

## 4

## Principles of Naming in Mohawk

Marianne Mithun

SUNY Albany

Most of the thinking done by philosophers and linguists about the nature of proper names has been limited to Indo-European names, especially English, or to philosophical constructs based on English names.<sup>1</sup> It has even been conjectured that "exotic" languages, such as Kwakiutl and Nootka, probably lack proper names altogether (Hacking 1968).

Mohawk, an Iroquoian language spoken in New York State, Quebec, and Ontario, is probably just the sort of language Hacking was referring to.<sup>2</sup> In addition to the fact that the distinction between nouns and verbs does not mirror that of Indo-European, it lacks major formal characteristics that are commonly cited as criteria for distinguishing proper names from common nouns (Algeo 1973). The first such criterion is an orthographic one: proper names are those that begin with capital letters. For most of its existence, Mohawk has been spoken by people who did not write it. If the distinction between proper names and other words were purely orthographic, it would be meaningless for Mohawk. A second common criterion is morphological: proper names do not appear in the plural. One does not say in English, *Washingtons* or *Parises*, unless one is using the name as a common noun, either referring to the class of things bearing that name, as,

There are two Parises in Ontario,

or innovatively to the class of things sharing certain secondary characteristics with the model, as,

How many more Irans will we need before we change our foreign policy?

Most Mohawk nouns are not marked for number. A cat is the same as several cats, *takò:s*, unless one cares to state explicitly that a particular number of cats is involved:

*Takò:s wakenáhskwaien*

I have a pet cat. / I have pet cats.

A third criterion frequently proposed for distinguishing proper names is their pattern of co-occurrence with definite and indefinite articles. One does not say, in English, things like:

I saw a Mary.

I like the John Jones.

unless, again one is using the term as a common noun, referring to the class of things bearing that name, such as "a person named Mary" or "the ship named John Jones." Mohawk does not have definite and indefinite articles corresponding to those in English and other Indo-European languages. It does have an optional particle that, in certain contexts, can be interpreted as implying definiteness, but it occurs with personal names as well as obviously common nouns:

*Wa<sup>?</sup>khé:ken (ne) ieksá:ʔa.*

I saw (the) girl.

*Wa<sup>?</sup>khé:ken (ne) Wá:ri*

I saw (the?) Mary.

Mohawk would appear to lack a formal distinction comparable to that between common and proper names. Does this mean that this distinction is a mere cultural peculiarity of some Indo-Europeans? In fact, bilingual Mohawk speakers do feel that the concept of proper noun has a counterpart in Mohawk, with fuzzy edges in exactly the same areas as English, such as days of the week and nationalities. The distinction between Mohawk proper and common nominals is semantic rather than formal, and constitutes part of a larger semantic continuum along which predicates and common nominals are differentiated.

Mohawk words fall into three categories according to their internal form: particles, nouns, and verbs. Particles are morphologically unanalyzable. They function as adverbials, subordinators, numbers, exclamations, etc.: *áhsen* 'three,' *ó:nen* 'now, when, at the time that,' *kwe:* 'hi.' Morphological nouns, which generally contain pronouns that agree with their referents, can function syntactically either as nominals or as predicates.

*rón:kwe*

*r + onkwe*

masculine subject + 'person'

man/he is a man

Verbs, which contain pronouns that agree with their subjects and/or objects, can function as nominals, predicates, or complete clauses in themselves.

*ranénhskwas*  
*ra + nenhskw + as*  
 masculine subject + 'steal' + habitual aspect  
 thief/he steals

Because they may incorporate noun stems referring to their patients, as well as numerous modifiers, they may be quite complex morphologically.

*iontkonhsekowáhtha?*  
*ie + at + konhs + ekow + aht + ha?*  
 indefinite person subject + semi-reflexive + 'face' + 'wipe' +  
 instrumental + habitual aspect  
 towel/one uses it to wipe one's face

The syntactic function of Mohawk words is not necessarily marked in discourse. Even word order does not generally signal syntactic function, since it is based on focus and the relative importance of constituents to the discourse, rather than case roles. The potential for ambiguity of the following type is great:

*Ranénhskwas rahkaratáhkwas.*  
 he-steals he-takes-out-wood-chips  
 The carver steals./the thief carves.

This ambiguity raises an intriguing issue: to what extent is identification (nominal function) distinct from predication (predicate function) in the minds of Mohawk speakers? A substitution test provides a clear answer to this. Any element in a Mohawk sentence can be questioned by moving it to the front of the sentence (focusing it) and following it with the particle *ken*.

*Shawátis roniáhton.*  
 John he-is-a-member-of-the-turtle-clan  
 John is a member of the turtle clan.

*Shawátis ken roniáton?*  
 Is John a member of the turtle clan?

*Roniáhton ken Shawátis?*  
 Is John a member of the turtle clan?

Note that nouns and verbs, subjects and predicates, are questioned in the same way.

A number of Mohawk speakers were asked to respond negatively to questions, then supply alternate answers. Sample questions and responses are below.

Question: *Wahaterá:ko? ken?*  
 he-kept-it ?  
 Did he keep it?

Answer: *Iah. Wahátka?we?*  
 No. He let it go.

Question: *Tsikenon?warísta? ken ne thi:?*  
 dragonfly ? the that  
 Is that a dragonfly?

Answer: *Iah. Taráktarak ne thi.*  
 No. That is a cricket.

Speakers can be expected to substitute predicates for predicates, and nominals for nominals. The second answer could not go with the first question, unless a very specific context were devised, and vice-versa. The normal expectation of syntactic equivalence between rejected answers and alternatives provides a means of identifying speakers' syntactic interpretations of words. What they interpret as predicates are replaced by predicates, what they interpret as nominals are replaced by nominals.

The test effectively categorizes verbs into varying degrees of nominalization. At one extreme are verbs that have not been conventionalized as nominals at all. The process of coining new nominals from verbs is quite productive in Mohawk, but it is generally a conscious act. Speakers frequently describe new objects with verbal circumlocutions, but they also discuss the relative merits of competing inventions with respect to capturing the salient features of their referents. They make such comments as, "She's always making up words." Such spontaneous coinages might be used as nominals when needed, but will be interpreted as predicates by most speakers under questioning out of context. I asked a friend what to call a mitre box. She replied: "*Tekahson?kária?ks* ['it cuts boards']? No, that would be more like a saw. A better name would be *Katakwaríhsions*. ['it untwists (straightens)']." Under questioning, speakers invariably interpreted this word as a predicate, not surprisingly. They supplied such alternatives as the following:

Question: *Katakwaríhsions ken?*  
 it-straightens-it/mitre box ?  
 Does it straighten?/Is it a mitre box?

Answer: *Iah. Tekakwá:ris.*  
 No. It twists it. [Not, for example, No. It is a vise.]

Conventionalized verbal nominals are treated very differently. They are replaced with nouns.

Question: *Kà:sere ken?*  
it drags/car ?  
Does it drag?/Is it a car?  
Answer: *Iáh. Kahonwé:ia thí.*  
no boat that  
No. That is a boat.

Question: *Teiothiohsahráhkwa? ken?*  
it-one's-elbow-set-with/chair ?  
Is it used for setting one's elbows on?/Is it an armchair?  
Answer: *Iáh. Sóhwha thí.*  
no sofa that  
No. That is a sofa.

Question: *Waterennótha? ken?*  
it-self-song-stand-s/radio ?  
Does it stand up songs?/Is it a radio?  
Answer: *Iáh. Kwah tekén: o'neróhkwa?*  
no just only it-box  
No. It is just a box.  
or: *Iáh. Tekaristó:roroks.*  
no it-metal-press-es  
No. It is a typewriter.

A demonstration that the difference between the two sets is conventional, and not somehow inherent in the words themselves, comes from the difference in reactions of speakers from two different Mohawk communities to the following question.

Question: *Ióhnhhe? ken?*  
it-alive ?  
Is it alive?  
Answer:  
Akwasasne: *Iáh. Ionhé:ion.*  
no it-dead  
No. It is dead.  
Caughnawaga: *Iáh. Akarè:t thí:ken.*  
no cake that  
No. It is cake.

*Ióhnhhe?* has become conventionalized at Caughnawaga as 'jello.'

The conventionalization of verbs as nominals represents an interesting semantic shift. A verb predicates an event or state. To be true, the predication must characterize the entity of which the event or state is predicated at the time specified:

*shakonshénhton*  
he has insulted someone

*teiakonónhkeri*  
she has curly hair

When a nominal is coined, generally a salient feature of the entity named is chosen to characterize it, and all others in its class. The characteristic chosen may pertain to some aspect of the entity's appearance, function, or habitual behavior. Examination of the particular features chosen by speakers as salient is of course fascinating:

*tetiatahà:sere*  
two roads are one on top of the other/crossroads

*tekaneniahríhton*  
rocks are broken up/gravel

*iontena'tara'tsha'ahtákhwa?*  
one uses it to burn bread/toaster

*akohsá:tens*  
one straddles it/horse

*iontata'tarákhwa?*  
one uses it to put ones body in/camera

*teiakohenrehtákhwa?*  
one uses it to yell/auction

What is interesting about the functional shift of verb to nominal is the conventional suspension of certain semantic features. The verb comes to identify the class rather than describe it. The distinguishing features actually necessary for class membership may be other than that specified by the verb, and they may change. One can say, for example:

*Nek tsi akítshé:nen anè:n:taks è:rhar raotíkhwa?*  
just that my-pet it-evergreen-eat-s dog their-food

*wahí:nonte? tsi wahatehià:ron.*  
past-I/him feed that past-he-grow

I raised my pet porcupine on dog food.

A porcupine raised exclusively on dog food is still *anèn:taks* ('it eats evergreen'). A rabbit with crooked ears is still *tehahonhtané:ken* ('his two ears are side by side'). A car with engine trouble is still *kà:sere* ('it drags') even if it will never drag anything or anyone anywhere again. A pool stick is still recognized as *teietsihkwaientákhwa?* ('one uses it to play/gamble the ball') if it has never been out of the shop window, and has never touched a ball. Speakers do not have to see that pool stick in use to know what it is called, nor the car in motion to know that it qualifies as *kà:sere*, nor the porcupine eating hemlock needles to recognize it as *anèn:taks*. The functional shift of verbs to common nominals involves originally the choice of a salient feature to characterize the class, then a suspension of the necessity of strict conformity among members of the class to that particular description at all times in all cases. The feature originally chosen as characteristic comes to stand for the set of features that actually characterize the class. In terms of sense and reference, the verb comes to refer to a set of properties that have their own sense. The sense of the new nominal might be quite different from the original sense of the verb.

Similar to the formally unmarked difference between predicates and nominals is the functional distinction between common nominals and proper names. Certain Mohawk words are identified by speakers as proper names, although they do not differ formally from regular verbs and nouns.

Most Mohawk proper names referring to persons and places are verbs. They pertain to such natural things as trees, grass, flowers, rivers, mountains, meadows, islands, the sky, stars, the mind, voice, or events or activities somehow associated with the person or place named.<sup>3</sup> Personal names, now disappearing from use as fewer people use Mohawk, were not traditionally given randomly. Each clan owned a set of names, which no one outside of the clan had the right to bear. The clan to which a name belonged could not be inferred from the name itself, by any regular principle, but was rather a fact learned with the name. Clan ownership of names has generally been lost among the Mohawk, who were converted by Jesuits anxious to discourage clan ties, but the system has been retained in other Northern Iroquoian communities. Among all groups, one should not simply choose any name at random, but, rather, consult the child's maternal grandmother or the clan "keeper of names" for an appropriate free name. Often this would be the name of an ancestor, but not necessarily. The name might be somehow associated with some circumstances surrounding the child's birth, or not. Certain names are only for women, others for men, and others may be for either, perhaps with an appropriate change of pronoun. Some examples of women's names follow:

*Kahnekiióhstha?*  
she clarifies the water

*Wathahí:ne*  
she takes up the path

*Skahiónhati*  
on the other side of the river

*Kahentíshon*  
she shakes the grass

*Kaniehtahá:wi*  
she carries the snow

*Kawennanó:ron*  
the word is precious

*Karonhianónhnhá?*  
she watches the sky

*Tekahawáhkwen*  
she has come from two places

This last name belonged to a woman whose parents came from two different Mohawk communities: her mother was from Oka, her father from Akwesasne. The following are names of men.

*Kaniehtaké:ron*  
snow is in patches

*Karonhia?kéhson*  
(it goes) here and there around the sky

*Tehaianó:ken*  
his tracks merge/fork

*Skahionhatíshon*  
alongside the river

*Tekaronhió:ken*  
the sky splits

*Akwirá:ʔes*  
the branch is long

*Oronhiatékha?*  
the sky is burning

*Aronhianónhnhá?*  
he watches the sky

Names of places are also generally formal verbs or locative nouns. The reasons the places were given the names they have are often immediately obvious, as below. They are probably most often descriptive of some characteristic of the location:

*Kaniatari:io*

the lake is beautiful—Lake Ontario

*Skahnéhtati*

beyond the pines—Albany

*Onontà:ke*

on the hill—Onondaga

*Kentsia<sup>?</sup>kowáhne*

where the big fish are—Salmon River

*Kenhtà:ke*

on the plain/meadow—La Prairie

*Otskwa<sup>?</sup>rhéhne*

place of frogs—Frog town

As in the case of verbal nominals, the salient characteristic chosen to identify a location may disappear, but the name remains appropriate:

*Takahson<sup>?</sup>karó:rens*

boards are split—Hogansburg (former location of a sawmill)

*Kaná:tase<sup>?</sup>*

new town:—Norfolk (no longer new)

*Kanatará:ken*

white town—Huntington (not obviously white)

*Kahnawà:ke*

at the rapids—Caughnawaga (Caughnawaga is not located near any rapids; an earlier settlement was, however, and the inhabitants of this *Kahnawà:ke* moved to the present location but retained the old name, apparently to no one's distress.)

In many cases, the reason behind the name is completely forgotten, although some people continue to use the name happily:

*Kanà:ts(i)o*

pail in water—Ottawa

*Tekaientané:ken*

two logs are next to each other—Deseronto

An interesting name in this regard is *Kanatakwenhtè:ke* 'outside of town.' This refers to an area at the edge of the Caughnawaga reserve near the road. As a group of Mohawk teachers examined this name, they decided with surprise that there must have once been a town there. Actually, this root, *-nat-* (on which the name Canada is based) originally meant something more like 'settlement,' probably in this case the whole reserve area. The literal meaning of the name had clearly not been in the minds of speakers each time they used it over the years.

In fact, speakers are not at all disturbed that many of the names they use continually are now uninterpretable except as names, although they apparently once had literal meanings as well. No one really knows the literal meanings of the following names, for example, although they contain identifiable morphemes:

*Kanón:no*

New York City

*Tiohtià:ke / Kiohkià:ke*

Montreal

*Tsisnáí*

Snye

One need not ever know the literal meaning of a name in order to use it correctly and comfortably.

This independence of proper names from their literal meanings (or senses) is exactly what distinguishes proper names from other words. Just as the most appropriate verb is carefully selected to name new objects, there is usually a reason behind the selection of a particular verb or noun for a proper name. When verbs are conventionalized to common nominals, their original senses are suspended. Instead of referring directly to the things they describe, they come to identify or refer to a particular set of entities. *Teká:tens* 'it flies' might originally refer to all things that fly, including butterflies, red-winged blackbirds, bats, and airplanes and then, by convention, refer specifically to airplanes alone. At this point, *teká:tens* also loses its direct sense relations to the rest of the lexicon. Flying is no longer a necessary and sufficient condition of being in the class of things called *teká:tens*. Ladybugs no longer qualify, but airplanes with engine trouble do. One can now say in Mohawk,

*Teiohri:<sup>?</sup>on teká:tens onón:tsi.*

two-it-broken-en it-fly-s it-head

The airplane has engine trouble.

The verb loses much of its original sense and reference, and comes to refer to a class, which may have other crucial characteristics for membership, or senses. Similarly, once common nominals become proper names, their sense is suspended entirely, and only pure reference remains. One can go to Onondaga ('on the hill') without climbing a hill, or to Albany (*Skahnéhtati* 'beyond the pines') without seeing any pines, or to Caughnawaga (*Kahnawà:ke* 'at the rapids') without approaching any rapids. When one learns the meaning of a proper name, one does not learn a set of properties that distinguish members of a class; one simply learns the identity of the referent.

Proper names can of course be assigned in several ways. The need for a personal name is normally felt at the time of a person's birth. A name is simply selected from the conventional set of personal names and assigned, probably for some reason, although the reason need not be clear to anyone once the assignment has been made. Place names can be assigned in different ways. They may simply be borrowed from another language that already has a name for the location, they may be bestowed ceremonially, or they may develop from common nominals (verbs or nouns). The conventional way of referring to a place frequently originates as a definite description. The referent will be clear from the context, just as the referents of 'in the house' and 'there.' At some point, the link between the nominal and its referent becomes conventionalized and is no longer inferred each time from the context at hand. At this point, the nominal has become a proper name.

The exact moment at which a word loses all sense and becomes purely referential, where the referent is defined by convention, may not always be identifiable, nor the same for all speakers in a community. A particular term may even be used sometimes as a common noun but other times as a proper name by a single speaker. The St. Lawrence River is called *Kaniá:tara*, for example. The common noun *kaniá:tara* denotes any large body of water, such as a wide river, a lake, or a sea. The St. Lawrence is the only such body of water in the vicinity of the Mohawk communities of Caughnawaga and Akwesasne. When asked for a translation of St. Lawrence, Mohawk speakers reply *Kaniá:tara*. Is this a common or proper name in this context? No capital letters, definite articles, or plural markers provide clues. Cornwall, a city near the Akwesasne Reserve, is referred to and translated as *Kaná:taien* 'town (laying).' This word presents the same dilemma. Where places still embody the properties denoted by the words that refer to them, contrast sets provide a clue. *Kaná:taien* not only contrasts with *Kaniá:tara* 'river' and *Onón:tá?* 'hill,' it also contrasts with *Kiohrionhó:ken* 'the creek forks') Brasher Falls and *tsi Ka?tarákeras* ('the clay stinks') Massena. This level of contrast suggests that the word *Kaná:taien* is now used as a proper name in such contexts. Caughnawaga residents often go across the river to shop at *Skaniatará:ti* ('on the other side of the river'). Some speakers translate this as Lachine, a town across the

St. Lawrence from Caughnawaga, while others translate it as LaSalle, a different town across the river. A similar situation is that of the place name *O?seronni:takon*. Some speakers translate this as St. Isidore, others as Côte Ste. Catherine. Now these are two distinct places. The ambiguity is easily explained, however. The term means, literally 'the area of the axe makers' (the French). Both areas are inhabited by French Canadians. Because the difference in usage is recognized as a difference, it is clear that the term has become conventionalized as a proper name. Because some speakers feel that *Skaniatará:ti* is ambiguous while others do not, it can be concluded that its status varies from speaker to speaker. The status of a nominal as proper or common is thus not necessarily as evasive as it seems, and in fact can be discovered from an examination of the terms with which it contrasts in a particular context.

The suspension of sense relations from proper names has a significant effect on their diachronic behavior. In several ways, the historical development of proper names often deviates from regular processes of linguistic change, a deviation that results in an even greater separation of the class from the rest of the lexicon. Both the composition of the set of proper names and the composition of the names themselves differ significantly from other sets of vocabulary.

A great many personal and place names were clearly once analyzable descriptive verbs, but their former literal meanings are now irretrievable. When asked about the literal meaning of a proper name, speakers will be often initially surprised at the question, only after some reflection come up with an etymology. This may be one they once heard or one that would have some phonetic similarity to the name but could not be derived according to regular phonological rules observable in the rest of the lexicon. One such name is *Kanehsatà:ke*, the name for Oka, a Mohawk community about 30 miles from Montreal. Partial analysis of the word is straightforward. *Ka-* is the neuter subject pronoun 'it' that is obligatory on all such neuter nouns. *-à:ke* is a nominal suffix plus locative, 'at the.' The remaining stem is *-nehsat-*. Some speakers say they heard someone say once that this referred to reeds in the lake there, although they do not know what stem would be involved. Some suggest that the name might refer to sand, *o?nehsarónhkwa?*. This word, which contains a pronominal prefix *o-*, is built on a stem beginning with *-?n*, not *-n*. Glottal stops never disappeared historically in this position from Mohawk. A similar mystery surrounds *Sha(h)rhé:?on*, the name of Chateaugay, a town next to Caughnawaga. Most speakers are puzzled about the original meaning of the name. A few have suggested that it might be built on the stem *à:share?* 'knife,' because this was probably where the Mohawk formerly took their axes to have the blades sharpened. What is strange about this etymology is that the stem for 'knife' has never had an *h* before or after the *r*, but the proper name does. No normal phonological rules could account for the loss of this *h*.

A frequent change found in proper names is syllable loss. Whole morphemes may be dropped from names because they are no longer semantically relevant:

*Skaniatará:ti* → *Skanárá:ti*  
on the other side of the river (*-niatar-* = 'river')

*Entewéhson* → *Tewéhson* (woman's name)  
we'll all walk (*en-* = future tense)

Finally, a great many names are built on noun or verb stems that have fallen out of the language. Since the sense of such a root was already suspended when the word became a proper name, there was no need to replace it with a newer term. Many of the above examples are probably of this type.

The suspension of expectations of sense from proper names has other ramifications in the historical development of this section of the lexicon. Mohawk has not generally borrowed from other languages.<sup>4</sup> It has borrowed a small number of nouns from French, but the vast majority of borrowings have been proper names. As the Mohawk were converted to Catholicism by French missionaries, they adopted French Christian names. Since the Mohawk were generally monolingual at the time, the names were adopted to fit Mohawk phonological patterns. What is significant is the ease with which these otherwise meaningless words were adopted into the language. They were not expected to fulfill any semantic function beyond identification. They were not destined to enter into sense relations with other lexical items in the language, but simply to refer to single entities. As can be seen from the names below, French borrowings were assimilated to Mohawk phonological patterns (which lack labial stops and l-r distinction) except for frequent distinctive ultimate stress:<sup>5</sup>

*Katerí:* Catherine  
*Konwákeri* Marguerite  
*Artsawe* Elisabeth  
*Warisó:se* Marie-Joséph  
*Rorén:* Laurent  
*Rowí:* Louis  
*Wishe* Michel  
*Wátio* Mathieu  
*Tie:r* Pierre

A number of place names were also borrowed into Mohawk. One is *Tarièn:ne* 'Italy.' *Tarién:* was borrowed as a word for Italian (Fr. *Italien*); then the addition of the locative suffix *-hne* yielded 'land of the Italians.' An inter-

esting borrowing is *Wastonhronòn:ke* 'the United States.' Lacking labial stops, Mohawk borrowed the name Boston as *Waston* ([wastũ]), then added the residential suffix *-hrononʔ* and the locative suffix *-ke*, yielding 'land of the residents of Boston.' An attempt at semantic borrowing can be seen in the Akwesasne name for Poland: *Thotirontatihenthóhsne*. Poles working with Mohawks were referred to as:

*thotirontatihéñhos*  
this way-they-log-pull  
they pull logs—Pollacks

The name for Poland was formed by the addition of the locative suffix *-hne*, to yield 'the land of the Pollacks.' Note that in all these cases, the location was named after the inhabitants, rather than vice versa, as in the European models. This is not actually a general phenomenon in Mohawk, but simply the result of the fact that the Mohawk were acquainted with the people before they learned their countries of origin. Compare, for example, *Onontà:ke* ('on the hill') Onondaga/Syracuse with *Onontaʔkehá:ka* ('hill people') Onondaga(s).

Finally, because their reference is the result of convention and not simply the natural semantic development of the words themselves, proper names vary much more from one community to another than does the rest of the lexicon. The same name often has different referents, as *Skaniatará:ti* and *Oʔseronni:takon*, mentioned above, and, conversely, a single location will often be known by different names in different communities or even among different individuals, even though they would feel that they speak the same language. Names for Europe, for example, include *Skaniatará:ti* 'on the other side of the water' and *Ohontsiakaiónhne* 'in the old land.'

Although they are not marked formally, proper names do constitute an identifiable category in Mohawk. As verbs acquire a conventionalized nominal function, they can lose much of their original sense and come to refer to classes of entities that may be defined by quite different properties. The syntactic status of such verbs can be ascertained from their contrast sets, the words speakers are willing to substitute for them in a given linguistic context. As common nominals move toward proper names, their senses are progressively suspended by convention until only pure reference remains. The status of such nominals can also be ascertained from the set of words with which they can contrast in a particular context. Names that are purely referential or proper differ significantly from the rest of the lexicon in their diachronic behavior. Free from constraints against the loss of literal meaning through phonological change, they may develop in quite unpredictable ways.

## Notes

1. See for example, the discussion of proper names by Mill (1843:Ch. 2), Russell (1948), and Strawson (1950).
2. I would like to thank Leatrice Beauvais, Annette Jacobs, Connie Jacobs, Georgina Jacobs, Dorothy Ann Lazore, and Mary MacDonald for their helpful discussions of the Mohawk with me.
3. A Mohawk speaker, Charles Cooke, collected over 6,000 Iroquois personal names during his lifetime and categorized them according to semantic content. For tallies of names containing lexical items from various semantic domains, see Cooke (1952).
4. I am referring here to actual borrowing, not code switching. Most Mohawk speakers are now bilingual, and often switch to English when the topic at hand is easier to discuss in English. The amount of switching varies enormously from speaker to speaker. The entire phonology and morphology is switched at these times, however, and speakers are clearly speaking English rather than borrowing English lexical items.
5. For a discussion of French names borrowed into Akwesasne Mohawk, see Bonvillain (1979).

## References Cited

- Algeo, John  
1973 On Defining the Proper Name. Gainesville: University of Florida Press.
- Bonvillain  
1979 Linguistic Change in Akwesasne Mohawk: French and English Influences. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 44:31-39.
- Cooke, Charles A.  
1952 Iroquois Personal Names: Their Classifications. *American Philosophical Society Proceedings* 96(4):426-438.
- Hacking, Ian  
1968 A Language without Particulars. *Mind* 77:168-185.
- Mill, John Stuart  
1843 A System of Logic. New York: Harper.
- Russell, Bertrand  
1948 Human Knowledge. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Strawson, P.  
1950 On Referring. *Mind* n.s. 49:320-344.

## 5

## Regional Names in Kalinga: Certain Social Dimensions of Place Names

*Michiko Takaki*

University of Massachusetts/Boston

The cultural significance of place names has been widely recognized. Works in onomastics dealing with place names abound (Lind 1962; Nègre 1963), and there are a number of important studies of place names that elucidate different aspects of a people's culture such as their linguistic history, population movement, contact with other peoples, perceived natural environment, reference system, subsistence strategy, and religious beliefs and practices (e.g., Goodenough 1966; Lounsbury 1960; Tindale 1974). Social dimensions of place names, however, have not yet received adequate attention despite a few excellent works (e.g., Firth 1963; Rosaldo 1975) that demonstrate the valuable contributions a systematic treatment of place names can make to ethnography. Study of Kalinga place names provides another example that underscores the ethnographic importance of examining social implications of place names.

This paper documents the social significance of inhabited-place names in Kalinga by focusing on the names of regions. This focus on the name of the region, the territorially integrated, primary unit in the peace-pact system, is prompted by the attention this interregional peace-pact system has been given in the recent literature not only in Kalinga ethnographic studies but also in comparative ones (e.g., Bacdayan 1967, 1969; Dozier 1964; Eggan 1963 351-352; Scott 1960:181-182; Service 1971:279-282, 1975:100-101; Wallace 1970:32-35). The discussion presented here will probe the sociopolitical dimensions of regional names and will provide a foundation from which to develop a proper understanding of the formation and continuation of the region as the territorial unit and to advance a valid ethnological interpretation of the Kalinga peace-pact institution (Takaki 1980).



# Naming Systems

1980 Proceedings of  
The American Ethnological Society

*Elisabeth Tooker, Editor*

*Harold C. Conklin, Symposium Organizer*

THE AMERICAN ETHNOLOGICAL SOCIETY

# Contents

	Foreword	vii
1	Name, Person, and Ideology in Central Brazil <i>David Maybury-Lewis</i>	1
2	Ilongot Naming: The Play of Associations <i>Renato Rosaldo</i>	11
3	Kadayan Personal Names and Naming <i>Allen R. Maxwell</i>	25
4	Principles of Naming in Mohawk <i>Marianne Mithun</i>	40
5	Regional Names in Kalinga: Certain Social Dimensions of Place Names <i>Michiko Takaki</i>	55
6	Western Apache Place-Name Hierarchies <i>Keith H. Basso</i>	78
7	The Study of Native North American Ethnonymy <i>Ives Goddard</i>	95

Copyright © 1984 by the American Ethnological Society  
All rights reserved  
Printed in the United States of America  
ISSN 0731-4108

**Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data**  
Main entry under title:

Naming systems.

(Proceedings of the American Ethnological Society, ISSN 0731-4108; 1980)  
Papers presented at the 1980 spring meeting, held April 10-11 at the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, jointly with the Central States Anthropological Society and the Association for the Anthropological Study of Play.

Includes bibliographies.  
1. Names, Personal—Congresses. 2. Names, Geographical—Congresses. 3. Folk classification—Congresses. 4. Indians—Names—Congresses. I. Tooker, Elisabeth. II. American Ethnological Society. III. Central States Anthropological Society (U.S.). IV. Association for the Anthropological Study of Play. V. Series.  
GN468.45.N35 1984 929.4 83-21532  
ISBN 0-942976-02-9

Copies may be ordered from:

American Ethnological Society  
1703 New Hampshire Avenue NW  
Washington, DC 20009