

Name and Naming

Name and Naming:
Synchronic and Diachronic Perspectives

Edited by

Oliviu Felecan

**CAMBRIDGE
SCHOLARS**

P U B L I S H I N G

Name and Naming:
Synchronic and Diachronic Perspectives,
Edited by Oliviu Felecan

This book first published 2012

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

12 Back Chapman Street, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2XX, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Copyright © 2012 by Oliviu Felecan and contributors

All rights for this book reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the copyright owner.

ISBN (10): 1-4438-3752-0, ISBN (13): 978-1-4438-3752-1

CONTENTS

Foreword	ix
Acknowledgments	xiv
Contributors	xv

PART ONE: THEORY OF NAMES

Denominational Differences in the Romanian Rendering of Greek- and Latin-Origin Proper Names in Ecclesiastical Literature: A Translation Theory Perspective	2
Octavian Gordon	

Appellativisation and Proprialisation: The Gateways between the Appellative and Proprial Spheres of Language	10
Milan Harvalik	

Pragmatics and Anthroponymy: Theoretical Considerations Regarding the System of Designating Terms in Contemporary Romanian	18
Margareta Manu Magda	

PART TWO: ANTHROPONOMASTICS

Section One: Anthroponyms: A Diachronic Perspective (Forenames and Surnames)

Avra(ha)m and Šara(i): Infertility Overcome by a Linguistic Redox	36
Daive Astori	

A Sociology of First Names in the Late Middle Ages	53
Pierre-Henri Billy	

On the Adaptation of Names of Romance Origin (Spanish, French, Occitan, Italian) into Valencian Catalan	65
Emili Casanova	

The Double System of Descent Groups and Surname Adaptations in a Francoprovençal/French Diglossic Situation	74
Jérémie Delorme	

<i>Dame Catherine, Allix la Barbriere</i> and <i>La Femme le Grant Jehan du Pasquier</i> : Naming Women in Accounting Records at the End of the Middle Ages	87
Aude Wirth-Jaillard	

Section Two: Anthroponyms: A Synchronic Perspective (Forenames and Surnames)

Onomastics and the Internationally-Minded Generations of Baia Mare	100
Minodora Barbul	

The Dynamics of Forenames in the Anthroponymy of Baia Mare	118
Nicolae Felecan	

Conformity and Nonconformity in Gypsy Names	129
Oliviu Felecan	

The Right to a Good Name: Muslim and Xhosa Children	147
Bertie Neethling	

Ethnolinguistic Adoption, Adaptation and Migration: The Example of Family Names from Baia Mare (and the Surrounding Areas) and Maramureş, Romania	162
Rodica-Cristina Ţurcanu	

Section Three: Unconventional Anthroponyms (Nicknames, Bynames, Hypocoristics)

The Dynamics of Generic Terms used to Designate Women in the Contemporary Romanian Show Business	184
Daiana Felecan	

Political Anthroponyms in French Mass Media	202
Georgeta Rus	

Hypocoristics among Young People in Germany: Methodical Problems
and Corpus Analysis 216
Bernd Spillner

Diachronic Classification of Bynames given by Adults, and Bynames
given by Young People 222
Willy Van Langendonck

Section Four: Literary Onomastics

Stylistic Aspects of Proper Names in Old Romanian Writings 234
Gh. Chivu

The Art of Names in Pascal Quignard's Literary Work 253
Nicoleta Cîmpian

Literary Onomastics within Postmodern Fragmentation 260
Carmen Dărăbuș

Good Names and Bad Names: The Axiological Aspect of Literary
Proper Names—A Cognitive Approach 269
Anna Fornalczyk and Aleksandra Biela-Wołośńcej

Esoteric Meanings of Names in the Prose of Mircea Eliade..... 284
Gheorghe Glodeanu

Hibernian Choices: The Politics of Naming in Flann O'Brien's
At Swim-Two-Birds..... 295
Adrian Oțoiu

Name Quest, Identity Quest with Patrick Modiano 310
Marcela Oțoiu

The Sense of Intention in the Pagan Anthroponyms of *The Song
of Roland* 316
Thierry Ponchon

Names and References in Shakespeare's *The Taming of the Shrew*..... 330
Grant W. Smith

PART THREE: TOPONOMASTICS

<i>And the River Flows: The Presence of Latin <i>amnis</i> in Italian Place Names</i>	346
Maria Giovanna Arcamone	
The Change of Names in 20 th Century Romanian Toponymy	353
Domnița Tomescu	
French Odonymy with a Link to Rumania: Naming Motivations of Political Origin	365
Michel A. Rateau	
The Translation of Official Country Names into Romanian	375
Ioana Vintilă-Rădulescu	

PART FOUR: NAMES IN SOCIETY

On Brands and Branding in the Romanian Space	388
Alina Bugheșiu	
Anthroponyms in the Names of Firms in Sighetu Marmăției	401
Adelina Emilia Mihali	
Proper Names of Perfumes	413
Mihaela Munteanu Siserman	
The Use of Proper Names in Early Finnish Newspaper Advertisements ...	424
Paula Sjöblom	
Index auctorum et operum	437
Index nominum et rerum	440

FOREWORD

Introductory Notes

Name and Naming: Synchronic and Diachronic Perspectives aims to analyse names (especially anthroponyms and toponyms) and the act of naming from an intercultural perspective, both synchronically and diachronically.

In this respect, the present collection of studies pertains to the field of the latest scientific endeavours, whose purpose is to research *the problematics related to the formation of intercultural onomastic and communicative abilities* (some of the critical abilities individuals today need, within a world that is undergoing various forms of *globalisation*). The stages in the formation of intercultural abilities refer to (1) observing various types of “cultural patterns,” different from one’s own, in view of valuing them, but without creating positive or negative hierarchies; (2) broadening the “patterns” of one’s own cultural behaviour, by flexibly using “cultural rules;” (3) selectively adopting certain norms from other cultures; (4) making cultural choices that are appropriate in specific situations; (5) surmounting “intercultural conflicts.”

The volume sets to offer a bird’s-eye view of names and naming, a synthesis that is made possible, on the one hand, by the blending of synchronic and diachronic viewpoints in the investigation of language facts and, on the other, by the fruitful conjunction of modern and classic theories.

The originality and the novelty of the subject lies in the multi-disciplinary approach, in which the field of onomastics merges with that of sociolinguistics, psycholinguistics, pragmatics, history, literature, stylistics, religion etc. The area investigated is vast and diverse, and it includes the Central, Eastern and Western European cultural spaces (in which isolated villages co-exist with cosmopolitan cities, in a heterogeneous mixture of ethnicities—e.g. Romanian, Hungarian, German, and Roma), as well as territories on the African continent.

The research starts from acknowledging that, in a world that is becoming increasingly globalised, sociocultural transformations are also reflected, almost im-mediately, in *the field of onomastics*, in the sense that people have the freedom to name people, places and products that result from human activity.

The theoretical background of the research is highly diversified; as this is a collective volume (with 35 contributors), the bibliography consists both of fundamental, classic works on the topic in question, and in up-to-date references.

The thematic diversity also derives from the meeting, within the pages of this book, of specialists (linguists and literati) from 11 countries on 3 continents.

The volume is divided into four main parts, which are, in turn, organised into thematic chapters and subchapters, as follows:

1. Theory of Names

The chapter deals with certain theoretical aspects regarding appellativisation and propriation, including studies related to the *translation theory perspective (denominational differences in the Romanian rendering of Greek- and Latin-origin proper names in ecclesiastical literature)*, and to the pragmatic configuration of the system of generic names in contemporary Romanian.

2. Anthroponomastics

2.1. Anthroponyms: A Diachronic Perspective (Forenames and Surnames)

The diachronic approach to names and naming underlies the presentation of biblical onymic tokens (*Avra[ha]m and Sara(i)*), and of a wide range of male and female anthroponyms in the Western Romance space during the Middle Ages (French, Spanish, Catalan, Italian, and even Maltese), or during the 19th and 20th centuries (the double system of descent groups and surname adaptations in a Francoprovençal/French diglossic situation).

2.2. Anthroponyms: A Synchronic Perspective (Forenames and Surnames)

The multiethnic, multicultural and multilingual Central European space (to be more precise, the North-Western part of Romania) is analysed synchronically. Nowadays, anthroponyms in the official system of naming are more and more subject to the process of internationalisation. The forenames that are most frequently disseminated by the media—those of celebrities from music, sports, cinema, show business, politics etc.—

captivate the attention of ordinary people everywhere, regardless of their country of origin (a fact which did not define times past). Traditional, conventional baptismal names grow less and less frequent, possibly as a result of the increasing influence exerted by the mass media and by the Internet.

Anthroponymic and linguistic stratification depend on the socio-economic status of the members of a group and on a community's index of social mobility. Most often, the choice of foreign forenames originates in travels made abroad, be they short visits or longer stays, for work or studies.

Anthroponymic changes may occur in two ways: by borrowing, as a result of the need to baptise children with foreign forenames which do not exist in the basic language, and by substitution, when the anthroponymic synonyms in the subject's primary system are considered "obsolete."

The appearance of family names (surnames) was determined by the historical circumstances in which these names were formed, by the influences they underwent, the cultural interferences that are inherent to the process of name-formation. The onomastic inventory of family names derives from diverse sources (lexical, toponyms, bynames or nicknames). At the same time, surnames may prove efficient in drawing the outline of the national unity of peoples scattered throughout vast territories, sometimes in different countries.

Regarding the areas outside Europe, this subchapter includes the study *The Right to a Good Name: Muslim and Xhosa Children*, which analyses the criteria and the conventions related to name-giving in multiracial communities, even according to the religious belonging of the onomastic agents.

2.3. Unconventional Anthroponyms: Nicknames, Bynames, Hypocoristics

The present subchapter deals with the way in which nicknames are given in multicultural areas to people belonging to ethnic groups other than the majority. Moreover, nicknames are classified according to the age or the socio-professional status of the name-bearers (teachers/students, important personalities in the Romanian or French public space). The notion of characterisation is relevant to most other names and pertains to a person's salient attributes, physical appearance, psychological peculiarities, behaviour, social status, profession, occupations, or other activities.

2.4. Literary Anthroponymy

Regardless of the historical age in which they professed their “creed,” writers have chosen for their characters names that have a conspicuous suggestive potential, to be able to send their readers the message they intended. The studies gathered within this subchapter treat the scope of literary anthroponyms from the Middle Ages (*Chanson de Roland*) to the pre-modern period (in the Romanian perimeter), from the beginning of the 20th century until today, from various spaces and cultures in Europe: France (Pascal Quignard, Patrick Modiano), Ireland (Flann O’Brien), Romania (Mircea Eliade), Serbia (Milorad Pavić). These studies propose a comprehensive approach to literary anthroponymy (e.g. of classic literary works, such as William Shakespeare’s *The Taming of the Shrew*). Similarly, they may follow the axiological aspects of literary proper names, analysed from a cognitive viewpoint.

3. Toponomastics

Toponyms are divided into categories according to the types of places they designate and according to the structure of the name used for its individualisation. The most relevant categories of socio-geographical toponyms, as a result of applying the first criterion, are *oikonyms* (e.g. the modification of Romanian place names, for administrative reasons) and *hydronyms* (e.g. the presence of Latin *amnis* in Italian place names). With reference to physical prominence and social importance, this subchapter considers the issue of *macrotoponyms* (names of states) and of *microtoponyms* (*odonyms* in the French space that are related to Romania).

4. Names in Society

This chapter exhibits a great thematic variety, as it deals with names of firms/brands (and the connection they establish with the field of anthroponymy), names of perfumes (a semiotic analysis), and the use of proper names in early Finnish newspaper advertisements. As a social act, naming cannot be detached from the context in which it is performed.

Concluding Remarks

The volume *Name and Naming: Synchronic and Diachronic Perspectives*

goes beyond the limited frame of an onomastic monograph, by offering a bird's-eye view, from a multi-disciplinary perspective, on the phenomenon of naming. Anthroponymy mingles with sociolinguistics, psycholinguistics, pragmatics, toponymy, literature, anthropology, stylistics, history, religion etc.

On a global level, we hope our work proves to be an illustrative example of the way in which theoretical contributions and practical case studies—diverse in matters of corpus, themes and approach—may become a complex synthesis in the field of recent onomastic research.

OLIVIU FELECAN

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We would like to thank the authors of this collection for their collaboration on this project, and Carol Koulikourdi, from Cambridge Scholars Publishing, for her support. I would also like to thank Willy Van Langendonck, Professor Emeritus at the Department of Linguistics from the University of Leuven, and Bertie Neethling, Professor at the University of the Western Cape, for their help in reviewing some of the studies, and for their helpful linguistic, stylistic and terminological analysis.

Last but not least, I owe special thanks to Alina Bugheșiu, a junior researcher of my team, for her creativity, enthusiasm, flexibility, and professionalism in the preparation of the manuscript, in the translation and reviewing process of several studies.

CONTRIBUTORS

- MARIA GIOVANNA ARCAMONE, University of Pisa, Italy
DAVIDE ASTORI, University of Parma, Italy
MINODORA BARBUL, North University Center of Baia Mare, UTCN,
Romania
ALEKSANDRA BIELA-WOŁOŃCIEJ, University of Warsaw, Institute
of Applied Linguistics, Poland
PIERRE-HENRI BILLY, C.N.R.S., Université Paris-I Sorbonne, France
ALINA BUGHEȘIU, North University Center of Baia Mare, UTCN,
Romania
EMILI CASANOVA, University of Valencia (AVL), Spain
GHEORGHE CHIVU, Romanian Academy, University of Bucharest,
Romania
NICOLETA CÎMPIAN, North University Center of Baia Mare, UTCN,
Romania
CARMEN DĂRĂBUȘ, North University Center of Baia Mare, Romania /
Novi Sad University, Serbia
JÉRÉMIE DELORME, FNRS & University of Liège, Belgium
DAIANA FELECAN, North University Center of Baia Mare, UTCN,
Romania
NICOLAE FELECAN, North University Center of Baia Mare, UTCN,
Romania
OLIVIU FELECAN, North University Center of Baia Mare, UTCN,
Romania
ANNA FORNALCZYK, University of Warsaw, Institute of Applied
Linguistics, Poland
GHEORGHE GLODEANU, North University Center of Baia Mare,
UTCN, Romania
OCTAVIAN GORDON, University of Bucharest, Faculty of Orthodox
Theology, Department of Church History, Biblical Studies and
Philology, Romania
MILAN HARVALÍK, The Institute for the Czech Language of the
Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic, Prague, Czech Republic

- MARGARETA MANU MAGDA, The Institute of Linguistics “I. Iordan – Al. Rosetti” of the Romanian Academy, Bucharest, Romania
- ADELINA EMILIA MIHALI, North University Center of Baia Mare, UTCN, Romania
- MIHAELA MUNTEANU SISERMAN, North University Center of Baia Mare, UTCN, Romania
- BERTIE NEETHLING, Xhosa Department, University of the Western Cape (UWC), South Africa
- ADRIAN OȚOIU, North University Center of Baia Mare, UTCN, Romania
- MARCELA OȚOIU, North University Center of Baia Mare, UTCN, Romania
- THIERRY PONCHON, University of Reims and University of Paris-Sorbonne – CNRS EA 4509, France
- GEORGETA RUS, North University Center of Baia Mare, UTCN, Romania
- MICHEL A. RATEAU, Société Française d’Onomastique, France
- PAULA SJÖBLOM, University of Turku, Finland
- GRANT W. SMITH, Eastern Washington University, USA
- BERND SPILLNER, University of Duisburg-Essen, Germany
- DOMNIȚA TOMESCU, University of Ploiești, Romania
- RODICA-CRISTINA ȚURCANU, North University Center of Baia Mare, UTCN, Romania
- WILLY VAN LANGENDONCK, Department of Linguistics, University of Leuven, Belgium
- IOANA VINTILĂ-RĂDULESCU, The Institute of Linguistics “I. Iordan – Al. Rosetti” of the Romanian Academy / University of Bucharest, Romania
- AUDE WIRTH-JAILLARD, Institut Émilie du Châtelet – LAMOP (CNRS & Université Paris 1 Panthéon-Sorbonne), France

PART ONE:

THEORY OF NAMES

DENOMINATIONAL DIFFERENCES
IN THE ROMANIAN RENDERING OF GREEK-
AND LATIN-ORIGIN PROPER NAMES
IN ECCLESIASTICAL LITERATURE:
A TRANSLATION THEORY PERSPECTIVE

OCTAVIAN GORDON

Introductory note

The Romanian rendering of anthroponyms and toponyms of the Greek-Latin Antiquity from and into Christian literature constitutes one of the most controversial points on the agenda of major translation projects in post-communist Romania. Most of these translation projects were preceded *by* or, at times, strewn *with* ample and—seemingly—inexhaustible discussions on a translational issue *par excellence*: namely, the Romanian rendering of Greek-Latin names in Christian literature.

The present study aims at pointing out certain aspects of the process of transposing the source-language onomasticon into the target-language, focusing on the “traditional” or “established” proper names. After endeavouring to describe this process of linguistic naturalisation, I will indicate certain *denominational differences* concerning the Romanian rendering of toponyms and anthroponyms from biblical and patristic Greek and Latin texts, attempting to pinpoint the linguistic and/or extra-linguistic motivation for these differences.¹

¹ This work was supported by the strategic grant POSDRU/89/1.5/S/62259, Project Applied Social, Human and Political Sciences. Postdoctoral Training and Postdoctoral Fellowships in Social, Human, And Political Sciences, funded in collaboration with the European Social Fund within the Sectorial Operational Program Human Resources Development, 2007-2013. The English translation of this paper has been made by Maria Băncilă, a colleague from the University of Bucharest, Faculty of Orthodox Theology, in collaboration with Maria Magdalena Rusen, English teacher.

The integration of names of Latin or Greek origin into Romanian

Generally speaking, the integration of names of Latin or Greek origin into Romanian is a matter that requires special attention from translators of Latin and Greek literature. The following observations can be made:²

(1) Once the problem of transliteration is solved, not only from Greek written in the Greek alphabet, but also from Latin written in the Latin alphabet,³ we can speak of the integration of proper names from the source language into Romanian, i.e. of their naturalisation, their adaptation to the phonetic and morphological characteristics of Romanian. As regards “traditional” names, they are *translated* and not simply imported into the target language, observing certain patterns of transliteration. Consequently, the integration of foreign names into Romanian, as defined so far, is a process that grammar should acknowledge, rather than discuss its acceptance or rejection.

(2) In this discussion, the main criterion for ascertaining whether a Greek-Latin name has been naturalised or not into Romanian—either through a natural process of assimilating the foreign name or through the pressure of literary usage (essentially and originally an artificial process)—is the name’s reception in literature (broadly speaking) and common language.⁴

(3) Within the church-related terminology, the toponymic forms we

² Focusing on rendering Latin and Greek toponyms in Romanian, I noted these general observations in full, in my paper, *Integrarea în limba română a toponimelor de origine latină sau greacă. Criterii, limite și eventuale soluții* [Integrating toponyms of Greek or Latin origin into Romanian. Criteria, limitations and possible solutions]. The study will be published in the proceedings of the international colloquium *Locus in fabula* (Bucharest, September 27-28, 2010), by Bucharest University Press.

³ See, for instance, the shift from capitals to lowercase letters in the distinction between vocalic *u* and consonantal *u*. Regarding the evolution of Latin writing, I also mention that the legendary founder of the town of the *Tarquinii* is *Tarcon*. In many instances, a Latin name is not rendered literally in Romanian, but there are special norms for reading and pronouncing such names in Romanian: in the absence of these rules, a person who hears the name *Cicero* read according to restitution rules, might write it as *Chichero* [Romanian spelling, pronounced *Kikero*].

⁴ There is sometimes, however, a clear distinction between the common usage of an imported name and its literary form. See, for example, *Grigore* (common)/*Grigorie* (cultivated) [Gregory]; *Ion* (common)/*Ioan* (cultivated) [John]; *Isus Cristos* (common)/*Iisus Hristos* (cultivated) [Jesus Christ] etc.

might deem naturalised are those used with or without variants in ecclesiastical, mainly liturgical literature, i.e. the part of church literature that, in my opinion, is essential for establishing the linguistic characteristics of a denominational group. However, in such a discussion, biblical or homiletic language is also relevant, especially with respect to proper names typical of the Christian domain, which are very close to or, most of them, identical with liturgical language. The only church “idiom” differing significantly from liturgical literature is the “idiom” of academic theology.⁵

Therefore, except for the language used in academic theological circles—a language which, for lack of a more accurate term, one might call “post-modern”—we can speak of a unitary language for liturgical, biblical, homiletic or canonical texts.

Summing up the issue of rendering toponyms of Greek and Latin origin in church language, practice would determine one to say, for example, that Saint Basil the Great was the bishop of *Cezareea Capadóciei* [Romanian rendering of Greek Καισαρεία Καππαδοκίας; Engl.: Caesarea in Cappadocia], whereas Saint Nicholas was a shepherd of *Mira Lichiei* [Romanian rendering of Greek Μύρα Λυκίας; Engl.: Myra in Lycia], also known as “archbishop or shepherd of the Myras [*Mirelor*]”,⁶ since Μύρα is, in Greek, a neutral plural.

These Romanian toponymic forms are even more difficult to alter as they are supported by a rich, unbroken liturgical tradition, which includes not only texts but also chants. After (the yet unparalleled) hieromonk Macarius and Anton Pann established the final guidelines for Romanian church chanting, a number of proper names have entered church usage and have been perpetuated in troparia, akathist hymns, prayers, even religious services, and they have been formally adjusted only inasmuch as the metrics and general poetic structure of Byzantine music allowed it.

Apart from this specific way of rendering ecclesiastical onomastics, the formal unity of the names “established” in church language is abolished due to the different denominational positions. For instance, in the Roman-Catholic or Greek-Catholic calendar, the same Saint Nicholas is called “bishop of *Mira Liciei* [Myra of Lycia].”

⁵ Even within the academic theology idiom, there are different phraseologies worth investigating from a stylistic point of view.

⁶ See, for example, the *Akathist hymn for St. Nicholas, Archbishop of Myras of Lycia*, eikos 7: “Rejoice, head of the Myras/Rejoice, great hierarch of Lycia” [in Romanian: „Bucură-te, întâi-stătătorule pe scaunul *Mirelor*/Bucură-te, mare ierarh al *Lichiei*”] (Acatistier 2004: 317).

Denominational differences in Romanian ecclesiastical proper names

Some examples

I would like to remove any doubt concerning the existence of denominational differences. The repeated controversies about the Saviour's name⁷ are notorious and constitute a compelling argument for the denominational differentiation in question: "Iisus Hristos" (the Orthodox name) vs. "Isus Cristos" (the Catholic name).

Besides the above-mentioned example of St. Nicholas's title (bishop of Myra or Myras in Lycia), I might add the different onomastic forms of the "Apostle to the Gentiles": for the former, he is St. Pavel, for the latter, St. Paul.⁸ Another (by now classical) example is: "Avraam" vs. "Abraham". And there are many more such examples.

The major denominational orientations

I would like to point out that, in speaking of denominational differentiation in a language, there is a marked opposition between the Orthodox language, on the one hand, and the Roman-Catholic and Greek-Catholic language, on the other.

With very few exceptions,⁹ Protestant and neo-Protestant creeds seem to avoid promoting a specific language. In full agreement with the ecclesiology it professes, the Protestant language is the secularised language of our time. Where theologically-loaded terms cannot be avoided, the Protestant language is closer to the Catholic language than the Orthodox one, probably because the former is more similar to Standard Romanian than the latter.

Hellenic vs. Latin

Regarding the Orthodox vs. Catholic differentiation, the Orthodox language usually evinces a predilection for the Hellenised pronunciation of ancient names, whereas Catholics tend to adopt onomastic forms that are as Latinised as possible.

⁷ For Catholics, *Salvatorul*, for Orthodox, *Mintuitorul*.

⁸ This difference is also manifest in the names of churches whose patron saint is the Apostle to the Gentiles.

⁹ See, for instance, the term "presbyter."

However, this general opposition of Hellenised vs. Latinised language is contradicted by examples provided by the Orthodox idiom, such as *Cezareea Capadóciei* (Καίσαρεια Καππαδοκίας) [Caesarea of Cappadocia], even though older forms record the form *Capadochia* [Cappadokia]. In another example (quoted above), Latinisation is only partial, generating a Greek-Latin hybrid in Romanian translation: *Mira Lichiei* (Μύρα Λυκίας/Myra of Lycia, Lat. *Myra Lyciae*), in which we can recognise the Greek pronunciation of the country's name, however with a Latin accent, rather similar to the accent of toponyms of genuine Latin origin, such as *Italia*, *Francia* > *Franța* [France], *Hispania* > *Spania* [Spain] etc.

Also to be noted is that Catholic language constantly avoids spelling names with a “v” to render βῆτα in Modern Greek pronunciation, as long as there is the Latin counterpart “b”. For example, *Iacob*, not *Iacov* [Engl. Jacob]; *Babilon*, not *Vavilon* [Engl. Babylon]; *Betleem*, not *Vitleem* [Engl. Bethlehem]; *Barnaba(s)*, not *Varnava*.

Nevertheless, a split occurred in the Orthodox language: while a more conservative party prefers names to be pronounced as in modern Greek, in more recent editions of cult books, forms with “b”, such as *Betleem* or *Barnaba*, are also encountered. Certain names spelt with “v” have become archaisms (e.g. *Elisaveta* [Elisabeth] or *Vartolomeu/Vartolomei* [Bartholomew]). Of course, genuinely Latin names like *Benedictus* have been imported into Romanian in a “Latinised” form: *Benedict*, even in Orthodox monastic circles, where the choice of names shows a clear preference for Greek forms.

The onomasticon in Romanian monastic circles

Monastic circles exhibit a specific anthroponymic stock. We can identify, without much philological investigation, names belonging to the monastic sphere: *Evdochim*, *Anania*, *Nicodim*, *Daniil* (while *Daniel* is the cultivated secular form of the monastic name), *Tecla*, *Filoteia* [Eudokimos, Ananias, Nicodemus, Daniel, Thecla, Philothea], as well as the series of Greek anthroponyms ending in *-ιος*, adopted in Romanian in the form of the Greek vocative, in agreement with the existing pattern of the names inherited in the vocative form—like *Petre*, *Vasile*, *Grigore*, *Ilie* [Peter, Basil, Gregory, Elijah] (the latter is most likely a form created by analogy)—like, e.g., *Ghenadie*, *Pafnutie*, *Ghelasie*, *Evloghie* [Gennadius, Paphnutius, Gelasius, Eulogius].

We can speak of a sub-idiom of monastic personal names, reflected in the parallel existence of onymic pairs like *Grigore* – *Grigorie* [Gregory],

Tănase – Atanasie [Athanasius] or *Vasile – Vasilie* [Basil]. *Grigore* is the secular name, while *Grigorie* is the name of a holy monk: *Grigorie* called the *Theologian*, with a recent neologism, by academic theological circles, but named *Cuvîntătorul de Dumnezeu* [The one who speaks with/of God] in monastic circles and old writings or—maintaining the Greek topic of the compound name—*De Dumnezeu Cuvîntătorul*.

Also, the old form of St. Basil the Great's name was *Vasilie*, from Greek *Βασίλειος*, as is proved by calendars, liturgical and patristic texts prior to the 20th century. The form *Vasile* entered the church idiom under the pressure of vulgar language, thus proving that it was normal for the two language varieties to be connected. However, the lack of a rigorous, specialised revision of cult books has resulted in the impairment of certain metric structures of Byzantine chants, which otherwise displays very strict prosodic canons.

Denominational differentiation in the history of the Romanian language

Ecclesiastic onomastics at the beginning of Romanian written literature

Denominational differences have not always been present in Romanian ecclesiastic literature. For example, a comparative reading of *Biblia lui Șerban* [Șerban's Bible] (1688), the Bible of Blaj (1795), and the *Bible* dubbed *Biblia Vulgata of Blaj* (a translation of the Latin *Vulgata*, 1760-1761), the latter two edited in Transylvanian Catholic circles, has not led to any creed-specific language. We can find everywhere the same onymic forms with a neo-Byzantine (modern Greek and partially Slavonic) origin and pronunciation: *Pavel*, *Vavilon*, *Vitle(a)em/Vifleem* [Paul, Babylon, Bethlehem]. I mention this with reference to biblical texts, as in the Roman Catholic space services were held in Latin until the Second Vatican Council (1962-1965), and the first Catholic liturgical texts were translated into Romanian only in the late 1960s.

The first split

The first notable denominational differentiation in Christian onomastics—and, most likely, not only in onomastics, but also in the broader ecclesiastical lexicon—took place in the second half of the 19th century. It came not from Catholic but from Protestant circles, with the so-called “British Bibles”, a number of editions sponsored by the “British Society”.

The most widely-known edition is that of 1874.¹⁰

At that time, in Romanian biblical literature there appeared a trend which involved the scholarly modernisation of the biblical language, including church language at large. Nevertheless, onymic forms such as *Pavel* continued to be present in church until the second half of the 20th century, even in the above-mentioned “British Bibles” or in Cornilescu’s *Bible*, which still represented the crucial scriptural text in Protestant circles.¹¹

The birth of denominational idioms

Church proper names have seen the same evolution as church language in general. After the translation of the main liturgical and biblical texts from Greek and Slavonic into Romanian, the church language, which at first was not undifferentiated from secular language, became “self-sufficient”,¹² and no longer needed any innovations, while secular language still evolved. Thus, a church idiom was involuntarily created and then voluntarily diversified denominationally. The Orthodox language maintains traditional, established forms, while Catholic and Protestant circles create their own idioms, through intentional differentiation, in an attempt to connect or re-connect with the language of the time.

Orthodox circles are not alien to this secularisation of language either, since under the influence of academic theology—whose structure is essentially scholastic-Occidental—they have witnessed a kind of terminological *aggiornamento* (update), partially accepted even in the most conservative circles.

Conclusion

In conclusion, I feel the need to insist on the idiomatic character of denominational idioms. Indeed, both the Orthodox and the Catholic language are defined by certain sociolinguistic elements, possessing all the defining attributes of an idiom, expressed as follows: “The idiom is a variant of the national language, delineated especially according to social, cultural or

¹⁰ It preceded the 1859 Bible of Heliade-Rădulescu, published in Paris, which, however, was only an attempt at asserting the Latinity of the Romanian language. It did not receive ecclesiastical approval.

¹¹ Saint *Paul* [instead of *Pavel*] appears quite recently in Catholic circles.

¹² Cf. Gh. Chivu, in the discussions on the occasion of the International Conference on Onomastics *Name and Naming*, 1st edition: *Multiethnic Connections in Anthroponymy*, North University of Baia Mare, 19-21 September 2011.

professional criteria” (Bidu-Vrănceanu et al. 2001: s.v. “jargon”). Consequently, using a confessional onomastic range would be the optimal editorial choice for any contemporary editorial project. The situation is more difficult in the case of a translation that is intended to be non-denominational.¹³

References

- Acatistier*. 2004. Alexandria: Editura Biserica Ortodoxă.
- Biblia sacră ce cuprinde Noul și Vechiul Testament*. 1859. I. Heliade-Rădulescu (trans.). Paris.
- Bidu-Vrănceanu, A., C. Călărășu, L. Ionescu-Ruxăndoiu, M. Mancaș and G. Pană Dindelegan. 2001. *Dicționar de științe ale limbii*. București: Nemira.

¹³ In a series of future articles, I intend to analyse: 1) to what extent a translation from Greek-Latin church literature (or associated, from a cultural point of view, with the ecclesiastic realities of its time) can remain independent of the church idiom(s) of a target-language such as Romanian, whose literary dawn virtually lies in church literature; 2) whether idiomatic denominational differences in Romanian are rooted or not in a hermeneutical differentiation; 3) whether upon the renewal of secular literary Romanian by the second half of the 19th century, the spoken language was closer to the church (archaising) idiom or adjusted to the evolution of secular literary language.

APPELLATIVISATION AND PROPRIALISATION: THE GATEWAYS BETWEEN THE APPELLATIVE AND PROPRIAL SPHERES OF LANGUAGE

MILAN HARVALÍK

On dealing with the specificity of proper names, an aspect that arises primarily from the function that proper names perform, lexicology treats proper names as a so-called second layer of language. It can also be defined as the result of the opposition of the appellative and proprial spheres of the language, but it has been shown convincingly (Šrámek 1999: 11) that this binary opposition cannot be understood as absolute. On the contrary, what we can see is a contrast determined by the interference of two different kinds of relationships between the name and the named object in one language. The vocabulary of each language is a complex, differentiated and structured heterogeneous whole, with many systems and subsystems of (even seemingly) isolated items linked through a number of one-sided or mutual relations. A characteristic feature of the relationships between the appellative and onymic sides of a language is their overlapping in social communication and in two-way dynamic interaction. This is visibly manifested, for example, in the existence of a transitional group of nouns, in which the appellative or proprial signs have not been sufficiently clearly polarised (cf. Blanár 1996: 42), and in the transformation of appellatives into proper names and vice versa (cf. Harvalík 2007).

A detailed study of those groups of nouns whose proprial or appellative nature are the subject of disputes shows that the difference in their understanding by different authors, in different languages, and in different onomastic schools, arises especially from a different definition of proper names vis-à-vis appellatives, as well as from the relevant traditional and philosophical perspectives. There are numerous differences in the opinions of scholars even as to the definition of proprialisation and appellativisation. Specific cases of transition from the appellative sphere of a language to the proprial one and vice versa may then be assessed differently, based on distinct positions. In particular, this is the situation

when, in the transformation of an appellative into a proper name and of the proper name into an appellative, the development of the new form is not connected to the changes that occur in the structure of the basic expression. Thus, the basic expression and the newly developed name are formally identical, with the exception of the first letter being a capital in the case of the proper name, and lower case in the case of the appellative, at least in most languages (cf. Harvalík 2007).

Proprialisation (also called onymisation or deappellativisation) is a process that takes place through the act of proprial naming, the result of which is a new lexical unit that bears all the signs and properties of a proper name (Šrámek 1999: 55, also cf. Koß 1995: 458).

In the examination of the transition of an appellative into a formally identical proper name, we must bear in mind that their relationship is only genetically etymological, and that the appellative is used (through the naming act) in the development of the proper name. However, as soon as a general noun becomes a proper name, the importance of the set of connotations related to the appellative declines, the proper name becomes a sign, and, in communication, it operates independently of the original appellative (e.g. in Czech the use of the appellative *kovář* /smith/ and the surname *Kovář* /Smith/, or the appellative *brod* /ford/ and the toponym *Brod* /Ford/). It is usually clear from the context and/or the situation whether the word is an appellative or a proper name. The link between them is revived only occasionally, for example, if there is some kind of connection between the named object and the appellative whose names are homonymous (e.g. *Mr. Short* is indeed short or, on the contrary, exceptionally tall; similarly, a tailor's name could be *Tailor*), in wordplay, or if the usual word order or structure is disrupted.

There is yet another fact that is important in analysing homonymous appellatives and proper names. Findings in general onomastic theory and their application to the study of proprial word-forming (i.e. 'name-forming') indicate that such proper names need not always be developed solely through onymisation from existing appellatives. A certain etymon that also appears in appellatives may be used in the formation of a proper name; however, this etymon is modified in onymisation, and the affixes used may be (and usually are) those that are commonly used in appellative formation. Nevertheless, on this occasion they act as proprial devices. This results in parallel developments from the same base, using identical word-building mechanisms and processes, in one case leading to the formation of an appellative, and in the second, to a proper name.

In the Czech language, as in other Slavic languages (for Polish cf. e.g. Mańczak 1995, Reichan 1998), grammatical tools are also used to

distinguish between homonymous appellatives and proper names (Harvalík 2007: 50). The difference between formally identical appellatives and proper names is conspicuous in the construction of gender and declension: e.g. the appellative *vrba* f. (willow) and the surname *Vrba* m.; dat., loc. *vrbě* x *Vrbovi*; similarly *dítě* n. (child) and the surname *Dítě* m.; gen. *dítěte* x *Dítěte*//*Dítě*, dat., loc. *dítěti* x *Dítětovi*//*Díťovi*, instr. *dítětem* x *Dítětem*//*Dítěm*. Various changes can be found in the transformation appellatives into proper names. One such example (as can be seen above) is when the grammatical gender changes under the influence of the natural gender of the onymic object; subsequently, a change in the declension paradigm also occurs (cf. Knappová 1999: 11-12).

The process opposite to proprialisation is appellativisation; it is also referred to as deproprialisation or deonymisation, and sometimes antonomasia (e.g. Lötscher 1995: 455-456). It consists of (1) the picking out of a component (or a certain set of components) from the onymic meaning of the original proper name, which is associated with only one object; (2) the gradual transmission and dissemination of that semantic component (components) to objects (phenomena) of a non-onymic nature that can be characterised and named in virtue of that component, in terms of their “connotation” (i.e. in a general, appellative way). These objects usually occur or are produced as an independent kind. The original proper name assumes properties characteristic for appellatives (Šrámek 1999: 55, Pokorná 1978, Koř 1995: 461). The same is described by the formulation that a proper name is appellativised, if the denotatum with the relevant denotation becomes general to such an extent that its proper name is understood as an expression that stands in for the basic appellative (Ivanová-Šalingová 1973: 220).

When a proper name of foreign origin turns into an appellative in a given recipient language, the graphic inscription of the appellative may be domesticated in the target language (e.g. in Czech *donkichot*, *donchuan* from *Don Quijote*, *Don Juan*), like in the case of borrowed appellatives (e.g. the Czech *džez* for *jazz*). As soon as a proper name becomes a common noun, it behaves accordingly, observing the rules of the appellative sphere of a language (cf. Šrámek 1999: 55), whereas the proper name from which the appellative developed maintains its original, foreign-language form (*Don Quijote*, *Don Juan*).

According to Hansack (2004: 64), connotations turn into denotations and vice versa in the transformation of proper names into appellatives. This opinion can only be accepted if we admit that proper names can have connotations. But if we reject this concept, according to Mill’s traditional

statement that proper names denote without connoting, we should underline, based on Hansack's explanation, what can be understood as the connotation of proper names (i.e. those characteristic properties of an onymic object that come to mind when its proper name is used). Moreover, as mentioned in Šrámek (1999: 55), we also need to establish what we mean by the component (or a set of components) of the onymic meaning of the original proper name. At the same time, the phrase "associations connected to a proper name" should also be considered. It is these associations that change into the connotations of the resulting general expression during the transformation of a proper name into an appellative (for recent works on the issue of denotation and connotation, see e.g. Lötscher 1995, and other literature referred to therein). For example, due to its prior use mainly in the lower strata of the society and in rural areas, the Czech hypocoristic form *Kuba* (from the given name *Jakub*) has given rise to the idea of its referring to a less educated person of somewhat limited mental capacity. In the transition of the anthroponym *Kuba* into the appellative *kuba*, these associations have become the connotations of this common noun.

The issue of appellativised proper names in the Czech lexicon was studied in detail by Pokorná (1978); the appellativisation of proper names as a lexical and semantic process was analysed, starting from Slovak materials, by Ivanová-Šalingová (1973), and individual processes whereby appellativisation occurs were recently thoroughly described and illustrated with examples from Polish by Rutkowski (2007).

Let us now focus our attention on certain cases that document how gradual and smooth the transition of proper names into appellatives is. Their shared feature is that the proper names shown in the examples below gradually stop performing their onymic functions and *de facto* correspond to appellatives or appellative descriptions, although they still tend to be generally understood as proper names.

An example of the transitional types between proper names and appellatives are designations deriving from metonymy, e.g. *to read Shakespeare* (i.e. Shakespeare's work), *They have several Monets in the museum* (i.e. paintings by C. Monet), *There are still several Old Father Goriots in stock* (i.e. several copies of the novel by H. de Balzac). These are used more in colloquial language and in unofficial communication. Essentially, they are expressions of the economy of language: a certain component of the sentence which is evident from the context or the situation is being left out (for example, the meaning of the sentence *Win the latest Madonna* is 'Win the latest record of the singer Madonna'). Any proper name has the potential to be used metonymically, but the level of

comprehensibility of such a statement will be limited by the ability of the receiver to infer the part of the sentence that has been left out. For example, the statements *I am done with Barcelona* and *Now I only have to write Uppsala* actually mean 'I am done with my paper for the congress in Barcelona' and 'Now I only have to write a paper for the symposium in Uppsala', but they are only comprehensible for those who know that the speaker (i.e. the author of the said statements) is attending a congress in Barcelona and preparing for a symposium in Uppsala.

A similar economical and abbreviated form of expression can be encountered in certain uses of proper names in the plural (on the plural of proper names, v. e.g. Coseriu 1989, Kolde 1995: 402-403, Van Langendonck 2007: 159-161). Naturally, we are leaving aside plural and *pluralia tantum* forms of proper names designating individual objects (e.g. *the Alps, the Rocky Mountains*). The statement *There are five Martins in our class* can be transposed into the statements *There are five boys named Martin in our class*, *There are five bearers of the name Martin in our class*, *There are five boys who are named Martin in our class* etc., all having the same meaning. In this context, we can talk about the general plural of proper names (Blanár 1996: 46). Whereas in the case of appellatives the existence of a so-called generic singular and plural and the neutralisation of the opposition between them is not questioned (e.g. *A dog is man's best friend* means the same as *Dogs are people's best friends*), according to Blanár (1996: 46), the generic singular does not essentially exist in the case of proper names. As a counterargument, we can adduce statements such as *Today is the name-day of David* and *Today is the name-day of Davids*, where the opposition between the singular and plural disappears and their meaning is identical. Hence, it is evident that in certain circumstances the generic singular can be found in the case of proper names, as well.

The pluralisation of proper names (aside from the example *five Martins*, where the proper name in the plural relates to several objects of one type and reflects the use of proper names in the form of a generic plural) constitutes a sort of generalisation in which partial appellativisation occurs. The meaning of the statement *There might be more Johns here* is 'There might be more persons that have the same defining traits as John has', but its use is (as is the case of the metonymical use of proper names) again limited to a certain context and situation: the speaker and the addressee must both know John. It is understandable that in the case of the pluralisation of names that are very well-known in a certain community (such as the names of politicians—*Messrs Camerons*; cf. Čech—David 2008), the frequency of the phenomenon is higher, but, still, the existence