CURRENT RESEARCH JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGICAL SCIENCES (ISSN: 2767-3758)

VOLUME: Vol.06 Issue08 2025
Page: - 01-08

RESEARCH ARTICLE OPEN ACCESS

Conceptualizing 'Property' in English Food Industry Terminology: A Linguistic Analysis of Lexical Representation

Dr. Helen S. Whitaker

PhD, School of English and Applied Linguistics, University of Birmingham, United Kingdom

Dr. Eleanor J. Hawthorne

PhD, Department of Linguistics and English Language, University of Edinburgh, United Kingdom

Received: 03 June 2025 **Accepted:** 02 July 2025 **Published:** 01 August 2025

ABSTRACT

The food industry, a dynamic and multifaceted sector, relies heavily on a precise and standardized terminology to facilitate communication across its diverse domains, from production and processing to quality control, safety, and consumer information. Central to this specialized lexicon is the linguistic representation of the 'property' category, encompassing attributes, characteristics, qualities, and inherent features of food products, ingredients, and related processes. This article undertakes a comprehensive linguistic analysis of how the concept of 'property' is encoded and expressed within the English terminology of the food industry. Drawing upon principles of cognitive linguistics, onomasiology, and specialized terminology, the study identifies various subcategories of properties (e.g., sensory, physical, chemical, nutritional, functional, legal) and examines the lexical, morphological, and semantic mechanisms employed for their representation. The analysis highlights the critical role of precision and unambiguous communication in ensuring food safety, quality, and regulatory compliance. By elucidating the intricate linguistic structures that define 'property' in this specialized domain, this research offers valuable insights for lexicographers, terminologists, translators, and industry professionals, contributing to enhanced clarity and effectiveness in global food communication.

Keywords: Food industry, English terminology, Property category, Linguistic representation, Cognitive linguistics, Onomasiology, Lexical semantics, Specialized vocabulary.

INTRODUCTION

The global food industry is an expansive and critically important sector, encompassing a vast array of activities from agricultural production and processing to distribution, retail, and consumption. Its complexity necessitates a highly specialized and precise terminology to ensure effective communication, maintain quality standards, guarantee food safety, and facilitate international trade and regulatory compliance [10, 11]. Within this intricate linguistic landscape, the conceptual category of 'property' holds a paramount position. 'Property,' in a broad sense, refers to an inherent or characteristic quality, attribute, or feature of something [7]. In the context of the food industry, this extends to a myriad of characteristics of food products, raw materials, ingredients, processing methods, and even packaging, all of which are crucial for their identification, classification, evaluation, and application.

The linguistic representation of 'property' in specialized terminologies is a fascinating area of study, as it reveals how a particular domain conceptualizes and categorizes the attributes of its objects of study. For the food industry, these properties can range from the tangible and

measurable (e.g., moisture content, pH, viscosity) to the sensory and subjective (e.g., taste, aroma, texture) or the functional and legal (e.g., shelf-life, allergen status, organic certification). The precise linguistic encoding of these properties is vital for scientific research, product development, quality control, consumer labeling, and regulatory frameworks. Any ambiguity or imprecision in describing these properties can have significant implications for product safety, consumer health, and economic viability.

This article embarks on a comprehensive linguistic analysis to explore how the concept of 'property' is represented within the English terminology of the food industry. The primary objective is to identify the various dimensions and subcategories of 'property' as they are lexically manifested, and to examine the linguistic mechanisms (e.g., morphological structures, lexical choices, semantic relations) employed to express these attributes. By delving into the linguistic intricacies, this research aims to:

- Map the conceptual landscape: Understand how the 'property' category is cognitively structured and linguistically articulated within the specialized discourse of the food industry.

- Highlight terminological precision: Demonstrate the imperative for exactness in defining and using terms related to food properties, given their practical implications.

- Inform cross-linguistic endeavors: Provide insights that are valuable for lexicography, terminology management, and translation in multilingual food industry contexts, recognizing that linguistic differences can pose significant challenges [6].

- Contribute to applied linguistics: Offer a detailed case study of semantic representation in a highly specialized domain, enriching the broader understanding of how language shapes and reflects expert knowledge.

The study draws upon theoretical insights from cognitive linguistics, which views language as deeply intertwined with human cognition and conceptualization [14, 15], and onomasiology, which investigates how concepts are named and lexicalized [16]. It also leverages principles of specialized terminology, emphasizing the systematic nature and standardization efforts within professional fields. The food industry, with its rich history and continuous innovation, provides a dynamic context for this linguistic inquiry, reflecting both established practices and emerging trends in food science and technology [8]. Understanding the linguistic representation of 'property' is not merely an academic exercise; it is fundamental to ensuring clear, unambiguous communication that underpins the safety, quality, and global exchange of food products.

METHODS

This article employs a qualitative, analytical, and descriptive linguistic methodology to investigate the representation of the 'property' category within the English terminology of the food industry. As a theoretical and conceptual review, it primarily synthesizes insights from established linguistic theories and specialized lexicographical resources, rather than conducting empirical data collection or statistical analysis of large corpora. The approach is inherently interdisciplinary, drawing upon principles from linguistics, food science, and industry standards to provide a comprehensive understanding of the phenomenon.

Theoretical Framework

The analysis is firmly rooted in several key theoretical perspectives from cognitive and specialized linguistics:

- Cognitive Linguistics: This framework is central to understanding how human cognition, conceptualization, and experience shape linguistic structures [14, 15]. It posits that language is not merely an arbitrary system of symbols but reflects underlying cognitive processes, including categorization, metaphor, and metonymy. In the context of 'property,' cognitive linguistics helps explain how abstract attributes are conceptualized and then encoded into concrete linguistic forms. Lakoff's work on the contemporary theory of metaphor [14] and Kittay's insights into metaphor's cognitive force [12] are particularly relevant, as food properties might sometimes be expressed metaphorically (e.g., "robust flavor"). Rudzka-Ostyn's work on cognitive linguistics also provides foundational understanding [15].

- Onomasiology: This linguistic discipline investigates the process of naming, studying how concepts are lexicalized in a language [16]. In the context of the 'property' category, onomasiology helps to trace the

various linguistic expressions (words, phrases, compounds) that are used to denote specific attributes of food. It moves from concept to name, providing a systematic way to identify the range of lexical units representing different properties. Selivanova's work on cognitive onomasiology [16] offers a direct theoretical lens for this aspect.

• Terminology and Lexicology of Specialized Fields: This perspective focuses on the systematic study of terms within specialized domains. Specialized terminology, such as that of the food industry, is characterized by its precision, monosemy (ideally one meaning per term), and systematic organization [2]. It aims to reduce ambiguity and facilitate clear communication among experts. This framework helps in understanding the efforts towards standardization and the unique features of terms in the food industry. The work by Narushevich-Vasilyeva on Ukrainian food industry terminology [3, 4, 5] provides a comparative backdrop, highlighting the universal principles of specialized terminology while acknowledging language-specific manifestations.

• Lexical Semantics: This area of linguistics studies the meaning of words and lexical relations. It is crucial for analyzing how different terms relate to the 'property' category, identifying synonyms, antonyms, hyponyms, and hypernyms, and understanding the semantic fields associated with food attributes.

Data Sources and Selection

The "data" for this conceptual review are primarily drawn from authoritative and representative English-language resources pertinent to the food industry and general linguistics. These sources include:

• General English Dictionaries: Used to establish the foundational understanding of 'property' and its various senses in common language [7].

• Specialized Food Industry Glossaries and Dictionaries: These are crucial for identifying terms specific to the food sector. Examples include the Food Industry Glossary [10] and the comprehensive The Oxford Companion to Food [8], which provide definitions and contextual usage of food-related terms.

• Official Documents and Standards: Publications from regulatory bodies like the Food Standards Agency (UK) [9] offer insights into the standardized and legally defined terminology used in official contexts, particularly concerning food safety, quality, and labeling.

• Linguistic and Terminological Studies: Academic papers and monographs that discuss language, terminology, and communication in specialized fields, including the food industry [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17]. These sources provide theoretical insights into lexical development, semantic shifts, and the role of language in interdisciplinary contexts. The work of Syrotina and Lashkul on conceptual categories in English food industry terms [17] and Lashkul's on object categorization [13] are particularly relevant as they directly address the structure of this lexicon.

The selection of these sources is based on their direct relevance to the linguistic and terminological aspects of the topic, ensuring a robust foundation for analysis.

Analytical Approach

The analytical approach involves a multi-layered examination of English food industry terms to identify and categorize the linguistic representation of 'property':

• Identification of 'Property' Terms: Initial scanning of specialized food industry glossaries and relevant academic texts to identify terms that explicitly or implicitly denote characteristics, attributes, qualities, or features of food products, ingredients, or processes. This includes nouns (e.g., texture, flavor, acidity), adjectives (e.g., crispy, sweet, organic), and compound terms/phrases (e.g., shelf-life, moisture content, nutritional value).

• Categorization of Property Types: The identified terms will be grouped into distinct conceptual subcategories of 'property' based on the nature of the attribute they describe. These categories will emerge from the data but are anticipated to include:

o Sensory Properties: Related to taste, smell, touch, sight, and sound (e.g., aroma, bitterness, crunchiness, color, mouthfeel).

o Physical Properties: Measurable physical characteristics (e.g., density, viscosity, elasticity, hardness, moisture content).

o Chemical Properties: Related to chemical

composition and reactions (e.g., pH, acidity, alkalinity, oxidation, fat content).

o Nutritional Properties: Related to nutrient content (e.g., protein content, vitamin enrichment, calorie count, fiber).

o Functional Properties: Related to how a food behaves during processing or consumption (e.g., emulsifying capacity, gelling ability, solubility, heat stability).

o Legal/Regulatory Properties: Related to standards, certifications, and compliance (e.g., organic, halal, kosher, allergen-free, GMO-free, best-before date).

o Quality/Safety Properties: Related to standards of excellence and absence of harm (e.g., freshness, purity, contamination, spoilage, pathogen-free).

• Linguistic Mechanisms of Representation: For each category, the specific linguistic mechanisms used to express these properties will be analyzed. This includes:

o Lexical Units: Single words (nouns, adjectives, verbs used nominally).

o Morphological Structures: Prefixes, suffixes, compounding (e.g., -ness, -ity, -able, hydro-, fat-free).

o Syntactic Structures: Phrases, collocations (e.g., high in fiber, rich in antioxidants).

o Semantic Relations: How terms within a category relate to each other (e.g., hyponymy, meronymy).

• Comparative Insights (Implicit): While the primary focus is English, the understanding of terminological development in other languages, particularly Ukrainian food industry terminology as researched by Narushevich-Vasilyeva [3, 4, 5] and Reyda [6], will provide an implicit comparative lens, highlighting universal principles of specialized language and potential areas of cross-linguistic challenge in translation [6].

This analytical approach, grounded in robust linguistic theories and drawing from authoritative sources, aims to provide a detailed and nuanced understanding of how the 'property' category is linguistically represented in the English terminology of the food industry. The insights derived are intended to be valuable for both theoretical linguistics and practical applications within the food sector.

RESULTS

The systematic analysis of English food industry terminology, guided by principles of cognitive linguistics and onomasiology, reveals a rich and multifaceted linguistic representation of the 'property' category. The findings demonstrate how various linguistic mechanisms are employed to encode the diverse attributes, characteristics, and qualities inherent to food products, ingredients, and processes. This section categorizes these properties and illustrates their linguistic manifestations, drawing upon the conceptual frameworks identified in the methods.

Categorization of 'Property' in English Food Industry Terminology

The analysis yielded several distinct, yet often interconnected, conceptual subcategories of 'property' that are prominently represented in the English food industry lexicon. These categories reflect the critical aspects evaluated and communicated within the sector:

• Sensory Properties: These relate to attributes perceived through the human senses (taste, smell, touch, sight, sound). They are fundamental to consumer acceptance and product development.

o Examples: flavor, aroma, taste, sweetness, bitterness, sourness, saltiness, umami, texture, crispness, chewiness, viscosity, mouthfeel, color, appearance, sheen, crunch, crackle.

o Linguistic Representation: Often expressed through direct nouns (flavor, taste, texture), adjectives derived from sensory experiences (sweet, bitter, crunchy, creamy, vibrant), or compound nouns (mouthfeel, aftertaste, color intensity).

• Physical Properties: These encompass measurable physical characteristics of food materials, crucial for processing, handling, and quality control.

o Examples: density, viscosity, elasticity, hardness, firmness, plasticity, solubility, water activity, moisture content, melting point, freezing point, boiling point, specific gravity, particle size, flowability, turbidity.

o Linguistic Representation: Predominantly nouns (density, viscosity, hardness), often combined with quantifying adjectives (high density, low viscosity) or forming compound nouns (moisture content, melting point). Terms often derive from scientific or engineering vocabulary.

• Chemical Properties: These relate to the chemical composition, reactions, and stability of food components, vital for food science, preservation, and nutritional analysis.

o Examples: pH, acidity, alkalinity, oxidation, rancidity, fat content, protein content, carbohydrate content, ash content, vitamin content, mineral content, enzyme activity, antioxidant capacity, volatile compounds.

o Linguistic Representation: Frequently nouns (pH, acidity, oxidation), often followed by "content" or "level" (fat content, protein level), or expressed as compound nouns (antioxidant capacity, volatile compounds). Scientific prefixes and suffixes are common (e.g., hydrophilic, lipophilic).

• Nutritional Properties: These describe the presence and quantity of nutrients and other beneficial or detrimental components, central to public health and dietary guidelines.

o Examples: calorie count, energy value, fat-free, low-sodium, high-fiber, vitamin-enriched, fortified, sugar-reduced, gluten-free, cholesterol-free, trans-fat.

o Linguistic Representation: Often adjectives or compound adjectives (fat-free, low-sodium), participles (enriched, fortified), or nouns followed by "content" or "value" (protein content, energy value). These terms are frequently used in labeling and health claims.

• Functional Properties: These refer to how food ingredients or products behave during processing, storage, or consumption, influencing their application and performance.

o Examples: emulsifying capacity, gelling ability, foaming ability, water-holding capacity, binding strength, heat stability, cold stability, shelf-life, dispersibility, crispness retention, textural stability.

o Linguistic Representation: Typically compound nouns combining a process or state with "capacity," "ability," "strength," or "stability" (emulsifying capacity, gelling ability, shelf-life). Verbs converted to nouns are also common (binding, foaming).

• Legal/Regulatory Properties: These pertain to attributes that must comply with specific laws, standards, or certifications, ensuring safety, authenticity, and fair trade.

o Examples: organic, halal, kosher, GMO-free, allergen-free, fair trade, certified, traceable, best-before date, expiry date, country of origin, grade (e.g., Grade A eggs).

o Linguistic Representation: Often adjectives (organic, halal, certified), compound adjectives (GMO-free, allergen-free), or specific nouns/phrases related to labeling and dating (best-before date, country of origin). These terms are highly standardized due to legal implications.

• Quality and Safety Properties: These describe the overall excellence, purity, and freedom from hazards in food products, crucial for consumer trust and public health.

o Examples: freshness, purity, contamination, spoilage, microbial load, pathogen-free, adulteration, integrity, wholesomeness, hygiene, sanitation, traceability.

o Linguistic Representation: Nouns (freshness, purity, contamination), adjectives (fresh, pure, contaminated, spoiled, hygienic), and compound terms (pathogen-free, microbial load). These terms are directly linked to food safety management systems.

Linguistic Mechanisms of Representation

The analysis reveals a diverse array of linguistic mechanisms used to represent these 'property' categories, reflecting the need for both precision and efficiency in specialized communication:

• Nouns and Noun Phrases: Many properties are directly lexicalized as nouns (e.g., flavor, texture, acidity, density). Complex properties are often expressed through noun phrases, frequently involving compound nouns (e.g., moisture content, shelf-life, water activity), which allow for concise and specific denotation. The use of "content," "level," "value," "capacity," and "ability" as head nouns in

these phrases is highly productive.

• Adjectives: Adjectives are fundamental for describing qualities (e.g., sweet, bitter, crispy, firm, stable, organic, fresh). They often derive from nouns (e.g., acidic from acid) or verbs (e.g., cooked, frozen). Compound adjectives (e.g., fat-free, low-sodium, heat-stable) are particularly common for expressing nutritional or functional properties.

• Suffixation and Prefixation: Morphological processes, particularly suffixation, are extensively used to form nouns denoting properties from adjectives or other nouns (e.g., crisp-ness, fresh-ness, elastic-ity, visco-sity, solubil-ity). Prefixes (e.g., un-, non-, anti-, hydro-) are also used to modify or negate properties (e.g., unstable, non-GMO, antioxidant, hydrophilic).

• Verbs and Participles: While properties are typically static attributes, their manifestation or change can be described using verbs or participles. For instance, processes like oxidation (verb: oxidize) or states like cooked (participle of cook) describe properties resulting from transformation. Functional properties often implicitly refer to actions or behaviors (e.g., emulsifying ability, gelling capacity).

• Collocations and Fixed Expressions: Many property terms appear in fixed collocations or idiomatic expressions that convey specific meanings within the food industry (e.g., organoleptic properties, nutritional facts, sensory profile, cold chain integrity). These collocations contribute to the specialized register and often carry precise technical meanings.

• Conceptual Metaphor and Metonymy: While less pervasive than in general language, conceptual metaphors can occasionally be observed, particularly in sensory descriptions (e.g., a "bright" flavor, a "heavy" texture). Metonymy is more common, where a property stands for the product itself (e.g., "the organic" refers to organic products). These linguistic devices, as discussed by Lakoff [14] and Kittay [12], demonstrate the cognitive underpinnings of linguistic representation.

The findings align with Syrotina and Lashkul's observations on the conceptual categories represented by English food industry terms [17], confirming the systematic nature of this specialized vocabulary. Lashkul's work on object categorization further supports the structured way in which food properties are classified and named [13]. The precision achieved through these diverse linguistic mechanisms is paramount for effective communication in a sector where accuracy directly impacts safety, quality, and economic value.

DISCUSSION

The linguistic analysis of the 'property' category within English food industry terminology reveals a highly structured, precise, and dynamic lexical fund that is deeply intertwined with the scientific, technological, and regulatory demands of the sector. The findings underscore that the representation of 'property' is not arbitrary but is systematically organized through various linguistic mechanisms to meet the imperative for clarity and unambiguous communication.

The comprehensive categorization of properties into sensory, physical, chemical, nutritional, functional, legal/regulatory, and quality/safety dimensions reflects the holistic approach required in the food industry. Each category serves distinct purposes, from product development and consumer appeal (sensory properties) to scientific analysis and quality assurance (physical, chemical, nutritional properties), and finally to market compliance and consumer protection (functional, legal, quality/safety properties). The linguistic mechanisms employed for each category are often tailored to the nature of the property. For instance, physical and chemical properties frequently rely on scientific nomenclature and compound nouns for precise quantification, while sensory properties might use more descriptive adjectives or terms derived from human perception. This linguistic specialization is crucial for ensuring that professionals across the food supply chain, from food scientists and engineers to quality control specialists and marketers, share a common understanding of product attributes.

The extensive use of nouns, noun phrases, and specialized adjectives, often enhanced by productive suffixation (e.g., -ness, -ity) and compounding, highlights the drive for terminological precision and conciseness. This precision is not merely a stylistic choice but a functional necessity. In a sector where product specifications, safety parameters, and legal compliance are paramount, ambiguity can lead to significant economic losses, product recalls, or even public health crises. For example, the distinction between "best-before date" and "expiry date" carries profound legal and safety implications for consumers. The standardization

efforts in terminology, as implicitly supported by the existence of official glossaries [10] and regulatory bodies [9], are therefore critical for ensuring consistent interpretation across different contexts and jurisdictions.

The insights from cognitive linguistics, particularly onomasiology [16], provide a valuable lens through which to understand how these properties are conceptualized and named. The process of lexicalization reflects the cognitive salience of certain attributes within the food domain. For instance, the proliferation of terms for 'texture' (e.g., crispness, chewiness, viscosity, mouthfeel) indicates the high importance placed on this sensory property in food product development and consumer experience. The systematic categorization observed in the results aligns with broader cognitive principles of how humans organize knowledge into conceptual categories [17].

The challenges of translating food industry terminology across languages are also implicitly highlighted by this analysis. While the underlying scientific concepts of food properties might be universal, their linguistic representation can vary significantly across European languages, as evidenced by studies on Ukrainian food terminology [3, 4, 5]. Reyda's work on translation problems in this field [6] underscores that direct word-for-word translation is often insufficient; a deep understanding of the specialized semantic nuances and cultural contexts is required to ensure accurate and equivalent communication. This is particularly true for sensory terms, which can be highly culture-specific, or legal terms, which are bound by national regulations. The globalization of the food industry necessitates robust terminology management systems and highly skilled translators and interpreters to bridge these linguistic gaps.

Furthermore, the dynamic nature of the food industry, driven by scientific advancements, technological innovations, and evolving consumer demands, continuously shapes its terminology. New properties emerge (e.g., related to novel ingredients, processing techniques, or sustainability), requiring new terms or the re-semanticization of existing ones. This constant evolution underscores the importance of lifelong learning for professionals in the field [10], including continuous engagement with linguistic and terminological updates.

Limitations of the Current Review:

While this review provides a comprehensive conceptual and linguistic analysis, it is important to acknowledge certain limitations. Firstly, as a theoretical review, it does not involve a large-scale empirical corpus analysis of food industry texts. The examples provided are illustrative, drawn from general knowledge of the field and the implications of the provided references, rather than being derived from quantitative frequency counts or detailed contextual analyses of vast amounts of specialized discourse. Secondly, the focus is primarily on English terminology, and while comparisons to other European languages are implicitly considered through the theoretical framework, a detailed contrastive analysis would require dedicated research beyond the scope of this article. Thirdly, the review does not delve into the historical evolution of specific terms within the English food industry in great detail, focusing more on their current representation. Finally, the practical application of these terms in specific industry contexts (e.g., marketing, consumer perception, regulatory enforcement) is discussed conceptually but not through direct case studies or user perception surveys.

Future Research Directions:

Building upon this foundational understanding, several promising avenues for future research emerge. A large-scale corpus-based linguistic analysis of diverse English food industry texts (e.g., scientific journals, industry reports, product specifications, regulatory documents) would provide empirical data on the frequency, collocations, and contextual usage of property terms. This could reveal more subtle patterns of linguistic representation. Secondly, contrastive linguistic studies focusing on the 'property' category across multiple European languages (e.g., English, French, German, Polish, Ukrainian) would provide valuable insights into cross-linguistic similarities and differences in conceptualization and lexicalization, which are crucial for improving translation quality in the food sector. Thirdly, cognitive experimental studies could explore how industry professionals and consumers interpret and categorize food properties, potentially revealing cognitive biases or discrepancies in understanding. Fourthly, research could investigate the impact of emerging technologies (e.g., AI in food processing, novel food ingredients, sustainable food systems) on the evolution of food industry terminology, particularly concerning new properties and their linguistic encoding. Finally, applied terminological research focusing on developing standardized multilingual glossaries and ontological representations of food

properties would be highly beneficial for international collaboration, regulatory harmonization, and automated translation systems in the global food industry.

REFERENCES

Busel, V. T. (2005). Velykyy tlumachnyy slovnyk suchasnoyi ukrayins′koyi movy [Big Explanatory Dictionary of the Modern Ukrainian Language]. Kyiv, Irpin: Perun.

Martynyuk, A. P. (2011). Slovnyk osnovnykh terminiv kohnityvno-dyskursyvnoyi linhvistyky [Dictionary of basic terms of cognitive-discursive linguistics]. Kharkiv: KHNU imeni V. N. Karazina.

Narushevich-Vasilyeva, O. V. (2017a). Semantyko-tematychna ta katehoriyno-ponyattyeva orhanizatsiya ukrayins′koyi terminolohiyi kharchovoyi promyslovosti. [Semantic-thematic and categorical-conceptual organization of the Ukrainian terminology of the food industry]. Slovenian terminology today, 567-576.

Narushevich-Vasilyeva, O. V. (2017b). Ekstralinhvistychni ta linhvistychni chynnyky vynyknennya y formuvannya ukrayins′koyi terminolohiyi kharchovoyi promyslovosti. [Extralinguistic and linguistic factors of the emergence and formation of the Ukrainian terminology of the food industry]. Notes on Ukrainian Linguistics, (24 (1)), 140-148.

Narushevich-Vasilyeva, O. V. (2017c). [Foreign loanwords in the Ukrainian terminology of the food industry]. Naukovi zapysky Kirovohrads′koho derzhavnoho pedahohichnoho universytetu imeni Volodymyra Vynnychenka [Scientific notes of Volodymyr Vinnichenko Kirovohrad State Pedagogical University]. Issue 154, 582–586.

Reyda, O. A. (2022). Osnovni problemy pry perekladi terminolohiyi u haluzi kharchovoyi promyslovosti [The main problems in the translation of terminology in the field of food industry]. Mova ta literatura u polikul′turnomu prostori: materialy mizhnarodnoyi naukovo-praktychnoyi konferentsiyi (Naukova filolohichna orhanizatsiya «Lohos», 11-12 lyutoho 2022r.). L′viv. P. 35-37.

Cambridge Dictionary. (2021). Property. URL: https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/property

Davidson, A., & Jaine, T. (2014). The Oxford Companion to Food (3rd ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Food Industries, Food Standards Agency (UK). URL: https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/food-standards-agency

Food Industry Glossary. (2006). URL: https://www.fmi.org/our-research/food-industry-glossary

Kittay, E. (1987). Metaphor: Its Cognitive Force and Linguistic Structure. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Lakoff, G. (1994). The Contemporary Theory of Metaphor. Metaphor and Thought. Cambridge, New York: Cambridge University Press.

Lashkul, V. (2023). Object categorization of English terms in the food industry. International Journal of Philology, 12(4), 69-76. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.31548/philolog14(2).2023.08

Rudzka-Ostyn, B. (1988). Topics in cognitive linguistics. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Selivanova, O. (2000). Cognitive onomasiology. Kyiv: Phytosociocenter.

Syrotina, O., & Lashkul, V. (2023). Conceptual categories represented by English terms of the food industry. Cogito-Multidisciplinary Research Journal, 4, 286-303.