TRANSLATION STRATEGIES AND METHODOLOGICAL FRAMEWORKS IN GLUTTONIC DISCOURSE

Safarova Fotima Isamiddinovna
Tashkent University of Information Technologies named after Muhammad al-Khwarizmi, Associate Professor

Abstract: Gluttonic discourse, which encompasses linguistic units related to food culture, culinary traditions, eating habits, and gastronomic communication, has become an important object of linguistic and translation studies in recent decades. The translation of gluttonic discourse presents significant challenges due to the presence of culture-specific vocabulary, national culinary concepts, idiomatic expressions, and sociocultural associations embedded within food-related texts. This article examines the principal translation strategies and methodological frameworks used in the translation of gluttonic discourse. The study analyzes the role of domestication, foreignization, descriptive translation, transliteration, and cultural adaptation in conveying gastronomic meanings from one language into another. Particular attention is paid to the interaction between language and culture in culinary discourse and to the preservation of national identity through translation. The article concludes that successful translation of gluttonic discourse requires not only linguistic competence but also intercultural awareness and pragmatic sensitivity.

Keywords: gluttonic discourse, translation studies, culinary discourse, translation strategies, domestication, foreignization, cultural adaptation, gastronomic terminology, intercultural communication.

Аннотация: Глюттонический дискурс, охватывающий языковые единицы, связанные с культурой питания, кулинарными традициями, пищевыми привычками и гастрономической коммуникацией, стал важным объектом лингвистических и переводческих исследований в последние десятилетия. Перевод гурманского дискурса представляет значительные трудности из-за наличия специфической для культуры лексики, национальных кулинарных понятий, идиоматических выражений и социокультурных ассоциаций, встроенных в тексты, связанные с едой. В данной статье рассматриваются основные стратегии перевода и методологические основы, используемые при переводе глуттонического дискурса. В исследовании анализируется роль одомашнивания, иноязычивания, описательного перевода, транслитерации и культурной адаптации в передаче гастрономических значений с одного языка на другой. Особое внимание уделяется взаимодействию языка и культуры в кулинарном дискурсе и сохранению национальной идентичности посредством перевода. В статье делается вывод, что успешный перевод обжоры требует не только лингвистической компетенции, но и межкультурной осведомленности, а также прагматической чуткости.

Ключевые слова: гурманский дискурс, переводоведение, кулинарный дискурс, стратегии перевода, одомашнивание, иностранизация, культурная адаптация, гастрономическая терминология, межкультурная коммуникация.

Annotatsiya: Oziq-ovqat madaniyati, pazandalik an’analari, ovqatlanish odatlari va gastronomik muloqotga oid lingvistik birliklarni qamrab oluvchi gluttonik diskurs so‘nggi o‘n yilliklarda tilshunoslik va tarjimashunoslikning muhim tadqiqot obyektiga aylandi. Gluttonik diskurs tarjimasi oziq-ovqatga oid matnlarga singib ketgan madaniyatga xos leksika, milliy pazandalik tushunchalari, idiomatik iboralar va ijtimoiy-madaniy assotsiatsiyalar mavjudligi sababli jiddiy qiyinchiliklar tug‘diradi. Ushbu maqolada gluttonik diskursni tarjima qilishda qo‘llaniladigan asosiy tarjima strategiyalari va metodologik tamoyillar ko‘rib chiqiladi. Tadqiqotda gastronomik ma’nolarni bir tildan ikkinchisiga o‘tkazishda mahalliylashtirish, begonalashtirish, tasviriy tarjima, transliteratsiya va madaniy moslashtirishning o‘rni tahlil qilinadi. Shuningdek, pazandalik diskursida til va madaniyatning o‘zaro ta’siriga hamda tarjima orqali milliy o‘ziga xoslikni saqlab qolishga alohida e’tibor qaratiladi. Maqolada gluttonik diskursning

muvaffaqiyatli tarjimasi nafaqat lingvistik salohiyatni, balki madaniyatlararo xabardorlik va pragmatik yondashuvni ham talab qilishi xulosa qilinadi.

Kalit so‘zlar: gluttonik diskurs, tarjimashunoslik, pazandalik diskursi, tarjima strategiyalari, mahalliylashtirish, begonalashtirish, madaniy moslashtirish, gastronomik terminologiya, madaniyatlararo muloqot.

In modern linguistics and translation studies, increasing attention has been devoted to the study of discourse as a culturally determined phenomenon. One of the emerging areas within discourse analysis is gluttonic discourse (also referred to as gastronomic or culinary discourse), which reflects food culture, culinary traditions, eating practices, and gastronomic communication within a particular society. Food is not merely a biological necessity; it is also a cultural symbol that embodies national identity, historical memory, and social values [1, p. 23].

The translation of gluttonic discourse is a complex process because culinary vocabulary often contains culture-bound elements that may not have direct equivalents in the target language [2, p. 45]. As a result, translators must employ various strategies and methodological approaches to preserve both semantic meaning and cultural specificity.

This article aims to analyze the main translation strategies applied in gluttonic discourse and to examine the methodological frameworks that contribute to effective intercultural communication in culinary translation.

The term “gluttonic discourse” originates from the Latin word gluttire, meaning “to eat” or “to swallow.” In contemporary linguistic studies, gluttonic discourse refers to the totality of verbal and non-verbal communication associated with food, cooking, eating traditions, restaurant culture, and gastronomic representation [3, p. 112]. This type of discourse encompasses a wide range of communicative events and text types, all of which are united by their thematic focus on food and eating practices. Researchers emphasize that gluttonic discourse includes not only the names of dishes and ingredients but also culinary metaphors and idioms, restaurant communication (such as menus, orders, and service interactions), food advertisements, recipes and cookbooks, as well as gastronomic media texts including blogs, reviews, and television shows [4, p. 78]. Each of these components carries specific linguistic features and cultural connotations. For instance, a recipe does not merely list ingredients and instructions; it often embeds culturally specific cooking techniques, measurement systems, and assumptions about the reader’s culinary knowledge. Similarly, restaurant menus function as persuasive texts that reflect local dining etiquette, price sensitivity, and aesthetic preferences. Because these elements are deeply rooted in national culture, their translation often requires more than lexical substitution; it demands a deep understanding of cultural codes and food symbolism [5, p. 156]. Food terms frequently evoke historical memories, religious practices, social hierarchies, and regional identities. Therefore, a translator working with gluttonic discourse must recognize that a dish name may carry connotations of hospitality, festivity, or even nostalgia, none of which are directly transferable through literal translation. Understanding the theoretical foundations of gluttonic discourse is thus the first step toward developing effective strategies for its cross-linguistic and cross-cultural transfer.

Translating gluttonic discourse requires a nuanced understanding of the relationship between language, food, and culture. Translators face a fundamental choice: whether to bring the foreign text close to the target reader (domestication) or to take the reader toward the foreign culture (foreignization) [6, p. 89]. Between these poles lie several intermediate strategies, including descriptive translation, transliteration, and cultural adaptation. Each strategy carries distinct advantages and limitations, and the optimal approach often involves a combination tailored to the text type, audience, and communicative purpose.

Domestication is a translation strategy in which foreign cultural elements are systematically adapted to the norms, values, and expectations of the target audience. This method prioritizes the readability and naturalness of the target text, making it accessible and familiar to readers who may lack knowledge of the source culture [6, p. 89]. The translator acts as a cultural mediator, smoothing over

differences that might otherwise confuse or alienate the audience. In the context of gluttonic discourse, domestication often involves substituting unfamiliar dish names with descriptive equivalents or even replacing them with analogous items from the target cuisine.

For example, certain Uzbek dishes may be translated descriptively rather than transliterated in order to help foreign readers understand their essential characteristics. The Uzbek dish somsa – a savory pastry traditionally baked in a clay tandir oven – may be rendered as "savory meat pastry" or "baked pastry filled with spiced lamb and onions" in English-language texts. Similarly, manti might be called "steamed dumplings," and norin could be described as "cold horsemeat and noodle salad." These translations convey the function and basic ingredients of the dish without burdening the reader with unfamiliar terminology.

The advantage of domestication lies in its improved readability and communicative efficiency. A foreign tourist reading an English-language menu in Tashkent, or a home cook attempting an Uzbek recipe online, benefits from immediate comprehension. Domestication prevents the frustration of encountering unrecognizable terms and allows the text to fulfill its practical purpose – whether that is ordering a meal, preparing food, or enjoying a culinary article.

However, excessive adaptation may lead to the loss of cultural authenticity. When somsa is reduced to merely a "meat pastry," the translation erases the specific dough (flaky or crisp), the traditional tandir cooking method, and the characteristic triangular shape with a pinched top – all of which are integral to the dish's identity. Moreover, domestication strips away the cultural symbolism embedded in food. Uzbek somsa is not just a food item; it is associated with hospitality, family gatherings, and street food culture. By domesticating too heavily, the translator risks producing a text that is culturally hollow – a generic description that could apply to a Cornish pasty or an empanada just as easily. Therefore, while domestication is useful for functional texts, it must be applied judiciously, especially when the source text is literary or carries strong cultural connotations.

Foreignization preserves the cultural uniqueness of the source language by retaining original terms, concepts, and stylistic features in the target text. This strategy deliberately resists the smoothing effect of domestication, allowing readers to experience the foreign culture more directly and authentically [7, p. 104]. Instead of adapting unfamiliar elements, the translator highlights them, often through transliteration or transcription, supplemented by glosses or footnotes. Foreignization is grounded in the belief that translation should not erase difference but rather celebrate it, enriching the target language and culture with new concepts and perspectives.

For instance, culinary terms such as plov, lavash, kimchi, sushi, or tandir are often transliterated rather than replaced with approximate equivalents like "rice dish," "flatbread," "fermented vegetables," "raw fish and rice," or "clay oven." By using the original term, the translator signals that the concept is culturally specific and cannot be reduced to a simple functional equivalent. In Uzbek culinary discourse, foreignization would render osh (the Uzbek national dish) as osh rather than "pilaf" or "rice plov," because osh encompasses not only ingredients and preparation but also the social rituals of communal eating, the hierarchical order of serving, and the deep symbolism of hospitality and celebration.

Foreignization contributes to cultural preservation and cross-cultural enrichment. When terms like plov, kebab, or baklava enter international culinary vocabulary through repeated foreignizing translation, they become recognizable even to readers unfamiliar with the source culture. This process expands the expressive capacity of the target language and fosters genuine intercultural understanding.

However, foreignization may also create comprehension difficulties for target readers unfamiliar with the source culture. A reader encountering the word kazy (horse meat sausage) or uzgra (a type of homemade noodle) for the first time may have no idea what these terms mean, leading to confusion or disengagement. To mitigate this problem, translators often combine foreignization with other strategies, such as providing a brief definition in parentheses, a footnote, or a glossary. For example, a menu might list "kazy – traditional horse meat sausage" or a literary translation might include an endnote explaining the significance of osh in Uzbek wedding ceremonies. In this way, foreignization does not have to be an all-or-nothing choice; it can be integrated with explanatory elements to balance authenticity and accessibility.

Descriptive translation involves explaining the meaning of culture-specific culinary terms through expanded descriptions or paraphrases. This method is especially useful when no direct lexical equivalent exists in the target language and when simple transliteration would be insufficient for comprehension [8, p. 67]. Rather than using a single word or phrase, the translator provides a miniature definition that captures the essential features of the dish, ingredient, or practice.

For example:

- halim — "a traditional wheat and meat porridge slow-cooked for several hours, often served during religious holidays and communal gatherings";
- kurut — "dried fermented dairy balls, sour and salty in taste, common in Central Asian cuisines and traditionally made from strained yogurt or buttermilk";
- dimlama — "a slow-cooked stew of meat and layered vegetables (potatoes, carrots, onions, peppers) cooked in its own juices with minimal water."

Descriptive translation ensures semantic clarity while maintaining cultural information. It is particularly valuable in travel guides, food blogs, cookbooks for foreign audiences, and culinary journalism, where the goal is to educate readers about unfamiliar foods. Unlike domestication, which may hide cultural specificity, descriptive translation explicitly presents it; unlike foreignization, it does not leave the reader guessing. The reader learns not only what the food is called but also what it consists of, how it is prepared, and often when or why it is eaten.

The main disadvantage of descriptive translation is its length. A descriptive phrase can be cumbersome, especially in texts where space is limited (e.g., restaurant menus) or where the term appears frequently. Descriptions can also become repetitive if the same dish is mentioned multiple times. To address this, translators sometimes introduce a transliterated term with a one-time descriptive gloss, after which the transliterated term is used alone. For instance: "We ordered halim – a slow-cooked wheat-and-meat porridge – and found it delicious. Later, we tried halim again in another region." This hybrid approach combines the clarity of description with the efficiency of foreignization.

Transliteration and transcription are closely related strategies that reproduce the phonetic or graphic form of culinary terms from the source language in the target language. Transliteration focuses on converting the writing system (e.g., Cyrillic to Latin), while transcription prioritizes the sounds of the spoken term. In practice, the two are often used interchangeably in translation studies [9, p. 132]. This approach is widely used for national dishes, ingredients, cooking utensils, and other food-related concepts that have gained international recognition or that lack simple equivalents.

Examples of successfully foreignized (via transliteration) culinary terms include: sushi (Japanese), pilaf (Persian/Turkic), baklava (OttomanTurkish), kebab (Arabic/Turkish), kim chi (Korean), taco (Spanish), and curry (Tamil). In the Uzbek context, transliteration might produce terms such as somsa, manti, osh, kazy, norin, chuchvara, yupka, shurpa, and lagman. These terms are increasingly used in English-language travel guides and gastronomic writing about Central Asia.

This strategy is particularly common in gastronomic tourism, restaurant menus (especially those targeting adventurous eaters), international culinary communication, and food branding. Transliteration signals authenticity and exoticism, which can be a selling point for tourists seeking authentic local experiences. A menu that lists "osh" rather than "Uzbek rice pilaf" suggests that the dish is prepared in the traditional way and that the restaurant values cultural authenticity. However, transliteration alone does not convey meaning. A reader unfamiliar with Uzbek cuisine will not know that norin is a cold horsemeat and noodle salad, or that kazy is a horsemeat sausage. Therefore, transliteration is most effective when combined with other strategies, such as a brief gloss or a visual image (photograph on a menu). In academic or literary translations, transliteration may be accompanied by footnotes, glossaries, or introductory explanations. The pure use of transliteration without any support is best reserved for internationally known terms (e.g., sushi, pizza, taco) or for contexts where the target reader is expected to have prior knowledge.

Cultural adaptation is a strategy that modifies culture-specific references, food associations, meal customs, or symbolic meanings to suit the sociocultural background, beliefs, and sensitivities of target readers. This strategy goes beyond lexical substitution or description; it involves reshaping the content so that it aligns with the target culture's norms and values [10, p. 201]. Cultural adaptation is frequently

applied in advertising, media discourse, children's literature, and any text where the primary goal is to persuade, entertain, or avoid offense rather than to provide a faithful cultural record.

For example, certain food associations, meal customs, or symbolic meanings may be adapted to ensure effective communication in another cultural environment. Horse meat, which is traditionally used in Uzbek dishes such as beshbarmak (a noodle dish with meat) and kazy (horsemeat sausage), may require cultural adaptation when translating into European languages where horsemeat is often tabooed or considered unacceptable. A translation intended for a British or American audience might replace kazy with "beef sausage" or simply omit the specific meat type, describing the dish as "traditional sausage." Similarly, the use of lamb fat (kurdyuk) is prized in Uzbek cuisine but might be described as "fat" or omitted entirely in translations targeting health-conscious Western audiences. Another example involves religious or dietary restrictions. Pork appears in many European and East Asian cuisines but is forbidden in Islam and Judaism. When translating a menu or recipe from a pork-consuming culture into a language spoken by Muslim or Jewish communities, a translator might adapt by suggesting a substitution (e.g., "lamb" or "beef") or explicitly noting the presence of pork. In advertising for halal or kosher markets, such adaptation is not optional but mandatory.

Cultural adaptation can also affect the emotional framing of food. For instance, the Uzbek practice of offering food to guests with both hands and insisting that they eat more (a sign of generosity) might be adapted in a translation for an individualistic culture as "the host welcomes you warmly and hopes you enjoy the meal." While the literal details are altered, the communicative function – conveying hospitality – is preserved.

The advantage of cultural adaptation is its ability to prevent misunderstanding, offense, or rejection of the message. It enables cross-cultural communication in sensitive domains. However, the disadvantage is significant: adaptation may distort the source culture's reality, sanitize differences, or even misrepresent the original text. A translation that replaces horse meat with beef may unintentionally erase an important aspect of Uzbek nomadic heritage. Therefore, cultural adaptation should be used transparently – with notes explaining the change – or reserved for texts where the target audience's comfort takes precedence over cultural accuracy (e.g., mass-market advertising, children's books, or governmental public health materials).

No single strategy is universally superior. The choice between domestication, foreignization, descriptive translation, transliteration, and cultural adaptation depends on multiple factors: the type of text (menu, recipe, literary work, advertisement), the target audience (tourists, scholars, home cooks, children), the purpose of translation (information, persuasion, entertainment, cultural exchange), and the specific cultural weight of the culinary term in question. Most successful translations of gluttonic discourse employ a combination of strategies, often using transliteration for key cultural terms, supplemented by descriptive glosses or footnotes, while domesticating or adapting only when necessary for comprehension or cultural sensitivity. The translator's ultimate task is to navigate these choices with cultural humility, linguistic precision, and a clear understanding of the communicative context.

The translation of gluttonic discourse is guided by several interrelated methodological frameworks. The linguocultural approach examines language as a reflection of national culture, emphasizing that culinary vocabulary carries deep historical and cultural significance; translators working within this framework prioritize the preservation of cultural identity over mere lexical accuracy [11, p. 45]. The communicative approach, in contrast, focuses on achieving an equivalent communicative effect in the target language, meaning that the translator's task is not simply to reproduce lexical meaning but also to convey emotional, stylistic, and pragmatic nuances that affect how the message is received [2, p. 78]. The cognitive approach studies how culinary concepts are represented in human consciousness, recognizing that food-related expressions often evoke cultural stereotypes, memories, and associations that must be carefully considered during translation [12, p. 99]. Finally, the pragmatic framework emphasizes the communicative purpose of the text and the expectations of the target audience; in restaurant menus, advertising texts, and food blogs, for instance, translation must influence readers effectively and persuasively, adapting the message to achieve a specific real-world outcome [13, p. 56]. Together, these frameworks remind translators that gluttonic discourse is never culturally neutral and requires a multidimensional strategy. The translation of gluttonic discourse presents several interconnected

difficulties [14, p. 210]. First, there is often a lack of direct lexical equivalents between languages, especially for ingredients, cooking methods, or dishes unique to a particular cuisine. Second, culture-specific culinary concepts (known as realia) carry meanings that cannot be transferred through simple substitution. Third, idiomatic expressions related to food – such as "to bite the bullet" or "to spill the beans" in their figurative uses – pose problems when the literal culinary image does not exist in the target culture. Fourth, symbolic meanings attached to specific dishes and eating traditions vary widely; for example, certain foods may carry positive connotations in one culture (e.g., fertility, hospitality, luck) but different or even negative associations in another. Differences in gastronomic perception between cultures further complicate translation, as tastes, textures, and even the appropriateness of eating certain animals are culturally constructed. Therefore, translators working with gluttonic discourse must possess not only linguistic knowledge but also strong intercultural competence, enabling them to navigate these challenges without distorting either the source text's meaning or the target audience's understanding [15, p. 78].

Gluttonic discourse represents a culturally rich and linguistically complex area of translation studies. The translation of culinary texts requires careful consideration of linguistic, cultural, cognitive, and pragmatic factors. Various translation strategies such as domestication, foreignization, descriptive translation, transliteration, and cultural adaptation help translators convey gastronomic meanings across languages and cultures.The study demonstrates that successful translation of gluttonic discourse depends on the translator's ability to balance semantic accuracy with cultural preservation. As globalization continues to intensify intercultural communication, the importance of gluttonic discourse in translation studies will continue to grow.

References:

1. Kramsch C. Language and Culture. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998. 134 p.
2. Hatim B., Mason I. Discourse and the Translator. London: Longman, 1990. 258 p.
3. Halliday M.A.K. Language as Social Semiotic. London: Edward Arnold, 1978. 256 p.
4. Bassnett S. Translation Studies. London: Routledge, 2014. 218 p.
5. Nida E. Language, Culture and Translating. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press, 1993. 215 p.
6. Venuti L. The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation. London: Routledge, 1995. 353 p.
7. Newmark P. A Textbook of Translation. New York: Prentice Hall, 1988. 292 p.
8. Baker M. In Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation. London: Routledge, 2018. 304 p.
9. Larson M.L. Meaning-Based Translation: A Guide to Cross-Language Equivalence. Lanham: University Press of America, 1998. 586 p.
10. Toury G. Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2012. 350 p.
11. Wierzbicka A. Understanding Cultures through Their Key Words. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997. 317 p.
12. Lakoff G., Johnson M. Metaphors We Live By. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003. 276 p.
13. Nord C. Text Analysis in Translation: Theory, Methodology, and Didactic Application of a Model for Translation-Oriented Text Analysis. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2005. 274 p.
14. Pym A. Exploring Translation Theories. London: Routledge, 2014. 248 p.
15. House J. Translation as Communication across Languages and Cultures. London: Routledge, 2016. 206 p.