What's left of rigidity?

I will argue that given some plausible assumptions about natural language and philosophical methodology, the following theses about names cannot be true together: (a) the same ('proper') name can be borne by distinct objects/individuals, and (b) names of natural language are (de jure) rigid designators but definite descriptions are not. The main assumptions that my argument appeals to are: (i) fragments of language (e.g., names) do not themselves refer, but can be used to refer, and (ii) every assumption involved in assessing whether names are (or are not) rigid designators must be preserved in the corresponding assessment for definite descriptions.