

## Placenames and Politics

W.F.H. Nicolaisen

### Abstract

At an international conference in Bozen/Bolzano (Italy) in 1985, I participated in discussions of the way that placenames of minority cultures or languages are treated in a number of countries and how political considerations tend to have a strong influence on the various attitudes.

\*\*\*\*\*

From September 29 through October 3, 1985, I had the pleasure of being the official U.S. representative at an international conference in Bozen/Bolzano (Italy), on the "Official Use of Geographic Names." This meeting, organized conjointly by the Südtiroler Kulturinstitut and the Landesverband für Heimatpflege in Südtirol, was attended by participants from eight different countries (Austria, Belgium, Canada, France, Italy, Netherlands, Switzerland, U.S.A.); the fifteen papers and reports presented were subsequently published, with German and Italian translations (if required), in a very full volume of *Proceedings* (Kühebacher).<sup>1</sup> Although these are therefore available in print, their accessibility is of necessity limited, since only the two North American papers were published in English. It can also be assumed that the *Proceedings* themselves are not easily obtainable in the English-speaking world. For these reasons, it is my intention to provide an overview of their contents, particularly as regards the insights they offer concerning the official treatment of placenames created and used by substantial cultural and linguistic minorities, within the countries represented at the conference.

The perspective from which I present this information is unavoidably scholarly and academic, as I am not normally involved in the political aspects of naming and name usage. In fact, this gathering of experts in Southern Tyrol was an eye-opener for me, because until then I had been almost exclusively concerned with such matters as the spelling, pronunciation, morphology, grammar, meaning, content, and usage of names in a descriptive, somewhat detached manner, deliberately setting aside

emotive issues and anything that might smack of political controversy. After all, is it not the scholar's prerogative—indeed, his duty—to stand back and describe and interpret in neutral terms the evidence he interrogates?

The good folk at Bozen/Bolzano thought and felt, and presumably still think and feel, otherwise. To them, placenames, especially their officially sanctioned or decreed linguistic form(s), are a matter of intense interest, untouchable though threatened symbols of the region's cultural heritage. In such a context, the 1985 international symposium of experts was for them not so much an opportunity to gather objective evidence and carefully weighed scholarly opinion as a chance to discover what other countries with linguistic minorities might have to offer in the way of experience and advice to bolster the regional German-speaking population's struggle against what they perceive as the unwarranted "Italianization" of their place nomenclature. We had been invited, as it were, as consultants who might turn into secret allies in their just cause.

Having heard all the papers as they were originally delivered and having reread them in their printed form, I am not certain how much they actually contributed to the furtherance of that deeply felt cause and cultural commitment, but the published conference proceedings, as they reflect the information provided and echo the voices that provided it, are in themselves a valuable compendium of reports and comments on the political, social, and cultural circumstances under which names are coined and used, frequently imposed, in the countries represented. Obviously there are many other areas in the world faced with similar problems, but the eight countries<sup>2</sup> which had delegates at the symposium supply important pointers toward possible solutions.

In this essay I shall use the eight countries as focal points in the discussion of such a controversial topic as "Placenames and Politics." In order to avoid the temptation of writing a conference report, I shall present the overview of the internal situations as we find them in the countries in question in alphabetical order and not in the sequence in which the respective papers were originally delivered. The papers followed a brief account of the recommendations made by the relevant committee of the United Nations, whose primary interest lies, of course, in international standardization but whose recommendations nevertheless require as an important basis consistent national policies regarding the written forms of names, as it is difficult to regiment pronunciation.

As this essay is not directly concerned with the knotty question of

international standardization, nor with the extent to which individual nations have implemented the recommendations of the several United Nations Conferences on the Standardization of Geographical Names, the basic recommendations of 1967 are here included in an Appendix based on Dr. Josef Breu's paper "Die amtliche Schreibung geographischer Namen in der Sicht der Vereinten Nationen" (Kühebacher 40-41). They clearly contain agreed guidelines relevant not only to the U.S. Board on Geographic Names but also to the U.S. Placename Commission and Placename Survey of the Society which publishes this journal and should therefore be made known to all individuals and institutions involved in decisions concerning official name usage in this country.

It might be assumed that well thought-out, acceptable, or even accepted policies would ensure that politics are kept out of the processes of naming and using names, but experience shows that this is by no means always the case. In times of linguistic controversy and cultural friction, names are apt to generate emotional rather than rational responses, and their symbolic force should never be underestimated, especially in the realm of politics. Different political circumstances and attitudes also engender different solutions; what is plausible, indeed eminently feasible, in one country, is out of the question in another. What looks like sweet reasonableness in one set of conditions leads to strife and division in another. A basic attitude of tolerance produces different reactions from a fundamental stance of authoritarianism. Here are some illustrations.

### **Austria**

An Austrian participant, Prof. Hermann M. Ölberg of the University of Innsbruck, after outlining some of the scholarly principles essential in the recovery of the pre-Bavarian Romance place nomenclature in the Austrian North Tyrol and recognizing that while it cannot be the academic's objective to undo secondary reinterpretations of names or historicizing spellings, states that it is nevertheless the scholar's duty to describe the situation correctly (107). He also insists (110) that it cannot be the task of official placename commissions, as set up within the UN guidelines, to be prescriptive in their approach to the collection of regional place nomenclatures, and that to make any name changes without the approval of the people affected by them goes against modern legal concepts. He also argues strongly for a clear-cut conceptual dis-

inction between bilingualism (*Zweisprachigkeit*) and binominalism (*Zweinamigkeit*), the implication being that the former does not necessarily have to result in the latter on the current map or in current usage.

Another Austrian participant, Dr. Alfred Ogris of the University of Klagenfurt, who also argues against unwarranted interference in the historically developed place nomenclature of a region, illustrates with the aid of examples from the bilingual German-Slovenian placename signs of certain parts of Carinthia (Kärnten), how difficult it is to implement official acts and pronouncements even in a benign climate of opinion when emotive political factors come into play (157-90).

Federal Austrian law is not only tolerant of cultural and linguistic minorities in the country but actively supports them; the recent provision of bilingual placename signs in designated areas is part of this policy. One of the major obstacles, however, in complying with the legal requirements is the transcription of names used in oral tradition into acceptable written forms, especially when regional usage differs from the linguistic standards developed in a neighboring country (Yugoslavia). Despite every effort on the part of well-trained and well-meaning scholars, politicization of the issue becomes almost inevitable, preventing an objective handling of such highly sensitive questions, particularly in the face of extremists' vociferous and active, though uninformed, demands

## Belgium

Belgian authorities and scholars are faced with somewhat different issues. Having passed through a French (1795-1814) and a Dutch (1814-1830) phase, the country has, in the years since its foundation in 1830, experienced a series of changes in its administrative communities, especially their drastic reduction in 1977, which has necessitated a considerable amount of naming and renaming. After initially lacking the advice of knowledgeable name scholars, the Ministry of the Interior, in 1926, formed an advisory commission consisting of fifteen Flemish-speaking and fifteen French-speaking experts who scrutinize suggestions in their respective language areas and offer their opinions on them. One of the major problems on the Flemish side was the discrepancy between placename spellings and the modernized spelling standards introduced for the Flemish and Dutch language in general in 1864, on the advice of de Vries and te Winkel. After a highly emotional campaign by the Flemish Movement and its supporters, the modernized spellings finally became official in 1937.

A new discrepancy was, however, created for some names when, in 1946 and 1947, Belgium and the Netherlands agreed on a moderate simplification of the de Vries-te Winkel system; two years later the spelling of the names affected by the reform was officially changed to comply with the new spelling rules. As Professor Jan Goossens of the University of Leuven points out (229-30), this apparently felicitous solution ignores the difference between lexical and onomastic characteristics and underestimates the importance of a name as an onomastic rather than as a linguistic sign. In its implementation it also has to overcome problems in the transformation of names with localized pronunciations and other dialect features to a standard, supra-regional orthography. This necessitated compromises but also occasionally led to faulty interpretations. The difficulties faced by any orthographic standardization of French placenames in Belgium were even greater and standardization has (therefore?) never been attempted. In the case of some officially bilingual communities, this has led to a curious juxtaposition of a modernized Flemish spelling and an old-fashioned one, as in *Schaar-bek/Schaerbeek* or *Oudergem/Auderghem* (233).

The reduction of Belgian administrative communities through the combination of several smaller units into one larger one has also required the substitution of new street names for confusing homonyms and homophones. Although the responsibility for the naming of streets lies with the local authorities, the placename commission also has an advisory role to play. In the Flemish part of the country which is now monolingually Flemish (Dutch), the commission advises on ways to eliminate the French influence to which street names had been subjected in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. As Professor de Smet points out, important criteria in the naming or renaming of streets are local history, art and culture, toponymy, and folklore (244).

## Canada

The general trend toward greater decentralization and more local or regional legislative authority and responsibility regarding placenames is also noticeable in Canada, where the provinces are in the process of acquiring effective control (267). Although Canada is officially bilingual English and French, only in the province of New Brunswick are the two languages accorded official recognition and status at the provincial level, and even here only one geographical location (Grand Falls) has two

official names, reinforcing the observation that official bilingualism does not have to result in official binominalism. The province of Quebec, of course, declared itself unilingually French in 1976, and the Northwest Territories where the country's aboriginal languages still hold their own has also been declared officially bilingual. Outside these areas, in Ontario, for example, the position is that a locality should have no more than one approved official name in use at a given time so that, for instance, only *Lake of the Woods* is used to the exclusion of the Franco-Ontarian *Lac des Bois*, the all-important criterion being "current local usage." In Quebec, on the other hand, practically the whole of the English language geographical nomenclature has disappeared, having been "translated" into French as the result of political decisions which are intended to preserve and ensure the French character of the whole of Quebec's toponymic fabric (280). The agency responsible for these matters is the *Commission de toponymie*, whose work, in contrast to the rest of Canada on the provincial level, is chiefly prescriptive. The federal coordinating role is carried out by the Canadian Permanent Committee on Geographical Names in Ottawa.

## France

From the highly political question of French names in Canada in general and in Quebec in particular, I turn to the treatment of non-French names in France. Here Alsace is the obvious focal point with its checkered history and, in recent centuries, its divided cultural and linguistic allegiances, for quite a while victim of the mistaken notion that national and linguistic boundaries are ideally identical ("*cujus regio, ejus lingua*"). After having been German for a thousand years, Alsace has changed hands five times since 1648; it has been part of France since 1945 and during this time the use of the regional Allemanic dialect has steadily regressed. Its field names, however, with very few exceptions, go back to Middle High German or even Old High German, while its street names reflect more directly the changing political and linguistic fortunes, having been translated three times into French and twice into German.

In some of the more enlightened communities, including Strasbourg, some German dialect street-name signs have in recent years been added to the official French ones. Settlement names have largely kept their original, mostly Allemanic or Franconian names which were sometimes adapted to

French pronunciation and in a few instances translated into French. In extreme cases, some places have three names: the original dialect one, the corresponding High German one, and the modern official French one, like *Nàrds/Nordhausen/Nordhouse* or *Kritt/Gereuth/Neubois* (215).

## Italy

It is the current situation in the northernmost Italian province of Alto Adige (German Südtirol), which borders on Austria, that triggered the international conference the *Proceedings* of which form the basis of this paper. The problem is summarized by one of the main conference organizers, Egon Kühebacher, who also edited the published volume (11):

It is the wish of the people of South Tyrol that in their part of the world (*Land*) only those placenames be retained and legally recognized which have grown historically. This would mean that the approximately 8,000 Italianized place designations which were introduced by Ettore Tolomei during the period of fascism be eliminated, except for two or three dozen Italian names which had existed when South Tyrol was almost completely German (and Ladino). The Italians in South Tyrol claim that for them who were born and have grown up here, the Italian place names have also "grown" here. They admit that the Italian names were initially introduced without justification but feel that one cannot blame the current generation for an illegal act committed several decades ago. Many German-speaking South Tyrolians find this difficult to understand; but are the Italians wrong?<sup>3</sup>

Even without knowing the various complex details of the issues involved, it is easy for an outsider to see that this is a matter which virtually begs for emotive politicization; a mediating middle ground is difficult to imagine in this divisive atmosphere. This is borne out by the several papers contributed to the conference on this subject, including those by Dr. Norbert Mumelter of Bozen/Bolzano (43-61), Professors Giuseppe de Vergotini (63-70) and Luigi Heilmann (91-105) of the University of Bologna, Umberto Corsini (71-89) of the University of Venice, Giovanni Battista Pellegrini (115-31) of the University of Padua, and Ferian Ormeling (133-55) of the University of Utrecht. It would, of course, be impossible to do them all justice in this survey.

At the very heart of the problem lie the activities associated with Ettore Tolomei whose name was heard more often at the conference than any other because, in the wake of the occupation and subsequent annexation of this part of Austria by Italy after the First World War (and to considerable degree even before the Austrian defeat), he devised and had to a large extent made official a list of about 8,000 Italian names for mandatory use in South Tyrol. Practically all of these names—translations, Italianizations, innovations—had never been used before and were, in a process of deliberate denationalization, superimposed on the existing place nomenclature, in addition to the few bilingual names that had “naturally” developed in boundary zones.

While this superimposition is seen by the German-speaking population of the province as an “unnatural,” autocratic, even fascist act against the will of the majority of the population, it is pointed out by the Italian side that the special provision for bilingualism, including bilingual placenames, for the province was a measure devised to protect and support the German heritage which, on a national scale, is that of a minority. For the same reason, it is claimed, it would be illegal to deprive the Italian-speaking population in the province of their right to use Italian names with which they are now thoroughly familiar and identify, even if these names were introduced in an authoritarian fashion in 1923 (70). To the neutral observer it looks as if, despite more ameliorative decrees since World War II (88), laws which were originally conceived to guarantee the language rights of a national minority have the opposite effect in a part of the country in which this minority is in the majority, quite apart from the tacit, but by no means self-evident, assumption that bilingualism includes, implies, or directly leads to binominalism.

## Switzerland

That placenames are an integral part of language is also a basic assumption of the language laws of Switzerland, which has four national languages: German, French, Italian, and Rhaeto-Romance. In 1983, the respective percentages were 73.6, 20.0, 4.5, and 0.9, and each of these languages is the only official means of communication in its own territory (191). This exclusivity includes education, and the rigorously enforced territorial principle demands assimilation of the individual in all public matters.

The same principle is echoed in the official place nomenclature of the country, i.e. in all name categories except field names. This means that in



German-speaking Switzerland only historically developed German names are acceptable, in French-speaking Switzerland equivalent French names, etc. Thus local usage determines official usage; the same is true in multi-lingual cantons. As a result, each place has only one official name, except for localities near linguistic boundaries; there many have two names if there is a linguistic minority of at least thirty per cent of the population. In such a rigorously enforced system political disputes about placenames are rare or nonexistent as they are inextricably linked to the languages which created them or in which they are embedded. A few individual exceptions do not break this rule, as even directional signs indicate the name form of the language area in which the destination lies (199).

### United States

If this is the solution in a country which has four national languages, each strictly enforced in its own territory, then the situation in the United States is almost diametrically opposed, insofar as there is no official national language, although English has a special status because all the Federal laws are written in that language. From this follows that no language is "foreign" to the United States, and for that reason minority languages and the place names they produce are probably best described as "non-English" (253). Many thousands of placenames have been transferred from other countries over the centuries and have been spread further throughout the country through internal migrations. Speakers of many languages have also coined new names in various parts of the country.

Any official effort on the standardization or regularization of placename spellings has therefore to be usage oriented and cannot impose the traffic rules of one language upon another, especially since onomastic usage and linguistic provenance are frequently two very different matters, both historically and philosophically. The official editorial treatment of "non-English" geographical names can therefore only be part of the official treatment of *all* geographical names within the United States and its territories. This basic approach governs the U.S. Board on Geographic Names whose responsibility it is to "develop policies, principles, and procedures governing the use, spelling, and application of geographic names" (254) and naturally also applies to its Domestic Names Committee. The primary principle or philosophy of the board is its recognition of present-day local usage and preferences.

When it comes to the adaptation of names of non-English origin by English speakers and name users, what matters is the natural process of language, not an imposition by any naming authority. As far as Native American names are concerned, which in the early stages of European settlement were so often sadly mangled, misplaced, or ousted altogether, present attitudes are much more sympathetic; such names are, together with other ethnic names, generally acceptable. It may be said therefore that the absence of a single national language is advantageous to the official handling of geographic names in the United States, especially of those of non-English or minority provenance, as the possibility of political interference is highly circumscribed.

### Summary

Naturally, the variety of ways in which placenames can become politicized is not limited to the instances presented here. One might think of the names along the German-Danish border at the end of the nineteenth and the beginning of the twentieth century, the treatment of names in the newly acquired parts of Western Poland after World War II, the treatment of Frisian names in the Netherlands, or of Gaelic or Welsh names in Britain, of Breton names in France, or of Hungarian names in Romania.<sup>4</sup> What nevertheless emerges from the illustrative examples offered here is the realization that, contrary to their supposed "neutrality" in their primary task of designating individual geographical features, placenames when employed as evidence in the arena of politics become highly charged objects provoking emotive responses. Especially when identified with particular minority languages and cultures or with certain nationalistic movements, their treatment can become divisive and lead to strong political action.

Under those circumstances, it does matter in what form a name appears on a sign at the entrance to a village, and a missing accent can cause displeasure.

One of the major problems is caused by the confusion of linguistic and onomastic usage so that names, although fundamentally part of an onomasticon and not a lexicon, are made to conform to exclusively linguistic rules. This assumed but unjustified congruency is especially noticeable in bilingual regions which are by definition also considered binominal. This is, it seems, a misunderstanding that cannot be eradicated. Although two languages may indeed produce two names or name

forms, this is not necessarily the case, and to argue otherwise is ill-informed, but this is where scholars and politicians, for the time being, can only accept a parting of the ways. Until a more enlightened attitude begins to prevail, one can only ask for as many detailed studies of local, regional, and national situations as possible in order to discuss patterns in the variety of official responses around the world in the fascinating realm of politics concerning placenames. One might also hope for greater tolerance.

State University of New York at Binghamton

### Notes

1. All internal references in this paper are to the pagination in that volume.
2. Only seven of the eight countries represented will be referred to since the representative of the Netherlands chose to speak about names in the host province.
3. The English translation of the original German text is mine.
4. Just recently the London *Times* (March 1, 1990), in an article on the "Saxons" (Germans) of Transylvania, reported a member of the German-speaking minority as complaining about post-revolutionary Romania: "They only speak about our rights but so far there has been no action. We cannot even erect a sign outside our German villages in German."

### Works Cited

- Breu, Josef. "The Official Spelling of Geographical Names in the Perspective of the United Nations" (German and Italian). In Kühebacher 23-41.
- Corsini, Umberto. "Italian Placenames in Alto Adige in the First Half of the Twentieth Century" (Italian and German). In Kühebacher 71-89.
- Glatthard, Peter. "On the Official Geographical Nomenclature of Switzerland" (German and Italian). In Kühebacher 191-208.
- Goossens, Jan. "The Names of Belgian Communities and Their Spelling" (German and Italian). In Kühebacher 225-42.
- Heilmann, Luigi. "Origin and Development of Placenames in Alto Adige" (Italian and German). In Kühebacher 91-105.
- Kühebacher, Egon, ed. *Amtlicher Gebrauch des geographischen Namensgutes*. Bozen: Südtiroler Kulturinstitut/Landesverband für Heimatpflege in Südtirol, 1986.
- Meyer, Joseph. "Field, Street, and Placenames in Their Adaptability in Alsace" (German and Italian). In Kühebacher 209-23.
- Mumelter, Norbert. "The Legal Position of Geographical Names in Südtirol since 1918" (German and Italian). In Kühebacher 43-61.

- Nicolaisen, Wilhelm F. H. "The Official Treatment of Non-English Placenames in the United States" (English, German, and Italian). In Kühebacher 253-65.
- Ölberg, Hermann. "Settlement Strata in a Tyrolian Community on the Basis of Names of Localities" (German and Italian). In Kühebacher 107-13.
- Ogris, Alfred. "The Official Treatment of Bilingual Placenames in Kärnten from a Historical and Contemporary Perspective" (German and Italian). In Kühebacher 157-90.
- Ormeling, Ferjan. "The Geographical Nomenclature of Südtirol from a Cartographical Perspective" (German and Italian). In Kühebacher 133-55.
- Pellegrini, Giovanni Battista. "On the Bilingual Character of Placenames" (Italian and German). In Kühebacher 115-31.
- Smart, Michael B. "Official Treatment of Geographical Names in Canada" (English, German, and Italian). In Kühebacher 267-313.
- Smet, Gilbert de. "Street Names in Flanders" (German and Italian). In Kühebacher 243-52.
- UN Department of Economic and Social Affairs. "Report of the Group of Experts on Geographical Names." *World Cartography* New York: United Nations, 1962. 7: 7-18.
- Vergottini, Giuseppe de. "Legal Guidelines for Place Nomenclatures" (Italian and German). In Kühebacher 63-70.

## Appendix

Resolution 4 of 1967 (Breu 40-41; UN 7-18)

### Recommendation A. National Names Authorities

It is recommended that, as a first step in international standardization of geographical names, each country should have a national geographical names authority:

- a) Consisting of a continuing body, or coordinated group of bodies, having clearly stated authority and instructions for the standardization of geographical names and the determination of names standardization policy within the country;
- b) Having such status, composition, function and procedures as will:
  - I. Be consistent with the governmental structure of the country;
  - II. Give the greatest chance of success in the national names standardization programme;

- III. As appropriate, provide within its framework for the establishment of regional or local committees according to area or language;
- IV. Provide for consideration of the effects of its actions on government agencies, private organizations and other groups and for the reconciliation of these interests, as far as possible, with the long-range interests of the country as a whole;
- V. Make full use of the services of surveyors, cartographers, geographers, linguists and any other experts who may help the authority to carry out its operations efficiently
- VI. Permit record keeping and publication procedures that will facilitate the prompt and wide distribution of information on its standardized names, both nationally and internationally.

It is recommended that those countries which have not yet begun to exercise their prerogative of standardizing their geographical names on a national basis should now proceed to do so.

It is further recommended that the appropriate United Nations office be kept informed by each national names authority of its composition and functions, and of the address of its secretary.

#### Recommendation B. Collection of Geographical Names

For each geographical name which is to be standardized, it is recommended that:

- a) The field and office research be as complete as possible in order to provide information on the following points:
  - I. Written and spoken form of the name and its meaning according to local inhabitants;
  - II. Spelling in cadastral documents and land registers;
  - III. Spelling on modern and old maps and in other historical sources;
  - IV. Spelling in census reports, gazetteers and other relevant documents of value;
  - V. Spelling used by other local administrative and technical services;
- b) The local spoken form of the name be recorded on tape and written in the phonetic notation approved by the national names authority;
- c) The character, extent and position of the feature named be determined—in this regard it should be noted that aerial photographs can provide useful supplementary information—and recorded as accurately as possible, and that the meaning of the generic terms used locally be clearly defined;
- d) If possible, at least two local independent sources be consulted for each inquiry.

It is further recommended that personnel responsible for the collection of names should have training adequate to recognize and deal with the linguistic problems (phonetic system, grammatical structure and orthography), geographic phenomena and terminology that they are likely to encounter.

**Recommendation C. Principles of Office Treatment of Geographical Names**

It is recommended that each names authority formulate, adopt and define the guiding principles and practices that it will normally apply in the course of operation. These principles and practices should cover:

- a) Formal procedures to be followed in the submission to the authority of proposals for new names or changes in names;
- b) Factors that the authority will take into account when considering name proposals, such as:
  - I. Current usage;
  - II. Historical background;
  - III. Treatment in multilingual areas and in unwritten languages;
  - IV. The extent to which hybrid names should be avoided;
  - V. Avoidance of repetition of names;
  - VI. Avoidance of more than one name for one feature;
  - VII. Clarification of the precise extent of application of each individual geographical name, including the naming of the whole and the parts of major features;
  - VIII. Elimination of objectionable names;
- c) Rules of writing names applied by the authority;
- d) Procedures whereby all interested parties may express their views on a name proposal prior to decision by the authority;
- e) Formal procedures for promulgation of the authority's decisions and for ensuring that standardized names shall appear on the national maps.

In the elaboration of these principles it is recommended that:

- 1) Unnecessary changing of names be avoided;
- 2) The spelling of geographical names be as much as possible in accordance with the current orthographic practice of the country concerned, with due regard to dialect forms;
- 3) Systematic treatment of names should not operate to suppress significant elements;
- 4) Where some names occur in varying or grammatical forms, the national names authority should consider making one of these forms the standard name (for nouns that can be declined, it will normally be the nominative case);
- 5) In all countries in whose languages the definite article can enter into geographical names, the national names authority should determine which names contain the definite article and standardize them accordingly. For languages in which both definite and indefinite forms exist for all or most names, it is recommended that standardization be based on one or the other form;
- 6) All countries set up standards for the use of abbreviations of elements in their geographical names;
- 7) A system be devised in each country for the treatment of compound names.

It is further recommended that the names authority give adequate publicity to these principles and practices.

**Recommendation D. Multilingual Areas**

It is recommended that, in countries in which there exist more than one language, the national authority as appropriate:

- a) Determine the geographical names in each of the official languages, and other languages as appropriate;
- b) Give a clear indication of equality or precedence of officially acknowledged names;
- c) Publish these officially acknowledged names in maps and gazetteers.

**Recommendation E. National Gazetteers**

It is recommended that each names authority produce, and continually revise, appropriate gazetteers of all its standardized geographical names. It is further recommended that, in addition to the standardized names, each gazetteer include, as a minimum, such information as is necessary for the proper location and identification of the named features. In particular, it is recommended that the following be included:

- a) The kind of feature to which the name applies;
- b) Precise description of the location and the extent, including a point position reference if possible, of each named feature;
- c) Provision for the parts of natural features to be additionally defined by reference to the whole and for the names of extended features to be defined as necessary by reference to their constituent parts;
- d) Such information on administrative or regional areas as is considered necessary and, if possible, reference to a map or chart within which the features lie;
- e) All officially standardized names for a feature, if there are more than one; and provision for cross references to be made to names previously used for the same feature.

When national authorities determine it possible, both technically and economically, they may include such information on geographical names as gender, number, definite and indefinite forms, position of stress, tone and pronunciation in the system of the International Phonetic Association and such other linguistic information as may lead to the better understanding and use of names both nationally and internationally.

## CALL FOR PAPERS

The Sixth Annual Meeting of the Language Origins Society will be held on the Campus of Northern Illinois University in DeKalb, Illinois, July 17-20, 1991.

Abstracts for papers on all areas of language origins and development (including origins and development of names, naming practices, and naming systems) are invited. Requests for further information about the conference and abstracts should be sent to the conference coordinator:

Edward Callary  
English Department  
Northern Illinois University  
DeKalb, IL 60115

\*\*\*\*\*

## CHRISTOPHER COLUMBUS 1492-1992

October 12, 1992, will mark the 500th anniversary of Columbus' landfall in the New World. *Names* will join the rest of America in recognizing this significant occasion with a special issue (September 1992) devoted to onomastic topics relating to Columbus and his legacy. Possible topics:

Columbus' influence on American placenames  
Columbus' influence on world placenames  
Columbus' influence on personal names  
Columbus' influence on names in literature

Deadline: November 15, 1991

For further information and inquiries, contact Thomas J. Gasque, Editor, *Names*, Department of English, University of South Dakota, Vermillion, SD 57069.