The Hungarian Versions of
Two International Onomastic Terminological Glossaries

1. Two international onomastic terminological glossaries. The two international glossaries of onomastic terminology published in the present volume were compiled by the Working Groups on Terminology of two international scientific committees of onomastics, aimed for different purposes. Experts at the International Council of Onomastic Sciences (ICOS) have collected the key terms of the discipline of onomastics, used primarily in professional communication, provided their definitions, together with general notes on onomastic terminology, and references from the specialised literature. Consultants at the United Nations Group of Experts on Geographical Names (UNGEGN) have prepared the list of linguistic, geographical, cartographical, documentary and information technological terms adopted in the standardization of geographical names, for specialists taking part in the practice of geographical names standardization. A brief description of the two international onomastic terminological glossaries, concerning the circumstances of their creation, their distinct aims and purposes, as well as their unique features as term lists is given below. A short introduction regarding the principles and methods of compilation characteristic of the Hungarian versions is also provided.

2. Main ambitions at ICOS. The International Council of Onomastic Sciences1 was founded in 1949, its current Statutes adopted in 2002 defines its aims as follows: “the advancement, representation, and co-ordination of onomastic sciences on an international level and in an interdisciplinary context, and the promotion of World Congresses at reasonable intervals” (ICOS Statutes Article 3). The successful operation of the Council has continuously been facilitated by the activities of its two standing working groups, the ICOS Bibliography Group and the ICOS Terminology Group (Icosweb, FARKAS 2015: 23–24, 26–27, 28, 31).

The establishment of the Terminology Group was proposed by Milan Harvalík (Czech Republic), the current president of ICOS at the 2002 ICOS Congress in Uppsala, Sweden. The working group began work in 2004, and published two smaller glossaries of terms in 2011 on the Terminology subpage of Icosweb (cf. HARVALÍK 2005, 2014). One of the glossaries lists and defines a few onomastic terms mostly used by the professional community in English; furthermore, it provides general comments on the linguistic features of onomastic terms (Icosweb Terminology). The other glossary presents and

explains 70 basic onomastic terms in English, French and German (List of Key Onomastic Terms, see Icosweb Terminology).²

2.1. The List of Key Onomastic Terms. The glossary containing 70 basic onomastic terms was first compiled by the members of the ICOS Terminology Group in English. The glossary gives illustrative examples for most terms, as well as term forms, and definitions. Notes and suggestions on meaning (e.g. anthroponymy, hagionym, oronym), forms (e.g. metronym), and use (e.g. first name, odonym) are also connected to certain terms; in some cases the term’s status as a proper name (e.g. ethnonym, inhabitant name) is also indicated. In other cases, the editors inform readers about the sub-, super- or coordination of terms (hyponyms, hyperonyms, co-hyponyms; consider, for instance, the relations between a nickname and a by-name, a street name and a kodonym, a choronym and a macrotoponym); while cross-references help identify synonymous terms and term variations (see, for example, the headwords animal name and zoonym, minor name and microtoponym, name bearer and denominatum).

The French and German variations of the glossary were prepared based on the English term list, each adopting slightly different approaches. The French glossary, promoting terms in the national language, is a proper translation of the English term list; the German version, however, first provides the term in the national language, then its English equivalent, followed by the definition and, if applicable, a remark on term use and relations in German. The German version includes several additional language specific notes in comparison to the original English text (see, for instance, the notes on Anthroponym, Appellativierung, Beiname, Mikrotoponym). The German version also contains a few cross-references, involving mostly terms of German origin as headwords, next to which English equivalents can not be found, because these latter terms are included in the main entries of the referenced, synonymous terms, together with the target definitions (see, for example, the German terms Deckname, Gewässername, Kosenname, Riedname).

The editors of both the French and the German versions faced many difficulties characteristic of interlingual terminological work: from time to time choices had to be made regarding whether a term of an international background or a term of national language origin should be used as a headword of the main entry; occasionally, the lack of terms as well as the existence of surplus terms caused problems. In the German version the above mentioned cross-reference terms of German origin are explained in main entries introduced by synonymous international terms as headwords (Kryptonym, Hydronym, Hypo-koristikon, Mikrotoponym, respectively), thus terms of an international background are preferred over those originating from the national language. A similar approach (i.e. the use of main entries and cross-references) was adopted in the German glossary when multiple terms of German origin or of an international background could be identified as equivalents of a single English term in the German language (e.g. nickname = Neckname in the cross-reference and Spitzname in the main entry; deonym = Epotoponym in the cross-reference and Deonym in the main entry).

² English, French and German are the official languages of ICOS. In the English and German glossaries, one can also find the selected international bibliography of onomastic terminology, comprising relevant works published between 1961 and 2002.
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The languages also differ in the number of traditionally established synonymous terms for a concept. Whenever there are fewer synonymous terms in German than in English, the German glossary lists the German terms accompanied by more than one English equivalent (e.g. *Familienname* = family name, surname, last name in entries and *Zuname* in the cross-reference; *Vornname* = first name, given name in the main entries and *Taufname* = Christian name in the cross-reference). As the French glossary does not contain English equivalents, the lack of the synonymous terms for a concept can only be unfolded indirectly (e.g. no cross-reference is given to *nom de famille*, or to *prénom*). Both the French and German versions of the glossary contain a term missing from the English version (cf. the entry *onymisch* in the German, and the entry *toponymiste* in the French list).

The *List of Key Onomastic Terms* successfully describes the peculiarities of the actual use of the terms under discussion, which is manifested in the acceptance of the glossary by field experts. The use of onomastic terms as defined in the glossary in ICOS publications, at ICOS congresses, in conference papers as well as other pieces of writing on onomastics has more and more become an expectation.

2.2. The Hungarian version of the ICOS glossary. The necessity of compiling multiple national language versions of the glossary was publicly declared at the ICOS Terminology Group meeting extended with experts interested in the topic in Barcelona, on 6th September 2011. This goal was re-expressed at the next group meeting organised in a similar way in Glasgow, on 26th August 2014. Participants here agreed to provide and publish the glossary in their respective mother tongues. Andrea Bölcskei, Tamás Farkas and Mariann Slíz represented Hungary at the Glasgow meeting. The Hungarian version of the *List of Key Onomastic Terms* – along with a supplementary Hungarian–English term index and a quadrilingual list presenting English–Hungarian–German–French term equivalents – was prepared by Bence Attila Oláh, university student (Károli Gáspár University, Faculty of Humanities, English Studies BA, Specialisation in Translation and Special Languages, then Terminology MA), under the supervision of Andrea Bölcskei, in 2015.

Several difficulties concerning terminological harmonization between languages, drafting definitions, choosing appropriate illustrative examples, elaborating the structure of the glossary had to be solved in preparation of the Hungarian version of the term list. The main principles of the work, illustrated with examples if necessary, are presented below.

Similarly to the German and the French versions, the Hungarian term list is based on the original, English glossary. The structure of the Hungarian glossary aims to indicate English–Hungarian term equivalents; to maintain the system of main entries and cross-references used in the original glossary; and to adjust the contents and the form of the list to that of the UNGEGN Glossary, which lists terms for the standardization of geographical names (see below), also published in the present volume. Entries have thus been built up as follows: the serial number of the entry is followed by the English term as a headword, then the Hungarian equivalent(s) has (have) been provided, and finally the definition (in the case of main entries), or the reference (in the case of cross-references) has been listed. As a result, entries in the Hungarian term list – contrary to the German and French versions of the ICOS list, but in accordance with the UNGÉGN Glossary –
follow the alphabetical order of the English terms, i.e. the sequence of the entries in the original English ICOS term list.

In identifying Hungarian equivalent(s) of English terms, traditionally established expressions, mostly of national language origin have been given preference; recently adopted, less frequent terms of an international background have been listed after the relevant terms of Hungarian origin in parentheses, e.g. 01 nénváltozat (= allonima); 19 népnév (= etnonima); 27 szentnév (= hagionima); 29 víznév (= hidronima); 68 helynév (= toponima). Naturally, if only a term of an international background is available in Hungarian, this equivalent has been given (e.g. 16 endonima, 20 exonima, 33 makrotonolina, 35 mikrotopolina). Hungarian terms of an international background, regardless of the morphology of their English equivalents, have been presented in the form in which they appear in Hungarian specialized communication, e.g. 13 denominatum (English) = megnevezett (= denotátum) (Hungarian). If an English term does not have a proper Hungarian equivalent, the Hungarian version of the term of an international background has been adopted (e.g. 10 koronima, 18 ergonima), or, alternatively, a term of Hungarian origin has been elaborated (e.g. 09 informális név, 42 szigetnév). In certain cases these methods have been combined, e.g. 34 anyanévi eredetű név (= matronimikum, metronimikum); 53 apanévi eredetű név (= patronimikum, patronimikon). The glossary also indicates if the Hungarian equivalent of an independent English term of an international background can only be identified as a component of Hungarian terms (e.g. 49 -onima as second constituent).

In approving English–Hungarian term equivalencies, attention has been given to the (attitudinal) equality of the concepts indicated by the terms concerned, e.g. 22 first name and 24 forename = utónév (sequence of name components); 21 family name = családnév (function); 32 last name and 64 surname = vezetéknév (sequence of name components). If possible, English terms related through identical term components have been rendered with the help of Hungarian terms with similar structural features, e.g. 67 toponomastics = helynévkutatás, helynévtan (= toponomastics), 68 toponym = helynév (= toponima) and 69 toponymy = helynévállomány. The traditionally established sub-, super- and coordination of Hungarian terms has been maintained and indicated in the Hungarian version of the term list (e.g. 68 helynév [= toponima] in certain cases a synonym of 25 földrajzi név, 43 ragadványnév a subcategory of 09 informális név in Hungarian). On a number of theoretical questions of Hungarian onomastic terms of national language origin and of an international background, cf. Farkas 2012, 2014; on certain factors influencing the appearance and changes of Hungarian onomastic terms, cf. Slíz 2012.)

Definitions in the main entries are based on the form and contents of those found in the original English term list. As a result, paraphrases of term meanings in the Hungarian version are regularly followed by illustrative place-name examples, and, if necessary, notes on term use have also been provided. A cross-reference consists of the English and Hungarian headwords of the main entry defining the term, and the number of the relevant main entry in parentheses. Illustrative place-name examples have mostly been taken from the original English text (see the examples for 09 informális név, 31 lakossági név, 43 ragadványnév), in certain cases supplemented by Hungarian examples (see the examples

---

3 The Hungarian term is preceded by the number of the entry in which it is to be found in the Hungarian list (NB serial numbers are followed by a full stop in Hungarian spelling).
for 30 becénév, 35 mikrotoponimá, 63 utcanév); when deemed necessary the original examples have been changed to different but functionally similar Hungarian names to avoid misinterpretation (see the examples for 22 utónév). Notes and suggestions given in the original glossary on meaning (e.g. 69 helynévállomány, 27 szentnév [= hagionima], 52 kegyénév [= oronima]), on form (e.g. 34 anyanévi eredetű név [= matronimikum, metronimikon]), on use (e.g. 10 koronima, 14 köznevesült túladonnév, 68 helynév [= toponima]) and on the term’s status as a proper name (e.g. 19 népnév [= etnonima], 31 lakossági név) have been kept; what is more, in some cases remarks on the interpretation or use of the English or Hungarian terms have also been added (e.g. 22 utónév, 49 -onima [utónag]). Notes were considered integral parts of the definitions; thus they have not been treated as separate units within the entries.

The Hungarian–English term index facilitates search according to Hungarian terms. In the first column of the index, Hungarian terms have been listed in alphabetical order; compound terms, in accordance with the practice of the indices in the UNGEGN Glossary, are given according to both their first and second constituents (e.g. személynévállomány and állomány, személynév-; dülőnév and név, dülő-); synonymous terms are presented in all possible orders, while indicating synonymity, e.g. allonima (= névváltozat), névváltozat (= allonima) and változat, név- (= allonima). In the second column of the index, the English equivalent(s) of the Hungarian term(s) has (have) been provided. If the ICOS list offers more than one English equivalent to a Hungarian term(s), all English terms have been indicated in each case, e.g. helynév (= toponima), név, hely- (= toponima), toponima (= helynév) → place name, toponym. The number of the main entry or that of the cross-reference including the Hungarian term(s) can be found in the third column of the index.

The quadrilingual list presents English–Hungarian–German–French term equivalents. Terms functioning as headwords in main entries and in cross-references as well as terms appearing in notes have all been provided. Establishing equivalencies between English and German terms was not problematic, as the English equivalents of the majority of German terms are indicated in the German version of the Glossary. The few German terms listed without English equivalents are headwords in cross-references, thus the quadrilingual list only notes them in parentheses after the headwords of the relevant main entries of the German glossary, e.g. Hydronym (= Gewässername), Hypokoristikon (= Kosename). The identification of the English equivalents of French terms was made possible by the comparison of definitions and through cross-checking the illustrative place-name examples given in the English and French glossaries. If the French glossary displays a single French equivalent for distinct, synonymous English terms, this term has been given next to all of the relevant English terms in the quadrilingual list, e.g. microtoponym, minor name → microtoponyme; Christian name, first name, forename, given name → prénom. The headwords of the surplus German and French entries have been listed next to the terms closest in meaning in the appropriate language with short explanations, see German Onym (adjectival form: onymisch); French onomasticien (concerning place names: toponymiste).

3. Main ambitions at UNGEGN. UNGEGN is one of the seven standing expert bodies working within the United Nations Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC). The committee started its work in 1959, first as a temporary body, which became permanent in 1973. In the present day it has over 400 members from more than 100 countries,
mostly geographers, cartographers, linguists, historians, planners, surveyors and officials from state administrations. The main tasks of UNGEGN include raising public awareness of the importance of the standardization of geographical names; governing the processes of name standardization at an international level; working on terminological standardization concerning place names; elaborating the principles of the formation and use of official place names; defining the rules for the romanization of geographical names; promoting the establishment of national names authorities and encouraging their effective work; collecting, storing, maintaining and disseminating toponymic data with respect to place names already nationally standardized; compiling gazetteers and databases of geographical names; and providing training in the standardization of geographical names. The international standardization of official, written geographical names is based on the results of national standardization processes; decisions of the expert body in standardization activities are generally reached through consensus (UNGEGN; on the organizational structure of the committee, the principles of the standardization of geographical names, the model of name standardization promoted by UNGEGN in Hungarian, cf. Bölcskei 2012a; on the changing principles and terms adopted in the standardization of geographical names in Hungary, cf. Bölcskei 2012c.).

To stimulate the successful implementation of the standardization of geographical names in different countries, UNGEGN has published two manuals on the theory and practice of names standardization processes. The volume entitled Manual for the National Standardization of Geographical Names includes the detailed description of a model of names standardization, compiled based on the “best practices” of countries that have achieved considerable goals in the standardization of geographical names at a national level (Manual 2006); and the volume entitled “Technical reference manual for the standardization of geographical names”, which offers practical help in the romanization of place names of languages with non-Roman or non-alphabetic writing systems; in the precise transfer of toponymic data in an international context; and in the dissemination of the official English and national names of the countries of the world (Manual 2007).

3.1. Terminology work at UNGEGN and the Glossary promoting the use of standardized terms in the standardization of geographical names. The publication of the above mentioned two manuals was preceded by the compilation of a Glossary presenting and defining terms used frequently in the processes of the standardization of geographical names (UNGEGN Glossary). This Glossary was published in the six official languages of the United Nations (English, Arabic, French, Chinese, Russian, Spanish), and, by and large, served as the basis of term use in the two manuals.

The predecessor of this Glossary was the 1984 document entitled Glossary No. 330: Technical Terminology Employed in the Standardization of Geographical Names, edited by H. A. G. Lewis, which listed and defined 175 terms for 115 topic related concepts in the six languages mentioned above. Its revised version was published in 1987, with the same title, under the reference Glossary No. 330/Rev² (RAPER 2000: 194; KERFOOT 2000: 205). This latter term list was translated into Hungarian by Ervin Földi, and was published in the onomastic journal Névtani Értesítő, accompanied by a paper on the practice of the standardization of geographical names within the United Nations (Földi 1992a, 1992b). However, in 1989 the 14th UNGEGN Session decided that the six language list was in need of revision, as it was considered incomplete with respect to the
topic concerned, included several repetitions, while its definitions did not examine the peculiarities of non-Roman writing systems and non-European languages.

UNEGGN initiated the establishment of a working group on toponymic terminology, convened by Naftali Kadmon (Israel), who also led the work on the revision of the term list. In 1991, at the 15th UNGEGN Session, the working group presented the first draft of the revised term glossary, which contained 336 terms and their definitions in English, with illustrative place-name examples from 16 languages and writing systems. In 1992, at the 16th UNGEGN Session, delegates decided that the constant functioning of the working group on toponymic terminology was desirable, and allocated it the task of editing and periodically revising the *Glossary of Terms for the Standardization of Geographical Names*, which is accessible in the official languages of the United Nations. In 1998, at the 7th UNCSGN Conference, the working group presented the latest and extended version of the Glossary. This version, containing 375 terms in six languages, was published in New York by the United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs Statistics Division as an UNGEGN document in 2002 (GTSGN). The editor of the Glossary was Naftali Kadmon, and its compilation and translation was carried out by the members of the Working Group on Toponymic Terminology on a voluntary basis.

The present duty of the Working Group is to continuously modernize the Glossary in light of the latest innovations in sciences and changes in languages. To fulfil this obligation, an Addendum (AGTSGN), which contains the revised definitions of 6 previously defined terms as well as the first definitions of 17 newly adopted terms in English, was drawn up in 2007, and translated into all six official languages of the United Nations. The current 2015 (pdf) version of the Glossary available on the UNGEGN website is the result of the compilation of the 2002 Glossary and the 2007 Addendum into a single document (UNEGGN Glossary). (For the linguistic analysis of the Glossary and the Addendum, cf. Bölcskei 2012b.)

Besides the six official languages of the United Nations, the Glossary has been adapted into several other national languages, including German (JORDAN–BEINESTEIN 2011), Czech (ČÚZK trans. 2013) and Polish (LUKASIK trans. 2014); the 2012 Korean version can also be downloaded from the UNGEGN website (UNEGGN Glossary Korean).

The activity of the Working Group on Toponymic Terminology is, on the one hand, strongly connected to the realization of the fact that the successful implementation of the main ambitions of UNGEGN is dependent on the introduction and promotion of a consistent use of a standardized and harmonized terminology with respect to the standardization of geographical names (UNEGGN Brochure). While, on the other hand, is in accordance with recent trends in stressing the importance of the international standardization of terminology in different branches of science. Since 2008, the Working Group, whose current convenor is Staffan Nyström (Sweden), in part due to personal connections, has been actively co-operating with the ICOS Terminology Group (cf. NYSTRÖM 2014).

### 3.2. The Hungarian version of the UNGEGN Glossary

The first draft of the Hungarian version of the UNGEGN Glossary was prepared in 2013 at the Department of Hungarian Linguistics of Károli Gáspár University of the Reformed Church in Hungary, through teamwork involving MA students of Terminology (namely, Dóra Miklódy, Ágnes Horváth, Ilona Erzsébet Nagy, Zsófia Szonja Sajermann and Julianna Varga; project leader: Andrea Bölcskei; cf. BÖLCSKEI 2013a). Its proofread version is aimed at
helping the standardization processes of Hungarian geographical names both in Hungary and in the regions of the neighbouring countries with ethnic Hungarian populations (on the latter issue see Szabómihály 2007, 2009, 2013; Csomortáni 2014).

The work process had to consider that the original Glossary aspires to adopt a fairly complex terminological principle and attempts to solve terminological problems in professional communication by removing geographical and language barriers (cf. Budin 2001: 14–17). It offers a theoretical background that can easily be shared by experts from different countries, and can also be easily modified according to the needs, languages and mother tongues of the said experts. Thus, the compilers of the Glossary – in accordance with modern terminographic principles (see Cabré 2003: 183) – describe terminological units with respect to their cognitive, linguistic and communicative components. The preparation of the Hungarian version of the Glossary was a dual task: on the one hand, the fundamental international approach of the original Glossary had to be preserved; on the other hand, its terms had to be adjusted to the characteristics of the Hungarian language and to the traditionally developed practices of Hungarian term use.

The underlying principles of the Hungarian version of the UNEGGN Glossary are very much similar to those adopted in the Hungarian version of the ICOS term list, mentioned above. In detail: when identifying the Hungarian equivalent(s) of English terms, the Hungarian version tends towards a compromise between the requirements of international intelligibility and Hungarian flavour. Thus, in cases when a traditionally used term of Hungarian origin is more common, it has been listed as the first equivalent, followed in parentheses by the synonymous term of an international background after an equality sign, e.g. 017 személynév (= antroponíma), 021 kényelvűség (= bilingvízmus), 064 mellekjel (= diakritikus jel), 129 ünév (= hodonima). If the Hungarian form of a term of an international background is used more frequently in professional communication than the equivalent term of Hungarian origin, the terms have been enumerated in reverse order, e.g. 007 allofon (= hangváltózat), 099 firmware (= belső vezérlőprogram), 171 ligatúra (= ikerbetű).

If only terms of native language origin (e.g. 280 latin betűs átírás) or of an international background have become accepted in Hungarian (e.g. 047 kreol, 142 interfész), only these have been given as equivalents. Presumable Hungarian term gaps have been eliminated by way of translation (e.g. 104 full title → teljes megnevezés, 299 short form [of a name] → rövid névforma), or by means of developing the Hungarian form of the term of an international background (e.g. B118 geonym → geonima). When required, these two methods have been combined, e.g. 277 retranszkripció (= kiejtés szerinti átírás visszaalakítása), 278 retranszliteráció (= betű szerinti átírás visszaalakítása). In the case of English terms of noun/adjective + noun structure, which can denote several distinct grammatical or semantic relations, it often seemed practical to create, in light of their definitions, Hungarian terms that are much 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 = helynév-egységesítési irányelvek.

In identifying English–Hungarian term equivalents special attention has been paid to the fact that languages can denote reality in several ways, thus the terminological vocabulary of languages can be different as well (see Klaudy 1997: 117). Sometimes an English term, depending on its distinct meanings, has two separate Hungarian equivalents,
English and Hungarian terms used as equivalents in specialized communication at times reflect very different perspectives, e.g. 110 *generic element* → földrajzi köznévi elem, 112 *generic term* = földrajzi köznév. A few “false friend” terms have also been identified, e.g. 003 *allograph* = allográf (= írásformátumváltás, betűváltás = ‘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 álnev ‘pseudo-nym’; 368 *vocalization* = magánhangzó-jelölés ‘indication of vowels in defective alphabetic scripts’, and not vokalizáció ‘change of a consonant into a vowel’. Information gained from definitions often proved to be crucial in the successful identification or formation of appropriate Hungarian terms, e.g. 092 *feature, natural* = alakulat, természetes: “→ [topographic feature] not made or significantly modified by man”; 093 *feature, physical* = alakulat, természet: “Any →topographic feature that can be observed visually”. Should a Hungarian term appear in different forms, the more frequently used version has been listed in the Hungarian glossary, e.g. 364 *vektoros mód*, and not vektorformáció.

Term groups have been rendered with the intention of preserving their connections, see, for instance, the terms ending in -gram → -gram → -gramma (= jel) = ‘sign’, or including the element script → írás, írásrendszer ‘writing (system)’, e.g. 257 *phonogram* → fonogramma (= hangjel), 134 *ideogram* → ideogramma (= képírás), 179 *logogram* → logogram (= szójel), 326 *syllabogram* → szóalabogram (= szótagjel); and 061 defective alphabetic script → hiányos betűírás, 075 *down script* → átdoló írás, 182 *logographic script* = szótagjel írás, 208 *multiscriptual map* → több írásrendszerű térkép, 189 *map script* → térképi írás.

The main entries have been edited to indicate the interdependence of the definitions in respect to meaning and form as found in the original Glossary (e.g. references to complementary terms; explanations discussing the logical relations of term meanings; definitions assisting each other’s interpretation or that are textually parallel); and to respect the perspective of the original definitions (e.g. more general or more specific definitions than the ones consensually accepted in the relevant branches of science). Background knowledge of the basics of linguistics, geography, cartography and informatics seemed vital to the formulation of certain definitions. A cross-reference, instead of a definition, gives the English headword as well as the number of the main entry presenting the meaning in parentheses.
Different translation strategies were adopted regarding examples based on the characteristics and on the function of the illustrative place names within the entries. In some cases, it was deemed desirable to keep the place names as they appear in the English text, e.g. Kaapstad and Cape Town as illustrative examples for the term 228 name, standardized → név, egységesített (= standardizált). In other cases, to illustrate the meaning of a term, the Hungarian form has also been given in parentheses next to a native language place name, e.g. Al-Mamlakah al-Hāshimīyah al-Urdunīyah (Jordán Hásimita Királyság) to explain the term 183 long form (of a name) → teljes névforma. It was also desirable to give additional explanations to place-name examples in certain cases, e.g. in the case of entry A240 nominative form (of a toponym) → helynév (= toponima) alanyese; to add illustrative Hungarian place names to the original set of examples, e.g. in the case of the entry 081 exonym → exonima; or, because of the different features of languages, to exchange the original example for a Hungarian one, e.g. in the case of the entry 201 morpheme → morfémá.

The form of the Hungarian version is identical with that of the other non-English versions of the original Glossary. In the Hungarian term list, entries consist of an identification number, the English term as a headword, followed by the Hungarian equivalent(s) and the definition, or the reference. The sequence of the entries in the Hungarian version is thus determined by the alphabetic order of the English headwords, as in other foreign language versions. To enhance practicality, the six revised definitions provided in the Addendum have been observed. Similarly, terms newly defined in the 2007 list were inserted in their alphabetically appropriate places within the 2002 Glossary. In accordance with the English glossary, compound terms have been listed according to both their first and second elements together with their Hungarian term equivalents, which have been treated the same way. As the English terms constitute a part of the Hungarian glossary, explanations for the use of some English terms provided in the original Glossary have also been included in the Hungarian version. Retrieval of Hungarian terms is guaranteed by the alphabetical Hungarian–English term index at the end of the Hungarian glossary. (For a detailed description of the principles adopted in the preparation of the Hungarian version of the Glossary with respect to the pre-proof draft, cf. BÖLCSKEI 2013b.)

The Hungarian translation was based on the English Glossary. However, the Hungarian text has also been checked against the French, Spanish and Russian versions with the help of language advisers (Borbála Vitányi, Mária Tóth and Mariann Sliz, respectively). To confirm the reliability of the definitions and the adequacy of English–Hungarian term harmonization, expert proof-readers were invited from the fields of linguistics (Eszter B. Papp, LEG Hungary Ltd.; Gábor Mikesy, FÖMI Institute of Geodesy, Cartography and Remote Sensing); geography (Tibor Tiner, Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Research Centre for Astronomy and Earth Sciences, Geographical Institute); cartography (Mátyás Márton, Eötvös Loránd University, Department of Cartography and Geoinformatics); engineering, informatics (László Kovács, TÉK Localizations Ltd.) and economy (Imre Perger, MÁV-START Ltd.). Furthermore, a discussion was held with an administrative adviser (Elemér György, Ministry of Interior, Department of Local Governments and Economic Affairs). If necessary, corrections and comments by field experts were included in the text, and this revised version was sent for a final proof-read to Ervin Földi (former President of FNB Hungarian Committee on Geographical Names) and Béla Pokoly (Senior Adviser, FNB Hungarian Committee on Geographical Names), who, as
formerly and currently active participants in the activities of UNGEGN, have a deep knowledge of the standardization of geographical names (see above). Following the implementation of the majority of the modifications proposed by them, the Hungarian glossary reached its present form. The publication of the Hungarian version of the Glossary in the present volume was authorized by the Secretary of the UN Publications Board and Exhibits Committee on 12th June 2015.

4. Conclusion. When producing the Hungarian versions of the ICOS list and the UNGEGN Glossary, the goal of the editors was to combine scientific accuracy, clarity and practicability; to respect the themes and the approach of the source documents; and also to pay attention to the features of actual term use in the appropriate special language registers of the Hungarian language. The two term lists and the related indexes are published below in the hope that both experts and novices interested in the discipline of onomastics will be able to use them with ease to achieve the best possible results.

Internet Resources


Icosweb = http://icosweb.net/drupal/

Icosweb Terminology = https://icosweb.net/drupal/terminology
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