



Parkatêjê Onomastics: Semantic Aspects of People's Proper Names

Onomástica Parkatêjê: aspectos semânticos dos nomes próprios de pessoas

Tereza Tayná Coutinho Lopes

Universidade Federal do Pará, Belém, Pará / Brasil
terezataynacl@gmail.com

Marília de Nazaré de Oliveira Ferreira

Universidade Federal do Pará, Belém, Pará / Brasil
mariliaferreira1@gmail.com

Abstract: This article aims to present semantic aspects found in Parkatêjê anthroponyms. Currently the Parkatêjê people live in villages in the Reserva Indígena Mãe Maria (RIMM – Mother Mary Indigenous Reserve, in English), near Marabá in the state of Pará. The Parkatêjê language belongs to the Timbira Dialectal Complex, from the Macro-Jê linguistic stock. The study of proper names from different typologies is the core interest of the discipline entitled Onomastics, in which Anthroponymy, the study of human proper names, will be our focus in this paper. In general, the significant content of proper names in Parkatêjê refers to certain personal characteristics of the nominator. From a semantic perspective, these anthroponyms can be considered denotative or figurative, according to Araújo and Ferreira (2001). Based on this perspective and the analysis of data collected through fieldwork, it was possible to verify specific semantic phenomena in Parkatêjê anthroponyms. Such phenomena, according to the presuppositions of Cultural Semantics and Cognitive Semantics, say a lot about cultural knowledge, values, thoughts, among other aspects that are reflected in that language. The methodology followed in this paper encompasses bibliographic research on indigenous languages and readings on Onomastics and Semantics, as well as ethnographic research with data collection in the Parkatêjê community.

Keywords: onomastics; semantics; Parkatêjê.

Resumo: Este trabalho tem por objetivo apresentar aspectos semânticos observados em antropônimos da língua Parkatêjê. Atualmente o povo Parkatêjê vive em aldeias na Reserva Indígena Mãe Maria (RIMM), às proximidades do município de Marabá. A língua Parkatêjê, denominada do mesmo modo que sua comunidade, filia-se ao Complexo Dialectal Timbira, tronco linguístico Macro-Jê. O estudo dos nomes próprios de diferentes tipologias é o interesse central da disciplina denominada Onomástica, sendo a Antroponímia, isto é, o estudo dos nomes próprios de pessoa, a área da Onomástica em foco neste estudo. De modo geral, no que diz respeito ao conteúdo significativo dos nomes de pessoa em Parkatêjê, é possível verificar que estes se referem a características pessoais do nominador. Da perspectiva semântica, os antropônimos em questão podem ser considerados denotativos ou figurativos, conforme Araújo e Ferreira (2001). Partindo dessa perspectiva e da análise dos dados coletados em campo, foi possível verificar fenômenos semânticos específicos, presentes na constituição dos antropônimos em Parkatêjê. Tais fenômenos, segundo pressupostos da Semântica Cultural e da Semântica Cognitiva, dizem muito a respeito dos conhecimentos culturais, valores, pensamentos, entre outros aspectos que se refletem na língua de um povo. A metodologia utilizada para a feitura deste trabalho consistiu em pesquisa bibliográfica de materiais a respeito de línguas indígenas, onomástica e semântica, além de pesquisa etnográfica com coleta de dados na comunidade da língua em estudo.

Palavras-chave: onomástica; semântica; Parkatêjê.

Received on November 04, 2017

Accepted on December 28, 2017

1 Introduction

The field of study called Onomastics consists of an interdisciplinary area that involves different fields of human knowledge in order to analyze their objects of study: proper names.

The two main areas of interest in Onomastics, according to Seabra (2006), among other authors, are: Anthroponymy and Toponymy. According to the author, Anthroponymy's object of study focuses on individual proper names, family names or surnames, and nicknames, while Toponymy is interested in the study of the motivations behind the proper names of places.

The present study focuses on Anthroponymy, given that our object of study focuses on people's proper names in the Parkatêjê language, spoken by an indigenous people referred to by the same name. The

anthroponyms in Parkatêjê are analyzed here from a semantic perspective, a discipline which receives special attention from onomastic studies and can be defined according to Ullmann (1964, p. 7) as the “study of the meaning of words.”

The transmission and creation of names in Parkatêjê, as well as their semantic uses are also addressed in this article as a means through which to support the preservation of the intangible culture of this Indian tribe.

The discussion presented in the pages that follow are a clipping of a broader study concerning the Parkatêjê anthroponymy. The main theoretical references used to treat this onomastic field of study were: Dick (2000, 2001), Ullmann (1964), Seabra (2006), Carvalhinhos (2007), Eckert (2016), among others. As regards the core semantic questions in this study, the assumptions from Cultural Semantics and Cognitive Semantics were used to conduct this study’s analyses.

This article is structured in the following manner: the first section is made up of this introduction; the second describes the methodology employed in the research; the third presents general considerations about the Parkatêjê language, as well as briefly describes the functioning of the Parkatêjê naming system; the fourth outlines some key questions regarding the onomastic study of these anthroponyms; the fifth addresses, from a semantic perspective, people’s proper names in Parkatêjê and presents discussions pertinent to the semantic phenomena observed in the analyzed data; and lastly, final considerations are made.

2 Metodology

The methodology used to develop this study followed the traditional descriptive linguistic approach, which works with generalizations at the fact level, and ethnographic research, according to the following steps: (i) bibliographic survey regarding the proposed theme; (ii) reading and critical analysis of the surveyed bibliographic references; (iii) fieldwork for data collection: data were collected through interviews, which were filed in both audio and video. All of the data were recorded in the Parkatêjê Indigenous Community by means of questions made directly to the indigenous collaborators. The major part of the data presented in this work was collected in interviews with the then-Chief of the Community, *Krôhókrenhum*, a bilingual speaker of Parkatêjê and

Portuguese, and one of the foremost experts on the linguistic and cultural knowledge of his people. Besides the referred Indian Chief, there were also other native speakers who contributed as collaborators in the present study, including: *Pojarêtetí*, First wife of Chief *Krôhókrenhum*; *Nākôti*, community healer; *Japênprãmti*, nephew of *Krôhókrenhum*; *Jôhapy*, second wife of Chief *Krôhókrenhum*, among others; (iv) transcription and organization of the data: material collected in fieldwork was transcribed in written form, both in Portuguese and Parkatêjê.¹ (v) annotation and morphological segmentation of the data: the data were duly segmented in such a way as to facilitate the employed analyses; however, it was not possible to perform the complete segmentation of all of the obtained data. Thus, some data present only the translation given by the speaker. The information needed for segmentation was not always provided by the speakers, since there are morphemes whose meaning demands greater attention in the description of the language; (vi) semantic analysis of the *corpus* of the research and discussion of the obtained results.

3 The Parkatêjê people: some considerations

The Parkatêjê language is spoken by the Parkatêjê people, who currently live in Indian villages located along the *Reserva Indígena Mãe Maria* (RIMM – Mother Mary Indigenous Reserve, in English), in the surrounding areas of the city of Marabá, Pará, Brazil. According to the data from the community's health clinic, the Parkatêjê Indian village has approximately 627 people (JÕPAIPARE, 2011).

According to Rodrigues (1986), the Parkatêjê language belongs to the Timbira Dialectal Complex, of the Jê family, of the Macro-jê linguistic stock. Also a part of this dialectal complex are such languages as Canela-Krahô, Canela-Apaniêkra, Gavião-Pykobjê, Krinkati, Krênjê, among other languages that present quite similar aspects. These groups share cultural characteristics, such as long hair with a groove around their heads at the level of the bangs; the production of artifacts made from braided straw (baskets, mats, banners); the Indian village is the shape of a large circle in which the houses are placed side by side, with paths leading to the central courtyard; rituals like the log race; and body

¹ The data from the Parkatêjê language from this article were written according to the Parkatêjê spelling proposed by the linguist, Leopoldina Araújo, around 1977.

decoration. However, these groups also present distinctions, among which we can cite the semantic content of the proper names, even though the way the names are transmitted is basically the same.

The Parkatêjê people, as is common among Indian tribes of the Timbira language, have an elaborate system of naming that involves age-old traditional knowledge. The naming system of the Parkatêjê people is directly linked to their kindred. Upon receiving a name, the nominated also potentially receives all the relationships of his/her nominator, that is, that which includes the receiving of his/her blood or marital relations, ritual positions (ritual halves² and their artistic representation in body art), as well as their ceremonial relationships of friendships and potential spouses, who, consequently, will refer to the nominated according to the same terms used by the nominator (COELHO DE SOUZA, 2002).

According to Arnaud (1964), the transmission of proper names in Parkatêjê,

is verified from the brother of the mother (uncle) to the son of the sister (nephew) = (keti – itua) and from the sister of the father (aunt) to the daughter of the brother (niece) = (katuí – itua), preferentially, as well as from the father of the father and of the mother, and the mother of the mother and of the father, to which are applied the same designated names (keti, katuí) (ARNAUD, 1964, p. 4).

This description from Arnaud (1964) agrees with the pattern described by Coelho de Souza (2002) for the Timbira people and has also been confirmed during the fieldwork carried out in the Parkatêjê Indigenous Community, as reported in Lopes (2014).

In the act of naming, the nominator chooses a feature, either positive or negative, of his/her own behavior with which the nominator will name the nominated. In the words of *Króhókrenhum*, traditional Chief of the Parkatêjê tribe, in a study conducted by Araújo and Ferreira (2001): “Every invention that a person invents we already know will give a name to the godchild.”

² The division of tribal members in ritual halves is a feature of the dualistic organizations, such as those represented by the Indian people of the Jê language. In Parkatêjê, for example, as part of the inheritance that the naming provides, the individual, upon receiving a Parkatêjê name, automatically pertains to the same ritual half of his/her nominator, which can be *hák* “hawk” ou *pàn* “parrot”.

In this sense, as Carneiro da Cunha (1986) explains, the name received by a child has no relation to the personal attributes of this child, nor does it intend to designate the child as an individual. According to the author, the name given to a child “is, before, a title, an operator that inserts and classifies him/her in his/her ceremonial life, actually ‘a character’ (...)” (CARNEIRO DA CUNHA, 1986, p. 23).

Moreover, the fact that the nominator gives his/her particular characteristics to the name of the nominated can be interpreted as a way for the former to “eternalize” him/herself in the community, since his/her characteristics will be remembered for generations to come through the very names transmitted to their equals.

Through the considerations presented here about the Parkatêjê people and their naming system, the next section will posit theoretical questions concerning the Onomastic discipline and the study of the so-called anthroponyms

4 The onomastic study of anthroponyms

When speaking about Onomastics, it is pertinent to situate such an area within the studies of language, or, more specifically, within the science of the lexicon. The lexicon is traditionally defined in linguistic studies as a groups of words from a given language. It is through this that one can name and express the universe of a given society through a lexical heritage that reflects the perceptions, experiences, feelings, and ideas of a people.

Biderman (2001) defines the lexicon as a part of the language that represents the extra-linguistic reality, beyond merely conserving the linguistic knowledge of humanity. According to the author, “the lexicon of a natural language can be identified with the vocabulary heritage of a given linguistic community throughout its history” (BIDERMAN, 2001, p.14).

The linguistic science responsible for the study of the lexicon is called Lexicology.³ Biderman (2001) presents the word, the lexical category, and the structuring of the lexicon as essential objects of study and analysis of Lexicology.

³ “From Greek *lexis* <<word>>, *lexicos* <<from or for the words>>” (ULLMANN, 1964, p. 62).

In this sense, Ullmann (1964) affirms that Lexicology, by definition, deals with words and the morphemes that form them, that is, of their significant units. Thus, the lexicological investigation takes into account both the form and the meaning. The author goes on to explain that lexicology, consequently, has two subdivisions: “morphology, the study of the forms of the words and their components, and semantics, the study of their meanings” (ULLMANN, 1964, p. 64).

Dubois *et al.* (1973), by contrast, perceive Lexicology as the scientific study of vocabulary. In this line of thinking, it is possible to understand Onomastics as an integral part of Lexicology, whose main object of study are the proper names of different typologies.

Eckert (2016) explains that the origin of the term Onomastics is related to the Greek form *onoma* (name) and *tékne* (art) which result in the term *onomastiké*, whose meaning is ‘*the art of naming*’. The Greek form was incorporated into Latin as *onomasticon*, which later entered the Portuguese vocabulary as *Onomástica* (or *Onomastics* in English).

Onomastics consists of a discipline that is in constant dialog with other areas of linguistics and human knowledge. Among such areas, we can cite Historical Linguistics, Anthropological Linguistics, Semantics, Logic, and Philosophy of the Language. Regarding the interdisciplinarity required by Onomastics, Zamariano (2012) affirms the following:

A work that is dedicated to the proper name elicits an investigation that is not concluded in a specific discipline, given that it crosses through distinct theoretical fields and the frontiers that, apparently, isolate the fields and are dissolved when faced with the first reflections on this theme (ZAMARIANO, 2012, p. 359).

The aspect of onomastic studies under investigation in this work is that of Anthroponymy, which, according to Dick (2000), is a subsystem of Onomastics, whose interest includes individual names, which distinguish the members of a community, and kinship, which relates the individual to a family group.

The term ‘anthroponym’ has a Greek origin and designates, according to Câmara Jr. (1985), proper nouns with individualizing character that, when applied to people, have the purpose of distinguishing one from another within society.

From this point of view, according to Linhares (2003), the individual name serves for both societal and institutional identification.

He distinguishes one subject from others and recognizes him/her as a citizen within the society as a whole or simply within the family group.

The study of the anthroponyms, among other things, helps to reveal important aspects both from the linguistic and the psychological and/or social points of view. Eckert (2016) affirms that these are the two main perspectives adopted by those scholars who study Anthroponymy.

Regarding the significant function of the proper names in Portuguese, Carvalhinhos (2007) reports that, in remote times, the proper name had its semantic function assured, that is, the individual, designated by his/her name, also received the entire burden of the meaning. The author explains that, due to the dynamic nature of the language, most of the names were emptied of their real etymological meanings, leaving only a shell, which is an opaque form that hides the true meaning of the name.

Today, Western societies present this phenomenon of semantic emptying, especially as regards people's proper names. However, in these same societies, there was a time when the names were not simply attributed by tradition or personal taste, but effectively for a reason.

Guérios (1973) defined some causes that most likely gave origin to many well-known names today. These include: historical, political, and religious influences; circumstances, place, and time of birth; physical particularities or moral qualities; names related to professions; curious or eccentric names.

There are also, generically, linguistic motivations. Carvalhinhos (2007) highlights phonetics, semantics, and morphology. In the words of the researcher:

The first type refers to onomatopoeias, the second to the diversity of meanings, where the decodification depends on the context; *root*, morphologically, is opaque, while the *root of evil* is transparent, as it refers to a self-explained metaphor. The third and last type of motivation recovers words like automobile, in which the constructing elements, *auto* and *mobile*, already have their own meanings (CARVALHINHOS, 2007, p. 14, *author's italics*).

Ullmann (1964) adds that there are cases of words that are both morphologically and semantically motivated. In addition, these two types of motivation have in common the fact that both are “relative”, since they allow one to analyze the words in their elements, but they are unable to explain these same elements.

Among the aforementioned linguistic motivations, the semantic motivation is especially interesting for Onomastics. This is what is linked to the phenomenon of the semantic emptying of the anthroponyms discussed by Carvalhinhos (2007). The author explains that the de-semanticization occurs, for example, by means of a last name originated from a nickname. At the moment of creation, the sign was transparent, but, upon being passed down from generation to generation, the originally perceived meaning was lost.

Dick (2001) affirms that people's proper names are hidden in their lexical-semantic content due to the opacity of the very sign that shapes it, often distanced from its original focus.

In general, what occurs with anthroponyms is similar to what Basílio (1987) claims regarding the regular and stratified forms. For the author:

The problem is a typical situation of the lexicon, that is, the situation in which we have forms constructed of various elements, in which they evolve semantically as a whole, but whose parts remain morphologically unchanged. Consequently, we begin to have forms whose meaning has little or nothing to do with what is expected from the morphological characteristics of construction (BASÍLIO, 1987, p. 23).

For Marcato (2009), there is a great complexity in the semantics of proper names. Thus, it is necessary to study them, also taking into account an extra-linguistic, diachronic, or synchronic perspective.

Given the considerations presented here about the field of study of Onomastics, with emphasis on anthroponymy, we will now move on, in the next section, to discuss the semantic characteristics observed in the analysis of anthroponyms in Parkatêjê, through the approaches of Cultural Semantics and Cognitive Semantics.

5 Semantic analysis of personal names in Parkatêjê

Among the many semantic approaches in the literature on this theme today, Cultural Semantics (CS) and Cognitive Semantics (CogS) provide special contributions for the type of reflections presented here regarding people's proper names in Parkatêjê.

According to Ferrarezi Jr. (2013), CS can be defined as follows:

One aspect of Semantics that studies the *relationship between meanings* attributed to words or other expressions of a language and a *culture* in which this same language is inserted. In a more simplified form, we can say that CS studies the formation and attribution of meanings in the relationship between a language and the culture in which this same language is used (FERRAREZI JR, 2013, p. 71, *author's italics*).

By contrast, CogS is considered, according to Lenz (2013):

[...] an area that does not configure exactly as a single theory, but rather as a conjunction of various approaches that share the same basic principles, with the general aim to investigate the global integrated system of the conceptual structuring of language (LENZ, 2013, p. 35).

CogS considers much more than the linguistic knowledge according to classical theories, since in its analyses it includes nuances of knowledge from the world, experience, perceptions, cultures, etc. (LENZ, 2013).

In this sense, as mentioned above, in general, as regards the meaning content of the personal names in Parkatêjê, it is possible to verify that these refer to the personal characteristics of the nominator, be they positive or negative.

It is important to note that, as regards the indication of gender in the anthroponyms in Parkatêjê, it can be observed that such names can be divided into: exclusively masculine, exclusively feminine, or for both sexes, according to the situational context lived by the godfather or godmother and that inspired them to create a given anthroponym. In this sense, activities or characteristics that, in the Parkatêjê cultural context, are restricted to one sex or to the other generate anthroponyms that are exclusively masculine or exclusively feminine, whereas activities that do not have cultural restrictions between the sexes can be used in names for both sexes.

Araújo and Ferreira (2001) affirm that, from the point of view of content, the proper names in Parkatêjê can be denotative or figurative. From this perspective, we define denotative names as this whose main system of meaning is denotation, while among the names called by the authors in question as figurative are, in general, those that contain metaphors or metonyms.

In this sense, the section below will offer some consideration concerning the anthroponyms of the Parkatêjê language, in an attempt to demonstrate how the cultural values and knowledge of this people are intricate and codified in their language. The following subsections will present examples according to the types of anthroponyms from the perspective of CS and CogS.

5.1 Denotative proper names in Parkatêjê

According to Trask (2004, p. 72), the denotation is “the central meaning of a linguistic form, viewed as a group of things that this form would refer to.”

Ilari (2004) explains, in a simplified manner, the concept of denotation as the effect of meaning through which the words speak “neutrally” of the world, that is, without subjective interventions. In this same line of thinking, Luft (2002) affirms that the denotation refers to the basic meaning of the words, disassociated from individual abstractions.

Taking this into account, below are some examples of proper names considered denotative in Parkatêjê:⁴

- 1) Krapyxitire ‘A Child’
Kra pyxiti re
Child one Dim

‘*Krapyxitire*’ is na anthroponym given by a nominator that has only one child.

- 2) Kãmtaihôprãmre ‘likes to write’
Kãmtaihô prãm re
Write likes to Dim

‘*Kãmtaihôprãmre*’ is an anthroponym transmitted by a nominator who has a personal characteristic of liking to write.

⁴ Some abbreviations were used in the data analysis, as follows: Aum = augmentative; Dim = diminutive; Neg = negation; Intens = intensifier.

- 3) Kôkupati ‘is afraid of water’
Kô kupati
Water is afraid

‘*Kôkupati*’ is an anthroponym transmitted by a nominator who has a personal characteristic of being afraid of water.

- 4) Têkikupati ‘is afraid to shoot an arrow’
Têki kupati
Arrow is afraid of

‘*Têkikupati*’ is a an nthropopnym given by a nominator that is afraid to shoot an arrow.

- 5) Awÿinõre ‘do not ask’
Awÿi nõ re
Ask Neg Dim

‘*Awÿinõre*’ is an anthroponym transmitted by a nominator who rarely asks for anything from anyone, which is one of his/her main characteristics.

In examples 1 to 5, it is possible to observe that the personal names presented here have transparent meanings, that is, they do not present figurative meanings and are thus considered denotative anthroponyms in Parkatêjê. This type of anthroponym occurs widely in Parkatêjê, and is even the most common way to create proper names in the language.

5.2 Figurative proper names in Parkatêjê: metaphoric and metonymic

Among the proper names considered to be figurative in Parkatêjê are those that are constituted as expressions with a metaphoric or metonymic value. Before presenting the data that illustrate the semantic phenomenon in question here, it is essential to present a brief review of these concepts.

As regards metaphors, Ullmann (1964) affirms that its utmost importance as a creative force in the language has always been recognized by scholars throughout the centuries. According to the author:

The metaphor is so intimately linked to the texture of human speech that we find it within a wide range of aspects: as a primordial factor of motivation, as an artifice of expression, as an escape to intense emotions, as a way to fill in blanks in vocabulary, and in many other roles (ULLMANN, 1964, p. 442).

In general, according to Ullman (1964), the basic structure of the metaphor presents two essential terms: the thing that we are talking about and that to which we are comparing it.

The definition presented by Trask (2004, p. 190) affirms that a metaphor is “the non-literal use of a linguistic form, used as a resource to call attention to a perceived similarity,” in this case, between one entity and another.

However, authors such as Lakoff and Johnson (1980) present a slightly different conception than those previously presented about metaphors. For these authors, the metaphors should not only be understood as a rhetorical figure responsible for the decoration of the language. Lakoff and Johnson (1980) propose a new point of view, according to which the metaphor should be understood as something present in our daily routine, but without being limited to the linguistic environment. The basic theory of Lakoff and Johnson (1980) about metaphors is that they allow us to interpret abstract concepts in terms of concepts that are familiar to us and come from everyday cognitive experiences. According to the authors, the human conceptual system is metaphoric by nature, since it is interwoven with the manner in which we think and act.

Ferrarezi Jr. (2012) affirms that the metaphor presents a structuring property in relation to the cultural organization of the world, that is, as the world is seen and interpreted by the speakers of a specific language. Such a proposal corroborates the idea of the influence of the metaphor in one's comprehension of the world.

According to Ferrarezi Jr. (2010), when a naming metaphor plays a clear role of cultural register, it can be called the *functional metaphor*. Such a perspective seems to be quite interesting for the analysis of some anthroponyms in Parkatêjê, when constructed in a metaphoric manner.

According to Ferrarezi Jr. (2010), one functional metaphor can be defined as:

a figurative construction in which the metaphorically constructed word presents a clear function of cultural deposit, a function of register of some type of knowledge resulting from lived experiences from this same community that attributes this metaphoric name to a referent (FERRAREZI JR., 2010, p. 198).

The metaphor can be considered a type of linguistic construction that allows for the attribution of a constructed meaning within a cultural paradigm of another word which, in its customary meaning, employed by a community of speakers, belongs to another cultural paradigm. For example, when someone calls a man a “bull”, this person is transferring meanings to the cultural paradigm to another, in this case, from the “animal” to the “people” paradigm, in an attempt to illustrate the man’s physical force (FERRAREZI JR., 2012).

In this manner, according to Ferrarezi Jr. (2012), a metaphoric construction can only be defined as such within a given culture, since each culture has different semantic classifications. Moreover, the author stresses that the metaphor, in the majority of languages, is not necessarily formulated as a lexically complex construction, nor mandatorily multi-vocabulary or with some esthetic, poetic-like treatment. To the contrary, most of the metaphors present in a language materialize in words from daily use, for example, names of day-to-day things, proper names of people, or names in the form of nicknames.

The use of the concept of “functional metaphor”, specifically, according to Ferrarezi Jr. (2012), appears due to a construction with a much more specific function of formation and perpetuation of a culture. In other words, such constructions carry important historical-cultural knowledge that needs to be preserved.

One example of a name found in Brazil that can be considered a functional metaphor, according to Ferrarezi Jr. (2012), is the form “trava-ventre” (in English, “close off the belly”), used by many *caboclos* (mixture of Brazilian Indian and European blood) in some regions of Brazil, to call the Guava Tree. The author explains that the form “trava-ventre” is a complex construction, fruit of an extra-linguistic experience of the speaker from the countryside who, often distant from “pharmaceutical medicines”, registers information that goes beyond the

usual form of the linguistic representation of the referent. Likewise, in some regions of Brazil, there is a plant called “quebra-pedra” (“rock-breaker”), recommended to treat kidney problems.

In this sense, both the “common” metaphor, as well as the functional metaphor are ways of registering cultural information and that involving the categorization of the world. Nevertheless, the second goes beyond and allows for the register of broader, more complex, and more historical information, which is the result of knowledge from a specific community and with the purpose of the perpetuation of knowledge (FERRAREZI JR., 2012).

In Parkatêjê, among the anthroponyms grouped together for analysis in this article, we also found names constructed through interesting metaphors that carry within themselves information relevant to the conception of the world of these people. Such metaphorically constructed names carry knowledge that can be lost in future generations, in such a way as to become obscure names due to the accelerated state of obsolescence of the Parkatêjê language and culture.

Below are some examples of anthroponyms metaphorically constructed in Parkatêjê:

- 6) Ropkukuti ‘hunter lit. ‘jaguar eater’ ou ‘hornets’

The nominator of the ‘*Ropkukuti*’ anthroponym attributes to the nominated his/her characteristic of the ‘good hunter’, since this personal name is made up of a name (*rop* ‘jaguar’) and by an action verb (*kuku* ‘eat’), whose literal meaning would be ‘jaguar eater’. Considering that, to eat a jaguar, one needs to confront it and hunt it, thus one can understand by the application of the meaning of the linguistic sign that it refers to the “good hunter”. Nonetheless, beyond this interpretation, we have two semantic phenomena that overlap in this case. One of these is the polysemy, since ‘*ropkukuti*’ is also the designation of a type of hornet that, according to the research collaborators, is a jaguar hunter.

Upon having the name ‘*ropkukuti*’, designating the hornet, in comparison to its ability to hunt that is similar to the jaguar and, consequently, the anthroponym ‘*Ropkukuti*’ indicates that he is a hunter, thus verifying the occurrence of the metaphor.

- 7) *Rahônti* ‘responds in kind, if provoked; pay back, react immediately’ lit. ‘hornet’

In the same manner, ‘*Rahônti*’ is the name given by a nominator who usually “pays back” or “responds in kind” when faced with specific circumstances. Such a name also originally belongs to another species of hornet known among the Parkatêjê for its characteristic of, if touched, stinging the individual mercilessly. The metaphor is precisely constructed due to the association of the name with the main characteristics of the hornet in question.

- 8) *Hàkti* ‘Hunter’ lit. ‘hawk’

‘*Hàkti*’ is also one of the possible names given by a nominator considered to be a good hunter. ‘*Hàk*’ literally means ‘hawk’ in Parkatêjê, in such a way that the meaning constructed for the name ‘*Hàkti*’ is precisely given because of one of the main characteristics of a hawk.

- 9) *Krÿiti* ‘eats slowly’ lit. ‘parrot’

The anthroponym above refers to the characteristic of the nominator, “eats slowly”, through a metaphor related to the typical way that a parrot eats.

- 10) *Pàrhyti* ‘bad for others’ lit. ‘pepper’

‘*Pàrhyti*’ is a name given by a nominator that has the characteristic of “being bad to other people”. In the words of the Indians, such a person is “as bad as pepper”.

- 11) *Kwÿkjê* ‘Midwife who pulls her companion’ lit. ‘pull the afterbirth’

Kwÿ *kjê*
companion/ pull
afterbirth

‘*Kwÿkjê*’ is the name given by a nominator who at the time in which the birth of a child was performed pulled the afterbirth out. In this case, the name referring to the ‘afterbirth’ is the same whose meaning is

‘companion’, in such a way that, for the Parkatêjê Indians, the afterbirth is “the child’s companion”. Carneiro da Cunha (1986) also affirms that this same conception of ‘afterbirth’ as ‘the child’s companion’ is also observed among the Krahó Indians. Furthermore, ‘kwy’ seems to be a polysemic term in Parkatêjê, since in other contexts it can mean ‘people’ or ‘relative’.

12) Krekràti ‘woman who has no children’ lit. ‘dry hole’

Kre krà ti
Dry hole Aum

The data above is an anthroponym given by a nominator who cannot have children. The association made with “dry hole” reminds one of the Western concept that also considers women who cannot get pregnant as “dry women”.

13) Kurêkti ‘killer lit. ‘drill’

kurêk ti
drill Intens

In ‘*Kurêkti*’ it is possible to observe that such an anthroponym in its literal meaning expresses the idea of something like a “drill” in relation to a nominator whose characteristic is to be a “killer”, that is, “he who drills to kill”. In this sense, we understand that the verb “drill” seems to be a type of synonym for ‘to kill’ due to the use of an arrow.

As regards metonymy, in general, this semantic process is traditionally defined in the literature about the theme as a displacement of meaning, in which a word usually used to designate an entity begins to designate another.

The classic studies, in general, do not give the same importance to metonymy that is dedicated to metaphors. Ullmann (1964, p. 454) affirms that the metonym is intrinsically less interesting than the metaphor, since, according to the author, it “[...] does not discover new relationships and appears only among words that are already interrelated”.

More recently, the metonym has gained space in language studies, especially as regards the contributions stemming from Cognitive Linguistics. Lakoff and Johnson (1980) affirm that, while the metaphor is a means through which to conceive one thing in terms of another, with

the primary function of understanding/comprehending, the metonym has a referential function, that is, it allows us to use one entity to represent another.

For Lakoff and Johnson (1980), both the metaphor and the metonym are cognitive processes that differ through the number of domains each one has, since the metaphor has the presence of two distinct domains, while the metonym has only one.

Taking this into account, the perspective of Lakoff and Johnson (1980) contemplates the traditional notion of the metonym in the sense that relationships, such as part/whole, material/object, cause/effect, etc., are relations that occur in a single domain.

Below are some examples of anthroponyms in Parkatêjê constituted by metonymy:

- 14) Kreixàre ‘always with a stomach ache’ lit. ‘intestinal pain’

Krei xà re

Intestinal pain Dim

The nominator of the above anthroponym constantly had stomach aches. As can be seen in the data in question, there is a kind of part/whole relationship, when constructing the name, upon using the generic term of ‘intestine’ to indicate a ‘stomach ache’

- 15) Purkôre ‘plant in the rain’ lit. ‘wet countryside’

Pur kô re

Wet countryside Dim

The above anthroponym was given by a nominator who used to plant in the countryside while it was raining. In this case, it is possible to observe that the activity ‘to plant’ is substituted by the place where one plants, that is, the ‘countryside’.

Given the examples highlighted in this subsection, it is possible to perceive how the environment, the cultural knowledge, and the experiences of the speakers favor the articulation of metaphoric and metonymic construction in the anthroponyms of the Parkatêjê language.

The next section will explain another semantic phenomenon observed in the analysis of the data in Parkatêjê: the linguistic taboo.

5.3 Linguistic taboo: analysis of a Parkatêjê anthroponym

Given the corpus of the analyzed anthroponyms from the Parkatêjê language, one stood out, as it presents a linguistic change resulting from a type of linguistic taboo.

According to Viaro (2014), the linguistic taboo is a scarcely studied phenomenon but that has called the attention of linguists, especially in the mid-twentieth century.

According to Ullmann (1964), the taboos of language can be divided into three somewhat distinct groups. These are:

- a. Taboo of fear: taboos imposed upon names related to supernatural beings, mainly due to the fright caused by such entities;
- b. Taboo of delicacy: this is a type of taboo created from the general human tendency to avoid direct references to unpleasant issues, such as diseases, death, physical defects, names related to criminal acts, etc.;
- c. Taboo of decency: the three largest spheres affected by this type of taboo are gender, certain body parts and functions, and oaths.

The Parkatêjê anthroponym that will be analyzed here can be framed within the so-called taboos of decency depicted in letter 'c'.

In this respect, it is important here to contextualize the anthroponym in question. First, in the data collection during fieldwork, the indigenous collaborator provided the following anthroponym and translation:

- 16) Totore 'who only eats the animal's rear end'

According to Indian who reported the above term, such a name was given by a nominator who liked to eat the rear end of the animals. However, when we tried, together with the research collaborator, to better understand the morphological and semantic construction of the anthroponym in question, we found out that, in fact, the name should be the following:

Tokrere ‘who only eats the animal’s rear end’

Tokre re

Rear end Dim

In this case, according to what the indigenous collaborator informed us, to not say, ‘*tokre*’, literally ‘ass’, the name was changed to ‘*Totore*’, in such a way as to avoid any type of embarrassment for the person who received such a name.

As can be observed, the base ‘*tokre*’ underwent a change in its structure, in such a way that the initial syllable was doubled. Viaro (2014) reports that, generally, words related to physiological excrements, sexual acts, or parts of the body involved in these actions commonly undergo changes of this nature due to taboos, as appears to be the case with the anthroponym presented here.

Although the relationship of indigenous people with physiological or bodily questions is quite distinct from the perspectives and ways of conceiving such aspects in other cultures, it is possible that someone who has received the name of a body part, like ‘ass’, may become the target of jokes or tongue-in-cheek pranks, which are quite common in the everyday lives of innumerable human communities. Hence the “taboo”.

Regarding some of the consequences provoked by a linguistic taboo, Viaro (2014) affirms that:

[...] the taboo can cause a drastic rupture in the history of a word, making etymological research nearly impossible. These changes depend only on an internal agreement, rarely documented, in the heart of the community of speakers. Once the original name has been forgotten throughout the generations, it is possible to imagine the difficulty the etymologist must face when surprised by the results of this phenomenon (VIARO, 2014, p. 294).

The same difficulty reported above for etymologists is also faced by many scholars of semantics and linguistics who study the linguistic taboo, since such a phenomenon often makes it impossible to reconstruct or simply know the etymological root of a word.

6 Final Considerations

This article addressed semantic aspects observed in the analysis of anthroponyms from the Parkatêjê language. Given the literature presented about the discussed phenomena and the data analysis, it was possible to forge considerations that demonstrate how onomastic and semantic aspects present properties related to cultural organization and the world views of the speakers of the Parkatêjê language.

Based on the observation of the data and in presumptions from Cognitive Linguistics and Cultural Linguistics, the Parkatêjê anthroponyms were divided, in accordance with Araújo and Ferreira (2001), into denotative and figurative. The anthroponyms considered denotative are those whose main meaning system is that of denotation, while the figurative anthroponyms are, in general, those considered to be metaphoric or metonymic. The meaning content of people's proper names refers to the personal characteristics of the individual who transmits the anthroponym. Another semantic phenomenon observed within the corpus of research and discussed in this study was that of the linguistic taboo, in which the analyzed case was classified based on the literature on the theme, such as the taboo of decency.

This study reaffirms that the Parkatêjê onomastic system, with all of its linguistic and cultural wealth, codifies values and principles that guide and identify the ways of life and the traditional knowledge of this people, as well as the properties related to the social organization and world view of Parkatêjê speakers.

Linguistic/Cultural investigations of languages like the Parkatêjê, which faces a serious risk of disappearing, are of utmost importance for the preservation and recovery of all of the cultural and scientific richness that the languages carry with them, since, as Seki (2007, p. 17) claims: "the loss of a language implies the loss of a culture and of a knowledge of a world to which it is directly linked."

The documentation of cultural knowledge and traditions, such as those contained and involved in the Parkatêjê onomastic system, also strengthen the identity question of a minority population. This refers to the safeguarding of an intangible heritage contained in the knowledge and memory of the Parkatêjê people.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank the Parkatêjê Indigenous Community for their kind embracement during these years of study, especially to Chief *Krôhokrenhũm* (*in memoriam*), for his example of generosity, wisdom, and leadership that he left to all those who had the honor of living with and learning from him. We also wish to thank CNPq for their Research Productivity Grant awarded to our advisor and to CAPES for their Masters Degree Grant.

References

ARAÚJO, L.; FERREIRA, M. *Nomes de pessoa em Parkatêjê*. Uberlândia: UFU, 2001. 10p. Available at: <<http://biblioteca.funai.gov.br/media/pdf/folheto48/FO-CX-48-3078-2003.PDF>>. Retrieved on: 17 fev. 2017.

ARNAUD, E. A terminologia de parentesco dos índios Gaviões de Oeste (Parkateyê): Tocantins, Pará. *Boletim do Museu Paraense Emílio Goeldi*, Belém, v. 20, p. 1-35, 1964.

BASILIO, M. *Teoria Lexical*. São Paulo: Ática, 1987.

BIDERMAN, M. T. C. As ciências do léxico. In: OLIVEIRA, A. M. P. P.; ISQUERDOV, A. N. (Org.). *As Ciências do léxico: lexicologia, lexicografia, terminologia*. Campo Grande, MS: Ed. UFMS, 2001. p.13-22.

CÂMARA JR., J. M. *Dicionário de Linguística e Gramática*. Petrópolis: Vozes, 1985.

CARNEIRO DA CUNHA, M. *Antropologia do Brasil*. São Paulo: Brasiliense, 1986.

CARVALHINHOS, P. J. As origens dos nomes de pessoas. *Revista Domínios da Linguagem*, Uberlândia, Ano 1, n. 1, p. 1-18. 2007. Available at: <www.seer.ufu.br>. Retrieved on: 29 de jan. 2017.

COELHO DE SOUZA, M. *O traço e o círculo: o conceito de parentesco entre os Jê e seus antropólogos*. 2002. 668 f. Tese (Doutorado) - Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro, Rio de Janeiro, 2002.

DICK, M. V. P. A. A Investigação Linguística na Onomástica Brasileira. In: GÄRTNER, Ebehard (Ed.). *Estudos de Gramática Portuguesa III*. Frankfurt am Main: TFM, 2000. v. III, p. 217-240.

DICK, M. V. P. A. O sistema onomástico: bases lexicais e terminológicas, produção e frequência. In: OLIVEIRA, A. M. P. P.; ISQUERDO, A. N. (Org.). *As ciências do léxico: lexicológica, lexicografia, terminologia*. 2. ed. Campo Grande: Editora UFMS, 2001. p. 79-90.

DUBOIS, J. *et al. Dicionário de Linguística*. São Paulo: Cultrix, 1973.

ECKERT, K. Os sobrenomes dos alunos do IFRS campus Bento Gonçalves: um estudo onomástico. *Revista Domínios da Linguagem*, Uberlândia, v. 10, n. 1, p. 46-66, 2016. Disponível em <www.seer.ufu.br>. Acesso em: 10 abr. 2017.

FERRAREZI JR., C. *Introdução à semântica de contextos e cenários: de la langue à la vie*. Campinas: Mercado de Letras, 2010.

FERRAREZI JR., C. Metáfora e função de registro: a visão de mundo do falante e sua interferência nas línguas naturais. *Revista Linha D'água*, São Paulo, n. 25, p. 67-82, 2012. Available at: <<http://www.revistas.usp.br/linhadagua/article/view/37368>> Retrieved on: 29 jun. 2016.

FERRAREZI JR., C. Semântica cultural. In: FERRAREZI JR. C.; BASSO, R. (Org.). *Semântica, semânticas: uma introdução*. São Paulo: Contexto, 2013. p. 71-87.

GUÉRIOS, R. F. M. *Dicionário etimológico de nomes e sobrenomes*. 2. ed. São Paulo: Ave Maria, 1973.

ILARI, R. *Introdução à semântica: brincando com a gramática*. 5. ed. São Paulo: Contexto, 2004.

JÕPAIPARE, T. K. *Me ikwýtejkê ri: isto pertence ao meu povo*. 1. ed. Marabá, PA: Gknoronha, 2011.

LAKOFF, G.; JOHNSON, M. *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago; London: The University of Chicago, 1980.

LENZ, P. Semântica cognitiva. In: FERRAREZI JR. C.; BASSO, R. (Org.). *Semântica, semânticas: uma introdução*. São Paulo: Contexto, 2013. p. 31-55.

LINHARES, A. J. P. *Tendências da Antroponímia Brasileira recente: um estudo da cidade de Belém*. 2003. Dissertação (Mestrado) – Universidade Federal do Pará, Belém, 2003.

LOPES, T. T. C. *Aspectos morfológicos de termos de parentesco em Parkatêjê*. 2014. Trabalho de Conclusão de Curso (Graduação) – Faculdade de Letras, Universidade Federal do Pará, Belém, 2014.

LUFT, C. P. *Moderna gramática brasileira*. 2. ed. rev. e atual. São Paulo: Globo, 2002.

MARCATO, C. *Nomi di persona, nomi di luogo: introduzione all'onomastica italiana*. Bologna: il Mulino, 2009.

RODRIGUES, A. D. *Línguas brasileiras: para o conhecimento das línguas indígenas*. São Paulo: Loyola, 1986.

SEABRA, M. C. T. C. de. Referência e onomástica. In: *Múltiplas perspectivas em linguística*: In: SIMPÓSIO NACIONAL E I SIMPÓSIO INTERNACIONAL DE LETRAS E LINGUÍSTICA (SILEL), XI., 2006, Uberlândia. *Anais...* Uberlândia: ILEEL, 2006. p. 1953-1960. Available at: <http://www.filologia.org.br/ileel/artigos/artigo_442.pdf>. Retrieved on: 1 out. 2014.

SEKI, L. Apresentação. In: PAULA, A. S. de. *A língua dos índios Yawanawá do Acre*. Maceió: EDDUFAL, 2007. p. 17.

TRASK, R. L. *Dicionário de linguagem e linguística*. São Paulo: Contexto, 2004.

ULLMANN, S. *Semântica: uma introdução à ciência do significado*. Lisboa: Fundação Calouste Gulbenkian, 1964.

VIARO, M. E. *Etimologia*. São Paulo: Contexto, 2014.

ZAMARIANO, M. Reflexões sobre a questão do nome próprio na toponímia. *Cadernos de Letras da UFF – Dossiê América Central e Caribe: múltiplos olhares*, Uberlândia, n. 45, p. 351-372, 2012.