CARTOGRAPHIES OF LANGUAGES:
GLOSSARIES FOR LITERATURE BOOKS

Vanise MEDEIROS[1]

- ABSTRACT: With this article we aim to contribute to the understanding of how glossaries function. In this work we consider glossaries produced for literature books and we use the History of Linguistic Ideas in conjunction with Discourse Analysis as theoretical support. This article is a reflection on glossaries for literature books, focusing on those produced from the position of the writer and which show some of his marks. It is proposed that these glossaries work as metalinguistic texts, that they influence the author's writing, and that they also work as an additional commentary about language. Differences between the production of glossaries created from the position of the writer and from the position of the editor are also shown, highlighting the way the two types of glossaries function. To elaborate on the second type of glossary, four books written in the Portuguese by an Angolan writer are analyzed. Some of the conclusions reached here are: although they are based on the illusion of making the text clearer, glossaries contain a position on language that reveals tensions in the language. Furthermore, it is possible to understand them as an instrument of grammatization of the Portuguese language in African countries as well as an instrument of grammatization of African languages in African territory.

- KEYWORDS: Language. Glossary. History of Linguistic Ideas.

The Author's Word

"Words are the devil"[2] warns Saramago (2011, p. 211, our translation), "We are arguably the echo of older voices"[3] says Agualusa (2010, p. 142, our translation), "What do words tell us inside where they resonate?"[4], questions Novarina (2003, p.14, our translation), "Between the word and the thing / a leap over nothing"[5] Paulo

---

2   *"As palavras são o diabo".*

3   *"Somos sem dúvida o eco de vozes mais antigas".*

4   *"O que as palavras nos dizem no interior de onde ressoam?"*

5   *"Entre a palavra e a coisa /o salto sobre o nada".*

Britto (1997, p.15, our translation) alerts, "Every word is a dead metaphor"[6] recovers Borges (2000, p.31, our translation), or, because the list needs to be finished, "The word is perhaps all that we can know of the real"[7] recalls Cendras (CASTELO, 2009, our translation), to whom we would say, it's all that you can know of the real since the real is unattainable. These are phrases about words that are the crux of the glossary, the research topic of this paper. With a glossary the word, sometimes, touches or twists syntax; other times, it touches, and speeds up, orality; others still, it imposes another writing: a new skin, a new orthography. In all, it denounces the delicate relationship between subject and language.

The focus of this study is on glossaries made for literary texts. These can be made from three discursive positions: the position of the lexicographer, of the editor and of the writer. In this article, we will be looking first at the writer's position and later at glossaries produced from the editor's position in books written in Portuguese by an Angolan writer published in Brazil, in order to confront the functioning of these two positions in the production of glossaries.

This reflection is anchored in the field of the History of Linguistic Ideas in Brazil (AUROUX, 1992a) articulated in Discourse Analysis (ORLANDI, 2002). Such an articulation means that we consider the lexical selection produced in the glossaries as discourses about language in relation to the subject; we don't bring into discussion the relevance of certain entries or even the absence of others. It implies understanding the definition of a word as an "imaginary attribution", according to Nunes (2006, p. 22, our translation), "[…] as part of the real, a unity that fails, that soon fades, creating the desire to complement, recast, reissue, in a repetition that unfolds to the extent that history gives it room"[8]. And, it should be noted, still according to Nunes (2006), that we take the lexicographer not as an empirical subject, but with a historically constituted position, that allows and makes him say that "the word X means Y"[9] (NUNES, 2006, p. 22, our translation). Since, in the case of the analyzed glossaries, we are not only working with the position of the lexicographer, which results in the unfolding of the position of the person that produces the glossary: that is why we have singled out the positions of the writer and the editor.

Folding, Unfolding and Signature

Glossaries in literature books arise from a writer's book or work and are therefore somehow attached to the text. In this sense, in addition to constituting a metalanguage,

---

[6]   *"Cada palavra é uma metáfora morta".*

[7]   *"A palavra é talvez tudo o que podemos conhecer do real".*

[8]   *"[…] imaginária a uma porção do real, unidade que falha, desvanecendo-se logo e criando o desejo de complementação, de reformulação, de reedição, numa repetição que se desdobra na medida em que a história lhe dá lugar".*

[9]   *"[…] uma palavra X significa Y."*

as is the case of a dictionary, you might say that, as according to Authier-Revuz (2014), they work as metatexts[10]. There are two interwoven discursive positions: the position of the writer – who weaves the text – and the position of the lexicographer – who produced the glossary. This second position is centered on the work of the former and focuses on both the text and on the language. About the text, in so far as it highlights what parts of it will compose a glossary; and so, it indicates with this that this text says something about the language. It doesn't let the word run free; it takes it out to form another body: a glossary which sends it back to the text and denounces a space for language there. About the language, in so far as it separates a certain number of words, it classifies them and/or proposes synonyms, definitions, explanations. Not all the words of a literature book will belong to a glossary: completeness, unlike the dictionary, is not its operational effect – and here we refer back to what Orlandi says about the dictionary. It aims for "the effect of completeness of representation of language"[11] (ORLANDI, 2002, p.103, our translation). The author adds: "[…] in fact, we consider that the dictionary assures in our imaginary the unity of language and its representation: it is assumed that a dictionary contains (all) the words of the language"[12] (ORLANDI, 2002, p.103, our translation), and so, what is not in the dictionary either is part of a past so remote that is no longer relevant or no longer part of the language. The mark of the glossary is different: is singularity and, according to Auroux, otherness. Quoting: "what truly drives linguistic reflection is *otherness*"[13] (AUROUX, 1992b, p.22, our translation, italics by the author), considering writing and pointing to lists of words or characters (in the case of Chinese) as one of the first practices to configure a linguistic knowledge.

The glossary, by separating a few words from the universe in which the book is woven, tells us about the limit of belonging to a language and the form of this belonging: it highlights some words and situates others as has-beens in the language. It points, then, to the borders in writing; it tells us about the partitions in a language (PETRI; MEDEIROS, 2013). The glossary of a literature book touches the materiality of a writer's writing, his text, and language. Its game is two-fold: it unfolds on the saying/doing while categorizes this written saying/doing.

Going forward, the glossary, by making return to the text, affects the writer's writing: on the one hand, it imposes a direction of reading. In this sense, we agree with Zoppi-Fontana's (1988) observation that the footnotes in teaching editions of literary texts function as "censorship hidden in the processes of signification of the literary text"[14] (ZOPPI-FONTANA, 1988, p.64, our translation). On the other hand, we say that the glossary is also a place that tells a bit more about the language. In this case we

---

[10] This observation stemmed from discussions with Jacqueline Authier-Revuz (2014) about the subject discussed in this article.

[11] *"[...] o efeito da completude da representação da língua."*

[12] *"Com efeito, consideramos que o dicionário assegura em nosso imaginário, a unidade da língua e sua representabilidade: supõe-se que um dicionário contenha (todas) as palavras da língua"*

[13] *"[...] o que faz deslanchar verdadeiramente a reflexão linguística é a alteridade".*

[14] *"censura encoberta dos processos de significação do texto literário".*

are thinking about the writer's position that unfolds into the lexicographer's position: it's like there is still something more to be said, to be highlighted, that does not end in the text and one has to do it somewhere else.

There are, however, differences in the functioning of a glossary created by the writer, by the editor and by the lexicographer[15]. One of them concerns the signature. In the writer's position that unfolds into the lexicographer's position, there is a signature that is maintained and that works by interweaving the two positions: the author's name folds itself again onto something said in another position, that of the lexicographer. This signature, that carries the name of the writer, produces other effects in the operation of the glossary: of what is missing in the language, with the language and about the language and what is additionally said in the gesture unfolded in the lexicographer. In the two other positions discussed, it is about achieving otherness in relation to the text, which, unlike the latter, is marked by difference. In them there is no name (con)founding positions. In the case of the lexicographers position, in which there is another person putting his name to the glossary, the signing of the text works distinctly: it confers legitimacy that comes from the authority to speak about the language and becomes part of a memory of creating a philology about the text; an archaeologist gesture about language: one that would remove from the past words with spellings, syntax and meanings that had already faded - here we are rekindling the memory of making glossaries mentioned by Auroux (2008) when he refers to the practice of creating glossaries for ancient texts whose words were unknown. However, from the editor's position, for example, in the case observed in the twenty-first century in Portuguese literature produced by African writers and published in Brazil, there is no signature for the glossary which has a distinct effect: the illusion created is that the words in the glossary are the final say (both in relation to what is not pointed out as well as that which is highlighted in the glossary), the effect of what has already been stated and does not lack certification.

Coming back to the position of the writer, there are a number or different types of glossaries that compose our corpus, that is, the part that relates to the position of the writer:

(i) the glossary that is created after the text, this is the case in Buzzo in *Favela toma conta* (MEDEIROS, 2012), among others that fall in a lineage begun by José de Alencar in *Diva* (NUNES, 2006), these are two examples of a type of glossary that occurs frequently;

(ii) the glossary which serves the writing of the author, that is, he anticipates its creation, collating words, expressions, syntax for the composition of his work; this is the case of João Antonio, for example, when he captures words from the street for his characters (MEDEIROS, 2014a), or Leo Godoy Otero (1984) in *O caminho das boiadas*, who investigates the language of Gypsies in Brazil and rewrites his book and glossary chasing for more than 20 years the right match.

---

[15] As stated in this article the focus resides on the glossary produced from the position of the editor: the writers and lexicographers positions are only discussed when relevant to the position of the editor.

(iii) the glossary that is composed as an aid to translation to another language and with which the writer returns to the language to explain another way of saying it in another language, this is the case of Guimarães Rosa who creates a glossary from the correspondence with his Italian translator (MARTINS, 2014);

(iv) the glossary which is a literary piece, for example, Manoel de Barros (2013) in *Glossário de transnominações em que não se explicam algumas delas (nenhumas) ou menos*, in this case, the game of writer-lexicographer isn't played inside and outside of the text, but an outside-inside of the text, that is, the glossary is not a separate annex, but a text made up of eleven articles, placed one after the other in a metalanguage indicating a grammatical and gender ranking, that slide in their sonority and polysemy. In this glossary the appendix is also part of the composition.

In short, as one can tell, it is a diverse corpus. In another work (MEDEIROS, 2014b)[16], it had already been noted that glossaries for literature books are located at the end of the book but can also be in the form of footnotes. There are few cases that make up a separate work. Although this is a factor that makes research more difficult (you need to flip through books to find them, an endless task), on the other hand, it allows us to observe two of the hallmarks of their functioning: the sporadic nature and the location of the glossary. To these two we can add heterogeneity which is shown in the typology of texts, that is, which stems from the making of the glossaries as we previously showed, namely, if it is in the form of an appendix, or footer text, or even if it is a separate text; with respect to the time of writing (if before or after the writing of the text); that comes from the gesture produced in directing another language and weaving it into a glossary in his own language (the case of Guimarães Rosa); and, finally, the heterogeneity that comes from the different discursive positions that engender the glossary.

Different from dictionaries, glossaries developed from the position of the writer, that is, those who carry the name of the writer, have no continuity or relationship with each other, do not refer to each other, do not repeat nor resume each other. In them, the memory and the language have other forms, it is not part of the chain that weaves itself through repetition in the entries, but that which weaves through difference or absence in relation to what is in the dictionary. Glossaries for literature books made from the position of the writer give what is personal, singular or unique. In other words, what we can see, on the one hand and with regularity, a lack in the imaginary language (ORLANDI, 1990). Orlandi proposes a distinction between imaginary language and fluid language which is important for this work. The author understands fluid language to be "[…] that which doesn't let itself be immobilized in the network of systems and formulas"[17], and imaginary language, "that which analysts fix with their systemizations"[18] (ORLANDI, 1990, p.74, our translation). They work on the

tension between a language in movement and language that is fixed in grammar, norms, dictionaries, and institutions.

In these glossaries by the writer what you have is absence as difference and/or an addition, as well as the possible which is not yet possible in the language: other word games, other formations, other ways of spelling and, more rarely, other syntaxes. In many cases, this absence is marked by the search for legitimacy for the "other" word. This use and function of the glossary starts with the first glossary by a Brazilian writer, José de Alencar, who, in his second edition of *Diva*, procures the rationale for the language that he produces from Latin, using it to respond to criticism that accuses him of gallicism, or distancing himself from the Portuguese language (NUNES, 2006; MEDEIROS, 2014a).

Beyond the gesture of making the words less obscure in the text, a primeval function according to Auroux (2008), in various glossaries studied, namely those created by Brazilian writers and published in Brazil, it was possible to observe the glossary as an arena in the imaginary language; or rather, working as a space of tension and disputes in the language to the extent to which they record that which does not appear in dictionaries, to which they bring up clashes on Brazilian soil. It is in this sense that glossaries make up cartographies of language(s). They capture what does not appear in the dictionary and tell us more about words by stating in another place that which isn't found in the writing or is proscribed or even which is unveiled as a new way of speaking; after all, the word, to return to the initial motto, never ceases to intrigue and instigate.

From the position of the editor

In glossaries created by the editor in Brazil, the functioning is different from the one created by the writer. Always created after the text has been written, they can repeat entries and what is inherent in them. If from the writers position the word can be thought of as specific, singular, unique, here, singular or unique doesn't seem to fit. What is at stake is different. It is what can be seen in some glossaries made for Portuguese language books by African writers published in Brazil in the 21st century; however, we are going to stick, to one writer.

We stated that glossaries made from the position of the writer are sporadic (appearing at certain times, in certain authors and in certain works); this does not mean, however, that they do not have conditions of production. One of the factors, as already pointed out, is the imaginary language that the cutting up of entries allows us to understand (see, for example, MEDEIROS, 2012); Another factor is the politics of language: here agreements on language as well as linguistic colonization and decolonization, or revolutionary moments come into play.

Mariani (2011, p.109, our translation) reminds us that, at the beginning of the 20th century, "[…] African languages spoken in Mozambique began to take written form,

establishing a circulation of opaque senses for the Portuguese"[19]. This writing that takes place in the press, we would add, also occurs in literature and, from it, enters glossaries, materializing the resistance, as Mariani (2011, p. 109, our translation) says, "whether it be in the oral mode or in writing"[20].

With regard to the Portuguese language, the 21st century opens with the question (posed at the end of the 20th century) of the orthographic reform, which brings to the scene a supposed (desired?) linguistic homogeneity out of linguistic diversity. The lusophone world, as we know, anchors itself in the illusion of a common language regardless of historical, geographical, social and ideological differences, regardless of the historicity of the language in each space of enunciation (GUIMARÃES, 2002). We understand a space of enunciation as

> […] spaces where languages function, where they split, re-split, mix, break down, are transformed by a ceaseless struggle. They are spaces ´inhabited´ by speakers, i.e. by subjects divided by their rights to talk and ways to talk. They are spaces consisting of the equivocalness of an event: the deontology that organizes and distributes papers, and the conflict, inseparable from this deontology, that re-splits the sensitive, the social roles. The space of enunciation is a political space, in the sense that I considered the political earlier.[21] (GUIMARÃES, 2002, p.18-19, our translation).

Lusophony enters with an argument that sustains the commodification of language that is also practiced in editorial policies in Portugal and in Brazil to publish literature by African writers in the Portuguese language. As Zoppi-Fontana (2009, p.37, our translation) notes "[…] languages, which have always been a weapon of political domination in the processes of colonization, become in contemporary times a new mechanism of financial speculation"[22], that is, language becomes a commodity. In other words, it is in this scenario that, in the 21st century, both on Brazilian and Portuguese soil, literature books by African writers with glossaries in Portuguese have been published. Mia Couto, Agualusa, Ondjaki are some of the recognized contemporary authors in whose books glossaries are added, commonly at the end. They are unsigned glossaries created by the editor. They are not sporadic, unlike the glossaries created from

---

[19] *"[...] línguas africanas faladas em Moçambique começam a ganhar forma escrita, instaurando uma circulação de sentidos opacos a portugueses".*

[20] *"seja na modalidade oral, seja na modalidade escrita".*

[21] *"[...] espaços de funcionamento de línguas, que se dividem, redividem, se misturam, desfazem, transformam por uma disputa incessante. São espaços ´habitados´ por falantes, ou seja, por sujeitos divididos por seus direitos ao dizer e aos modos de dizer. São espaços constituídos pela equivocidade própria do acontecimento: da deontologia que organiza e distribui papéis, e do conflito, indissociado desta deontologia, que redivide o sensível, os papéis sociais. O espaço de enunciação é um espaço político, no sentido que considerei há pouco o político."*

[22] *"[...] línguas que sempre foram arma de dominação política nos processos de colonização, se tornam na contemporaneidade novo mecanismo de especulação financeira".*

the writer position; they arise from measures imposed on the language and the circulation of a certain literature: in the Portuguese language and produced in Africa. This does not occur with books of Brazilian authors in Portugal or with books of Portuguese authors in Brazil. The presence of glossaries for African Portuguese-language writers in contrast to the absence of a policy on glossaries in Brazilian writers books in Portugal and Portuguese writers books in Brazil, produces the effect of stabilizing the language both in Brazil and in Portugal, with the illusion that both countries have the same language, as well as the illusion of language being constructed in African countries that have Portuguese as an official language.

There are several writers of different African nationalities published in Brazil. In this article, we will be using glossaries from the Angolan writer, Ondjaki, in order to discuss glossaries produced from the position of the editor.

Captured Words

We analyzed four books by Angolan writer Ondjaki with glossaries by four distinct editors: (i) *Bom dia camaradas* (Good day comrades), published by Companhia das Letras (ONDJAKI, 2004), (ii) the same book, *Bom dia camaradas*, published by Agir (ONDJAKI, 2006) (iii) *Os da minha rua*, (From my street), by the publisher Língua Geral (ONDJAKI, 2007), and (iv) *Os transparentes* (The transparent), by Companhia das Letras (ONDJAKI, 2013).

In the four books, the glossary is presented at the end. In them there are entries common to all, as it is the case of the word *camba*, where the definitions are repeated totally (Examples 1, 2 and 3) or in part (4) by the three different editors,

(1) Camba: amigo, companheiro (*Bom dia camaradas*, Cia das Letras),
(2) Camba: amigo, companheiro (*Bom dia camaradas*, Agir),
(3) Camba: amigo, companheiro (*Os da minha rua,* Língua Geral),
(4) Camba: amigo (*Os transparentes*, Cia das Letras);[23]

there are also entries that are specific to each glossary, such as the examples below:

(5) Bofa: bofetada (*Bom dia camaradas*, Cia das Letras),
(6) Aldrabar: mentir (*Bom dia camaradas*, Agir),
(7) Esquebra: excedente (*Os da minha rua*, Língua Geral),

---

[23] (1) Camba: friend, companion (*Bom dia camaradas*, Cia das Letras),

(2) Camba: friend, companion (*Bom dia camaradas*, Agir),

(3) Camba: friend, companion (*Os da minha rua,* Língua Geral),

(4) Camba: friend (*Os transparentes*, Cia das Letras);[23]

(8) Tundem: desapareçam (*Os transparentes*, Cia das Letras).[24]

In the glossaries of *Bom dia, camaradas*, published by Cia das Letras (ONDJAKI, 2004) and by Agir (ONDJAKI, 2006), there are repetitions of entries and definitions (examples 1 and 2) and there are entries and definitions that are specific to each of them (as can be seen in Examples 5 and 6).

The repetition of entries from the same book, as in the case of *Bom dia, camaradas,* as well as in different books allow us to observe that the function of the glossary is distinct from that in the position of the writer, in which the entry is always unique. In this case the glossary becomes closer to a dictionary, in which referencing other sources is common practice. The difference in the choices of lexicon captured in the glossary shows that a glossary, although founded on the illusion of de-mystifying the text, actually contains a position on language; the same words and expressions are not present in glossaries of the same book or of the same author. In other words, we can say that each glossary consists of a gesture of reading that distinguishes itself through a position on the language. It shows certain elements as being relevant and necessary and not others.

In these glossaries, one of the hallmarks is the record of orality, which is present in different ways; for example, in entries with quotation marks that are brought through the speech of characters:

(9) "Abuçoitos" ("pedir abuçoitos"): pedir licença para se aposentar de um jogo ou brincadeira. (*Os da minha rua,* Língua Geral)

(10) "Goiabera": Camisa de estilo cubano (*Os da minha rua,* Língua Geral).[25]

To register a word as an entry is to turn it into an autonomous sign, a sign that refers to itself (AUTHIER-REVUZ, 2008). Quotation marks can produce this effect, for example, something like, "One of the glossary entries is 'abuçoitos.'" In this case, they are redundant since labelling it as an entry already produces autonimy. Just in the glossary of *Os da minha rua* published by Língua Geral two entries come with quotation marks (abuçoitos and goiabera); both precede other entries that appear in alphabetical order initiated by a letter, i.e. after abuçoitos and goiabera we find the entry aká without quotation marks. It is not the quotation marks that indicate entries included in persons differently from the other lexical items selected.

---

[24] (5) Bofa: slap (*Bom dia camaradas*, Cia das Letras),

(6) Aldrabar: to lie (*Bom dia camaradas*, Agir),

(7) Esquebra: surplus (*Os da minha rua,* Língua Geral),

(8) Tundem: disapear (*Os transparentes*, Cia das Letras).

[25] (9) "Abuçoitos" ("ask for abuçoitos"): to ask to leave a game or prank. (*Os da minha rua,* Língua Geral)

(10) "Goiabera": Cuban style shirt (*Os da minha rua,* Língua Geral).

In other words, we cannot say that the quotation marks in abuçoitos and goiabera are autonomic quotation marks, but quotes that make the word unusual in relation to the others without quotation marks. Words kept at a distance (in reference to the article on quotation marks by Authier-Revuz, 2004). An orality that is highlighted and surprised by the redundant quotation marks in the entries and in the capture of the text in parentheses, as shown in example 9.

Indeed, the record of orality is one of the marks of the three glossaries, whether in the quotation marks of the two entries, or in the abbreviation that indicates how it should be said.

> (11) aká: metralhadora de fabrico russo (AK47). (*Os da minha rua,* Língua Geral),[26]

be it in the capture of the exclamation pointed out by the meta-language that classifies or explains,

> (12) Ché: interjeição de espanto (*Os da minha rua,* Língua Geral),
> (13) Ché: expressa dúvida ou surpresa (*Bom dia camaradas*, Agir),[27]

in the foreignness, confiscated by the writing, which again brings us the spoken language, and is reported as having its source corrupted,

> (14) Bigue: corruptela do inglês (*Os da minha rua,* Língua Geral),
> (15) Xuínga: corruptela de chewing gum (*Bom dia camaradas*, Agir),
> (16) Bizno: negócio (corruptela de "business") (*Os transparentes*, Cia das Letras),[28]

or in the contraction of speech which is shown in writing,

> (17) masé: contração de "mas" e "é" (*Bom dia camaradas*, Agir).[29]

It is interesting to observe that in the example (17) the entry is a contraction that is also used in Portuguese in Brazil, although it is not listed in any Brazilian dictionary or glossary since it is not a lexical item.

---

[26] (11) aká: russian machine gun (AK47). (*Os da minha rua,* Língua Geral)

[27] (12) Ché: exlamation of surprise (*Os da minha rua,* Língua Geral),
      (13) Ché: expression of doubt or surprise (*Bom dia camaradas*, Agir),

[28] (14) Bigue: corruption of big (*Os da minha rua,* Língua Geral),
      (15) Xuínga: corruption of chewing gum (*Bom dia camaradas*, Agir),
      (16) Bizno: business (corruption of "business") (*Os transparentes*, Cia das Letras),

[29] (17) masé: contraction of "but" and "is" (*Bom dia camaradas*, Agir).

Returning to the argument, orality appears in spelling, which makes use of the letter k: the way in which our dictionaries indicate a foreign word[30], or spell unwritten languages with the illusion of a phonetic transcription:

> (18) Kitaba: pasta feita de amendoim torrado (*Os da minha rua,* Língua Geral)[31],
>
> (19) Kibidi: perseguição (*Bom dia camaradas*, Cia das Letras),[32]

and also in maintenance of a pronunciation that appears in letters that come one after the other, unlike what happens in Portuguese, and is indicated as coming from another language. It is noteworthy that the entries in the following examples may refer to other entries in the glossary thereby creating a certain circularity:

> (20) Ndengue: diminutivo de candengue (*Bom dia camaradas*, Agir)
>
> (21) Ndengue: (quimbumdo): criança (*Os da minha rua*, Língua Geral)
>
> (22) Candengue: miúdo, mais novo. (*Bom dia camaradas*, Agir)
>
> (23) Candengue (do quimbundo ndengue): criança. (*Os da minha rua,* Língua Geral).[33]

It is relevant, before proceeding, to make an observation: when it comes to the indication of the origin, only the words coming from English are seen as a corruption (examples 14, 15 and 16); for those that come from African languages just the origin is stated, and the spelling also differs (compare the name of the language in examples 21, 23 with 24):

> (24) Dikota (Kimbundu): mais velho, velho (*Os transparentes*, Cia das Letras).[34]

---

[30] On the subject of the function of the letter K indicating foreign words, we can recover the story that Yaguello (1990) creates about the letters of the alphabet. According to the author, for a long time the letter K was considered wretched in the French language and became an exotic letter that marked word in a foreign language, such as Kiwi or Klaxon (examples by the author in French. These words have the same spelling in Portuguese). She explains that the Romans borrowed the letter K from the Greeks, but this was not the case of the French. They, instead of integrating the K, which would avoid problems of ambiguity which occur in French with the letter C, kept the letter for foreign words and kept the letter C, as it stemmed from Latin. In short, we can observe that in French the letter is marked by otherness.

[31] The entry Kitaba is from the glossary of *Os transparentes* by Cia Letras but in it the way the peanut paste is created is removed and the entry reads solely "Peanut paste"

[32] (18) Kitaba: paste made from toasted peanuts (*Os da minha rua,* Língua Geral),

(19) Kibidi: persecution (*Bom dia camaradas*, Cia das Letras),

[33] (20) Ndengue: diminuative of candengue (*Bom dia camaradas*, Agir)

(21) Ndengue: (quimbumdo): child (*Os da minha rua,* Língua Geral)

(22) Candengue: smaller, younger. (*Bom dia camaradas*, Agir)

(23) Candengue (from quimbundo ndengue): child. (*Os da minha rua,* Língua Geral)

[34] (24) Dikota (Kimbundu): older; old. (*Os transparentes*, Cia das Letras).

Therefore, those arising from the English language are corrupted; whilst those that come from African languages enter the language adding to the Portuguese language and indicating at the same time the power of the Portuguese language to be able to coalesce and grow...

The glossary explains how to use the words in distinct environments in relation to the Portuguese language. Note that it makes use of examples, something rare in the glossaries studied:

(25) Male: "dói male" (dói muito); "vejo male" (vejo muito bem). [35]

The transition from orality to writing in Brazil involves the passage of one space of enunciation to another. It is not only the change of a medium, but writing inscribing and de-inscribing the conflict between two distinctive spaces in the language on Brazilian soil, two spaces that say and signify differently: Portugal and Brazil. We can see this clash in these glossaries when we think of orality and observe the fluctuations that occur in them. Because of this you can understand these glossaries as grammatization instruments [36] (AUROUX, 1992a) for the Portuguese language in Angola as well as grammatization instruments of African languages in Angola, to the extent of what is marked as another language in that territory. There are therefore two distinct and simultaneous movements in the language. And it should be added that grammatization, accding to Auroux (1992a), does not leave languages intact.

In the glossaries of Ondjaki's books, as some entries show, at least one other African language, quimbundo / Kimbundu, is denounced as alterity. If, following Mariani, linguistic colonization imposes a silencing of the language of the colonized (here we are referring to his study of Mozambique and considering his remark as a hypothesis on the linguistic situation in Angola), we can maybe say that with these glossaries the other language will be grammatized in Portuguese. In a space, a glossary, which institutionalizes speech, that is, a space in which one you deems to stabilize speech. As an other language, captured by that one, and as part of the Portuguese language in Angola.

Words that end

In another study (MEDEIROS, 2014b), it was said that just as a grammar is not the sole representation of a language, a glossary is not the sole representative of a book or a text. If with grammar we can say that it manufactures a language (recovering COLOMBAT; PUECH; FOURNIER, 2010), we can say that a glossary by the writer

---

[35] (25) Male: "dói male" (it hurts a lot); "vejo male" (I see very well).

[36] By grammatization "[…] it should be understood as the process which describes and instruments a language on the basis of two technologies, which are until today the pillars of our metalinguistic knowledge: grammar and the dictionary." (AUROUX, 1992b, p.65, our translation).

denounces the imaginary language which grammar books and dictionaries create as a national standard. A glossary by the writer indicates that something is missing in the language that monumentalizes itself as the national language. It illuminates that which occurs or may occur in the language and that, however, is not in the dictionary.

We cannot say the same about a glossary created by an editor for African authors as we can say about one produced by the writer. We believe that with these glossaries there is a grammatization of the other language in tension with Portuguese. In other words, with glossaries created by the editor in African literature books in Portuguese, other languages on African soil become known and are legitimated in Portuguese. They leave the silence that the other, official, language imposes. And so one can say that the glossary serves as the beam of light on what occurs and stands out from literature as another language. In short, if linguistic colonization, as we can read in Mariani (2011), imposes a silencing of other languages and the glossary, in Portuguese, conveys other languages, we can then think that these glossaries are language tools working somehow to decolonize linguistics.

But we cannot forget that it is a glossary for a literature book…

Zoppi-Fontana (1988), in his analysis of the notes in educational editions of literary texts, notes that they show something missing in the text - information and clarity - and in the reader - knowledge - resulting in contradictory needs: to raise awareness and, at the same time, censorship, thought of in the dimension of silence, as theorized by Orlandi (1997)[37].

The notes, according to Zoppi-Fontana (1988), assume the literary text as a reference in the illusory work of capturing, controlling all. It's not different from the glossary, as it can be read, for example, when the entry of that which is judged not to be understood confronts the fragment of the text where the word referenced in the glossary is located. Note the following example:

> (26) dibinga: fezes (*Os da minha rua,* Língua Geral),
>
> (27) "Chegamos `a casa do sacana do Lima numa rua bem escura que era preciso cuidado quando andávamos para não pisar nas poças de água nem na *dibinga* dos cães. Eu ainda avisei `a tia Rosa, "cuidado com as minas", ela não sabia que "minas" era o código para cocó quando estava assim na rua pronto para ser pisado." (*Os da minha rua*, Língua Geral, p. 20, our italics).[38]

It doesn't seem to be the case, then, that the word should be highlighted so that its meaning can be understood...

---

[37] Censorship is thought of as local silencing in the politics of silence.

[38] (26) dibinga: feces (*Os da minha rua, Língua Geral*),

(27) "We arrived at the house of rascal Lima in a very dark street where we had to care so as not to step in puddles or in the *dibinga* of dogs. I even told Aunt Rose, "Beware of the mines", she did not know that "mine" was the code for the dog shit when it was in the street ready to be stepped on." (*Os da minha rua*, Língua Geral, p.20, our italics).

Before concluding, there is still a distinction between notes and glossary that deserves to be highlighted. The word that is included in the glossary can be marked in the text, in a marked heterogeneity with an asterisk or numbering, or not highlighted as a non-marked heterogeneity (AUTHIER-REVUZ, 1990)[39]. The first example is the case of notes while glossaries at the end of the text fit in the second example. They are scars in the body of the text[40] denouncing to the reader that this is speech from the other - another language - indicating another place of reading and at the same time, configuring a certain reader: in this case, one who does not know the universe(s) of language(s) in Angola. The glossary that is presented in the form of unmarked heterogeneity leaves the reader the option of searching through the end of the book. On the one hand, a supposed freedom in consultation is what sets it apart; on the other, since it does not impose a scar, it maintains the significant in its power in the text or even in its power of enigma. However, both with notes and with the glossary we forget that something always escapes as we, as Brazilian readers, can read in the passage below:

> (28) "Não ia poder matabichar leite com café, como todos os dias de manhã [...]" (*Bom dia*, *camaradas*, Cia das Letras/ *Os da minha rua,* Agir)[41]

The entry matabichar, to give an example, cannot be found in Brazilian dictionaries, the public at whom the publications of the editors are aimed, nor can it be found in any glossaries of the analyzed books. Why does it not appear? Should it be included in the glossary?

As we have seen, if the word is sometimes opaque in the text, many times it is not. We need to return to the question that also guides this paper: why should we mark them? Why should we not mark them?

In addition to the argued need for making the text less obscure, from our point of view, we would say that the gesture that drives the glossary is traversed by the political in language, understood as a division of meaning. Political in which misconception is inscribed ... we observe, as a closing salvo, two entries:

> (29) Giro: bonito, interessante (*Os da minha rua,*Agir)
> (30) Sandes: sanduíches (*Os da minha rua,*Agir)[42]

---

[39] In the theoretical framework proposed by Authier-Revuz (1990), the forms of heterogeneity shown split into marked and not marked indicating the explanation in the body of the text of the other discourse. In this sense a direct or indirect discourse, question marks for example, would find themselves in the first case where irony or allusion are non-marked forms in the discourse of the other.

[40] As pointed out in Buzzo (MEDEIROS, 2012).

[41] (28) "I would not be able to matabichar milk with coffee, like every morning [...]" (*Bom dia, camaradas*, Cia das Letras/*Os da minha rua,* Agir)

[42] (29) Giro: beautiful, interesting (*Os da minha rua,* Agir)
(30) Sandes: sandwiches (*Os da minha rua,* Agir)

Giro and sandes are entries that come from the Portuguese language from Portugal. To justify it as an error could be one solution. But as discourse analysts, we know that failure is constitutive of the ritual: in this case, the gesture that captures the otherness ... and here words from Portugal are presented in the glossary of a Brazilian editor... As a final provocation we pose this question: would they be part of a glossary created by a Brazilian editor if the author was Portuguese?

- *RESUMO: Com este artigo pretende-se contribuir para uma compreensão do funcionamento dos glossários. Considera-se, para este fim, aqueles produzidos para livros de literatura e tem-se como aporte teórico a História das Ideias Linguísticas na articulação com a Análise de Discurso. O artigo porta uma reflexão sobre glossários para livros de literatura centrando-se naqueles produzidos pela posição escritor e trazendo algumas das suas marcas. Propõe-se tais glossários como metatexto que afeta a escrita do autor, por um lado, e como um dizer a mais sobre a língua cujo texto não esgota. Em seguida, são evidenciadas diferenças entre a produção de um glossário feito pela posição escritor e aquele elaborado pela posição editor, mostrando marcas distintas no funcionamento dos dois tipos de glossários. Para a reflexão sobre o segundo tipo, quatro livros de um escritor angolanoem língua portuguesa são analisados. Algumas das conclusões a que se chega são: embora se funde na ilusão de desopacização do texto, glossários comportam uma posição sobre a língua que revela tensões na língua. Ademais, é possível compreendê-los também como instrumentos de gramatizaçãoda língua portuguesa em países africanos bem como instrumento de gramatização de línguas africanas em território africano.*

- *PALAVRAS-CHAVE: Língua. Glossários. História das ideias linguísticas.*

REFERENCES

AGUALUSA, J.E. **Milagrário pessoal**. Rio de Janeiro: Língua Geral, 2010.

AUTHIER-REVUZ, J. **Palavras incertas:** as não-coincidências do dizer. Campinas: Ed. da Unicamp, 2008.

_____. Palavras mantidas à distância. In: _____. **Entre a transparência e a opacidade**. Porto Alegre: EDIPUCRS, 2004. p.217-237.

_____. Heterogeneidade(s) Enunciativa(s). **Cadernos de Estudos Linguísticos**, Campinas, n.19, p.25-42, 1990.

AUROUX, S. Listas de palavras, dicionários e enciclopédias: o que nos ensinam os enciclopedistas sobre a natureza dos instrumentos linguísticos. **Revista Língua e Instrumentos Linguísticos**, Campinas, n.20, p.9-23, 2008.

_____. Le processos de grammatisation et ses enjeux. In: _____. **Histoire des idées linguistiques**. Tome 2. Liège: Pierre Mardaga, 1992a. p.11-64.

_____. **A revolução tecnológica da gramatização**. Campinas: Ed. da Unicamp, 1992b.

BARROS, M. de. **Poesia completa**. São Paulo: Leya, 2013.

BORGES, J. L. **Esse ofício do verso**. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 2000.

BRITO, P. **Trovar claro**. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 1997.

CASTELO, J. Coluna José Castelo. **O Globo**, 25 abr. 2009. Caderno 2, p. 4.

COLOMBAT, B.; FOURNIER, J-M.; PUECH, C. **Histoire des idées sur le langage et les langues**. Paris: Klincksieck, 2010.

GUIMARÃES, E. **Semântica do acontecimento**. Campinas: Pontes, 2002.

MARIANI, B. Língua, colonização e revolução: discurso político sobre as línguas em Moçambique. In: ZANDWAIS, A.; ROMÃO, L. (Org.). **Leituras do político**. Porto Alegre: Ed. da UFRGS, 2011. p.105-126.

MARTINS, H. O dicionário como antologia lírica, romance autobiografia. **Letras**, Santa Maria, n. 24, p.69-85, 2014.

MEDEIROS, V. Memória e singularidade no gesto do escritor-lexicógrafo. **Revista Confluências**, Rio de Janeiro, n.46, p.143-156, 2014a. Available at: <http://llp.bibliopolis.info/confluencia/rc/index.php/rc/article/view/13/14>. Accessed on: 18 mar. 2016.

_____. **Savoirs sur la langue et le sujet**: les glossaires faits par l´écrivain. Apresentação de trabalho na Journée d´étude Langue, discours, histoire. Paris: Université Sorbonne Nouvelle Paris III, 2014b.

_____. Um glossário contemporâneo: a língua merece que se lute por ela. **Revista Rua**, Campinas, n. 18, 2012. Available at: <http://www.labeurb.unicamp.br/rua/pages/home/lerArtigo.rua?pdf=1&id=132>. Accessed on: 18 mar. 2016.

NOVARINA. V. **Diante da Palavra**. Rio de Janeiro: 7 Letras, 2003.

NUNES, J. H. N. **Dicionários no Brasil:** análise e história. Campinas, SP: Pontes: FAPESP; São José do Rio Preto, SP: FAPERP, 2006.

PETRI, V.; MEDEIROS, V. Da língua partida: nomenclatura, coleção de vocábulos e glossários brasileiros. **Letras**, Santa Maria, n. 46, p.43-66, 2013.

ONDJAKI. **Os transparentes**. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 2013.

_____. **Os da minha rua**. Rio de Janeiro: Língua Geral, 2007.

_____. **Bom dia camaradas**. Rio de Janeiro: Agir, 2006.

_____. **Bom dia camaradas**. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 2004.

OTERO, L. G. **O caminho das boiadas**. 2.ed. São Paulo: GRD, 1984.

ORLANDI, E. **Língua e conhecimento linguístico***: para uma história das ideias no Brasil. São Paulo: Cortez, 2002.

_____. **As formas do silêncio**. Campinas: Ed. da UNICAMP, 1997.

_____. **Terra à vista**. São Paulo: Cortez; Campinas: Ed. da Unicamp, 1990.

SARAMAGO, J. **O homem duplicado**. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 2011.

ZOPPI-FONTANA, M. **O Português do Brasil como Língua Transnacional**. Campinas: Ed. Estante Ametista, 2009.

_____. Limiares de silêncio: a leitura intervalar. In: ORLANDI, E. (Org.). **A leitura e os leitores.** Campinas: Pontes, 1988. p.59-85.

YAGUELLO, M. **Histoires de Lettre**. Paris: Éd. Du Seuil, 1990.