

Mediated Naming: The Case of Unconventional Anthroponyms (UA)

DAIANA FELECAN

North University Center of Baia Mare, Technical University of Cluj-Napoca, Romania

The present paper deals with *mediation*, a particular linguistic mechanism of designating referents, which is different from conventional naming (performed by means of official proper names) and which relies on (synthetic or analytic) *nomination auxiliaries*. In the cases discussed, a referent's identity is established *indirectly*, by means of *unconventional names*, the discursive functions of which are identified contextually. To be more precise, the attention is focused on mechanisms of fixing references through *alterity*, *locative*, and *property*.

Theoretically, this article is based on *descriptive semantics*, *pragmatics*, and *philosophy of language*, whereas the field of investigation to which the study pertains is that of *anthroponymy*.

The corpus analyzed consists of unconventional anthroponymic structures from Romanian public space and from the Bible.

KEYWORDS unconventional anthroponym, mediated naming, discursive function, alterity, identification

Introductory considerations¹

The present paper² starts from the premise that to formulate *naming* utterances about another individual or about objects around us is the preliminary condition underlying the initiation of verbal communication.

For them to become communicable, objects in our referential field have to be released from the anonymity conferred by the state of being *un-named* and included into corresponding categories (with species and subspecies).

In what follows, it is not the standardized act³ of name-giving⁴ that is approached, but that situation in which the mechanism of attributing-receiving a name deviates from its conventional trajectory, in which the name giver (a pre-established authority whose role cannot be substituted) signals the entrance of a new member in social life⁵ by means of an act that is acknowledged by the entire administrative and linguistic community.

This paper deals with *mediated/indirect/deviated/unconventional naming*, starting from the observation that, at the level of language use, the existence of initial names (considered as preliminary links between interlocutors) is challenged by the occurrence of other names, some chosen by the individuals themselves, others given by various people one meets on the way to becoming *homo singularis* (a person's projection of oneself) or *homo socius* (the others' projection of a person).⁶

Subsequently to the establishment of an official name, the attribution of names does not observe any rituals of naming: it is the *ad hoc* result of an individual's behavior in the various circumstances (s)he interacts. The role of the primary *onomaturge* (the priest, registrar, etc.) is undermined by a series of naming agents that are not invested with any official naming capacity. Among these, one can also find, as noted, the very person that is the object of naming, who can decide to change his/her name for various reasons — most of which are related to the drawbacks determined by how the name received at birth is perceived, hence from the desire to annihilate someone else's projection (i.e., the parents') through one's own nominal projection (which functions as the linguistic expression of an accumulation of affective or rational grounds).⁷ Sometimes, this change is felt as requiring a legal confirmation, which is marked by the *de re* invalidation of the name. In other cases, the person in question is simply satisfied with operating this substitution on a social (i.e., family, intimate) level, considering that this *de facto* approach is enough to indicate the breaking of the official naming agreement. On the other hand, the community can decide and act in the sense of abandoning a real name, by replacing it with one or more borrowed names that are used permanently or temporarily. Through the process of *attributing/receiving* a name, there occurs a transfer of properties from the agent (*the name giver*) to the patient (*the named individual*).

Verbal and extra-verbal factors of name-giving

Both the initial (*conventional*) name, and the name(s) received by an individual subsequently (*unconventional* names) carry the image of the person that chose them. When we give a name to someone, we eventually end up picking from a selective list that is representative for *us* — not for the person who is about to be named — the name that meets most of *our* (euphonic, phonetic, aesthetic, cultural, social, etc.) expectations, based on a series of factors that describe *our* socio-cultural behaviour.⁸

Naming an individual that has just entered a world can be done by relating him/her to someone who is already integrated in the human paradigm. In this context, Lévi-Strauss (2011: 184, orig. Romanian) states that a name is, on the one hand, “a sign of identification, which confirms, through the application of a rule, the belonging of a *named* individual to a pre-established class (a social group within a system of groups, a natal status within a system of statuses)”; on the other hand, the name is

a free creation of an individual *that names* and that expresses, by means of the person (s)he names, a transient state of his/her own subjectivity. [...] Apparently, one can only choose between identifying another person, assigning him/her to a certain class, and identifying oneself through that person, under the pretext of giving him/her a name. Therefore, we never simply give names: we classify someone (if the name (s)he receives

is related to his/her characteristics), or the name giver classifies him/herself (when, believing him/herself exempt from observing rules, (s)he names another person “freely,” that is, according to his/her own traits). Most often, the two things occur simultaneously. [...] We always signify either another person, or ourselves. We choose only between these two options, just as a painter chooses between figurative and non-figurative art, but which is, in fact, nothing but deciding on whether to assign a class to an identifiable object or, by taking the object out of its class, to make this choice a means of classifying oneself by expressing oneself through that object. (2011: 185, orig. Romanian)

A given name is, to a great extent, an aggregation of all sorts of events from the name giver’s experience and, to a much lesser extent, from the named person’s experience; a name is the projection of the name giver about himself/herself or about the named individual. It allows for one’s personality to transpire through another, as it favors the occasion of *permanently attributing one’s self to another*. When we give a name, the mechanism of comparison is triggered in our mind, or, in other words, of all the processes of the imagination with which it functions, our cognitive stylistic faculty activates that of comparison — of relating to a model — as the operation responsible for the attribution of names. When we give an established, “embodied” name,⁹ we only compare the named person *virtually*, as (s)he is yet to achieve something that would legitimate his/her investment with the properties of the one whose name has served for a model. Our nominal selection often lies in an *exemplary* name, a reflection of our intention to “embody” the neophyte into a *prototype*¹⁰ at the level of the name; we introduce in the “parent space” (the name that is already known due to the person who made it famous) a “daughter space” (the name that is transferred to a new individual) (see Fauconnier, 1984, the theory of mental spaces).

Prototypical uses of proper names

Besides the *referential* function (and the *vocative* one, which, however, does not fall into the scope of the current research — in this respect, see Jonasson, 1994: 65–72), the category of proper names fulfills two other functions: *nomination* and *identification*.

As a means of reference par excellence, the proper name “designates an individual without describing or classifying him/her, but by means of an *ad hoc* convention of naming that links directly, through a solid bond, the sound form or the graphical form of a proper name to the individual in question” (Jonasson, 1994: 65, orig. French). At the same time, when used *referentially*, the proper name “can contribute to the construction of an object of reference, that is, to the introduction of a new referent at the level of discourse, or to the reiteration of an object that has already been formed” (Jonasson, 1994: 65, orig. French).

When the function it develops is that of *nomination*, the proper name appears “in utterances that assert the naming relation which exists between a proper name and a given individual” (Jonasson, 1994: 69, orig. French). In agreement with Lyons (1978), the following types of nomination can be distinguished:

- *didactic nomination*, within which “a certain proper name is already linked to an individual, an object, or a place, by means of a pre-existing convention” (Lyons, 1978: 177, *ap.* Jonasson, 1994: 69, orig. French), and

- *performative nomination*, obtained “within the performative utterance of a baptismal act” (Jonasson, 1994: 70, orig. French). Not only the act of baptism, but also “the attribution of a nickname at school or within one’s family, of terms of endearment between lovers, etc.” (Lyons, 1978: 178, *ap.* Jonasson, 1994: 40, orig. French) are instances of performative nomination.

The *nomination* function develops a derivative, *pragmatic* function, namely *identification*. Talking about the theory of mental spaces, Fauconnier (1984) defines *identification* as follows: “If two objects (in the broadest sense) *a* and *b* are linked by means of a pragmatic function¹¹ F ($b = F(a)$), a description of *a* can serve for the identification of its correspondent *b*” (*ap.* Moeschler and Reboul, 1999: 144, orig. Romanian). By *a*, Fauconnier designates the *reference trigger*, by *b*, the *reference target*, and by *F*, the *connector*.

The unconventional anthroponyms (UA) in the present paper are created by semantic encapsulation, by the inclusion of a “daughter space” into a “parent space” by means of “space introducers.”¹²

Although they consist of noun phrases with definite articles (with one exception: *son of man*), the UA analyzed do not designate the *initial referent* directly (hence they do not signal it as being already introduced in space), but by resorting to a *secondary referent*. In other words, one gets to the “reference target” (the *initial referent*) by introducing a “daughter space” (the *secondary referent* or *reference trigger*) into the “parent space.”

The completeness of the definite descriptions¹³ considered is supported by the fact that they determine a unique referent.

Identifying referents in the case of mediated UA

By preserving all the functions that are representative of proper names in general and by developing a certain *referential autonomy* (i.e., they indicate a unique referent¹⁴), the UA discussed in this paper are the result of an act of *performative nomination*. As some of them are more solidly “embodied” than others and *mediation* is achieved through different semantic structures, these UA are treated as belonging to three distinct classes.

Concretely, a particular linguistic mechanism of designating referents is tackled, which is different from the conventional one (based on official proper names), as it performs designation through *mediation*, that is, by using *nomination auxiliaries* that fix references through

- *alterity*,
- *locative*, and
- *property*.

In these cases, the identity of the denotatum is not established directly, through a conventional proper name, but *indirectly*, through the semantic values conveyed by the corresponding nominal phrases. These constructions function as proper names, “condensing” a *description* or a *cluster of definite descriptions* (see *the descriptivist theory of proper names*, especially Russell, 1956 and Frege, 1971).

Mediated UA are transparent signs that communicate something about the bearer on various levels:¹⁵ for example, the bearer can be described as being

- *related* to X: *the mother of Jesus* (for Mary),
- linked in a certain way (i.e., belonging to it by birth) to a particular geographical area (*locative*): *the Stagirite* (for Aristotle), or
- characterized by a *trait* that is considered extreme by the members of a community: *the Iron Lady* (for Margaret Thatcher, due to her conservative, uncompromising politics).

Except for the first class of UA analyzed (those that identify the referent by means of *alterity*), the other two classes are generally treated as *nicknames* or *byname*s.

The unconventional names in the first category can be viewed as *proper names* by reconsidering the traditional semantic sphere of the concept of *anthroponym* (“the proper name of a human being,” Bidu-Vrănceanu *et al.*, 2005, *s.v.*), in view of including this term in *anthroponymic formulas*, namely in “*discursive units* which perform the function of *individualization* and *identification* [...]” (Ionescu Pérez, 2007: 218–219, orig. Romanian). Contextually, these constructions develop various *pragmatic functions*; most often, the speaker’s intention is to signify *in absente*, that is, to mention the object of reference without making use of the obvious, the explicit, but only by implying, therefore compelling the interlocutor to carry out inference processes, a necessary activity in the *correct establishment of the representational component*.¹⁶

On the contextual *onymization* of referring expressions, Coates (2006: 29) mentions the following: “[...] a referring expression [...] may evolve into a name (onymize) through the manner of its use in appropriate contexts,” or “[...] properhood is something which expressions may have in context, rather than something which is part of the definition of particular expressions” (2006: 30).

As regards the construction of UA in the other two categories, the speaker’s subjective intention is explicit, since these units are transparent, *motivated* nominal structures.

The analysis of all these constructions together, in a single study, is accounted for not only because they acquire the status of anthroponyms as a result of the *identification* function that they develop *in use*, but also, on the one hand, due to the indirect manner in which they identify their referents and, on the other hand, due to the fact that they designate unique denotata *in the reality from which they have been taken out*.¹⁷

Pragmalinguistic mechanisms of fixing referents

Normally, a NPh identifies a single referent. However, this does not hold in the case of proper names that are used indirectly, metonymically, as the following examples show.

I. The first category of mediated UA includes items that fix referents by resorting to *alterity*. As the nominal connection established between names and referents is very tight, the name structures in question have been “solidified,” indissolubly uniting their form with their denotata, due to their function as strong referential expressions that can be traced in speakers’ discursive memory. Illustratively, nominal constructions that identify biblical characters are examined.

In the examples below, *designation* is achieved by means of *teknonyms* (see Lévi-Strauss, 2011: 195), that is, through names that point to kinship (kinship terms). A name (an *autonym*, according to Lévi-Strauss, 2011: 196) “determines only a ‘self’ by contrast with other ‘selves’,” whereas a *teknonym*, “which includes a proper name (that does not belong to the subject), can be defined as expressing a *relationship with another self*” (2011: 196, orig. Romanian).

(1) *the daughter of Herodias:*

But when Herod’s birthday was kept, the daughter of Herodias danced before them, and pleased Herod. (Matthew 14:6).¹⁸

And when the daughter of [the said] Herodias came in, and danced, and pleased Herod, and them that sat with him, the king said unto the girl, Ask of me whatsoever you will, and I will give it to you (Mark 6:22).

Salome is called *the daughter of Herodias* to underline the crucial role played by the mother in the daughter’s decisions (the mother’s “name”¹⁹ is present in the phrase as a “secondary referent”).

The name *Jesus* is frequently replaced by the following nominal phrases, whose heads are relational nouns, and which highlight Christ’s divine and human origin:

(2) *thel/thou Son of David:*

And, behold, a woman of Canaan came out of the same coasts, and cried unto him, saying, Have mercy on me, O Lord, thou Son of David; my daughter is grievously vexed with a devil (Matthew 15:22).

And the multitude rebuked them, because they should hold their peace: but they cried the more, saying, Have mercy on us, O Lord, thou Son of David (Matthew 20:31).

(3) *Son of man:*

And he said unto me, Son of man, I send thee to the children of Israel, to a rebellious nation that hath rebelled against me: they and their fathers have transgressed against me, even unto this very day (Ezekiel 2:3).

And thou, son of man, be not afraid of them, neither be afraid of their words, though briars and thorns be with thee, and thou dost dwell among scorpions: be not afraid of their words, nor be dismayed at their looks, though they be a rebellious house (Ezekiel 2:6).

(4) *the Son of God:*

And unclean spirits, when they saw him, fell down before him, and cried, saying, Thou art the Son of God (Mark 3:11).

(5) *the Son of the Highest:*

He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Highest: and the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David (Luke 1:32).

(6) *the son of Mary, the brother of James, and Joses, and of Juda, and Simon:*

Is not this the carpenter, the son of Mary, the brother of James, and Joses, and of Juda, and Simon? And are not his sisters here with us? And they were offended at him (Mark 6:3).

Likewise, the noun phrases *the mother of Jesus* and *His mother* for *Mary* evoke, through the presence of the *secondary referent*, the argument of divine authority in

the interpretation of Virgin Mary's destiny. The *secondary referents* in these structures lend their meaning to the construction of the *primary referent's* significance. Thus, a *mediated, indirect* reference is created, in which the function of the post/pre-modifier of the relational noun is used to develop connotation in the noun phrases in question:

(7) *the mother of Jesus:*

And when they wanted wine, the mother of Jesus saith unto him, They have no wine (John 2:3).

(8) *His mother:*

His mother saith unto the servants, Whatsoever he saith unto you, do it (John 2:5).

There are similar values of such types of noun phrases in contemporary Romanian media, in discourses of various socialites: *I will for ever be the son of my father* (<<http://www.okmagazine.ro>>) (Honorius Prigoană, the son of a famous Romanian businessman and politician). The notorious personality of the *secondary referent* and the “embodiment” of his name into locutors' discursive memory can serve as a positive or negative reference/introduction in the existence of the *primary referent* (the son).

These NPhs develop contextual pragmatic and stylistic values, as they designate a “primary referent” by evoking a “secondary referent” (Searle, 1969).

Structurally, the aforementioned UA consist of noun phrases in which the head, a relational noun, establishes a relation of belonging with the modifying elements (see Pană Dindelegan, 2010: 387).

II. Another category of UA analyzed in this paper fixes referents by using substitutes of conventional names, namely by turning to a *property*²⁰ that defines the referent identified. The noun phrases that fall into this group are generally treated as bynames/nicknames. They function as definite, “embodied” nominal constructions, because the denotatum has earned its unique quality. As in a palimpsest, the initial referent can be seen in nominal constructions like *Carmen Silva* (the literary pseudonym of Queen Elisabeth I of Romania), *the Iron Lady* (Margaret Thatcher), *the Morning Star of Romanian Poetry* (Mihai Eminescu), *the Morning Star of Coal* (Miron Cozma), *the Forerunner* (John the Baptist), *the Queen of Hearts* (Princess Diana), *the Psalmist* (David), *the Sun King* (Louie XIV), *the Father* (Stalin), *the Seller* (Judas). All these UA define an identity through the *onymization* of a *property*.

Stylistically, the *proprial* character of a name is obtained by means of *antonomasia* (the turning of a common name into a proper name) and *metonymy* (*pars pro toto*: highlighting a part — a property of the referent — for the whole, i.e., the official name).

The mechanism of *onymization* is salient in two of the examples provided above:

- (1) *The Morning Star of Romanian Poetry* (Mihai Eminescu, the greatest Romanian poet). One of the author's most significant poems is called *Luceafărul* (*The Morning Star*). The title became a byname/nickname for the poet, implying an indirect reference that can be described as a *pragmatic function*, linking the writer to his literary work (see Nunberg, 1978 and Fauconnier, 1984).
- (2) Along the same lines, the phrase *the Morning Star of Coal* designates Miron Cozma, a former leader of the miners from Jiu Valley, who discovered his artistic inclination while he was in prison²¹ and published a volume of poetry.

This is why he was given the byname *the Morning Star of Coal*, by analogy with *the Morning Star of Romanian Poetry*, but ironically.

III. The last category of UA investigated on this occasion consists of nominal structures that fix their referents through a *locative*; these function as bynames, as well: *the Bard of Mircești* (Vasile Alecsandri, a Forty-Eighter Romanian poet, born in Mircești), *the Monk of Rohia* (Nicolae Steinhardt, a well-known Romanian prose writer, who retired to Rohia Monastery during the communist regime, and was buried there), *the Oracle of Dămăroaia* (Silviu Brucan, a former political analyst, from a neighborhood in Bucharest called Dămăroaia, who was a constant presence on the TV show *Prophecies on the Past*, which aired on ProTV, a Romanian television channel), *the Poet of Lancrăm* (Lucian Blaga, an important Romanian poet and philosopher, born in Lancrăm), *the Tomitan poet* (the Latin poet Ovid, who was exiled to Tomis, nowadays Constanța), *the Stagirite* (Aristotle).

Structurally, *nomination by means of locatives* is achieved through noun phrases that are made up of a prepositional phrase which modifies the head noun (in the first four cases), a noun phrase in which the head noun is pre-modified by the definite article and an adjective (*the Tomitan poet*), or simply by the definite article (*the Stagirite*).

Special attention within this category is given to the phrase *the tenant of the White House*, which cannot function as a nominal label for a single individual, as it relates to several individuals that have, at one point in time, occupied this position. The definite description *the tenant* reveals both the *role* and the *values* attributed to this function. Depending on the various historical periods, *the tenant* designates different individuals, and the *role* function activates *distinct values* that correspond to these parameters (see Moeschler and Reboul, 1999: 150).

Conclusion

The process of name-giving implies a transfer of the name-giver into the named person, a temporal or permanent situation into the other, a lending of the self to another, a transplant of identity into alterity. From this perspective, names have a polyphonic dimension: they do not report something about the individuals designated, as they are a sum of the “voices” of the name giver(s). Names are polyphonic for yet another reason: they are part of a common onomastic inventory and, once taken from it, they convey characteristics that belong to name bearers over time and space.

Notes

¹ The translation of the quotes that are underlined as being originally in Romanian or French (marked by “orig. Romanian” and “orig. French” respectively) was made by the author of the present paper.

² This study is part of a research project funded by CNCS, code PN-II-RU-TE-2011-3-0007 (contract no. 103/2011), called Unconventional Romanian Anthroponyms in European Context: Formation Patterns and Discursive Function, won in an international competition in 2011.

³ By *standardized* act of naming, the author means that instance in which a name is acknowledged by an administrative and/or clerical authority, and one’s registration into this new status (as a named entity) is supported by the authentication of the baptism in official documents (in registries, birth certificates, etc.).

⁴ “The act of naming is the starting point of every identity. In our society, an individual’s name points to his/her affiliation, that is, to his/her place within

a series. [...] Name-giving is the first symbolic act, the one that allows for the existence of an identity, not only with reference to a formal and administrative status, but, to the same extent, in relation to one's introduction into a symbolic system of language. Likewise, the identity of a group and of its members consists in the name that is used to designate it. A group's name indicates its origin, history, and place within society" (Chauchat and Durand-Delvigne, 1999: 62, *ap.* Martin, 2012, 43, orig. French).

⁵ "[...] if to name an object is to give meaning to it, to identify an individual is to acknowledge him/her" (Martin, 2005: 6, *ap.* Martin, 2012: 43, orig. French), "[...] but also to situate him/her within groups of affiliation. The first group, the one to whom the individual belongs, is that of gender affiliation, which is recorded in the registrar of civil status. Besides information related to one's sex, this primary registration data also contains one's forename and surname, date and place of birth, and a mention of parents' identity. [...] Name-giving offers individuals a unique status (in terms of the existence of a personal nominal space); it is an 'organized ensemble of identifying elements that allow an individual to define himself/herself in a given situation, as a social agent'" (Taboada-Leonetti, 1990: 44, *ap.* Martin, 2012: 43, orig. French).

⁶ This article does not pay attention to unconventional anthroponyms that are given in traditional rural communities to individuals who fall severely ill. In such cases, the initial name is changed with another that is believed to have apotropaic qualities (see also Evseev, 1997: *s.v.*).

⁷ Referring to the *classifying* function of names and considering the distinction Gardiner makes between "embodied" and "disembodied" names, Lévi-Strauss (2011: 188, orig. Romanian) claims the following about the latter onomastic class (which tallies with the stand supported by this paper, on the self-centered position of the name giver, as opposed to the peripheral role of the named object): "[...] they [n. n. names] assign parents (who choose their children's names) to a certain environment, age, and style, but they also classify their bearers in several ways: firstly, because a John is a member of the class of Johns; and secondly, because every forename has, consciously or not, a cultural connotation that is ingrained onto the image others get of the bearer and that, by means of subtle twists, can contribute positively or negatively to shaping his/her personality."

⁸ Given the fact that in the Catholic and Orthodox churches baptism occurs very early in one's experience, it is premature to assert the prominence of certain mental/physical features that are representative of the child and that would lead to the giving of a "transparent" name, *motivated* by the existence of such traits. Nevertheless, the situation is different as far as names of animals are concerned, whose

mental and physical behavior allows for the attribution of names that tally with animals' specific features, even if they are very young. This is actually one of the criteria that determine the choice of pet names. (In this respect, see the article the author wrote in collaboration with Oliviu Felecan, *Considérations concernant les zoonyms: attribution et classification des noms dans le cas des chats de compagnie*, forthcoming).

⁹ Gardiner (1954) distinguished between two types of proper names: "embodied" and "disembodied". "Embodied" proper names are linked to an individual, a place, or an object, and refer 'exclusively' to this particular entity; these types of names are what we commonly call today (direct or rigid) designators. On the contrary, 'disembodied' proper names are phonic and lexical formations ('word sounds'), which we usually study as regards their etymology, frequency, and usage in onomastics" (Jonasson, 1994: 72, orig. French).

¹⁰ In agreement with Moeschler and Reboul (1999: 365, orig. Romanian), the prototype can be defined as "the best exemplar of a category, because it has the typical properties of the category in question, which is why it is not necessarily an instance of that category any longer, but it can be a mental construction;" the prototype is "the object that has the biggest number of typical properties and, therefore, the most numerous relations of similarity with the other members of the category."

¹¹ "The pragmatic function [...] is the connection that, starting from a trigger-element belonging to the parent space, identifies a target-element in a daughter space, thereby establishing the link between these two spaces" (Moeschler and Reboul, 1999: 158, orig. Romanian).

¹² "The pragmatic connection between a given space and the parent space is created by the pragmatic connectors between the triggers of parent spaces and the targets of daughter spaces" (Moeschler and Reboul, 1999: 145, orig. Romanian).

¹³ "A definite or indefinite description is *incomplete* if it fails to determine a unique referent. This incompleteness is generally solved by means of pragmatic mechanisms of returning to the context" (Moeschler and Reboul, 1999: 351, orig. Romanian).

¹⁴ Proper names have a multiple reference potential, but the reference is fixed for each of the uses (see Coates, 2006: 41).

¹⁵ The class of UA does not only include the names analyzed in this study, but *nicknames*, *byname*s, *pseudonyms*, and *user names* as well, unofficial names that the author of this paper has dealt with on other occasions. "The proper name, or *nomen proprium* conveys a relationship that links an individual to his/her self; it equally covers a nominal space that contains proper names (patronymic/matronymic and forename) [...]. The *nomen proprium* marks a subject's belonging to civil society,

just as in the digital age, a user name marks one's belonging to virtual (Internet) society; contrariwise, appellatives designate objects that have the same nature" (Martin, 2012: 49, orig. French).

- ¹⁶ There are two aspects to significance: an *interior* one (related to what is in our mind), corresponding to the *representational* component, and an *exterior* one (related to what is in reality), corresponding to the *referential* component (see Oltean, 2003: 23).
- ¹⁷ Starting from Kripke's statement (2001: 48), according to which *rigid designators* have to designate the same object in any possible world (without implying that the object must exist in all possible worlds), the UA discussed could be included in the category of *rigid designators*. Nevertheless, taking his interpretation further, Kripke dismisses this initial thesis, which complicates things by the descriptivist approach to names: "Suppose the reference of a name is given by a description or a cluster of descriptions. If the name *means the same* as that description or cluster of descriptions, it will not be a rigid designator. It will not necessarily designate the same object in all possible worlds, since other objects might have had the given properties in other possible worlds [...]" (2001: 57). It does not fall within the scope of the present study to prove whether or not mediated UA function as rigid designators. This

controversial issue has been somewhat solved by Coates (2006: 30): "It is therefore *false* that the essential nature of names is that they uniquely denote individuals (except in the accidental case where a name as a matter of fact has only one bearer), but it is *true* that their essential duty is to refer uniquely to individuals [...]."

- ¹⁸ For the quotations in the examples, *The Official King James Bible Online* (<<http://www.kingjames-bibleonline.org/>>) was used.

¹⁹ In fact, Salome's mother is not mentioned in the *Bible* with any name; she is merely known as *Herodias*, Herod's wife. One can claim that, in this case, there occurs a double encapsulation: *the daughter of Herodias* (for Salome) → *Herodias* (for X, the wife of Herod).

- ²⁰ "A partially descriptive name *n* is semantically associated with both a descriptive property *P_D* and a referent *o*. The referent *o* is determined in part by the same non-descriptive mechanisms that determine the reference of ordinary non-descriptive names — for example, by a historical chain of transmission leading back to *o*" (Soames, 2002: 88).

²¹ Due to the mining protests he organized in the 90s (and, implicitly, due to the resulting damage), Miron Cozma was seen as a threat to Romanian post-revolutionary democracy.

Bibliography

- Bidu-Vrânceanu, Angela, Cristina Călărașu, Liliana Ionescu-Ruxândoiu, Mihaela Mancaș, and Gabriela Pană Dindelegan. 2005. *Dicționar de științe ale limbii (DSL) [Dictionary of Language Sciences]*. Bucharest: Nemira.
- Chauchat, Hélène, and Annick Durand-Delvigne. 1999. *De l'identité du sujet au lien social*. Paris: PUF.
- Coates, Richard. 2006. "Some Consequences and Critiques of The Pragmatic Theory of Properhood." *Onoma* 41: 27–44.
- Evscev, Ivan. 1997. *Dicționar de magie, demonologie și mitologie românească [Dictionary of Romanian Wizardry, Demonology, and Mythology]*. Timișoara: Amarcord.
- Fauconnier, G. 1984. *Espaces mentaux. Aspects de la construction du sens dans les langues naturelles*. Paris: Minuit.
- Frege, B. 1971. *Écrits logiques et philosophiques*. Trans. C. Imbert. Paris: Le Seuil.
- Gardiner, Alan H. 1954. *The Theory of Proper Names: A Controversial Essay*. London/New York: Oxford University Press.
- Ionescu Pérez, Pedro Cristian. 2007. "Concepte, metodologie și terminologie în antroponimia romanică" [Concepts, Methodology, and Terminology in Romance Anthroponymy]. *Limba română, limbă romanică [The Romanian Language, a Romance Language]*. Coord. Sanda Reinheimer Ripeanu, and Ioana Vintilă Rădulescu. Bucharest: Editura Academiei Române, 215–230.
- Jonasson, Kerstin. 1994. *Le nom propre. Constructions et interprétations*. Louvain-la-Neuve: Duculot.
- Kripke, Saul A. 2001. *Naming and Necessity*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Lévi-Strauss, Claude. 2011. *Gândirea sălbatică [The Savage Mind]*. 2nd edn. Trans. I. Pecher. Iași: Polirom.
- Lyons, J. 1978. *Éléments de sémantique*. Paris: Larousse.
- Martin, Marcienne. 2005. *Les constructions identitaires du sujet à travers la mise en place de pseudonymes et l'émergence d'un nouveau code langagier via l'outil Internet*. Doctoral thesis. Saint-Denis: Île de La Réunion.
- Martin, Marcienne. 2012. *Se nommer pour exister. L'exemple du pseudonyme sur Internet*. Paris: L'Harmattan.
- Moeschler, Jacques, and Anne Reboul. 1999. *Dicționar enciclopedic de pragmatică (DEP) [Encyclopaedic Dictionary of Pragmatics]*. Trans. coord. Carmen Vlad and Liana Pop. Cluj: Echinox.

- Nunberg, G. D. 1978. *The Pragmatics of Reference*. Bloomington: IULC.
- Oltean, Ștefan. 2003. *Lumile posibile în structurile limbajului* [*Possible Worlds in Language Structures*]. Cluj-Napoca: Echinox.
- Pană Dindelegan, Gabriela (ed.). 2010. *Gramatica de bază a limbii române (GBLR)* [*The Basic Grammar of the Romanian Language*]. Bucharest: Univers Enciclopedic Gold.
- Russell, B. 1956. *Logic and Knowledge: Essays, 1901–1950*. Ed. Robert C. Marsh. London: Allen and Unwin.
- Searle, J. 1969. *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Soames, Scott. 2002. *Beyond Rigidity. The Unfinished Semantic Agenda of "Naming and Necessity."* New York: Oxford University Press.
- Taboada-Leonetti, Isabelle. 1990. "Stratégies identitaires et minorités: le point de vue du sociologue." *Stratégies identitaires*. Ed. Carmel Camilleri, Joseph Kastersztein, Edmond Marc Lipansky, Hanna Malewska-Peyre, Isabelle Taboada-Leonetti, and Ana Vasquez. Paris: PUF, 43–83.
- The Official King James Bible Online*. Available at: <http://www.kingjamesbibleonline.org/> [Accessed November 1 2012].

Notes on contributor

Daiana Felecan has a BA degree in Romanian-Latin studies (1997, University of the West, Timișoara), and a PhD in Philology (2004, Romania). She is Associate Professor at the Faculty of Letters, Technical University of Cluj-Napoca (CUNBM), and the manager of a CNCS grant project. She has written five books and dozens of studies published in specialized proceedings/journals from thirteen countries.

Correspondence to: Daiana Felecan, North University Center of Baia Mare (UTCN), Department of Philology and Cultural Studies, 62 Victor Babeș Street, Baia Mare 430083, Romania. Email: daiana18felecan@yahoo.com