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easy for us to call a rock a moose or a sushi or a tipi. And names for people and places are similarly arbitrary. However, the names we learn for places and people can sometimes carry such powerful emotional associations that we have a hard time changing our minds about them, hence the resistance to calling “Squaw Creek” anything but “Squaw Creek.”

While linguists believe names in all languages are arbitrary, many people have a tough time believing it because names don’t really seem arbitrary. Some families, for example, like to observe the tradition of naming the firstborn son after his father. Royal families often repeat this practice for generations, thereby creating a need for a system of distinguishing an earlier Henry from a more recent Henry. But the fact that naming practices are traditional means that people developed ways of naming over time. Despite the arbitrary nature of names, we still feel that our names are irrevocably essential to our identities.

A question of semantics

Semantics, the study of meaning, helps us understand that we respond to words in different ways, on different levels. The linguist Edward Finegan identifies a number of meaning types. The dictionary definition of a word, its denotation, is called referential meaning. For instance, the first entry in my American Heritage dictionary for the word beach is “the shore of a body of water, especially when sandy or pebbly.” The referential meaning of beach is largely uncontroversial. However, the affective meaning of the word beach depends on interpretation. Sylvia might hear the word beach and dream of warm sand, the soft crash of waves on the shore, the comforting heat of midsummer’s sunshine. Juan, on the other hand, may despair because he remembers getting stung by a jellyfish, getting sunburned on his left shoulder blade (where he forgot to put sunblock), and having his nose bloodied by a rogue ball from a nearby beach volleyball game. Sylvia has a positive experience with beach, so it conjures a positive affective meaning, but Juan will not be vacating in Miami any time soon.

There are synonyms for beach, like shore, ocean, sea, oceanside, and seaside, indicating more than one name for that strip of sandy, aquabound geography. In contrast, proper nouns like Rutgers, Argentina, ConAgra, and Greg Louganis don’t really have synonyms. They might have nicknames (maybe Greg’s close friends call him Lou), but by and large they have one and only one name with no equivalents.

Synonym choice means that speakers always have to select the word they think is best in any given situation. When do we use shore instead of beach? When do we use rock instead of boulder? Sometimes the choice is determined by the situation — an enormous rock is a boulder, especially if it can tumble down a mountain. Other choices have more artistic, poetic effect. For instance, the word paradise denotes “a place of ideal beauty and loveliness.” In writing about a certain kind of paradise, Stevie Nicks penned “Trouble in Shangri-La” on her 2001 album of the same name. The name Shangri-La, according to the American Heritage dictionary, comes originally from James Hilton’s novel Lost Horizon. Stevie could have used the title “Trouble in Paradise” or “Trouble in Utopia,” but Shangri-La somehow has a specific, exotic connotation that the ordinary, more familiar synonyms lack.

What’s in a name?

Shakespeare, speaking through his two most famous lovers in Romeo and Juliet, discusses the problem of naming. As Juliet pines for her new love, Romeo, she engages in a difficult debate that the playwright attempts to explore in just a few short lines. (My source is The Riverside Shakespeare):

O Romeo, Romeo, wherefore art thou Romeo?
Deny thy father and refuse thy name;
Or, if thou wilt not, be but sworn my love,
And I’ll no longer be a Capulet. [...]”
’Tis but thy name that is my enemy,
[...] O, Be some other name!
What’s in a name? That which we call a rose
By any other word would smell as sweet...
(Act II, Scene 2)

What Juliet is talking about is the fundamental nature of a name. Does a name necessarily have any connection to the object or person it’s attached to? Does the name Montague have an unbreakable bond to the person that Juliet loves? Logic tells us that there is no connection between the name (the sign) and the person named (the signifier), that Montague has no hold on Romeo, but our emotional response tells us otherwise.