

## **Translating culture-bound terms in viticultural texts from French into English: a practical approach.**

### **Introduction**

One of the most recurrent difficulties encountered by translators, whether they are working on general, literary or specialised texts, is to find equivalents for so-called 'culture-bound' terms. Culture-bound terms, whether single-unit lexemes, phrases or collocations are those which are readily perceived, according to Newmark (1988:94) as being particularly tied to :

the way of life and its manifestations that are peculiar to a community that uses a particular language as its means of expression.

Terms such as 'peculiar' and 'particular' imply a degree of exclusivity which is, however, difficult to apply even in cases where relatively isolated cultures are involved. As Nida and Taber (2003 :4) point out, each language is [relatively] rich in vocabulary for its areas of cultural focus, the specialities of its people, although the examples quoted – cattle (Anuaks in the Sudan) yams, (Ponapeans in Micronesia), hunting and fishing (Piros in Peru) and technology (the western world) – are all shared over a number of languages and cultures. Such relative degrees of comparative terminological richness are far more frequently encountered than what might be called target-culture blanks, where in a given domain a language lacks more or less completely both the underlying concepts and the lexis to express them. Relative lexical richness on one side of a language pair implies comparative underdevelopment on the other. It is generally accepted in the field which we have chosen to focus on, that the language of wine-growing, and particularly its domain-specific terminology, are considerably more highly developed in French and Italian (cf., Taylor, 1990:126) than in English. As Taylor has it, English in this field is a developing language.

If we may extend Leppihalme's (1997:21) notion of 'culture bumps' beyond the frame of cultural allusions in literary source texts to specialised texts, so-called culture-bound concepts give rise to some of the most difficult translation problems :

culture-bound concepts, even where the two cultures involved are not too distant, can be more problematic for the translator than the semantic or syntactic difficulties of the text.

In addition to its connotations of exclusivity already discussed, the notion of being 'bound' conjures up a relatively static situation. High levels of cultural contact are, however, likely to cause changes in the usage of receptor languages in areas of activity where linguistic items with strong cultural ties to a donor language are borrowed.

It may well be that viticulture, construed as encompassing the agricultural, chemical and biological processes of making wine, will see more such cross-linguistic developments in its technical vocabulary. In the present state of play, however, of the two communities that we have chosen to discuss, France has unquestionably a longer and better established tradition in wine growing than the United Kingdom in particular, and consequently French has a considerably more highly developed terminology than English in this field. This is not to deny that many French-speaking communities do not practise viticulture to any significant degree if at all, and an increasing number of English-speaking communities have developed it to high standards (USA, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa and even to a modest extent the United Kingdom). It is certainly conceivable that the cultural or terminological bumps referred to in this article will increasingly be smoothed down.

Undeniably, however, since France has long been home to the world's wine experts, up until now there is no nation with a closer affiliation to the beverage and its manufacture, there remains a sizeable cultural gap between French and English in the domain of viticulture, not least because of the historically more intense practice of the art in France. As Newmark observes :

when a particular speech community focuses its attention on a particular topic, it spawns a plethora of words to designate its special language or terminology... (Newmark (1988:94))

This gives rise to two kinds of practical difficulties: firstly, the need to deal with lexical gaps in English; and secondly, if translating texts aimed at a non-expert readership, to take account of the fact that assuming an equivalent general educational level, English-speaking readers will have a lower degree of cultural awareness and knowledge of viticultural terminology. For the English-speaking expert, there is no escape from mastering terms of French origin, which may remain opaque to a wider wine-buying public.

In the following sections, we briefly review the range of solutions to the rendering of culture-specific items put forward in the translation studies literature (Section 1) and to argue that a pragmatic approach, such as Newmark's (1988) proposed set of problem-solving strategies, is the most readily applicable both in classifying those techniques and procedures actually used and in helping practitioners refine their practice. Section 2 discusses a corpus of texts – some translated, others drafted directly in English – in the field of viticulture showing how terms perceived by ourselves to be culture-bound have been translated, before attempting a more systematic analysis in Section 3, where tabulated presentations will be used to help discern patterns within the data. Section 4 summarises the findings and discusses pointers to further research and possible wider applications.

### **1. Culture-bound terms and translation studies**

As Nida and Taber (2003: 5) observe, translation becomes all the more difficult between language pairs where either or both linguistic and cultural distance are greatest. Cultural and linguistic distance are by no means interdependent variables. Nonetheless it seems reasonable to believe, as Malone (1988: 74) demonstrates for a short extract, that more of what he somewhat jargonistically calls trajections (indirect translations)<sup>1</sup> are required between typologically distant languages, e.g. Hebrew and Japanese, than between languages of the same group, such as Hebrew and Arabic. While the distance between Hebrew and English appears to be intermediate in terms of the number of trajections required, it is not clear how representative of the full spectrum of linguistic distance, these three languages are, or whether the nature of the passage chosen (Genesis 1.1) is indicative of what would occur over a wider range of text types. In such a broadly defined comparative perspective, French and English are both in terms of linguistic structure and general cultural backdrop relatively similar, although viticulture constitutes an example of an area where cultural disparities are sufficient to give rise to a considerable number of translation problems, particularly in the direction French to English.

How far such generalised notions of structural and cultural differences apply to discourse and text within specialised sub-cultures, such as viticulture is of course

an open question but one which, we suspect, might open up worthwhile lines of investigation. It is, however, our intention to concentrate on lexical items in relatively specialised texts where translation is not so much ‘a way of establishing contact between cultures’ (Ivir, 1987: 35) as between sub-cultures. Among specialists, Ivir’s contention is that: (p.38)

the integration of one element into a culture and into the conceptual framework of its members and individuals cannot be said to have been achieved unless and until the linguistic expression of that element has been integrated into the language of that culture

Within a specific field of activity, where specialists may be fairly expected to be familiar with source-language terms, borrowing as a translation procedure, as Ivir goes to argue, has much to recommend it, in that it may be deemed to ensure ‘very precise transmission of cultural information’. Thelen (2001:20) refers to ‘sub-field specific language’, which he sub-classifies in a communication pyramid, presented in the form of a grid in Table 1, according to the level of specialism of the writers and their target readership.

**Table 1. Grid of levels of communication in sub-field specific texts according to producer and reader (Thelen, 2001: 21)**

		<b>Writer</b>	<b>Reader</b>
<b>A</b>	<b>1</b>	specialist in sub-domain	specialist in same sub-domain
	<b>2</b>	specialist in sub-domain	specialist in same field but different sub-domain
	<b>3</b>	specialist in given domain	generalist or ‘all-round specialist’ in this field
<b>B</b>	<b>4</b>	generalist in one science	generalist in a number of allied fields
	<b>5</b>	generalist in a number of allied fields	educated interested layperson
<b>C</b>	<b>6</b>	educated interested layperson	general public
	<b>7</b>	ordinary person	ordinary person

While in fields such as medicine such a fine-grained grid may be justified, there seems to be little reason, as far as viticulture is concerned, to sub-divide the more technical aspects such as oenology into three sub-domains corresponding to A1, A2, A3.

---

<sup>1</sup> Trajectories correspond very much to what Vinay and Darbelnet (1976) call transpositions and modulations.

**Table 2. Medicine used as an illustration of Table 1 (Thelen, 2001: 21)**

		Writer	Reader
A	1	medical specialist involved in implanting pacemakers	a medical specialist involved in implanting pacemakers
	2	medical specialist involved in implanting pacemakers	cardiologist
	3	cardiologist	doctor of medicine
B	4	doctor of medicine	science journalist
	5	science journalist	educated interested layperson
C	6	educated interested layperson	general public
	7	general public	general public

If it is legitimate to equate the occurrence of sub-field specific lexis with what Taylor 1990 (among many others) calls technical texts, the proportions of technicity in terms of the word typically account for under 10% of the lexical items used. As far as so-called ‘technical’ texts are concerned, Taylor proposed the following sub-divisions of lexis according to ‘technicity’ (Table 3).

**Table 3. Types of lexis in ‘technical’ texts (Taylor, 1990 : 174)**

	Type	Examples
1	structural	the, a, but
2	general	dog, table
3	sub-technical	engine, spindle
4	technical	creatinine, alveolar

Moreover, as the same author points out, the degree of lexical overlap between related sub-domains is hard to assess but undoubtedly considerable.

While it has been argued, e.g. by Widdowson (1979) and Hutchinson and Walters (1987) that scientific and medical texts are free of cultural pressures, few today would wish to argue that any type of text is culturally neutral and therefore exempt from culture-bound terms, in the sense of containing terms with significantly stronger ties to, and richer lexical sub-divisions within, certain languages and cultures than others. Clearly, the more international the sub-cultural framework, the fewer such culturally linked terms are likely to be found. At one end of the spectrum, fields such as medicine and the so-called hard sciences are practised in all parts of the world<sup>2</sup>, whereas at what may be argued to

<sup>2</sup> It should be recognised too that medicine and hard sciences are practised within national frameworks and therefore medical texts may contain institutional terms like ‘National Health Service’ or ‘British Medical Association’.

be located at the other end, institutional terms (politics, social welfare, law, health, legal and administration) may be largely specific to given nation-states (Ketteringham, 2001). That said, the parallels described by Ketteringham between France, Spain and Italy compared to the United Kingdom which he discusses are remarkably close despite the language differences. In contrast, the major French-speaking areas of the northern hemisphere – France, Belgium, Switzerland, Quebec – exhibit far less cultural overlap. Unlike institutional terms referring to stable social constructs which are the contingent results of historical processes, viticulture may be practised wherever the climate and soil are suitable, but the associated cultural domain may extend to a much greater number of countries<sup>3</sup>. While the languages of long-standing and large-scale producer countries are undoubtedly far richer in viticultural terms than in countries where mainly imported wine is drunk, such traditional cultural bindings are arguably more open to becoming loosened as they are increasingly shared<sup>4</sup>.

That said, English translators dealing with viticultural texts encounter a fair number of lexical gaps. Although she does not attempt to deal with sub-field specific texts, Branco (2001) sets out a non-hierarchical list of reasons for borrowing (shown in Table 4) which, in various guises, is the principal source of solutions for plugging lexical gaps.

**Table 4. Reasons for lexical borrowing (Branco, 2001)**

1. lexical and referential gaps in the target context
2. issues of technology
3. terminological conventions
4. the choice of a 'hybrid solution'
5. neologism conventions
6. precise transmission of cultural information
7. stylistic choices
8. exotic flavour
9. the "foreign is best" syndrome
10. the "law of the strongest"
11. power differentials among languages
12. inequality of languages

<sup>3</sup> People from 140 countries were reported to have attended the 2005 Vinexpo in Bordeaux (<http://www.vinexpo.com>)

<sup>4</sup> It is a moot point against the backdrop of EU expansion, whether institutional terms, which, after all, have largely come into customary use over the last two centuries are less or more readily changeable than longer standing practices like viticulture. Commercially related activities, it seems to us, are likely to undergo globally greater uniformising pressures than institutional terms, since, for instance, many nation-states outside the EU will continue to French (-language) institutional terms.

According to Ivir (1977: 36), gaps may be so called when they have been recognised by both translators and theorists who have sought possible ways of plugging them. The same author goes on to say that, generally speaking:

emphasis is on referential (denotational) meaning rather than on the communicative value of particular cultural elements in specific acts of communication.

Among the most commonly used strategies are: definition, literal translation, substitution (transliteration), lexical creation, omission and addition. Ivir (p. 37) adds the following three observations:

- (i) not all of the procedures achieve cultural transfer in the sense of filling the gap, but they all serve the purpose of achieving communicative equivalence in translation;
- (ii) combinations of procedures rather than single procedures are required for optimum transmission of cultural information;
- (iii) in planning the translation strategy, the translator does not make a 'one-time decision on how he will treat unmatched elements of culture', but usually makes 'a new decision for each such element and for its each use in an act of communication'.

The usefulness of translation couplets or doublets (Point ii) in rendering culture-specific elements with minimal loss (Hervey and Higgins, 2002: 20) assumes greater importance in specialised texts than in more diffuse subject matter, given that consistency of equivalence is more often unavoidable. Nonetheless, mechanical repetition of a doublet in a target text may prove tedious and unnecessary in an extended reference chain (Point iii; cf. Malone, 1988: 47).

As regards what Branco calls 'issues of technology' (Line 2; Table 4) she simply reiterates something of a truism that it is usual for a receiver culture of technical or indeed any form of innovation to import the linguistic term in the wake of products and practices. This does not necessarily exclude calquing or adapting more general target-culture terms for more specialised use (cf. Dubuc, 1981).

Clearly 'hybrid' solutions (Line 4) would allow for doublets, but as already observed, these do not usually need to be repeated intratextually, since certain frequent elements of doublets, e.g. glosses are mainly used in combination and on one occasion for any given text. Subsequent references to the same entity would not usually require a full hybrid rendering and consequently the way may be open for the 'core borrowing' to be used without marking its insertion into the target text.

There may of course be conventions regarding nativising neologisms in specific fields, either on the basis of individual practices, e.g. linguistic terms in Arabic (e.g. Giaber, 2001) or through directives from quasi-official organisations set up to deal with issues of terminology, like those which have proliferated in France (cf. Offord, 2003).

Applied to viticulture, factors 5 to 9 listed in Table 4 would appear to point to the likelihood of French terms being used in English texts to fill lexical gaps. It may be for reasons of precision and exoticism (Lines 6 and 8) (Fawcett, 1997: 34-5) or perhaps image where what Crystal (1997: 350) calls the ‘foreign is best’ mindset exerts an influence. The well documented dominant position of English in so many spheres of activity, whether in relation to developing countries (e.g. Phillipson, 1992; Pennycook, 1994) or continental Europe, as exemplified by the overwhelming imbalance of translation ‘traffic’ in favour of English over Spanish and Italian (Aixelà, 1996: 55) may seem strange when English is the target language. Dealing with this issue of cultural dominance between English and Polish, Kwiecinski (1998) evokes two possible broad-level strategies: firstly foreignisation:

the introduction into the target text of concepts and language forms that are alien to and/or obscure in the target language culture.

and secondly, domestication:

the accommodation of the target text to the established TL/TC [Target Language/Target Culture] concepts, norms and conventions.

Whatever may be said about the general dominance of English, English speakers gladly tolerate use and even encourage foreignisation in specific sub-fields. For French these would include viticulture, as well as other so-called luxury goods, like perfume and lingerie<sup>5</sup>. Rather than, as does Branco, refer to the reasons for borrowing in translation to plug lexical gaps, it seems to us preferable to adopt a problem-solving approach like that proposed by Newmark (1988: 103) and list the techniques that have proved useful for translating culture-bound terms (Table 5).

---

<sup>5</sup> Foreign names evoke different images in different spheres between language groups, e.g. English car names are redolent of reliability in Japanese, whereas the use of Japanese terms to officiate at karaté competitions in the United Kingdom derives from a desire to conjure up an image of authenticity.

Although the techniques or procedures are not derived from corpora, they are because of their explicitness are well suited (with some modification) to quantitative analysis. In the next section, therefore, Newmark's set of problem-solving practices is reviewed and in Section 3 applied to a corpus consisting of both English translations of French viticultural text and English texts on viticulture.

## 2. A problem-solving approach

**Table 5. Strategies for translating culture-bound terms (Newmark, 1988:103)**

<b>1. Transference</b>	Original SL item used as loan in TL e.g. <i>coup d'état</i> .
<b>2. Cultural Equivalence</b>	Swapping the culture-bound item for an equivalent item in the TL culture, e.g. <i>Baccalauréat</i> = A Level.
<b>3. Neutralisation</b>	Providing a functional or descriptive equivalent using a more general, culture-free item e.g. <i>Baccalauréat</i> = <i>French school leavers' exam</i> ).
<b>4. Literal Translation</b>	Self-explanatory, literal translation but not necessarily adhering to grammar structures like word-for-word or one-to-one translations e.g. <i>Treasury</i> translated as <i>finance ministry</i> .
<b>5. Label</b>	Provisional translation, of a new institutional term, usually done through literal translation and may be left in inverted commas, e.g. <i>heritage language</i> = <i>langue d'héritage</i> .
<b>6. Naturalisation</b>	An extension of transference, adapts the loan word to sound like a TL word, e.g. <i>thatchérisme</i> .
<b>7. Componential Analysis</b>	Splitting up the lexical unit into sense components, the translation will then often comprise several words: e.g. <i>gîtes</i> = <i>rural lodgings in France let to tourists</i> .
<b>8. Deletion</b>	Omission
<b>9. Doublet</b>	A combination of two (or more) procedures, most frequently in the form of transference followed by explanation but can be Label or Naturalisation followed by explanation.
<b>10. Accepted standard translation</b>	The accepted official translation, often of an institutional term, e.g. <i>Bundesrat</i> = <i>Council of Constituent States</i> .
<b>11. Paraphrase, gloss, notes, etc</b>	Provides additional cultural information on the assumption that the reader will not have heard of the word.
<b>12. Classifier</b>	A word added, often a generic noun, to classify a cultural item e.g. <i>Basque skirt</i> .

Translations resulting from the application of any of the first six procedures may become the accepted standard translation, as in the case of *coup d'état*, more usually truncated to *coup*. Deletion is most likely to be used as a one-off solution where ST items are not repeated. Where items are translated on first mention using a doublet, subsequent occurrences may not require full repetition, giving rise to what are arguably partial deletions. It is difficult to imagine, however, that any SL term would turn out to be consistently deletable over a range of contexts. Componential analysis, doublets, paraphrases and classifiers are by their nature

temporary solutions to specific problems and none is likely to become the accepted standard solution where the SL concept is referred to frequently or in contexts where it comes to the attention of a wider audience. Both these factors create pressure for an equivalent as succinct as the SL term.

Some of the examples suggested in Table 5 need to be glossed in the light of socio-cultural changes that have occurred since Newmark first suggested them. For instance, 'baccalaureate' is only through the increased prominence of the International Baccalaureate is almost certainly becoming more widely known, although neutralisation would be likely to remain the preferred solution for other school leaving examinations, such as the German *Abitur*. The development of EU institutions and other international groupings such as the G8 has given rise to doublets within English, such as *Treasury* and *Finance Ministry* or *Lord Chancellor* and *Justice Minister* according to whether the context is international or national. Moreover, EU legislation and arguably in a wider context, the increasing internationalisation of English have resulted in what at first blush appear to be non-idiomatic terms becoming accepted standard equivalents, such as *viande de porc* being translated as *pigmeat* rather than *pork* in much EU documentation. The so-called label example *langue d'héritage* appears less satisfactory than *langue patrimoine* (cf. Pooley, 2004 : 620-622). Accepted standard equivalents are derived from one of the other procedures as is the case with *Council of constituent states* which may be classed as a paraphrase or possibly as a case of componential analysis. While the principle of the procedure is unquestionably valid, the example of componential analysis cited, i.e. *rural lodgings in France let to tourists* for *gîtes* is highly questionable as regards the accuracy of its components. *Gîtes* are by no means restricted to France, since they are available in Wallonia and may be rented out to people other than tourists<sup>6</sup>. While the term *gîte* is arguably becoming increasingly better known in English and may well be used in conversation without gloss, some additional explanation based on componential analysis (self-catering, rural, often privately owned holiday houses and flats) appears essential in written texts, at least if intended for

---

<sup>6</sup> For instance, local people in need of a temporary home or temporary workers requiring comfortable self-catering accommodation.

a general readership. For the purposes of analysing our corpus, the category of accepted standard equivalent was omitted. A corpus-based approach may reveal examples which do not readily fit into any of the categories proposed by Newmark. Two such examples are discussed in Section 3.

While Newmark's classification draws on examples from a far wider range of areas than the very constrained field of activity selected for scrutiny in this study, it appears to be a collection of examples gathered together over long years of experience. It seemed to us, however, that a corpus-based approach based on viticultural texts might reveal the relative importance of the various procedures, at least in terms of their frequency. The corpus consists of published (print and on-line) translations supplemented by translations in the field by Wylie (before she considered any kind of applied framework). In any case, virtually all of the solutions decided upon in Wylie's translations were derived through consultation of published translations and parallel texts (readers are referred to the list of wine-related sites noted in Table 6).

The corpus of viticultural texts selected for study is relatively specialised and technical in nature, positioned between levels 3 and 5 (or A and B in our adaptation in Tables 1 and 2) of the communication pyramid (Thelen, 2001: 21). While the texts under discussion are written by specialists for people with specialist or near-specialist knowledge, many of the culture-bound terms are used or need to be explained in publications about wine intended for a wider readership. Unlike the more strictly scientific terms, which have readily available and fully English equivalents in specialised work, the culture-bound terms call for the kinds of solutions suggested by Newmark, which, as with *Baccalaureate* and *school-leaving examination*, may call for an array of solutions determined by skopos.

In using a corpus-based approach, it is important to look at texts whether in print or on-line that are either written by trusted English-language authorities on wine, e.g. *New Sotheby's wine encyclopedia* (2001) (Table 3 Type C) or accepted translations and/or adaptations, e.g. *Larousse encyclopedia of wine* (1994) (Table 3 Type A) Texts selected for the corpus are thus drawn only from credible sources in the wine-making world. While the study cannot claim to be wide-ranging, care was taken to include a variety of sources to achieve at least some degree of

breadth. Only examples that both corresponded to Levels A or B in Tables 1 and 2 and contained a relatively high density of specialised terminology were selected.

### **3. Analysing the data**

Analysis of the corpus yielded 35 tokens of translations of terms (listed in Table 6) which could be plausibly considered to be culture-bound in the sense of having clearly stronger cultural ties to France than Great Britain within the field of viticulture, classified according to whether they were: found in an 'authoritative' English translation of a French original (A) : equivalents used by Wylie (B) ; found in English-language texts (C).

**Table 6. List of culture-bound terms in corpus**

Item		Source	Translation
millérandage	B	Wylie	millerandage, mixed berry size
	A	Berry Bros & Rudd ( <a href="http://mobile.bbr.com">http://mobile.bbr.com</a> )	millerandage (uneven fruit set)
	C	winegrowers.info	millerandage
cuvée	A	Larousse	vat-house or cuverie
chaptalisation	A	Larousse	chaptalization
véraison	A	laudun-vignerons.com	après avoir complètement changée de couleur lors de la véraison, le raisin arrive maintenant à maturité =once 'veraison is complete and the grapes have changed colour, the fruit is considered to be ripe.
	B	Wylie	véraison, the change of berry colour
cuvage	C	winedine.co.uk	cuvage (winery)
levurage	C	winedine.co.uk	
pigeage	C	winedine.co.uk	
remontage	C	winedine.co.uk	
vendange	A	laudun-vignerons.com	'vendanges', harvest
glabre	A	beaujolais.com	glabrous, smooth
Beaujolais Mâconnais	A	beaujolais.com	the Beaujolais and the Maconnais regions
coulure	C	winegrowers.info	coulure
méthode champenoise	C	english-wine.com	méthode champenoise
terroir	C	english-wine.com	terroir, (the place, the soil, the climate)
	A	Larousse	<i>terroir</i>
marcs	A	Larousse	pulp (marc)
vigneron européen	A	Larousse	The European vigneron
prise de mousse	A	vins-fr.com	bottle fermentation (prise de mousse)
remuage	A	vins-fr.com	turning the bottle (remuage)
AOC	C	adepta.com	AOC, controlled appellation of origin,
	C	winesofia.tripod.com	CAO, controlled appellation of origin,
	A	medexo.com	AOC
	A	somacvins.com	AOC
	B	Wylie	AOC
Appellation d'origine contrôlée	C	adepta.com	AOC, controlled appellation of origin, keeps French acronym but uses English translation of the full title
	C	winesofia.tripod.com	CAO, controlled appellation of origin, uses the translation of both
	C	harpers-wine.com	controlled appellation of origin,
	A	somacvins.com	controlled appellations
	A	vins-fr.com	appellation
décade	B	Wylie	les 2 premières décades = first 3 weeks of the month , la troisième décade=end of the month
vers de la grappe	B	Wylie	the caterpillars cochylis and eudemis
éraflage ou égrappage	B	Wylie	de-stemming

A (15) =Accepted English translation of a French text ; B (6) = Wylie's translation ; C (14) =English original text by a wine authority

**Table 7. Frequency of use of revised list of translation procedures (Newmark, 1988) : a) per item (35); b) in all occurrences (65); c) with doublets discounted and shown only atomised by component procedures.**

<b>Procedure</b>	<b>a</b>	<b>b</b>	<b>c</b>
Transference	8	22	22
Cultural Equivalent	0	0	0
Neutralisation	1	1	1
Literal Translation	6	11	11
Label	0	0	0
Naturalisation	3	3	3
Componential Analysis	1	1	1
Deletion	1	1	1
Doublet	15	15	-
Accepted Standard Translation	0	0	0
Paraphrase, gloss, notes	0	10	10
Classifier	0	1	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>50</b>

Table 7 shows by what procedures the 35 items listed in Table 6 were translated (Column a). In Column b, the component procedures of doublets are also listed separately. Thus if *véraison* is rendered by ‘veraison’ or ‘véraison’ by transference and glossed with ‘change of berry colour’, there will be one entry in Column a under doublet and three entries in Column b (doublet, transference and gloss). In Column c doublets are only countered by their component procedures, which would yield one entry in each of the categories transference and gloss.

The two most problematical examples *coulure* and *millérandage* both happened to be taken from the same source, [www.winegrowers.info](http://www.winegrowers.info) and both are from English original texts. In both cases the French word has been transferred to refer to the notion in the English text, yet without any indication that it is a nonce or recent loan. In cases of transference, the items in question are generally highlighted in some way, such as italics or quotes. In the case of *millérandage*, omission of the acute accent is about all that could be done to anglicise the French word, although, significantly, it does not appear to figure in English viticultural lexicons. When translated, both authoritative texts and Wylie use doublets, of naturalisation and gloss, of ‘uneven fruit set’ (<http://mobile.bbr.com>) or ‘mixed berry size’ (Wylie). The use of ‘coulure’ and ‘millerandage’ without gloss in English might arguably be seen as cases of naturalisation by stealth or at least without acknowledgement.

While these unacknowledged naturalisations may in due course become accepted equivalents, the un glossed occurrences are shown as part of a separate sub-set.

Table 7 clearly shows that four of the 11 procedures listed, i.e. transference, literal translation, doublet and gloss, accounting for 57 (88%) of the total of 65 tokens noted (Column b). Naturalisation is used three times, if unacknowledged naturalisations are included. Neutralisation, componential analysis, deletion and classifier are only used once and labels and paraphrase not at all.

We now propose to concentrate the discussion on the four most frequently used procedures. While doublets commonly provide the solution to the problem of finding an equivalent of a culture-bound term, the doublet is not the same kind of procedure as the other ten, since its occurrence merely signifies that two of those other procedures are applied 'in harness' (Newmark 1988: 81). What is more, doublets account for 43% of the examples noted, and include one procedure, the gloss, which is only used as part of a doublet (20%). Although transference (23%) and literal translation (17%) do occur singly, all doublets consist of a combination of two of these three most frequently used procedures. If the doublet is excluded as a separate category, 50 examples remain (Table 7, Column c) 22 of which (44%) are cases of transference. Transference emerges as important in percentage terms as the other two frequently utilised procedures combined with literal translation accounting for 11 solutions (22%) and glosses, which are not used singly, for 10 (20%). On the basis of the corpus, translators and English text writers turn mostly to transference and literal translation, adding a gloss for clarification in around one case in five to render the culture-bound items listed.

The dominance of French loan words may be partly attributable to the relatively high level, given the nature of the field, in terms of Thielen's categorisation (Tables 1 and 2) of the texts selected for the corpus. In specialised texts, the French term may well be preferred for its greater precision. Indeed, English readers knowledgeable enough to want to read such texts may enjoy greater familiarity with such terms than their overall level of French would otherwise suggest. With lower-level texts, one would expect glosses (and even paraphrases and componential analysis) to be used more frequently, although the French term acquires the attraction of being chic or redolent of local colour or exoticism in what is after all a luxury trade. Be that as it may, it seems valid to claim that a relatively higher number of French terms would be deemed to be perfectly

acceptable in texts about wine-making than would generally be the case. This is not to say that viticultural texts are unique in this respect. As already mentioned, it would be reasonable to expect comparable results for texts about perfumery, lingerie and possibly cookery, although texts of a ‘technicity’ corresponding to A might prove to be relatively unusual in these fields.

#### **4. Summary and conclusions**

In the translation of French high-level (A and B in Table 1) viticultural texts into English, as well as in the composition of such texts in English, three of the techniques or procedures suggested by Newmark (1988) are most frequently used to find equivalents to culturally specific terms in the corpus analysed, virtually to the exclusion of the others. Moreover, one of the procedures, transference, accounts for as many actually used solutions as the other two (gloss and literal translation) combined. One of these procedures, the gloss, is only used in combination with one of the other two procedures. A combination of techniques or doublet, if considered as a single procedure, would be the most resorted to manoeuvre for the translation of culture-bound terms observed in the corpus, accounting for 15/35 items (43%) (Table 7, Column a).

Can such observations be ‘translated’ into advice, particularly if the skopos of the translation is changed? In the translation and drafting of lower-level texts aiming at a more general readership, it seems likely that the use of French terms gives the text and products a certain *cachet*, although a greater number of glosses, whether in the form of paraphrase, literal translation or componential analysis may be required. These conclusions appear to be applicable to other areas involving the production of luxury goods particularly and historically associated with France.

In the case of viticulture, and indeed with other spheres of activities, one would expect them to be increasingly developed in English-speaking countries, which means that more accepted standard equivalents will be established and possibly more ‘native’ English equivalents will emerge. French wine producers may also be constrained to adopt more aggressive export-marketing strategies and thus be increasingly forced to present their products in other languages, and in particular English. If wine-drinking continues to gain in popularity in English-speaking countries, familiarity with certain specialised lexical items, including some of

those now plausibly deemed to be deemed to be culture-bound, will undoubtedly increase. Currently, the relative unfamiliarity of viticultural terms means that doublets and glosses are particularly useful. This current level of culture-boundedness of many viticultural terms, however, may or may not persist. There are of course spheres of activity, such as ballet or fencing, where French terms continue to be used, despite internationalisation. As regards viticulture, obvious commercial pressures from non-French-speaking producers and the prospect of technical advances, say, in œnology originating outside France may appear in the erosion of traditional French (lexical) dominance in this field, for instance in labelling.

In this study, only single-word terms have been considered and one can wonder whether further studies would suggest that techniques such as componential analysis and paraphrase might prove more effective and/or acceptable for longer units. It would be interesting to investigate other language pairs, to see whether the cultural gap is greater. Given the dominance of 'borrowing' techniques in French-English translations, one may speculate that heavily used techniques such as transference would be very much to the fore, although the need for combinations, including glosses is likely to be greater.

## References

- Aixelá, Javier Franco (1996) Culture-specific terms in Translation. In: R Álvarez and M. C.-Á. Vidal (eds.). *Translation, power, subversion*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 52-78.
- Álvarez, Román and Vidal Maria Carmen-África (eds.). (1996) *Translation, power, subversion* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Branco, Sinara O. (2001) A new look upon the use of borrowings in Brazil: The Linguistic/Cultural Border. In: *Cadernos de Tradução*. Florianópolis: NUT, Vol. 2: 8, 145-163.
- Crystal, David (1997) 2<sup>nd</sup> edition. *The Cambridge encyclopedia of language*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Desblache, Lucile (ed.) (2001) *Aspects of Specialised translation*. Paris: La Maison du Dictionnaire.
- Dubuc, Robert (1981) *Manuel de terminologie*. Paris: Conseil International de la Langue Française.
- Fawcett, Peter (1997) *Translation and language: Linguistic theories explained*. Manchester: St. Jerome.
- Giaber, Jamal (2001) Translating the suffix *-eme* in linguistics terminology from English into Arabic. In: L. Desblache (ed.) *Aspects of Specialised translation*. Paris: La Maison du Dictionnaire, 152-164.
- Grand Dictionnaire Encyclopédique* (1996) Paris: Hachette.

- Hervey, Sandor and Higgins, Ian (2002) *Thinking French Translation: A course in translation method*. London: Routledge.  
<http://accurapid.com>  
<http://mobile.bbr.com>  
<http://winesofia.tripod.com>
- Hutchinson, T. and Waters, A. (1987) *English for Special Purposes*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Ivir, Vladimir (1987) Procedures and Strategies for Translation of Culture. In: Gideon Toury (ed.), *Translation across cultures*. New Delhi: Bahri Publications, 48-60.
- Ketteringham, Graham (2001) Culture-bound terms in institutional-type texts. In: L. Desblache (ed.) *Aspects of specialised translation*. Paris: La Maison du Dictionnaire, 99-108.
- Kwiecinski, Piotr (1998) Translation Strategies in a Rapidly Transforming Culture. A Central European Perspective. *The Translator*, 4.2.
- Landick, Marie (ed.) (2003) *Le français face aux institutions*. Paris: l'Harmattan.
- Larousse des vins. Tous les vins du monde* (2001) Paris: Larousse.
- Larousse encyclopedia of wine* (1994) Paris: Larousse.
- Leppihalme, Ritva (1997) *Culture Bumps*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Malone, Joseph L. (1988) *The Science of Linguistics in the art of translation. Some tools from linguistics for the analysis and practice of translation*. Albany: SUNY Press.
- Newmark, Peter (1988) *A Textbook of Translation*. London: Longman.
- Nida, Eugene A. and Taber, Charles R. (2003) 4<sup>th</sup> impression. *The Theory and practice of translation*. Brill: Leiden/Boston.
- Offord, Malcolm (2003) The role of private associations. In: M. Landick (ed.) *Le français face aux institutions*. Paris: l'Harmattan, 95-109.
- Pennycook, Alistair (1994) *The cultural politics of English as an international language*. London: Longman.
- Phillipson, Robert (1992) *Linguistic imperialism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Pooley, Tim (2004) *Language, dialect and identity in Lille*. Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen Press.
- Taylor, Christopher (1990) *Aspects of Language and Translation. Contrastive Approaches for Italian/English Translations*. Udine: Campanotto Editore.
- The New Sotheby's Wine Encyclopedia* (2001) London: Dorling Kindersley.
- Thelen, Marcel (2001) Present issues in teaching specialised translation: a practice-oriented MA programme. In: L. Desblache (ed.) *Aspects of specialised translation*. Paris: La Maison du Dictionnaire, 15-25.
- Toury, Gideon (ed.), *Translation across cultures*. New Delhi: Bahri Publications.
- Vinay, Jean-Paul and Darbelnet, Jean (1976) *Stylistique comparée du français et de l'anglais*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Widdowson, Henry (1979) *Explorations in Applied Linguistics*. Cambridge: CUP
- [www.adepta.com](http://www.adepta.com)  
[www.athensams.net](http://www.athensams.net)  
[www.beaujolais.com](http://www.beaujolais.com)  
[www.english-wine.com](http://www.english-wine.com)  
[www.harpers-wine.com](http://www.harpers-wine.com)  
[www.hormel.com](http://www.hormel.com)  
[www.medexo.com/roussillon/](http://www.medexo.com/roussillon/)  
[www.somacvins.com/](http://www.somacvins.com/)

[www.vinexpo.com](http://www.vinexpo.com)  
[www.vins-fr.com](http://www.vins-fr.com)  
[www.winedine.co.uk](http://www.winedine.co.uk)  
[www.winegrowers.info](http://www.winegrowers.info)

Jennifer Wylie  
Tim Pooley  
London Metropolitan University