

Discussion

Isolde HAUSNER*

RAINER DORMELS:

A CATEGORIZATION OF DIFFERENT NAMES FOR SEAS IN EAST ASIA

Prof. Dormels gave a very sophisticated paper comparing the issue *East Sea / Sea of Japan* with the sea names in the South China Sea. He made a categorization in three different ways:

- According to the official status of the names
- According to designated objects of the names
- According to the status of endonym and exonym

This classification in categories and the comparison with the naming difficulties in the South China Sea shall enable a clear view on the ongoing naming dispute between Korea and Japan. The categories according to the official status of the names encompass three further subitems emphasizing the type of name, that are

- the controversial name
- the challengers
- proposals by individuals (or alternative names)

Interesting in this categorization are the names *Sea of Japan* versus Japan Sea, the latter was the term in the IHO guidelines from 1928, 1937 and 1953. From a linguistic point of view there is a tiny but fine difference regarding the type of that name. *Sea of Japan* expresses clearly a proprietary claim, whereas Japan Sea – regard: not Japanese Sea – can be seen as a construct composed of two substantives forming not a proper name in the onomastic sense. In our case I would regard Japan Sea as a label ranking between an appellative and a proper name (it expresses that this is the sea nearby Japan). One would expect Japanese Sea as the ground form of the current name *Sea of Japan*, but this form never existed. Therefore one can classify *Sea of Japan* as a name keeping motives of power in continuation of the former political status, when Korea was under Japanese rule, and neglecting the sovereignty of the new founded Republic of Korea. It

* Professor, Austrian Academy of Sciences, Austria.

is clear, that nobody would raise the claim on the absolute ownership of whole sea portion between Korea and Japan, but the current official name and the insistence on its one and only status entails claims on the exertion of political power and can be regarded as name with a distinct political background. (The Oxford Dictionary gives a comprehensive definition of the preposition of: „(1) Expressing the relationship between a part and a whole; (5) Expressing the relationship between a general category ... and the thing being specified...: example: the city of Prague ; the etymology is old-English and has a Germanic/Indo-European root).

SANG-HYUN CHI:

LINGERING ISSUES ON SEA NAMES: WHY ARE WE DRIFTING ABOUT?

This paper gives insight into the issue why the naming problem is not moving forward, and presents us some considerations why this is the case.

One of his most important statements is, that place-names cannot be subjects of evaluation in that sense, which name would be the better or less better name. But this regard to better or worse does not touch the matter, on the contrary, it can lead to a „conflict“. He states furthermore, that a cardinal direction as determinator in a composed name is one of the many motives to name a place, a sea etc., and the trend of post-colonial renaming is a matter of standardization. Here the issue „dual naming“ comes up for discussion and he stresses the term discourse. But according to prof. Chi this could create a „fear“, could trigger renamings in other regions, could lead to „chain reactions“. On the other hand, „dual naming“ would give more freedom to the users which name they prefer, and he suggests, that whichever of the two names people choose should be respected. After evaluating the various proposals made in the course of this seminars he comes to the conclusion, that the cultural and historical values of place-names should be discussed as holistic perspectives, and that standardization has hitherto been influenced by ideologies of the times. Our present era is the time of post-colonialism and he proposes a careful review of the ingredients constituting the anti-discourse of dual naming practices.

PAUL WOODMAN:

DUAL NAMING IN CARTOGRAPHIC AND NON-CARTOGRAPHIC ENVIRONMENTS

While the cartographic sector in conjunction with toponyms has been widely discussed, the presenter concentrates on non-cartographic environment and comes to the conclusion, that dual naming especially in non-cartographic environment is „... tautological and inelegant “ and cannot solve the problem.

He discusses the use of a place-holder name for the matter in question, e.g. North-East-Asian-Sea, but lastly comes to the conclusion that this also cannot sort out the problem. In his view a way forward could be a working arrangement, by which Japan as well as Korea use their own choice of label for the sea in international meetings, as it is the practice in UN's editorial directive for the case of the Persian Gulf / Arabian Gulf.

In a revised paper Paul Woodman gives more „Thoughts on the way forward“, he refers to the Australian practice, where aboriginal names as second names are added to local features and pleads for a „pick and choose“ method, this could be a policy of real

choice and would lead to a relaxation of tension especially in international meetings. As discussant I would support this approach as regards our Sea, but the question remains, how to manage it and how to go on in the future:

- is there a common agreement to file out a resolution within the UN?
- should there be further technical papers to explain such a procedure and starting a knowledge building process in the frame of ‘critical toponymy’?

My opinion is that the proposed ‘pick and choose’ procedure should be supported by an accurate theoretical framework, which encompasses all / or most dual-naming practices with a perspective on the case *East Sea / Sea of Japan*.