Jennifer & Winson, Tony (eds). 2012. *Critical Perspectives in Food Studies*. Don Mills & Oxford: OUP.
- Koivisto, Ulla-Kaisa, Fellenius, Jan & Sjöden, Per-Olow. 1994. Relations between parental mealtime practices and children's food intake. *Appetite* 22(3): 245-258.
- Kolmer, Lothar & Rohr, Christian (eds). 2000. *Mahl und Repräsentation: Der Kult ums Essen*. Paderborn: Schöningh.
- Korsmeyer, Carolyn. 1999. *Making Sense of Taste: Food and Philosophy*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Korsmeyer, Carolyn (ed). 2005. *The Taste Culture Reader*. Oxford: Berg.
- Kosse, Krisztina. 1990. Group size and societal complexity: Thresholds in the long-term memory. *Journal of Anthropological Archeology* 9: 275-303.
- Koustrup, Lisa, Wittrup, Inge, Terkildsen, Morten Deleuran & Nielsen, Claus Vinther. 2012. 'But I've also tried': Predominance of the medical and parental discourses in dietetic consultations with an obese Danish child. *Anthropology of Food* S7. <<http://aof.revues.org/7117>>
- Kövecses, Zoltán. 2002. *Metaphor: A Practical Introduction*. Oxford: OUP.
- Krifka, Manfred. 2010. A note on an asymmetry in the hedonic implicatures of olfactory and gustatory terms. In *Between the Regular and the Particular in Speech and Language*, Susanne Fuchs, Philip Hoole, Christine Mooshammer & Marzena Zygis (eds), 235-245. Frankfurt: Peter Lang.
- Kurlansky, Mark. 2002. *Salt: A World History*. New York: Penguin.
- Kurlansky, Mark. 1998. *Cod: A Biography of the Fish that Changed the World*. New York: Penguin.
- Kuroshima, Satomi. 2010. Another look at the service encounter: Progressivity, intersubjectivity, and trust in a Japanese sushi restaurant. *Journal of Pragmatics* 42(3): 856-869.
- Labov, William. 1972. *Language in the Inner City: Studies in the Black English Vernacular*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Lakoff, Robin. 2006. Identity à la carte: You are what you eat. In *Discourse and Identity*, Anna De Fina, Deborah Schiffrin & Michael Bamberg (eds), 142-165. Cambridge: CUP.
- Lakoff, George & Johnson, Mark. 1980. *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Landar, Herbert. 1976. Six Jicarilla Apache verbs of eating. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 42(3): 264-267.

- Landar, Herbert. 1964. Seven Navaho verbs of eating. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 30(1): 94-96.
- LanguaL – The international framework for food description, <www.languaL.org> (28 July 2012).
- Larson, Reed W., Branscomb, Kathryn R. & Wiley, Angela R. 2006. Forms and functions of family mealtimes: Multidisciplinary perspectives. *New Directions for Child and Adolescent Development* 111: 1-15.
- Laurier, Eric. 2008. Drinking up endings: Conversational resources of the café. *Language & Communication* 28(2): 165-181.
- Laurier, Eric. 2005. Field Report 3: What café customers do. In *The Cappuccino Community: Cafés and Civic Life in the Contemporary City*, May 2005, <<http://web2.ges.gla.ac.uk/~elaurier/cafesite/texts/customer.pdf>> (30 July 2012).
- Laurier, Eric, Whyte, Angus & Buckner, Kathy. 2001. An ethnography of a neighbourhood café: Informality, table arrangements and background noise. *Journal of Mundane Behaviour* 2(2): 195-232.
- Laurier, Eric & Wiggins, Sally. 2011. Finishing the family meal: The interactional organisation of satiety. *Appetite* 56(1): 53-64.
- Lave, Jean & Wenger, Etienne. 1991. *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Lavric, Eva. 2009. Gastronomastics: Towards a rhetoric of dish names on restaurant menus. In *Food and Language: Sprache und Essen*, Eva Lavric & Carmen Konzett (eds), 29-42. Frankfurt: Lang.
- Lavric, Eva & Konzett, Carmen (eds). 2009. *Food and Language: Sprache und Essen*. Frankfurt: Lang.
- Leach, Edmund. 1964. Anthropological aspects of language: Animal categories and verbal abuse. In *New Directions in the Study of Language*, Eric H. Lenneberg (ed), 23-63. Cambridge: Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press.
- Lehrer, Adrienne. 2009. *Wine and Conversation*. Oxford: OUP.
- Lehrer, Adrienne. 1991. As American as apple pie – and sushi and bagels: The semiotics of food and drink. In *Recent Developments in Theory and History: The Semiotic Web 1990*, Thomas Sebeok & Jean Umiker-Sebeok (eds), 389-401. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Lehrer, Adrienne. 1975. Talking about wine. *Language* 51(4): 901-923.
- Lehrer, Adrienne. 1972. Cooking vocabularies and the culinary triangle of Lévi-Strauss. *Anthropological Linguistics* 14: 155-171.
- Lehrer, Adrienne. 1969. Semantic cuisine. *Journal of Linguistics* 5(1): 39-56.
- Leidner, Robin. 1993. *Fast Food, Fast Talk: Service Work and the Routinization of Everyday Life*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Leitch, Shirley & Davenport, Sally. 2007. Strategic ambiguity as a discourse practice: The role of keywords in the discourse on ‘sustainable’ biotechnology. *Discourse Studies* 9(1): 43-61.
- Lemke, Harald. 2007. *Ethik des Essens: Eine Einführung in die Gastrosophie*. Berlin: Akademie.
- Leonardi, Susan. 1989. Recipes for reading: Summer pasta, lobster à la Riseholme, and key lime pie. *PMLA Journal of the Modern Language Association* 104(3): 340-347.
- Leung, Cynthia B. 2009a. Collaborative narration in preadolescent girl talk: A Saturday luncheon conversation among three friends. *Journal of Pragmatics* 41(7): 1341-1357.

- Leung, Geneviève Y. 2009b. Language use and negotiation in a Philadelphia Chinatown Bakery. *Working Papers in Educational Linguistics* 24(1): 61-78.
- Levenstein, Harvey. 2003. *Paradox of Plenty: A Social History of Eating in Modern America*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Levin, Beth. 1993. *English Verb Classes and Alternations: A Preliminary Investigation*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lévi-Strauss, Claude. 1979. *The origin of table manners: Introduction to a science of mythology III*. New York: Harper Colophon.
- Lévi-Strauss, Claude. 1968. *Mythologiques III: l'origine des manières de table*. Paris: Plon.
- Lévi-Strauss, Claude. 1965. Le triangle culinaire. *L'Arc* 26: 19-29.
- Lévi-Strauss, Claude. 1964. *Mythologiques I: Le cru et le cuit*. Paris: Plon.
- Lewis, Michael, & Feiring, Candace. 1992. Indirect effects and family interaction. In *Social Referencing and the Social Construction of Reality in Infancy*, Saul Feinman (ed), 111-134. New York: Plenum Press.
- Lewis, Michael, & Feiring, Candace. 1982. Some American families at dinner. In *The Family as a Learning Environment, vol 1*, Luis M. Laosa & Irving E. Sigel (eds), 115-145. New York: Plenum.
- Lien, Marianne & Nerlich, Brigitte (eds). 2004. *The Politics of Food*. Oxford: Berg.
- Lindquist, Julie. 2004. Class identity and the politics of dissent: The culture of argument in a Chicago neighborhood bar. In *Ethnolinguistic Chicago: Language and Literacy in the City's Neighborhoods*, Marcia Farr (ed), 295-319. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Lindquist, Julie. 2002. *A Place to Stand: Politics and Persuasion in a Working-Class Bar*. Oxford: OUP.
- Livingstone, Sonia. 2004. A commentary on the research evidence regarding the effects of food promotion on children, prepared for the Research Department of the Office of Communications (OFCOM), February 2004, <http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/21756/1/A_commentary_on_the_research_evidence.pdf (15 March 2013).
- Logue, Alexandra W. 1991. *The Psychology of Eating and Drinking*. New York: Freeman.
- Lupton, Deborah. 1996. *Food, the Body and the Self*. London: Sage.
- Lyman, Bernard. 1989. *A Psychology of Food: More than a Matter of Taste*. New York: Van Nostrand.
- Majid, Asifa & Levinson, Stephen C. 2011. The senses in language and culture. *The Senses and Society* 6(1): 5-18.
- Malinowski, Bronislaw. 1972. Phatic communion. In *Communication in Face-to-Face Interaction*, John Laver & Sandy Hutcheson (eds), 146-152. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Malinowski, Bronislaw. 1935. *Coral Gardens and their Magic*. Cincinnati: American Book.
- Malinowski, Bronislaw. 1922. *Argonauts of the Western Pacific*. New York: Dutton.
- Malkiel, Yakov. 1944. The Etymology of Portuguese 'Iguaria'. *Language* 20(3): 108-130.
- Mallinson, Christine & Brewster, Zachary W. 2005. 'Blacks and bubbas': Stereotypes, ideology and categorization processes in restaurant servers' discourse. *Discourse & Society* 16: 787-807.

- Mannur, Anita. 2010. *Culinary Fictions: Food in South Asian Diasporic Culture*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Mannur, Anita. 2007. Culinary nostalgia: Authenticity, nationalism, and diaspora. *Journal for the Study of the Multi-Ethnic Literature of the United States MELUS* 32(4): 11-31.
- Markham, Gervase. 1631. *The English Housewife Containing the inward and outward virtues which ought to be in a complete woman; as her skill in physic, cookery, banqueting-stuff, distillation, perfumes, wool, hemp, flax, dairies, brewing, baking, and all other things belonging to a household*. 3 Michael R. Best (ed), 1986. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Marko, Georg. 2009. Eating the right thing: A critical analysis of orthorexic discourses. In *Food and Language: Sprache und Essen*, Eva Lavric & Carmen Konzett (eds), 261-274. Frankfurt: Lang.
- Marra, Meredith, King, Brian & Holmes, Janet. (Forthcoming). Food talk at work: The influence of norms. Manuscript in preparation.
- Marshall, Joanna Barszewska. 2007. 'Boast now, chicken, tomorrow you'll be stew': Pride, shame, food, and hunger in the Memoirs of Esmeralda Santiago. *Journal for the Study of the Multi-Ethnic Literature of the United States MELUS* 32(4): 47-68.
- Massam, Diane. 1992. Null objects and non-thematic subjects. *Journal of Linguistics* 28(1): 115-137.
- Massam, Diane. 1987. Middles, tough, and recipe context constructions in English. *North East Linguistic Society* 18: 315-322.
- Massam, Diane & Roberge, Yves. 1989. Recipe context null objects in English. *Linguistic Inquiry* 20(1): 134-139.
- Maurer, Donna & Sobal, Jeffery (eds). 1995. *Eating Agendas: Food and Nutrition as Social Problems*. New York: de Gruyter.
- Mayr, Andrea. 2009. Representations of food on British television: Jamie Oliver's 'School Dinners'. In *Food and Language: Sprache und Essen*, Eva Lavric & Carmen Konzett (eds), 275-286. Frankfurt: Lang.
- McBride, Anne E. 2010. Food porn. *Gastromica* 10(1): 38-46.
- McIlwraith, Thomas. 2008. 'The bloody moose got up and took off': Talking carefully about food animals in a Northern Athabaskan village. *Anthropological linguistics* 50(2): 125-147.
- McIntosh, William Alex. 1996. *Sociologies of Food and Nutrition*. New York, NY: Plenum.
- McMillan, John & Coveney, John. 2010. Editorial: What took you so long? Sociology's recent foray into food. *Health Sociology Review* 19(3): 282-284.
- Mead, Margaret. 1943. The problem of changing food habits. In *The Problem of Changing Food Habits, Report of the Committee on Food Habits 1941-1943. Bulletin No. 108*, Carl E. Guthe & Margaret Mead, 20-32. Washington: National Research Council, National Academy of Sciences.
- Mechling, Jay. 2005. Boy scouts and the manly art of cooking. *Food and Foodways* 13(1-2): 67-89.
- Meneley, Anne. 2007. Like an extra virgin. *American Anthropologist* 109(4): 678-687.
- Mennell, Stephen. 2005. Of gastronomes and guides. In *The Taste Culture Reader: Experiencing Food and Drink*, Carolyn Korsmeyer (ed), 239-249. Oxford: Berg.

- Mennell, Stephen. 1996. *All Manners of Food: Eating and Taste in England and France from the Middle Ages to the Present*. 2nd ed. Chicago: University of Illinois Press.
- Mennell, Stephen. 1985. *All Manners of Food: Eating and Taste in England and France from the Middle Ages to the Present*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Mennell, Stephen, Murcott, Anne & van Otterloo, Anneke H. (eds). 1992. The sociology of food: Eating, diet, and culture. *La sociologie contemporaine* 40(2): 1-152.
- Meredith, Mamie J. 1944. 'Gazelleburgers' in Persian palaces. *American Speech* 19(4): 308-309.
- Merritt, Marilyn. 1976. On questions following questions in service encounters. *Language in Society* 5(3): 315-357.
- Messer, Ellen. 1984. Anthropological perspectives on diet. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 13: 205-249.
- Metcalf, Allan & Doviak, Martin J. 1981. Pizza as pie in Albuquerque. *American Speech* 56(2): 149-151.
- Miller, Jeff & Deutsch, Jonathan. 2010. *Food Studies: An Introduction to Research Methods*. Oxford: Berg.
- Miller, Joan & Berry, Nicole. 1999. Culture in conversation: A commentary on Pontecorvo and Fasulo's 'Planning a typical Italian meal'. *Culture & Psychology* 5(4): 459-469.
- Mintz, Sidney W. 2000. Sows' ears and silver linings: A backward look at ethnography. *Current Anthropology* 41(2): 169-189.
- Mintz, Sidney W. 1985. *Sweetness and Power: The Place of Sugar in Modern History*. New York: Viking.
- Mintz, Sidney W. & Du Bois, Christine. 2002. The anthropology of food and eating. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 31: 99-119.
- Minuchin, Salvador, Rosman, Bernice L. & Baker, Lester. 1978. *Psychosomatic Families: Anorexia Nervosa in Context*. Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta.
- Mishler, Elliot G. 1979. 'Wou' you trade cookies with the popcorn?': Talk of trades among six year olds. In *Language, Children & Society*, Olga K. Garnica & Martha L. King (eds), 221-236. Oxford: Pergamon.
- Modan, Gabriella. 2001. White, whole wheat, rye: Jews and ethnic categorization in Washington, D.C. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 11(1): 116-130.
- Mondada, Lorenza. 2009. The methodical organization of talking and eating: Assessments of dinner conversations. *Food Quality and Preference* 20(8): 558-571.
- Mooney, Kim M. & Lorenz, Erica. 1997. The effects of food and gender on interpersonal perceptions. *Sex Roles* 36(9/10): 639-653.
- Morgan, Lewis Henry. 1877. *Ancient Society*. New York: Holt.
- Morrison, Hugh. 1952. The argot of soda jerks, car-hops, and restaurant waiters in the vicinity of Gainesville, Texas. *American Speech* 27(3): 231-233.
- Morrot, Gil, Brochet, Frédéric & Dubourdieu, Denis. 2001. The color of odors. *Brain and Language* 79(2): 309-320.
- Morton, Mark. 2005. Boning up on language. *Gastronomica* 5(4): 6-7.
- Morton, Mark. 2000. *Cupboard Love: A Dictionary of Culinary Curiosities*. Toronto: Insomniac.
- Møller, Janus S. 2010. 'Two frankfurters' and a 'shawarma' for 'Yoshimitsu': Membership categories involved in interactional play in a dinner conversation in Copenhagen. In *Love Ya Hate Ya: The Sociolinguistic Study*

- of *Youth Language and Youth Identities*, Jens Normann Jørgensen (ed), 123-150. Cambridge: CUP.
- Mühleisen, Susanne. 2003. Globalized tongues: The cultural semantics of food names. In: *Eating Culture*, Tobias Döring, Markus Heide & Susanne Mühleisen (eds), 71-88. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Mühlfried, Florian. 2006. *Postsowjetische Feiern – Das Georgische Bankett im Wandel*. Stuttgart: ibidem.
- Murcott, Anne (ed). 1998. *The Nation's Diet: The Social Science of Food Choice*. London: Longman.
- Murcott, Anne. 1983. *The Sociology of Food and Eating: Essays on the Sociological Significance of Food*. Aldershot: Gower.
- Murcott, Anne. 1982. On the social significance of the 'cooked dinner' in South Wales. *Anthropology of Food* 21(4/5): 677-696.
- Næss, Åshild. 2011. The grammar of eating and drinking verbs. *Language and Linguistics Compass* 5(6): 413-423.
- Næss, Åshild. 2009. How transitive are 'eat' and 'drink' verbs?. In *The Linguistics of Eating and Drinking*, John Newman (ed), 27-43. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Nedlinko, Anatoli, 2006. Viticulture and winemaking terminology and terminography. *Terminology* 12(1): 137-164.
- Nestle, Marion. 2013. *Food Politics: How the Food Industry Influences Nutrition and Health*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Nestle, Marion. 2010. *Safe Food: The Politics of Food Safety*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Nestle, Marion & Nesheim, Malden. 2012. *Why Calories Count: From Science to Politics*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Neuhaus, Jessamyn. 2001. The joy of sex instruction: Women and cooking in marital sex manuals, 1920-1963. In *Kitchen Culture in America: Popular Representations of Food, Gender, and Race*, Sherrie Inness (ed), 95-117. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Neumark-Sztainer, Dianne, Hannan, Peter J., Story, Mary, Croll, Jillian & Perry, Cheryl. 2003. Family meal patterns: Associations with sociodemographic characteristics and improved dietary intake among adolescents. *Journal of the American Dietetic Association* 103(3): 317-322.
- Newman, John (ed). 2009. *The Linguistics of Eating and Drinking*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Nichter, Mimi. 2000. *Fat Talk: What Girls and their Parents say about Dieting*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Nielsen, Klaus. 2008. Gender, learning and social practice: Gendered discourses in the bakery. *Vocations and Learning: Studies in Vocational and Professional Education* 1(3): 175-190.
- Niemelä, Maarit. 2010. The reporting space in conversational storytelling: Orchestrating all semiotic channels for taking a stance. *Journal of Pragmatics* 42(12): 3258-3270.
- Nilsen, Alleen Pace. 1995. From Aunt Chilada's to Cactus Willy's: Gender naming and the marketing of food in Arizona. *Names* 43(1): 29-52.
- Norrick, Neal R. 2011. Conversational recipe telling. *Journal of Pragmatics* 43(11): 2740-2761.
- Norrick, Neal R. 2000. *Conversational Narrative: Storytelling in Everyday Talk*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

- Norrick, Neal R. 1983a. Technical instructions. In *All Kinds of English*, Hans-Jürgen Diller (ed), 119-130. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Norrick, Neal R. 1983b. Recipes as texts: Technical language in the kitchen. In *Sprache, Diskurs und Text, Akten des 17. Linguistischen Kolloquiums, Brüssel, 1982*, René Jongen, Sabine De Knop, Peter H. Nelde & Marie-Paule Quix (eds), 173-182. Tuebingen: Niemeyer.
- Nützenadel, Alexander & Trentmann, Frank. 2008. Introduction: Mapping food and globalization. In *Food and Globalization: Consumption, Markets and Politics in the Modern World*, Alexander Nützenadel & Frank Trentmann (eds), 1-18. Oxford: Berg.
- Ochs, Elinor. 1994. Stories that step into the future. In *Sociolinguistic Perspectives on Register*, Douglas Biber & Edward Flanagan (eds), 106-135. Oxford: OUP.
- Ochs, Elinor, Pontecorvo, Clotilde & Fasulo, Alessandra. 1996. Socialising taste. *Ethnos* 61(1/2): 7-46.
- Ochs, Elinor & Shohet, Merav. 2006. The cultural structuring of mealtime socialization. *New Directions for Child and Adolescent Development* 111: 35-49.
- Ochs, Elinor, Smith, Ruth & Taylor, Carolyn. 1989. Detective stories at dinnertime: Problem-solving through co-narration. *Cultural Dynamics* 2(2): 238-257.
- Ochs, Elinor & Taylor, Carolyn. 1995. The 'father knows best' dynamics in dinnertime narratives. In *Gender Articulated: Language in the Socially Constructed Self*, Kira Hall & Mary Bucholtz (eds), 97-120. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Ochs, Elinor & Taylor, Carolyn. 1992a. Family narrative as political activity. *Discourse & Society* 3(3): 301-340.
- Ochs, Elinor & Taylor, Carolyn. 1992b. Mother's role in the everyday reconstruction of the 'father knows best.' In *Locating Power: Proceedings of the 1992 Berkeley Women and Language Conference*, Kira Hall, Mary Bucholtz & Birch Moonwoman (eds), 447-462. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Ochs, Elinor & Taylor, Carolyn. 1992c. Science at dinner. In *Text and Context: Cross-Disciplinary Perspectives on Language Study*, Claire Kramsch & Sally McConnell-Ginet (eds), 29-45. Lexington: Heath.
- Ochs, Elinor, Taylor, Carolyn, Rudolph, Dina & Smith, Ruth. 1992. Storytelling as a theory-building activity. *Discourse Processes* 15(1): 37-72.
- Oddy, Derek, J. 2003. *From Plain Fare to Fusion Food: British diet from the 1890s to the 1990s*. Woodbridge and New York: Boydell.
- Oldenburg, Ray. 1989. *The Great Good Place: Cafés, Coffee Shops, Community Centers, Beauty Parlors, General Stores, Bars, Hangouts, and How They Get You Through the Day*. New York: Paragon House.
- Olshtain, Elite & Blum-Kulka, Shoshana. 1989. Happy Hebrish: Mixing and switching in American-Israeli family interaction. In *Variation in Second Language Acquisition, I: Discourse and Pragmatics*, Susan Gass, Carolyn Madden, Dennis Preston & Larry Selinker (eds), 59-84. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- O'Mahony, Michael & Ishii, Rie. 1986. A comparison of English and Japanese taste languages: Taste descriptive methodology, codability and the umami taste. *British Journal of Psychology* 77(2): 161-174.

- O'Mahony, Michael & Tsang, Teresa. 1980. A preliminary comparison of Cantonese and American English as taste languages. *British Journal of Psychology* 71(2): 221-226.
- Orr, Winnie W. F. 2008. 'Prospecting an encounter' as a communicative event. *Discourse Studies* 10(3): 317-339.
- Orrell-Valente, Joan K., Hill, Laura G., Brechwald, Whitney A., Dodge, Kenneth A., Pettit, Gregory S. & Bates, John E. 2007. 'Just three more bites': An observational analysis of parents' socialization of children's eating at mealtime. *Appetite* 48(1): 37-45.
- Orwenjo, Daniel Ochieng. 2009. Political grandstanding and use of proverbs in African political discourse. *Discourse & Society* 20(1): 123-146.
- Padolsky, Enoch. 2005. You are where you eat: Ethnicity, food and cross-cultural spaces. *Canadian Ethnic Studies* 37(2). <<http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=a9h&AN=19471233&lang=de&site=ehost-live>>
- Pan, Barbara Alexander, Perlmann, Rivka Y. & Snow, Catherine E. 1999. Food for thought: Dinner table as a context for observing parent-child discourse. In *Methods for Studying Language Production*, Lise Menn & Nan Bernstein Ratner (eds), 205-224. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Panchen, Alec. 1992. *Classification, Evolution, and the Nature of Biology*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Pantli, Anna-Katharina. 2009. Pralinénamen: Angewandte Linguistik für einen Schokoladenhersteller. In *Food and Language: Sprache und Essen*, Eva Lavric & Carmen Konzett (eds), 79-87. Frankfurt: Lang.
- Parasecoli, Fabio. 2008. *Bite me: Food in Popular Culture*. Oxford: Berg.
- Parasecoli, Fabio. 2005. Feeding hard bodies: Food and masculinities in men's fitness magazines. *Food and Foodways* 13(1-2): 17-37.
- Parasecoli, Fabio & Scholliers, Peter (eds). 2012. *A Cultural History of Food, 6 Volume Set*. New York: Berg.
- Parker, Sue Taylor. 1985. A social-technological model for the evolution of language (and comments and reply). *Current Anthropology* 26(5): 617-639.
- Paugh, Amy L. 2005. Learning about work at dinnertime: Language socialization in dual-earner American families. *Discourse & Society* 16(1): 55-78.
- Paugh, Amy & Izquierdo, Carolina. 2009. 'Why is this a battle every night?': Negotiating food and eating in American dinnertime interaction. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 19(2): 185-204.
- Paules, Greta Foff. 1991. *Dishing it out: Power and Resistance among Waitresses in a New Jersey Restaurant*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Peckham, Shannan. 1998. 'Consuming nations'. In *Consuming Passions: Food in the Age of Anxiety*, Sian Griffiths & Jennifer Wallace (eds), 171-182. London: Mandolin.
- Perković, Anica, Petroman, Ioan & Petroman, Cornelia. 2008. Lexical categories in English: Restaurant (an etymological approach). *Journal of Linguistic Studies* 1(2): 59-64.
- Perković, Anica & Rată, Georgeta. 2008. English borrowings in Croatian and Romanian: Food-related words. *Journal of Linguistic Studies* 1(2): 65-74.
- Perregaard, Bettina. 2010. 'Luckily it was only for 10 minutes': Ideology, discursive positions, and language socialization in family interaction. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 14(3): 370-398.
- Perrier, Xavier, De Langhe, Edmond, Donohue, Mark, Lentfer, Carol, Vrydaghs, Luc, Bakry, Frédéric, Carreel, Françoise, Hippolyte, Isabelle, Horry, Jean-

- Pierre, Jenny, Christophe, Lebot, Vincent, Risterucci, Ange-Marie, Tomekpe, Kodjo, Doutrelepont, Hugues, Ball, Terry, Manwaring, Jason, de Maret, Pierre & Denham, Tim. 2011. Multidisciplinary perspectives on banana (*Musa spp.*) domestication. *PNAS* 108(28): 11311-11318.
- Pilcher, Jeffrey M. 2012. *The Oxford Handbook of Food History*. Oxford: OUP.
- Placencia, María E. 2004. Rapport-building activities in corner shop interactions. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 8(2): 215-245.
- Plotnicov, Leonard. 2008. Introduction, Special issue on trash food. *Ethnology* 47(2): 85-88.
- Pontecorvo, Clotilde & Fasulo, Alessandra. 1999. Planning a typical Italian meal: A family reflection on culture. *Culture & Psychology* 5(3): 313-336.
- Pontecorvo, Clotilde & Fasulo, Alessandra. 1997. Learning to argue in family dinner conversation: The reconstruction of past events. In *Discourse, Tools and Reasoning: Essays on Situated Cognition*, Lauren B. Resnick, Roger Säljö, Clotilde Pontecorvo & Barbara Burge (eds), 406-442. Berlin: Springer.
- Prell, Hillevi, Palmblad, Eva, Lissner, Lauren & Berg, Christina M. 2011. Health discourse in Swedish television food advertising during children's peak viewing times. *Appetite* 56(3): 607-616.
- Puttaswamy, Chaithra. 2009. Tracing the tracks of curry. In *Food and Language: Sprache und Essen*, Eva Lavric & Carmen Konzett (eds), 237-244. Frankfurt: Lang.
- Rappoport, Leon. 2003. *How we eat: Appetite, Culture, and the Psychology of Food*. Toronto: ECW.
- Ratã, Georgeta & Perković, Anica. 2008. Words of Russian origin in the English of cuisine. *Journal of Linguistic Studies* 1(2): 87-94.
- Rathmayr, Renate. 2006a. In drei Minuten auf dem Tisch! Maximale Zeitersparnis bei maximaler Erinnerung an Hausgemachtes: Zur Modellierung der impliziten Rezipient/inn/en in russischen und deutschen Zubereitungsanleitungen bei Fertiggerichten. In *Zeit – Ort – Erinnerung: Slawistische Erkundungen aus sprach-, literatur-, und kulturwissenschaftlicher Perspektive*, Eva Binder, Wolfgang Stadler & Helmut Weinberger (eds), 557-574. Innsbruck: Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Kulturwissenschaft.
- Rathmayr, Renate. 2006b. Kontrastive Textpragmatik am Beispiel russischer und deutscher Zubereitungsanleitungen. In *Slavistische Linguistik 2004-2005*, Tilman Berger, Jochen Raecke & Tilmann Reuther (eds), 398-421. Munich: Sager.
- Rathmayr, Renate. 2004. Produktnamen als wesentlicher Bestandteil der Textsorte Lebensmittelverpackung. In *Slavische Linguistik 2002*, Marion Krause & Christian Sappok (eds), 201-234. Munich: Sagner.
- Redclift, Michael. 2004. *Chewing Gum: The Fortunes of Taste*. New York: Routledge.
- Renne, Elisha P. 2007. Mass producing food traditions for West Africans abroad. *American Anthropologist* 109(4): 616-625.
- Ribeiro, Ricardo, Batista, Fernando, Pardal, Joana P., Mamede, Nuno J. & Pinto, H. Sofia. 2006. Cooking an ontology. In *Artificial Intelligence: Methodology, Systems, and Applications, 12th International Conference, AIMS 2006, Varna, Bulgaria, September 12-15, 2006, Proceedings*, Jérôme Euzenat & John Domingue (eds), 213-221. Berlin: Springer Verlag.

- Richards, Audrey. 1939. *Land Labor and Diet in Northern Rhodesia: An Economic Study of the Bemba Tribe*. London: OUP.
- Richards, Audrey. 1937. *The Food and Nutrition of African Natives*. London: International Institute of African Languages and Cultures.
- Richards, Audrey. 1932. *Hunger and Work in a Savage Tribe: A Functional Study of Nutrition Among the Southern Bantu*. London: Routledge.
- Riley, Sybille. 1996. Eigennamen in gastronomischen Garnituren im Deutschen und Englischen oder: Was sind Echte Langenburger Wibeke und Yorkshire Pudding? In *Eigennamen in der Fachkommunikation*, Rosemarie Gläser (ed), 131-154. Frankfurt: Lang.
- Riley-Köhn, Sybille. 1999. *Englische Kochrezepte und Speisekarten in Vergangenheit und Gegenwart: Eine linguistische Analyse zur Fachsprache der Gastronomie*. Frankfurt: Lang.
- Rivera, Diego, Obón, Concepción, Inocencio, Cristina, Heinrich, Michael, Verde, Alonso, Fajardo, José & Palazón, José Antonio. 2007. Gathered food plants in the mountains of Castilla-La Mancha (Spain): Ethnobotany and multivariate analysis. *Economic Botany* 61(3): 269-289.
- Röcklinsberg, Christoph. 2009. *Kulturspezifische Interaktionsstile oder Wenn schwedischsprachige und deutschsprachige Arbeitskollegen im Restaurant zu Mittag essen: Eine Studie zur Einbettungskultur in kommunikativer Praxis*. Linköping: LiU-Tryck.
- Romeo, Luigi. 1979. Medieval food signs in the monastery of Cluny. *Ars Semeiotica* 2: 375-379.
- Roosth, Sophia. 2013. Of foams and formalisms: Scientific expertise and craft practice in molecular gastronomy. *American Anthropologist* 115(1): 4-16.
- Rosch, Eleanor H. 1977. Human categorization. In *Advances in Cross-Cultural Psychology*, Neil Warren (ed), 1-49. New York: Academic.
- Rosenblum, Jordan D. 2010. *Food and Identity in Early Rabbinic Judaism*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Ross, Malcolm. 2006. Review of 'Examining the farming/language dispersal hypothesis' by Peter Bellwood and Colin Renfrew. *Language* 82(3): 628-648.
- Ross, Sheila. 1995. 'Do I really have to eat that?': A qualitative study of schoolchildren's food choices and preferences. *Health Education Journal* 54(3): 312-321.
- Rossato, Linda. 2009. *The Discourse of British TV Cookery*. PhD dissertation, University of Naples Federico II.
- Sacks, Harvey. 1992. *Lectures on Conversation*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Scapp, Ron & Seitz, Brian (eds). 1998. *Eating Culture*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Sceats, Sarah. 2000. *Food, Consumption and the Body in Contemporary Women's Fiction*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Schegloff, Emanuel A. 2005. On integrity in inquiry... of the investigated, not the investigator. *Discourse Studies* 7(4-5): 455-480.
- Schegloff, Emanuel & Sacks, Harvey. 1973. Opening up closings. *Semiotica* 8(4): 289-327.
- Schieffelin, Bambi. 1990. *The Give and Take of Everyday Life: Language Socialization of Kaluli Children*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Schieffelin, Bambi & Ochs, Elinor (eds). 1986. *Language Socialization across Cultures*. Cambridge: CUP.

- Schlotke, Florian, Becker, Wulf, Ireland, Jayne, Møller, Anders, Ovaskainen, Marja-Leena, Monspart, Judit & Unwin, Ian. 2000. EUROFOODS recommendations for food composition database management and data interchange. *Journal of Food Composition and Analysis* 13: 709-744.
- Schofield, Mary Ann (ed). 1989. *Cooking By the Book: Food in Literature and Culture*. Bowling Green: Bowling Green State University Popular Press.
- Scholliers, Peter (ed). 2001. *Food, Drink and Identity: Cooking, Eating and Drinking in Europe since the Middle Ages*. Oxford: Berg.
- Schröder, Konrad. 2012. Die Sprache des Essens. *Praxis Englisch* 2: 44-46.
- Schumacher-Voelker, Uta. 1980. German Cookery Books, 1485-1800. *Petits Propos Culinaires* 6: 34-46.
- Sen, Sharmila. 2005. Indian spices across the black waters. In *From Betty Crocker to Feminist Food Studies: Critical Perspectives on Women and Food*, Arlene Voski Avakian & Barbara Haber (eds), 185-199. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press.
- Shankman, Paul. 1969. Le Rôti et le bouilli: Lévi-Strauss' theory of cannibalism. *American Anthropologist* 71(1): 54-69.
- Shortridge, Barbara G. & Shortridge, James R. (eds). 1998. *The Taste of American Place: A Reader on Regional and Ethnic Food*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Shulman, David. 1959. Culinary Americanisms. *American Speech* 34(1): 26-32.
- Shultz, Jeffrey J., Florio, Susan & Erickson, Frederick. 1982. Where's the floor?: Aspects of the cultural organization of social relationships in communication at home and at school. In *Ethnography and Education: Children in and out of School*, Perry Gilmore & Allan A. Glatthorn (eds), 88-123. Washington: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Shuy, Roger W. 1966. Sauce. *American Speech* 41(1): 74-75.
- Sifianou, Maria. 1992. The use of diminutives in expressing politeness: Modern Greek versus English. *Journal of Pragmatics* 17(2): 155-173.
- Simmel, Georg. 1997. Sociology of the meal. In *Simmel on Culture*, David Frisby & Mike Featherstone (eds), 130-135. London: Sage.
- Simmons, Amelia. 1796. *American Cookery, or the art of dressing viands, fish, poultry and vegetables, and the best modes of making pastes, puffs, pies, tarts, puddings, custards and preserves, and all kinds of cakes, from the imperial plumb to plain cake, adapted to this country and all grades of life*. Hartford: Hudson & Goodwin.
- Singer, Peter & Mason, Jim. 2006. *The Way We Eat: Why Our Food Choices Matter*. Emmaus: Rodale.
- Skubal, Susan. 2002. *Word of Mouth: Food and Fiction after Freud*. London: Taylor & Francis.
- Smith, John. 2002. *The Psychology of Food and Eating: A Fresh Approach to Theory and Method*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Smith, Michael. 1986. Food subtractives: Losing -ed and -ly. *Word Ways* 19(2): 74-78.
- Smith, Monica L. 2006. The archaeology of food preference. *American Anthropologist* 108(3): 480-493.
- Sneijder, Petra & te Molder, Hedwig. 2009. Normalizing ideological food choice and eating practices: Identity work in online discussions on veganism. *Appetite* 52(3): 621-630.

- Sneijder, Petra & te Molder, Hedwig. 2006. Disputing taste: Food pleasures as an achievement in interaction. *Appetite* 46(1): 107-116.
- Sneijder, Petra & te Molder, Hedwig. 2005. Moral logic and logical morality: Attributions of responsibility and blame in online discourse on veganism. *Discourse & Society* 16(5): 675-696.
- Sneijder, Petra & te Molder, Hedwig. 2004. 'Health should not have to be a problem': Talking health and accountability in an internet forum on veganism. *Journal of Health Psychology* 9(4): 599-616.
- Snow, Catherine E., Perlmann, Rivka Y., Gleason Berko, Jean & Hooshyar, Nahid. 1990. Developmental perspectives on politeness: Sources of children's knowledge. *Journal of Pragmatics* 14(2): 289-305.
- Sobal, Jeffery & Maurer, Donna. 1999a. *Weighty Issues: Fatness and Thinness as Social Problems*. New York: de Gruyter.
- Sobal, Jeffery & Maurer, Donna. 1999b. *Interpreting Weight: The Social Management of Fatness and Thinness*. New York: de Gruyter.
- Soudek, Lev. 1968. Further members of the 'burger' family. *American Speech* 43(1): 74-76.
- Spitzer, Leo. 1946. Portuguese 'iguaria', Judeo-Spanish 'yegueria' again. *Language* 22(4): 358-359.
- Spitzer, Leo. 1945. Portuguese 'iguaria'. *Language* 21(2): 98-99.
- Steele, Robert (ed). 1898. *Three prose versions of the Secreta Secretorum*. London: Trübner.
- Stein, Alan, Woolley, Helen, Cooper, Sandra D. & Fairburn, Christopher G. 1994. An observational study of mothers with eating disorders and their infants. *Journal of Child Psychology* 35(4): 733-748.
- Sterponi, Laura. 2003. Account episodes in family discourse: The making of morality in everyday interaction. *Discourse Studies* 5(1): 79-100.
- Stommel, Wyke & Koole, Tom. 2010. The online support group as a community: A micro-analysis of the interaction with a new member. *Discourse Studies* 12(3): 357-378.
- Strauss, Susan. 2005. The linguistic aestheticization of food: A cross-cultural look at food commercials in Japan, Korea, and the United States. *Journal of Pragmatics* 37(9): 1427-1455.
- Sutton, David E. 2001. *Remembrance of Repasts: An Anthropology of Food and Memory*. Oxford: Berg.
- Swadesh, Morris. 1971. *The Origin and Diversification of Language*. Chicago: Aldine.
- Swadesh, Morris. 1950. Salish internal relationships. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 16(4): 157-167.
- Szawerna, Michael. 1997. Towards the complex base of the prototype of the lexical category 'verbs of eating' in English and in Polish. *Poznan Studies in Contemporary Linguistics* 32: 39-49.
- Tannen, Deborah. 1984. *Conversational Style: Analyzing Talk among Friends*. Norwood: Ablex.
- Tate, Shirley. 2003. Talking identities: Food, Black 'authenticity' and hybridity. In *Eating Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Food*, Tobias Döring, Markus Heide & Susanne Mühleisen (eds), 89-105. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Taveras, Elsie M., Rifas-Shiman, Sheryl L., Berkey, Catherine S., Rockett, Helaine R., Field, Alison E., Frazier, A. Lindsay, Colditz, Graham A. & Gillman,

- Matthew W. 2005. Family dinner and adolescent overweight. *Obesity Research* 13(5): 900-906.
- Teller, Joan W. 1969. The treatment of foreign terms in Chicago restaurant menus. *American Speech* 44(2): 91-105.
- Terragni, Laura, Boström, Magnus, Halkier, Bente & Mäkelä, Johanna. 2009. Can consumers save the world? Everyday food consumption and dilemmas of sustainability. *Anthropology of Food* S5. <<http://aof.revues.org/6379?lang=fr>>
- Tingley, Elizabeth C., Berko Gleason, Jean & Hooshyar, Nahid. 1994. Mothers' lexicon of internal state words in speech to children with Down syndrome and to nonhandicapped children at mealtime. *Journal of Communication Disorders* 27(2): 135-155.
- Tomlinson, Graham. 1986. Thought for food: A study of written instructions. *Symbolic Interaction* 9(2): 201-216.
- Truong, Monique. 2004. *The Book of Salt*. Boston: Mariner.
- Truswell, A. Stewart, Bateson, Deborah J., Madafoglio, Kathryn C., Pennington, Jean A. T., Rand, William M. & Klensin, John C. 1991. INFOODS Guidelines for describing foods: A systematic approach to describing foods to facilitate international exchange of food composition data. *Journal of Food Composition and Analysis* 4(1): 18-38.
- Tryggvason, Marja-Terttu. 2006. Communicative behavior in family conversation: Comparison of amount of talk in Finnish, SwedishFinnish, and Swedish families. *Journal of Pragmatics* 38(11): 1795-1810.
- Tryggvason, Marja-Terttu. 2004. Comparison of topic organization in Finnish, SwedishFinnish and Swedish family discourse. *Discourse Processes* 37(3): 225-248.
- Tryggvason, Marja-Terttu & De Geer, Boel. 2002. Eliciting talk as language socialization in Finnish, SwedishFinnish and Swedish families: A look at syntactic structures. *Multilingua* 21(4): 345-369.
- Tulviste, Tiia. 2000. Socialization at meals: A comparison of American and Estonian mother-adolescent interaction. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology* 31(5): 537-556.
- Tulviste, Tiia, Mizera, Luule, De Geer, Boel & Tryggvason, Marja-Terttu. 2003. A silent Finn, a silent Finno-Ugric, or a silent Nordic?: A comparative study of Estonian, Finnish and Swedish mother-adolescent interactions. *Applied Psycholinguistics* 24(2): 249-265.
- Tulviste, Tiia, Mizera, Luule, de Geer, Boel & Tryggvason, Marja-Terttu. 2002. Regulatory comments as tools of family socialization: A comparison of Estonian, Swedish and Finnish mealtime interaction. *Language in Society* 31(5): 655-678.
- Twiss, Kathryn C. (ed). 2007. *The Archaeology of Food and Identity*. Carbondale: Center of Archaeological Investigations.
- Van den Berghe, Steven. 2009. The language of taste: Discursive aspects of 20th century restaurant reviews in Brussels. In *Food and Language: Sprache und Essen*, Eva Lavric & Carmen Konzett (eds), 187-200. Frankfurt: Lang.
- Van den Eeckhout, Patricia & Scholliers, Peter. 2003. The language of a menu (Le Grand Hôtel, Bruxelles, 1926). *Food and History* 1: 241-247.
- Van Gelder, Geert Jan. 2000. *God's Banquet: Food in Classical Arabic Literature*. New York: Columbia University Press.

- Veen, Mario, te Molder, Hedwig, Gremmen, Bart & van Woerkum, Cees. 2012. If you can't eat what you like, like what you can: How children with coeliac disease and their families construct dietary restrictions as a matter of choice. *Sociology of Health and Illness* 35(1): 1-18.
- Videon, Tami M. & Manning, Carolyn K. 2003. Influences on adolescent eating patterns: The importance of family meals. *Journal of Adolescent Health* 32(5): 365-373.
- Visser, Margaret. 1993. *The Rituals of Dinner: The Origins, Evolution, Eccentricities and the Meaning of Table Manners*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Walker, Harlan (ed). 2003. *The Fat of the Land: Proceedings of the Oxford Symposium on Food and Cookery 2002*. Bristol: Footwork.
- Warde, Allen. 1997. *Consumption, Food & Taste. Culinary Antinomies and Commodity Culture*. London: Sage.
- Warde, Alan & Hetherington, Kevin. 1994. English households and routine food practices. *The Sociological Review* 42(4): 758-778.
- Warde, Alan & Martens, Lydia. 2000. *Eating Out: Social Differentiation, Consumption and Pleasure*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Watson, James L. & Caldwell, Melissa L. (eds). 2005. *The Cultural Politics of Food and Eating: A Reader*. Malden: Blackwell.
- Waxman, Nach. 2004. Recipes. In *The Oxford Encyclopedia of Food And Drink in America*, Andrew F. Smith (ed), 247-250. Oxford: OUP.
- Wharton, Tim. 2010. Recipes: Beyond the words. *Gastronomica: The Journal of Food and Culture* 10(4): 67-73.
- Whitfield, Susan. 2005. From Plov to Paella. *Index on Censorship* 34(1): 125-130.
- Wierzbicka, Anna. 2009. How transitive are 'eat' and 'drink' verbs?. In *The Linguistics of Eating and Drinking*, John Newman (ed), 65-90. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Wierzbicka, Anna. 1985. Different cultures, different languages, different speech acts: Polish vs. English. *Journal of Pragmatics* 9(2-3): 145-178.
- Wierzbicka, Anna. 1982. Why can you have a drink when you can't *have an eat? *Language* 58(4): 753-799.
- Wiessner, Polly & Schiefenhövel, Wulf. 1996. *Food and the Status Quest: An Interdisciplinary Perspective*. Oxford: Berghahn.
- Wiggins, Sally. 2004a. Good for 'you': Generic and individual healthy eating advice in family mealtimes. *Journal of Health Psychology* 9(4): 535-548.
- Wiggins, Sally. 2004b. Talking about taste: Using a discursive psychological approach to examine challenges to food evaluations. *Appetite* 43(1): 29-38.
- Wiggins, Sally. 2002. Talking with your mouth full: Gustatory mms and the embodiment of pleasure. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 35(3): 311-336.
- Wiggins, Sally. 2001. Construction and action in food evaluation: Conversational data. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology* 20(4): 445-463.
- Wiggins, Sally & Hepburn, Alexa. 2007. Food abuse: Mealtimes, helplines and 'troubled' eating. In *Discursive Research in Practice: New Approaches to Psychology and Interaction*, Alexa Hepburn & Sally Wiggins (eds), 263-280. Cambridge: CUP.
- Wiggins, Sally & Potter, Jonathan. 2003. Attitudes and evaluative practices: Category vs. item and subjective vs. objective constructions in everyday food assessments. *British Journal of Social Psychology* 42(4): 513-531.

- Wiggins, Sally, Potter, Jonathan & Wildsmith, Aimee. 2001. Eating your words: Discursive psychology and the reconstruction of eating practices. *Journal of Health Psychology* 6(1): 5-15.
- Willetts, Anna & Keane, Anne. 1995. You eat what you are. *The Guardian Weekend London*, April 5th: 42-43.
- Williams, Arnold. 1939. Hamburger progeny. *American Speech* 14(2): 154.
- Williams-Forsen, Psyche. 2006. *Building Houses out of Chicken Legs: Black Women, Food, and Power*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Williamson, Kay. 1970. Some food plant names in the Niger delta. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 36: 156-167
- Wong, Sau-Ling Cynthia. 1993. *Reading Asian American Literature: From Necessity to Extravagance*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Wright, Wynne & Middendorf, Gerad (eds). 2008. *The Fight Over Food: Producers, Consumers, and Activists Challenge the Global Food System*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Xu, Wenying. 2008. *Eating Identities: Reading Food in Asian American Literature*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- Yasmeen, Gisèle. 2006. *Bangkok's Foodscape*. Bangkok: White Lotus.
- Yorkston, Eric & Menon, Geeta. 2004. A sound idea: Phonetic effects of brand names on consumer judgements. *Journal of Consumer Research* 31(1): 43-51.
- Zing-Schmidt, Zhuo. 2008. Much mouth much tongue: Chinese metonymies and metaphors of verbal behavior. *Cognitive Linguistics* 19(2): 241-282.
- Zlatev, Jordan, Smith, Viktor, van de Weijer, Joost & Skydsgaard, Kristina. 2010. Noun-noun compounds for fictive food products: Experimenting in the borderzone of semantics and pragmatics. *Journal of Pragmatics* 42(10): 2799-2813.
- Zlotnick, Susan. 1996. Domesticating imperialism: Curry and cookbooks in Victorian England. *Frontiers* 16(2/3): 51-68.
- Zwicky, Ann & Zwicky, Arnold. 1980. America's national dish: The style of restaurant menus. *American Speech* 55(2): 83-92.