



National and Cultural Specifics of the Glutton Discourse (on the basis of the Russian, English and Chinese Languages)

Elvira K. Valiakhmetova 1

Flyuza G. Fatkullina a 2

Almira K. Sulejmanova 3

Raysa Kh. Khayrullina 4

Aygul F. Davlethbayeva 5

Yevgeniya A. Morozkina 6

Galina G. Fefelova 7

1 Ufa Law Institute of the Ministry of Internal Affairs of Russia Russia.

2 Bashkir State University Russia.

3 Ufa State Petroleum Technological University.

4 Bashkir State Pedagogical University named after M. Akmulla Russia.

5 Bashkir State University Russia.

6 Bashkir State University Russia.

7 Ufa State Petroleum Technological University Russia.

ARTICLE INFORMATION

Original Research Paper

Received Dec. 2018

Accepted Feb. 2019

Keywords:

gastronomic discourse,
language and culture,
cultural linguistics,
national linguistic picture of the
world,
connotation,
anthropocentrism

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this research is studying the problems connected with the identification of the national features in the glutton (gastronomic) discourse and the representation of the national world pictures in the Russian, English and Chinese languages. This paper proves the linguistic status of the gastronomic discourse and offers its definition, analyses its genres, defines the notions and the concept of the gastronomic world picture.

The special attention is given to the identification and the complex analysis of the types of the pragmatonyms in the Russian, English and Chinese languages. The authors draw the conclusion that gastronomy is one of the most important tools for assimilation of another culture.

Having accurately analyzed the names of dishes from various national cuisines, the authors specify the concept of gastronomic discourse, reveal similarities and differences in the names of various dishes from the perspective of cultural linguistics.

Thus, the glutton discourse expressed by verbal means, has its own semantic form determined by its values and characterized with ethnic and cultural specifics.

1. Introduction

Reflecting the religious belief, life and setup of people of different nationalities, gastronomy is an important

component of peoples' mentality. Hence, it is no surprise that national cuisines differ from each other. In our opinion, gastronomy, along with the language, is an important tool for assimilation of another culture. This paper is devoted to a comparative analysis of the national and cultural aspect of the gastronomic discourse. The subject of the research is culturally marked names of dishes and foodstuffs.

The purpose of the article is to differentiate the gastronomic world pictures of the Russians, Englishmen and the Chinese in the light of the names of national dishes.

Mankind cannot live without foodstuffs, however, the representatives of every nationality have their own taste preferences reflected in the adequate language and text material: gastronomic terminology, the recipes of national cuisine, menus, articles on cookery, etc. Any lexical or text material in this area of human activity is an inexhaustible source for identifying the ways of verbalization of the dominant features of a national character.

Since the state of food supply, their processing and consumption for every nation are determined by a relatively rigid set of consumer standards, the stable nature of the national features of a linguistic personality is reflected in the glutton discourse. The glutton discourse is interpreted as a form of the implementation of a national language in the text structure of speech in the line of communication connected with food consumption.

The communicative situation of food consumption is ethnically and culturally conditioned and has character parameters by which the mental signs of a nation can be identified. The glutton component of the discourse is primarily based on the glutton vocabulary which acts as a key material for the identification of a national character.

2. Literature Review

Discourse is an act of communication that results in a spoken or written speech (Arutyunova, 1990; Morozkina, 2016). The typology of discourse can be based on various grounds.

As the gastronomic (glutton) discourse operates within the framework of the institution of cookery, it is studied as a genre of institutional communication. A. V. Olyanich defines the gastronomic discourse as a special type of communication related to the state of food supply, their processing and consumption (Olyanich, 2007). The study of the gastronomic discourse phenomenon is associated with the works of A.Yu. Zemskova who singles out skill sharing, training, familiarization with the cookery culture and traditions of other peoples and the formation of food preferences as the goals of this type of discourse (Zemskova, 2009). P.P. Burkova also identifies training (skill sharing), familiarization with the cookery culture and traditions of other nations as the goals of this discourse (Burkova, 2004). According to A.Yu. Zemskova, the participants of the gastronomic discourse are: an agent, i.e. a person with extensive experience, skills, abilities, knowledge in the field of glutton, and a client, i.e. a person with an intention to cook something, or a visitor to a catering establishment (Zemskova, 2009).

On the basis of the abovementioned features, we see that these authors hold similar points of view. A. Yu. Zemskova marks out an agent with wide experience in the field of gastronomy and a client who means to cook something or to visit a place of public catering as the participants of the discourse. The linguists also have common ground in the issue of the purposes of the gastronomic discourse apart from one distinctive feature specified by N.P. Golovnitskaya. A. Yu. Zemskova and P.P. Burkova believe skill sharing or training, familiarization with the cookery culture and traditions of other nations to be the goals of this discourse, but according N.P. Golovnitskaya, the goal of the gastronomic discourse is developing the consumer's food preferences and cultural dominants associated with food as it is the man's primary need (Golovnitskaya, 2008).

3. Research Methods

The methodology used in the study has a complex and integrative approach, including general, general scientific and special methods: descriptive, comparative, linguistic and cultural, cognitive and interdisciplinary approaches to the analysis of the names of dishes in the framework of the gastronomic discourse.

The typological method allows to typologize and analyze historically developed ideas on cookery (in our case – on the basis of several languages of different structure) as well as to reveal how the comprehension of the gastronomic discourse is connected with the main world-view preferences, social and economic processes, culture, traditions and customs of organizational structures of a particular era.

4. Results and Discussion

The world is the man and the environment in their interaction. The picture of the world is the result of processing information about the environment and the man. The picture of the world is necessary for the man to adapt to the world in order to gain a clear comprehension of it. In general, the picture of the world is understood as an arranged set of knowledge about reality which was formed in the public consciousness. The linguistic form of reality allows us to distinguish its special kind, namely, the linguistic picture of the world. The proposition that language is a necessary condition for the process of thinking was formulated in the works of the greatest linguist–theorist of the nineteenth century Wilhelm von Humboldt. He wrote that the person's thinking depends on the language he/she uses. Every language has its own internal form; besides sounds and media of expression, languages also differ from each other by the way of perceiving the world (Humboldt, 1984). Wilhelm von Humboldt wrote that "the language is not the product of an activity, but an activity» (Humboldt, 1984). The definition "the language picture of the world" was introduced by L. Weisgerber, a German linguist of the XX century, a representative of the new humboldtian school. In every language, in his opinion, there is a special world-view, i.e., "the linguistic representation of the world can be considered as a linguistic thinking, because, firstly, the representation of the world is its comprehension, and, secondly, the representation of the world, or the reflection, is of a linguistic nature" (Weisgerber, 2004). L. Weisgerber found the idea of the ethnicity of the language content in W. Humboldt's doctrine about the inner form of the language. L. Weisgerber developed his theory of the language picture of the world on its basis. L. Weisgerber believed that the freedom of the human mind from the linguistic picture of the world exists but it exists within the picture of the world. The representatives of one nationality cannot get rid of their picture of the world, but within it they can afford some "maneuver" which makes them individualities. However, the peculiarity of the personality is always limited by the national specificity of his/her language picture of the world. L. Weisgerber wrote, "Everyone is known for the ability to maneuver in the process of learning and applying his/her native language and ... he/she is quite able to keep the peculiarity of his/her personality in this regard" (Weisgerber, 2004). That's why the Frenchman will always see the world from his/her language window, the Russian - from his/hers, and so will Chinese do, etc. Thus, like E. Sepir, L. Weisgerber could say that people who speak different languages don't live in the same world on which the different language labels merely hang but in different worlds (Fatkullina, 2002). In the same way as Leo Weisgerber, American linguists E. Sepir and B. Wharf proceeded from Humboldt's doctrine about the inner form of the language. The main idea of E. Sepir and B. Worf's hypothesis is that people see the world differently through the perspective of their language. Every language reflects the reality, i.e. the world, in its own way; any language leads the thoughts of its speakers in the direction that is determined by the world-view reproduced in the language, that is why languages differ in their pictures of the world. The linguistic picture of

the world is a set of ideas about the world which was historically formed in the everyday consciousness of a particular linguistic collective and reflected in the language. It is a certain way of conceptualization of the reality. In this context Yu.D. Apresyan (Apresyan, 1995) notes that every natural language reflects a specific way of perceiving and organizing (=conceptualizing) the world, and the meanings expressed in it develop into a certain unified system of views, a kind of the collective philosophy, which is imposed as a mandatory for all native speakers. According to Yu.D. Apresyan, the way of the reality conceptualization peculiar to the language is partly universal and partly nationally specific, hence, speakers of different languages can see the world a little differently through the perspective of their languages.

To reveal the character of the nation means to reveal their most significant social and psychological features which were historically developed by the nation under the influence of their living conditions, the lifestyle, etc. The national image is formed by the natural conditions and the environment which determine the kind of work, traditions and customs. In this regard, the works of modern linguists draw the conclusion that the language, being a unique sign system that serves as a means of communication, thinking, self-knowledge and learning the world, expresses the national culture, stores and transmits social and collective experience, cultural norms and traditions from generation to generation, thus, uniting people in time, geographical and social space.

It is the language that helps people to understand themselves and the world. Social and historical experience, including the national one which determines the specific features of the language at all levels, is secured in the language. Due to the specificity of the language, in the minds of its speakers there appears a certain linguistic picture of the world. This picture of the world is characterized with the national and cultural specificity, as it is formed under the influence of historical events, geographical conditions and the ethnic characteristics of the nation. That is why, in the humanitarian paradigm the language is defined as one of the leading features of the ethnic group. The study of the national character cannot do without learning the language of the people, as the language plays an important role in understanding the mentality of the people - native speakers.

The mentality, in its turn, being part of culture, is a "generalized social and psychological state of the people, nation, person, formed as a result of the historically long ... impact of the natural, geographical, ethnic, social and political, cultural conditions of the environment on the subject of mentality ... on the basis of the organic connection of the past with the present" (Vorobyov et al, 2014). There exist many different approaches to understanding the content and specificity of the national and cultural mentality. The most significant is the linguistic and cultural methodology, which is based on the anthropocentric paradigm of understanding the language and the culture, considering it as a key principle not only of linguistics, but of other human sciences. Anthropocentrism shows that the language "is created according to a human being, and this scale can be seen in the organization of the language; in accordance with it, the language must be studied" (Apresyan, 1995). A person develops in the space of the language and the culture, thus he/she is a language and culture carrier. This unity forms a national linguistic picture of the world, where language is one of the main features of an ethnic group. The main objective of the linguistic and cultural studies is "to understand the culture through the language" (Fatkullina, 2015), which is thought to be the most important factor for preservation and manifestation of the national and cultural mentality. In this paper we investigate the *glutton* (gastronomic) picture of the world, which is, in a wide linguistic and cultural, social and philosophical aspect, a multi-level construct reflecting the views of different ethnic groups. The *glutton* picture of the world can be attributed to as part of the cultural picture of the world. At the same time there is a particular connection with the language picture of the world. The research pays special attention to the cultural differences that influence gastronomic nomination. "The

gastronomic picture of the world” means "the conceptual model of gastronomic preferences", which influences the names of food products (Yermakova, 2011).

The gastronomic nomination, using the set of means existing in the language, is considered to express the spirit of the people, is a reflection of the identity of the nation and has the ability to influence the formation and development of ethnic culture as a whole. The gastronomic language picture of the world is a set of certain components, which include a taste sense, glutton ideas, gastronomic concepts. Verbalizing with the help of language means (discourse), these components form a complex structural and semantic entity. The gastronomic language picture of the world is formed as a result of the evaluation activity of the human consciousness in the process of cognitive comprehension of the reality.

Gastronomic objects and their linguistic representatives in the language picture of the world correlate primarily at the level of the nominative vocabulary of national languages. It is the specificity of the glutton nomination that makes up the wealth of linguistic means typical for every nation, in which the spirit of the nation is reproduced.

This phenomenon can be clearly seen, for example, at the level of motivated pragmatonyms, denoting products of consumption important for national cultures: Russian, chocolate “Chime”, “Russia-Troika”, “A Happy Easter”, vodka “Hope you enjoyed your bath!!”, «Let’s Start! »; English, Poular de Edouard VII chicken, Earl Grey tea, Yorkshire Pudding, Chinese, General Tso chicken.

The “Russian cuisine” concept is as wide as the country itself. The names and the ingredients of dishes, taste preferences differ quite significantly depending on the region. Whenever people move, very soon they introduce their traditions in local cooking and get acquainted with the cookery practice of the region, implement and adapt it to their own ideas about healthy and tasty food. Thus, over time in the vast territory of the country people developed their own food preferences.

Traditional Russian dishes do not need exotic ingredients and special knowledge; however long experience is needed to cook them. Through centuries the major ingredients have been turnip and cabbage, fruits and berries of every sort and kind, radish and cucumber, fish and meat, such cereals as oats, rye, scarlet grosbeak, wheat and millet. The Russians learnt about fresh dough from Scythians and Greeks. China introduced tea to the Russians, and Bulgaria told them how to cook peppers, vegetable marrows and eggplants. A lot of interesting Russian dishes were adopted from the European cuisine of the XVI-XVIII centuries, this list includes smoked foods, salads, ice-cream, liqueur, chocolate and wine. Pancakes, borshch, Siberian pelmeni, okroshka, Guryev porridge, Tula gingerbread, the Don fish have long been a kind of culinary brands of the state.

English cooking preferences are connected with the history of national culture, too. The concept "food" is not often come across in the legends and myths of Albion. Most often there described meals on the tables of the knights of the Round table. They are mainly dishes made of meat of wild animals. Traditionally Englishmen are considered to be “meat-eaters”. There is a legend that in England fried beef was granted the official status “Aristocrats’ food”, and in the XVII century bull gammon was knighted. In the XXI century the conservative English cuisine remained true to its traditions. Meat is still very respected at any feast, and, first of all, they are roast beef and beefsteak (Oshchepkova, 2006).

In the minds of the Chinese people food and spiritual culture are interrelated concepts. This phenomenon is reproduced in the language, where there is the concept “cookery culture” formed by the confluence of two words “food” and “spiritual culture”. In addition, the expression "food is the God of the people" (Bol’shoi kitaysko-russkiy slovar’), i.e. "the people consider food as their heaven", conveys the idea of Chinese people about food

in the best way. It emphasizes the primacy of nutrition in human life, not only in terms of the life support of the organism, but also in terms of enriching the culture of the people with the phenomenon of national cuisine and related traditions.

The history of Chinese civilization and their national cuisine has more than 5,000 years. The ancient written treatise “Shutszin” contains a well-known phrase “ruo4 zuo4 he2 geng1, wei2 er3 yan2 mei2” which can be interpreted as follows: “If you make seasoned soup, than only salty and sour” (Bol’shoi kitaysko-russkiy slovar’). This expression has two meanings. The first one, which can be understood easily, dates back to the Chinese tradition of using table salt and sour plum fruit as the main seasonings to cook a dish of excellent taste. Thus, they emphasize harmony and balance which are the key philosophical and aesthetic values of the Chinese culture. The second meaning, a deeper one, is a delicate metaphor for the governance of the country, symbolizing the fruitful unification of a variety of skills and talents.

The Chinese language is rich with metaphors that include cookery terms. The names of many national dishes are very poetic and figurative, for example, “ants climbing a tree”, “lion’s head”. Besides, there are a lot of dishes which names include proper nouns – as a sign of people's respect and love for the cook who invented the dish, or for the place where the dish was firstly cooked (Fatkullina, 2014).

Let’s analyze the anthroponyms used in the glutton nomination, which can be divided into the following groups:

1. Dishes and food which names contain toponyms: the names of cities, towns, regions, districts, etc.:

Tula gingerbread, Guryev porridge, Siberian pelmeni, beef bourguignon, chicken Kiev, Scotch eggs, Lianozovo milk, Vologda butter, Poltava sausages, Peking duck, fried rice Cantonese, sub fried rice from Yangzhou style, Yangshuo beer fish, fried fish Sihua (this name contains the name of Sihua lake which is located in Hangzhou, province Zhejiang), fried chicken Dōngānzǐjī (the name is the name of distrito Dōngānzǐjī, Yongzhou city, province Hunan. The legend says that it is the place where three elderly women started a small restaurant and were first to make this dish, which became popular in many Chinese provinces). Cocktails and drinks: Hiroshima, Manhattan, Cuba Liber, Australian gold, Welcome to Miami. Vodkas: “Moscow”, “Belebey”, “Gzhelka”, “Tomichka” and others.

2. Nominal pragmatonyms (dishes named after men, who were statesmen, writers or diplomats and invented new dishes):

beef stroganoff, rakhmanov shchi, peter’s and ekaterina’s kvass, garnish kanning, crazy and consomme nelson, pudding cowley, soup john bull, soup of charles V, mutton chops pompadour, salad olivier, pies napoleon and pies talleyrand, chickens richelieu, pavlov’s dessert, stalin’s chops, dongpo pork, steamed pork with spices and vegetables (the name of this dish contains the name of Tszo Tszuntan, a Chinese military and political figure of the Qing dynasty. This dish was invented in 1950s by Pan Canhui, a Hunan cook, who was forced to emigrate to the United States), vodka “Putinka”, cocktails: Tom Collins, John Collins, Hemingwayspecial, Alexander, etc. (Hongjin, 2008).

However, nominal pragmatonyms should be differed from of historicism-pragmatonyms. Personal pragmatonyms are always written with a lowercase letter, which emphasizes the complete fusion of the name of the inventor with the concept of this dish. Whereas, "historical" dishes are always written with a capital letter, which emphasizes the fact that they are named exclusively in honor of this or that person in respect for them or for their glorification as a kind of monument of their era.

3. Pragmatonym-nominations created by using a word in a new function of the commercial nomination:

choc-ice “Victoriya”, pelmeni “Dar’ya”, biscuits “Anna”, chocolate “Alyonka”, Earl Grey tea.

All phenomena of the reality, especially pragmatonyms, are reflected in the language picture of the world (Fatkulina, 2011). The language is a mirror of the surrounding world, as it reflects the reality and creates its own picture of the world, specific and unique for every language and, accordingly, the nation. Reproducing the conceptual picture of the world, the pragmatism is secured in the phraseological fund of a language. Very often, the stereotypes only peculiar to one culture are fixed in the phraseological units with the names of national products and dishes. In the Russian language an example of this is lexeme “kasha” (porridge) symbolizing something incomprehensible, muddled or viscous:

who made kasha, let him/her eat it, it means “who made the mess, let him unravels it”.

The British associated fish with the food of the monks; meat was a usual dish mostly for rich people; the poor could only afford smoked herring. If a certain object or person was said to be neither the first, nor the second, nor the third, it meant that he was either insignificant and it was not even worth mentioning about him, or he was “at the wrong time, in the wrong place» (Sakaeva, et al, 2017).

Например: *neither fish, flesh nor fowl nor whatever is, neither fish nor fowl, neither fish, flesh, nor good red herring.*

A lot of Chinese dishes and their components have a symbolic meaning associated with historical figures, beliefs, events. For example: fish in the culinary culture of China is a symbol of good luck and prosperity; the word “yú”, i.e. “fish”, is pronounced in the same way like “plenty”, “abundance” (Simvolicheskoye znachenie kitayskoy kuhni). Hence, the fish served to the table symbolizes good luck, a wish for success and prosperity.

5. Conclusion

Thus, we can say that glutton discourse has both universal and ethnic and cultural characteristics. Universal names should include the equivalents available in a variety of languages and corresponding to identical recipe, such as “scrambled eggs” (English, omleite; Portuguese, omelet; French, omelette; Turkish, Omlet, etc.). However, in terms of nomination mechanisms, these names have national characteristics stipulated by the structure of national languages.

The analysis the theoretical material revealed that the linguistic identity of the person is an integral part of the structure of national consciousness and communication (Fatkulina, 2011). Food consumption acts as one of the types of communication activities. The integrative part of the communication of this type is the glutton discourse, in which the national character is located and demonstrated.

Ethnic and cultural pragmatonyms are motivated for the representatives of one nation, while for another linguistic culture they are often lacunar units: Russian, borshch, kvass; English, pudding; Chinese, fried rice, Peking duck.

The most typical for the Russian and English linguistic cultures object of gustative consumption is “porridge”, for the Chinese, it is rice. For Russian culture, porridge is a kind of calling card and an iconic food product. As a rule, the pragmatonym “porridge” is connected with folk customs: as a symbol of fertility, porridge was a must treat at a wedding feast. The English culture is also closely related to the referent “porridge”. The well-known “oatmeal” is one of the favourite English dishes.

In the course of the research it was revealed that in the linguistic cultures analyzed the perceptive feature

prevails in the nomination, and the emotional parameters prevail in the Russian and Chinese languages while the pragmatic ones dominate in the English language.

Acknowledgements

The study was supported by the Russian Foundation for Basic Research, projects 17-04-00193/OGH and 19-012-00430 A.

References

1. Abisheva V.T., al. (2014). *Sotsial'no-gumanitarniye problem sovremennosti* [Social and humanitarian problems of our time]. Saint Louis: Publishing House Science and Innovation Center.
2. Apresyan Yu.D. (1995). *Obraz cheloveka po dannym yazyka: popytka sistemnogo opisaniya* [The image of a man according to the language: an attempt of systematic description]. // *Voprosy yazukoznaniya*. (1). 37-67.
3. Arutyunova N.D. (1990). *Diskurs* [Discourse]. In *Lingvisticheskiy entsiklopedicheskiy slovar'*, pod red. V.N. Yartsevov. (pp.136-137). M.: Sovetskaya entsiklopediya.
4. Bol'shoy kitaysko-russkiy slovar' [Big Chinese-Russian dictionary]. [On-line] Available: <https://bkrs.info/slovo.php?ch=%E6%89%AC%E5%B7%9E%E7%82%92%E9%A5%AD> (October 28, 2018).
5. Burkova P.P. (2004). *Kulinarny retsept kak osoby tip teksta* [The recipe as a particular type of the text]. *Avtoreferat diss.... kand.filol.nauk*. Stavropol.
6. Fatkullina, F.G. (1997). *On the destructive lexicon of the Russian language*. In *Yazykovaya semantika i obra zmira: Tezisy mezhdunarodnoi nauchnoi konferentsii*. (pp.64-66). Kazan. Book 1.
7. Fatkullina F.G. (2002). *Kategoriya destruktivnosti v sovremennom russkom yazyke* [Category of destruction in the modern Russian language]. *Diss...dokt. filol.nauk*. Ufa.
8. Fatkullina F.G. (2011). *Otrazheniye etnicheskogo haraktera i kul'tury v kontseptsfere raznostrukturykh yazykov* [Reflection of the ethnic character and culture in the conceptual sphere of languages of different structures]. In *Russkiy yazyk v sovremennom mire: traditsii i innivatsii v prepodavanii russkogo yazyka kak inistrannogo i v perevode*. (702-707). M.: Vysshaya shkola perevoda.
9. Fatkullina F.G. (2014). *Toponimicheskaya leksika kak otrazheniye natsional'noy yazykovoy kartiny mira* [Toponymic vocabulary as a reflection of the national language picture of the world] // *European Social Science Journal*.3. Volume 1. 212-225.
10. Fatkullina F.G. (2015). *Prepodavanie russkogo yazyka v polietnicheskom regione: problem i perspektivy* [The Russian language teaching in a multiethnic region: problems and prospects]. In *Culture of the peoples of Bashkortostan in the context of the Eurasian civilization: history, present and prospects*. (pp. 343-347). Ufa: RITS BashGU.
11. Golovnikskaya N.P. (2008). *Lingvokul'turnye karakteristiki nemetskoyazychnogo gastronomicheskogo diskursa* [The linguistic and cultural characteristics of gastronomic discourse in the German language]. Volgograd: Niva.
12. Hongjin, Zhao (2008). *Rasskazy ob izvestnykh blyudah kitayskoy kuhny* [Stories about well-known dishes of the Chinese cuisine]. Beijing: Huaxia.
13. Humboldt, Wilhelm von (1984). *Izbrannye trudy po yazykoznaniiu* [Selected works on linguistics]. Moskva: Progress.
14. Khayrullina R., al. (2017). *Language Personality in the Bilingual Context of the National Linguistic World Pictures*. *Man in India*. 97(14). 17-26.
15. Morozkina E., al. (2016). *Terminological Multifaceted Educational Dictionary of Active Type as a Possible*

- Way of Special Discourse Presentation // International Journal of Environmental and Science Education». Den Haag the Netherland. LOOK Academic Publisher. Volume 11. No 17. 10081-10089.
16. Olyanich A.V. (2004). Prezentatsionnaya teoriya diskursa [The presentation theory of discourse]. Volgograd: Aradigma.
 17. Oshchepkova V.V. (2006). Yazyk i kul'tura Velikobritanii, SSHA, Kanady, Avstralii, Novoy Zelandii [The language and the culture of Great Britain, the USA, Canada, Australia, New Zealand]. M.: SPb.: GLOSSA; KARO.
 18. Sakaeva, L., al. (2017). The history of studying of phraseological units in English, Russian and Kumyk. [On-line] Available: <http://revistas.proeditio.com/iush/quid/article/view/1845/1842>. (January 19, 2019).
 19. Simvolicheskoye znachenie kitayskoy kuhni [Symbolic meanings of the Chinese cuisine]. [On-line] Available: <http://ru.gbtimes.com/zhizn/simvolicheskoe-znachenie-kitayskoy-kuhni> (January 19, 2019).
 20. Vorobyov, al. (2014). Otrazsheniye natsional'noy yazykovoy kartiny mira v realiyah Bashkortostana [Reflection of the national linguistic picture of the world in the realities of Bashkortostan]. Ufa: RITs BashGU.
 21. Weisgerber L. (2004). Rodnoy yazyk i formirovaniye duha [The mother tongue and the formation of the spirit]. Moskva. Yeditorial URSS.
 22. Yermakova L.R. (2011). Glyuttonicheskaya nominatsiya v etnokul'turnom aspekte [The glutton nomination in the ethnic and cultural aspect]. [On-line] Available:
23. http://www.rusnauka.com/28_PRNT_2011/Philologia/9_94631.doc.htm (January 14, 2019).
 24. Zemskova A.Yu. (2009). Lingvosemioticheskiye harakteristiki angloyazychnogo gastronomicheskogo diskursa [The linguistic and semiotic characteristics of Anglophone gastronomic discourse]. Avtoreferat diss.... kand.filol.nauk. Volgograd.