

# **Wine-making Terminology in Translation**

Jiří Kadlubiec

---

Bachelor Thesis  
2012



**Tomas Bata University in Zlín**  
Faculty of Humanities

---

Univerzita Tomáše Bati ve Zlíně  
Fakulta humanitních studií  
Ústav anglistiky a amerikanistiky  
akademický rok: 2011/2012

# **ZADÁNÍ BAKALÁŘSKÉ PRÁCE**

(PROJEKTU, UMĚLECKÉHO DÍLA, UMĚLECKÉHO VÝKONU)

Jméno a příjmení: **Jiří KADLUBIEC**  
Osobní číslo: **H09000**  
Studijní program: **B 7310 Filologie**  
Studijní obor: **Anglický jazyk pro manažerskou praxi**

Téma práce: **Vinařská terminologie v překladu**

Zásady pro vypracování:

**Studium odborné literatury**  
**Formulace hypotézy**  
**Sběr a analýza materiálů**  
**Potvrzení nebo vyvrácení hypotézy**

Rozsah bakalářské práce:

Rozsah příloh:

Forma zpracování bakalářské práce: **tištěná/elektronická**

Seznam odborné literatury:

**Baker, Mona, 2010. In other words: A coursebook on translation. New York: Routledge.**

**Barty-King, Hugh, 1989. A Taste of English Wine. London: Pelham Books.**

**Jackson, Ronald, S, 2002. Wine Tasting: A Professional Handbook. San Diego: Elsevier Academic Press.**

**Mounin, Georges, 1999. Teoretické problémy překladu. Praha, Univerzita Karlova, nakladatelství Karolinum.**

**Vinařský zákon je (zkrácený název zákona č. 321/2004 Sb., o vinohradnictví a vinařství a o změně některých souvisejících zákonů (zákon o vinohradnictví a vinařství)).**

Vedoucí bakalářské práce:

**PhDr. Katarína Nemčoková**

Ústav anglistiky a amerikanistiky


Datum zadání bakalářské práce:

**30. listopadu 2011**

Termín odevzdání bakalářské práce:

**4. května 2012**

Ve Zlíně dne 6. února 2012

  
doc. Ing. Anežka Lengalová, Ph.D.  
děkanka



  
doc. Ing. Anežka Lengalová, Ph.D.  
ředitelka ústavu

# PROHLÁŠENÍ AUTORA BAKALÁŘSKÉ PRÁCE

Beru na vědomí, že

- odevzdáním bakalářské práce souhlasím se zveřejněním své práce podle zákona č. 111/1998 Sb. o vysokých školách a o změně a doplnění dalších zákonů (zákon o vysokých školách), ve znění pozdějších právních předpisů, bez ohledu na výsledek obhajoby <sup>1)</sup>;
- beru na vědomí, že bakalářská práce bude uložena v elektronické podobě v univerzitním informačním systému dostupná k nahlédnutí;
- na moji bakalářskou práci se plně vztahuje zákon č. 121/2000 Sb. o právu autorském, o právech souvisejících s právem autorským a o změně některých zákonů (autorský zákon) ve znění pozdějších právních předpisů, zejm. § 35 odst. 3 <sup>2)</sup>;
- podle § 60 <sup>3)</sup> odst. 1 autorského zákona má UTB ve Zlíně právo na uzavření licenční smlouvy o užití školního díla v rozsahu § 12 odst. 4 autorského zákona;
- podle § 60 <sup>3)</sup> odst. 2 a 3 mohu užít své dílo – bakalářskou práci - nebo poskytnout licenci k jejímu využití jen s předchozím písemným souhlasem Univerzity Tomáše Bati ve Zlíně, která je oprávněna v takovém případě ode mne požadovat přiměřený příspěvek na úhradu nákladů, které byly Univerzitou Tomáše Bati ve Zlíně na vytvoření díla vynaloženy (až do jejich skutečné výše);
- pokud bylo k vypracování bakalářské práce využito softwaru poskytnutého Univerzitou Tomáše Bati ve Zlíně nebo jinými subjekty pouze ke studijním a výzkumným účelům (tj. k nekomerčnímu využití), nelze výsledky bakalářské práce využít ke komerčním účelům.

Prohlašuji, že

- elektronická a tištěná verze bakalářské práce jsou totožné;
- na bakalářské práci jsem pracoval samostatně a použitou literaturu jsem citoval. V případě publikace výsledků budu uveden jako spoluautor.

Ve Zlíně .....3.6.2012.....

.....Kovářec Petr.....

*1) zákon č. 111/1998 Sb. o vysokých školách a o změně a doplnění dalších zákonů (zákon o vysokých školách), ve znění pozdějších právních předpisů, § 47b Zveřejňování závěrečných prací:*

*(1) Vysoká škola nevydělečně zveřejňuje disertační, diplomové, bakalářské a rigorózní práce, u kterých proběhla obhajoba, včetně posudků oponentů a výsledku obhajoby prostřednictvím databáze kvalifikačních prací, kterou spravuje. Způsob zveřejnění stanoví vnitřní předpis vysoké školy.*

(2) *Disertační, diplomové, bakalářské a rigorózní práce odevzdané uchazečem k obhajobě musí být též nejméně pět pracovních dnů před konáním obhajoby zveřejněny k nahlížení veřejnosti v místě určeném vnitřním předpisem vysoké školy nebo není-li tak určeno, v místě pracoviště vysoké školy, kde se má konat obhajoba práce. Každý si může ze zveřejněné práce pořizovat na své náklady výpisy, opisy nebo rozmnoženiny.*

(3) *Platí, že odevzdáním práce autor souhlasí se zveřejněním své práce podle tohoto zákona, bez ohledu na výsledek obhajoby.*

2) *zákon č. 121/2000 Sb. o právu autorském, o právech souvisejících s právem autorským a o změně některých zákonů (autorský zákon) ve znění pozdějších právních předpisů, § 35 odst. 3:*

(3) *Do práva autorského také nezasahuje škola nebo školské či vzdělávací zařízení, užije-li nikoli za účelem přímého nebo nepřímého hospodářského nebo obchodního prospěchu k výuce nebo k vlastní potřebě dílo vytvořené žákem nebo studentem ke splnění školních nebo studijních povinností vyplývajících z jeho právního vztahu ke škole nebo školskému či vzdělávacímu zařízení (školní dílo).*

3) *zákon č. 121/2000 Sb. o právu autorském, o právech souvisejících s právem autorským a o změně některých zákonů (autorský zákon) ve znění pozdějších právních předpisů, § 60 Školní dílo:*

(1) *Škola nebo školské či vzdělávací zařízení mají za obvyklých podmínek právo na uzavření licenční smlouvy o užití školního díla (§ 35 odst.*

3). *Odpirá-li autor takového díla udělit svolení bez vážného důvodu, mohou se tyto osoby domáhat nahrazení chybějícího projevu jeho vůle u soudu. Ustanovení § 35 odst. 3 zůstává nedotčeno.*

(2) *Není-li sjednáno jinak, může autor školního díla své dílo užit či poskytnout jinému licenci, není-li to v rozporu s oprávněnými zájmy školy nebo školského či vzdělávacího zařízení.*

(3) *Škola nebo školské či vzdělávací zařízení jsou oprávněny požadovat, aby jim autor školního díla z výdělku jim dosaženého v souvislosti s užitím díla či poskytnutím licence podle odstavce 2 přiměřeně přispěl na úhradu nákladů, které na vytvoření díla vynaložily, a to podle okolností až do jejich skutečné výše; přitom se přihlédne k výši výdělku dosaženého školou nebo školským či vzdělávacím zařízením z užití školního díla podle odstavce 1.*

## **ABSTRAKT**

Tato bakalářská práce se zabývá překladem vinařské terminologie a terminologie, která je s vínem spojená. Bakalářská práce je rozdělena na dvě části. Teoretická část se zabývá překladem a identifikuje funkční přístup k překladu, který je pro tuto práci výchozí. Dále se zabývá stylistikou vinět a webových stránek jako propagačních materiálů a stanovuje potřebné zázemí pro pochopení rozdílných stylů hodnocení kvality. V poslední části se práce zabývá konceptem terminologie.

Analytická část nabízí analýzu existujících překladů vinět a webových stránek českých vinařů a upozorňuje na škálu chyb a problémů, které se v nich vyskytují.

Klíčová slova:

Překlad, Funkční překlad, Výchozí text, Cílový text, Vinařství, Viněty, Jakost, Ekvivalence

## **ABSTRACT**

This bachelor thesis is aimed at translation of wine-making terminology and of terminology, which is connected to wine. The thesis is divided into two parts. The theoretical part deals with the notion of translation and identifies the functional approach towards translation, on which the thesis is based on. It subsequently deals with the stylistics of the wine labels and websites as promotional materials. It states the necessary background for understanding of different styles of quality judgment. The last part deals with the notion of terminology.

The analytical part offers the analyses of existing translations of wine labels and websites of Czech wine producers. It points out the range of mistakes and problems, which occur in the translations.

Keywords:

Translation, Functional translation Source text, Target text, Wine-making, Wine labels, Quality, Equivalence

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

I would like to thank especially to my thesis advisor PhDr. Katarína Nemčoková for her valuable advice and her time. Many thanks go to my family and friends, who were patient and supportive.

I would also like to thank to Pavel Jelen and Helena Baker for their willingness to consultate the thesis from their professional point of view as well as for their advice.

# CONTENTS

<b>INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>1 THEORY .....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>1 TRANSLATION .....</b>	<b>12</b>
1.1 Literal vs. Free Translation .....	13
1.2 Contemporary Theories of Translation Processes .....	13
1.3 Equivalents .....	14
1.3.1 Word and Meaning: One-to-one Relationship.....	14
1.3.2 Collocations .....	15
1.3.3 Idioms .....	16
1.4 Translation strategies .....	17
1.4.1 Borrowing .....	17
1.4.2 Calque .....	17
1.4.3 Literal Translation .....	17
1.4.4 Transposition .....	18
1.4.5 Modulation .....	18
1.4.6 Adaptation .....	18
1.5 Diminutives .....	19
<b>2 STYLISTICS.....</b>	<b>20</b>
2.1 Genre, Register .....	20
2.1.1 Genre .....	20
2.1.2 Register.....	21
2.2 Wine Labels and Websites.....	21
2.2.1 Wine Labels .....	21
2.2.2 Web pages.....	23
<b>3 THE KNOWLEDGE OF THE FIELD.....</b>	<b>24</b>
3.1 The Czech Historical Background.....	24
3.2 The English Historical Background.....	24
3.3 The Two Systems of Evaluation.....	25
3.3.1 Germanic system .....	25
3.3.2 Romance (appellation) system.....	26



3.4	Residual Sugar .....	27
3.5	The French Terminology .....	27
3.6	Varieties .....	28
3.7	Semantic Fields.....	29
<b>4</b>	<b>TERMINOLOGY .....</b>	<b>31</b>
4.1	Schools of Terminology.....	32
4.1.1	Vienna School of Terminology .....	32
4.1.2	Prague School of Terminology .....	33
4.1.3	Soviet and Canadian School of Terminology .....	33
<b>II</b>	<b>ANALYSIS .....</b>	<b>34</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>LABELS.....</b>	<b>35</b>
5.1	Quality .....	35
5.2	Regions, Geographical Designations .....	38
5.3	Translation of the Varieties .....	39
5.4	Descriptions of the Tastes and Wines.....	41
5.4.1	Generalization.....	42
<b>6</b>	<b>TRANSLATION OF WEBSITES.....</b>	<b>44</b>
6.1	Quality of Wine .....	44
6.2	Translation of Varieties and Typos.....	45
6.3	Activities and Places Connected to Wine Degustation.....	47
<b>7</b>	<b>FINDINGS IN THE ANALYSIS.....</b>	<b>49</b>
	<b>CONCLUSION .....</b>	<b>50</b>
	<b>BIBLIOGRAPHY .....</b>	<b>51</b>
	<b>APPENDICES RULANDSKÉ MODRÉ – EUROPEAN SYNONYMS .....</b>	<b>57</b>

## **CONTENT OF TABLES**

Table 1	Two types of labels .....	23
Table 2	The Czech designations and their literal translations .....	26
Table 3	Designations according to the residual sugar level.....	27
Table 4	Names of the Czech varieties and their official synonyms .....	28
Table 5	Jedlička&Novák vs. official translation.....	45

## INTRODUCTION

Wine is said to be the liquid of gods. Even though this may not be true, it definitely is a part of culture, of dining and even a part of business.

Is it not desirable to impress your partner on a date by your knowledge of wine? But what if you are on a date in an English speaking country or what if you have an English speaking visitor and you would like to show them the traditions of wine-making of the Czech Republic?

The world market is becoming more and more open and globalized, customers may buy products from all over the world and the producers are adapting to this phenomenon in many ways.

One of the ways is translation of promotional materials and product descriptions to worldwide languages. This applies for the Czech wine-makers, who are trying to make their products more available for foreigners by translating the labels, and other promotional materials.

The current theories of translation focus mostly on the pragmatic function of the texts and what the texts evoke in their readers. Czech and Moravian wines are not at the top of the European production nor they are close to it, but the producers are trying to make their best and improve the status quo. No matter how hard they try and how hard they focus on quality products, the translations of the promotional materials does not meet the requirements of the functional translation approaches and may become more harmful than useful.

## **I. THEORY**

## 1 TRANSLATION

The purpose of this chapter is to acknowledge the reader with the topic of translation. It deals with the translation techniques, with the equivalence on word and contextual level, the problems of non-equivalence and the ways and strategies of solving these situations.

Within this work, translation is understood as a process of converting a written text from the source text and the source language to the target text and the target language (Jacobson 1959). Thinking about translation has a long history. It was in the ancient Rome that Cicero mentioned the difference and importance between the literal and free translation. But despite this fact the theoretical scientific approach to translation appears as late as the 19<sup>th</sup> century. It corresponds with the development of linguistics. According to Knittlová (2010) the basic purpose of translation is to keep the equivalence of the meaning and the pragmatic outcome of the text (Knittlová, 2010). She also mentions that the product of the translating process should be perceived rather as a creative piece than translation. Furthermore, a quality translation has to fulfil at least three criteria:

- a) The language in the target text is natural.
- b) The target text has the same meaning (or at least the meaning is as close as possible) as to the source text. The impact on the addressee in the target language is the same as the impact on the reader in the source language.
- c) The language means of the target text should evoke the same reactions as the means of the source text (Knittlová 2010, 14-15).

Nida says that “translating must aim primarily on reproducing the message. But to reproduce the message one must make many grammatical and lexical adjustments” (1969, 12). He also adds that “the translator must strive for the equivalence not for the identity” (Nida 1969, 12). Many other authors agree on the fact that the equivalence of the effect is more important than literal translation. This brings us to the idea that translation does not mean a word-for-word (or literal) language shift. But that does not imply that the literal translation is forbidden. It is perfectly fine to use this method when the literal equivalent has the same effect on the target reader as the translated term does on the reader in the source language.

The role of the translator in the process of translation is crucial. They are the “mediators” between the source text and the target text, who recreate the text for the needs and understanding of the target reader (Nord 2005).

Koller simply states that the translator’s job is to transform the meaning and the style

(1992, 343). This chapter describes the translation as a process of converting the purpose and meaning. In translation of wine-making terminology this process seems to be omitted more than often as it appears to be rather conversion of the literal meaning.

### 1.1 Literal vs. Free Translation

- **Literal translation** – sometimes called slavish. Using this method the translator is transforming the lexical units without regarding the context, though they respect the grammatical structure of the text.
- **Free translation** - contrary to the first type this method does not tightly respect the structure of the source text in register or stylistics. Even though it takes the idiomatic expressions and collocations into account it lacks the aesthetic values of the source text (Knittlová 2010, 17).
- **Communicative/idiomatic translation** – this type is closely related to the pragmatics of the text. It uses both grammar and proper lexical choice of the target language (Knittlová 2010, 17).

Literal (or word-for-word) and free (or sense-for-sense) are two basic types of translation. It is necessary to mention this distinction, because literal translation otherwise undesirable, appears in the translation of wine's quality. As the types of evaluating the quality of wine differ (see Chapter 3) the literal translation might be considered wrong. On the other hand as it is further demonstrated in the analytical part, the authors choose quite free approach towards the translation, especially in the case of websites.

Baker (1992) adds that the communicative or functional translations are approaches which do not separate the act of translating from the meaning of the text.

Nord distinguishes between documentary (word-for-word, literal) translations, which transfer a message from one language to another, and instrumental translations. The target text of the instrumental translation has similar or the same function as the source text (Nord 2005).

### 1.2 Contemporary Theories of Translation Processes

The approach to translation has changed in the second half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. Instead of evaluating the final product the emphasis in the modern approaches is to focus on the process, of which the final product emerges. The translators should consider the historical, regional and cultural values (and imply them) first, then they should analyze the source text

on grammatical and lexical levels (Knittlová 2010, 27). The field of wine-making has a long tradition, therefore the cultural, historical and regional values should be considered deeply. The crucial values are mentioned in Chapter 3.

According to Nord (2005) the translator is fully committed to the target situation, the target text is related to a situation and the translator's duty is to transfer the situation. The point is the translator should be loyal to the function of the text before the text itself and the translator has to consider the background of the target culture.

### 1.3 Equivalentents

The basic feature of the translator's job is finding the equivalence in the target language. If the outcome of the translated text does not meet its equivalence in the target text the translation might cause incomprehension and misunderstanding. Nevertheless, House stresses that even the notion of this phenomenon is not a simple one (House 2009).

This chapter deals with the situations when there is non-equivalence on the word level. When we speak about equivalence we speak about the functionality, not about the absolute identity of two words or expressions. House states that "the focus is on making the translation 'relevant' to the recipients. Target culture norms are crucial, because it is in the target cultural environment that the translation will have to achieve its purpose" (House 2009, 26).

House also calls the translator the co-author as they are responsible for finding the equivalent/functional words and expressions. Lyons (2005) mentions the term *translatability*, which refers to the semantic bank of a language and semantic distinctions in equivalence. This is connected with the notion of terms and concepts dealt with in Chapter 4.

The field of wine-making is very specific about terms and terminology as it is a very old field (see Chapter 3) and the words and terms developed separately and uniquely in different countries and places.

#### 1.3.1 Word and Meaning: One-to-one Relationship

According to Baker the translators cannot rely on a presumption of one-to-one relationship between the word and the meaning (Baker 1992). An example to this may be the translation of the word *viněta*; in Czech it means a label of a bottle of wine. The English language needs to use two words: *wine label*. Whereas another word offered by a

dictionary used in English of the French origin *vignette* is described by the Cambridge dictionary as: *a short piece of writing, music, acting, etc. which clearly expresses the typical characteristics of something or someone* (Cambridge Online Dictionary). Therefore it is not an equivalent to Czech *viněta*. Words *viněta* and *vignette* are typical examples of false friends<sup>1</sup>. A perfect reversed example goes to the basic unit of the field of winery. The word *wine* as a plant, finds its equivalent in Czech as *vinná réva* not in the word *víno* (which is for the liquid itself).

German linguist Otto Kade (1968) formed four types of equivalence on a word level:

- One-to-one (e.g. white wine = bílé víno)
- One-to-many ( a glass > sklenka, sklenička)
- One-to-a-part of one
- One-to-none (Svatomartinské >???)

Kade also says that “after dividing the text up into frames or units, the translator was to pick up the “optimal equivalent” from a varying field of equivalents or options...” (Kade 1968). That is supported by House (2009), who says that it is translator’s responsibility to decide between several options in a context.

### 1.3.2 Collocations

According to Baker (1992, 47) collocations are “semantically arbitrary restrictions” which co-occur from two basic reasons. They are connected to pre-supposed meaning and form selectional restrictions and collocational restrictions, which are compulsory concerning the semantic meaning of the unit. Baker also adds that another point of view on collocations is how often certain words collocate – occur together.

When translating a collocation the translator should be aware of the genre and register of the source and target text. Butler states that, “word’s collocational and syntactic patterns even differ across registers and genres” (Butler 2004, 157) (See Chapter 2 for register and genre).

Collocations are not translatable word-by-word. The translator must find the most acceptable equivalent in the source language. “Because collocations cannot be

---

<sup>1</sup>False friends – lexical units, which have similar spelling and pronunciation in different languages but they differ in meaning (Malmkjær 2004)

characterized on the basis of syntactic and semantic regularities, they cannot be translated word-by-word” (McKeown and Radev, 2).

On the other hand collocations are easier to translate (compared to the idioms below) for the parts of collocations, the individual words, keep their meaning as if they stood separately (Seretan 2011). For example in the collocation *dry wine*, both words *dry* and *wine* keep their meaning, but together they describe the wine with very little or none residual sugar.

Typical criteria for collocations:

- non-compositionality – people say *white wine* even though the *wine* is not *white*, the colour is more likely yellowish;
- non-substitutability – despite it may seem more accurate from the point of view of perception we do not say yellow wine;
- non-modifiability (Boswell 2004).

### 1.3.3 Idioms

Baker defines idioms as “frozen patterns of language which allow little or no variation in form and, in the case of idioms often carry meanings which cannot be deduced from their individual components” (Baker 1992, 63). Translation of metaphors and idioms is a particularly difficult part of a translator’s job (Munday 2005, 58).

Special types of idioms are sayings and proverbs. Some of the idioms, proverbs and sayings have similar equivalent in the TL\*, some need to be adjusted for the needs of the TL\*\*to sound natural and some of them do not have an equivalent in the TL\*\*\*

- \**There is truth in wine* > *Ve víně je pravda* (Lacinová 1996);
- \*\**Dobré víno i bez víchy vypijí, Dobré víno nepotřebuje reklamu* > *Good wine needs no bush*;
- \*\**Víno a rozum nejdou dohromady* > *When wine is in, wit is out* (Świerczyński, Świerczyńska 2008);
- \*\**Wine is a whetstone to wit* > *Sklínka vína myslí přidá*;
- \*\**Drink wine in winter for cold, and in summer for heat* > *V zimě tě víno zahřeje, v létě osvěží* (Lacinová 1996);
- \*\**You cannot put new wine into old bottles* > *Starého psa novým kouskům nenaučíš*;
- \*\*\**To wine and dine someone* > *Czech equivalent ???*



## 1.4 Translation strategies

Following strategies or techniques are connected to the notion of free and functional vs. literal translation. In order to keep the meaning the translator should choose the right strategy to transform the source text. The translator unlike an automatic translating computer has to be aware (or should be) of the cultural background, semantic problems, collocations, idioms and others. To solve those situations they should know following techniques. Baker (1992) says that different situations require different strategies.

First three techniques apply for the literal translation the others for the free translation.

### 1.4.1 Borrowing

Borrowing means a transfer of a word from one language to another, it is used to fill a gap in a semantic field. The wine terms from Czech are not being transferred, though this field covers a whole branch of borrowings. It contains “borrowings from a third party” (borrowings from French). The semantic field of wine-making and wine contains expressions, which include complex information within one word – e. g. *barrique* – a wine which has matured in an oak barrel of a certain capacity, or *terroir* – the sum of various characteristics of geology, climate and geography conditions of a certain place.

### 1.4.2 Calque

Calque is a special kind of borrowing, when the translated expression is shifted word for word into the target language. Terminology of wine quality is often incorrectly translated by means of calque. For example: *pozdní sběr* x *late harvest*. Vinay and Darbelnet note that both calque and borrowing might be false friends (Vinay and Darbelnet 1958). The example given shows the actual problem when both of the terms are indicators of quality, but *pozdní sběr* does not (or may not) literally mean the grapes were picked up late, while *late harvest* does (Wine Tasting Guide). Therefore these two terms have the same denotative<sup>2</sup> meaning but they evoke different connotative<sup>3</sup> meaning in the target readers.

### 1.4.3 Literal Translation

Vinay and Darbelnet note occasions and reasons when the literal translation is unacceptable:

---

<sup>2</sup> Denotation – the literal meaning, found in dictionaries

- a) It gives a different meaning – again the concept of *pozdní sběr* vs. *late harvest*;
- b) It has no meaning in the target text and culture – translation of *přívlastková vína* (predicate wines) vs. *wines with attributes*;
- c) It is impossible for structural reasons;
- d) It does not have corresponding meaning in the target culture (Vinay and Darbelnet 1958) – translation of *cimbálová muzika* as *cymbal music*.

#### 1.4.4 Transposition

According to Vinay and Dalbernet the transposition is a change of a part without changing a sense. There are two types of transposition, one is obligatory – adoption of grammatical structures (singular to plural, verb to noun) of the target language, and optional - when there are more options. (Vinay and Darbelnet 1958)

#### 1.4.5 Modulation

Based on what Vinay and Dalbernet say modulation is a technique used when the literal techniques or even the transposition would emerge into unnatural translation in the target language. This category includes changes from active to passive, changes of the notions of space and time (Vinay and Darbelnet 1958).

#### 1.4.6 Adaptation

Vinay and Dalbernet use this term to refer to a cultural situation, which does not occur in the target language. The authors state an example of adaptation between the game of cricket in England and Tour de France in France (Munday 2005, 58). Czech wine culture is also connected to cultural and folklore activities. Some of the typical Czech cultural phenomena offer an interesting thought for future research, e.g. - adaptations of *Svatomartinské víno*. Nord (2005) says that it is important to analyze the receiver's expectations towards the cultural phenomena and try to reconstruct them in the target text. Though the more different cultures the more difficult the reconstruction would be. Adaptation helps to understand the intended meaning of the source text. Baker (2009) says that adaptation is rather transposition of the ST to the text of similar length in the TL.

---

<sup>3</sup> Connotation – a situation or emotion, the word evokes to native speakers

## 1.5 Diminutives

“Diminutives are basically indicating a small size of something” (Matthews 2005, 98). To the question of diminutives in the English language Jespersen adds that “English is generally considered a language, which does not have many diminutives, if any” (Jespersen 1948, 9). On the other hand Czech language is not modest about using diminutives. Even in the field of wine-making and wine-consuming we may find diminutives like *vínko*, *vínečko*, *sklenička*. These expressions though do not find their equivalents in *little wine or little glass*. In the Czech language the approach towards alcohol using diminutives appears to be euphemism<sup>4</sup>.

---

<sup>4</sup> Euphemism – a polite term for something, what is perceived negatively

## 2 STYLISTICS

Stylistics is the study of style. It might be defined as the analysis of distinctive expressions. It studies the effect and purpose (Verdonk 2002). Stylistics also studies the effect the writer or the speaker wishes to have on the receiver (Academy of the Punjab in North America). As the translator should keep the purpose of the text and its effect on the reader, they should also adopt the style. Stylistics, by studying the extra-linguistic means helps the translator to understand the cultural context of the text (Simpson 2004). This chapter deals with the style applied in wine labels and other promotional materials.

“Style is a goal-directed choice of grammar, lexis and language means according to the purpose which is to be reached” (Knittlová 2010, 135). The styles are divided into administrative, language of the science, language of the news, language of art and journalistic style. The wine labels and brochures and promotional materials combine the administrative style (the information required by the law) and the art (description of the tastes).

### 2.1 Genre, Register

Texts are divided according to genre and register. The main distinction between these two terms is that genre relates to the culture and register relates to the situation (Nuan 2008). Nuan also says the two of these are complementary and therefore the translator should be aware of them.

#### 2.1.1 Genre

“Genres are the text categories readily distinguished by mature speakers of a language, and we may even talk about a “folk typology” of genres. Texts used in a particular situation for a particular purpose may be classified using everyday labels such as a guidebook, a nursery rhyme, a poem, a business letter ... such categories are referred to as genres” (Trosborg 1997, 6).

The main distinction in genres is to fiction and non-fiction. Wine labels, brochures and website pages are non-fictional. They are rather formal as the author is limited by laws and tradition (mostly in the case of wine labels).

Nord perceives genre as “a textual result of a certain type of communicative action” (Nord 2005, 78) and separates the genre from the text function - genre is the structural outcome of

a communicational situation. Therefore the genre of wine labels, and website pages is the result of the business communication between the wine-maker and the customer.

### 2.1.2 Register

“Register is a variety of language that a user considers appropriate to a specific situation” (Baker 1992, 15). Generally registers are divided into formal and informal and according to the register the vocabulary and grammar are chosen.

In the case of the wine labels the register is rather formal, whereas in the case of websites we may find both formal and informal language expressions.

The concept of register works with three elements, which are all connected to discourse:

- **Field** – the topic, what is being written about, the field affects the choice of stylistic devices and language means;
- **Tenor** – who is communicating whom, affects the register. It is a term describing the relationship of the participants of the conversation. It also determines the language. In the case of promotion the language might happen to be pandering and persuasive. Baker says that getting the tenor right is very important for the purpose of translation;
- **Mode** – the form of the communication; written x oral. It describes the role of the text and its way of transmission. Munday differs between oral and written mode (Munday 2005; Baker 1992).

For the purpose of this work the field is wine-making and wine generally. The wine-makers, or their marketing representatives on one side and the customers on the other might be considered as the tenor (therefore there is the intention to persuade someone) and the mode is most commonly written.

Register is closely related to the functional approach to the translation.

## 2.2 Wine Labels and Websites

### 2.2.1 Wine Labels

This chapter describes the language means and stylistic devices used on wine labels.

The wine labels are very specific kind of text, the art of creating wine labels dates back to the ancient Egypt. “Label requirements have become very strict and vary greatly by region, but it is universally believed that the beauty of the label reflects the divinity of the wine

inside” (Oenologist.com). Its main purpose is to attract, to draw the attention of the consumer and persuade him/her to buy the product.

The labels are divided into two parts – the textual part and the design part (extra-linguistic and graphic means). The textual part contains information about the product. It belongs among official documents, in which some of the information are obligatory and stipulated by the law (e.g. the alcohol content), some information are voluntary, but can be mentioned only under certain circumstances (e.g. *Moravské zemské víno* can be mentioned only when the grapes were grown in the Moravian area; *English/Welsh wine* can be mentioned only when the grapes were grown in England or Wales). The last part mentions the information that should attract the consumer – the poetic description of the taste of the wine.

The author should stay in the neutral language layer, using the neutral vocabulary in the informative part, whereas they may use different means in the other part. The literary and colloquial language may be used to catch the consumer’s attention.

Due to the limited space the choice of vocabulary is crucial. One of the possibilities is to divide the label into two separate parts – front and back. By this means the author is given more space for the expressive means in the front and they may hide the informative part at the back of a bottle.

In the stylistic analysis of the label we should consider mostly:

- graphology – the shape of the language on the label
- semantics – the choice of words
- pragmatics – the context of words
- extralinguistic means – pictures, colours, symbols

(Simpson 2004).

The wine labels might be divided into two basic groups the labels into two groups:

- a) traditional (wine has a long tradition, cultural phenomenon)
- b) artistic, shocking (wine for non-conforming people of the 21<sup>st</sup> century)

Both of these differ mainly in the use of graphological means and extra-linguistic means.

The chart bellow shows some differences in stylistic means.

<b>Traditional Labels</b>	<b>Expressive Labels</b>
Colours corresponding to wine	Shocking, unexpected, bright colours
Ornamental, Handwriting like	Alternative
As much information as possible	Only the necessary information
Pictures of grapes or wine yards	Works of art, flowers

Table 1 Two types of labels

### 2.2.2 Web pages

Very similar structure applies for the web pages. They are a promotional tool of the producer and its purpose is to persuade the customer. The translation of web pages sometimes covers only some parts of the Czech-language contents.

In all cases both the author and the translator should keep in mind that the tenor is the producer communicating to the customer. The popularity of websites as a marketing tool is growing and websites are an essential instrument in the electronic world. Many of the Czech wine-growers offer websites in English, though not as many of them have them translated completely (e.g. e-shops are not translated - some of the producers offer the possibility of e-shopping though the English version it is still in Czech).

### **3 THE KNOWLEDGE OF THE FIELD**

This chapter deals with the basic knowledge a translator should gain about the field of wine-making to be able to translate that kind of text. The translator cannot approach the source text with no overview of the background of the field. Koller (1992) suggests evaluation of the translation in three stages:

- a) Source text criticism – is the text transferable to the target language?
- b) Translation comparison
- c) Translation evaluation (Koller 1992).

For the purpose of this chapter I assume Czech as the source language and English as the target language. The norms about making of wine differ in those countries.

#### **3.1 The Czech Historical Background**

The history of the wine-making dates as far as to the 3<sup>th</sup> century in Moravia to the Roman settlement and 9<sup>th</sup> century in Bohemia. This shows how old the tradition is. In the 14<sup>th</sup> century the grapes were brought to the Czech lands from France and Germany and the vineyards became to be grown around monasteries. Charles IV had issued a decree to support setting up of the vineyards and banned the import of foreign wines. The first official guideline to wine-making was written by Rudolf II.

Nowadays the field of wine-making is regulated by the Act 321/2004 Sb. on viticulture and wine-making. This legislation is in force since 2004 when the Czech Republic joined the EU. It corresponds to the requirements of the European Union. Among other issues, it regulates the quality designations, which are especially problematic field for translation (Wine of the Czech Republic).

#### **3.2 The English Historical Background**

The history of English wine making is almost two thousand years old. The wine grapes were introduced to England by the Romans. The English market has always been threatened by the stronger wine makers from the continent such as France and Portugal. This led the English produce to decline. Now, at the breakdown of the twentieth and the twenty-first century it enjoys rebirth (Barty-King 1989). Both English and Moravian wines are not considered to be at the top of the European wine production. For example the English production reaches only 0,05 % of the French production.



In general those wines are mostly praised by the countries of their origin. For example Prague Online Guide says that the Moravian wines belong among the best in Europe (Prague Online Guide: Moravian Wine), while The Guardian says that the Moravian wine “might be excellent, but the beer will always be supreme” (The Guardian). Some other sources speak about Moravian and English wine as it is not rubbish anymore; worth tasting etc. One of the sources also mentions that the Moravian wines are not well known, but the producers are working hard to change it (Chiff.com). That is, also according to the producer’s own words, the reason why they translate the labels and promotional materials.

### **3.3 The Two Systems of Evaluation**

In Europe the winemakers use two main systems of judging the quality of wine. This applies for a translator since the Czech wines are judged differently to the English wines. The Czech wines are judged according to the Germanic system.

#### **3.3.1 Germanic system**

The Germanic system of the wine evaluation is typical for northern wine regions such as Germany, Austria, Slovakia and also the Czech Republic. It is based on the level of sugar content of the grapes during the harvest. For this purpose the wine-makers use special unit: ° NM. Based on the level of sugar, the system divides wines into several categories, with no respect to the origin of the grapes – no regional distinction is taken into account (by the law majority of the grapes must be from Moravia, though the system does not differ between regions within Moravia).

Designation	Minimal sugar content
Stolní (Table)	11 ° NM
Zemské (Provincial <sup>5</sup> )	14 ° NM
Jakostní (Quality)	15 ° NM
<b>Vína s přívlástkem (Predicate wines)</b> (Designation for wines which meet certain sugar level and other requirements stipulated by law)	x
Kabinetní (Cabinet*)	19 ° NM
Pozdní sběr (Late harvest*)	21 ° NM
Výběr z hroznů (Selection of bunches of grapes*)	24 ° NM
Výběr z bobulí (Selection of grapes*)	27 ° NM
Ledové víno (Ice wine)	27 ° NM
Slámové víno (Straw wine)	27 ° NM
Výběr z cibéb (Selection of raisins infested by <i>Borytris Cinerea</i> )	32 ° NM

Table 2 The Czech designations and their literal translations

° NM - one degree equals one kilogram of sugar in hundred of litres of must

These designations are stated on the labels. When they are translated the translator should take into consideration the lack of knowledge of the target reader about this sugar content based evaluating system of the Czech wines. To match the equivalence, the options might be the usage of German terms (*pozdní sběr = spätlese x late harvest*), which correspond to the Czech ones (as they are based on them) or a note with explanation.

### 3.3.2 Romance (appellation) system

On the other hand the winemakers from France, Spain, Portugal and also England use the regional appellation system. This system is not based on the level of the sugar content but on the specifics of a region. To be given this quality status the wine has to be of a typical variety and fulfil characteristics of the region.

A combination of the characteristics include: geographical location, geological bedrock and microclimate, in one word *terroir* (Pokladnice Vín).

---

<sup>5</sup> \* Literal translation of the Czech terms

Czech winemakers started to introduce the appellation system in Moravia simultaneously with the Germanic system. Nevertheless it is used only in two wine regions.

### 3.4 Residual Sugar

One of the most important factors on the taste of wine is the content of residual sugar. It is again stipulated by the law.

Indication	Residual sugar content
Suché (Dry)	Maximum of 4g/l, or 9g/l where the total acidity content is not more than 2 g/l below the residual sugar content.
Polosuché (Medium Dry)	The residual sugar content must exceed the maximum for "Dry" but not exceed 12g/l, or 18g/l where the total acidity content is not more than 10g/l below the residual sugar content
Polosladké (Medium, Medium Sweet)	The residual sugar content must exceed the maximum for "Medium Dry" but not exceed 45g/l
Sladké (Sweet)	At least 45g/l

Table 3 Designations according to the residual sugar level

The data are from the EU guide to winemaking and the figures are equal to those in the Czech law. The EU actually offers the English translation for the terms as it is in the table above. Even though, some of the producers use different expressions in English.

### 3.5 The French Terminology

The French terms are alpha and omega of wine's expressions. As France is considered to be supreme in wines it is quite important to realize, the translator might need to use some of the French terminology as well. For example among all the red and white wines we may also find *rosé* wines, which is often translated as *růžové* or *pink*. Wine, which is a mix of more varieties is universally called *cuvéé* not a *mixture* or *směs*.

In the case of the French terminology the Czech language adopted some of the terms like *bouquet* to *buket*. It is an example of transliteration – adjusting a word to the Czech

phonetic system. Nevertheless in English this term matches not only with the French term *bouquet* but also *nose*.

### 3.6 Varieties

The wine has many varieties. All over the world there are thousands of varieties of wine. According to Jancis Robinson (1996) there are over 800 names of grape varieties, many of which are names of the same varieties in different languages. The translator should be aware of the fact that, as Robinson mentions in *Vines, Grapes and Wines* (2005) the names of the varieties in different languages are synonyms.

The group of varieties which produces white wines is called *white varieties* in Czech *bílé odrůdy*, a slight difference occurs in the name of the group, which produces red wines. Within this category, some of the varieties are called *purple varieties* (Jancis Robinson.com) but in Czech they are called *modré odrůdy*. Following list shows some varieties in Czech with their synonyms.

THE NAME OF THE VARIETY IN CZECH	SYNONYM(S)
Frankovka	Lemberger, Blaufränkisch
Modrý Portugal	Blauer Portugieser, Portugieser Blau
Müller Thurgau	Rivaner
Muškat Ottonel	Muscat Ottonel
Muškat Moravský	-
Neuburské	Neuburger
Rulandské Bílé	Pinot Blanc
Rulandské Modré	Pinot Noir
Rulandské Šedé	Pinot Gris
Ryzlink Rýnský	Rheinriesling, Riesling
Ryzlink Vlašský	Welschriesling
Sauvignon	Sauvignon Blanc
Svatovavřinecké	Saint Laurent
Tramín Červený	Gewürtztraminer
Veltlínské Červené Rané	Malvasier, Malvasia
Veltlínské Zelené	Grüner Veltliner

Table 4 Names of the Czech varieties and their official synonyms

The listed synonyms are those which are allowed to use on the labels according to the law. Some of the varieties have many synonyms all around the Europe (see appendix 1 for list of synonyms of *Rulandské Modré*) but only some of them can be used on the labels (Znalec Vín).

### 3.7 Semantic Fields

Semantic fields of lexical sets are groups of words that belong to one particular field. Semantic field theory says that words from one field cluster together to form bigger fields of meaning (Malmkjær 2004). E.g. *purple-red, cherry* and *ruby* belong to the semantic field of *red* (which together with *yellow, blue, green etc.* belong to the semantic field of *colours*). For the purpose of this work we need to take into account the semantic fields inside the semantic field of wine-making. The most descriptive semantic fields are connected to senses i.e. semantic fields of *taste, smell, colours* and *visual aspects*. It may be an interesting further research to show how different cultures perceive different tastes, colours and smells concerning wine. Several examples are listed below. Chapter 1 says the translator should consider the cultural values and background (House 2009), they might also consider an adaptation of this notion. The following examples are not translations, but descriptions of the same variety in different languages. They show the how similarly but also differently the senses might be described. Here is an example on Pinot Noir (*Rulandské Modré*):

#### a) Colours

- *purple-red, cherry* x *cihlová (brick-like), rubínová (ruby), granátová (garnet-like)* – Czech language frequently describes Pinot Noir's colour as *cihlová (brick-like colour)*;

#### b) Tastes

- *Třešně (cherries) and švestky (plums)*
- *Raspberry* x *ostružina (blackberry)*

The field of tastes the English and Czech language differ between Raspberry and Blackberry. Even though it may seem as a slight difference, the translator might consider the adaptation of it.

(Kraus, Kuttelvašer, Vurm 1997; Segue Cellars 2007).

Another example is on the tastes of Sauvignon Blanc (Sauvignon):

**a) Tastes**

- *Kopřiva* (nettle), *angrešt* (gooseberry), *černý rybíz* (black currant), *zralé broskve* (ripe peaches)
- *Green melon, grapefruit, lime, freshly mown grass, gooseberry*

The only common denominator here is gooseberry. As this variety often gets grassy taste the distinction between *nettle* and *freshly mown grass* might be interesting (Kraus, Kuttelvašer, Vurm 1997; Wine Guide).

Jacobson (2002) says that “there is no terminology for colours”. It is the consumer’s job to name the colour of a wine for themselves. Nevertheless the translator might want to adapt the perception of the senses to the target culture.

These two examples show how various might the descriptions be. From the basic point of view people sense only four types of tastes: sweet, salty, sour and bitter. Despite this a diverse range of adjectives is used to describe the attributes of a wine.

## 4 TERMINOLOGY

Terminology is a study of terms, their creation, collection and use in certain fields. Although it has existed for a long time, it has been perceived as a scientific discipline since 1930's and it has been systematically developed (Cabré 1999). Dubuc (1985) says that terminology is more art than a science, it has a very specific goal – to satisfy the expressive needs of the consumers.

„The language of wine is often colorful, poetic, and evocative. It also poorly articulates actual sensory perceptions, especially those of odor. Typically, impressions are funneled through the language of taste and mouth-feel. Flavor, if mentioned, often involves illusions of size or shape (e.g., big, round), power (e.g., robust, slight), or weight (e.g., heavy, watery).” The other vocabulary is connected to the emotions (pleasant, warm), use of metaphors (opened, shy) and use of the previous experience of a consumer (description by tastes of fruits or various meals, smells of flowers...) (Jackson 2002, 142). Jackson (2002) also distinguishes between the language of wine consumers, which is mostly poetic and the language used of teetotallers, which is strictly practical (using terms like alcoholic, vinegary etc.

The field of wine making is soaked with terms and terminology. The following paragraphs deal with the different approaches towards terminology and help to understand its importance and correct interpretation.

It may seem that terminology is a given set of words and terms written in dictionaries and the translators must learn them and use them. However Cabré mentions that the creativity of a translator in situations when no dictionary nor any data bank offers a solution, is closely connected with the creation of new terminology. Moreover the translator should provide the new term with an explanation of the concept and information how to use it (Cabré 1999).

Wüster (1981) considers terminology as a very interdisciplinary science. According to Wüster it lies somewhere between linguistics, logic, information science, computer science, ontology and individual disciplines.

More pragmatic approach towards the science of terminology says that it is a process of collecting, naming, describing and using terms in one or more languages. Its main purpose is to ease or allow the communication between specialists in a field. Terminology allows the communicators to act in the most effective way (Cabré 1999).

Goffin acknowledges that terminology is basically a part of a work within one field, it exists with the field and within its context (1985; quoted from Cabré 1999).

Auger (1988) mentions three types of terminology (by the goals of terminology):

- 1) Terminology for linguistic purposes
- 2) Terminology for translation
- 3) Terminology for planning (Cabré 1999).

## 4.1 Schools of Terminology

The schools of terminology are connected to the approaches towards the terminology. The approaches are also connected to the perception of terminology, whether it is or is not a science. The Vienna, Prague and Soviet schools of terminology emerged when the terminology was given a status of science. Traditional approach towards terminology says terms should be bounded to a concept and that terms and “concepts should be studied synchronically”<sup>6</sup> (Temmerman 2000, 4).

### 4.1.1 Vienna School of Terminology

The Vienna school is concerned with the nature of concepts, conceptual relations, the relationships between terms and concepts as well as with assigning designations to concepts (Kast-Aigner 2010).

“The Vienna school ignores the fact that naming of many concepts is part of their creation in the human mind” (Temmerman 2000, 5). The Vienna school of Terminology belongs among the traditional ones and it follows five principles:

- 1) Onomasiological perspective – Wüster (1991) says that the creation of the terms starts with the concept and tries to label it.
- 2) Concepts are clear-cut – the concepts are not studied out of context.
- 3) Concepts and terminological definitions – set the basis which led to ISO norm, concerning terminology (ISO 704:2009).
- 4) The concepts are given the terms permanently.
- 5) The terms and concepts are studied synchronically (Temmerman 2000, 4).

---

<sup>6</sup> Synchronical studies – studies of collected linguistic data at one point of time (Malmkjær 2004)



#### 4.1.2 Prague School of Terminology

The Prague School Terminology or the Prague linguistic circle is connected with the name of Vilém Mathesius. The approach towards terminology is focused on function and means. Mathesius pointed out the connection between the terms and word order. Whereas in English the word order is mainly determined by the grammar, in Czech it is the “TFA – topic/focus articulation, which primarily sets the word order of a sentence (Luelsdorff 1994). The Prague School perceives the language as a complex and studies it from the point of view of its function and what are the roles of its components (terms) (Sampson 1980).

#### 4.1.3 Soviet and Canadian School of Terminology

The approaches of Soviet and Canadian schools were practical on national levels as they wanted to unify the terminology in their multi (Soviet) or bilingual (Canadian) environment. Both of these schools belong to the traditional terminology field. Traditional terminology works in three stages:

- 1) Hypothesis – existence of a concept, which is to be proven
- 2) Description – describing the concept
- 3) Prescription – naming the concept (Temmerman, 2000).

Whether the terminology is a scientific discipline or not is a theoretical question, nevertheless the terminology exists as a tool of communication within fields of human actions or interactions and the translator as a mediator of the communication acts should consider the terminology, because the *term* is not only the *term itself*, but a whole concept, which lies behind the term and that is absolutely crucial for a translator to realize.

## **II. ANALYSIS**

## 5 LABELS

The theoretical part deals with the notion of translation, with approaches towards translation, its function, different types of translation and different methods, of creating a functional text in the target language. In the analytical part these techniques and methods are applied on existing translations and translations from Czech to English of labels and websites of several chosen Czech wine-makers are analyzed. The analyses of the translation are done not only from the point of view of equivalence, but primarily from the point of view of function. The English speaking people and their cultural background are assumed as the recipients of the translation.

### 5.1 Quality

As it has been already mentioned in the theoretical part the notion of predicate wines (jakostní vína s přívlastkem) is especially difficult and tricky one to translate. Pavel Pavloušek, from Faculty of Horticulture of Mendel University in Brno says that the notion of *jakostní víno s přívlastkem*, particularly *pozdní sběr*, *výběr z hroznů* and *výběr z bobulí* is basically untranslatable to English (Pavel Pavloušek, e-mail message to author). Nevertheless some of the producers are trying to describe the quality of their wine in English. The motivation of the producers is obvious, since they have to pay for official tests to be allowed to state the quality level on the label, they want to present their products in Czech as well as in English.

The theoretical part mentions the two systems of evaluation the quality of wines and their differences. The problem of literal translation occurs in the cases of translation of quality. To exemplify this, the labels of wine producer Vinofol, s.r.o. are used here:

#### Czech version

(1) *Sauvignon 2009, jakostní víno s přívlastkem, pozdní sběr, polosladké*

#### English version

(1a) *Sauvignon 2009, Quality wine with attributes, Late harvest, semi-sweet*

#### Czech version

(2) *Tramín červený 2010, jakostní víno s přívlastkem, výběr z hroznů, polosladké*

#### English version

(2a) *Gewürtztraminer 2010, Quality wine with attributes, Selection of grapes – semi-sweet*

All of the examples show the use of literal translation, thus word-for-word approach (not sense-for-sense), which is the contemporary approach towards translation (see Chapter 1.1) According to the Cambridge dictionary *an attribute* (1a, 2a) is “*a quality or characteristic that someone or something has*”. This may lead the reader to confusion that the product is somehow characteristic and distinctive from others (which may or may not be true). Nevertheless the concept of the terms in Czech is that the grapes reached a certain level of sugar during the harvest and it has been officially measured. While the English system does not work on this principle, the function of the term disappears and leads to confusion. As House (2009) says, it is the translator’s responsibility to make the translation as understandable for the target reader as possible.

In this case the authors might prefer another approach. As mentioned in Chapter 1.4 the adaptation seems to be a better solution. There is a German term *pradikatswein*, which is a synonym to *predicate wine*. *Pradikatswein* is basically the same as *jakostní víno s přívlastkem* (although the German indications differ to the Czech ones in slight details). Mathematically displayed it may look like:

$$\textit{Pradikatswein} \approx \textit{predicate wines} \approx \textit{jakostní víno s přívlastkem}$$

This may be a solution for the translator how to make the term *jakostní víno s přívlastkem* more understandable to an English speaking person. Mounin mentions the issue of hypertranslation – sometimes the translators translate too much, because they fear they would not translate enough (1999, 177).

The indication of quality of the wines follows by the terms *pozdní sběr* and *selection of grapes*. Referring back to what Pavel Pavloušek said, these terms have no equivalents in English (Pavel Pavloušek, e-mail message to the author). Obviously the translator of the example texts did not take that into account and performed an example of literal translation.

Chapter 3.3 speaks about the two main systems of evaluation of quality in Europe. It says that it is a cultural phenomenon of “northeast European wine regions” (such as Germany, Austria, the Czech Republic, Slovakia ...). Problems may arise in the case of *pozdní sběr* > *late harvest* shift. *Late harvest* is a designation for wines, which grapes were literally picked up in late season and the final product is usually sweet, dessert wine. *Late harvest* as a term is also a hyperonym of a semantic field of late harvested wines– it is a general term which embraces other terms like *ice wine* and other sweet dessert wines). In some other wine regions, especially the newer ones like the U.S. even some table wines may be

labelled as *late harvest* (Wine Tastings Guide). “*Late harvest* is made of very ripe grapes and usually very sweet” (Robinson 2005, 268). Also The Handbook of Enology by Ribéreau-Gayon

et al. lists the term *late harvest* under sweet wines with a potential for long ageing. Thus there is a difference between the Czech term *pozdní sběr* and English term *late harvest*.

In extreme cases it may be rated as misleading of customers, although unintentional.

The other label bears the designation *Výběr z hroznů* which the translator translated as *Selection of grapes*. It is again an example of literal (word-for-word) translation. As in the previous case this translation does not fulfil the function of the source text. While a Czech speaker, with at least a brief knowledge of the field, imagines under this term a wine of fine quality, which has met a certain level of sugar during the harvest, the English speaking prospective customer might find themselves confused by the term. For example it may evoke the grapes were actually selected.

Labels of wine-makers Hrabal and Proquin use the very same system – literal translation.

#### Czech version

(3) Hrabal – *Ryzlink Vlašský sur-lie, víno s přívlastkem pozdní sběr, 2010*

(4) Proquin - *Sauvignon, víno s přívlastkem pozdní sběr, 2010*

#### English version

(3a) Hrabal – *Welschriesling, late harvest, 2010*

(4a) Proquin – *Sauvignon Blanc, late harvest, 2010*

Examples 3 and 4 demonstrate another technique, which is omission (Baker 1992, 40) of the missing concept in the target language. In these cases it is the omission of the term *víno s přívlastkem*. It belongs among the adaptation techniques. Nevertheless the term *late harvest* remains confusing.

To compare the designations of quality here are examples of the labels of Mikrosvín a.s.

#### Czech version

(5) *Svatovavřinecké 2006, víno s přívlastkem, červené, suché*

#### English version

(5a) *Saint Laurent, 2006, late-picked wine, red, dry*

This wine-producer used to use the designation *late-picked wine* instead of confusing *late harvest*. According to David Chrápek, Sales Manager of the company this designation was recommended to them by a translation agency (David Chrápek, e-mail message to the

author). As mentioned repeatedly above the Czech term *pozdní sběr* does not mean the grapes were harvested lately in the harvest season, it means the grapes reached a certain sugar level (see Chapter 3). On the other hand out of the two solutions I have found during the research (*late harvest + late-picked*) this one seems to be less confusing (as it does not refer to a different designation of quality in the target culture) to the target reader. When the target language does not offer the translator should use the expression which as close as possible to the source text (Knittlová 2010).

## 5.2 Regions, Geographical Designations

For analysis of regional designations labels of Vinofol, s.r.o. are discussed again:

### Czech version

(6) *Sauvignon 2009 vinařská oblast MORAVA, podoblast Mikulovská, vinařská obec Mikulov, viniční trať Mariánský kopec*

### English version

(6a) *Sauvignon 2009, Region MORAVA, Subregion Mikulovská, Village Mikulov, Vineyard Mariánský kopec*

### Czech version

(7) *Tramín červený 2010, vinařská oblast MORAVA, podoblast Mikulovská, vinařská obec Pavlov, viniční trať Sahara*

### English version

(7a) *Gewürtztraminer 2010, Region MORAVA, Subregion Mikulovská, Village Pavlov, Vineyard Sahara*

First of all the stylistics of the translation needs to be pointed out. In Chapter 2 Koller (1992) says the translator should adopt the style. The texts on the labels, which mention the quality and the regional classification, are very short and strictly informative, though no personal style of an author is developed. On the other hand there are several features like the font, capitalization of letters, colours and others, which the translator as the co-author may want to preserve in the target text (House 2009). In the case of Vinofol's labels the translations keep all the original stylistic properties (e.g. capitalized letters in the word *MORAVA*), only the font is slightly smaller. Concerning stylistics the translator was accurate.

On the other hand the translation of the regional designation evinces some features of poor translation. From the three designations carrying the word *wine* given in the Czech version (ex. 6–7a) only the last one – the vineyard keeps the connection with *wine*. The other names which in the Czech version carry the word *wine* somehow lost the link during the translation process.

*vinařská oblast MORAVA* > (*wine?*) *Region MORAVA*

*vinařská obec Pavlov* > (*wine?*) *Village Pavlov*

As Knittlová (2010) says the translator should stay as close to the meaning of the original text as possible. The source text speaks about regions that are connected to wine, but the target text speaks about regions with no other characteristics or specifics. The official server Wine of the Czech Republic offers two possibilities:

- 1) *Wine-growing region*
- 2) *Viticultural region*

This official server also speaks about the importance of the designation with connection to the EU regulations (Wine of the Czech Republic). This server uses *Wine region* in its English version for the term *Vinařská oblast*.

The translator kept not only the capitalized letters in the word *MORAVA* but also that the word remains unchanged in its form. To the matter of translation of proper names there are different opinions. Vendler (1975) and Sciarone (1967) say a proper name should be treated like a label, which is connected to an object and that the translators should not change it as it has no meaning within the system of language. On the other hand Searle (1975) mentions this point of view is wrong and that the proper names carry also meaning and the translation of them is rather uneasy (Articlesbase). Many European place names have different names in different languages (Translation directory) In English there is a name for *Morava* > *Moravia*.

### 5.3 Translation of the Varieties

Czech Version (Vinofol, s.r.o. Svatovavřínecké 2009)

(8) *Typický "Vavřínek" s chutí nezralé švestky...*

English Version (Vinofol, s.r.o. Saint Laurent 2009)

(8a) *A typical "Laurent" with the flavour of young plums...*

In the Czech Republic, some of the most traditional varieties (but not only them) are sometimes referred to only by the parts of their names or by nicknames, e.g. *Vavřínek* (8) (instead of *Svatovavřínecké*), *Portugal* (instead of *Modrý Portugal*), *Vlašák* (instead of *Ryzlink Vlašský*) etc. Those shortened versions signify the typicality of the varieties and their unmistakable features. *Svatovavřínecké* is the most often grown red variety in the Czech Republic, whereas it is not even listed among the typical English varieties. Therefore the Czech consumer imagines the typical taste and features of this variety,

whereas the other reader lacks the concept. The impact of such a shortened version on the Czech reader would be different than the impact on the English speaking person (who may get confused). This leads to the discussion of the cultural values, which as Knittlová (2010) mentions should be considered first and implemented to the functional approach of the translation > (8a) the target text does not meet the function of the source text.

As mentioned in Chapter 3.6 the varieties have many synonyms, but only a certain number of them is allowed to be used on the labels. Considering the translation of the labels, the translators seem to be aware of this fact, nevertheless certain exceptions appear. The following three examples show the transformation of the Czech names using the allowed synonyms:

(9) Vinofol, s.r.o. *Svatovavřínecké* 2009 > Vinofol, s.r.o. *Saint Laurent* 2009

(10) Hrabal *Ryzlink Vlašský sur-lie, víno s přívlastkem pozdní sběr, 2010* > *Welschriesling, late harvest, 2010*

(11) Proquin *Sauvignon, víno s přívlastkem pozdní sběr, 2010* > *Sauvignon Blanc, late harvest, 2010*

This applies to most of the translations of the names of the varieties. However we may find also different situations:

(12) Vinofol, s.r.o. *Rulandské Modré* 2010 > Vinofol, s.r.o. *Pinot Bleu* 2010

From the linguistic point of view *Pinot Bleu* is a synonym to *Rulandské Modré* and therefore the translation is correct, but on the other hand the only allowed synonym to *Rulandské Modré* in the Czech Republic is *Pinot Noir*. That means that from the formal reasons this translation is incorrect.

The awkward use of unofficial synonyms is from the reason that no official synonyms exist. The Czech made variety *Muškat moravský* has no synonym listed, but the producers use *Moravian Muscat*. Though it is unofficial the motivation is to produce a functional translation (have the same effect on the target reader). There is a similar variety *Muškat Ottonel*, which has been used to cultivate the newer variety and it has an allowed synonym > *Muscat Ottonel*. Therefore the synonym for *Muškat* is *Muscat* and the adjective *moravský/Moravian* is obvious and as English uses most of the adjectives as pre-modifiers to nouns the two switch, resulting in *Muškat Moravský* > *Moravian Muscat*. It differs from the previous case, because the translator used an unofficial synonym even though there was a synonym available. In this case the use of the unofficial version comes out of necessity.



Mikros, a.s. *Muškat Moravský 2010* > Mikros, a.s. *Moravian Muscat*

## 5.4 Descriptions of the Tastes and Wines

The description of the taste of the wine offers the author much more space considering the choice of language. Until now the focus was on the translation of official and demanded information. The description of the wine is not obligatory, but the producers like to give the consumer the idea about the product. It is universal that they share similar features such as poetic language and unlimited use of adjectives. Nevertheless the goal of the poetic features is not to write spectacular pieces, but to sell the product.

It may seem harmless if the translator slightly changes the expressions (and as in Chapter 3.7 the translator may even think of adaptation of the description). But from the point of view of translation, the target text then does not carry the same amount of information as the source text. Mistakes in these types of text may become serious from the point of view of function (promotional material). Misunderstandings of the text may discourage the consumer from buying the product. In this part several translations are demonstrated and analyzed:

(10) Czech Version (Mikros, Svatovařinecké 2006)

*Ve vůni již od počátku jsou neochvějně višně v hořké čokoládě, jenž přechází až k toustům.*

(10a) English Version (Mikros, Saint Laurent 2006)

*Right from the start the aroma contains hints of cherries in hot chocolate, blending into toastiness.*

In the two sentences above the author of the translations changed or omitted the meaning of the highlighted parts. The ways how a wine can be described are unlimited, but when it comes to the translations the meaning should be preserved or kept as close to the source text as possible. Looking more closely on the sentence from the beginning we may notice that somehow the adjective *neochvějně* (*unswerving, unfailing*) disappeared in the English version. The omission belongs to the translation techniques and it is used in the cases of missing concept in the target language. In situations like this, however the English vocabulary offers synonyms and therefore there is no need to omit the word. The following pair *hořké/hot*, might be an example of the translator's inattention. They might have "only" failed to notice the inverted circumflex. They saw the word *horké* and translated it as *hot*. The pair at the end of the sentences *toustům/toastiness* is worth the attention as well. Based on personal conversation with Steve Harris a friend of mine and a native speaker of English

if there is such a word as *toastiness* in English it was suggested that it is “a word that describes a thing or a situation as having “delicious, comfortable warmth” (Steve Harris, e-mail message to the author). Thus in the source text the taste of the wine is compared with the taste of toasts, while in the target text it is described as “deliciously and comfortably warm/ very pleasant.”

#### 5.4.1 Generalization

(12) Czech Version (Vinofol, s.r.o. Rulandské Modré 2010)

... schopností být kombinováno s tradičními českými pokrmy – smaženým hermelínem, francouzskými brambory...

(12a) English Version (Vinofol, s.r.o. Pinot Bleu 2010)

..combine well with all traditional Czech cuisine – fried blue vein cheese, baked potatoes...

Wine and cheese belong together and frequently the wine is offered to enjoy with a specific type of cheese. Examples 12 and 12a show the generalization technique. “Translators often deal with semantic gaps in the target language by modifying a superordinate word or by means of circumlocutions based on modifying superordinates” (Baker 1992, 20). As Baker points out the easiest way how to deal with the semantic gap in the target language (and the translator is aware of the lack of knowledge of the Czech brand *hermelín* for the target reader) is to use a superordinate word from the semantic field.

Unfortunately in this case the translator used a wrong superordinate. We may find smaller units within the semantic field of *cheese* > *blue vein cheese*, *camembert type cheese*, *Swiss cheese* etc. The semantic field of *blue vein cheese* cover for example *gorgonzola*, *Roquefort* and also Czech *niva*. But *hermelín* belongs to the family of *camembert type cheese* therefore this would be the right superordinate expression to use.

(13) Czech Version (Vinofol, s.r.o., 2009 Rulandské Modré Klaret)

V chuti plné, ve vůni můžeme nalézt tóny bonpari bonbónů a lesního ovoce.

(13a) English Version (Vinofol, s.r.o., 2009 Pinot Noir Claret)

Full in flavour, and in the aroma we can find tones of fruity sweets and forest fruits.

The same producer performed a successful generalization on other label using *fruity sweets* as a general superordinate word to translate *bonpari bonbóny*. To be even more precise, we may find a very similar type of sweets in the UK. Bonpari brand belongs to a big company Nestlé. On their websites version in the UK they offer sweets called *Rowntree's*, which are

apparently famous fruity sweets in the UK. Moreover they look similar to Bonpari. Given this circumstances the generalization might not have been necessary and using the adaptation might serve even better.

(14) Czech Version (Vinofol, s.r.o. 2010, Ryzlink Vlašský)

...- s houbami, s koprem, ke **kulajdě**, které může doplnit telecí steak.

(14a) English Version (Vinofol, s.r.o.,2010, Welschriesling)

...mushroom or dill sauces, **some traditional soups**, or veal steak.

Such a typical meal as *kulajda* (a creamy soup made with potatoes, dill and mushrooms) demands generalization or omission since the possibilities and the ingredients are already mentioned. What can a person imagine under *some traditional soups*? Assuming that the target reader has low or none knowledge of the Czech cuisine, the translation by using very general term is vague or confusing. Also the source text says *kulajdě* (singular) but in the target text the expression *some traditional soups* is in plural.

## 6 TRANSLATION OF WEBSITES

Websites are becoming more and more influential in the world of business. They are the presentation of the producer, a marketing tool, a means to persuade the consumer about the superiority of the producer among others. The trend is that the wine-makers are trying to enter, or to become more successful, at the international market and for this reason they translate their websites. However, poor translations might be harmful. From the point of view of translation they offer and display more likely two different texts than translations of the Czech (original) versions. I chose to analyze translations of websites of Vinařství u Kapličky, Rodinné vinařství Jedlička&Novák and Templářské sklepy. The translations share similar features – omission of words or whole parts, adding adjectives, incorrect terminology or misspelled words. What they have in common is that none of them functions well as a translation. This chapter analyses not only the translation of the language of wine, but also of the features closely connected to wine from the commercial point of view like business terminology and currency transposition as well as problematic words connected to cultural phenomena. Compared to the translation of the labels the authors seem to be less concentrated on the accuracy and function of the target texts.

### 6.1 Quality of Wine

Translation of the notion of wine quality is omnipresent and appears in several variations. While analysing the translations of websites I found the term, which seems to be the closest to the notion of Czech *Jakostní víno s přívlastkem*, but also its mutations, literal translations and misleading versions. The website of Rodinné vinařství Jedlička&Novák ([www.vinoboretice.cz](http://www.vinoboretice.cz)) deal with the term as listed:

*Predicate wines* – which is the English version of the German term *prädikatswein* = *víno s přívlastkem*. Even though they use the closest term for the whole group of quality wines (correct hyperonym), the subset of its hyperonyms (the designations of certain quality) is not consistent. In their Czech version of e-shop, we may find *Rulandské modré, výběr z hroznů, 2010* as well as *Rulandské modré, výběr z hroznů, 2005*. At the first sight the only difference seems to be the vintage, but when we switch to the English version of the same e-shop, there is *Pinot noir, selection of grapes, 2010* and *Pinot noir, auslese, 2005*.

The translator used two different terms for the same notion. The lack of English terms for the Czech designations of quality as well as the possibility of using the German terminology were discussed in Chapter 3.

The website of Templářské sklepy Čejkovice ([www.templarske-sklepy.cz](http://www.templarske-sklepy.cz)) use the expression *predicated wines* the term is *jakostní víno s přívlastkem*. The translation of *přívlastek* is *a predicate*. The first producer put the noun in a noun/adjective position to make it an adjective (Veselovská, Emonds 2011), whereas the other created an adjective *predicated*. Both versions seem to be appropriate and much more accurate than the following example.

The website of Rodinné Vinařství U Kapličky ([www.vinarstviukaplicky.cz](http://www.vinarstviukaplicky.cz)) there is also mention the expression *vína s přívlastkem* (plural form) and the translation in the English version is *attributive wines*. This is an example of translation lacking the concept, using the first option a dictionary offers for the word *přívlastek*.

## 6.2 Translation of Varieties and Typos

As it has been already mentioned and analyzed the names of varieties have many synonyms, but only few of them are permitted to be used instead of the Czech version. The most problematic one appears to be *Sauvignon*. Most probably the name is understandable in other European countries, but the synonym of *Sauvignon* is *Sauvignon Blanc*. Even within one website the translators uses both versions. E.g. Jedlička&Novák, e-shop:

(15) CZ: *Sauvignon 2011, pozdní sběr* > EN: *Sauvignon 2011, late harvest*

(16) CZ: *Sauvignon 2010, pozdní sběr* > EN: *Sauvignon Blanc 2010, late harvest*

The English version of Jedlička&Novák's website offers the reader many new varieties, which even a wine connoisseur might find him/herself new and interesting.

Jedlička&Novák's version	Permitted translation
Frankovka – Blau Frenkish; Blue Frankish	Frankovka - Lemberger, Blaufränkisch
Modrý Potugal – Blau Portugal	Modrý Portugal - Blauer Portugieser, Portugieser Blau
Veltlínské Zelené – Green Veltline	Veltlínské Zelené – Grüner Veltliner
Tramín Červený – Red Traminer	Tramín Červený – Gewürtztraminer
Muškat Ottonel – Muskát Ottonel	Muškat Ottonel – Muskat Ottonel

Table 5 Jedlička&Novák vs. official translation

Note that for example *Frakovka* has two different versions, where the letters *a* and *e* are switched one time using the adjective *modrý* in German version *blau* and the other time English version *blue*. Nemčoková calls the phenomenon – translating one word from the

source text in several occasions by different terms in the target text a translation inconsistency (Nemčoková 2011, e-mail message to the author).

The author brings an innovative style to translation of varieties by using English colour adjectives and modifications of the name of the variety in German in e.g. *Green Veltline(r)* and *Red Traminer*. On the other hand the translation of *Modrý Portugal* gets German colour adjective *Blau* and the second part of the name stays in Czech. The translations of varieties on this website create an impression of unprofessional and poorly organized approach towards the translation, as also certain typos appear – missing *r* in *Veltline(r)* or keeping the acute accent on *á* in the translation of *Muškat Ottonel*.

The problems of translation of varieties appear not only in the translation of websites of various wine-makers. Pavel Jelen, reviewer for *O Víně, nezávislý portál* ([www.ovine.cz](http://www.ovine.cz)) mentions this very issue in his review of translation of *Hugh Johnson's Pocket Wine Book 2009* (in Czech *Hugh Johnson: Světová ročenka vín 2009*) in which the translator also misspelled the varieties, e. g. *Blaufränkisch* > *Blaufränkish*. The authors are most probably aware of the fact that names of the varieties in different languages are synonyms, but they are not precise in their use. This may weaken the effort to enter the international business, especially, when the producers offer wines of fine quality with poor translation use wrong or made-up terminology.

Another example of wrong or misspelled terminology appears at the website of *Templářské sklepy*, features: *Sekt: metoda kvašeno v lahvi* in the Czech version. In the English version there is a headline *Sparkling wine: champagne*. The first half of the expression is correct. The word *champagne* (in this spelling) is the name of a French painter from the 17<sup>th</sup> century. What the author was most probably aiming at is the word *champagne*, which is only for wines grown in the French wine region Champagne (AOC see appellation system 3.3.2). The term for *metoda kvašeno v lahvi* is *méthode champenoise* or *méthode classique* or *méthode traditionnelle* or *traditional method*. On the other hand in the text itself the author uses for *kvašeno v lahvi* term *classical method*. The use of adjective *classical* is a bit unfortunate as it refers more to something of high value, whereas the adjective *classic* (for something traditional) seems to be more appropriate. It is another example of a translation inconsistency. *Vinařství Hrabal* (AV Sekt č.š.27S) uses for the term *kvašeno v lahvi*, “English” term *method classic*. The usage of the adjective is more accurate than in the case of *Templářské sklepy*'s translation but it gives the impression of literal translation from French (*méthode classique*) to English as the adjective stands in the position of a post-

modifier to the noun, rather than in front of it. Another producer of sparkling wines, Proqin, uses the French version *méthode traditionnelle* for the term *kvašeno v lahvi*. It confirms the producers are familiar with the correct terminology.

### 6.3 Activities and Places Connected to Wine Degustation

The biggest difference between the translation of labels and website of the wine producers is the websites offer and try to sell activities closely connected to wine-making such as wine tastings, accommodation, food and tourism. The Czech versions of the offers are clear, but the English versions offer certain curiosities that might cause confusion to the target English speaking reader.

What goes together with wine-making is tasting and degustation. The websites of *Jedlička&Novák* and *Rodinné Vinařství U Kapličky* both inform the target reader there is the possibility of tasting and degustation. Both share an interesting feature: the omission of whole parts from the source text to the target text. As was mentioned earlier omission is only acceptable when the two languages do not share the concept. Interestingly, in some instances the websites show examples of reversed omission – there is something additional in the target versions. In the case of *Jedlička&Novák* the Czech version offers four types of tasting menus whereas the English version offers only two menus, which pretend to be identical to the first two menus from the Czech version. Following is the list of differences between the CZ and EN version:

Menu 1:

- EN version offers additional *tasting of plum and apricot brandy*, which is listed nowhere in the CZ version
- The same applies for *soft drinks* available only in the English version

Menu 2:

- The target text covers only content of one of three bullet points mentioned in CZ version
- Both menus list the prices – CZ version mentions the prices are without VAT, but it is not stated in the EN version.

Both *Jedlička&Novák*'s and *Rodinné Vinařství U Kapličky* websites mention the instructions to the order of the tastings. It concerns money and the arrangements necessities (check-in, check-out, booking). The English speaking customers are never to know this.

From the functional approach towards translation this would be the biggest mistake as the source text informs the reader about all the instruction, whereas the target reader has no idea of needs to be done before their arrival.

In Moravia tastings are closely connected also with folklore music. Both of the producers above offer the possibility of live music. Unfortunately the translator of *Rodinné Vinařství U Kapličky* fell into trap of false friends and translated:

*Cimbálová muzika* > *Cymbal music (činelová muzika)* - the English reader must be terrified by the image of wine degustation accompanied by the rattle of cymbals.

The Jedlička&Novák's translator uses for *Cimbál* the word *Cimbalom*, which is the correct equivalent. It might be also desirable to add information that the music is folklore or traditional to have the same effect on both the source and target reader as the word *cimbalom* evokes connotative folklore feeling/imagination in a Czech (Moravian) person.

The wine tastings and degustation are supplemented with local delicatessen. While Jedlička&Novák offers home-made smoked meat from a *smokehouse*, *Rodinné Vinařství U Kapličky* offers the same from *the smoking chamber* – here the English reader may want to ask why the meat is from a chamber where people smoke. They also offer *wedding cookies*. This exemplifies a try for adaptation, nevertheless not very precise one. The English word *cookie* means *sušenka* in Czech whereas the traditional dessert is called *svatební koláčky* and the synonym for *koláček* is *a cake*. This also shows the translator was aware of the notion of adaptation, but used it in a wrong place.

*Rodinné Vinařství U Kapličky* provides the tastings in *Stylová vinárna (stylish wine bar)* for the Czech people, while the English speaking people are expecting the tastings in a *Stylish Tavern* (which is a rather obsolete word for Czech *hospoda*, a place connected with alcohol in a general sense, not with wine only).



## 7 FINDINGS IN THE ANALYSIS

In the previous two chapters, the existing translations of labels and websites were analyzed. The outcome of the analysis is rather negative for the producers, who had their promotional materials translated the target language versions do not serve the same functions as the original source texts. Generally the producers want their promotional materials in both Czech and English in order to enter the international market.

The most common mistake appears to be the inappropriate use of literal translation from one language to another. The instances, where the use of word-for-word translation is inappropriate cover mostly the quality designations. It is a difficult matter as the concepts of quality judgment are different in the source and in the target culture. The solutions for this situation might be the usage of German terminology or stating that the wine is a quality wine and the level of sugar during the harvest only. The producers might also want to consider the other concept of quality judgement, where the place of origin plays the most important role and sets the level of quality. Concerning this, they may want to highlight the place of origin and the vintage rather than stick to the Czech designation.

The lack of cultural awareness is another finding. The Czech wine-makers want to offer their products to English speaking foreigners. Nevertheless, they do not take their cultural background and knowledge of cultural phenomena into account. As it was demonstrated in the chapter on tastes of wines as well as in the chapter on translation of websites in the cultural section (Chapter 6.3) local phenomena are poorly translated. The outcome is non understandable or confusing target text, which does not give the target reader the exact (or the closest possible) image of what they should expect.

Another phenomenon the translators should be more aware of is the notion of wine varieties. As mentioned throughout the text the varieties have many synonyms, which may function as equivalents and be comprehensive for the target reader. However only a few of them are allowed to be used on the labels and that limits the number of options. The other issue concerning the names of varieties is the attempt to create and develop new names. The translator is limited by the choice and it is not desirable to use different synonyms nor make them up. All in all there is a need for improvement in the translation of wine-making terminology and the language of wine from Czech to English. It would be pity if the effort to enter the international market offering quality products was set back by poor translation of the promotional materials.

## CONCLUSION

This bachelor thesis focused on translation of wine-making and wine connected terminology from Czech to English. The need for translation emerges from the fact that the European market is more open than ever before. Even though the Moravian wines are not considered to be of the highest quality in Europe the wine-producers are trying to turn it around and according to their own words the translation of the promotional materials is a necessity in a fierce competition and helps them to enter the market. On the other hand poor translations might be of ill service to the producers.

The functional approach towards translation, which this thesis is based on, says that the most important feature of the outcome of the target text is to keep the original effect. It also says the cultural and conceptual knowledge of the target reader should be taken into account and implemented into the translation. Nevertheless the majority of the analyzed materials show the lack of knowledge or ignorance to this approach of the authors of the translations. They frequently use literal translation when it is not appropriate and they do not consider the cultural awareness of the target reader. The target texts differ in meaning from the source texts. The authors quite often omit whole parts of the source texts and make up new terminology, when it already exists which is from the translator's point of view unacceptable.

Even though the Moravian and Czech products are not on the top of the European production, they are growing in quality and awareness. The business is not only about the wine, but also about tourism and the promotion in foreign languages plays a crucial role. The improvement in translation of these products may be a way to enter the European market, with much better name and more rapidly.

**BIBLIOGRAPHY**

- Academy of the Punjab in North America. *Stylistics and Discourse Analysis: A Contribution in Analysing Literature*. <http://www.apnaorg.com/research-papers/zulfiqar-1/> [accessed January 24, 2012].
- Baker, Mona. 1992. *In Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation*. New York: Routledge.
- Baker, Mona. Saldanha, Gabriela. 2009. *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition. New York: Routledge.
- Barty-King, Hugh. 1977. *A Tradition of English Wine: The Story of Two Thousand Years of English Wine Made From English Grapes*. Illustrated Press. 1<sup>st</sup> Edition.
- Barty-King, Hugh. 1989. *A Taste of English Wine*. London: Pelham Books.
- Boswell, Dustin. 2004. *Chapter 5: Collocations*, presented May 3, 2004. <http://dustwell.com/PastWork/Collocations.pdf> [accessed January 3, 2012].
- Butler, C. S. 2004. *Corpus Studies and Functional Linguistic Theories: Functions of Language*. Quoted in: Yamasaki, Nozomi. 2008. *Collocations and Colligations Associated with Discourse Functions of Unspecific Anaphoric Nouns*. Kansai Gaidai University. John Benjamin Publishing Company.
- Cabré, M. T. 1999. *Terminology: Theory, Methods and Applications*. John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- DrinkWine.com. *Wine guide, Sauvignon Blanc*. [http://drinkwine.com/wine\\_guide/varietals/sauv\\_blanc.html](http://drinkwine.com/wine_guide/varietals/sauv_blanc.html) [accessed February 6, 2012].
- Dubuc, Robert. 1985. *Manuel Pratique de Terminologie*. 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition. Montréal: Linguatex. Quoted in: Cabré, M., T. 1999. *Terminology: Theory, Methods and Applications*. John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Znalec Vín. *Encyklopedie Vína, Vinařství a Vinohradnictví: Státní Odrůdová Kniha*. <http://www.znalecvin.cz/statni-odrudova-kniha/> [accessed February 16, 2012].
- Europe, a Neverending Journey. *Beers and Wines from Central Europe*. <http://www.visiteurope.com/Discover/Where-To-Go/Central-Europe/Drinks-Central-Europe> [accessed January 27, 2012].
- Fišer, Zbyněk. 2009. *Překlad jako kreativní proces: Teorie a praxe funkcionalistického překládání*. Brno, Host.

- Gentzler, Edwin, 2010. *Contemporary Translation Theories: Revised 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition*. Lighting Source UK, Ltd.
- Guide to EU Wine Regulations. 2005.  
<http://www.food.gov.uk/multimedia/pdfs/euwineregs.pdf> [accessed February 1, 2012].
- House, Juliane. 2009. *Translation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jackson, Ronald, S. 2002. *Wine Tasting: A Professional Handbook*. San Diego: Elsevier Academic Press.
- Jacobson, Roman. 1959. *On Linguistic Aspects of Translation*. Reuben A. Brower (Ed.), Cambridge, Harvard University Press.
- Jancis Robinson.com. [http://www.jancisrobinson.com/categories/wine\\_grapes.html](http://www.jancisrobinson.com/categories/wine_grapes.html) [accessed February 14, 2012].
- Jespersen, Otto. 1948. *Essentials of English Grammar*. Allen&Unwin. Quoted in:  
Schneider, Klaus. 2003. *Diminutives in English*. Linguistische Arbeiten.
- Kade, Otto. 1968. *Zufall und Gesetzmässigkeit in der Übersetzung*. Leipzig: Enzyklopädie. Quoted in: Gentzler, Edwin, 2010. *Contemporary Translation Theories: Revised 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition*. Lighting Source UK, Ltd.
- Kast-Aigner, Judith. 2010. *The Terminology of the European Union's Development Cooperation Policy: Gathering Terminological Information by Means of Corpora*. WU – Vienna University of Economics and Business.
- King, Barty, Hugh. 1977. *A Tradition of English Wine*. Illustrated Press.
- Knittlová, Dagmar, a kolektiv. 2010. *Překlad a Překládání*. Olomouc: Univerzita Palackého v Olomouci, Filozofická fakulta.
- Koller, Werner. 1992. *Einführung in die Übersetzungswissenschaft*. 4. Völling Neu Bearb. Aufl. Heidelberg; Wiesbaden: Quelle u. Meyer, pg. 343. Quoted in: Fišer, Zbyněk. 2009. *Překlad Jako Kreativní Process: Teorie a praxe funkcionalistického překládání*. Brno, Host.
- Kraus, V., Kuttelvašer, Z., Vurm, B. 1997. *Encyklopedie Českého a Moravského Vína*. Praha. R. B. Vurm ve spolupráci s Knižním klubem.
- Lacinová, Eva. 1996. *Nejužívanější Anglická Přísloví*. Havlíčkův Brod, Tiskárny Havlíčkův Brod, a.s.
- Luelsdorff, Philip, A. 1994. *Prague School of Structural and Functional Linguistics: A Short Introduction*. John Benjamins Publishing Co.
- Lyons, John. 2005. *Linguistic Semantics: An Introduction*. Cambridge University Press.

- Mail Online. *Pop Open a Winner - It's a Vintage Year for English Bubbly*. November 27 2011. <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/home/moslive/article-2065210/English-wines-Pop-open-winner--vintage-year-English-bubbly.html> [accessed January 26, 2012].
- Malmkjær, Kirsten. 2004. *The Linguistics Encyclopedia*. Second Edition. London. Routledge.
- Matthews, P. H. 2005. *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Linguistics*. Oxford. Oxford University Press.
- McKeown, Kathleen R. and Radev, Dragomir R. *Collocations*. Columbia University, New York, Department of Computer Science, <http://clair.si.umich.edu/~radev/papers/handbook00.pdf>, accessed January 28, 2012.
- Mounin, Georges. 1999. *Teoretické problémy překladu*. Praha, Univerzita Karlova, Nakladatelství Karolinum. Z originálu *Les problèmes théoriques de la traduction*, Edition Gallimard 1990 přeložila PhDr. Milada Hanáková, CSc.
- Munday, Jeremy. 2005. *Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and Application*. New York, Routledge.
- Nida, Eugene, A. and Taber, Charles, R. 1969. *The Theory and Practise of Translation*. Leiden: E. J. Brill.
- Nuan, David. *Exploring Genre and Register in Contemporary English*. English Today 94, Vol. 24, No. 2 (June 2008). Cambridge University Press.
- Nord, Christiane. 2005. *Text Analysis in Translation: Theory, Methodology, and Didactic Application of a Model for Translation-Oriented Text Analysis*. 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition. Amsterdam: Editions Rodopi B.V.
- Oenologist.com. *The Art of the Wine Label*. <http://www.oenologist.com/wine-label-art.htm> [accessed January, 2012].
- Pokladnice Vín. *Dva pohledy na systém značení vína: germánský a románský*. 2008. <http://www.pokladnicevin.cz/clanky-o-vine-aktuality/dva-pohledy-na-system-znacenivina:-germansky-a-romansky--55.html> [accessed November 5, 2011].
- Prague Online Guide: *Moravian Wine*. <http://www.prague-online-guide.com/moravian-wine.html>[accessed January 26, 2012].
- Ribéreau-Gayon, P., Dubourdieu, D., Donèche, B., Lonvaud, A. 2006. *Handbook of Enology Volume 1: The Microbiology of Wine and Vinifications 2nd Edition*. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

- Robinson, Jancis. 1996. *Jancis Robinson's Guide to Wine Grapes*. Oxford University Press.
- Robinson, Jancis. 2005. *Vines, Grapes and Wines: The Wine Drinker's Guide to Grape Varieties*. Octopus Publishing Group, Ltd.
- Sampson, Geoffrey. 1980. *Schools of Linguistics*. Stanford, California, Stanford University Press.
- Searle, John. 1975. *Syntax and Semantics*. New York: Academic Press. Quoted in: <http://www.articlesbase.com/science-articles/translation-of-proper-names-2032210.html> [accessed February 16, 2012].
- Seretan, Violeta. 2011. *Syntax-Based Collocation Extraction*. London, New York: Springer.
- Segue Cellars. 2007. *All about Pinot Noir*. <http://www.seguecellars.com/aboutpinot.htm> [accessed February 6, 2012].
- Simpson, Paul. 2004. *Stylistics: A Resource Book for Students*. London: Routledge.
- Świerczyński, A., Świerczyńska, D. 2008. *Słownik Prísloví v Devíti Jazycích: České Ekvivalenty Eva Mrhačová*. Translation Eva Mrhačová. Warszawa, Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN SA.
- Temmerman, Rita. 2000. *Towards New Ways of Terminology Description: The Sociocognitive Approach*. John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Translationdirectory.com. *Translation of Geographical Names*. <http://www.translationdirectory.com/article100.htm> [accessed February 16, 2012].
- Translatorsbase.com. *Brochure translation*. <http://www.translatorsbase.com/articles/1183.aspx> [accessed January 25, 2012].
- Translation of Proper Names. <http://www.articlesbase.com/science-articles/translation-of-proper-names-2032210.html> [accessed February 15, 2012].
- Trosborg, Anna. 1997. *Text Typology and Translation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Co.
- The Guardian: *Demand for English Wine at All-Time High as Quality and Reputation Improve*. Rebecca Smithers. November 15, 2009 [accessed January 26, 2012].
- The Guardian: *Not Only Here for the Beer: Moravia, the Czech Republic's Wine Region*. November 9, 2011. <http://www.guardian.co.uk/travel/2011/nov/09/czech-republic-wine-moravia-prague> [accessed 26 January, 2012].
- Vendler, Z. 1975. *Singular Terms*. In: Steinberg, D. & Jakobovits, L. (eds.).

- Verdonk, Peter. 2002. *Stylistics*. Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Veselovská, L. and Emond, J. 2011. *A Course in English Morpho-Syntax: Syllabi for the Lectures, Examples and Exercises*.
- Vinay, J. P. And Darbelnet, J. 1958. *Stylistique Comparée du Français et de l'anglais: Méthode de Traduction*. 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition. 1977. Translated by J. Sager and M. Hamel. Quoted in: Munday, Jeremy. 2005. *Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and Application*. New York, Routledge.
- Wine Tastings Guide. <http://www.wine-tastings-guide.com/late-harvest-wine.html>, [accessed January, 2011].
- What Is the World Looking For. <http://www.chiff.com/wine/europe/czech.htm> [accessed January 26, 2012].
- Wüster, E. (1991). *Einführung in die Allgemeine Terminologielehre und Terminologische Lexikographie*. 3rd edition. Bonn: Romanistischer Verlag. Quoted in: Temmerman, Rita. 2000. *Towards New Ways of Terminology Description: The Sociocognitive Approach*. John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Znalec Vín. *Státní odrůdová kniha*. <http://www.znalecvin.cz/statni-odrudova-kniha/>. [accessed February 23, 2012].

## **CORPUS MATERIAL**

### **Websites**

- Vinařství U Kapličky. *Relax uprostřed vinohradů*. <http://www.vinarstviukaplicky.cz/>. [accessed March 2012].
- Rodinné Vinařství Jedlička&Novák Bořetice. <http://www.vinoboretice.cz/>. [accessed March 2012].
- Templářské Sklepy Čejkovice, *Víno plné emocí a hrdosti*. <http://www.templarske-sklepy.cz/> [accessed March 2012].

### **Wine Labels**

#### **Rodinné Vinařství Hrabal**

Ryzlink Vlašský 2010, pozdní sběr, suché, č.š. 310, ev. č. jak. 74B1-11/4  
AV Sekt, kvašeno v lahvi, method classic, č. šarže 2S7

#### **Mikrosvín Mikulov, a.s.**

Svatovavřínecké 2006, pozdní sběr, suché, č. vz. 40, 89E1-07  
Muškát Moravský 2010, pozdní sběr, polosuché, č. vz. 34, 50A1-11

**PROQIN, s.r.o.**

Sauvignon 2010, suché, ev. č. 43F1-11/23, č.š. L0007

**Vinofol, s.r.o.**

Sauvignon 2009, pozdní sběr, polosladké, č.š. 467

Tramín Červený 2010, výběr z hroznů, polosladké, č.š. 682

Svatovavřínecké 2009, pozdní sběr, suché, č.š. 490

Rulandské Modré 2010, pozdní sběr, suché, č.š. 658

Rulandské Modré klaret 2009, výběr z hroznů, č.š. 493

Ryzlink Vlašský 2010, pozdní sběr, suché, č.š. 684



## APPENDICES

### RULANDSKÉ MODRÉ – EUROPEAN SYNONYMS

APROFEKETE, ARBST, ARBST BLAU, ARBST BLAUER, ASSMANNSHAEUSER, AUVERGNAT, AUVERNAS, AUVERNAS ROUGE, AUVERNAT, AUVERNAT NOIR, AUXERRA, BERLIGOUT, BLACK BURGUNDY, BLACK MORILLON, BLAK BURGUNDY, BLAU BURGUNDER, BLAUBURGUNDER, BLAUER ARBST, BLAUER AUGUSTINER, BLAUER BURGUNDER, BLAUER CLAEVNER, BLAUER CLEVNER, BLAUER KLAEVNER, BLAUER KLEVNER, BLAUER NUERNBERG, BLAUER NUERNBERGER, BLAUER RISCHLING, BLAUER SPAETBURGUNDER, BLAUER SYLVANER, BODENSEETRAUBE, BOEHMISCHER, BON PLANT, BORGOGNA NERA, BORGOGNA NERO, BORGOGNA ROSSO, BOURGIGNON, BOURGUIGNON GROS, BOURGUIGNON NOIR, BOURGUIGNON PETIT, BRUENLAEUBLER, BURGUNDA, BURGUNDAC CRNI, BURGUNDAC CRNI POZNI, BURGUNDER BLAU, BURGUNDER BLAUER, BURGUNDI CRNI, BURGUNDI MIC, BURGUNDSKÉ MODRÉ, CERNA OKRUGTA BANKA, CERNA RANKA, CHAMBERTIN, CHAMPAGNER, CHERNA, CHIAVENASE, CHIAVENNA, CHPATCHOK, CLAEVNER, CLAEVNER BLAU, CLAVENSIS, CLEVNER, CORTAILLOD, DERICE AUVERNAS NOIR, DICKBLAU, ECHTER SCHWARZBLAUER KLEVNER, ELSASSER ROT, ELSASSER ROTH, FIN NOIR, FIN NOIR DE TOULON, FIN PLANT DORE, FORMENTIN NOIR, FRANC NOIREN, FRANC NOIRIEN, FRANC PINEAU, FRANC PINOT, FRANCOIS NOIR, FRISCHSCHWARZER, FRUEHBLAUE, FRUEHBLAUER, FRUEHSCHWARZER, FRUHBLAUER, GAMAIS, GENETIN DE ST. MENIN, GRIBALET NOIR, GROSSE BURGUNDER, GROSSE FRUEHSCHWARZE, GUT BLAU, GUTBLAU, KARAPINO, KEK KISBURGUNDI, KIS BURGUNDI, KIS BURGUNDIKEK, KISBURGUNDI KEK, KLAEVNER, KLEBROT, KLEBROTH, KLEBROTT, KLEINE BURGUNDER, KLEINER BURGUNDER, KLEINROT, KLEINROTH, KLEVINGER, KLEVNER, KLEVNER KEK, KLEVNER SCHWARZBLAU, LANGEDET, MAEHRCHEN, MALTERDINGER, MALTERTINGER, MARILLON N, MASSOUTEL, MASSOUTET, MAURILLON, MENSIS, MODRA KLEVANJKA, MODRA KLEVANYKA, MOEHRCHEN, MOHRENKOENIGIN, MOR BURGUNDER, MOREOTE NOIR, MOREOTISCHE TRAUBE, MORILLON, MORILLON NOIR, NAGYBURGUNDI, NEYRAN, NEYRON PETIT, NOBLE, NOBLE JOUE, NOIR DE FRANCONIER, NOIR DE VERSITICH, NOIR MENU, NOIR MEUN, NOIRIED, NOIRIEN, NOIRIEN FRANC, NOIRIEN TERNENT, NOIRIN, NOIRUN, OKRUGLA RANKA, ORDINAERER BLAUER, ORDINAERER ROTHER, ORLEANS, PETIT NOIR, PETIT NOIRIN, PETIT PLANT DORE, PETIT VEROT, PIGNOL, PIGNOLA, PIGNOLET, PIGNOLIGA, PIGNOLO, PIMBART, PINEAU, PINEAU, DE BOURGOGNE, PINEAU DE

BOURGOYNE, PINEAU DE CHAMBERTIN, PINEAU DE GEVREY, PINEAU FRANC, PINEAU NOIR, PINO CEREN, PINO CERNIL, PINO CHEREN, PINO CHERNYI, PINO CORNI, PINO CORNIJ, PINO FRAN, PINO GO, PINO NEGRU, PINO NERO, PINO NUAR, PINOT, PINOT CLEVNER CL. MARIA- FELD, PINOT D'AY, PINOT DE CHAMBERTIN, PINOT DE FLEURY, PINOT DE GEVREY, PINOT DE MIGRAINE, PINOT DROIT, PINOT FIN, PINOT FRANC NOIR, PINOT GO, PINOT MARE, PINOT MARIAFELD, PINOT NEGRU, PINOT NERA, PINOT NERO, PINOT NOIR CORTAILLOD, PINOT NOIR CORTAILLOD 9-18, PINOT NOIR SALVAGNIN, PINOT SALVAGNIN, PINOT TINTO, PLACK MORILLON, PLANT A BON VIN, PLANT DAE, PLANT DE CUMIERES, PLANT DE LA DOLE NOIR, PLANT DE S. MARTIN, PLANT DORE, PLANT FIN, PLANT MEDAILLE, PLANT NOBLE, PYNOZ, RAISIN DE BOURGOGNE, RAUCY, RAUCY MALE, ROTER ASSMANNSHAEUSER, ROTER BURGUNDER, ROTHER, ROTHER ASSMANNSHAEUSER, ROTHER BURGUNDER, ROUČÍ, ROUČÍ MALÉ, ROUČÍ MODRÉ, ROUGET, RULANDSKÉ MODRÉ, SALVAGNIN, SALVAGNIN NOIR, SAMOIREAU, SAMOREAU, SAMTROT, SAUMENSOIS, SAUMOIREAU, SAVAGIN NOIR, SAVAGNIN NOIR, SCHURZIR RIESLING, SCHWARTZ KLEVNER, SCHWARZ TRAEUBLE, SCHWARZBLAUER KLEVNER, SCHWARZER, SCHWARZER, ASSMANNSHAEUSER, SCHWARZER BURGUNDER, SCHWARZER KLAEVNER, SCHWARZER KLEVNER, SCHWARZER RIESLING, SCHWARZER SUESSLING, SCHWARZKLAEVNER, SCHWARZKLEVNER, SERVAGNIN NOIR DE SEYSSEL, SEVAGNIN NOIR, SHPACHOK, SPACOK, SPAETBURGUNDER, SPAETER BURGUNDER, SPAETES MOEHRCHEN , SPETBURGUNDER, SUESSEDEL, SUESSLING, SUESSROT, SUESSROTH, SUESSSCHWARZ, SUESSSCHWARZER, SUSSCHWARZER, SUSSEDEL, SUSSROT, SUSSSCHWARZER, TALVAGNERE ROUGE, TALVAGNUES ROUGES, TERNENT, THALROTHER, TINTO, TRAMINER BLAU, TRAMINER SCHWARZ, VERT DORE, VRAI AUVERNAS.