Position

- Anonymous Named Graphs match the use case.
 - RDF 1.1 defined named graphs, but not their semantics.
 - JSON-LD 1.0 provided support for graphs named by URI, but also without an explicit name (i.e., *blank* node)
 - The only reasonable (IMHO) interpretation of graphs named via blank node (anonymous named graphs) is that the blank node denotes the graph it names.*
 - Statements made about the name of a named graph effectively can be thought of as statements about that graph, at least when the name is a blank node.
 - Note that blank nodes may be identified with a blank node identifier, which people seem to hate. However, the notion that some nodes in a graph don't have an explicit name shouldn't be too controversial. By definition these are blank nodes.

^{*} This is my opinion, and not necessarily that of either the JSON-LD WG or CG; offered as a suggestion for future work.

Example

 The canonical RDF* example[1] is the following:

Using formulae (Notation3):