

2 Glocal Languages Beyond Post-Colonialism

The Metaphorical North and South in the Geographical North and South

Manuela Guilherme

Metodicamente o explorador examinou com o olhar a barriguita do menor ser humano maduro. Foi neste instante que o explorador, pela primeira vez desde que a conheceu, em vez de sentir curiosidade ou exaltação ou vitória ou espírito científico, o explorador sentiu mal-estar.

É que a menor mulher do mundo estava rindo.

(Methodically, the explorer looked at the belly of the smallest adult human being. It was in this moment, for the first time since he had met her that he, instead of feeling curiosity or excitement or victory or scientific interest, felt discomfort.)

The smallest woman in the world was laughing. [my translation]

Clarice Lispector, *A menor mulher do mundo* (1920–1977)

Language, Nationality and Coloniality

Language official status has been awarded by nation-statehood since the idealisation of this political entity, the nation-state, in France and its first accomplishment in the United States of America, although the latter has never had an official language per se. The expansion of this political model—the nation-state—all over the world mainly resulted from the independence of previous colonies that, after all, tended to reproduce the political model of the colonial power. Hence, it becomes clear that the end of colonialism, in political terms, did not mean the end of coloniality, in epistemological and cultural terms (Quijano 2000, Grosfoguel 2007), and, therefore, language status in the new global era still replicates the hierarchies previously established in modern and colonial times. In addition, at the intra-national level, the link between the nation and the state has been mutually reinforced through the national language and the national system of education. ‘Glocal languages’ are not necessarily national languages, although most languages that have become global across the Atlantic Ocean, which is our focus here—besides the Pacific and

the Indian oceans—were originally and have become national languages. However, there were indigenous languages, before and during colonisation, that covered immense regions, although they have not crossed the oceans unless by immigration, for example, in South America, Central America, China and India, and which have resisted or survived external colonisation and internal nation-statehood, even though in residual circumstances in some cases.

At the international level, on the one hand, elite multilingualism, leading to elite cosmopolitanism, has been composed by linguistic and cultural literacy in distinct national languages whose value is ensured by their power in the global economy and finance, business and politics, while deficit multilingualism brings in the so-called minority-in-power languages, those which have survived both colonialism and coloniality across times and spaces (Guilherme 2007). Such a divide mirrors what Mignolo calls “*the geo-politics of epistemology*” to describe “the uneven distribution of knowledge” (2005: 44), not that knowledge is unevenly distributed in the world but, instead, he is talking about the uneven distribution of epistemological recognition, across the ‘abyssal line’ as identified by Sousa Santos (2001, 2007, 2014). According to Sousa Santos, such “abyssal thinking . . . consists of a system of visible and invisible distinctions, the invisible ones being the foundation of the visible ones” (2007: 45) in such a way that the former, the invisible, not only supports the latter, the visible, but also gives it the strength of the unquestionable. Such a power system is also expressed, extrinsically, in the relations between distinct languages, as discrete entities, as well as, intrinsically, in the hierarchy of linguistic registers and, finally and more subtly, in the cosmopolitan translanguaging, the hypothesis offered more recently by several authors to be discussed below.

The North and the South—Geography and Metaphor

Hence, the idea of plurilingualism, together with the concept of multilingualism, does not only entail an enticing promise of harmony but also evidences the impact of world multiple stratifications whose focus here lies on the North-South metaphor (Sousa Santos 2014) that determines the power relations between peoples, languages, cultures and epistemologies across the Atlantic, namely between and within the Americas, Europe and Africa both in the inter- as well as in the intra-national contexts. As Mignolo puts it, “Theories travelling from the South have the colonial difference inscribed in their luggage” (2000: 183), however, this can also be understood as a metaphorical South that can be found in the globalised societies of both the geographical north and south. The different perceptions of plurilingualism and multilingualism and of the various statuses of plurilingual or multilingual individuals or communities are relative to each social, cultural, political and epistemological context,

and corresponding global capital and are not necessarily numerically determined, that is, by the number of languages one speaks/writes or are spoken/written in a community. Instead, different perceptions of plurilingualism are determined by their status and the power relations between the languages, as entangled with the epistemological distinctiveness of the context that underlies the predominant notion of language and culture in there. It is within this context that we place 'glocal languages', meaning a context where languages and cultures cohabit with each other, at different stages, in complex tugs-of-war, whose motivations are not innocent or disinterested and whose results are never definitive.

This understanding requires a different perspective of difference that reminds me of a reflection made by Souza about "the indigenous philosophy of perspectivism", on accounts of his experience, within the scope of a literacy programme, with the Kashinawa people of Amazonia, where he concludes that, in their world: "Difference is qualitative and not quantitative, contextual and never decontextualized" (2007: 160). Thus inspired, difference between distinct conceptions of plurilingualism and multilingualism is then more of a qualitative nature, depending on the languages and cultures involved, rather than to be merely describable in a quantitative manner. Here Souza is inspired by Castro, a Brazilian anthropologist, who argues that, for an indigenous philosophy of perspectivism that he generalises as 'Amerindian cosmologies', "personhood and 'perspectivity'—the capacity to occupy a point of view—is a question of degree and context rather than an absolute, diacritical property of particular species" (2004: 470). The world view of 'Amerindian cosmology', according to Castro, unsettles the order and the rationality established by European modernity for which difference is but dichotomous and can be countable. Souza then elaborates on indigenous perspectivism for the purpose of critical linguistic and intercultural literacy supported by Castro, who explains that "Amerindian myths speak of a state of being where self and other interpenetrate, submerged in the same immanent, presubjective and preobjective milieu" (464). Both argue that there other possible 'perspectives' rather than that of one independent Self and one independent Other and, furthermore, that such 'perspectives' are not only synchronic but also diachronic, not only material but also spiritual.

Plural Multilingualism or Plural Monolingualism?

It is important to understand that concepts, although reaching a universal conceptual dimension and common features in practice, such as plurilingualism and multilingualism that exist in many languages, are, at the same time, embedded in particular languages and cultures that do not flow apart from each other or remain enclosed within themselves. Languages indeed follow their lives, even migrate, but neither do languages and cultures become a hybrid mishmash when in contact, nor do they simply or

totally transcend themselves of themselves, as language and as culture, unless viewed from the perspective of a mythical centre. This can be the case of some theories that have attempted to describe language and culture, in general, as following the waves of hegemonic globalisation and to focus on diversity from where the flow ends and not from where the flow starts. This can be the case of English as a Lingua Franca (ELF), that for some reason only goes for the English language, and of some extreme perceptions of 'translanguaging' and 'transculturalism'.

Neither this book, nor this chapter, are only about English teaching; on the contrary, they aim to provide a view of some languages and cultures (teaching/learning of Portuguese, English, Spanish and indigenous languages) from a decolonial South-North perspective—in Latin America, that is, from a particular *locus of enunciation*, Brazil, despite the fact that data collected cannot be considered as representative of the general language education landscape in that immense territory. Nevertheless, it is relevant to give beforehand some account of the idea of ELF, since this terminology is gaining some ground in all the 'circles' identified by Kachru, in a way that the 'inner circle' feels relieved that the 'expanding circle' is designated as speaking a *lingua franca*, not English *stricto sensu*, while the 'expanding circle' feels compensated for the fact and legitimated. No matter how un-proficiently in English a native-speaker can perform, s/he will not be allowed in the ELF club, whereas a highly proficient non-native communicator remains qualified as an ELF performer by the ELF supporters themselves. Such a divide between native and non-native English performers is too simplistic and, furthermore, ends up validating this divide and supporting corresponding bias even among non-native speakers themselves who will certainly assume any other arbitrary and immediate criteria for that discriminatory purpose. Moreover, academic arguments for ELF have been published in native-like linguistic proficiency of the 'inner circle' and far from the ELF it proclaims.

While the argument for EFL aims for plural monolingualism, the argument in this chapter suggests plural multilingualism through the possibility to look at languages and cultures from a 'glocal' point of view that encompasses plural *loci of enunciation* for the same language, both through its own experience in different *loci of enunciation* and with other languages in the same *locus of enunciation*. Therefore, this 'glocal' position calls for *fortis lingui* in the plural, not for a *lingua franca* in the singular. Finally, there is no such thing as a *lingua franca* at all, since every language is loaded with heavy luggage, the more powerful and dominant the less free the zone is. Not that the role of English has not been important in circumstances of world communication, in those of advantage and in those of disadvantage, however, it must be subject to everyday negotiation with other languages since there is no one language that is sufficient to describe the whole world (Guilherme 2018). The concept of *lingua franca* is itself acritical, if not uncritical, because it does not entail

critical reflection upon power issues at the deeper layers of communication, instead it targets the superficial and apparent achievements of communication, the top of the iceberg only. Moreover, this is an issue of a North-centric English-speaking elite, both native and non-native, not an issue for most English speakers or relevant for the rest of the population in the world.

Jenkins calls English “the primary global multilingua franca”, supported by terminology such as Canagarajah’s ‘plurilingual English’ and Pennycook’s ‘translingua franca English’, while admitting that until recently “multilingualism has on the whole been restricted to underdeveloped references to ELF’s multilingual nature”, therefore, she “finally decided the time had come to work on a reconceptualization of ELF in relation to multilingualism” (2018: 68–76). In this excerpt, Jenkins justifies the interest ELF research work should take in the multilingual background of ELF speakers by condemning the fact that “the learning of additional languages therefore is the learning of their monolingual versions” and by emphasising the need to pay attention to the multilingual nature of ELF speakers and resorting to “ELF users’ multilingual resources”. As I see it, ELF’s multilingualism appears to reside in some kind of linguistic Darwinism, where the stronger grow at the expense of the weaker, and not through some ecologically sustainable development that includes reciprocity and mutual negotiation of permeable linguistic units. The latter, nonetheless, remain as independent, both subjective and objective, entities capable to take decisions at every step without being dispersed in some apparently non-ruled world where the weaker will finally perish. ELF supporters are therefore seeking support in ‘translanguaging’ and ‘transcultural’ theories that have, to a larger or shorter extent, been questioning the existence of languages as discrete systems. From this point of view, ELF carries, in its hubris, the danger of uncritically reinforcing the idea of English as an ambiguous and haunting “Hydra” (Bunce et al. 2016). Indeed, education both in the English language and in the other languages with which it has to negotiate life in this complex world deserve profound disquiet, vigilance and prudence, and that one dives into the deep waters to watch the lower levels of the iceberg.

Globality and Locality Across Synchronicity and Diachronicity

Blommaert highlighted the importance of the relationship between text and context when he wrote his critical introduction to discourse. In this regard, he discussed the conceptualisation, dynamics and implications between each other, namely amongst ‘context’, ‘contextualisation’ and ‘entextualisation’, whose discussion adds to the argument of this chapter. The author, to start with, argues that “context is local as well

as translocal” (2005: 45) and, in order to clarify the intrinsic dynamics of the notion of ‘context’, in its discursive (trans)locality, he ties it up with ‘contextualisation’ which he describes as ‘not unproblematic’ as “all kinds of things can go dramatically wrong” (*ibid.*: 42). And this is where we get to the nitty-gritty of the problem, all kinds of things can indeed go wrong, or right to be positive, for a number of reasons beyond individual deliberation. However, “Context and contextualisation are dialogical phenomena” (43) and discourse cannot happen but in the process of such a contextualising endeavour, to which another concept concurs, that of ‘entextualisation’ which “refers to the process by means of which discourses are successively or simultaneously decontextualized and metadiscursively recontextualised” (47). Since context always involves constraints, discourse happens within “the interplay between creativity and determination that accounts for . . . the connection between agency and structure, or micro-events and macro-relations and patterns in society” (99). In this book, Blommaert widens the scope of his understanding of context, that he seems to narrow later in his work when he concentrates more on ‘superdiversity’ and ‘translanguaging’, to be discussed below.

Still in his critique of ‘Critical Discourse Analysis’ (CDA), Blommaert calls for a ‘higher-level of situatedness’ that is “large, general, supra-individual, typical, structural, and higher than the single society” (2005: 67), however, he later narrows this scope to the ‘here’ and ‘now’, aiming at a sociolinguistics restricted to a globalised urban space. In this respect, Pavlenko and Mullen (2015) give his work as an example of the lack of ‘diachronicity’ in current studies of ‘linguistic landscapes’ and claim that “the interpretation of signs is intrinsically linked to the preceding signs and to related signs elsewhere and is thus diachronic in nature” (114) and only then do such studies “examine linguistic landscapes as a site of social, political and economic changes” (129). Although Blommaert contested this critique elsewhere (2016), by reminding that his ethnographical studies target “traces of multimodal communicative practices within a socio-politically structured field which is historically configured” (2), both discussions about ‘context’ and ‘diachronicity’, as well as about ‘synchronicity’, add to the argument of ‘glocal languages’. This concept is located at the crossings of ‘synchronicity’, of ‘here’ and ‘now’, with ‘diachronicity’, of ‘there’ and ‘then’, therefore, across multiple spaces and times, since ‘glocal languages’ evolve simultaneously either in large regions or across the oceans and have been developed across different historical moments, contexts and geographies. In any way, they have survived, expanded and dominated other languages and have been dominated, and eventually remain in close relations with other languages, being ‘contextualised’, ‘recontextualised’ and ‘entextualised’ in social, cultural and political sites, both at home and abroad, in different spaces and times. They have been ‘territorialised’, ‘reterritorialised’ and

'deterritorialised', both at home and abroad, in play with different social, political and cultural events.

Superdiversity Requires Superdemocracy

Blommaert adopted the description of 'superdiversity' for the context, the linguistic landscape, of his ethnographic studies, a term that was put forward by Vertovec to describe the ethnic landscape of London, and that he defines as "a multidimensional perspective on diversity" (2007: 1025), which, besides, it cannot simply be reduced to ethnicity or country of origin, according to him. Vertovec points out the "widely differing statuses within groups of the same ethnic or national origin" (1039) and "enhanced transnationalisation" (1042) of migrants as aspects not to be disregarded and that result in "new patterns of inequality and prejudice" that he enumerates (1045). This concept is further described and dissected in categories by Meissner and Vertovec (2015), and the idea was adopted by several authors while, at the same time, it has responded to earlier concerns expressed by others, as discussed below. These authors suggest new categories and new approaches for a new situation—the intensification of migration to the northern hemisphere, mainly to Europe, that has changed the social and cultural landscape, although the political landscape has not changed that much. If we observe the political and economic leaders of the countries in the northern hemisphere that have been invaded by an explosion of 'superdiversity', we must conclude that the circles of power are not 'superdiverse' yet. Therefore, we must also conclude that change in numbers is not equivalent to change in power and that inequality remains inequality, despite a few escapes through some net holes.

Furthermore, such a state of 'superdiversity', with intensive diversified immigration, has been familiar, for centuries in the past, to urban spaces, and beyond, in most southern hemisphere colonies, whereas the reverse was in fact exceptional. Such a dominating north-south movement was general, although with different historical, political and social contours, from the geographical north to the south, in every continent. Even the movements to the east and inland were, to some extent, characterised by this colonial pattern, although each also depending on specific colonial matrices—Portuguese, British, Spanish, etc.—prevalent in each colonised region, and which can be seen as reflected in the hosting patterns to immigration in Europe and in former colonies, with remaining colonial institutional frameworks, as well as in other large powers in the northern hemisphere (China, Russia, Japan). The metaphorical North-South relationship, within previously colonial and colonised societies, seems therefore adequate to describe the situation of diverse societies in a far from completed 'decolonialisation' process. With the social, political, cultural and economic implications of such a backdrop, the idea of

'super-diversity' misses the conundrum that such diversity entails, despite its sudden intensiveness in specific spaces where 'superdiversity' was not previously allowed in, directly or indirectly, and was until now made invisible. Nowadays, 'superdiversity' is piling up at European doors and, more than before, the 'superdiverse' ones are needed due to many factors and not only due to travel costs but also to demographic needs of aged societies as well as 'immigrants' and 'refugees' higher levels of education and, in a few cases, financial status.

The concept of 'glocal languages' aims to address the linguistic landscape of the same transnational engagements, both personal and professional, that many authors today call 'translanguaging' in 'superdiversity' (Arnault et al. 2016), but which our work in this book intends to 'localise', though in translocal spaces bound by globalisation. In this discussion, we generally bring into play several concepts with different prefixes, e.g. trans-, inter-, multi- and super-, as if they were of common understanding and ready-made universal abstractions, which they aren't (Guilherme and Dietz 2015). By questioning the prefixes, we also question the nouns, and none is static, neither the trans- nor the inter- or the multi-, and certainly not -cultural, nor -linguaging or diversity. Blommaert finds "much argumentation on postcolonial views highly problematic when it presumes, without much substantive proof, that certain academic discourses are 'clearly' locked into one or another culture" (2015a: 22). In fact, the more we pretend that we do not have ties, or better that we are not tied up, the more hidden and inaccessible those ties remain and therefore, the more unquestioned, the more powerful or weaker those who tie or are tied become. If 'superdiversity' implies that we don't acknowledge 'who's who', then there is no diversity at all, because it remains fuzzy and blurred; we can see it but we cannot identify its fabric or its backdrop. For we all know, in academic discourse, there have been some who have been expected to teach and some who have been expected to learn and they both have been "clearly" locked into one or another culture" and, moreover, into one or another language. The conundrum cannot be solved by ignoring the historical-cultural-ethnic-political-social fossils that lie in our way, by remaining blind and moving beyond—by simply 'translanguaging', 'transculturalising' or 'superdiversifying'. As Blommaert (2015b) recalls, based on his study of Bourdieu's work and with regard to Blommaert's notion of 'orders of indexicality', "Recognition as (identity X) is a socially regimented effect that demands *recognizability* within a frame of intersubjectivity" (8). My argument above goes precisely in this direction, that recognition demands recognisability and, for this purpose, difference should be made evident both synchronically and diachronically, across space and time, while acknowledging mental hierarchies that have become crystallised and established into 'regimes of truth', in Foucault's terms.

There have been certain arguments lately for 'transcending' language as well as the idea of multilingualism because the former implies the concept of 'a' single language and the latter is viewed as an addition of distinctive linguistic codes; therefore, codeswitching is perceived as jumping from one code to another, both remaining untouched (Jorgensen et al. 2011). Translanguaging, currently adopted by many sociolinguists (e.g. Canagarajah, Blommaert, Pennycook, Wei, etc.), highlights the creative potential of 'language' use, in the context of linguistic diversity, without being attached to codes, that is, 'language' without 'languages', an explosion of linguistic swirls. This is poetics. And poetics used to demand a higher command of the linguistic codes, but "one can extend to all discourse what has been said of poetic discourse alone, . . . the effect which consists in awakening experiences which vary from one individual to another" (Bourdieu 1991: 39). The average 'citizen' is thus assumed to enjoy the same discursive liberty, however, only once 'superdiversity' entails 'superdemocracy' and when full polycentricity is a given and not yet a mirage or if this is not made a hidden detail in the discussion.

Beyond Language and Diversity

Pennycook (2017) mentions a general 'translingual turn', whose first proposal he credits to Canagarajah and Blommaert, and where he includes a 'translanguaging turn', which he assigns to Garcia and Wei. Along the discussion, Pennycook concludes that "there are several strands to this shifting landscape, but they are all unified by an emphasis on language practices", by which he means "local practices [that] need to be understood in relation to local language ideologies . . . and to other social and cultural practices" (p. 135). Our proposal of a perspective that we call 'glocal languages' meets this 'local' focus; however, it is our understanding that neither the global nor the local social, cultural or linguistic practices are territorially circumscribed, static or independent from each other, since the two (or multiple) levels live in close interaction with each other. In sum, how local are local practices in the 21st century? Each communication situation in diverse societies—any of them nowadays—is involved in such complexity of intervening features at various levels and of different nature that to reduce it to singularity always lags behind the elastic whole in which it evolves.

However, unanimity about the 'trans-lingual/language' concept is more apparent than real and some contradictions can be found between and even within the various arguments. Wei concedes that, by proposing 'translanguaging' as a 'practical theory of language', he thought of "a term that better captures multilingual users' fluid and dynamic practices" in the sense that "multilinguals do not think unilingually in a politically named linguistic entity" (2017: 18). Therefore, Wei accepts the existence of multiple and named languages, although the 'translanguaging'

practice entails border crossing on which he, nevertheless, puts the focus. Likewise, his challenge is for 'language' to be rethought as a 'multisensory', 'multimodal' and 'multi-scalar' collection of events, therefore, also looking beyond the local nexus. Interesting to our argument is also his description of a "*Translanguaging Space* . . . where language users break down the ideologically laden dichotomies between the macro and the micro, the societal and the individual, and the social and the psychological through interaction" (23), despite our refusal to believe that these spaces of interaction and border breaking result in an 'ideologically free' translanguaging space. This is where the notion of 'glocal languages' sets apart from the idea of 'translanguaging' practices, as such, and remains suspicious of the 'lightness' of the 'trans-world' some authors proclaim, in spite of the inspiration that the notion of 'glocal languages' may draw from other afore mentioned aspects of the description.

Jorgensen et al., for example, offer a 'polylinguaging norm' that contradicts a 'multilingualism norm', the former consisting of "whatever linguistic features are at their [language users'] disposal to achieve their communicative aims as best they can, regardless of how well they know the involved languages" (2011: 34). Such more radical understandings of 'translanguaging' and 'polylinguaging' raise questions about language teaching and learning, which is our main interest in this book. If, according to a 'polylinguaging norm', language users are expected to employ whatever linguistic features they have at their disposal, we can ask where such linguistic knowledge was acquired at first hand. School? Home? Media? And, furthermore, what is the balance between the different features? Who establishes the 'polylinguaging norm'? How should it be implemented in language classes, either at university or at school? Say, classes of Danish in Denmark, named as such in the curriculum? First, second, foreign, additional language. Can one imagine that there can ever be no legitimate interference of other languages in any case? Can this be considered a highly probable expectation by language teachers? And what about students and their parents/tutors' expectations? The authors claim an impossibility, since "learning 'a language' is then, with the statements we have made so far, of course impossible in a purely linguistic understanding" (p. 30). Agreed, with or without their statement (Byram 2008, Guilherme 2002). And Jorgensen et al. clarify that "one can learn a number of features associated with a specific sociocultural construction, for instance, 'Spanish'" (ibid.). One can raise many questions about the statements above. What does the 'polylinguaging norm' eventually establish for the identification, breadth and evaluation of such features? What should be the purpose of the 'polylinguaging' formal learning from the perspective of the learner? What worries me most is not so much the proposal of 'polylinguaging' as the assumptions about the 'state-of-the-art' in language education and in sociolinguistics that it implies. Wei also briefly mentions the educational implications of the concept for which

he claims, “Translanguaging has proven to be an effective pedagogical practice in a variety of educational contexts”, and he even associates it with a critical pedagogy in that “translanguaging empowers both the learner and the teacher, transforms the power relations” (2017: 15). Still, we remain unknowledgeable about the different perceptions of ‘translanguaging’ that guide such practises, that is, how much you need to ‘translanguage’ in language education in order to be ‘translanguaging’ in a way that meets the theory of language practice put forward as above.

The idea of ‘glocal languages’ does not aim to present linguistic theory but to address a critical pedagogy and decolonial curriculum development under the umbrella themes of language education and teacher education. ‘Glocal languages’ require a critical, both synchronic and diachronic, approach to language education enlightened by a political and cultural understanding of language. This approach entails the critical examination of the ‘globalness’ and the ‘localness’ of language use without overlooking the power relations and the subtleness of pressures that they convey on language users and that cannot be ignored while teaching and learning languages (Guilherme 2018). Languages are in fact displayed as discrete entities in the curricula, but they should be regarded and treated like porous and malleable material in the classroom, reflecting social language practice, respecting learners’ linguistic ‘capital’ and heritage while promoting ecological knowledge for sustainable societies. It is evident that we are talking in general about very diverse learning contexts, of which the above references are only a few examples. In sum, language education cannot go without basing itself upon local linguistic practices and enhancing their impact into the global understanding of the language in question, without neglecting the global pressures upon them and, above all, the learners’ potential to agency, their purposes and expectations while engaging in such a task.

Makoni and Pennycook stated that “*languages, conceptions of languageness and the metalanguages used to describe them are inventions*” (2007: 1). Do they mean from scratch? Do they mean that such a thing does not exist at all? The authors clarify that they suggest us to ‘reconstitute’ and ‘reinvent’ the idea of languages as it has developed in the last centuries, that is, to ‘disinvent’ the descriptions of language as they were ‘reinvented’ and schooled in ‘modernity’ and ‘colonial times’ by “rethinking the ways we look at languages and their relation to identity and geographical location” (p. 3). The authors admit that their notion of ‘invention’ is not far from Anderson’s idea of ‘imagined community’ through which he described the formation of nationality (1983). Likewise, Pavlenko and Norton (2007) use the same image, also quoting Anderson, to figure out “the relationship between second language learning and identity”, with a focus on English language education, and language learners’ expectations to be part of respective linguistic communities. However, they expand and make the idea of ‘imagined community’

plural by pointing out ‘five identity clusters’ to be kept in mind in language education, namely “postcolonial, global, ethnic, multilingual and gendered identities”. The concept of ‘glocal languages’, here put forward, also pluralises the idea of ‘imagined communities’ both beyond and within the ‘nation-state’ entity and identity as well as for the relations between nation states that have intensified due mainly to market globalisation, transnational governance and people’s mobility. The implications of a critical pedagogy of ‘glocal languages’ concur with Makoni and Pennycook’s statement as below:

The ideology of invention serves as a critique of language imposition or linguistic imperialism . . . in the sense that the imposition lies in the ways in which speech forms are constructed into languages, and particular definitions of what constitutes language expertise are constructed and imposed. (2007: 30)

Above all, ‘global’ and ‘local’ concepts also need to be reinvented. Anything that is global has been local and has become global due to unbalanced power relations. More equity, reciprocity and dialogue are necessary in order to achieve such balance in the recognition of the actual entanglement between the local and the global. And this should be done, according to Canagarajah’s, “by taking greater account of the local and respecting its value and validity” (2005: xiv). Furthermore, the ‘local’ has often been delocalised, although not necessarily globalised, through diaspora communities, but remains generally ‘imagined’ as powerless and situated in a static past, while the ‘global’ is connected with progress and the future (Canagarajah 2005). Finally, neither ‘global’ nor ‘local’ is unidimensional; nor are they mutually exclusive layers or is there ‘first-hand global’; ‘global’ is ‘local’, to some extent, imposed and adopted but always recycled locally. ‘Glocal’ aims to encompass such dynamics and ‘glocal languages’ to focus on the dialogicity between and within languages. Canagarajah also discusses the issue of scales that interferes directly with the idea of ‘global’ and ‘local’ and, therefore, the ‘glocal’ scale as well. The author highlights the ways “how micro and macro-level relations interpenetrate the spaces of globalization and intercultural communication” (2013: 204) that contribute to describe the ‘glocal’ spaces and languages that ‘people’ (as a verb) both the global and local layers of interaction and communication. Canagarajah also notes that:

scales cannot be considered as static and predefined. The translocal scale may have been associated with privileged varieties of native speaker English in the past. However, this scale is being redefined with new language ideologies and norms presently. (2013: 221)

Furthermore, the 'translocal' scale is also 'globalised' while territorial size is also being made more visible in this process. The view taken by the 'centre' of itself shrinks as it starts a dialogue with the peripheries in the process of localising themselves in globalisation (e.g. Western Europe vs. South America or Austral Africa or southeast Asia). The potential that this 'relocalising' process may bring to the epistemological wealth in our planet is immense, not only by bringing in some 'exotic' raw materials that the metaphorical North keeps recycling or by appreciating the ways in which the metaphorical South has been recycling the colonising epistemologies but also by reshuffling scales, layers and limits without forgetting the remaining social and mental constraints.

Features of Decolonial Language Education in Brazilian Higher Education

The empirical study I am describing here was carried out in three federal universities in Brazil,¹ lasted for one year (October, 2014–2015) and comprised the participation of 27 university language teachers (Portuguese, English, Spanish, evenly distributed across the three universities, indigenous languages and studies at USP and UFPR only and Afro-Brazilian Studies at UFBA only²). The study was carried out within the scope of the broader aims³ of the Glodemics project, accomplished under the auspices of a Marie Skłodowska-Curie grant (2014–2017), whose aim was to find out, through curriculum analysis, about the respective language's global and local features that teachers prioritised and enhanced and single out the critical and decolonial approaches they had meant to undertake.⁴

With regard to Portuguese language education, both classes of Portuguese as mother tongue and as foreign language were taken into account and, therefore, contents depended on this circumstance. However, there are common aspects in both cases such as the focus on Brazilian Portuguese, as it should be expected, and likewise geographical varieties and historical evolution were taken into account. Besides, there is evidence of a strong interest in other varieties of Portuguese and creole categories mainly derived from research carried out in African Lusophone countries on the other side of the Atlantic, together with an understanding of Portuguese as a transnational language.

European Portuguese is analysed as one reference point, among others, for comparative studies versus the versions mentioned above, since Portuguese is also understood mainly as a language of contact, in that it has developed throughout its history between other languages: some more powerful languages, other European languages, and also in contact with indigenous languages, as well as together with its creole versions and dialects throughout its multiple territorialities scattered throughout the world. Power relations within the Portuguese language's diverse

performances are also approached, as revealed by the data collected, by means of its stereotypes, hierarchy of patterns, related prejudice, semantics, subjectivities and alterities. This led me to conclude that the study of the Portuguese language in Brazilian universities, within the limits of the data collected, enhances language varieties more than the study of English or Spanish, understandably due to its predominant status as mother tongue and official language.

The data collected about the teaching/learning of Spanish, according to the sample, give a heavy focus on comparative studies between Latin American Spanish and Brazilian Portuguese in higher education language classes as well as on research, especially in one particular department. According to Fanjul and González, such comparative studies have moved "from inventories of forms to a comparison of functioning" ("de uma comparação de inventários de formas para uma comparação do funcionamento") (2014: 20, my translation, the author's emphasis). Participant teachers mentioned that most students decide to learn Spanish because they think that it is easier for Portuguese speakers; however, their learning experience results "in a mismatch, for the Spanish speakers, and, for the Brazilians, in the ratification of an illusion" ("para os falantes de espanhol um desencontro e para os brasileiros a ratificação de uma ilusão", Fanjul and González 2014: 9). Furthermore, Spanish lessons also pay attention to different textual genres both in the written and spoken language. In addition, a few syllabi also analyse the importance of frontier language contact in Brazil, namely with Paraguay and, in this context, the influence of indigenous languages in the border.

All in all, Spanish language education has increased in Brazil and grown more and more focused on Latin America, especially after the Mercosul (Assunção Treaty) was established in 1991. The teaching/learning of Spanish in pre-university education was established, although it still remains a long way behind English. This also coincides with a growing academic focus on Spanish from a local perspective, based in South America, and an increasing awareness of Spanish as a global language competing with English. And the same goes for Brazilian Portuguese—there is increasing awareness of its status as a global language competing with English, both in teaching/learning as well as in research activities and outcomes. In the same line, some academic attention is being given to 'portunhol', a mixture of Portuguese and Spanish, which is interestingly an endeavour undertaken mostly by Portuguese speakers whereas the reverse effort is less frequent. 'Portunhol' can be considered an example of 'translanguaging' that, in any case, can express language status inequality since in Latin America it can occur due to the territorial and economic superiority of Brasil, which leads Brazilians to dare speak 'portunhol' with their Latin American peers. The reverse can also happen with Brazilians speaking 'portunhol' with Argentinians or Portuguese with Spaniards, for example, besides individual examples and

circumstances. In any case, a greater flexibility, in general, of Portuguese speakers to dare 'translanguaging' and to be prone to adventure in other languages should also be taken into account.

As far as English is concerned, on the whole, the syllabi contents address the language from a transcultural, nonetheless hegemonic, point of view, even though it is examined through different methodologies, either based on distinct categories of discourse analysis, or on multimodality and critical literacy types, or on intercultural approaches. Often, the understanding of English as a *Lingua Franca*, more or less explicit, underlies mixed-theory methodologies that sometimes appear to be merely eclectic or indeed paradoxical (namely when it claims for ELF in conjunction with Critical Discourse Analysis or Critical Pedagogy). Actually, it was noticeable that, in general, a different perspective was taken by the participant teachers according to each department of modern languages where this study was carried out as to the role that English is perceived to play in the contemporary world and how it should be approached in language education. This means that it was visible that each department developed a particular endemic school of thought for each language, notwithstanding that each participant kept some degree of independence in their particular approaches to teaching and research.

As for Portuguese and Spanish, it was evident that their teaching and research work was more independent and, to some extent, individualistic, perhaps because they were neither perceived as to be foreign to Latin America nor so powerfully imposing from abroad. However, all participant teachers, for every language, maintained their individual international networks and corresponding research fields. To be more precise, while some participant English teachers, in two departments, put a stronger focus on English as an international language, by endorsing English as a *Lingua Franca*, although often in ambiguous terms as mentioned above, by questioning the supremacy of the native-speaker model and either concentrating on discourse analysis or discussing cross-cultural relations, in another department, they were more concerned in examining "language as the locus of socio-cultural processes in the production of meaning" and in undertaking a "meta-theoretical and critical approach" to language (my translation). In relation to the different approaches mentioned above, in each department, other topics were addressed that evidenced such difference, respectively globalisation and multimodality in one case, intertextuality and interdiscursivity, in another case, and finally technology, science and travelling.

Although the teaching/learning of Portuguese and Spanish also revealed different approaches and methodologies in each department, they did not imply distinct perceptions of the roles played by the language in reference. Both Portuguese and Spanish were fundamentally taking an intercultural view departing from the local to the global, which seldom happened with English that generally remained at the transcultural and

transnational global level, even though Spanish also represents a foreign language in Brazil and students, on the whole, are not expected to travel more frequently to other South America neighbouring countries, or host travellers, than to or from English-speaking countries. Nevertheless, Spanglish in North America was also an issue addressed by one participant teacher.

While all participant teachers of English were Brazilian, and speakers of Portuguese as their first language, some of the participant teachers of Spanish were originally either from Argentina or from Spain, but equally staff of their respective universities and at different stages of their career, as were all the participant teachers in this study. Every participant teacher gave priority to the use of authentic materials, not produced for pedagogic purposes, in many cases issued out by Brazilian media, therefore in Portuguese, in order to stimulate discussion of local issues in the foreign language classroom. Despite the fact that Brazilian policy-makers tend to replace the 'foreign' terminology by that of 'additional languages', both English and Spanish languages were indeed handled as 'foreign' by the participant teachers, due to the fact that "English is not used for communication neither within the country (as it seems to be the case when the words 'second' and 'additional' are used) nor inside the classrooms where it is taught/learned" (Jordão 2011: 39). Moreover, there is an academic need to acknowledge that research on Spanish or Portuguese as foreign or second, or even additional, languages, and corresponding teaching methodologies or comparative analysis, is much more recent, especially in Latin America where linguistic studies, when international, were more directed at dominant European languages, above all of previous epistemological, not necessarily political, colonial powers.

Although the study's focus was curriculum analysis, the participant teachers' voices were offered the main stage, not only through two 60 minute-long meetings but also in a written semi-structured inquiry, to which almost all participants generously, committedly and fully responded. It seems worth noting that, during this last step of data collection, which consisted of a written 'final statement', all participant teachers, no matter the language they taught, expressed a similar language concept, which means that, at the abstract level, they coincided in the same conceptual framework about the language they were teaching. On the whole, they view the language to be taught as political and social practice, a means to communicate ideas and values, a linguistic tool inseparable from its cultural construction, changeable and diverse, responsible for the interaction between the self and the world, impregnated by historicity and power relations. All participant teachers place their scientific field, with regard to their conception of language and language teaching, in sociolinguistics and applied linguistics.

When questioned about the linguistic and cultural representations that they privileged in their classes, all the participant teachers agreed

that theirs was an approach focused on linguistic and cultural diversity. However, it was my understanding that the perspective of the English language was one from above, that is, having hegemonic international globalisation in mind, with an eye on North American and British patterns, spreading geographically North-South. On the contrary, Portuguese and Spanish languages were setting their foundations at the local/regional levels, nonetheless diverse, while keeping an eye on globalisation and the growing influence worldwide, spreading geographically South-North. Awareness of the volatility and variability of linguistic and cultural representations, in class and in their social context, was steady.

Despite the fact that all participant teachers' approaches to language were prone to diversity, questioning the fictional model of the native-speaker, but not necessarily its existence, discussing power relations, hierarchical positions, stereotypes and prejudice, and hesitating in the normative idea of 'error', they all were understandably providing, and to some extent requiring from, their university students with an 'academic' register of written and oral linguistic performance. This was justified by the fact that they needed to respond to higher levels of mutual intelligibility, communication efficacy and recognition and that this could even be considered as more praiseworthy. According to participant teachers, this is what higher education students are generally looking for, nonetheless considering that they also benefit from critically reflecting upon contextualised linguistic and cultural representations about languages and cultures to which they are having access, both at home and abroad, while increasing awareness about the relativity of centre and periphery relations and corresponding epistemological hierarchies.

It is worth remembering that this study was limited to data collection of individual participant teachers' oral and written statements, the latter through syllabi and final statements, without any classroom observation. Such statements were both theoretical and practical in that most participant teachers reported results of their own research and described the conceptual frameworks that they thought were guiding their pedagogical practices. Hence, when questioned about their conception of '*interculturalidade*' and how they developed it in their practice, none of the participant teachers showed any perplexity about this terminology, idea or feasibility. All of them referred to a recognition of and respect for linguistic and cultural diversity, no matter the language they were teaching, and to the need of renegotiating meanings and perceiving cultural encounters and fluxes, be they due to the new intensiveness of Brazil's voice in international relations or the recent increase of voluntary immigrants and refugees, the latter fleeing from war (Syria) or environment cataclysms (Haiti). Not to be disregarded are also the intra-national and, until recently, 'invisible and voiceless' groups (e.g. indigenous and *quilombolas*⁵). Some of the teacher participants (of Portuguese) described '*interculturalidade*' as encompassing "new possibilities of

human relations . . . in complex historical, multilingual, multi-ethnic and multicultural contexts", while others of English mentioned that it entailed "to problematize difference . . . revise hierarchies . . . and a real opportunity for recognising the Other", and those of Spanish as "the possibility to recognise ourselves as belonging to a place, although always in dialogue with other places . . . as well as the recognition of differences and power relations that permeate those representations [linguistic and cultural] and social interactions" (my translation).

The participant teachers also expressed their concern about addressing citizenship education at its different levels (local, national and global) in their university language classes. In all three languages, Portuguese, Spanish and English, the relation between the global-local and the local-global world levels was evidenced, however, the starting point was obviously different; while it emerged mainly from the 'national-local' direction to the 'global' in Portuguese classes, it was highlighted from a 'regional/local-global' viewpoint in Spanish classes and from a 'global-local' perspective in English classes. With regard to indigenous languages and Afro-Brazilian studies the direction appeared to be '(intra-)national/local-global', based on data analysis provided by the respective syllabi and individual meetings only. As for Portuguese as 'second', 'foreign' or 'additional' language, the view taken on citizenship education depended on the student groups, whether classes of incoming or outgoing students or for adult immigrants and refugees.

In first language Portuguese, participant teachers were more focused at the intra-national level, on the variety of the peoples of Brazil, and, at the global level, on the lusophone (Portuguese-speaking) peoples, e.g. in Africa. Although this was not their straightforward or explicit objective, the participant teachers, when questioned directly, admitted that all the above would help their students, still at the undergraduate level, to be better prepared to carry out plurilingual and intercultural research, both at the intra-national and transnational levels. This would occur, most particularly, if they had learned how to critically analyse difference, how to place themselves in a position that gives priority to South-South relations (Spanish), how to reflect upon language from its political dimension and to analyse the historical path of colonial dominations (Portuguese language classes), to pinpoint ethnocentric attitudes and to discuss the role of discourse in the maintenance/transformation of power relations.

Finally, the participant teachers were requested to comment on the power relations between languages in their departments and to describe their 'horizon' as researchers, meaning the limits they had established for the impact of their research work, that is, at the local, regional, national or global levels. Therefore, we may conclude that, within the intra-national scope, Portuguese is naturally stronger in language departments but still exceeding the limits of what one might expect since, in these modern language departments, the publication rate is higher in Portuguese, which

is also the leading language adopted even in international conferences in Brazil, in opposition to English. Interestingly enough is that there has been a reverse tendency in the natural sciences departments with increased numbers of publications in English. Nevertheless, a participant teacher reminds us that it is only the standard form of Brazilian Portuguese, with an academic register, that is awarded more power as opposed to its vernacular varieties, namely Brazilian Portuguese spoken by Afro-Brazilian, indigenous or disadvantaged immigrants and refugees, as in society in general.

Spanish is gaining ground both in the language departments, mainly after its learning/teaching in pre-university education was enforced by law and, therefore, created an exponential need for many more teachers of Spanish, as well as in the labour market after the Mercosul market was established, although it is still not considered a prestigious language in the Brazilian society according to one of the participant teachers of Spanish. As far as English is concerned, its power has strongly increased not only in the labour market but also in the academy due to the process of globalisation and internationalisation of Brazilian universities and, therefore, countering the tendency to monolingualism in the Brazilian society and education, resulting in an intensive and steady growth in the amount of students and teachers. This overwhelming presence of the English language is also causing conflict in the Brazilian academy, according to one of the participant teachers. However, almost all of them describe their professional 'horizon' as 'glocal', that is, in the confluence of the 'local' and the 'global'.

On the whole, the learning/teaching of indigenous languages and cultures at the undergraduate level in Brazilian universities is almost non-existent, despite the fact that there are around 200 indigenous languages in Brazil still struggling for survival and that research carried out on indigenous studies in Brazilian universities is proliferating intensively and becoming rather relevant, sometimes excessive from the indigenous communities' point of view. In this study, I could find and include data about language classes of indigenous languages at the *Universidade de São Paulo*, both of *Ancient Tupi* and *Modern Tupi* (*Nheengatu* or 'general language'), from the Amazonian civilisations, and an introduction to the *Karitiana* language, whose communities refused to mix from the onset of colonisation.

Ancient Tupi is the old family tree comprehending the language varieties spoken in the coastal areas of Brazil when the Europeans arrived and, therefore, by then it was called the *língua brasileira* meaning the language from Brazil, the famous wood—*pau-brasil*—which inspired the name given to the territory (Navarro 2006). It was still used for the two following centuries, until the 17th century. After the second half of the 17th century, *Ancient Tupi* developed into *Modern Tupi* (*Nheengatu* in the Amazonian territories), which was predominant in Brazil, not only

among indigenous peoples but also among European colonisers and missionaries and African slaves and, therefore, earned the status of *língua geral*, common language, later forbidden by the Portuguese government in the 19th century when the Portuguese language was imposed. Nevertheless, another *língua geral paulista* survived, still for quite some time, inland the S. Paulo State (Navarro 2016).

It should not be forgotten that Brazil comprises an immense territory that more than doubles the area of the European Union, which justifies the use of terminologies such as 'global' and 'local' inside its borders. Moreover, the remaining 200 languages were the ones that survived the "epistemicide" (Sousa Santos 2014) of the 1,500 found by Europeans in the current territory of Brazil, and they are spoken by only a minority of indigenous descendants who have remained in rural areas and in indigenous communities. The *Nheengatu* still exists in Amazonia where it once was more popular than Portuguese. This language did not exist before colonization; it was developed through language contact among indigenous languages based on the heritage language called *Ancient Tupi* (Navarro 2016) and pidginised with Portuguese, through Jesuit missionaries, and African languages. Brazilian Portuguese displays a rich heritage of words borrowed from the *língua geral* and specific indigenous languages, namely in Brazilian toponymy and vocabulary related to food. As far as the *Karitiana* language is concerned, belonging to the *Aikém* branch, in the *Tupi* family, it is spoken by a community of around 400 speakers, in the Rondonia state, in the northwest of Brazil (Storto and Rocha 2015).

At the *Universidade de S. Paulo*, students of such Indigenous languages abound not only raising the interest of students from the Department of Modern Languages but also of some students of Physics and Biology, for example. At the *Universidade Federal do Paraná*, teaching/learning of Indigenous languages has been less successful even though there was a previous attempt to offer it at the Language Centre (CELIN). The *Universidade Federal da Bahia* does not offer Indigenous languages courses at the undergraduate level or other. However, it offers courses of Afro-Brazilian literature that focus on Brazilian writers of Afro-Brazilian descent and take both a local/national perspective (Bahia/Brazil) and a global viewpoint with discussion of racism and ethnicity in general and also by providing examples of literary works other than Brazilian ones.

Conclusion

This chapter has provided a theoretical discussion of the state-of-the-art in the 'globalness' and 'localness' of linguistic landscapes and language education. It has made a brief contextualisation of the concept of 'glocal languages' with the support of theories on globalisation, coloniality and (trans)nationality. Therefore, it has proposed a decolonial epistemological

framework based on the North-South metaphors for the discussion of the conceptual framework of the notion of 'glocal languages'. Furthermore, it has addressed this concept in relation to 'translingual' and 'translanguaging' theoretical arguments in sociolinguistics that have developed with regard to contemporary societies described as in a state of 'superdiversity'. By introducing the term 'glocal languages', this chapter engaged in a discussion about a critical pedagogy of language education through questioning the concepts that have been describing and theorising linguistic practices in our times. Finally, this chapter illustrates the ideas discussed beforehand with the analysis of data collected from a small sample of language teaching in three universities in Brazil, namely Portuguese, both first and foreign language, Indigenous languages, Spanish and English as foreign or additional languages. On the whole, this chapter attempts to counter remainings of coloniality in language practice and education since, in agreement with Souza "even though language, literacy, and culture are multiple and heterogeneous, they are also inseparable from the epistemologies, knowledges, and socio-historic conditions that produce them" (2017: 261).

Pequena Flor respondeu-lhe que 'sim'. Que era muito bom ter uma árvore para morar, sua, sua mesmo. Pois—e isso ela não disse, mas seus olhos se tornaram tão escuros que o disseram—pois é bom possuir, é bom possuir, é bom possuir. O explorador pestanejou várias vezes.
(Little Flower answered 'yes'. She said it was really good to have a tree to live in, to call one's own, one's very own. Since—this she didn't say, but her eyes became so dark that they said it instead—it's so good to call something one's own, to call something one's own, one's very own. The explorer's eyes blinked several times. [my translation])

Clarice Lispector, *A menor mulher do mundo* (1920–1977)

Notes

1. Universidade de S. Paulo, Universidade Federal da Bahia, Universidade Federal do Paraná.
2. (USP) Universidade de S. Paulo; (UFB) Universidade Federal da Bahia; (UFPR) Universidade Federal do Paraná, respectively in the centre, the northeast and the south of Brazil.
3. The main aim of this project, and of its two-year empirical study in Brazil, was an interdisciplinary study of the implications of plurilingualism and intercultural epistemological negotiation throughout the research tasks of five research groups (Linguistics, Political Science, Indigenous studies, Biology/Ecology/Philosophy of Science and Nutrition) at the Universidade de S. Paulo, Universidade Federal da Bahia and Universidade Federal do Sul da Bahia.
4. The general methodology was the following: (1) first 60-minute meeting with each participant teacher in order to find out about subjects they taught at undergraduate level, priorities with regard to teaching objectives, curriculum contents and methodologies, and finally to jointly select the two subject syllabi on which data analysis was going to be focused; (2) data categorization

according to contents, perspective, approach and bibliography; (3) second 60-minute meeting meant to discuss completed syllabi analysis and to clarify the aims of the final written statement to be produced by each individual participant teacher; (4) final statement delivery and analysis.

5. Descending from ancient African slaves who fled from their masters and occupied small farms or formed villages called *quilombos*. This word originates in tupi-guarani and means "that who flees". These populations often mixed with indigenous tribes who sheltered them. There are still more than 2,000 *quilombos*, whose land was theoretically made legally owned by the 1988 Federal Constitution. They are scattered mainly in the northeast and centre of Brazil, in the regions where slavery was once more present.

References

- Anderson, B. (1983) *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso.
- Arnault, K., Blommaert, J., Rampton, B. & Spotti, M. (eds.) (2016) *Language and Superdiversity*. London: Routledge.
- Blommaert, J. (2005) *Discourse: A Critical Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Blommaert, J. (2015a) Commentary: 'Culture' and superdiversity. *Journal of Multicultural Discourses*, 10, 1, 22–24.
- Blommaert, J. (2015b) Pierre Bourdieu and Language in Society. Working Papers in *Urban Language and Literacies*, 153, Tilburg University.
- Blommaert, J. (2016) *The conservative turn in Linguistic Landscape Studies*. <https://alternative-democracy-research.org/2016/01/05/the-conservative-turn-in-linguistic-landscape-studies/>
- Bourdieu, P. (1991) *Language and Symbolic Power*. Malden, MA: Polity Press.
- Bunce, P., Philipson, R., Rapatahana, V. & Tupas, R. (2016) *Why English? Confronting the Hydra*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Byram, M. (2008) *From Foreign Language Education to Education for Intercultural Citizenship: Essays and Reflections*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Canagarajah, A. S. (2005) Introduction. In A. S. Canagarajah (ed.) *Reclaiming the Local in Language Policy and Practice* (pp. xiii–xxix). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Canagarajah, A. S. (2013) Agency and power in intercultural communication: Negotiating English in translocal spaces. *Language and Intercultural Communication*, 13, 2, 202–204.
- Castro, V. De (2004) Exchanging perspectives: The transformation of objects into subjects in Amerindian ontologies. *Common Knowledge*, 10, 3, 463–484.
- Fanjul, A. P. & González, N. M. (2014) Políticas do saber e (re)descoberta das línguas. In A. P. Fanjul & N. M. González (eds.) *Espanhol e Português Brasileiro: Estudos Comparados* (pp. 7–25). São Paulo: Parábola.
- Grosfoguel, R. (2007) The epistemic decolonial turn. *Cultural Studies*, 21, 2–3, 211–223.
- Guilherme, M. (2002) *Critical Citizens for an Intercultural World: Foreign Language Education as Cultural Politics*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Guilherme, M. (2007) English as a global language and education for cosmopolitan citizenship. *Language and Intercultural Communication*, 7, 1, 72–79.
- Guilherme, M. (2018) 'Glocal languages': The 'globalness' and the 'localness' of world languages. In S. Coffey & U. Wingate (eds.) *New Directions for Research in Foreign Language Education* (pp. 79–96). London: Routledge.

- Guilherme, M. & Dietz, G. (2015) Difference in diversity: Multiple perspectives on multi-, inter-, and trans-cultural conceptual complexities. *Journal of Multicultural Discourses*, 10, 1, 1–21.
- Jenkins, J. (2018) No English but English-within-multilingualism. In S. Coffey & U. Wingate (eds.) *New Directions for Research in Foreign Language Education* (pp. 65–78). London: Routledge.
- Jordão, C. M. (2011) New designs for new identities: Are we going anywhere? *Critical Literacy*, 5, 1, 36–44.
- Jorgensen, J. N., Karrebaek, M. S., Madsen, L. M. & Moller, J. S. (2011) Polylinguaging in superdiversity. *Diversities*, 13, 2, 23.
- Makoni, S. & Pennycook, A. (2007) Disinvented and reconstituting languages. In S. Makoni & A. Pennycook (eds.) *Disinventing and Reconstituting Languages* (pp. 1–41). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Meissner, F. & Vertovec, S. (2015) Comparing super-diversity. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 38, 4, 541–555.
- Mignolo, W. (2000) *Local Histories/Global Designs: Coloniality, Subaltern Knowledges, and Border Thinking*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Mignolo, W. (2005) *The Idea of Latin America*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Navarro, E. de A. (2006) *Método Moderno de Tupi Antigo: A língua do Brasil dos primeiros séculos*. São Paulo: Global Ed. (3^a ed.).
- Navarro, E. de A. (2016) *Curso de Língua Geral (Nheengatu ou Tupi Moderno): A língua das origens da civilização amazônica*. São Paulo: Paym Gráfica e Editora (2^a ed.).
- Pavlenko, A. & Mullen, A. (2015) Why diachronicity matters in the study of linguistic landscapes. *Linguistic Landscape*, 1, 1/2, 114–132.
- Pavlenko, A. & Norton, B. (2007) Imagined communities, identity, and English language learning. In J. Cummins & C. Davison (eds.) *International Handbook of English Language Teaching* (pp. 669–680). Dordrecht, Netherlands: Springer.
- Pennycook, A. (2017) Language policy and local practices. In O. Garcia, N. Flores & M. Sporti (eds.) *The Oxford Handbook of Language and Society* (pp. 125–140). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Quijano, A. (2000) Coloniality of power and Eurocentrism in Latin America. *International Sociology*, 15, 2, 215–232.
- Sousa Santos, B. de (2001) Toward an epistemology of blindness: Why the new forms of 'ceremonial adequacy' neither regulate nor emancipate. *European Journal of Social Theory*, 4, 3, 251–279.
- Sousa Santos, B. de (2007) Beyond Abyssal thinking: From global lines to ecologies of knowledges. *Review*, 30, 1, 45–89.
- Souza, L. M. T. M. de (2007) Entering a culture quietly: Writing and cultural survival in indigenous education in Brazil. In S. Makoni & A. Pennycook (eds.) *Disinventing and Reconstituting Languages* (pp. 135–169). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Souza, L. M. T. M. de (2017) Multiliteracies and transcultural education. In O. Garcia, N. Flores & M. Sporti (eds.) *The Oxford Handbook of Language and Society* (pp. 261–279). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Storto, L. & Rocha, I. (2015) Estrutura argumental na língua Karitiana. In L. Storto, B. Franchetto & S. Lima (eds.) *Sintaxe e Semântica do verbo em Línguas Indígenas no Brasil* (pp. 17–41). Campinas, São Paulo: Mercado de Letras.
- Vertovec, S. (2007) Super-diversity and its implications. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 30, 6, 1024–1054.
- Wei, L. (2017) Translanguaging as a practical theory of language. *Applied Linguistics*, 39, 1, 9–30.

Section II

Indigenous Languages as Glocal Languages

3 Glocalism Now and Then

The De-Colonial Turn of Guarani, Portuguese and Spanish

Fernanda Martins Felix

Introduction

This chapter integrates a theoretical background on historical conditions about Portuguese, Spanish, and Guarani languages, and a concept of a workshop designed to put into practice the discussed theory.

Guarani, Portuguese, and Spanish are languages of significant power in Latin America and have been sharing territories for more than 500 years. The first part of this chapter intends to contextualize their battles for space, voice, and power in the world, and the dynamics that have led to a fusion of languages and cultures. Also part of this fundamental moment is a positioning on the glocality of those three languages and how, by so, they have overcome colonialism in certain ways. The struggles for a “de-colonial turn”, making use of the concept by Sousa Santos (2004), have found some tools in contemporary flows, and the pedagogical approach of Intercomprehension among related languages, is here presented as one of them. Seeking discourse practices where interlocutors can use their own repertoire, while being able to comprehend the languages of the others because of their lexical, morphological, and phonological similarities comes up as an instrument for tackling hegemonic mentalities on language contacts, policies, and teaching/learning.

In the second part, this chapter announces a proposal of experience based on Intercomprehension among related languages approaches, taking the three languages as subjects. Even though the Guarani language has a completely different root from the Neo-Latin languages Portuguese and Spanish, they have been in contact for so much time that each of them is deeply permeated by the others. This level of relatedness might be perceived as a space in which Intercomprehension experiences could take place (Felix 2016). Making use of the accessible social media Facebook, this practical part aims to the structuring of workshops, university subjects, language teaching/learning courses, etc. From a perspective aligned with plural pedagogy studies, this practical proposal has been entitled “Awaking to what is ours”, while attempting to reduce the “waste of experience” (Sousa Santos 2004), and to celebrate knowledge that lingers around. This practical

proposal's fluid structure calls to collectivity and engagement. What is presented here does not compose a rigid method. Quite the opposite, it is a first attempt to brainstorm on the search for experiences that are contextualized with nowadays society and struggles for the validity and legitimacy of cultural, linguistic, and knowledge diversity.

The hundreds of languages that exist in South America are, unquestionably, a common heritage to humankind. Not only should they be recognized as such and preserved, but also this diversity should become a fountain from which we can learn and prosper. Giving voice to languages that have been historically underestimated is more than recognizing the importance of languages within cultural identities construction; it is an opportunity to all—as we benefit from the cultural knowledge that constructs every language.

Throughout history, indigenous languages share experiences of contact with non-indigenous languages, such as Portuguese and Spanish. They experience subjugation, imperialism, resistance, transformation of themselves and the cultural societies intrinsic to them. As global contacts intensified, speakers have found a wave of opportunities. What was once a period of obliteration of many languages now is much more adapted to diversity. Documenting languages that linger through oral traditions has never been so achievable. In addition, with the advent of the Internet, many minoritized languages have conquered more space on the globe.

Even though efficient digital resources are far from evenly diffused, indigenous languages such as Guarani are growing on the web. The significance of the Guarani language presence reflects its history as a language with wide powers in ancient Latin America, a language that has resisted through more than 500 years of colonization. Living today with languages considered "glocal", Guarani is experiencing phenomena quite similar to becoming a glocal language itself. Widespread and powerful during a pre-colonial time, the Guarani language already had a glocal existence: structured by many local practices and yet covering extensive lands. Nevertheless, the age of the Internet intensified contacts to a point where the glocality of the Guarani language is a growing process, making through the savage decimating from colonialism.

The communicative resources provided by a globalized society can rearrange language roles and the way speakers relate in their cultural society or outside it. For the purposes hereby exposed, digital platforms such as educational projects Galanet¹ and MIRIAD² or even social media network Facebook³ come to hand as significant tools for the process.

Historical Conditions on Guarani, Portuguese, and Spanish: How Their Glocality Reflects an Overcoming of Colonialism

The dynamical character of languages is a long-lasting subject of interest. Despite this, not all speakers ask themselves where their language came

from or why one language is so similar to another; many are the historical and comparative studies that allow us to have a glimpse on how language development works. Languages that nowadays play important roles in worldwide communication and that, sometimes, even get in conflict with one another for political reasons are frequently connected by a common ancestral link.

That is the case of Portuguese and Spanish, languages of specific interest in this chapter. Deriving from the imperialistic Latin language, more specifically its vulgar variety, they have progressively grown in Roman Hispania territories. Latin kept its hegemony until the Roman Empire ended in the fifth century. The barbarian states that followed the disintegration of the Empire, such as Hispania, configured themselves as spaces of innovative phonetics and grammars, of new linguistic constructions, until the Latin hegemony was definitively broken and the local differences became official languages.

The precise period when the Roman conquest began in the Iberian Peninsula and the social basis that settled in that territory produced specificities in the languages that originated there. Not only the fact that when the peninsula was conquered, the Latin language had not yet acquired its classical form, but also the particular cultures of the colonizers that have arrived to the new settlements have been effective components of a linguistic development that culminated with the organization of the Portuguese and Spanish languages (Fernández Jaen 2006).

The expansionist policy of Iberian kingdoms involved new spaces in the practices of Portuguese and Spanish. From the sixteenth century on, the Romanic languages have established themselves permanently over the Americas and until the eighteenth century, Portuguese was the communication language in India and Southeast Asia harbours as well (Teyssier 1982).

The peculiarities of these diverse places implied a constructive variation of linguistic production. Nevertheless, the political actions amongst the lusophones and hispanophones territories keep directed towards a still shallow recognition of the varieties, focusing on the maintenance of centres of reference, which remain conveniently connected to the colonizers. This still keeps the mentality of centralization of power over the language and the restrictive normative objectives.

There are nine territories that unite by sharing Portuguese as an official language. They are Portugal, Brazil, Angola, Cape Verde, Guinea Bissau, Macau, Mozambique, São Tomé and Príncipe, and Timor-Leste. Apart from these nations, emigrants all over the world are speakers of this language, which makes around 260 million speakers. It is the eighth language in numbers of speakers in the world, and the third when we consider only the Western world (Peralta 2008). It is also one of the official languages of the European Union since 1986, and of the MERCOSUR.

The Spanish language takes second place in Western languages with the biggest amount of speakers. Worldwide, it is the fourth, only behind

Mandarin, English, and Hindi, according to the Instituto Cervantes (2016). The number of speakers of Spanish, which is believed to be around 472 million, is increasing, with predictions that assume the mark of half billion speakers by 2030. This allows the deduction that the contemporary practices of sharing and strengthening of the Spanish language have been effective on their purposes. It is a greatly spread language, sustaining twenty-one Hispanic speaking countries. They are: Argentina, Bolivia, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Equatorial Guinea, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Puerto Rico, Spain, Uruguay, and Venezuela.

In Central and South America, Portuguese and Spanish share a great territory conquered by the European colonial entrepreneurship. Because of MERCOSUR policies, both of them are sustained to be taught, on regular education in Brazil, Argentina, Paraguay, Uruguay, and Venezuela, the official members of the organization.

Even though, for many, they are the languages of Latin America, they are actually only two of the hundreds that co-exist in this "cultural-linguistic continent". They share lands and social interactions with a large number of other languages. Immigrants and native languages, which have been lingering minorities and minoritized, have been in contact with these two Romance languages for centuries. The relationships amongst them are configured as intricate dynamics, which have been historically favouring Portuguese and Spanish in detriment of the entire variety.

Only in Brazil, where Portuguese remains as the official language of the nation and Spanish is established as foreign languages in regular basic education, there are more than 200 other languages actively in production across the country (Lewis *et al.* 2013). This is, surprisingly, a relatively small number, compared to what existed before the arrival of the European colonizers. The number of indigenous languages enduring over Brazilian lands, nowadays, turns around 170 languages (De Oliveira 2009), what is believed to be only 25% of what once existed (Moore *et al.* 2008). Even though the majority of them have perished along the way, some of them remain vivid and linger through cultural groups that struggle to keep them alive.

The situation of the Brazilian minority languages, amongst themselves, is obviously heterogeneous. There are languages in high risk of extinction with less than ten speakers alive, like some from the Macro-jê linguistic branch, and others, which have not been documented yet. They persist on oral traditions, although, depending on the community, this is no longer a wide habit (Guirardello 1993). Fortunately, some of them remain quite successful, with a large amount of speakers. That is the case of the Guarani language, for instance.

The genealogy of the Guarani language goes back to what is nowadays considered to be a whole linguistic family, but, just like Latin,

had been once a language itself. Guarani is a Tupi-Guarani language, derived from what comparative linguistics refers to as the proto-language Tupi (Rodrigues 1993). This branch holds together languages like the Nheengatu, the Kamayurá, and all significant indigenous languages in existence. On the arrival of the European colonizers, the Tupi language was used to instrument intercultural contacts. It was known as "*língua geral*" and "*língua general*" (Lagorio and Freire 2014: 574). The convenience of adopting languages of wide communication took over extensive geographical areas, "many times formed by 'empires' that have now disappeared"⁴ (ibid 575). Not only the Tupi language, but also the Quéchua, Aimará, Náhuatl, and Chibcha all have sustained intercultural contacts as *línguas gerais*.

The concept of *línguas gerais*, like the current perception of English as a *lingua franca*, is aligned with the understanding of the global practices of languages over extensive areas of land. From the perspective of global-local characteristics in languages, it can be relevantly noticed that those powerful ancient languages owned a diversity of local practices, while stringing together and impersonating growing linguistic empires. As happens to languages during war and colonialism, there is a revolution when politics realize how power is connected to language, when languages are perceived as one of the supreme constitutional spheres of human living.

The European groups arriving to colonize immediately recognized the wide use of the Tupi by different ethnic groups in ancient South America. There were even documented perceptions, exemplified by the appointment of Pr. Antonio Ruiz de Montoya about a language "so universal that domains both seas, the one from the South, all over Brazil, and the two great rivers, the Plata and the Maranhão"⁵ (Meliá *et al.* 1987: 102). This area supposedly corresponds to an extension bigger than India, for example.

The Jesuits elaborated the first written documentations of this language, and the adoption of the Latin alphabet constituted a proposal of comprehension, absorption, and standardization, all precise strategies of colonial politics of expansion (Lagorio and Freire 2014). Even though, paradoxically, many of those documents play, nowadays, the main role on languages maintenance and expansionism.

Even though the dynamics on that time involved a larger number of monolingual speakers of the *língua geral* rather than bilinguals, to Ayron Rodrigues (2000: 11), the *línguas gerais* did not reach the "stability that would allow them to expand in space and survive for a long time"⁶.

By the eighteenth century, the *línguas gerais* no longer sustained their vivacity, and Portuguese initiated to gain control over the national territory. Not only the immigrants who came for the gold and diamond mines, many of them speakers of Portuguese, but mainly the political actions have started an effective obliteration of the native languages. As an example, the Directory established by the Marquis of Pombal, in

1757, prohibited the use of the *línguas gerais* and officially obligated the use of the Portuguese language. From this moment on, Portuguese would have barely eliminated the linguistic concurrence, reducing them to sparse lexis, integrated in local vocabularies. It also was during the eighteenth century that the first documents engaged in characterizing the specific traces of Brazilian Portuguese; there was a realization about the specificities from the different places of practices. The Tupi language inevitably permeated Brazilian Portuguese, even though this language was no longer recognized as an official characteristic of the nation and its citizens.

Moreira (2005) defends that, because of strate phenomena suffered by Portuguese and Spanish languages in their conquering of the South American territory, these languages went through the natural tendency of receiving lexis influences from the native languages, especially from the Tupi. In a power game, the Tupi language, powerful and widespread as it was back then, injected many semantic contributions that remain preserved in proper names, in fauna and flora names, in food names and represent a rich, yet neglected, corpus in South American Portuguese and Spanish etymology studies.

The Guarani group is one of the main survivors from the Tupi peoples. There are wide linguistic groups in Brazil, Paraguay, Argentina, Uruguay, and Bolivia. The far-reaching Guarani territory is believed to advance, nowadays, over one-fifth of South American lands (Silvetri and Silvetri 2015). Because of the lack of investments in the language, data are quite inconclusive when it comes to the total number of speakers. Appointments estimate from 5 to 8 million speakers of Guarani (Lewis *et al.* 2013; Silvetri and Silvetri 2015), being more than 4 million of them Paraguayans and between 30,000 and 50,000 Brazilians. According to the latest Brazilian Demographic Census (IBGE 2010), 67,523 people within the Brazilian territory declared or considered themselves belonging to a Guarani ethnic group. From this number, around 50% spoke their language at home.

Guarani has held the status of official language in Paraguay, along with Spanish, since 1992. Lagorio and Freire (2014) appoint that 85% of the country's population speak Guarani, either exclusively or combined with Spanish. This country has been successful in maintaining its investments over this native language, mainly because of strategic movements during war periods. It has been politically favourable, along with socially interesting, to keep the population of Paraguay bilingual (Felix 2016). It is also because of this country that Guarani remains as official language of the MERCOSUR. Even though, differently from Spanish and Portuguese, it does not benefit from the same amount of investments or interests within the group.

Guarani has become official in the province of Corrientes, in Argentina and in some Brazilian cities, such as Dourados, in the state of Mato

Grosso do Sul. Apart from Paraguay and the Argentinian province of Corrientes, where Guarani is taught in the regular education systems, no other places with significant Guarani groups have yet implemented effective language policies for the maintenance and promotion of this language (Dietrich 2010).

Because of the colonial dispersion and the cultural habits of relative nomadism, different varieties compose the Guarani group, while they have kept their individualities and a common sense of unity. Specially defined by Silvetri and Silvetri, "It possesses a distinctive particularity among American native languages: it is not only spoken by indigenous communities but by all groups and social classes: it is the only pre-Columbian language spoken by a large non-indigenous community" (2015: 3).

Reduced in numbers of speakers and spaces of occurrence, after the colonial attempts of obliteration, the Guarani peoples have been demonstrating notable practices of resistance, which have allowed, even under huge adversity, the survival of one of the most representative indigenous people in the Americas and in the world.

With the current globalization flows in intensive scale, Guarani speakers have spread all around the globe. Not only are there representations of Guarani members in migration currents, but also virtual linguistic contacts have put this language in a privileged position amongst minority languages. The amount of data available in and about Guarani language presents an unquestionable fact that Guarani is a powerful enough language to fight colonialism and to spread over many places. Such optimistic information has only earned sparse governmental initiatives and, more often, some private actions. Despite concluding that, compared to other minority languages, Guarani holds a position of prominence; when we compare it to widely promoted languages such as Portuguese and Spanish, investments are far from substantial or satisfactory.

As pointed out by Guilherme (2014: 56)

[T]he hierarchy of languages in multilingual, postcolonial settings, between European colonial languages and indigenous languages, and even amongst themselves, reveals the complex relationship that multiculturalism and multilingualism has shared throughout history.

This proves the extent to which the hierarchy that comes from the dynamics of colonial systems is still a strong residual in contemporary post-coloniality. In fact: "[m]uch of the post-colonial theory (Spivak 1990; Bhabha 1986; Gandhi 1998; Mignolo 2000, 2007) has pointed to the *continuity* and not the break implied in the prefix post-, where elements of colonial hegemony persist long after the departure and end of official colonialism" (De Souza 2014: 36).

This hegemonic form of reason that persists and needs to be seen as shooting ourselves in the foot has unequally valued the different languages

and knowledge that co-construct societies. When we speak of (non-)valued knowledge, we are talking about a “waste of experience”, as proposed by Sousa Santos (2004), when we ignore “the alternative knowledge and practices that exist” (De Souza 2014: 43) and maintain ourselves in a limited row of cosmologies that impoverishes our knowledge repertoires.

This comes in accordance with a group of scholars who, in Guilherme’s words (2018: 4):

have been theorizing about a “de-colonial turn” (*el giro decolonial*) that Mignolo defines as an epistemic decolonization, a new way of thinking that imprints an unthinkable fracture in the imperial genealogy of modernity, a kind of thought that releases and opens a critical border thinking (2007). (...) [H]e also claims that “we need to think seriously about the processes by which languaging and the allocation of meanings to groups of people presumed to have common features (e.g., ‘ethnic culture’, ‘national culture’, etc.) are being relocated and how linguistic maps, literary geographies, and cultural landscapes are being repainted”.

These assumptions bring a lot into discussion. They suggest that not only should we detach ourselves from the colonial ways of thinking, which transfers languages and knowledge from “North to South”, but to rethink all the spatial and social aspects of languages and cultural groups.

With the unfolding of colonialism and globalization, which have constituted different phases of a continuing process led by capitalism at both its early and later stages, North and South have, to some extent, been de-territorialized and therefore permeated every society in both hemispheres.

(Canclini 2005 cited in Guilherme 2014: 54)

The “North and South”, so historically dichotomic and imprinted with so many symbolic values, have been facing innumerable cracks that are punctually located and head unpredictably around the globe. This brings the necessity to look from many perspectives and allows languages and their speakers to move intricately.

What Sousa Santos (2004) brings in the terms of “cosmopolitan reason” is an opening of possibilities, a different model of rationality that expands that of the Western colonist reason. Explained by Lynn Mario T de Souza (2014: 43):

This cosmopolitan reason [...] would seek to expand the present and contract the future, re-signifying the concepts of time-space in order to make visible the co-extensive complexities and diversities (*ecology of knowledges*) existent today so that the knowledges and

social practices once produced as absent and invisible,—wasted—may emerge, be faced and signified in all their complexity.

As languages, knowledge, and culture are interlaced, the demand for spaces where languages can prosper and “from which we all have to reciprocally learn the most” (Guilherme 2018: 5) is a right to be fulfilled. Leaning on globalization resources, reorganizing the uneven state of access and investments, languages may be empowered, as some of them have been.

A main aspect of these reflections is that languages have been surviving “between and across the global and the local” (Guilherme 2014: 53) and their characteristics are not frozen. The sophisticated development of languages demands updates on how we conceptualize its components. It is not new that several authors have been theorizing about the relationships between the local and the global aspects of language dynamics.

According to Sousa Santos’ remarks (1999 cited in Guilherme 2018), modes of production that compose globalization, more specifically *globalized localisms* and *localized globalisms*, have been happening on languages developments and present their own characteristic results in languages contacts, languages developments, and in how speakers relate to their language(s) and the language(s) of the others.

The impact of the connection between the local and the global has brought us to a point where analyzing them from a perspective of an intrinsic bond is a strong way of validating their current flows as well as of objectifying dynamics that need to be understood in order to pursue a counter-hegemonic strategy for languages and their speakers. It is taken into consideration that “the dichotomy of global scale versus local setting is false, for we live in a globalized world, we live it through local circumstances, and the terms global/local are necessarily linked” (Collins *et al.* 2009: 1 cited in Guilherme 2014). Consequently, the definition of languages like Portuguese, Spanish, and even Guarani as *glocal* languages seems the most accurate perception of how they have organized themselves throughout time and across global borders.

Not only have Portuguese and Spanish ranged all the way from localized empowered heirs of the Latin language to globalized, widespread phenomena, they have also been hosting impacts on local instances. More than that, the Guarani language, as a language of long-lasting resistance and significance of diffusion, is perceptibly a *glocal* language as well. All of them have been printing their traces on each other as well as re-signifying and reconstructing themselves while in contact with many other languages of the world.

For this reason, I have called them “glocal” languages, using the composite word introduced by Robertson (1995), keeping in mind his statement that “the ‘global-local’ is more complex than an

'action-reaction' relationship", since they have become global, de-territorialized, and again been reinvented locally. "Glocal" languages are, therefore, confronted with issues of power; as they compete with each other and subjugate other languages, at the intra-, inter-, and trans-national levels.

(Guilherme 2014: 65)

Guarani, Portuguese, and Spanish have been pluralizing themselves all the way from their local starting points. They have been flowing across boundaries of space and time, accumulating epistemologies, knowledge, along the socio-historic conditions that co-produce them (De Souza 2014), and also undergoing dislocations, fractures, and re-significations. This dialogical, intensively dynamic process impacts not only across colonized and colonizer spaces, but also across and within nations.

[Glocal languages] "translate" simultaneously different cultural baggage related to both native users as well as others. [T]hey refer to a plurality of equally valid native speaker's models and encompass diverse non-native speakers' legitimate performances. (...) Therefore teaching/learning of a "glocal" language implies a critical intercultural pedagogy that calls for a critical and conscientious use of linguistic tools and offers plentiful opportunities for critically active cosmopolitan citizenship (Guilherme 2002, 2007), while also making room for expansive cross- and inter-cultural *savoirs* (Byram 1997).

(Guilherme 2018: 9–10)

Speaking about diversity does not imply to speak only to those who are considered a majority or a minority.

[Addressing society as a whole] does not imply a holistic concept of culture; on the contrary, it suggests that the intercultural character of life in society is not a matter only for those who are different, [...] but rather, it is the cultural diversity in society as a whole. In sum, it is everyone's issue; that is, everyone is someone else's Other.

(Guilherme 2014: 62)

That way, when speaking about languages teaching/learning, we might need to consider the "symbolic nature of transcultural competence" as it entails "a risky circulation of values across historical and ideological time scales, the negotiation of nonnegotiable identities and beliefs". It demands "reflecting on the way that our and the Other's realities mutually construct each other through symbolic systems" (Kramsch 2012 *apud* Guilherme 2014: 63).

Dealing with linguistic relationships, policies, imperialism, and diversity is not simply analyzing and validating different linguistic status and

positions in societies. It alludes to taking into consideration the symbolic experiences that surround every linguistic use, as speakers and their languages are constantly dwelling in the symbolic values of their linguistic performances.

Therefore, seeking approaches that enable experiences of mutual valuation, of meaning confrontation, that are structured over collaborative negotiation of meanings, and are constantly reinforcing the intrinsic and non-derogatory relationships amongst languages, is a challenging endeavour towards overcoming colonialism.

Intercomprehension and Numeric Platforms: Tools for the Battle

Comprehending various languages, while keeping whenever possible your own language(s) to express yourself, has been a proposal of Intercomprehension approaches.

As an area of studies, it finds its origins in Contrastive Linguistics. During the 1990s, it shifted towards language pedagogy, spreading and becoming a complex subject of interest, research, and action (Felix 2016). Doyé conceptualizes it as a "form of communication in which each person expresses in one's own language and comprehends that of the other" (2005).

Experiences of Intercomprehension inherently involve socio-political relations. With educational, emotional, or economic purposes, understanding the language of the Other may have implicit attitudes towards the opening for the Other; the valuing of different knowledges, the interest in relating to others. In the same way, making yourself comprehensible in your own language also presents relational, intercultural phenomena, as noticed, for example, in the efforts to conceive ways of making yourself clear, accessible (Felix 2016).

In accordance to a critical framework proposed by Guilherme (2014) when dealing with intercultural speakers, the processes of Intercomprehension may well motivate "a reflective, exploratory, dialogical and active stance towards cultural knowledge and life that allows for dissonance, contradiction, and conflict as well as for consensus, concurrence, and transformation" (64).

With the intention of defining Intercomprehension both in a direct and overarching way, it is valuable to make use of Degache's (2006) formulation: "comprehend the language of the Other and make yourself comprehensible in your language[s]".⁷ Carola points out the reason why this is fundamental (2015: 31):

It covers two essential aspects to the notion of intercomprehension: the (written and oral) comprehension and the interaction—the latter here understood not only in the context of an encounter of two or

more subjects, but in the context of the encounter of the subject with acknowledged languages or those in terms to be revealed, and in the sense built in this encounter.⁸

Intercomprehension practices may well be understood as possibilities to overcome the “waste of knowledge” (Sousa Santos 2004), as it offers an enabling atmosphere to the development of linguistic and social skills. Not only are we offered the possibility of being in touch with and learning (from) different languages, but also of rearranging our cultural and linguistic paradigms while re-signifying others and ourselves.

As a communicative strategy, Intercomprehension settles over this quality or property of languages. A fundamental concept about Intercomprehension states that it benefits from interlinguistic contacts amongst related languages, successors of a common root (Éloy 2004).

Éloy (2004) presents a series of categories for languages’ distance and proximity. He argues that complete mutual comprehension can occur—level zero—amongst the differentiations of the same language, the varieties of a language widely perceived as a single one. An example is the varieties of Portuguese, as in Brazilian Portuguese, European Portuguese. In addition, it refers to varieties within the “same language”, such as regional practices of Brazilian Portuguese, for example. Amongst different languages, it is also possible to find categories of proximity, as in languages from the same family. Also, according to the researcher, this closeness begins to fade as historical distance rises. This notion could be interpreted as in the distance between classic and contemporary Spanish, for example, or as in the distance between Portuguese and Sanskrit, on the other hand, languages that remotely share the Indo-European and have grown apart along history.

Perspectives like this assume that because of the common origin, a speaker from a Romance language, for example, would be able to comprehend other languages that have derived from Latin. Accordingly, the resemblances and analogies that exist amongst languages from the same family are so numerous and profound that the differences do not break the fundamental unit that string them together. Languages are considered susceptible to Intercomprehension by the use of common lexis, by phonetic similarities, by similar morphological and syntactic constructions, by sharing cultural matters (Felix 2016). Santos (2010) conceives this bond as either a real concept amongst them or a concept perceived by individuals. That is, languages may be perceived as proximate, as related, because they share a common ancestor, as Portuguese and Spanish, from Latin. As Also, their similarities and bonds may be an individual’s perceptive phenomenon.

In education, Intercomprehension comprises locating the language apprentices in the centre of the learning process, where they engage in organizing, reorganizing, sharing, and accumulating knowledge, where

they value the linguistic and cultural expertise of those involved and relativize the complexity of languages.

Evidencing not only the mental processes, the cognitive activities, the purely linguistic knowledge, but also the valuing, the construction and the renewal of the knowledge from all the individuals, assigning an inexorable social character to Intercomprehension practices.⁹
(Felix 2016: 28)

While working with related or non-related languages, Intercomprehension experiences intend to overcome the traditional teaching/learning process, in which previously known languages are underestimated pillars for the learning of a new one. It allows spaces of simultaneous learning and values different levels of abilities. The collaborative dynamics intrinsic to many Intercomprehension experiences are a solid track to emphasizing a “horizontal” hierarchy for speakers. As for languages, the validation of their similitude and the active approach to them as related and equally valuable also promotes this horizontality amongst languages. Attributing equal value to the use of languages—quite different from many language teaching/learning processes, when the use of a specific language is deliberately suppressed—practices of Intercomprehension aim a more equalized linguistic hierarchy.

Bringing to attention the possibilities of closeness, the obscurities and many of the symbolic values ingrained in languages dissipate, offering an environment where languages can be unveiled. For involving a plural practice of language teaching/learning, Intercomprehension experiences frequently promote the specific development of one or a few linguistic proficiencies, prevailing the work with reading and writing on most of the European projects so far (Planet 2011).

This approach promoted by Intercomprehension practices does not need to be seen as weak. There is no sense in saying one would remain a shallow knowledge holder if confronted by a plural and simultaneous languages pedagogy. Such approach goes beyond a fragmented knowledge of independent languages; it might as well indicate a perspective of fluid configuration of languages. Intercomprehension proposals usually make meaning on languages dynamics, boundaries, and their juxtapositions. They might as well be heading towards a notion of indeterminate languages, touching theories with translanguaging¹⁰ or even the complete subjectivity of languages (Pennycook 2006).

The collaborative creation of spaces and moments of discovery reaches to comprehend bonds of similarity amongst languages, to get aware about your own linguistic and cultural knowledge as representative and useful for embracing a wider, new linguistic repertoire. This integrant proposal of most Intercomprehension experiences is understood within the terms of “*éveil aux langues*”, an “awareness of languages”, although

personally I prefer “awakening to languages”. Alluding to a clearing of the fog that surrounds languages, which, after all, are connected and yet have so many peculiarities.

Many educational practices, and quite significant Intercomprehension practices, have been benefiting from the boom of the Internet as a space of diffusion and encounters for collective works. It allows the emergence of projects that, profiting from the web resources, produce new experiences in languages teaching/learning. An example is the development of numeric platforms directed towards practices of Intercomprehension by projects maintained by governmental and private initiatives (Felix 2016).

The Galanet and the MIRIADi are two large projects that aim at the diffusion of Intercomprehension as a basis for the teaching and learning of languages. They have built virtual spaces organized to sustain, materially and theoretically, experiences of Intercomprehension amongst, not exclusively, speakers of different Romance languages. Based on the principles of hybrid education they had been proposed, primarily, to students and adults with competences on at least one Romance language, not necessarily initiated in any other.

Specifically, for working with Intercomprehension among speakers of different languages, the local proximity of the participants of practices is usually a challenge. Initial works with hybrid pedagogy seem to offer a way so people from different locations can virtually meet, also inciting presence encounters and live group work. It conceives online and offline moments, both theoretically designed for profiting the most from each circumstances. Numeric platforms such as Galatea, Galapro, MIRIADi, and, why not, some social media, are instrumented with digital resources for language teaching/learning and can take place in both formats.

The Galanet project began in 2001, and the platform remained available for work until 2015. It has been organized by the Socrates Lingua Group and financed by the European Commission. According to Capucho, such were the prerogatives of the platform:

This platform [...] allows to speakers of different Romance languages the practice of intercomprehension, namely, a form of plurilingual communication where each one comprehends the languages of the others and expresses him/herself in the language(s) that one knows; this way developing the knowledge of such languages in different levels.¹¹

(2011: 26)

The MIRIADi project—*Mutualisation et Innovation pour un Réseau de l'Intercompréhension à Distance*—aimed to offer a wider prospect on language teaching/learning and on Intercomprehension training, and it would succeed the extinct Galanet project. It is also structured on

Sessions, where groups of speakers arrange themselves and work collaboratively around activities directed to the discovery of languages' similarities, to cultural encounters, and to the reformulation of paradigms. Although both platforms have a pedagogical emphasis and contemplate a wide range of activity possibilities, the MIRIADi platform was thought to overcome some of the proposals of the Galanet. With a more dynamic structure, in terms of contextualizing the organization of the Sessions and its resources specifically to the needs of the context in which it is being used, MIRIADi has been conceived as a sharp tool.

It is composed by virtual pedagogical resources, like forums, chat rooms, data basis, groups, and personal profiles, which are intended to assemble phases of different interactions in a process of “awakening to languages”. Activities such as self-presentation, debates on themes to be discussed along the Session, sharing of pertinent data, and collective work for the production of linguistic and cultural materials are some of the possibilities of organization. MIRIADi has come up with a dynamic that allows the organizers of the Session to arrange its own flow, while Galanet had a less flexible structure, previously defined for the fulfilling of a Session's four phases.

Selma Martins (2014: 20) understands some of the objectives and possibilities of the Galanet project, which still underlie the MIRIADi project basis:

It favors interactions amongst the apprentices of languages from distinct cultural contexts, allowing the development of the know-how-to-do and the know-how-to-be in a cooperative and collaborative dynamic of learning. This kind of collaborative on-line learning reinforces the active participation of its actors, representing a space of cognitive and social development through the mediation amongst the subject, as one is responsible for the comprehension of the other, what provokes a feeling of safety and equality, favoring the motivation and engagement for learning.¹²

Most experiences shared on the platforms have been mainly about speakers of Romance languages, even though not exclusively. That requirement is quite delicate to impose. Since the recognition of a language as being accessible to oneself is not immediately evident, the width of intercomprehensibility has been stretched only up to a certain point. For educational purposes, the need to be familiar with at least one Romance language has been cautiously ensured, so that the organized activities could depend the least on deepening metalinguistic discussions.

Documented experiences have, so far, reached a point where participants were able to work with non-related languages, stringing with shared lexis as a basal connection. That is the case of the InterRom Project, from

the Universidad Nacional de Córdoba—Argentina, with Romance languages and English, and the Guaranet Project (Felix 2016), where the Guaraní language has been discussed by speakers of Portuguese, Spanish, and French. Nevertheless, the teaching/learning of a non-related language through Intercomprehension experiences situated on hybrid programs is still very incipient in terms of amount of experience and research. Far from fading the importance of actions on that direction, this shallowness reveals the exact opposite necessity—that of more attempts to reach the similar aspects amongst languages, to a point where they can be as comprehensible as their closeness allows.

Finally, this presentation of the pedagogical platforms is a requirement for offering meanings to an understanding of how a social media network such as Facebook can be a pedagogical resource as well. The accessibility of this contemporary device is not only attractive because of its broad use, but for its allowance to a deliberate use for teaching/learning uses: organizing a profile on Facebook, where people can meet virtually and engage on transcending experiences, facing themselves and the others, valuing their own knowledge and that from the others, putting in question all this knowledge and disposing for new paradigms on speakers contacts, on languages status, on teaching/learning, on world borders.

The fluidity and the intrinsic diversity of experiences within such a space declare a pronunciation of the glocality of languages. Connected along time and crossing through space, they are always taking place from a local perspective, from a punctual moment and location. These concepts are, in a social media platform, easily perceived as dialogical, as the locality of phenomena in symbiosis with their globalism. Things that happen from a local perspective, which have already been touched by globalism, happen to flow gigantically and affect other localities, and so on. This dynamics detailed in Sousa Santos remarks (1999 cited in Guilherme 2018) can be evidently perceived in social media praxis.

Awaking to What Is Ours: A Practical Experience on Guaraní, Portuguese, and Spanish

This section will be organized in aligned phases. The structure is based on the idea of a Session, from Galanet and MIRIADi experiences, where, for a certain period, people get to work together through different, oriented but yet dynamic and flexible activities. The encounters can be exclusively virtual or hybrid, when people can both meet face-to-face, engaging on different dynamics, while simultaneously using the platform.

An awakening to, a sensitization for, ultimately, the teaching/learning of “glocal” languages, namely Portuguese, Spanish, and Guaraní, might be pointed as main objectives for such an experience. As well as with

the duration, specific objectives will match the context of each singular implementation. They may vary according to available time, to the level of acquaintance among the participants, to their needs or interests in working for more or less time in one phase or another, among other context specificities.

The development of specific abilities of linguistic performance, an endeavour aimed to discover resemblances or differences amongst those languages in question, or critical reflection on the languages in question, are some examples of what might be identified as a guideline for activity and discussion proposals. As for this particular experience, hypothetically located in South America, detailed objectives are focused on reflections on the glocality of the languages in question and the points in which they touch each other. However, they are re-presented, along the work plan and when pertinent, by their localization.

The public is also rather broad. A group of students from a university degree, a group of teachers in a teacher training programme, high school students, groups of speakers of the selected languages from different sites. It will depend in which context it is to be applied. This text will focus on a group of language students participating in a workshop. They are speakers of Romance languages with the intention of getting in contact with Portuguese, Spanish, and Guaraní. It might be also particularly interesting to have speakers of Guaraní amongst them.

As work phases do not depend on specific timings, they can be estimated and rearranged, depending on the possibilities of each specific scenario. The workshop hereby proposed was intended to last two weeks, be completely virtual, and be developed in synchronized or asynchronous patterns.

The creation of an interest group in Facebook is one first step in the use of this platform as a place of work. It will unfold a series of resources available for fulfilling the purposes already mentioned. Furthermore, the creation of a group for inbox messaging is another possibility for more fluid communication. As it is not sectioned, which means that messages line up and can be posted simultaneously, it can work as a less structured forum, when compared to posts on the page's main wall. Therefore, on the wall, all those who are allowed to create messages and they are organized in posts that can be subdivided, creating niches of debates. In addition, the possibility of video hangouts is easily available and allows participants to engage in live conversations, each one from one's local point on the globe.

On the wall or by inbox messaging, many kinds of digitalized material, such as texts, videos, pictures, images, links, and external files, can be shared. That is one of the main aggregated values for using Facebook for educational purposes. A very wide range of material can be shared in a very accessible, easy way.

After the creation of the page on the platform, the following steps can take place:

Phase 1: Ice-Breaking

Objectives: Self-presentations; objectives discussion and first agreements.

Discussions: By making use of the communication resources provided on the platform, participants use their own languages to present themselves, to discuss the structure proposed and therefore begin the first linguistic contacts. A “linguistic biography” can be an activity that is intended not only to present the linguistic background of each participant, but be a way of one realizing more effectively all the linguistic knowledge already possessed. It can be a simple form, structured previously, that attempts to cover all relevant linguistic contacts made by the participants or an open demand for reflecting on and sharing information about the participants’ personal linguistic experiences.

Phase 2: Brainstorming

Objectives: Discussing the main theme; discussing sub-themes; and organizing group(s) of work.

Discussions: This is usually one of the phases with the longest duration, as linguistic contacts begin but also are already put in use for negotiation of ideas, contents, and meanings. Also making use of wall messages, of inbox mail, or video calls, participants engage in using their languages to discuss a main theme for them to work on as the experience unfolds. The use of their own languages will already begin to appear as an exercise for all the purposes discussed along this chapter and will reflect on how the participants work for choosing a main theme.

This main theme will guide the following of the discussions and will chain together the inter-communications. For this example of experience, “The glocality of Portuguese, Spanish and Guarani” will be specified as the main theme for the workshop and it can be sectioned into “global reaches and local contexts”, “peculiarities of each language or speakers participating”; “resemblances”; and “how socio-historical contacts have merged them”. The whole group can discuss these themes, or they can be delegated for sub-groups, which will engage in discussing them within their own borders. All that will depend on the contextual objectives and possibilities.

Participants will be active in discussing the topics scheduled but will also be constantly dwelling on their linguistic transactions. They will be constantly trying to make themselves comprehensible, while trying to

understand the others. That is a very intricate process, which cannot be predicted.

Phase 3: Collecting Data

Objectives: Collecting and sharing linguistic and thematic materials. **Discussions:** Although linguistic data and information on the themes have been shared already, this phase is usually when the discussions go deeper, and linguistic experiences are expected to go along with other thematic learnings. The sharing of information with the intention of learning the language of the other through the discussion of a theme is the thick moment of the process. While the group, or groups, searches many source materials to be shared, put into debate, questioned, reconfigured, analyzed, the theme in question is explored and the participants remain on the quest for Intercomprehension.

Previously elaborated activities can be an example of shared material. Information about the languages, exercises on language comprehension, on language production and even as a form of evaluation, all this can be prepared in advance and proposed to the participants, in a most pedagogically structured moment. Digitalized materials on language teaching/learning can provide language support for more clearness in language comprehension, while simultaneously, collective, organic productions give form to the process.

Phase 4: Press Pack

Objectives: Production of collaborative material, aimed to summarize the experiences of the participants.

Discussion: The allusion to the press pack is for emphasizing the action of producing collective material, capable of representing a little bit of what has been apprehended along the workshop and that is posted, presented, and discussed. They are produced by groups or by the whole group; usually it is when participants generate text documents and multi-media materials that are a collection of linguistic and information production. Summarizing their experiences, participants elaborate a collective document, usually multilingual and negotiated in every aspect.

Conclusions

From a factual point of view, Guarani, Spanish, and Portuguese all have overcome colonization. They had localisms and globalisms, in different scales, reconfiguring them, mainly after their first contacts. This indigenous language and both Romance languages in question, especially in Latin America, but definitely worldwide, have permanently enlaced

themselves. None of them went through colonialism, followed by post-colonialism, immune from each other or from other world languages; that would be a radical yet existing purpose in coloniality.

The social positions of the Tupi language right before European colonizers arrived were powerful, even to a point where we could discuss its “globality” way before its contact with other imperialistic languages. It was powerful enough that it has not only survived but also deeply incorporated itself into languages such as Portuguese and Spanish. Guarani, as a significant heir of the Tupi language, exhibits an outstanding ability to maintain and expand its events of practice and all the knowledge along them, which happens, as well, with Romance languages, Portuguese and Spanish. This is a reference to the observation of the glocal dynamics of these languages, which, in constant move, reconfigure and sustain themselves.

Finally, working along non-hegemonic forms of reason can allow speakers of different languages to enrich themselves linguistically and culturally, offering experiences in which we can confront, negotiate, and overcome paradigms. Intercomprehension as a socio-pedagogical proposal, directed to language teaching/learning, more specifically glocal languages, reveals one of many ways through which we can provoke experiences such as the ones described above. As for the use of social media as educational tools, it has been widely perceived that these globalized phenomena have plenty to offer.

Notes

1. www.galanet.net
2. www.miriadi.net
3. www.facebook.com
4. Translation by the author. “[...] muitas vezes formadas por ‘impérios’ agora desaparecidos”.
5. Translation by the author. “tan universal que domina ambos mares, el del Sur por todo el Brasil, y los dos grandes ríos, el de la Plata y el gran Marañón”.
6. Translation by the author. “a estabilidade que lhes permitiria expandir-se no espaço e sobreviver por longo tempo”.
7. Translation by the author: “compreender a língua do outro e se fazer compreender na sua língua”.
8. Translation by the author: “ela aborda dois aspectos essenciais à noção de intercompreensão: a compreensão (escrita e oral) e a interação—esta última compreendida aqui não somente no contexto do encontro de dois ou mais sujeitos, mas no contexto do encontro do sujeito com as línguas conhecidas ou em fase de descoberta, e no sentido construído neste encontro”.
9. Translation by the author: “[E]videnciar não apenas os processos mentais, as atividades cognitivas, os conhecimentos puramente linguísticos, mas também a valorização, a construção e a renovação dos conhecimentos de todos os indivíduos, atribuindo um caráter inexoravelmente social às práticas de Intercompreensão”.
10. Canagarajah (2011, 2017); Pennycook and Makoni (2006); De Souza (2014).
11. Translation by the author: “Essa plataforma [...] permite aos locutores de diferentes línguas românicas a prática da intercompreensão, a saber, uma

forma de comunicação plurilingue onde cada um compreende as línguas dos outros e se exprime na ou nas línguas românicas que conhece, desenvolvendo assim em diferentes níveis o conhecimento dessas línguas”.

12. Translation by the author: “favorece interações entre os aprendizes de línguas de contextos culturais distintos, permitindo o desenvolvimento do saber-fazer e do saber-ser em uma dinâmica de aprendizagem cooperativa e colaborativa. Esse tipo de aprendizagem colaborativa online reforça a participação ativa de seus atores, representando um espaço de desenvolvimento cognitivo e social por meio da mediação entre os sujeitos, uma vez que cada um é responsável pela compreensão de outrem, o que provoca um sentimento de segurança e igualdade, favorecendo a motivação e o engajamento pela aprendizagem”.

References

- Bhabha, H. K. (1986) Introduction to the English edition of Black Skin White Mask. In Fanon, F. & Markmann, C. L. (eds.) *Black skin, white masks*. London: Pluto Press.
- Byram, M. (1997) *Teaching and assessing intercultural communicative competence*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Canagarajah, S. (2017) *Translingual practices and neoliberal policies*. Switzerland: Springer International Publishing.
- Canagarajah, S. (2013) *Translingual practice: Global Englishes and cosmopolitan relations*. Routledge: London.
- Canagarajah, S. (2011). Translanguaging in the classroom: Emerging issues for research and pedagogy. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 2, pp. 1–28.
- Canclini, N. G. (2005) *Hybrid Cultures: Strategies for entering and leaving modernity*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Capucho, F. (2011) L'intercompréhension: l'innovation decline au passé, au présent et au futur. *REDINTER-Intercompréhension*, Chamusca, Edições Cosmos/REDINTER, 3, 15–36.
- Carocha, C. H. (2015) *Práticas de Intercompreensão entre línguas românicas: desenvolvimento da competência de leitura plurilingue em estudantes do Ensino Médio de uma Escola Técnica (ETEC) de São Paulo*. Master's Thesis. Universidade de São Paulo.
- Collins, J., Slembrouck, S. & Baynham, M. (2009) Introduction. In J. Collins, S. Slembrouck & M. Baynham (eds.) *Globalization and Language in Contact: Scale, Migration and Communicative Practices* (pp. 1–16). London: Continuum.
- Degache, C. (2006) Didactique du plurilinguisme. Travaux sur l'intercompréhension et l'utilisation des technologies pour l'apprentissage des langues. In *Synthese de la activité de recherche*. Grenoble: LIDILEM/Université Stendhal Grenoble III.
- De Oliveira, G. M. (2000) Brasileiro fala português: Monolingüismo e Preconceito Linguístico. In Silva, F. L & Moura, M. M. (eds) *O direito à fala: a questão do preconceito linguístico* (pp. 83–92). Florianópolis: Editora Insular.
- De Souza, L. M. T. M. (2014) Epistemic Diversity, Lazy Reason and Ethical Translation in Post-Colonial Contexts: The Case of Indigenous Educational Policy in Brazil. *Interfaces Brasil/Canadá*, 14, 2, 36–60.
- Dietrich, W. (2010) *O Guaraní Paraguaio*. Presentation Website. Available in: www.etnolingüística.org/lingua:guarani-paraguaio
- Doyé, P. (2005) *Intercomprehension: Guide for the Development of Language Education Policies in Europe: From Linguistic Diversity to Plurilingual Education*. Reference Study. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.

- Éloy, J. (2004) Langues proches: que signifi e de les enseigner. In *ÉLA-Accès aux langues proches et aux langues voisines* (pp. 393–401). Paris: Didier Érudition.
- Felix, F. M. (2016) *Guaranet: Experiências de contato e intercompreensão em Guaraní, Português, Espanhol e Francês*. Master's Thesis. Universidade Federal do Paraná. Available in: <http://calvados.c3sl.ufrpr.br/bitstream/handle/1884/45946/R%20-%20D%20-%2020FERNANDA%20MARTINS%20FELIX.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y>
- Fernández Jaen, J. (2006) El latín em Hispania: la romanización de la península Ibérica. Alicante: Biblioteca Virtual Miguel de Cervantes. Available in: www.cervantesvirtual.com/obra/el-latn-en-hispania-la-romanizacin-de-la-pennsula-ibrica-el-latn-vulgar-particularidades-del-latn-hispnico-0/
- Gandhi, L. (1998) *Postcolonial theory: A critical introduction*. Crows Nest: Allen & Unwin.
- Guilherme, M. (2018) 'Glocal Languages': The 'Globalness' and the 'Localness' of World Languages. In Coffey, S. & Wingate, U. (eds.) *New Directions in Foreign Language Education* (pp. 79–96). London: Routledge.
- Guilherme, M. (2014) 'Glocal' Languages and North-South Epistemologies: Plurilingual and Intercultural Relationships. In Teodoro, A. & Guilherme, M. (eds.) *European and Latin American Higher Education between Mirrors: Conceptual Framework and Policies of Equity and Social Cohesion*. (pp. 55–72). Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.
- Guilherme, M. (2007). English as a Global Language and Education for Cosmopolitan Citizenship. *Language and Intercultural Communication*, 7 (1), 72–79.
- Guilherme, M. (2002). *Critical Citizens for an intercultural world: Foreign language education as cultural politics*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Guardello, R. A. (1999) *Reference Grammar of Trumai*. Doctoral Thesis, Linguistic Department. Houston: Rice University, 1999.
- Instituto Brasileiro de Geografia e Estatística-IBGE. (2010) *Censo Demográfico: Características Gerais dos Indígenas* (pp. 1–245). Rio de Janeiro: IBGE.
- Instituto Cervantes. (2016) El Español, una lengua viva. *Departamento de Comunicación Digital del Instituto Cervantes (Ed.)*. Available in: www.cervantes.es/imagenes/File/prensa/EspanolLenguaViva16.pdf
- Kramsch, C. (2012) Theorizing Translingual/Transcultural Competence. In G. S. Levine & A. Phipps (eds.) *Critical and Intercultural Theory and Language Pedagogy* (pp. 15–31). Boston, MA: Heimele.
- Lagorio, C. A. & Freire, J. R. B. (2014) Aryon Rodrigues e as Línguas Gerais na historiografia linguística. *D.E.L.T.A.*, 30 especial, 571–589.
- Lewis, M., Simons, G. F. & Fennig, C. D. (eds). (2013) *Ethnologue: Languages of the world*. Dallas: SIL International.
- Makoni, S., & Pennycook, A. (2006) *Disinventing and Reconstituting Languages*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Martins, S. A. (2014) A intercompreensão de línguas românicas: proposta propulsora de uma educação plurilíngue. *Revista Moara*, 42, 7–12.
- Meliá, B. (1987) *O Guaraní. Uma bibliografia etnológica*. Santo Ângelo: Fundames.
- Mignolo, W. (2007) Coloniality and modernity/rationality. *Cultural Studies*, 21, 2–3, 155–67.
- Mignolo, W. (2000) Coloniality of power, ethnocentrism, and Latin America. *Nepantla*, 1 (3), 533–580.
- Moore, D., Galucio, A. V. and Gabas, JR., N (2008) O desafio de documentar e preservar as línguas amazônicas. *Scientific American (Brasil)*, 3, Amazônia (A Floresta e o Futuro), 36–46.
- Moreira, C. M. (2005) A influência do Tupi na formação do português do Brasil. In *Mesa-redonda, II CLUERJ*. Rio de Janeiro: CIFEFL.
- Pennycook, A. (2006) Uma linguística aplicada transgressiva. In Lopes, L. P. M. (org.) *Por uma linguística aplicada Indisciplinar* (pp. 67–84). São Paulo: Parábola Editorial.
- Peralta, J. (2008) Princípios e Diretrizes do Pacto Lusófono Mundial. Disponível em: www.portaldalusofonia.com.br/pactoprincipios.html
- Planet, M. T. (2011) Les perspectives multimodales de l'intercompréhension aujourd'hui, ou différentes manières de '[partir] de sa langue [et de sa culture] pour aller vers celle[s] des autres'. *REDINTER-Intercompreensão, Chamusca, Edições Cosmos/REDINTER*, 3, 51–62.
- Rodrigues, A. D. (1993) Línguas Indígenas: 500 anos de descobertas e perdas. *Ciência Hoje*, 16, 95.
- Rodrigues, A. D. (2000) Panorama das Línguas Indígenas da Amazônia. In Queixalós, F. & Renault-Lescure, O. (orgs.) *As línguas amazônicas hoje* (pp. 15–28). São Paulo: IRD/ISAMPEG.
- Santos, B. S. (1999) Towards a multicultural conception of human rights. In Featherstone, M. (ed.) *Spaces of Culture: City, Nation, World* (pp. 214–229). London: Sage.
- Santos, B. S. (2004) A Critique of Lazy Reason: Against the Waste of Experience. In Wallerstein, I. (ed.) *The Modern World-System in the Longue Durée* (pp. 157–197). London: Paradigm Publishers.
- Santos, L. (2010) Defining Intercomprehension: Is a Consensus Essential? *REDINTER-Intercompreensão, Chamusca, Edições Cosmos/REDINTER*, 1, 29–46.
- Silveti, J. & Silveti, G. (2015) Shaping the Guarani Territory. *Harvard Review of Latin America*. *DRCLAS*, 14, 3, 2–6.
- Spivak, G. (1990) *The post-colonial critique: Interviews, strategies, dialogues*. New York: Routledge.
- Teysier, P. (1982) *História da Língua Portuguesa*. São Paulo: Martins Fontes.

4 Reshuffling Conceptual Cards What Counts as Language in Lowland Indigenous South America

Jamille Pinheiro Dias

Introduction

This chapter discusses communicative practices and potential notions of language in lowland Indigenous South America by taking two key dimensions into account: that of intersemiotic relations involving image, words, and music, and that of affect that takes place beyond the human/non-human divide. Drawing mainly on applied linguistics and South American Indigenous ethnology, it provides a review of examples coming from ethnographic studies in an effort to emphasise how the co-presence and simultaneous engagement of different verbal and non-verbal components by Indigenous peoples in the region—as well as their particular dynamics of affect between people, animals, plants, spirits, and a range of other characters that may not be humans for us, but that are human for themselves—call for a broader understanding of what counts as “a language,” primarily understood as a signifying system used by a specific group of people, and “language,” generally seen as the model of signifying systems. The intention here is not to give an exhaustive exposition of the topic, but to draw attention to its importance and to work out possible grounds for further investigation.

Considering that the very idea of “language”—identified and delimited in Western ideologies of linguistic standardization—corresponds to an invention arising from seventeenth- and eighteenth-century coloniality and nationalism, the assumption that such a notion, as a pre-constituted, independent object, is readily transposable to all locations and populations, is questionable from the very start. In this sense, I resort to the notion of “root metaphor” as discussed by anthropologist Marilyn Strathern (1988: 134) in order to address the category of “language” that is widely used as an operator of our relationship with multiple communicative practices. Strathern’s approach to root metaphors can help us understand how, from our exogenous frame of reference, we project the notion of “language” onto Indigenous peoples, entailing assumptions that interfere with and limit our understanding of their communicative practices. By drawing on Strathern’s perspective, I propose that a

critical and self-reflexive dialogue between applied linguistics and South American Indigenous ethnology, operating at both local and global levels, involves being aware of, and calling into question, root metaphors—such as “language”—that underlie the modes of thinking and convictions of each discipline. In other words, it calls for a “reshuffling of our conceptual cards,” to quote from Eduardo Viveiros de Castro (2002/2003: 348).

Towards a More Inclusive Approach to Language

Reducing language to a communication device, a vehicle for messages expressible in an ideally abstract verbal code, or a system for naming or reflecting a reality which supposedly precedes it, rules out an array of local communicative practices that resonate closely with Deleuze’s approach to language as comprising, among other aspects, the sensorial, the kinesic, and the verbal, as it engages the entirety of an affective framework. As we will see in this chapter, if one is to speak of language among non-modern humankind such as the Amerindians, working towards a more inclusive approach to what language is or, rather, to what language does, is inescapable.

The notion we inherited from Aristotle¹ that man alone, among all living beings, is endowed with the capacity for speech that makes political life possible lies ingrained in the Western historical presumption of human exceptionalism and superiority. We are also heirs to the Cartesian agenda of rationality and its ascription of language to human beings.² Considering the underpinnings of this view of language, Robert B. Loudon says that

From at least the time of Aristotle, philosophers and scientists have repeatedly pointed to the faculty of language as one of the primary differentia between humans and nonhumans. Language, perhaps because its presence or absence seems more easily detectable than other alleged differentia such as rationality or consciousness, is, as Mary Midgley remarks, “possibly our favourite human distinguishing mark.”³

This leads us to one of the cornerstones of Giorgio Agamben’s well-known investigation of the way humankind was dignified and privileged over other species on the basis of the presumption that language is the defining attribute of the properly human mode of existence.⁴ The construction of humanity through the acquisition of language, as he shows, extracted the human out of animality, constituting what he calls the anthropological machine—an apparatus that divides life into human and non-human. The ethical implications of the perception that language exists, and that the human is the living being who has it, highlight the need to consider what counts as language. What might sound

indiscernible and like inarticulate noise to some might count as language to others, especially if we are to conceptualise language, in a Deleuzo-Guattarian way, as affect rather than information or representation. That said, this leads us back to our case in point, and to question, then, what counts as language in lowland Indigenous South America. Before outlining a review of pertinent ethnographic studies, though, let us summarise some of the ways applied linguistics has been examining and questioning hegemonising conceptions of language.

Disinventing Language as a Root-Metaphor

The cultural specificity of the notion of “a language” was highlighted by Peter Mühlhäusler (2000, 2002) in his discussion of the issue of Western linguistic imperialism in the Pacific. It is problematic to reify “a language,” as Mühlhäusler demonstrates, since this gesture abstracts languages from the complex ecology of forms of communication in which they are embedded. Also, his criticism draws attention to the association between the notion of “a language” and “the rise of the European nation states and the Enlightenment,” and to how referring to “a language” “makes little sense in most traditional societies” (2000: 358). In his study of the development of the Tok Pisin pidgin in Papua New Guinea, for instance, Mühlhäusler has shown how it would reunite a wide array of linguistic varieties under the same name; how it would borrow lexical items from German or English; and how neighbouring languages would borrow lexical items from it. Cases such as that of Tok Pisin indicate that the neutrality of a supposedly countable phenomenon called language must be called into question.

Along similar lines, Richard Bauman and Charles Briggs explain how languages “came into being” (2003: 7) through their conceptualization and division into bounded entities, detachable from their environment, by the modernist metadiscursive regimes used to describe them. The deprovincialisation of Euro-American³ linguistic ideologies naturalised certain metadiscursive regimes (30), which were determinant to the widespread construction of languages as unified systems—giving rise, as Bauman and Briggs argue, to “a powerful means of creating social inequality” (9). In particular, they discuss the ways in which words of Others were approached from the early nineteenth century onwards, through the collection, management, and publication of their “oral traditional texts” (15). If this appropriative intervention was key to how modernity was symbolically shaped, we are now in a position of not allowing “constructions of language and tradition masquerade as cartographies of the real” (317).

In the spirit of Bauman and Briggs, Simfree Makoni and Alastair Pennycook state that “languages do not exist as real entities in the world and neither do they emerge from or represent real environments; they

are, by contrast, the inventions of social, cultural and political movements” (2007: 2). They point out the need for unpacking the metadiscursive regimes that have underpinned the classification, naming, and invention of languages. Makoni and Pennycook support the view that if languages were invented, we need to imagine ways of “disinventing” and “reconstituting” them through an acknowledgement of fluidity in the concrete workings of language at the local level. Their suggestion for challenging an ideology of languages as fixed and enumerative is to embrace actual communicative practices. Bearing that in mind, they argue that “we need to understand the interrelationships among metadiscursive regimes, language inventions, colonial history, language effects, alternative ways of understanding language and strategies of disinvention and reconstitution” (4).

Makoni and Pennycook (2012) argue that languages are discursive and social constructions that foster inequalities and serve political purposes, being frequently used as instruments of domination that have material effects on the living conditions of people. This theoretical framework, therefore, has emphasised the problem of hegemonising and colonialist conceptions of language. Makoni and Pennycook’s critical historiographical approach demonstrates that languages were invented through a process of classification and naming (1). For instance, they highlight how languages such as “Bengali” e “Assamese” were constructed as “new objects” (10). That said, since local knowledge is crucial to our understanding of language, this leads to a call for more research allowing us to develop a more localised understanding of the relationships between what people think about their language (or about the language of other people), their situated forms of speech, and the material—social, economic, environmental—effects of such practices and uses.

In this respect, Makoni and Meinhof (2006) argue that it is essential that conceptions that speakers have of their own language are taken into consideration, even if those conceptions seem to contradict scientific data. In their study of Applied Linguistics in Africa, they argue for the importance of verifying how discourses about “languages” are understood by the ones who use them, in so far as African experiences with language and linguistic practice in the content may diverge from the imposed notion of language as a distinct entity (196). Since Makoni and Meinhof share the understanding that “the notion of ‘language’ as a marker of social identity did not exist prior to colonisation and the introduction of Christian evangelism and literacy in Africa,” the “outside” perspective of linguists may not necessarily coincide with the “inside” perspective of speakers (208). Taking the “inside” perspective of speakers seriously poses the challenge of putting aside the tendency to disqualify the specificity of other modes of existence on the basis of a supposed scientific universalism.

Additionally, Makoni and Mashiri (2007) suggest that instead of developing linguistic policies that isolate languages hermetically, we should describe the use of vernaculars that come into contact and influence each other in order to understand the social realities of their users. They argue that proposing a world in which plurality is privileged over singularity requires rethinking conceptions based on notions of uniformity, and giving preference to those based on diversity. Placing an emphasis on the speaker, not on the code or the system, is decisive for this argument, since for many people the question is not whether they are monolingual or multilingual, but whether they actually use languages. Thus, Makoni and Pennycook provide a powerful questioning of assumptions about how languages are encapsulated in regimes that have become naturalised by the colonial project. They suggest that if a supposed scientific neutrality of linguistic knowledge characterises native speakers as idealised and language as an autonomous entity, engaging in a more symmetric dialogue with the users of multiple minority languages leads us to a necessary disinvention of “language” as a root-metaphor that guides our thinking about communicative practices.

As such studies in applied linguistics remind us, linguistics has long served the “interests and politics of missionaries and colonial administrators” (Makoni 2003: 136), and it certainly runs the risk of reinforcing power asymmetries through its practices. But this is not always necessarily the case today. Linguistics can also be a locus of resistance, empowerment, creativity, and positive change. Indigenous peoples and their allies can mobilise linguistics against coloniality. Think of Indigenous linguists like Mutuá Mehinaku (2010), for instance, who are interested in studying and documenting their languages for the best interest of their communities (Franchetto 2004: 43). Nowadays, we are even in the position of mobilising linguistics against linguistics: in other words, of meta-methodologically turning it against its colonial legacy in a way that allows for a deep look into questions of power, dominance, privilege, and ideological and religious bias in language.

The Flesh of Language

As I write, a railway cuts through portions of Awá Guajá lands in the state of Maranhão. Once again, Awá Guajá men will fail to hunt howler monkeys. The hunting relationship depends on sonic features: hearing, echoing, and deceiving the monkeys. In other words, the Awá Guajá hunt by mimicking. This is constantly threatened by the noise coming from the railway. It might be that no game will be brought home by night.⁶ This relates to how, in Indigenous Amazonia, “sound is the flesh of language,” to borrow from Charles Bernstein (1998). From the “strictly” linguistic perspective, though, some sounds count more than others: those associated with articulate language and humanness. At

all events, there are multiple instances in which sound mimicry, echo, repetition, and reiteration make sense and make life in Indigenous sonic regimes in Amazonia.

Numerous accounts and comparative analysis of the sonic regimes of Indigenous peoples in South America put flesh on this statement. As musicologists Bernd Brabec de Mori and Anthony Seeger say (2013), Indigenous Amazonian songs play a central role in rituals involving non-human knowledge, since they are a means of communication between humans and non-humans. Also, even if non-humans usually might not understand speech, they do understand songs. People with a trained ear can listen to non-humans and bring their knowledge into their own music. These are people who have mastered “world hearing,” as Brazilian ethnomusicologist Rafael José de Menezes Bastos—who has been working with the Kamayurá in the Upper Xingu region, in the state of Mato Grosso, Brazil, since the 1960s—calls it. Over the course of decades of fieldwork, Menezes Bastos has studied this topic in depth. In 1981, he was crossing Ipavu Lake by canoe with Eweka Kamayurá, an Indigenous master of “world hearing”—as Menezes Bastos would later describe him. Menezes Bastos recalls (2013a: 287):

We talked, rowing, under a beautiful sunset. Suddenly Eweka stopped speaking and rowing, fell silent and asked me to be quiet too, gesturing towards the bottom of the lake. Whispering he told me to listen to what was coming from down below. Despite my best efforts, I heard nothing from the watery depths. He said to me insistently: “Can’t you hear the fish singing? Listen, listen I heard nothing. This went on for several minutes. Later, back in the village, I concluded that Eweka had experienced some kind of hallucination, a fit of poetic inspiration or holy ecstasy, the whole event just a flight of imagination. I recall that some days later he simply told me that I needed to train my hearing.

It was not until years later that Menezes Bastos became acquainted with recordings of the “acoustic behaviour” of fish in an exhibition at the Federal University of Santa Catarina (288). This was how he realised how skilful Eweka was as a listener, to the extent of being able to perceive fish songs. By sharing this account, Menezes Bastos drew attention to another aspect related to how music is accessed among Indigenous societies in lowland South America: the way in which they become audible, which has to do with the development of an expertise in “world hearing.” In this sense, the Kamayurá term “anup,” which evokes both “hearing” and “understanding,” indicates that “world hearing” demonstrates an astounding ability for comprehension.

In his turn, Yanomami shaman and leader Davi Kopenawa, in his elaborate autobiography *The Falling Sky—Words of a Yanomami Shaman*,

co-produced with French ethnologist Bruce Albert, tells of how he began to sing by listening to the voices of the shamanic spirits known as xapiri (2012: 89–90):

At the moment the xapiri finally reveal their voices, your fear vanishes and you experience an intense bliss. (. . .) This is how I began to sing, despite all my fears! (. . .) I decided to answer the xapiri's voices by echoing them. (. . .) Their voices seemed perfectly discernible to me. Satisfied, I applied myself to imitating their sound and their words, again and again, without stopping. Seeing my efforts, the xapiri came to my assistance. They told themselves: "He probably doesn't hear us well! Let's start over! What can we do so our songs become audible to him?" Then they start to sing again, making our voices stronger. This is how I finally heard them and began to sing like them. If we try hard to answer the spirits, (. . .) they lend us their throats and reinforce our tongues. This way, the words of the xapiri's song rapidly increase within us in a tape recorder.

Having mastered how to echo xapiri spirits, Yanomami men are ready to engage in a ritual that starts when one man begins chanting softly and asks another man to repeat his words. They take turns, chanting very rapidly and echoing each other, sometimes all night long, until the sun comes up.

"Altership" and Affect Beyond the Human/ Non-Human Divide

Indigenous specialists on world hearing such as Eweka Kamayurá and Davi Kopenawa have mastered the practice of listening to apparently inaudible nonhuman voices that remain unknown or ignored within distributions of the sensible proper to Euro-American frames of reference. In *The Politics of Aesthetics and its Discontents*, French philosopher Rancière defines the distribution of the sensible as both "the system of a priori forms determining what presents itself to sense experience" (2008: 13) and the way in which "the practices and forms of the visibility of art . . . distribute spaces and times, subjects and objects, the common and the singular" (2009: 25). Taking seriously that listening to fish songs and to the xapiri is possible puts into question *a priori* distributions of the sensible brought about the human/non-human divide in relation to communicative practices. This awareness calls into question the tendency to disqualify the specificity of Indigenous communicative practices with derogatory and colonially condescending common places such as "It's their belief," which imply there's one reality, and then true and untrue versions of it, the untrue versions being the ones that should be merely tolerated.

Affect beyond the human/non-human divide also takes place among the Yanéscha of Peruvian Amazonia, as Fernando Santos-Granero reports: "It is only after having heard the same song ten times that an apprentice must begin to repeat it and learn it, which consists on attracting the animal that owns the song, making it into a friend and spiritual protector" (2006: 113). In addition, Deise Lucy Oliveira Montardo (2002: 45) tells us about how Guarani songs are not created by them but come from elsewhere:

The Guarani do not consider themselves masters of songs. Even individual songs personally received by each one of them in dreams are received by merit, as a gift. They are not composed by the person. The person listens to them. Their idea is that music already exists elsewhere.

This has to do with the idea of "altership" proposed by Marc Brightman, Carlos Fausto, and Vanessa Grotti (2016: 20) in order to emphasise how humans in Indigenous Amazonia are not exactly creators in the sense of an individual author, but rather *alterers*, "capable of othering themselves and switching perspectives in order to appropriate new songs and new names" (21). By presenting that proposal, the ethnologists are interested in making explicit the contrast between the individuation of property in Western property relations and the multiplicity of alterities that constitutes forms of ownership in Indigenous Amazonia.

This is not the same as saying that a notion that could be related to a property regime does not exist among Indigenous groups in the region (also when it comes to the complex relationships they establish with the State and market economy), but that the specificity of the idea of Western property as the institutionalisation of ownership, predicated on assumptions of individualism and possession, needs to be acknowledged—in other words, its presumed universality has to be challenged. It cannot be simply generalised to lowland Indigenous South America, where "personhood extends far beyond the human," "the subject-object distinction is by definition fuzzy (even inapplicable)" (11), and ownership is above all a relational phenomenon which has more to do with rights over relationships with others—be them persons, parts of persons, or things—than with people with respect to things and ideas (8).

The appropriation of new songs and new names among lowland Indigenous South American peoples is often made possible through a rigorous process of physical and intellectual learning, as well as through negotiations with nonhuman beings, song owners,⁷ and master spirits from different realms of the cosmos. If an idea of "authorship" is to emerge here, it will differ radically from the "generic image of primitive collectivism and from some of the other commonplaces brought by Western thought," as argued by Pedro de Niemeyer Cesarino (2010: 150),

who has been conducting a long-term ethnographic research among the Marubo, a Panoan people from the Javari Valley in Western Amazonas, Northwestern Brazil. Among Marubo shamans, what really matters is an ability to make connections with a “virtual field of knowledge” (162) that is neither individual nor internal; what really matters is mediating, with effectiveness and eloquence, words that come from elsewhere—for example, recursively embedding voices of different persons within one another. The web of relationships from which a shamanic utterance unfolds is an important indication that Amerindian multivoical “alter-ship” distances itself from the image of individual creativity that permeates much of our repertoire in literature and other arts.⁸

Intersemiotic Relations

In lowland Indigenous South America, ritual songs relate to manifestations that involve non-verbal features such as music, gesture, dance, graphic patterns, among others, as Pierre Délage explains (2012: 114). The association with modes of expression distinct from the song itself, of which Délage talks about, is even more revealing of the reductions and constraints that such modes of expression undergo when approached in a strictly linguistic manner:

Numerous rituals add various modes of expression to the songs, which are distinct from them: instrumental music, gesture, dance, artefacts, the organization of the space and chronology of the ritual etc. Each of these modes of expression comes from a particular form of learning, sometimes temporally distinct from that of the songs, but which in any case requires capacities that differ widely from those required for the memorization of speech. However, they are all intersemiotically connected to the ritual songs.

Menezes Bastos showed not only that ritual makes communication between different groups in the upper Xingu possible, but also that Kamayurá music is a “machine that transforms words into bodies” (1999b: 53). A similar dynamic to that of Kamayurá music can be verified in rituals of several peoples of Indigenous America, says Menezes Bastos, and it consists precisely on the role of music as the pivotal element of what he calls an “intersemiotic chain of ritual,” in which verbal, choreographic, and plastic-visual systems connect. Menezes Bastos refers to this dynamic as translation and to music as the Kamayurá “translating machine.”

Similar intersemiotic connections were observed by Angelika Gebhart-Sayer among the Shipibo-Conibo, a Panoan people living in Peruvian Amazon, between songs and graphic patterns. For the Shipibo-Conibo, therefore, reading the graphic patterns would mean to read music—in

other words, to translate between modes of expression: “In the shamanic ritual of this people, songs are the sonorous, reversible transposition of pictorial motifs. One might even say that the latter would be the visual transcription of the former, which would be, therefore, their musical score,” explains Menezes Bastos (2007: 298) as he recalls Gebhart-Sayer’s study.

The importance of the extralinguistic dimension highlights a decentralisation of the verbal code, which finds resonance in the context of studies on multimodality.⁹ In particular, Lynn Mario T. Menezes de Souza (2009) explains the multimodal tradition of the Kashinawá, another Panoan people, who live in the state of Acre, Brazil. Kashinawá multimodality, according to Menezes de Souza, integrates various systems of symbols—words, figures, icons, colours, and spatial dispositions—contrasting with the verbocentric bias propagated worldwide by the colonising legacy of Europe, which led to the suppression of other modes of expression.

Effectiveness Rather Than Referential Meaning

Thinking about communicative practices among Indigenous peoples in lowland South America also leads us to question the assumption of referentiality that is deeply rooted in Euro-American ways of conceiving of language. For instance, let us consider the limitations of referential semantics for approaching techniques of enunciation in shamanic songs. If, as Carlo Severi (2007) reported, the therapeutic effectiveness¹⁰ of Kuna healing songs does not depend on the understanding of the message by the person who receives care—as in the case of women who give birth without understanding the meaning of the words sung by the shaman who assists her—what actually matters is the production of sound images through the proliferation of parallelisms, rather than the intelligibility of narration. Severi’s account echoes the way Graham Townsley (1993: 458) describes the “elliptical” language of shamanic Yaminahua songs: among this Panoan people of Peruvian Amazon, shamanic practice

[is] intended to construct a particular type of visionary experience in the shaman himself and a communication, not with other humans, but with the non-human yoshi¹¹ who populate that visionary experience. The clue to this is given by the fact that most Yaminahua can barely understand the songs. Many shamanic songs are almost totally incomprehensible to all but other shamans.

As we see, the songs’ effectiveness prescinds being understood by those who are “sung” by them. This is related to the argument that Yaminahua shamanism is an “ensemble of techniques for knowing,” not “a system of knowledge”; that it is “a way of constituting” a discourse, not a

“constituted discourse” (452). And if singing, in turn, constitutes a path of verbal images to be traversed, traversing it in a skilful way is a capacity that is acquired through a process of transformation of the “condition of the body and its perceptions” (456).

As to Marubo shamanic songs, Cesarino (2008) talks about how parallel intensity in the healing songs mediates ritual agency and controls the shamanic processes of duplication which are involved in neutralising agents of illness. Through initiation rituals, shamans learn to master this parallel intensity by gradually transforming their bodies and empowering their speech. Instead of being directed towards the patient as an audience, the reiterative formulae actually seek to directly approach doubles/spirits as helpers. In other words, patients do not need to interpret them in order to be healed. Once again, effectiveness, rather than semantic referentiality, plays a prominent role.

Conclusion

By way of conclusion, I want to point out that we are colonised by certain ways of conceiving of language, but there is space for a disinvention and reconstitution of reified approaches to language through a consideration of the non-verbal and nonhuman complex ecology of forms of communication. In this chapter, I suggested that a critical approximation and shared commitment between applied linguistics and South American Indigenous ethnology may contribute to calling into question colonising ways of conceiving of language, as well as to permanently decolonise thought (Viveiros de Castro 2014: 40) and, as such, to help improve “the conditions of the ontological self-determination of the collectives” (43).

As we call for a reshuffling of conceptual cards in relation to what counts as language among lowland South American Indigenous peoples, it is important to elucidate the cosmological contrast between other worlds and our modern, Euro-American world. In the decolonising agenda that we need to constantly articulate and re-articulate along global and local dimensions, there is also the possibility of “post-abyssal thinking” (Sousa Santos 2007: 97)—a systematic, collective effort towards self-reflexivity that may give rise to the “epistemological diversity of the world.” Post-abyssal thinking emerges from the idea that there is endless diversity in the world and that this diversity still lacks an adequate epistemology, which still needs to be constructed (84).

What needs to be avoided in the construction of epistemological diversity is the epistemology of the “point zero” or the “point zero hubris”—in other words, the epistemic coloniality of a subject of enunciation that does not consider the situatedness of his point of view, presupposing a “point zero” from which it would be possible to mask both the speaker

and the location from where he speaks (Castro-Gomez and Grosfoguel 2007). Finally, it is important to remember that translating across cultural differences does not lie in consensus, nor in a unifying perspective, but in an ethical attitude of acceptance in face of the incompleteness of one’s own knowledge—one that is capable of allowing “a mutual intelligibility between different experiences of the world,” as Boaventura de Sousa Santos puts it (2005: 16).

Notes

1. Aristotle (2015) *Politics*. London: Aeterna Press.
2. Descartes, R. (2003) *Discourse on Method and Meditations*. Translated by Elizabeth Haldane and G. R. T. Ross. New York: Dover Publications.
3. Loudon, R. B. (2007) ‘Language: Who/What Has It? (And Were Aristotle and Descartes Right?)’. *History of Philosophy Quarterly* 26, 373–387 (373).
4. See, among others, Agamben, G. (2002) *The Open: Man and Animal*. Translated by Kevin Attell. Stanford: Stanford University Press and Agamben, G. (1993) *Infancy and History: On the Destruction of Experience*. Translated by Liz Heron. London and New York: Verso.
5. Let me clarify at the outset that when I say “Euro-American” or “we,” I don’t refer to a reified, unchanging, monolithic construct, but to discursive traditions that dwell in North American and Western European categories, vocabularies, and frames of reference, regardless of being located in Europe or in the Americas, and whose perspectives are to a large extent informed by Greco-Roman and Judaeo-Christian lenses or filters—even if not in stable, homogenous ways. Moreover, this clarification is important to prevent us from falling into the trap of a Manichean dichotomy between a readily familiar Euro-America versus a presumably unfathomable non-Euro-America.
6. For further information on the railway cutting through portions of Awá Guajá land, see “Indigenous tribe occupies railroad in protest” (<http://plus55.com/brazil-culture/2016/06/indigenous-tribe-occupies-railroad-in-protest>, last accessed: August 3, 2017).
7. For an in-depth discussion of the category of “owner,” see Carlos Fausto (2008). In a nutshell, it designates “a generalized mode of relationship which constitutes Amazonian sociality and characterizes interactions between humans, between humans and nonhumans, and between persons and things” (333), playing a fundamental role in Amerindian cosmological and political relations.
8. As Cesarino notes, this certainly does not mean that Indigenous peoples do not claim they possess forms of “knowledge such as songs and graphic patterns” (184).
9. As Kress and Van Leeuwen observe, multimodal texts are those “whose meanings are realized through more than one semiotic code” (1996/2006: 177).
10. In “The Effectiveness of Symbols” (1949/1963), Claude Lévi-Strauss attributed a physiological and psychological “effectiveness” to the shaman’s ritual symbols, which would be able to induce healing. Carlo Severi’s argument offers a revision of that theory.
11. “Yoshi” is defined by Townsley as spirit or animate essence (452). The greatest the shaman’s ability to deal with a yoshi is, the more powerful the former will be.

References

- Agamben, G. (1993). *Infancy and History: On the Destruction of Experience*. Translated by L. Heron. London and New York: Verso.
- Agamben, G. (2002). *The Open: Man and Animal*. Translated by K. Atwell. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Aristotle (2015). *Politics*. London: Aeterna Press.
- Bauman, R. and Charles, L. B. (2003). *Voices of Modernity: Language Ideologies and the Politics of Inequality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bernstein, C. (1998). *Close Listening: Poetry and the Performed Word*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Brabec de Mori, B. and Seeger, A. (2013). Introduction: Considering Music, Humans, and Non-Humans. *Ethnomusicology Forum*, 22, 3, 269–286.
- Castro-Gomez, S. and Grosfoguel, R. (2007). *El giro decolonial: Reflexiones para una diversidad epistémica más allá del capitalismo global*. Bogotá: Siglo del Hombre.
- Cesarino, P. (2008). *Oniska: A poética do mundo e da morte entre os Marubo da Amazônia ocidental*. Ph.D. Dissertation in Social Anthropology. Rio de Janeiro: Museu Nacional, Federal University of Rio de Janeiro.
- Cesarino, P. (2010). Donos e duplos: relações de conhecimento, propriedade e autoria entre marubo. *Revista de Antropologia*, 53, 1, 147–197.
- Déléage, P. (2012). Transmission et stabilisation des chants rituels. *L'Homme*, 203–204, 103–138.
- Descartes, R. (2003). *Discourse on Method and Meditations*. Translated by E. Haldane and G. R. T. Ross. New York: Dover Publications.
- Fausto, C. (2008). Donos demais: Maestria e domínio na Amazônia. *Mana*, 14, 2, 329–366.
- Franchetto, B. (2004). Línguas indígenas e comprometimento linguístico no Brasil: situação, necessidades e soluções. *Cadernos de Educação Escolar Indígena*, 3, 9–26.
- Grotti, V., Fausto, C. and Brightman, M. (eds.) (2016). *Ownership and Nurture: Studies in Native Amazonian Property Relations* (pp. 186–209). New York: Berghahn Books.
- Kopenawa, D. and Bruce, A. (2012). *The Falling Sky: Words of a Yanomami Shaman*. Translated by N. Elliott and A. Dundy. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Kress, G. and Van Leeuwen, T. (1996). *Reading Images: The Grammar of Visual Design*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Lévi-Strauss, C. (1949). The Effectiveness of Symbols. *Structural Anthropology* (pp. 186–205). New York: Basic Books.
- Makoni, S. (2003). *Black Linguistics: Language, Society, and Politics in Africa and the Americas*. London: Routledge.
- Makoni, S. and Mashiri, P. (2007). Critical Historiography: Does Language Planning in Africa Need a Construct of Language as Part of Its Theoretical Apparatus? In S. Makoni and A. Pennycook (eds.). *Disinventing and Reconstituting Languages* (pp. 62–89). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Makoni, S. and Meinhof, U. (2006). Linguística aplicada na África: Desconstruindo a Noção de Língua. In L. P. Moita Lopes (ed.). *Por uma Linguística Aplicada Interdisciplinar* (pp. 191–213). São Paulo: Parábola Editorial.
- Makoni, S. and Pennycook, A. (2007). Disinventing and Reconstituting Languages. In S. Makoni and A. Pennycook (eds.). *Disinventing and Reconstituting Languages* (pp. 1–41). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Makoni, S. and Pennycook, A. (2012). Disinventing Multilingualism: From Monological Multilingualism to Multilingual Francas. In M. Martin-Jones, A. Blackledge and A. Creese (eds.). *The Routledge Handbook of Multilingualism* (pp. 439–453). New York: Routledge.
- Mehinaku, M. (2010). *Tetsuialii: pluralismo de linguas e pessoas no Alto Xingu*. MA Thesis. Rio de Janeiro: Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro.
- Menezes Bastos, R. J. de (1999a). Aputap World Hearing: On the Kamayurá Phono-Auditory System and the Anthropological Concept of Culture. *The World of Music*, 4, 1, 85–99.
- Menezes Bastos, R. J. de (1999b). *A Musicológica Kamayurá: para uma Antropologia da Comunicação no Alto Xingu*. 2nd ed. Florianópolis: UFSC.
- Menezes Bastos, R. J. de (2007). Música nas sociedades indígenas das terras baixas da América do Sul: estado da arte. *Mana*, 13, 2, 293–317.
- Menezes Bastos, R. J. de (2013a). Aputap World Hearing Revisited: Talking with ‘Animals’, ‘Spirits’ and Other Beings, and Listening to the Apparently Inaudible. *Ethnomusicology Forum*, 22, 3, 287–305.
- Menezes Bastos, R. J. de (2013b). *A festa da jaguatirica: Uma partitura crítica interpretativa*. Florianópolis: Editora da UFSC.
- Menezes de Souza, L. M. T. (2009). The Ecology of Writing among the Kashi-nawá: Indigenous Multimodality in Brazil. In A. S. Canagarajah (ed.), *Reclaiming the Local in Language Policy and Practice* (pp. 73–95). Mahwah and London: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Montardo, D. L. O. (2002). *Através do mbaraka: música e xamanismo guarani*. Ph.D. Dissertation in Social Anthropology, Universidade de São Paulo, São Paulo.
- Mühlhäusler, P. (2000). Language Planning and Language Ecology. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 1, 3, 306–367. Print.
- Mühlhäusler, P. (2002). *Linguistic Ecology: Language Change and Linguistic Imperialism in the Pacific Region*. London: Routledge.
- Rancière, J. (2008). *The Politics of Aesthetics*. Translated by G. Rockhill. New York: Continuum.
- Rancière, J. (2009). *Aesthetics and Its Discontents*. Translated by S. Corcoran. Cambridge: Polity.
- Santos-Granero, F. (2006). Vitalidades sensuais. Modos não corpóreos de sentir e conhecer na Amazônia indígena. *Revista de Antropologia*, 49, 1, 93–131.
- Severi, C. (2007). *Le principe de la chimère: une anthropologie de la mémoire*. Paris: Musée du Quai Branly/Éditions Rue d’Ulm.
- Sousa Santos, B. de (2005). The Future of the World Social Forum: The Work of Translation. *Development*, 48, 2, 15–22.
- Sousa Santos, B. de (2007). Para além do Pensamento Abissal: Das linhas globais a uma ecologia de saberes. *Revista Crítica de Ciências Sociais*, 78, 3–46.
- Strathern, M. (1988). *The Gender of the Gift: Problems with Women and Probability in Society in Melanesia*. Berkeley, Los Angeles and London: University of California Press.
- Townley, G. (1993). Song Paths: The Ways and Means of Yaminahua Shamanic Knowledge. *L’Homme*, 126–128, 449–468.
- Viveiros de Castro, E. (2002). *A inconstância da alma selvagem*. São Paulo: Cosac Naify.
- Viveiros de Castro, E. (2014). *Cannibal Metaphysics: For a Post-Structural Anthropology*. Edited and translated by P. Skafish. Minneapolis: Univocal.

Section III

**Portuguese as Glocal
Language**

5 The Imaginary in Portuguese Language Perceptions in Academia

(Mis)directions Between the Local and the Global

Gesualda dos Santos Rasia

Introduction

In a documentary by Victor Lopes, entitled *Língua, vidas em Português* (Language: Lives in Portuguese) (Lopes 2002), the writer José Saramago argues: "There is not a Portuguese language, there are languages in Portuguese." This statement puts us face to face with the paradoxical uniqueness-plurality of the language of Camões and Machado de Assis. It also raises another question about the issue that we aim to investigate in this study: How are identity ties formed in a language that increasingly inhabits the interstices between local and global? Furthermore, another correlated question emerges from the latter: How is the Imaginary in the Portuguese language formed by language students, having in mind that previously they also become acquainted with theoretical assumptions that motivate these questions?

This analysis is based on the discourse studies of a materialistic approach, as proposed by Michel Pêcheux (1988), focusing specially on the notion of the Imaginary as developed in the "Imaginary Formations."¹ This approach concerns the fact that meanings are of a social character, and they are produced from the positions that the subjects attribute to each other mutually. In the same way, indexes of value are attributed via the material through which we speak: language. These discursive postulates are observed in relation to the studies on Sociolinguistics² and Sociology developed by Pierre Bourdieu, which grounded the notions of norm, identity, and power relations.

The approximation established between both of these fields of knowledge is justified by the relation between the values that are socially attributed to the different linguistic registers and to the production of a political division on the very core of the language. This is outlined in its global instance and also in its internal borders, which need to be overcome by subjects in their daily exchanges.

The hybridization movement consists of a coming and going between linguistic identity processes that are situated in a localized instance, in which there is a differential marking and a global marking, which is

responsible for the effect of the universalizing norm. This finding allows us to problematize how, in the case of Brazilian Portuguese, centripetal and centrifugal forces act in the power relations concerning the recognition/legitimation processes of the subjects and their linguistic registers.

The empirical dimension of this research consists of interviews with language professors in the undergraduate program of the Federal University of Paraná. The students were selected from different semesters and degrees and have attended the Sociolinguistics and/or the Discourse Analysis subjects in the last three years. The aims of the research plan consisted in: a) mapping the representations these students have about Portuguese as a language that moves between the local and the global; b) pointing out how theoretical contributions studied in academia provide subsidies for the confrontation of linguistic dissensions in daily exchanges; and c) realizing how Portuguese is spoken and placed in relation to foreign languages also studied in this program.

Given that the condition of the language of Camões and Machado de Assis is that of a plurality in its uniqueness, we are concerned with mapping how the imaginary that forms representations about this language constitutes itself from different points of view—woven by internal and external forces—as well as from its multiple developments.

Theoretical Assumptions: The Multiple Faces of Brazilian Portuguese's Constitution of Identity

Heterogeneous as any language, the differences in the Portuguese language in all the different countries/continents where it is spoken are not smaller in its Brazilian territory, which is our starting point for this study. The interplay and clashes between diversity and uniqueness have their historical roots in the conditions of production in which the establishment of this language, originated beyond the Atlantic, is inserted in the Brazilian historicity.

Its double foundation, which has given the language a paradoxical character, as previously affirmed, of diversity in unity, beckons us to approach the language issues from a historical and cultural perspective tightly influenced by aspects of political order. Orlandi (2009) refers to the local memory that has been weaving the language through the elaboration of its own linguistic instruments, which contemplated aspects that have been distinguishing Brazilian Portuguese from European Portuguese since the colonization process. It is worth emphasizing that these instruments are not limited to grammars and dictionaries, which are historically endorsed as a source of language legitimization. Nonetheless, the instruments have, in a special way, given visibility to the regional registers, in a clear *eulogy to the difference*. However, these only started finding their formal place in the early nineteenth-century production named *Brasileirismos*, *idiotismos*, *curiosidades verbaes* (Brazilianisms,

idiomatisms, verbal curiosities) (Orlandi 2009: 80). The author above nevertheless based his argument by providing legitimacy to the margins of what is generally considered the norm. The same norm that played, from its original institution, with what the author called “false bottom” in which

the “same” has, however, an “other,” a historical “different” that constitutes itself even in the resemblance of the same. The Portuguese and the Brazilian languages cover each other as if they were the same language; however, they are not. They produce different discourses; they have different meanings. (Orlandi 2009)

While attempting to constitute an identity of this language, the relation of the Brazilian memory with the Portuguese memory produced its effects in the determination of what is the grammatical norm and of what is “to use the language.” Consequently, it generates a double linguistic reality, defined by Orlandi (2009) as the imaginary and the fluid language, in which the latter would be the real, spoken language. The fluid language is the language that cannot be constrained since it is in a state of constant motion. The imaginary language would be the idealized form, which is installed in a fixed system of rules.

This Imaginary establishes not only the external border but also the multiple internal borders of the language, determined in an axial mode by the imaginary language. This occurs in a continuous and permanent attempt to paralyze the multiplicity of other possible and real forms, the fluid language. This relation is paradoxical due to the fact that the same movements towards the stiffening, the immutability, nonetheless confirm that of the becoming. From this tension derive the dissents that are not infrequently present in the media—for example, in situations where we witness attempts of regulation of what is imposed as correction patterns, defined by normalization manuals as “writing and speaking well.” In addition, there is—not absolutely disconnected from the previous situation—the political division of the speakers. The farther from the imaginary language, the more distant are the subjects from the possibility of being recognized as legitimate speakers of the language. This fact, in Bourdieu's terms, is an attribution of symbolic value of the subjects' social status through their respective linguistic registers. Hence, it is a relation of symbolic forces that is not, according to the author, “only defined by the structure of existing and properly linguistic competences, and the properly linguistic dimension cannot be separate from the linguistic productions” (Bordieu 2008: 11–12).

Marcellesi and Gardin already affirmed that “the groups effectively do not exist if not through the collective society, and the collective society through the groups” (Marcellesi and Gardin 1975: 19). Especially

if these groups distinguish themselves by their antagonisms and not by their similarities. From this point of view, the authors propose the study of linguistic activity by contrast, because “the various social classes have a historical role to consider.” This occurs as it starts from the following assumptions: linguistic activity is determined by an exteriority that is contingent in itself; the elements of culture are also active in linguistic activity, and not as an external and independent entity; the linguistic problems of the modern societies must be considered in its social connotations. This study does not perceive the external variables in an objective relation to the linguistic phenomena, but considers them in a historical-symbolic perspective.

Besides some of the questions reported above and to be discussed below about Brazilian Portuguese regarding the refraction of the mother tongue, there are still more recent linguistic relations. Marked by globalization, the twentieth century was the century of economic and political exchanges. However, we know that these two dimensions are not only overdetermined but also unequally related to each other and, furthermore, they affect linguistic issues directly. Thus, the influences on Brazilian Portuguese have been increasing due to the enlargement of the economic exchanges, to people flow, and, more particularly, to the importing of technology. The presence of the other languages reveals itself through morphic segments, words, and, finally, the limit of syntactic constructions. The incorporation of elements from outside the language inevitably incites confrontations of a political-ideological order—some ascribed to nationalistic positions—and also from the idea that it is possible to control the movements of the language and its uses through legal regulation.³

Both internal frontiers and external borders, woven in the multiple territorialities of the Portuguese language, refer to constructions that derive from political and economic orders. This fact ends up producing effects in the imaginary relations as the subjects project their own places and the place of the Other on society. However, the functioning of the Imaginary reaches the concrete relations, and it has not avoided leaving traces of symbolic violence. For example, the recent case of a Brazilian doctor who mocked a patient on social networks, because the patient, in an appointment, pronounced the pulmonary infection “pneumonia” as “peleumonia” (Vital 2016). The doctor made this jocular comment: *There is no “peleumonia.”* Nonetheless, the conditions of production in which the word has emerged were situated in an interactive context, spoken, in which the doctor understood his patient very well. At that interval, the word existed. Not only at that interval, because in that moment the notion of a certain social segment identity was already marked. Such marking is not related to a causal relation between the social segment and the phonetic-phonologic occurrences, but to a place of resistance against the spoken, well represented in the case mentioned.

Also emblematic is the case of an advertisement exhibited in the streets of a Brazilian state capital in 2013, at public transportation stops, in upper-middle class neighborhoods, which read, among other information, the following as a main slogan:

*Curso de Português para brasileiros.
Não tropece no Português e cresça na carreira.*

(Portuguese course for Brazilians. Do not stumble on your Portuguese and move forward in your career). The text says much more than one may think at a first glance, as soon as the effects of evidence are undone. Starting with the core assumption that Brazilians supposedly do not know their own language when they should already be proficient in it and, moreover, if we consider the image in the advertisement of a teenager and an adult. Then, we can understand that Portuguese is a language that presents difficulties, unveiled by the idea of “stumbling,” and that can be understood if we analyze it in terms of the ever-present dichotomy between the stiff norm and the flexible uses, which has already been discussed. Last, the relation between language mastery and professional success. This aspect has its share of veracity in the world order. Nonetheless, the problem lies in the gaps of what has not been said in the advertisement, and even among what could be said considering the historical conditions in which the advertisement had been produced. The advertisement is from a language school, which implies that it is the mother tongue taught from the perspective of the Other. Hence, what does “do not stumble on” mean? A better qualification on reading and writing a text? In this case, we believe that, in fact, this could qualify the subjects not only for a professional career, but also for their lives. However, if it is something restricted to normative knowledge, the effectiveness of this promise remains in doubt.

Up to this point, we have discussed some aspects that constitute Brazilian Portuguese identity, whether in its internal or external dimension, as well as in its historical and contemporary dimension. The fact that it is the language of colonization, which has obtained its own statute, not forgetting this memory, which is nonetheless re-signified, brings some elements that direct us to the next point of discussion, the local and global dimension of the language.

Agreements and Disagreements Between the Local and the Global

Nowadays, the Portuguese language lies in the sixth position of the most spoken languages in the world, with 244 million speakers (Camões: Instituto da cooperação e da língua). This fact, on the one hand, allows this language a political-cultural position and, therefore, an economic

position; on the other hand, it brings about a discussion on the meanings implied in its realization in this wide range of countries and continents where its speakers are spread. Saramago's statement above, "There is not a Portuguese language, there are languages in Portuguese," emphasizes the unity/diversity paradox. This paradox is based on the questions recently discussed around the identity of the Brazilian language and can be put in terms of diversity in unity.

Pêcheux's notion of *imaginary formations*, which refers to the places that subjects attribute to themselves and to others within the discursive processes, may help us in this matter. These places emerge from the projected image regarding the position they occupy in the social spectrum, and also from the projected image about the referent. In this case, the language of which they are speakers: Brazilian Portuguese.

Following Pêcheux (Gadet and Hak 1993: 83), a discursive process implies the anticipation, from the subject who speaks, based on the representations resulting from the interplay of images, which impose the following questions mutually: "Who am I to speak to you in this manner?" "Who is he for me to speak with him in this manner?" as well as the different ways these questions respectively unfold.

Such interrogations enable the understanding, for example, of the meaning implied in the previously discussed language school advertisement about the Portuguese language. The subject of discourse who makes an utterance there, speaks from a realm of anticipation, crystallized in the already-spoken, which affirms the difficulties of learning the mother language. At this point, the gap between the notions of fluid language and imaginary language is installed. In the name of such supposed difficulty, the subject of discourse situates him/herself in the site of arrival, of waiting for the subject-Other, the one addressed by the advertisement, promising the dissipation of all and any possibility of "stumbling." Therefore, the relation with the referee is somewhat ambiguous, due to its double standing in a double position of inaccessibility to its own speakers. This is parallel to the possibility of "disclosure" strangely assigned to the Other's place. This advertisement is very emblematic in this discussion by demonstrating some aspects of the relation between the local and the global since that is where the zones of contradiction become materialized.

Orlandi (2012: 6–18) approaches the notion of globalization also from the perspective of an imaginary construction that establishes the idea of an "apparent global unification" that, however, "erases deep disparities and, by doing so, reinforces the differences, both in space and social levels" (my translation). Such imbalance materializes itself both in the discourse of expropriation of the language by its own speakers and in the incoherence between the national language and the foreign language school. The question of value, as pointed out by Bourdieu (2008), emerges once again in the materialization of difference amid the discourse of universalism.

Nevertheless, the compensation, the instruments of resistance, and the forms that make possible the agreement between the local (or the locals) and the global emerge while giving visibility to the multiple cultural, social, and linguistic forms, in the different spaces, being they local or global. However, it is important to highlight, as emphasized by Orlandi (2012: 5) that it is: "*the capacity to get in touch with different languages that allow the local actors to impose themselves at an international level.*" And not the monolingualism, I would add, that deprives the subject from their pluridimensional and interchangeable subjectivities" (his emphasis).

This repositioning of the subject in relation to his/her language, when considered in the spectrum of other languages in the global scenario, can be conceived in a special manner if we consider the historicity of the Portuguese language. Its memory domains must also be considered as well as the internal and external relations of forces that derive from it and still produce their effects. These questions have immediate implications in the sphere of international organizations, which regulate the linguistic policies. Their effects are not infrequently sensed/experienced by tourists, (im)migrants or students who every day move across borders. These are not those who make political decisions because they are in the condition of language users, some of whom are language scholars. These will be our focus from now on.

The Brazilian Portuguese Language in Transit: In and Between the Glances of University Students

As far as the non-universalization of the Portuguese language in the world context is concerned, its speakers are now in a much more global condition than in previous decades. And, in the Brazilian case, more specifically, the last decade experienced a maximization of this transit in the academic sphere, as a result of public policies that aimed at research and internationalization. As a consequence, the subjects were called to interact with other languages from the starting point of their mother and official language. As an effect of globalization and its economic movements, many young students came to Brazil seeking cultural and knowledge exchanges. Here they also put themselves at the linguistic border, in which they produced meaning about and to their mother languages having the Brazilian language as a parameter and, dialectically, produced meaning toward it, although based on their own language's otherness in relation to Brazilian Portuguese, and what they mean to the participants as their speaking subjects. Therefore, these relations, which constituted this study's material of analysis, will be the focus below.

The subjects of this research were: three native speakers of Brazilian Portuguese without experience of living abroad; three native speakers of Brazilian Portuguese with experience of living at least six months abroad; and three speakers of Portuguese as a foreign language who were

undergraduate students in exchange programs at the Language department. It is important to note that the first three students without experience abroad are also studying other languages, most of them English. The research questions conducted the analysis excerpts presented in the sections below as *discursive blocks*. This notion helps us give a certain discursive unity throughout the analysis since the various particular "sites of voice," by which we mean their particular contexts, will not be given a focus here.

3.1. *The Brazilian Portuguese Language From Inside: The Vision of Academics With No Experience Abroad*

Identities are always forged from the glance of the Other, a relation of otherness that configures from the outside how the subjects are seen so that they can speak about themselves. We are discussing the domain of the Imaginary Formations, in Pêcheux's terms (Gadet and Hak 1993: 82), and when the first question was proposed, "Which aspects define/distinguish you as a Brazilian?" we understood that the answers are not only projected on the horizon of a distinguishable Other, but also on an imaginary constructed *Brazilian-ness*.

De1: The first of the aspects that I consider is to have been born and have always lived in Brazil. The understanding of the Brazilian culture and the use of the Portuguese language as my mother language.

De2: The fact that I have the Brazilian Portuguese as my mother language and all the cultural aspects of the society where I live, which were incorporated by me.

Language and culture converge as elements of identification in both discursive sequences. It is important to stress that language emerges in its *mother* status with regard to the constitution of identity, the meaning of which can be perceived beyond the mere scope of designation; it is circumscribed to that which cuts/divides the space of politics in language between the dimension of the State language, with its injunctions and the language that is brought from home, used for the daily exchanges, and is submitted to institutionalization at school. Another aspect that also deserves attention is the reference to the language, which is, however, stated in the quotes above: *Portuguese language*, in De1, and *Brazilian Portuguese* in De2. The subjects reproduce, in the very space of the utterance, the double filiation, determined by different historical conditions of production, which was discussed in the initial part of this study.

Concerning the second question, "What does 'to know the Portuguese language' mean to you?" it can be stated that the answers point out to the internal dimension of the language: the skill of making themselves

understood among their pairs. On the one hand, this seems to be obvious but, on the other hand, it is in fact a discourse that deconstructs utterances about the hermeticism of the language, of a supposed incomprehensibility for the speakers themselves.

De3: Being able to make other speakers of the language understand what is been said in Portuguese.

De4: To know the Portuguese language is not only to be able to communicate in the language, but also to understand the nuances of the language.

3.2. *The Brazilian Portuguese Language Across the Border: The Imaginary Constructed About and From the Language*

The point of view of academics who had studied abroad was undoubtedly partial since it is a small sample within a significantly larger universe. However, this is not a quantitative research—for this reason, we consider the quotes provided below as representative of some perceptions produced by academics with experience across borders.

The constitution of social memory is not woven, by default, of the subjects' constitution of identity when talking about their culture or about their language. The academics who participated in this study are from a public University of the State of Paraná, in southern Brazil, and are all descendants of European immigrants.⁴ The question proposed in this research was: "*Are/where you easily and immediately identified as a Brazilian, in your contacts with other people abroad? In this case, in what aspects specifically?*" Invariably, all answered that initially they were not recognized as Brazilians, especially because of their physical traits. A few of them were identified as foreigners "through their first words," but not necessarily as Brazilians. However, what calls our attention in their answers is the projection of an imaginary distant from the Brazilian identity, provoked by the look of the foreign-Other and legitimated at once by the former:

De5: "No, not even my accent *was* identified as one of a Brazilian, people seem very surprised when they know about my origin."

De6: "In the first moment, I was not identified as a Brazilian, *on the contrary*, they *even* thought I was Spanish (. . .) before my first words, *of course*, they thought I was Spanish."

De7: "I was *easily* identified as foreigner, *but they only* knew that I was Brazilian after I said that."

The legitimation, which we referred to, is given through the symbolic, constituted by the surprise element in De5. In this moment, it can be said that

there is a desire of approximation with the European identity, observed in the double negative: "not even my accent was identified." Furthermore, the "confusion" made by the Other's perception when the subject is not himself/herself attached to their language, as is apparent in De6. In this "arrival" to the Other-language, the subject presents him/herself at distance from possible elements of identification with their homeland identity, materialized by the intensifiers on the contrary and even. De7 follows the same perspective, in which the adversative structure has a strangely made inversion: in a first moment, there is a false assertive, which is, however, presented as true: "I was easily identified as foreigner." Only in the second segment of the sentence the true proposition related to her nationality is presented. The expected, in terms of the construction of the utterance, from the point of view of a desire of recognition of their Brazilian identity, could perhaps be stated as: "I was not recognized immediately as Brazilian, but only after I said I was not a foreigner."

Another question proposed to the interviewees was, "Are there written materials in Portuguese in the country you lived in? In this case, in which contexts and which kinds of materials?" In addition: "Was it in Brazilian or European Portuguese? Besides written materials, did you perceive the presence of other aspects of Brazilian culture (song, art, food, etc.)?" These three questions were used as subsidies to the study tools so that the research participants could reflect on the following question: "What is your evaluation about the space that the Portuguese language occupies in the country you lived in?"

De8: A very small number. At the university (Lyon 2) there is an undergraduate course in Languages—Portuguese. I know that there is a Portuguese center in the city. In general, the Portuguese language is associated to Portuguese people, because there was a great migratory flux at some time. The Portuguese occupied jobs notably in civil construction.

De9: I opted to circulate in a space where there were many speakers of Portuguese. Because of the music, all musicians interested in samba, bossa nova and MPB ended up learning Portuguese. Then, considering this space specifically, I felt that there were many exchanges with the Brazilian culture being passed on through the language.

On the other hand, in more institutionalized spaces there was nothing in Portuguese. Even in some museums, with guides in several languages, I realized that we could not find it in Portuguese at all times. Or when Portuguese was presented, it was marked with the flag of Portugal. Audio guides were always in European Portuguese too.

De10: I think that the interest in the Portuguese language is very specific. I got in touch with Portuguese classes, and the majority

of the students were learning the language because they had some kind of relationship with Brazilians or Portuguese (they were dating, married, had grandchildren or friends in Brazil/Portugal).

The interest in learning Spanish is much higher too, which in a certain way "overshadows" the teaching of Portuguese. De11: In Munich especially, one can find a lot about Brazilian culture. I found some places, as hairdressers, Brazilians food stores, nightclubs with the same music and operation as in Brazil, *forró* events, cultural meetings with Brazilians stalls and many Brazilians. The Germans I have met loved *caipirinha* and soccer; they always reminded me of both. Especially of soccer because they won the last World Cup.

The answers were almost consensual since academics practically did not notice the free circulation of Portuguese language items. The considerations about this absence of linguistic awareness deserve our attention. The ways in which the subjects answered allow us to perceive the production of meanings about the language and the subjects themselves.

Due to the European context, it is understandable that Portuguese, if found to be present in any environment, has its European variant as a dominant, as reported by the student who mentions the Portuguese flag. However, even this presence is sporadic and restricted to touristic spaces and in writing. Another feature of the Portuguese presence, besides tourism, is the specificity of learning the language as it is determined by the particular interests of the individuals themselves. Even if this interest emerges from interpersonal relationships, in fact it is also determined by the actual exchanges. However, the question resides in which ways these actions are considered, ranging from a political perspective, which aims to the institutionalization of a space in which language affairs, identity, and political dimension are considered constitutive.

The relation between language and its cultural dimension also called our attention. It is known that Brazil is recognized by its music, especially samba and MPB (Brazilian popular music), by its festivities in Carnival, and by soccer. These characteristics are not absent of internal criticism, because we see in this a recognition of a stereotypical form of our representation. This stereotype obliterates other materialities of our cultural multiplicity, besides overestimating the economic-touristic dimension. Then, considering this criticism, the music sphere works as a link for linguistic approximation and also for learning, as expressed in De9. If in the French context, the "meeting" with the language occurred through cultural elements that happened due to the initiative and the movement of Brazilian residents, it seems not to be the case of a German context in Munich, as represented by De11. The emergence of the Brazilian presence through labor occurs in an interesting manner. On the one hand, it seems to maintain a niche aiming at Brazilians, especially for the maintenance/