

Introduction

Lusofonia—A Concept and Its Discontents

A Concept Is a Concept Is a Concept

A short introduction is not the proper place for a thorough theoretical discussion on the concept of Lusofonia. It is a complex multilayered concept—with linguistic, political, historical, and multi-secular cultural implications—and the dossier of articles under *Lusofonia and Its Futures* deals specifically with its history and theorization. I therefore refer the reader interested in grasping the current debates on the issue to the groundbreaking collection of essays gathered here, as they present an up-to-date rewriting of the boundaries of the lusophone universe.¹

Moreover, it is important to remember that several other issues of *Portuguese Literary & Cultural Studies* have already discussed specific aspects of Lusofonia, including substantial case studies of particular contexts. I have in mind volumes 8 (*Cape Verde: Language, Literature & Music*), 10 (*Reevaluating Mozambique*), 11 (*Vitorino Nemésio and the Azores*), 15/16 (*Remembering Angola*), and 17/18 (*Parts of Asia*).² As a matter of fact, the editorial guidelines of *Portuguese Literary & Cultural Studies* have always been committed to rendering visible the plurality underlying the notion of Lusofonia. In this sense, the present issue provides a unique opportunity to propose a theoretical gaze at the work accomplished by the journal over the past fifteen years.

A wave of publications in English has been devoted to the topic, constituting a refreshing look at the field itself.³ Two dominant tendencies can already be discerned, namely, deliberate efforts to revise the history as well as the concept of Lusofonia within the broader context of the world-system, as conceptualized by Immanuel Wallerstein,⁴ and within the contemporary debates over globalization and its political and cultural consequences. These are relevant theoretical moves. Instead of being understood in isolation, as an autonomous historical force, Lusofonia is being read as an outcome of a historical and ideological movement that encompasses and at the same time surpasses the linguistic boundaries of any given linguistic territory. This vantage point prompts the overcoming of any essentialist concern, once what is privileged is the relational

nature of the lusophone world, which can be better seized within a comparative framework. If in José Saramago's novel, *The Stone Raft*,⁵ Portugal is literally set adrift from Europe, Lusofonia is a concept metaphorically adrift, and if any anchorage is to be found, it will have to be through a complex triangular structure, always implying a circuit (and sometimes a short circuit) of uncertain exchanges and reciprocal gazes. The insularity that fostered the search for "authentic" forms of Lusofonia is replaced by a dialogical model, in which the very notion of authenticity loses its former significance.

A telling example of the first approach—understanding the lusophone world within the dynamics of the world-system—is Boaventura de Sousa Santos's thought-provoking essay "Between Prospero and Caliban: Colonialism, Post-colonialism, and Inter-identity." As the author states, "The aim of this essay is to further ongoing research on identity processes in the time-space of the Portuguese language. A vast, multi-secular contact zone is implied involving the Portuguese people and other peoples of America, Asia, and Africa." His innovative viewpoint can only be unfolded within the acknowledgment of the semiperipheral position occupied by the Portuguese empire in the world-system, which brought forth "an intermediate economic development and a position of intermediation between the center and the periphery of the world economy."⁶ It is, so to speak, a truth universally acknowledged that triangular inter-relations of all sorts are the leitmotif of Lusofonia.

Fernando Arenas's *Lusophone Africa: Beyond Independence* is the most recent and compelling example of the second tendency, underscoring the potential relationships between lusophone issues and contemporary approaches developed in the fields of literary, cultural, and anthropological studies. The author provides a lucid summary of his project: "One of the primary objectives of *Lusophone Africa: Beyond Independence* is to stress the importance of carefully situating discussions on globalization and postcolonialism within the specific historical, geopolitical and cultural contexts of given nation-states, regions, and/or linguistic communities."⁷ One of the main concepts of the theoretical framework proposed by Arenas is the notion of "Lusophone transatlantic matrix,"⁸ which allows him to establish a groundbreaking dialogue among Portugal, Brazil, and African nations based on a dialectical oscillation between the global and the local, the self and the other. Luiz Felipe de Alencastro had already shown how these triangular connections were crucial to the economic and cultural development of Brazil;⁹ Arenas enlarges the scope of the reflection, providing analyses

of case studies that shall become important references in the field. As far as the history of the diplomatic and cultural relationship of Brazil with the independent African lusophone countries is concerned, Jerry Dávila has produced a lucid account in *Hotel Trópico: Brazil and the Challenge of African Decolonization, 1950–1980*. Once more, his research relies on the seemingly inescapable triangularity that determines the strength as well as the dilemmas of the lusophone worldview.¹⁰

In light of recent publications and innovative approaches, *Lusofonia and its Futures* aims at contributing to this increase in dialogue. A succinct reflection on its contents is necessary in order to encompass the diversity of viewpoints conveyed by its contributors.

Discontent and Necessity

Traditionally, Lusofonia has been conceived as the historical outcome of the cultural identity forged among speakers of Portuguese. In a different context, and with a different objective, Oswald de Andrade dreamed of an anthropophagic civilization in which the common denominator would be a strategic gesture rather than an essential feature: “Cannibalism alone unites us. Socially. Economically. Philosophically.”¹¹ By the same token, according to this traditional perspective, Lusofonia would refer to the act of speaking the “same” language across various countries and cultures. Thus understood, the concept seems to describe an objective circumstance; after all, Portuguese is the official language of eight countries: Angola, Brazil, Cape Verde, Guinea-Bissau, Mozambique, Portugal, São Tomé and Príncipe, and East Timor. And this list, for instance, does not include Macau, regions in Africa, and areas in India where the idiom of *Camões* is also present. It is no surprise then that Portuguese ranks fifth among spoken languages and among those used on the Internet: approximately 270 million persons employ the language daily. Finally, the creation of the *Comunidade dos Países de Língua Portuguesa (CPLP)* in 1996 was aimed precisely at fostering this alleged cultural unity, grounded upon the usage of Portuguese.¹²

This neutral description, however, does not allow for much-needed understandings of the plurality and, above all, the contradictions that underlie the concept. This issue of *Portuguese Literary & Cultural Studies* emphasizes a critical reappraisal of the history of Lusofonia, stressing its polemical meanings and its ideological resonances. The contributors to *Lusofonia and Its Futures* have assumed the task of turning the concept literally upside down. Their essays evoke

Reinhart Koselleck's reflection on the perception of time in moments of epistemological crisis, when it is not granted that the experiences of past and present can be aligned, much less properly interpreted. In hermeneutic terms, the "horizon of expectation" concerning Lusofonia does not look particularly promising nowadays, for it has become an overcharged word, with a long and sometimes distressing history. Indeed, the title of this issue could easily have been rewritten as "Lusofonia and Its Futures Past."¹³

In a nutshell, if we are to rescue a potential commonality promised by the usage of Portuguese, the common ground cannot be determined by a neutral image of a "natural" speech act; rather, it must be established by a collective effort toward a new understanding of the political and epistemological implications of sharing a language initially imposed as an intrinsic part of a colonial enterprise. We are not referring to an Adamic experience of naming a brave new world, but to a historical process that goes hand in hand with the suppression of alternative languages and worldviews. Antonio de Nebrija, in the preface to his *Gramática de la lengua española*, printed in 1492, rendered this dimension with unmistakable clarity. In his plain words, "siempre la lengua fue compañera del imperio" (language has always been the companion of Empire).

Miguel Tamen has voiced this misapprehension with great eloquence. According to his remarks, the very idea of Lusofonia has to be called into question because it "corresponds historically to a kind of liberal colonialism, the idea that with the disappearance of the Portuguese Empire, it might be possible to maintain its spiritual substitute." This notion would have enabled the postulation of a "Portuguese exceptionalism, the idea that Portuguese are different from anyone else."¹⁴ The recent scholarship on Lusofonia precisely rejects any sort of exceptionalism, which cannot but reiterate outmoded essentialist assumptions. An emphasis on comparative approaches may then be considered an academic as well as a political statement.

This is the main contribution of the essays assembled in this issue of *Portuguese Literary & Cultural Studies*. Lusofonia can only become an important conceptual tool if, first and foremost, we fully acknowledge that, as in the case of Sigmund Freud's analysis of the civilizing process, it is paired with a corresponding notion. In other words, "Lusofonia and Its Discontents" should be the proper motto for our reflections on the topic.

However, in order to develop the analogy, Freud's notion of the necessary discontent produced by the civilizing process should be grasped in its complexity.

It is not simply a nuisance that in better circumstances could be circumvented toward a happier way of life. The discontent is intrinsically associated with the fact that, by merely living in society, one is obliged to measure the fruition of his desires according to their consequences upon others: measure for measure seems to be the Freudian law of desire. It is not a matter of either/or, but rather a question of simultaneously embracing and not embracing Lusofonia; above all, it is a matter of learning to turn this paradox into a productive machine for thinking and creating.

There is a double bind that constitutes the lusophone worldview. As a result, in order to renew our understanding of the concept of Lusofonia, a reading of Gregory Bateson's work may be as relevant as a discussion of the latest theoretical trends.¹⁵ Or we may think of Paul Gilroy's usage of the notion of "double consciousness."¹⁶ In both cases, the only way to deal with the difficulties created by the inextricable ambiguity of the predicament implied by the notion of Lusofonia is precisely to talk about it, to translate it into a theoretical discourse.

After all, it is not the language, alone, that unites us, but a critical gaze towards its complex history, plural presents, and plural possibilities.

About This Volume

The essays gathered in this issue systematically bring to the fore the diversity of the usages of Portuguese language, along with the different appropriations of its heritage in various cultural contexts.

Benjamin Abdala proposes a keen reflection on the limits as well as the possibilities of cultural flows and exchanges—trademarks of globalization. However, he keeps one eye open for the political implications of these movements; after all, they keep on being asymmetrical, faithfully obeying the current political hegemony. Abdala's article, therefore, critically unveils the foundations of contemporary lusophone connections: "Supranational community relations today are ties of a society that tends to organize itself into networks. In relation to Portuguese-speaking countries, these linguistic and cultural ties were formed through a common historical experience associated with the colonial system."

Bethania Mariani's essay vigorously relies on the case study of Mozambique in order to scrutinize the unavoidable exclusions that ground the formation of nation-states. In a famous lecture, Ernst Renan recalled that the establishment

of modern nations was only possible through a methodic act of forgetting the conflicts of the national past, always tainted by “deeds of violence.”¹⁷ Mariani focuses on a paradox typical of Lusofonia: “Portuguese, like all languages, exists in relation to other languages, and it is precisely this aspect that the term ‘Lusofonia’ insists on silencing in multilingual countries, especially when it involves the long historical route that ranges from colonization to independence movements.” Mariani’s article, on the contrary, gives voice to the contentious encounters underlying the idealized notion of Lusofonia.

Christopher Larkosh is concerned with the Portuguese-American experience, although his essay also touches upon other aspects of Lusofonia as well. Larkosh offers the reader a multilayered text, fusing academic reflection with personal memoir. He wishes “to reexamine the dynamics of literary resonance, not only in the works of two contemporary Portuguese-American authors, Katherine Vaz and Frank X. Gaspar, but also across the sites and common places of lived experience in southeastern Massachusetts, the place from which I reconstitute my own encounter with the Portuguese language.”

Luís Madureira’s contribution has a perfectly descriptive title: “Lusofonia: From Infancy to Necrology.” Indeed, he manages to establish a complex link between his personal experience and the vicissitudes of the lusophone worldview, mediated by a solid knowledge of its history. Moreover, Madureira produces a disquieting mapping out of Lusofonia, stressing the ambiguity of its predicament, grounded, as we now know, on a double-bind structure. As he states: “the history of the Portuguese language in Africa has been ambivalent. Its violent inception notwithstanding, Portuguese played a significant role in the liberation movements, not only in mobilizing and politicizing, [but also in] building a ‘national culture’ across ethnolinguistic lines.”

Michelly Carvalho and Rosa Cabecinhas have conducted research on the high-voltage controversies concerning the orthographic agreement signed on 12 October 1990¹⁸ and currently being implemented, although not without resistance. Their article provides evidence that, more than ever in its multifaceted history, the traditional concept of Lusofonia demands a radical rethinking of its assumptions. An assertion of the supposed commonality of language is no longer a necessary cause to sustain its claims.

Vincent Barletta’s essay performs a keen deconstruction of the connection between Portuguese language and Portuguese empire. He does so by returning to the empire’s origins in order to denounce even more poignantly the illusions

drawn in the ideological promise of an alleged “Mapa Rosa.” As Barletta clarifies, it “was a nineteenth-century document that represented Portugal’s claim to sovereignty over Angola, Mozambique, and the wide strip of land between the two (modern-day Malawi, Zambia, and Zimbabwe). The Portuguese government discarded the Pink Map in 1890, in the wake of a British ultimatum that laid claim to the territory between Angola and Mozambique.” This ultimatum renders explicit the semiperipheral status of the Portuguese colonial empire, even when it was at its peak. Its decline, therefore, does not represent an adverse historical moment, but the very “fado” of this predicament, properly recalling the simultaneity of both “chaos and splendor,” as has been suggested by the uncompromising Eduardo Lourenço.¹⁹

This notion is particularly relevant to the set of articles dedicated to a complex and fascinating case study, “Inside/Outside Lusofonia: The Case of Goa.” Joana Passos, Sandra Ataíde Lobo, Constantino Xavier, and Duarte Drumond Braga raise a disquieting albeit indispensable question: If, in spite of its impressive numbers, Portuguese has never been a hegemonic language, then how should one think of a peripheral experience within a semiperipheral circumstance? The double-bind structure of the lusophone worldview comes to a paroxysm: this is exactly the case of Goa within the world of Lusofonia. In terms rendered well known by Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari, how to theorize on a minority expression when it takes place within an already minor language?²⁰ The theoretical potential of these article-manifestoes deserves to be further developed.

For instance, a current cinematographic and literary project seems to take full advantage of this possibility. In *Nada tenho de meu* (I Have Nothing of My Own), a title inspired by a sentence extracted from one of Camilo Pessanha’s letters, Miguel Gonçalves Mendes, a Portuguese moviemaker, Tatiana Salem Levy, a writer born in Portugal and raised in Brazil, and João Paulo Cuenca, a contemporary Brazilian author, travel together to the Far East.²¹ One of their destinations is Macau, and some of the best moments of the project are derived from the surprise of finding oneself immersed in the repetition of the “same” language and yet surrounded by radical differences in historical and cultural environment.²²

As the reader may now appreciate, *Lusofonia and Its Futures* provides sufficient food for thought concerning recent discussions of the concept. At the same time, however, *Portuguese Literary & Cultural Studies* is also composed of three other permanent sections—Essays, Reviews, and Fiction.

In the Essays section, Sandra Guardini Teixeira Vasconcelos, the foremost Latin American specialist on the phenomenon of the rise of the novel, studies the presence of the British novel in nineteenth-century Brazilian literature; her essay represents the most accurate research yet carried out on the topic. Walnice Nogueira Galvão offers a refined and comprehensive analysis of the reception of Fernando Pessoa in Brazil.

In Reviews, Greg Mullins provides an insightful reading of *The Book of Emotions*, a novel by one of the most important Brazilian contemporary authors, João Almino, whose growing international accolades have stimulated the translation of his work into several languages. Pedro Meira Monteiro, a leading scholar of Brazilian and contemporary literature, dissects with great acumen the work of José Miguel Wisnik, a renowned musician and powerful thinker. As part of a promising work-in-progress, Richard Simas initiates a careful interpretation of the fictional universe of Gonçalo M. Tavares, one of the most celebrated writers of the new Portuguese generation. Sandra Guerreiro Dias puts forward a well-informed and original discussion of Lídia Jorge's *A noite das mulheres cantoras*. Tania Martuscelli clarifies the importance of Márcia Valéria Zamboni Gobbi's critical work on the presence of myth and parody in the shaping of contemporary Portuguese literature.

Last but not least, we introduce a new section—Fiction and Interview—as part of our endeavor to create a venue for the translation of fictional works originally written in Portuguese. This initiative should energize *Portuguese Literary & Cultural Studies* by bringing its readers a sense of the different ways in which the language is currently being experienced across the lusophone world. Repetition and difference will be our compass in this enterprise. We welcome submissions from writers as well as from translators and scholars interested in promoting contemporary authors. It goes without saying that we also encourage the submission of new translations of classical texts. Ideally, this section should become an open forum for the development of linguistic experiences, including authorial comments on their specific literary craftsmanship.

The new section is inaugurated by the witty reflections of Brazilian author Evando Nascimento, in which literature engages actively with the memories of a personal and imaginary library. Millicent Borges Accardi contributes with an enlightening interview with the Portuguese author Jacinto Lucas Pires, whose story "L" is also included here. Finally, we present the first of Brazilian writer

Mario Araujo's short stories to be translated into English, "The Extreme Hour," an award-winning narrative by a new voice.

Portuguese Literary & Cultural Studies owes its existence and continuity over the past fifteen years to the indefatigable work of Victor K. Mendes. Thanks to his commitment, vision, and leadership, the journal now arrives at issue number 25. Both Frank F. Sousa, director and publisher of the Center for Portuguese Studies at the University of Massachusetts Dartmouth, and myself, the current editor in chief of *Portuguese Literary & Cultural Studies*, wish to acknowledge Victor's achievements. *Lusofonia and Its Futures* is the first volume to be published in this new phase. We hope to honor the tradition he initiated.

NOTES

1. In order to avoid unnecessary although predictable misunderstandings, I resort to a recent and straightforward definition: "The term 'Lusophone' is used analogously to the terms 'Anglophone' and 'Francophone' (i.e., the community of nations that share the same language, in this case, Portuguese). . . . [T]he prefix 'Luso' comes from *Lusus*, the mythical founder of the Roman province of Lusitania (the westernmost territory of the Iberian peninsula), where modern Portugal is situated. 'Luso' today indicates 'things' Portuguese or related to the Portuguese language. In spite of its possible neocolonial connotations, 'Lusophone' constitutes the most practical term available to refer to Portuguese-speaking nations." Fernando Arenas, *Lusophone Africa: Beyond Independence* (University of Minnesota Press, 2011), p. 205.

2. Ana Mafalda Leite was guest editor of *Cape Verde: Language, Literature & Music*; Phillip Rothwell of *Reevaluating Mozambique and Remembering Angola*; Francisco Cota Fagundes of *Vitorino Nemésio and the Azores*; and Cristiana Bastos of *Parts of Asia*.

3. As a matter of fact, the increasing number of publications, in English, renders any bibliographical list necessarily a tentative effort, which will always fall short even before it begins. Let me therefore only mention a few recent titles, with no intention to exhaust the field or to establish an artificial hierarchy among them. *A History of Postcolonial Lusophone Africa* (Indiana University Press, 2002) edited by Patrick Chabal, David Birmingham, Joshua Forrest, and Malyn Newitt, offers a comprehensive historical account of the dilemmas that still haunt the world of Lusofonia. As early as 1996, Patrick Chabal had already edited *The Post-Colonial Literature of Lusophone Africa* (Northwestern University Press, 1996). Susan Canty Quinlan and Fernando Arenas edited *Lusosex: Gender and Sexuality in the Portuguese-Speaking World* (University of Minnesota Press, 2002), aiming at rendering lusophone studies properly contemporary to some of the most recent theoretical

approaches in literary and cultural studies. As the editors stress in their introduction: "Since the 1980s in the English speaking-world, particularly in the United States, there has been an explosion of studies in the humanities, most notably in the field of literary and cultural studies, that place sexuality at the center of their analyses of human subjectivity in ancient and modern societies, as well as within national cultures" (p. xiii). In *Mother Africa, Father Marx: Women's Writing of Mozambique, 1948–2002* (Bucknell University Press, 2007), Hilary Owen added a new layer to the discussion by bringing to the fore the gender issue in the building of new lusophone nations after independence, with a specific analysis of Mozambique's literary and cultural history. In the same year, Nancy Priscilla Naro, Roger Sansi-Roca, and David Treece edited *Cultures of the Lusophone Black Atlantic* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2007). This collection of essays proposed to establish an innovative and comparative approach with Paul Gilroy's already classical study *The Black Atlantic: Modernity and Double Consciousness* (Verso, 1993). The main goal of the editors was to "suspend for a moment our rigid and dogmatic dichotomies between nations, civilizations, Us and Them, Europe and Africa, the West and the Rest" (p. 1). Also in 2007, Paulo de Medeiros edited an insightful collection of essays, *Postcolonial Theory and Lusophone Literatures* (Portuguese Studies Center, Universiteit Utrecht, 2007). His introduction to that volume, "Turning Points: An Introduction to Postcolonial Theory and Lusophone Literatures" (pp. 1–7), attempts to put Lusofonia in dialogue with contemporary cultural critique. There is, finally, a tendency to underscore the comparative nature of literary and cultural studies; indeed, it is becoming common to bring together lusophone and Hispanic historical experiences as well as to broaden the scope of analysis through the incorporation of cultural artifacts not exclusively oriented to the reading of texts. For instance, see the volume edited by Patricia O'Byrne, Gabrielle Carty, and Niamh Thornton, *Transcultural Encounters Amongst Women: Redrawing Boundaries in Hispanic and Lusophone Art, Literature and Film* (Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2010). It is also worth mentioning the book edited by Lisa Shaw, Rob Stone, and Ian Biddle: *Screening Songs in Hispanic and Lusophone Cinema* (Manchester University Press, 2012).

4. The best introduction to Immanuel Wallerstein's world-system approach was provided by himself in *World-Systems Analysis: An Introduction* (Duke University Press, 2004).

5. I am referring to José Saramago's novel *A Jangada de Pedra*, published in 1986. It was published in English in 1996 as *The Stone Raft*, translated by Giovanni Pontiero.

6. Boaventura de Sousa Santos, "Between Prospero and Caliban: Colonialism, Postcolonialism, and Inter-identity," *Luso-Brazilian Review* 39.2 (2002): 9. An engaging reading of Sousa Santos's perspective is provided by Ana Paula Ferreira, "Specificity without Exceptionalism: Towards a Critical Lusophone Postcoloniality," in Paulo de Medeiros (ed.), *Postcolonial Theory and Lusophone Literatures* (Portuguese Studies Center, Universiteit Utrecht, 2007), p. 21–40.

7. Fernando Arenas, *Lusophone Africa*, pp. xxxvii–xxxviii.

8. "The nations composing the 'Lusophone transatlantic matrix' have been interconnected for several centuries through the experience of Portuguese colonialism and the slave trade that simultaneously involved Portugal, various regions of West, Central and East Africa, and colonial as well as independent Brazil. These historical phenomena and actors were key to the rise of Western modernity during the early stages of globalization." *Ibid.*, p. 2.

9. Luiz Felipe de Alencastro, *O Trato dos Viventes: Formação do Brasil no Atlântico Sul, Séculos XVI e XVII* (Companhia das Letras, 2000). This important book will soon be published by Duke University Press. There is an article already available in English on the topic: "The Economic Network of Portugal's Atlantic World," in Francisco Bethencourt and Diogo Ramada Curto (eds.), *Portuguese Oceanic Expansion, 1400–1800* (Cambridge University Press, 2007), pp. 109–37. Let me recall that Luiz Felipe de Alencastro will be the guest editor of issue 27 of *Portuguese Literary & Cultural Studies*, which is dedicated to "The South Atlantic, Past and Present."

10. "In the end Brazilian diplomats and policymakers saw Africa through what Dzidzienyo calls the 'triangular mirror.' These Brazilians saw their actions with regard to Africa as reflecting upon Brazil's economic development and its system of race relations." Jerry Dávila, *Hotel Trópico: Brazil and the Challenge of African Decolonization, 1950–1980* (Duke University Press, 2010), p. 8.

11. Oswald de Andrade, "Cannibalist Manifesto," translated by Leslie Bary, *Latin American Literary Review* 19.38 (1991): 38. The original reads: "Só a antropofagia nos une. Socialmente. Economicamente. Filosoficamente." Oswald de Andrade, "Manifesto Antropófago," *A utopia antropofágica / Oswald de Andrade—Obras Completas*, 2nd ed. (Globo, 1995), p. 47.

12. For a history of the CPLP see its official Web site at www.cplp.org/id-45.aspx.

13. I am referring to Reinhart Koselleck's classic book *Futures Past: On the Semantics of Historical Time*, translated by Keith Tribe (Columbia University Press, 2004).

14. Nelson Pereira, "Miguel Tamen: 'A lusofonia é uma espécie de colonialismo de esquerda,'" *iOnline*, 24 April 2012. Interview available online at www.ionline.pt/portugal/miguel-tamen-lusofonia-uma-especie-colonialismo-esquerda.

15. I refer specifically to Bateson's key concept of the double bind in "Toward a Theory of Schizophrenia," *Steps to an Ecology of Mind* (The University of Chicago Press, 2000), pp. 201–27.

16. "Striving to be both European and black requires some specific forms of double consciousness. By saying this I do not mean to suggest that taking on either or both of these unfinished identities necessarily exhausts the subjective resources of any particular identity." Paul Gilroy, *The Black Atlantic: Modernity and Double Consciousness* (Verso, 1993), p. 1.

17. The whole quote is as follows: "Forgetting, I would even go so far as to say historical error, is a crucial factor in the creation of a nation, which is why progress in histori-

cal studies often constitutes a danger for [the principle] of nationality. Indeed historical enquiry brings to light deeds of violence which took place at the origin of all political formations, even of those whose consequences have been altogether beneficial.” Ernst Renan, “What is a Nation?” in Hommi Bhabha (ed.), *Nation and Narration* (Routledge, 1990), p. 11.

18. The “Acordo Ortográfico da Língua Portuguesa” was signed by the representatives of seven countries: Angola, Brazil, Cape Verde, Guinea-Bissau, Mozambique, Portugal, and São Tomé and Príncipe.

19. Eduardo Lourenço, “Chaos and Splendor,” in *Chaos and Splendor & Other Essays*, edited by Carlos Veloso (Center for Portuguese Studies and Cultures, University of Massachusetts Dartmouth, 2002), pp. 25–29. It is important to note that, in this essay, the author is not characterizing Portuguese culture, but proposing a general reflection on the topic.

20. I am actually radicalizing the concept. In the authors’ definition: “A minor literature doesn’t come from a minor language; it is rather that which a minority constructs within a major language.” Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari, *Kafka: Towards a Minor Literature*, translated by Dana Polan (University of Minnesota Press, 1986), p. 16.

21. It is worth noting the peculiarity of the creators of the project: on the one hand, a Portuguese; on the other, a Brazilian; in between, a Brazilian contemporary author, born in Portugal. The in-betweenness, as a matter of fact, is the main motive of *Nada tenho de meu*. The category of in-betweenness is inspired by the work of Silviano Santiago, an acclaimed Brazilian writer and literary critic. See Silviano Santiago, *The Space In-Between: Essays on Latin American Culture*, edited by Ana Lucia Gazzola, translated by Tom Burns and Gareth Williams (Duke University Press, 2002).

22. A Web site of the project is available at <http://canalbrasil.globo.com/programas/nada-tenho-de-meu/materias/nada-tenho-de-meu.html>.