



RESEARCH ARTICLE

Section: *Literature, Linguistics & Criticism***Culinary language as cultural practice: An anthropological linguistic comparison of Indonesian and French food**Nurilam Harianja¹, Robert Sibarani^{1*}, Gustianingsih¹, Mahriyuni¹, Mulyadi¹ & Dwi Widayati¹¹Universitas Sumatera Utara, Indonesia*Correspondence: rs.sibarani@usu.ac.id**ABSTRACT**

This study examines culinary language in Indonesian and French culinary traditions as a reflection of cultural values, social norms, and ideological orientations through the analysis of food naming practices. This study departs from an anthropological linguistic perspective. This study used a qualitative method. The data were collected from restaurant menus, traditional culinary documentation, and official gastronomic sources in Indonesia and France. The findings reveal distinct ideological orientations reflected in culinary language across the two traditions. Indonesian culinary language tends to exhibit transparent and functional naming patterns that directly reference ingredients or cooking techniques, reflecting pragmatic cultural values, communal interaction, and social accessibility. In contrast, French culinary language demonstrates higher symbolic complexity and strong institutional connections through gastronomic heritage and territorial identity, particularly reinforced by regulatory systems such as Appellation d'Origine Contrôlée (AOC) and Indication Géographique Protégée (IGP). This study contributes to anthropological linguistics by conceptualizing culinary naming as an everyday symbolic practice through which cultural values, social identities, and ideological meanings are reproduced. By providing a comparative perspective on Indonesian and French culinary discourse, the research highlights culinary language as an important semiotic domain for understanding the intersection of language, culture, and social structure in a global context.

KEYWORDS: anthropological linguistics, culinary linguistics, cultural ideology, French gastronomy, Indonesian cuisine

Research Journal in Advanced Humanities

Volume 7, Issue 2, 2026

ISSN: 2708-5945 (Print)

ISSN: 2708-5953 (Online)

ARTICLE HISTORY

Submitted: 25 March 2026

Accepted: 07 May 2026

Published: 26 May 2026

HOW TO CITE

Harianja, N., Sibarani, R., Gustianingsih, Mahriyuni, Mulyadi, & Widayati, D. (2026). Culinary language as cultural practice: An anthropological linguistic comparison of Indonesian and French food. *Research Journal in Advanced Humanities*, 7(2). <https://doi.org/10.58256/m2zjw520>



Published in Nairobi, Kenya by Royallite Global, an imprint of Royallite Publishers Limited

© 2026 The Author(s). This is an open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Introduction

In anthropological linguistics, language is understood not merely as a neutral instrument of communication but as a cultural practice deeply embedded in social life. Language functions both as a medium for expressing meaning and as a mechanism through which social relationships, cultural values, and ideological orientations are produced and reproduced within communities (Sibarani et al., 2024, 2025). As Duranti (1997) emphasizes, language practices are inseparable from the cultural contexts in which they occur. Linguistic expressions reflect how societies conceptualize their social worlds and organize cultural knowledge.

Subsequent developments in linguistic anthropology have further emphasized that everyday language use constitutes an important arena for the reproduction of cultural ideology and social identity (Ahearn, 2017; Blommaert, 2020). Language practices occurring in daily interaction—such as storytelling, ritual discourse, and culinary naming—provide insight into how communities structure cultural knowledge and negotiate social meaning. These practices demonstrate that language does not simply describe cultural reality but actively participates in shaping it.

Among the numerous domains of language use, culinary language occupies a particularly significant position because food exists at the intersection of biological necessity, social interaction, and cultural identity. Food is not merely a source of nourishment; it is also a cultural practice through which communities express collective identity, reinforce social bonds, and transmit cultural knowledge across generations. Consequently, the language used to describe, categorize, and name food represents an important dimension of cultural communication systems (Counihan & Van Esterik, 2013).

Anthropological research has long recognized that food practices carry deep symbolic significance. Mintz & Du Bois (2002) argue that food serves as a powerful medium through which social relationships are expressed and cultural identities are negotiated. Food practices may reinforce social solidarity within communities while simultaneously marking social distinctions between groups. Through culinary traditions, societies encode cultural values, historical experiences, and symbolic meanings associated with food.

Within this broader cultural framework, culinary language functions as a semiotic system that connects sensory experiences with social meaning. From a semiotic perspective, food names are not merely labels used to identify dishes but signs that encode cultural knowledge and ideological orientations. Danesi (2018) explains that culinary discourse operates as a system of cultural signs linking taste experiences with symbolic meanings embedded within social contexts. Names such as *nasi goreng*, *soto ayam*, or *bouillabaisse* therefore represent more than culinary descriptions; they also evoke historical narratives, geographical identities, and cultural traditions associated with those dishes.

Language plays a central role in mediating these cultural meanings. The way food is named, described, and categorized reflects how societies conceptualize taste, value ingredients, structure culinary knowledge, and construct social meanings surrounding food practices. Culinary naming practices therefore reveal how communities interpret their culinary traditions and negotiate cultural identity through everyday language. Research in food discourse has increasingly highlighted the importance of language in shaping culinary meaning. Johnston & Baumann (2015) demonstrate that contemporary culinary discourse frequently constructs narratives of authenticity, tradition, and cultural distinction. Similarly, Riley & Cavanaugh (2017) show that language about food plays a crucial role in shaping how societies represent cultural heritage, identity, and social belonging. Through culinary language, food becomes not only a material object but also a symbolic resource through which cultural values are communicated.

Despite these insights, many previous studies continue to treat language and food as separate analytical domains. Anthropological research on food often focuses on consumption practices, food production systems, or culinary traditions, while linguistic studies tend to emphasize structural aspects of language without fully considering the cultural contexts in which language operates. As a result, relatively few studies explicitly examine culinary naming practices as anthropological linguistic phenomena that reveal the interplay between language, culture, and ideology (Paxson, 2009).

Another limitation in existing research concerns the lack of cross-cultural comparisons in culinary language studies. Culinary traditions develop within specific cultural frameworks that shape how food is linguistically represented and socially interpreted. However, comparative studies examining culinary naming practices across different cultural contexts remain limited, particularly between Southeast Asian and European

culinary traditions (Goody, 2013).

Such comparisons are important because culinary systems reflect broader cultural orientations. In many Western European contexts, culinary discourse is closely associated with institutionalized gastronomic traditions, geographic labeling systems, and the symbolic production of culinary prestige (Ferguson, 2014; Parasecoli, 2017). Gastronomic institutions often regulate food naming practices in order to preserve culinary heritage and reinforce territorial identity (Parasecoli, 2022).

In contrast, culinary traditions in many Southeast Asian societies tend to emphasize communal dining practices, accessibility of food, and the everyday transmission of culinary knowledge. Food naming practices in these contexts frequently prioritize descriptive clarity, functional transparency, and shared cultural understanding. This study addresses these gaps by examining culinary language in Indonesian and French culinary traditions from an anthropological linguistic perspective. Indonesia and France represent two culturally rich culinary traditions with distinct gastronomic orientations. Indonesian cuisine is characterized by its diversity of ingredients, regional culinary variations, and strong communal dining traditions. French gastronomy, on the other hand, is widely recognized as one of the most institutionalized culinary traditions in the world, with formal systems regulating the authenticity and geographical identity of food products.

In addition to its role in everyday communication, culinary language also reflects broader cultural systems through which societies construct meaning around food. Food naming practices frequently encode historical experiences, geographical identities, and cultural narratives associated with culinary traditions. In many societies, culinary names function as repositories of collective memory, linking present-day food practices with historical culinary knowledge (Agha, 2007). Through linguistic expressions referring to food, communities preserve cultural knowledge related to ingredients, cooking techniques, and symbolic meanings associated with particular dishes.

From an anthropological perspective, culinary naming practices represent a form of cultural categorization. Through naming, societies classify ingredients, cooking techniques, and flavor profiles into culturally meaningful categories. These classifications often reflect local ecological knowledge as well as cultural preferences regarding taste, texture, and food preparation. Culinary language therefore reveals how communities conceptualize their relationship with food resources and culinary traditions.

Recent developments in linguistic anthropology have also emphasized the importance of examining everyday discourse related to food. Cavanaugh & Riley (2023) argue that food discourse provides a particularly productive domain for anthropological linguistic research because it connects sensory experience with social meaning. Culinary language appears not only in conversations about cooking and eating but also in institutional contexts such as restaurant menus, culinary media, and gastronomic tourism. These contexts illustrate how culinary discourse participates in shaping cultural perceptions of food.

Furthermore, globalization has intensified scholarly interest in culinary language. As cuisines circulate across national and cultural boundaries, food names frequently undergo reinterpretation and adaptation. Culinary names may be translated, modified, or hybridized when dishes are introduced into new cultural contexts. These linguistic transformations illustrate how culinary language participates in broader processes of cultural exchange and identity negotiation within contemporary food cultures.

Against this background, comparative research on culinary language becomes particularly valuable. By examining how different societies linguistically represent food, researchers can better understand how cultural values shape culinary discourse. The comparison between Indonesian and French culinary traditions presented in this study therefore offers an opportunity to explore how linguistic practices surrounding food reflect broader cultural orientations toward culinary knowledge, social interaction, and gastronomic heritage.

By comparing food naming practices in these two cultural contexts, this study aims to explore how culinary language reflects and reproduces cultural values, social norms, and ideological orientations. The research investigates how everyday culinary naming practices function as symbolic cultural practices through which societies articulate identity, negotiate meaning, and maintain culinary traditions.

The central argument proposed in this article is that culinary naming constitutes an everyday symbolic practice embedded in social life. Through culinary language, societies not only describe food but also construct cultural narratives about identity, heritage, and social values. Examining culinary language therefore provides valuable insights into the broader relationships between language, culture, and society.

Literature Review

Language as Cultural Practice

Within the field of anthropological linguistics, language is understood not merely as a system of grammatical structures or lexical categories but as a cultural practice embedded in social interaction. Language operates as a medium through which cultural knowledge is transmitted, social identities are negotiated, and ideological meanings are reproduced. Duranti (1997) emphasizes that linguistic practices cannot be separated from the social and cultural contexts in which they occur. In this perspective, language use is not simply about conveying information; it also involves the enactment of cultural norms and the construction of shared meanings within communities.

Ahearn (2017) further explains that language functions as a social action that shapes how individuals understand their roles within society. Through linguistic interaction, individuals construct identities, negotiate relationships, and interpret cultural experiences. Language practices therefore serve as mechanisms through which cultural knowledge is maintained and transmitted across generations.

Anthropological linguistics also highlights the role of language ideologies in shaping linguistic practices. Language ideologies refer to the cultural beliefs and assumptions about language that influence how language is used, evaluated, and interpreted within particular communities (Kroskrity, 2010). These ideologies often reflect broader social structures such as power relations, social hierarchies, and cultural values.

Blommaert (2020) notes that everyday linguistic practices are central to the reproduction of social ideology. Ordinary language use—whether in conversations, rituals, or daily interactions—serves as an arena where cultural meanings and social norms are continually negotiated and reaffirmed. In this sense, linguistic practices reveal how communities organize cultural knowledge and interpret social experiences. From this perspective, culinary language represents an important domain of linguistic practice because it connects language use with everyday cultural activities (Riley & Paugh, 2018). The way food is described, categorized, and named reflects how societies conceptualize culinary knowledge and cultural identity. Culinary language therefore provides valuable insights into the cultural meanings embedded in everyday communication.

Culinary Naming as Semiotic Practice

Food naming practices represent a particularly important dimension of culinary language. Names assigned to dishes often encode complex cultural meanings that extend beyond simple descriptions of ingredients or preparation methods. From a semiotic perspective, culinary naming functions as a system of signs linking sensory experience with cultural meaning.

Danesi (2018) explains that food operates as a cultural semiotic system in which culinary objects, practices, and names function as symbolic signs. Food names therefore represent more than linguistic labels; they constitute cultural symbols that communicate shared knowledge and values within a community.

In many societies, culinary naming practices incorporate references to geography, history, or cultural identity. For example, dish names may include references to regional origins, historical figures, or traditional cooking techniques. Such naming practices connect culinary experiences with broader cultural narratives (Silverstein, 2003).

Bourdieu's concept of symbolic capital provides an additional framework for understanding culinary naming practices. According to Bourdieu (1984), cultural practices—including culinary traditions—can function as forms of symbolic capital that confer social prestige and cultural distinction. In certain contexts, culinary language may therefore reflect social hierarchies and cultural authority.

This phenomenon is particularly evident in gastronomic cultures where culinary traditions are closely associated with cultural heritage and institutional regulation. In such contexts, culinary names may serve to reinforce the authenticity and prestige of particular dishes or food products.

From an anthropological linguistic perspective, culinary naming practices therefore represent an intersection between language, culture, and ideology. Through everyday linguistic acts of naming and describing food, societies reproduce cultural values and social meanings associated with culinary traditions.

Understanding culinary language as a semiotic practice allows researchers to explore how linguistic expressions related to food reflect broader cultural orientations. By examining culinary naming practices across different cultural contexts, scholars can gain insight into how societies organize culinary knowledge and interpret gastronomic experiences.

Method

Research Design

This study employed a qualitative research design grounded in an anthropological linguistic approach. Qualitative methodology is particularly appropriate for this research because the objective of the study is not to measure linguistic phenomena statistically but to interpret the cultural meanings embedded in culinary language. Anthropological linguistics emphasizes the relationship between language practices and cultural contexts, making it suitable for analyzing how food naming practices reflect broader cultural values and ideological orientations.

In anthropological linguistic research, language is examined as a form of social action embedded in everyday cultural practices (Duranti, 1997). Culinary language represents one such domain of everyday communication in which linguistic expressions intersect with cultural practices related to food preparation, consumption, and social interaction. The present study therefore focuses on interpreting culinary naming practices as symbolic cultural practices rather than merely describing linguistic structures.

This interpretive orientation aligns with contemporary qualitative approaches in linguistic anthropology, which emphasize contextual analysis of language use within specific cultural environments (Ahearn, 2017). Through qualitative interpretation, the study seeks to uncover how culinary language reflects cultural meanings, social norms, and ideological values embedded in culinary traditions.

Data Sources

The primary data of this study consist of culinary names drawn from Indonesian and French culinary traditions. These culinary names were collected from several sources in order to capture a representative range of food naming practices across everyday culinary contexts and culturally significant dishes.

Three main categories of data sources were used in this research:

1. **Restaurant menus**, which provide examples of contemporary culinary naming practices used in everyday gastronomic settings. Menus reflect how culinary language functions in public communication between restaurants and consumers.
2. **Traditional culinary documentation**, including cookbooks, culinary archives, and cultural publications describing traditional dishes. These sources provide insight into historically established culinary names and their cultural meanings.
3. **Official gastronomic references**, including materials related to culinary heritage and gastronomic classification systems, particularly in the French context where culinary naming is sometimes regulated through institutional frameworks.

By combining these sources, the study aims to capture both everyday culinary naming practices and culturally institutionalized forms of culinary language.

Data Collection

The data were collected using purposive sampling. This sampling strategy allows the researcher to select culinary names that are particularly relevant for illustrating patterns of culinary naming within each cultural context.

The selection criteria for culinary names included:

1. Culinary dishes that are widely recognized within their respective culinary traditions.
2. Dish names that clearly represent typical naming structures used in each culture.
3. Culinary names that illustrate meaningful cultural references such as ingredients, cooking methods, geographic origins, or symbolic associations.

Examples of Indonesian culinary names include *nasi goreng*, *soto ayam*, *ikan bakar*, and *rendang*. These examples represent typical Indonesian naming practices that emphasize ingredients or cooking methods.

Examples of French culinary names include *coq au vin*, *bouillabaisse*, *ratatouille*, and *crème brûlée*. These names often include symbolic or regional references reflecting historical culinary traditions.

The use of purposive sampling ensures that the selected data provide meaningful insights into the cultural logic underlying culinary naming practices in both contexts.

Data Analysis

Data analysis was conducted using the interactive model of qualitative data analysis proposed by Miles et al. (2014). This model conceptualizes qualitative analysis as a cyclical and iterative process consisting of three interconnected stages: data condensation, data display, and conclusion drawing.

a. Data Condensation

In the first stage, culinary names were organized and categorized according to relevant analytical dimensions. These dimensions included:

- (a) linguistic structure of culinary names
- (b) references to ingredients or cooking techniques
- (c) symbolic or geographic associations
- (d) cultural meanings embedded in naming practices

This process allowed the researcher to identify recurring patterns in culinary naming practices across the two cultural contexts.

b. Data Display

The second stage involved organizing the data into comparative analytical tables and thematic categories. Data display enables the researcher to examine relationships between linguistic forms and cultural meanings more systematically.

Through this process, patterns of culinary naming in Indonesian and French traditions were compared in terms of their linguistic characteristics, symbolic references, and cultural functions.

c. Conclusion Drawing and Verification

The final stage involved interpreting the patterns identified during the analysis. Interpretive conclusions were developed by linking linguistic patterns with cultural contexts and theoretical frameworks discussed earlier in the study.

Throughout the analytical process, interpretations were continuously revisited and verified to ensure that conclusions remained grounded in the empirical data.

d. Validity and Trustworthiness

To ensure the credibility of the findings, this study employs several strategies commonly used in qualitative research.

First, data triangulation was applied by collecting culinary names from multiple sources, including restaurant menus, culinary documentation, and gastronomic references. This approach reduces the possibility that findings are based on a limited or biased dataset.

Second, theoretical triangulation was applied by interpreting the data through multiple theoretical perspectives, including anthropological linguistics, food studies, and cultural semiotics.

Third, iterative analysis was conducted throughout the research process. Data were repeatedly examined to ensure consistency between empirical observations and interpretive conclusions.

Through these procedures, the study aims to produce interpretations that are analytically rigorous while remaining sensitive to the cultural contexts in which culinary language is used.

Results and Discussion

Indonesian Culinary Language as Communal Cultural Practice

The analysis of Indonesian culinary naming practices reveals a strong tendency toward linguistic transparency and functional clarity. Culinary names in Indonesian cuisine often directly reference the primary ingredient, cooking technique, or dominant flavor of a dish. Examples such as *nasi goreng* (fried rice), *soto ayam* (chicken soup), *ikan bakar* (grilled fish), and *sayur asem* (sour vegetable soup) illustrate how culinary names frequently describe the essential characteristics of the food. These naming patterns provide immediate information about the composition or preparation of the dish, making culinary knowledge accessible to a broad audience.

From an anthropological linguistic perspective, such naming practices reflect cultural orientations emphasizing social accessibility and shared culinary knowledge. Transparent naming structures facilitate communication about food in everyday contexts and enable individuals from different social backgrounds to easily understand culinary terminology. The linguistic clarity found in Indonesian culinary naming practices therefore supports the transmission of culinary knowledge within communities.

Indonesian culinary language also reflects the communal nature of food practices in Indonesian society. In many Indonesian cultural contexts, food is closely associated with collective social interaction. Meals are frequently shared among family members, neighbors, and community members during everyday dining as well as during ceremonial occasions. Communal dining traditions such as *kenduri*, family gatherings, and social celebrations emphasize food as a medium for reinforcing social solidarity. Within this cultural framework, culinary naming practices function as mechanisms for facilitating collective participation in culinary traditions. When dish names clearly indicate ingredients or preparation methods, individuals can easily recognize and reproduce culinary knowledge in their own cooking practices. This linguistic transparency supports the continuity of culinary traditions by enabling knowledge to circulate widely within the community.

Anthropological research has long highlighted the importance of food in reinforcing social solidarity. Mintz & Du Bois (2002) argue that food often functions as a medium for expressing collective identity and social belonging. In communal societies, food practices frequently emphasize inclusivity and shared access to culinary resources. Indonesian culinary language reflects this orientation by prioritizing functional clarity and social accessibility.

Another characteristic of Indonesian culinary naming practices is the close relationship between language and everyday culinary experience. Rather than emphasizing symbolic or metaphorical associations, many Indonesian dish names focus on practical aspects of cooking and consumption. Names frequently describe cooking techniques such as *goreng* (fried), *bakar* (grilled), or *rebus* (boiled). These linguistic patterns demonstrate how culinary language is closely integrated with everyday culinary practices.

From the perspective of language ideology, such naming practices reveal cultural beliefs regarding the role of food in society. Indonesian culinary discourse tends to emphasize the practical and communal functions of food rather than its symbolic status as a marker of social distinction. Culinary language therefore reflects an ideology of inclusivity in which food is understood primarily as a shared cultural resource.

This ideological orientation contrasts with culinary systems in which food naming practices function as markers of prestige or exclusivity. In Indonesian culinary discourse, the emphasis on descriptive transparency suggests that culinary knowledge is meant to be widely shared rather than restricted to particular social groups. Culinary language thus reinforces the communal ethos underlying Indonesian food culture.

To further illustrate the characteristics of Indonesian culinary naming practices, several representative examples can be examined. These examples demonstrate how linguistic transparency functions in everyday culinary discourse.

Table 1. Examples of Indonesia Culinary Naming Patterns

<i>Dish Name</i>	<i>Literal Meaning</i>	<i>Linguistic Structure</i>	<i>Cultural Interpretation</i>
Nasi Goreng	Fried rice	Ingredient + cooking method	Emphasis on cooking technique
Soto Ayam	Chicken soup	Dish type + main ingredient	Functional description of ingredients
Ikan Bakar	Grilled fish	Ingredient + cooking method	Practical culinary terminology
Sayur Asem	Sour vegetable soup	Dish type + taste profile	Focus on flavor characteristics
Ayam Goreng	Fried chicken	Ingredient + cooking method	Everyday culinary naming

As shown in Table 1, Indonesian culinary naming practices emphasize descriptive clarity. Dish names typically contain direct references to ingredients or cooking techniques, allowing individuals to quickly understand the characteristics of a particular dish. Such linguistic transparency supports the communal circulation of culinary knowledge and facilitates the transmission of culinary traditions within society.

French Culinary Language as Symbolic and Institutional Practice

In contrast to the transparency observed in Indonesian culinary naming practices, French culinary language often exhibits greater symbolic complexity and institutional significance. Many French dish names incorporate

references to historical traditions, regional identities, or culinary techniques associated with specific gastronomic cultures.

Examples such as *coq au vin*, *bouillabaisse*, *ratatouille*, and *crème brûlée* illustrate how French culinary names frequently evoke cultural narratives beyond the basic description of ingredients. While these names may include references to cooking methods or ingredients, they often carry additional symbolic meanings linked to regional traditions or culinary heritage.

French gastronomy is widely recognized as one of the most institutionalized culinary systems in the world. Culinary traditions in France are closely associated with formal gastronomic institutions, professional culinary education, and regulatory frameworks designed to protect the authenticity of regional food products. Systems such as *Appellation d'Origine Contrôlée* (AOC) and *Indication Géographique Protégée* (IGP) regulate the use of culinary names in order to maintain the geographical and cultural identity of certain food products. French culinary naming practices often incorporate historical, geographical, and symbolic references that extend beyond basic descriptions of ingredients or cooking methods. These naming conventions reflect the strong cultural association between gastronomy, regional identity, and culinary heritage within French culture.

Table 2. Examples of French Culinary Naming Patterns

<i>Dish Name</i>	<i>Literal Meaning</i>	<i>Linguistic Structure</i>	<i>Cultural Interpretation</i>
Coq au Vin	Rooster cooked in wine	Ingredient + preparation method	Traditional rural culinary heritage
Bouillabaisse	Fish stew from Marseille	Regional culinary name	Strong geographic identity
Ratatouille	Vegetable stew	Traditional dish name	Regional Provençal cuisine
Crème Brûlée	Burnt cream dessert	Descriptive culinary term	Classical French dessert tradition
Soupe à l'Oignon	Onion soup	Ingredient-based name	Historical peasant cuisine

The examples presented in Table 2 illustrate how French culinary naming practices often combine descriptive terminology with cultural symbolism. Dish names frequently evoke regional identity, historical culinary traditions, or gastronomic heritage. Such naming patterns reinforce the cultural prestige associated with French cuisine and highlight the institutionalization of culinary traditions within French gastronomic culture.

These regulatory frameworks illustrate how culinary language in France functions as an institutional resource for preserving cultural heritage. By linking culinary names to specific geographical regions, these systems reinforce the symbolic relationship between food and territorial identity. Culinary language therefore becomes part of a broader cultural system that protects gastronomic traditions.

From the perspective of cultural semiotics, French culinary naming practices demonstrate how food language can function as a symbolic system communicating cultural prestige and historical continuity. Danesi (2018) notes that culinary discourse frequently serves as a medium through which cultural identities and social meanings are expressed. In the French context, culinary language often reflects narratives of tradition, craftsmanship, and gastronomic expertise.

Bourdieu's concept of symbolic capital provides additional insight into the social significance of French culinary language. According to Bourdieu (1984), cultural practices such as gastronomy can function as forms of symbolic capital that confer prestige and social distinction. Culinary knowledge and refined gastronomic language may therefore signal cultural competence and social status.

French culinary naming practices illustrate this phenomenon through their association with professional culinary culture and gastronomic prestige. Dish names often evoke historical traditions or regional authenticity, reinforcing the perception of French cuisine as a cultural heritage worthy of preservation. In this sense, culinary language functions not only as descriptive terminology but also as a symbolic marker of cultural authority.

Comparative Culinary Language Ideologies

A comparison of Indonesian and French culinary naming practices reveals contrasting linguistic and cultural orientations. While Indonesian culinary language emphasizes transparency and accessibility, French culinary discourse often highlights symbolic complexity and institutional legitimacy.

These differences can be interpreted through the concept of language ideology. Language ideologies reflect cultural beliefs about how language should be used and what social meanings linguistic practices convey (Kroskrity, 2010). Culinary language therefore reflects broader cultural ideologies regarding food, identity, and

social relations.

In the Indonesian context, culinary naming practices reflect an ideology of communal accessibility. Dish names are designed to facilitate understanding and participation in culinary traditions across different social groups. Culinary language therefore supports the collective transmission of culinary knowledge.

In contrast, French culinary discourse often reflects an ideology of gastronomic distinction. Culinary names may emphasize historical authenticity, regional heritage, or culinary expertise, reinforcing the symbolic prestige associated with French gastronomy.

The contrast between these two systems illustrates how culinary language can function as an indicator of broader cultural orientations toward food and social identity.

To synthesize the comparative findings of this study, the following table summarizes key differences in culinary naming practices between Indonesian and French culinary traditions.

Table 3. Comparative Culinary Language Ideologies

<i>Dimension</i>	<i>Indonesian Language</i>	<i>Culinary</i>	<i>French Culinary Language</i>
Naming transparency	Highly descriptive	Often symbolic	Naming transparency
Primary reference	Ingredients and cooking techniques	Heritage and regional identity	Primary reference
Cultural orientation	Communal accessibility	Gastronomic distinction	Cultural orientation
Institutional regulation	Informal culinary tradition	Strong institutional regulation (AOC/IGP)	Institutional regulation
Ideological orientation	Inclusivity and shared knowledge	Prestige and cultural authority	Ideological orientation

The comparison demonstrates that culinary naming practices reflect broader cultural ideologies regarding food. Indonesian culinary language prioritizes accessibility and practical communication, whereas French culinary discourse emphasizes cultural heritage and gastronomic prestige.

Culinary Language as Cultural Ideology

The findings of this study demonstrate that culinary language operates as a domain in which cultural ideologies are reproduced through everyday linguistic practices. Food naming practices reveal how societies conceptualize culinary traditions and negotiate social meanings associated with food.

In Indonesian culinary discourse, linguistic transparency reflects a cultural ideology emphasizing communal sharing and social inclusivity. Culinary knowledge is treated as a shared cultural resource rather than a marker of social distinction.

French culinary language, on the other hand, reflects a cultural ideology emphasizing gastronomic heritage and symbolic prestige. Institutional frameworks regulating culinary naming practices reinforce the cultural authority of French gastronomy and protect its historical traditions.

From an anthropological linguistic perspective, these findings highlight the importance of examining everyday language practices in order to understand broader cultural processes. Culinary language provides a valuable lens through which the relationships between language, culture, and ideology can be explored.

Novelty and Contribution

This study contributes to the field of anthropological linguistics by conceptualizing culinary language as a cultural practice embedded in everyday social interaction. Rather than treating culinary names merely as lexical labels describing food items, this research demonstrates that culinary naming practices function as symbolic cultural actions through which societies express cultural values, social norms, and ideological orientations.

The primary novelty of this study lies in its theoretical reconceptualization of culinary naming as a form of everyday symbolic practice. While previous research in food studies and linguistic anthropology has explored the cultural significance of food discourse, relatively few studies have examined culinary naming practices as

anthropological linguistic phenomena that directly reflect cultural ideologies. By situating culinary naming within the framework of language ideology and cultural semiotics, this study expands the analytical scope of anthropological linguistics into the domain of culinary discourse.

Empirically, this research offers an original comparative perspective on culinary language in Indonesian and French gastronomic traditions. The comparison reveals how distinct cultural orientations shape linguistic practices related to food. Indonesian culinary language reflects pragmatic and communal cultural values through transparent naming practices that emphasize ingredients and cooking techniques. In contrast, French culinary discourse demonstrates higher symbolic complexity and institutional significance, particularly through gastronomic heritage systems such as *Appellation d'Origine Contrôlée* (AOC) and *Indication Géographique Protégée* (IGP).

The comparative findings illustrate that culinary naming practices can reveal broader ideological differences between cultures. In Indonesian culinary traditions, food naming reflects an ideology of inclusivity and communal knowledge sharing. Culinary language facilitates collective participation in culinary practices and supports the transmission of culinary knowledge across social groups. Conversely, French culinary language reflects an ideology of gastronomic distinction and cultural heritage preservation. Culinary naming practices in this context reinforce symbolic capital associated with culinary expertise, territorial identity, and institutionalized gastronomy.

From a theoretical perspective, this study contributes to anthropological linguistics by demonstrating that culinary discourse constitutes an important semiotic domain through which cultural meanings are reproduced in everyday communication. Culinary language operates as a system of cultural signs linking sensory experience with social values and cultural identity. The analysis therefore highlights the importance of examining everyday linguistic practices in order to understand how cultural ideologies are embedded in language.

Methodologically, this research also demonstrates the relevance of qualitative anthropological linguistic approaches for studying language in cultural contexts. By combining linguistic analysis with cultural interpretation, the study reveals how seemingly simple linguistic practices such as food naming can encode complex cultural meanings. The qualitative interpretive approach employed in this research allows culinary language to be analyzed not merely as linguistic structure but as a cultural practice embedded within social interaction.

Overall, this study contributes to interdisciplinary scholarship at the intersection of linguistic anthropology, food studies, and cultural semiotics. By examining culinary naming practices across cultural contexts, the research provides new insights into how language, food, and culture interact in shaping social meaning and cultural identity.

Conclusion

This study has examined culinary language in Indonesian and French culinary traditions from an anthropological linguistic perspective. By analyzing food naming practices across these two cultural contexts, the research demonstrates that culinary language represents more than a descriptive system for identifying dishes. Instead, culinary naming practices function as symbolic cultural practices through which societies express cultural values, social norms, and ideological orientations.

The findings reveal that Indonesian culinary naming practices are characterized by linguistic transparency and functional clarity. Dish names frequently describe the primary ingredients or cooking methods associated with a particular food. This pattern reflects broader cultural values emphasizing pragmatism, communal participation, and social accessibility in culinary traditions. Culinary language in this context facilitates the collective transmission of culinary knowledge and reinforces the communal nature of food practices within Indonesian society.

In contrast, French culinary language demonstrates a higher degree of symbolic complexity and institutional significance. Many French dish names evoke historical traditions, regional identities, and gastronomic heritage. The presence of regulatory frameworks such as *Appellation d'Origine Contrôlée* (AOC) and *Indication Géographique Protégée* (IGP) further illustrates how culinary language can become institutionalized as part of cultural heritage preservation. Culinary naming practices in this context contribute to the symbolic prestige associated with French gastronomy and reinforce territorial identity.

The comparative analysis presented in this study highlights how culinary language reflects distinct cultural ideologies. Indonesian culinary discourse emphasizes inclusivity and communal knowledge sharing, while French culinary language reflects an ideology of gastronomic distinction and cultural heritage. These differences demonstrate that culinary language functions as an arena in which cultural values and social meanings are continually negotiated through everyday linguistic practices.

From an anthropological linguistic perspective, the findings underscore the importance of examining everyday language practices in order to understand broader cultural processes. Culinary language provides a particularly valuable site for such analysis because food practices intersect with social interaction, cultural identity, and symbolic meaning. By studying culinary naming practices, researchers can gain deeper insight into how cultural knowledge and ideological values are embedded in ordinary language use.

Although this study has focused on textual analysis of culinary names, future research could extend this framework through ethnographic observation of culinary communication in social contexts such as restaurants, markets, or family dining practices. Discourse analysis of culinary media, digital gastronomy platforms, and food-related social media could also provide further insights into how culinary language evolves within contemporary global food cultures.

In conclusion, culinary language represents an important domain of cultural expression through which societies articulate identity, transmit cultural knowledge, and negotiate social meaning. By situating culinary naming practices within the framework of anthropological linguistics, this study demonstrates that everyday language about food offers a rich source of insight into the complex relationships between language, culture, and society.

Acknowledgments: We would like to thank to those who helped during the process of the research.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest.

References

- Agha, A. (2007). *Language and social relations*. Cambridge University Press.
- Ahearn, L. M. (2017). *Living language: An introduction to linguistic anthropology* (2nd ed). Wiley-Blackwell.
- Blommaert, J. (2020). *Durkheim and the internet: On sociolinguistics and the sociological imagination*. Bloomsbury.
- Bourdieu, P. (1984). *Distinction: A social critique of the judgement of taste*. Harvard University Press.
- Cavanaugh, J. R., & Riley, K. C. (2023). Language and Food. In *A New Companion to Linguistic Anthropology* (1st ed., pp. 461–476). Wiley. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119780830.ch25>
- Counihan, C., & Van Esterik, P. (2013). *Food and culture: A reader* (3rd ed). Routledge.
- Danesi, M. (2018). *The semiotics of food*. Bloomsbury.
- Duranti, A. (1997). *Linguistic Anthropology*. Cambridge University Press.
- Ferguson, P. P. (2014). *Word of mouth: What we talk about when we talk about food*. University of California Press.
- Goody, J. (2013). *Cooking, cuisine and class: A study in comparative sociology*. Cambridge University Press.
- Johnston, J., & Baumann, S. (2015). *Foodies: Democracy and distinction in the gourmet foodscape* (2nd ed). Routledge.
- Kroskrity, P. V. (2010). *Language ideologies: Evolving perspectives* (J. Jaspers, J.-O. Östman, J. Verschueren). John Benjamins.
- Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldana, J. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook (3rd Edition)* (3rd ed., Vol. 4). SAGE Publications Inc.
- Mintz, S. W., & Du Bois, C. M. (2002). The Anthropology of Food and Eating. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 31(1), 99–119. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.anthro.32.032702.131011>
- Parasecoli, F. (2017). *Knowing where it comes from: Labeling traditional foods to compete in a global market*. University of Iowa Press.
- Parasecoli, F. (2022). *Gastronativism: Food, identity, politics*. Columbia University Press.
- Paxson, H. (2009). *The life of cheese: Crafting food and value in America* (Expanded ed). University of California Press.
- Riley, K. C., & Cavanaugh, J. R. (2017). *Food and language: Discourses of identity and cultural meaning*. Routledge.
- Riley, K. C., & Paugh, A. L. (2018). *Food and Language: Discourses and Foodways across Cultures* (1st ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315695235>
- Sibarani, R., Kimura, T., & Simanjuntak, P. (2025). The schematic structure of folk discourses of Toba Caldera Geosites as the collective memory for tourist destinations at lake Toba area. *Cogent Arts & Humanities*, 12(1), 2451491. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311983.2025.2451491>
- Sibarani, R., Nababan, M., Wahyudi, W., Simatupang, D. E., & Octavianna, Y. (2024). Speech performance in language teaching-learning: Culturally textual and non-textual landscapes of Toba Caldera Geosites. *Studies in English Language and Education*, 11(3), 1729–1747. <https://doi.org/10.24815/siele.v11i3.35003>
- Silverstein, M. (2003). Indexical order and the dialectics of sociolinguistic life. *Language & Communication*, 23(3–4), 193–229. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0271-5309\(03\)00013-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0271-5309(03)00013-2)