

Visualizing place-name qualities on maps and in texts

Peter Jordan ^{a,*}

^a Austrian Academy of Sciences, Institute of Urban and Regional Research; University of the Free State (South Africa), Faculty of Humanities, peter.jordan@oeaw.ac.at

* Corresponding author

Keywords: toponymy, school atlases, topographical maps, endonym/exonym divide, minority names

Abstract:

The difference between endonyms in the sense of place names used by the local community and exonyms in the sense of places names not used by the local community but differing in writing from the endonym is not just a marginal aspect of place names but has consequences for space-related identity and the pragmatics of place-name use. It can also be politically sensitive. The same applies to place names in the majority language and in minority languages and their relative legal status.

Thus, it is also not just a marginal aspect, how they are typographically represented on maps and in texts. Cartographic practice, however, varies widely in both respects, and standardization efforts are scarce or have not been successful. The same is true for representing the endonym/exonym divide as well as the majority/minority name dichotomy in written texts. When majority and minority names enjoy the same legal status, they would have to be represented in the same way, i.e. the same font type and size, just separated by a slash. Most frequently, however, the minority name appears in brackets, in smaller font size and/or in a different font type. It would also be appropriate regarding endonyms of the same legal status as inseparable name compounds that had to appear also in written texts invariably in the same way. With exonyms used in a written text of the exonym language, in contrast, it could be considered to add the endonym only with the first mentioning of the feature in a book or a chapter, e.g., in rectangular brackets (rectangular to indicate the special quality of this divide), while the exonym remains without the corresponding endonym later.

After examining current practice and discussing pros and cons of certain solutions, the paper proceeds to proposing and arguing for standards in both problem fields for maps as well as written texts based on the author's practice in map, book and journal editing as well as his experience in place-name standardization.

References:

- Jordan, P 2019, 'The endonym/exonym divide from a cultural-geographical perspective', *Language and Society*, vol. 10, pp. 5-21.
- Jordan, P 2022, *Breslau oder Wrocław? Das Begriffspaar Endonym/Exonym als Kernthema der Kritischen Toponomastik. Wie politische Haltungen den Gebrauch geographischer Namen bestimmen* [Breslau or Wrocław? The concept pair endonym/exonym as a core topic of critical toponomastics. How political attitudes affect the use of geographical names], Franz Steiner Verlag, Stuttgart.
- Jordan, P 2023, 'Functions and principles of geographical names' in *The Atlas Cookbook. Ten ingredients how to edit an atlas*, ed. ICA Commission on Atlases, Zurich, pp. 61-67.
- Jordan, P 2023, 'Adequate Minority Place-Name Representation on Topographic Maps', *Kartographische Nachrichten/Journal of Cartography and Geographic Information*, vol. 73, pp. 289-299.
- Ormeling FJ 1983, *Minority Toponyms on Maps. The Rendering of Linguistic Minority Toponyms on Topographic Maps of Western Europe* (= Utrechtse geografische studies, 30), Utrecht.
- Woodman, P (ed.) 2012, *The Great Toponymic Divide. Reflections on the definition and usage of endonyms and exonyms*, Head Office of Geodesy and Cartography, Warsaw.