



Apple Varietal Names as Culturemes: Translation Issues in Scientific Textual Environments

Imola Katalin NAGY

Department of Applied Linguistics
Sapientia Hungarian University of Transylvania (Cluj-Napoca, Romania)
Faculty of Technical and Human Sciences
nimolkat@gmail.com

Abstract. In this study, our purpose is to establish a link between the concept of cultureme and a very intriguing type of specialized discourse: scientific texts belonging to the field of pomology (horticultural sciences). At least a segment of apple (and other fruit) varietal or cultivar names (especially those restricted to a certain geographical and cultural area or region) can be considered from a linguistic and translational viewpoint lexemes which carry cultural meaning. In our research, we focus on the apple varietal names which are specific to the region of Transylvania. We intend to see the way Romanian specialized literature observes or flouts the mentioning of Hungarian terms related to pomology (i.e. apple varietal names which are culturemes) as synonyms of the currently promoted Romanian versions. We also examine whether Hungarian specialists tend to mention the Romanian versions of Hungarian apple varietal names in their works. In fact, this research is, to a certain degree, an analysis of the attitude specialists display with regard to the scientific terminology and the long-established terms of the proximal culture.

Keywords: realia and cultureme, standardized, parallel versions or synonyms, Transylvanian apple varieties, Romanian, Hungarian

1. Introduction

In our research, we focus on the apple varietal names which are specific to the region of Transylvania, part of the Hungarian Kingdom and the Austro-Hungarian Empire prior to World War I and presently part of the Romanian state. We have chosen the field of apple varietal names as they are specific cases of cultural realia (as defined and described by Vlachov–Florin 1970, 1980), cultural words (Newmark 1988), or culturemes (Katan 1999). As a result of the specific historical and political shift which took place in 1918, a remarkable amount of peculiarities and changes

can be spotted not only in social, political, or administrative organization but also in some seemingly stable and less mutable areas such as scientific terminology: names related to the geography, flora, and fauna of the region started to be used in Romanian (while Hungarian terminology slowly receded).¹

We intend to see the way Romanian specialized literature observes the mentioning of Hungarian terms related to pomology (some of the apple varietal names we analyse are very-very old, and, in fact, they were overtaken by Romanian terminology) or whether Hungarian specialists tend to mention the Romanian versions of Hungarian apple varietal names in their works. In fact, this research is, to a certain degree, an analysis of the attitude specialists display with regard to the scientific terminology and the long-established terms of the proximal culture.

In our research, we focus mainly on two reference books in Transylvanian pomology, one in Hungarian (Nagy-Tóth, Ferenc. 1998. *Régi erdélyi almák*) and one in Romanian (Bordeianu, T. et al. 1964. *Pomologia Republicii Populare Romîne, vol. II, Mărul*). We have built up a corpus of 102 Transylvanian apple varietal names from Bordeianu et al. (1964) and 120 Transylvanian apple varietal names from Nagy-Tóth (1998). We compare the way Romanian variants are provided in the Hungarian reference book and the way Hungarian variants are listed in the Romanian reference book. As this is an ongoing research, we do not intend to offer statistics in this study; our aim is solely to notice tendencies and analyse phenomena.

2. Peculiarities of botanical taxonomies from a linguistic viewpoint

From the point of view of the specialized vocabulary, texts in the field of agriculture or horticulture are connected with several related scientific fields belonging to natural sciences but also to economic or social sciences. A particular segment that lends itself to terminological confusions is the field of taxonomies, especially botanical taxonomy. Flora lexemes are one of the most interesting themes of linguistic research, which is also a source of difficulty if it comes to translation. Plant naming and botanical terminology has a long history.

The father of systematic denomination of plants was Carl von Linné, or Linnaeus, who introduced in 1753 the binary nomenclature in Latin (*Species Plantarum*, 1753; *Systema Naturae*, 1758). In the 19th century, Latin was more and more competed by the many national languages, and, in order to avoid the emergence of terminological chaos, the Vienna Botanical Congress (1905) imposed the mandatory use of Latin

1 Nevertheless, the impact of politics and ideologies on (the language of) science and terminology (ban imposed on terms, ideas, concepts, and languages, the presence of *snarl* words and *purr* words in scientific or specialized discourses, etc.) is intended to be the subject of a forthcoming study.

names as official scientific names. Today, the standardization of plant names is ensured and regulated by nomenclature codes (cf. Nagy 2013c, 2014).

In previous studies, we have described the main tendencies which regulate botanical denominational practices (Nagy 2013a–c). The scientific name (*nomen scientificum*) is Latin. Over time, the scientific nomenclature has undergone a process of uniformization and standardization because of the need for precise and stable names, universally valid for plants. The scientific name of the plant is the name given to each taxon in Latin in accordance with the rules stipulated in the *International Nomenclatures* (for instance, *Malus domestica*). The name of the taxon in the national language is also called scientific name provided that the botanical nomenclature is standardized and developed. Thus, each taxon corresponds to a single scientific name, therefore meeting the demands of scientific denomination (one name corresponds to one variety only).

Besides the scientific name in Latin and the scientific name in the national language, there is the so-called *folk taxonomy*, i.e. popular names of plants, a domain which is subject to semantic phenomena like synonymy, homonymy, etc. Folk taxonomy refers to the popular name of the plants (also called *colloquial name*, *trivial name*, *country name*, *farmer's name*). Popular names are not standardized or regulated by international documents such as Latin scientific names or cultivated plant names (also called cultivars). The spelling of popular names follows general rules of different languages.

Therefore, we can talk about three types of botanical nomenclatures: an international botanical nomenclature, a national botanical nomenclature, and a popular botanical nomenclature.

In the botanical taxonomy, valid in international communication and terminology, each variety is named in two terms, the first word representing the genus (first letter written in capitals), and the second name is the specific epithet (name of the species) written in lower-case letters used only with the generic name: e.g. *Prunus domestica* (plum). The binomial scientific name is always Latin or transcribed, transliterated in Latin. Both terms are written in italics. According to the *International Code of Nomenclature for Cultivated Plants* (also known as the *Cultivated Code*, first published in 1953 and revised several times at irregular intervals since then), all varieties or derivatives of wild plants which are raised under cultivation are to be called *cultivars*, and cultivar names are not subject to translation. Scientific names in Latin are never translated. Scientific names in the national language are spelled according to the rules of each language, and they can be translated. If there is no available recognized translation, then the loan translation technique is applied.

3. Cultural words. Culturemes. Realia

From a translational viewpoint, the cultural aspects (lexemes with cultural implications) have received different denominations throughout time and the problem of culture-related linguistic units has been the subject of numerous research studies. One must mention remarkable contributions such as Andrei Fiodorov's (1941), who establishes the theoretical basis for the study of words with cultural specificity, introducing in the translational language the term *realia* to refer to "objects or phenomena with a national specificity and the term *realia-word* to name, to designate these objects and unique phenomena" (cf. Jordan 2017: 59).

Eugene Nida (1945) speaks about *cultural foreign words*. Nida analyses cultural translation and offers a classification of such foreign words, dividing them into five major areas: ecology, material culture, social culture, ideological culture, and linguistic culture (starting from which Peter Newmark created his own taxonomy in 1988). In the 1952 volume signed by Leonid Sobolev, *Пособие по переводу с русского языка на французский* (Russian–French Translation Manual), there is an argued and pertinent definition of the term *realia*, conceived as the set of those words that do not exist in other languages because these objects and phenomena do not exist in other countries (apud Jordan 2017: 60).

Vlakhov and Florín (1970) define *realia* as words connected with realities strongly associated with a specific culture. In Barkhudarov's view (1975: 94), *realia*, or *non-equivalent vocabulary*, represent a part of background information, "implying specific historical facts and information about the state structure, the peculiarities of the geographic environment, concepts of ethnography and folklore" (Barkhudarov 1975: 94 apud Ketevan-Pareshishvili 2014: 8).

According to L. Barkhudarov (1975), such non-equivalent vocabulary mainly includes the following groups of words:

1. Words that denote the objects, concepts, and situations non-existent in the practical experience of the groups of people speaking other languages.
2. Words that denote the objects characteristic of the material and spiritual culture of a particular nation, for example, national dishes, clothes, shoes, etc.
3. Words and set expressions denoting the political institutions and social events characteristic of a particular nation (Barkhudarov 1975: 93 apud Ketevan-Pareshishvili 2014: 9).

The concept of *cultureme* was originally introduced by Oksaar (1988), then retaken by Reiss and Vermeer (1984) and revisited by Katan (2009). Peter Newmark (1991) speaks about *cultural words* or *cultural terms*, while Mona Baker (1992, 1995) talks about *culture-specific concepts*. Leppihalme (1997) calls the words with cultural implications *cultural bumps*, whereas Franco Aixelà (1996) proposes the term *culture-specific items*. Nedergaard-Larsen (2003) refers to *cultural references* and proposes four main headings: references to geography, history, society, and culture.

When the term *realia*, derived from the Russian *Realii*, penetrated the field of translation studies, a radical terminological change occurred, and the distinction between linguistic and objectual *realia* emerged since *realia*, in fact, “does not mean objects, but signs, words and, more precisely, those words signifying objects of the material culture, especially pertaining to a local culture. It is, therefore, necessary to distinguish *realia*-objects (mostly outside translation studies) and *realia*-words (mostly inside translation studies)” (Ischenko 2012: 274).

Ischenko (2012: 275) divides linguistic *realia*, or *realia* “as the units of translation”, into abbreviations and phrases. From a thematic viewpoint, they may be subdivided into geographic (names of the geographic and atmospheric objects and endemic species) and ethnographic *realia* (which describe the daily life and culture of nations, their spiritual and material culture, traditions, religion, art, folklore, items connected with everyday life, names of residents and ethnic objects, currency units, etc.). Within one language, Ischenko (2012) distinguishes *own* *realia* and *borrowed* *realia*, which are further subdivided into *national* (known to all the citizens of the country), *local* (belonging to one dialect), and *microlocal* *realia* (peculiar to a definite locality) (Ischenko 2012: 275). In interlinguistic comparison, Ischenko talks about *regional* *realia* and *international* *realia*, “existing in the lexicon of many languages, which entered the vocabulary though preserving their initial colour” (Ischenko 2012: 275).

In translation studies, the notion of *realia* and that of *cultureme* are used alternatively as culture-bound lexemes or linguistic units that designate or bear cultural information. In Romanian specialized literature, the term *realia* first emerged in 2001 (Condrea 2001); Romanian specialists, however, seem to prefer the term *cultureme*. In the comparative-cultural theory of translation promoted by Georgiana Lungu Badea (2012: 54–56), culturemes are defined as some words that bear cultural information (cultural information words or the smallest units of cultural information).

Hungarian specialist Dusan Tellinger (2005: 124) highlights the polysemantic nature of the term *realia*, stating that it designates the objects specific to a given community on the one hand and the words that designate those objects on the other. *Realia* encompass both the entities in the objective reality and the language units that name those objects. What is interesting is that, prior to Tellinger, Hungarian translation studies specialists (Klaudy 2003, Forgács 2004) generally operated with the terms *reália* ‘*realia*’. Tellinger already introduces the term *cultureme* in the form of *etnokulturéma* ‘ethnocultureme’. Although in the practice of everyday use of translational terminology there is a tendency to treat the terms *cultureme* and *realia* as perfect synonyms, there are differences in the semantic nuances between the two concepts: while *culturemes* are words that designate cultural objects or phenomena, they are words bearing the cultural information, the concept of *realia*; in Georgiana Lungu Badea’s view (2012: 118), it is also linked to what is called

common knowledge or *common ground*, that is, that set of common knowledge that bridges the two cultures. According to Lungu Badea (2004), culturemes are monocultural, realistic, autonomous units of translation, elements and structures that carry cultural information which impose a type of cultural translation.

In this study, we will treat the terms *linguistic realia* and *linguistic cultureme* as relative synonyms as we consider that, in this sense, culturemes and realia are those linguistic units that carry cultural information, are part of the culture about which they provide information, describe or define a segment of that culture, are linked to culture and are rooted in it, have a meaning that awakens associations related to that culture. We subsume the term *cultureme* and *realia* to those culture-bound linguistic units (words, combinations of words, phrases) referring to the ethnic and cultural life of a given population, all the linguistic elements related to the natural, material, spiritual, and administrative life of populations or communities living in a given geographical-cultural space. In this sense, apple varietal names emerging from specific geographical regions can be treated as linguistic realia or linguistic culturemes.

4. Apple cultivar names as culturemes

Following the criteria offered by specialists in the field of culture-bound lexical elements, we consider that apple (and other fruit) varietal or cultivar names (especially those restricted to a certain geographical and cultural area; in our case, Transylvania) can be considered, from a linguistic and translational viewpoint, lexemes which carry cultural meaning and should therefore be treated as linguistic culturemes. As the majority of the names we will look at are prior to the introduction of the term *cultivar*, despite the fact that most of the varieties we examine have been raised under cultivation, and are the result of early human intervention and grafting (and are, thus, cultivars), hereinafter we will use the term *variety* instead of the term cultivar as this latter started to be used only after the 1950s.

In our research, we aim to analyse the way old apple varietal names from Transylvania are used by Hungarian and Romanian reference book writers, i.e. whether the names of apple varieties are mentioned in Hungarian, Romanian, or both variants (in case some apple varietal names display Hungarian and Romanian versions as well). Why are there two parallel name versions of the same apple variety in Transylvania?

The explanation is historical: some of the traditional fruit variety names from Transylvania (once part of the Hungarian kingdom and part of Romania since 1918) have developed two parallel forms (a Hungarian and a Romanian version) mainly due to two reasons: the cohabitation of the two ethnic groups and the fact that Romanian pomology and its terminology had to cope with the scientific and linguistic heritage they overtook with Transylvania's annexation to Romania

after the Treaty of Trianon. In the case of apple cultivar names, it is striking that sometimes the Romanian version is the simple translated form of the Hungarian name, while some other times adaptation, transcription, or transformation is used to coin the Romanian name.

5. Hungarian apple names in Transylvania. A historical insight

One of the oldest written records of Hungarian apple names in Transylvania is Péter Méliusz Juhász's *Herbárium* (Herbarium) (1578), which contains two names – 'bolondító alma' and 'leánczeczü alma'.

Balázs Szikszai Fabricius's *Szójegyzék* (Glossary) (1590) mentions 14 apple varieties in Latin and in Hungarian, almost all of them being still existing varieties in Transylvania today (cf. Nagy-Tóth 1998: 17).

Towards the end of the 16th century, there were some 60 Hungarian apple varieties in the records. János Lippay's *Posoni kert* (The Poson Garden) (1664) is another rich source of apple variety names in Hungarian, a lot of them being Transylvanian varieties (Nagy-Tóth 1998: 19).

It was only in the 17th century that the very first Romanian variety names appeared, first in a Latin–Romanian dictionary (out of the seventeen names mentioned here, seven names did not have a Latin equivalent and eight names had been taken from Szikszai's *Szójegyzék* (Glossary) from 1590, highlights Nagy-Tóth (1998: 20)). Bordeianu et al. also mention this source, calling it simply *a dictionary fragment from Caran-Sebes* (1740). This manuscript from 1740 (written by the so-called *dictionary writer from Caran Sebes* – cf. Bordeianu et al. 1964; *karánszebesi szótárkészítő* – cf. Nagy-Tóth 1998) listed some early Romanian apple names, such as *mer gushat* 'apple with goiter', which seems to be the literal translation of the Hungarian varietal name *nyakas alma* 'apple with a large, swollen neck'.

Al. Borza, a pioneer of Romanian pomological terminology creation, is the author of *Flora grădinilor țărănești românești* (The Flora of Romanian Peasants' Gardens), a book issued in 1921 (short after Transylvania's annexation). In this volume, the author consequently diminishes the Hungarian contribution and presence in Transylvania by avoiding to admit the existence of Hungarian fruit names and by stating that some of the apple varieties were borrowed by Romanian peasants from *străini* 'foreigners' (Borza 1921) instead of stating that one variety or another is of Hungarian origin. Nevertheless, all the varietal names he mentions show the Hungarian origin of the lexemes: e.g. 'mere strugurii' (*grape-like apple*) corresponding to the Hungarian 'fürtös alma' (*apple like a bunch of grapes*); 'mere bostănești' (*pumpkin-like apple* or *head-like apple*, as *bostan* in Romanian means *pumpkin* and *human head*) corresponding to the Hungarian 'kobak alma' (*apple*

like human head); ‘mere de glajă’ (*glass-like apple*) corresponding to the Hungarian ‘üveg alma’ (*glass-like apple*).

In his 1933 contribution, Borza goes even further and states that it is absolutely inadmissible to spell apple cultivar names such as ‘Pónyik’ according to Hungarian spelling rules (and therefore accept the existence of the Hungarian name), given the fact that it is, in his opinion, an ancient Romanian word (Borza 1933: 7). The only thing Borza forgets to mention is that the Romanian word (variety name) ‘Poinic’ started to be used in the late 19th century, whereas the Hungarian variant (‘Pónyik’) had already been recorded centuries earlier in Hungarian writings and chronicles such as in *Döbrentey Kódex* (1508) and *Érsekújvári Kódex* (1530–1531).²

Quite intolerant towards Hungarian terminology and its legitimacy, Borza (1921, 1933) constantly demonstrates that some of the oldest Transylvanian apple varieties are “ancient Romanian” varieties although they first appeared in Hungarian texts, and the Romanian name is, in fact, either the calque translation of the Hungarian name: ‘borsos alma’ (*apple with pepper*)/‘mere țipărate’ (*apple which tastes like pepper*), ‘káposzta alma’ (*cabbage-like apple*)/‘mere vărzești’ (*cabbage-like apple*)³ (recorded in Lippay’s *Posoni kert*, 1664), ‘marosszéki páris alma’ (*Paris apple from Marosszék/Central Transylvania*) /‘Parișe ardelenești’, *Paris apple from Transylvania*) (described in János Lippay’s *Posoni kert*, 1664) or its corrupted and/or transcribed version: ‘Török Bálint’/ torombule,⁴ a variety mentioned in Cordus’s *Historia plantarum* (1561), Szikszai’s *Szójegyzék* (1590), and Bauhin’s *Historia plantarum universalis* (1650).

Bereczki’s four-volume work on pomology, published in Arad (formerly Hungary, present-day Romania) in 1877, *Gyümölcsészeti vázlatok* (Sketches on Pomology) is one of the most outstanding reference works on pomology in Central Europe, a work which was widely used by the Romanian specialist Al. Borza (1921, 1933) in his attempt to lay the foundations of Romanian pomological literature.

In our research, we have consulted two reference books in Transylvanian pomology, one in Hungarian (Nagy-Tóth, Ferenc 1998: *Régi erdélyi almák* [Old Transilvanian Apple Varieties]) and one in Romanian (Bordeianu, T. (ed.) 1964: *Pomologia Republicii Populare Romîne, vol. II, Mărul* [The Pomology of the Romanian People’s Republic. Volume II. The Apple]). We have built up a corpus of 102 Transylvanian apple varietal names collected from Bordeianu et al’s text and 120 Transylvanian apple varietal names from Nagy-Tóth’s text. We have compared the way Romanian variants are provided in the Hungarian reference book and the way Hungarian variants are listed in the Romanian reference book. As the Romanian book proved to be very reluctant to provide Hungarian apple varietal names, we have

2 For further details on the etymology of the term, see: Nagy 2016.

3 The word *vărzești* being an ad-hoc lexical creation, coined by the author from the noun *varza* ‘cabbage’.

4 Created through word corruption from the proper name Török Bálint.

also attempted to identify the parallel Hungarian versions (synonyms) based on the following criteria: comparing the morphological description of the fruit, comparing the place of emergence, and analysing the Romanian name in point of origin. In each case, we matched the varieties against each other according to these criteria, thoroughly checking the coincidence of Romanian and Hungarian toponyms (i.e. place of emergence of the varieties) as well.

In the case of the Hungarian reference book, we have noticed an obvious tendency to provide Hungarian synonyms and Romanian names as well. In this respect, we mention some examples: 'Páris alma'/'Mere pariş'; 'Piros pap alma'/'Mere popeşti'; 'Sikulai (narancsvörös csíkos) alma'/'Mere şiculane'; 'Piros cigányalma'/'Mere ţigăneşti'; 'Szeplős piros alma'/'Mere roşii'; 'Kerekített alma'/'Mere rotilate'; 'Kormos alma'/'Mere chermese', 'Édeskés alma'/'Mere dulcuțe'; 'Esperes alma'/'Mere protopopeşti'; 'Fehér (kicsi) alma'/'Mere albe'; 'Borsos alma'/'Mere ţipărate'; 'Mustos alma'/'Mere mustoase'; 'Gusztáv alma'/'Mere costane (gostane)'; 'Halmágy alma'/'Mere hălmăgene', 'gălbejele'; 'Kék alma'/'Mere vinete'; 'Kemény alma'/'Mere tari'; 'Kerekített alma'/'Mere rotilate'; 'Királyi alma'/'Mere crăieşti'; 'Kormos alma'/'Mere chermese'; 'Bonaburuttya'/'Mere bunebute'; 'Kormoscigány alma'/'Mere chermese ţigăneşti'; 'Erdélyi kék alma'/'Mere vinete ardelenesţi'; 'Gormos (kormos) alma'/'Mere golmoaşe'; 'Kőrösbányai alma'/'Mere crişăneşti'; 'Kövér alma'/'Mere grase'; 'Kicsike alma'/'Mere pizloape, prâsloape'; 'Lisztos (kásás) alma'/'Mere mălăiețe'; 'Petres alma'/'Mere petruşele'; 'Medve alma'/'Mere urseşti'; 'Kerek alma'/'Mere cugle'; 'Édes alma'/'Mere dulci'; 'Bulzesdi alma'/'Mere de Bulzeşti'; 'Mocskotár renet alma'/'Mere muşcotaiu, muşcătarnițe'; 'Muskotályos alma'/'Mere muşcătarnițe'; 'Mustos alma'/'Mere mustoase'; 'Narancsvörös szürke alma'/'Mere sure'; 'Nyakas vadalma'/'Măr pădureț'; 'Nyári alma'/'Mere văratices'; 'Ormányos alma'/'Mere boghişe, botişe'; 'Ordos alma'/'Mere urdaşe'; 'Piros almák'/'Mere roşii'; 'Pirosas sárgás szürke alma'/'Mere sure'; 'Piros vékony csíkos alma'/'Mere roşii'; 'Savanyú (kicsi sárga) alma'/'Mere acre'; 'Ribicei zöld'/'Mere verzi de Ribita'; 'Szép alma'/'Mere frumoase'; 'Rengeti fűzfa alma'/'Mere sălcii de Renghet'; 'Tartós alma'/'Mere statornice'; 'Téli alma'/'Mere de iarnă'; 'Téli alma'/'Mere iernatices'; 'Téli fehér kálvil vadonc, meddő alma'/'Mere sterpe'; 'Török Bálint'/'Mere torombule'; 'Úri alma'/'Mere domneşti'; 'Várfalvi alma'/'Mere mulduane, moldovane'; 'Zsálya alma'/'Mere jalnice'; 'Vindai kemény alma'/'Mere tare de Ghinda'; 'Fürtös alma'/'Mere strugurii'; 'Bondoraszói csíkos alma'/'Mere vărgate de Budureasa'; 'Marossalatnai kerek alma'/'Mere rotilate din Slatina de Mureş'. It is to be remarked that sometimes the author provides the Saxon name as well: 'Kék alma'/'Sächischer Blauapfel'.

Due to editorial reasons, we do not insist on the translation aspects of these terms as this aspect is so vast that it certainly requires another study. To illustrate the amount of calque translations from Hungarian into Romanian, we offer the translation of the last few examples: 'Bondoraszói csíkos alma' (literally: *striped*

apple from Bondoraszó /‘mere vărgate de Budureasa’ (literally: striped apple from Budureasa);⁵ ‘Marosszaltnai kerek alma’ (literally: round apple from Marosszaltna /‘Mere rotilate din Slatina de Mureș’ (literally: round apple from Slatina de Mureș).⁶

In their massive volume published in 1964, Bordeianu et al. make a thorough presentation of the apple varieties and cultivars that can be found on Romanian territory. Among these, an impressive number of varieties are Transylvanian, and we have included in our corpus the Transylvanian varieties to analyse these varietal names in point of linguistic explanations and the synonyms given. In the field of pomology, synonymy mainly refers to acknowledged and accepted parallel versions created by translation, transcription, and/or adaptation of a fruit name into other languages.

One of our first remarks is that the authors provide, in some cases, an impressive number of synonyms in four or five languages. The majority of varieties are described thoroughly, the author providing details regarding the origin of the cultivar: American (‘Frumos galben’/‘Yellow Bellflower’), English (‘Winter Pearmain’/‘Parmen auriu’), or French (‘Reinette Grise’/‘Renet cenușiu’). Nevertheless, in the case of varieties with proven Hungarian origin, the information is either withheld (*origine necunoscută* ‘unknown origin’) or simply transformed into *soi autohton* ‘autochthonous variety’.

Bordeianu et al’s volume resumes to a certain extent Borza’s guidelines, and his tendency to avoid reference to Transylvania’s Hungarian terminological heritage. Another surprising fact is that, in the case of old Transylvanian varieties, which certainly do have a Hungarian name, they do not provide this and pretermit Hungarian-related information (variety’s origin, place of emergence, synonyms, pomologists who described it, first documentary attestation, and details regarding hybridization or cultivation).

We have made a list of examples of apple variety names which do have a Hungarian name but that go unmentioned in Bordeianu et al’s volume. The first and most striking example is ‘Ouțe de Ardeal (literally: eggs from Transylvania), in the case of which only the Romanian synonym is given. ‘Țâța fetei’ (literally the *girl’s breast*) – this variety is obviously the same as ‘Leánycsöcsű alma’ (literally meaning: apple like a girl’s breast), recorded in Szikszai Fabricius Balázs’s 1590 *Szójegyzék* (Glossary) under the form ‘Lean czezcü alma. The Romanian variant ‘Țâța fetei’ is a literal translation of the Hungarian ‘Leánycsöcs(ű) alma’.

In the case of a typical Hungarian variety, ‘Budai Domokos’, Bordeianu et al. provide the name without mentioning that it is a Hungarian variety and name. Another classical Hungarian variety, ‘Török Bálint’, appears under one of its well-

5 Bondoraszó (in Hungarian), or Budureasa (in Romanian) is a village in Bihor County (Transylvania) – <http://szabo.adatbank.transindex.ro/index.php?action=keres1>.

6 Marosszaltna (in Hungarian), or Slatina de Mureș (in Romanian) is a village in Arad County (Transylvania) – <http://szabo.adatbank.transindex.ro/index.php?action=keres1>.

known synonyms, ‘Roșu de Stettin’/‘Rotter Stettiner’, but the Hungarian name is listed among many other synonyms, and the misleading phrase “unknown origin” appears as a piece of key information. ‘Talgere’ (*plate-like apple*) is the Romanian version of the old Hungarian apple varietal name ‘Tányéralma’, or ‘Tánygyéralma’ (*plate-like apple*), and ‘Parișe roșii’ (*red Paris apple*) is ‘Piros Páris’ (*red Paris apple*). The variety names ‘Sălci de vară’ (*summer willow*), ‘Mere Rusmaline’ (*rosemary apple*)⁷ – where Bordeianu et al. admit no known synonyms – are linked to the Hungarian names ‘Fűz alma’ (*willow apple*), ‘Rozmaring alma’ (*rosemary apple*), all these varieties being present together with their names quite early in Transylvanian pomological history.

The list of Romanian apple names withholding Hungarian synonyms and Hungarian-related information goes on as follows (in brackets we have provided the Hungarian name which is not mentioned in Bordeianu et al. 1964): ‘Roșii de Geoagiu’ (the same as the Hungarian ‘Gyógyi piros’); ‘Mușcătare’ (the same as the Hungarian ‘Muskotály alma’);⁸ ‘Mălăiețe’ (the same as the Hungarian ‘Lisztes kásás alma’, grown in Căinelu de Sus, formerly Felsőkajanél); ‘Crișănești’ (the same as the Hungarian ‘Kőrösbányai alma’); ‘Frumoase’ (grown in Țebea, the same as the Hungarian ‘Szép alma’, grown in Țebea, formerly Cebe); ‘Sterpe’ (the same as the Hungarian ‘Meddő alma’); ‘Jalnice’ (the same as the Hungarian ‘Zsálya alma’); ‘Pizloape’ (the same as the Hungarian ‘Kicsike alma’); ‘Vărgate de Budureasa’ (the same as the Hungarian ‘Bondoraszói csikos alma’); ‘Domnești de Ardeal’ (the same as the Hungarian ‘Úri alma’); ‘Ursești’ (the same as the Hungarian ‘Medve alma’); ‘Cugle’ (the same as the Hungarian ‘Kerek alma’); ‘Boghișe’ (the same as the Hungarian ‘Ormányos alma’, grown in Călata/Kalota); ‘Verzi de Ribița’ (the same as the Hungarian ‘Ribicei zöld’); ‘Rotilate din Slatina de Mureș’ (the same as the Hungarian ‘Kerekített alma’); ‘Mustoase de Albac’ (the same as the Hungarian ‘Mustos alma’, grown in Fehérvölgy/Albac); ‘Grase’ (originating from and cultivated in Fornădia; the same as the Hungarian ‘Kövér alma’ from Fornădia); ‘Hălmăgene’ (cultivated in Cociuba Mică; the same as ‘Halmágy’ alma, cultivated in Felsőkocsoba); ‘Crăiești’ (cultivated in Ribița; the same as the Hungarian ‘Királyi alma’ from Ribice); ‘Golmoașe’ from Țebea (the same as the Hungarian ‘gormos/kormos’ from Cebe); ‘Sălci de Renghet’ (the same as the Hungarian ‘Rengeti fűzfa alma’); ‘Murgi de Săcătura’ (the same as the Hungarian ‘Szürkülő alma’ grown in Szekatúra); ‘Acre de Damiș’ (the same as the Hungarian ‘Savanyú kicsi sárga alma’ from Erdődámos); ‘Costane’, or ‘Gostane’ (the same as the Hungarian ‘Gusztáv alma’); ‘Petrușele’ (the same as the Hungarian ‘Petres alma’); ‘Statornice’ (grown in Albac; the same as the Hungarian ‘Tartós alma’ from Fehérvölgy/Albac); ‘Mușcătarnițe’ (grown in Fornădia; the same as the Hungarian ‘Muskotályos alma’ from Fornădia). ‘Unsurtoase de Geoagiu’ is ‘Gyógyi alma’ mentioned by Bereczki (1877, vol. 2: 307).

7 The variant *Rusmaline* is a corrupted form of the standard term *rozmarin*.

8 The Romanian term *Mușcătare* and its derived variant *Mușcătarnițe* are of Hungarian etymology, springing from the name of one of the oldest varieties of grapes, apples, and pears: *muskotály(os)*.

There are quite a lot of Romanian apple names in the case of which the Hungarian version and/or implications are neglected but with the indication of Transylvanian origin under the form *soi autohton* ‘autochthonous variety’: ‘Tare de Ghinda’ (the same as the Hungarian ‘Vindai kemény alma’); ‘Sălcii de vară’ (the same as the Hungarian ‘Fűzfa alma’); ‘Urdașe de Feleac’ (the same as the Hungarian ‘Ordos alma’, grown near Cluj, in Feleac); ‘Sunătoare’ (the same as the Hungarian ‘Zörgő alma’); ‘Mulduane’, or ‘Moldovane’ (the same as the Hungarian ‘Várfalvi alma’, Várfalva being a village called Moldovenești in Romanian, near the town of Torda/Turda).

There are some Romanian apple names in the case of which the Hungarian version and/or implications are neglected but with the indication of the Transylvanian origin (*originar din Transilvania*): ‘Pătul’/‘Batul-alma’, ‘Poinic’/‘Ponyik’.⁹

There are some other Romanian apple names in the case of which the Hungarian synonym is provided but with the indication *soi autohton* ‘autochthonous variety’: ‘Șiculane’/‘Sikulai alma’; ‘Cormoșe vărgate de Mada’/‘Mádai kormos’.

There is a number of Romanian apple varietal names which the Hungarian synonym is provided for, but the origin is specified as *origine necunoscută* ‘unknown origin’: ‘Șovari nobil’/‘Nemes Sovari-alma’ (although the place of emergence is indicated as a county in Central Transylvania). Another striking case of misinformation in a scientific text is the case of ‘Șovari comun’, where the authors communicate that there are no available data regarding the origin of this variety (*nu se cunosc date* ‘there are no data’) although it is more than obvious that the name itself proves that it originates from a village called Sívár, and – as Nagy-Tóth (1998: 60) puts it – it is an ancient variety from Sălaj County, Central Transylvania, cultivated in the early Middle Ages (Nagy-Tóth 1998: 60). Its Hungarian name is ‘Közönséges Sívári alma’, a name imposed and standardized by Bereczki in 1886 by dropping the alternative, competing variant ‘Daru alma’.¹⁰ The Romanian name ‘Șovari’ is a simple transcription of the Hungarian term ‘Sívári’. The problems which emerged in the field of sciences due to the social and political changes which occurred in 1918 (shift of borders) are signalled by the inconsistencies that can be spotted up to this day in the database of the National Fruit Collection (UK), where, for instance, under the heading ‘Sovari nobil (of Romania)’ the information regarding origin is the following: “Originated in Hungary. Distributed in 1880 when it was already known to be old.”,¹¹ whereas in the case of ‘Sovari comun’ they state that it “Originated in Romania. Recorded in 1876.”¹²

9 Several Hungarian synonyms are mentioned: Ponyik, Pojnik, Ponyik-alma, Pojenics. Only two of them are more or less correct, and the authors explain the etymology of the term incorrectly. For further details, see: Nagy 2016.

10 See also data from: <http://www.nationalfruitcollection.org.uk/full2.php?varid=1470&&acc=1948363&&fruit=apple>.

11 <http://www.nationalfruitcollection.org.uk/full2.php?varid=5911&&acc=1958110&&fruit=apple>.

12 <http://www.nationalfruitcollection.org.uk/full2.php?varid=5910&&acc=1958109&&fruit=apple>.

Finally, we have found a smaller number of Romanian apple varietal names in the case of which the Hungarian synonym is provided, but the origin is left unmentioned by Bordeianu et al. (1964): ‘Roz de Geoagiu’/‘Roze de Gyógy’, ‘Gyógyi csíkos’; ‘Popesc’/‘Szászpapalma’.¹³

6. Conclusions

In our research, we have focused on the apple varietal names which are specific to the region of Transylvania (part of the Hungarian kingdom and the Austro-Hungarian Empire prior to World War I and presently part of the Romanian state). Our aim was to see the way Romanian specialized literature observes the mentioning of Hungarian terms related to pomology as synonyms of the currently promoted Romanian versions. We have noticed that the Romanian volumes we have consulted seem rather unwilling to communicate or to include terms belonging to the Hungarian apple variety terminology despite the fact that some of the apple varieties they deal with were recorded in very old Hungarian documents.

In fact, a lot of the Romanian varietal names (from Transylvania) are calque translations, transcriptions, or corrupted forms of the Hungarian names. To illustrate this, we mention that, from a semantic viewpoint, the meaning of the Romanian term is quite often definitely opaque, whereas the corresponding Hungarian name does carry meaning: for instance, the Romanian word *urdașe* carries no meaning whatsoever, whereas the Hungarian word *ordos* means striped;¹⁴ the Romanian word *costane*, or *gostane*, lacks meaning, while *Gusztáv* is a proper name; the Romanian word *Sovar* has no meaning, but the Hungarian *Sóvári* literally means *from a place called Sóvár*.

We have also examined whether Hungarian specialists tend to mention the Romanian versions of Hungarian apple varietal names in their works. We have found that out of the 120 terms we have extracted, 59 varietal names were also given their Romanian equivalents as synonyms. Nagy-Tóth’s 1998 volume is more complex from this viewpoint (cultural terms have some functions; cf. Klaudy 1999), and in this sense apple variety names as *culturemes* should display not only the informative but the intercultural function as well.

One should expect scientific texts to be characterized by objectivity, appropriateness, correctness, and clarity, and scientific discourse should be unambiguous, comprehensive, impersonal, accurate, and lacking affective connotations or prejudices. If we approach the volumes we have studied from the

13 According to the National Fruit Collection: “Originated in Hungary. Described in 1909. Fruits have crisp, fine, white flesh with a subacid and slightly sweet flavour.” <http://www.nationalfruitcollection.org.uk/full2.php?varid=6241&&acc=1948403&&fruit=apple>.

14 https://adtplus.arcanum.hu/hu/view/MagyarTajszotar_2/?pg=11&layout=s.

viewpoint of apple varietal names and their objective and precise treatment, we must say that in the Romanian volume the pieces of information related to Hungary's and Transylvania's joint destiny in the past (i.e. the presence of Hungarian language and terminology in Transylvania) are most times simply overridden, and Romanian specialists tend to disregard the Hungarian names of apple varieties and do not list them as synonyms of the Romanian names.

What is more, Al. Borza, the father of Romanian pomology, considers the usage or the acknowledgement of Hungarian terms absolutely *impermissible* (Borza 1933). This research is, to a certain extent, a parsing of what we would call *terminological intolerance* due to the inference of ideologies in science (Borza's works were born a few years after the 1918 change, while Bordeianu et al. published their work during the socialist rule) and, perhaps, an analysis of the attitude specialists display with regard to the scientific terminology and the long-established term inventory of the proximal culture.

References

- Aixelá, J. Franco. 1995. Specific cultural items and their translation. In: Jansen, Peter. (ed.), *Translation and the manipulation of discourse*. CETRA. 109–125.
- Baker, Mona. 1992/2006. *In other words: A coursebook on translation*. (2nd edition). London–New York: Routledge.
- Barkhudarov, Leonid. S. 1975. *Voprosy obshchey i chastnoy teorii perevoda*. Moscow: Mejdunarodnie otnoshenia.
- Berecki Máté. 1877. *Gyümölcsészeti vázlatok* [Sketches on pomology]. Arad.
- Bordeianu, Teodor (ed). 1964. *Pomologia Republicii Populare Romîne, vol. II, Mărul* [The pomology of the Romanian People's Republic. Volume II. The apple]. Bucharest: Editura Academiei RPR.
- Borza, Alexandru. 1921. *Flora grădinilor țărănești românești* [The flora of Romanian peasants' gardens]. *Buletinul Grădinii Botanice și al Muzeului Botanic de la Universitatea din Cluj* 1.
- Borza, Alexandru–Gürtler, Cornel. 1933. *Varietățile de mere cultivate în grădina botanică din Cluj* [Apple varieties grown in the botanical garden of Cluj]. *Buletinul Grădinii Botanice și al Muzeului Botanic de la Universitatea din Cluj* (13): 1–23.
- Condrea, Irina. 2001. *Comunicarea prin traducere* [Communication through translation]. Chișinău: Tehnica-Info.
- Djachy, Ketevan–Pareshishvili, Mariam. 2014. Realia as carriers of national and historical overtones. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies* 4(1): 8–14.
- Forgács, Erzsébet. 2004. Reáliák és fordításuk Garaczi László műveiben [The translation of realia in the works of László Garaczi]. *Fordítástudomány* 6(2): 38–56.

- Jordan, Corina. 2017. Parcursul istoric și problematica conceptului de cuvânt realitate în traducere [The problematics of the concept of reality throughout history]. *Studia Universitatis Moldaviae* 10(110): 59–63.
- Ischenko, Tamara. 2012. Difficulties while translating realia. Вісник дніпропетровського університету імені альфреда нобеля. *Серія «ФІЛОЛОГІЧНІ НАУКИ»* 1(3): 273–278.
- Katan, David. 2009. Translation as intercultural communication. In: Munday, Jeremy. (ed.), *The Routledge companion to translation studies*. London–New York: Routledge. 74–92.
- Klaudy, Kinga. 1999. *Bevezetés a fordítás elméletébe* [Introduction to the theory of translation]. Budapest: Scholastica.
2003. *Languages in translation*. Budapest: Scholastica.
- Klaudy, Kinga–Simigné Fenyő, Sarolta. 2000. *Angol-magyar fordítástechnika* [English-Hungarian translation techniques]. Budapest: Nemzeti Tankönyvkiadó.
- Leppihalme, Ritva. 1997. *Culture bumps: An empirical approach to the translation of allusions*. Clevedon–Philadelphia–Toronto–Sydney–Johannesburg: Multilingual Matters.
- Lippay János. 1664/2002. *Posoni kert, kiben minden kerti munkák, rendelések, virágokkal, veteményekkel, fákkal, gyümölcsökkel és kerti csömötékkal való baimológusok: azoknak nemek, hasznok, bé-csinálások bövségessen magyar nyelven le-irattattanak ... Lippay János-áttal*. Original publication: Nagy-Szombat–Vienna: Acad Ny.; Cosmerovius Ny., 1664–1667. Reprint. Budapest: Pytheas.
- Lungu Badea, Georgiana. 2004. *Teoria culturemelor, teoria traducerii* [The theory of culturemes, the theory of translation]. Timișoara: Editura Universității de Vest.
2012. *Mic dicționar de termeni utilizați în teoria și practica traducerii* [Little dictionary of terms used in translation studies]. Timișoara: Editura Universității de Vest.
- Nagy, Imola Katalin. 2013a. Numele de plante. O abordare lingvistică [A linguistic approach to plant names]. *The Proceedings of the European Integration between Tradition and Modernity Congress* 5: 467–478. Târgu-Mureș: Editura Universității Petru Maior.
- 2013b. The usage and translation of plant names. In: Munteanu, Sonia–Bretan, Bianca. *Diversitate culturală și limbaje de specialitate*. Cluj: Casa Cărții de Știință. 119–129.
- 2013c. Aspects of horticultural terminology. In: Butiurca, Doina–Imre, Attila–Druta, Inga (eds.), *Specialized languages and conceptualization*. Saarbrücken: Lambert Academic Publishing. 189–203.
2014. English for horticulture. The professional and historical background of teaching horticultural terminology. In: Burada, Marinela–Tatu, Oana (eds.), *10th Conference on British and American Studies. Crossing boundaries. Approaches*

- to the contemporary multicultural discourse. Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing. 145–157.
2016. Handling old Transylvanian apple variety names in translation. *Acta Universitatis Sapientiae, Philologica* 8(3): 449–472.
- Nagy-Tóth, Ferenc. 1998. *Régi erdélyi almák* [Old Transylvanian apple varieties]. Cluj-Napoca: Erdélyi Múzeum-Egyesület Kiadó.
- Nedergaard-Larsen, Birgit. 1993. Culture-bound problems in subtitling. *Perspectives: Studies in Translatology* 1(2): 207–240.
- Newmark, Peter. 1988. *A textbook of translation*. Hertfordshire: Prentice Hall International.
- Oksaar, Els. 1988. *Kulturremtheorie. Ein Beitrag zur Sprachverwendungsforschung*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Rupprecht.
- Reiss, Katharina–Vermeer, Hans. 1984. *Grundlegung einer allgemeinen Translatonstheorie*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Shuttleworth, Mark–Cowie, Moira. 2007. *Dictionary of translation studies*. Manchester–New York: St. Jerome Publishing.
- Tellingier Dusán. 2005. *Az etnokulturémák szerepe a műfordításban* [The role of ethnoculturemes in literary translation]. www.matarka.hu/koz/.../ISSN_1219-543X_tomus_10_fas_3_2005_123-129.pdf (downloaded in: March 2018).
- Vlakhov, Sergei–Sider, Florin. 1970. *Neperevodimoye v perevode: realii* [The untranslatable in translation: Realia]. *Masterstvo perevoda* 1969 [The craft of translation 1969]. Moscow: Soveskii pisatel. 432–456.

Web sources

- <http://szabo.adatbank.transindex.ro/index.php?action=keres1> (downloaded on: 04.20.2019).
- https://adtplus.arcanum.hu/hu/view/MagyarTajszotar_2/?pg=11&layout=s (downloaded on: 04.20.2019).
- <http://www.nationalfruitcollection.org.uk/names.php>. (downloaded on: 04.10.2016).
- Döbrentei Kódex*. 1508. Downloaded from: <http://mek.oszk.hu/07500/07589/pdf/dobrentei2.pdf>. (downloaded on: 03.21.2016).
- Nagy-Tóth, Ferenc. *Népi gyümölcsészet és szakszerű gyümölcstermesztés Erdélyben*. eda.eme.ro/.../EME_MNTE2005_123-140_Nagy-Toth%20Ferenc%20... (downloaded on: 04.19.2016).