

## “It’s not Really a Nickname, it’s a Method”: Local Names, State Intimates, and Kinship Register in the Irish *Gaeltacht*

---

*Naming systems in Gaeltacht (Irish-speaking) communities in western Ireland produce different sociolinguistic registers. I argue that the use of a person’s ainm áitiúil (“local name”) establishes and enlists a generalized register of kinship and social intimacy in the Gaeltacht. Local agents of the state (“state intimates”) articulate local names with official state-recognized names, operating between the registers these names represent. The ways in which local names are used, the knowledge about persons they produce, and the social relations they represent draw together personal identity, spoken practice, and kinship values in this particular Gaeltacht community. [Ireland; Irish language; kinship; names; register]*

---

In the *Gaeltacht* community in Connemara where I conducted fieldwork, a five-year-old boy, Eamon Conghaile, was asking his mother what his own name was in Irish. His mother told him “Eamon Conghaile.” He replied, in English, “No, my ‘Michael Sheáin Tom’ name!” He was referring to a man whose official name would have been written on a government document as Michael Flaherty.<sup>1</sup> But Michael has another name, a “local name” or *ainm áitiúil*, Michael Sheáin Tom, corresponding with his first name and those of his father and grandfather.<sup>2</sup> In his community Michael is known by most (and he is known by nearly everyone, especially since he owns a line of tour buses) by his *ainm áitiúil*. Some who work for him have taken to calling him “MST.” One would be hard-pressed to find his *ainm áitiúil* written on any of his tour buses, in part because the use of these local names is entirely oral. Young Eamon’s use of an individual token of a well-known example of such a “local name” as a metapragmatic descriptor for the whole category shows his awareness, even at his early age, of the complex ways that such local names condense the social attributes of kinship, genealogy, social intimacy, Irish-language use, and identity and make available a sense of person and register that is personal and socially close. But this use of a local name as a metapragmatic descriptor, as an emblem of a generalized register of kinship and social intimacy, represents, as I will argue, a second-order pragmatics based on a first-order pragmatics of local naming, according to which a “local name” is a way of differentially referring to a person to identify them within a locality in which, among other things, everyone seems to have the same, or similar, official names. In this sense, as one respondent said, the *ainm áitiúil* “[is] not really a nickname; it’s a method.”

In this article I am primarily interested in the kinship and genealogical registers generated and practiced through personal names. What I want to suggest in this

article is that, in addition to serving as a “method” for securing local reference for people in this small community, these first-order pragmatics of local names invoke a strong sense of kinship closeness, producing as a second-order pragmatics a generalized register of kinship and social intimacy, standing as an intimate register opposed to the more socially distant register represented by official names. By register I follow Asif Agha’s description: “behavioral signs . . . [that] acquire recognizable pragmatic values that come to be viewed as perduring ‘social facts’ about signs, and which, by virtue of such recognition, become effective ways of indexing roles and relationships among sign-users in performance” (Agha 2007:80).

Local names differ from both prototypically intimate forms of name, such as nicknames, whose circulation defines a highly circumscribed circle of intimates, and official names, whose circulation defines contexts belonging to public, official, state spheres. Local names are not nicknames in that unlike a nickname, an *ainm áitiúil* would generally not be used as a term of address. In addition, an *ainm áitiúil* such as “Michael Sheáin Tom,” represents his kinship ties and his genealogy. Official names too, of course, are genealogical, and the names in official names represent designators of descent that the state formally recognizes. And because names are the signs though which personal and intimate knowledge flow, and because they—like the people they stand for—are agentive in contributing to the semiotic production of social relations (cf. Lele 2006), they are also sites of state interest, “the first fact on documents of identity” (Scott 1998:71). Official names in *Gaeltacht* communities (and in others) are circulated through official documents, such as passports and health identification cards, as required by the state. In contrast the *ainm áitiúil*, widely used here in this community but never written, circulates in conversation through people between whom the social distance is quite small. Betsy Rymes notes,

A proper name, then, is not simply a useful label, but a repository of accumulated meanings, practices, and beliefs, a powerful linguistic means of asserting identity (or defining someone else) and inhabiting a social world. [2000:165]

As both indexical and symbolic signs, accretions of prior invocations and agentive in a semiotic correlative sense, names reflect social historically formed registers and “positions in a system” (Lévi-Strauss 1966:187), in this case state-governed systems and local kinship systems. In addition, names represent human personhood as both social and unique (for similar discussion of local names and social position see Williams 2003:51).

While the local name would appear to be opposed to the official name as the locality is to the state, nevertheless inasmuch as state agents such as schoolteachers and postal agents provide services in the locality, they often must articulate official names with local names and knowledge, producing hybrids between these otherwise opposed naming registers. State agents like schoolteachers may be the first persons from whom one learns both one’s “official name” read aloud during attendance in class, but also may be the first persons from whom one hears one’s “local name,” as schoolteachers seek at the end of the school day during “parent pickup” to differentially refer to students who share the same official name. Such local state representatives as schoolteachers and postal workers must supplement their knowledge of official names and addresses written on documents with this “culturally intimate” register of kinship knowledge represented by local names, making them “state intimates” in their hybridizations of these opposed registers which seems, at first glance, to define the opposed spheres of kinship and locality and the state. The “method” that is productive of senses of kinship and locality opposed to the state is in part the product of the ongoing work of such “state intimates” like schoolteachers and postal workers as they mediate between the locality and the state.

### *Ainm Áitiúil*

First, I will situate the *ainm áitiúil* name use and naming practices in the ethnographic context of a *Gaeltacht* community composed of several villages in western Ireland

within which I have conducted research for the past several years.<sup>3</sup> People in this community use these local names anywhere there is talk about others: at the schools, at work, in the kitchen, in the pub, at the céilí dances in the community hall. The community is not large, approximately 800 people living in year-round households, though many have kin in other parts of Ireland, in the United Kingdom, the United States, and increasingly in continental Europe, who visit the *Gaeltacht* regularly. The community could be described as a "face-to-face" community (Hannan 1979; Peace 2001:47; Salazar 1996), a kind of *Gemeinschaft* condition where Irish language speaking operates in a "small-scale human universe" (Coleman 1999:5).

In genealogical interviews that I conducted as a part of my fieldwork many respondents invoked a discourse of kinship to describe the foregrounded form of social relations. *Tá muid fite fuaite le chéile*, they said: "we are all intertwined together," stressing that most people there were "all related to one another," a pattern present in other *Gaeltacht* communities (Coleman 1999, Lele 2003, Ní Dhomhnaill 2000). One respondent from one of the villages told me that although everyone might in fact be "related" this fact alone was not necessarily significant: "Everyone knows each other anyway. It's not like they're strangers and you only know them because they're cousins" to which she added, "It's like how everybody knows who owns which land." Fields here are also named. I argue that the kinship register manifest through local names is generalizable to nearly all residents in this community, primarily through spoken reference of the *ainm áitiúil*. Identifying people and relationships through their local names was central in constructing the genograms (genealogical diagrams) from these interviews. As Richard Alford notes it is through names that much of ethnography occurs (1988).

Though local names form the common coin of local daily discourse, reflecting perhaps the formal relationship of ethnographer and respondent in interviews, when asked their name people most often responded with their formal or "official name" (*ainm oifigiúil*), most often in English: that is, their forename or "Christian" name, perhaps their given second or middle name (often the name of a Catholic Saint or a close relation), and their surname or family name (*sloinne*). Typical official names in English might be "Catherine Mullen," or "Patrick Conneely." The (by now equally official) Irish form of Catherine and Patrick would be "Cáit Ní Mhaoláin" and "Pádraig Ó Conghaile" respectively, as the Irish surname "Maoláin" could be anglicized into "Mullen" and the surname "Conghaile" anglicized as "Conneely" (and there could be other orthographic variants of these such as "Mullin" and "Connolly").

"Ní" (var. *nic*) is a contraction from the Irish word *iníon*, "daughter." Traditionally female members of a family would take this form of their family surname. Male members would most often include Ó, from the Old Irish for "grandson/daughter of", as in Pádraig Ó Conghaile ("Patrick Conneely"), but which signifies "son" (or perhaps "male offspring") in the surname form. Hence, Máire Ní Chongaile ("Mary Conneely") would be a daughter of the *Conghaile* family, Pádraig Ó Conghaile would be a son, and Áine Uí Chongaile ("Anne Conneely"; *Uí* is Ó in genitive form) would be the wife of a son of the *Conghaile* family, though this last practice is less common now. The surname prefix *Mac/Mc* (son) appears as a composite form in family surnames.<sup>4</sup>

The Irish and European state institutions know of Catherine Mullen, of Patrick Connolly, and increasingly of Cáit Ní Mhaoláin and Pádraig Ó Conghaile. These are the forms—formerly in English, now increasingly in Irish—through which most negotiations with state agents and bureaucracies would occur. From passport applications, to driver's licenses, to health care services, the state's resources and interests are distributed to and executed through these names. The official name is heard stereotypically as being spoken by a state agent or a state document, addressing the person as a subject of the state. As one respondent said: "[My] official name would be 'Patrick,' but since I was little I was called 'Páidín' [Little Patrick]. If someone said 'Patrick' it would have to be a *garda* [police officer] or someone holding my passport."

But in this *Gaeltacht* community, and in others like it (cf. Breen 1982, Coleman 1999; cf. Dorian 1970) there is more than one Catherine Mullen, more than one Cáit Ní Mhaoláin, and those names could refer to more than one person. As many people in this community have the same surname (possibly a dozen or so surnames would capture 90% of the residents<sup>5</sup>), and as there are similarly many recurring forenames, referring to people through these names alone would be difficult, depending upon the kind of specificity one wanted. The common names might make certain kinds of people indistinct to the state and at times to residents for certain purposes. As one respondent put it “in a classroom [there’s] Cáit and there’s Cáit and there’s Cáit.” Further, most respondents in genealogical interviews could not tell me with certainty the surnames of many neighbors, friends, even cousins, as these names were not critical in knowing people. Another respondent, a 20-year-old woman, remarked, “How often do you think of friends by their surname?” So to constrain ambiguity, to produce specificity, and to allow speakers to distinguish and identify referents from one another one uses an *ainm áitiúil*. From the example above, Cáit’s *ainm áitiúil* might be *Cáit Pheadair Sheáinín*, Pádraig’s might be *Pádraig Mháire Mhóir*. It is this use of the *ainm áitiúil* to distinguish referents who have identical official names that exemplifies the respondent’s description of local name as “method.”

The *ainm áitiúil* name is not given like nicknames or official names, and while the local name can contain information similar to nicknames and official names, including genealogical information, local names contain kinship information resonant only within this community. Often (though not exclusively) representing patrilineal or matrilineal relations, Cáit’s local name *Cáit Pheadair Sheáinín* indicates that she is a descendant (possibly a daughter of, possibly a granddaughter of) Peadar Sheáinín (“Peter, son/descendent of (little) John”), and Pádraig’s indicates he is a son/descendant of Máire Mhór (“Big Mary”—*Mháire Mhóir*). The second name takes the genitive case (“Peadar’s Cáit”), and this second name could stand for someone’s father, grandfather, mother, or grandmother—standing for the relationship (e.g., Máire Mhóir is mother to Pádraig) and not simply for a “person.” Sometimes it might represent an apical ancestor, a person several generations back about whom there is a great deal of social memory. Respondents in one village, several of whom were cousins and who shared the second name of their *ainm áitiúil*, described their ancestor in common three generations back as a progenitor of the village. As another respondent put it, “it [might relate] to a pivotal person in the family—probably a strong personality, because sometimes it can be the mother.” And because this apical ancestor may have had many descendants within one village, many in that village would have that name so that the name would become associated with the place. Not only would people in this community know each other’s local name, they would know where each person lived and which people lived in which house. These two coordinates, genealogies or family lines and homes or physical residence, serve to help one navigate the social landscape. Local origin and residence can also refract name relations with one’s parents. One woman noted that “if the mother is from here and the father is from [outside this *Gaeltacht*], they’d be known by the mother’s name.” Local names represent salient gender patterns in residence and migration.

The second name might also include physical features—a person’s height or size (*Mór*, “big”) or complexion or hair (*Rua*, “red”; *Bán*, “white”), relative age (*Óg*, “young”), or birth order (*Mór*, “big” (or “old”)). It might include an occupation—*Siúinéara* (“carpenter”) or *Gr(l)éasaí* (“cobbler”) or *Na Gaibhne* (“the Blacksmiths”)—even for people in families where no one is any longer a carpenter, cobbler, or smith. My interview respondents also said the second name might be ascribed through a particular sociohistorical event to a kin group and to all those in that group: the arrival to the community several generations back under unusual circumstances, an interaction with an important political figure, or the performance of a special or unusual talent or trait.

### Local Names and the State

Although this is a practice that has occurred for at least five generations according to respondents, and most likely for longer than that (in genealogical interviews, most respondents were able to tell me the *ainm áitiúil* of ancestors at least three generations back and would include their own children's generation), it is not an ahistorical, timeless kinship practice (Coleman 1999, 2004, Ó Giolláin 2000). And while the social and political conditions of both Irish and English language use have changed over time in *Gaeltacht* communities and throughout Ireland, the form of the *ainm áitiúil* has remained constant. Agha writes that the "continuous historical existence of a register depends upon mechanisms for the replication of its forms and values over changing populations" (Agha 2007:155). Though some of the associated practices, relations, and meanings of this naming register have changed over the past 150 years, the *ainm áitiúil* register continues to be enlisted in the service of producing generalized social kinship and genealogical values.

One of the changes of local name use in relation to official name use is the change in the official status of English and Irish. There is in *Gaeltacht* communities an ongoing dialectical tension between English language (*Béarla*) and Irish language (*Gaeilge*) use, a tension that represents both colonial systems of knowledge about people and postcolonial European state modernity. Constitutionally, Irish and English are the first and second languages of the state. As of 2007 Irish is an official state language recognized by the European Union (see European Commission 2006). *Béarla* stands in relation to *Gaeilge* in *Gaeltacht* communities, as it has for several centuries, but this relationship has changed over time (Coleman 2004)—and in recent decades the relationship has become even more complex as the status of Irish language has changed socioculturally. The profile of the Irish language has risen, reflected by the dramatic growth of *Gaelscoileanna* (Irish-language-medium state schools) over the past fifteen years, particularly of schools outside of the *Gaeltacht* (Foras na Gaeilge 2008).

In line with these changes, most of the official names in this community have both English and Irish forms, though some Irish names do not have English counterparts. According to their descriptions of how local names are used, local names would seem to stand in opposition to official names. The strict opposition between local and official names no longer corresponds, if it ever did, to the opposition between Irish and English forms. In fact, increasingly, an Irish form is used in official contexts where the user would have used an English one. Respondents, including teachers, told me that Irish forms of names are used for students in the national primary school. One respondent described how her daughter, "Theresa," was called "Treasa" the Irish form of the name, though my respondent (a native Irish-speaker from this community) kept insisting to the school that her daughter's proper name was Theresa. National schoolteachers are in a position to arbitrate the official forms of names, as they work in the small social space of this community.

But even as schoolteachers might be among the first people from whom one heard the official version of their name, schoolteachers might well also be among the first to refer to one using a local name. Several respondents said they thought teachers in the primary school generated *ainm áitiúil* for students, even before the parents did. One parent described how at "parent pickup" at the end of the school day teachers would call out students by their *ainm áitiúil* and then release them to their parents. Schoolteachers are among the local agents of the state who occupy a hybrid role. In the school itself they would know the official Irish names of each student, and knowing the families and kingroups of all the children they are perhaps the first to assign an *ainm áitiúil* to each, linking the official and the local name together in their role as "state intimates."

Among the discursive fields within which this linking occurs, kinship is central. Carles Salazar has noted that kinship is important in rural western Ireland "as long as it can be related to something else, i.e. . . . coextensive with another type of social

structure" (1996:112). And although kinship may have been an "elementary social language" (Salazar 1996:2; Salazar 2004), in contemporary Ireland kinship stands in dialectical relationship with the state's interest in people within its writ. This is not "thatched cottage kinship," in Adrian Peace's memorable phrase (2001:137), but recognizes that social and cultural life are tied to global forces of capital and state and suprastate institutions such as the European Union (Peace 2001). And kinship intimacy is of a register that differs from other forms of social intimacy. One may share intimate information with one's physician or with one's confessor, but for analytic purposes the intimacy of kinship is of a different kind. Specifically, it rests and rides upon a sense not only of shared "biogenetic substance" as biopolitical populace (Ferme 2004, Foucault 1991, Salazar 2004, Schneider 1980, Williams 1995), but of "shared natural history" made possible in part because as noted before *ainm áitiúil* names are diagrammatic of kin relations.<sup>6</sup>

These "natural histories" that in *Gaeltacht* communities are redolent of local kin relationships have occurred not separate from, but in deep relation with the state (Borneman 1992, Das and Poole 2004, Herzfeld 2005, Williams 1995). And because *ainm áitiúil* names do not change over the course of a person's life, and because the naming patterns reflecting genealogies have not changed substantially over the past 150 years, the local kinship register has persisted, dialogically, as the Irish state has organized and extended into peoples' lives, as shown here in the state-sanctioned *Gaeltacht*. Kinship is one of the main "tropes of social order" (Das and Poole 2004:5), and the state is part of the criteria that permits kinship being recognized as natural.<sup>7</sup> In other words, while local name use (representing social intimacy and kinship relations and values) may seem in opposition to official names (representing state institutions and knowledge), in the *Gaeltacht* the state's support (material and otherwise) is one of the main factors for contemporary life. They are not in stark opposition and as the schoolteachers' practices show, the ascription of a local name can and does occur through the acts of those who have regular cause to use the official one.

Receiving special attention for Irish language maintenance since Irish political independence, *Gaeltacht* areas have loomed within the national imaginary as a "Gaelic homeland" (see Coleman 2004:382–3 on *Gaeltacht* as "territory" vs. "people"; Foster 1989; cf. Herzfeld 2005:67; Ó Giolláin 2000).<sup>8</sup> *Gaeltacht* communities are state-recognized (and to an extent state-sponsored) communities where Irish is the first or primary language. After the separation from British colonial rule and formation of the Irish Free State in the early 1920s, the new Irish state in 1926 began the formal organization and recognition of these *Gaeltacht* areas and continues to support the maintenance and "preservation" of the language (Coleman 2004:382) through grants and subsidies for Irish-speaking families. Because of the long career of English and British colonial control over much of Ireland for several centuries, the Irish language—through educational restriction and emigration of many native Irish speakers particularly from the west of Ireland during the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> centuries—had suffered a decline in both daily use and national (though not symbolic) presence (Foster 1989). English was for much of the colonial period the official and "technical" language of the state (Salazar 1996:46). Scholars have noted that English language use operated and perhaps operates still within certain differentials of power, especially within colonial conditions (Agha 2003, Denvir 1997).

In the recent past state documents normally would have recorded people's official names in their English forms. One respondent told me "It used to be that on anything official it used to have to be in English . . . [so that] on the death certificate, [the] formal name in English means you're officially dead." Looking through the Catholic Church parish archives going back approximately one hundred years in this community, I noted that most of the masses held for the signal events—baptism, marriage, and death—recorded the person's official name in English, even though nearly all in the community including the parish priest at the time would have been fluent in Irish, as is the current parish priest in the community and as was the one before him (and many older persons at the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century would have been monoglot

Irish speakers). This is not about fluency in Irish: it is about negotiating relations of power through producing knowledge about people, and by authorizing, maintaining, and reproducing the medium through which "official" knowledge is produced—the English *habitus* (see Ferme 2004 for a somewhat similar post/colonial condition). In this case the production of officially dead people occurred through English, so that as far as the state was concerned, all the dead have English names. The named presence of the dead deserves some comment.

In his sensitive ethnography of a French Mānuš (Gypsy) community, *Gypsy World* (2003), Patrick Williams writes that for Mānuš people, the presence of their dead is marked by nearly absolute silence. The material possessions of the dead are put aside, never to be used, they are sold off (but not with an eye to make profit) or they are destroyed. The names of the dead are not spoken, neither in address nor in reference "which means that the living and the dead are not present in the same way among the living. Because in normal everyday conversation, the names of individuals being addressed are constantly uttered" (Williams 2003:7). This contrasts with name use in the *Gaeltacht*, as the names of (dead) ancestors live on in many *ainm áitiúil* (cf. Glassie 1995:41). For Mānuš people, the dead are occluded from the living, and this is represented by the avoidance of their names.

Mānuš people have a "local name" for people in their own community, a *romeno lap*, and a *Gadzo* name, or official name that is used when interacting with the French state, and used on "administrative documents" (Williams 2003: 50). This *Gadzo* name would not be used by Mānuš for themselves, neither in address nor reference and similar to official names in the *Gaeltacht*, often these names are not known by others within this community. *Romeno lap* come from parents, and they can change over time, unlike *ainm áitiúil*. But similar to official names in English in the *Gaeltacht*, *Gadzo* names are used on gravestones (Williams 2003: 50). *Gadzo* names remain in ways that *romeno lap* do not. The French state and dead French persons, through these *Gadzo* names, persist materially. There are state-discourse regularities, a *habitus*, for Mānuš people in France and for Irish-speaking people in the *Gaeltacht*, that despite the differences in their local name systems, the official name systems within which they stand produce similar effects.

Yet the relative status of Irish may be changing: Irish is now an official language of the European Union, and in this community surviving kin are now using their dead kin's official names in Irish for official documents, and these names are also appearing on headstones in graveyards. Many younger respondents stated that for university registration forms, email names and addresses, and on medical documents Irish forms of names are increasingly common. So the profile of Irish is increasing through state symbolic use, but also through the more mundane practices of people in the *Gaeltacht* who do business with and through the state.<sup>9</sup>

### Kinwork

In her essay "Cé Leis Tú?," the Irish-language poet Nuala Ní Dhomhnaill writes of walking down a village road as a young girl of five in her parents' rural County Kerry and of being stopped by an older man, Jacsaí Shea, and of him asking her "Cé leis tú?" or "to whom do you belong?" which Ní Dhomhnaill says "was the usual local way of asking children their name." She writes "I drew myself bristling to my great height of all three foot nothing and stoutly replied "Ní le héinne mé. Is liom féin mé féin" (I don't belong to anyone. I belong only to myself)" (Ní Dhomhnaill 2000:39). The question "To whom do you belong?" means simply "Who are you?" The question "To whom do you belong?" does not ask what name is written on your passport, but rather it asks "What is your *ainm áitiúil*?" In the question is the "method," an attempt to identify a person specifically in terms of this locality. But Ní Dhomhnaill uses this encounter as a touchstone to discuss the various aspects of her own social identity in relation to her parents' Kerry *Gaeltacht*, which points to another dimension of

meaning of local names, kinship values. Kinship values and relations are still central in these small *Gaeltacht* communities, and *ainm áitiúil* are the signs through which this kinwork works.

I recognized this first through genealogical interviews. Constructing genealogies and genograms was not new in this community. Two young women remarked that they had done family genealogies in biology class in school. “[It was] Mendelian genetics—we didn’t actually do family trees, just did case studies.” Another young woman showed me a genealogy for her father’s side of her family, in the form of a tree, a *crann teaghlaigh* (related to the word *teaghlach*, or “household”). The crafting of these genealogies (itself a metapragmatic kinship practice) and of kinship and genealogical registers occurs orally through the recitation of *ainm áitiúil*.

Although some respondents mentioned the role of primary schoolteachers, many respondents were unclear about how these names were first assigned, or if they were assigned at all. For the most part, local names are not assigned—they grow through accreted use (Agha 2003, Dickinson 1999). Nicknames, in contrast, are often associated with memorable baptismal events: several respondents recounted an event decades ago where a particular local man had difficulty saying a certain number in English for the purpose of record keeping when unloading goods from a boat docked at the local pier. He was subsequently known by that number. While there does not seem to be a formal “baptismal event” (Agha 2007, Kripke 1972, Silverstein 2005; cf. McIntosh 2005), local names are generated in an ad hoc fashion as referring expressions within the context of kin-talk, and spread through subsequent uses and iterations of a person’s *ainm áitiúil*, producing a “speech chain” (Agha 2007). As Silverstein notes, “Every proper name, then, rests on normativities of a system of role-recruitment in which social differentiations of ‘natural’ social kinds of entities are stipulated” (2005: 11), so that any *ainm áitiúil* assignment is a “metapragmatic description of the categories” (11) that obtain in this *Gaeltacht* community. The use by others of a person’s *ainm áitiúil* makes “a particular kind of linguistic behavior—the act of using a particular name for a particular person—socially replicable through a process of communicative transmission” (Agha 2007: 66). Indeed, as the name is iterated and reiterated, that person’s ancestry is cited and recited. That is to say, a historical and genealogical register is also formed. And just as the name is a part of the semantic content, a part of the message, so are the other social attributes, specifically kinship and genealogy, associated with this register.

More specifically, the different registers produced through the different uses of names are examples of Michael Silverstein’s distinction between first-order and second-order indexicals (Silverstein 2003): the first-order is a system of securing reference, the second-order “effect” being generalized kinship values.<sup>10</sup> Silverstein (2003) discusses the different interrelated indexical orders in sociolinguistic phenomena. As described above, *ainm áitiúil* are used to establish and secure reference, the local name as a method for doing this. This “first-order” indexical practice produces a “second-order” indexical effect, which is that the local names are understood as representing and constituting a valorized kinship register, which is understood to be at work presupposed in the first-order securing of reference (Silverstein 2003:212). The kinship register predominates and is part of the context of meaning for the referential practice in local name use.

The use of the *ainm áitiúil* establishes and extends the “social regularity of recognition” (Agha 2007: 65). One learns the *ainm áitiúil* of people through iteration across many instances in daily interaction. Just as children learn social position and family hierarchies through kin terms (Howard 2007), in many genealogical interviews (over fifty) that I conducted in English and in Irish, respondents discussed how they learned who is in their wider kin network through the use of *ainm áitiúil*. As a young girl growing up in a nearby village (she now lived in her husband’s natal village) a neighbor of mine visited a more distant village within this *Gaeltacht*, where she had relations. She remembers on one visit there of an adult asking her if she knew that they were related. She said she did not but that she remembers that occasion now, and

knows the *ainm áitiúil* that goes with it. She said a relative "would be sure to let you know you were related if they thought you didn't know." Kinship practices in turn, including kinship reckoning, serve as a metapragmatic register through which names are learned and transmitted.

There are various words in Irish for "family," with different uses and meanings. *Clann* means "family," but most use it to signify their immediate family, though this too varies depending upon where one is in their life course. For adults it corresponds with their own selves, their partner/spouse, and their children. For younger, unmarried persons without children it would signify their family of orientation, as one young woman said, "when I think *clann*, when I'd be talking about *mo chlann*, I'd say you know, my parents and brothers and sisters." The term *muintir*, "people," as in "*mo mhuintir*" ("my people") is for many a broad term including aunts, uncles, cousins (but not too far out) and maternal and paternal ancestors including those in the fairly distant past. One respondent said that *clann* referred to a smaller unit, whereas *muintir* involved a "broader spectrum" of people. One respondent said about *muintir*

I suppose [here] it would be about to second cousins, and you know, aunts, uncles, aunts in laws, you know the *muintir* part—I don't know how far out you'd say, not too far, but [here], nearly everybody is, I mean I wouldn't find out that somebody is related to me four generations back, I probably wouldn't know, you know, if Mom said to me you're related to him, like back back back, I wouldn't know, but *muintir* I wouldn't say it would go further than say my grandparents sisters and brothers. That would be *muintir*, I'd say; you know *Muintir* [Village name], as in *muintir* and then surname, they'd say *Muintir na Seoighe* ["Joyce," her surname].

Her statement demonstrates that current kinship relations cite deep historical relations, reproducing the kinship register as a genealogical register in a "genealogical present." For some *mo mhuintir* would include all the people who might share with them the same family name, for example, *Seoighe*. Others noted that *muintir* had become "more of a sentimental word." The term *gaolta*, "kin relation" (from *gaol*, "relatedness") is also used, although respondents noted a difference between "family" and "relations." These various kin terms represent the social matrix within which kin reckoning and kin work through names occur.

One resident gave a very precise reckoning of kinship: "*Muintir* could mean your *colceathrair* up to *colochtar*—up to cousins eight removed." Relationships with cousins, *colceathrair*, are an important aspect of kinship reckoning. *Colceathrair* means a person who is four times removed from one's own self (including one's own self), or a "person to the fourth degree," that is, one's "first-cousin" in common Anglo-American kinship terminology: yourself ("Ego"), your parent (either one), their sibling (of any gender), and that sibling's child. *Colcúigear* (five persons removed), *colseisear* (six persons removed), all have a possible place in one's kinship cosmology and history. *Colochtar* means "eight-people-removed" but also implicates four generations back. These "col-" names are descriptive terms of reference, describing a person, but in actuality describing one's position in relation to another.<sup>11</sup>

*Col* means "taboo" or prohibition and may correspond with Roman Canon law prohibiting marriage between *colceathrair* relatives. I was told of a few people who were *colceathrair* to each other who were dating. This was not necessarily approved of, but nor was it forbidden. In interviews several respondents told me they would consider their *colseisear* cousin to be within their *muintir* designation, for some it was their *colochtar* (eight persons) relations but usually not further out than that. Some younger respondents told me that they would consider it strange or weird to date their *colceathrair* cousin, unless they had grown up apart. For example if their *colceathrair* cousin had grown up in England but then later had moved back to the *Gaeltacht* with his or her family it might be okay. But for the most part they said that someone *colceathrair* to them would be like a brother or sister and that would be too close. Referring to one of her second cousins, with whom she was close, one young

respondent told me: "I would be closer to [her] and second cousins than I would to first cousins who moved to Boston and who I didn't grow up with . . . I don't want to marry any of my cousins." And she and her cousin agreed that the two of them themselves were more like sisters than *colseisear* to each other. The daily lived relationships of kinship closeness determine, among other things, the shape of romantic possibilities.

Women might change their surname on marrying, but locally they would still be known by their natal *ainm áitiúil*, and referential talk would establish this, as a neighbor of mine (from whom I first heard the term *ainm áitiúil*) remarked that in conversation someone might ask "Who were you before you were married?" Couples who had the same surname prior to marriage would almost certainly be known by their respective *ainm áitiúil*. Interestingly, respondents mentioned that if a married couple prior to marriage shared the same surname, then upon marriage "the couple would have a 'cure,'" that is, an ability "to cure a certain thing, like whooping cough."

The other central feature of *ainm áitiúil* use is its manifestation through oral, verbal practice. These names are the primary forms of reference through which people talk about one another, and they are rarely if ever written.<sup>12</sup> What do these names mediate? Talk *about* people binds people together by establishing a common set of referents (Dickinson 1999), and by establishing "networks" of authority and reference (Agha 2003). Most of this work is done face-to-face. This "highly 'concrete' type of discursive chain" (Agha 2007: 70) where orality is the practice regulatively inscribes and prescribes further iterations and becomes a part of the register itself. In other words, kinship and orality are both parts of this particular social register represented through *ainm áitiúil* use.

Engaged with the bewildering complexity of human naming systems and practices, ethnographers have provided much of the empirical data, allowing for comparative research supporting the important conceptual distinctions of terms of reference and terms of address (Alford 1988, Braun 1988, Dickinson 1999, Keane 1997). Among residents in this community *ainm áitiúil* names are the most common form of reference used to talk about other members of the community, and it is primarily through talk (*caint*) that these names are used and are manifest. *Ainm áitiúil* names are not "nicknames" (*leas ainm*), and people might have a *leas ainm* through which they are addressed, but the *ainm áitiúil* is reserved primarily for reference. While generally a person would not hear their *ainm áitiúil* as a term of address respondents have told me that they would use a variation of their local name to refer to their local self in a telephone conversation with someone else from this community, in order to situate and identify themselves within this kin/local network: "*Mise Cáit, iníon Pheadair Sheáinín*" ("It's me Cáit, daughter of Peadar Sheáinín"), one respondent said, as she inquired on the telephone about a local job.

The seeming immediate (though not ephemeral; cf. Coleman 2004) quality of verbal intercourse suggests a register of intimacy; but it is a register of intimate discourse that involves people other than the person referred to, or rather, it involves the referent in their "referent-self," and as such the name and referent are the "agent" (cf. Kockelman 2004) and the occasion of social intimacy. With local names and with official names the ostensible referential use of the names themselves are part of the meaningful content—they do not have simply a "semantico-referential" aspect (Silverstein 1976:23). That is, if you are *Cáit Pheadair Sheáinín*, this is intimacy with you *through* talk about you, through interrelations between other people (see Colapietro 1989:38). As Geneviève Calame-Griaule notes "to utter one of a person's names is to address that part of [their] self which is called into play by one's particular relationship with [them]," and with others (Calame-Griaule 1986:430).

This also makes manifest the semiotic nature of "personhood" (Colapietro 1989: 38). Names do not represent a "box of flesh and blood" we might mistakenly equate with a "stable person" (Colapietro 1989; Keane 1997:132; Peirce 1994:7.591; Singer 1984). Personal names are indexical signs and in the Peircean framework they are

rhetic indexical legisigns (Peirce 1994:8.341), connected by convention and habit to what they represent. That is, personal names do not simply represent a "class" of objects, but rather a specific "token." While a person's direct name of address is a deictic sign, *ainm áitiúil* names, as Agha describes them, are "speech-chain deictics" (Agha 2007:65). *Ainm áitiúil* names are also diagrammatic of kinship genealogy. That is, in the *Gaeltacht* when *ainm áitiúil* names iconically represent an aspect of a person's genealogy, they are diagrammatic of kinship history, while indexing that specific person.

While the *ainm áitiúil* represents the form through which knowledge about people is produced, and specific social attributes assigned to them, how does this social register articulate with other domains of knowledge production? What kinds of identities are produced, and how does this affect cultural concepts of local and national, of personal and public? Names are central to social control and they are also central to the production of knowledge about social persons, the form through which social control operates in civil societies. In addition to smaller-level actors and institutions, state-level institutions and actors are interested in knowing who people are, and names are one—perhaps still the principal—way that institutions know and identify people (Ferne 2004, Jeganathan 2004, Scott 1998). In the next section I examine more closely the kinds of information that circulate through local names and official names in this *Gaeltacht* community, and the social registers that are negotiated.

### The Postman

What people know about people includes how they know about people (Agha 2003, Dickinson 1999, Silverstein 2005, Ferne 2004). Just as naming networks or "chains" accrete authority onto a name in use, the semantic content can include intimate information about people. Agents of state institutions such as schoolteachers, tax-collectors, police officers, physicians, and postal workers in small *Gaeltacht* communities in Ireland would often have to negotiate between the register represented by an official name and the register represented by a local name.<sup>13</sup> State schools and their teachers are one site and one set of agents through which the articulation of different social registers occurs, as described above, and their hybrid role allows them to use their local knowledge in their official capacities, linking the official name with the local. Postal workers are another group of local state agents who do this. One particular interview exchange that I had with the local postmistress [PM] revealed the complex relationship between local-name knowledge and official-name information. She told me that *An Post* (the state postal system in Ireland) has a rule for postal employees.

**PM:** [They] can only deliver a letter to a person if you're sure that that letter belongs to them—but what if there's four [Cáit Ní Mhaoláins]? That's why it helps to have all the [local] names. Now an awful lot of people [in this community] wouldn't get their letters if [the mail carrier] was to go by the rules. Now he has a system in his head based on his knowledge of what's going on [here], he can have an idea whose letter that belongs to . . .

**Me:** So what information does he use?

**PM:** Gossip. If he heard that someone was expecting results from the hospital and it looks like the hospital letter, and he knows it's *that* [Cáit Ní Mhaoláin] and not the other one. If someone sends off a passport application and they're expecting a passport [he] would know if he saw the application sent out, and would know when it came back in. [Still] there's an awful lot of mix-up—only a few people would put a little *leas-ainm* ["nickname"].

**PM:** [So] local knowledge—three might be expecting farming subsidy stuff; someone gets a usual magazine; someone gets info on the [boats]. But what if two are getting farming subsidies? Then you'd have to remember if one got it last week, and now the other this week . . .

Local knowledge can become intimate knowledge. In his important discussion of "cultural intimacy," Michael Herzfeld argues that nation-states are "constructed out of intimacy" (2005:13), and that kinship is one of the primary discursive forms

through which this occurs. While his argument is principally directed toward understanding the ways in which modern nation-states appropriate, organize, and interact with metaphors of social proximity, family, the body, kinship, and private sentiments, his argument is equally concerned with the ways in which local specificities articulate with national interests. And in the *Gaeltacht*, a sociolinguistic kinship register as represented by *ainm áitiúil* is a site for this articulation. The postmistress explained what happens when mix-ups occur.

**PM:** [People] sometimes . . . come back with the letter re-taped and said “no, this isn’t mine”

**Me:** Would they redeliver the letter themselves?

**PM:** No, they wouldn’t do that. They might be really upset if someone had read it or seen it. So it’s best just to bring it back to [the post].

**Me:** But wouldn’t they know anyway [that another person in the community had opened it]?

**PM:** they will and they won’t—because [the postman] could easily handle it by saying “I had to look inside it and notice that it was yours . . .”

What the postmistress was suggesting is that people would want to know that official, state-generated information about people had not gone through unofficial channels. So that even though they would know that their neighbor or someone else had seen it, they would want to know it had been “washed” of the original opener through the state’s agent. The social relationships represented by *ainm áitiúil* names and the social register of intimacy that allows people in this community to get their mail through the state is also the same set of relations that requires them to resend mail through the state. The letter-carrier links the official information with the local name, contributing to the dialogic production of this local register (see Hull 2003:293, 311), and he has to work with both sets of names to do so. That is, the first-order securing of reference through the local name is articulated with and extends through a second-order register of kinship through the occasion of state-level information and the agency of the state.

This example brings together aspects of social register, but also the semiotic aspects of names. The state identifies its index (token) through a common class of names, the official name being paramount. To the extent that a person has an official name (and hence is a member of a common class or type), they can be known (Jacquemet 1992:743). But the general rule of the official name that most represents this official register is unable to serve as a “rigid designator” (Kripke 1972), unable to index the specific person. With *ainm áitiúil* names, the name indexes a person while symbolizing a social register of kinship, and it includes the iconic aspect of diagramming that person’s genealogy. *Ainm áitiúil* name use represents a sociolinguistic register of kinship proximity and consequently a sense of genealogy inflected by this.

The local kinship register also establishes an historical, genealogical register associated with village and residence. *Ainm áitiúil* use in the *Gaeltacht* brings together oral referential practice, personal identity, and kinship values in relation to broader contemporary sociocultural conditions. But as we have seen, these local names and official names are often mutually constituting in the *Gaeltacht*. In the first exchange with the postmistress described above, the intimacy of neighbors’ knowledge of each other is not severable from the information that was in the envelope itself: school exam results, passport applications, farming subsidies, (state) medical information. Further, interactions with the state regarding *Gaeltacht* maintenance (in the form of Irish-language or farming subsidies) are part of the cultural and material conditions of local life in the *Gaeltacht*. Here the state’s agent has to establish his “footing” (Agha 2007:178) through his use of official names, *ainm áitiúil*, local and state knowledge. The *ainm áitiúil* and the official name are not radically severed from one another; rather, they represent distinct and mutually constituting social orders in *Gaeltacht* communities. As new patterns of migration and settlement in Ireland interact with changing values of kinship (Lele 2008), it remains to be seen how people in *Gaeltacht* communities and people new to *Gaeltacht* communities will articulate these changes in relation to existing sociolinguistic orders.

## Notes

*Acknowledgments.* Earlier versions of this paper were presented at the Mid-Atlantic American Conference for Irish Studies, Princeton University, November 2004, as well as at the University College Dublin/Humanities Institute of Ireland conference "Identity, Memory, and Meaning in the Twenty-First Century" in Dublin, Ireland, June 2006. My thanks to the anonymous reviewers who provided critical suggestions that made this article immeasurably stronger. Marion Mullin provided great critical feedback and suggestions, as did Steve Coleman. Nuala Ní Dhomhnaill, J. Dickinson, Heather Hindman, and Ruth Toulson all provided thoughtful comments, readings, and suggestions at various stages of the research. Thanks also to editors Paul Manning for his excellent editorial stewardship and advice, and to Miyako Inoue for her insightful reading and suggestions. Pamela Vail, Nimarta Singh, and Michelle Oyakawa all provided valuable research assistance at Denison University. Funding for this research was provided by the Office of the Provost, Denison University, and earlier funding by the Wenner-Gren Foundation for Anthropological Research, and an IIE-Fulbright Fellowship. My greatest debt and sincerest thanks goes to the many, many people in the *Gaeltacht* community where I lived, people who gave a great deal of their time, information, and interest to this research. All errors of fact and interpretation are mine alone.

1. All names used are pseudonyms. Any formal similarity to any actual people is coincidental.

2. I had several discussions with colleagues and respondents in other *Gaeltacht* communities and in other parts of Ireland about this term "*ainm áitiúil*" (pl. *ainmneacha áitiúla*): many of my respondents were unfamiliar with it as they were with synonymous terms such as *baile ainm* ("village name/home name"), or even *leas-ainm* ("nickname"). See Coleman (1999:65) on "string names"; Dorian (1970) on "by-names", a similar, yet different practice in the Scottish-Gaelic Highlands; J.M. Synge (1992:86) remarks on the use of local names in the Aran Islands in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century.

3. I conducted fieldwork research in this community from 1999–2000, and again in 2004 and 2006.

4. This information is a compilation from several respondents in this community.

5. See Haddon and Browne (1892) for an historical referent in the Aran Islands; and Dorian (1970) in the Scottish Highlands.

6. See Herzfeld 2005:28 on the "natural" as iconic, that is, "cultural resemblance"; because local names are genealogical diagrams, they contribute to this cultural equation of "kinship as natural".

7. See Schneider's (Carsten 2004:155) Nietzschean insight on "born American" where the "American" effect is actually the meaningful agent.

8. Michael Herzfeld argues that "cultural intimacy cannot be understood in isolation from the power of European colonial domination; the myth of freedom from colonial control is an especially rich soil for developing a sense of cultural intimacy, since people know that their supposed freedom is to a large extent the freedom to elaborate on cultural themes already partially decided for them by overwhelmingly powerful outside forces." (2005:67)

9. I was reminded by a colleague in Ireland that on *Raidió na Gaeltachta*—the Irish-language radio network/station that broadcasts throughout the Republic of Ireland—when announcing the "death notices" (*scéalta báis*), the announcer will often use the *ainm áitiúil* form of the deceased's name.

10. I am grateful to an anonymous reviewer for help with this insight.

11. One could say "*Tá sí colceathrair liom*" ("She is cousin to me") using the *tá* form of the verb "to be" indicating a subject with its predicate, and not the copula *is* form, which would join two nouns, though one could say "*Is mo cholceathrair í*", "She is my cousin."

12. There are a few rare exceptions to this: a local carpenter I know who works in this community will sometimes write a person's *ainm áitiúil* on blueprints for that person's house for which this carpenter is doing work. Another more interesting use of written *ainm áitiúil* involves mobile (cell) phones. Nearly everyone in this community, from teenagers on up, has a mobile phone, and in the scrollable directory of names on their mobiles some use *ainm áitiúil* with the corresponding numbers for quick access "dialing"—an intriguing example of the written supplementing the oral, though in this community people send written text messages on their phones as much as they talk on them.

13. Thanks to Heather Hindman for assistance with this.

## References

- Agha, Asif  
 2003 The Social Life of Cultural Value. *Language & Communication* 23:231–273.  
 2007 *Language and Social Relations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Alford, Richard D.  
 1988 *Naming and Identity: A Cross-Cultural Study of Personal Naming Practices*. New Haven, Conn.: HRAF Press.
- Borneman, John  
 1992 *Belonging in the Two Berlins: Kin, State, Nation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Braun, Friederike  
 1988 Terms of Address: Problems of Patterns and Usage in Various Languages and Cultures. Joshua A. Fishman, ed. New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Breen, Richard  
 1982 Naming Practices in Western Ireland. *Man* 17(4):701–713.
- Calame-Griaule, Geneviève  
 1986[1965] Words and the Dogon World. Trans. Deirdre LaPin. Philadelphia: Institute for the Study of Human Issues.
- Carsten, Janet  
 2004 *After Kinship*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Colapietro, Vincent Michael  
 1989 *Peirce's Approach to the Self*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Coleman, Steve  
 1999 *Return from the West: A Poetics of Voice in Irish*. Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Anthropology, University of Chicago.  
 2004 The Nation, the State, and the Neighbors: Personation in Irish-Language Discourse. *Language & Communication* 24:381–411.
- Das, Veena and Deborah Poole  
 2004 State and its Margins: Comparative Ethnographies. In *Anthropology in the Margins of the State*. Veena Das and Deborah Poole, eds. Pp. 3–33. Santa Fe, N.M.: School of American Research Press.
- Denvir, Gearóid  
 1997 Decolonizing the Mind: Language and Literature in Ireland. *New Hibernia Review* 1(1):44–68.
- Dickinson, Jennifer Ann  
 1999 *Life on the Edge: Understanding Social Change through Everyday Conversation in a Ukrainian Border Community*. Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Anthropology, University of Michigan.
- Dorian, Nancy C.  
 1970 A Substitute Name System in the Scottish Highlands. *American Anthropologist* 72(2):303–319.
- European Commission  
 2006 Irish becomes the 21st official language of the EU. Electronic document, [http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/translation/spotlight/irish\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/translation/spotlight/irish_en.htm), accessed Sept. 27, 2006.
- Ferme, Mariane C.  
 2004 Deterritorialized Citizenship and the Resonances of the Sierra Leonean State. In *Anthropology in the Margins of the State*. Das, Veena and Deborah Poole, ed. Pp. 81–115. Santa Fe, N.M.: School of American Research Press.
- Foras na Gaeilge  
 2008 *Gaelscoileanna Teo. Irish-Medium Education: Growing and Developing*. Baile Átha Cliath.
- Foster, Roy F.  
 1989 *Modern Ireland: 1600–1972*. London: Penguin Books.
- Foucault, Michel  
 1991 Governmentality. In *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality*. Graham Burchell Miller, ed. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Glassie, Henry  
 1995 *Passing the Time in Ballymenone*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

- Haddon, A. C. and C. R. Brown  
 1892 *The Ethnography of the Aran Islands, County Galway*. Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy II of the Third Series:768–830, plus 24 plates.
- Hannan, Damian F.  
 1979 *Displacement and Development: Class, Kinship, and Social Change in Irish Rural Communities*. Dublin: The Economic and Social Research Institute.
- Herzfeld, Michael  
 2005 *Cultural Intimacy: Social Poetics in the Nation-State*. 2nd ed. New York: Routledge.
- Howard, Kathryn  
 2007 *Kinterm Usage and Hierarchy in Thai Children's Peer Groups*. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 17(2):204–230.
- Hull, Matthew S.  
 2003 *The File: Agency, Authority, and Autography in an Islamabad Bureaucracy*. *Language and Communication* 23:287–314.
- Jacquemet, Marco  
 1992 *Namechasers*. *American Ethnologist* 19(4):733–748.
- Jeganathan, Pradeep  
 2004 *Checkpoint: Anthropology, Identity, and the State*. In *Anthropology in the Margins of the State*. Veena Das and Deborah Poole, eds. Pp. 67–80. Santa Fe, N.M.: School of American Research Press.
- Keane, Webb  
 1997 *Signs of Recognition: Powers and Hazards of Representation in an Indonesian Society*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Kockelman, Paul  
 2004 *Stance and Subjectivity*. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 14(2):127–150.
- Kripke, Saul A.  
 1972 *Naming and Necessity*. In *Semantics of Natural Language*. Donald Davidson and Gilbert Harman, eds. Pp. 253–355. Boston: D. Reidel Publishing Company.
- Lele, Veerendra P.  
 2003 *The Archaeology of Identity in Aran*. Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Anthropology, Columbia University.  
 2006 *Material Habits, Identity, Semeiotic*. *Journal of Social Archaeology* 6(1): 48–70.  
 2008 *Demographic Modernity in Ireland: A Cultural Analysis of Citizenship, Migration, and Fertility*. *Journal of the Society for the Anthropology of Europe* 8(1):5–17.
- Lévi-Strauss, Claude  
 1966 *The Savage Mind*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- McIntosh, Janet  
 2005 *Baptismal Essentialisms: Giriama Code Choice and the Reification of Ethnoreligious Boundaries*. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 15(2):151–170.
- Ní Dhomhnaill, Nuala  
 2000 *Cé Leis Tú? Eire-Ireland XXXV(1–2):39–78*.
- Ó Giolláin, Diarmuid  
 2000 *Locating Irish Folklore: Tradition, Modernity, Identity*. Cork: Cork University Press.
- Peace, Adrian  
 2001 *A World of Fine Difference: The Social Architecture of a Modern Irish Village*. Dublin: University College Dublin Press.
- Peirce, Charles Sanders  
 1994 (1933–1935 (1958)) *Collected Papers of Charles Sanders Peirce*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press; Intelix Past Masters.
- Rymes, Betsy  
 2000 *Names*. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 9(1–2):163–166.
- Salazar, Carles  
 1996 *A Sentimental Economy: Commodity and Community in Rural Ireland*. Providence: Berghahn Books.  
 2004 *Primordial Obligations: An Exploration of the Moral Basis of Western Kinship Systems*. *Journal of the Society for the Anthropology of Europe* 4(1):16–23.
- Schneider, David M.  
 1980 *American Kinship: A Cultural Account*. 2nd ed. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Scott, James C.

1998 *Seeing Like a State: How Certain Schemes to Improve the Human Condition Have Failed*. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press.

Silverstein, Michael

1976 Shifters, Linguistic Categories and Cultural Description. *In* *Meaning in Anthropology*. K. Basso and H. Selby, eds. Pp 11–53. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.

2003 Indexical Order and the Dialectics of Sociolinguistic Life. *Language and Communication* 23:193–229.

2005 Axes of Evals: Token Versus Type Interdiscursivity. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 15(1):6–22.

Singer, Milton

1984 *Man's Glassy Essence: Explorations in Semiotic Anthropology*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Synge, John Millington

1992 [1907] *The Aran Islands*. London: Penguin.

Williams, Brackette F.

1995 Classification Systems Revisited: Kinship, Caste, Race, and Nationality as the Flow of Blood and the Spread of Rights. *In* *Naturalizing Power: Essays in Feminist Cultural Analysis*. Sylvia Yanagisako and Carol Delaney, eds. Pp. 201–235. New York: Routledge.

Williams, Patrick

2003 *Gypsy World: The Silence of the Living and the Voices of the Dead*. Trans. Catherine Tihanyi. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Department of Sociology and Anthropology

Denison University

Granville, OH 43023

lelev@denison.edu