

Alexandra Assis Rosa
Universidade de Lisboa

Who is holding the blue pencil?

A visit to intralingual translation in the Portuguese Theme Park “Portugal dos Pequenitos”

1. Introduction

Like a “a small nation of tiny houses for smaller stature people” as one reads in online reviews,ⁱ the theme park “Portugal dos Pequenitos”, in Coimbra, was designed by Bissaya Barreto, a prominent professor of Medicine of the University of Coimbra (1886-1974) with the help of the famous modernist architect, Cassiano Branco (1897-1970). It was inaugurated on 8th of June 1940, and built from 1938 until the end of the 1950s. It is now kept by the Foundation Bissaya Barreto.ⁱⁱ

This precursor of children’s theme parks holds small scale reproductions of buildings divided into three distinctive areas: the first one usually mentioned is the “Village of the Little People” (“Aldeia dos Pequenitos”) that is dedicated to Portugal’s traditional regional homes; the second area called “Monumental Portugal” (“Portugal Monumental”) holds miniatures of the most important Portuguese monuments, such as the Village Palace in Sintra, the Convent of Christ in Tomar, or the Archway of Rua Augusta in Lisbon; it is the third area called “Overseas Nucleus” (“Núcleo Além-Mar”) that will be subject to analysis in this paper. Clearly built as nationalistic promotion or propaganda for the Portuguese colonial empire, the gigantic map that delimits it is illustrative of the world vision presented in this area. In its center, at the heart of the empire lies Portugal, point of departure for the discoveries, with the inevitable patron image of Prince Henry, the Navigator (third son of King John I of Portugal; 1394-1460).

So, this third area is dedicated to the Portuguese colonial empire and holds buildings representing some of the Portuguese former colonies. The miniature architecture of most buildings attempts to be illustrative of that of the region it represents. Each building holds a collection of items related to one ultramarine colony, or overseas province as they were called, since under the ideology of national colonialism, as António de Figueiredo stated, “the colonies became ‘overseas provinces’ of a single nation” (Figueiredo 2001: 1919).

The buildings in this area represented eleven overseas provinces: Madeira and The Azores, which are currently autonomous regions of Portugal; as well as Mozambique, Angola, India, Cape Verde, S. Tomé and Príncipe, Guinea-Bissau, Timor, Macau, and an additional building was dedicated to Brazil, an independent state since 1822, but prior to that also part of the Portuguese overseas empire. Before entering the building dedicated to each one of these former colonies, the visitor is presented with a plaque that consists of an introduction to each one of the different former overseas provinces with special reference to their relationship with Portugal at the center of the empire.

The noticeable fact that led to this project is that in six cases these plaques are presented to the visitor in two different Portuguese versions. There are actually two generations of plaques: a more recent version is met by the visitor outside each building. However, in some cases, upon entering the building the visitor finds another version that is evidently a former version of the more recent one displayed outside. Similarly to a bilingual edition, the source text version found inside the buildings seems to have been replaced by the second target text version, a more recent one that is displayed at the entrance. This difference is also perceptible in the stone layout of these plaques. Those which seem to have been the original ones display the “Padrão”, with the coat of arms of Portugal, as is the case with the outdoor plaques for the buildings dedicated to Madeira and the Azores, a layout that is exactly the same as that of the six plaques that are currently exhibited inside the buildings. These seem to have been the original plaques.

Apparently, the first versions of these plaques have been subjected to intralingual translation made necessary not only by the fact that the colonies became independent countries but also or even, one feels tempted to say, mainly by ideological changes in Portugal that seem to have made the first version obsolete or unacceptable. This paper proposes to analyze these six parallel texts and the translational strategies underlying such cases of rewriting.

2. Analysis

As Deirdre Burton states:

If the analyst is interested in ‘making strange’ the power relationships that obtain in the socially constructed world – be it the ‘real’ world of public and private social relationships or the spoken and written texts that we create, hear, read, and that ultimately construct us in that ‘real world’ – then, crucially, it is the realization of processes and participants (both the actors and the acted upon) in those processes that should concern us. (Burton 1982: 200)

Given the nature of the corpus under scrutiny the analysis will firstly focus on descriptions used as forms of reference to the colonizer that can be interpreted as forms of self-reference, i.e. forms used by the addresser to refer to himself. Special attention will be given to the attempt to encompass other participants within the forms of self-reference used: the addresser and readers, the addresser and other participants mentioned, such as the discoverers. Secondly, the analysis will also consider descriptions used as forms of reference to the colonized, i.e. forms used by the addresser to refer to third parties, in this case, special attention will be paid to the forms chosen to identify the regions and peoples of the former colonies. These categories differ from the definition of deictic role by John Lyons, given that his definition explicitly excludes the use of names or descriptions to consider only personal or demonstrative pronouns (Lyons 1977: 574-575). This collection of forms of self-reference and reference to third parties are deemed likely to reveal a network of relationships that associate the profiles of the colonizer and the colonized generated by these texts. Finally, the analysis will also consider the expressions used to describe the actions performed by the colonizer and the colonized, i.e. by the Portuguese and by the peoples of the former colonies.

2.1 First Version

In the first version, the forms used to mention the colonizers, as forms of self-reference are:ⁱⁱⁱ

(1) Kings, examples: “King Manuel I” (India), “King Afonso V” (S.Tomé and Príncipe), “King João II” (S.Tomé and Príncipe);

(2) Navigators, examples: “Vasco da Gama” (India and Mozambique), “Diogo Cam” (Angola), “The Portuguese navigators of the time of Prince Henry”, “Some of the first navigators”, “Our discoverers” (Guinea);

(3) The vessels of the navigators, examples: “The Portuguese-Men-of-War of the route to India” (Mozambique), “The Portuguese-Men-of-War” (India), “By the caravels of Diogo Gomes and António da Nola” (Cape Verde), “Our caravels” (Angola);

(4) “the Portuguese” (Angola and S.Tomé and Príncipe);

(5) “Portugal” (S. Tomé and Príncipe);

(6) Our empire, examples: “our empire in India” (India);

(7) Markers for the third person singular and plural; as well as

(8) Several markers for the first person plural, examples: “we would buy,” “we were forced to,” “we built,” “our empire in India,” “we have still left” (India); “Our navigators” (Cape Verde); “we gave over” (S.Tomé and Príncipe); “our caravels,” “our biggest province” (Angola); “the primacy of our discoverers and the value of their effort” (Guinea).

As forms of self-reference in Portuguese, first-person singular verbal forms are enough and thus considered neutral, non-marked forms of self-reference (Faria 1991: 49-53). All the forms mentioned are therefore marked and contrast significantly. It is worth stressing that they are all forms of collective reference, either to kings as representatives of the nation, or to the people, the Portuguese, and their heroes, the navigators and discoverers, also by synecdoche by means of reference to the vessels. Especially remarkable is the choice of first-person plural verbal and pronominal possessive forms that signals qualitative and quantitative integration of the addresser in a group of categories. It signifies empathy and identification, which can also be interpreted as a means to draw the reader into this inclusive “we”. “We”, addresser and reader, are reinforced by identification with kings and heroes, with navigators and crews, with the Portuguese people and nation.

The colonizers appear mainly as syntactic subject and semantic agents, and as for the processes attributed to them, to use the typology of Deirdre Burton (1982: 195-214), adapted from Michael Halliday (1970, 1973, 1978), they are mainly agents of verbs of material process (vs. mental, relational), action process (vs. event) and intention process (vs. supervision): so we/they “go,” “go beyond,” “anchor,” “rest,” “deal with,” “open the way of civilization,” or “initiate a civilizing action,” “buy,” “attempt to deal peacefully,” “are obliged to maintain by force,” “defeat,” “establish,” “discover,” “sight land,” “give impulse,” “explore in giant steps,” “find,” “give names,” “colonize,” “take caravels,” “go back,” “build,” “go up river,” “carve in rock,” and “die, pierced by poisoned assegais”.^{iv}

The descriptions used to refer to the colonized regions are:^v

(1) designation of places, often as syntactically optional adjuncts of place, examples: “in several points of Western Africa,” “on the small island of Mozambique,” “they made of Mozambique and the ports of that coast” (Mozambique); “to India,” “in the Indian Ocean” (India); “we reached the end of the big gulf of Guinea, Benim and Mina” (S.Tomé and Príncipe); “as far as Congo,” “in Angola, our biggest overseas province” (Angola); “All the coast of Africa that was being discovered beyond Cape Bojador,” “The current province of Guinea comprises several black races” (Guinea);

(2) indigenous peoples, examples: “they dealt with the natives” (Mozambique); “the peoples of India,” “the scheming of Moor merchants,” “Turks, Egyptians, and Indians” (India); “he [Diogo Cam] dealt with the black King of Congo” (Angola); “country of Azenegues [Znaga] and Negroes” (Guinea);

(3) “there” (deixis expressing distance; India, Cape Verde, Angola);

(4) objects of actions by the colonizers, frequently as subjects of passive voice clauses, examples: “they made of Mozambique and the ports of that coast their usual moorings” (Mozambique); “he tried to deal peacefully with the peoples of India” (India); “in front of the cape that, being covered with trees, was called Cape Verde,” “the first to be sighted was that of Santiago” (Cape Verde); “The coast of Africa was progressively explored in giant steps” (S.Tomé and Príncipe); “4 islands were discovered,” “King John II was intent on colonizing those islands in the middle of the torrid zone that the ancients said was uninhabitable” (S.Tomé and Príncipe).

The most frequent forms of reference to the colonized regions and peoples are made by spatial reference to the region as geographical location for the actions of the colonizers, mainly as adjuncts of place, or as objects of the actions of the colonizers, frequently as subjects of clauses in the passive voice. They are dehumanized, mentioned as geographical spaces (as syntactical adjuncts) or as semantic beneficiaries of actions by the colonizers. Deixis when identifiable marks distance, and both the addresser and the reader are therefore not identified with the colonized. In terms of processes illustrative of the patterns in this first version: these regions “offer shelter,” “are made moorings,” “are named,” “are sighted,” “are discovered,” “are given over,” “are colonized by blacks and whites,” “are explored,” “are found,” “receive a name,” “comprise several black races” and “are a beacon of the primacy of colonizers and the value of their effort”.^{vi}

2.2 Second Version

The forms of self-reference used in the second version are the following:^{vii}

(1) navigators, examples: “the famous Vasco da Gama, first Portuguese navigator” (Mozambique); “The Portuguese navigators” (S.Tomé and Príncipe); “the navigator Diogo Cão” (Angola); “the Portuguese navigators of the 15th century” (Guinea);

(2) the vessels, example: “The armadas of the ‘Route of India’” (India);

(3) the Portuguese, examples: “With the voyage of Vasco da Gama, the Portuguese” (India); “The Portuguese” (Cape Verde, Angola);

(4) Europeans, examples: “They [the islands of Cape Verde] were peopled by populations of African and European origin” (Cape Verde); “African and European population centres” (S. Tomé and Príncipe);

(5) a former empire, examples: “The former Portuguese empire in Asia” (India);

(6) a presence, examples: “the Portuguese presence” (Mozambique); “the presence of the Portuguese” (Angola and Guinea);

(7) sovereignty, example: “Portuguese sovereignty” (S. Tomé and Príncipe, Guinea); and

(8) verbal forms of the third person singular and plural.

Despite the maintenance of self-reference to the navigators, their vessels and the Portuguese, the main change of this second version is related to additional references, firstly to the European, which again signal allegiance although of a different nature. The addresser mentions colonizers as part of a group but instead of just belonging to the Portuguese people the self-definition has a supplementary reference: Europe. Perhaps as a reaction to the strongly nationalistic promotion of the Portuguese nation during ‘Estado Novo,’ the purpose of this post-dictatorship version may be to dilute Portuguese nationality into Europe. Secondly, additional instances of self-reference include abstract nouns such as “empire” (“in former empire”), “presence,” and “sovereignty”. Such nominal abstract categories together with verbal forms of third person singular or plural and clauses in the passive voice without mention to an agent, make empathy and identification of addresser and reader with the colonizer more distant, although still implicit. They are in blatant contrast with the markers for the first person plural found in the first version.

Among the processes related to the colonizer are: “they arrived,” “remained,” “found,” but also “needed,” “achieved the objective,” “left Lisbon,” “managed to establish themselves” and “eventually established contacts with populations” (which encode effort), “celebrated an alliance” and “established amicable relationships,” “sailed beyond,” “made geographical reconnaissance,” “Portuguese navigators were the first to make voyages and geographical reconnaissance” (instead of open the way for civilization).^{viii}

Participle forms such as “sailing beyond,” “setting an example,” and passive voices omitting the agent such as “peopling was promoted,” “population centres were established” are also forms of lessening the connection between the colonizers as agents and these actions. The expressions “Portuguese sovereignty lasted,” “the presence of the Portuguese in Angola lasted,” mention events, not actions, together with abstract nominal categories that again make identification of the addresser with the colonizer more remote.

The descriptions used to refer to the colonized are:^{ix}

(1) designation of places, examples: “Mozambique,” “on the beautiful island of Mozambique” (Mozambique); “to India,” “in the Orient,” “Goa, Damão and Diu” (India); “the islands of Cape Verde,” “the archipelago of Cape Verde” (Cape Verde); “the reconnaissance of the Gulf of Guinea,” “several uninhabited islands,” “on two of them later named S.Tomé and Príncipe” (S. Tomé and Príncipe); “contacts with Angola,” “of African coast line,” “in Angola” (Angola); “in West African coast line and in the gulf of Guinea,” “in the regions of Guinea-Bissau” (Guinea);

(2) designation of function, examples: “several ports in the coast of western Africa,” “a basis for the ships in the route of India,” “settlement of Portuguese presence” (Mozambique); “an important basis for navigations,” “a meeting-point for the Atlantic and African world” (Cape Verde);

(3) civilizations, examples: “African civilizations South of the Equator” (Angola); “the populations” (Guinea);

(4) kings, examples: “the King of Congo” (Angola);

(5) there (deixis expressing distance), examples: “there” (Angola);

(6) these (deixis expressing proximity), example: “these territories” (India; which, however, may also be interpreted as expressing co-textual proximity);

(7) objects of actions by the colonizers, example: “the islands of Cape Verde were discovered” (Cape Verde);

(8) nations and territories, example: “Popular Republic of Mozambique,” “the new country” (Mozambique); “State of India,” “these territories” (India); “Republic of Cape Verde,” “as an independent country” (Cape Verde); “Democratic Republic of S.Tomé and Príncipe,” “the new country” (S.Tomé and Príncipe); “Popular Republic of Angola,” “the new country” (Angola); “Republic of Guinea-Bissau,” “the new country” (Guinea);

(9) members of a wider community, example: “another member of the Luso-Afro-Brazilian Community” (Guinea).

Again, despite the maintenance of reference to these regions as geographical places, the main differences are additional reference to them as designation of functions, civilizations, populations, and nations that are members of wider communities.

As for processes, “Mozambique remained” (Mozambique), “when the islands of Cape Verde were discovered (...) they were still uninhabited,” “they were peopled by populations of African and European origin, setting an example as a remarkable cultural process of miscegenation,” “would become in the future” (Cape Verde), “were named,” “peopling was promoted and in them were African and European population centres established – the first in the equatorial area” (S. Tomé and Príncipe); and in a clearly apologetic version the new countries “ascend to independence” (Mozambique, S.Tomé and Príncipe) “become independent” (Angola) or “become members of a wider community, one of the most significant in the planet” (Guinea), and are in this way also depicted as agents of material, action and intention processes.^x

3. On the definition of censorship

Now, the question is does this rewriting have anything to do with censorship? Is censorship applicable to what we find in these examples of intralingual translation in “Portugal dos Pequenitos”? Studies on censorship in Portugal usually focus on freedom of the press during and after the dictatorship as is also the case of works for the wider public such as *Portugal Contemporâneo*, including two chapters by Maria Antónia Palla (Palla 1996a and 1996b).

During the dictatorship “Estado Novo,” censors controlled information, there was a considerably long list of facts and international personalities that could not be mentioned, any global criticism to governmental policies was, of course, excluded from the press (Palla 1996a: 208). News on demonstrations, feminist or hippie movements, torture or political prisoners, showing disrespect toward military authorities or contestation within the Church were also subject to prepublication censorship (Carvalho 1973). Naturally censors controlled information regarding forced labour (which ended with the abolition of the ‘Estatuto dos Indígenas da Guiné-Bissau, Angola e Moçambique’ in 1961), and they also controlled information on armed resistance against the Portuguese colonial system that eventually developed into colonial war in 1961. But, the 1974-“Carnation Revolution” is said to have put an end to censorship in Portugal, with the proclamation of freedom of the press and assembly the very next day, 26th of April 1974 (Figueiredo 2001: 1917).

However, as one reads in Antonio de Figueiredo’s entry in *Censorship: a World Encyclopedia*,

Portugal was not quite through the woods of censorship. The abolition of prior censorship was upheld by the Council of Ministers, but a decree emphasized ‘the imperative need to avoid any abuse of freedom, which must be exercised responsibly so as to prevent the country from being dragged into a climate of anarchy through incitement to disorder and violence. (Figueiredo 2001: 1917)

Media worker movements seized control over newspapers (e.g. *Republica*) and radio stations (e.g. *Rádio Renascença*) and transformed television by doubling airtime devoted to news and discussions of contemporary issues,

which were, for some observers, just party propaganda (Figueiredo 2001: 1917). The Council of Information was created in 30th December 1974, as a means of controlling information disseminated by the media. The Council for the Press was created in 1975 to ensure freedom of the press. But, occasionally, government initiatives cancelled television programs or confiscated copies of cartoons as late as 1979. In 1983 the Council for the Media was founded in order to guarantee the independence of state-owned media (Palla 1996b: 662).

3.1 Denotative dimension vs. connotative dimension

Although the above information is important in order to understand how media censorship worked in Portugal during the dictatorship, another definition is called for in order to deal with the two textual versions of 'Portugal dos Pequenitos' under scrutiny, also because the second version we are analyzing is clearly a post-dictatorship text.

Therefore, in order to answer the above question, it may be more helpful to profile more recent developments of the notion of censorship and to recover the suggestions Strange, Green and Brock make in their article "Censorship" in *Encyclopedia of Sociology* when they mention connotative and descriptive dimensions for the meaning of censorship (Strange, Green, Brock 2000).

Three descriptive uses for this term are listed: (1) "the prior restraint of information by government"; (2) "any form of government regulations that restrict or disable speech"; and (3) "in a third, less conventional usage, the term is modified to refer to nongovernmental restrictions on speech." (Strange, Green, Brock 2000: 268). Therefore, the descriptive meaning encompasses pre- and post-publication censorship that may be government-enforced or not.

In terms of connotative meaning the authors state:

Underlying the connotative force of the term is the strong conviction that suppression of speech is at best a necessary evil.

As such the term typically carries with it a highly pejorative connotation and a strong air of illegitimacy. (Strange, Green, Brock 2000: 268)

3.2 Core Meaning vs. wider scope meaning

Consequently, we may distinguish a core meaning of the term related to restrictions on expression that are preemptive, government enforced and deemed to be illegitimate, so defined as "illegitimate government action" (Strange, Green, Brock 2000: 269).

However, besides this core understanding, although less frequently, the more recent definitions for this term also cover restrictions consensually deemed to be legitimately enforced in everyday practices by power relationships.^{xi} So, censorship also comprehends "instances in which private concerns and impersonal market forces can produce deleterious effects; ones that exclude particular viewpoints from the marketplace of ideas." (Strange, Green, Brock 2000: 269)

Important for understanding this last definition encompassed by the third descriptive use of the term is Pierre Bourdieu's work "for whom censorship is located not only in explicit prohibitions, but also in the everyday practices and power relationships that determine what is and is not said." (Strange, Green, Brock 2000: 268)

This is labeled by some authors as 'soft censorship', 'de facto censorship' or 'private censorship' (Barber 1996: 137-138), i.e. as some form of control of expression that is not government-enforced or consensually deemed illegitimate but is exercised by "private and impersonal forces that lead some forms of expression to be systematically excluded from the marketplace of ideas" (Strange, Green, Brock 2000: 269).

In view of this wider scope of meaning, two other notions are also become pertinent to our current purpose: hate speech and political correctness. "Hate speech" is defined as "harassing or intimidating remarks that derogate the hearer's race, gender, religion or sexual orientation." (Strange, Green, Brock 2000: 275). The notion of political correctness is equated by some with socially-enforced censorship given that as an impersonal force it seems to eradicate some forms of (hate) speech from discourse, due to the fact that certain opinions are currently deemed unthinkable and unspeakable and thus such restrictive powers are deemed legitimate.

The influence of political correctness often takes the form of "self-censorship" or guarded expression so as to avoid controversy or conflict with hegemonic ideologies. If we consider the dichotomy prepublication restraint vs. post-publication censorship, political correctness appears as mainly parallel to the former, although it can also correspond to the latter (since one can also find websites with expressions struck out and politically correct ones added). Ideologically, it is more than just another form of euphemism, since it results from the ideational power of sanitized or whitewashed language to not only represent but also create reality. Therefore, it is thought capable of promoting a

positive social outcome by explicitly drawing attention to what may be offensive, harassing or intimidating to other people especially as regards “labeling” or forms of reference to identity groups.

However, the recently growing intervention of these “private and impersonal forces” that limit speech and thought have again brought to the fore the discussion on their legitimacy. They are called “New Threats to Freedom of Speech” and made the cover of a recent number of *Courier Internacional* (No. 92, 5-11 January 2007) that devotes six pages to reflections on these disquieting forms of collective silence in a growingly globalized and multicultural world. The articles are signed by Timothy Garton Ash (Oxford University), Umberto Eco on taboos developed by political correctness, Ian Buruma on pressure by community leaders (Bard College, State of New York), Daniel Innerarity on the interference of emotion in the public sphere (University of Zaragoza), Adrian Kreye (New York University) who interviews Tony Judd (British historian) on political correctness in North-American universities or by Vicente Molina Foix (Spanish writer and film critic) on current changes to popular Spanish festivities.

4. Conclusion

The article on censorship of *Encyclopedia Britannica* starts with the following definition: “To censor is to act so as to change or suppress speech or writing that is condemned as subversive of the common good.” (G.An 1998: 604)

In view of the above, and going back to the intralingually translated versions found in “Portugal dos Pequenitos”, one would most likely agree that the intralingual translators working in post-dictatorship Portugal were holding blue pencils, or weren’t they? In the light of changing hegemonic ideologies, they substituted offensive language use by politically correct one, removing pejorative references to “blacks” (“pretos”) or to “black King of Congo” (“rei preto do Congo”), omitting reference to colonizers “opening the way to civilization”, or performing a peaceful “civilizing action” as well as to former colonies as “a beacon of the primacy of colonizers and the value of their effort”.

But the question “who is holding the blue pencil?” can perhaps be extended to each and every reader of these two parallel versions. For, also when one reads the second intralingually translated apologetic, euphemistic, whitewashed versions, one may hold at least a “mental” blue pencil too. Current Portuguese citizens will probably read them out loud to children visiting the buildings and some at least may feel the need to re-phrase them or dwell upon their interpretation, for instance when the discoveries are described as a “fantastic adventure” that enabled the establishment of “contact with populations” or even “amicable relationships” and alliances or “set an example for a remarkable process of cultural miscegenation”, or when motivation for the discoveries is stated to have been a scientific search for “geographical reconnaissance of the African coastline” with hardly any mention to a more pressing drive: trade (see Mattoso *et al.* 1993a and 1993b: 336-353).

So the question remains: who would be willing to use a blue pencil on both versions found in “Portugal dos Pequenitos”? Who is holding a blue pencil? And how (il)legitimate does it feel?

References:

- Barber, Benjamin R. 1995. *Jihad vs. McWorld*. New York: Times Books.
- Burton, Deirdre. 1982. “Through Glass Darkly: Through Dark Glasses” in: *Language and Literature. An Introductory Reader in Stylistics*. Edited by Ronald Carter. London: Allen & Unwin. 195-214.
- Carvalho, Arons de. 1973. *A Censura e as Leis da Imprensa*. Lisbon: Seara Nova.
- Courier Internacional*. 92. 5-11 January 2007.
- Faria, Isabel Hub. 1991. “Formas de Auto-Referência e Modalidades do Sujeito-Locutor” in: *Para a Análise da Variação Sócio-Semântica. Estrato sócio-profissional, sexo e local de produção enquanto factores reguladores, em Português Contemporâneo, das formas de auto-referência e de orientação para o significado*. Lisbon: Instituto Nacional de Investigação Científica. 49-53.
- Figueiredo, António de. 2001. “Portugal” in: *Censorship: A World Encyclopaedia*. Vol. 3. London, Chicago: Fitzroy Dearbourn Publishers. 1912-1919.
- G. An. 1998. “Censorship” in: *The New Encyclopaedia Britannica*. 15th Edition. Chicago: Encyclopaedia Britannica. 604-611.
- Halliday, M.A.K. 1970. “Language structure and language function” in: *New Horizons in Linguistics*. Edited by John Lyons. Harmondsworth: Penguin. 140-165.
- Halliday, M.A.K. 1973. *Explorations in the Functions of Language*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Halliday, M.A.K. 1978. *Language as a Social Semiotic*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Lyons, John. 1977. “Communicative competence” in: *Semantics*. Cambridge: CUP. 573-585.
- Mattoso, José *et al.* 1993a. “O comércio ultramarino” in: *História de Portugal*. Vol. 3. *No alvorecer da modernidade (1480-1620)*. Lisbon: Editorial Estampa. 336-249.

- Mattoso, José *et al.* 1993b. “Num mercado à dimensão do mundo” in: *História de Portugal*. Vol. 3. *No alvorecer da modernidade (1480-1620)*. Lisbon: Editorial Estampa. 349-353.
- Palla, Maria Antónia. 1996a. “A renovação da imprensa, apesar da censura” in: *Portugal Contemporâneo*. Vol. 3. Organized by António Reis. Lisbon: Selecções do Reader’s Digest. 207-220.
- Palla, Maria Antónia. 1996b. “A liberdade da imprensa entre o poder e a independência” in: *Portugal Contemporâneo*. Vol. 3. Organized by António Reis. Lisbon: Selecções do Reader’s Digest. 655-664.
- Strange, Jeffrey J, Melanie C. Green and Timothy C. Brock. 2000. “Censorship and the Regulation of Expression” in: *Encyclopedia of Sociology*. 2nd Edition. Vol. 1. New York: MacMillan Reference USA. 267-281.

ⁱ See: http://www.tripadvisor.com/Attraction_Review-g189143-d456688-Reviews-Portugal_dos_Pequenitos-Coimbra_Beiras.html (accessed 19 July 2006).

ⁱⁱ See: http://www.fbb.pt/pp_apresentacao.htm (accessed 19 July 2006).

ⁱⁱⁱ For the sake of readability, English glosses will be used in the text and the majority of Portuguese examples will be included in endnotes. In the first version, the Portuguese forms of self-reference to the colonizers are: (1) Kings, examples: “D. Manuel I” (India), “D. Afonso V” (S.Tomé and Príncipe), “D. João II” (S.Tomé and Príncipe); (2) Navigators, examples: “Vasco da Gama” (India and Mozambique), “Diogo Cam” (Angola), “pelos navegadores portugueses do tempo do Infante D. Henrique” “alguns dos primeiros navegadores”, “dos nossos descobridores” (Guinea); (3) the vessels of the navigators, examples: “as naus portuguesas da carreira da Índia” (Mozambique), “as naus portuguesas” (India), “pelas caravelas de Diogo Gomes e António da Nola” (Cape Verde), “as nossas caravelas” (Angola); (4) the Portuguese, example: “os portugueses” (Angola and S.Tomé and Príncipe); (5) “Portugal” (S. Tomé and Príncipe); (6) our empire, examples: “o nosso império da Índia” (India); (7) markers for the third person singular and plural; as well as (8) markers for the first person plural, examples: “íamos comprar,” “obrigaram-nos a manter pela força,” “ali construímos,” “o nosso império da Índia, (...) de que hoje nos restam” (India); “os nossos navegadores” (Cape Verde); “cedemos” (S.Tomé and Príncipe); “as nossas caravelas,” “a nossa maior província” (Angola); “a primazia dos nossos descobridores e o valor do seu esforço” (Guinea).

^{iv} In the Portuguese first version, the processes attributed to the colonizers are: “ia em demanda,” “dobrou,” “ancorou,” “descansou,” “tratavam com os indígenas, abrirão-lhes [sic] o caminho da civilização,” or “começou pacificamente a acção civilizadora,” “íamos comprar,” “procurou tratar pacificamente com os indígenas,” “obrigaram-nos a manter pela força,” “derrotaram,” “o nosso império da Índia firmou-se,” “descobriram,” “a primeira a ser avistada,” “dar o maior impulso,” “foi sendo explorada a passos de gigante,” “se chegou,” “foi o nome dado pelos navegadores portugueses,” “colonizar,” “levou as nossas caravelas,” “voltou ali,” “a erguer o padrão de Portugal,” “subiu pelo rio,” “gravou na rocha,” and “morreram, varados por azagaias envenenadas”.

^v The Portuguese forms of reference to the colonized regions are: (1) designation of places, often as syntactically optional adjuncts of place, examples: “em vários pontos da África oriental,” “na pequena ilha de Moçambique,” “fizeram de Moçambique e dos portos daquela costa” (Mozambique); “para a Índia,” “no oceano Índico” (India); “assim se chegou (...) ao golfo da Guiné, a Benin e a Mina” (S.Tomé and Príncipe); “até ao Congo,” “em Angola – a nossa maior província do ultramar” (Angola); “Toda a costa de África que se ia descobrindo para além do Cabo Bojador,” “A actual província da Guiné portuguesa compreende ainda muitas raças negras” (Guinea); (2) indigenous peoples, examples: “tratavam com os indígenas” (Mozambique); “os povos da Índia,” “as intrigas dos mercadores moiros,” “os turcos, os egípcios e os índios” (India); “tratou [Diogo Cam] com o rei preto do Congo” (Angola); “país de azenegues [Znaga] e negros” (Guinea); (3) “there” (deixis expresses distance) examples: “ali” (India, Cape Verde, Angola); (4) objects of actions by the colonizers, frequently as subjects of passive voice clauses, examples: “fizeram de Moçambique e dos portos daquela costa os seus ancoradouros costumados” (Mozambique); “procurou tratar pacificamente com os povos da Índia” (India); “Em frente do cabo que, por estar coberto de arvoredo, foi chamado Cabo Verde,” “A primeira a ser avistada foi a de Santiago” (Cape Verde); “A costa de África foi sendo explorada a passos de gigante,” “foram achadas 4 ilhas,” “D. João II empenhou-se em colonizar aquelas ilhas no meio da zona tórrida, que os antigos diziam ser inabitável.” (S.Tomé and Príncipe).

^{vi} Portuguese expressions illustrative of processes in the first version are: “oferecia bom abrigo,” “as naus portuguesas fizeram de Moçambique e dos portos daquela costa os seus ancoradouros costumados,” “foi o nome dado,” “a primeira a ser avistada,” “os nossos navegadores descobriram, ao largo, uma a uma, as ilhas deste arquipélago,” “e mais duas que depois cedemos a Espanha,” “colonizadas por brancos e pretos,” “foi sendo explorada,” “foram achadas,” “recebeu o nome,” “compreende ainda muitas raças negras” and “é como um padrão que atesta a primazia dos nossos descobridores e o valor do seu esforço”.

^{vii} The Portuguese forms of self-reference used in the second version are the following: (1) navigators, examples: “o célebre Vasco da Gama, o primeiro navegador português” (Mozambique); “os navegadores portugueses” (S.Tomé and Príncipe); “o navegador Diogo Cão” (Angola); “os navegadores portugueses do século XV” (Guinea); (2) the vessels, examples: “as armadas regulares da ‘Carreira da Índia’” (India); (3) the Portuguese, examples: “Com a viagem de Vasco da Gama, os portugueses” (India); “portugueses” (Cape Verde); “dos portugueses” (Angola); (4) Europeans, examples: “Foram [as ilhas de Cabo Verde] desde então povoadas por populações de origem africana e europeia” (Cape Verde); “foram instalados núcleos populacionais africanos e europeus” (S. Tomé and Príncipe); (5) a former empire, examples: “do antigo império português da Ásia” (India); (6) a presence, examples: “da presença portuguesa” (Mozambique); “a presença dos portugueses” (Angola and Guinea); (7) sovereignty, example: “a soberania portuguesa” (S. Tomé and Príncipe, Guinea); and (8) verbal forms of third person singular and plural.

^{viii} The processes related to the colonizer in the Portuguese second version are: “chegou,” “demorou-se,” “encontrou,” but also “necessitava,” “conseguiram o objectivo,” “partiam de Lisboa,” “conseguiram estabelecer-se no Oriente” and “vieram a estabelecer contactos com as populações” (which encode effort), “estabeleceu uma aliança” and “estabeleceu relações amistosas,” “ultrapassou a foz do rio Zaire,” “fez reconhecimentos geográficos,” “Os navegadores portugueses do século XV foram os primeiros a fazer viagens e reconhecimentos geográficos” (instead of open the way for civilization).

^{ix} The Portuguese descriptions used to refer to the colonized in the second version are: (1) designation of places, examples: “Moçambique,” “na bela ilha de Moçambique” (Mozambique); “para a Índia,” “no Oriente,” “Goa, Damão e Diu” (India); “as ilhas de Cabo Verde,” “o arquipélago de Cabo Verde” (Cape Verde); “o reconhecimento do golfo da Guiné,” “várias ilhas desabitadas,” “em duas delas, mais tarde chamadas de S.Tomé e Príncipe” (S. Tomé and Príncipe); “os primeiros contactos (...) com Angola,” “no litoral africano,” “em Angola” (Angola); “nos litorais da África Ocidental e do golfo da Guiné,” “nas regiões da Guiné-Bissau” (Guinea); (2) designation of function, examples: “vários portos da costa oriental africana,” “uma base dos navios da Carreira da Índia,” “ponto de fixação da presença portuguesa” (Mozambique); “importante base das navegações,” “um ponto de encontro do mundo atlântico e africano” (Cape Verde); (3) civilizations, examples: “civilizações africanas ao sul do equador” (Angola); “as populações” (Guinea); (4) kings, examples: “o rei do Congo” (Angola); (5) there (deixis expressing distance), examples: “ali” (Angola); (6) these (deixis expressing proximity), example: “destes territórios” (India; which, however, may also be interpreted as expressing co-textual proximity); (7) objects of actions by the colonizers, example: “as ilhas de Cabo Verde foram descobertas” (Cape Verde); (8) nations and territories, example: “República Popular de Moçambique,” “Moçambique” (Mozambique); “Estado da Índia,” “destes territórios” (India); “República de Cabo Verde,” “país independente” (Cape Verde); “República Democrática de S.Tomé e Príncipe,” “o novo país” (S.Tomé and Príncipe); “República Popular de Angola,” “o novo país” (Angola); “República da Guiné-Bissau,” “o novo país” (Guinea); (9) members of a wider community, example: “mais um dos membros da comunidade luso-afro-brasileira” (Guinea).

^x As for processes attributed to the former colonies in the Portuguese second version “Moçambique continuou a ser” (Mozambique), “quando as ilhas de Cabo Verde foram descobertas (...) estavam ainda desabitadas,” “foram desde então povoadas por populações de origem africana e europeia, dando o exemplo de um notável processo cultural de miscigenação,” “iria transformar-se no futuro” (Cape Verde), “[foram] chamadas,” “foi promovido o povoamento e foram instalados núcleos populacionais africanos e europeus – sendo estes os primeiros na zona equatorial.” (S. Tomé and Príncipe); and in a clearly apologetic version “o novo país ascendeu à independência” (Mozambique, S.Tomé and Príncipe) “o novo país se tornou independente” (Angola) or “[d]o novo país que se veio a tornar em mais um dos membros da comunidade luso-afro-brasileira” (Guinea), and are in this way depicted as agents of material, action and intention processes.

^{xi} Even if, as one should add, the authors also state: “it tends not to be applied to restrictions that are consensually deemed to be legitimate, although they fall within the descriptive scope of the term.” (Strange, Green, Brock 2000: 268)