Challenges in Updating the Hungarian Terminology for Geographical Names Standardization[*]

ANDREA BÖLCSKEI

Károli Gáspár Református Egyetem

H-1088 Budapest, Reviczky u. 4.

bolcskei.andrea@kre.hu; bolcskeiandrea@hotmail.com

This paper outlines the reasons why and the conditions under which a team of Hungarian experts in terminology at Károli Gáspár University decided to edit the Hungarian version of the UNGEGN document entitled *Glossary of Terms for the Standardization of Geographical Names* and its *Addendum.* During the work, the experts had to eliminate several discrepancies between the existing and the required new Hungarian terminology for geographical names standardization. Whilst the traditional Hungarian toponomastic terminology consists primarily of terms of Hungarian origin, recent literature in Hungarian seems to give preference to internationally recognized terms. With respect to language theory, the principles of Cognitive Linguistics have become widely adopted also in the discipline of terminology, which influences the identification or the establishment of equivalent terms. In the modern Hungarian glossary, term gaps had to be filled in accordance with the dominant trends in today's term formation, and term changes also had to be treated appropriately. Definitions reflecting the latest results in distinct professional fields (e.g. linguistics, geography, cartography, computer science) had to be worded adequately, but in an easily intelligible way – a task requiring a vast amount of background knowledge even in the case of translation. Depending on the phenomenon described in the definition and the nature of the illustrative toponyms, examples had to be translated, explained, completed with or changed into relevant Hungarian name forms. Formally, the Hungarian glossary should be compatible with the UNGEGN lists; it also has to be easy to use on its own. All these factors, discussed in detail in the paper, were taken into consideration when the experts prepared the Hungarian version of the UNGEGN Glossary, with the aim of updating the Hungarian terminology for geographical names standardization.

Keywords: geographical names standardization, Hungarian, mother tongue, glossary, UNGEGN

Kihívások a földrajzi nevek egységesítése magyar nyelvű terminológiájának korszerűsítésében. A dolgozat áttekinti azokat az okokat és körülményeket, amelyek hozzájárultak ahhoz, hogy magyar szakemberek egy csoportja a Károli Gáspár Református Egyetemen az UNGEGN *Glossary of Terms for the Standardization of*

Geographical Names című szójegyzéke és a hozzá kapcsolódó *Addendum* magyar nyelvű változatának elkészítésére vállalkozott. A munka során a már meglévő és a modern irányzatok tükrében szükségesnek mutatkozó magyar nyelvű földrajzi névi egységesítési terminológia jó néhány ellentmondásának kiküszöbölésére sor került. Amíg a hagyományos magyar helynévtani terminológia főként magyar eredetű terminusokat használ, az újabb magyar nyelvű szakirodalom gyakran a nemzetközi hátterű terminusokat részesíti előnyben. A nyelvelméleti hátteret tekintve, a kognitív nyelvészet alapelveit a terminológiában is egyre szélesebb körben alkalmazzák, s ennek hatása a terminusekvivalenciák azonosításakor, kidolgozásakor is érzékelhető. A szójegyzék magyar változatának elkészítésekor a hiányzó magyar terminusokat a terminusalkotás ma jellemző tendenciái szerint kellett létrehozni, és a terminusok változását is megfelelően kellett kezelni. A definícióknak különböző szakterületek (pl. nyelvészet, földrajz, térképészet, informatika) legújabb eredményeit kell tükröznie, pontos, de könnyen érthető formában – ennek megvalósítása, fordítás esetén is, csak jelentős mennyiségű háttérismeret birtokában lehetséges. A definícióban foglalt jelenség és az azt szemléltető helynevek jellegének megfelelően egyes névpéldák esetében fordításra, máskor a névpéldák magyarázatára, kiegészítésére vagy megfelelő magyar névformákra cserélésére volt szükség. Formailag a magyar szójegyzéknek az UNGEGN jegyzékkel összeegyeztethetőnek kell lennie, de szükséges, hogy önmagában is könnyen használható legyen. A szakemberek ezeket a dolgozatban részletesen is kifejtett tényezőket vették figyelembe, amikor az UNGEGN szójegyzék magyar változatát azzal a céllal készítették el, hogy megújítsák a földrajzi nevek egységesítése magyar nyelvű terminológiáját.

Kulcsszavak: földrajzi névi egységesítés, magyar, anyanyelv, szójegyzék, UNGEGN

1. The importance of the use of the mother tongue in geographical names standardization

In our era, the consistent use of internationally standardized geographical names not only can ensure unambiguous communication and spatial orientation worldwide by, for instance, enabling the establishment and maintenance of global geographic information systems, but could also serve national administration, social and economic development, education as well as the preservation of linguistic and cultural values (UNGEGN Brochure, UNGEGN Media kit 2, 7, 8). The United Nations Group of Experts on Geographical Names (UNGEGN) states that it is the right and responsibility of each country to standardize its own geographical names, preferably in compliance with some well-defined, unified and internationally accepted principles; and to share this ever-increasing, constantly revised name stock with other human communities for common benefit (UNGEGN Media kit 7).

It is easy to see that the use of the mother tongue in the process of geographical names standardization is inevitable for at least two reasons. Firstly, if they are selected according to UNGEGN policies and guidelines, the standardized name forms, whether in the national

language or in a minority language of a country, necessarily reflect local language use (Manual 2006: 36). Secondly, in conformity with the endeavours of the Terminology Group of the International Council of Onomastic Sciences (ICOS), UNGEGN clearly promotes applying standardized terminology in place name matters; thus its Working Group on Toponymic Terminology edited a nomenclature in the six official languages of the UN (i.e. Arabic, Chinese, English, French, Russian and Spanish) entitled *Glossary of Terms for the Standardization of Geographical Names* in 2002 (hereafter: GTSGN) as well as a short *Addendum* for it (hereafter: AGTSGN) in 2007, and compiled them into a single publication (hereafter: GTSGNRev) (UNGEGN Brochure: 4; http://unstats.un.org/unsd/geoinfo/ungegn/wg3.html). The elaboration of the terminology for geographical names standardization in the mother tongue based on these publications, by establishing a common, internationally-based and topic-related understanding of the relevant terms among national professionals in different relevant fields, definitely helps collaboration and may lead to a generally satisfying effectuation of place names standardization processes in a country.

The importance of the use of the mother tongue in terminology is strongly emphasized by current trends in the theory of terminology policy as well: "An ever-increasing body of empirical evidence indicates that there is a critical relationship between individuals' opportunity to use their mother tongue in a full range of cultural, scientific and commercial areas, and the socio-economic well-being of their respective language communities […] a language that lags behind in its terminology for a given domain risks losing the ability to communicate in that subject in its language over time" (GTP 2005: v–vi).

2. The project aimed at preparing the Hungarian version of the revised UNGEGN Glossary

The above considerations motivated our decision to prepare the Hungarian version of the revised UNGEGN Glossary at the Department of Hungarian Linguistics of Károli Gáspár University of the Reformed Church in Hungary in a project led by the present author and involving the contributions of several experts as well as the assistance of students majoring in terminology.

The draft of the Hungarian version was edited in the spring term of the year of 2013 by first-year students of terminology in team work under my supervision.[1] I considered the translation[2] of a terminological glossary currently in use as an appropriate practice for my

students, because it would give them the opportunity to get insight into and find out more about several important technical problems, e.g. what sort of activities could be assisted by terminological standardization and how; what content elements and methods are needed to edit a terminological glossary with a coherent theoretical background (cf. Bölcskei 2012b); what the criteria are for terms included in a glossary; how to grasp and form the interconnections among the terms and definitions within the glossary; what the recent expectations are in identifying term meanings, formulating definitions and selecting illustrative examples; what the basic formal features of a user-friendly terminological glossary are. Preparing the Hungarian version of the glossary also provided the students with some translation practice, during which they could recognize the difficulties in identifying or establishing the Hungarian equivalents of English terms and the possible ways of getting the necessary background information if terms outside the scope of Linguistics were treated. More generally, the challenges of teamwork could also be experienced. In the project, all things considered, the students were able to obtain theoretical knowledge and professional skills that can be exploited later in their work as terminologists. In addition, by way of realizing the importance of the use of standardized names and onomastic terms, they could become aware of an aspect of Onomastics that is crucial in terminological work.

To get support from representatives of different fields of knowledge and professions, the Department of Hungarian Linguistics as well as the Research Group on Terminology of Károli Gáspár University, the Institute of Hungarian Language of Eötvös Loránd University and the Society of Hungarian Linguistics – at the succeeding session of the recently launched annual programme examining the relations of Onomastics and Terminology – organized a workshop entitled *Onomastics and Standardization* on 11th of June, 2013. At this event, apart from addressing some current issues of geographical names standardization in Hungary and abroad, we asked for volunteers to revise the draft version of the Hungarian glossary, paying special attention to those aspects connected to their fields of expertise. This is how the team of our proofreaders was formed, involving the following participants: Eszter B. Papp (Language Experts Group; terminologist), Mária Tóth (freelance translator, Spanish), Borbála Vitányi (independent researcher, onomastician, French), Mariann Slíz (Eötvös Loránd University; onomastician, Russian), Tibor Tiner (Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Research Centre for Astronomy and Earth Sciences, Geographical Institute; economist, geographer), Mátyás Márton (Eötvös Loránd University, Department of Cartography and Geoinformatics; cartographer), László Kovács (TEK Localizations; technical translator), Imre Perger (MÁV-START Zrt; economist), Ágota Fóris (Károli Gáspár University; terminologist), Tamás

Farkas (Eötvös Loránd University; onomatician), Ervin Földi (FNB Hungarian Committee on Geographical Names, former President), Béla Pokoly (FNB Hungarian Committee on Geographical Names, Senior Adviser). In the final version, corrections and improvements suggested by the proofreaders were incorporated by the present author. We expect the revised Hungarian version of the glossary to be published next year in a volume of studies on geographical names standardization as well as online on a specialized website specified later.

Our work to establish a modern Hungarian terminology for geographical names standardization was not without antecedents (cf. Bölcskei 2012a). A previous list of 111 relevant Hungarian terms, based on a former version (i.e. Lewis ed. 1984; for its description see Kerfoot 2000: 205, Raper 2000: 194) of the currently accepted UNGEGN Glossary, was compiled by Ervin Földi more than twenty years ago. His glossary, accompanied by a paper presenting geographical names standardization processes coordinated by the UN, was published in *Névtani Értesítő* in the last decade of the 1990s (Földi 1992a, 1992b). At the beginning of the 2000s, as we have seen above, the new international glossary of almost 400 terms was edited and published by UNGEGN; and, owing primarily to modern technology, conditions in language use have recently been changed as well. Thus, during the work we had to eliminate several discrepancies between the existing and necessary Hungarian terminology for geographical names standardization.

Several aspects of the structure of the glossary compiled by Ervin Földi necessarily reflect an earlier phase of terminological development: e.g. it is often only the elements of the compound terms that are defined (e.g. 41[3] *conventional,* 47 *official,* 67 *non-official;* Földi 1992b); there are no references to other relevant headwords in the entries; thus, the inherent connections among the terms and definitions are not indicated within the text. These features had to be improved in the present Hungarian version. In some cases, at the same time, we preferred terms worked out by Földi over other possible Hungarian terms in use for cultural reasons (e.g. English *names authority* = Hungarian *névtestület* 'names body', and not *névhatóság* 'names authority'[4]). Földi rendered the English term *toponym* as *helynév* ('place name') as a headword, but seemingly he preferred to use the expression *földrajzi név* ('geographical name') in the definitions. We eliminated this duality by using the former term more consistently in our glossary, because today's Hungarian onomastic literature seems to apply this term more frequently (Hoffmann 2012: 128–130). We retained, however, the valid remarks by Földi on imperfect term correspondences, e.g. only one of the two possible meanings of the English term *alphabetic sequence* is carried by its best Hungarian equivalent *betűrend* (cf. Földi 1992b: entry 27 and HGTSGN: entry 014).

Some definitions could be kept (almost) entirely as worded by Földi, since the relevant entries of the international glossary have not been changed either (e.g. 106 *gazetteer, index*). In other cases, Földi's definitions could only be used partially, because the entries of the UNGEGN Glossary were slightly modified, either as a result of technological advances (e.g. 101 *format:* only the qualities of written, but not printed documents are mentioned in Földi's relevant definition; 1992b: entry 32), or as a result of changes in approach (e.g. 151 *language, national:* the representation of speakers' identity does not constitute a part of the former definition; cf. Földi 1992b: entry 86). Most definitions in the recent international glossary, however, were significantly rewritten in comparison with those of the 1984 list; thus Földi's entries often had to be completely reworded. Definitions in the currently used glossary usually display more precise and up-to-date professional knowledge than the earlier ones (a 066 *dialect* is described in GTSGNRev as a regional and social language variety with complex features, whilst the former definition emphasized only the phonological and/or morphological peculiarities, cf. Földi 1992b: entry 87). Certain terminological distinctions, considered important enough formerly, happened to disappear in GTSGNRev, e.g. the 1984 term list differentiated between *hydrographic* and *hydrological features,* based on whether seas and oceans, or inland waters were understood (cf. Földi 1992b: entries 8, 11); GTSGNRev, on the other hand, recognizes only the term 090 *hydrographic feature* to refer to any and all waters.

3. Terminological problems

Whilst preparing the Hungarian version of the glossary, the most significant terminological problems arose in relation to terms, definitions, illustrative examples, background knowledge and formal requirements.

3.1 Terms

Regarding terms, the question whether terms of Hungarian and/or of foreign origin should be given preference in the Hungarian glossary had to be decided upon; English (sometimes another relevant language) and Hungarian term equivalents had to be identified or established; (supposed) terms gaps needed to be recognized and eliminated; and recent term changes in the English language were expected to be reflected in Hungarian as well.

3.1.1 Terms of Hungarian and/or of foreign origin?

At the beginning of our work, we had to decide whether in the Hungarian version of the glossary we wanted to give preference to terms of Hungarian or of foreign origin to indicate concepts connected to geographical names standardization. To effect a sort of reconciliation between the seemingly contradictory requirements of international intelligibility and Hungarian flavour, we decided to use both the appropriate terms of Hungarian origin and, in parentheses after equals signs, the corresponding internationally recognized terms (i.e. of foreign origin) (occasionally in reverse order) as headwords. We chose this solution because, although the traditional Hungarian toponomastic terminology consists primarily of terms of Hungarian origin (cf. Farkas 2012), recent onomastic literature in Hungarian seems to prefer internationally recognized terms (cf. Szabómihály 2007, 2008, 2009, 2013: *standardizáció* 'standardization'; Termini website: *újrastandardizálás* 're-standardization'). Our decision to adopt both term varieties was strengthened by the realization that in some cases the terms of Hungarian origin alone could not operate appropriately in the glossary, either because of the lack of accuracy in meaning (e.g. 077 *endonym, standardized = endonima, egységesített [= standardizált]*), or because of clumsiness in form (e.g. 277 *retranscription = retranszkripció [= kiejtés szerinti átírás visszaalakítása]*).

We made an effort to display the duality of internationally recognized terms and those of Hungarian origin also in the case of the translation of English terms ending in *-onym* (here: 'name'), e.g. 005 *allonym = névváltozat [= allonima],* 017 *anthroponym = személynév [= antroponima],* 132 *hydronym = víznév [= hidronima],* 247 *odonym = útnév [= odonima],* 250 *oronym = hegynév, domborzati név [= oronima].* We did so partly because the relevant Hungarian ending *-onima* has for long been used in a similar sense in the terminology of Hungarian semantics (e.g. *homonima* 'homonym', *szinonima* 'synonym'), and partly because in this way we could emphasize that the terms in question constitute a term group. We avoided adopting the term of foreign origin if, in comparison with the corresponding inherently Hungarian term, it is basically out of use in Hungarian onomastic literature, e.g. the Hungarian equivalent of the English term 028 *choronym* is simply *tájnév.* We used only the internationally recognized term as a headword if a corresponding term of Hungarian origin has failed to appear in Hungarian professional language until now, e.g. 076 *endonima* 'endonym', 081 *exonima* 'exonym'.

In the glossary, we tended to indicate the actual Hungarian equivalents of the internationally recognized linguistic terms that have long been established in Hungarian linguistic terminology in order to inform non-linguist experts involved in geographical names

standardization, e.g. 064 *diacritic = mellékjel (= diakritikus jel)*, 070 *diglossia = kettősnyelvűség (= diglosszia)*, 073 *diphthong = kettőshangzó (= diftongus)*. When developing Hungarian terms, sometimes we adopted partial translation, e.g. for the English term 118 *geographic information system* we considered the expression *geoinformációs rendszer* to be a better Hungarian equivalent than the word by word translation *földrajzi információs rendszer,* because the former expression can more easily be connected to the relevant English abbreviation *GIS,* appearing more and more frequently these days also in Hungarian.

3.1.2 Identifying or establishing English–Hungarian term equivalents

It is a well-known fact that languages lexically divide reality up in different ways, thus terms in distinct languages are not necessarily the exact equivalents of each other either (Klaudy 1997[3]: 117; Fóris–Sermann 2010: 48). In the glossary, we could identify cases in which a single English term, according to its different interpretations, has two Hungarian equivalents, e.g. 344 *toponymy*[5] = (a) *helynévtan, helynévkutatás (= toponomasztika)* and (b) *helynévállomány* (on such occasions, we added a remark in the Hungarian glossary as an explanation, e.g. in the English language, the term *toponymy* is used in both senses); 001 *acronym = mozaikszó (= akronima)* (it is to be noted, however, that when actual examples are treated it can always be determined what the appropriate Hungarian term is, e.g. 263 *pixel [= képpont]* [an "[a]cronym for 'picture element'"] is considered to be a *szóösszevonás,* and 358 *UNGEGN* [an "[a]cronym for United Nations Group of Experts on Geographical Names"] is classified as a *betűszó* in Hungarian linguistic traditions.[6]

In other cases, two – formally (at least partially) distinct, but synonymous – English terms have a single Hungarian equivalent, e.g. 269 *proper name* and 270 *proper noun = tulajdonnév;* 032 *composite name* and 033 *compound name = összetett név;* 185 *man-made feature* and 048 *cultural feature = mesterséges alakulat;* 265 *place name index* and 343 *toponymic index = földrajzinév-mutató.* Sometimes the original lexical variability could be reflected by adopting two, (partially) different Hungarian terms, e.g. 173 *linguistic area = nyelvterület* and 175 *linguistic region = nyelvi régió.* It was also necessary in some occasions to take over comments on harmonization of terms from the English version of the glossary, e.g. regarding the English term 079 *eponym,* especially when a "group of persons after or for whom a place is named" is concerned, "[t]he corresponding term in French is ethnonym".

English and Hungarian corresponding terms used in the specialized literature might reflect considerably different approaches. This difference, which is sometimes hardly

understandable for non-experts, however, can not be disregarded when term equivalents are identified. For instance, context in literature clarifies that the Hungarian equivalent of the English term 110 *generic element* is the expression *földrajzi köznévi elem,* and that of 112 *generic term* is *földrajzi köznév.* The conventionally adopted English and Hungarian terms in these cases carry little similarity to each other in form.

We were also able to find in the glossary so-called "false friend" terms, e.g. 003 *allograph = allográf (= íráselem-változat, betűváltozat* 'type font'*),* and not *más által írott* 'written by someone else' (cf. *allográf végrendelet* 'self-proved will'); 005 *allonym = névváltozat* 'name variety' *(= allonima),* and not *álnév* 'pseudonym'; 368 *vocalization = magánhangzó-jelölés* 'indication of vowels in defective alphabetic scripts', and not *vokalizáció* 'change of a consonant into a vowel'. The specified meaning of the latter term is involved in case of related terms, too, e.g. 242 *non-vocalized = a magánhangzó nem jelölt;* 359 *unvocalized = a magánhangzó nem jelölt.* In identifying or establishing the appropriate Hungarian term, definitions did help a lot, e.g. the right Hungarian term for 093 *feature, physical* is *alakulat, természeti* and for 092 *feature, natural* is *alakulat, természetes,* based on the phenomena described in their definitions (a topographic feature "that can be observed visually" and one that is "not made or significantly modified by man", respectively).

In formulating the Hungarian version of the glossary, we intended to interpret term groups in the best possible way, e.g. the Hungarian equivalent of the English term 139 *indigenous language* finally became *őshonos nyelv* instead of the potential *eredeti nyelv,* because the term 140 *indigenous name* could best be given back as *őshonos név,* and not as *eredeti név,* since the latter term primarily has a different meaning: 'a name that has not been changed'. Basically, we used the ending *-gráf* in the sense of 'letter' (*betű* in Hungarian; see the terms below) and the ending *-gram ~ -gramma* in the sense of 'sign' (*jel* in Hungarian) as second elements of compound terms,[7] e.g. 003 *allograph = allográf (= íráselem-változat, betűváltozat*); 072 *digraph = digráf (= kétjegyű betű,* but cf. e.g. SZTAKI English–Hungarian online dictionary: *digraph = digramma*); 331 *tetragraph = tetragráf (= négyjegyű betű*); 257 *phonogram = fonogramma (= hangjel*); 134 *ideogram = ideogramma (= képírásjel*); 179 *logogram = logogram (= szójel*); 326 *syllabogram = szillabogram (= szótagjel*). *Script* in most cases means '(a type of) writing' (*írás* in Hungarian), e.g. 013 *alphabetic script = betűírás;* 039 *consonant script = mássalhangzó-jelölő írás;* 061 *defective alphabetic script = hiányos betűírás;* 075 *donor script = átadó írás;* 135 *ideographic script = ideogrammatikus írás (= fogalomírás, képírás);* 182 *logographic script = szójelölő írás;* 274 *receiver script = átvevő írás;* 306 *source script = forrásnyelvi írás;* 323 *syllabic script = szótagírás;* 330 *target*

script = célnyelvi írás; 283 *script = írás;* though sometimes it has a slightly different meaning, e.g. 022 *biscriptual = két írásrendszerű;* 208 *multiscriptual map = több írásrendszerű térkép* (*írásrendszer* precisely means 'writing system'); 189 *map script = térképi írás;* or other expressions might also convey the meaning 'writing' in certain terms, e.g. 165 *lettering, multilingual = írás, többnyelvű;* 186 *map lettering = térképi névírás.*

Whenever the Hungarian term appears in different forms in use, we decided on the form to be adopted in the glossary on a frequency basis, e.g. the expression *vektoros mód* gives more Google hits on Hungarian web pages than *vektor mód* (for 364 *vector mode*). Mostly, it was difficult to render the English terms of noun + noun structure in Hungarian, because distinct grammatical and semantic relations could be found behind these expressions. In such cases, it proved practical to develop, in the light of the definitions, Hungarian terms that are more explicit than the English ones, e.g. 372 *vowel marker = magánhangzó-jelölő kiegészítő írásjegy;* 015 *alphabetic sequence rules = betűrendet meghatározó szabályok;* 342 *toponymic guidelines = földrajzinév-egységesítési irányelvek.*

3.1.3 Elimination of term gaps

Whenever we believed we had discovered a term gap in Hungarian, we tried to eliminate it. Term gaps might be the results of cultural, attitudinal differences or distinct practices in name use. For instance, in the United States the frequent use of full and abbreviated name forms (cf. *Los Angeles* vs. *L.A.*) has understandably necessitated the development of appropriate terms for such forms. This practice, however, is not so deeply-rooted in Hungarian, which is the reason why we do not have conventional terms for such name forms. We eliminated the term gaps here simply by translating the English terms into Hungarian, e.g. 104 *full title = teljes megnevezés;* 299 *short form (of a name) = rövid névforma.* Besides, barely known Hungarian terms used in connection with geographical names standardization might also become more widespread, at least among professionals, as a result of being glossed, e.g. 277 *retranscription = retranszkripció (= kiejtés szerinti átírás visszaalakítása),* 278 *retransliteration = retranszliteráció (= betű szerinti átírás visszaalakítása).*

3.1.4 Recent term changes

Ervin Földi also included the English terms in parentheses after the Hungarian equivalents in his Hungarian glossary (Földi 1992b). By comparing these English terms with the ones

appearing in the present UNGEGN list, we were able to point out some cases of term changes (cf. Slíz 2012: 151–154). If the earlier English term used to identify a certain phenomenon happened to be different from the one used in the currently accepted glossary, we had to change the Hungarian term as well, e.g. 53 *írásjegy, rövidített (character, abbreviated)* (Földi 1992b) and 025 *írásjegy (= karakter), egyszerűsített (character, simplified)* (GTSGNRev). In other cases, although the English term has not changed its form, it was used in a somewhat different sense in the past, which explains why we had to adopt a different Hungarian term. For instance, in the 1992 list the term 104 *típusmegjelölés (designation)* referred to an expression indicating the place of a feature in comparison with other elements of the class to which it belongs (cf. Földi 1992b), whilst today's definition says: 063 *megjelölés (designation)* = 062 *leíró kifejezés (descriptive term)* is "[a] word (usually a common noun, an adjective or a phrase), e.g. printed in a map, that designates a →**topographic feature** by its properties, but that does not constitute a →**toponym**" (GTSGNRev).

3.2 Definitions

With respect to definitions, we intended to maintain their logical connections as well as to connect the references to their theoretical background.

3.2.1 Definitions belonging together logically

In a glossary, not only the terms, but also the definitions must be examined in their interdependence. In the UNGEGN Glossary, we often find parallel texts to define phenomena properly belonging together (e.g. a 091 *feature, man-made* is a "→**[t]opographic** feature made, or significantly modified, by man" and a 092 *feature, natural* is a "→**[t]opographic** feature not made or significantly modified by man"), which we had to reflect in the translation. In some cases, even the differences between related things are best comprehended if the relevant definitions are compared (e.g. a 187 *map, multilingual* is a "[m]ap that, for a particular topographic feature, shows →**allonyms** in different →**languages,** not necessarily →**standardized**" and a 188 *map, multiscriptual* is a "[m]ap that presents →**toponyms** in two [biscriptual] or more different types of →**script** or →**writing systems**"); the easy comparability of the definitions had to be kept in the Hungarian version as well. Sometimes the explanation of a remark that is hard to understand without previous background knowledge is to be found in a separate definition. For instance, the definition of 294 *script,*

syllabic, among other things, says that "Korean, though alphabetic, is graphically and visually syllabic", which gets its explanation in entry 284, in which the term *script, alphabetic* is defined and exemplified as "[i]n (alphabetic) Korean, letters are graphically organized in roughly square syllabic units".

3.2.2 Theoretical background behind the definitions

In comparison with definitions adopted in Hungarian linguistic traditions, certain definitions of the UNGEGN Glossary are more general, e.g. a 201 *morpheme* is defined as "the smallest functioning unit in the composition of words" (cf. the definition from the most widely used university textbook on Hungarian descriptive grammar: "a morpheme is a minimal linguistic unit which possesses a distinct form as well as a meaning connected to it, and which can not be further divided into similar smaller units displaying definite forms and meanings";[8] Laczkó 2000: 38). In other cases, it is the UNGEGN definition that is more elaborated, e.g. a 370 *vowel* is a speech sound "in the articulation of which the breath channel is not blocked and not restricted so as to cause friction" (cf. the relevant definition from a well-known university textbook on Phonetics: "in the articulation of vowels, there is no obstacle in the oral cavity";[9] Gósy 2004: 57).

3.3 Illustrative examples

The editors of the UNGEGN Glossary made a conscious effort in definitions to use illustrative place names in a manner respecting linguistic diversity; thus, not only names for European places and name forms written in Roman letters are given as examples in the entries. To maintain this principle, according to the role and characteristics of the toponyms originally included in the text, we adopted different techniques in selecting Hungarian name forms.

In certain cases we had to keep the toponyms in the forms in which they were given in the English text, even if the names have conventional Hungarian equivalents, because only these forms of the names can exemplify the phenomena described in the given entries, e.g. 228 *name, standardized:* "*Example:* Kaapstad and Cape Town (but not Capetown)", likewise *Fokváros,* the Hungarian version of the same name, is not standardized either. To illustrate other definitions, apart from the name forms in their original languages, we also gave the corresponding Hungarian name forms in parentheses, e.g. 183 *long form (of a name) = teljes*

névforma: "Al-Mamlakah al-Hāshimīyah al-Urdunīyah (Jordán Hásimita Királyság); Zhonghua Renmin Gongheguo (Kínai Népköztársaság)". The duality of full and short forms of country names (i.e. the ones that include and the ones that lack a reference to the form of government, respectively) can also be observed with respect to several Hungarian country names (cf. Gercsák 2008). Sometimes, beside the internationally accepted standardized English name forms, to help identification it is reasonable to indicate in brackets the Hungarian exonyms as well, e.g. 352 *transliteration = transzliteráció (= betű szerinti átírás):* "Владивосток → Vladivostok [Vlagyivosztok]; Αθήνα → Athína [Athén]".

There were definitions in the glossary in the case of which it proved to be useful to comment on the illustrative name forms [here these comments are indicated in brackets], e.g. A240 *nominative form (of a toponym) = helynév (= toponima) alanyesete:* "*Examples*: in German, Berlin (and not Berlins, of Berlin, genitive case); in Hungarian, Budapest (and not, for example, Budapestre, to Budapest [a sublative form])".

In some special cases, the list of examples could be improved by adding a relevant Hungarian name form or another expression to illustrate the phenomenon under discussion, e.g. with respect to term 081 *exonym = exonima* the section "*Examples:* Warsaw is the English exonym for Warszawa (Polish); Mailand is German for Milano; Londres is French for London; Kūlūniyā is Arabic for Köln" is completed with "Bécs is Hungarian for Wien" in the Hungarian glossary; in case of the term 112 *generic term = földrajzi köznév* the examples "mountain, sierra, san, shan, dagh, jabal, har, river, wadi, gang" are completed with Hungarian expressions „patak, domb"; in the definition of the term 130 *homonym = homonima* the examples "Monaco (Principauté de) and Monaco (di Baviera), the Italian →**exonym** for München" are completed with the Hungarian examples *Sárospatak* (a Hungarian town) and *Sárospatak* (a village in Transylvania); and *Medina* (a city in Saudi Arabia) and *Medina* (a village in Tolna county, Hungary). Exceptionally, we had to change the example found in the English text into a completely different Hungarian one to be able to illustrate the feature explained in the definition, e.g. in the English version, the term 201 *morpheme* is exemplified as follows: " "names" consists of the free morpheme "name" and the bound plural morpheme "s" " – with the help of the word *nevek,* the Hungarian translation for *names,* however, the difference between a free and a bound morpheme can not be illustrated, thus we used as an example the more appropriate Hungarian geographical common noun *dűlők* 'fields', consisting of the free morpheme *dűlő* and the bound plural morpheme *-k.*

3.4 Background knowledge

Whilst preparing the Hungarian version of the glossary, having access to background information connected to Linguistics, as well as certain natural (primarily geographic and cartographic) and computational sciences, played an important role in the identification of the appropriate terms and in the formulation of the definitions.

3.4.1 Linguistics

As the UNGEGN Glossary has reached its present form over a longer period of time, it is not surprising that different linguistic approaches have left their mark on it. Where it was relevant or possible, we tried to indicate these features in our translation as well. Wording characteristic of Generative Grammar can be observed in the following definition: 121 *grammar:* „The field of study dealing with the formal features of a →**language** and the rules that govern their combination, reference and interpretation". A Cognitive Linguistic approach could be discovered in the definition of the term 308 *speech:* „An oral manifestation of →**language**".

Within Linguistics, the latest results of Onomastics are also included in the definitions. The 2002 GTSGN list defines the term 028 *choronym* in the following way: "→**Toponym** applied to an areal feature". This definition is modified in the 2007 AGTSGN list as "Name of a large geographical or administrative unit of land", which bears a strong resemblance to the definition that can be found in the ICOS terminology list („*choronym* – proper name of a larger geographical or administrative unit of land", ICOS TL; cf. also Harvalík–Caffarelli ed. 2007).

Regarding Terminology, the UNGEGN Glossary clearly intends to put a complex terminological principle (cf. Budin 2001: 14–17) into practice and solve the terminological problems of professional communication regardless of geographical and linguistic boundaries by providing a theoretical framework that can be shared by experts of different nationalities and that can easily be developed further by them according to the requirements of their special demands and distinct mother tongues. Thus, terminological units are described with respect to their cognitive, linguistic and socio-communicative functions in the glossary (cf. Cabré Castellví 2003: 183) – a practice we found important to follow also in the Hungarian version.

3.4.2 Natural and computational sciences

In preparing the Hungarian version of the glossary, the greatest difficulty presented itself for us in acquiring and applying the terminology as well as certain elements of background knowledge connected to natural and computational sciences. Though certain terms of Geography and Computer Technology might have been familiar to us from the compulsory secondary school curriculum (e.g. "perennial, seasonal [for streams]" among the examples for the term 062 *descriptive term;* the equivalence between English 053 *data dictionary* and Hungarian *adatkönyvtár*), in other cases the lack of extensive professional knowledge could have a negative influence on the success of translation (e.g. in finding the Hungarian equivalents of "central processing unit, CPU" and "tape consoles" in the definition of the term 127 *hardware*). Sometimes the lack of factual knowledge made translation difficult, e.g. among the examples for the term A340 *toponym, underground* there is the expression "level-10 mine tunnel", whose Hungarian equivalent, "10-es szinti bányavágat" was provided by one of our proofreaders.

3.5 Formal requirements

The formal features of the Hungarian glossary are adapted to those of the UNGEGN Glossary: to maintain the GTSGNRev order of the terms, we followed the practice of the glossaries in foreign languages published in the UNGEGN volume and, in case of each entry, we gave the number of the English term and the term itself first, followed by its Hungarian equivalent as well as the relevant Hungarian definition. Retrieval of the Hungarian terms is guaranteed by the alphabetic Hungarian–English index at the end of the Hungarian glossary. To enhance user-friendliness, terms from GTSGN and terms from AGTSGN are merged in the Hungarian version.

Terms consisting of more than one constituent are included in the English glossary according to their first and second term-elements as well. We also tried to adopt this practice, even if, in the case of some Hungarian compound terms, it led to unusual headwords, e.g. 136 *index, names = mutató, név-;* 245 *noun, common = név, köz-; szó, köz-*. We also had to take into consideration the different traditions in lexicography in the two languages: e.g. English nouns in glossaries are usually preceded by their indefinite articles, whilst Hungarian nouns typically stand alone. Remarks from GTSGNRev referring to the use of English terms, as the terms themselves constitute parts of the Hungarian glossary, were incorporated into the Hungarian version, e.g. 321 *syllabic (as a noun) = szótag (főnév)* "Az angolban túlnyomóan a többes számú syllabics forma használatos [In English, mostly the plural form syllabics is

used]". It is also interesting to note that in the English glossary it is not the place-name examples or other linguistic expressions and terms in definitions that are printed in italics, but the words *See* and *Example(s),* which is somewhat unconventional in a work of linguistic relevance, so we adjusted the typeface to linguistic conventions.

4. Conclusion

In compiling the Hungarian version of the UNGEGN Glossary we hope that we have managed to contribute to the previous efforts by Ervin Földi to establish and update the terminology for geographical names standardization in Hungarian; to give practical assistance to experts currently working in different projects aiming at standardizing Hungarian majority and minority geographical names home and abroad; to help to protect the language rights of the Hungarian speaking professionals in the field in question; to emphatically connect, by way of terminological harmonization, the essentially identical tendencies that determine today's Hungarian and international geographical names standardization processes; and also to edit a glossary that can become a consistent, thematic unit in a general Hungarian onomastic terminological dictionary or database, which, it is hoped, will be realized in the near future (see Farkas 2013).

REFERENCES

AGTSGN 2007. = *Addendum for Glossary of Terms for the Standardization of Geographical Names.* http://unstats.un.org/unsd/geoinfo/UNGEGN/docs/pubs/glossary_add_e.pdf (accessed: 16.09.2013)

Bölcskei, A. 2012a. Helynevek standardizációja: alapelvek, terminológiai kérdések a nemzetközi és a magyar gyakorlatban [Geographical names standardization: principles, terminological questions in the international and Hungarian practice]. *Helynévtörténeti Tanulmányok [Studies on Place-Name History]* 7, 85–102.

Bölcskei, A. 2012b. A helynév-standardizáció terminológiájáról [On the terminology of geographical names standardization]. *Névtani Értesítő [Onomastic Review]* 34, 167–178.

Budin, G. 2001. A critical evaluation of the state-of-the-art of terminology theory. *ITTF Journal* 12 (1–2), 7–23.

Cabré Castellví, M. T. 2003. Theories of terminology. Their description, prescription and explanation. *Terminology* 9 (2), 163–199.

Farkas, T. 2012. Szempontok a magyar névtani terminológia megítéléséhez [On some characteristics and problems of Hungarian onomastic terminology]. *Névtani Értesítő [Onomastic Review]* 34, 139–148.

Farkas, T. 2013. Egy magyar névtani terminológiai szótár tervéről [Plan of a Hungarian onomastic terminological dictionary]. In: Tóth, Sz. (ed.) *Társadalmi változások – nyelvi változások. Alkalmazott nyelvészeti kutatások a Kárpát-medencében. A XXII. MANYE Kongresszus előadásai. Szeged, 2012. április 12–14. [Social changes – language changes. Research into Applied Linguistics in the Carpathian Basin. Proceedings of the 22nd MANYE Congress. Szeged, 12–14 April, 2012].* Budapest–Szeged: MANYE – Szegedi Egyetemi Kiadó Juhász Gyula Felsőoktatási Kiadó. 442–445.

FNB = *Földrajzinév-bizottság [Hungarian Committee on Geographical Names].* http://www.fvm.hu/main.php?folderID=2234 (accessed: 16.09.2013)

Fóris, Á. – Sermann, E. 2010. A terminológiai szabványosítás és a terminológiai harmonizáció [Terminology standardization and terminology harmonization]. *Magyar Terminológia [Journal of Hungarian Terminology]* 3 (1), 41–54.

Földi, E. 1992a. Az ENSZ földrajzinév-egységesítési tevékenysége [Geographical names standardization by the UN]. *Névtani Értesítő [Onomastic Review]* 14, 21–35.

Földi, E. (trans.) 1992b. Az ENSZ földrajzinév-egységesítési szakkifejezések szótára [UN Dictionary of Terms for the Standardization of Geographical Names]. *Névtani Értesítő [Onomastic Review]* 14, 127–138.

Gercsák, G. 2008. Magyar és angol országnevek a fordításban [Hungarian and English names for countries in translation]. *Fordítástudomány [Translation Studies]* 10 (1), 71–78.

Gósy, M. 2004. *Fonetika, a beszéd tudománya [Phonetics, the science of speech].* Budapest: Osiris Kiadó.

GTP 2005. = *Guidelines for Terminology Policies. Formulating and implementing terminology policy in language communities.* Prepared by Infoterm. Paris: United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0014/001407/140765e.pdf (accessed: 16.09.2013)

GTSGN 2002. = *Glossary of Terms for the Standardization of Geographical Names.* http://unstats.un.org/unsd/geoinfo/UNGEGN/docs/glossary.pdf (accessed: 16.09.2013)

GTSGNRev = *Glossary of Terms for the Standardization of Geographical Names (Revised).* http://unstats.un.org/unsd/geoinfo/UNGEGN/docs/pdf/Glossary_of_terms_revised.pdf (accessed: 25.10.2015)

Harvalík, M. – Caffarelli, E. ed. 2007. Onomastic terminology: an international survey / Terminologia onomastica: un'inchiesta internazionale. *Rivista Italiana di Onomastica* 13 (1), 181–220.

HGTSGN 2016. = The Hungarian version of the UNGEGN document entitled "Glossary of Terms for the Standardization of Geographical Names (Revised)" (forthcoming).

Hoffmann, I. 2012. Elmélet és terminológia a magyar helynévkutatásban [Theory and terminology in Hungarian Toponomastics]. *Névtani Értesítő [Onomastic Review]* 34, 127–137.

ICOS TL = *ICOS List of Key Onomastic Terms.* http://www.icosweb.net/index.php/terminology.html (accessed: 16.09.2013)

Kerfoot, H. 2000. Wien or Vienna; Kalaallit Nunaat, Grønland or Greenland? Recent work and directions in geographical names standardization through the United Nations. *Onoma* 35, 199–213.

Klaudy, K. 1997[3]. *A fordítás elmélete és gyakorlata. Angol, német, francia, orosz fordítástechnikai példatárral [Theory and practice of translation. English, German, French, Russian exercises on translation technology].* 3rd edition. Budapest: Scholastica Kiadó.

Laczkó, K. 2000. Az alaktan tárgya és alapkategóriái [The subject matter and basic categories of Morphology]. In: Keszler, B. (ed.) *Magyar grammatika [Hungarian Grammar]*. Budapest: Nemzeti Tankönyvkiadó. 37–50.

Lewis, H. A. G. (ed.) 1984. *Glossary No. 330: Technical Terminology Employed in the Standardization of Geographical Names*. UNGEGN document.

Manual 2006. = *Manual for the National Standardization of Geographical Names*. New York: United Nations. http://unstats.un.org/unsd/publication/seriesm/seriesm_88e.pdf (accessed: 16.09.2013)

Raper, P. E. 2000. Introduction to Standardization of Geographical Names. *Onoma* 35, 187–198.

Slíz, M. 2012. Terminusok keletkezése és változása [Appearance and changes of terms]. *Névtani Értesítő [Onomastic Review]* 34, 149–156.

Szabómihály, G. 2007. Magyar neve? Szlovákiai magyar helységnevek standardizációs problémái [Standardization of Hungarian settlement names in Slovakia]. *Névtani Értesítő [Onomastic Review]* 29, 189–200.

Szabómihály, G. 2008. A határon túli névhasználat és a nyelvi tervezés [Name use and language planning in Hungarian spoken outside Hungary]. In: Bölcskei, A. – N. Császi, I. (eds.) *Név és valóság. A VI. Magyar Névtudományi Konferencia előadásai [Name and Reality. Proceedings of the 6th Hungarian Conference of Onomastics]*. Budapest: Károli Gáspár Református Egyetem Magyar Nyelvtudományi Tanszéke. 41–52.

Szabómihály, G. 2009. A határon túli magyar helynevek standardizációs kérdései [Questions of standardization of Hungarian settlement names outside the present boundaries of Hungary]. *Korunk [Our Era]*. http://www.korunk.org/?q=node/8&ev=2009&honap=5&cikk=10583 (accessed: 16.09.2013)

Szabómihály, G. 2013. A szlovákiai magyar helységnevek standardizálásakor alkalmazott elvek [Principles adopted in the standardization of Hungarian settlement names in Slovakia]. In: Bauko, J. – Benyovszky, K. (eds.) *A tulajdonnevek a fordítás és a kétnyelvűség kontextusában [Proper Names in the Context of Translation and Bilingualism]*. Nyitra: Konstantin Filozófus Egyetem Közép-európai Tanulmányok Kara. 54–67.

SZTAKI Angol–magyar szótár [SZTAKI English–Hungarian dictionary]. http://szotar.sztaki.hu/angol-magyar-szotar (accessed: 16.09.2013)

Termini website = A Kárpát-medencei magyar helynévanyag újrastandardizálása [Re-standardization of Hungarian geographical names in the Carpathian Basin]. *Termini Kutatóhálózat [Termini Hungarian Language Research Network]*. http://ht.nytud.hu/index.php?option=com_content&task=blogcategory&id=16&Itemid=50 (accessed: 08.09.2013)

Tolcsvai Nagy, G. 2007. *Idegen szavak szótára [Dictionary of foreign words]*. Budapest: Osiris Kiadó.

UNGEGN Brochure. http://unstats.un.org/unsd/geoinfo/UNGEGN/docs/pubs/ UNGEGNbrochure_en.pdf (accessed: 08.09.2013)

UNGEGN Media kit. http://unstats.un.org/unsd/geoinfo/UNGEGN/mediakit.html (accessed: 08.09.2013)

UNGENG = *United Nations Group of Experts on Geographical Names*. http://unstats.un.org/unsd/geoinfo/UNGEGN/default.html (accessed: 08.09.2013)

¹ Participants by name at this stage of the work were Dóra Miklódy, Ágnes Horváth, Ilona Erzsébet Nagy, Zsófia Szonja Sajermann and Julianna Varga.

² We used the English version of the UNGEGN Glossary and the Addendum as texts for the translation.

³ Numbers in front of the terms indicate entry numbers in the relevant glossaries.

⁴ In Hungary, standardization customarily is carried out by different "bodies", cf. *Magyar Szabványügyi Testület* (Hungarian Standards Institution).

⁵ For its different interpretations cf. its definition in GTSGNRev (entry 344): "(a) The science that has as its object the study of →**toponyms** in general and of →**geographical names** in particular. (b) The totality of →**toponyms** in a given region".

⁶ Direct quotations in this section, if not otherwise indicated, are taken from the relevant entries (see the numbers in front of the terms) of GTSGNRev.

⁷ In Hungarian, *-gráf* (as a second element) conventionally means 'writing' and *-gram ~ -gramma* (as a second element) means 'figure' (Tolcsvai Nagy 2007: 401).

⁸ The author's translation.

⁹ The author's translation.