

Wine and translation: an analysis of phraseological units in English and Spanish wine technical sheets

Leticia Moreno-Pérez & Belén López-Arroyo

To cite this article: Leticia Moreno-Pérez & Belén López-Arroyo (09 Nov 2023): Wine and translation: an analysis of phraseological units in English and Spanish wine technical sheets, Perspectives, DOI: [10.1080/0907676X.2023.2268115](https://doi.org/10.1080/0907676X.2023.2268115)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/0907676X.2023.2268115>



Published online: 09 Nov 2023.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 65





View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)



Wine and translation: an analysis of phraseological units in English and Spanish wine technical sheets

Leticia Moreno-Pérez  and Belén López-Arroyo 

Departamento de Filología Inglesa, Universidad de Valladolid – ACTRES, Valladolid, Spain

ABSTRACT

The language used to market and describe wine is characterised by the subjectivity and creativity of the terms used. This makes the encoding and decoding of oenology-related texts a demanding task. As genres in this field are persuasive in nature, the correct translation of wine-related terminology is crucial to sell the product. In wine-related genres, phraseological units have been understudied especially with regards to translation. The aim of this paper is to shed light on the use of phraseological units in one of the most representative genres in the field, i.e. wine technical sheets, with a view to assisting translators in the comprehension and management of oenology-related texts. A contrastive analysis was carried out using an English-Spanish comparable corpus in order to identify and classify phraseological units according to their function and semantic characteristics; further analysis of the distribution of these units allowed us to define the rhetorical structure of wine technical sheets. The study evidenced the high frequency and complexity of phraseological units in the genre.

ARTICLE HISTORY

Received 23 March 2023
Accepted 12 September 2023

KEYWORDS

Specialised phraseology;
oenology; comparable
corpora; translation

1. Introduction

The wine industry has experienced a constant growth in the last decades, with international trade having a value of 34.3 bn EUR in 2021, and international production and consumption reaching 260 and 236 mhl respectively during the same year (International Organisation of Vine and Wine, 2022). This commercial exchange has given rise to relationships between the different actors in the market of oenology (producers, agents, consumers, etc.) at international level, which entails a growing demand of inter-linguistic exchanges. However, it is rare to find specialised language professionals and mediators in the field of oenology (Moreno-Pérez & López-Arroyo, 2021) and more specifically in the discourse of tasting, whose linguistic mediation is understudied in many languages despite its economic significance (Ramírez Almansa, 2018); this reality makes it a relevant specialised field where translators might find plenty of opportunities.

When handling a specialised translation, translators need to be familiar with not only the terminology, but also the contextualised use of terms in order to produce technically

appropriate and pragmatically equivalent (Scarpa, 2019, p. 281) target texts (TTs) (López Arroyo & Moreno Pérez, 2019). Specifically, the phraseology of specialised languages poses a notable problem for translators, since it is culturally bound (Temmerman, 2017, p. 133), may vary from one language to another, and is 'partly arbitrary' (Biel, 2014, p. 182). The phraseology in the field of oenology shares these characteristics (Ramírez Almansa, 2019), and in addition it poses an unconventional problem in specialised discourse, since subjectivity and creativity often play a key role in the conveyance of specialised meanings in the language of wine making and commercialisation.

The aim of this paper is to define, identify and classify the phraseological units (PUs) in wine technical sheets, using a multidimensional approach by analysing an English-Spanish comparable corpus. The specialised language of wine is addressed at restricted audiences not only in source but also in translated language, ranging from experts to lay persons and has 'very specific professionally and subject related communicative needs and expectations' (Scarpa, 2019, p. 280). As other types of specialised translation, it has to look for *pragmatic equivalence* (Scarpa, 2019, p. 281), preserving the source text (ST) intention and catering for the target reader's expectations. The problem is that, sometimes, the translators of wine-related texts do not use the conventions of the target language (phraseology and terminology included) because they do not know them or just because they do not exist. In other words, and drawing on Toury's translation laws (1995), interference may dominate the relationship between ST and TT as a quality standard (Ishizaki & López Arroyo, 2023); thus, translators into English tend to use the conventions of the Spanish language in a particular genre to convey concepts in English. The present study aims to define, identify and classify the phraseological units (PUs) in a relevant macro-genre in oenology, i.e. wine technical sheets, using a multidimensional approach by analysing a Spanish-English comparable corpus.

We will begin by defining the concept of phraseology and presenting our approach to its study; we will then analyse and classify the PUs we have identified in our corpus focusing on their form, function, meaning, and on how their distribution affects the structure of the text, contrasting the findings obtained in the two languages in order to establish how phraseology is used as an aid to translation. Given the peculiarities of the specialised language of wine, as well as its persuasive nature, new word combinations emerge frequently according to different factors, so providing translators with a glossary of PUs would be of limited help; thus, our intention is to offer a more in-depth profile of these units at understanding level so that translators from Spanish into English can choose the most appropriate pragmatic equivalent. By comparing the cultural, discursive and cognitive pragmatic features, we hope to fill a gap in the literature of the field: although there are previous studies on the phraseology of wine (López Arroyo & Roberts, 2016; López Arroyo & Sanz Valdivieso, 2022), they do not specifically focus on their application to Spanish into English translation. On the other hand, studies addressing translation in the field of oenology deal with different genres¹ such as labels on wine bottles (Champney, 2014), tasting notes (Negro Alousque, 2014), or specialised dictionaries (Bertulesi et al., 2021) to mention a few examples, but none of them with wine technical sheets (WTS) despite their importance (Bomrad, 2012).

We consider that WTSs constitute a macro-genre in the field, since they are ‘complex’ texts that involve other multiple embedded genres (Hyland, 2002, p. 122), such as tasting notes.

2. The language of wine: translation issues

The language in the field of wine needs to describe what wine looks, smells, tastes and feels like as faithfully as possible, but, at the same time, it needs to do so in a way that may be understood by a growing readership (Caballero, 2017, p. 69). In sensory science, sensory perceptions are commonly divided into four categories: colour, aroma, flavour and texture (which correspond to the tasting phases) – a categorisation that helps experts organise our sensory perceptions into attributes that can be analysed for each wine (Diederich, 2015, p. 36).

As has been previously reported (López Arroyo & Sanz Valdivieso, 2020, among others), the specialised language of wine, and more specifically of wine tasting, is used by three different discourse communities: (1) professional oenologists and wine tasters, (2) informed amateurs² presenting a product to guests at a dinner tasting and (3) wine journalists (Peynaud, 1987, p. 163).

When producing a text in the field, often referred to as a pragmatic text (Scarpa, 2019, p. 280), all three groups face the same problem: that of expressing in words subjective sensations of smell and flavour. In this subjective area, the relationship between sensation and expression, between the word and the quality it describes, is not always clear. However, López-Arroyo and Sanz-Valdivieso (2022, p. 40) report that

such a variety of types of writers will produce different types of tasting notes, in terms of micro and macro linguistic features, that could not be considered comparable because of their differences in style, their format and the way to render knowledge to readers

that implies that the terminology and phraseology might vary depending on the participants (writer and reader) of the communication. In this sense, the PUs used by experts are more accurate than those used by amateurs, and that poses a problem for translation purposes.

As a consequence, it is essential for translators to find the appropriate micro and macro linguistic strategies (from terminology to rhetoric) to convey not only the subjective and pragmatic meanings to be understood by the three discourse communities mentioned above, but also the translation strategies to reproduce the original purpose. That search is not always easy. Oftentimes, depending on the translation brief and/or the relationship between the translator and the client, the former might only be able to infer the intention of the source text from their experience in the field or their intuition if not enough context is provided.

A further issue for translators is the fact that wine terminology transmits specialised concepts in a specialised context by using mostly words from general language (Martínez Lanzán, 2008), although they carry a distinctive meaning in the field. This might drive translators to the incorrect assumption that they are dealing with known words and concepts, overestimating their capacity to convey the meaning in this specialised context (Dobnik, 2019). In addition, this author also notes the importance of the extralinguistic knowledge, as the language of oenology is strongly culturally bound.

2.1. Wine technical sheets

The three discourse communities mentioned above do not share the same genres or macro-genres to evaluate or describe wine: although these groups might produce tasting notes, this is not the case of WTSs, or labels on wine bottles, produced and released exclusively by wineries and addressed to the wine industry people, wine lovers (Geoghegan, 2018) and/or critics. The object of study of the present paper, WTSs, are only used by one of the discourse communities mentioned above: professional oenologists addressing consumers.

WTSs are short documents, usually of just one page, produced by or on behalf of a winery, and are intended to help the reader to quickly understand a given wine (Geoghegan, 2018). While there is no universal format, most WTSs share a common structure and language, which includes: the producer's name and the wine brand name, the wine's geographic origin, information about the grape variety or blend, alcohol content, vineyard and winegrowing information, winemaking information, tasting note, and optimally, critic scores, awards, and food pairing (Geoghegan, 2018).

WTSs are promotional macro-genres which include a strategic description, information, and evaluation of the product for experts but mainly for customers, constituting then an excellent marketing opportunity (Geoghegan, 2018). They are the winery's chance to influence what the trade says about its wine. Trade partners – sommeliers, distributors, retailers or otherwise – draw upon the WTSs to craft their own marketing message.

Hence, micro and macro linguistic features are comprised in WTSs and affect the translator task enormously since they might be different in the target discourse community: the terminology and PUs may not be used with the required linguistic accuracy and may be biased by the overall persuasive intention. Thus, mastering the specialised terminology of the field will inevitably involve understanding and having a deep knowledge of the genre and its specific context in order to provide a successful translation (García Izquierdo, 2005); nevertheless, as mentioned above, the agents involved might vary, and so does the terminology.

WTSs include an ample variety of macro and microlinguistic characteristics such as the following:

- Pragmatic functions (Rabadán et al., 2021, p. 210):
 - State, or delivering referential information applied to proper names of products, dishes, etc., as *Hafner Vineyards 2009 Chardonnay*.
 - Direct, which indicates an action to be carried out to fulfil a goal, as *serve it chilled*.
 - Persuasion, refers to the product's good properties, as perceived intersubjectively, as in *perfectly balanced flavour combination*.
 - Evidence, adds positive factual information about the product, as in *this wine has won many awards*.
 - Description, as is the case of the raw description of the harvest, the soil or the weather: *This sudden change in weather resulted in small, concentrated berries and vines with smaller canopies, which allowed the ideal amount of partial sunlight onto ripening clusters*.
 - Suggestion and or recommendations, as is the case of drinking suggestions and food pairing, *Enjoy now or cellar for up to 2 years; ideal with lamb or stews*.

- Terminology and Phraseology:
 - High terminological density – i.e., number of terms as compared to the number of words – and diversity – i.e., variety of terms (Bomrad, 2012, p. 55).
 - Variety of fields of specialisation: *hand-picked fruit* (wine growing); *lees* (wine production); *residual sugar* (chemistry); *legs* (tasting); *frost* (meteorology); *terroir* (Earth sciences).
- Registers: which connect the linguistic choices with the situational contexts (Biber & Conrad, 2009, p. 22). See Section 2 above.

The analysis of all these unique macro and micro linguistic features in the macro-genre of WTSs, and more specifically of specialised phraseology, might help the translation process.

3. Approaches to the study of phraseology

The tendency of language components to cluster together in predictable ways to achieve meaning has led some researchers to study PUs in depth not only in general discourse, but also in specialised languages. In this context, PUs can be defined as all the different types of phrases that have some degree of idiomatic meaning or behaviour (Atkins & Rusell, 2008, p. 166) and that: ‘(a) can be decomposed into multiple lexemes; and (b) display lexical, syntactic, semantic, pragmatic and/or statistical idiomaticity’ (Baldwin & Kim, 2010, p. 3). They are identified by their collocability, contiguity, idiomaticity, compositionality, figuration and fixedness (Gantar et al., 2019, p. 141). Traditional approaches have long dealt with multi-word units, wherein a single meaning is attached to more than one word, for example, phrasal verbs, compounds, and idioms. But corpus-based research, the approach that will be used in this study, has shown that PUs extend far beyond the level of such units: in fact, it is quite common for longer sequences of words to pattern together, and they recur frequently enough to be treated as units in their own right.

3.1. Phraseology and translation

As Huertas-Barros and-Buendía Castro (2017, p. 41) state, ‘the analysis of how words co-select with other words is a necessary focus of study for any translator wishing to create a text that is as natural and linguistically correct as possible’. Phraseology can entail problems at different stages of the translation process (Castro et al., 2014; Moreno-Pérez, 2017): first, in the pre-writing stage, the translator should be able to decode the PUs in the source text, which requires a good command of the source language and of the field; later, in the writing stage, the translator should (a) be able to detect problematic PUs and find their adequate equivalent via documentation, expert consultation, or knowledge of the field, and (b) reproduce the meaning of the source text in a manner that is acceptable for the target community, which ideally means writing like an expert. Thus, PUs are vital ‘for both text encoding and decoding’ (Castro et al., 2014, p. 60).

However, the handling of PUs is a proven obstacle for translators, as suggested by Biel (2014, p. 182), whether it is because of interference of source and target languages in the

detection of collocational patterns, interference of the source language in the TT (Toury, 1995, p. 278) (e.g. lack of spontaneity, calques ...), or because of the tension between both languages (e.g. accuracy vs. naturalness), among others. In this regard, Hatim and Mason (1990, p. 205) pointed out that '[i]n translation, the collocations should in general be neither less unexpected (i.e., more banal) nor more unexpected (i.e., demanding greater processing effort) than in the source text'. This is especially complex in the language of oenology, given its subjective nature and the creativity that the common use of figures of speech entails.

Therefore, we will analyse and classify the PUs in a corpus of English and Spanish WTSs from a multidimensional perspective following a bottom-up approach: first, we will identify the PUs in the corpus and analyse their composition, to help with pattern detection; second, we will classify PUs in the corpus according to their function in the text in order to foster both accuracy and naturalness; then, we will classify PUs according to their meaning, to try and clarify the aim of the PUs found in the genre; finally, we will study their distribution in the text in order to provide the prototypical rhetorical structure, so that translators become familiar with the genre. This comprehensive analysis aims at identifying similarities and differences between English and Spanish PUs to facilitate the translation process.

3.1.1. *The study of PUs from a functional point of view*

In order to analyse and classify PUs for translation purposes, we decided to adopt Biel's classification according to their function in the text (2014). This classification was originally created to analyse the translation of PUs in a specific field, that of institutional translation, but research has shown that it can be extrapolated successfully to other genres (López Arroyo & Moreno Pérez, 2019). All these characteristics make this classification a good base for this work.

Biel argues that phraseology is based on 'fixed recurrent patterns at the textual, grammatical, and collocational level' (Biel, 2014, p. 177) and makes a functional classification containing five different categories, both at the macrostructural and microstructural levels, which have no clear boundaries between them. Her classification of phraseology includes the following: 'text-organizing patterns, grammatical patterns, term-forming patterns, term-embedding collocations, and lexical collocations' (Biel, 2014, pp. 178–181):

- (i) Text-organising patterns, which are repetitive structures sometimes prescribed in drafting guidelines (*on the nose, on the palate, colour*).
- (ii) Grammatical patterns, which are genre-specific recurrent grammatical structures, e.g., conditional clauses or the passive voice (*to be pressed, to be racked*).
- (iii) Term-forming patterns (or multi-word terms), which are described as 'collocates of a generic term' that add a higher degree of specificity (*malolactic fermentation, aromas primarios*).
- (iv) Term-embedding collocations, which are verb-based structures that denote 'what one can typically do with (or to) the object denoted by the base noun' (Martin, in Heid, 1994, p. 238) (*aged in wood, to inoculate with yeast, fermentar en barrica*).
- (v) Lexical collocations: routine formulae which are not constructed around terms and are identified through recurrence (*subject to this regulation*).

3.1.2. The study of PUs from a semantic point of view

Given the importance of adjectives in the description of perceptions and sensations in the genre of WTSs, we will also analyse PUs from the point of view of lexical semantics, as mentioned above. Paradis (2005, 2010) shows that nominal meanings, and in particular concrete nominal meanings such as ‘wine’, are construed with the focus either on *constitution* or on *function*. *Constitution* involves taxonomic and meronymic aspects of entities whereas *function* involves telic and agentive aspects, i.e., focus on its use and focus on its origin; in other words, constitution refers to the ‘static aspects [of wine] such as an entity or as an object’, and function is the ‘dynamic aspects related to the production, i.e., how an entity such as wine came into being or how wine is used’ (ibid). The activation of either of the two is essentially a part-whole construal of salience, which does not involve different senses but different zones within a sense. In this study, we will use this classification to observe the construal to which the PUs of wine technical sheets belong. For a more comprehensive semantic description that can help translators understand and predict the use of the different PUs they might face, and given the peculiarities of the genre under study, we will then differentiate PUs related to *description* from those related to *evaluation* to determine their usage in different parts of the genre.

4. Corpus

4.1. Compilation

We began our study by following Sinclair’s bottom-up approach to PUs (2000), i.e., using corpora as a tool ‘to identify specific discourse units within texts’ (Biber et al., 2007, p. 241). The starting point of our study was an ad-hoc domain-specific (Corpas Pastor & Seghiri Dominguez, 2009, p. 78) comparable corpus, that is to say, a representative, reliable text compilation (Seghiri, 2015, p. 142) of WTSs written originally in English and Spanish. Given the limited scope of this study we restricted our samples to European Spanish and North American English, including Canada and the US.

To ensure its qualitative representativeness, i.e., the quality of the samples, we built a comparable corpus of WTS in English and Spanish by searching this genre in the same type of source (López Arroyo & Roberts, 2016, p. 167), namely in specific websites, such as those of the Denominations of Origin in Spain that give direct and restricted access to the information written by winery oenologists, or the VQA Ontario Appellations of Origin website in English that groups together all the different Denominations of origin and hence wineries in that Canadian province, among other sources. Since we decided to use WTSs released by wineries, similarity seems to be ensured. In other words, similarity of the source led to similarity of writers and readers, which allowed for more parallelism between the English and Spanish texts and hence for a more accurate interlingual comparison of the wine technical sheets.

The final texts included in the corpus were chosen at random from a larger compilation to avoid biasing the results: we wanted to examine as many different technical sheets from different wineries as possible, as producers often adopt a specific writing style for their technical sheets. Our samples were all published between 2004 and 2019. Our corpus includes 750 samples in English and 606 in Spanish which amount

to 118,846 and 118,760 words respectively. Studies by scholars like Bowker and Pearson (2002, p. 48) and Biber (1993, p. 254), among others, confirm that the size of the corpus is more than adequate for a specialised *ad hoc* corpus.

4.2. Methodology of analysis

- Annotation: the corpus was grammatically annotated using the POS tagger specially designed for the ACTRES research group to identify the structure of the PUs, and semantically tagged to study the semantic components of the PUs. For the semantic tagging, the set of tags of the Semantic Analysis System (USAS) developed by UCREL was used.³ Semantic annotation was done in two different ways: every lexical unit was annotated individually and then PUs were annotated as a unit; this became an essential step in our methodology, since it allowed us to extract PUs in a particular semantic subfield within our corpus (e.g., all the units denoting colour).
- Identification of PUs: we followed the system-oriented method developed by Thomas (1993, p. 47), identifying first the key nouns and verbs (term candidates) found in the whole corpus with, at least, 25 occurrences in English and in Spanish. The next step consisted on examining our corpus in order to (i) see which key terms form collocations and (ii) identify the collocates and grammatical patterns related to these nouns and verbs. We used the ACTRES⁴ browser to retrieve concordance lines and statistics from the bilingual comparable corpus, and AntConc, a monolingual corpus analysis tool for concordancing and text analysis, for a more in-depth analysis of concordances.
- Analysis of function: the next step was to analyse the PUs identified in our comparable corpus in terms of Biel's classes, based on their function in the text (2014, pp. 178–181).
- Analysis of semantics: we also analysed how the PUs found fitted in the extended classification of Paradis (2010), as explained above.
- Lastly, the analysis of the distribution of the PUs in the macro-genre under study lead us to define the internal organisation of the genre's content: starting from the micro-linguistic characteristics found in the previous phases, we performed an annotation of the texts using labels that indicate the rhetorical structure of WTSs following Swales' classification (1990, 2002) into *moves* - 'a structural segment that has a specific communicative function and purpose' (Maswana et al., 2015, p. 1) and *steps* - 'the smaller rhetorical segments composing a move' (ibid).

5. Results and discussion

5.1. Identification and classification of PUs

We first obtained a list of 25 key terms in English and 24 in Spanish; however, not all the key terms extracted in the first round produced collocates. Once collocates were identified, their structure was analysed. Eleven different structures were found in English PUs and six in Spanish PUs. Their description, along with the components and the number of occurrences of each structure, are presented in Table 1 below:

Our English PUs show far more variation than the Spanish PUs: thirteen different form types occur in English, while only seven were found in Spanish. As shown in Table 1 PUs in wine technical sheets vary in length from two to four components in English and from two to three in Spanish; three different patterns are made up of two components in English (a total of 764 PUs), five patterns of three components (1,175 PUs) and three patterns of four components (a total of 187 PUs). In Spanish, three patterns are made up of two components (475 PUs) and another three of three components (292 PUs). As can be seen in Table 1 the lower the number of components, the more usual the pattern in Spanish (e.g. *entrada sedosa* or *en boca*); that is not the case in English, where three components seem to constitute the favourite structure (e.g. *red in colour*, *linger on the finish*).

The parts of speech that comprise these PUs are nouns, adjectives, verbs, prepositions, articles and adverbs. The most common pattern in English is Adj + N while in Spanish is N + Adj; however, this is not surprising, given that morphologically poor languages, such as English, usually create nominations by adding nominal or adjectival pre-modifiers to a head noun (*ruby red colour*) and in Romance languages, such as Spanish, the modifiers are placed on the right of the nominal head and are often adjectives or prepositional phrases (e.g. *colour cardenalicio muy intenso* or *aromas de gran intensidad*) (Fernández-Domínguez, 2016, p. 67). In particular, nominations are frequently used to designate specialised concepts in English (Cabezas-García & Faber, 2018; Sager et al., 1980).

Generally, the two-word units consist of the key word with a descriptor. The descriptor is normally a noun used adjectivally in English (e.g., *peach aromas*) Three-word units in both languages consist mainly of a noun with a phrase used adjectivally (e.g., *nose of red cherries*; *crianza en barrica*). The fact that the two-word units are ADJ + N (inverse order in Spanish) or N + (Prep/conj) + N units is not surprising, given both the nature and the style of our corpus (wine technical sheets): the purpose of WTSs is to show the features of a wine to be sold, and the obvious way to do that is to collocate descriptors (adjectives or nouns used adjectivally) with the features of the wine itself or one of its key aspects.

Table 1. Structure of PUs in English and Spanish and their frequency.

Structure	EN	Example	SP	Example
Adj + N	593	Golden colour	12	<i>alta intensidad</i>
N + Adj	0		397	<i>entrada sedosa</i>
Adj + Adj + N	407	Full malolactic fermentation	0	
N + Prep + N	407	Nose of red cherries	244	<i>crianza en barrica</i>
N + Adj + Adj	0		29	<i>color rojo cereza</i>
Prep + Art + N	223	On the nose	0	
Prep + N	0		66	<i>en boca</i>
N + N	148	Apple flavours	0	
Art + N + Prep + N	98	A hint of tobacco	0	
N + Prep + N	92	Aromas of tangerines	0	
Adj + Prep + Art + N	68	Creamy on the palate	0	
Adj + Prep + N	46	Red in colour	0	
Prep + N	23	After fermentation	0	
V + Prep + Art + N	21	Linger on the finish	0	
N + Adv + Adj	0		19	<i>nariz muy compleja</i>
Total	2126		767	

Smaller PUs are often combined to make larger units as in the following examples: *red colo(u)r* > *ruby red colo(u)r*; *aroma a ciruelas* > *aroma a ciruelas negras*.

5.2. Function

Both languages show a preference for term-forming patterns: 1160 (52%) in English and 431 (65%) in Spanish belong to this category. The PUs in this category show ‘varying levels of terminologicality’ (Sax, 2012): the degree of specialist information required to understand them differs from term to term, as is shown in the following examples: *malolatic fermentation* or *aromas primarios* show a higher level of terminologicality than *stainless steel fermentation* or *aromas cítricos* respectively. Most of the term-forming patterns are not restricted semantically, i.e. their meaning tends to be compositional, transparent and analysable. However, the more terminologicalized the PU, the less transparency it possesses. As in the case of terminologicality, there also exist different levels of transparency: e.g. *Bordeaux red*, cannot be deciphered simply by adding the meaning of each component.

The second category corresponds to term-embedding collocations: 727 PUs (33%) in English and 269 (35%) in Spanish. They reflect action and enable terms to enter into relations and, consequently, they play an important role in establishing the conceptual system of the domain. In the case of wine technical sheets, the goal of these PUs is to describe and evaluate the wine.

Text-organising patterns are limited in number: 227 (10%) in English and 64 (8%) in Spanish. They seem to be used to introduce different sections of the wine technical sheet. They are characterised by the Prep + Art + N or Art + N + Prep pattern in English (*on the nose*) and Prep + N or Art + N + Prep pattern in Spanish (*en boca*).

The rest, 5% in English and 1% in Spanish, correspond to the category of grammatical patterns, and more specifically, in our corpus, PUs using the passive voice (e. g. *to be pressed*, *to be racked* ...).

No lexical collocations were found in our corpus. Table 2 below summarises the functional patterns illustrated by examples from our corpus:

5.3. Semantics

Our corpus shows that the meaning of most PUs in WTSs in both languages focuses on the aspect of ‘constitution’, a descriptive and or evaluative viewpoint e.g. *pale yellow*, *amarillo pajizo* (colour); *long lasting finish*, *acidez equilibrada* (taste). On the other hand, 18% of the PUs in English and 12% in Spanish focus on ‘function’, in other

Table 2. PUs classified according to their function in the text.

	English		Spanish		
Text-organising patterns	227 (10%)	On the nose	Text-organising patterns	64 (8%)	<i>en boca</i>
Term-forming patterns	1160 (52%)	Golden straw colour	Term-forming patterns	431 (56%)	<i>color rojo cereza</i>
Term-embedding collocations	727 (33%)	To tank ferment	Term-embedding collocations	269 (35%)	<i>crianza en barrica</i>
Grammatical patterns	12 (5%)	To be racked	Grammatical patterns	(1%) 3	<i>se muestra con</i>

Table 3. Moves and steps in wine technical sheets.

Moves	Steps
1. ID	a. Winery b. Wine and vintage
2. Description of the vineyard	a. Location b. Soil c. Grape variety
3. Weather	a. Weather conditions b. Season
4. Harvest	a. Picking b. Pressing c. Time
5. Fermentation	a. Method b. Time
6. Aging	a. Method b. Time
7. Tasting note	a. Appearance: • Colour • Effervescence • Viscosity • Effervescence b. Aroma: • Fragrance • Intensity • Development c. Taste: • Flavour • Astringency/tannins • Body • Balance • Finish • Mouthfeel
8. Technical data	a. Denomination of origin b. Grape variety c. Alcohol content d. Residual sugar e. Total acidity f. Ph. g. Others

words, they describe how the wine is used or came into being. Examples of function could be *carbonic fermentation*, *crianza en barrica* (production).

Both languages share the conceptual domains of vision, aroma, taste and mouthfeel since WTSs describe and evaluate sensations. Among PUs that accentuate constitution, a distinction must be made between those that report features objectively (such as those denoting colour: *dark red*, *greenish yellow*; *amarillo verdoso*, *rojo cereza picota*) and can be corroborated empirically, and those which seem rather subjective (those denoting smell – *new wood*, *whole grain*; *aceite vegetal*, *cacao desgrasado* – and taste – *orange blossom*, *tree nuts*; *estructura tánica*, *herbáceos frescos*). Unlike the visual colour, the perceptions of smell and taste are highly subjective and, therefore, ‘strongly tied to the experiencer and less autonomous’ (Dubois, 2007, p. 170). However, linguistic propositions describing visual perceptions (colour) are more objectively reportable and more reliable than those related to smell and taste. The latter are more subjective and unstable due to the indirect cognitive path people take to conceptualise this kind of reality (Martínez Lanzán, 2006).

Apart from that, the way to express aroma and taste sensation is through synaesthesia in both languages: our corpora show that nearly the totality of samples includes SMELL

and TASTE, which are conceptualised through VISION as can be observed in the following examples: *The 2004 Cabernet opens with bright aromas of sweet plums* or *It sparkles in the mouth*, and *lágrimas teñidas lo que le confieren a este vino un aromático colour* [coloured tears which give an aromatic colour to the wine] in Spanish.

5.4. Rhetorical structure of wine technical sheets

After the functional and semantic analyses of the PUs found in our corpus, as well as their distribution, we were able to define the rhetorical structure of the genre (shown in Table 3 below) dividing it into *moves* (marked one, two, three, etc.) and *steps* (identified as a, b, c, etc.):

According to our study, WTSs can be divided into eight different moves, PUs mainly occurring in three of them in both languages: fermentation, aging and tasting note. The latter contains more information, which does not seem surprising since, as mentioned above, tasting notes are considered a genre on their own. The results were especially helpful for the subdivision of the moves into the different steps that make up the final rhetorical structure: semantic annotation, which distributed terms into semantic subfields; text-organising patterns, as arranging devices of discourse; and the inspection of the evaluative or descriptive nature of the units found in the corpus.

6. Conclusions

Our description and classification of PUs in a bilingual corpus of wine technical sheets in Spanish and English has shown that the language of oenology contains a fairly large number of such units. They are more recurring in English, and their frequency is generally higher in English than in Spanish.

Annotating our corpus at different levels of language has proven useful since it identifies grammatical, semantic and rhetorical features, which provide a comprehensive analysis that results in the identification of the following ‘trouble spots’ that translators should take into account:

1. When dealing with the sometimes complicated task of pattern detection in the field, which arises from the fact that oenology uses terms that often come from general language to convey specialised meaning, our identification and classification of PUs shed light on: the usual number of components of PUs in this genre (two-component PUs being the most common in Spanish, three-component PUs in English); the parts of speech they are usually made up of (attention should be specially paid to the less common structures other than the somehow predictable Adj + N in English and N + Adj in Spanish); and the fact that it is common to find extended PUs by combination with other terms. In addition, as wine technical sheets reflect terminology, registers and pragmatic functions present in other genres of the field, translators can extrapolate the previous findings to other genres after a small verification.
2. PUs in wine technical sheets mostly intend to add specificity to simplex terms, so their correct detection and handling is what will provide accuracy to the target text. As regards the PUs that mark the progression of the text and those that allow terms to enter into relations with each other, they play a crucial role in the genre, since their correct management will provide naturalness. Therefore, being aware of the

different functions of PUs in the genre will be helpful to better encode and decode the text (Castro et al., 2014).

3. Our study has confirmed the necessity of paying special attention to the evaluation of subjective features of wine, as they are higher in number; this highlights the need for translators to research on the encoding of perceptual experiences in language in order to master wine translation.
4. The type of PUs highly depend on the move of the rhetorical structure (mainly evaluative in the tasting note, and descriptive for the rest), and the moves of fermentation, aging and tasting in both languages contain the highest amount of PUs. These findings will make it easier for translators to identify and predict the type of information to be translated when facing this genre.
5. Generally speaking, there are no outstanding differences between Spanish and English, which suggests that the understanding of the field and the WTSs are the most important assets for translators facing these texts. As the present study has focused on this specific genre for a particular discursive community, further studies analysing other genres used by the other two discursive communities are needed to demonstrate whether the same PUs and translation strategies are used.

To conclude, the phraseology of wine technical sheets has proven to be both complex and frequent, which makes it a crucial area of study within this specialised language: this is essential to transmit information within this field. Failing to handle these structures acceptably might affect the correct understanding of the characteristics of the product; this is especially relevant in this field, where genres are aimed at convincing the reader of the exceptional qualities of a product (Diederich, 2015, p. 47). The inadequate handling of phraseology could, therefore, impact the intended effect, and the text would not fulfil its goal.

Notes

1. The concept of genre refers to a specific set of communicative purposes used by discourse communities (Bhatia, 2004, p. 23) which impose constraints at micro and macro linguistic levels. For a comprehensive classification of text genres in the field of wine cf. Ramírez Almansa (2021).
2. The term 'amateur' in wine tasting was coined by Robinson (2015) to describe laypeople or beginners in the world of wine.
3. <http://ucrel.lancs.ac.uk/usas/> USAS groups together words according to a set of tags with three level of hierarchical semantic fields using the alphabet and a decimal system. Although it was originally developed for general language, in the present study the tags were adjusted to fit the LSP language of oenology.
4. <https://actres.unileon.es/wordpress/?lang=en>

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author(s).

Funding

This work was supported by the Ministerio de Ciencia e Innovación (Spain) under Grant PID2020-114064RB-I00 as part of the research project *Lenguajes naturales controlados*,

comunicación colaborativa y producción textual bilingüe en entornos 3.0; the corresponding author was also supported by the European Union – NextGenerationEU via Ministerio de Universidades (Spain) and Universidad de Valladolid (Spain) under Grant Programa Recualificación del Profesorado Universitario.


Notes on contributors

Leticia Moreno-Pérez holds a PhD in Professional and Institutional Translation from Universidad de Valladolid (Spain), where she has lectured topics such as English for Specific Purposes or specialised translation since 2010. Her research focuses on specialised language and its translation from a functional approach through corpus-based studies, specifically in the field of legal and business translation. She has published and presented at international conferences on this area, and she is a member of the international research group ACTRES (Contrastive Analysis and Translation English-Spanish in its Spanish acronym), also specialised in the field. She has combined her academic work with professional translation and language training in the business sector for 10 years.

Belén López-Arroyo is an Associate Professor in ESP at the University of Valladolid (Spain). She taught legal and business translation in the School of Translation and Interpreting from 1997 to June 2013 and she currently teaches legal and business translation and Corpus Linguistics in the English Studies Degree. Her research interests include Discourse Analysis, Genre Analysis, Lexicography and Terminology, Contrastive Analysis and Translation. She is author of several articles and books related to contrastive analysis of scientific and professional genres and its implications for translation. In the ACTRES team she is in charge of the Rhetoric and Phraseology of Expert-to-Expert Discourse (in different areas) and its applications for developing writing aids in English for Spaniards.

ORCID

Leticia Moreno-Pérez  <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-9211-7166>

Belén López-Arroyo  <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-9171-1910>

References

- Atkins, B. T. S., & Rusell, M. (2008). *The Oxford guide to practical lexicography*. Oxford University Press.
- Baldwin, T., & Kim, S. N. (2010). Multiword expressions. In N. Indurkha & F. J. Damerau (Eds.), *Handbook of natural language processing* (pp. 243–257). CRC Press.
- Bertulesi, C., Lupano, C., Mottura, B., Riva, N., & Zhou, Y. (2021). The languages of wine: Negotiating intercultural exchanges through translation. In M. Castorina & D. Cucinelli (Eds.), *Food issues 食事. Interdisciplinary studies on food in modern and contemporary East Asia* (pp. 143–160). Firenze University Press.
- Bhatia, V. K. (2004). *Worlds of written discourse: A genre based view*. Continuum.
- Biber, D. (1993). Representativeness in corpus design. *Literary and Linguistic Computing*, 8(4), 243–257. <https://doi.org/10.1093/lc/8.4.243>
- Biber, D., Connor, U., & Upton, T. A. (Eds.). (2007). *Discourse on the move: Using corpus analysis to describe discourse structure*. John Benjamins.
- Biber, D., & Conrad, S. (2009). *Register, genre and style*. Cambridge University Press.
- Biel, Ł. (2014). Phraseology in legal translation: A corpus-based analysis of textual mapping in EU law. In K. Le, K. Kui Sin, & A. Wagner (Eds.), *The Ashgate handbook of legal translation* (pp. 177–193). Ashgate.
- Bomrad, D. (2012). *La Variación Terminológica del Español de la Vid y el Vino en el Espacio Geográfico. Implicaciones en la Traducción Especializada* [Unpublished PhD dissertation].
- Bowker, L., & Pearson, J. (2002). *Working with specialized language: A practical guide to using corpora*. Routledge.

- Caballero, R. (2017). From the glass through the nose and the mouth. *Terminology*, 23, 66–88.
- Cabezas-García, M., & Faber, P. (2018). Phraseology in specialized resources: An approach to complex nominals. *Lexicography*, 5(1), 55–83. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40607-018-0046-x>
- Castro, M. B., Martínez, S. M., & Faber, P. (2014). Verb collocations and phraseology in EcoLexicon. *Yearbook of Phraseology*, 5(1), 57–94. <https://doi.org/10.1515/phras-2014-0004>
- Champney, A. G. (2014). Wine translation in the Chinese market. Communicating in a connected world, 78.
- Corpas Pastor, G., & Seghiri Dominguez, M. (2009). Virtual corpora as documentation resources: Translating travel insurance documents. In A. Beeby, P. Rodríguez, & P. Sánchez Gijón (Eds.), *Corpus use and translating* (pp. 75–107). John Benjamins.
- Diederich, C. (2015). *Sensory adjectives in the discourse of food*. John Benjamins.
- Dobnik, N. (2019). Didactics of specialized translation – Experiences and observations on student translation errors in the case of a wine-related document. *Scripta Manent*, 14, 49–69.
- Dubois, D. (2007). From psychophysics to semiophysics: Categories as acts of meaning. In M. Plümacher & P. Holz (Eds.), *Speaking of colors and odors* (pp. 167–184). John Benjamins.
- Fernández-Domínguez, J. (2016). A morphosemantic investigation of term formation processes in English and Spanish. *Languages in Contrast*, 16(1), 54–83. <https://doi.org/10.1075/lic.16.1.03fer>
- Gantar, P., Colman, L., Parra Escartín, C., & Martínez Alonso, H. (2019). Multiword expressions: Between lexicography and NLP. *International Journal of Lexicography*, 32(2), 138–162. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ijl/icy012>
- García Izquierdo, I. (Ed.). (2005). *El género textual y la traducción: Reflexiones teóricas y aplicaciones pedagógicas*. Peter Lang.
- Geoghegan, C. (2018). How to read (and write) a wine technical sheet. Last accessed July 29, 2019, from <http://www.charliegeoghegan.com/>
- Hatim, B., & Mason, I. (1990). *Discourse and the translation*. Longman.
- Heid, U. (1994). On ways words work together. In Martin, W. et al. (Eds.), *Topics in lexical combinatorics' in EURALEX'94 proceedings* (pp. 226–257). Vrije Universiteit.
- Huertas Barros, E., & Buendía Castro, E. (2017). Analysing phraseological units in legal translation: Evaluation of translation errors for the English-Spanish language pair. In S. Goźdz-Roszkowski & G. Pontrandolfo (Eds.), *Phraseology in legal and institutional settings: A corpus-based interdisciplinary perspective* (pp. 41–60). Routledge.
- Hyland, K. (2002). Genre: Language, context, and literacy. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 22, 113–135. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190502000065>
- International Organisation of Vine and Wine. (2022). State of the world vine and wine sector 2021. Available from https://www.oiv.int/sites/default/files/documents/eng-state-of-the-world-vine-and-wine-sector-april-2022-v6_0.pdf
- Ishizaki, S., & López Arroyo, B. (2023). Genre appropriateness of translations: A corpus-based rhetorical analysis of wine tasting notes. *JosTrans*, 44 (in press).
- López Arroyo, B., & Moreno Pérez, L. (2019). Lexical chunks in English and Spanish sales contracts: A corpus based study. *Terminology*, 25, 32–59.
- López Arroyo, B., & Roberts, R. P. (2016). The phraseology of the language of wine in English and Spanish. *Debate Terminológico*, 16, 2–14.
- López Arroyo, B., & Sanz Valdivieso, L. (2020). On describing olive oil tasting notes in English. *Fachsprache*, 42(1–2), 27–45. <https://doi.org/10.24989/fs.v42i1-2.1825>
- López Arroyo, B., & Sanz Valdivieso, L. (2022). The phraseology of wine and olive oil tasting notes: A corpus based semantic analysis. *Terminology. International Journal of Theoretical and Applied Issues in Specialized Communication*, 28(1), 37–64. <https://doi.org/10.1075/term.20035.lap>
- Martínez Lanzán, G. (2006). El lenguaje de la cata: análisis de algunos de sus términos. In M. Ibáñez & M. T. Sánchez Nieto (Eds.), *El lenguaje de la vid y el vino y su traducción* (pp. 359–370). Universidad de Valladolid.
- Martínez Lanzán, G. (2008). The language of wine tasting: Specialised language? In M. Muñoz Calvo, C. Bueso Gómez, & M. A. Ruiz Moneva (Eds.), *New trends in translation and cultural identity* (pp. 397–412). Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

- Maswana, S., Kanamaru, T., & Tajinu, A. (2015). Move analysis of research articles across five engineering fields: What they share and what they do not. *Ampersand*, 2, 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amper.2014.12.002>
- Moreno-Pérez, L. (2017). The management of documentation resources in specialised translation trainees: A case study on legal translation. *Entreculturas. Revista de Traducción y Comunicación Intercultural*, 9(9), 291–301. <https://doi.org/10.24310/Entreculturasertci.vi9.11268>
- Moreno-Pérez, L., & López-Arroyo, B. (2021). Atypical corpus-based tools to the rescue: How a writing generator can help translators adapt to the demands of the market. *MonTI. Monografías de Traducción e Interpretación*, 13(13), 251–279. <https://doi.org/10.6035/MonTI.2021.13.08>
- Negro Alousque, I. (2014). La Traducción de las Metáforas en el Lenguaje del Vino. In A. Díaz Galán, M. C. Fumero Pérez, M. P. Lojendio Quintero, S. F. Burgess, E. Sosa Acevedo, & A. Cano Ginés (Eds.), *Comunicación, Cognición, Cibernético* (pp. 845–855). Universidad de La Laguna.
- Paradis, C. (2005). Ontologies and construals in lexical semantics. *Axiomathes*, 15(4), 541–573. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10516-004-7680-7>
- Paradis, C. (2010). Touchdowns in winespeak: Ontologies and construals in use and meaning-making. In M. Goded Rambaud & A. Poves Luelmo (Eds.), *Proceedings for the 1st congress on linguistic approaches to food and wine descriptions* (pp. 57–72). UNED University Press.
- Peynaud, É. (1987). *The taste of wine: Art and science of wine appreciation*. The Wine Appreciation Guild.
- Rabadán, R., Ramón, N., & Sanjurjo-González, H. (2021). Pragmatic annotation of a domain-restricted English-Spanish comparable corpus. *Bergen Language and Linguistics Studies*, 11(1), 209–223. <https://doi.org/10.15845/bells.v11i1.3445>
- Ramírez Almansa, I. (2018). Interpretación (español > alemán inglés) en el sector vitivinícola: la cata de vino. *Estudios Franco-Alemanes*, 10, 181–199.
- Ramírez Almansa, I. (2019). Terminología y traducción en contextos especializados (DE-ES): Vitivinicultura [Unpublished PhD dissertation]. Universidad de Córdoba.
- Ramírez Almansa, I. (2021). *El mundo del vino: textos, terminología y traducción (alemán-español)*. Comares.
- Robinson, J. (2015). *The Oxford Companion to Wine*. O.U.P.
- Sager, J. C., Dungworth, D., & McDonald, P. F. (1980). *English special languages: Principles and practice in science and technology*. Oscar Brandstetter.
- Sax, D. J. (2012). “Good feelings” and “hospitality” in Polish business language: An intercultural-pragmatic challenge neglected in Polish-English translator tools and training. In Ł. Bogucki & M. Deckert (Eds.), *Teaching translation and interpreting* (pp. 3–21). Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Scarpa, F. (2019). Pragmatic aspects of scientific and technical translation. In R. Tipton & L. Desilla (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of translation and pragmatics* (pp. 279–294). Routledge.
- Seghiri, M. (2015). Determinación de la Representatividad Cuantitativa de un Corpus ad hoc Bilingüe (Inglés-Español) de Manuales de Instrucciones Generales de Lectores Electrónicos. In M. T. Sánchez Nieto (Ed.), *Corpus-based translation and interpreting studies: From description to application/Estudios Traductológicos Basados en Corpus: De la Descripción a la Aplicación* (pp. 125–146). Frank & Timme.
- Sinclair, J. (2000). Lexical grammar. Darbai Ir Dieno. Last accessed January 12, 2020 from <http://donelaitis.vdu.lt/publikacijos/sinclair.pdf>
- Swales, J. (1990). *Genre analysis: English in academic and research settings*. Cambridge University Press.
- Swales, J. (2002). *Research genres: Explorations and applications*. Cambridge University Press.
- Temmerman, R. (2017). Verbalizing sensory experience for marketing success. *Terminology*, 23, 132–154.
- Thomas, P. (1993). Choosing headwords from LSP collocations for entry into a terminology data bank. In H. B. Sonneveld & K. L. Loening (Eds.), *Terminology: Applications in interdisciplinary communication* (pp. 43–68). John Benjamins.
- Toury, G. (1995). *Descriptive translation studies and beyond*. John Benjamins.