

“EVERYTHING NEW IS WELL-FORGOTTEN OLD”: TRADITION AND INNOVATION IN THE NARRATIVES OF NEW GEORGIAN CUISINE

Giorgi Gotua, Nino Rcheulishvili

Giorgi Gotua, Center for Study of Social Practices (Tbilisi, Georgia). Address for correspondence: Zakaria Paliashvili St. 41-8, Tbilisi, 0179, Georgia. ggotua@gmail.com.

Nino Rcheulishvili, Ilia State University (Tbilisi, Georgia). Address for correspondence: Kakutsa Cholokashvili Ave. 3/5, Tbilisi, 0162, Georgia. nrcheulishvili@iliauni.edu.ge.

The article is about “New Georgian Cuisine,” an alternative culinary movement that represents a “postmodern” trend in the Georgian food scene. This movement is trying to preserve culturally authentic Georgian cuisine and, at the same time, make it modern and innovative. We were interested in how these two goals are negotiated in texts produced by supporters of the movement. Tradition is a key concept used in this negotiation process. Using discourse analysis, we identified three cultural repertoires associated with this concept in texts produced by supporters of the movement. These repertoires are “lost and regained tradition,” “falsified (Soviet) tradition,” and “innovative tradition.” Representatives of the movement believe that New Georgian Cuisine is reviving a genuine Georgian tradition of creativity and innovation. They consider this tradition to be part of a Georgian “European” heritage, which was suppressed by Russian and Soviet rule. Through this myth, supporters reconcile the competing demands of innovation and preservation of authenticity. Discourse about “innovative tradition” stands in contrast with other cases discussed in the scholarly literature, where on discursive level tradition and innovation are presented as discrete and sometimes opposed values. The narrative of New Georgian Cuisine has a twofold result in terms of influencing the distribution of cultural capital in society. On the one hand, it helps to elevate the social status of cooks and to transform this profession into avenue of upward social mobility. On the other hand, it emphasizes values associated with the elite or “creative” middle class and downgrades the significance of the everyday practices of representatives of other social groups.

Keywords: Tradition; Innovation; New Georgian Cuisine; Cultural Authenticity; Symbolic Power

TEDx Tbilisi 2016¹ hosted a talk by Tekuna Gachechiladze, a Georgian chef associated with the New Georgian Cuisine culinary movement. In her presentation Gachechi-

¹ This talk was given in the TED Talk conference format, independently organized by the local community.

ladze told an "unpleasant" story about something that had happened to her seven years before (TEDx Talks 2016). During preparations for the ceremonial opening of one of the hotels in the Anaklia sea resort, a cook under her supervision refused to follow the instructions she gave. They were asked to prepare modified versions of two dishes of Georgian traditional cuisine—*elarji* and *bazhe*. Gachechiladze's idea was to put some spin on traditional ways of preparation: to serve *elarji* in a nontraditional form (as croquettes/balls instead of a porridge) and to replace one of the ingredients of *bazhe* (using almonds instead of walnuts). The cooks protested against this innovation and considered it a "betrayal" of national traditions. When asked by the host how she solved this problem, the chef replied that she reached to the local governor for help. He, in turn, forced the cooks to prepare the assigned dishes by threatening to fire them.

This story illustrates the intensity of struggle over national heritage and the future of ethnic culture in modern Georgia (Jones 2012). In the case of food, the struggle for changes in national cuisine is led by supporters of the New Georgian Cuisine movement, or "Supra Nova." The latter term was coined by foreign food writer and restaurant critic James Brennan (2011) in his blog post about innovations in the Georgian culinary landscape and was readily adopted by the local protagonists of this movement. The name itself consists of two words: one ("Supra") means the traditional Georgian feast, while the other obviously refers to novelty and innovation.

At the same time, the story of the Anaklia incident exemplifies a dilemma. On the one hand, as supporters of "ethnic" cuisine, people associated with New Georgian Cuisine want their movement to be perceived as culturally authentic. On the other hand, as reformists, they want to be seen as innovative. This dual agenda is captured in a quote from one of the active supporters of New Georgian Cuisine, General Director of the TV station Rustavi 2 and renowned local gourmet Nika Gvaramia: "Georgian cuisine is an ideal base, a remarkable one, but it needs to be developed and modernized to become relevant to the twenty-first century" (Rustavi 2 2017).

Under the Soviet regime Georgian cuisine enjoyed high status and popularity across Soviet republics (Scott 2016:87). As some sources suggest, demand for Georgian cuisine in Russian cities has persisted through the subsequent years (Kroz 2018). Recently there was a surge of interest in Georgian cuisine at the global level as well, both as a part of a growing tourism industry at home and as a "newly discovered" authentic cuisine abroad (Gogiberidze 2017; *Foodspark* 2018). The ambition of representatives of the New Georgian Cuisine movement is to catch this moment and transform Georgian cuisine into "high cuisine" that would approach standards of modern "fine-dining" restaurants and be competitive with the "high cuisines" of other countries (Makashvili 2013).

Why do supporters of this movement demand changes in an already apparently successful cuisine? Why modify popular food practices if there is a demand for "traditional" dishes both at home and abroad? The answer, we argue, is related to modern trends in global gastronomy. Cultural authenticity and innovation are two values widely acknowledged in this market (Guerrero et al. 2009). These two criteria are also resonating with wider trends in contemporary "postmodern" societies, particularly

the tendencies toward nativism noted by Zygmunt Bauman in his book *Retrotopia* (2017), and apology for innovation, typical of the phenomenon of “neoliberal governmentality” (Foucault 2011). According to Bauman, the current disappointment with dominant cultural and political projects leads to idealization of the past and the desire to go back to it or preserve what remains of it (Bauman 2017). As for innovation, according to Foucault, it is a central feature of neoliberalism, a form of governmentality that emerged in the 1970s. For him, the innovative, self-reliant subject-entrepreneur, constantly introducing novelties into her/his everyday practices, is neoliberalism’s answer to the problem of the falling rate of profit (Foucault 2011:235).

Negotiating these two values in particular situations can be a difficult task. On the one hand, as a number of scholars have noted, food practices are strongly linked to ethnic identity in the Georgian context (e.g., Mühlfried 2005, 2007). The most discussed topic in the scholarly literature is the relationship between Supra, the Georgian traditional feast, and ethnic identity (Chatwin 1997; Manning n.d., 2014; Mühlfried 2014; Nodia 2014; Ram 2014a, 2014b; Curro 2017). Despite differing views presented in works about Supra, authors agree that the Georgian traditional feast is a celebration of unity and of the authenticity of national culture. Any attempt to question “traditional” food practices might be interpreted as shaking the pillars of national identity and, as a consequence, can encounter resistance from different groups in Georgian society.

On the other hand, since the 2010s there have been recurring complains about a lack of development and creativity in Georgian cuisine. Such critiques come mostly from young Georgian chefs and bloggers. Very rarely, this kind of criticism is expressed by foreigners, more often in personal communication than in writing (an example of the latter can be found in Dunbar [2013]). However, instances of such critique from foreigners are exploited by representatives of the Supra Nova movement. For instance, one of the pioneers of New Georgian Cuisine often refers to an informal conversation with world-renowned food scholar Darra Goldstein in 2013. According to this report, the scholar was disappointed to find the same old menus and even lower quality of dishes, compared with her first visit to Georgia in 1997 (Makashvili 2013; TabulaTelevision 2016). These complaints serve as tools for representatives of the Supra Nova movement to justify the necessity of creating an alternative Georgian cuisine.

The aim of our study is to understand how demands for innovation and cultural authenticity are reconciled in texts produced by representatives of the Supra Nova movement. Our approach can be called postmodernist, theoretically following the line suggested by Bauman (2000). The general aim of this analysis is to understand how social institutions are constantly reshaped in times of what Bauman calls liquid modernity and how these changes affect social inequality. We consider Georgian cuisine to be one of these institutions, while New Georgian Cuisine represents a “progressive” movement that shows us possible directions of development of Georgian cuisine. We are interested in how “old” and “new” tendencies are reconciled in the midst of the transformation of social institutions and what consequences these transformations can have for changing forms of inequality.

We believe that our case represents one possible model of reconciliation of these values. Exploring this case will help us to compare different models found in the literature on this topic. We conclude with a few theoretical speculations on how the success of New Georgian Cuisine can influence social inequality. For that purpose, we use the concept of symbolic power proposed by Pierre Bourdieu (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992).

Using the methodology of discourse analysis, we identified three ways of speaking about culinary tradition in the texts analyzed: lost and regained authentic tradition, "falsified" tradition produced by the Soviet regime, and continuous tradition of innovation as the hallmark of Georgian culinary heritage. The aim of the New Georgian Cuisine movement, according to its supporters, is to reanimate "good" traditions, namely, restore pre-Soviet culinary practices and revive the spirit of innovation. Similar to other cases discussed in the literature, market demand is acknowledged as an important driver for change. In addition, changes are justified through reference to the patriotic motive of preserving and elevating the status of national cuisine. Values of cultural authenticity and innovation are reconciled by invoking the myth of the "European," "progressive," and "dynamic" character of Georgian culture.

The narrative of New Georgian Cuisine helps to elevate the social status of cooks almost to members of an artistic profession and, as a result, helps to transform cuisine into a road to upward social mobility. On the other hand, creativity as a part of everyday food practices is largely neglected in this narrative, while Soviet influences are denounced. Both of these lead to a downgrading of the value of practices in which representatives of lower class and parts of the middle class are involved in everyday life.

LITERATURE REVIEW

In this section we will explore scholarly definitions of some concepts used in this article and touch upon the application of these concepts in social science literature on food. We will particularly focus on works where two concepts important for our research, tradition and innovation, are used in conjunction. Finally, we will look at the emergence of the term "nouvelle cuisine" and similar trends in the culinary landscapes of postsocialist countries.

Most of the social-scientific and historical uses of the concept of tradition are associated with processes of "constructing" or "imagining" tradition (Hobsbawm 1983; Tonkinson 1993). As far as the construction of tradition for political purposes is concerned, the current article represents the same line of research. In our case, we demonstrate that the concept of tradition can be used by representatives of the same movement in various ways and for various purposes (e.g., both to criticize past legacies and to represent one's own movement as the true heir to national tradition).

In the past, tradition was also described by some scholars as a factor inhibiting processes of modernization (Langlois 2001). While this meaning of the concept is no longer popular among social scientists, it has influenced everyday perceptions and ways of talking about tradition as a barrier to innovation. In this study we demon-

strate how representatives of the Supra Nova movement respond to this understanding of tradition by differentiating between the “good,” progressive traditions of the pre-Soviet period and the “negative,” conservative tradition created in Soviet times.

Recently there has been increased interest in how “traditional” food is used in food marketing (Gonzalez-Hemon, Pantin-Sohier, and Ferrandi 2016). However, few sociological or anthropological works are focused on this phenomenon (see, e.g., Cavanaugh 2007; Heath and Meneley 2010). The existing literature does not provide a definition of “traditional food” (Gonzalez-Hemon et al. 2016). This term is used differently by various studies, depending on the research setting and intuition of the scholar. A review of the literature in this field suggests that one of the key characteristics of “traditional” food is its connection to rituals (Gonzalez-Hemon et al. 2016). A strong link between traditional food and ritual in the Georgian context is also noted by researchers working on this topic (Chatwin 1997; Manning n.d.). Supra, the traditional Georgian feast, is a most important ritual in this regard (Manning 2014; Mühlfried 2014).

A more commonly used concept that could be linked to tradition is that of cultural authenticity (Pratt 2007; Gonzalez-Hemon et al. 2016). A culturally authentic cultural object, in this perspective, is an original, unique object that represents an ethnic culture. According to cultural heritage scholars, culturally authentic objects retain their value for long periods of time (Stovel 2007). As anthropologist Jeff Pratt puts it, “authenticity is widely evoked in the analysis of antiques, art objects, vintage cars and certain kinds of tourism, but not in discussion of kitchen cabinets or washing powder” (2007:293). Authenticity has been a recurrent theme in food studies in recent decades. One strand of research conceptualizes the growing interest in food traditions and authenticity as a form of nationalism, or “gastromonialism” (De-Soucey 2010). Other researchers consider cultural authenticity to be a social construct created in response to consumer demand in the realms of tourism and leisure (Urry 2006; Pilcher 2012). It is also described as one of the most widespread criteria for evaluating the market value of food (Borghini 2014). For example, to fulfill customer demand for “ethnic” food, restaurants are offering standardized, familiar versions of “ethnic” dishes (Ferrero 2002). While demand for cultural authenticity does not directly contradict or exclude the possibility of introducing innovations, it creates the necessity to prove that the boundaries established by tradition are not violated by innovations. Another key concept for our study is innovation. It is defined in social science literature as “the process by which new products and techniques are introduced into the economic system” (Nelson 2008). According to political economist Joseph Schumpeter, innovation plays a central role in ensuring the effectiveness of the market system (Heilbroner 1995). During recent decades there has been a rise of scholarly interest in innovation as a motor of capitalist development (Bau-mol and Litan 2012). Philosopher Michel Foucault (2011) understood innovation as a one of the main elements of neoliberalism, a new dominant form of governmentality that emphasizes the idea of the self-reliant subject. In particular, innovativeness is an important characteristic of a successful entrepreneur, the main role model of the neoliberal subject. The innovative entrepreneur who embraces this quality is better

prepared to win in a competitive struggle with other entrepreneurs or any members of society in general.

At the same time, creativity and openness to innovations are equally important criteria for success on the global food market (Cook et al. 2013). In the media, the preparation of food is often depicted as an artistic, creative act performed by chefs. Creativity is also sometimes linked by researchers to the process of reimagining national cuisine (Imai 2010).

Hybridization of tradition and innovation in the food industry is a topic that has relatively recently been explored by researchers from the fields of anthropology, geography, and the sociology of food. Most of these studies indicate that attempts to combine these two are driven by market forces. Julie L. Cidell and Heike C. Alberts (2006), in their comparative study of chocolate production in America and Europe, found that producers in continental Europe respond to demands for both traditional and innovative food by combining the two in their products. According to research by Matt Mariola and David McConnell (2013), Amish farmers in the United States, under pressure from market forces, are introducing modern practices of organic farming into their traditional agriculture in order to preserve their identity as a predominantly agrarian community. However, innovations in food production and consumption can emerge as a response to other factors too. Anthropologist of food Hanna Garth (2009) shows how innovations are emerging in everyday practices of cooking as a response to a dearth of products in modern Cuba (rather than as a result of marketization processes).

In some accounts hybridization is depicted as a creative endeavor undertaken by individuals and/or business organizations. For example, Natalia Magnani (2016) argues that "traditional" food and other cultural objects presented at the annual Saami people's festival are products of creative efforts by local entrepreneurs to combine traditional and modern elements. Other studies have argued that the success of the hybridization process depends on the support of powerful actors. Philip A. Loring and S. Craig Gerlach (2010) have demonstrated that the modernization of gardening practices in Alaska is inhibited by their lack of recognition by the state as "traditional."

In business studies "innovation through tradition" is often depicted as a strategy leading to improvements in the results of business practices by incorporating past knowledge and experience (De Massis et al. 2016). Other authors have painted a more nuanced picture. Michele Gorgoglione, Antonio Messeni Petruzzelli, and Umberto Panniello (2017) argued that in the case of the Italian coffee industry some customers value the traditional elements, while others prefer the innovative parts or appreciate the combination of the two.

Generally, authors from the field of business studies present hybridization as always having positive results. For example, Elisa Giacosa, Alberto Ferraris, and Filippo Monge (2017) suggest various models for combining tradition and innovation as a path to success in Italian small food enterprise. However, other scholars demonstrate that the results can vary, depending on who the initiators and beneficiaries of the process are. Alfredo Macías Vázquez and Pablo Alonso González (2015), who stud-

ied innovation in local food systems in Spain, have shown that control over the process of innovation from the side of powerful economic groups can result in a drain on local resources and loss of control over local cultural capital from communities of origin.

Speaking of innovation in traditional cuisines, the phenomena of “new cuisine” must be mentioned. In the late 1960s, the *nouvelle cuisine* movement emerged in France and spread across Europe (Mennel 1996:164). This movement distinguished itself from “classic” haute cuisine through lighter, freshly cooked dishes and the creativity of the chef (Rao, Monin, and Durand 2003). A decade ago culinary movements with the same name emerged in postsocialist spaces as well. A series of cookbooks highlight “New Polish” (Baruch 2002; Zak 2016), “New Ukrainian” (Corona Ogrodnik 2012; Melher 2018), “New Hungarian” (Bonis 2012) food concepts and dishes. A quick overview of these publications suggests that the discourse around new cuisines in postsocialist contexts is associated with nationalist projects. The “new cuisines” of postsocialist countries have not received attention from social science scholars yet. However, some scholarly work on the relationship between food and nationalist projects indicates that the revival of pre-Soviet practices and a return to true “roots” are a major theme in food-related movements. For instance, Oleksandra Seliverstova’s study (2018) shows how the consumption of “authentic” Estonian products contributes to nation building and to the consolidation of the Estonian and Russian populations of the country. Similar studies link the consumer movement that supports products “made in Ukraine” to attempts at elevating Ukrainian cookery to the status of “high cuisine” (Bulakh 2018) and distancing from Russian cuisine at the level of everyday consumption (Seliverstova 2017).

METHODOLOGY

In our research we used different types of sources, including video, audio, and textual materials. Most of these sources are television programs with content directly or indirectly related to cooking. These TV programs are: *Tekuna’s Culinarium* (aired on Maestro TV in 2014–2015 and Rustavi 2 in 2016–2017), *Keti’s Kitchen Adventure* (Rustavi 2, 2016–2017), reality shows *Restaurant* (TabulaTelevision, 2014) and *My Kitchen Rules* (Rustavi 2, 2017), *Gurmania* (Public Broadcaster, 2016–2017), parts of daytime shows and other programs dedicated to cooking (on channels Imedi, Rustavi 2, GDS, and Ertzulovneba).

The second group of sources comprises blogs and online magazine articles about Georgian cuisine, culinary tourism, international gastronomic standards, and healthy nutrition. In addition, we analyzed social media content, in particular posts and comments by individual users, restaurant profiles, and customer reviews. Finally, we analyzed advertisements for food produced in Georgia (texts, photos, and videos).

To analyze these media texts we used the methodology of discourse analysis. Particularly, we adopted the concept of “interpretive repertoires.” The concept has its origin in the constructivist sociology of science and is widely used in discourse-based studies (Jorgensen and Phillips 2011; Silverman 2015). This concept is used to

analyze various ways of talking and writing about particular cultural objects (Jorgensen and Phillips 2011). Compared to some other, poststructuralist methodologies, this perspective on discourse implies that actors are actively involved in the construction of situations. Interpretive repertoires can be thought of as

the building blocks speakers use for constructing versions of actions, cognitive processes and other phenomena. Any particular repertoire is constituted out of a restricted range of terms used in a specific stylistic and grammatical fashion. Commonly these terms are derived from one or more key metaphors and the presence of a repertoire will often be signaled by certain tropes or figures of speech. (Wetherell and Potter 1988:172)

Also, to analyze this corpus of texts as a whole as well as some individual texts and portions of texts, we used other semiotic and discourse analysis techniques such as analysis of narratives or identification of basic statements (Gibbs 2008; Chandler 2018).

At the first stage, we coded materials using keywords and themes emerging from the texts. At the second stage, we used our own cultural knowledge to identify various ways of discussing culinary tradition.

Below we present our discussion of each repertoire and examples of segments in which these repertoires appear.

NEW GEORGIAN CUISINE: TOWARD A SOCIAL AND IDEOLOGICAL PROFILE

Supporters of New Georgian Cuisine form a rather heterogeneous group—chefs, restaurant owners, writers, bloggers, TV anchors, and media managers. There are different reasons to be involved with innovation of the Georgian food concept. While a poet might engage in the creation of new Georgian recipes as a literary endeavor,² some popular figures represent culinary innovations as a cure for Soviet/Russian influences. However, the popularization and elevation of the status of Georgian cuisine on the global level is a common goal that unites them all.

Representatives of the movement are also active in antioccupation movement and civil resistance against the Russian occupation of territories in Georgia after the 2008 Russian-Georgian war. For example, around 40 cafés and restaurants were closed for several hours on March 4, 2018, to join the protest against the alleged murder of a Georgian citizen in South Ossetian custody. Supporters of antioccupation movements often treat the Russian military presence not only as a breach of territorial integrity but also as a threat to the process of integrating Georgia with the West (Dalakishvili 2016). The defense of state territorial integrity is often equated with support for liberal values (Sanikidze 2017).

The chefs involved with the New Georgian Cuisine movement can be divided into two groups or “generations.” The first generation consists of chefs who received

² See, for example, culinary writings by Diana Anphimiadi (2012).

some formal or informal training in the United States or Europe. These chefs, including Gachechiladze, mentioned at the start of this article, are recognized as pioneers of the movement. They are considered celebrities of a sort because they appear as hosts of popular culinary TV programs (e.g., *Tekuna's Culinarium*) and run cafés and restaurants in Tbilisi (e.g., Litera and Shavi Lomi). The second generation mostly consists of graduates of the Georgian Culinary Academy. While some chefs work in "Asian" or "European" restaurants, they all declare the development of Georgian cuisine to be their ultimate goal (Naneishvili 2016).

People directly involved in supporting changes to this field are mostly associated with the Georgian Culinary Academy based at the Agricultural University of Georgia. In this section, we will briefly present the academy and its founder, Kakha Bendukidze.

Bendukidze is considered one of the central figures in the neoliberal reforms of Mikhail Saakashvili's presidency in the 2000s. First as the minister of economic development and then as the minister of reforms, he and his team played a leading role in the radical reforms of that period. Later he was a sponsor of and leading contributor to several cultural initiatives. One of these initiatives was the establishment of a nonprofit organization called the Knowledge Fund that aims at enhancing quality of higher education in Georgia.³

The Culinary Academy was established in November 2012, as a part of Agricultural University, which, in turn, was partly funded by the Knowledge Fund. The idea of opening this institution came from Bendukidze himself, and he actively participated in further development of the concept until his death in 2014. Graduates of the academy currently occupy leading positions in the "contemporary" sector of Tbilisi cafés and restaurants. Their transfer to the restaurant business was greatly facilitated by the culinary TV show *Restorani*, created with the purpose of promoting the innovation of Georgian cuisine and helping graduates of the academy to demonstrate their talents to potential employers.

Bendukidze was an influential figure among creators of the concept of New Georgian Cuisine. His writings and speeches are frequently quoted by supporters of the movement. In addition, he is considered an important author who brought debates about Georgian cuisine into wider debates about Georgian nationalism. His associates claim that he was the first person in recent decades to criticize bad "traditions" (Babunashvili 2016; Alexander Giorgadze 2016).

Colleagues compared Bendukidze to Ilia Chavchavadze, one of the most influential public figures of the nineteenth century and founder of the liberal nationalist movement. Similar to Chavchavadze's criticism of Georgian culture, Bendukidze's criticism of Georgian cuisine was reformist rather than radical. In regard to the culinary field, his aim was to revive the best traditions, develop a national culinary culture, and get rid of traditions that, in his opinion, were impeding the development of Georgian ethnic cuisine. His associates claimed that his expertise in gastronomy

³ For details on the mission of the Knowledge Fund please refer to the following source: <http://freeuni.edu.ge/en/node/589>.

made him equal to Barbare Jorjadze, another figure from the period of nationalist revival in the nineteenth century (T'abidze, Papava, and Ram 2014), who was the author of the most famous Georgian cookbook of the pre-Soviet era. "After his death, Kakha was compared to the 'paunchy liberal' Ilia Chavchavadze; but I think that when speaking about cooking, he is not only a modern Ilia Chavchavadze but a modern Barbare Jorjadze as well" (TabulaTelevision 2015).

This text, like many other texts about reforms to Georgian gastronomy, implies that it is about more than just food. It is about the accomplishment of long-desired national dreams that have been deemed impossible. Another example of such a framing is Vakho Babunashvili's blog post "Duck Dolma and Owl's Eggs" (2016) and a public lecture with the same title that was held in Bendukidze's memory (Alexander Giorgadze 2016). The blog can be read as a kind of apologia for Bendukidze and the Culinary Academy, praising their contribution to the revitalization project of Georgian gastronomic culture. In Georgian folklore duck dolma and owl's eggs are considered rare foods, very difficult or impossible to get. Telling someone they want duck dolma or owl's eggs means that their desires are unrealistic. Babunashvili used these metaphors to demonstrate how difficult it had been for Bendukidze to do what he did. Reference is made to his efforts to revive forgotten Georgian recipes, one of which is exactly that rare dish from the folklore—"duck dolma." The second task (getting "owl's eggs") the author expects to be accomplished by the new generation of Georgian cooks, educated by the Culinary Academy.

CRITIQUE OF THE CURRENT STATE OF GEORGIAN CUISINE

Narratives about New Georgian Cuisine have as their starting point a critique of the current situation in Georgian gastronomy. Below we present some typical statements representative of the critical narrative about current Georgian cuisine, sometimes referred to as "traditional cuisine"⁵ by the critics.

The food scene in Georgia is way behind the times. That is, in the epoch of globalization, sedentary lifestyle, ecological problems, Georgians follow the same diet as their ancestors who had a completely different lifestyle (Makashvili 2013; Skhva Shuadze 2013).

Some contemporary Georgian dishes are considerably heavy with fat and spices (TEDx Talks 2016; Ryan 2018).

It is necessary to create lighter, healthier versions of "traditional" dishes (Makashvili 2013; Maestro TV 2014).

⁴ The speaker is implying the similarity of Chavchavadze's and Bendukidze's physical appearance.

⁵ Quotation marks are used to emphasize the critics' idea that contemporary Georgian cuisine is falsely regarded as authentically Georgian. In the context of the critique, they use the word "traditional" to index this popular (false) understanding of what Georgian cuisine is.

Over the years, Georgian cuisine has become dogmatic and tabooed (TabulaTelevision 2014; BMG 2017a, 2017b).

Society reacts to changes negatively and considers them an offense against national feelings (Chlaidze 2016; TabulaTelevision 2016; TEDx Talks 2016).

A limited, highly standardized repertoire has been formed, mostly due to the influence of the Soviet regime (Alexander Giorgadze 2016).

Georgian cuisine has “frozen,” ceased to progress past a certain stage. If left this way, it will gradually lose its popularity (Ana Giorgadze 2015; TabulaTelevision 2016).

The gastronomical scene in Georgia does not reflect the “richness” of Georgian culinary heritage; many dishes, ingredients, and cooking rules have been forgotten and should be revived (Bedwell 2016; Lomsadze 2017; *Georgian Journal* 2018; Kokiashvili 2018).

Some of traditional dishes are often “overspiced” and “overcooked.” The authentic taste of the vegetables is lost due to overuse of spices or prolonged cooking time (Tekunas Culinariumi 2016).

Traditional dishes offered by Georgian restaurants lack the “relevant presentation”; on the one hand, little importance is given to the decor and the way the dish is served; on the other hand, menus are not built around thematic concepts—seasonal, festive, traditional, modernized, etc. (Tekunas Culinariumi 2016).

These points do not always appear in all critical texts. At the same time, it is difficult to determine which line of criticism is fundamental and shared by all and which line of criticism is of secondary importance. One of the most common issues is the impeded development of Georgian cuisine. We encountered this topic in all the texts that, directly or indirectly, criticized current Georgian cuisine. Almost everywhere, it is formulated identically (Kharbedia 2010; Ana Giorgadze 2015; Alexander Giorgadze 2016): it is claimed that culinary landscape has not changed much through the post-Soviet period (Goldstein 2013). The dishes and menus of most Georgian restaurants look as if the national cuisine has been “frozen,” according to the common metaphor (Ana Giorgadze 2015).

CRITIQUE OF SOVIET INFLUENCE ON GEORGIAN CUISINE

How and when was the old, innovative Georgian cuisine replaced by “traditional” Georgian cuisine? To answer this question, supporters of New Georgian Cuisine refer to the history of the twentieth century (Babunashvili 2016). They see the origin of their problems in the Soviet Union. According to them, the Soviet government promoted the standardization of national cuisines by highlighting a small number of “national” dishes (Feiring 2017; Gegenava 2017) and narrowing down the variety of

indigenous specialties (e.g., for four types of cheese, see Goldstein 2013:xvi). Consequently, breaking with the Soviet conception of "tradition" in cuisine should be considered as part of a wider project of breaking with the Soviet past (Kukulava 2017; Kokiashvili 2018).

In the most radical version of this narrative Georgian cuisine in its current state is Georgian in form but Soviet in content (Babunashvili 2016). The Soviet government worked to standardize menus in Georgia for 70 years (for an example of this narrative, see Adeishvili 2011). To create the combined menu, they used the elements of ethnic cuisines to establish an "internationalist" menu in all countries. "The 70-year communist experiment had an aim of creating Homo Sovieticus—a new personality, who would not only think and act on behalf of the community but also eat special food and live in communal spaces" (Sukhashvili 2017).

According to the narrative of New Georgian Cuisine and its associates, the "standardized" approach to the culinary practices adopted by the Soviet Union had a negative influence on traditional Georgian cuisine. On the one hand, traditional dishes were preserved and popularized, but their "original" spirit of innovation was lost. Supporters of New Georgian Cuisine claim that the Soviet Union made us forget that Georgian cuisine was traditionally innovative (TEDx Talks 2016). We would like to note that this topic resonates with widespread narratives beyond the culinary field—for example, the Sukhishvili Georgian National Ballet is also considered an innovative project and the present generation of the National Ballet choreographers is the successor of this innovative tradition, rooted in the pre-Soviet past (Sukhishvili 2002).

One of the harmful culinary additions forced on Georgian cuisine by the Soviet Union is, according to some, mayonnaise. It is abundantly used in cold and hot dishes, salads, and meals made of meat. Mayonnaise is the "enemy icon" against which representatives of New Georgian Cuisine have declared war. However, it is very difficult to defeat this enemy by removing it from dishes, as consumers have used it for years and are used to its taste. In the majority of the New Georgian Cuisine texts the popularity of mayonnaise is attributed to the Soviet Union. An episode from the radio program *Niko's Podcast* featuring the founder of the popular Georgian culinary blog *Ratatouille* is illustrative.

Guest: Mayonnaise still is our problem... I blame the Soviet period and its influence because all kinds of creativity disappeared in that period.

Host: I like mayonnaise in *kalakuri* salad [Russian potato salad, aka *stolichnyi salat*], for instance, but not with everything.

Guest: It is clear that mayonnaise is a simple solution, it is cheap and gives a delicious taste to meals, but we are accustomed not to think about how harmful it is to health. (Radio Tavisufleba 2015)

TRADITION(S): LOST, FALSIFIED, AND INNOVATED

Below, we will explore three interpretive repertoires of the concept “tradition” found in texts about New Georgian Cuisine. We refer to these as “lost traditions,” “falsified tradition,” and “tradition of innovation.” Each of these repertoires offers a different interpretation of the concept, with different connotations.

RECLAIMING LOST TRADITIONS: SORREL SOUP

One important topic in narratives of New Georgian Cuisine is the revival of old culinary traditions or Georgian foodways in general. This repertoire can be found in discourse from chefs, journalists, and gastronomes when they refer to some little-known Georgian dishes (Tsatava 2016), newly discovered recipes of well-known dishes (Gegenava 2017), or ancient techniques of food preparation and conservation (Topuria 2016; Melikidze 2017). This repertoire implies that some essential parts of Georgian culinary heritage were lost and should be regained. The key words to this repertoire are “rediscovery” and “recalling.” Both words imply an encounter with something familiar but long forgotten, therefore appearing to us as strange and unfamiliar. The repertoire of recalling/reclaiming lost traditions revolves around particular dishes. Duck dolma, mentioned earlier in this article, can be illustrative in this regard. Some chefs claim that duck dolma used to be part of Georgian cuisine. For unknown reasons the dish and its recipe were forgotten and rediscovered just recently, due to the efforts of people associated with the Georgian Culinary Academy (Babunashvili 2016). The name was preserved in language as a metaphor for something desirable but impossible to get. Now it is listed on the menus of Georgian cafés and restaurants.⁶

Another example of a “reclaimed” traditional food is *shechamandi*—a thin, homogenous soup that is usually plant-based but may contain dairy products. One variety is *gholos shechamadi* (sorrel soup⁷). Sorrel soup and other vegetarian *shechamandi* were popular in feudal Georgia and episodically reappeared during the “hungry times” of the 1990s, mostly among families with some peasant background. Sorrel soup is not a common dish nowadays, but it is believed that talking about it, reading some materials, and remembering personal stories will evoke the memory of this authentic Georgian dish. For instance, the restaurant Barbarestan in Tbilisi recently included sorrel soup in its menu and attempted to gain customers’ attention by placing a proverb about sorrel on its Facebook page: “Trying to escape sorrel, still encountered it at the end of the day.”⁸ Some promotional text was added to the proverb as a commentary: “If you taste it, you will realize that sorrel is not a plant to avoid but is a highly respectable plant, which Georgians of old were actively consuming.”

⁶ See, for example, the menu of Café Discovery in Tbilisi (https://www.menu.ge/en/restaurant/discovery-marjanishvilze/duck-dolma_64091.html).

⁷ The Latin name of the plant is *Rumex confertus*.

⁸ The proverb refers to the past when this plant could be found spread over large territories in the countryside.

Including Georgian proverbs in elementary school textbooks is a tradition that survived several waves of educational reforms in Georgia. Maybe a few people know what sorrel is. However, the main point here is that the proverb enables potential customers to establish a link between themselves and the new food. Most potential patrons of Barbarestan will relate to this proverb as something familiar associated with their childhood and consequently relate to the unfamiliar dish through the familiar phrase. The photo of sorrel soup accompanied by the proverb received positive feedback from Facebook users—some of them even recalled that they had tasted this soup, made by their grandmothers, during their childhood and shared different recipes for its preparation. This was a moment of recognition of the place of sorrel soup among the “authentic” Georgian dishes. Also, many customers explicitly linked this dish to Georgian traditional culture and presented it as an example of a genuine and rich Georgian tradition.

Generally, narratives about the rediscovery of forgotten recipes imply that there is a big void in the current conception of Georgian cuisine. It is also implied that this void must be filled. However, some effort and special mnemonic techniques are required to bring back the lost parts of Georgian culinary heritage. This motif of regaining the true, authentic Georgian self through remembering resonates with some basic texts from Georgian literature. One of them is the popular short story “Iavnana ra Hqmna” (“The Miracle of a Lullaby”) by Georgian writer and pedagogue Iakob Gogebashvili who belonged to the group of “enlighteners” of the nineteenth century. The main character of this story, a young Georgian girl named Keto, was kidnapped as a child and raised in Dagestan. After many years, her parents managed to get her back, but she did not recognize them, nor did she remember anything from her childhood. She only recalled her true identity when her mother sang her a childhood lullaby. The story contains detailed descriptions of how memories of childhood returned to the main character and how, with these memories, awareness of her culture and home also grew (Gogebashvili [1890] 2015). While “mnemonic” texts produced by representatives of Supra Nova do not contain direct reference to this famous story, there is an important similarity in the structure and content of these narratives, which allows us to speak about indirect intertextual links.

GEORGIAN CUISINE: TRADITION OF INNOVATION

Another repertoire for representing Georgian culinary tradition posits that innovation is part of this tradition itself. According to the authors of some texts, Georgians have been experimenting with elements of other cultures and incorporating results of these experiments into their own culture for centuries. The narrative about *khinkali*, one of the iconic Georgian dishes, is illustrative in this regard.

Authors of the narrative about New Georgian Cuisine constantly emphasize that *khinkali* was originally a Mongolian dish. Consequently, it is represented as a part of a foreign culture that Georgians have incorporated into their own culture by changing its form and content (Gachechiladze, cited in Makashvili 2013). *Khinkali* is presented not as Georgian by origin but as a kind of “naturalized” member of the pantheon of Georgian traditional cuisine. A foreign dish was adopted, modified, and

transformed into a truly Georgian dish. The narrative of New Georgian Cuisine emphasizes that *khinkali* is not a rare exception in this regard. In most cases, examples of borrowing from Turkic, Persian, or even Indian (the famous *satsivi*, chicken in a special sauce, is example of the latter) culinary traditions are cited. Examples of borrowing from Russian cuisine are absent from this repertoire, as Georgian cuisine and culture in general are described in opposition to Russian culture. Other examples of dishes prepared from “naturalized” products in traditional kitchens include *mchadi* (cornbread), *ghomi* (corn porridge), and *lobio* (beans).

It should be noted that this representation goes against the commonly held view that “traditional” dishes were invented by the Georgian nation long, long time ago. Many Facebook users leave overtly negative comments under posts in which the “foreign” origin of “traditional” Georgian dishes is suggested.

Why are supporters of this movement involved in the “deconstruction” of traditional Georgian cuisine? Do they want to replace these dishes with new ones? Looking at the context in which these discussions unfold, we see that this act is aimed at creating a positive image of culinary innovation. *Khinkali* is used to argue that the process of “tradition making” has not ended: the enrichment of a culinary culture, making it even more authentic and different from other cuisines, can be achieved only through the renovation of traditions by the introduction of innovative dishes, ingredients, and forms. This has been happening in Georgia “since time immemorial,” and it is the correct way to continue now. This opinion can be found in an interview given by Chef Gachechiladze to the Georgian edition of *Forbes*:

I do nothing new. I do what Barbare Jorjadze did, and before that, many others did ... what the [Georgian] kings did, what George II was doing. They were adding new ingredients to old dishes, and, finally, they came up with new dishes that became ours. An example of this is corn flour, which was not here from ancient time, but it came to us, we accepted it and now we cannot live without *ghomi* and think about it as totally “ours.” What is called “traditional” Georgian cuisine is a mix of many cultures, many influences (like our nation, in general). (Makashvili 2013)

Other supporters of New Georgian Cuisine—journalists and public figures—also state that Georgian cuisine and Georgian culture are the result of interaction with neighboring cultures. Malkhaz Kharbedia, a Georgian writer, argues that:

The main problem with Georgian restaurant culture is that it does not develop, it stands in one place, frozen in *khinkali* and *kebab*. In Italy, France, or Spain gastronomy like ours would have been adopted and well nurtured. On the one hand, they would retain and restore ancient traditions, and on the other hand, novelties and radical experiments would have been welcomed. However, the problem is that the consumer does not grow and does not develop. Therefore, we remain constantly demanding *khinkali* and *kebab*. (Kharbedia 2010)

Again, the negative influence of the Soviet Union on the development of Georgian “innovative” cuisine is stressed. In public lectures, musician and chef Vakho Babunashvili often speaks about the recent origin of some “traditional” dishes. His

main point is that what Georgian people believe to be an old tradition was in fact created in the twentieth century. These kinds of stories contribute to the desacralization of tradition and the popularization of the argument that tradition is something that is created every day, by ordinary people.

Georgian cuisine is really rich and has a long history, but how much do we know, for example, how traditional is *khinkali*? Why did *khinkali* become so popular? From my personal research, I know that *khinkali* became popular in the 1960s. The traditional mountain dish became Georgian fast food. *Khinkali* cafeterias [were opened] where people were standing while eating, with *khinkali* served in 10 minutes. Now there are no cafeterias, but restaurants are performing the same function.... This was mountain food and was serving that environment. Everyone thinks it has always been popular.... Even the inventor of *chkmeruli* [a dish widely regarded as "traditional"] is still alive. (Babunashvili cited in Alexander Giorgadze 2016)

The history of innovation, as well as the history of resistance to innovation, is well represented in the discussion about the emblematic dish of New Georgian Cuisine, *elarji* (cornmeal with *suluguni* cheese) balls with almond *bazhe*.

Today *elarji* balls can be found on the menus of dozens of restaurants, including restaurants that are known as strict adherents of Georgian traditional cuisine (for example, the restaurant Dadiani in Tbilisi. This dish is also included on the menus of Georgian restaurants in Washington, DC, and London). Foreign bloggers, journalists, and tourists recommend *elarji* balls as a unique Georgian dish. It can be found under different names (polenta and cheese balls, cornmeal and cheese croquettes, etc.). For foreign customers the name "*elarji* balls" is not informative. To give customers an idea of what it is and where it comes from, a long description of the dish is added. Thus, *elarji* balls can be regarded as an emblematic dish of New Georgian Cuisine—it is at the same time traditional and innovative, modern and exotic; it appeals to both Georgians and foreigners.

The inventor of *elarji* balls is well known: Georgian chef Tekuna Gachechiladze. It should be noted that representatives of New Georgian Cuisine emphasize the creativity and originality of their dishes, in contrast to classic Georgian dishes that are generally perceived by Georgian audiences as having no particular author but "the Georgian people." *Elarji* balls were created by Gachechiladze in the early 2000s, and at that time the dish was received negatively by more conservative Georgian cooks. "All the cooks protested, and one woman said that she would not make it in a different way because her mother and grandmother were preparing it so and how can almond be brought into *bazhe*! It's unheard of!" (TEDx Talks 2016).

It appears from the quote that the negative reaction of cooks was caused by the attempt to make changes to a traditional Georgian dish. Gachechiladze herself does not consider that her modification of the dish cardinally differs from the classic mode of preparation. According to her, the dish has changed its shape and now better fits modern global culinary trends. The classic form of *elarji* was very large and shapeless—it looked like porridge, filling the entire plate. In the form of balls, it looks smaller, more

beautiful, and familiar in form to foreign customers (similar to croquettes). To sum up in one phrase, *elarji* balls are European in shape and Georgian in content. In the case of *bazhe*, the replacement of walnuts with almonds makes it less allergenic and more easily digestible. It is adapted to global standards of lightness and health.



Figure 1. Traditional *elarji* vs. *elarji* balls (Source: Facebook page of the restaurant Dadiani, Tbilisi.)

“FALSIFIED” TRADITION

Another repertoire is false or falsified tradition. According to supporters of the New Georgian Cuisine movement, the Soviet regime made efforts to standardize Georgian cuisine and reduce it to a limited set of dishes. While some dishes were selected to represent Georgian cuisine, others were neglected and forgotten—like the sorrel soup, mentioned earlier. According to critics, this condensed version of Georgian ethnic cuisine is falsely representing traditional cuisine in contemporary Georgia. The goal of the movement is to challenge this false, though dominant, concept. Recipes developed in the nineteenth century by Barbare Jorjodze are considered to be culinary masterpieces. The famous Orbeliani candies, diverse cuisine, delicate and tasty dishes—all these things were parts of Georgian culture. However, the communist system destroyed this heritage, as it did in many other fields. Cuisine and chefs were subsumed under the *obshchepit* (public canteen system) label. Gradually, the chef became a *povar* (the Russian word for cook), and Barbare Jorjadze was replaced by a category of people who were not successful in other areas of life, “losers who became cooks” (Chlaidze 2016).

Old-school chefs are considered the primary perpetrators of “false tradition.” This group is frequently referred as *povary* by supporters of the Supra Nova movement. The Russian word emphasizes the inauthentic character of their cooking style. *Povary* are opposed to the refined, aristocratic cooks of pre-Soviet times, like Princess Barbare Jorjadze. Thus, the word *povar* symbolizes the story of how the Soviet regime downgraded Georgian “high cuisine” to low-quality, standardized, plebian cookery. The stereotypical *povar* is a middle-aged woman or man, with a limited imagination and lack of good taste. They are conservative, only recognize standard recipes, and are afraid of the changes. This *povar* not only actively resists changes in their own kitchen but also struggles against innovations on a wider scale and blames others for violating the traditions of Georgian cuisine.

Based on the same text, we can reconstruct an image of the proper, modern cook who is the opposite of the *povar*. This is a person whose mission is to break the stereotype of the cook as old and of cooking as a low-prestige profession. This cook could be a young, motivated person with higher education. The good cook is ambitious, not afraid of difficulties, and seeks to test their own limits. Their profession is, for this person, a means of achieving self-awareness and self-realization. They have an education in other fields and maybe even had a career in that field previously, but have come to see that they want more and seek new experiences. In this process, they realize their culinary vocation. Unlike older cooks, they are doing this willingly, not simply due to life circumstances—they *want* to be a chef. The goal of such a person is not just individual self-expression. They understand the social consequences of their activities and hence are trying to be the type of cook their society needs, a cook who can introduce positive changes: "It is my call, and I have to do it because there are so many things to be done in this field here and now" (TabulaTelevision 2016).

According to a contemporary culinary narrative, young people become cooks out of choice and not due to life circumstances. Their action is goal orientated—they become cooks in order to accomplish something, not just because they have to. That is what distinguishes them from the old cooks who did not care about their profession. The stagnation of Georgian cuisine is attributed to this indifference. The old cooks are represented as having neither motivation nor education or a broader horizon, without which professionalism in the modern sense is impossible. That is why they are the "*khinkali* makers" and "*povary*"; in other words, craftsmen, workers without professional motivation. This condition has harmful consequences for the whole society because this kind of cook hinders progress and blocks positive innovations.

Some texts in which old cooks and new chefs are contrasted can help to illuminate this image. A story told by celebrity chef Tekuna Gachechiladze is an important source in this regard. "When I opened a restaurant, I expected that young boys and girls full of enthusiasm would come to work there. Actually, those who came were middle-aged women and men with little sense of taste. I realized that there is no chance of changing them" (TabulaTelevision 2016).

Texts drawing on this repertoire do not touch upon the question of the future prospects for old-fashioned cooks; namely, what will happen to those who do not keep up with changes and innovations? However, some stories like the one mentioned at the beginning of this article show us some possible outcomes of the confrontation between practitioners of the old and new Georgian cuisines. Recalcitrant cooks may not find employment or be threatened with dismissal unless they change old habits.

DISCUSSION

In this article we have explored different interpretative repertoires of tradition encountered in texts produced by supporters of New Georgian Cuisine. We identi-

fied three repertoires, or ways of speaking about Georgian culinary traditions: lost and regained traditions, falsified tradition, and tradition of innovation. The first repertoire refers to traditional food as a part of a cultural heritage that has been partly forgotten and should be revived. The second repertoire refers to the false conception of Georgian traditions created by the Soviet state. This repertoire implies that the Soviet government impoverished the Georgian gastronomic legacy—it reduced Georgian cuisine to a limited collection of dishes and misrepresented Georgian tradition as highly conservative. The third repertoire revolves around the notion of a “true essence” of Georgian culture being “creativity” and “openness to innovation.” New Georgian Cuisine is represented as a contemporary embodiment of the true spirit of Georgian cuisine of all eras (except the Soviet period) in the sense that it follows a continuous tradition of innovation. We argue that the combination of these three repertoires makes it possible to find a middle way between the fulfillment of sometimes opposing demands for cultural authenticity and innovation.

In Georgian liberal nationalist discourse, the position of the Soviet Union is similar to the position of the metropole in the anticolonial nationalist discourses of third world countries (Broers 2014). We can see the same in narratives of the New Georgian Cuisine movement: the Soviet Union is represented as an imperial power that deliberately impeded the development of Georgian cuisine. At numerous points, representatives of the New Georgian Cuisine movement position themselves as participants in a struggle against a colonial Soviet legacy.

Similar to some other studies (Alberts 2006; Mariola and McConnell 2013), we claim that the impetus for innovation in the case of Georgia comes from market forces. Innovation is depicted by supporters of New Georgian Cuisine as a precondition for both the survival of national culinary heritage and the elevation of the status of Georgian cuisine on the global level. Georgian cuisine is depicted as a valuable part of global cultural heritage and, at the same time, as a business project with good potential for success on the global market. Thus, in this case a market-led drive for innovation is accompanied by patriotic sentiment or a desire to preserve and enhance national cuisine (conceived as modernist and innovative). This modernized version of the past strongly resembles other narratives popular in “pro-Western” parts of Georgian society. The general belief behind these narratives is that Georgian culture is, and has always been, part of European culture (Brisku 2013). Innovation, according to the authors of the texts we analyzed, is a distinctly “European” value. Similar beliefs are expressed by researchers who trace the origins of the concept of “Western culture” (Bowman 2015). In the mythology on Georgian culture as part of European culture, the Russian and Soviet empires are presented as evil powers that impeded the development of Georgian-European cultural ties (Brisku 2013). The mission of the current generation of intellectuals is to revive these connections and bring Georgian society “back” to Europe. Thus, the mythology about the European character of Georgian culture helps supporters of New Georgian Cuisine to negotiate between innovation and authenticity as values.

For supporters of New Georgian Cuisine, innovation does not present a break with the past. Nor do they use tradition as a "cover" for innovation, as in the case described by Magnani (2016). For them, innovation is a value inherent in Georgian culture and traditions. Similar to what Vázquez and González (2015) found, in our case the movement for innovation has some powerful actors as sponsors. On a discursive level these relations are revealed in apologetic representations of the roles of powerful persons (like Kakha Bendukidze) and the state (e.g., the case of Anaklia) in the process of innovation of Georgian cuisine.

Previous discussions on the results of combining tradition and innovation in food focused on marketing issues (De Massis et al. 2016; Vrontis, Bresciani, and Giacosa 2016). Research by Vázquez and González is important as it turns our attention toward the distribution of cultural capital. Similar to other processes of change in (post)modern societies, the process of reshaping culinary culture has influenced the distribution of symbolic and material resources in society. To explore this issue, we use Bourdieu's concept of "symbolic power" (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992). According to him, social domination operates through control of the process of classification and evaluation of the relative worth of various cultural and material objects. Any social change can lead to changes in classificatory schemes and in the hierarchy of values. As a consequence, it can lead to the empowerment or disempowerment of people whose stock of cultural capital is affected by these changes.

We see New Georgian Cuisine as having two consequences in terms of social inequality. On the one hand, it tries to elevate the social status of cooks as a professional group and transforms cuisine into an avenue for upward social mobility. On the other hand, the movement is clearly oriented toward the values of upper- and middle-class people, who represent the majority of visitors of "ethnic" restaurants in Western countries (Fine 2001). This is most obviously manifested in the choice of relatively expensive ingredients, which we can observe in television programs hosted by proponents of the movement. Also, creativity is associated with certain cultural competencies, such as the ability to accumulate and use information from global sources. Creativity and innovation are also values most often associated with the entrepreneurial or creative class in modern societies (Florida 2006). Overall, the project of New Georgian Cuisine leads to enhanced domination of segments of the upper and middle classes, related to the "new," globalized, "creative" economy. Conversely, it contributes to the marginalization of other groups, be they supporters of more "old-style" culinary practices, the poor, or food nonconformists.

We end our discussion with some considerations of what an alternative, still innovative but more democratic project of Georgian cuisine might look like. Most often, in texts by representatives of the New Georgian Cuisine movement, innovativeness is exclusively linked to the work of the new generation of chefs. However, we believe that creativity and innovation are part of the everyday activities of homemakers and "ordinary" cooks. An alternative version of Georgian cuisine can be based on a more participatory approach, with chefs from various strata of the food industry, as well as people involved in home cooking, taking part in the construction of project. This can

be achieved by using various participatory mechanisms (social media, letters, site visits). It should be acknowledged that any cuisine, including the Soviet one, has creative and constantly changing characteristics. This can also be related to more open discussions about why Mongol heritage is recognized as part of ethnic culture, while Russian or Soviet influence is not. Overall, this dialogue should lead to the creation of an alternative vision of ethnic cuisine, even more open to past and future influences from other cultures. This recognition of a wider set of influences can help to create a more inclusive vision of Georgian cuisine, one in which borscht, an everyday dish which came to Georgia from other parts of the Soviet/Russian state, will be recognized as equal to Ajarian *khachapuri*, a popular dish closely resembling Turkish *pide* but found nowadays in Georgian cafés and restaurants.

REFERENCES

- Baruch, Michael J. 2002. *The New Polish Cuisine*. Del Mar, CA: LBCM Pub.
- Bauman, Zygmunt. 2000. *Liquid Modernity*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Bauman, Zygmunt. 2017. *Retrotopia*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Baumol, William, and Robert Litan. 2012. "The Four Type of Capitalism, Innovation and Economic Growth." Pp. 115–128 in *Oxford Handbook of Capitalism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bonis, Eva M. 2012. *New Hungarian Cuisine: Traditional & Contemporary Favorites*. N.p.: NovisTrend.
- Borghini, Andrea. 2014. "Authenticity in Food." Pp. 180–185 in *Encyclopedia of Food and Agricultural Ethics*, ed. by Paul D. Thompson and David M. Kaplan. New York: Springer.
- Bourdieu, Pierre, and Loïc J. D. Wacquant. 2013. *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Bowman, Johnathan. 2015. *Cosmopolitan Justice: The Axial Age, Multiple Modernities, and the Post-secular Turn*. New York: Springer.
- Brennan, James. 2011. "Supra Nova—the New Georgian Cuisine." *The Dubai Guzzler* (blog), April 28. <http://duguzzle.blogspot.com/2011/04/supra-nova-new-georgian-cuisine.html>.
- Brisku, Adrian. 2013. *Bittersweet Europe: Albanian and Georgian Discourses on Europe, 1878–2008*. New York: Berghahn.
- Broers, Laurence. 2014. "Unpacking the Meta-Conflict: Claims to Sovereignty, Self-Determination and Territorial Integrity in the Georgian-Abkhazian Conflict." Pp. 263–283 in *The Making of Modern Georgia, 1918–2012: The First Georgian Republic and Its Successors*, ed. by Stephen F. Jones. London: Routledge.
- Bulakh, Tetiana. 2018. "Made in Ukraine: Consumer Citizenship during EuroMaidan Transformations." Pp. 73–90 in *Identity and Nation Building in Everyday Post-Socialist Life*, ed. by Abel Polese, Jeremy Morris, Emilia Pawlusz, and Oleksandra Seliverstova. London: Routledge.
- Cavanaugh, Jillian R. 2007. "Making Salami, Producing Bergamo: The Transformation of Value." *Ethnos* 72(2):149–172. doi:10.1080/00141840701387853.
- Chandler, Daniel. 2018. *Semiotics: The Basics*. New York: Routledge.
- Chatwin, Mary Ellen. 1997. *Socio-Cultural Transformation and Foodways in the Republic of Georgia*. Commack, NY: Nova Science Publishers.
- Cidell, Julie L., and Heike C. Alberts. 2006. "Constructing Quality: The Multinational Histories of Chocolate." *Geoforum* 37(6):999–1007. doi:10.1016/j.geoforum.2006.02.006.
- Corona, Annette Ogrodnik. 2012. *The New Ukrainian Cookbook: A Blend of Tradition and Innovation*. New York: Hippocrene Books.
- Cook, Ian, Peter Jackson, Allison Hayes-Conroy, Sebastian Abrahamsson, Rebecca Sandover, Mimi Sheller, Heike Henderson, et al. 2013. "Food's Cultural Geographies: Texture, Creativity, and Publics." Pp. 343–352 in *The Wiley-Blackwell Companion to Cultural Geography*, ed. by Nuala C. Johnson, Richard H. Schein, and Jamie Winders. Chichester, UK: John Wiley and Sons.

- Curro, Costanza. 2017. "From Goods to Emotions: The Transformation of Informal Practices in the Republic of Georgia." Pp. 139–156 in *The Informal Economy: Exploring Drivers and Practices*, ed. by Ioana A. Horodnic, Peter W. Rodgers, and Colin C. Williams. New York: Routledge.
- De Massis, Alfredo, Federico Frattini, Josip Kotlar, Antonio Messeni Petruzzelli, and Mike Wright. 2016. "Innovation through Tradition: Lessons from Innovative Family Businesses and Directions for Future Research." *Academy of Management Perspectives* 30(1):93–116. doi:10.5465/amp.2015.0017.
- DeSoucey, Michaela. 2010. "Gastronationalism: Food Traditions and Authenticity Politics in the European Union." *American Sociological Review* 75(3):432–455. doi:10.1177/0003122410372226.
- Feiring, Alice. 2017. "Humble Magic in Georgian Capital's Restaurant Renaissance." *New York Times*, February 16. <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/02/16/travel/tbilisi-georgia-republic-post-soviet-restaurant-dining-scene.html>.
- Ferrero, Sylvia. 2002. "Comida sin par. Consumption of Mexican Food in Los Angeles: 'Foodscapes' in a Transnational Consumer Society." Pp. 194–219 in *Food Nations: Selling Taste in Consumer Societies*, ed. by Warren Belasco and Philip Scranton. London: Routledge.
- Fine, Gary Alan. 2001. "Review Essay: You Are Where You Eat." *Contemporary Sociology* 30(3):231–233.
- Florida, Richard. 2006. *The Rise of the Creative Class: And How It's Transforming Work, Leisure, Community, and Everyday Life*. New York: Basic Books.
- Foucault, Michel. 2011. *The Birth of Biopolitics: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1978–1979*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Garth, Hanna. 2009. "Things Became Scarce: Food Availability and Accessibility in Santiago de Cuba Then and Now." *NAPA Bulletin* 32(1):178–192. doi:10.1111/j.1556-4797.2009.01034.x.
- Giacosa, Elisa, Alberto Ferraris, and Filippo Monge. 2017. "How to Strengthen the Business Model of an Italian Family Food Business." *British Food Journal* 119 (11):2309–2324. doi:10.1108/BFJ-03-2017-0124.
- Gibbs, Graham. 2008. *Analysing Qualitative Data*. London: SAGE.
- Gogiberidze, Sesili. 2017. "Georgia and Cultural Globalization: Effect and Challenges." *International Relations and Diplomacy* 5(11):650–659. doi:10.17265/2328-2134/2017.11.002.
- Goldstein, Darra. 2013. *Georgian Feast: The Vibrant Culture and Savory Food of the Republic of Georgia*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Gonzalez-Hemon, Georgina, Gaëlle Pantin-Sohier, and Jean-Marc Ferrandi. 2016. "The Concept of Traditionality for Food Products." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the International Marketing Trends Conference, Venice, January 21–23. https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Pantin_Sohier_Gaëlle/publication/291808708_The_concept_of_traditionality_for_food_products/links/56acc52008aeaa696f2c9934.pdf.
- Gorgoglione, Michele, Antonio Messeni Petruzzelli, and Umberto Panniello. 2017. "Innovation through Tradition in the Italian Coffee Industry: An Analysis of Customers' Perceptions." *Review of Managerial Science* 12(3):661–682. doi:10.1007/s11846-017-0226-3.
- Guerrero, Luis, Maria Dolors Guàrdia, Joan Xicola, Wim Verbeke, Filip Vanhonacker, Sylwia Zakowska-Biemans, and Marta Sajdakowska. 2009. "Consumer-Driven Definition of Traditional Food Products and Innovation in Traditional Foods: A Qualitative Cross-Cultural Study." *Appetite* 52(2):345–354. doi:10.1016/j.appet.2008.11.008.
- Heath, Deborah, and Anne Meneley. 2010. "The Naturecultures of Foie Gras." *Food, Culture & Society* 13(3):421–452. doi:10.2752/175174410X12699432701024.
- Heilbroner, Robert L. 1995. *The Worldly Philosophers: The Lives, Times, and Ideas of the Great Economic Thinkers*. New York: Touchstone Books.
- Hobsbawm, Eric. 1983. "Introduction: Inventing Traditions." Pp. 1–14 in *The Invention of Tradition*, ed. by Eric Hobsbawm and Terence Ranger. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Imai, Shoko. 2010. "Nobu and After: Westernized Japanese Food and Globalization." In *Food and Social Identities in the Asia Pacific Region*, ed. by James Farrer. Tokyo: Sophia University Institute of Comparative Culture. http://icc.fl.sophia.ac.jp/global%20food%20papers/pdf/3_4_IMAI.pdf.
- Jones, Stephen Francis. 2012. *Georgia: A Political History since Independence*. London: I. B. Tauris.
- Jørgensen, Marianne, and Louise Phillips. 2011. *Discourse Analysis as Theory and Method*. Los Angeles: SAGE.

- Langlois, Simon. 2001. "Traditions: Social." Pp. 15829–15833 in *International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences*, ed. by Neil Smelser and Paul Baltes. Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- Loring, Philip A., and S. Craig Gerlach. 2010. "Outpost Gardening in Interior Alaska: Food System Innovation and the Alaska Native Gardens of the 1930s through the 1970s." *Ethnohistory* 57(2):183–199. doi:10.1215/00141801-2009-060.
- Magnani, Natalia. 2016. "Reconstructing Food Ways: Role of Skolt Sami Cultural Revitalization Programs in Local Plant Use." *Journal of Ethnobiology* 36(1):85–104. doi:10.2993/0278-0771-36.1.85.
- Manning, Paul. N.d. "Socialist Supras and Drinking Democratically: Changing Images of the Georgian Feast and Georgian Society from Socialism to Post-Socialism." Department of Anthropology, Trent University, Peterborough, ON, Canada. Unpublished Manuscript. Accessed April 26, 2019. <http://www.mapageweb.umontreal.ca/tuitekj/cours/Manning-Supra.pdf>.
- Manning, Paul. 2014. "Domestication of the Wild Supra." *Ab Imperio* 4:53–62. doi:10.1353/imp.2014.0115.
- Mariola, Matt, and David Mcconnell. 2013. "The Shifting Landscape of Amish Agriculture: Balancing Tradition and Innovation in an Organic Farming Cooperative." *Human Organization* 72(2):144–153. doi:10.17730/humo.72.2.e16uh26306774ul4.
- Melher, Anna. 2018. *The Modern Ukrainian Kitchen: 70 Contemporary Recipes of Ukrainian Cuisine*. N.p.: CreateSpace Independent Publishing Platform.
- Mennell, Stephen. 1996. *All Manners of Food Eating and Taste in England and France from the Middle Ages to the Present*. 2nd ed. Chicago: University of Illinois Press.
- Mühlfried, Florian. 2005. "Banquets, Grant-Eaters and the Red Intelligentsia in Post-Soviet Georgia." *Central Eurasian Studies Review* 4(1):16–19.
- Mühlfried, Florian. 2007. "Sharing the Same Blood: Culture and Cuisine in the Republic of Georgia." *Anthropology of Food*, S3. <http://aof.revues.org/2342>.
- Mühlfried, Florian. 2014. "A Taste of Mistrust." *Ab Imperio* 4:63–68. doi:10.1353/imp.2014.0120.
- Nelson, Richard. 2008. "Innovation." In *The Columbia Encyclopedia*. 6th ed. <https://www.encyclopedia.com/social-sciences-and-law/economics-business-and-labor/businesses-and-occupations/innovation>.
- Nodia, Ghia. 2014. "The Values of the Georgian Supra: Nationalist or Nativist?" *Ab Imperio* 4:69–74. doi:10.1353/imp.2014.0125.
- Pilcher, Jeffrey M. 2012. *Planet Taco: A Global History of Mexican Food*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Pratt, Jeff. 2007. "Food Values: The Local and the Authentic." *Critique of Anthropology* 27(3):285–300. doi:10.1177/0308275X07080357.
- Ram, Harsha. 2014a. "A Feast for Thought." *Ab Imperio* 4:85–92. doi:10.1353/imp.2014.0108.
- Ram, Harsha. 2014b. "The Literary Origins of the Georgian Feast: The Cosmopolitan Poetics of a National Ritual." *Ab Imperio* 4:19–52. doi:10.1353/imp.2014.0110.
- Rao, Hayagreeva, Philippe Monin, and Rodolphe Durand. 2003. "Institutional Change in Toque Ville: Nouvelle Cuisine as an Identity Movement in French Gastronomy." *American Journal of Sociology* 108(4):795–843. doi:10.1086/367917.
- Ryan, Libby. 2018. "Looking for the Best Eastern European Food? It's Time to Head to Georgia." *Swirled*, July 11. <https://swirled.com/georgian-cuisine/>.
- Scott, Erik R. 2016. *Familial Strangers: The Georgian Diaspora and the Evolution of Soviet Empire*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Seliverstova, Oleksandra. 2017. "'Consuming' National Identity in Western Ukraine." *Nationalities Papers* 45(1):61–79. doi:10.1080/00905992.2016.1220363.
- Seliverstova, Oleksandra. 2018. "Consumer Citizenship and Reproduction of Estonianness." Pp. 109–127 in *Identity and Nation Building in Everyday Post-Socialist Life*, ed. by Abel Polese, Jeremy Morris, Emilia Pawlusz, and Oleksandra Seliverstova. London: Routledge.
- Silverman, David. 2015. *Interpreting Qualitative Data*. Los Angeles: SAGE.
- Stovel, Herb. 2007. "Effective Use of Authenticity and Integrity as World Heritage Qualifying Conditions." *City & Time* 2(3):21–36.

- T'abidze, T'itsian, Shota Papava, and Harsha Ram. 2014. "With Blue Drinking Horns." *Modernism/Modernity* 21(1):321–342. doi:10.1353/mod.2014.0028.
- Tonkinson, Robert. 1993. "Understanding 'Tradition': Ten Years On." *Anthropological Forum* 6(4):597–606.
- Urry, John. 2006. *Consuming Places*. London: Routledge.
- Vázquez, Alfredo Macías, and Pablo Alonso González. 2015. "Collective Symbolic Capital and Sustainability: Governing Fishing Communities in a Knowledge Economy." *Marine Policy* 53:21–26. doi:10.1016/j.marpol.2014.11.014.
- Vrontis, Demetris, Stefano Bresciani, and Elisa Giacosa. 2016. "Tradition and Innovation in Italian Wine Family Businesses." *British Food Journal* 118(8):1883–1897. doi:10.1108/BFJ-05-2016-0192.
- Wetherell, Margaret, and Jonathan Potter. 1988. "Discourse Analysis and the Identification of Interpretative Repertoires." Pp. 168–183 in *Analysing Everyday Explanation: A Casebook of Methods*, ed. by Charles Antaki. London: SAGE.
- Zak, Zuza. 2016. *Polska: New Polish Cooking*. London: Quadrille.

SOURCES

- Adeishvili, Ketii. 2011. "Sabch'ota k'avshiris mier mot'anili k'ulinariuli ghirebulebebi." *Marani*, June 16. <http://vinoge.com/samzareulo/sabWoTa-kavSiris-mier-motanili-kulinariuli-Rirebulebebi>.
- Anphimiadi, Diana. 2012. *P'iradi K'ulinaria*. Tbilisi, Georgia: Bakur Sulakauri Publishing.
- Babunashvili, Vakho. 2016. "Vakho babunashvili's blogi: Ikhvis t'olma da bus k'vertskhebi." *Culinart*, March 21. <http://culinartmagazine.com/2016/03/31/ვახო-ბაბუნაშვილის-ბლოგი-5/>.
- Bedwell, Helena. 2016. "The New Food Revolution... Started in Georgia in 1874." *Dante Magazine*, December 30. <https://www.dantemag.com/2016/12/the-new-food-revolution-started-in-georgia-in-1874/>.
- BMG (Business Media Georgia). 2017a. "Kalebis narat'ivi—merik'o gubeladze." Posted September 26. Video, 10:22. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7hI6c3n6VIQ>.
- BMG (Business Media Georgia). 2017b. "Kalebis narat'ivi—tek'una gachechiladze." Posted June 21. Video, 13:17. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=s2CUw2tNz3E&t=605s>.
- Chlaidze, Nino. 2016. "Tvis shepi—tek'una gachechiladze." *Culinart*, March 13. <http://culinartmagazine.com/2016/03/14/თვის-შეპი-თეკუნა-გაჩეჩილი/>.
- Dalakishvili, Nino. 2016. "Sabch'ota ok'up'atsia dasrulda, magram ok'up'atsia grdzeldaba." *Voice of America*, February 25. <https://www.amerikishma.com/a/soviet-occupation-of-georgia/3208027.html>.
- Dunbar, William. 2013. "Rat'om aghar shevch'am khink'als agharasodes: Kartuli k'erdzebis savalalo mdgomareoba." *Forbes Georgia*, December 23. <http://forbes.ge/news/207/ratom-aRar-SevWam-xinkals-aRarasodes:--qarTuli-kerZebis.savalalo-mdgomareoba->
- Foodspark*. 2018 "Georgian Cuisine: Does This Regional Food Have Potential to Capture Consumers?" December 10. <https://www.foodspark.com/Trends-People/Georgian-cuisine-does-this-regional-food-have-potential-to-capture-consumers>.
- Gegenava, Tika. 2017. "'Sakhli Madatovze'—utsnobi kartuli k'erdzebis akhali rest'orani aghmashenebelze." *Marketer*, August 4. <https://www.marketer.ge/saxli-madatovze-qartuli-restorani/>.
- Georgian Journal*. 2018. "Prominent Georgian Female Chef Barbare Jorjadze." July 13. <https://www.georgianjournal.ge/society/34721-prominent-georgian-female-chef-barbare-jorjadze.html>.
- Giorgadze, Alexander. 2016. "Ikhvis t'olma da bus k'vertskhebi." Posted April 25. Video, 18:36. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=iu4L885rdKI>.
- Giorgadze, Ana. 2015. "'Ert k'erdzshi 5 k'ont'inent's vetamashebi'—shep-mzareuli, romelits k'erdzebs sakartvelos sami p'rezident'istvis amzadebda." *Kviris Palitra*, April 14. <https://www.kvirispalitra.ge/public/24831-qarthveli-shef-mzareuli-romelic-kerdzebs-saqarthvelos-sami-prezidentistvis-amzadebda.html>.

- Gogebashvili, Iakob. [1890] 2015. *Iavnanam ra hkmna da skhva motkhroebi*. Tbilisi, Georgia: Sulakauri Publishing.
- Kharbedia, Malkhaz. 2010. "Kartuli K'ulinaria pesvebidan tanamedroveobamde." *Marani*, September 11. <http://vinoge.com/samzareulo/qarTuli-kulinaria-fesvebidan-Tanamedroveobamde>.
- Kokiashvili, Levan. 2018. "Gast'ronomiuli mitebi da ok'up'ant'i 'vinegret'i.'" *Forbes Georgia*, November 22. <http://forbes.ge/blog/313/gastronomiuli-miTeBi-da-okupanti-olivie>.
- Kroz, Varvara. 2018. "Pochemu seichas v trende gruzinskaia kukhnia?" *Restoran.ru*, September 19. <https://www.restoran.ru/msk/article-list/pochemu-seychas-v-trende-gruzinskaya-kukhnya/>.
- Kukulava, Maka. 2017. "CineFoodography—Sabch'ota saakhalts'lo supris ironia." *Culinart*, January 6. <http://culinartmagazine.com/2017/01/06/cinefoodography-საბჭოთა-საახალწლო-სუფრა/>.
- Lomsadze, Giorgi. 2017. "19th Century Princess and Cookbook Author Was also Georgia's First Feminist." NPR, April 28. <https://www.npr.org/sections/thesalt/2017/04/28/524404924/19th-century-princess-and-cookbook-author-was-also-georgias-first-feminist>.
- Maestro TV. 2014. "Tek'unas K'ulinariumi." Posted June 22. Video. Accessed January 3, 2019. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hbXv8C78wQY>.
- Makashvili, Ana. 2013. "Tek'una gachechiladze—gast'ronomiuli t'ransi." *Forbes Georgia*, December 16. <http://forbes.ge/news/203/Tekuna-gaCeCilaZe---gastronomiuli-transi>.
- Melikidze, Eka. 2017. "Riti ik'vebebodnen sakartveloshi sauk'uneebis ts'in?" Posted November 21. Video, 10:00. <https://www.palitravideo.ge/yvela-video/eqskluzivi/90493-rithi-ikvebebodnen-saqarthveloshi-sauk'uneebis-tsin.html>.
- Naneishvili, Mariam. 2016. "Tvis shepi—irak'li iosava." *Culinart*, March 25. <http://culinartmagazine.com/2016/03/25/2886/>.
- Radio Tavisufleba. 2015. "Nik'os p'odk'ast'i 130: Ek'a oniani." Posted November 13. Podcast, 54:58. <https://www.radiotavisupleba.ge/a/27362990.html>.
- Rustavi 2. 2017. "Chemi samzareulos ts'esebi—Akhali shou rustavi2-is etershi." November 19. Video, 14:08. <http://web2.rustavi2.ge/ka/news/90109>.
- Sanikidze, Luka. 2017. "Ebrdzole liberalizms." Training Center for Liberalism, December 3. <https://libcentri.wordpress.com/2017/12/03/ebrdzole/>.
- Skhva Shuadze. 2013. "Skhva shuadghe—sp'aget'i k'rbonara—25 okt'omberi, 2013." Posted October 23. Video, 35:13. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=9ALQLFKwTts&t=1884s>.
- Sukhashvili, Toma. 2017. "Sabch'ota K'erdzebis k'avshiri." *Chaikhana*. <https://chai-khana.org/ka/soviet-food-union>.
- Sukhishvili, Tamar. 2002. "Es bich'i k'argad tamashobs, pekhis ts'verebe dgebao—sukhishvilebis ansambli k'ontsert'ebi tbilisshi." 24 *Saati*, June 13. <http://www.opentext.org.ge/index.php?m=21&y=2002&art=14257>.
- TabulaTelevision. 2014. "Amaoebis bazari: Giorgi iosava." Posted October 15. Video 45:17. https://www.youtube.com/watch?time_continue=644&v=41qCBRekwMs.
- TabulaTelevision. 2015. "K'ulinariuli realiti shou rest'orani." Posted February 21. Video, 4:17. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=MT2aSw-id_U.
- TabulaTelevision. 2016. "Mdzime k'atstan—tek'una gachechiladze." Posted March 18. Video, 31:09. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=I9MrqO50aDM>.
- TEDx Talks. 2016. "Supra Nova: Innovating Georgian Cuisine. Tekuna Gachechiladze. TEDxTbilisi." Posted June 1. Video, 14:53. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ShZbmqCStQ>.
- Tekunas Culinariumi. 2016. "27.03.16 tek'unas K'ulinariumi—pkhalis ganskhvavebuli retsep't'i." Posted March 29. Video, 14:51. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=PrQ4aNa67lg>.
- Topuria, Tea. 2016. "Rit ik'vebebodnen dzvel sakartveloshi." Radio Tavisupleba, June 10. <https://www.radiotavisupleba.ge/a/rit-ikvebebodnen-istoriul-sakartveloshi/27790696.html>.
- Tsatava, Dali. 2016. "Dali tsat'avas blogi—ra dagvit'ova k'neina barbare jorjadzem." *Culinart*, September 19. <http://culinartmagazine.com/2016/09/19/დალი-ცატავას-ბლოგი-რა-დაგ/>.

«ВСЕ НОВОЕ – ЭТО ХОРОШО ЗАБЫТОЕ СТАРОЕ»: ТРАДИЦИИ И ИННОВАЦИИ В НАРРАТИВАХ ДВИЖЕНИЯ «НОВАЯ ГРУЗИНСКАЯ КУХНЯ»

Георгий Готуа, Нино Рчеулишвили

*Георгий Готуа, Центр изучения социальных практик (Тбилиси, Грузия).
Адрес для переписки: ул. Закария Палиашвили, 41-8, Тбилиси, 0179, Грузия.
ggotua@gmail.com.*

*Нино Рчеулишвили, Государственный университет Ильи (Тбилиси, Грузия).
Адрес для переписки: пр-т Какуца Чолокашвили, 3/5, Тбилиси, 0162, Грузия.
nrcheulishvili@iliauni.edu.ge.*

В статье речь идет о так называемой «Новой грузинской кухне» – актуальном пост-модернистском течении в современном кулинарном ландшафте страны. Это движение пытается преобразовать грузинскую кухню, превратив ее в современный инновационный проект, сохраняя при этом культурную самобытность. Нас интересовало, как эти две цели сосуществуют в текстах, выступлениях (письменных или устных) представителей движения. Выяснилось, что в текстах центральным понятием при обсуждении тем самобытности и инновации оказалась традиция. При помощи методологии дискурс-анализа мы выделили три варианта использования данного понятия: традиция «утраченная и возвращенная», традиция «фальсифицированная» и традиция «инновационная».

Сторонники движения считают, что их деятельность направлена на возрождение «настоящей» грузинской кулинарной традиции. Последняя, по их мнению, всегда была максимально открыта творчеству и инновациям. Для них эта традиция является частью грузинского «европейского» наследия, искаженного за годы российского и советского правления. Миф о «европейской» традиции позволяет примирить конкурирующие требования самобытности и инновационности. Наличие репертуара «инновационной традиции» отличает рассматриваемый случай от других подобных, обсуждаемых в литературе. В других исследованиях традиции и инновации представлены как отдельные, а иногда и противоположные, ценности. Нарратив о «Новой грузинской кухне» имеет неоднозначное влияние на распределение культурного капитала в обществе. С одной стороны, он помогает повысить социальный статус профессии повара и способствует ее превращению в путь повышения социального статуса в целом. С другой стороны, в нем особо подчеркиваются ценности и практики, связанные с элитой или «творческим» средним классом, а повседневные практики других социальных групп представлены как менее важные и менее значимые.

Ключевые слова: традиция; инновация; «Новая грузинская кухня»; культурная самобытность; символическая власть