

When names meet schemas: a conversation with Juliana Soledade

Prof. Dr. Juliana Soledade (UFG)

Interviewers:

Mônica Nunes Carneiro (UFBA/FAPESB)

Raphael Alves de Oliveira (UERJ/CAPES)

Morphology has accompanied Juliana Soledade Barbosa Coelho's academic trajectory since her early formative work. In her undergraduate degree in Vernacular Letters at the Federal University of Bahia (UFBA), completed in 1999, she studied morphological creation in Guimarães Rosa; in her master's degree, defended in 2001, she turned to suffixation in Archaic Portuguese; and in her doctorate, completed in 2004, she deepened the investigation of the suffixal paradigm of that phase of the language, examining the relations between lexical formation and meaning. During her doctorate, she also completed a period of study at the University of Coimbra. Full Professor at the Federal University of Goiás (UFG) and CNPq Research Productivity Scholar – Level C, she is also part of the faculty of the Graduate Program in Linguistics at the University of Brasília (UnB), where she completed postdoctoral research in 2019–2020 and again in 2024. Her connection with the Program for the History of the Portuguese Language (PROHPOR) dates back to her years at UFBA: in addition to coordinating the Historical Morphology and Lexicology subgroup, she has previously served as the coordinator of the program itself.

The studies developed in her master's and doctoral degrees opened a line of research that would continue in the following years, now focused on a broader set of problems in historical Portuguese morphology. Suffixation remained among her most frequent objects of study, but it also came to be examined in relation to polysemy, allomorphy, synmorphism, and semantic change. In 2012, she coordinated a project for the elaboration of a historical dictionary of Portuguese language suffixes, constructed from a corpus dating back to her doctoral research. Working with materials from different

periods already posed a question that would become recurrent in her production: how to formally represent morphological regularities whose uses and meanings reorganize over time.

In 2013, Construction Morphology explicitly appears in her work with *Experimentando esquemas: um olhar sobre a polissemia das formações [Xi -EIR-]Nj no português arcaico*. From then on, notions such as constructional schema, productivity, polysemy, and inheritance relations began to feature more frequently in analyses that remained rooted in historical data. Between 2016 and 2020, in the project *Mapeando esquemas construcionais: a polissemia das formações X-dor na história da língua portuguesa*, she tracked the uses of the formative from Latin, through Archaic Portuguese, to Contemporary Portuguese, seeking to describe the polysemic relations observed at different moments in the language. In the texts *Por uma abordagem cognitiva da morfologia: revisando a Morfologia Construcional* (2018) and *A morfologia histórica e a morfologia construcional: encontros e desencontros* (2019), the discussion also reaches the boundaries of the model itself when attempting to represent change, varying degrees of productivity, and semantic relations that do not constitute simultaneously. Her historical data, therefore, do not merely serve the application of Construction Morphology; they also provide material to discuss and adjust its forms of representation.

Anthroponymy, however, had already been occupying space in her research before this alignment with Construction Morphology. In 2007, the project *Todos os nomes: análise sócio-histórica, etimológica e mórfica da antroponímia baiana* began, which she coordinated until 2015. In the same period, studies appeared on the social construction of personal names, neological anthroponymy in Bahia, and names recorded in 19th and 20th-century historical documentation. Proper names thus walked alongside historical morphology research from early on, revisiting issues already present in other objects: the constitution of forms, the recurrence of patterns, productivity, innovation, and change. With the incorporation of the constructional perspective, these questions also came to be formulated in terms of schemas and relations between formatives, leading to the hypothesis of the prevalence of biformative constructions in Brazilian anthroponymic neology.

The morphological description of names was joined, early on, by an interest in the historical and social conditions of their creation and circulation. Her studies began to

follow the motivations involved in naming, the formation of the Brazilian anthroponymic repertoire, and the evaluations cast upon certain names, without separating these phenomena from the linguistic organization of the forms themselves. Since 2017, she has coordinated the *Novo Dicionário de Nomes em Uso no Brasil*, a project dedicated to recording names in circulation in the country and describing recurrent formatives in anthroponymic creation, complete with information on origin, morphological behavior, and productivity. In 2024, she published *Os brasileiros e seus nomes: teoria e história da antroponímia no Brasil*, a 507-page authored work that gathers and develops research built over nearly two decades on the formation and history of personal names in Brazil.

Alongside this research, editing collective works also played an important role in circulating discussions on Historical Linguistics, Onomastics, and Construction Morphology. Following *Do português arcaico ao português brasileiro: outras histórias* (2009) and *ROSAE: linguística histórica, história das línguas e outras histórias* (2012), she organized, with Natival Almeida Simões Neto, *Nomes próprios: abordagens linguísticas* (2021) and, with Carlos Alexandre Victorio Gonçalves and Natival Almeida Simões Neto, *Morfologia Construcional: avanços em língua portuguesa* (2022). In this latter volume, she also contributed to the introduction to Construction Morphology and studies on suffixal derivation and semantic change, revisiting, through constructional instruments, problems that had already appeared in her initial works on Portuguese morphology.

The interview that follows is part of issue 52 of *Palimpsesto* and the dossier *Arquiteturas do sentido em contextos de uso: descrições do português brasileiro na Linguística Cognitiva*. The conversation starts from this body of work to move forward on questions that remain open in her studies: the status of meaning in proper names, the organization of productive patterns in Brazilian anthroponymy, the possible cognitive reality of constructional schemas, dialogue with experimental methods, the difficulties that diachrony poses to network representation, and the social evaluations that affect names. The questions thus seek to reach points where data description also demands rethinking analytical categories and instruments, particularly when morphology, cognition, history, and social naming practices are considered together. We thank Professor Juliana for her availability for this conversation and for her thoughtful attention to the questions we proposed.

PALIMPSESTO

1) In Construction Morphology, one starts from the idea that every construction pairs form and meaning. In the common lexicon, the semantic pole of certain schemas is usually quite specified, involving notions such as agent, locative, or instrument. In the anthroponymic schemas you propose, such as [[XFA -ane]NP], this pole seems to approach a more categorical meaning, something like "female person," in dialogue with Langacker's notion of basic-level meaning. In this case, to what extent would the productivity of these schemas be sustained less by lexical semantic richness and more by formal, pragmatic, or sociocognitive factors? Would it be possible to consider that proper names hold a type of meaning still little explored by the theory?

JULIANA SOLEDADE

This is a question that touches on a sensitive point and, at the same time, is very significant for my research on anthroponymy. I understand that the observation is absolutely correct. In the schemas I propose, such as [[XFA -ane]NP] or [[XFA -elson]NP], the semantic counterpart indeed approaches, in Langacker's terms, categorical meanings at a basic level, in the case of anthroponyms: "proper name > of person > female gender" or "proper name > of person > male gender," respectively. There is no rich lexical specification in these models like what is seen in common lexicon schemas, such as [[X]V -dor]S or [[X]N -eir-]N, which can specify different information such as "instrument," "locative," or "agent." Although the meaning of anthroponyms seems much more complex than the schemas, as conceived, are capable of describing, there is no ignoring their crucial importance for the organization and functioning of the anthroponymic lexicon of Brazilian Portuguese.

The productivity of anthroponymic schemas is fueled, first, by their function of naming/identifying individuals and, second, by their formal template. As I argued in the article *A hipótese da prevalência de construções biformativas* (2018), what is abstracted in the hierarchical organization of the anthroponymic lexicon is not a complex meaning, but a constructional pattern of association between two anthroponymic formatives. This biformative model is abstracted and internalized from abundant previous models in heritage anthroponymy. The speaker does not need to know what *-ane* means lexically;

they need to recognize that, by combining a formative on the left margin (such as *Jose-*, *Franci-*, *Cleid-*) with a formative on the right margin (*-ane*, *-elson*), they obtain a personal name. Productivity, in this case, is driven by the regularity and stability of this formal template, which is easily replicable. It is what I call the entrenchment (cf. the concept of entrenchment) of the schema. In basic terms, one can state with Brown (1965), Rosch et al. (1976), Downing (1977), and Bybee (1995) that the more frequent a linguistic construct is, the more entrenched it will be in the grammar of the language, and the more entrenched it is, the more frequent it will be. Productivity, therefore, is anchored in frequency and schematicity. The speaker does not abstract a complex meaning from *-ane*; they abstract a pattern from concrete, frequent models. Names like *Joseane* and *Roseane* (with tens of thousands of records since the 1940s) serve as optimal models. The high frequency of these models renders the $[[X\text{-}ane]NP]$ schema highly entrenched and productive, regardless of the vagueness or semantic opacity of the formative.

In turn, the motivation to create a new name with *-ane* or *-elson* is not lexical, but crossed by cultural, pragmatic, and subjective matters. As I discuss in "*Antropônimos, usos e cognição*", naming individuals is linked to the search for identity and distinction. The name does not need to mean "agent" or "instrument"; it needs to mean "a unique individual," "someone with an identity of their own." The motivation lies in the pragmatic scene of naming, not in the semantic content of the anthroponymic formatives. Thus, whether *Adal-* meant 'noble' in its Germanic origin seems to imply absolutely nothing when someone names their son *Adalmário*, in honor of the parents (*Adalberto* and *Maria*). Many names are created through word blending, such as *Edívia* (*Edson* + *Olívia*) or *Julícia* (*Juliana* + *Letícia*). Here, the meaning cannot be objectively described, as it is constructed through an attempt to project the senses that the base names carry in the namer's memory onto the person being named. So, when we talk about the meaning of proper names, especially anthroponyms, we are dealing with a phenomenon that is much more complex than it might seem.

I propose that the meaning of proper names is multifaceted and operates on different levels: a) basic-level categorical meaning: appears in the counterpart of my schemas ("male/female person"). It is a minimum type of meaning, categorical, conventional, and shared, accessed by semantic memory. It allows the speaker, upon hearing an innovative name, to categorize it almost immediately as an anthroponym; b)

associative meaning linked to the referent: richer and little explored. It is not in the name itself, but in the episodic memory of each speaker. Proper names can carry a universe of cultural, historical, and affective associations. When a mother names her daughter *Joseane*, she is not merely activating the schema $[[X\text{-}ane]NP] \leftrightarrow [female\ person]$; she is possibly projecting onto her daughter the meanings that the name or parts of the name hold for her (for example, José being the father's name). This meaning is difficult to delimit, as it depends on individual experiences and the sociocultural context; c) motivational/pragmatic meaning: underlies the act of naming. It is not lexical, but it is real. It is the search for originality, paying tribute to an idol, using a fashionable or devotional name, or the desire to create a new, beautiful, or strong name; d) cultural meaning: implies the incidence of an evaluation regarding names: old names vs. young names, rich names vs. poor names, Brazilian names vs. foreign names, among other categorizations; e) etymological meaning: the most referenced in anthroponymy studies, yet seems rarely triggered during the naming process. Only words with links to the common lexicon (like *Vitória*, *Rosa*, *Aparecida*) are usually associated with their original sense; aside from these cases, only a few rare names, like *Letícia*, seem to resist semantic opacity.

Excepting categorical and etymological meanings, the other meaningful dimensions of anthroponyms are discursive, pragmatic, and sociocultural in nature, and Construction Morphology, with its focus on form-meaning pairing, cannot yet incorporate this level of complexity.

Therefore, I conclude that the theory already gives us the tools (such as the notions of schemas, entrenchment, and frequency of use), but there remains a vast field to explore. The meaning of proper names is not "empty" or "opaque"; it is multifaceted and manifests across different levels of schematicity. The semantic counterpart of anthroponymic schemas, such as $[[X\text{-}ane]NP] \leftrightarrow [female\ person]$, is merely the most visible and basic tip of an iceberg of meanings anchored in experience, culture, and social naming practices.

PALIMPSESTO

2) You propose the hypothesis of the prevalence of biformative constructions in Brazilian anthroponymic neology, according to which many names are organized into two

formatives, maintaining continuity with inherited patterns, like the Germanic model, albeit with unprecedented combinations. If this biformative template exhibits a relevant degree of entrenchment, in Bybee's sense, could we say that it functions as a dominant trend in name creation in Brazil? But how should we understand cases that seem to escape this pattern, such as blends like *Julícia* or splinters like *Franci-*? Would they strain the biformative metaschema, or could they be interpreted as variations anticipated within its own productive dynamics?

JULIANA SOLEDADE

This question goes straight to the heart of my hypothesis. And the answer, based on everything I developed in my research, is that these cases do not strain the biformative metaschema, but rather confirm and reinforce it.

First of all, it must be made clear that the hypothesis of the prevalence of biformative constructions, as I developed in the 2018 article, is not a hypothesis about one morphological pattern among others; it is a hypothesis about the organizational metaschema of the Brazilian anthroponymic system. What I am stating is that, regardless of the genolexical process triggered (compounding, word blending, splintering), the final outcome tends to organize as a structure with two formatives, one on the left margin (F1) and another on the right margin (F2).

This model is not arbitrary; it is formed from the set of inherited names used in the formation of Brazilian anthroponymy. These are Latin names like *Crist+ina*, *Evel+ina*, *Just+ina*, *Lucina*, *Regina*, or *Cristiano*, *Juliano*, *Justiniano*, *Luciano*, *Mariano*; or Germanic names like *Adal+berto*, *Adal+fredo*, *Adal+giza*, or *Cass+ilda*, *Crem+ilda*, *Hermeneg+ilda*, *Leon+ilda*, which enabled the generalizations that allowed the elaboration of anthroponymic constructional schemas taking the biformative structure as basic. That is, biformativity is not one pattern among others; it is the fundamental template upon which other processes act.

Let us take the example of the blend. What I argue is that, although the formation process is non-concatenative, the result aligns perfectly with the $[[X]F1 [Y]F2]NP$ schema. The blend does not create a triformative or amorphous structure; it simply operates upon the biformative template, filling both positions with fragments of other names. In *Julícia*, there is a fusion of two names, with loss of phonic material from both,

but a clearly biformative structure is maintained: [Jul(i)-] + [-(i)cia], where the *i* functions as a fusion point.

The case of splinters, such as *Franci-*, is even more illustrative. You ask if they would strain the metaschema. My answer is: on the contrary, they are among the strongest pieces of evidence of its power. The splinter *Franci-* is a fragment detached from highly frequent names like *Francisco* and *Francisca*. The [[Franci-]F1 [Y]F2]NP schema is extremely productive in Brazil, giving rise to names such as *Franceilma*, *Franciane*, *Franciela*, *Franciele*, *Francielia*, *Francila*, *Francileide*, *Francilene*, *Francilia*, *Francimar*, *Francine*, *Francineia*, *Francinete*, *Francislaine*, *Francislene*, *Francielio*, *Francilio*, *Francinaldo*, *Francinei*, *Francivaldo*, *Francisclei*, *Francismara*, *Francisnaldo*, *Francisval*, *Francisvan*, *Francisvaldo*, *Francislai*. Notice that, in all these cases, *Franci-* occupies the F1 position, and the second element (F2) is a formative that can be a free form (*Cleide*, *Valdo*, *Mara*) or a bound form (*-ane*, *-ele*, *-nildo*). The structure is always biformative.

The same occurs with the *-elson/-ilson* splinters that Natival Almeida Simões Neto and I analyzed in "Nomes masculinos X-son na antroponímia brasileira". These splinters were extracted from models/names like *Nilson* and *Nelson*. From these models, it is deduced that they always occupy the F2 position (right margin). Meanwhile, the first element (F1) is filled by formatives or given names like *Adr-*, *Antonio*, *Den-*, *Jo-*, etc. Once again, the structure is biformative: [Adr-] + [-elson], [Antoni-] + [-elson], [Den-] + [-ilson], [Jo-] + [-elson].

In short, what occurs in Brazil is a creative updating of an ancestral linguistic pattern: bithematic > biformative. Speakers are not creating a new model; they are operating on a model deeply entrenched in Western onomastic tradition, but filling the positions with unprecedented materials (splinters, blends, elements from common and onomastic lexicons, etc.).

This does not mean that there are no anthroponymic creations outside the biformative pattern, because indeed there are. These are cases such as graphic-phonetic alterations like *Diego* > *Tiego*; *Lívia* > *Dívia*; *Berenice* > *Derenice*; or polyformative constructions such as *Tospericargerja*, honoring the 1970 soccer World Cup champions: *Tostão*, *Pelé*, *Rivelino*, *Carlos Alberto*, *Gerson*, *Jairzinho*. However, these other types of

formation are sporadic, incapable of generating productive series as happens with the biformative model.

PALIMPSESTO

3) In *Antropônimos, uso e cognição*, you suggest that common names and proper names, although they may involve distinct brain areas, access constructional schemas through a route linked to procedural memory. This proposal seems to open space to think of CxM schemas not merely as descriptive instruments, but also as structures with possible cognitive reality. Considering that CxM still dialogues little with experimental psycholinguistics, do you see room for methods such as morphological priming, lexical decision, or eye-tracking to investigate whether speakers mobilize these schemas in real time? Could a Construction Morphology more informed by psycholinguistic evidence be a productive development in this field?

JULIANA SOLEDADE

This question deeply excites me, as it touches on what I consider the natural and necessary next step for Construction Morphology (CxM) and, in particular, for my own research agenda on anthroponymy.

In "Antropônimos, usos e cognição", I suggested that constructional schemas, once abstracted from concrete instantiations and entrenched by use, come to be stored in procedural memory. I cited Izquierdo (2004) to define this type of memory as "an execution system, involved in learning distinct types of skills that are not represented as explicit information about the world."

What this means in practice is that the speaker does not need to "think" about the $[[X\text{-}ane]NP] \leftrightarrow [female\ person]$ schema to create or interpret a name like *Franciane* or *Joseane*. They simply know how to do it, just as they know how to ride a bicycle or recognize a melody. It is implicit, automated, and procedural knowledge. This alone is a strong argument in favor of the cognitive reality of schemas. They are not mere descriptive tools created by the linguist; they are generalizations that the human brain effectively executes when processing and producing language. However, I recognize that this argument, although theoretically grounded, still lacks empirical validation through experimental methods.

Methods from experimental psycholinguistics can and must test the cognitive reality of constructional schemas. Furthermore, I believe CxM urgently needs this dialogue to avoid becoming a theory that is descriptively rich yet deficient within the cognitive sciences.

One possibility concerns morphological priming, an experimental language technique in which prior exposure to a word (the prime) unconsciously facilitates the recognition of a second word (the target) sharing the same structure or root. Thus, for example, the speaker is exposed to a stimulus (e.g., *Francisco*) and then to a target word (e.g., *Francivaldo*). Reaction time to recognize or produce the target word is measured. If the speaker processes *Francivaldo* faster after having seen *Francisco* (compared to an unrelated control, like *Pedro*), this would indicate that the formative *Franci-* was activated in memory and facilitated the processing of the new word.

I believe this type of evaluation would directly test the hypothesis that the splinter *Franci-* is an entrenched formative automatically accessed by procedural memory. If experiments show that priming occurs even for neological names that the participant has never seen before (e.g., *Francivânia*), we would have strong evidence that the [[Franci-]F1 [Y]F2]NP schema has cognitive reality and is not merely an ad hoc construction.

Lexical decision experiments (identifying whether a string of letters is a word in the language) could also be adapted to test the recognition of neological proper names. For instance, we could present participants with names like *Adilson*, *Joilson*, and *Ronielson* (which follow the [[X]-elson/-ilson]NP schema) and measure reaction time to decide that they are names, compared to pseudo-names that violate the pattern (e.g., *Sonadil*, *Elsondi*).

If participants process names following the biformative pattern faster, this would indicate that the [[X]F1 [Y]F2]NP metaschema is active and facilitates recognition. And again, if this occurs even for unprecedented names, we would face evidence that the schema is a procedural generalization, not a list of memorized items.

Eye-tracking, meanwhile, could be used to investigate the real-time processing of proper names in reading contexts. For example, we could measure eye-fixation duration on names like *Cleverson* or *Franciane* compared to names that do not follow the biformative pattern (e.g., *Pompeu*, *Xavier*). If participants' eyes fixate for less time on

biformative names, this would indicate faster and more automatic recognition, suggesting that the schema is activated online.

Additionally, we could use eye-tracking to investigate how speakers segment innovative names. In a name like *Cleider-son*, would the reader's gaze fixate more on *Cleider-* and then on *-son*? On *Cleid-* and then on *-erson*? Or would they process the name as an indivisible whole? If there is evidence of segmentation into two formatives, this would be a strong indicator that the biformative structure is psychologically real.

Beyond this purely cognitive perspective, I understand these tests must also be intersected by sociolinguistic factors: diastatic aspects, such as literacy level, social class, and ethno-racial identity, can reveal important differences in experimental outcomes.

Today, CxM is a descriptively powerful theory. It allows us to capture generalizations about morphological patterns, represent affixal polysemy in subschema networks, and explain lexical creativity in terms of schemas and inheritance. However, it still lacks a stronger commitment to the experimental validation of its hypotheses. Thus, adding psycholinguistic evidence would be not only productive, but necessary for the theory to advance toward a more robust understanding of linguistic cognition.

PALIMPSESTO

4) Your constructional description shows that names like *Cleidierson* or *Francineide* follow regular morphological patterns, comparable in some measure to derivational processes in Portuguese. At the same time, in *Os brasileiros e seus nomes* (2024) and on the Rádio Novelo podcast, you demonstrate that many of these names are socially stigmatized and frequently labeled as "poor people's names." There seems to be a tension between the linguistic description of these names as systematic formations and the social judgments cast upon them. In this context, what do you see as the role of linguistics: merely to describe these patterns and their social uses, or to intervene critically in the public debate on linguistic and anthroponymic prejudice?

JULIANA SOLEDADE

This question is important to me because it concerns not only my academic work, but my position as a citizen and an educator. And the answer, based on everything I have

written—especially the chapter on the sociohistory of anthroponymic innovation in Brazil in the book *Os brasileiros e seus nomes*—is that linguistics cannot refrain from speaking out critically in the public debate regarding the pejorative evaluation cast upon names created in Brazil.

From a strictly linguistic standpoint, names like *Cleidierson*, *Francineide*, *Joseane*, *Adilson*, or *Richarlysson* are perfectly systematic formations. They follow the biformative metaschema [[X]F1 [Y]F2]NP. They are instantiated by formatives that are recurrent and entrenched in the Brazilian anthroponymic system: *-son*, *-ane*, *-eide*, *-ilson*, *-erson*. They obey morphological patterns that, in terms of regularity, do not fundamentally differ from derivational processes in the common lexicon, such as suffixation with *-eiro* or nominalization with *-ção*.

I have sought to demonstrate that these names are not chaotic or arbitrary; they are the result of schematic generalizations made by speakers who, exposed to a set of frequent models (*Nelson*, *Joseane*, *Roseane*, *Anderson*, *Emerson*), abstracted productive patterns and applied them creatively. From the perspective of Construction Morphology, *Cleidierson* is just as "well-formed" as *jardineiro* (gardener) or *declaração* (declaration), or as "well-formed" as *Juliana* or *Adalberto*. The difference lies not in structure, but in the social evaluation cast upon some and not others.

By observing comedy sketches on social media, I observed that these uniquely Brazilian names (an intangible heritage of our culture) suffer from stigma and are labeled "poor people's names." Another indication of this stigmatization is that these names do not appear in baby name suggestion lists on countless websites. Thus, we can say that although they are perfectly elegant constructions from the perspective of morphological formation, these names are judged as defective. However, as can be seen, this judgment is not based on linguistic criteria, but on historically constituted social and racial categorizations.

I contend that anthroponymic innovation in Brazil is directly related to the expropriation of African names during slavery, which erased the cultural identities of the peoples brought to Brazil. After abolition and the establishment of civil registries, former enslaved individuals and their descendants gained the freedom to name their children—a process that until then had been completely controlled by the Catholic Church and white

society, which appropriated and encapsulated all written documentation produced in Brazil.

We believe that innovative, uniquely Brazilian names (essentially biformative) arose out of this search for a new identity by Black, mixed-race, and impoverished populations. Unbound from the white, Christian tradition that oppressed them, they began creating anthroponymic options as a way of affirming a new social identity. It is worth noting that societies where African slavery was dense, such as Cuba and the United States, present similar anthroponymic processes.

I consider this association between Blackness, poverty, and low formal education to be the primary factor leading names created by this population to be automatically classified as "ugly," "defective," or "poor people's names." When someone says *Marinalva* "is a housemaid's name," they are not making a linguistic statement; they are reproducing a racial and social prejudice that associates certain names with subaltern positions in society historically occupied by Black and mixed-race people, who were excluded from civilizing and development processes by the slavery system that founded this nation. Therefore, prejudice against innovative Brazilian names has deep historical roots and constitutes one face of structural racism.

The role of linguistics in this context cannot merely be to describe morphological patterns and remain silent in the face of prejudice. Linguistics, as a science studying language in its social and cognitive dimensions, has the ethical duty to denaturalize prejudice: to show that the association between certain names and poverty/Blackness is not a natural or objective relationship, but a historical and social construction. In this case, CM helps prove these names are not "errors" or "deviations," but regular formations following perfectly describable morphological patterns.

In my view, describing and denouncing is not enough. Action is necessary. My engagement in the public debate on anthroponymic prejudice is reflected not only in my classroom teaching or podcast interviews, but also in the preparation and future publication of the *Dicionário de nomes em uso no Brasil*. By recording and describing innovative names—showing their etymology, frequency, geographical distribution, and morphological patterns—this dictionary offers society a tool to combat ignorance and prejudice. A dictionary that includes *Cleidierson*, *Joseane*, and *Francineide* alongside

Pedro, Maria, and João is a political act acknowledging the linguistic diversity and creativity of the Brazilian people.

I also believe this knowledge must be brought into schools, teacher training courses, and instructional materials. Proper names also vary, reflecting the history and culture of a people. We need to occupy public space: write newspaper and magazine articles, participate in podcasts, give interviews, and produce social media content. The Rádio Novelo podcast mentioned earlier is an example of this work. We need more initiatives like it to take academic knowledge beyond academia and place it at the service of fighting prejudice. Linguistics as a science has the tools to dismantle this prejudice by demonstrating its irrationality, historical origin, and symbolic violence. And as a researcher, I believe we have the ethical responsibility to do so. It is not enough to describe the world; we must also try to contribute to making it more just. Stigmatizing these names is stigmatizing the people who bear them, and that is, obviously, a form of racism.

PALIMPSESTO

5) Booij's Construction Morphology was formulated largely for the synchronic description of morphological networks. In your research, however, you mobilize this perspective to address the emergence and transformation of anthroponymic schemas over time, from Archaic Portuguese to the so-called "anthroponymic revolution" of the 20th century. In the chapter "A morfologia histórica e a morfologia construcional: encontros e desencontros" (2019), you discuss precisely some of these tensions. To what extent can CM be historicized without losing its operational strength? Or would this movement require formulating a more specific historical-constructional model to handle change, productivity, and the reconfiguration of schemas over time?

JULIANA SOLEDADE

This question has accompanied me for years, since my doctoral research, but especially since 2013, when I approached Cognitive Linguistics and Construction Morphology. When applying CM assumptions to historical studies of the lexicon, I noticed the need for important adaptations to account for the language's diachronic dimension.

Before pointing out problems, however, we must recognize that CM offers extremely powerful tools for historical investigation. Unlike generative models, which tend to treat morphological change as a matter of rule substitution, CM operates with schemas—generalizations abstracted from concrete instantiations that can be reconfigured over time. That is, we deal with real data from language in use.

This flexibility is crucial for Historical Morphology because, as I have argued, language is a mix of innovation and conservation, and in any given synchrony, the use of inherited forms is always far superior to that of newly created ones. CM captures this dynamic because schemas accommodate inheritance relations, and polysemic subschemas can be reorganized as new meanings emerge. Furthermore, notions such as *entrenchment* and *frequency* explain why certain patterns become more productive than others at different historical moments.

Additionally, by acknowledging that schemas are acquired based on a set of memorized complex words, CM leaves room to understand how speakers in different eras, exposed to different sets of models, can abstract distinct schemas and thereby generate morphological changes over time. In Brazilian anthroponymy, for instance, I showed that the biformative metaschema $[[X]F1 [Y]F2]NP$, inherited from earlier linguistic traditions, was reconfigured during the 20th century, incorporating new formatives (splinters like *Franci-*, *-elson*, *-erson*, and *Regi-*) and generating a true "anthroponymic revolution."

However, applying CM to historical data reveals several tensions, which can be grouped into five main problems:

a) Prolificacy *versus* vitality: Booij (2010, 2017) states that the basic criterion for proposing subschemas is productivity: if a pattern is productive, that is good reason to assume a subschema. But in historical data, defining productivity becomes complex. Many schemas may have been *prolific* in past stages (generating many inherited forms), but no longer possess *vitality* (the capacity to generate new forms) in current synchrony. Conversely, a schema may have had low prolificacy in the past but gained vitality in a new historical context, like the suffix *-ineo*, which was revived on social media a few years ago with a new sense (*fofineo*, *gatineo*).

The Booijian model does not anticipate this distinction, and in graphic representations, the ordering of subschemas (usually linear or hierarchical) fails to capture

degrees of prolificacy. For example, regarding the suffix *-eiro* in my Archaic Portuguese data, agentive senses had 47 occurrences, whereas the sense of anomaly had only 1. A linear representation fails to capture this difference.

b) The dominant schema and semantic underspecification: Booij proposes a dominant schema with a semantic counterpart general enough to accommodate all polysemic subschemas (e.g., $[[X \text{ -eiro}]S \leftrightarrow [x \text{ involved in SEM}]S]$). However, as I argued, it does not seem plausible that the human brain stores this dominant schema. It is actually an analyst's methodological resource; I do not believe it is a real cognitive structure, as language is semantic-centric. In a historical perspective, this becomes even more problematic because subschemas may have emerged at distinct times and do not need a "blanket" of semantic void to exist, but rather relations of meaning projection from other schemas.

c) Representation of metaphorical and metonymic relations: CM does not offer an adequate way to represent horizontal relations between subschemas—that is, the metaphorical and metonymic extensions connecting them. For the suffix *-dor*, for instance, I showed that the relation between a habitual agent and a professional agent is metonymic (part-whole), but this relation is completely lost in a vertical hierarchical representation. Likewise, for *-eiro*, metonymic relations between the senses of "object" and "place" or "agent" and "instrument" are not captured by formulating isolated subschemas. This is especially relevant for history, as semantic changes often occur through metonymy and metaphor; without representing these relations, we lose the dynamic of change.

d) Semantic inheritance from the base: Booij (2017) recognizes the importance of inheritance between schemas and complex words, and between complex words and their bases. However, his representation does not include the base's semantic inheritance in subschema formation. I showed through the suffix *-udo* that the polysemy between "provided with X" (*barbudo* [bearded]) and "resembling X" (*abelhudo* [snoopy/nosy]) is motivated by the semantic nature of the base: if the base is a body part, one meaning applies; if it is not, another applies. This type of semantic restriction finds no space in the Booijian formulation.

e) The relation between habitual agents, professional agents, and experiencers: For the suffix *-dor*, I showed that distinguishing between a habitual agent and a

professional agent is not a matter of morphological rules, but of sociocultural conceptualization: a professional runner (*corredor*) differs from a habitual runner not by action frequency, but by financial return and accumulated specialized knowledge. This metonymic relation (part-whole) is dynamic and historical: what is professional in one era may be merely habitual in another. CM, with its static representation of subschemas, fails to account for this fluidity.

I do not advocate for a completely new model, but rather the adjustment and expansion of the Booijian framework. With technological advances, I believe we will be able to capture not only synchronic structure, but also the emergence, transformation, and loss of schemas over time, representing these descriptions in more dynamic and flexible models.

REFERENCES

BOOIJ, Geert. *Construction Morphology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.

BOOIJ, Geert E. Inheritance and motivation in Construction Morphology. In: GISBORNE, Nikolas; HIPPISEY, Andrew (ed.). *Defaults in morphological theory*. Inglaterra: Oxford University Press, 2017. p. 18-39.

BROWN, Roger. *Social Psychology*. New York: Free Press, 1965.

BYBEE, Joan. Regular morphology and the lexicon. *Language and Cognitive Processes*, [S. l.], v. 10, n. 5, p. 425-455, 1995.

DOWNING, Pamela. On the creation and use of English compound nouns. *Language*, [S. l.], v. 53, n. 4, p. 810-842, 1977.

IZQUIERDO, Iván. *A arte de esquecer*. Rio de Janeiro: Vieira & Lent, 2004.

ROSCH, Eleanor et al. Basic objects in natural categories. *Cognitive Psychology*, [S. l.], v. 8, n. 3, p. 382-439, 1976.

Juliana Soledade: bachelor's degree in Vernacular Letters, master's degree in Letters and Linguistics, and doctorate in Letters and Linguistics from the Federal University of Bahia

(UFBA). She is currently a Full Professor at the Federal University of Goiás (UFG) and a CNPq Research Productivity Scholar – Level C. She has experience in the field of Letters, with an emphasis on Morphology, Lexicon, Onomastics, and Historical Linguistics. From diachronic and synchronic perspectives, she investigates common and onomastic lexicons, especially anthroponymy, focusing on morphological processes involved in their constitution, as well as genolexical formations in Portuguese and other Romance languages, focusing on derivation and non-concatenative processes. Currently, her projects focus on the semantic-cognitive processes involved in the morphological constitution of common and onomastic lexicons, including studies of Portuguese grammar from a cognitivist perspective, particularly within Construction Morphology and Construction Grammar. She is a faculty member of the Graduate Program in Language and Culture (PPGLinC) at the Federal University of Bahia (UFBA) and the Graduate Program in Linguistics (PPGL) at the University of Brasília (UnB). E-mail: julisoledade@gmail.com | ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3637-3453>.

Mônica Nunes Carneiro: doctoral student in the Graduate Program in Language and Culture (PPGLinC) at the Federal University of Bahia (UFBA), master's in Linguistic Studies from the Graduate Program in Linguistic Studies (PPGEL) at the State University of Feira de Santana (UEFS), and holds a bachelor's degree in Vernacular Letters from the same institution. She is a member of the Constructionist and Cognitive-Functional Observatory of Portuguese (CONPOR) research group, where she conducts research in Construction Morphology, focusing on X-oso formations, from the original form *X-osus* in Latin to its development in Ibero-Romance languages, particularly Portuguese, Spanish, and Galician. During her undergraduate studies, she served as a scientific initiation fellow for three consecutive years and participated in the Pedagogical Residency Program. She currently teaches Portuguese and Writing in the private school system of Feira de Santana. E-mail: moninunes190@gmail.com | ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0008-5087-2006>.

Raphael Alves de Oliveira: doctoral student in Linguistics through the Graduate Program in Letters at the State University of Rio de Janeiro (PPGLILP/UERJ), master's in Linguistics, and holds a bachelor's degree in Letters – Portuguese/French from the same

institution. Researcher at the Constructionist and Cognitive-Functional Observatory of Portuguese (CONPOR/UFBA), currently developing research in Construction Morphology, Frame Semantics, and Metapragmatics. He is a scholar of the Coordination for the Improvement of Higher Education Personnel (CAPES). E-mail: ra.alvesdeoliveira@gmail.com | ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0002-4361-6780>.