



PRAGMATICS AND SEMANTICS OF GASTRONOMIC NOMINATIONS IN INTERCULTURAL COMMUNICATION

TALIPOVA SHAXNOZA SHUXRATOVNA

Tashkent State Medical University

+998946850906

e-mail: stolipova12@gmail.com

Abstract: *This paper examines the semantic and pragmatic features of gastronomic nominations and their role in intercultural communication. In the context of globalization, food-related lexical units function not only as designations of dishes but also as carriers of cultural meanings and values. The study highlights how gastronomic terminology reflects national identity, cultural traditions, and communicative intentions. Special attention is given to the challenges of translation and interpretation of culturally specific food terms across languages. The relevance of the study lies in the increasing interaction between cultures, where accurate understanding of gastronomic vocabulary contributes to effective communication and mutual understanding.*

Keywords: *gastronomy, semantics, pragmatics, intercultural communication, nomination, cultural linguistics.*

Introduction:

In modern linguistics, increasing attention is paid to the study of language units not only in terms of their lexical meaning but also in relation to their functional use in communication. One of the most illustrative areas in this respect is gastronomic vocabulary, which reflects both linguistic and cultural dimensions of human interaction. Gastronomic nominations, understood as lexical units naming food and culinary practices, occupy a special place in the linguistic worldview of different nations. According to George Lakoff,



language is deeply rooted in cultural and cognitive models, and food-related terms are among the most culturally marked elements of vocabulary. These units often carry symbolic meanings that go beyond their direct reference. In intercultural communication, misunderstanding of gastronomic terms may lead not only to linguistic confusion but also to cultural misinterpretation. Therefore, the study of their semantics and pragmatics is essential for developing effective cross-cultural interaction.

Main Body:

1. Semantic Features of Gastronomic Nominations

The semantic aspect of gastronomic nominations involves their denotative meaning, referring to specific dishes, ingredients, or culinary processes. However, these meanings are often culturally bound. As noted by Ferdinand de Saussure, the relationship between the signifier and the signified is arbitrary, yet in the case of gastronomic terms, this relationship is frequently reinforced by cultural conventions. For example, traditional dishes such as “plov,” “sushi,” or “pizza” are not merely food items but symbols of national identity. Their meanings include associations with history, geography, and social practices. According to Anna Wierzbicka, culturally specific words, including food terms, require semantic explication to be properly understood in cross-cultural contexts. Moreover, semantic shifts may occur when gastronomic terms are borrowed into other languages. For instance, the word “kebab” may refer to different types of dishes depending on the cultural context, which illustrates the variability of meaning.

2. Pragmatic Functions in Communication

From a pragmatic perspective, gastronomic nominations perform various communicative functions beyond simple naming. They can express politeness, hospitality, social status, and cultural identity. As emphasized by Dell Hymes, language use is always embedded in a social context, and meaning is shaped by the situation of communication. In many cultures, offering food is a key



element of social interaction, and the use of specific gastronomic terms may signal respect or friendliness. Furthermore, gastronomic vocabulary is widely used in advertising and media discourse. Terms such as “organic,” “traditional,” or “homemade” carry strong pragmatic implications, influencing consumer perception and behavior. According to Teun A. van Dijk, discourse structures, including lexical choices, play a crucial role in shaping social cognition.

3. Gastronomic Nominations in Intercultural Communication

In intercultural contexts, the interpretation of gastronomic terms often requires background cultural knowledge. Direct translation is not always sufficient, as many food-related concepts lack exact equivalents in other languages. For example, Uzbek dishes such as “sumalak” or “norin” have no direct analogues in many cultures and require descriptive translation. This aligns with the view of Eugene Nida, who argued that dynamic equivalence in translation should prioritize the effect on the target audience rather than literal accuracy. Misinterpretation of gastronomic terms may lead to communication breakdowns or even cultural misunderstandings. Therefore, translators and language users must consider both semantic content and pragmatic context.

4. Cultural and Cognitive Dimensions

Gastronomic nominations also reflect cognitive categorization and cultural models. Food is closely related to human experience, and its linguistic representation reveals how people conceptualize the world. According to Edward Sapir and Benjamin Lee Whorf, language influences thought and perception. In this sense, gastronomic vocabulary can shape how individuals perceive and evaluate food and related practices. Additionally, globalization has led to the spread of culinary terms across cultures, creating hybrid forms and new meanings. This process enriches language but also increases the complexity of intercultural communication.

Conclusion:



In conclusion, gastronomic nominations represent a significant area of linguistic study, combining semantic, pragmatic, and cultural dimensions. Their analysis reveals the intricate relationship between language, culture, and communication.

Understanding the semantics and pragmatics of food-related terms is essential for successful intercultural interaction, as these units carry not only referential meaning but also cultural values and communicative intentions.

Future research should focus on empirical studies of gastronomic discourse in different languages and contexts, as well as the development of effective translation strategies for culturally specific vocabulary.

REFERENCES:

1. Lakoff, G. (1987). *Women, Fire, and Dangerous Things*. University of Chicago Press.
2. Saussure, F. de (1916). *Course in General Linguistics*.
3. Wierzbicka, A. (1997). *Understanding Cultures through Their Key Words*.
4. Hymes, D. (1974). *Foundations in Sociolinguistics*.
5. van Dijk, T. A. (1998). *Ideology: A Multidisciplinary Approach*.
6. Nida, E. (1964). *Toward a Science of Translating*.
7. Sapir, E. (1921). *Language: An Introduction to the Study of Speech*.
8. Whorf, B. L. (1956). *Language, Thought, and Reality*.