

MARIUSZ RUTKOWSKI

University of Warmia and Mazury in Olsztyn, Poland

ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7113-5074>

e-mail: [rutkow@uwm.edu.pl](mailto:rutkow@uwm.edu.pl)

KATARZYNA SKOWRONEK

AGH University of Science and Technology in Kraków, Poland

ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0200-7217>

e-mail: [kskowron@agh.edu.pl](mailto:kskowron@agh.edu.pl)

## The Onomastic Discourse Analysis

---

### Onomastyczna analiza dyskursu

The article constitutes a report on the work on the project named “Onomastic discourse analysis” (Rutkowski and Skowronek, 2019). We wish to show the general outline of this concept, present its theoretical background, and indicate a few possible and, in our opinion, interesting ways of research. This is an attempt to detail certain methodological paths, indicated or signalled in our earlier works devoted to discursive onomastics (cf. Rutkowski and Skowronek, 2010; Rutkowski, 2016, 2017; Skowronek, 2013). We are striving to develop a relatively stable method of describing proper names, which will take into account research postulates, objectives and tools appropriate for discourse analysis, and, in particular, critical discourse analysis (CDA). This method, we believe, should provide an instrumentarium for the analysis of all onymic spheres (naming categories) in the scope of their discourse functions as well as socio-communication determinants of proper names.

## I. CDA AND ONOMASTICS. DISCOURSE AND PROPER NAMES

Critical discourse analysis (in various versions presented, among others, by Teun van Dijk, Norman Fairclough, Ruth Wodak) (cf. e.g. Fairclough, 2013; van Dijk, 1984, 1993; Wodak, 2001a, 2001b, 2003; Weiss and Wodak, 2003) assumes that language communication (discourse) is based on social, political and ideological assumptions (often concealed, not directly expressed) and thus “the essence of social activity can be explained or even revealed through various language analyses” (Warzecha, 2014, p. 167). From this perspective, discourse is not an isolated textual structure, but a complex communication phenomenon within which cultural and ideological conditions are usually expressed only indirectly (cf. Czyżewski, 2013; Jabłońska, 2006; Warzecha, 2014). This ideological message can be revealed through lexical-semantic, grammatical (syntactic), textual and, in the case of the onomastic discourse analysis we postulate, also onymic analysis. The aim of CDA is therefore to discover the relationships (usually indirect, hidden) between textual and discursive structures and social, political and ideological ones.

CDA emphasizes the social context of language in use and its relations with social reality. It is a way of thinking scientifically about the role and functioning of language in society – a broad platform where onomasticians can meet with researchers from other fields. In the light of the scope of CDA sketched out in such a way, a question may arise about the legitimacy of distinguishing a separate sub-methodology (i.e. OAD – onomastic analysis of discourse) on the basis of a method that is fully formed and well rooted in the tradition of humanistic thought. Is the research on names, even using CDA in its detailed aims and assumptions, so separate that instead of using CDA to describe selected fragments / the entirety of the onymic sphere it justifies the postulate of a separate methodology? If CDA assumes a comprehensive approach to linguistic phenomena, including lexical ones, then are not proper names also subject to CDA as a certain subcategory of the lexical and, consequently, textual and discourse system?

First of all, it is worth noting that the study of texts/discourses within CDA in the Anglo-Saxon but also in Polish context focuses mainly on the analysis of semantic-lexical common words, while proper names are often neglected, as they are a bit “out of tune” with the rest of the lexical sphere. If there are analyses of onyms, they are rather fragmentary, limited to certain categories, for example, concerning the names of states or state-like organisations (e.g. *European Union*) as determinants of certain general discourse strategies (cf. e.g. van Leeuwen and Wodak, 1999). The different Anglo-Saxon terminological tradition, where *anthroponym/toponym* often refers (also) to the appellative names of persons or places, also favours this “mistreatment” of the proper names.

Secondly, we believe that proper names form a largely separate lexical class, and that their uniqueness is not only due to the features that most linguists and philosophers of the language have long pointed out. It is sufficient to recall the disputes and debates of the 1950s and 1960s about the place of onomastics in linguistics understood as an auxiliary science of history (Taszycki, 1963; Rospond, 1961), discussions about the separation between the sphere of proper names and the sphere of appellatives (Kucała, 1967; Pisarek, 1966), the reflections of the 1990s and the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century on the special and interdisciplinary character of onomastics (Mrózek, 2000, 2004) and successful attempts to introduce elements of literature theory (Sarnowska-Giefing, 2003), culture theory (Rzetelska-Feleszko, 2006; cf. also Lech-Kirstein, 2015), sociology of language and sociolinguistics (Borek, 1978; Lubaś, 1984), etc. In our understanding, the categorical specificity or peculiarity of proper names is mainly (but not exclusively) visible within their communication and social functions and their behaviour in texts and discourses.

Proper names are not only linguistic signs – they are also social constructs, often strongly ideologized, entering into numerous text and discourse relations, forming both formal and semantic-connotational, or metaphorical-metonymic series, playing in many cases a key role in (re)constructing social reality. Limiting the role of proper names to the level of nominative, indicative and merely name-giving signs is at the present level of development of onomastic research a heresy, which ignores almost the entire accomplishments of the last twenty years of the development of this discipline of science.

These ideas allow us to reflect on the possibility of separating the onomastic discourse analysis (OAD) from the territory of CDA. We believe that it is worth devoting a separate “space” to proper names within CDA, that just like onomastics itself, which is separated from linguistics, it has become independent and now functions at the interface of linguistics, sociology, anthropology, history, religion, literature theory, psychology, neuroscience and other humanities and social sciences; thus emancipated, OAD can provide a broad insight into the nature of proper names as important symbols and metaphors, meaningful points or “access nodes” to reality – above all to the symbolic social reality.

## II. THE ONOMASTIC DISCOURSE ANALYSIS. DISCOURSE AND ONOMASTIC ASSUMPTIONS

The assumptions on which the onomastic analysis of the discourse should be based are as follows:

1. Proper names are not to be treated as isolated figures, but are analysed for their use in specific texts within their socio-cultural, ideological, historical, local, situational and global contexts.

2. Proper names are to be treated in discourse terms – we assume that their selection (why they were chosen and used in the text), their inflected and syntactic forms, ortho/graphic forms (e.g. incompatibility of the notation with the spelling rules), etymologies and motivations, co-presence with other syntactic elements, sentences is (or may be) a form of action on the pragmatic level of the text and consequently a sign of certain ideologies or socio-cultural practices at work.

3. Proper names in texts/discourses are “records” of the social conditions (conflicts and social problems) in which they arose (e.g. tabooing certain names, their concealment and invalidation: the proper name of *Katyń* in didactic-educational discourse during the communist era, similarly proper names forbidden to be used for political-ideological reasons, e.g. names or titles of emigrant writers’ works).

4. Proper names in texts are used in discourse strategies, which are herein understood as a plan of linguistic-discourse actions used by addresser to achieve a certain (social, political, psychological) goal, for example, discourse analyses of proper names in the speeches of politicians, New Year’s messages or sermons and letters of bishops of the Catholic Church in Poland show their strategic goals – e.g. the creation of an ideological map of the world, pointing to the basic anthropological categories of *familiar – alien/hostile* type (cf. e.g. Skowronek and Galasiński, 2000; Skowronek, 2014).

Within the framework of such a model of research procedure, it is important to indicate a few issues from onomastics theory.

1. Proper names in OAD are treated analytically, i.e. we are not interested in the general, system level (*langue*), but in the level of text or application (*parole*). This is important as, on the text-discourse plane, different properties of proper names of *nomina propria*<sup>1</sup> class are often revealed from those postulated by, e.g. philosophers and logicians.

2. The systematically postulated asemancticity of proper names gives way in discursive terms to their textual, momentary (and frequently also from this point persisting)

---

<sup>1</sup> On this distinction and the lack of appropriateness of the two theoretical perspectives – cf. Rutkowski (2013).

meaning. These meanings are founded both on the appellative material, which is updated and reproduced by users in texts and constitutes an important background for the functioning of proper names. It is not possible to assume, for example, that the user of Polish language will “bypass” in the receiving process the lexical databases of such units as: names of political parties: *Prawo i Sprawiedliwość* (Law and Justice), *Samoobrona Rzeczpospolitej Polskiej* (Self-Defence of the Republic of Poland), beer brands: *Perfekcyjna Pani Domu* (The Perfect Housewife), *Wiśnia w Piwie* (Cherry in a Beer), names of service and medical facilities: “*Babie Lato*” *Gabinety Lekarskie* (“Indian Summer” [lit. Ladies Summer] Doctor’s Office), *Prywatne Centrum Terapii Mowy “Gadula”* (“Chatterbox” Private Speech Therapy Centre).

3. Meanings, connotations and structure refer, in turn, to the level of a discourse game in which participants pursue their communication goals through ideological and symbolic characteristics of onyms (also in an unconscious way, e.g. the ideology of consumerism in marketing names and names of service and commercial objects, or Americanization as a manifestation of globalization approach in new name-giving tendencies: *Brajan*, *Dżesika*, *Nicole*, etc.). The unveiling of this plan allows us to see an invisible network of social meanings, in which naming units create very important signs that make the discourse, and, thus, social groups and worlds, coherent. Such an understanding of onymic discursivity is the centre of gravity of the whole method of onomastic analysis of discourse proposed by us.

### III. DISCURSIVE ANALYSIS OF PROPER NAMES – METHODOLOGY

The description below shows the steps or actions that need to be taken (sometimes using different arrangement and order) to analyse and interpret the repertoire of proper names appearing in a specific text corpus within the OAD framework:

**Step 1. Study of the linguistic and grammatical functions and mechanisms in which proper names take part** in texts; and in particular the study of:

- the strategy of *reference* and *nomination* – who and through which proper names is represented in a given discourse and how is that person described?;
- the strategy of *predication* – what traits/actions are assigned by the onyms to the represented (individual and collective) actors?

For example, under the first and second strategy, there are certain functions ascribed to some names of states, nationalities and ethnicities in discourses shaped by the rhetoric of pro- and anti-refugee function.

– whether the names can be referred to such basic categories as: *familiar–alien*, *centre–periphery*, *proximity–distance*; cf. plateonymic conventions, which allow even the unaware user to locate the streets named after the *Marshal Józef Piłsudski*, *Adam*

*Mickiewicz* or *John Paul II* in a central or peripheral way, as opposed to the names of the following types: *Wiosenna* (Spring), *Przylaszczki* (Liverwort), *Chabrowa* (the Basket Flower) or *Pszczółki Mai* (Maya the Bee); also the homeliness of first names trending once again (*Jan, Stefan, Stanisław*) as opposed to foreign names (fashionable a few years ago) against the background of more general social phenomena, such as the rebirth of new, sharpened national identities, the return “to the roots”, etc.;

– do the names activate or passivate certain individuals or groups (to take some actions or be subject to their consequences)?, e.g. first (and often last) names of children needing help in various texts of social advertising referring to financial support (“eight-year-old *Zosia* suffers from leukemia”, “four-year-old *Przemek Zieliński* needs bone marrow”); names related to the cult of “cursed soldiers” (*Inka, “Ogień”* [Fire], “*Ponury*” [Grim]) – restoring (in principle: creating from scratch) a new memory and a new collective identity, and, on the other hand, activating by “intensifying” a kind of national “readiness”; similarly, saturating the discourse with the names of *Putin* or *Trump* creates (depending on the objective) a climate of danger or, on the contrary, security in a situation of uncertainty and political instability in the world;

– is genericization, aggregation and collectivization (presenting social actors as a group) or, on the contrary, individualization (presenting the actions of individuals) carried out by means of proper names; e.g. different levels and contexts of using the name *Poland* – *Poland is here...*; *Poland is not there...* – who has the right to this collective term?, who is denied that right? also: over-representation in discourse of the names of political parties and groups *versus* over-representation of the names of politicians – showing either the collective as a subject of the political scene or the particular agility of individuals; cf. also the names such as *Tusk* and *Kaczyński* as discursive representations of certain ideologies or even a vision of the development of Poland; similarly the names of popes: *Pius XII, John XXIII, Francis* in properly organized ecclesial texts serve to indicate the essential elements in the history and thought of the Catholic Church in the world;

– other typical mechanisms, such as the presence of proper names in texts:

a) abstractivization, i.e. representing social actors through the attribute assigned to them (through onyms) (*Kraków is stingy...*; *Warsaw is a dump...*),

b) objectification, reification, i.e. calling people by reference to a place or object (*Volkswagen apologizes for unethical behaviour*; *Nike resigns from working with Federer*).

The other elements of such an OAD study would be as follows:

**Step 2. Analysis of the share of proper names in the creation of the topic of discourse;** including, among others:

– the accumulation of certain types of names in the text/discourse – due to the represented category or word-formation type, e.g. in the letters and sermons of Cardinal

Stefan Wyszyński, was dominated by Marian names and descriptors, which was a sign of the theology/mariology he practised, which deviated from the recommendations of the Second Vatican Council, as well as an element of the Church's vision of Poland and its policy towards the authorities of the People's Republic of Poland.

**Step 3. Analysis of the names in building an argumentation strategy**, e.g. analysis of proper names (such as: *Gniezno*, *Wawel*, *Giewont*) in the sermons of some Polish bishops shows that they create a specific "symbolic geography", indicating the alleged superiority of Poland over the countries of Western Europe.

**Step 4. The participation and function of proper names in genre structures and stylistic forms**, i.e. how proper names co-create the genre of the text. Analyses conducted within the framework of literary onomastics, including those by Irena Sarnowska-Giefing (2003), Artur Rejter (2018), Halszka Górny (2013), Magdalena Graf (2015), concerning the presence of proper names in various genres of Baroque, Enlightenment, 19<sup>th</sup>-century, and contemporary literature, illustrate this phenomenon very well.

**Step 5. Reconstruction of the context (situational, historical, geopolitical) of the presence of proper names in a given text** – particularly visible in the case of many analyses of onyms in historical documents and sources – they enable to reconstruct the local, demographic, economic context, etc.

**Step 6. Reconstruction of the hidden ideological assumptions underlying the proper names**, e.g. elements of consumerism, therapeutic culture, medicalisation and psychologisation, liberalism, nationalism, etc. (cf. e.g. Skowronek, 2016a, 2016b).

The onomastic analysis of discourse in the presented version is therefore principally and foremost linguistic analysis, but proper names are examined in the context of expanded speech acts and written texts, and these in turn – in relation to their social and cultural contexts; therefore, at least partially, it is also critical, i.e. within the area of critical humanities and critical linguistics.

#### IV. CRITICAL HUMANITIES, CRITICAL LINGUISTICS

Critical humanities constitute a certain type of humanistic thought whose task is not only to describe and explain social and cultural reality, but also to play a certain social, critical and emancipatory role; some theorists even use the term *political humanities* for this reference.<sup>2</sup> Of course, this is not about a narrow, *ad hoc* understanding of politics or the actions of humanist researchers to be taken on

---

<sup>2</sup> Cf. articles contained in: *Teksty Drugie 1* (2017) and also: Kuziak (2017), Markowski (2013), Nussbaum (2015).

behalf of one or another of the current political options, but rather about the term *politicalness* understood in the wake of the Belgian philosopher Chantal Mouffe (2008; cf. Ozimek, 2014). In her opinion, *politics* is a set of practices and institutions that are empirically observable and dynamic, and *politicalness* exists in deeper layers of social existence, at a level at which not all phenomena must be intentional and conscious – the essence of politicalness is constant conflict and antagonism (cf. Mackiewicz, 2018, p. 16). In this broad sense, therefore, many researchers today speak of the politicalness of the body, intimacy or family – spheres that are not political in the common sense.

Thus, critical humanities is a field of reflection in which the autonomy of research does not exclude a certain type of social involvement, understood as an overview of social phenomena and their possible evaluation. More specifically, the task of critical literature studies is not only to study texts and create theories, but also to diagnose socially relevant problems (cf. Tabaszewska, 2017). In this perspective, humanities should play a role in the democratic transformations of the social world, become a criticism of the limitations of human freedom, and condemn the manifestations of domination, inequality and social exclusion.

At the linguistic level, critical linguistics reflects the assumptions of critical humanities. Language is a social phenomenon, but it also constitutes the social world. The description and explanation of the linguistic reality should, therefore, be accompanied by a reflection: how does language work? How does language create hierarchies and inequalities? When does language create social problems? Critical linguistics should show the social functions of language, its role in social changes. It must show language as a tool with a community and identity function, but also provide a criticism of the situation in which language becomes a tool of domination, inequality and social exclusion. Within the framework of the concept of the school of so-called critical linguistics (e.g. Roger Fowler, Bob Hodge, Gunter Kress, Tony Trew and Norman Fairclough), the basic postulate is to take into account the presence of ideological message in verbal messages and to reveal the mechanisms of domination, inequality and violence acting within language. The titles of such flagship texts as *Language and Control* (Fowler, Hodge, Kress, and Trew, 1979) and *Language and Power* (Fairclough, 1996) well illustrate the main assumptions of this doctrine. What is needed here is a specific imagination understood as the ability to show the relationship between the *public statements* of individuals or groups and the general *problems* concerning social structure and culture (cf. Rozenbaum, 2013).



## V. PROPER NAMES AS A WAY TO CRITICALLY EXAMINE SOCIETY AND CULTURE

The proposed method of discourse analysis, that is OAD, is therefore meant to provide insight into social structure, culture and the world of values, symbols, ideologies, attitudes and social tensions, which is invisible at first glance. We want to make *nomina propria* the gate to such levels of interpretation. Below we would like to present a few possible directions of research in which OAD could be useful:

The most important level of analysis for us is always discourse, and within it – proper name. This means that when tracking naming units in their natural use (text) we have in mind rather their place in the structure of the text, their position in it (beginning/end, strongly accented position or not, etc.), all kinds of textual-grammatical connections, rather than categorical approaching them as the elements of an onymic subsystem. However, it is not true that the categorical affiliation of the analysed units is completely unimportant – we even believe that some (natural?) correlations can be indicated between the onymic category and the type of discourse. Many of such connections will probably be revealed in the course of further studies, but some can be outlined *a priori* on the basis of the thematic orientation of some discourses and the related increased frequency of proper names of certain categories (i.e. the type of named objects is particularly important for a given discourse). We indicate here only selected sets of names within specific discourses (some fragments of these discourses have already been well researched in Polish onomastics):

1. Medical and cosmetological discourse – names of health centres, pharmacies, clinics, hospitals, medicines, salons and cosmetic companies, hairdressers, tattoo parlours, etc. This type of nomenclature reflects certain ideas and concepts of modern societies concerning the body as a social phenomenon; social illness and health, medicine and prevention; philosophical concepts concerning individual individualism, self-control, disciplining practices, etc. are important for this context.

2. Political discourse – names of parties and groups, names of politicians, but also: proper names in the statements of politicians. The analysis of this type should reveal power relations, various concepts of governance, explicit, declared and hidden ideologies, etc.

3. Religious discourse – proper names in homiletic texts, letters to the faithful, names of religious associations. They are treated here as elements of preaching strategy or as signs of persuasion strategies; symbols accumulating certain attitudes, types of piety, ideologies.

4. Economic and marketing discourse – names of products and companies, *branding*, which present elements of consumption and various styles and trends in it. Within this analysis, it is possible to use elements of multimodal and multisemiotic research.

5. Scientific and popular science discourse – names of titles of scientific articles, textbooks, monographs, etc. What is important here is the presence of specific narrative strategies, ways of presenting oneself and one's thoughts (author – work – thought), the position of authorities and experts (in media communication), institutional conditions of contemporary science.

6. Media discourse – elements of media onomastics in discourse perspective. This includes the position of broadcasters, the positioning of voices and media agendas, the strategies and values they promote and the rules of media policy of the various broadcasters.

7. Gender discourse – first and last names of persons from the viewpoint of sexuality, names in media profiled according to the gender of the recipients; elements of gender identity in the statements of public figures. Thanks to this collection of names, it is possible to examine elements of cultural sexuality, as well as the issues of symbolic violence, discrimination, political correctness and homophobia.

8. Sports discourse – names of clubs, names and nicknames of players, sports competitions. There will then be problems related to competition understood in terms of fight, the winners and the defeated, the phenomenon of antagonization, exclusion, community-forming activities, related to collective identity and “sports patriotism”.

9. Urban discourse – names of streets and squares; all urbanonyms; names of facilities. They show historical and contemporary elements of cities; changes in thinking about the urban environment; urban and civic movements; the idea of the smart city; gentrification processes, etc.

10. Ecological discourse – names of natural objects, national parks, nature reserves. Natural objects, protected and excluded from such protection, etc. Such studies could show some trends in the environmental trend and elements of the debate on the climate crisis.

11. Discourse of culture and art – titles of literary, film and theatre works, graphic and spatial projects, objects, museums facilities, cinemas, cultural institutions, etc. These names in a certain perspective reveal not only past and present trends in art, but also the contemporary cultural, organizational, political context, etc.

The areas of discourse listed above, and also other areas which were not mentioned, are, therefore, to some extent, consistent with some naming categories, which become a prioprial emanation of the most important discourse components. Some classes of onyms, however, have a more universal or trans-discursive character – e.g. anthroponyms or toponyms that designate persons and places that are important or emblematic, co-creating narrative, axiological and ideological layers of discourses regardless of their thematic profile. In each of these cases, the proper names – understood not systematically but in the context of use – create a very

important perspective for the description of socio-cultural reality. OAD gives an insight into these invisible, non-obvious and sometimes unconscious functions, the carriers of which are discursively contextualised naming units. The emphasis in the proposed method of basic critical categories of discourse research in relation to selected, formally small elements of the lexical subsystem does not violate or interfere with the overall description of discourse within CDA, nor does it in any way undermine or contradict onomastic analyses made from other perspectives. It is our intention to detail both of these overarching methodologies and trends.

“Is it, therefore possible to reach a consensus – a humanistic research program which, without breaking the methodologically important ties with a shaped and empirically proven canon, at the same time responds accurately to the changing reality, explains its phenomena in a socially useful way”, ask the authors of the monograph *Pragmatyka, retoryka, argumentacja* (Cap and Stalmaszczyk, 2014, p. 8). We are striving to provide a positive answer to this question. We want to perceive the OAD as an integrated, synergetic proposal of onomastic research, which includes the achievements of both contemporary and historical onomastics, as well as, in appropriate proportions, other disciplines of contemporary humanities.

The discourse analysis of onyms (OAD) is not understood here as a branch of linguistics or a completely separate method, but as a certain type of humanistic thinking (linguistic, cultural, anthropological, sociological), involving reflection on man and society, their norms, values, attitudes and practices that are reflected in their proper names and their use. Such discourse onomastics widely and in various ways uses the concept of contemporary humanities. It comprehends nomenclature not only as being related to the historical and social worlds (that is, in the sense that proper names appear in a way on their background), but as being those that *transmit* these cultural and social worlds to the linguistic/text level and allow them to be recreated, focusing on differences and plurality within concepts, cultures, ethics and languages.

In conclusion, we can assume that the concept of onomastic discourse analyses outlined herein meets, in a sense, Robert Mrózek’s postulate, presented almost 20 years ago at a conference devoted to the multiplicity of methodologies in the research on proper names:

[...] Thus, both within the consciousness of individuals and of social groups, proper names are associated with different areas of language use: strictly linguistic, communication-cultural and onymic. They partially participate in creating a linguistic image of the world and a linguistic mentality [...]. The use of various, including the latest, interpretative methods – from sociolinguistic through text-theory to cognitive – in onomastics determines its development not in the conditions of theoretical isolationism, but in the academic relation with other disciplines (Mrózek, 2000, p. 38).

## REFERENCES

- Borek, Henryk. (1978). Socjolingwistyczne aspekty imiennictwa. *Onomastica*, 23, pp. 163–175.
- Cap, Piotr, Stalmaszczyk, Piotr. (2014). *Pragmatyka, retoryka, argumentacja*. Kraków: Universitas.
- Czyżewski, Marek. (2013). Teorie dyskursu i dyskursy teorii. *Kultura i Społeczeństwo*, 2, pp. 3–25.
- Fairclough, Norman. (1996). *Language and Power*. London–New York: Longman.
- Fairclough, Norman. (2013). *Critical Discourse Analysis. The Critical Study of Language*. London–New York: Routledge.
- Fowler, Roger, Hodge, Bob, Kress, Gunther, Trew, Tony. (1979). *Language and Control*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Górny, Halszka. (2013). *Nazwy własne w piśmiennictwie pamiętnikarskim XIX wieku. Perspektywa funkcjonalno-tekstologiczna*. Kraków: Lexis.
- Graf, Magdalena. (2015). *Literackie nie-nazywanie. Onomastykon polskiej prozy współczesnej*. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Naukowe UAM.
- Jabłońska, Barbara. (2006). Krytyczna analiza dyskursu: refleksje teoretyczno-metodologiczne. *Przegląd Socjologii Jakościowej*, 2(1), pp. 53–66.
- Kucała, Marian. (1967). Co już jest, a co jeszcze nie jest nazwą własną. *Onomastica*, 12, pp. 153–161.
- Kuziak, Michał. (2017). W sprawie polityczności polskiej humanistyki. *Teksty Drugie*, 1, pp. 253–261.
- Lech-Kirstein, Danuta. (2015). Zwrot kulturowy w badaniach onomastycznych. *Poznańskie Spotkania Językoznawcze*, 30, pp. 85–95.
- Lubaś, Władysław. (1984). Metoda socjolingwistyczna w badaniach onomastycznych. *Makedonski jazik*, 35, pp. 159–167.
- Mackiewicz, Wojciech. (2018). *Ciało i polityczność. Koncepcja cielesności w filozofii Michela Foucaulta*. Kraków: Universitas.
- Markowski, Michał P. (2013). *Polityka wrażliwości. Wprowadzenie do humanistyki*. Kraków: Universitas.
- Mouffe, Chantal. (2008). *Polityczność. Przewodnik Krytyki Politycznej*. Transl. by Joanna Erbel. Warszawa: Krytyka Polityczna.
- Mrózek, Robert. (2000). Współczesna lingwistyka a sfera onimiczna języka. In: Magdalena Czachorowska, Łucja Maria Szewczyk (eds.), *Onomastyka polska a nowe kierunki językoznawcze* (pp. 31–39). Bydgoszcz: WSP.
- Mrózek, Robert. (2004). Nazwy własne jako przedmiot badawczy onomastyki. In: Robert Mrózek (ed.), *Nazwy własne w języku, kulturze i komunikacji społecznej* (pp. 9–19). Katowice: Wydawnictwo UŚ.
- Nussbaum, Martha C. (2015). *Nie dla zysku. Dlaczego demokracja potrzebuje humanistów*. Transl. by Łukasz Pawłowski. Warszawa: Fundacja Kultura Liberalna.
- Ozimek, Magdalena. (2014). Polityczność kwestii światopoglądowych w ujęciu dyskursywnym. *Refleksje*, 9, pp. 109–124.
- Pisarek, Walery. (1966). Tytuł utworu swoistą nazwą własną. *Zeszyty Naukowe WSP w Katowicach, Prace Językoznawcze*, 3, pp. 67–81.
- Rejter, Artur. (2018). *Nazwy własne w kon/tekstach kultury*. Katowice: Wydawnictwo UŚ.
- Rospond, Stanisław. (1961). Stan i perspektywy onomastyki polskiej. In: Witold Taszycki (ed.), *I Międzynarodowa Sławistyczna Konferencja Onomastyczna. Księga referatów* (pp. 59–68). Wrocław–Warszawa–Kraków: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich.
- Rozenbaum, Jakub. (2013). Nauka odpowiedzialna społecznie. *Nowy Obywatel – Pismo na Rzecz Sprawiedliwości Społecznej*, 15 April 2013. Downloaded from: <https://nowyobywatel.pl/2013/04/15/nauka-odpowiedzialna-spolecznie/> (access: 05.06.2019).
- Rutkowski, Mariusz, Skowronek, Katarzyna. (2010). Onomastyka dyskursu: zakres, problematyka i metody badawcze. In: Romana Łobodzińska (ed.), *Nazwy własne a społeczeństwo* (pp. 87–95). Vol. 1. Łask: Oficyna Wydawnicza Leksem.

- Rutkowski, Mariusz, Skowronek, Katarzyna. (in press). *Onomastyczna analiza dyskursu*. Kraków: Wydawnictwa AGH.
- Rutkowski, Mariusz. (2013). Nazwy w systemie – nazwy w tekście. Kilka uwag o poziomach interpretacji nazw własnych. In: Ewa Dzięgiel, Tomasz Korpysz (eds.), *Niejedno ma imię... Prace onomastyczne i dialektologiczne dedykowane Profesor Ewie Wolnicz-Pawłowskiej* (pp. 323–329). Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Kardynała Stefana Wyszyńskiego.
- Rutkowski, Mariusz. (2016). Jeszcze o dyskursywnym opisie nazw własnych. In: Maria Biolik et al. (eds.), *Slavica – onomastica – regionalia. Prace dedykowane Panu Profesorowi Jerzemu Dumie* (pp. 161–167). Olsztyn: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Warmińsko-Mazurskiego.
- Rutkowski, Mariusz. (2017). Nazwy w dyskursie – w kontekście koncepcji wtórnej oralności. *Poznańskie Studia Polonistyczne. Seria Językoznawcza*, 24(1), pp. 145–158.
- Rzetelska-Feleszko, Ewa. (2006). *W świecie nazw własnych*. Warszawa–Kraków: Wydawnictwo Naukowe DWN.
- Sarnowska-Giefińg, Irena. (2003). *Od onimu do gatunku tekstu. Nazewnictwo w satyrze polskiej do 1820 r.* Poznań: Wydawnictwo Naukowe UAM.
- Skowronek, Katarzyna. (2013). Inspiracje socjologiczne w polskiej onomastyce – stare i nowe związki. *Socjolingwistyka*, 27, pp. 31–41.
- Skowronek, Katarzyna. (2014). Nazwy własne jako elementy strategii kaznodziejskiej (na przykładzie wybranych homilii arcybiskupa Sławoja Leszka Głódzia). *Onomastica*, 58, pp. 331–347.
- Skowronek, Katarzyna. (2016a). *Kultura konsumpcji – kultura terapii. Studia językoznawcze*. Kraków: Libron.
- Skowronek, Katarzyna. (2016b). Nazwy własne jako symptomy kultury (na przykładzie tytułów poradników autoterapeutycznych). *Onomastica*, 60, pp. 47–67.
- Skowronek, Katarzyna, Galasiński, Dariusz. (2000). „Kłaniamy się Józefowi Piłsudskiemu”. Krytyczna analiza nazw własnych w polskim dyskursie politycznym. In: Magdalena Czachorowska, Łucja Maria Szewczyk (eds.), *Onomastyka polska a nowe kierunki językoznawcze* (pp. 75–95). Bydgoszcz: Wyższa Szkoła Pedagogiczna.
- Tabaszewska, Justyna. (2017). Literaturoznawstwo służebne. *Teksty Drugie*, 1, pp. 262–273.
- Taszycki, Witold. (1963). Stosunek onomastyki do innych nauk humanistycznych. *Onomastica*, 8, pp. 1–19.
- Van Dijk, Teun. (1984). *Prejudice in Discourse. An Analysis of Ethnic Prejudice in Cognition and Conversation*. Amsterdam–Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Van Dijk, Teun. (1993). *Elite Discourse and Racism*. Newbury Park: SAGE Publications.
- Van Leeuwen, Theo, Wodak, Ruth. (1999). Legitimizing Immigration Control: A Discourse-Historical Analysis. *Discourse Studies*, 1(1), pp. 83–119.
- Warzecha, Adam. (2014). Krytyczna analiza dyskursu (KAD) w ujęciu Normana Fairclougha: zarys problematyki. *Konteksty Kultury*, 11(2), pp. 164–189.
- Weiss, Gilbert, Wodak, Ruth. (2003). Introduction. Theory, Interdisciplinarity and Critical Discourse Analysis. In: Ruth Wodak, Gilbert Weiss (eds.), *Critical Discourse Analysis. Theory and Interdisciplinarity* (pp. 1–34). London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Wodak, Ruth. (2001a). What CDA Is about – a Summary of Its History, Important Concepts and Its Developments. In: Ruth Wodak, Michael Meyer (eds.), *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis* (pp. 1–13). London: Sage.
- Wodak, Ruth. (2001b). The Discourse-Historical Approach. In: Michael Meyer, Ruth Wodak (eds.), *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis* (pp. 63–95). London: Sage.
- Wodak, Ruth. (2003). Populist Discourses: The Rhetoric of Exclusion in Written Genres. *Document Design: Journal of Research and Problem Solving*, 4(2), pp. 133–148.

## ABSTRACT

The article is a synthetic discussion of the discourse analysis method from the onomastic perspective. In our opinion, proper names are not merely linguistic signs – they are also social constructs, often highly politicised, forming various textual and discursive relations. Names understood in that way are often crucial to (re)constructing social reality. Thanks to the methodological orientation used, names can be a good tool for identification, discovery, and interpretation of important aspects of discourse. In our opinion, the use of particular names is not random, but it helps us discover objects vital for the analysis of axiology and ideology of discourse. The methodology we propose should provide tools used in analyses of all onymic spheres (naming categories). The text also highlights the theoretical framework of the method and a proposal of a research procedure in onomastic discourse analysis (ODA) is shown. Moreover, examples of analysis domains are indicated: discourse types and naming categories related to them.

**Keywords:** onomastic, proper names, discourse, methodology

## ABSTRAKT

Celem artykułu jest syntetyczne omówienie metody analizy dyskursu w perspektywie onomastycznej. W naszym ujęciu nazwy własne to nie tylko znaki językowe – to również konstrukty społeczne, często silnie zideologizowane, wchodzące w rozliczne relacje tekstowe i dyskursywne. Nazwy tak pojmowane odgrywają często kluczową rolę w (re)konstruowaniu rzeczywistości społecznej. Dzięki takiej orientacji metodologicznej mogą one stanowić dobre narzędzie do identyfikacji, ujawnienia i interpretacji kluczowych aspektów dyskursu. Użycie nazw – takich a nie innych – nie jest w naszym rozumieniu przypadkowe, ale odślania ważne dla aksjologii i ideologii danego dyskursu obiekty. Proponowana przez nas metodologia powinna zapewnić instrumentarium służące do analiz wszystkich sfer onimicznych (kategorii nazewniczych). W tekście naszkicowane jest teoretyczne tło metody, a także pokazana propozycja postępowania badawczego w ramach onomastycznej analizy dyskursu (OAD). Wskazane zostały również przykładowe domeny analiz: typy dyskursów i przyporządkowane im kategorie nazewnicze.

**Słowa kluczowe:** onomastyka, nazwy własne, dyskurs, metodologia

---

Article submission date: 18.03.2019

Date qualified for printing after reviews: 07.06.2019