

## **LANGUAGE POLICY MANAGEMENT FOR MULTILINGUALISM IN PORTUGUESE-SPEAKING AFRICAN COUNTRIES: DISCUSSIONS FROM ANGOLA AND MOZAMBIQUE**

**JEFFERSON EVARISTO**

[jeffersonpn@yahoo.com.br](mailto:jeffersonpn@yahoo.com.br)

Professor of Portuguese at the State University of Rio de Janeiro (Brazil), where he teaches on the postgraduate programmes PPGLILP and PPLIN/FFP. He is currently undertaking postdoctoral research in Linguistic Studies and has previously completed postdoctoral research in Linguistics and Portuguese Language. He holds a PhD in Portuguese Language from UERJ, as well as a PhD and an MA in Neo-Latin Studies (Italian Language) from the Federal University of Rio de Janeiro (UFRJ). A recipient of the Young Scientist of Our State fellowship awarded by FAPERJ and the Procientista scholarship granted by UERJ, he is an elected member of the Brazilian Academy of Philology, where he occupies Chair 18. <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7561-5400>

**ALEXANDRE ANTÓNIO TIMBANE**

[Alexandre.timbane@unilab.edu.br](mailto:Alexandre.timbane@unilab.edu.br)

Linguist whose academic career spans Brazil and Mozambique. He holds postdoctoral qualifications in Philology and Portuguese Language from the University of São Paulo (USP), in Letters from the Federal University of Sergipe (UFS), and in Forensic Linguistics from the Federal University of Santa Catarina (UFSC). He also completed both a postdoctoral degree and a doctorate in Linguistics and Portuguese Language at São Paulo State University (UNESP). He holds an MA in Linguistics from Eduardo Mondlane University, Mozambique, and a Licentiate and Bachelor's degree in French Language Teaching from the Pedagogical University of Mozambique. He serves as a faculty member at the University for International Integration of the Afro-Brazilian Lusophony (UNILAB) and the Graduate Programme in Linguistic Studies at the State University of Feira de Santana (Brazil). <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-2061-9391>

**DANIEL PERES SASSUCO**

[dperesasuku@gmail.com](mailto:dperesasuku@gmail.com)

Assistant Professor in the Faculty of Humanities at Agostinho Neto University (Angola). He holds a PhD in General Linguistics from Atlantic International University (USA) and a PhD in Language, Culture and Society from Zambeze University, Mozambique. He earned a Master's degree in Multilingual Information and Communication Processing from the Autonomous University of Barcelona, Spain, and a Licentiate and Bachelor's degree in Applied Pedagogy, specialising in French and African Linguistics, from the Higher Pedagogical Institute of Lubumbashi in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. His teaching and research interests encompass linguistics, multilingualism, language policy, and intercultural communication. <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0965-0483>

### **Abstract**

Language policy management is a significant challenge in the African Portuguese-speaking Countries (APSC). It stems from the idea that poorly constructed language policies threaten the existence of languages, reducing their preservation, and can contribute to their obliteration. In this sense, Angola and Mozambique share a common historical and linguistic past: the existence of Bantu and Khoisan African languages and their coexistence with Portuguese, a language inherited from Portugal and also the only language established for administrative services, which puts multilingualism in check. Our research aims to analyse the sociolinguistic situation of Angola and Mozambique, describing the established policies and the challenges that can contribute to the revitalization of endangered languages. This is bibliographic research (also supported by interviews) that seeks to understand how language



policies can be established that effectively contribute to the safeguarding, revitalization, and preservation of Bantu and Khoisan African languages in both contexts. In conclusion, our discussion points to the need to rethink the place of African native languages in the APSC countries and to debate the need to implement multilingual education, as well as the creation of grammars for the African varieties of Portuguese.

### Keywords

Language Policies; Multilingualism; African Languages; Angola; Mozambique.

### Resumo

A gestão de políticas linguísticas constitui-se como um desafio significativo nos Países Africanos de Língua Oficial Portuguesa (PALOP). Parte-se da ideia de que políticas linguísticas mal construídas ameaçam a existência das línguas, reduzem sua preservação e podem contribuir para sua obliteração. Nesse sentido, Angola e Moçambique compartilham um passado histórico e linguístico comum: a existência das línguas africanas bantu e khoisan e a convivência com o português, língua herdada de Portugal e, também, a única língua instituída para os serviços administrativos, o que coloca o multilinguismo em xeque. Nossa pesquisa visa analisar a situação sociolinguística de Angola e de Moçambique, descrevendo as políticas estabelecidas e os desafios que podem contribuir para a revitalização das línguas em perigo. Trata-se de uma pesquisa bibliográfica (com suporte, também, em entrevistas) que busca entender como se pode estabelecer políticas linguísticas que efetivamente contribuam para a salvaguarda, a revitalização e a preservação das línguas africanas bantu e khoisan nos dois contextos. Ao final, nossa discussão aponta para a necessidade de se repensar o lugar das línguas originárias africanas nos PALOP e de debater a necessidade de implementar uma educação multilíngue, assim como a criação de gramáticas para as variedades africanas do português.

### Palavras-chave

Políticas Linguísticas; Multilinguismo; Línguas africanas; Angola; Moçambique.

### How to cite this article

Evaristo, Jefferson, Timbane, Alexandre António & Sassuco, Daniel Peres (2026). Language Policy Management for Multilingualism in Portuguese-Speaking African Countries: Discussions from Angola and Mozambique. *Janus.net, e-journal of international relations*. Thematic Dossier – Geopolitics of Anxiety: Ideology, Identity, and (Un)Bordering in Contemporary Europe and Asia, VOL. 17 Nº. 1, TD4, October 2026, pp. 43-63. DOI <https://doi.org/10.26619/1647-7251.DT0726.2>

**Article submitted on 12 July 2026 and accepted on 14 August 2026.**





## **LANGUAGE POLICY MANAGEMENT FOR MULTILINGUALISM IN PORTUGUESE-SPEAKING AFRICAN COUNTRIES: DISCUSSIONS FROM ANGOLA AND MOZAMBIQUE<sup>1,2</sup>**

**JEFFERSON EVARISTO**

**ALEXANDRE ANTÓNIO TIMBANE**

**DANIEL PERES SASSUCO**

### **Introduction**

Angola is a country located in Africa, more specifically in the Southern African region, occupying an area of 1,246,700 km<sup>2</sup>. According to the final results of the Census (INEA, 2024) <sup>3</sup>, the population is 36,604,681. With an area of [insert area here] 4.837 km, its land borders are located in the north of the province of Cabinda with Congo Brazzaville, to the north and to the east with the Democratic Republic of Congo (formerly Zaire), to the East with Zambia, and to the South with Namibia. In accordance with Law No. 14/24 of September 5th <sup>4</sup>, the new Political-Administrative Division of the country was approved <sup>5</sup>, establishing 21 (twenty-one) Provinces, 326 (three hundred twenty-six) Municipalities, and 378 (three hundred seventy-eight) Communes. On the ground, Angola is to the South of the Francophone countries of the centre and to the North of the Anglophone countries, being the only Lusophone country in this region.

Mozambique, located on the southeastern coast of Africa, is a country composed of eleven provinces, with an estimated population of over 26 million, according to the General

---

<sup>1</sup> Declaration of Interest - The author declares that there are no known financial, professional, or personal conflicts of interest that could have appeared to influence this research. The author has no competing interests to declare.

<sup>2</sup> Acknowledgment - The author acknowledges the use of Microsoft Copilot in assisting with the improvement of English grammar, the formatting of references, and the standardization of citations in this work. All intellectual content, arguments, analysis, interpretations, and conclusions remain the sole responsibility of the author.

<sup>3</sup> Retrieved from <https://www.ine.gov.ao/publicacoes/detalhes/NDc0MTE%3D>

<sup>4</sup> Retrieved from <https://mpla.ao/wp-content/uploads/2024/09/Lei14.24de5deSetembro.pdf>

<sup>5</sup> Retrieved from Diário da República [Official Gazette] of November 28, 2024, 1ª Série, nº 229/12938. Also, in Law nº 14/24, of September 5, of the Political-Administrative Division, which revokes Law nº 18/16, of October 17, Law of the Political-Administrative Division, and all legislation that contradicts the provisions of this Law.



Population and Housing Census conducted in 2017. The Mozambican people are characterized by their wide geographical, cultural, and linguistic diversities. With a vast territory and a multi-ethnic population, it borders Tanzania to the North, Malawi and Zambia to the northwest, Zimbabwe to the West, Eswatini and South Africa to the southwest, and is bathed by the Indian Ocean to the East. The arrival of the Portuguese language through the colonization process brought profound changes to the lives of Angolans and Mozambicans, especially from the prohibition of the use of local languages.

Thus, the consolidation of Portuguese as an official and taught language intensified its spread, especially throughout the 20th century, producing profound linguistic and social inequalities: both countries came to have Portuguese as an official language because they were overseas provinces of Portugal. During the colonial period, local languages were prohibited, and the colonial system contributed to their silence, an erasure aimed at potentiating Portuguese dominance and materializing its linguistic superiority. In the colonial context, Portuguese was a superior language that should be compulsorily learned and known by the citizens of the colonies.

Angola and Mozambique fought for and won their freedoms, proclaiming their independences in 1975. However, with power in their hands, they adopted attitudes similar to those of colonial language policies: both imitated the Portuguese government and made Portuguese the official language, to the detriment of the local languages spoken at the time by the majority of the population. The independence fighters failed to see that this strategy was an authentic erasure of the local languages that constituted the languages of the cultural identities and traditions of their respective peoples. The idea of forming the post-colonial "new man," therefore, failed, because the "new man" was supposed to abandon his traditions, cultures, languages, and religion, behaving in practice as a "non-African," a replica of a "Portuguese."

In this sense, the linguistic issue has been neglected in the African Portuguese-speaking Countries (APSC<sup>6</sup>), especially in Angola and Mozambique, and politicians rarely discuss the subject publicly. The universities have conducted studies and researches presenting these linguistic challenges, but the topic of languages is treated as a secondary and complementary element. For example, fifty years after independence, the sign languages have not been included in education and public institutions, multilingual/bilingual education is not promoted, and the protection and revitalization of local languages of African origin is not encouraged. The local radio stations are exceptions, providing parts of their broadcasts in local languages.

On the other hand, incentives for literary production in local languages are non-existent, public television channels ignore the presence of deaf people in both countries, and local languages are only used during election campaigns. All these concerns are considered of little interest, which explains the absence of language policies promoting locally spoken languages.

It is important to say that we do not support the idea of prohibiting the use of Portuguese in the APSC because this language allows communication between ethnic groups within

---

<sup>6</sup> The original: PALOP – Países Africanos de Língua Oficial Portuguesa



the country and with the outside world; however, learning a language for national and international communication does not mean abandoning local mother tongues. We, therefore, advocate for equal opportunities and respect among speakers of these languages.

This study aims to analyse how language policy management can influence the dimension of multilingualism in the APSC. We start from the idea that the similarity of political decisions has largely hindered the expansion of Angolan and Mozambican languages. Specifically, we seek to (i) explain the current linguistic situation in Angola and Mozambique; (ii) criticize established language policies, drawing attention to a future in which local languages may disappear; and (iii) explore possible paths towards a more inclusive language policy and planning that does not exclude other languages which are spoken in these territories, understanding that linguistic hierarchies are ideological and colonizing, and above all, constructs of cultural domination should be critically examined. Thus, through bibliographic and documentary research (also supported by interviews), we were able to understand the sociolinguistic reality, language management, and language policy decisions in this context.

This research is divided as follows: the first section discusses (de)coloniality, seeking to understand how linguistic ideology was implemented in the two countries. The next one, we discuss language policies, language planning, and their impacts. In sections 3 and 4, we analyse the sociolinguistic realities of Angola and Mozambique from the (de)coloniality paradigm. Finally, in the fifth section, we compare the two realities in order to present some concluding remarks.

## Coloniality and decoloniality

The African case is perhaps the most evident example for a discussion of coloniality and decoloniality. Understanding its existence and implications, first, recognizing that the Portuguese overseas colonization that began in the fifteenth century went beyond the physical occupation of territories, constituting a broad project of domination, control, and the political, economic, cultural, and epistemological reorganization of the affected regions; it was also a form of linguistic domination.

Although the etymological origin of the term refers to the Latin verb *colo*, originally associated with the occupation and cultivation of land, authors such as Bosi (1992) demonstrated that the colonial process also implied the imposition of values, languages, forms of knowledge, and models of social organization that disrupted the cultures of the subjugated peoples. Colonization, in this sense, produced lasting effects that did not end with the political independence<sup>78</sup> of the former colonies (Nascimento and Bittencourt,

<sup>7</sup> "On November 11, 1975, a date agreed upon between Portugal and the Angolan liberation movements, Angola's independence was declared" (Pinheiro, 2007, p. 83).

"The Mozambique Liberation Front (FRELIMO) was responsible for leading the movement that culminated in the independence of Mozambique in 1975" (Rêgo, 2024, p. 22)

<sup>8</sup> All quotations in our text were freely translated by the authors.



2016), remaining present in power relations, institutions, and the production of knowledge.

It is precisely this permanence that underlies the concept of coloniality, developed primarily through the work of Aníbal Quijano and further developed by authors such as Mignolo (2003). From this perspective, modernity cannot be understood separately from the European colonial expansion that began in the sixteenth century. Contrary to traditional interpretations, which locate its origin in the Enlightenment or the Industrial Revolution, decolonial studies argue that the conquest of Africa and America, together with the consolidation of the colonial system constitutes the initial landmark of modernity. European centrality brought about a fundamental rupture in those colonized countries, relegating the experiences of their peoples to the status of peripheral or inferior knowledge, originating from societies equally inferior to the colonizer.

Many of today's geopolitical boundaries were imposed through the process of colonization. It was the Europeans, for example, who demarcated African territories and separated families, ethnic groups, and languages. We need only remember that no African was present at the Berlin Conference (1884/1885), the event that defined the current partition of Africa. In the context of the APSC, this reflection takes on particular relevance. Angola, Mozambique, Cabo Verde, Guinea-Bissau, and São Tomé and Príncipe, for example, experienced long processes of Portuguese colonization that left deep marks on their political, cultural, and linguistic structures. The fact that Portuguese played an important role in the construction of nation-states and in communication between different linguistic groups results from colonial policies that sought to marginalize African languages and associate the colonizer's language with social prestige, access to education, and the exercise of power.

From this perspective, decoloniality does not propose rejecting the Portuguese language or denying the shared history between these countries. Its objective is to problematize the hierarchies inherited from colonialism and to recognize the legitimacy of the multiple forms of cultural, linguistic, and intellectual production existing in these territories – and, as a consequence of this position, to act for their promotion, safeguarding, and protection, understanding these actions as fundamental issues of language policies and multilingualism. By shifting the centre of knowledge production to the historical and social experiences of the Global South, decolonial thought contributes to valuing local knowledge, strengthening national identities, and broadening the understanding of Portuguese-speaking African societies beyond the categories traditionally constructed by the Eurocentric gaze. It is, therefore, a movement that seeks to make visible historically silenced epistemologies, reaffirming the cultural and linguistic diversity that characterizes the APSC and questioning the mechanisms by which coloniality continues to produce asymmetries even after the end of formal colonial domination. Thus, the decoloniality movement can be summarized by the following assumptions: Decolonial studies share a systematic set of theoretical statements that revisit the question of power in modernity. These conceptual procedures are:

1. *The location of the origins of modernity in the conquest of America and the control of the Atlantic by Europe, between the late 15th and early 16th*



*centuries, and not in the Enlightenment or the Industrial Revolution, as is commonly accepted;*

*2. Special emphasis is placed on the structuring of power through colonialism and the constitutive dynamics of the modern/capitalist world-system and its specific forms of accumulation and exploitation on a global scale;*

*3. Understanding modernity as a planetary phenomenon constituted by asymmetrical power relations, and not as a symmetrical phenomenon produced in Europe and subsequently extended to the rest of the world;*

*4. The asymmetry of power relations between Europe and its "others" represents a constitutive dimension of modernity and, therefore, necessarily implies the subordination of the practices and subjectivities of the dominated peoples;*

*5. The subjugation of the majority of the world's population is established through two structural axes based on the control of labour and the control of intersubjectivity;*

*6. The designation of Eurocentrism/Westernism as the specific form of knowledge and subjectivity production in modernity (Quintero, Figueira and Elizalde, 2019, p. 5)*

Originating in the Global South, the notion of decoloniality finds its first contributions from subaltern studies, pioneered in India by the research of Ranajit Guha and strongly influenced by Gramscian Marxism, constituted an important contribution to the critique of Eurocentrism and the general dynamics of colonialism during the 1980s (Quintero, Figueira and Elizalde, 2019, p. 4).

If "the second half of the 20th century was marked by a series of conflicts and events that highlighted the rupture between the colonizer and the colonized, now independent" (Rêgo, 2024, p. 21), this occurred, to a large extent, coinciding with the growing discussion about decoloniality. We have seen, with Pinheiro (2007), Rêgo (2024) and Nascimento and Bittencourt (2016), that this process, which took place in Angola and Mozambique in 1975, culminated in the liberation of these countries, then Portuguese colonies, and led to their autonomy from the former colonizing country.

This autonomy, however, could not be verified in all areas. In our analysis, this is particularly evident in the linguistic domain and directly impacts language policy issues, especially in relation to the expected Lusophony that would unite PSC or, on a more localized level, the articulation of different African countries as a cohesive group based on the APSC. The following section addresses these issues.

### **Language policies, language planning and their impacts**

The discussion about language policies – or, more broadly, "policy" and "policies," even if not necessarily "linguistic" ones – historically dates back to the Greek world, with



Aristotle systematizing the first structured argument in this regard (although Socrates and Plato had already begun developing ideas in this direction). In Evaristo (2021a; 2021b), one can find an extensive discussion about the diverse interpretations of the concept of politics, ranging from the Greek world, Aristotle, Augustine of Hippo, Machiavelli, Hobbes, Locke, Rousseau, Marx, and contemporary authors, especially based on dictionaries. This long journey shows how the idea of politics is multifaceted and how different authors have appropriated it in very varied, sometimes conflicting or mutually exclusive ways. Following the discussion and bringing the idea of "politics" closer to the linguistic field, we arrive at the new concept of "language policies." Its first appearance as an autonomous idea conventionally dates back to the discussions initiated by Ferguson in 1959 (Calvet, 2007), when he systematized problematizations about the relationship between languages and societies and outlined the first aspects of the organization and management of these languages. Naturally, it is possible to find many other episodes in human history where one could say there was some discussion about what we understand today as language policy, such as the Socratic and Platonic discussions of the Greek world, the defence of the Latin language as a unifying factor of the Roman Empire, the perception of a socio dialectal variation in the 14th to 17th centuries, or even the first steps of Philology and the historical-comparative method, to cite a few occurrences. However, although they existed, these situations showed the seeds of a discussion that only centuries later would acquire a name and transform into an autonomous concept. Here, it is also possible to consider that, in a certain way, the emergence of the concept of language policy could only have occurred from the point of the very foundation of Linguistics as a science, which took place at the beginning of the 20th century.

From Ferguson's initial proposal in the late 1950s, even if not in immediate and direct connection, discussions arose regarding the position of European languages in the world, a situation in which the Portuguese language fits. This fact shows, once again, how the status of these languages remains almost perpetually high and prestigious, reinforcing their interpretation from the notion of coloniality. In Calvet (2007), for example, there is a detailed exposition of the notions of Francophonie and Anglophonie, indicating their historical development. The fact of thinking about a "Francophonie" and an "Anglophonie" - and, in our case, a "Lusophony" - is an unequivocal demonstration of how these languages expanded through processes of colonization and how they occupy places of symbolic power as a result of these events.

In this movement, we arrive at the idea of Lusophony, a theoretical construct that has been widely discussed, fundamentally because of its implications for language policies. On the one hand, we have authors such as Brito (2013), Bastos (2012), and Martins (2014), who associate – not without critical connotation – Lusophony with the linguistic and cultural rapprochement between Portuguese-speaking countries, identifying positive points and geopolitical advances in its adoption; on the other hand, we have authors such as Bagno (2017) and Faraco (2016), who will show the theoretical inconsistencies of this construct and argue that it is yet another colonial stage of Portugal, which would recolonize its former dominations from a new form of control and exercise of power. Finally, authors such as Rizzo (2019) critically discuss the implications of different ways of understanding Lusophony and how it oscillates between the imaginary of a natural



association among countries, as if they were all perfectly equal not only linguistically but also politically and socioculturally; a union of forces shaped by international geopolitics; and an epistemology of neo-colonization that should be resisted. However, regardless of how we understand Lusophony, the fact remains that it presents itself as an unavoidable form of categorization for its member countries. Thus, Lusophony is a construct that directly impacts the context of the APSC countries, the situation of Angola and Mozambique. As a political and administrative construct, the idea of APSC emerged around the 1970s, coinciding with several of the independence movements of these countries. Chabal *et al* (2002) show, for example, a fundamental problem in constructing the idea of a "Lusophone Africa." For the authors, thinking of African countries as a single linguistic unit is a reductionist view of reality, since, after their independence processes, the post-colonial trajectory of each country was such that it would be impossible to consider these countries as part of any unified bloc. Thus, starting from an epistemological discomfort with the idea of "Lusophone Africa," the work served to show how adopting the notion of APSC could be more realistic given the context of these countries: a non-homogeneous and natural union of nations on the African continent, but rather an agglomeration of countries that shared the common characteristic of maintaining Portuguese as an official and prestigious language due to their historical colonization.

The APSC, then, will be a key conceptual element in our analysis, since they will represent, at the same time: (i) the language policies of these countries, which adopted a certain bureaucratic monolingualism based on the Portuguese language; (ii) the territoriality of these countries, belonging to the African continent; and (iii) the inseparable link between language policies and coloniality. In Evaristo (2020; 2022) we can see a discussion that extends to dictionaries and shows that, in practice, little attention is paid to the concept. The management of language policies, therefore, constitutes a significant challenge in the APSC from the colonial period to the present (Timbane, 2022). In our proposal, as mentioned, we start from the idea that poorly constructed language policies threaten the existence of languages, reduce the preservation of these languages, and can contribute to their obliteration, as we will see in the analyses of the Angolan and Mozambican contexts. In this sense, the two countries share a common historical and linguistic past which, in effect, is also that of all the almost 60 African nations: "observing the 54 Constitutions [of the African nations,] it is observed that there was the inclusion of at least one European language for official status" (Timbane and Tamba, 2020, p. 99). Furthermore,

*What is observed in the constitutions seems to be a combination of factors across countries. This is because the place of African languages is secondary or tertiary. Colonization was so intense that Africans were unable to appreciate the value of their native languages (Timbane and Tamba, 2020, p. 99).*

In this way, the existence of African Bantu and Khoisan languages, for example, is erased or diminished. This gesture amounts to a new form of linguistic colonialism - or, echoing



Phillipson's (1992) discussion, linguistic imperialism. Although Phillipson's analysis focuses on English, his observations apply by analogy to the Portuguese language in Africa - a context also deeply marked by imperialism and colonialism. As the author demonstrates, the sociopolitical dimensions—note: not merely “linguistic,” but broadly “sociopolitical”—of these countries deemed subaltern are rarely considered based on their own premises; instead, they are viewed (almost) exclusively from external perspectives that disregard their actual needs.

In the preface to the *Atlas of the World's Languages in Danger*, Bokova (2010, p. 7) states: “Over recent decades, as information technologies have brought more of the world's knowledge to more of the world's people at unprecedented speed, humanity's linguistic diversity has been shrinking.” This statement by the UNESCO Director aligns with our discussion and illustrates that, in the African context, the risk of such disappearance is real - specifically regarding local mother tongues, as highlighted by Firmino (2014). Thus, even though these local languages coexist with Portuguese - a language inherited from Portugal and the only one established for administrative services - this fact calls multilingualism into question (Timbane and Penha, 2022). As we indicated earlier, our research aims to analyse the sociolinguistic situation of Angola and Mozambique, describing the established policies and the challenges that can contribute to the revitalization of endangered languages, a situation in which they are minority or marginalized (Lagares, 2011). In the following section, we will address the situation of Angola in relation to its language policies.

### **The sociolinguistic reality of Angola: issues of language policy.**

Angola achieved its independence on November 11, 1975, and adopted Portuguese as its official language. In sociolinguistic terms, Angola is a multi-ethnic, multicultural, and multilingual country. Its original population is comprised of two origins: Bantu and non-Bantu. The Bantu includes the Ovimbundu, Ambundu, Tuvokwe, Bakongo, Ovakwanyama, Vangangela, Ovahelero, Ovanyaneka, Vambunda, Valuvale, Andembo, and Vasongo; the non-Bantu include the Khoisan<sup>9</sup>. People present in the provinces of Cunene, Kwando Kubango, Huíla and Namibe (Kondja, 2023, p. 32), and by the Indo-European community represented by Portuguese descendants. Bantu languages cover the entire national territory and are divided into three linguistic zones (Guthrie, 1948), as described in Maho (2009, pp. 63-86):

- (i) Zone **H**, with the Kikongo (H16) and Kimbundu (H21) languages;
- (ii) Zone **K** with languages Cokwe (K11), Lwimbi (K12a), Ngangela (K12b), Luchazi (K13), Lwena or Luvale (K14), Mbunda (K15), Nyengo (K16), Mbwela (K17), Nkangala (K17), Lunda Ndembo (K22); and
- (iii) Zone **R** with the languages Umbundu (R11), Oshikwanyama (R21), Olunyaneka (R13), Olukumbi (R14), central Herero (R31a).

<sup>9</sup> Khoisan has two lexemes: *khoi-*, which designates people, the indigenous herders and farmers, and *-San*, which means hunters, gatherers.



Considering the sociolinguistic overview above, the INEA (2024) classifies the most spoken languages and those included in social communication in this order: Portuguese 71.15%, followed by *Umbundu* (22.96%), *Kikongo* (8.24%), *Kimbundu* (7.82%), *Cokwe* (6.54%), and other several languages distributed among the remaining percentages. Therefore, three groups of languages define the country's sociolinguistic landscape, namely: Portuguese, Bantu languages, and Khoisan languages. In any case, "the official language of the Republic of Angola is Portuguese" (CRA, 2010, p. 9), and the other languages are considered Angolan national languages (Oliveira, 2018).

This kind of consecration of the Portuguese language dates back to 1975, with National Independence, when it was reinforced by the Basic Law of the Education and Teaching System<sup>10</sup>, which defined Portuguese as the language of schooling and communication. This fact ruled out both the possibility of education geared towards multilingualism/bilingualism and any possibility of adopting educational policies in this sense. Thus, the definition of Portuguese as the sole official language in Angola was accompanied by the adoption of prejudiced ideologies, cultural negligence, and devaluation and social injustice that implied seeing the world somewhat distant from the pluridiscursive, multilingual, and diverse reality of Angolan identity; consequently, the Portuguese language acted strongly as an element of silencing, isolation, and hierarchies (Oliveira, 2018).

The Constitution of the Republic of Angola (CRA, 2010) does not clearly define its role regarding the Bantu languages of Angola: even with its five revisions between 1975 and 2010, none of these occasions saw any increase in the number of languages recognized. The document only mentions Angola's multilingual status by stating that "the State values and promotes the study, teaching and use of the other languages of Angola, as well as the main languages of international communication" (CRA, 2010, p. 9 [emphasis added]). Even so, in the only article that provides legal provisions on language, the document cites "the other languages of Angola," without specifying which languages these are. Ultimately, this could include both Bantu languages and non-Bantu languages, or foreign languages from other nations. In short, there is no clear provision regarding local/national languages.

In Article 21 CRA, when listing some of the "fundamental tasks of the Angolan State" (CRA, 2010, p. 10 [emphasis added]), it only speaks, in a generic way, of "protecting, valuing and dignifying Angolan languages of African origin, as cultural heritage, and promoting their development as languages of national identity and communication". Bernardo (2026), an Angolan linguist, regarding language policies in this context, states:

*I understand language policies in three very fundamental dimensions: those related to decisions, actions, and laws themselves. These elements are adopted by a given government to manage, promote, or restrict the use of certain languages by a specific group.*

<sup>10</sup> Retrieved from

[https://sys.portais.gov.ao/uploads/13lei\\_32\\_20\\_de\\_12\\_de\\_agosto\\_lei\\_de\\_bases\\_de\\_educacao\\_e\\_ensino\\_alteracao\\_a\\_lei\\_17\\_137004928963237a670211f\\_16\\_compressed\\_28b9365abc.pdf](https://sys.portais.gov.ao/uploads/13lei_32_20_de_12_de_agosto_lei_de_bases_de_educacao_e_ensino_alteracao_a_lei_17_137004928963237a670211f_16_compressed_28b9365abc.pdf)



Let us examine the Angolan context from the perspective of the CRA and the statement on language policies made by Bernardo (2026), and the result can only be one, as anticipated by the author himself:

*Now, anyone who intends to act in the area of language policy must first decolonize their mind. This is a very fundamental element because the exercise of decolonizing the mind is an element that makes people remove the blindfold from their eyes and begin to see elements that, until very recently, were seen as fundamental to the language policy we have today in Angola. I am referring here to the language policies currently upheld by Angola, which focus on the Portuguese language and marginalize national languages.*

It is noteworthy that the Angolan Constitution does not concretely define the function of national languages, which contributes to their marginalization and secondary position in the Angolan sociolinguistic landscape. Further evidence of this can be seen in the constant confusion of nomenclatures, since the concept of "national languages" does not appear in the CRA: the document speaks, as we have seen, of "Angolan languages of African origin" or "languages of Angola," which shows a real lack of attention and consistency in language policy. When listing national symbols in Article 18 (CRA, 2010, p. 9), the national flag, the national insignia, and the national anthem are listed; nothing is said about the Portuguese language or the other languages mentioned.

In linguistic terms, therefore, the only point that is clearly defined is the fact that Portuguese is the official language of the Republic of Angola; for all other languages, the State recognizes and promotes their study and protects them as cultural heritage and identity of the indigenous peoples of Angola. Nothing more. Thus, "the official monolingual model marginalizes national languages, exacerbating social exclusion and school dropout in rural areas" (Bernardo, 2026).

*In our view, colonial ideology was so strong that it obscured the relevance of local languages. We repeat: multilingualism had never been seen as a problem before colonization. The linguistic policy of Africans failed by denying the potential of their languages (Timbane and Tamba, 2020, p. 99).*

Thus, colonialism on the African continent is still a reality, at least linguistically, even though political-territorial and economic domination has ceased. In this context, thinking about language policies and the planning of different languages in society involves understanding that one of them will have official *status*, social prestige, and public and everyday acceptance; all the others will have to coexist with the central language, adapt to its restrictions, and seek, in their own way, to remain alive. Even so, it would be possible to ask ourselves if, from the point of view of language policies and decoloniality, there is any possible progress for the Angolan scenario. The answer given by Bernardo (2026) is direct:



*Unfortunately, no. I say no because, until very recently, there was a proposed law for national languages that included some elements which, in turn, raised several questions, among them the conception of the status that should be attributed to national languages, because thinking about attributing a status to national languages in the Angolan context presupposes looking at the Constitution of the Republic of Angola. That's how I understand it. If we only look at the status of national languages, without considering the Constitution of the Republic of Angola, which has an article that defines Portuguese as the only official language, we will hardly give due space to national languages, which are very marginalized and segregated.*

Angola, then, is an example of a country where language policies have failed to promote the safeguarding of the country's linguistic heritage, value its linguistic diversity, or even respect the existence of these other languages. In the next section, we will examine the Mozambican context and then we will compare the two scenarios.

### **The sociolinguistic reality of Mozambique: issues of language policy**

The official status of the Portuguese language in Mozambique dates back to the country's independence, when FRELIMO adopted it as the movement's official language:

*It was the language of the movement—the one that could unite everyone. The name itself says it all: it was a "front," a union of all people, provided they held an anti-colonial stance. FRELIMO brought together diverse tendencies; we chose a common catalyst, and the Portuguese language served that purpose. However, this often confuses people: it does not mean that everyone spoke Portuguese (Firmino, 2014).*

Unlike what happens in Angola, in Mozambique, only Bantu languages exist. These languages are classified as such due to their common characteristics. Mozambique encompasses 4 zones, namely Zone G (G40-Swahili), Zone P (P20-Yao, P30-Makhuwa), Zone N (N30-Cewa-Nyanja, N40-Nsenga-Sena) and Zone S (S10-Shona, S50-Tswa-Ronga, S60-Kopi), according to Guthrie's classification, updated by Maho (2009).

Mozambique possesses a linguistic diversity characterized by the coexistence of Bantu languages and Portuguese, the official language, according to the CRM, the Constitution of the Republic of Mozambique (2004), in its Article 10. In addition to Portuguese, approximately 20 Mozambican Bantu languages are spoken in Mozambique, of which 17 already have standardized the orthography, according to Ngunga and Faquir (2011): Kimwani, Shimakonde, Ciyaawo, Emakhuwa, Echuwabu, Cinyanja, Cinyungwe, Cisená, Cibálke, Cimanýika, Cindau, Ciwute, Gitonga, Citshwa, Cicopi, Xichangana, and Xirhonga. There are also languages of Asian immigrants (Hindi, Gujarati, Urdu, and Konkani, according to Maciel [2018]). There are Bantu languages from neighboring countries, spoken in the border regions: cimanýika, cishona, isiswati, isizulu, kunda, nsenga, tonga,



nindi, mwera, kokola, chewa, kunda, tawara. There are also languages classified as foreign, international and used in trade relations (English, French, Mandarin) and languages of religion (Arabic, isizulu, Swahili), in addition to Mozambican Sign Language (LMS).

This linguistic mosaic does not pose a problem for the lives of Mozambicans, as each language has its own domain of use. Firmino (2014), a renowned Mozambican linguist, when asked in an interview which language he learned first, explains:

*It is very difficult for some Mozambicans to say what their first language is, because we are exposed to so many. The one spoken at home – which was likely the first I heard, though I cannot be certain – is a Bantu language, Gitonga, one of the many in the country. My parents live in a region where another Bantu language is also spoken; so, when I was with my friends, I had to speak a different language. And throughout my life, I went on to learn others.*

The same author (Firmino, 2014) goes on to say that "Mozambique is multilingual; people speak various languages. There are various pockets of languages, and even when we say 'multilingual', we are simplifying". Multilingualism is a normal phenomenon in each member of the communities, based on the idea that each language carries cultural traits of its speakers. We understand that if Bantu languages spoken in Mozambican territory were official, they would have greater vitality and would not experience a decrease in the number of their speakers, as the Table 1 illustrates:

| <b>Table 1.</b> Census results for speakers of Portuguese and Bantu languages (as mother tongues) |             |             |             |             |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| <b>Languages</b>                                                                                  | <b>1980</b> | <b>1997</b> | <b>2007</b> | <b>2017</b> |
| <b>Bantu (L1)</b>                                                                                 | 98.8%       | 93%         | 85.2%       | 79.2%       |
| <b>Portuguese (L1)</b>                                                                            | 1.2%        | 6.5%        | 10.7%       | 16.5%       |

Source: Data from INEM (1980, 1997, 2007, 2017)

As shown in Table 1, the number of native Portuguese speakers has been increasing, while the number of Bantu languages spoken as native languages has been decreasing. From 1980 to 2017, there was a reduction in the number of native Bantu language speakers, a fact that is dangerous in a context where Portuguese is valued at the expense of African languages.

The data presented warn of the possibility of language extinction in the coming decades. A language dies when the last speaker passes away, and with them disappears a way of looking at and organizing the world specific to the community that speaks it. With the language dead, the knowledge and wisdom accumulated by that community throughout its history also disappear (Crystal, 2005). The extinction of a language is an incomparable, irreparable, and inestimable loss for human diversity. What we are analysing in this table is a gradual, slow and collective process of the disappearance of speakers of Bantu languages as mother tongues. Languages expand rapidly through



acquisition processes, not learning, because acquisition involves more everyday uses that represent the culture and life of the speech community.

We are not aware of the death of a language in the context of Mozambique, but rather of the death of varieties. There are varieties that are no longer spoken or heard. This is already a reality that warns that, soon, the death of these languages may be observed if the established language policies are not adjusted to the real context. For example, Xirhonga is a Bantu language (S54) with 4 variants, according to Bachetti (2006): (i) Xilwandle or Xikalanga, spoken in the Manhiça district; (ii) Xinondrwana, spoken in Marracuene, Maputo, Matola and Boane; (iii) Xizingili or Xiputru, spoken from kaTembe to Ponta do Ouro; and (iv) Xihlanganu, spoken in Moamba, the capital and part of the Namaacha district. The districts of Manhiça, Marracuene, Boane, Namaacha, Moamba and kaTembe are no longer inhabited by speakers of these varieties: they have become urbanized districts inhabited by people from various parts of the country, which weakens the maintenance of the Xirhonga variant.

Mozambique is not a monolingual country, and the co-officialization of local languages (of Bantu origin) would be fundamental not only for their revitalization but also for their expansion to new generations. The situation presented shows that new generations are not learning Bantu languages. These generations do not learn them because the dominant and official language has greater power compared to the local languages, which causes parents to lose interest in their acquisition. Politicians rarely debate language policy and seldom read studies and research on the subject. Languages disappear in a short period of time, and the factors leading to their disappearance are not exclusively linguistic, but markedly political and of colonial origin, as the scenario allows us to affirm.

To grant official status to a language is to give it power; it is to confer legitimacy and, above all, to give it an opportunity to be taught in schools, to be used without prejudice and without fear. We understand that "from the State's perspective, it is important to find the common factor, especially to awaken in people the awareness that they belong to the same State" as argued by Firmino (2014); however, we also understand that this common factor cannot be used to reject other linguistic forms. We believe that there are no languages superior to others, just as there are no weak, poor, or inferior languages (Soares, 2015). Timbane and Berlinck (2012) show that, at times, the linguistic prejudice of teachers is passed on to students, with many still repressing any kind of manifestation of linguistic variety, punishing errors, crossing out locally used words, deducting points on tests, and promoting the failure of students. This has undermined the self-esteem and self-confidence of students, who feel that they will never be able to perfectly master their languages, especially grammatically.

Language policy and planning, therefore, interfere with and influence the valuation or devaluation of languages. Even so, Bantu languages resist the expansion of Portuguese, as the three most spoken mother tongues continue to be Emakhuwa (26.3%), Xichangana (11.4%), and Cisena (7.8%) – even though, according to CRM (2004), Portuguese is the only official language among other national and international languages spoken in the territory. "Even now, in Mozambique, many people don't speak Portuguese"



(Firmino, 2014). This data is corroborated, for example, by the INE (2017, p. 25), which shows that:

*In urban areas, the mother tongue with the highest percentage is Portuguese (39.2%) and is spoken most frequently at home (42.8%). Only 5.2% of the population residing in rural areas has Portuguese as their mother tongue (Table 8.1). The data show that, overall, almost half (47.4%) of the population aged 5 and over can speak Portuguese, with urban areas standing out (78.1%) compared to rural areas (31.7%).*

In rural areas, there are more women (52.1%) than men (47.9%). The women, in the vast majority of cases, who teach their children their first language. If these women have a Bantu language as their mother tongue, there is a greater likelihood of having more speakers of Bantu languages over the next few decades, since Portuguese is learned as a second language in school there. When they return home from school, students continue speaking Bantu languages, which are the languages of the community's cultures and traditions. This interaction between the few Portuguese speakers and the majority of Bantu language speakers contributes to the stabilization of the local variety of Portuguese, which linguists refer to as the "nativization" of Portuguese (Silva and Mevis, 2024).

Illiteracy is one of the major problems in Mozambican society, especially in rural areas. Schools need to move out of the city and into rural areas. More attention needs to be given to the rural population, where illiteracy rates are higher. Data from the INE (2017) shows a significant reduction in illiteracy rates, but efforts must be redoubled to truly reach rural populations. Mozambique has been independent for half a century, but progress in the linguistic and educational sectors is slow and contradicts the promises of the independence movement. Education should be a priority because no country in the world has developed without investing in the education of its people, and in the post-colonial context of the APSC, the scenario could not be different.

### **Angola and Mozambique: Sociolinguistic realities in comparison.**

By way of comparison, Angola and Mozambique share some aspects that we would like to highlight: in the sociocultural and political-administrative domain, they are former Portuguese colonies, inherited Portuguese as their official language, and achieved independence in 1975. They suffered linguistic reprisals, forcing indigenous people, who had no right to education, to speak Portuguese (Mingas, 2000; Ngunga, 2010; Severo et al., 2014). They looked down on Bantu languages and those who spoke these, culminating in punishments for their use – which led, to a large extent, to the progressive and massive abandonment of Bantu languages.

In the realm of language policies, these countries, in the post-independence context, intended to restore the freedom, autonomy, and circulation of national languages to their peoples, so that they would feel valued and effectively integrated into the country (Sassuco 2016). Over the years, however, the situation took a new turn, since the



adoption of Portuguese as the sole official language not only created discontent but definitively established a hegemonic linguistic colonization. The sequence was even worse: until today, there are no clear language policies to guide the use and management of linguistic and cultural diversity in these countries, maintaining only the common fact of the official language as established by their constitutions.

This reality further delays the desire and hope of seeing Bantu and Khoisan languages as languages of administration and schooling, although there are now greater efforts to value multilingualism and cultural plurality in these countries. The "linguistic situation of Angola, like that of most African countries, characterized by heterogeneity where most languages are of Bantu origin and have a more or less limited and defined territorial location," writes Miguel (2014, p. 13), which leads us to consider that in these two countries, policies of linguistic oppression, exaggerated monolingualism, linguistic coloniality, linguistic exclusion, injustice, and linguistic prejudice prevail as a result of the hegemony of Portuguese. This scenario can lead, as we have seen, to the genocide of Bantu and Khoisan languages in these spaces.

Mozambique and Angola share a common historical past, that is indisputable. First, because both nations are made up of peoples of Bantu origin whose cultures and traditional practices are similar; second, because in both nations Bantu languages are spoken as the languages of the majority of the population. The term "Bantu" was coined by Guthrie to designate a set of African languages that have a common vocabulary; that have a set of invariable roots from which most words are formed by agglutination of affixes; third, because Angola and Mozambique were colonies of Portugal and their territories were demarcated by the Europeans at the Berlin Conference, with Portuguese being the only official language among dozens of local languages; fourth, because both achieved independence in 1975, after years of armed struggle against Portuguese colonialism; fifth, because in both nations the formation of <sup>11</sup>Portuguese-based "creoles" did not occur, a situation of linguistic contact that happened in Guinea-Bissau, Cabo Verde, and São Tomé and Príncipe.

The reasons for the non-existence of creoles in Mozambique and Angola were diverse: (i) African (mother tongue) languages were used in everyday life in all contexts, beyond the specific situations of communication with the Portuguese; (ii) there were many bilingual intermediaries, such as missionaries and merchants; (iii) the territorial extension of these countries is vast, given the small number of their speakers (Portuguese) compared to the number of speakers of Bantu languages; (iv) the stability and isolation of rural groups and the low mobility strengthened these languages among autochthonous populations (Timbane, 2017); (v) both are potentially rich countries with varied natural resources, but with very poor populations and low life expectancy.

Above all, and ultimately, both countries have in common the fact that their language policies and sociolinguistic realities do not work to promote, safeguard, or protect their linguistic heritage. This, in fact, lies the main colonial problem that independence failed to resolve.

---

<sup>11</sup> The term, as described by several authors, is questionable and problematic (Bagno, 2017).



## Conclusion

As we have seen, the constitutions of neither Angola nor Mozambique make any reference to Bantu or Khoisan languages that would define, protect, or promote them within their respective countries. This omission reflects a problematic approach to language policy that contributes to social injustice and reinforces the hegemony of Portuguese at the expense of indigenous languages. In doing so, it perpetuates colonial dynamics and hierarchies that have persisted beyond the independence processes of the African Portuguese-Speaking Countries (APSC). However, these actions provoke enormous dissatisfaction because they are seen as linguistic and cultural genocide that promotes the erasure of these languages and their cultures for future generations. This represents a genuine lack of linguistic planning and encourages a linguistic and sociocultural devaluation of the legitimate peoples of this immense multilingual and multicultural territory. Ultimately, the management of linguistic policies in the two countries, we analysed, does not promote multilingualism or concern itself with the preservation of local languages.

Angola and Mozambique share very similar sociolinguistic realities, including challenges in teaching the Portuguese language and managing other languages, which are frequently and imminently at risk of extinction. At the same time, Angolan Sign Language (LGA) and Mozambican Sign Language (LMS) still lack accommodation and support from their respective states, which also means that established language policies are not inclusive. Angolan and Mozambican varieties of Portuguese are present in the daily lives of teachers and students, and their existence cannot be ignored; however, teachers need to engage in debates on the subject, especially given that these varieties do not coincide with the variety of Portuguese spoken in Portugal. Bringing discussions about linguistic variation into the classroom is a necessary, positive, and, in this context, courageous attitude, since presenting students with the different varieties and forms of language use is an important step in combating linguistic prejudice.

A language policy management approach for multilingualism is one that values local languages and offers equal opportunities for development, a principle also defended in other official international documents, such as the Universal Declaration of Linguistic Rights (1996), which states that all linguistic communities have the right to self-organize, ensure their survival, and have their languages represented in socio-political and administrative functions, while also maintaining the right to officialize them, create mechanisms for standardization and normalization, without having to submit to external influences. This guarantees – or should guarantee – a more efficient language policy management, as it would make it possible to preserve and promote the teaching and preservation of local languages in the PALOP countries.

No foreigner will value local languages on behalf of Angolans or Mozambicans, meaning that, this language policy action must come from Africans themselves. Joseph Ki-Zerbo, historian and philosopher, in his work "When Africa Will Come," argues that Africa cannot achieve "endogenous development" without the use of local languages, because they are the means of understanding its world, making it necessary to "return to literacy and schooling in African mother tongues" (Ki-Zerbo, 2006, p. 17). Both Angola and



Mozambique have constitutional indications that the State should be concerned with national languages, even if this is superficial and vague in these documents. This makes it clear that the legislator's discourse does not align with decisions on language policies. The promotion of Angolan and Mozambican languages remains a wish, the teaching of these languages is still in the realm of imagination, and their use continues to be undervalued. In this sense, the languages of the Khoisan group are the ones that suffer the most prejudice and social exclusion, due to the isolation of their peoples.

The effective management of multilingualism in Angola and Mozambique depends on the recognition by state institutions of the sociocultural, historical, and communicative roles played by indigenous languages. Such recognition must be accompanied by measures aimed at their preservation, protection, and promotion through comprehensive linguistic, educational, and public policies. Official recognition of these languages would represent a significant step toward their revitalization and the mitigation of ongoing language shift and speaker decline. Moreover, sustained state support for literary, cultural, and artistic production in indigenous languages is essential for safeguarding linguistic diversity and sustaining multilingualism within these societies. By contrast, the continued marginalization of local languages is likely to accelerate processes of language attrition, contributing to linguistic homogenization and potentially culminating in language extinction, or *linguicide*, in the coming decades.

## References

- Bachetti, C. (2006). *Gramática da língua Ronga*. Paulinas Editorial. Maputo.
- Bagno, M. de A. (2017). *Dicionário crítico de sociolinguística*.
- Bastos, N. B. (2012). *Língua portuguesa: Aspectos linguísticos, culturais e identitários*. EDUC
- Bernardo, Ezequiel. (16 de junho de 2026). *Se a gente aqui disser que não existe um português de Angola, a gente está doente e é preconceituoso*. Recurso. Retrieved from <https://recurso.info/se-a-gente-aqui-disser-que-nao-existe-um-portugues-de-angola-a-gente-esta-doente-e-e-preconceituoso/>
- Brito, R. H. P. (2013). Sobre lusofonia. *Verbum*, 4, 6–19
- Bokova, I. (2010). Preface. In C. Moseley (Ed.), *Atlas of the world's languages in danger* (3rd ed., pp. 6–7). UNESCO Publishing. <https://lenguasdearagon.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/02/Atlas-of-the-World-Languages.pdf>
- Bosi, A. (1992). *Dialética da colonização*. Companhia das Letras.
- Calvet, L.-J. (2007). *As políticas linguísticas*. Parábola Editorial; IPOL.
- Chabal, P., Birmingham, D., Forrest, J., Newitt, M., Seibert, G., & Andrade, E. S. (2002). *A history of postcolonial Lusophone Africa*. Indiana University Press
- Cristine, G. Severo; Bento, Siteo e José, D. Pedro (2015). *Estão as línguas nacionais em perigo?* 1ª ed. Escolar Editora. Cadernos de Ciências Sociais, ISBN9789725924563.



- Crystal, D. (2005). *A evolução da linguagem*. Rio de Janeiro: Jorge Zahar Ed., 2005.
- Cunha, A. G. da. (2010). *Dicionário etimológico da língua portuguesa*. Lexikon.
- Evaristo, J. (2021a). O conceito de política no período antigo e medieval: Maquiavel e Aristóteles como bases epistemológicas da política contemporânea. *Medievalis*, 7, 1-9.
- Evaristo, J. (2021b). Do bem comum da *Pólis* em direção à Cidade de Deus: O conceito de política em Agostinho de Hipona em comparação com Aristóteles. *Medievalis*, 7, 1-9.
- Faraco, C. A. (2016). *História sociopolítica da língua portuguesa*. São Paulo: Parábola Editorial
- Firmino, G. (2025). A situação do português no contexto multilíngue de Moçambique. *Comunicação apresentada no Colóquio sobre diálogos Culturais em contexto Post-Colonial*, Universidade de Genébra, Suíça (UC), aos 10-11 de Dezembro 2015.
- Firmino, Gregório. (24 de janeiro de 2014). *Os limites da Lusofonia, segundo o linguista Gregório Firmino, de Moçambique*. Recurso. Retrieved from <https://ventosdalusofonia.wordpress.com/2014/02/02/os-limites-da-lusofonia-segundo-o-linguista-gregorio-firmino-de-mocambique/>
- Guthrie, M. (1948). *The classification of Bantu languages*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Instituto Nacional de Estatística de Angola (2014, 2016, 2024). *Resultados definitivos: Recenseamento Geral da População e Habitação 2011*. Luanda: INE.
- Instituto Nacional de Estatística de Moçambique. (2017, 2007, 1997, 1980). *Recenseamento Geral da População e Habitação*. Maputo: INE.
- Ki-Zerbo, J. (2006). *Para quando África?* Entrevista com René Holenattein. Trad. Carlos Aboim de Brito. Rio de Janeiro: Pallas.
- Lagares, X. C. (2011). Minorias linguísticas, políticas normativas e mercados. In X. C. Lagares & M. Bagno (Orgs.), *Políticas da norma e conflitos linguísticos*. Parábola.
- Maho, J. F. (2009). *The Online Version of the New Update Guthrie List*, a Referential Classification of the Bantu Languages, NUGL Online.
- Martins, M. de L. (2014). Língua portuguesa, globalização e lusofonia. In N. B. Bastos (Ed.), *Língua portuguesa e lusofonia*. EDUC.
- Mignolo, W. (2003). *Histórias locais / projetos globais*. UFMG.
- Miguel, Maria Helena (2014). *Dinâmica da pronominalização no português de Luanda*. Luanda: Mayamba Editora.
- Mingas, Amélia (2000). *Interferência do Kimbundu no português falado em Luanda*. Luanda: Chá de Caxinde.
- Moçambique (2004). *Constituição da República de Moçambique*. Maputo: Assembleia da República.



Nascimento, A., & Bittencourt, M. (2016). Quatro décadas de independência: da cartilha ideológica às contingências políticas e sociais nos PALOP. *Estudos Ibero-Americanos*, 42(3), 797–814. <https://doi.org/10.15448/1980-864X.2016.3.25663>

Ngunga, A. (2015). *Introdução à linguística bantu*. Maputo: Imprensa Universitária.

Ngunga, Armindo (2010). *A problemática de interferências das línguas moçambicanas na língua portuguesa*. 1 ed.

Oliveira, Heloisa (2018). Tramontim de. Língua Portuguesa em Angola: silenciamentos, isolamentos e hierarquias. *Revista da ABRALIN*, [S. l.], v. 17, n. 2.

Pinheiro, L. (2007). "Ao vencedor, as batatas": o reconhecimento da independência de Angola. *Revista Estudos Históricos*, 1(39), 83-120.

Quintero, P., et al. (2019). *Uma breve história dos estudos decoloniais*. MASP.

Rêgo, A. S. (2024). O Processo de Independência dos PALOP: Uma Análise da Independência de Moçambique e sua Trajetória. *Revista CEDEPEM*, 4(3).

Rizzo, M. F. (2019). Discusiones actuales en torno a la lusofonía: Panorama de los estudios sobre política internacional del portugués. *Trabalhos em Linguística Aplicada*, 58(1), 287–312.

Sassuco, Daniel Peres (2016). Pistas essenciais para um Português de Angola. In *kadila. Culturas e ambientes*. Diálogos Brasil-Angola, Blücher. Pp. 199-218,

Timbane, A. A. (2012). Os estrangeirismos e os empréstimos no português falado em Moçambique. *Cadernos de Estudos Linguísticos*, Campinas, SP, v. 54, n. 2, p. 289–306, 2011.

Timbane, A. A. (2022). Políticas linguísticas de internacionalização do português nos Países Africanos de Língua Oficial Portuguesa: Caminhos e desafios do português africano. *Revista de Estudos de Português Língua Internacional*, 2(2), 187–205.

Timbane, A. A., & Tamba, P. (2020). A política linguística na África e situação das línguas autóctones na educação: Uma análise crítica das Constituições. *Revista Digital de Políticas Linguísticas*, 12, 85–105.

Timbane, A. A.; Berlinck, R. de A. (2022). A norma-padrão europeia e a mudança linguística na escola moçambicana. *Revista Gragoatá: Revista dos Programas de Pós-Graduação do Instituto de Letras*. Niterói, n.32, p.207-226.

Universal Declaration of Linguistic Rights. (1996). Universal Declaration of Linguistic Rights [Declaração Universal dos Direitos Linguísticos]. World Conference on Linguistic Rights.