Maja Stergar

A Taste of Slovene Culinary Masterpieces with a Pinch of Contrastive Analysis

Summary

This paper examines what can be done in the field of food-related terminology (from ingredients to culture-specific dishes) by using contrastive functional analysis as the research methodology. Each language offers different semantic contents to refer to the same referents. The background for the lexico-semantic analysis is investigated and meanings are brought together by studying examples in detail and establishing their functional equivalence.

Key words: contrastive lexicology

Slovenske kuharske mojstrovine s ščepcem protistavne analize

Povzetek

V članku so predstavljene možnosti za raziskovanje terminologije s področja gastronomije (od sestavin do značilnih slovenskih jedi), in sicer z uporabo funkcijskega modela protistavne analize kot raziskovalne metodologije. V vsakem jeziku se uporabljajo različne semantične vsebine za poimenovanje istih nanosnikov. Predmet preučevanja je ozadje leksikalno-semantične analize, pomeni pa so zbrani na podlagi podrobne analize primerov, pri čemer je cilj vzpostavitev funkcijske ustreznosti.

Ključne beside: kontrastivna leksikologija

A Taste of Slovene Culinary Masterpieces with a Pinch of Contrastive Analysis

1. Introduction

Contrastive linguistics is the systematic comparison of two or more languages. Its aim is to describe similarities and differences between languages. The objective of the comparison may vary, as language comparison is of great interest from a theoretical as well as an applied perspective. It helps us to uncover what is general and what is language-specific, what is important for the understanding of language in general, and what for the study of the individual languages in question.

Contrastive functional analysis represents one general approach to contrastive analysis. For its staring point it takes "perceived similarities of meaning across two or more languages, and seeks to determine the various ways in which these similar or shared meanings are expressed in different languages" (Chesterman 1998, 1). It is based on the model of language and grammar developed by M. A. K. Halliday (2004) and his followers within the functional paradigm.

Contrastive lexicology is the contrastive study of two or more languages. By adopting a contrastive approach one looks for similarities and differences. "Between the lexical items of two languages, specifically Slovenian and English, the basis for interlingual comparison (the so-called tertium comparationis) being for the most part meaning, and very occasionally form. The very notion of false friends, interlingual lexical and referential gaps, divergent polysemy, to mention a few notables only, go some way toward suggesting the range of contrastive lexical problems – moreover these topics do not even exist without the presence of at least two different languages" (Gabrovšek 2005, 64).

2. The Translation Process

For a Slovene translator who has to deal with culinary terms, especially those that are culture-bound or language-specific, contrastive orientation means the focus on two specific languages (in this case Slovene and English). The translation process itself is extremely complex; the situation is intercultural and interlingual, the purpose of the translation has to be kept in mind at all times, as well as the function of both texts (the source language text and the target language text).

Translation is the interpretation of the meaning of a text and the subsequent production of an equivalent text. Its goal is to communicate the same message in another language. Translation equivalence, "the relationship between words and phrases (from two or more languages) which share the same meaning," (Stergar 2007, 10) may be simple, complex, or nonexistent. Simple or clear (some authors call it "full") translational equivalence, very common when dealing with culinary terms, is easiest to establish (e.g. apple – *jabolko*, bay leaf – *lovorov list*, butter – *maslo*). Quite often we face only partial equivalence, which is lexically complex – the type

of correspondence in terms of structural/lexical non-congruence (e.g. cottage cheese – *skuta*, (pickled) gherkin – *kisla kumarica*, Parma ham – *pršut*), or zero (nonexistent) equivalence. When faced with zero equivalence we have to provide a descriptive translation (e.g. coleslaw – *zeljna solata s korenjem in majonezo*, *štruklji* – a rolled-up and filled dough usually boiled, *ocvirki* – fragments of streaky bacon fried until very crisp).

Lack of word-for-word translation equivalence is one of the most common challenges when translating a culinary text (e.g. cook gently – *kuhati na zmernem ognju*, work top – *delovna površina*, spare rib – *hrustančno rebro*, extractor fan – *kuhinjska napa*, chopping board – *kuhinjska deska*). Some general meanings are also expressed differently in different languages. When it comes to idioms and proverbs, translators often struggle to find corresponding figurative combinations (e.g. eat like a horse – *jesti kot volk*, hunger is the best sauce – *lakota je najboljši kuhar*, the way to a man's heart is through his stomach – *ljubezen gre skozi želodec*).

The concept of equivalence has been understood and analysed in the two related disciplines of translation theory and contrastive analysis. The contrastive functional approach advocated in Chesterman's *Contrastive Functional Analysis* (1998) is closely related to issues of translation. The term "translation equivalence" or the concept behind it has somewhat independently evolved in the field of translation theory. In its beginnings translation has been thought of in much the same way as metaphor is thought of, i.e. a target text is a metaphor of its source text. Both a metaphor and a translation build upon a perceived similarity between two entities (cf. Chesterman 1998).

3. Contrastive Functional Analysis

"Language is as it is because of what it is used for. To subscribe to this statement is to take a functional view of language" (Chesterman 1998, 63).

Chesterman's work discusses and illustrates one general approach to Contrastive Analysis – "an approach designated as 'functional', in the sense that it is based on meaning and mirrors the process of semiosis: it looks at the ways meanings are expressed. The focus is therefore from meaning to form. More particularly, it starts from perceived similarities of meaning across two or more languages, and seeks to determine the various means by which these similar or shared meanings are expressed in different languages. Additionally, it aims to specify the conditions (syntactic, semantic, pragmatic etc.) which govern the use of the different variants, and ultimately to state which variant is preferred under which conditions. The approach is thus a paradigmatic one, with a Hallidayan-type focus on the options that speakers have in expressing meanings. It is in fact a kind of cross-linguistic variation analysis" *http://www.helsinki.fi/~chesterm/ 1998bCFA.html*).

Under what kind of circumstances is something considered functional? A tool (e.g. a pizza cutting wheel) is functional if it can do what it is supposed to do. Fillmore (1984, 122–3) goes so far as to refer to grammar as a "tool factory" and further describes pragmatics as how workmen use these tools; semantics is seen as "the knowledge of the purposes for which the individual tools were

constructed," text as "a record of the tools used in carrying out an activity," and understanding as "figuring out, from the list of tools, just what that activity was."

Halliday argues that the form of language is determined by three functional components which reflect certain general uses of language. These are "the ideational function (to express content, to talk/write about something), the interpersonal function (to establish social relations, to talk/write to someone), and the textual function (to organize the form of the talk or text itself). The textual function is subservient to the other two, in that the form of a message needs to be organized in such a way as to be optimally appropriate to what is being talked/written about, and also to the overall communicative situation centred around the participants themselves" (Chesterman 1998, 64).

Language, in any linguistic form (whether it be written marks, sounds, gestures, etc.), has meaning potential, and to use language is to mean; the means of language is its form, and the end of language is to express or communicate the meaning.

According to Chesterman (1998), contrastive functional analysis seeks ultimately to do three things: provide a theoretical model of semantic structure in general; provide a description of the primarily syntactic forms of expression of particular semantic structures in two or more languages; and provide a description of the conditions of use determining the differential distribution of the various forms of expression of a given semantic structure, in the languages concerned. The general aim is to construct a single, coherent theoretical framework for a wide range of different types of contrastive studies. The following model of semantic structure is taken from Chesterman (1998, 72–3). Suggested stages for a contrastive methodology are:
1. Primary data: instances of language behaviour in different languages.
2. Comparability criterion: a perceived similarity (of any kind), between a phenomenon X in language A and a phenomenon Y in language B.
3. Problem: what is the nature of this similarity?
4. Initial hypothesis: that X and Y are identical.
5. Test: on what grounds can the initial hypothesis be supported or rejected? On what conditions (if ever) does it hold?
6. Revisited hypothesis (in case the identity hypothesis fails): the relation between X and Y is such-and-such; or, the use of X and Y depends on such-and-such conditions.
7. Testing the revisited hypothesis.

This kind of model serves as a conceptual toolbox that is of use particularly in the testing stages, it can also provide ways of formulating hypotheses and specifying conditions, and it provides an interpretation of the similarity constraint. This serves to define the range of phenomena whose similarity is such that a contrastive analysis is warranted.

Note: The first stage – primary data: instances of language behaviour in different languages – suggests a multilingual comparison; but the second stage – comparability criterion: a perceived similarity (of any kind), between a phenomenon X in language A and a phenomenon Y in language B – reverts to a bilingual scenario.

4. Empirical Part

The Chamber of Agriculture and Forestry of Slovenia works hard to preserve the culinary heritage of the Slovene countryside. Through various projects they present characteristic, sometimes almost forgotten, Slovene dishes which help us understand the eating habits of people and dishes typical of individual regions. They reflect the times, the living conditions, and are an important part of Slovene cultural heritage. As a main course I offer an analysis of examples taken from an article about Slovene culinary masterpieces (*Tako dobro, tako slovensko*) and its translation into English (So Good, so Slovene). Stages for a contrastive methodology suggested by Chesterman are used to explore examples from both texts on the lexical level.

5. Translation of Culinary Terms

The translation process itself, when dealing with culinary terms, is extremely complex; the situation is intercultural and interlingual, and the purpose of the translation has to be kept in mind at all times as well as the function of both texts.

Cookery books can be found in almost every household. They include information on cooking, and a list of recipes. When translating a recipe one faces various challenges such as food substitutions, food equivalents, conversions of weights and measures, and of course finding the right translation equivalents.

The following example shows how traditional Slovene recipes are translated into English.
The metric system does not cause any problems (as we do not need to convert decilitres into pints, cups or gallons) because the intended target group for the English translation of culinary terms is not necessarily native speakers of English but cooking enthusiasts (linguists and contrastivists included) from all over the world. In international cookery books, grams are used predominantly, but in Slovene cookery books, decagrams are still very popular. From the lexical point of view, a translation equivalent has to be found for each translation unit separately (e.g. *ostra moka* – strong flour, *kvas* – yeast, *lopar* – baking peel). All the ingredients for Cottage Cheese and Sour Cream Topped Bread (*Kvasenica*) are widely known, so no food substitutions are necessary.

Kvasenica

Sestavine:
Testo:
50 dag ostre moke,
3 dag kvasa,
1 žlička sladkorja,
¼ l mleka,
malo masti ali nekaj žlic kisle smetane,
sol.
Nadev:
50 dag skute,
3 dl kisle smetane,
1 jajce,
sol,
sladkor po želji.

Postopek priprave:
Iz sestavin za testo pripravimo kvašeno testo; ko je vzhajano, ga razvaljamo na loparju in namažemo z nadevom 2 cm od roba testa, da sestavine ne odtekajo na rob. Po vrhu premažemo s kislo smetano, ki ji dodamo žličko moke. Kvasenico pečemo v krušni peči ali električni pečici. Ponudimo še vročo.

Cottage Cheese and Sour Cream Pastry (*Kvasenica*)
Ingredients:
For the yeast dough:
500 g strong flour,
30 g fresh yeast,
1 tsp sugar,
250 ml milk,
a little fat or a few tbsp of sour cream
salt.
For the filling:
500 g cottage cheese,
300 ml sour cream,
1 egg,
salt,
sugar (optional).

Preparation method:
Knead yeast dough and let it rest. When the dough rises, roll it on a baking peel. Spread the filling over the dough, leaving a 2 cm border on all sides. Top with the cream (mix a teaspoon of flour in it). If possible, bake in a stone oven. Serve warm.

Most traditional Slovene dishes have very old names (often in dialect) that tell us very little about the dish itself. Even native speakers of Slovene often need an explanation when looking at a menu because some words are written in dialect (e.g. *makov retaš* (dialect) – *makov zavitek* (standard Slovene) – poppy seed strudel). Zero translation equivalence is very common, thus descriptive translations are needed.

e.g. *bujta repa* – turnip kasha with pork
   bograč – beef, pork, and venison stew
   gorenjska prata – pork roasted in a caul

In English translations, Slovene names of the dishes should be written in brackets to make it easier for the reader to find more information about the dish if ever required, as English translations may vary from translator to translator.

e.g. Cottage Cheese and Sour Cream Topped Bread (*Kvasenica*)
   Cottage Cheese and Sour Cream *Potica* (*Ognjiščna potica*)
   Potica with *Mlinci* (*Mlinčeva potica* or *Mlinčevka*)
   Dough Pockets with Pear Filling (*Kvočevi/Kločevi nudlni*)

It is recommended that every English translation of Slovene dishes, whether in the form of a cookery book or a recipe collection, also include a glossary in which the dishes/ingredients that remain in the source language be explained. Bilingual menus are often a problem as items remain untranslated and unexplained. A glossary would take up too much space and the reader would waste time looking for explanations. One possible solution is a short explanation in brackets that follows the untranslated italicized term (e.g. *štruklji* (a rolled-up and filled dough, usually boiled), *žlikrofi* (a type of filled pasta)).

e.g.   *Mlinci* – unleavened dough made of wheat, buckwheat, or corn flour; rolled thinly and cooked directly on a hot plate
   Ocvirki – fragments of streaky bacon fried until very crisp
   Potica – traditional Slovene cake or enriched bread, mostly enjoyed during festivities; made in a number of different ways, all of which include leavened dough and a filling
   Štruklji – a rolled-up and filled dough, usually boiled
   Zaseka – dripping made from fat bacon; minced or finely chopped and then seasoned
   Žganci – crumbled mush, obtained by cooking buckwheat, wheat, barley, or corn flour in water
   Žlikrofi – a type of filled pasta

For such terms the use of italics is recommended to show the foreign origin of the word. When a word or phrase has become so widely used and understood that it has become part of the English language – such as the Italian "pasta" or "pizza" – we would not italicize it. Italicization is often a matter of individual judgment and of context (it depends largely on the audience and the subject matter).

e.g.   Serve the dish with *mlinci*.
   We season the dish with *ocvirki* and fat.
   There should be eight layers in a *gibanica*.

Culinary terms are not represented well enough in general Slovene-English dictionaries for a translator to use them when working with a text about contemporary gastronomy. Ingredients can be found as long as they are not too "new", but names of dishes, sauces, exotic herbs, etc. and more complex cooking techniques are almost nonexistent. I do not consider that a defect, as general dictionaries are meant to provide a description of language in general use. On the other hand "specialised dictionaries (also referred to as technical dictionaries) focus on linguistic and factual matters relating to specific subject fields. A specialised dictionary may have a relatively broad coverage, e.g. a picture dictionary, in that it covers several subject fields such as science and technology (a multi-field dictionary), or their coverage may be narrower, in that they cover one particular subject field such as law (a single-field dictionary) or even a specific sub-field such as contract law (a sub-field dictionary)" (Stergar 2007, 9). Unfortunately there are no specialised culinary bilingual dictionaries (Slovene-English, English-Slovene) available. Translators of culinary texts have to use general Slovene-English dictionaries (which can, especially the older editions, prove very useful), existing cookery books, surf the Internet, etc. A recently published

booklet *1000 najpomembnejših besed: Angleščina – Hrana in pijača* (*Die 1000 wichtigsten Wörter Englisch Essen & Trinken*) has many useful entries, but unfortunately the adaptation for the Slovene market was not done adequately, and most of the terminology specific to the Slovene culture is missing. Entries such as *zavitek*, *gibanica*, *potica,* etc are not to be found.

Using Suggested Stages for a Contrastive Methodology on a Lexical Level

This part of the paper provides a few samples of contrastive analyses which illustrate the basic methodology (Chesterman's model) of contrastive functional analyses on a lexical level. In each of the contrastive analyses I attempt to show differences and similarities between Slovene and English found within a particular paradigm.

The first example deals with a simple object which we use on a daily basis. What is the background for the lexico-semantic difference? How can the meanings of the two terms be brought together?

e.g. cutting/chopping board – *kuhinjska deska*

    1. Primary data: instances of language behaviour in different languages.

    Primary data are utterances, instances of language use. What is to be observed here is that users of Slovene use certain expressions, and speakers of English use other expressions.

    English: cutting/chopping board   Slovene: *kuhinjska deska*

    2. Comparability criterion: a perceived similarity (of any kind), between a phenomenon X in language A and a phenomenon Y in language B

    "This is a perception of similarity of some kind, in the first instance of form and sound, between language-A-speakers' use of their language and language-B-speakers' use of theirs" (Chesterman 1998, 55). These similarities reflect similarities on the level of language. And as Chesterman further claims "it is this perception, not some assumed equivalence, that provides the initial comparability criterion." This initial perception can be a trigger for interference in language learners.

    Negative interference could lead to an error: **rezalna deska* or **kitchen board*.

    Initial perception is often vague and one task of contrastive research is to clarify and specify it.

    3. Problem: what is the nature of this similarity?

    First we have to define the criteria by which phenomena are judged to be similar. In this case the lexical level is our only criterion for the similarity constraint.

    The terms cutting/chopping board and *kuhinjska deska* have to be similar as translation equivalence is automatically assumed to incorporate sameness of meaning.

    2. Initial hypothesis: that X and Y are identical.

    How can one bring the meanings of the two terms together?

    Compare the dictionary definitions to establish equivalence of the two meanings expressed in different ways (i.e. distinguish between the referent and the semantic content):

        • Noun 1. chopping board – a wooden board where meats or vegetables can be cut; Synonyms: cutting board (*http://www.webster-dictionary.org/definition/chopping%20board*)

        • kúhinjski -a -o prid. (ú) nanašajoč se na kuhinjo: ima veliko kuhinjskega dela / kuhinjski

odpadki; kuhinjsko okno gleda na dvorišče / kuhinjski element kos kuhinjskega pohištva, ki se lahko uporablja sam ali se kombinira z drugimi kosi; rezati s kuhinjskim nožem; **kuhinjska deska za rezanje, sekljanje hrane**; kuhinjska kredenca, miza; kuhinjska krpa; pomivati (kuhinjsko) posodo; (kuhinjska) sol; kuhinjska tehtnica / slabš. kuhinjska filozofija · ekspr. kuhinjski muc kdor (rad) pomaga v kuhinji in ima od tega koristi

● sekálnica -e ž (á) 1. prostor, obrat za sekanje: delati v sekalnici 2. stroj za sekanje: električna sekalnica za meso 3. **knjiž. kuhinjska deska: pospravila je z mize kruh in sekalnico** (*http:// bos.zrc-sazu.si/cgi/a03.exe?name=sskj_testa&expression=kuhinjska+deska&hs=1*)

The English semantic content is based on the action of cutting/chopping of the vegetables or meat, while the Slovene counterpart focuses on the kitchen (i.e. the area of the house in which this particular type of board is primarily used). The Slovene formal term *sekalnica* is functionally very close to cutting/chopping board as it stresses the chopping function performed on the board, but it is not used among native speakers of Slovene (0 hits in the FidaPlus corpus).

Cutting/chopping board and *kuhinjska deska* are identical.

5. Test: on what grounds can the initial hypothesis be supported or rejected? On what conditions (if ever) does it hold?

This stage may include many stages: "selection of a theoretical framework, selection or elicitation of primary and additional data, use of corpora (translated or otherwise relevantly matched), appeal to one's own intuition (one's own native-speaker, bilingual or translational competence), use of bilingual informants, and so on" (Chesterman 1998, 58).

The testing hypothesis is not a complex one in our case. Consulting a dictionary or relying on our own translation competence gives us evidence in favour of the initial hypothesis.

The second example explores a verb 'to fillet' (Slovene *filirati*).

e.g.   to fillet – *filirati* (*ločiti meso od kosti*)

1. Primary data: instances of language behaviour in different languages.

What is to be observed in this case is that users of Slovene use certain forms, and speakers of English use other forms.

　　English: to fillet   Slovene: *filirati*

2. Comparability criterion: a perceived similarity (of any kind), between a phenomenon X in language A and a phenomenon Y in language B

As words are very similar in both languages interference can only be seen as positive in this case.

3. Problem: what is the nature of this similarity?

The lexical level is our only criterion for the similarity constraint.

The terms to fillet and *filirati* have to be similar as translation equivalence is automatically assumed to incorporate sameness of meaning. They both mean "to separate the flesh from the bone".

3.   Initial hypothesis: that X and Y are identical.

　　● to fillet verb (used with object) Cookery.

　a to cut or prepare (meat or fish) as a fillet.

　 b to cut fillets from. (*http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/fillet*)

- filírati -am nedov. in dov. (í) gastr. po dolgem razpolavljati ribe in odstranjevati hrbtenico: filirati ribe za konzerviranje ♪ (*http://bos.zrc-sazu.si/cgi/a03.exe?name=sskj_testa& expression=filirati&hs=1*)

The terms to fillet and *filirati* are identical. Reliable linguistic sources, such as *SSKJ* (Slovene monolingual dictionary), *Slovenski pravopis* (manual of style), and *Veliki slovar tujk* (dictionary of foreign words) only mentions the verb in connection with fish (i.e. cutting in half and deboning of fish), but Slovene culinary articles, cookery books, and corpora (e.g. FidaPlus) show that the use of verb *filirati* is used for both meat and fish. The meanings of the two terms can be brought together without difficulty.

5. Test: on what grounds can the initial hypothesis be supported or rejected? On what conditions (if ever) does it hold?

The hypothesis testing is again not complex. Consulting a dictionary or relying on our own translation competence, gives us evidence in favour of the initial hypothesis.

The following is an example that also deals with a simple culinary concept we use on a daily basis. It is widely understood but very often translated incorrectly. Yet again, each language offers different ways (i.e. different semantic content) to refer to the same referent. What is the background for the lexico-semantic difference? How can the meanings of the two terms be brought together?

e.g. t o cook gently – *kuhati na zmernem ognju*

1. Primary data: instances of language behaviour in different languages.

What is to be observed in this case is that users of Slovene use certain forms, and speakers of English use other forms.

English: to cook gently   Slovene: *kuhati na zmernem ognju*

2. Comparability criterion: a perceived similarity (of any kind), between a phenomenon X in language A and a phenomenon Y in language B

Negative interference could lead to an error: *kuhati nežno or *cook on moderate fire.

3. Problem: what is the nature of this similarity?

The lexical level is our only criterion for similarity constraint.

The terms to cook gently and *kuhati na zmernem ognju* have to be similar as translation equivalence is automatically assumed to incorporate sameness of meaning.

4. Initial hypothesis: that X and Y are identical.

The terms to cook gently and *kuhati na zmernem ognju* are indeed identical. The meanings of the two terms can be brought together without difficulty. They both mean "to cook something carefully, on a low heat".

5. Test: on what grounds can the initial hypothesis be supported or rejected? On what conditions (if ever) does it hold?

The hypothesis testing is again not complex. Consulting a dictionary, browsing through some cookery books, or relying on one's own translation competence, gives us evidence in favour of the initial hypothesis.

When faced with only partial equivalence, which is lexically complex – the type of correspondence in terms of structural/lexical non-congruence (e.g. cottage cheese – *skuta*, gherkin – *kisla kumarica*, Parma ham – *pršut*) – the analysis becomes more challenging.

e.g.   cottage cheese – *skuta*

1. Primary data: instances of language behaviour in different languages.

What is to be observed in this case is that users of Slovene use certain forms, and speakers of English use other forms.

English: cottage cheese   Slovene: *skuta*

2. Comparability criterion: a perceived similarity (of any kind), between a phenomenon X in language A and a phenomenon Y in language B

Negative interference could lead to an error: **kočarski/bajtarski sir* (cf. sirček, *SSKJ*, sense 1) but not to a descriptive translation of *skuta* in English (e.g. a dairy product resembling cottage cheese). As cottage cheese and *skuta* are so similar (from form, taste, colour, nutrition value, etc.) they can be considered translation equivalents.

3. Problem: what is the nature of this similarity?

The lexical level is our only criterion for similarity constraint.

The terms cottage cheese and *skuta* have to be similar as translation equivalence is automatically assumed to incorporate sameness of meaning. Even though they are not exactly the same (cottage cheese is slightly milder in taste) they perform exactly the same function in Slovene and English cuisine and can be easily substituted with one another.

5.   Initial hypothesis: that X and Y are identical.

  • skúta 1 -e ž (ú) 1. mehka snov, ki ostane po odstranitvi sirotke iz posnetega mleka: delati skuto; namazati palačinke s skuto / kisla skuta; sladka skuta dobljena iz sirotke 2. nar. kravje mleko prve dni po porodu; mlezivo: skuto je posesal teliček / skuhati, speči skuto ♪ (*http://bos.zrc-sazu.si/cgi/a03.exe?name=sskj_testa&expression=skuta&hs=1*)

  • cottage cheese – noun an extremely soft, or loose, white, mild-flavoured cheese made from skim-milk curds, usually without rennet.

    [Origin: 1840–50, Americanism]

    Regional variation note farmer cheese and farmer's cheese are widely used throughout the U.S. as terms for a kind of cottage cheese. This same kind of cheese, with varying curd size and sourness, is also called sour-milk cheese in Eastern New England; curd or curd cheese, chiefly in the North-eastern and Southern U.S.; pot cheese, chiefly in the Hudson Valley; smearcase, chiefly in the North Midland U.S., and sometimes cream cheese in the Gulf States. (http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/cottage%20cheese)

The terms cottage cheese and *skuta* are not identical but the meanings of the two terms can be brought together. They both mean a type of soft, loose, white mild-flavoured cheese. As we can see the term cottage cheese covers a wide variety of cottage cheeses, and at the same time acquires regional variety names such as curd cheese, or pot cheese.

5. Test: on what grounds can the initial hypothesis be supported or rejected? On what conditions (if ever) does it hold?

The hypothesis can be supported. This can be done by a dictionary, browsing through some cookery books, or relying on our own translation competence, which give us evidence in favour of the initial hypothesis.

6. Conclusion

Most culinary terms are simple objects we use on a daily basis or familiar simple concepts. Yet again, each culture (i.e. language) offers various ways (i.e. semantic contents) to refer to the same referents. "What is the background for the lexico-semantic difference?" and "How can the meanings of the two terms be brought together?" are the two questions I tried to answer in the empirical part of this article. Meanings are brought together by studying examples in detail and establishing the functional equivalence. Through simple day-to-day ingredients and regional dishes the equivalence is proven and the meanings of the two terms given are brought together. Through food (the examples studied in this article) we are given a proof that each culture/language uses various semantic contents to refer to the same referents, but this is not true of culture-specific lexical items and lexical gaps.

This paper provides insight into what can be done in the field of contrastive analysis with food-related terminology. The domain of culinary expressions viewed from a Slovene- English, English-Slovene contrastive perspective has a great potential for further explorations on the lexical level. Taking one or more steps above lexical level, also presents a future challenge for contrastive research. The use of the passive voice in English recipes, and the use of the active voice in Slovene should be further explored. It is also interesting to note that many Slovene authors assume a greater knowledge of cookery skills on the part of their readers than do their English counterparts.

Bibliography

Chesterman, A. 1988. *Contrastive Functional Analysis*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Fillmore, C.J. 1984. Remarks on Contrastive Pragmatics. In *Contrastive Linguistics: Aspects and Problems*, ed. J. Fisiak, 119-41. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Gabrovšek, D. 2005. *Words Galore – Aspects of General and Slovenian-English Contrastive Lexicology*. Ljubljana: Filozofska fakulteta.

Halliday, M.A.K. 2004. *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. London, New York, Sydney, Auckland: OUP.

Stergar, M. 2007. Bilingual glossary of drinks and drink-related terminology. BA dissertation. Ljubljana: Filozofska fakulteta.

Toporišič, J., et al., eds. 2001. *Slovenski pravopis*. Ljubljana: SAZU, ZRC SAZU.

Logar, T., ed. 2002. *Veliki slovar tujk*. Ljubljana: Cankarjeva založba.

Electronic sources

http://www.isfla.org/Systemics/ (accessed: 10/10/2008)

http://www.helsinki.fi/~chesterm/index.html (accessed: 10/10/2008)

http://bos.zrc-sazu.si/sskj.html (accessed: 30/10/2008)

http://www.webster-dictionary.org/definition/chopping%20board (accessed: 26/10/2008)

Dictionary.com. WordNet® 3.0. Princeton University.

Dictionary.com. Dictionary.com Unabridged (v 1.1). Random House, Inc. *http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/fillet* (accessed: 26/10/2008)

Dictionary.com. Dictionary.com Unabridged (v 1.1). Random House, Inc. *http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/cottage cheese* (accessed: 26/10/2008).

http://www.slovenia.info/?recepti=0&lng=2 (accessed: 3/10/2008)

http://www.fidaplus.net/ (accessed: 30/10/2008)