

An Idealized Cognitive Model of Naming: Converging Linguistic and Cognitive Evidence from Tunisian Arabic⁽¹⁾

Zouhair Maalej⁽²⁾

*Department of European Languages and Translation,
College of Languages and Translation,
King Saud University,
Riyadh, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia
zmaalej@ksu.edu.sa*

(Received 20/02/1430H.; accepted for publication 28/10/1430H.)

Abstract. Naming people has been studied etymologically (Jäkel, 1999) and syntactico-semantically (Van Langendonck, 1999). But they have been argued to lack lexical meaning (Jäkel, 1999; Van Langendonck, 1999). The present paper, however, offers a cognitive semantic view of naming in Tunisian Arabic (TA) as an Idealized Cognitive Model (Lakoff, 1987; Langacker, 1991). First names are regarded as semantically and unconsciously motivated, describing a propositional model (Lakoff, 1987), a LINK image-schema (Lakoff, 1987; Johnson, 1987), a metaphoric mapping (Lakoff and Johnson, 1980-1999), and a part-whole metonymic model (Lakoff, 1987). Prototypically, first names in TA rely on a conceptual domain either recruited from within the experience of name-givers or are the outcome of a desirable state of affairs on the part of name-givers. Such a desirable state of affairs is the product of an imaginative projection on the part of name-givers, who build this projection from within emotions, morality, beauty, piety, etc. The conceptual metaphors capitalized upon in naming reveal name-givers' bias to males at the expense of females. The result is a cultural model of naming, whereby conceptual metaphors interface with categorization and derivational morphology.

1. Introduction

The objective of every act of naming is to make what is named knowable and communicable (Shore, 1996: p. 221). As a descriptive and categorizing process, naming objects has received ample treatment (Aitchinson, 1994; Harley, 1995; Györi, 1996), while naming people has had less substantial scrutiny. Human first names (henceforth, FN) have been treated referentially (Quirk *et al.*, 1972; Downing, 1996),

etymologically (Jäkel, 1999; Van Langendonck, 1999), syntactico-semantically (Van Langendonck, 1999), sociolinguistically (Allerton, 1987), pragmatically (Carroll, 1983; Marmaridou, 1989), etc. What most of these approaches seem to take for granted is the fact that proper names lack lexical meaning (Jäkel, 1999; Van Langendonck, 1999).

Naming people is not a unique way of categorizing or referring to a particular person since more than one person can be designated by the same FN (Langacker, 1991: p. 59). And FN share with common nouns a type specification, instantiation, quantity and grounding (Langacker, 1991: p. 59). However, as will be discussed later on, in Tunisian Arabic (henceforth, TA) naming involves projecting one's own personality onto one's children. Even though naming children is partly a way of identifying them (Jäkel 1999: p. 211) and does not make them unique in having those particular names that they do, yet identifying them with those particular names still evokes some of the features of the common noun in the TA culture. Converging evidence to this effect will be presented later on in the paper.

⁽¹⁾ The author thanks the following colleagues for giving him their time and support: Guy Acahrd-Bayle, Valeria Belloro, Eugene Casad, Adam Glaz, Ana Ibanos, Olaf Jäkel, Pascal Ntirampeba, Panther Klaus-Uwe, Jarek Pluciennik, William Rapaport, Clai Rice, Anne Sumnicht, Tamar Sovran, Sandra Thompson, Karen Van Hoek, Willy Van Langendonck, and Jean Louis Vaxelaire. Particular thanks should go to Willy Van Langendonck for having read a first draft of this paper and contributing invaluable comments. I wish also to extend my thanks to Diane Ponterotto for her comments and support. Needless to say that responsibility for the contents is incumbent on the author alone.

⁽²⁾ The author is grateful to two anonymous reviewers for the insightful comments they made on a first version of the current paper. However, responsibility of the contents is the author's.

The current study is data-driven. First names for females (henceforth, FNF) and males (henceforth, FNM) used in this study have been collected from various sources. A section on *Change of Name in Official Journal of the Republic of Tunisia* (12 January 2001) took care of derogatory names whose holders managed to change them through the legal system. Two versions of the Tunisian telephone directory have been relied upon to collect FN. However, it is beyond the scope of this study to deal with cross-regional variation (rural vs. urban), statistical counts (within males and females groups and across genders), or whether some names carry over from one generation of FNF and FNM to the next, even though some of this is occasionally dwelt upon for the sake of converging evidence. Neither are FNF and FNM to be studied in a diachronic perspective. The apparent collection of FN in this paper is only meant to reach a representative body of names for the sake of illustration and explanation.

This paper investigates naming children in TA as a cognitive category (Lakoff, 1982). It offers a cognitive semantic view of naming as an Idealized Cognitive Model (henceforth, ICM) (Lakoff, 1987; Langacker, 1991). Most FN in Arabic do relate to the Arabic lexicon from which they are derived. Thus, FN are semantically motivated, but only at the level of our “cognitive unconscious” (Lakoff and Johnson, 1999: p. 10). The ICM view of naming includes a propositional model, captured in Fillmore’s concept of frame; a LINK image-schematic structure (Johnson, 1987; Lakoff, 1987), a metaphoric mapping (Lakoff and Johnson, 1980-1999), and a metonymic model (Lakoff and Johnson, 1980-1999). Naming reveals the name-givers’ cultural perception of children in TA, whereby FN are seen as the epitome of gender perception, with preference often given to males at the expense of females. The outcome of this account is a cultural model of naming, whereby conceptual metaphors interface with categorization and derivational morphology.

The paper includes seven sections. Section 1 is the introduction. Section 2 offers an overview of naming in both Western and non-Western traditions. Section 3 is concerned with the morphological differences between FNF and FNM, whereby some of the grammatical features are correlated with experiential explanations. Section 4 offers an overview of the notion of ICM, and fleshes out the ICM of naming. Section 5 spells out the conceptual domains behind the ICM for naming. Section 6 is devoted to a battery of converging evidence for meaningful naming beyond the connotative. Section 7 is the conclusion.

2. Overview of First Names

For the purposes of the current paper, there is a need to divide this overview into two parts, one for the western and another for the eastern perspectives on naming.

2.1. Western perspective

Working with surnames, Jäkel (1999) isolates three semantic motivations for surnames in German, namely, genealogical, professional, and metonymic patterns. As the metonymic pattern is the most productive in German, Jäkel devotes much more space to it in his study. For Jäkel (1999), underlying the strategy of naming are two basic conceptual metonymies, namely, IMPORTANT UTENSIL FOR PERSON or SALIENT QUALITY FOR PERSON. Jäkel’s main argument is that the initial bearer of a surname such as *Hering* (a herring) may have acquired it because “he worked as a fishmonger, or because he was a famous fisherman, or because he was a notorious lover of smoked herring, or because he once had an accident or a unique encounter in which a herring played a special part” (Jäkel, 1999: p. 215). This experiential basis for surnames in German is known in Arabic as *kunya* (Sublet, 1991: p. 9) such as *?abu 3ammaar* (the father of 3ammaar) as a way of talking about Yassir Arafat, or identifying one’s wife in the presence of strangers as *?umm l-baniin* (the mother of the children). The *?abu* and *?umm* nicknames in Arabic translate the notion of possession (Sublet, 1991:9) as when someone is metonymically identified as *?abu liHya* (the one who has a beard: a bearded guy).

However, this kind of framework may not be valid for all naming because it begs the question in at least three respects. First, this view seems to suggest that before exercising a profession or experiencing that which is afterwards picked up as a surname, experiencers had no names. Second, since the attribution of FN is done before or at birth by parents and/or relatives, bearers of these names cannot possibly have participated in acquiring their own name experientially in any of the ways described by Jäkel for German surnames. Third, talking about (acquired) surnames presupposes other surnames, which does not explain how the acquired surnames come to supersede previous names. This strategy of naming as described by Jäkel seems to work more with the attribution of nicknames to already named people. As an intra-domain mapping, metonymy cannot be relied upon to fully explain naming in TA. For instance, it is not the case that *siwaar* (necklace)

and *?akram* (kinder) are called so because she used to wear a necklace and he showed excessive kindness.

Working from a different perspective, Van Langendonck (1999: p. 95) proposes a view of naming as an “*ad hoc* assignment” of a referent to a proper name “in an *ad hoc* name-giving act”. Van Langendonck (1999: p. 95) assumes that proper names “display presuppositional meanings of several kinds: categorical (basic level), associative (introduced either via the name-bearer or via the name-form) and grammatical meanings”. The categorical presupposition distinguishes the different classes of proper names and the associative presupposition assumes the form of an intersubjective connotation. One of the important contributions of Van Langendonck is his adducing neurolinguistic evidence to show that proper names and common nouns are processed differently. It is true that FN like Napoleon, John, Peter, William, etc., do mean by evocation. However, there is a host of less evocative first names such as Peter, Charles, etc. whose life history may be so uneventful as to warrant an associative account.

Proper names are held to have no descriptive content, i.e. no meaning except for some incidental meanings inherent in their professional or pragmatic motivations. A perspective on proper names from the philosophy of language comes from Searle (1969), who claimed that proper names do have senses. For the sake of argument, Searle’s (1969: pp. 164-5) objections to the view that proper names do not have senses run as follows:

- (i) We use proper names in existential propositions, e.g., “there is such a place as Africa,” “Cerberus does not exist.”... An existential statement does not refer to an object and state that it exists, rather it expresses a concept and states that that concept is instantiated. Thus, if a proper name occurs in an existential statement it must have some conceptual or descriptive content...
- (ii) Sentences containing proper names can be used to make identity statements which convey factual and not merely linguistic information... Thus it seems that proper names must have descriptive content, they must have a sense.
- (iii) The principle of identification requires that an utterance of a proper name must convey a description just as the utterance of a definite description must if the reference is to be consummated. And from this it seems to follow that a proper name is a kind of shorthand description.

To extrapolate from Searle’s arguments about proper names in general, it seems advisable to consider that FN are not merely referential tools devoid of descriptive content. FN have a psychological reality and a corresponding social content. Their descriptive content suggests that they have some form of conceptual content that relates to the conceptual domain that governs the basic-level category they represent. The fact that some people find their own names aberrant in light of the negative reaction of members of their society to them is evidence that those names do have a negative connotation that is affecting them psychologically.

The tendency among researchers to deny any meaning for FN in general can be traced to the fact that “European personal names do not give direct information about the events they commemorate”, and are, thus, “lacking in semantic content” (Akinaso, 1980: p. 301). Naming and names in the Western culture are a matter of psychological concern. Studying a corpus of FN from England and Australia, Colman *et al.* (1980: pp. 114-5) argue that “the social significance of personal names is not as strikingly reflected in our culture as it is in many others”. The fact that the Western culture is engrossed in material welfare and individualism did not make it easy for its members to keep an eye on family. The authors argue that the only significance that Western culture seems to acknowledge for FN is their “psychological significance” as “evident in the strongly held likes and dislikes” of certain names across time and space (Colman *et al.*, 1980: pp. 114-5). However, Colman *et al.* (1980) argue that this correlation seems to experience a U-turn, where even the most liked names are being given up in favor of others, which leans more towards the cyclical vogue hypothesis.

2.2. Non-Western perspective

A different perspective on FN concedes a socio-cultural meaning for them in contrast to the total arbitrariness conceded to them in the Western culture. Although cultures may have strategies of naming differing in linguistic and socio-cultural complexity, all of them agree on the fact that FN do have a semantic content, be it psychological, social, cultural, religious, or linguistic. According to Weslager (1971: p. 273), the Delaware Indians are assigned nicknames at birth, but real personal names come later in life. Name-givers should be endowed with “personal holiness”, which is equivalent to observing religious restrictions, respecting tribal taboos, and having visions. This testifies to the sacred nature of names to such an extent that, except during the Big House rituals, FN are avoided as appellatives to evade

mischievous and evil spirits. Thus, “a real name among the Delawares was not a device to facilitate interpersonal communication... but was a mark of identity by which the Creator and his Spirit Forces knew the individual” (Weslager, 1971: p. 274). Thus, “a person and his name are one. Once an individual received a real name, it became part of his personality” (Weslager, 1971: p. 280). In assigning names to their holders, the Delawares make sure that their natives have “the personality traits or talents” reflected by the name (Weslager, 1971: p. 277). Thus, the Delawares are highly individualized and their FN die with them. Following this practice, the Akima Indians are reported to name their children at puberty, and to operate a change of name for adults if the latter fail to match the name they bear or if they accomplish something more praiseworthy (Weeks, 1971: p. 204).

In the Indian tradition, the Marathi—an Indo-Aryan language—recruit FN from their habitat, units of time, seasons, and personal qualities (Junghare, 1975: p. 36). Naming children after cosmic objects shows Indians’ appreciation of nature; time reflects their awareness of the perpetual temporal cycle; and personal qualities express the parents’ hope that their child would develop that attribute s/he is named after. Linguistically, Marathi was found to conform to Sanskrit phonology and morphology in name formation (Junghare, 1975). Affixation is used to mark names for gender (*pramod*, boy’s name, becoming *Pramodini*, girl’s name). Marathi uses the suffix *kar* (doer, maker) with boys’ names, thus conceptualizing boys but not girls in the agentive form. Marathi morphology interacts with the social structure, thus serving a host of sociolinguistic functions, such as the expression of reverence (by suffixing *rav* to men’s names and *bai* to women’s), the expression of intimacy (by suffixing *u* to the first syllable of a name and dropping the rest), or the expression of anger and contempt (by suffixing *ya* boys’ names and *i* to girls’ and dropping the rest) (Junghare, 1975: p. 41). The Tamils of Tamil Nadu, India, on the other hand, name their children according to the historical association between a given cultural concept and the caste the child belongs in (e.g., power for the Ksatriya, wealth for the Vaisya, contempt for the Sudra, etc.) (Britto, 1986: p. 350). Thus, the cultural meanings encoded in Tamil names have to do with “some desirable quality such as power, happiness, success, prosperity, joy, beauty, victory, greatness, piety, or devotion”, but many contemporary names may draw on names of precious minerals and other values (Britto, 1986: p. 352). Owing to the multi-caste and multi-religious dimensions of the Tamil society, Tamil names reveal

transparent caste and religious content, although the caste practice is progressively disappearing in urban areas (Britto, 1986: p. 358).

In the African tradition, naming children is as complex, both socio-economically and linguistically. In Sesotho, a Bantu language of South Africa, the Basotho name their children after “events, experiences, and emotions” marking their own society (Mohome, 1972: p. 171), which practice tends to function like a historical “recording system” (Mohome, 1972: p. 173), especially owing to the oral nature of Sesotho. The Basotho also name their children after their kinsmen, believing that “the child so-named will automatically inherit the virtues of its grandparent” (Mohome, 1972: p. 172). Another important source for naming for the Basotho is significant events such as wars, visits, or religious and political movements. The motivation for naming children after these events is the belief that “the child will take on the good qualities of that person and that he will behave like him” (Mohome, 1972: pp. 172-3). The belief that the circumstances of birth affect an individual was also found to psychologically dominate naming among the Ashanti people (West Africa), who name boys after the name of the day they are born in. It was found that Monday boys are quiet and well behaved whereas Wednesday boys are quick-tempered and aggressive, which strongly suggests that boys “live up to their names”, i.e. there was more delinquency among the latter than the former (Colman *et al.*, 1980: pp. 113-14). Linguistically, the Sesotho naming system borrows names from the verbal lexicon and uses them as raw names, or operates a change to them by turning them into nouns through suffixes. Names also occur as mass nouns (*Sefako*: hail, for boys), plural nouns (*Dikeledi*: tears, for girls), or count nouns (*Mookgo*: a tear, for girls) (Mohome, 1972: p. 175). Socio-culturally, names reflect values expressing social (dis)harmony (love, prosperity), gratitude (for the birth of a child), wishes, hopes, requests, natural calamities (hail, snow, thunderstorm, lightning, famine) (Mohome, 1972: pp. 174-5). Interestingly, names using natural calamities and death are boys’ not girls’ names.

Another interesting African naming system for our purposes is presented by Akinnaso (1980) for the Yoruba people in southwestern Nigeria. The Yoruba naming system is one of the most complex ones. Akinnaso (1980: p. 277) argues that the “special quality of Yoruba personal names is their elaborate linguistic structure and socio-cultural significance.” The linguistic complexity of this system consists in a syntactic structure described as VP Nominalization. Names can occur in the declarative, interrogative, or imperative moods. One part of the name can even serve as a focus of a question. In spite of this

sentence-like status, FN in Yoruba are conceived of as a unit. Such complexity is due to the amount of socio-cultural information that must be packaged into the name (Akinnaso, 1980: p. 286). This socio-cultural packaging is motivated by what Akinnaso (1980: p. 283) calls “home context”, which is the sum of the special circumstances of birth, the socio-economic-political conditions of the birth, the religious affiliation of the family, and the professional stature of the parents. For that, unlike FN in the West, Yoruba FN are unique to their bearers. Owing to the aforementioned motivations and to the oral nature of the Yoruba society, FN have “a diary-keeping function”, whereby the daily repetition of the name serves as “a reminder of those dominant social values, important personal concerns, and other social events that are reflected in personal names” (Akinnaso, 1980: p. 279). Akinnaso (1981: p. 63) argues that “personal names do not only identify individuals” but, more importantly, “can be seen to constitute a symbolic system”. The Yoruba community proverbially believes that “a person’s name directs his actions and behavior” (Akinnaso, 1981: p. 46).

If studies of native American, Indian, and African names abound, there are, however, very few studies of FN in Arabic. Antoun (1968), for instance, studied the relation between nicknames and social control in a Jordanian village, classifying surnames in an anecdotic fashion, according to profession and religion, which is not of great interest to the present study. Oman (1980) gives a frequency count of FN in Oman, addressing no issues of importance to the Arabic naming system such as the relation of the naming system to the lexicon or the socio-linguistic significance of FN. Yassin’s (1986) study of names is methodologically unsound because, although some FN can be used in many Arab countries as family names, he mixes his account of FN with surnames, but manages to isolate a few important functional domains for naming in Arabic in general, namely, (country of) origin, status (relating to slaves before Islam and their change of status as reflected in names), habitat, religion, etc. Working on Palestinian FN, Tushyeh *et al.* (1989) describe the distributional variables of religion, gender, and geography, dictated mostly by the occupational situation Palestine has been experiencing for over half a century. Their study is more socio-linguistically oriented, thus ignoring the linguistic and conceptual import of FN in Arabic. However, the most thorough study of FN in Arabic is Abd-el-Jawad (1986), who studied FN linguistically by relating them to their derivational morphology and using a few socio-cultural variables to highlight the

significance of FN in Arabic. The present paper substantially draws on and hopes to complement Abd-el-Jawad (1986).

3. Morphology of First Names in TA

The Arabic grammatical tradition (cf., for example, ?ibn Ya3iiš) distinguishes two types of naming: transferred and improvised. As its name indicates, the transferred type operates a transfer on common nouns, turning them into proper names. Three subtypes of transferred naming are isolated: those that come from nouns, those that come from verbs, and those that derive from a sound (onomatopoetic). First names deriving from nouns are often adjectival like *naayla* from verb *naalat* (she obtained something) or *nawwalathu* (to give him) or *faaTma* from *faTamam waladahaa* (she weaned her child). Those FN originating in verbs occur as a *maSdar* (or verbal noun) like *3alaa?*, which comes from verb *3alaa* (go high).

Lakoff (1987: pp. 289-290) notes that names for basic-level physical entities—people, places, and things—are prototypical nouns. A prototype is a “schematic representation of the conceptual core of a category”, where no single entity is to be called a prototype, but where each entity “instantiates the prototype” (Taylor 1995: p. 59). As prototypical nouns, FN in TA are derived from one of the parts of speech of nouns, verbs, or adjectives, and may show number (singularity or plurality without this entailing agreement with the verbs), and may assume a mass noun status (without this implying that they are to be assimilated to the common nouns to which they relate). Morphology is central to this study, in that morphological considerations are used as evidence for gender classifications and gender bias. For instance, in cognitive semantic terms *nur* (light) and *?anwaar* (lights), derived respectively from a mass common noun and a plural common noun, used to designate a female human being in TA⁽³⁾ are to be interpreted as different strategies of naming as will be explained later in the paper. Stressing the role of motivation, Lakoff (1987: p. 346) argues that it is “a central phenomenon in cognition”. By motivation, Lakoff meant that things are neither arbitrary nor predictable. FN are not arbitrary but will be demonstrated to be morphologically motivated. What is unpredictable about FN in this cultural tradition is the (mis)match between the value and the role, i.e.

⁽³⁾ This should remind us of the mass noun *sukkar* (sugar) in Egyptian Arabic used as a FNM while the countable one is assigned the FNF as *sukkara* (a sugar lump).

between the person and the name s/he bears. Thus, unlike the Delawares and Akima Indians traditions, Tunisians do not name their children because they have the cultural values that they desire in them, but name them in the hope that their behavior conform with the descriptive content of their names, i.e. the meaning of their names.

Prototypical FNF lack articles and article contrast like with *Habiiba* (a lover or beloved) but not **al-Habiiba* (*the lover). Van Langendonck (1999: p. 110) rightly argues that FN do not need determiners to define them because they are “inherently definite” by “displaying a presupposition of uniqueness”. However, some FNM may show article contrast like with *Habiib* (a lover) or *al-Habiib* (the lover). Syntactically, FN do not show case (nominative, objective, and genitive) and diacritic features in TA (unless they are part of a name-occupation collocation as we will see shortly)⁽⁴⁾. There seems to be no limit morphologically to the derivation of FN from the lexicon of TA except where society and culture disallow it. For instance, although verb *3ašaq* (to love passionately) has positive connotations, it is not found at the origin of first names for females or males, the reason being that the topic of love is somewhat taboo in TA⁽⁵⁾.

3.1. Nominal first names for females and males

When they are nominal, FNF and FNM show more derivational variety. Although they do not behave syntactically like the rest of common nouns, they draw on singular count nouns, plural nouns, mass nouns, agentive nouns, and deverbal nouns as illustrated in Table 1.

This classification into the various derived nouns will serve the purpose of grading FN according to their cognitive semantic correlates. As is clear from “light” and “lights”, *?anwaar* is the plural of *nur*, but *muniira* is the agentive noun from verb *anaara* (to light) in Arabic. It should be noted that for a FN to qualify as one for a baby girl it needn't correspond gender-wise to the female gender. For instance, *nur* (light) in Arabic is masculine when used as a common noun but comes to be used with girls

not boys. Conversely, *šams* (sun) is feminine but comes to be used as a first name for boys (*šams id-diin*: the sun of religion). It should also be noted that there exist no FNM as singular count nouns and plural nouns, which fact will be commented upon shortly.

Discussing the difference between count and mass nouns, Langacker (1987: p. 203) argues that “a count noun designates a region that is specifically construed as being bounded within the scope of predication in a primary domain. By contrast, a mass noun designates a region that is not so construed”. Accordingly, mass nouns used as FN are limitless and unbounded while count nouns are limited and bounded. In this sense, *nur* could be said to be more unbounded and absolute than *?anwaar*. Extrapolating from this grammatical observation, it can be argued that this systematicity in attributing FN that are bounded to girls and FN that are unbounded to boys is, to say the least, not an isolated or arbitrary event, but motivated, albeit unconsciously, by socio-cultural factors which hold males to be more privileged in a patriarchal society.

3.2. Adjectival first names for females and males

FNF and FNM deriving from adjectives assume two morphological forms: plain adjective or comparative adjective. However, there are many FNF for which only a plain adjective exists while FNM exist in the comparative form as well, as shown in Table 2.

The existence of FNM modeled on the morphological pattern of *?af3al* is literally called a “name of preference,” which is defined as a name whose “bearer outdoes the others in deed”⁽⁶⁾. The fact that FNF on this pattern are not available suggests that it is males that surpass females in action, and that the grammar is biased to the male gender.

4. An ICM View of Naming

In this paper, a FN is treated as an ICM, i.e. a cognitive model “reflecting the cultural practice of giving every person a name supposedly unique to that person and hence sufficient as a means of identification” (Langacker, 1991: p. 60). Why an ICM of naming? Intuitively, FN are different from common nouns in that they do not stand in a signifier-signified relation with the persons they are used to identify. Rather, FN activate frames, and proceed by

⁽⁴⁾ It should be noted that in Modern Standard Arabic FN show different endings depending on the case they assume. For instance, *Dahaba 3amrun* (Amr left) is nominative, *ra?ajtu 3amran* (I saw Amr) is accusative, and *tađaddaTtu ?ila 3amrin* (I talked to Amr) is genitive. TA, however, does not show case ending.

⁽⁵⁾ In one of the sub-dialects of TA, that of Sfax, a southern town of Tunisia, a variety of almond is named as *3aššaq* (literally, that whose love is abundant), which might mean that, because this variety is beautiful, delicious, and abundant in yield, it has admirers that would love it for its merits.

⁽⁶⁾ Al-?astarabaadi, A. *?arđu r-raDijji 3ala l-kefiyati* (Explication of *l-ke:fiyati* by *r-raDijji*). 2nd ed., Vol. 3, Benghazi: Gar Younes University, (1996), 447 p.

Table 1. Nominal first names for females and males

Grammatical form	First names for females	First names for males
singular count noun	<i>durra</i> (a pearl)	
plural noun	? <i>anwaar</i> (lights)	
Mass noun	<i>nur</i> (light)	<i>RiDaa</i> (contentment)
agentive noun	<i>muniira</i> (the one who lights (the world))	<i>muniir</i> (the one who lights (the world))
deverbal noun	? <i>iimaan</i> (faith)	

Table 2. Adjectival first names for females and males

Grammatical form	FNF	FNM
Adjective	<i>naffiisa</i> (precious)	<i>kariim</i> (generous)
Comparative adjective	*? <i>akrama</i> (more generous) *? <i>ašrafa</i> (more high born)	? <i>akram</i> (more generous) ? <i>ašraf</i> (more high born)

evocation, i.e. they suggest connections between a name, a name-bearer, and the hearer's possible experience with the name-bearer. Further, by virtue of their morphological relation with common nouns, FN are induced metaphorically. Further still, owing to their lack of uniqueness, FN evoke a metonym, where the name-bearer stands in a part-whole relation with others in the world bearing the same name.

Lakoff (1987: p. 68) argues that an Idealized Cognitive Model is "a complex structured whole", using the following principles:

- (i) propositional structure (as in Fillmore's frames),
- (ii) image-schematic structure (as in Langacker's cognitive grammar),
- (iii) metaphorical mappings (as described by Lakoff and Johnson), and
- (iv) metonymical mappings (as described by Lakoff and Johnson).

For Lakoff (1987: p. 341), cognitive models are not "internal representations of external reality" for two reasons: (i) "they are understood in terms of embodiment, not in terms of direct connection to the external world", and (ii) "they include imaginative aspects of cognition such as metaphor and metonymy".

Lakoff (1987: p. 70) qualifies an ICM as follows: "An Idealized cognitive model may fit one's understanding of the world either perfectly, very well, pretty well, somewhat well, pretty badly, or not at all", which will be profitably capitalized upon in talking about the ICM of naming. The power of the theory of ICMs, thus, lies in the idealized nature of ICMs, which presupposes the existence of non-idealized members within the cognitive models that may not fit our idealized ones so well. The ICMs seem to be what individuals in the same culture share, including folk theories of meaning and reality. The non-idealized cognitive models, however, are the ones individual people interact with in their quotidian interactions with other people in their culture and with categories in the

world. Lakoff (1982: p. 165) makes it clear that "the theory of ICMs depends upon keeping one's idealized cognitive models separate from one's knowledge about and understanding of the world".

To show how an ICM works, addressing strangers in Tunisia will be taken as an illustrative case. Tunisians inject, among other things, kinship-related terms to engage in conversation with strangers. To spell out the propositional model of terms of address, the speaker, through the vocative "ya" (hey) in TA, draws the attention of an unfocused addressee, using a kinship-related term of address. Depending on the addressee's age, the speaker does this by invoking feelings of motherhood (ya um-mi, ... : Hey my mother), fatherhood (ya baba, ... : Hey my father), sisterhood (ya uxt-i, ... : Hey my sister, ...), brotherhood (ya xu-ya, ... : Hey my brother), unclehood (ya 3ammi, ... : Hey my uncle), and aunthood (ya xaalt-i, ... : Hey my aunt). Being at the CENTER of her speech act, the speaker negotiates with the addressee at the PERIPHERY in the following way: The invocation of kinship terms of sisterhood, brotherhood, motherhood, fatherhood, etc. manipulates the CENTER-PERIPHERY image schema from within, negotiating the physical FAR-NEAR image schema, which creates in the addressee a favorable attitude of rapprochement with the speaker. The metaphoric model is captured in the kinship space being mapped onto the socio-physical space. This mapping consists in positing a stranger, by way of using the kinship term, to be a kin to the speaker, which legitimizes the conceptual metaphor, NON-AQUAINTANCES ARE KIN. One important entailment of this metaphor is the reduction of (physical) aloofness/distance created by the socio-physical distance between speaker and addressee, which conceptually transforms PHYSICAL REMOTENESS into EMOTIONAL CLOSENESS. In this connection, Jones (2004) argues that "the analysis of kin terms seems to illuminate a different corner of conceptual structure, one grounded not in physical but social cognition". The metonymic model

for terms of address has to do with a pragmatic, metonymic link between a role and its value (Fauconnier, 1994: p. 146). The role-value metonymy posits the kinship role corresponding to the age and gender of the addressee (sister, brother, uncle, aunt, mother, father) to be filled by each addressee selected as a value or variable. As such, each individual can be assigned a kinship role by the speaker, creating the conceptual metonymy A VALUE IS A ROLE (where VALUE is the addressee and ROLE is the kinship term judged to be suitable for the gender and age of the addressee).

The remainder of this section will be devoted to spelling out the components of the ICM of naming in TA.

4.1. Propositional model of naming

Lakoff (1987: p. 113) notes that “much of our knowledge structure is in the form of propositional models... A propositional model characterizing our knowledge of fire would include the fact that fire is dangerous”. The propositional structure of an ICM is captured in Fillmore’s (1975: pp. 123-4) concept of frame, which is said to include “certain schemata or frameworks of concepts or terms ... [that] link together as a system, which impose structure or coherence on some aspect of human experience, and which may contain elements which are simultaneously parts of other such frameworks”. According to Fillmore (1982: p. 117), the interpretation of every piece of human interaction involves “an abstract structure of expectations which brings with it roles, purposes, natural or conventionalized sequences of event types, and all the rest of the apparatus that we wish to associate with the notion of ‘frame’ ”.

The notion of role in the overall naming ICM includes name-givers and name-holders. As owners of the prerogative of naming, parents exploit this for their own purposes. When their children are young, parents exercise a parental power of ownership over their offsprings. Prototypically, naming enables them to choose a name for their children which psychologically expresses their wishes, compensates their failures, and reflects the foundations of their culture. In the TA culture, the parent-offspring tie remains very strong even when children become independent of their parents. The offspring-parent tie is expected to be even stronger than the parent-offspring tie as offsprings are expected to care for and show gratitude to their parents who gave them birth and devoted their life bringing them up. This bias to parents invokes a model of parenthood much influenced by the teachings of the Koran, the Holy

Book of Muslim, whereby happiness of Allah is paired with that of parents as illustrated in *ma riDaa?u il-laahi illa bi riDaa?i l-waalidayn* (Allah’s gratification goes by parents’ gratification).

4.2. Image-schematic structure of naming

Johnson (1987: p. 29) was one of the first cognitive scientists to insist on the role that image schemas play in organizing experience and meaning and drawing inferences in domains of understanding. Johnson (1987: p. 2) defines an image schema as “a dynamic pattern that functions somewhat like the abstract structure of an image, and thereby connects up a vast range of different experiences that manifest the same recurring structure”. These patterns emerge as meaningful structures chiefly at the level of our bodily movements through space, our manipulation of objects, and our perceptual interactions. The image-schematic structure of an ICM is meaningful since image schemas are “directly and repeatedly experienced because of the nature of the body and its mode of functioning in our environment” (Lakoff, 1987: p. 268).

FN involve a LINK image-schematic structure captured in the frame that naming triggers, which describes a particular mental space that is neither factual nor counterfactual, but about what Jackendoff (1995: p. 29) calls “*the projected world*”. The entities of the mental space include name-givers and name-holders. Their relation in this projected world is realized by a projected emotional, moral, religious, superstitious, or aesthetic LINK inherited from the culture. Johnson (1987: p. 117) writes the following about Links:

“Without links, we could neither be or be human. We come into existence tethered to our biological mothers by umbilical cords that nourish and sustain us. But this merely physical linking is never the full story of our humanity, which requires a certain nonphysical linking to our parents, our siblings, and our society as a whole. The severing of the umbilical cord launches us into an ongoing process of linking, bonding, and connecting that gives us our identity.”

Obviously, the LINK schema of naming has to do with what Johnson calls the “nonphysical linking to our parents,” which is an abstract kind of link as suggested by its image-schematic nature.

4.3. Metaphoric mappings of naming

Lakoff and Johnson (1980: p. 3) argue that “our ordinary conceptual system, in terms of which we both

think and act, is fundamentally metaphorical in nature”, that “*the essence of metaphor is understanding and experiencing one kind of thing in terms of another*” (5) (emphasis in original), and that “*no metaphor can ever be comprehended or even adequately represented independently of its experiential basis*” (19) (emphasis in original). As such, metaphoric understanding is grounded in semantically autonomous conceptual structure like spaces, containers, substances, and objects (Lakoff and Turner, 1989: p. 113). The metaphoric dimension of the ICM develops as a mapping from source to target domain, i.e. from the physical to the non-physical, from the more concrete to the less concrete, from the semantically autonomous to the semantically non-autonomous, from the more clearly delineated to the less clearly delineated. Lakoff (1987: p. 288) tells us that “the source domain is assumed to be structured by a propositional or image-schematic model”.

Prototypical FN rely on a conceptual domain recruited from within the experience of the name-giver, selecting a desirable state of affairs from the cognitive domains of emotion (*surur*: happiness), morality (?*amiina*: reliable), justice (*3aadil*: fair), beauty (*jamiila*: beautiful), piety (*3afaaf*: chastity), etc., and turning it into a FN. We may not be aware of these FN as depending precisely on those cognitive domains. However, we become aware of them when they evoke some form of derogation, which brings their lexical meanings to the surface of our social consciousness and cognition. Audiences may smile or even laugh at that the bearers of these names. Owing to this social and psychological pressure, their bearers often decide to get rid of them via the legal system. For instance, the following names⁽⁷⁾ have been controversial to their own bearers:

3aanis⁽⁸⁾ (an old maiden)
jaHša (a young donkey)
Hajla (a partridge)
ma3yufa (a disgusting entity)
Hujja (evidence)
Taawis (a peacock)
qišša (a straw)
xarufa (a young sheep)
bagra (a cow)
Hamaama (a pigeon)

⁽⁷⁾ These have been taken from the Official Journal of the Republic of Tunisia, 12 January 2001. Many holders of these names have sought legal action to change them.

⁽⁸⁾ Names are given in small letters as if they were common names owing to the fact that capitalization does not exist in Arabic. Instead, FN are italicized.

The previous FN exist in rural areas, where they are not considered derogatory by name-givers.

The role of metaphor in the ICM of naming is crucial. It takes care of mapping the cultural value in general onto the name-holder, producing a unique form of metaphoric categorization where the name-holder is expected to reflect those cultural patterns. Although we implicitly acknowledge that as individuals we entertain an image-schematic relation with the world, the tendency to be different from the rest of the world is very strong in us.

4.4. Metonymic model of naming

Lakoff and Johnson (1980: p. 39) argue that “metonymic concepts allow us to conceptualize one thing by means of its relation to something else”. The metonymic model of the ICM is said to describe a metonymic mapping “within a single conceptual domain” if A is an element of a category B (Lakoff 1987: p. 288). A prototype effect can arise in connection with metonymic mappings: “Given category B, where A is either a member or sub-category of B, suppose that A metonymically “stands for” B. That is, it is either a social stereotype, or a typical case, or an ideal, or a sub-model, etc. Then, A will be a *best example* of B” (Lakoff 1987: pp. 288-89). This conceptual mechanism is held to be motivated by the expression of a wish, hope, desire, aspiration, or expectation on the part of the name-giver indirectly via the name-bearer so that a state of affairs obtain in the world through giving the name-bearer that name.

Shore (1996: p. 173) points out that “humans partake in a double relationship with ‘nature,’ both participating in the natural order as part to whole (i.e., metonymy) and categorically distinguishing themselves from nature as distinct but parallel forms of life (i.e., metaphor)”. Every individual entertains a double metonymical relation with: (i) the group of which s/he has the same first name, whereby s/he incidentally loses his/her uniqueness as holder of that name but keeps a part-whole metonymic relation with the group; (b) the group of human beings, where s/he keeps his/her uniqueness as an individual bearing that name vis-à-vis the rest of the world. The importance of metonymy also lies in the fact that the name comes to stand for the person in a PART-WHOLE relation similar to the person’s membership in the world and in the group bearing the same names.

5. Conceptual Domains of FN in TA

This section spells out the metaphoric domains capitalized upon by Tunisian name-givers in naming

children. The names show a variety of domains, but variety is more the case with FNF. The writing of the domains in conceptual metaphors using “is” or “as” may be confusing, but this is the mnemonic used in the contemporary theory of metaphor to capture the conceptual side of what is encoded linguistically. Since the paper is about metaphor, the use of these should be taken metaphorically.

5.1. A HUMAN BEING AS COSMIC ENTITY⁽⁹⁾

The cosmos makes up part of the physical environment of all humans, and constitutes a major part of their experience. The WOMAN AS COSMIC ENTITY branches out as WOMAN AS PART OF THE DAY AND NIGHT, WOMAN AS NATURAL STAR, WOMAN AS A SOURCE OF LIGHT, AND WOMAN AS ANIMAL. The FN realizing WOMAN AS PART OF THE DAY AND NIGHT metaphor are metonymic by entertaining a PART-WHOLE relation with the day and the night. Such metonyms include *saHar* (early dawn), *SabaaH* (morning), *SabiiHa* ((diminutive of) morning), *DuHa* (forenoon), *samar* (evening or night conversation), *samiira* (lover of evening or night conversation). There exists, however, a FNF in TA that overlaps with night (*layla*). The suggestion is reminiscent of the Arabian Nights folk stories, where the Arab woman was conceived of as a matter of spending one night with until Scheherazade appeared and reversed the trend. The sexual connotation in this particular name is clear: night metonymically triggers via a *pragmatic function* (F) the target sex (cf., Fauconnier 1994: p. 3, reporting on G. Nunberg’s *pragmatic function*). The WOMAN AS NATURAL STAR metaphor includes *qamar* or *gamra* (moon) and *šams* (sun).

The list of FN reflecting the WOMAN AS A SOURCE OF LIGHT is one of the most favorable set. Among other things, *nur* (light) in Arabic extends metaphorically to religious faith and knowledge. However, this should not blind us, as pointed out earlier, to the morphological objectification of women by assimilating them to objects such as chandeliers and lamps, which reinforces, in the words of Hines (1996: p. 193), “semantic depersonalization”, i.e. the fact that one source of light is like another. This again could be used to evidence the lack of uniqueness of FN. Although FNF and FNM share object as a source of light (e.g. *siraaj* (a lamp)) and emitting light (e.g. *muniir* and *muniira* (that who emits light)) for both genders, the existence of *?anwar* (gives more light) on

the pattern of *?af3al* suggests that its bearer surpasses the others in action. Using FNF that morphologically suggest that males surpass females in action may be argued to be a mark of distinction for males and a sign of females’ subordination.

The linguistic “zoologizing” of women has been attested by many in different cultures (Nesi, 1995; Pace Nilsen, 1996; Hines, 1999; Maalej, 2001). Such “zoologizing” has been found to be responsible for evaluating women negatively, disapproving of gender-inappropriate behaviors, and of endearing them. The WOMAN AS ANIMAL metaphor is, however, positive. Naming women as *maha* (antelope) and *riim* (white gazelle) is capitalizing on positive features of the antelope and the gazelle, namely, the beauty of the antelope’s eyes and the slenderness of the gazelle in the Arabic culture.

5.2. WOMAN AS FRAGRANCE AND BEAUTY

The WOMAN AS FRAGRANCE metaphor draws on (i) names for natural scents like *?ariij* (scent), *3abiir* (aroma), or *šada* (fragrance); (ii) names of different flowers like *warda* (rose) and *zahra* (flower); and (iii) plants that are reputed in the Arab culture for their scent like *yasmiin* (jasmine), *fulla* (Arabian jasmine), *narjis* (narcissus), *nisriin* (musk rose, jonquil), etc. It should be noted that such names also evoke beauty on top of having a natural scent. All the aforementioned FNF relate to common nouns for natural elements that are only seasonally available, which may suggest the partial sexual availability of women. As FNF, the names of different flowers as against names of plants that yield all sorts of fragrance are severed from their tree, implying withering on the part of women.

FN after beauty exist for men and women in TA. FNF can be simply names or adjectives for beauty such as *Hasna* (a beauty), *jamiila* (beautiful), or an adjective evocative of beauty such as *faatin* (fascinating, captivating, charming), *hayfa* (slender), *badii3a* (wonderful), *naahid* (bosomy). The reason for including *naahid* (bosomy) under beauty has to do with the fact that culturally rotundity (as evoked by a full-bosomed lady) is a mark of beauty and bodily perfection. FNM after beauty also exist, such as *Hassan* (good), *jamiil* (handsome), *waseem* (handsome), etc. That such names exist in TA has to do with the fact that beauty is appreciated by all, and is, therefore, laudatory rather than derogatory. It should be noted that culturally name-givers avoid naming males with excessively beautiful names as beauty per se is deemed more feminine in the Tunisian culture.

⁽⁹⁾ Although I am aware that names are attributed to children at birth, I will still use MAN and WOMAN in writing the conceptual metaphors.

5.3. WOMAN AS SUPERNATURAL BEING

Although the list of FNF as supernatural creatures is limited in scope *malaak* (angel) and *Hurijja* (nymph, houri)), it corroborates similar findings arrived at by Maalej (2001) regarding the conceptualization and evaluation of woman as a mythical creature in languages such as Afrikaans, Arabic, Armenian, Bulgarian, French, Persian, Russian, etc. Naming girls *malaak* (angel) and *Huriyya* (nymph, houri) reflects males' obsession with beautiful and well behaved girls, two notions associated with angels and nymphs in TA.

Using this abstract source domain (less known) to enlighten a concrete one (more known) is significant in more than one respect. First, it has been claimed (Gibbs, 1994: p. 6; Deignan, 1997: p. 21) that conceptual metaphors arise to solve difficult, complex, abstract, or less delineated concepts. Such a claim wants more fine-tuning and revision because some of the familiar and basic concepts in our life such as *woman* and names for woman are conceptualized using less known concepts as source domain such as supernatural beings of which very little is known except through stereotypes and superstitions. Second, it questions the other claim made by Sweetser (1990: p. 30) to the effect that the "unidirectional" cross-domain mapping proceeds from abstract-to-concrete. The case of WOMAN AS A SUPERNATURAL BEING, however, proceeds from concrete-to-abstract. Morale of the story: Not all mappings are grounded in physical experience; imagination, stereotypes, and superstitions may motivate some mappings.

5.4. WOMAN AS COMMODITY

Objects and their possession is a fact of life and part of human experience. A HUMAN BEING IS A COMMODITY branches out as WOMAN AS A PRECIOUS COMMODITY, WOMAN AS A POSSESSION, and WOMAN AS A DANGEROUS WEAPON. Calling women after precious objects such as raw gold (*tibr*), silver (*fiDDa*), bracelets (?*asaawir*), pearl (*durra*), turquoise (*fairuz*), jems (*jawaahir*), emerald (*zmurda*), coral (*murjaana*), and corundum (*jaquta*) tells a lot about the many functions that these valuable objects have in the life of many people. First, the appreciation of these precious metals owes so much to their non-corrosive nature, i.e. their unlikely change of state, which is capitalized upon for naming women. Second, owing to their beauty, these objects have always been worn by women for their decorative value. Third, when you own precious objects, the other side of the privilege of ownership is their marketable value and

exchangeability for currency. Extrapolating from these functions, naming women after these objects is a pledge on the part of name-givers that the name match the referent, and that the woman would live up to the entailments the metals trigger for us. However, man-as-a-commodity metaphor is only a precious commodity.

Also subsumed under WOMAN AS A COMMODITY is WOMAN AS POSSESSION that is realized through the concept of property like in *mulka* (property), *nawwaal* ((intensive case of) obtaining), and *manaal* (obtainment). The dowry that parents demand in exchange for their daughters confirms their marketable value. Furthermore, the frequent reference to people's children as their "merchandise" (*sil3a*) in the Tunisian culture corroborates naming daughters as *mulka* (property).

The FN realizing WOMAN AS A DANGEROUS WEAPON are *sihem* (arrows, darts) and *rimeH* (spears). Both can be subsumed under another conceptual metaphor for emotion, i.e. LOVE IS WAR. Woman is shown as an offensive creature, equipped with an arsenal of arrows and spears addressed to the heart of man. It should be noted here that woman is seen in a more active light, where her body is the emanation of weapons and man is her target. Man is helpless and contented with receiving arrows into his body, which arrows may be conceptualized as looks such as in, "Her look killed me", where LOOKING AT SOMEONE IS KILLING THEM, which is coherent with LOVE IS WAR, and the first names *sihem* (arrows) and *rimeð* (spears). The reason for not using *sahm* (arrow, dart) as a FNF is the fact that it is a masculine one.

However, FNM only realize the MAN AS A PRECIOUS COMMODITY metaphor such as *jawhar* (a jem, a jewel), *naadir* (rare, exceptional), etc. Although *naadra* (rare, exceptional) exists as a FNF (*naadra*: rare/exceptional), it is lost in the midst of the first names that realize the WOMAN AS POSSESSION metaphor, which commodify women and make them objects possessed by men.

5.5. HUMAN BEING AS EMOTIONAL STATE

The pervasiveness of emotions in humans experience is beyond demonstrating. The place of metaphor in emotions has been long acknowledged as a privileged mode of talking about them (Lakoff and Kövecses, 1987; Lakoff, 1987; Kövecses, 1993, 2000; Yu, 1995, 1998; Deignan, 1997; Maalej, 2004, 2007). Naming females after emotions capitalizes on generic emotions, happiness, and intimacy. FNF can assume the generic names for emotions such as *3awaaTif* (feelings), *Hanaan* (affection), *wijdaan* (sentiments),

etc., which evokes the WOMAN AS EMOTION conceptual metaphor. FNF for happiness include *faraH* (joy), *sarraa* (happy), *surur* (merriment), *zahiyya* (cheerful), *sa3iida* (happy), *basma* (a smile), *?inširaaH* (cheerfulness), *hanaa?* (bliss, felicity), *?ibtisem* (smiling), *su3aad* (harmony), *salwaa* (amusement), etc. Such names can be subsumed under WOMAN IS HAPPINESS. FNF based on intimacy may include *Habiiba* (lover), *huyem* (passionate love), *wi?em* (rapport), *?ulfa* (intimacy), *wided* (intimacy), *wiSaal* (intimate communication or sexual intercourse), *najwaa* (intimate talk), *?iinas* (entertainment), etc., which can be governed by the conceptual metaphor, WOMAN IS INTIMACY. Some other FNF capitalise on concepts that relate in one way or another to one of the emotions. Such names include *?amal* (hope), *?aamaal* (hopes), *?amaani* (wishes), *?aHlem* (dreams), *dalaal* (coquetry), *3iteb* (friendly reproach), *rajaa* (hope, wish), *rafiqa* (companion), *šaadiya* (songstress), etc.

Although FNF include naming via emotions, the set of FNM remains very restricted to a few such as *sa3iid* (happy), *las3ad* (the one who is happier), *lTayyif* (diminutive of good-natured), *Habiib* (lover), *riDaa* (satisfaction), *rafiq* (companion), etc. Two facts should be noted about this list. First, the existence of *las3ad* (the one who is happier) as a “name of preference” corroborates the linguistic complicity of morphologically making the bearer as outdoing the others in deed, on the one hand, and the conceptually experiential level, on the other. Second, the existence of *lTayyif* in the diminutive form (*laTiif* vs. *lTayyif*) may suggest that culturally a man does not have to be *laTiif* (good-natured), which may be feared to contribute to making him effeminate. Therefore, if a male is ever to be named after an emotional state, to be culturally acceptable the name has to be softened down as a diminutive.

5.6. HUMAN BEING AS MORAL VALUE/QUALITY

There exist FN that reflect moral qualities or religious values. Such qualities and values are deeply entrenched in people’s morality and piety. Naming children after one of those qualities and values, I suppose, serves as a reminder about these moral and religious principles. It should be noted that such FNF are favorable because all of them are taken from a domain of virtue. They can be distributed over a few sub-metaphors.

5.6.1. WOMAN AS PIETY

3afef (chastity), *3afiifa* (chaste), *hela* (halo), *na3iima* (blissful), *huda* (guidance), *raHma* (mercy),

?aamna (believer), *?ilhaam* (inspiration), *?islam* (Islam), *?iiman* (faith), *?eya* (Koranic verse), *?asmaa* (names (of Allah)), *ra?fa* (mercy), *nabiila* (noble), *naziha* (honest, virtuous), *taysiir* (facility), *taqwaa* (piety), *yusr* (facility), *faadya* (redeemer).

5.6.2. A HUMAN BEING AS VIRTUE

faDiila (virtue), *?amiina* (reliable), *?inSaaf* (fairness), *šariifa* (highborn), *wafaa* (loyalty), *šafiqa* (compassionate), *samaaH* (generosity), *zakiyya* (pure), *Haliima* (indulgent), *jaliila* (lofty).

5.6.3. A HUMAN BEING AS KINDNESS

?ikraam (hospitality), *faayda* (utility or benefit as an agentive noun), *kariima* (kind), *laTiifa* (good-natured), *Safiyya* (sincere friend/fresh or pure), *um l-xiir* (the mother of goodness), *xayriyya* (does good/charitable).

FNM do exist along these lines (see Appendix), except that they reiterate the same preference pattern. For instance, when a FNF is *šariifa* (highborn), it is *?ašraf* (more high born) for FNM. More examples include *kariima* (kind) vs. *?akram* (kinder), *?amiina* (reliable) vs. *?ajman* (more reliable), etc., although *šarif*, *kariim*, and *?amiin* do exist as FNM in TA. Another difference lies at the level of singular-plural distinction, where a FNF is related to the singular version of the common noun and the FNM is related to its plural counterpart as in *?eiya* (Koranic verse) vs. *?eiyet Allah* (Koranic verses of Allah). Linguistically, this is further evidence for the bias of the cultural model of naming to males.

5.7. HUMAN BEING AS INTELLIGENCE

Intelligence is a human concern, having to do with experience and with changing it. The conceptual domain of intelligence is another area where both males and females are represented without much discrimination against the latter. The only slight difference is at the level of derivation of *faahim* (he has understood) vs. *fahiima* (she is likely to understand). *faahim* is modeled on the *faa3il* pattern, which gives rise to agentive nouns favorable to males. The same does not hold for *nabiha* (clever) vs. *nabiha* (clever).

5.8. A HUMAN BEING IS SUBMISSION

The concept of submission as a source domain for FNF and FNM is an exceptional domain as it also involves males in submission, which is probably not to their partners but to their parents. FNF are unambiguously names that try to immortalize submission in embodying it in FN. Such names include *muTii3a* (obedient), *raaDiya* (does accept),

Saabriin (patient), *?umayma* ((diminutive of) bondmaid) as FNF and *muTii3* (obedient), *raaDi* (does accept), *Saabir* (patient) as FNM.

However, the only name available in TA that is the antithesis of submission is a male name: *muTaa3* (the one who is obeyed). In Maalej (1998-99: p. 57), the same templates have been evidenced to exist in Tunisian Arabic. *MuTaa3* is modeled morphologically on the *mufaa3il* template, which yields passive participles to the effect that in this case people obey this person. However, no similar FNF exists, which suggests that no provision has been made for females' orders to be obeyed.

5.9. A HUMAN BEING IS WARFARE

The particular domain of warfare is restricted to FNM as males are considered culturally to be more prone to violence. Examples include *Raazi* (invader), *Saddaam* (he who shocks frequently), *naaSir* (supporter), etc. Women seem to be excluded from the domain of bravery and violence as far as FNF are concerned.

5.10. A HUMAN BEING IS UPWARD ORIENTATION

So far, most of the conceptual metaphors governing FN have been of the structural kind. FN do exist that are governed by orientational metaphors (Lakoff and Johnson, 1980: 14) for both males and females. Examples include *saamiya* (elevated), *sumayya* (diminutive of elevated), *rafi3a* (high standing), *3alya* (high), *3ulayya* (diminutive of high) for females and *saami* (elevated) and *3aliy* (elevated) for males.

6. Converging Evidence for Meaningful Naming

First, FN in TA relate to the lexicon, in that like common nouns they occur as nouns and adjectives. As nouns, FN can occur as *?ism faa3il* (agentive noun) such as *3aadil* (fair [masc.]), *SiRat mubaalRa* (intensive participle form) such as *3afiiqa* (compassionate [fem.]), and *maSdar* (verbal noun) such as *?ikraam* (hospitality [fem.]) (Abd-el-Jawad, 1986:82). Following from the complex morphology of nouns, FN may occur as countable (singular and plural) such as *durra* (a pearl [fem.]) and *?anwaar* (lights [fem.]) respectively, and mass nouns such as *nur* (light [fem.]). As adjectives, they can occur in the simple or comparative form of the adjective as in *?a3raf* (more high born). This situation can be explained by the Arabic grammatical tradition that classifies naming as a form of transference of

common nouns from the lexicon, following the same morphological processes as common nouns do. The implication of this is that FN are not simply used referentially (Quirk *et al.*, 1972; Downing, 1996), but they also carry descriptive and conceptual content (Searle, 1969: pp. 164-5). Thus, this argument may be called *conceptual evidence*.

Second, this conceptual content is linked to descriptive content in the history of Arab-Moslems. In the times of Islamic conquests, one of them (*TalHa*) named his children after names of prophets while another (*Zubayr*) named them after those of martyrs. In an interchange between them, *Zubayr* addressed *TalHa* as follows: "I am hopeful that my children will deserve their name and become martyrs while yours have no chance of becoming prophets" (quoted by Sublet, 1991: pp. 27-28, from M. J. Kister, 1975: p. 23). The fact that *Zubayr* talks about the significance of his children's names to his friend is evidence that (a) historically, names are supposed to mean something and have an influence on their bearers, and that (b) he named them with the intent of precisely deserving those names, i.e., they can work in their life towards emulating the heroic acts of martyrs, thus making their lives match those of the martyrs. As *Zubayr* carefully put it, he was "hopeful" that by naming his children after martyrs they would honor the memory of martyrs. In this connection, Abd-el-Jawad (1986: p. 80) argues that:

"Names express in the Arab community of Jordan, as in many other communities, parents' wishes, expectations, likings or dislikings to either wish the baby to behave in accordance with its name or to wish the name to be a description of the baby. Such expectation might become a model for the bearer to live up to; otherwise, he will be considered as 'spoiling his name,' while if he becomes famous and acquires reputation, he is keeping and honoring his name."

Historically, naming in the Arabic tradition is semantically motivated. If, for instance, *Taarak*, the name of a martyr who is known to have accomplished heroic deeds (*Taarak ibn ziyaad*), is used to name a baby-boy, the latter is expected through a projection of his parents' cultural value of heroism and bravery to be like *Taarak* in deed. If he manages to do so, he would be said to have lived up to his name and deserved it; if he fails, which very often is the case nowadays, he would be said not to deserve it. Examples can be multiplied here. In recent history, after the Gulf war in the 1990s many people named their children *Saddaam* in Tunisia, the intent being in

the folk understanding of politics that they would dare, like Saddam Hussein, challenge the oppressive West and promote Arab cultural values such as honor, pride, and greatness. This can be called *historical evidence*.

Third, closely related to the conceptual and historical motivations of naming is the fact that names carry socio-cultural significance that name-givers have internalized from their own culture and would like to see perpetuated through assigning them to bearers. In this way, names are thought about as embodying cultural values that their bearers would remind us of. As Tushyeh *et al.* (1989: p. 245) put it, “the names have a meaning, a tradition, and a history which should be of interest to the concerned scholar.” In this sense, names are laden with socio-cultural meanings that extend beyond their linguistic connotative significance. First names within a culture do not only tell us about the person holding the name, but also about that culture and the values that the name-givers hold (Akinaso, 1981: p. 63). They seem to “reflect the cultural, psychological, and social atmosphere of the namer” (Abd-el-Jawad, 1986: p. 80). This binary dimension can be called *evidence from socio-cultural motivation*.

Fourth, there is a common practice in Tunisia consisting in evaluating people positively or negatively judging them by the names they bear. For instance, if your name is *3aadil* (fair/just) and you happen to be unfair to people, some may comment that it would be better for you to change your name (*laww kaan biddil ?ismu xayrlu*: he would have done better to change his name: He is not living up to his name). However, if the person named *3aadil* shows fairness and justice, people would comment that he is indeed just/fair in all ways (*maahu 3aadil illa 3aadil*: he is 3aadil because he is 3aadil: He is indeed true to his name). In the mind of people, one has to be true to one’s name as in the following saying: *?ismu 3alaa jismu* (His name is on his body: His personality is true to his name), where body should be understood as the self. Clearly, in the popular culture people are expected to be accountable for their names, i.e., they should be true to their name, and the name’s significance is to be preserved through deeds that correspond to the name that one bears.

On a similar vein, while we were discussing, a Saudi friend of mine and myself, the qualities of a Tunisian friend that we share, my Saudi friend commented: “He is dead right whoever named him Habib”. Habib in Arabic literally means lovable/loving. I take this comment to presuppose that it is ideal for someone to have their name be true to their personality traits, which is further

confirmation that names are unconsciously held to be meaningful. Whether negatively or positively meant, such comments are not infrequent in our everyday conversation in TA and maybe even in other dialects of Arabic. This will be called *evidence from evaluation*.

Fifth, the significance of names can be sought in the negative attitudes that they evoke. Although some parents still superstitiously promise to call their children after the name of a saint or a holy man if they conceive or if they are cured from a disease as a way of acknowledging their powers, those saints’ names are so rare, obsolete, and derogatory that they become a source of embarrassment for the name holder and a cause of derision from peers. Such examples may include *bulbaaba* (literally, the one with a crumb) and *Haariθ* (the one who ploughs) or *Harraθ* (the one who repetitively ploughs the land) used as a name or part of a compound name as is the custom nowadays in naming boys *MuHammed Haariθ* or *Harraθ*. *Bulbaaba* carries with it an ideology of life as thrift and piety, which in spite of its merits does not seem to attract young and old people anymore. Now *Haariθ* and *Harraθ* in Arabic etymologically relate to verb *Haraθa* (to plough the land), which is a profession now in disgrace. It is not the lexical meaning as such that is at the origin of the derogation, but what the associations of the lexical item suggest. For instance, *Haariθ* or *Harraθ* evoke in the mind of people the word *miHraaθ* (the plough), which has come to connote negatively with awkward person and hard worker in TA, which suggests that work as a socio-cultural value is also in disgrace in Tunisia. By the past, the initial motivation for giving boys such names was to wish for them to live long enough and plough the land of their fathers and forefathers (i.e., not to die young).

A superstition of another kind may be behind “bad” names. It is believed (in rural areas mainly) that if a child is given an ugly name like *ma3yufa* (a disgusting one), God will spare it and let it live longer. Naming one’s daughter *3aanis* (an old maid) translates the parents’ eagerness to see her quickly wed to a worthy man. So the opposite of what might happen to a young lady if nobody asks for her hand is wished for by her parents as name-givers in naming her *3aanis*. Akinaso (1981: p. 51) explains that there is a “common Mediterranean principle of avoiding the evil eye and envy by not naming a baby positively”. Akinaso (1981: p. 59) also reports that the Maharashtrian society (India) name their children “Stone”, “Rags”, “Heap of dirt”, etc., to signal to their deity that the child is “not worthy of His attention”. This is known as *name magic* (Van

Langendonck, 1999: p. 112), but will be called *evidence from superstition*.

Last, evidence that names are not vacuous can be found in what is known as “bad” names. Some first names for females are so strikingly derogatory that their bearers often decide to get rid of them via the legal system under social and psychological pressure. For instance, the following names, though rare now, are found in Tunisia’s rural areas: *jaHša* (a young donkey), *Hajla* (a partridge), *Ma3yufa* (a disgusting one), *Hujja* (evidence), *Taawis* (a peacock), *qišša* (a straw), *xarufa* (a young sheep), *bagra* (a cow), *Hamaama* (a pigeon), etc. These FNF are not considered derogatory by some name-givers, but their holders feel the need to change them when they come into contact with town people and become the object of derision. Explanations for the derogatory dimension of these first names for females may be attempted here. In many cases, parents’ ignorance of the meaning of the name they have chosen for their baby girl is responsible for derogatory naming (e.g. *Hujja*: evidence). For instance, the name may sound attractive or original for illiterate parents, who do not have knowledge of the linguistic meaning of the name chosen. The appeal of the name may also be attributed to its being polysemic with another collocation, *Hujjat milkiyya* (evidence or contract of property). Such ambiguity may be intended by name-givers as an assertion of the right to property over their children as is the practice in many societies (Shore, 1996). However, intentional humiliation of both mother and daughter in the countryside may be at the origin of derogatory naming (e.g. *bagra*: a cow). As daughters did not use to be welcome in the family, and mothers used to be wrongly held to be responsible for the gender of their children, giving one’s daughter a derogatory name used to be a way of punishing both mother and daughter. Sometimes, superstition and endearment may be the explanation for derogatory naming. It is believed (in rural areas mainly) that if a child is given an ugly name (e.g. *ma3yufa*), God will spare it and let it live longer. In other cases, naming daughters after animals’ names is a form of endearment that treats daughters as possessions exactly like one possesses animals (e.g. *jaHša*: a young donkey and *xarufa*: a young sheep). This will be called *evidence from derogation*.

7. Conclusion

In this paper, I have offered a cognitive semantic view of naming as an ICM. To do so, I have tried to show that the morphological grounding of FN in TA can be exploited to shed light on the

unconscious nature of the conceptual domains governing them. The study of those conceptual domains has revealed conceptual patterns of metaphors that are more favorable to patriarchy in a cultural model of naming. The value of an ICM resides in its multifarious dimensions: the propositional model stipulates basic knowledge about naming, the image-schematic model describes the frame with its foreground lexical meaning and background associative meaning, the metaphoric model provides the mappings and the mapping domains of naming, and the metonymic model provides the PART-WHOLE interface between naming and the world.

One important common denominator to FNF and FNM is that naming as a whole is motivated linguistically and conceptually. Linguistically, naming in TA makes use of morphological patterning, whereby different degrees of morphological derivation have been noticed. Conceptually, FNF capitalize on source domains that are quantitatively and qualitatively different than those capitalized upon by FNM. The result is a great area of conceptual intersection, with a noticeable difference in the selection of domains reflecting cultural specificity. Although the differences are in terms of degrees, they are important. Crystal (1987: p. 113) noticed that “there is much greater variation in girls’ names”. FNF in TA show the same tendency. This trend can be explained by Arabic’s rich morphology, but the fact that FNF outnumber those for males cannot only be explained by linguistic matters. The proliferation of FNF may be accounted for by the name-givers’ need to give vent to their imaginative projection, which enables them to be elated by emotions, morality, beauty, piety, etc.

The differences between FNF and FNM far exceed the similarities. For one, there are hardly any derogatory FNM while such names do exist among females in TA as has been pointed out in Sections 3 and 5 in this paper. However, there are very few FNM that evoke or invoke other things by association or through etymology. For instance, some parents still superstitiously promise to call their children after the name of a saint or a holy man if they conceive or if they are cured from a disease. Another important difference between FNF and FNM has to do with the conceptual domains capitalized upon in naming. The conceptual domains used with FNF far exceed those used with FNM. The following conceptual domains are not used with males: weaponry, supernaturalness, preciousness, space, natural ecology, and zoology. More significantly, some derogatory conceptual

domains are not used with males but used with females such as preciousness and zoology.

Associative meanings do occur with FN (Van Langendonck 1999: p. 112), but do not account for all FN in TA. For instance, appositional collocations such as *3aadel id-dahhen* (*3aadel* the decorator) can be a productive source of associative meaning. The name-profession collocation evokes connotations that we experience with the bearer of the name that exercises that profession. When FN collocate with professions or occupations, there occurs a shift from first name-bearer to profession-bearer, where, as Van Langendonck argues (private communication), “the associative meaning induced by the name-form of a common noun is superseded by the associative meaning induced by the name-bearer”.

What FN reveal about the perception of gender differences in TA should not imply that naming children is done with intent and deliberation. As Lakoff and Johnson (1999: p. 12) put it, “since cognitive operations are largely unconscious,” when we use FN we have done so under the assumption that the whole thing “operates beneath the level of cognitive awareness” (Lakoff and Johnson, 1999: p. 10). Rather, what is being suggested is that people are not fully aware of the significance of FN without really consciously trying to think about them, but that the analysis of the conceptual metaphors that leak from FN can give insight into the perception of both genders at large.

It should be noted in this study of source domains that there exist first names for females⁽¹⁰⁾ and first names for males that either do not admit any of the recurrent source domains below or do not admit a source domain at all, i.e. they are not motivated semantically. However, their motivation may be either phonological (i.e., they ring well and are short), or pertain to those FN that are inspired by TV serials and fashion. Names of this kind are found in the Appendix under “Miscellaneous”. Where arbitrariness prevails, a “no derivational meaning” (ndm) is inserted after the first name. The story of naming has to do with the semantic type of source domain, which ranges across the concrete and the abstract, the spatial and the non-spatial, the natural and the supernatural, the vegetal and the animal, the emotional and the moral, etc. as will be discussed in more detail shortly.

⁽¹⁰⁾ A few FNF have been drawn from Soumaya Laadhari (2000), who wrote under my supervision a graduate paper titled, “How are women conceptualised in Tunisian Arabic?” Although her paper is concerned with how women are categorized and evaluated, her work includes a small section where FN are analyzed in keeping with gender bias in TA.

I do not know if conceptual metaphor has been used to make sense of FN. If this is not new or does not add anything to the understanding of unconscious mechanisms underlying the strategy of naming in the culture I belong in, I will end this talk with a quote by Fillmore (1975: p. 130), because I feel all the time the way he describes himself:

“Sometimes I think that what I am proposing is new, but sometimes I fear that it is exactly what everybody has been talking about all along. If it is new, it is probably too commonsensical to be impressive, and will have to undergo some careful reformulation. If, however, this is what semantic theorists have believed all along, then with this paper I am doing no more than announcing that I at last understand something about my field.”

References

- Abd-el-Jawad, H.** “A Linguistic and Sociocultural Study of Personal Names in Jordan.” *Anthropological Linguistics*, Vol. 28, No. (1), (1986), 80-94.
- Aitchinson, J.** *Words in the Mind: An Introduction to the Mental Lexicon*. 2nd ed., Oxford and Cambridge: Blackwell, (1994).
- Akinaso, F. N.** “The Sociolinguistic Basis of Yoruba Personal Names.” *Anthropological Linguistics*, Vol. 22, No. (7), (1980), 275-304.
- Akinaso, F. N.** “Names and Naming Principles in Cross-cultural Perspective.” *Names*, Vol. 29, No. (1), (1981), 37-63.
- Allerton, D. J.** “The Linguistic and Sociolinguistic Status of Proper Names.” *Journal of Pragmatics*, Vol. 11, (1987), 61-92.
- Antoun, R. T.** “On the Significance of Names in an Arab Village.” *Ethnology*, Vol. 7, (1968), 158-170.
- Britto, F.** “Personal Names in Tamil Society.” *Anthropological Linguistics*, Vol. 28, No. (3), (1986), 349-65.
- Carroll, J. M.** “Toward a Functional Theory of Names and Naming.” *Linguistics*, Vol. 21, (1983), 341-371.
- Colman, A. M.; Hargreaves, D. J. and Sluckin, W.** “Psychological Factors Affecting Preferences for First Names.” *Names*, Vol. 28, No. (2), (1980), 113-129.
- Crystal, D.** *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of Language*. Cambridge/New York: Cambridge University Press, (1987).
- Deignan, A.** “Metaphors of Desire.” In: K. Harvey and C. Shalom (Eds.), *Language and Desire: Encoding Sex, Romance and Intimacy*. London and New York: Routledge, (1997), 21-42.
- Downing, P.** “Proper Names as a Referential Option in English Conversation.” In: B. Fox (Ed.), *Studies in Anaphora*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, (1996), 95-143.
- Fauconnier, G.** *Mental Spaces: Aspects of Meaning Construction in Natural Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, (1994).
- Fillmore, C. J.** “An Alternative to Checklist Theories of Meaning.” *Berkeley Linguistic Society*, Vol. 1, (1975), 123-131.
- Gibbs, R. W., Jr.** *The Poetics of Mind: Figurative Thought, Language, and Understanding*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, (1994).
- Györi, G.** “Historical Aspects of Categorization.” In: E. Casad (Ed.), *Cognitive Linguistics in the Redwoods: The Expansion of a New Paradigm in Linguistics*. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter, (1996), 175-206.

- Harley, T. A.** *The Psychology of Language: From Data to Theory*. Sussex: Psychology Press, (1995).
- Hines, C.** "What's So Easy about Pie?: The Lexicalization of a Metaphor." In: A. E. Goldberg (Ed.), *Conceptual Structure, Discourse and Language*. Stanford: CSLI Publications, (1996), 189-200.
- Hines, C.** "Foxy Chicks and Playboy Bunnies: A Case Study in Metaphorical Lexicalization." In: M. K. Hiraga, C. Sinha and S. Wilcox (Eds.), *Cultural, Psychological and Typological Issues in Cognitive Linguistics*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, (1999), pp. 9-23.
- ʿibn Ya3iis̄, M.** *ṣarHu l-mufaSSal (Explication of the Detailed)*. Beirut: ʿaa3lam l-kutub, (n.d.).
- Jackendoff, R.** *Languages of the Mind: Essays on Mental Representation*. Cambridge and London: The MIT Press, (1995).
- Jäkel, O.** "Metonymy in Onomastics." In: K-U Panther and G. Radden (Eds.), *Metonymy in Language and Thought*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, (1999), pp. 211-229.
- Johnson, M.** *The Body in the Mind: The Bodily Basis of Meaning, Imagination, and Reason*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, (1987).
- Jones, D.** "The Universal Psychology of Kinship: Evidence from Language." *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, Vol. 8, No. (5), (2004), 211-215.
- Junghare, I. Y.** "Socio-psychological Aspects and Linguistic Analysis of Marathi Names." *Names*, Vol. 23, No. (1), (1975), 31-43.
- Kövecses, Z.** "Friendship." In: Z. Kövecses (Ed.), *Voices of Friendship: Linguistic Essays in Honor of Laszlo T. Andras*. Budapest: Eötvös Lorand University, (1993), 131-177.
- Kövecses, Z.** *Metaphor and Emotion: Language, Culture and Body in Human Feeling*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, (2000).
- Lakoff, G.** "Categories: An Essay in Cognitive Linguistics." In: The Linguistic Society of Korea (Ed.), *Linguistics in the Morning Calm*. Seoul: Hanshin Publishing Company, (1982), 139-193.
- Lakoff, G.** *Women, Fire, and Dangerous Things: What Categories Reveal about the Mind*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, (1987).
- Lakoff, G. and Johnson, M.** *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, (1980).
- Lakoff, G. and Johnson, M.** *Philosophy in the Flesh: The Embodied Mind and its Challenge to Western thought*. New York: Basic Books, (1999).
- Lakoff, G. and Turner, M.** *More than Cool Reason: A Field Guide to Poetic Metaphor*. Chicago/London: The University of Chicago Press, (1989).
- Lakoff, G. and Kövecses, Z.** "The Cognitive Model of Anger Inherent in American English." In: D. Holland and N. Quinn (Eds.), *Cultural Models in Language and Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, (1987), 195-221.
- Langacker, R. W.** *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar: Theoretical Prerequisites*. Vol. 1, Stanford: Stanford University Press, (1987).
- Langacker, R. W.** *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar: Descriptive Applications*. Vol. 2, Stanford: Stanford University Press, (1991).
- Maalej, Z.** "Passives in Modern Standard and Tunisian Arabic." *Matériaux Arabes et Sudarabiques-Gellas*, Vol. 9, (1998-99), 51-76.
- Maalej, Z.** "Of Animals, Foods, Objects, and Plants, or How Women are Conceptualized: A Cross-cultural Perspective." *The 4th International Conference on Researching and Applying Metaphor (RAAM IV): Metaphor, Cognition, and Culture*, University of Manouba, Tunisia, (5-7 April 2001).
- Maalej, Z.** "Figurative Language in Anger Expressions in Tunisian Arabic: An Extended View of Embodiment." *Metaphor and Symbol*, Vol. 19, No. (1), (2004), 51-75.
- Maalej, Z.** "The Embodiment of Fear Expressions in Tunisian Arabic: Theoretical and Practical Implications." In: F. Sharifian and G. B. Palmer (Eds.), *Applied Cultural Linguistics: Implications for Second Language Learning and Intercultural Communication*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, (2007), 87-104.
- Marmaridou, S. A.** "Proper Names in Communication." *Journal of Linguistics*, Vol. 25, (1989), 355-372.
- Mohome, P. M.** "Naming in Sesotho: Its Sociocultural and Linguistic Basis." *Names*, Vol. 20, No. (3), (1972), 171-85.
- Nesi, H.** "A Modern Bestiary: A Contrastive Study of the Figurative Meanings of Animal Terms." *ELT Journal*, Vol. 49, No. (3), (1995), 272-278.
- Oman, G.** "Personal Names in the Southern Region (Zufar) of the Sultanate of Oman." *Oriente Moderno*, Vol. 60, (1980), 181-195.
- Pace Nilsen, A.** "Of Ladybugs and Billy Goats: What Animal Species Names Tell about Human Perception of Gender." *Metaphor and Symbolic Activity*, Vol. 11, No. (4), (1996), 257-271.
- Quirk, R.; Greenbaum, S.; Leech, G. and Svartvik, J.** *A Grammar of Contemporary English*. London: Longman Group Ltd., (1972).
- Searle, J. R.** *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, (1969).
- Shore, B.** *Culture in Mind: Cognition, Culture, and the Problems of Meaning*. New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press, (1996).
- Sublet, J.** *Le Voile du Nom: Essai sur le Nom Propre Arabe*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, (1991).
- Sweetser, E.** *From Etymology to Pragmatics: Metaphorical and Cultural Aspects of Semantic Structure*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, (1990).
- Sweetser, E. and Fauconnier, G.** "Cognitive Links and Domains: Basic Aspects of Mental Space Theory." In: G. Fauconnier and E. Sweetser (Eds.), *Spaces, Worlds and Grammar*. Chicago/London: The University of Chicago Press, (1996), 1-28.
- Taylor, J. R.** *Linguistic Categorization: Prototypes in Linguistic Theory*. 2nd ed., Oxford: Clarendon Press, (1995).
- Tushyeh, H. Y.; Lawson, E. D. and Rishmawi, G.** "Palestinian First Names: An Introduction." *Names*, Vol. 37, No. (3), (1989), 245-264.
- Van Langendonck, W.** "Neurolinguistic and Syntactic Evidence for Basic Level Meaning in Proper Names." *Functions of Language*, Vol. 6, No. (1), (1999), 95-138.
- Weeks, T. E.** "Child-naming Customs among the Yakima Indians." *Names*, Vol. 19, No. (4), (1971), 252-256.
- Weslager, C. A.** "Name-giving among the Delaware Indians." *Names*, Vol. 19, No. (4), (1971), 268-80.
- Yassin, M. A. F.** "The Arabian Way with Names: A Sociolinguistic Approach." *The Linguist*, Vol. 25, No. (2), (1986), 77-82.
- Yu, N.** "Metaphorical Expression of Anger and Happiness in English and Chinese." *Metaphor and Symbolic Activity*, Vol. 10, No. (2), (1995), 59-92.
- Yu, N.** *The Contemporary Theory of Metaphor: A Perspective from Chinese*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, (1998).

Appendix

1. Conceptual Domains for First Names for Females

1.1. WOMAN AS A SOURCE OF LIGHT

nur (light), *?anwaar* (lights), *muniira* (that which lights), *?išraaq* (rising (of the sun)), *θurayya* (chandelier, luster), *siraaj* (lamp), *nibraas* (cresset), etc.

1.2. WOMAN AS A SUPERNATURAL BEING

malaak (angel), *Huriyya* (nymph, houri), etc.

1.3. WOMAN AS A COMMODITY

?asaawir (necklaces), *durra* (a pearl), *fairuz* (turquoise), *jawaahir* (jems), *Dahbiyya* (golden), *fiDDa* (silver), *nafiisa* (precious), *yaquta* (corundum), *manaal* (obtainment), *mulka* (property), *murjaana* (a coral), *naadra* (rare, exceptional), *nawwaal* ((intensive case of) obtaining), *sihem* (arrows, darts), *siwaar* (bracelet), *sindis* (silk brocade), *rimeH* (spears), *tibr* (raw gold), *zmurda* (emerald), etc.

1.4. WOMAN AS SPACE

kawθar (river in Paradise), *rawDa* (garden, meadow), *riHaab* (open space), *riyaaD* (gardens, meadows), etc.

1.5. WOMAN AS BEAUTY

Hasna (a beauty), *jamiila* (beautiful), *faatin* (fascinating, captivating, charming), *hayfa* (slender), *badii3a* (wonderful), *naahid* (bosomy), etc.

1.6. WOMAN AS A NATURAL ELEMENT

?ariij (fragrance, scent), *baHriyya* (maritime), *3abiir* (aroma), *jasmiin* (jasmine), *fulla* (Arabian jasmine), *nadaa* (dew), *narjis* (narcissus), *nisriin* (musk rose, jonquil), *qamar* (moon), *šams* (sun), *nsaima* ((diminutive of) breeze), *DuHa* (forenoon), *layla* (a night), *maha* (antelope), *marwa* (place where one's thirst is quenched), *qamar* or *gamra* (moon), *ramla* (sand), *riim* (white gazelle or antelope), *samar* (evening or night conversation), *samiira* (lover of evening or night conversation), *saHar* (early dawn), *sawsin* (iris-lily), *šada* (fragrance), *šams* (sun), *SabaaH* (morning), *SabiiHa* ((diminutive of) morning), *sulef* (best part of wine), *warda* (rose), *zahra* (flower), *zuhur* (flowers), etc.

1.7. WOMAN AS AN EMOTIONAL STATE

?amal (hope), *?aamaal* (hopes), *?amaani* (wishes), *?aHlem* (dreams), *?ibtisem* (smiling), *?iinas* (entertainment), *?inširaaH* (cheerfulness), *?ulfa* (intimacy), *basma* (a smile), *dalaal* (coquetry), *faraH* (joy), *najwaa* (intimate talk), *sa3iida* (happy), *3iteb* (friendly reproach), *3awaaTif* (feelings), *hanaa?* (bliss, felicity), *huyem* (passionate love), *Hanaan* (affection), *Habiiba* (lover), *rajaa* (hope, wish), *rafiqa* (companion), *sarraa* (happy), *surur* (merriment), *su3ad* (harmony), *salwaa* (amusement), *šaadiya* (songstress), *wi?em* (rappport, harmony, agreement), *wided* (intimacy), *wiSaal* (intimate communication or sexual intercourse), *wijdaan* (sentiments), *zahiyya* (cheerful), etc.

1.8. A WOMAN AS A MORAL VALUE/QUALITY

?amiina (reliable), *?asma* (names (of Allah)), *?inSaaf* (fairness), *?ikraam* (hospitality), *?aamna* (believer), *?ilhaam* (inspiration), *?islam* (Islam), *?iiman* (faith), *?eiya* (Koranic verse), *3afef* (chastity), *3afiifa* (chaste), *3azza* (glory), *faDiila* (virtue), *faayda* (utility or benefit as an agentive noun), *faadya* (redeemer), *hela* (halo), *huda* (guidance), *Haliima* (indulgent), *Hasiiba* (wellborn), *jaliila* (lofty), *karaama* (dignity), *kariima* (kind), *laTiifa* (good-natured), *mufiida* (helpful), *nabiila* (noble), *na3iima* (blissful), *naziiba* (honest, virtuous), *ra?fa* (mercy), *raHma* (mercy), *Safiyya* (sincere friend), *samaaH* (generosity), *šafiqa* (compassionate), *šariifa* (highborn), *um l-xiir* (the mother of goodness), *taysiir* (facility), *taqwa* (piety), *wafaa* (loyalty), *xayriyya* (does good), *yusr* (facility), *zakiyya* (pure), etc.

1.9. WOMAN AS SUBMISSION

muTii3a (obedient), *raaDiya* (does accept), *Saabriin* (patient), *?umayma* ((diminutive of) bondmaid), etc.

1.10. WOMAN AS AN INTELLIGENT BEING

nabiiha (shrewd), *fahiima* (likely to understand), *rašiida* (sensible), *Hakiima* (wise person), etc.

1.11. WOMAN IS UP

saamiya (elevated), *sumayya* (diminutive of elevated), *rafii3a* (high standing), *3alya* (high), *3ulayya* (diminutive of high), etc.

1.12. Miscellaneous

?amiira (princess), *3aqiila* (spouse), *fadwa* (probably a deformation of *fidya*, ransom), *kamilya* (ndm), *naSiira* (supporter), *dalinda* (ndm), *šadliyya* (ndm), *madiiHa* (laudatory), *3ayda* ((agentive noun) coming back), *munya* (ndm), *dalinda* (ndm), *haajir* (immigrate), *raanya* (ndm), *hind* (ndm), *šayma* (ndm), etc.

2. Conceptual Domains for First Names for Males

2.1. MAN AS A SOURCE OF LIGHT

muniir (that which emits light), *siraaj* (lamp), *?anwar* (gives more light), *nur id-diin* (the light of religion), *šams id-diin* (the sun of religion)

2.2. MAN AS A COMMODITY

jawhar (gem), *naadir* (rare, exceptional), *3zayyiz* (rare)

2.3. MAN AS BEAUTY

Hasan (beauty), *jamiil* (handsome)

2.4. MAN AS AN EMOTIONAL STATE

s3iid (happy), *las3ad* (the one who is happier), *ITayyif* (diminutive of), *rafiiq* (companion), *Habiib* (lover), *riDaa* (satisfaction), *tawfiiq* (success)

2.5. MAN AS A MORAL VALUE/QUALITY

?akram (kinder), *?amiin* (reliable), *?ayman* (more reliable), *?ašraf* (more high born), *?eiyet Allah* (Koranic verses of Allah), *faaDil* (perfect), *3afiiif* (chaste), *Haliim* (forbearing, indulgent), *kariim* (kind), *mufiid* (beneficent), *munSif* (fair), *mun3im* (blessing), *muStaafa* (the one who has been chosen), *nabiil* (noble), *Saadaq* (does not lie), *šafiiq* (merciful, compassionate), *Taahir* (chaste), *faySal* (arbitrator), *fraj* (relief), *SaalaH* (goodness), *šariif* (highborn), *xaalid* (eternal)

2.6. MAN AS SUBMISSION

muTii3 (obedient), *raaDi* (does accept), *Saabir* (patient), *muTaa3* ((passive participle) obeyed)

2.7. MAN AS AN INTELLIGENT BEING

nabiih (shrewd), *faahim* (he has understood), *rašiid* (sensible), *Hakiim* (wise person)

2.8. MAN AS UP

saami (elevated), *3aliy* (elevated), *3alaa?* (elevation), etc.

2.9. MAN AS A WARRIOR

Raazi (invader), *Saddaam* (he shocks frequently), *naaSir* (supporter), etc.

2.10. Miscellaneous

3aamir (the one who lives long), *3umar* (age, life), *HaTTaab* (woodcutter), *makram* (treated well), *Rassaan* (ndm), etc.

نموذج معرفي مؤمئل لأسماء العلم: أدلة لسانية ومعرفية من اللهجة العربية التونسية

زهير المعالج

أستاذ، قسم اللغات الأوروبية والترجمة، كلية اللغات والترجمة،

جامعة الملك سعود، الرياض، المملكة العربية السعودية

zmaalej@ksu.edu.sa

(قدم للنشر في ٢٠/٢/٢٠١٤ هـ؛ وقبل للنشر في ٢٨/١٠/٢٠١٤ هـ)

ملخص البحث. تعتمد البحوث المتعلقة بأسماء العلم وتسمية الإنسان مقاربات إتمولوجية ونحو-صرفية، ولكن جل هذه المقاربات أفادت أن الأسماء لا تنطوي على معاني معجمية. ولكن هذا البحث يقترح مقارنة في الدلالة المعرفية لأسماء العلم وتسمية الإنسان في اللهجة العربية بتونس معتمداً النموذج المعرفي المؤمئل الذي بناه دجورج لايف (١٩٨٧م). فيعتبر البحث أن أسماء العلم لها دلالة رغم وجود ذلك إلا على مستوى الوعي المعرفي. ومن عناصر هذا النموذج المعرفي المؤمئل (والذي يوجد في كل اسم علم كما تثبته النظرية): طراز إيطالي، وطراز رابط مخطط الصورة، و طراز إسقاط استعاري، وطراز كنائي. ومن الناحية النمطية، تعتمد أسماء العلم على حقل مفاهيمي مستفاد من تجربة المسمي أو كنتاج لحالة نفسية للمسمي. وكثيراً ما تكون هذه الحالات نتاجاً لإسقاط خيالي عند المسمي الذي يبني هذا الإسقاط حول الأحاسيس والأخلاق والجمال والتقوى إلى غير ذلك من الحقول الدلالية. ولكن الاستعارات المفاهيمية في التسمية تظهر انحيازاً جلياً للذكور على حساب الإناث. إن نتيجة هذه العمليات تولد طرازاً ثقافياً للتسمية قوامه تقاطع الاستعارات المفاهيمية مع الصرف الاشتقاقي.