

Naming Patterns of Indian Cuisine: An Onomastic Analysis

Ali R. Fatihi*

Abstract:

The paper is about the means of naming, that is the ways in which Indian cuisine were named rather than the meaning of names in the old-fashioned etymological sense. It is very much, however, about the meaning of names in much broader sense, and it derives from the conviction that to elucidate this is essentially a task for historian. Moreover, the paper is an attempt to manifest the grammar of names with regards to Indian cuisine.

Key Words: Junk Food, Connotations, Memorization, Classifier, Metaphor.

Introduction

The paper, despite the generality of the title, is concerned specifically with what I see as the contribution of onomastic studies to our understanding of the grammar of names of Indian cuisine.

From ancient times, scholars and authors in particular, have been concerned with the etymology of names and their relationship to their non-name sources. At various periods in the history of English name-giving has had a very special significance by virtue of the “meanings” of names. Name-givers may wish to attribute qualities to the names by their choice of name (Modesty, Patience, Felicity, etc.). Smith-Bannister comments in his study of names in early modern England: ‘Children were named and supposed to act accordingly’ (1997: 13). Or names have been supposed to provide names with protection, as well as figuring in other, more abstruse necromantic practices (Smith-Bannister (1997: 13–14), who cites Thorndyke (1941a: 661; 1941b: 147, 169; 1958: 269, 509). Defining the term name Latham (1862: 633) suggests:

Names are either Proper or Common. Proper names are appropriated to certain individual objects. Common names are applied to a whole class of objects. George, Mary, London, & c., designate one particular person or place. Man, father, town, horse, & c., represent objects of which there is a class or collection.

* Hankuk University of Foreign Studies, Seoul, South Korea

The quotation from Latham suggests that linguists and philosophers have clearly separated words and names. For John Stuart Mill, proper names were “meaningless marks set upon things [or persons] to distinguish them from one another”. Camille Jullian puts it in 1919, names are “sterilized words”, words that have lost their original meanings and have come to be employed as simple labels. Put yet another way, “words connote and names denote”. A name “has no lexical meaning, or rather...whatever lexical meaning it may have had, or still retains, does not interfere with its denotative function”.

Thus, “Burger” is a name of a junk food. The etymology of the name given on the Wikipedia suggests that the term *hamburger* originally derives from Hamburg, Germany’s second largest city, from which many people immigrated to the United States. Hamburger started with the Tatars (or Tartars), a nomadic people who invaded central Asia and Eastern Europe in the middle Ages. The Tatars ate their shredded beef raw (hence the name “steak tartare” these days). According to one account, they tenderized their beef by putting it between the saddle and the horse as they rode. When the Tatars introduced the food to Germany, the beef was mixed with local spices and fried or broiled and became known as Hamburg steak. German emigrants to the United States brought Hamburg steak with them. It showed up on New York restaurant menus in the 1880s. Hamburgers became a sensation as sandwiches at the 1904.



In High German, Burg means fortified settlement or fortified refuge and is a widespread component of place names. Hamburger, in the German language, is the demonym of Hamburg. Similar to frankfurter and wiener, names for other meat-based foods, being demonyms of the cities of Frankfurt and Vienna (Wien), respectively. The term “burger”, a back-formation, is associated with many different types of sandwiches similar to a (ground meat) hamburger, using different meats, such as a buffalo burger, venison, kangaroo, turkey, elk, lamb, salmon burger or veggie burger.

The same can be said about another popular Italian dish Pizza. Cliff Lowe is of the view that Pizza, like so many other foods, did not originate in the country for which it is now famous. Unless you have researched the subject, you, like so

many people, probably always thought Pizza was strictly an Italian creation. The foundations for Pizza were originally laid by the early Greeks who first baked large, round and flat breads which they "annointed with oil, herbs, spices and Dates." Tomatoes were not discovered at that time or, very likely, they would have used them as we do today.

Eventually the idea of flat bread found its way to Italy where, in the 18th century, the flat breads called "Pizzas", were sold on the streets and in the markets. They were not topped with anything but were enjoyed au naturel. Since they were relatively cheap to make, were tasty and filling, they were sold to the poor all over Naples by street vendors. The acceptance of the tomato by the Neapolitans and the visit of a queen contributed to the Pizza as we know and enjoy it today.

In about 1889, Queen Margherita, accompanied by her husband, Umberto I, took an inspection tour of her Italian Kingdom. During her travels around Italy she saw many people, especially the peasants, eating this large, flat bread. Curious, the queen ordered her guards to bring her one of these Pizza breads. The Queen loved the bread and would eat it every time she was out amongst the people, which caused some consternation in Court circles. It was not seemly for a Queen to dine on peasant's food. Nevertheless, the queen loved the bread and decided to take matters into her own hands. Summoning Chef Rafaele Esposito from his pizzeria to the royal palace, the queen ordered him to bake a selection of pizzas for her pleasure.

It suggests that instead of an absolute contrast, there is a continuum: "Words which have become names never totally cease to be words, nor can names ever fully deny their lexical origins." One should not confuse the absence of lexical meaning in a name with total lack of meaning. Names of all kinds have associations, flavors; they are evocative, and carry messages that are no less powerful for being ambiguous. Novelists, poets, advertisers, and creators of names for film stars and other performers are expert in these meanings of names. They know that "Dilip Kumar" is a suitable Mumbai film industry name for Yusuf Khan the Bollywood Film actor. Dilip Kumar has more appeal than Yusuf Khan for Hindi speaking population of India. Nicolaisen also points out that there are onomastic fields, or sets of names appropriate in particular contexts. Thus in the naming of children, parents depend on a "conventionally accepted" repertoire of personal names, from which few depart. This is largely different from the repertoire of names for animals or houses. Within the personal name repertoire there are names for boys and names for girls, few of which overlap; and all names have a penumbra of connotations. It is these which are significant in guiding choice and not the literal meaning of the name.

As Zelinsky expressed it in 1970, "each forename is a one-word poem", but he added "in an undecipherable language", which is not really true. The meanings are complex, multiple and shifting, as the example of Cynthia shows, but they are not totally obscure. Names, moreover, like other words, 'only have meaning...in relation to other names'. They are part of a system. First names or forenames are distinct from second or family names, which are distinct again from nicknames, though each also interconnects with the others. Different particular names have

belonged to these different categories at different times. Indeed, the categories themselves have evolved. So names are connotative, but in a way that requires social and historical analysis to explain. And beyond individual names, naming systems must be described and analyzed.

Names identify individuals and are often the focus of a person's sense of identity, but the name also "defines an individual's position in his family and in society at large; it defines his social personality". In other words, it classifies a person. Zonabend writes that the name is "a mnemonic tool whose function is to mark out the different fields of reference of the society in question: the kinship field, the social field, the symbolic field", placing the individual in each. So, to take the modern European or North American name, the family name attaches the person to a family as a legitimate child; the first name or names may indicate place and roles within the family; a nickname may in addition say something about the status and past behaviour of the person or the family. Different functions may be more important in different kinds of society. In "traditional" societies individuation may be less stressed; in modern societies more. In some societies names may be more obviously central to and expressive of the total structure than in others. Among the Iatmul of New Guinea, for example, the naming system is indeed a theoretical image of the whole culture and in it every formulated aspect of the culture is reflected.

Conversely, we may say that the system has its branches in every aspect of the culture and gives its support to every cultural activity. Every spell, every song...contains lists of names. The utterances of shamans are couched in terms of names... Marriages are often arranged in order to gain names. Reincarnation and succession are based upon the naming system. Land tenure is based on clan membership and clan membership is vouched for by names. The situation in South Asia was not so far removed from this. Names may also register progress through the life cycle, with appropriate changes of names at puberty, marriage, death of father and so on. In all societies, too, and more so in complex ones, a single individual is known by a variety of names depending on the role he or she is playing and the milieu of reference. So there will be one name used by close relatives of origin, another by spouses and lovers, another by children, another by friends, another in public, another at work, and so on. Again, names here serve as a kind of social map, placing individuals in the broader multi-dimensional landscape.

But, as we have stressed, naming systems and categories themselves change and develop and they must therefore be investigated historically and in the long term. We shall therefore begin with culinary terms.

As its title indicates, the paper is basically about the means of naming, that is the ways in which Indian cuisine were named rather than the meaning of names in the old-fashioned etymological sense. It is very much, however, about the meaning of names in a much broader sense, and it derives from the conviction that to elucidate this is essentially a task for the historian.

The paper dwells on manifestations of the continuing human fascination with the 'meaning' of names, which is a label for a noun, normally used to distinguish one

from another. Names can identify a class or category of things, or a single thing, either uniquely, or within a given context. Thus, a name identifies a *specific* unique and identifiable thing. Linguistically, names are developed by combining morphemes, phonemes and syntax to create a desired representation of an item. In the process of naming, names that are phonetically easy to pronounce and that are well balanced with vowels and consonants have an advantage over those that are not. Some specific naming techniques, including a combination of morphemes, phonemes and syntax is the concern of the paper. It deals with the ideas about the distinctive structure of names and the systems of naming that determine the components of names of Indian cuisine in general and Indian sweets in particular. It is important to recognize here that in many food names, common-word components remain transparent, synchronically accessible, and therefore, potentially part of the lexical representation of the name is not merely a matter of etymology. It suggests that naming and the use of names can serve various functions, and this may be reflected in our knowledge concerning a particular name-referent. All of these aspects in particular must be taken into account in a grammar of names. Names for Indian food products typically fall into one of four categories: descriptive, suggestive, arbitrary and fanciful.

Descriptive Names

Descriptive names ascribe to the product a characteristic, feature, ingredient, appearance or geographic location. Examples of descriptive names of Indian cuisine include *Kala jamun*, *Nargisi kabab*, *rasgulla*, *dam biriyani*, *pera* etc. Descriptive food names can be overly long like “*alu diye mangsho jhol*” *chana jor garam*, *khubani ka mittha*, *Nadru ka gular*. These names can become genericized and turned into a category name instead of a general name. Descriptive names might add a positive halo to a food, they might have little effect, or they might “backfire” if they unfairly raise expectations that lead to disappointment. When in restaurants, people scan menus looking for benefits they believe will satisfy their expectations at that point in time. Consider how people evaluate “*Shahi Paneer*.” Or “*Moghlai Chicken*” If they associate *Moghalai*’s cooking as being flavorful, they may combine their beliefs about the characteristics of *Moghalai*’s *Qorma* (flavorful) with the characteristics of spicy *qorma*. These expectations they have about cooking can establish an affect state that can bias the taste evaluation. Unless these expectations are grossly disconfirmed (Cardello and Sawyer 1992), research studies show that their post-consumption evaluation seems to generally assimilate with prior expectations. It suggests that as long as the food is of reasonable quality, the use of high sounding descriptive labels may help improve perceptions of foods in institutional settings, and it may help facilitate the introduction of unfamiliar foods. By providing a more rich and hedonic stimulus (in the form of a descriptive food label), one’s thoughts and evaluations of it are more likely to reflect thoughts in a similar direction. If a person is cued to the hedonic nature of a product by a descriptive label, this should be evidenced by the valence of comments they might make about the food. If positively cued by a favorably

descriptive label, a person might end up generating a greater number of positive comments about the food and a smaller number of negative comments than those who saw a regular label. This should be reflected in the number and type of thoughts a person writes down when asked to comment on the food.

		Rate (₹) Per Plate	
		FULL	HALF
SHAN-E-TANDOOR			
TANDOORI RAAN	(ORDER BEFORE 24 HRS.)	800/-	
TANDOORI FISH	(WINTER)	430/-	
MUTTON BURRA		380/-	195/-
CHICKEN BURRA		350/-	185/-
TANDOORI BAKRA	(ORDER BEFORE 24 HRS.)	7000/-	
SPECIAL TIKKAS			
CHICKEN TIKKA		360/-	195/-
FISH TIKKA	(WINTER)	400/-	220/-
PANEER TIKKA		200/-	120/-
KABAB'S			
MUTTON SEEKH KABAB		(1 Pcs.)	50/-
CHICKEN SEEKH KABAB		(1 Pcs.)	50/-
SHAMI KABAB		(1 Pcs.)	60/-
SHAHJAHANI KABAB		(1 Pcs.)	70/-

The beauty of these names – and why they are far and away the most commonly embraced name type – is the fact that they require little thought, little explanation, little effort to build understanding of what the offering actually is.

Arbitrary Names

At the opposite end of the continuum are the polar opposites of *descriptive* names: the names that mean nothing and/or say nothing about the offering. Called arbitrary names. This can happen in a number of ways, including: invented names of sweet (*qalauqand*), abstract names of sweet (*ghewar*), alphanumeric names of pickles and nutrias food (*battisa*, *panch mel*), and heritage names of sweet (*petha*, *anarsa*, *jilebi*). These names do not describe cosine or literally suggest a cosine meaning. They are likewise not adapted from

features or benefits of the food item. They are literally arbitrary. Arbitrary names can be made up of either coined or natural words. This is not to say that meaning cannot be built or derived: of course, "*Jilebi*" has come to represent a lot of meaning in our minds. But the name did not intrinsically facilitate that meaning. Here is where the "*too much to explain*" concern is valid. While distinctive, and often very evocative, empty vessel names tend to lack the linkage of relevancy between the food product and name. Essentially, they ask consumers to memorize a definition without any type of helpful mnemonic – a much more taxing process for passive brand participants.

Suggestive Names

Between *descriptive* and *arbitrary* lies some of the richest naming territory, filled with opportunity to create unique, evocative, and deeply meaningful names. We call them *suggestive*: names that *suggest* meaning rather than asserting it. Suggestive names open the door to creativity, originality, and differentiation, without losing sight of essential communication objectives. The ways to do it are limited only by the imagination, making the taxonomy of this name type a moving target, and one that evolves with the world of brand names themselves. Below, though, are some common tactics, with very successful real-world examples. Suggestive names, the second type of names, suggest or hint at the food item's key features or benefits. They are allusive and are often formed by metaphors, allusions or simile. Suggestive naming is common in food and household goods. *Rasmalai* is an example of suggestive name that is meant to imply a variety of positive associations.

Fanciful Names

Fanciful coined names, also referred to as neologisms, are often perceived as a recent phenomenon and as "completely made up," although neither of these assumptions is true. They have been popular in India for more than a century. These product names are so readily understood that, to many people, they simply do not sound coined. *Razala*, (*bangali dish*) *halim*, *haris* or Kashmiri dish *goshtaba* are some of the examples of coined names. Names that are usually judged to be the most effective are "meaningfully coined": that is, they are built on descriptive or suggestive words that have meaning for the speech community for example *Haleem* is a thick Indo-Persian dish. *Harisa* is also a popular version of *Halim* in Hyderabad. Although the dish varies from region to region, it always includes wheat, lentils and meat. *Haleem*, and a variation called *Khichra* is very popular in India.

If, during a naming process, the understandable pang of anxiety comes from considering a name that does not feel descriptive enough, remember the power of suggestion. A good name makes the connection easier than we often assume, and the benefits are long lasting. When it feels like an expensive proposition, just remember that investment in a powerful cuisine name is well worth it.

There are some descriptive names which highlight the way of cooking. For example descriptive names like, *dam biryani*, *tanduri chicken*, *pathar ka gosht*

provide idea about the process of cooking. Conversely some descriptive names showcase onomatopoeic features; the examples are *murmura*, *jhal murmuri*. In the light of the above discussion the following properties of the 'ideal proper name' can be short listed:

1. 'Precise identification', 'brevity', 'Brevity' is included as constituting one of the advantages of names over descriptions that compensates for the memory burden they impose; at least part of the motivation for naming is the frequency with which the entity has to be referred to.

2. 'Ease of memorization', This last and 'ease of memorization' are enhanced by descriptive names, with the first of these involving a description of the referent itself: names which are identical with common words aid memorization, while possibly obscuring 'onomastic status'.

Formal marking of onomastic status'

3. Mononyms is a one-word name such as barfi, jilebi, rabri, by which a food item is known. Hindi Urdu Jalebi is commonly known as zoolbia; in Persian and zalabiyah in Arabic. It is an Arabian sweet that gained popularity in South Asia. It is made by deep-frying batter in a kind of circular shape, and then soaked in syrup. It has a somewhat chewy texture with a crystallized sugary exterior coating. A similar sweet is imarti, which is red-orange in color and sweeter in taste, made in many North Indian States [(Uttar Pradeh, Rajasthan, madhya Pradesh and some more)], India. Jalebis are also sometimes made of chhena, such as in parts of Rajasthan, Bengal or Orissa though the form can differ quite a bit from place to place. The earliest written references to the sweet are in a 13th century cookbook by Muhammad bin Hasan al-Baghdadi. In Iran, where it is known as Zlebia, the sweet was traditionally given to the poor during Ramadan. It likely arrived India during Muslim rule of the Indian Subcontinent, through cultural diffusion and trade, and its local name is Jalebi as Z is replaced by J in most Indian languages.

3.00ronyms: A word or a sequence of words (for example baRa, of dahi bara, batasha and batasha) that sounds the same as a different word or a sequence of word. gol gappa pani puri or batasha is a street chat. Batasha or gol gappe is a common fast food. Everyone especially girls like to enjoy it in India. It is usually unhygienic if not eaten at good places else good for health and great to taste. Batasha sweet on the other hand is a traditional sweet sugar drop which is very popular in northern part of India.

4.Paronym: A word that is derived from the same root as another word, for example MiTha > miThai. papaR > Papri . In other words paronymous name is linked to another by similarity of form. Forexample bundi or bundiya which has been derived from bund is distributed as prasad after evening aarti, in some temples of northern India. Sometimes it is made at home during some festivals or puja....these are small fried balls of besan, filled with sugar syrup. To the extent to which some such cluster characterization of the 'ideal name' is well founded, the satisfaction in different ways by different systems of the possibly contrary demands of different properties may also account for some of the difficulties in finding cross-linguistic 'criteria' for names. This among names in the same

communities and across language systems is intensified, not just by attempts to satisfy the other functions of naming such as the classificatory function, but also by the multiplicity of factors of use.

Consider, for example, the names of sweets presented in table (1). Many of these examples contain a descriptive noun 'classifiers':

Table 1

<i>Sohan Papri</i>	<i>Sohan</i>	<i>Papri</i>
<i>Habshi Halva</i>	<i>Habshi</i>	<i>Halva</i>
<i>Dahi bara</i>	<i>Dahi</i>	<i>Bara</i>
<i>Mitha caval</i>	<i>Mitha</i>	<i>Caval</i>

Here the presence of classifiers is an idiosyncratic property of subcategories of name or even of individual names. A name may also or alternatively incorporate a descriptive, sub-classifying noun; in this case, the subcategory of name is overtly and systematically signaled. Still other food names consist entirely of descriptive elements, with or without the classifiers:

The examples are:

With Classifier	Without Classifier
Habshi halva	Zarda
Shir Mal	Pera
Roghan josh	Gulgula

The 'classifier' components are often not cognitively salient in any particular instance of use. In the terminology of Giering et al. (1980: 66) they may be 'fossilized'. But even fossilization does not obscure the accessibility of a term relevant to sub-categorization. Thus, a classifier component equivalent to *shahi* is part of the lexical structure of many food names, though this may not be relevant to the particular act of reference being made; but the classifier component *shahi* conveys an element of sense, whether necessary or not.

Table 2

<i>Shahi tukra</i>
<i>Shahi panir</i>
<i>Balu Shahi</i>
<i>Shahi qorma</i>
<i>Murgh shahi</i>
<i>Shahi khir</i>
<i>Shahi murabba</i>

Phrasal Names

Many names of sweets in Hindi Urdu are based on phrases. But as names the phrases are 'frozen'. There may be some variation with some sub-types of phrasal name, as in *gajar ka halwa*, *Motichur ka Laddu* but the variety of ways in which the components may comport themselves with respect to each other is

very limited. They too belong to an onomastic system. We look more carefully at the structure of these phrasal names by analyzing some of these names.

Table 3

<i>Gond ka laddu</i>
<i>Motichur ka laddu</i>
<i>Besan ka Laddu</i>
<i>Gajar ka halwa</i>
<i>Kaju ki burfi</i>
<i>Nadru ka gular</i>

One thing that immediately emerges from consideration of the varied functions of these names is the elaboration of meaning. Names together with questions of system of economy impose limitation on the identificatory function of names. However, in the above examples we typically have naming systems that aim at distinguishing referents, in which different referents share the same name. It suggests that the sources of names correlate with different functions, like discriminatory, classificatory and expressive. The phrasal names are discriminatory in nature. These names leave traces in our lexical and encyclopedic knowledge. Thus, another important, if rather obvious, conclusion to be drawn from all the preceding discussion is that, though categorization is a not uncommon tendency, many names contain elements which in origin are descriptive and have remained transparently and accessibly so, and this does not detract from their status as names. This is true particularly of generic names, insofar as they identify food family and not individual food item. In these phrasal names titles are descriptions, though they are usually only part of a name, not a name in themselves: *Motichur*, *besan* and *gond* are the descriptions and not the name itself.

Therefore there seems to be no point in denying that these elements are used as names or as parts of names, in identifying individuals without recourse to distinct determiner expressions involving anaphora or cataphora.

As we have seen, this conclusion is perhaps even more strikingly apposite in the case of many food names, which are often even more obviously based on common words. As we are acquainted with the fact 'names of all kinds are created out of elements taken from ordinary language. A food name, that is to say, normally begins as a description of the food originally concerned'. And parts of these descriptions may remain transparent, as emerges from many traditional descriptions of food names. The status of sense - bearing particularly in food names has aroused some controversy in more recent onomastic studies. The examples presented in Table 3 can be seen as involving a kind of eponymy.

Table 3

Mughlai	Chicken	Mughlai Chicken
---------	---------	-----------------

Mughlai	Mutton	Mughlai mutton
Mughali	Biryani	Mughali Biryani
Chinise	Food	Chinise food
Italian	Cuisine	Italian Cuisine

Recognition of this diversity of names and their role in derivational relationships is another of the insights to emerge from onomastic studies, particularly as practiced in more recent years. The notion of subcategories of name, particularly as overtly signaled, remains controversial. It is only when such controversy has been confronted that we shall be in a position to look in a more systematic way at the subcategories of names and their structures.

We have, indeed, already extended our discussion in this section somewhat beyond the confines of the traditional onomastics.

In onomastic studies, names, particularly food names, are traditionally divided into semantic subcategories in accordance with what the referents of each subcategory (such as ingredients, regions, way of cooking,) have in common.

However, according to Thrane (1980: 214), for instance, 'proper names are non-categorical signs, which means that they do not in any way indicate what kind of thing they are being used to refer to on a given occasion'. In support of this view, we may point out that when presented with a sentence like 'This is Mughlai', there is no non-contextual way in which the hearer may learn whether it is a Mughlai food or dress.

Assigning particular food names a gender category is purely conventional. Most of these names fall in the category of masculine or feminine with some names 'doing service in both categories'.

Laddu accha hai
Laddu is good (masc)
Jalebi acchi hai
Jilebi is good (fem)

The conveying of gender by use of a name is varyingly important in different languages: not all languages differentiate between male and female names as starkly as does Hindi Urdu. But, as we have seen, such 'conventionality' of origin is equally not relevant as such to the categoriality of names, as opposed to that of many instances of their sources. It is the synchronic role of these descriptive elements that is controversial, along with (possibly non-overt) gender distinctions. So, it is controversial whether it is linguistically relevant or even true that *jilebi*, for instance, is still overtly based (for many speakers) on a name and a noun, i.e. is 'relatively motivated' in the Saussurean sense, compared with, say, *Laddu*. This information may not be relevant to an act of reference, but it has been argued that it is part of the structure of the name and remains available in any particular speech act. We return to this, compare again Saussure on the relative arbitrariness of some signs (1916: 181).

As regards the use of these names in public discourse, the issues of ‘centrality’ and dominance of particular conceptual mappings have to be operationalized in terms of their representation in a discourse. As Graham Low (1999) points out, inferences from metaphoric data “to social behaviour and conceptual/mental organisation” should “not be assumed to be true; they need to be justified” (Low 1999: 63). In order to make plausible the claim that certain conceptual mappings are typical or characteristic of language-use in a discourse community, it is necessary to show that they can be found in sufficient quantities in authentic linguistic data and that their distributional patterns can be related to specific communicative attitudes, beliefs and value systems. Only then can we draw conclusions regarding the “supraindividual” level of conceptual metaphors. The linguistic data of the use of these names in metaphoric and idiomatic phraseologism and their conceptual analysis, can only provide interpretative evidence yielding material for the cognitive study of the conceptual structure and usage frequency of metaphor idioms. For example,

*Jilebi ki tarh sidha
laddu phutna
donon hathon main laddu
mirchi lagna*

contain a short phraseologism, which might be recognizable to Hindi Urdu speakers who know its long tradition, but without such a specialized knowledge, the phraseologism would be just comprehensible as an instantiation of mapping rather than fitting into a whole system of food related metaphors. In general, statements containing lexical items such as *sidha*, *phutna mirchi lagna* do not provide clues as to the metaphorical sense they are used in, unless they are signaled in the co-text as requiring special interpretative effort, e.g. by rhetorical “hedges” or “tuning devices” such as *mat kahiye*, *ab kyun* in *mat kahiye ye to jilebi ki tarah sidhe hain ab kyun mirchi lag rahi hai*

Using their general, non-expert background knowledge about food topics, interlocutors may notice that the term *sidha* is likely to have a special meaning, as it does not denote a well-known form. Even so, the term cannot be interpreted as *prima facie* evidence of a metaphorical meaning.

Thus, we conclude with the observation that the identificatory function is not necessarily the only function of naming. The requirements on the identificatory function itself may be in conflict. Some other properties apparently concerned with other functions of names may also contribute to some aspect of identification.

We have also observed concerning the non-lexical information conveyed by names that use of a name may have a directly pragmatic role, as in the use of a diminutive rather than the corresponding non-diminutive, or the reverse, as an affective term, to express affection or (dis-)affection. And a name may serve, to call up a particular referent—a question of reference, not sense. We must be cautious in our attribution of ‘meaning’ to an individual name, and not only with

respect to etymological 'meaning'. Indexical and other encyclopedic information and affective and even referential uses do in themselves involve sense.

References

- Adams, J.N. 1978. Conventions of naming in Cicero. *Classical Quarterly* NS 28: 145–66.
- Carroll, J. M. 1985. *What's in a Name? An Essay in the Psychology of Reference*. New York: W. H. Freedman.
- Chapman, R. W. 1939. *Adjectives from Proper Names*. (SPE Tract LII.) London: Oxford University Press.
- Chomsky, N. 1957. *Syntactic Structures*. The Hague: Mouton.
- 1965. *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax*. Cambridge MA: MIT Press.
- 1966. *Cartesian Linguistics: A Chapter in the History of Rationalist Thought*. New York: Harper and Row.
- 1992a. Onomastics. In R. M. Hogg (ed.), *The Cambridge History of the English Language, I: The Beginnings to 1066*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 452–89.
- Conrad, B. 1985. Two Essays on Reference without Meaning: Suppositio Materialis and Proper Names. *Acta Linguistica Hafniensia* 19:1–129.
- Curtius, E.R. 1953. *European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Fries, C. C. (1952). *The Structure of English: An Introduction to the Construction of English Sentences*. London: Longmans, Green and Co.
- Gleason, H. A. 1965. *Linguistics and English Grammar*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Halliday, M. A. K. 1994. *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*, 2nd edn. London.
- Arnold, Herbert, R. K. 1998. *Personal Naming and Social Organization: The Comparative Anthroponymy of Southern Africa*. In W. F. H. Nicolaisen (ed.), vol.3.187–94.
- Hess, H. H. 1968. *The Syntactic Structure of Mezquital Otomi*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Nicolaisen, W. F. H. 2001. *Scottish Place-Names: Their Study and Significance*, 2nd edn. Edinburgh: John Donald.
- Smith-Bannister, S. 1997. *Names and Naming Patterns in England 1538–1700*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wilbur Zelinsky. 1970. Unearthly Delights: Cemetery Names as a Key to the Map of the Changing American Afterworld. In Martyn Bowden and David Lowenthal, (eds.) *Geographies of the Mind; Papers in Geosophy in Honor of John K. Wright*. New York: Oxford University Press. 171-195.

