

## THE DISCOURSE OF THE QUILOMBOLAS OF THE SERTÃO DAS GERAIS<sup>1</sup>

 <https://doi.org/10.56238/sevened2025.018-016>

**Ana Cristina Santos Peixoto<sup>2</sup>**

---

### ABSTRACT

This article describes the discursive manifestations uttered by members of quilombola communities, understood in this research as traditional communities whose members are now recognized as descendants of enslaved blacks. We investigated the discourses of the quilombola members that revealed the constitution of identities, specifically, of the Orion camp belonging to the Territory of Brejo dos Crioulos. We based the investigation on the Theory of Analysis of the French Discourse, and the analysis of the data confirmed that there are several identities that constitute the narratives investigated.

**Keywords:** Quilombola territory. Speech. Discourse Analysis-ADF.

---

<sup>1</sup> This text is part of Peixoto's PhD Thesis (2014) entitled: The construction of identities in narratives of quilombola communities in the hinterland of the generals. From this thesis and from the Territory of Brejo dos Crioulos we also have a book chapter from the work Educational Sciences: Perspectives and Interdisciplinary Practices- 2025 by Editora Seven.

<sup>2</sup> PhD in Linguistics and Portuguese Language. Federal University of Southern Bahia  
E-mail : [anacris@ufsb.edu.br](mailto:anacris@ufsb.edu.br) Orcid : <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0108-0674>  
Lattes: 3020458823430194

# 1 INTRODUCTION

## 1.1 FOR STARTERS

The purpose of this article is to show how the identity of the quilombolas of the Orion camp, located in the Territory of Brejo dos Crioulos, in the north of Minas Gerais, takes place. We understand that the quilombola struggle for the recognition of their territory (land) and the understanding of the place of their remnant (black descendants of slaves), together with other needs that arose from the constitution of the communities, constitute the first steps to think about the diversity of the quilombola identity. We defend the hypothesis that, in the discourses given by the quilombolas, on the one hand, the identity that constitutes them inside and outside the communities where they are inserted is revealed, that is, social groups understood as remaining communities of enslaved blacks, and, on the other hand, other identities are claimed, based on the conditions, and places, of production of those discourses, instances that ensure the emergence of identities. To this end, we anchored ourselves in the French school of Discourse Analysis, operating mainly with the concepts of Subject, Discursive Formation, Interdiscourse and Identity, with the purpose of analyzing the discourses uttered by the quilombolas observing the discursive regularities that surround such discourse. Because it is about discourse analysis in various language situations, it was necessary in this research to collect data from informal and spontaneous conversations understood as discursive manifestations. Quilombola communities are defined in Peixoto's (2014) research as traditional communities whose members are now recognized as descendants of enslaved blacks. The discourses of the quilombola members revealed the constitution of identities, and that here specifically, we will deal with the narratives of the members of the communities belonging to the Orion camp in the Territory of Brejo dos Crioulos.

## 1.2 LINGUISTIC RESEARCH IN THE LANDS OF BLACKS

Our studies revealed that the territories of the communities surveyed originated from quilombos or mocambos initially formed by slaves who escaped from Bahia who rebelled against slavery and piled up and constituted ethnic territories of resistance. Such territories began to have political and social visibility and be the object of research from the Brazilian Republic, in the twentieth century, with the Brazilian Black Front movement, in the mid-1930s and 1940s and in the late 1970s, during the process of redemocratization of the country. However, it was only with Article No. 68/1988 (BRASIL, 1988), of the Act of Transitory Constitutional Provisions (ADCT) of the Constitution of the Federative Republic of Brazil, that

such territories began to be understood as communities of remnants of descendants of enslaved blacks.

In 2003, based on Federal Decree No. 4,887/2003 (BRASIL, 2003), by President Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva, and considering the histories of struggle and resistance of their people, the remaining quilombolas began to be recognized and their cause legitimized. We understand that the quilombola struggle for the recognition of their territory (land) and the understanding of the place of their remanence (black descendants of slaves), together with other needs that arose from the formation of the communities, constitute the first steps to think about the diversity of the quilombola identity. In the excerpts selected for analysis, we maintained the transcription pattern originally used by the groups that researched the structure of the language, seeking to maintain the authenticity of the speech, although we did not make specific use of that pattern. Defining language as human interaction requires differentiated studies and research on the mother tongue that situates it as a place of constitution of social relations, during which speakers constitute themselves as subjects.

In this line of thought, we analyze language, discourse and culture in the narratives of members of two quilombola communities in the North of Minas Gerais, using the French<sup>3</sup> DA. Choosing DA and its categories of analysis allowed us to know if they still preserve the cultural issues that bring them closer to the descendants of enslaved blacks, or if they have built a new identity. To understand in a summarized way the entire historical path, we will start from the concept of quilombos that historically composes the imaginary of Brazilians, it is still the one that was established by the Overseas Council in 1740, according to Moura, who tells us that quilombo is "[...] all the dwellings of escaped blacks, who number more than five, in part depopulated, even if they do not have ranches built and there are no pestles in it" (MOURA, 1987, p. 13). Moura (1987, p.13) also comments that this concept was expanded and resignified and, today, quilombos are understood as black rural communities occupied by African descendants, who maintain "kinship ties and live, for the most part, on subsistence crops, on donated, purchased or occupied land". The blacks of these remaining quilombo communities value the cultural traditions of their ancestors, religious or not, recreating them in the present. They have a common history and have explicit norms of belonging and awareness of their identity as descendants of enslaved blacks.

During slavery, as a form of resistance to all exploitation and violence and rebellion against the imposition of white culture, slaves fled and settled in places of difficult access where it was possible to preserve their cultural traits - language, religion, customs, traditions,

---

<sup>3</sup> DA will be understood in this article as Discourse Analysis

history, etc. In this movement of escape, there was "a denial of the official society, which oppressed the black slaves. [...] and the quilombo [...] was a confirmation of African culture and lifestyle" (GUIMARÃES, 1988, p. 65). Despite its importance, what defines quilombo is not only the place where blacks live, but, mainly, the existence of a living, dynamic element: the runaway slave. The starting point, according to Guimarães (1988), for characterizing a community as a quilombo is the existence of a certain number of runaway slaves, which does not prevent the presence of other individuals who do not fit into this category, such as free white men, Indians and mestizos. What constitutes the quilombo is not only the question of it being the place of refuge for runaway blacks, but of the transition between being a slave and being free. Such words indicate that the identity of these quilombola conceptual social groups is not defined by size, number of members, but by their lived experience, their social practices and their common trajectory and continuity as a collective, and/or social group. This continuity as a collective group confers on it as an ethnic-racial group within anthropological studies, what we understand as social belonging, because they develop daily practices, which unite them for common interest in the same way that they exclude them. In this sense, Munanga 2006 defines quilombo as:

[...]Quilombo does not mean refuge for runaway slaves, it is a fraternal and free meeting, with bonds of solidarity and coexistence resulting from the effort of enslaved blacks to rescue their freedom and dignity through escape from captivity and the organization of a free society. The quilombolas were men and women who refused to live under the regime of slavery and developed actions of rebellion and struggle against this system. (MUNANGA, 2006, p.62).

The investigation of this work takes place in the northern space of Minas Gerais, where there are still almost unknown quilombola communities, defined, according to Arruti, as:

[...] a relatively recent social category, [which] represents a relevant social force in the Brazilian rural environment, giving a new translation to what was known as rural black communities (more in the center, south and southeast of the country) and black lands (more in the northeast and north), which also begins to penetrate the urban environment, giving a new translation to a varied range of situations ranging from old rural black communities affected by the expansion of urban perimeters to neighborhoods in the around the Candomblé terreiros. (ARRUTI, 2006, p. 26).

In 2003, after great political pressure from quilombola communities and centers of reference and ethnic-racial movements, the then President of the Republic of Brazil, Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva, signed Decree No. 4,887, composed of 25 articles, referring to the recognition and identification of quilombola communities that we highlight here and transcribe articles two and three, respectively, which characterize such communities, according to Decree 4.887/2003:

For the purposes of this Decree, remnants of quilombo communities are considered to be ethnic-racial groups, according to the criterion of self-attribution, with their own historical trajectory, endowed with specific territorial relations, with a presumption of black ancestry related to resistance and historical oppression [...]. For the measurement and demarcation of the lands, territoriality criteria indicated by the remnants of the quilombo communities will be taken into account, and the interested community will be allowed to present the technical documents for the procedural instruction. [...] It is incumbent upon the Ministry of Agrarian Development, through the National Institute of Colonization and Agrarian Reform - INCRA, to identify, recognize, delimit, demarcate and title the lands occupied by the remnants of the quilombo communities, without prejudice to the concurrent competence of the States, the Federal District and the Municipalities. (BRAZIL, 2003).

As of this decree, in the North of Minas Gerais, there are approximately 140 institutionally recognized quilombola communities, emphasizing that since 2019 no quilombola community has been recognized in Brazil under the government of Jair Bolsonaro. Among the communities already titled, 97% are located in the rural area of northern Minas Gerais and among them, the Orion camp. The quilombola territory of Brejo dos Crioulos is located in the north of Minas Gerais, and according to the oldest residents, its first inhabitants appeared in the eighteenth century. It is located on the border of the cities of São João da Ponte and Varzelândia, along the slopes of the Arapuim stream, in the northern hinterland of Gerais, which currently includes about 460 families. Costa clarifies that

[...] the border of the municipalities of São João da Ponte and Varzelândia, along the slopes of the Arapuim stream, in the northern hinterland of Gerais, are located the localities of Araruba and Arapuim on the south side, to the north of the Pontense territory and Cabaceiros, Caxambu, Conrado and Furado Seco on the north side, to the south of the Varzelandense territory. (COSTA, 2006, p. 70).

According to CEDEFES, the community is located in the region of the Verde Grande River basin and is part of the network of rural black communities in the north of Minas Gerais. Currently, the Brejo dos Crioulos quilombola community is structured in several local groups: Araruba, Arapuim, Cabaceiros, Caxambu, Conrado, Serra D'água and Furado Seco (CEDEFES, 2008, p. 244). In this research, we chose to study the Orion camp belonging to the community of Araruba. We corroborate Costa's (2006) reports on the origin of this community, when he refers it to the period when the lands of the Rio Verde Grande Valley were still considered unsuitable for human presence, given the fact that its vegetation, in addition to hindering access, favored the emergence of insects that cause various tropical diseases, like malaria, for example. As a result, the region became known as Mata da Jaíba, a term that would have Tupi origin and would mean "bad waters" or "bad fruit". Thus, because they had bad and unhealthy land, the community was not sought. The infrastructure of the localities in which the communities that make up this territory are located is not adequate, because, although they can count on electricity, there is no treated water or sewage. The

houses and camps that make up the territory are simple and the residents live from family farming, poultry raising, a few head of cattle and the planting of beans and corn. Part of the culture of the quilombolas in the region is manifested through the festivities, the dances to the sound of the drumming of the box. With regard to religiosity, the majority of the local population is made up of Catholics, but there are some evangelicals affiliated with the Christian Congregation of Brazil. To move within the swampy territory, its members use horses, ox carts and bicycles. The territory of Brejo dos Crioulos is already recognized by the Palmares Foundation.

In the 1990s, this territory was studied by anthropologist João Batista de Almeida Costa in his Master's dissertation entitled "From the time of abundance of the Creoles to the time of penury of the Morenos: identity through a rite in Brejo dos Crioulos". It is a description of the members of the quilombola community belonging to the territory of Brejo dos Crioulos, municipality of São João da Ponte, North of Minas Gerais, in which the author exposes historical, social and cultural issues related to this population. According to Costa (1999), in order to better understand the trajectory of this group, it is essential to place it in a historical-social context in which social and economic groups seek to establish forms of control over the territory they historically occupy. In Moura (1993), there is reference to the remaining community of Brejo de Crioulos as one of the oldest and whose formation dates back more or less 200 years. The choice for this place dates back to the period in which the lands of the Verde Grande River Valley were still considered unsuitable for human presence, due to their unhealthiness and the fact that the forest of that region was difficult to access, which kept the white man away from that place. Another reason, and this time positive, for the flight of blacks to this place is the fact that it was abundant in hunting and fishing (dense forest with an abundance of water). According to Costa (1999), there are also two views on the occupation of these lands near the Arapuim River: a) the view of the local oligarchies explains that the existing population was made up of slaves because they were immune to malaria; Soon, the landowners used them to start the cultivation of land they owned in the region; b) the view of the black communities explains that the existing population is made up of ancestors of runaway slaves from other areas of Minas Gerais and from Bahian lands that settled in this region. The quilombolas of the territory of Brejo dos Crioulos rescued a little of the way of life of their ancestors (practices that go back centuries), however, new social and economic relations were created due to certain circumstances and periods lived. Costa (1999) describes the transformations that the community went through in three phases: time of plenty, time of farmers and time of penury. According to this scholar, approximately in the 1940s, black descendants of runaway former slaves lived with the Indians in this region and

cut down the forest to build their houses and cultivate the land. The surplus production was traded to some farmers. However, around 1956, men arrived in Brejo dos Crioulos and devastated the forest that hid it. The lands are being farmed by members of the main families of cities in the region, with the help of armed gunmen who forced the removal of entire families from the swampy area. According to the reports of the quilombolas, at the time of the expulsion of the quilombolas and the loss of land, when the time of the farmers imposed itself, the time of penury for the members of this quilombola community was established, that is, the time of maintenance difficulties, the time of hunger, which continues to this day.

### 1.3 THE COMPLEXITY OF DISCOURSES AND THEIR CHARMS

In spite of the numerous studies and research already carried out, treading the paths of DA, without a doubt, is still stepping on the place of the unknown, of the new, of what, even if constituted by meanings "already said", these paths allow us other looks, other meanings and new sayings. Foucault teaches us that when we analyze discourses, senses and meanings, no matter how stable they may seem, slide, get out of control, unravel during discursive practice. Such assertions find support in what the author considers about the role of the subject in language. In Foucault's perspective, the subject does not play the role of generative source, or founding instance of language, because it is an empty function, a place to be filled by other individuals, when they formulate the utterance attributing new meanings to the discourse. Foucault, then, rejects any unifying conception of the subject, since his discourse is crossed by positions of subjectivities, by interdiscursiveness. Thus, discourse resizes the role of the subject in the process of language organization and in order to analyze discourses, according to the Foucaultian perspective, which would also be the Pêcheuxian one, it is necessary, first of all, to refuse univocal explanations, easy interpretations, and also not to insistently seek the ultimate meaning or the hidden meaning of things – very common practices when talking about studying a "discourse". For Foucault (1970) it is necessary to stay simply at the level of the existence of words, of things said. This means that it is necessary to work hard with one's own discourse, letting it appear in the complexity that is peculiar to it. There is nothing "behind the scenes", nor under the ground we walk on, says Foucault (1970). There are, indeed, statements and relations that the discourse itself puts into operation.

To analyze discourse from this perspective is to account for all these specificities, to apprehend discourse as an event, as an event that erupts in a certain time and place, considering it as an effect of historical relations, concrete practices that are alive in the utterances. This implies analyzing the speeches trying to explore them in their context, to the

extent that they are a socio-historical, political production, to the extent that they are also constructed speeches, to the extent that language is also constituted of practices. In this type of analysis, it is always worth remembering that what allows us to situate a tangle of statements in a certain organization is precisely the fact that they belong to a certain FD. Michel Pêcheux (1997), considered one of the most important figures of French DA, theorizes how language is materialized in ideology and how it manifests itself in language. For him, discourse is an effect of meanings, a particular place in which this relationship occurs. Pêcheux proposes the creation of a "new field of investigation" that has as its object of study the discourse that, "different from enunciation and different from text", "operates the articulation between the linguistic and the historical". Pêcheux (1997) elaborated an epistemological framework for DA, developed as a Marxist critique of Foucault's conception of discourse, considered from the point of view of the category of contradiction, and concluded on the need for "an appropriation of what Foucault's work contains of materialism". In turn, Pêcheux and Fuchs, aiming to articulate Foucault's conception of discourse and a materialist theory of discourse, created a general framework of DA that encompasses three areas of knowledge: a) historical materialism - theory of social formations and their transformations, which also includes the theory of ideologies; b) linguistics - theory of syntactic mechanisms and enunciation processes at the same time; c) discourse theory - theory of the historical determination of semantic processes. (PÊCHEUX, 1997).

We recall that these three areas of knowledge – whose basic concepts are those of social formation, language and discourse – are in a certain way crossed by the reference to a theory of subjectivity, of a psychoanalytic nature, a nature that we do not deal with in this investigation. Defended by Pêcheux (1975), the notion of discursive-ideological process presupposes that its concern is to inscribe the discursive process in an ideological class relation, since it recognizes that, if language is indifferent to the division of social classes and their struggles, they are not indifferent in relation to language, according to the field of their antagonisms. Thus posed, language constitutes the condition of the possibility of discourse, as it is a kind of invariant presupposed by all possible conditions of production, at a given historical moment. Thus, we can conclude that Pêcheux proposes a formal consideration of discursive processes, both within discourses and between one discourse and another, and less a substantive consideration of particular ideologies and Discursive Formations within an established concrete form. In this line of reasoning, a FD can be understood as a set of regulatory principles that constitute the basis of effective discourses, but which remain separate from them. In this way, words, expressions and propositions acquire their meanings from certain socio-historical-discursive formations within which they are produced, and in

which meaning becomes an effect on an active subject, and not a stable property. Pêcheux thus emphasizes the resulting point that produced the emergence of this "matrix of meaning": individuals are interpellated "as speaking subjects (as subjects of their discourse) by the discursive formations in which they represent within language the ideological discursive formations that correspond to them" (PÊCHEUX, 1975, p. 111).

This conception leads Pêcheux (1975) to conclude that the subject is "susceptible to forgetting", that is, this subject misinterprets or absorbs the "cause" or determination of his discourse and, on the contrary, thinks he is its creator, source and origin of meaning. The interconnection between elements of one or the other opposing FD is specified as the effect of the impositions of hegemonic struggles that permeate the social field. In recent decades, the Human and Social Sciences have faced and been guided by a great theoretical challenge: to build a system capable of conceptually articulating the planes of the actor/subject and the social structure. Articulating these plans has always been the goal of social theory, but today, unilateral responses, which privilege one plan to the detriment of the other, have come under criticism from the international scientific community. Increasingly, there is an attempt to understand the link, the mediation between the plane of the subject, with his intentions, preferences and more or less conscious strategies, and the plane of social structures, of collectivities, of the external conjuncture, of the external world.

#### 1.4 DISCOURSE AND IDENTITY

We know that the initial proposal of DA was to describe the articulations and materialities of the utterances, the subjects of the discourse, their discursive formations and practices, their ideological-historical inscription. Thus, Pêcheux (1997a) proposed a "change of terrain" within the new discipline. However, he kept two important concepts of the theory of linguistics contained in the General Linguistics Course: language as a system and the social institution. To conceptualize language in the position of DA, we reiterate, is to say that it is seen in its condition of materiality, as one of the essential characteristics that make up the discursive fabric, and such materiality is an open and heterogeneous system. In turn, discourse as an object of DA is conceived as a word in movement, effects of meanings between the interlocutors, a historical and ideological object that is produced socio-historically (like everything else), through a specific materiality, language, which is always understood as a social practice. Discourse is, therefore, a practice of language, being conceived as a daily, natural practice of man in society.

We recall the importance of the concept of FD already briefly addressed in this text, because, based on it, we proceed to the analysis of the excerpts of the data collected in the

speeches of the informants of the quilombola communities, seeking to show that FDs compose the discourses they gave. After all, according to Foucault, discourse has the "regularity of a practice that must be apprehended from a system of education". (FOUCAULT, 1969, p. 42). In this same work, Foucault argues about discursive practices and defines them as a

a set of anonymous, historical rules, always determined in time and space that defined, at a given time and for a given social, economic, geographical or linguistic area, the conditions for the exercise of an enunciative function. (FOUCAULT, 1969, p. 43).

And so, discursive practices determine that not everything can always be said, that what can be said is regulated by an order of discourse. That is, one cannot speak of something in any place and time at all; it is always necessary to submit this something to the order of discourse. From this definition, we understand that FD refers to what is allowed to be said in a given time and social space, to what takes place and takes place based on specific and historically defined conditions of production (which constitute the instance of discourse, the place from which one speaks, the image, the context, etc.). It is, in fact, a possibility of explaining how each utterance has its place and its reason. With regard to the conditions of production, they will be treated in this work under the historical, social and ideological aspects that constitute and found the discourses and the relations of their meanings, and which operate according to certain factors that we have emphasized.

In this line of thought, there is no discourse that is not related to other discourses. In other words, meanings result from established relationships: a discourse points to others that sustain it, as well as opens to future sayings. From this perspective, we highlight Pêcheux's thesis, when he postulates that "every discursive formation conceals, through the transparency of the meaning that is constituted in it, its dependence with respect to the complex whole with dominant". (PÊCHEUX, 2009, p. 162) Pêcheux calls this "complex with dominant" "interdiscourse" and develops the thesis that it is also subject to the law of inequality, contradiction, subordination, which, as we said earlier, characterizes an ideological formation, understanding such formation as a "complex set of attitudes that are neither individual nor universal". (PÊCHEUX, 2009, p. 161). Therefore, interdiscourse is a process of incessant reconfiguration, in which a FD is led to incorporate pre-constructed elements (understood as "what is spoken before") produced outside of it, which, in turn, also constitutes other new meanings. From the relations of meanings conceptualized above, we observed the fabric of the discourses in the narratives of the speakers of the communities analyzed, taking into account the conditions of production of those speeches. Therefore, it is our point of view

that from the discourses given by the quilombolas meanings can emerge that seek to highlight common characteristics. That is, characteristics of being and belonging to a stigmatized community and, based on them, constructing and reconstructing identities that, in this work, we call floating identities. It is worth remembering that the issue of the subject's identity is permeated by social, ideological and cultural representations that are and are constituted in discursive practices, in relationships established inside and outside the community.

The social theorist Hall (2006), in his work "Cultural Identity in Postmodernity", proposes to discuss some issues related to identity, presenting it, however, as a provisional and, therefore, mutable notion. The truth, says Hall, is that there is no unity in the sociological community on the subject. The concept of identity, which is still debated today, according to the author, "is too complex, too little understood in contemporary social science to be definitively put to the test" (HALL, 2006, p. 8). This statement is corroborated by other authors when they argue that the opacity about the theme makes it possible to surf perspectives and limits, to elaborate different concepts and to (re)think the concept of identity from various perspectives, due to its non-fixity. Identity is also constructed in the interdependence between similarity and difference and vice versa (SILVA, 2000). It is interesting to observe that conflicts can emerge from the difference that marks identity and, as Woodward (2000) advocates, there are cases in which these differences are understood by a given group as more important than the others. An example of this are the "differentiations" from which the prejudice of "color", origin, class and other discriminatory attitudes originate, and the subjects are called upon to occupy these identities and do so. The conception that identities are constructed through differences and not apart from them raises questions about whether it is an act of power as a social constitution (HALL, 2003, p. 110).

Questioning what they are, what they have ceased to be, what they will become constitutes a path of challenges, with regard to the process of identity construction for any group of subjects, including, in particular, our research subjects, the quilombolas of the Orion camp, since, for them, the challenge is to deconstruct the stereotyped image of a savage individual, without a soul, intellectually unfit, which lasted for more than three centuries of history (HALL, 2000). Aren't these author's definitions mixed up here with the notion of FD? After all, when the subject defines himself, discursiveizes himself, is he not positioning himself in a place of meaning of the sayable, in a regionalization of saying?

According to Hall, "the subject assumes different identities at different times" (HALL, 2006, p. 13) because thinking about identities requires taking them as a meeting point where discourses and discursive practices meet, intersect and call each other, summoning the individual to assume a place as a socio-historical subject. Therefore, thinking about the issue

of the quilombola implies reflecting on the relationship of this individual with the place where he lives, as well as with the place of his quilombola community in the national historical context. In the case of a quilombola community, we found that the construction of identity for most of the subjects of this research was operated, first, through identification with the place where they live. For some interviewees, the community is configured as a space of protection, a place of belonging and possession (of the land). In this way, notes were made about his personal formation and his connections with the past, with being a descendant of enslaved blacks and the identities articulated from the context of being quilombola and being Afro-Brazilian. About this last identity, some questions arise, such as the strategies to deal with being a descendant of enslaved blacks, exposed to the ills of discrimination, and prejudice inside and outside the community. Both identities constitute barriers to be overcome in order to provide an identification as quilombolas. At this point a question can be posed: would the quilombola identity (descendants of enslaved blacks) have been an achievement/choice of theirs, or would it have been conveyed, taught, inflated or launched by other ideological discourses, such as, for example, those of the researchers who transited through the communities or those of the members of the associations they created? All of this finds echoes in the suspicions cast by Bauman "[...] Identities float in the air, some of our own choosing, but others inflated and thrown by the people around us, and we must be on constant alert to defend the former against the latter." (BAUMAN, 2005, p. 13).

It is for these reasons that we affirm that identities are fluctuating, transitory, flexible and destructure what is fixed, ready and determined; They are identities characterized by the so-called post-modernity and, from this place, because it does not make sense, it does not allow their solidification, in terms of social practices. That is why it is also affirmed that identity is never ready, finished and perennial, because its condition of collective existence is precisely the fact that it is "fragile", unfinished, provisional, temporary. When we think of identity as a movement and construction that depends on the social and political context and the conditions of production of the subjects, it is possible to say that there are identities that can resurface and others that can be silenced. Thinking about the process of identities in this way allows us to consider the set of people/subjects as a social body capable of operating and constructing their culture, modifying and transforming it, according to their values, even if, in this process of transformation of culture and identities, they often act unconsciously.

Thus, according to Costa (1999), when talking about the quilombolas of the North of Minas Gerais at different levels of social belonging, it is propitious for them to develop and possess situational fluctuating identities, as members of an extended family, of a family trunk, of a collectivity that groups several family trunks and that affirm their belonging according to

the structural place in which they are. Discourse and Identity are discursive categories that constitute the quilombola subject.

The analysis of the discourses of the quilombola members of the Orion camp was developed from the interdiscursive relations that constitute the FDs that regulate the discourses uttered by the quilombolas. These formations are brought to the surface by the flow of discursive memory and represented linguistically and discursively. We verified whether new interdiscursive relations were constituted in their discourses and their relations with the origins, the external world and the social structure. For this reason, in the analyses, we try to remain at the level of the existence of the words, of the things said, which means that it is necessary to work hard with the discourse itself, letting it appear in the complexity that is peculiar to it. According to Foucault, as previously stated, there is nothing "behind the scenes", nor under the ground we walk on. There are only statements and relations that the discourse itself puts into operation (FOUCAULT, 1970, p. 50). The oral narratives of the selected quilombolas are marked by memories of stories that were told to them by their black ancestors captive in Bahia, and who fled to Minas Gerais to rebuild their lives in freedom.

## **2 METHODOLOGY**

We made a discursive cut in Peixoto's thesis (2014) and presented the collected data (semi-structured interviews as the central question "what does it mean to be a quilombola") for analysis that discusses the process of identity constitution of that group. From the transcribed oral narratives, we selected the fragments of the members of the Orion camp that most demonstrated the diverse nature of socio-political and cultural identity. To proceed with the analysis of the narratives, we selected the categories for the analysis of the discourse of the interviewees, namely: discursive formation, interdiscursivity and identity imbricated in the dialogues and representations that the members of the communities built on topics such as politics, social public policies and their historical and socio-discursive practices. The choice of these categories allowed us to verify whether the members of the communities still preserved cultural aspects that brought them closer to the cultural practices of the enslaved blacks who founded the quilombos, from which the communities where they live today originated.

## **3 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION OF THE DATA**

### **3.1 IDENTITIES, DISCOURSES AND MEMORIES: WHAT THE NARRATIVES OF THE QUILOMBOLAS BREJEIROS SAY.**

The very words that make up the name of the community invite us to make some linguistic considerations. The term swamp, according to Ferreira, is "swamp, rough, humid and windy terrain, eyes of water," (FERREIRA, 2009, p. 187) where the puddled water fertilizes the terrain, and which can become a wetland if its dimensions are enlarged. In popular thought, connotatively, swamp also refers to a place so dirty and infected that one should not set foot there. The term Creole, in turn, according to Ferreira, is attributed "to individuals of the white race born in the colonies overseas, particularly in the Americas; it is said to be black born in America; it is said of the dialect of these people; it is said of any black individual; it is said to be black born in the Americas" (FERREIRA, 2009, p. 276). If we think about the formation of the name of the community in these negative senses, the swamp syntagm of the creoles, perhaps it could reveal something about the identities that emerge from the interdiscourses of the quilombolas brejeiros. However, we did not find historically conclusive data on the origin of the community's name. The discourses of the quilombolas of Brejo dos Crioulos were researched from the interdiscursivity from which the FD category emerges, composed of the elements that determine the meanings of what it is to "be a quilombola", to belong to this differentiated and stigmatized ethnic group, citizens understood as remnants of enslaved blacks. Hence, it is necessary to observe their social structure, their origins and the relationship of these citizens with the external reality.

The narratives of the quilombola members of Brejos dos Crioulos portray the moments of constitution of the community and its ideologies. To analyze their discourses, we worked with the categories interdiscursiveness, discursive memory, identity and ethnic identity. The analyses are developed from the themes: a) quilombola origin and ancestry; b) constitution and structure of the community; c) struggle for land; d) politics and political arrangements; e) culture, language and religion. As stated in their discourses, some of the members who make up the community of Brejo dos Crioulos demonstrate that they know that the land belongs to them by tradition and occupation, but they see themselves dispossessed of their place of work, removed, and even expelled, from their lands by the farmers, as shown in the following discursive sequences:

#### Subject 01

[...]u father says that this land is ours...\ it was our ancestors that it was xpulsu from here [...]my acquaintance is little [...] \ but our land was taken by the white farm [...] until it arrived informatium for us di João qui aparece andãnu i perguntãnu sobri nós \ é qui nós discubrimu qui somu remanescenti di quilombu [...] eli ajudô a genti i nós tâmu aqui é pra cobrá u direitu qui é nossu [...]

The conditions of production of the utterances of this discursive sequence point to historical aspects ("[...] foi nossus antepassadus qui foi xpulsu daqui [...]"), educational ("[...]

my acquaintance is pocu [...]), politicians ("[...] our land was taken by the Fazenderu Brancu [...]) and ideological ("[...] we are here for cobrá u direitu qui é nossu [...]) constitutive and founding of discourses and the relations of their meanings and that operate according to certain factors, since, as pointed out by Pêcheux (2009), there is no discourse that is not related to other discourses, where referential networks of meanings do not intersect. Therefore, in the interdiscursivity of discursive sequence 1, the statement "[...] my knowledge is little [...] \ but our land was taken by the Fazenderu Brancu [...]" should prove the considerations that open this subsection. However, the discourse reveals the speaker's doubt in relation to heredity and land ownership, because his discourse is crossed by the discourse of another subject, when the quilombola-enunciator calls to the enunciative scene enunciates who speak of their specific places, that of the family and that of ancestry, at the moment when he states: "[...] u pai fala qui esse terra é nossa... \ foi nossosus antepassadus qui foi ixpulsu daqui [...]". Our informant's doubt was resolved when João (anthropologist João Batista de Almeida Costa, who in his studies delimited and wrote the anthropological report that favored the recognition of Brejo dos Crioulos as a quilombola community) appears in the narrative of enunciator 1: "[...] until it arrived it informatted for us di João qui aparece andãnu i perguntãnu sobri nós. [...]". In the following excerpt, the informant speaks of a specific enunciative place, that of the researcher, who clarifies to the quilombolas what it is to be a remnant/descendant of enslaved blacks and helps them to recognize their community and their remnant of enslaved people: "[...] qui nós discutimu qui somu remanescenti di quilombu [...] eli ajudô a genti i nós tãmu aqui é pra cobrá u direitu qui é nossu [...]" .

Thus, the quilombolas begin to constitute themselves as such, and only from the constructed consciousness does it become possible to "be a quilombola subject", which evidences a place of regularity, or of claiming an identity, since, in order to be able to fight for their rights constituted in federal legislation, the subjects are inscribed in a given discursive order. As a result, the discourse also points to the formation of an identity that is in a constant process of construction, that is, the ethnic dimension of what comes to "be quilombola", unknown until then, and the awareness of the representation of an ethnic-racial group. The interdiscourse also reveals a social structure formed by the farm, the land, the family group and the maintenance of the structure of the past. The relations of landowner power X quilombola power are also linguistically materialized in "[...] our land was taken by the Fazenderu Brancu [...]". It was then also based on the place from which the anthropologist João speaks, and on the search for a discursive regularity for an identity, that other regularities emerged: those that are always demarcated in the narratives of the quilombolas by the lexical choices of the subjects "[...] é qui nós discutimu qui somu remanescenti di

quilombu [...]"), which evidence the (re)construction of meanings that demarcate the place of a quilombola identity (constituted from the remnant of enslaved blacks).

This reconstruction is motivated by the ideology of the discourse of João Batista de Almeida Costa, the researcher. The information shared by the anthropologist gave the quilombola member the awareness of belonging to a specific community, a fact that was verified by the members' knowledge of their rights institutionalized in the Federal Constitution of 1988 and Decree No. 4,887 instituted by President Lula in 2003 (BRASIL, 2003). This decree recognizes the remanence of quilombola communities from their constitution as "ethnic-racial groups, [...] with its own historical trajectory, [...] with a presumption of black ancestry related to resistance and historical oppression [...]".

Referring to this decree, subject 1 took the following position:

Subject 01

[...] é sobu u decretu [...] sempri a genti tá atê/ feliz qui Lula [...] lançô/ u decretu pa [...] dá/ us apoiiau [...] as aras quilombola [...] mas veja beim [...] u [...] u artigu sessenta i oitu [...] eli é um artigu qui tá/ [...] trezentu i quarenta i treis ânu que vei aqui pru Brasil [...] né [...] quando eli [decreto] vei aqui pru Brasil [...] só vei u artigu [...] direitu di quilombu [...] mais nãu forãum execuçãu [...] é [...] intãu aí qui tá/ o pobrema [...] qui [...] qui hoji tá/ tenu [...] a [...] essa diculdadi pa regularizá/ as ara di quilombu [...] é [...] porque eli num vei completamenti [...]

The enunciator's speech demonstrates the crossing of the quilombola discourse that allows the entry, in the enunciative scene, of the legal discourse (interdiscourse), when the subject uses terms that are attentive to the legal area: "[...] u decretu pa [...] dá/ us apoiiau [...]"; " u artigu sessenta i oitu [...]"; " direitu di quilombu [...] mais nãu forãum execuçãu [...]"; " [...]Difficulty to regularize/ the ara di quilombu [...]". The quilombola reveals a certain knowledge not only of history ("[...] [...] trezentu i quarenta i treis ânu que vei aqui pru Brasil [...]"), but also on the conflicting situation between the existence of article 68 and its application, by using the expressions "[...] but it was not executed [...]"; " [...] this difficulty to regularize/ [...]". This crossing is represented by the act of signing Decree No. 4,887/2003 sanctioned by the then President Lula and materialized in the instance of meaning, through the lexical choice of the subject by the verb "to launch", and reinforced by the mention of article 68 of the Federal Constitution that legitimizes the right of the quilombola remnant to possess the land. However, in the statements "[...] só vei u article [...] direitu di quilombu [...] mais nãu forãum execuçãu [...] é [...] intãu aí qui tá/ o pobrema [...] qui [...] qui hoji tá/ tenu [...] a [...] essa diculdadi pa regularizá/ as ara di quilombu [...] é [...] porque eli num vei completamenti [...]", the quilombola not only denounces the non-regularization of the lands on which they live and which still belong to the farmers, but it also reveals a recurrent and well-known political discourse: the rights of citizens are not respected and those of

quilombolas are ignored. However, knowing that the right to land is guaranteed by the Federal Constitution ratifies the struggle of the quilombolas, which has been just, according to them, since the arrival of blacks in the country (about 343 years ago), that is, since slavery.

Regarding the construction of the FD that claims ethnic identity, the lexical items used by subject 01 refer to a black ancestral memory, another voice (interdiscourse) materialized in terms such as land, expelled, remnants, discover, rights, ancestors, which configure meanings pertinent to the quilombola identity (the one that refers to the remnant of enslaved blacks). This black ancestral memory differentiates them from other blacks who do not belong to the quilombo. Such remanence, which configures ethnic identity, is present in the discourses and meanings constructed in these discourses that are consistent with the definition of quilombola community contained in Decree No. 4,887/2003, a document that attests that quilombolas have "their own trajectory, their ancestry, resistance and oppression". Thus, the race is recognized, previously silenced and now materialized in the remaining expression of quilombo, and which emerges in the discursive materiality of the verbs "to be" and "to discover".

Subject 02 reports the same content as the narrative of subject 1 and says that:

Subject 02

[...] at the time [...] I still remember a little bit [...] my grandfathers spoke what came puliça right [...] i forçãnu assiná na marra né [...] essi povu di antigamenti assinatura no era efficienti assim né [...] era meu forçadu [...] es cumeçô/ forçá/ es [...] comu forçô assiná/ mais num pagô [...] neim nada né [...] ficô/ assim apertãnu [...] aí atravéis di nós rendenu [...]

Subject 02 brings to the fore, in the enunciative scene, another identity, the political, materialized in the statements "[...] essi povu di antigamenti assinatura no era efficienti assim né [...] era meu forçadu [...] es cumeçô/ forçá/ es [...] comu forçô assinana/ mais num pagô [...] neim nada né [...] ficô/ assim apertãnu [...] aí atravéis di nós rendenu [...]", which lays bare, behind the relationship of power and authority, the corruption of the farmers, when they try to acquire the land through excusable means, such as the documents signed through symbolic violence, oral persuasion, veiled threats and, all this, without paying for their possession: "[...] es [...] comu forçô signá/ mais num pagô [...] neim nada né [...] ficô/ assim apertãnu [...] aí avéléis di nós rendenu [...]". The discourse points to the place of memories that do not necessarily need to be experienced individually ("[...] my grandfathers speak [...]"), but they can be apprehended in the group in which the individuals are inserted in the process of verbal interaction.

Still in the narrative of subject 02, the interdiscourse denounces the material violence exerted by the "[...] ques vei puliça né [...] i forçãnu assiná na marra né [...]". Then, from the

interdiscourse, another voice emerges indicating an ideological formation (landowners and repressive apparatus (police)) that confirms the relationship between power and authoritarianism and makes up the FD. The excerpt corroborates what Foucault (1970, p. 6) said, when he proposes that there are statements and relations that discourse itself puts into operation, since it is the space in which knowledge and power are articulated, because whoever speaks, speaks from somewhere, based on an institutionally recognized right. This supposedly true discourse, which conveys knowledge (institutional knowledge), is a generator of power. For the subjects belonging to the territory of Brejo dos Crioulos, the search for quilombola identity is intrinsically related to the stories of their ancestors and to the right to repossess the land instituted by the Federal Constitution of 1988 that had once belonged to them, mainly because they believe in the "dreams of a future to come, in which the condition in which they lived is restored, provided by access to the land that worked produces wealth" (COSTA, 1999, p. 44).

Still, under this topic, let us analyze the following discursive sequence.

Subject 04

[...] it is very important, yes [...] the conquest by the right is very important [...] porque  
 antis us nossus antepassadus [...] us nossus great-grandfathers [...] grandfathers [...] us  
 nossus parenti [...] right [...] elis u geral [...] elis u brigava [...] é lutãnu for the land  
 [...] lutãnu for the land [...] resgatãnu us direitu da genti [...] qui a genti sãu  
 remanescenti di quilombola [...] u direitu da genti [...] trabaliá/ [...] morá/ [...] i tê/ a  
 terra prus filiu trabaliá/ [...] nós querê família reunida [...] trabaliãnu [...] todus direitus  
 igual [...] mais tudu pertu di suas propria família [...] eu cuidei du meus filho [...] nu  
 intermédiu [...] da ajuda da família/ [...] inso, eu agraçaço muito a Deus i toda família  
 [...]

The beginning of this narrative sequence completes the question of the citizen and cultural identity that would be guaranteed by the possession of the usurped land. The place from which a subject in possession of his land speaks is that of a legitimate remnant and of a politicized citizen. Through the flow of discursive memory, subject 04 describes the socio-historical spaces of a people who struggle over time for the recognition of their acquired and legitimized rights "[...] us our great-grandfathers [...] grandfathers [...] us nossus parenti [...] right [...] elis u general [...] elis fought [...] it's lutãnu for the land [...] lutãnu for the land [...] resgatãnu us direitu da genti [...]". The collective memory here is formed by the facts and aspects that the quilombolas deem relevant and that are memorized in their discourses and kept as the official (permanent) memory of the group under study. Ideologically, the quilombolas share with the social movements of landless workers the conception that land is for those who work on it, thus revealing that the quilombola identity of the members of the Brejo dos Crioulos community is also constituted by the possession of land.

The meaning of the discourse of this quilombola (subject 04) is determined by the socio-ideological positions at stake in the socio-historical process in which words, expressions and propositions are produced (i.e., reproduced). In turn, they "[...] change their meaning, according to the positions held by those who employ them [...]", that is, in reference to the ideological formations in which these positions are inscribed (PÊCHEUX, 2009, p. 160). In the sequence as a whole, meanings result from the relationships established in which a discourse not only points to others that sustain it, but also opens to future sayings. In this sense, interdiscourse is detected when, in the enunciative scene, the quilombola materializes them by using terms such as "ancestors", "great-grandfathers" and "grandparents": "[...] our ancestors [...] our great-grandfathers [...] grandfathers [...] our parenti [...] right [...] they the general [...] they fought [...] it's fighting for the land [...] fighting for the land [...], I rescue the rights of the people [...]".

We know that identities are constituted in the presence and from the "other", with the family being the first social and ideological space in which its members share their histories, their traditions, their ideology, including sociopolitics. In the case of this research, it is the struggle for land, outlined in several excerpts of speech analyzed in this thesis. Thus, by declaring "[...] nós querê família reunida [...] todus direitus igual [...]", subject 04 is inscribed in a new FD which, in turn, reveals a new identity, which we call "family identity" (which brings together, in our understanding, the struggle of the ancestors experienced in the quilombos and the struggle of the present, in the quilombola communities), that of belonging to a consanguineous group and that must be passed on to other ancestors.

The words of subject 04 take up the idea that

[...] it is a struggle for the land [...] it rescues us right from the genti [...] qui a genti sãu remanescenti di quilombola [...] [and this makes them social beings] [...] u direitu da genti [...] trabaliá / [...] morá / [...] e tê / a terra prus filiu trabaliá / [...] direitu da genti [...] trabaliá / [...] morá i tê / im trabaliãnu [...] todus direitus igual [...]

Thus, his discursive memory allows the interdiscursive relations materialized in the linguistic expressions "[...] direitu da genti [...] trabaliá / [...] morá / [...] and tê / the land [...] todus direitus igual [...]" which, perhaps, refer to the voices of anthropologist João Batista de Almeida Costa and the members of quilombola associations, weaving networks of meanings that intertwine. In this line of thought, let us see what the discourse of the following two narratives reveals to us.

Subject 01

(sequence 01)

[...] our struggle is u siguinti [...] a genti beginning / [...] sempri pur ocupacãis [...] né [...] ocupãnu the land of the people there [...] of the corrupt people [...] né [...] i a genti

teim u:: the obligation of [...] di lutá pela terra [...] porqui Deus dexô/ the land pru homi  
trabaiá/ [...] intáu nós asujeitô/ fazer/ these occupations [...]  
(sequence 02)  
[...] more [...] is the chamber [...] di deputado [...] a genti dá pa analisá/ qui [...] qui [...] futuromenti es nãu don't think like this [...] in the regularization of the process of the  
ara di quilombu [...] porqui si elis qué/ eventá/ imenda [...] pra acabá/ decretu [...] i  
voltãu dismantelãu us direitu di lei [...] né [...] porque [...] u país nãu é democráticu  
[...] u quilombola nãu teim u direitu desas ara di quilombu [...] é [...] é [...] porque [...] qui  
elis hoji qué/ acabá/ decretu [...] eu achu qui no podi acaba / decretu [...] porque si  
elis [...] fô/ acabá/ u decretu [...] es tãu acabãu tãméim the democracy of the  
country [...]

The discourse of subject 01 reveals a FD crossed by (inter)discourses of other subjects coming from specific enunciative places, that of the fighters and that of the owners of the land. A religious discourse emerges from sequence 1, which is configured as a space in which "the voice of God" speaks ("[...] because God dexô/ the land pru homi trabaiá/ [...]" ) and, through the ideology of that discourse, the subjects are interpellated and subjected into Christian subjects. Such a discourse evokes the belief in the Divine, laying bare an ideological-religious-family formation that attributes to God the responsibility for the (re)occupation and the right to possession of the land. In sequence 02, the discourse of subject 01 is crossed by the voice coming from the Brazilian legislative power represented by the Chamber of Federal Deputies in its position of constituted authority, that is, voices materialized in the linguistic expressions of the enunciator: "[...] it is the chamber [...] of the deputy [...] in the regularization of the process of the ara di quilombu [...] elis qué/ eventá/ imenda [...]". The two sequences of subject 01 reveal an ideological-political formation that goes back to Pêcheux's thesis commented above: "every discursive formation conceals, through the transparency of the meaning that is constituted in it, its dependence with respect to the complex whole [...]" (PÊCHEUX, 2009, p. 161). The interdiscourse, in the words of the French philosopher, is subject to "[...] law of inequality, contradiction, subordination" which, as we said earlier, characterizes an ideological formation, understanding such formation as "a complex set of attitudes that are neither individual nor universal" (PÊCHEUX, 2009, p. 161).

In the first sequence, the political-ideological FD is revealed when the enunciator narrates the way and reasons for the quilombolas to occupy the lands and, in the second sequence, when he addresses the issue of the decree that guarantees them possession of the land, and whose extinction would cast doubt on democracy: "[...] achu qui num podi acaba / decretu [...] porque si elis [...] fô/ acabá/ u decretu [...] es tãu acabãu tãméim the democracy of the country [...]". It is in this sense that interdiscourse plays a fundamental role for DA, because it is through it that sayings that affect and make the subject signify in a communicative situation are set in motion. This FD is constituted by knowledge acquired from

other political and social discursive places. However, the quilombola seems to have elaborated another meaning for the term democracy, which reveals a certain lack of knowledge about the outside world, and, in this case, about the denotative meaning of the word democracy "[...] porque si elis [...] fô/ acabá/ u decretu [...] es tãu acabãnu tãméim the democracy of the country [...]". This quilombola resignifies the term democracy, speaking of its social place and the class interests at stake. After all, approving or not approving decrees is the responsibility of the legislature, but the functions of federal deputies do not include the power to "end democracy", but with rights, yes. However, the vehement discourse of the quilombola citizen, in our view, simply points to the absurdity of the possibility of federal deputies rejecting the decree in question. In the end, the accumulation of the aspects outlined points to identities of the quilombola that were added to previous ones, and that evidence the growth of the quilombola citizen in relation to his position in society and the world. Once the political identity is constituted in their discourses, the quilombola subjects reveal conceptions about this identity and are inscribed in a certain discursive order, as subject 01 points out:

#### Subject 01

[...] u Lula was a president who ... I also believed in the PT [...] I [...] I believed a lot in the president Lula [...] I continued to believe that he was [...] a president of the republic [...] in my time of political recognition [...] it was a little more [...] it was a little more [...] the genti see/ qui tá favorecenu us piquenu [...] there is no doubt in the administration of Lula until / today [...]

The informant reveals an ideological formation from which the political-partisan discourse emerges ("[...] eu comu membru du PT [...]") and also his belief and confidence in former President Lula ("[...] I [...] believed a lot in President Lula [...] continued to believe [...]"), a political-ideological position also materialized in "[...] Lula [...] was [...] a dus presidenti of the republic [...] here [...] more look / prus pequenu [...] i tá / olhãnu [...] i [...] i [...] I believed a lot in the Delhi administration [...] continuu is sendu Lula in the head [...]". This discourse indicates other voices speaking from specific enunciative places, those of the political-ideological discourses of PT supporters heard repeatedly during Lula's speeches during the campaign, whose content led him to conquer space and credibility. Within the FD that reveals them as remnants of enslaved blacks, other FDs were constituted, in the words of the quilombolas, in a process sometimes of alliance, sometimes of duel among themselves, brought to the surface by the flow of discursive memory, and establishing new relations of meaning.

These FDs were contemplated in the previous analyses, starting from the place of belonging of the quilombola group and are summarized, from the point of view of which political issue involves the quilombola identity of descendants of enslaved blacks, in three

dimensions: a) FD 1: institutional discursive formation, which encompasses the organization and political arrangements; b) FD 2: social and ideological discursive formation, which refers to regional conflicts and the struggle for land; c) FD 3: cultural discursive formation, referring to issues of culture, language, religion and customs. The institutional FD encompasses the organizational issues of the community and the political arrangements made for its survival as a community, since all the discussion involving the rights of quilombolas, such as legislation and decrees, are articulated in the political sphere. With regard to the social and ideological FD, there are the conflicting relations between the quilombolas and the farmers, the effective search for titling or deed and the recognition of the land as belonging to the quilombolas, as well as their ideological positions, in the face of the situations in which they are involved in recovering the lands once belonging to their ancestors. The cultural FD, on the other hand, seeks to reveal the issues that relate to culture, religion and customs that, over time, have been constructed and reconstructed from the conditions of production in which the quilombolas inserted themselves in their search for a quilombola identity in its most diverse aspects. This interdiscursive relationship in the discourses of the quilombolas becomes clear when they discursively inscribe themselves in the constituted social place: that of the racial ethnic group to which they belong, the descendants of enslaved blacks. This same interdiscursivity exposes other discourses that permeate the original discourse of the quilombolas, also revealing identities understood as family, ethnic-racial, political and cultural. Thus, discourse is posed as an incessant process of reconfigurations within which an FD is led to incorporate pre-constructed elements (understood as "what is spoken before"), produced outside of it, which, in turn, will also constitute other new meanings.

It is remarkable to perceive, in linguistic practices, how individuals maintain a close relationship with politics and with politicians. An example of this, as pointed out earlier, is the excerpt: "[...] I also became a member of the PT [...] I [...] believed a lot in President Lula [...]". It is from these relationships that a bond is created that unites the politician to the subject, at the time of electoral campaigns. Let us see how this bond is present in the reports of other quilombolas.

### Subject 03

[...] you know, the conversation is good [...] I offered something, I'm already going to vote for that [...] I won't vote for that [...] because I always [...] you will favor / [...] you're going to fight/ pur your rights / offer/ a bag of bread [...] I offered you a beer [...] I could be a drop [...] porque u electo/ from the countryside these little things I already thanked [...] intão [...] more genti say that to elis [...]

From the discourse of subject 03, in the sequence in general, but specifically, of the statements: [...] you knew the conversation is good [...] I offered something I already voted

for it [...] I didn't vote for that [...] because I always [...] you will favor / [...] you will fight / pur your rights / offer / a bag of bread [...] I offered you a beer [...] I could be a drop [...] two of the categories selected for our analyses emerge: ideological-political formation and ethical identity, the latter referring to an ethical subject, politicized and aware of what it is to vote well, when he criticizes the position of those who, instead of choosing to vote for someone suitable who will fight for their rights, let themselves be carried away by the offers of the political game of unscrupulous politicians. Thus, his discourse highlights the absolutely unethical, but commonplace, occurrences of the behavior of politicians at election times: the sharing of the exchange of favors between the candidates themselves and between the voters and the candidate, the latter, sometimes, with alms (bread bag, beer, pinga), with the vote being the currency of negotiation within the community. In the statement "[...] Cê sabi a conversinha é boa [...]" of subject 3, the term "conversinha", diminutive and ironically used, refers to competent rhetoric and effective political discourse, but, most of the time, empty, which convinces unenlightened communities, needy or not. However, the statements indicate that the involvement of the quilombola with politics reveals his progress as an individual on the way to a citizen identity.

In the same way that they discuss political issues and arrangements, the members of these communities participate in the social and educational programs promoted by the federal government that seek to strengthen cultural aspects related to their black (Afro-Brazilian) remnant, as well as to elect black brothers and sisters who constitute the bench that defends them in the National Congress. In addition to government programs, the communities have the support of reference centers, CEDEFES and the Center for Alternative Agriculture (CAA), which donate basic food baskets and medicines. By accepting donations from social projects, because they are descendants of blacks, the quilombola identity is reaffirmed, when the members recognize themselves as remnants. Even so, the issue of prejudice permeates the discourse of the quilombolas, as in the discourse of subject 02, as follows:

#### Subject 02

[...] u povu look at different people [...] even mermu the people here in the community look different for us... teim genti qui pensa qui a genti é quilombola pra ganhá fera [...]

Commenting "[...] u povu olha pra genti diferenti [...]", the referential networks show us that the subject alludes to the same prejudiced and contemptuous look (discourse), a stigma, from the times of slavery, which is not only of the whites, but also of the members/brothers of that community themselves. Being a quilombola attracts both the negative gaze of whites (prejudice) and that of their peers (distrust), aspects guaranteed in the interviewee's previous

speech by the use of the term "different". The final part of the narrative accuses the presence of doubt from other people about the authenticity of the praised quilombola identity (black descendants of slaves) of the citizens of the community in question, because "[...] teim genti qui pensa qui a genti é quilombola [só] pra ganhá fera [...]" and only those who are quilombola win the fair (BRASIL, 2003). Thus, the quilombola identity is also constructed in a discriminatory social place in which its subjects live, which explains the conditions of production of their discourses, a collective space in which the eyes of two parts of society see them, although with the same type of treatment. The fact that their peers also see them as different points to another ideology, perhaps to a contamination arising from the specific place of a voice, that of the white population of local society, that of racial discrimination.

With regard to the issue of culture disseminated in the communities, it was possible to perceive that, over time, the culture and customs of the communities that have traces of African origin have undergone a process of construction and deconstruction, but also of reconstruction within the community. This occurred due to the understanding of the members of the community about their Brazilianness, that is, the awareness of the subjects that they are Brazilians and that their culture, with traces of the African matrix, was "transformed", giving body to what we call Afro-Brazilian culture. Thus, the quilombola identity tries to reaffirm its place of fluidity, constituted by the oscillation between acceptance and denial of its ancestry and descent. As we have seen, the object of study of DA is not only language, since discourse is constituted by the effects of meaning of the junction of the subject, language and history. By making the lexical choice of three colors: "black", "black" and "moreno", around which revolves his tense discourse marked by oppositions with the argumentative power of qualifying his identity, the subject, when speaking for the community, distances himself from blacks by denying his color ("[...] we didn't add to you, porque pretu was the color of slavery [...]") as well as blacks ("[...] neim negru, porque negru is a contempt and the genti does not agree im to be called negru [...]").

In this argument, it is important to highlight the citizen's refusal to be black, due to the causal relationship with slave, and to be black, due to the causal relationship with *desacato*, which certainly resignifies the meaning for some form of disqualification. Therefore, there is a refusal to construct a qualitatively different identity, either by specifying skin color ("[...] nós aqui nus tratãmu pur morenus [...]"), or by the disconnection with slavery ("[...] mais nós num somu [...] escravu [...]"). Furthermore, he professes his identity as a free citizen ("[...] nobody here was a slave \ we were sous And, at the same time that it assumes a quilombola identity ("[...] Nós Gostãmu di sê quilombola yes [...]), denies his ethnicity ("[...] mais nós num somu pretu i neim escravu, nós somu morenu i assim gostãmu di sê chamadu [...]"). This desire

for an authentic record of identity to be a quilombola leads this subject to produce certain meanings from which a form of racial and color prejudice emerges, patented in "[...] neim negru, porque negru is a contempt and the genti does not agree im to be called negru [...]". The subject claims another identity, that of mestizo/moreno, or that of Afro-Brazilian, but not that of black. It is interesting how the interviewee deals with the term "black", which was the color of the slave, according to him ("[...] porque pretu was the color of slavery [...]"), and, as they are free ("[...] nós somu todus livris, desdi antigamenti [...]"), could not assume or accept to be called that.

We recall Pêcheux (2009), when he states that all discourse is dialogical by nature and that it is in constant relationship with other discourses and with other subjects that produce discourses. It is what makes one utterance always give rise to another. This articulation between discourses leads us to the definition of FDs, previously theorized as being that which determines what can and should be said by the subject, based on their ideological formations. By understanding that there are differences in customs, beliefs and culture between the quilombolas portrayed here and their enslaved ancestors, the process of construction and deconstruction of the identity of this community as a result of the social transformations of the time becomes open, but also of reconstruction, since they recognize, through their ancestors, the place of belonging to the ethnicity and culture of African matrices. The diverse identities of the quilombola members of this community, then, are constituted by difference, as can be seen in the words of subject 5, when he states that the African culture they possess is not the same as the African culture of their ancestors ("[...] we [...] não temu [African culture]... us mais véiu qui já morre qui teim [...]"). In other words, they reaffirm their constitutive place (Afro-Brazilians), based on the recognition of the place of their enslaved ancestors, but pointing to a difference between the former and the latter. And it is based on this that they begin to (re)construct their Afro-Brazilian identity, with their customs, ways of behaving, ways of being, experiencing, acting, choosing, fighting and adapting to a new place, to a new society. And, it is in the construction of this identity that African cultural matrices are present in the culture of the Brazilian people.

We know that the quilombola communities of the North of Minas Gerais maintain a significant variety of musical and religious expressions, traditional cultural manifestations that are transmitted through orality, the narratives of their members, who seek the preservation of legends and myths. In the discourse on traditions and cuisine (cultivation of corn and cassava, rice, herbs and spices, use of cabbage, chicken, angu and beans in everyday life), the quilombola points to an ethnic identity that intersects with African, indigenous and Portuguese matrices, some of them rescued for the present through numerous festivals (rice,

do Bom Jesus) and celebrations. The network that links them to the culture of African origin is woven, in addition to the cuisine and the lexicon, also by dance (batuque, forró, xote, lundu (dance of the Folia de Reis), a way for them to preserve their Afro-descendant identity and ensure the place of a miscegenated construction of Brazilian culture that results in Afro-Brazilianness. According to our studies, the quilombola remnants of the north of Minas Gerais have a strong Christian religiosity evidenced in the linguistic materiality that reveals an ideological-religious FD and brings to light the religious discourse. An example of this is the Folia de Reis, a ritual and traditional manifestation present in several communities, especially in the North of Minas, which refers to the story of the path taken by the Magi until they arrived in Bethlehem of Judah, to the corral where Jesus was born. The Three Kings festivities begin on December 25 and end on January 7 of each year. Let us see what subjects 6 and 5 tell us about quilombola religiosity.

#### Subject 06

[...] é [...] vinti cincu u nascimentu di Cristu [...] aí nós trabaia até u dia [...] seis [...] dia seti [...] nós pará [...] nós começa dia vinti cincu [...] certu [...] vinti cincu [...] nascimentu di Cristu é aí nós namora o nascimentu di Cristo [...] aí nós ficâmu na rua né [...] aí nós cantâmu nas casa lá [...] até/ o dia vinti seti [...] nós incerra [...] dia primeru de janeru [...] aí nós começa di novamenti [...] aí nós parâmu dia quatru [...] discansa dia cincu [...] dia seis di janeru [...] we make cumeçá/ traveis [...] aí incerra dia seti [...]

Marked by the date of December 25, the discourse of subject 06 is anchored in Catholicism, understood as a religious system of the rural peasant community that reveals, in quilombola religiosity, a cultural manifestation woven from the place of Christian faith from which his family members spoke in the past and from which his members speak in the present.

The religious issue is a very interesting and much debated aspect among quilombola subjects, not only because of the constant cultural practices, but mainly because of the absence of religious rituals of African matrices in the communities under study. An interesting fact is that, when we questioned the subjects who participated in this research about the rituals developed in Brazil (Candomblé, Umbanda and Macumba) based on African religious matrices in their celebrations, the quilombolas denied understanding about these rituals and/or rejected the possibility of their participation in these practices, as reported by subject 06.

#### Subject 06

[...] I only / [...] raised in [...] I was born in Catholic law [...] I am going / to die / in Catholic law [...] I am / very contritu to God [...] I didn't like it in macumba [...] I didn't like it at all [...] u:: my gender is already essi qui I tô ti falânu [...] in a creditu nissu nãu

[...] I believed eim God [...] understood [...] because this there [...] I believed [...] plus these things don't [...]

Remembering Pêcheux, an FD is that which in a given ideological formation, that is, from a given position and in a certain conjuncture, "determined by the state of class struggles, determines what can and should be said" (PÊCHEUX, 2009, p. 147). FD, then, refers to what is allowed to be said in a given time and social space, to what takes place and is carried out, based on the specific conditions of production that constitute the instance of discourse, the place from which one speaks, the image, the context, etc., historically defined. FD is, in fact, a possibility of explaining how each utterance has its place and its reason. Taking all this into account, it can be understood that, by inscribing himself in the traditional religious discourse, in which Catholic dogmas and laws are followed, the quilombola subject apparently denies the voices of ancestry, a position materialized in the negation in the statement "[...] I don't like macumba [...] I don't like anything [...] u:: my gêneru is already essi qui eu tô ti falãnu [...] no creditu nissu nãu [...] I creditu eim Deus [...]".

However, in reality, the interdiscourse reveals that, when the quilombola denies this cultural space of enslaved blacks, it is inscribed in another, that of white culture, of Brazilian Christianity/Catholicism, by using the statements "[...] I only / [...] created in [...] I was born in Catholic law [...] I vô / die / in Catholic law [...] only / very contritu to God [...]". At this moment, the quilombola also claims his place as white, his white identity, since he is the result of the miscegenation of the races that constitute the Brazilian people. Therefore, he has the right to occupy this space and practice the religion that is predominant in the country. Let's see what subject 05 says about religion.

#### Subject 05

[...] Reza é o qui mais teim [...] yesterday day I say Tevi prays for the church to rain [...] I was not nãu [...] I am only evangelical [...] but most are catholic [...] macumba here nãu teim nãu [...] é cosa du demôniu [...] Deus mi livri [...] aqui nós somu evangélicu or catholic.

Torn between Catholicism and evangelism (another religious ideological formation), the Brejeiro informants who had already revealed distaste for the religious practices of African matrices admit that the people who carry out these practices have ties with the devil ("[...] It's Cosa du Demoniu [...] Deus mi livri [...]"). This belief concretizes his white Brazilian identity, a component of his discursive formation, built from the discourses of those Christian religions that sometimes pass on the idea that the rites of some African practices are demonic. It should be noted, however, that not all wings of the Christian religions have such an opinion. After all, ecumenism is preached in Brazil. The denial of the rites of African religion is materialized in the word "demon" ("[...] é cosa du demôniu [...]"), which in Christian religions

is the symbol of evil, or of the one who practices evil. The subject's speech "[...] Tevi reza prus santus da igreja pra chovê [...]" proves the presence of another enunciator, who addresses a specific place, that of the Brazilian popular belief. By denying the practice of African-based religions in the community, subject 5, again, seems to reject such a belief "[...] macumba aqui não teim não [...]" é cosa do demônio [...]" Deus mi livri [...]" and, when, through the expression "[...] Deus mi livri [...]", demonstrates his disgust for this ritual. It reveals a Catholic religious ideological formation, demanding the identity of white and establishing the Afro-Brazilian religious identity (Catholic or Evangelical). We also observed, in the discursive sequence uttered by subject 05, the use of the pronoun "we", which refers to a collectivity that shares the Catholic belief. In contrast, the quilombola uses the pronoun "I", which reveals the individuality of the subject who places himself as an evangelical: "[...] I am only evangelical [...]". Preserving culture, customs, language and beliefs are striking traits among quilombolas and is part of the community's place of memory, a space in which a referential, spatial and temporal network is created.

## 4 CONCLUSION

### 4.1 AQUILUMBAR IS ACCURATE

Our look at rural black communities allows us to make brief considerations about their narratives. The life that the interviewees report flows from their narratives and their discourses. It also exudes its intention to preserve the identities that are anchored in the individual and collective memory that bring to the fore the voices of their ancestors, of constituted, ecclesiastical and political authorities, of identities that also reveal the marginalization and violence to which they were subjected, merely because of the color of their skin. In the research developed, to show aspects of quilombola identity, we resorted to a fundamental FD often crossed by interdiscourses that allowed us to understand the constructions of identities within a range of instabilities with ethnic, cultural, ideological and political links. We verified, in the path traced by the quilombola members of the Orion camp, that in their discursive practices, identities were formed over time and were assumed. This analysis was based on the interdiscourse, on the positions of the subjects, on the conditions of production of this discourse, on the crossing of individual and collective memory, and according to the relations of meanings intertwined by multiple voices speaking from their specific places. In this network, the quilombolas share the experiences accumulated, from the period of the ancestors, to the present day, through the flow of memory, through the often fragmented and retold accounts of their people. Memory is worked on in and by the collectivity, established in a determined space and time. Connecting the dots between

individual memory and collective memory reminds us that the first brings to the fore the experiences lived by the individual and the second deals with the experiences shared between individuals and the memory of the social group in which the individual was constituted, that is, in which he was socialized.

At the end of the analysis of the narratives of the speakers of the territory of Brejo dos Crioulos, we realized that several identities of the quilombola members emerged, and such identities fluctuate and are constituted by difference. This is perceived when some of them reveal that the African culture they possess is not the same as the African culture of their ancestors, that it has undergone changes over time, adapting to new socio-historical situations. That is, when they find that their culture, despite having traces of the African matrix, is influenced by what is typically Brazilian. However, they reaffirm their constitutive place, based on the recognition of the place of their ancestors. In a constant process of construction and reconstruction, heterogeneous and fragmented, and constituting culturally defined concepts, the versions of identity constructed by the subjects of the discourses can, of course, also be submitted to the principle of contradiction. This is possible because they are constituted by equality in relation to their peers (groupings) and, mainly, by difference (dispersion).

That is why it is known that belonging and identity are not solid and cannot be guaranteed for life, since they are revocable, negotiable, replaceable, interchangeable and dependent on the decisions that the individual makes, the paths he travels and the way he acts – crucial factors for both belonging and identity. Identities fluctuate. Some depend on our own choice, but others are disseminated and inculcated by the subjects around us. In addition, it is necessary to be on constant alert to defend the former in relation to the latter, because, after all, the concept of discourse teaches us that it is instituted in and in the ideological inscription.

## REFERENCES

- Arruti, J. M. (2006). *Mocambo: Antropologia e história do processo de formação quilombola*. Edusc.
- Bauman, Z. (2005). *Identidade* (C. Medeiros, Trad.). Jorge Zahar.
- Benveniste, É. (1989). *Problemas de linguística geral II*. Pontes.
- Brasil. Presidência da República. Casa Civil. Subchefia para Assuntos Jurídicos. (2003). Decreto nº 4.887, de 20 de novembro de 2003. [http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil\\_03/decreto/2003/D4887.htm](http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/decreto/2003/D4887.htm)
- Centro de Documentação Eloy Ferreira da Silva. (2007). *Comunidades quilombolas de Minas Gerais no século XXI: História e resistência*. Autêntica; CEDEFES.
- Costa, J. B. de A. (1999). *Do tempo da fartura dos crioulos ao tempo de penúria dos morenos: A identidade através de um rito em Brejo dos Crioulos* [Dissertação de mestrado, Universidade de Brasília].
- Ferreira, A. B. de H. (2009). *Novo dicionário Aurélio da língua portuguesa: Conforme a nova ortografia (4a ed.)*. Positivo.
- Foucault, M. (1986). *A arqueologia do saber* (L. F. B. Neves, Trad.; 4a ed.). Forense Universitária. (Obra original publicada em 1969)
- Foucault, M. (1970). *A ordem do discurso*. Loyola.
- Guimarães, C. M. (1988). *A negação da ordem escravista*. Ícone.
- Hall, S. (2000). Quem precisa de identidade? In T. T. da Silva (Org.), *Identidade e diferença: A perspectiva dos estudos culturais* (pp. 103–134). Vozes.
- Hall, S. (2003). *A identidade cultural na pós-modernidade* (T. T. da Silva & G. L. Louro, Trans.). DP&A.
- Hall, S. (2006). *Da diáspora: Identidades e mediações culturais* (A. L. G. Rezende, Trad.). UFMG.
- Moura, C. (1993). *Quilombos: Resistência ao escravismo*. Ática.
- Munanga, K. (2006). *Para entender o negro no Brasil de hoje: História, realidades, problemas e caminhos* (2a ed. rev. e atual.). Global; Ação Educativa Assessoria, Pesquisa e Informação.
- Pêcheux, M. (1997a). Análise de discurso: Três épocas. In F. Gadet & T. Hak, *Por uma análise automática do discurso: Uma introdução à obra de Michel Pêcheux* (pp. 37–52). Edunicamp.
- Pêcheux, M. (1997b). *O discurso: Estrutura ou acontecimento* (2a ed.). Pontes.
- Pêcheux, M. (2009). *Semântica e discurso* (4a ed.). Editora da Unicamp.
- Silva, T. T. da. (2000). A produção social da identidade e da diferença. In T. T. da Silva (Org.), *Identidade e diferença: A perspectiva dos estudos culturais* (pp. 73–102). Vozes.