JOURNAL OF
Linguistic Anthropology

■ *Michele Koven*
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
mkoven@illinois.edu

■ *Isabelle Simões Marques*
Universidade Aberta & NOVA-CLUNL

Multiaddressivity and Collective Addressivity in Vlog-based Interactions between Diasporic and Nonmigrant Portuguese

We use the notion of addressivity to analyze interactions between diasporic Portuguese in France and nonmigrant Portuguese in Portugal, in a vlog by Jonathan Da Silva. Through sets of interlocutor-oriented strategies, participants address one another not only as specific individuals *but also as* collective social types*, as if addressing* all *diasporic and nonmigrant Portuguese. We thus consider how participants use* collective addressivity *to hail one another as essentialized tokens of social types in a fantasy of telecommunication (Nozawa 2016). These materials reveal not only the construction of ethnonationally Portuguese identified "we's," but also of the collectivized "you's" such "we's" address, in a genre of online interaction.* [addressivity, essentialism, migration, Portugal, social media, vlogging]

Introduction

> "Oh! Oh, Portuguese people! Listen! We, im/emigrants, eh, who are fuck older far from our country, eh.[1] We run around working eleven months, do you understand? . . .I am going to say, eh, to Portuguese people, eh, we, im/emigrants, we are more Portuguese than some Portuguese who are here [Portugal]. Oh yeah, fuck, damn it, eh? . . .
>
> (Jonathan Da Silva)

The above excerpts come from a controversial Facebook post from August 2018, by Jonathan Da Silva, a well-known Franco-Portuguese vlogger since 2015.[2] The topic is the Portugueseness and patriotism of Portuguese abroad, relative to Portuguese nonmigrants. Da Silva uses this vlog post to rant on behalf of "us," members of the Portuguese diaspora in France who vacation in Portugal, while addressing "you plural," the imagined collectivity of nonmigrant Portuguese.[3] In so doing, he invites viewers to take up sides and participate in a particularly interlocutory online interaction about the well-worn tensions surrounding the relationships and ethnonational identities of "Portuguese from here" versus "Portuguese from there" (where "here" and "there" can alternatively designate the diaspora or homeland).

Journal of Linguistic Anthropology, Vol. 31, Issue 1, pp. 1–22, ISSN 1055-1360, EISSN 1548-1395. DOI: 10.1111/jola.12301.

We examine how Da Silva and commenters use strategies of what we call *collective addressivity* to presuppose and establish participant frameworks comprised of a particular type of "we"/ "you" relation between the imagined groups of diasporic Portuguese in France and nonmigrant Portuguese in Portugal. We show how collective addressivity is a strategy for hailing participants to larger group identities, particularly in online settings. Participants' use of collective addressivity allows them to participate in a "fantasy of telecommunication" (Nozawa 2016: 95), where the online participants can imagine they are addressing *all* members of the category. We consider more generally how diasporic and nonmigrant Portuguese participants use strategies of collective addressivity to debate whether and how members of each category are part of a larger encompassing Portuguese ethnonational identity, a longstanding controversial topic online and offline.

In addition to illuminating dimensions of the politics of Portuguese diasporic and nonmigrant identities, our focus on collective addressivity contributes to discussions about how social actors use discourse to interpellate selves and others as members of opposed, often essentialized social groups (Gal and Irvine 2019; Bucholtz and Hall, 1960; McIntosh 2018). Previous scholarship has examined how participants use various types of generic or nomic constructions when they engage in forms of essentialization, presenting social actors and their actions as types (Gelman 2003; Silverstein 1993; Koven 2016; Agha, 2006; Reyes 2004) (e.g., "those people always do X"). Such analyses have often focused on essentializing utterances in the third person, that is, reporting what "they" are like. In this article, we examine how essentializing strategies work in highly interlocutory participant frameworks, as *strategies of address* (e.g., American English "you people"). Participants thus essentialize the people whom they address, recruiting them to a social type as collectivized interlocutors. Such highly interlocutory strategies invite participants to alternatively inhabit "we" and "you people" roles and their alternating identity categories through online genres that facilitate these real and imagined interactions.

Collective addressivity may emerge as particularly salient in the context of a specific genre of social media interaction, the rant-based vlog (Werner 2012; Lange 2014). Participants may presuppose and establish not only an in-group "we" but also speak to an adversarially constructed "you (plural)," imagined to encompass all members of the out-group. As such, we show an underanalyzed way in which participants use social media to not only "imagine" themselves part of the same space–time of shared "community" (Anderson 1991) but also to do so through intense *interlocutory debate*. This allows those in both the online interaction, as well as all members of the larger diaspora to argue over who should be included in an imagined Portuguese community.

To explain strategies of addressivity, we also draw from recent scholarship on the notion of scales, understood as the often interconnected spatial, temporal, and social frameworks that participants signal as relevant to their ongoing social activities (Canagarajah and Costa 2016; Carr and Lempert 2016; Blommaert 2015, 2020; Wortham 2012). Indeed, addressivity involves scale making. As discussed at greater length elsewhere (Blommaert 2010; Flowers 2020; Koven 2016), participants often use deictics as a resource to shift from more specific to more generic forms in ways that produce scale jumps. That is, shifts from a first or second person singular deictic to a plural form may invoke the relevance of higher-order scales, such as when a participant says "I" and is corrected to "we," to evoke institutional authority (Blommaert 2010). We may often see participants recontextualize and produce this rescaling through their use of shifts from specific to generic or singular to plural deictic usage, not only from "I" to "we" but also from "you (singular)" to "you (plural)" or "you people" (Blommaert 2010; Koven 2016; Lempert 2016; Uitermark 2002; Wortham 1996), through equivalent French and Portuguese forms, discussed below. Our vlogging participants often use deictic shifts in addressivity, from "you" (singular) to designate Jonathan Da Silva or a specific commenter, to "you" (plural) to designate all diasporic or nonmigrant Portuguese. Specifically, when participants broaden the scope of their addressivity from a singular to

a pluralized or collectivized addressee, they engage in a kind of interscalar work. This constitutes a scale jump that thereby transforms the scale of the online interaction from that between individual social actors to that between the broad categories imaginatively constructed as encompassing all diasporic and nonmigrant Portuguese, such as in the opening excerpt, with "Oh, Portuguese people!" Participants' strategies of addressivity, that is, whom they indicate as their imagined and/or actual interlocutors, thus constitute scalar strategies. We will thus designate shifts from singular to collective addressivity as key to our analysis of these vlog-based interactions between diasporic and nonmigrant Portuguese.

Ultimately, a focus on addressivity allows us to consider some underdiscussed ways which people understand the imagined "centers" related to diaspora and the "home" society (See Dick 2010, 2018). Strategies of addressivity reveal another dimension of what has sometimes been called polycentricity (Blommaert 2010: 38-40). Blommaert defined polycentricity as the multiple, layered evaluative authorities toward which people orient, that guide their notions of how they should speak and act in given settings. Although Blommaert's notion of centers is more nuanced, one might be tempted to treat the relevant "centers" of diaspora and migrations as *places, whether locatable or imagined*. In our materials, we show the "centers" to be real or imagined *types of addressees*, associated with home and/or host society. More specifically, in vlog-based interactions, our participants do not only address one another as *specific individuals* (who may live within and across French and Portuguese borders). In our materials, as vlogging participants broaden the scope of their address from singular to plural you, the "centers" that they address become *generic social types* of diasporic and nonmigrant Portuguese, whom participants literally treat as *addressees—people they talk to*. Participants then interact with one another as tokens of types and/or parts of larger wholes (Gal and Irvine 2019).

The rest of the article is organized as follows. We first review the concept of addressivity, and more specifically notions of what we call multiaddressivity and collective addressivity. We then introduce our case materials in ethnographic context, that is, Jonathan Da Silva's vlog post and responses to it, in the setting of longstanding tensions between diasporic and nonmigrant Portuguese, especially during the month of August when Portuguese abroad "return" to vacation in Portugal. We give an overview of the strategies of addressivity in the corpus, with a focus on the original vlog post and illustrative comments from diasporic and nonmigrant positions. We conclude by considering what the relevant addressivity strategies reveal about how participants can transform online interactions into sites for constructing and contesting ethnonational community in the particularly interlocutory manner that the online genre of vlogging facilitates.

Addressivity

Given our focus on the essentializing nature of collective addressivity, we first define addressivity more generally. Addressivity involves how social actors orient their utterances to particular imagined or actual recipients, which could include those in the immediate interlocutory interaction, or those positioned as real or imagined overhearers (see also Bakhtin 1981, 1986; LaDousa 2014; Lempert 2009, 2011, 2012; Lempert and Silverstein 2012; Nakassis 2017; Irvine 1996; Nozawa 2016). The notion overlaps with related concepts in discourse-related scholarship. Conversation analysts have discussed recipient design (Schegloff 2001). Sociolinguists have developed the notion of audience design (Bell 1984). With a greater focus on power dynamics, Althusser (2001/1970) discussed how those in positions of power may address or "interpellate" less powerful others, recruiting them into certain subject positions (See also Carr 2011 and Dick 2018). Addressivity is also relevant in scholarship on the public sphere where particular texts indexically presuppose and establish their audiences (Cody, 2011; Gal 2006; Gal and Woolard 2001; Habermas 1991; Warner 2002). Rather than groups existing prior to a given event, "publics"

involve sets of mutually unknown addressees who are mobilized around particular messages or texts (Warner 2002).

A key dimension of addressivity is that social actors often orient their utterances to *multiple* intended, imagined, and actual addressees, making addressivity often "polyadic" (Lempert 2011; Lempert and Silverstein 2012). Similarly, Irvine (1996) evoked the related notion of the multiple shadow conversations to which participants may harken. Goffman (1979) also discussed how participant frameworks are not necessarily dyadic, between a monolithically defined "speaker" and "listener." Bakthin distinguished between multiple potential addressee roles, the audience-addressee and super-addressee (1986), an implicit overhearer of sorts (for discussion of role of real and imagined third party overhearers, see Lempert 2009, 2011; Bell 1984). Related notions of multiaddressivity appear in work on indirectness among African-American girls and women (Goodwin 1990; Morgan, 1991), which highlight how utterances are often oriented toward those other than the immediate addressee.

We synthesize these different approaches to how social actors often orient their utterances to multiple (sets of) addressees with the notion of *multiaddressivity*. In particular, multiaddressivity is present in social-media-based interactions, where messages may target and reach different audiences with varied uptakes (Chun 2013; Chun and Walters 2011; Jones and Schieffelin 2009; Koven and Marques 2015, 2017; Leppanen and Hakkinen 2012).[4]

Addressing Collective Recipients

In addition to the possibility of *multiple addressees*, there is great breadth in the social entities that can be addressees:

> a differentiated collective of specialists in some particular area of cultural communication, a more or less differentiated public, ethnic group, contemporaries, likeminded people, opponents and enemies, a subordinate, a superior, someone who is lower, higher, familiar, foreign, and so forth. And it can be an indefinite, unconcretized other (Bakthin 1986: kindle location 1565).

Beyond multiaddressivity, social actors may collectively address *all imagined members of a social group*. One sees collective addressivity in an utterance such as, "why do you people do that?," often understood as lumping immediate addressees in with a larger, often stigmatized or even racialized group.[5] Furthermore, shifts from singular to collective addressivity can be a key strategy through which participants link those in the immediate interaction to broad social categories. Such shifts resemble other shifts from specific to generic language use (Gelman 2003) or reportive versus nomic calibration (Agha, 2006; Dick 2010; Koven 2016; Silverstein 1993), such as when storytellers move from recounting one off events in a preterit past tense to recounting in a timeless present, in order to make claims about timeless social truths. These shifts may allow participants to typify social actions and actors as tokens of types (Koven 2016; Reyes 2004). We argue that shifts from hailing a specific interlocutor to hailing collectivized addressees, from "you, Jonathan Da Silva" to "you, diasporic Portuguese," function in a similar way. In our materials, we will see how multiaddressivity and collective addressivity co-occur, as participants confront one another in contentious discussions about Portuguese diasporic and national belonging. They do not only establish ethnonational "we's" but also plural "you's" to be welcomed into or excluded from an imagined Portuguese community.[6]

Our analysis of addressivity elucidates some of the interactionally and deictically signaled dynamics surrounding discussions of Portuguese identity, as these relate to the diaspora in France versus those who remained in Portugal. We thus contribute to scholarship on the indexically signaled participant frameworks associated with imagined communities or in-groups (Anderson 1991; Billig 1995; Dori-Hacohen 2014; Gumperz 1982; Lee 1997; Marques and Koven 2017; Pavlidou 2014; Silverstein 2000;

Urban 2001; Yeh, 2018). Scholars have argued for attention to the routine discursive practices through which participants imagine and establish the "we" of national communities (Anderson 1991; Silverstein 2000). Anderson indeed focused on shared reading practices as (re)productive of a national "we," through which social actors come to experience themselves as simultaneously inhabiting the same homogenous ethnonational space and time, which must be reinstated in ongoing communicative practices (Silverstein 2000). Indeed, by using the interactional affordances of a Facebook group to co-narrate their summer trips to Portugal, diasporic Portuguese participants instantiate a diasporic Portuguese narrating and narrated "we," where they are both simultaneously together with one another as narrators on Facebook, while concurrently on the road to the Portuguese homeland as narrated figures (Marques and Koven 2017). Deictics, such as "we," thus provide critical resources through which participants may signal ethnonational identification in ritual and everyday settings, including online interactions.[7]

However, establishing Portugueseness in vlog-based interactions may not only be a matter of establishing "us," or even "them," but "you people," making the online interaction a site for interlocutory confrontation between imagined groups. Following Benveniste's (1971) claim that the "I"/ "you" relation is fundamental to interaction, our materials reveal participant frameworks and associated deictic forms of ethnonational discourse that involve constructions not only of imagined "we's" but also of the imagined collectivized "you's" such "we's" address. Through deictically informed strategies of multiaddressivity and collective addressivity, participants can engage in a particular "fantasy of telecommunication" (Nozawa 2016: 95), treating the online interaction as a way to imaginatively address *all* diasporic and nonmigrant Portuguese. This produces a novel type of collectivity and simultaneity: the real-time sense of inhabiting enduring categories and conflicts in the setting of seemingly ephemeral online encounters (Blommaert and Varis 2015).

Background of Communicative Issues between Diasporic and Nonmigrant Portuguese

In this section, we provide ethnographic contexts for the online interaction between participants identified as members of polarized social categories of diasporic and nonmigrant Portuguese.[8] Of course, diasporic and nonmigrant Portuguese experiences are more complex than a binary pair of categories could possibly capture. That said, while erasing much of participants' lived complexity, such binary categorizations often remain fundamental lenses through which social actors evaluate themselves and others (See Gal and Irvine 2019).

There have been multiple waves of emigration from Portugal, making it a recurrent feature of Portuguese society (Baganha and Góis 1999; Serrão 1971; Brettell 2003). The Portuguese in France have established a robust and longstanding presence in France, largely comprised of migrants and multiple generations of their descendants from the wave of migration in the 1960s and 1970s. France was the main destination during that time for those seeking economic improvement. The majority of these economic migrants to France came from rural regions of the North and West. Many who emigrated and their offspring have maintained connections to Portugal through travel, home owning (De Villanova et al 1994), sending remittances (Rodrigues-Ruivo 2001), and often imagining an eventual if delayed "return" (Brettell 2003; Charbit et al 1997; Pereira 2015a; Dos Santos 2010; Sardinha 2011; Koven 2019; Marques and Koven 2017; Wagner and Koven 2017). Affirming Portuguese identity relative to "host" or "home" societies is a tricky issue for many diasporans in France. This article focuses on diasporans' concerns about being ratified as Portuguese by those who have remained in Portugal.

Emigration is also an ever-present topic in Portugal both for those who have stayed (Baganha and Góis 1999; See also Dick 2018). Many nonmigrant Portuguese indeed treat those in France as an important part of the Portuguese social imaginary

(Brettell 2003; Feldman-Bianco 1992; Gonçalves 1996; Klimt and Lubkemann 2002; Koven and Marques 2017; Marques and Koven 2017; Matozzi 2016; Pereira 2015a, 2010, 2017). The lives of diasporic Portuguese are a frequent topic of concern and criticism among nonmigrant elites and everyday citizens (Gonçalves 1996).

Discussions about migration and the Portuguese in France easily tap into larger concerns about contested meanings of Portuguese identity, within Portugal and on the world stage (Lourenço 1992; Feldman-Bianco 1992; Cabral 2003; Santos Silva 2018). With the loss of its colonies, some official Portuguese discourse has made Portuguese communities the new exemplars of Portugal's global presence (Feldman-Bianco 1992; Pereira 2015a,b).

As many have noted, there is an ambivalent relationship between those who have emigrated and those who have not (Gonçalves 1996; Koven 2004, 2013; Koven and Marques 2015, 2017; Brettell 2003; Pereira 2015a,b). Nonmigrants have alternatively treated diasporans as national heroes and as a source of national shame (Brettell 2003; Pereira 2015a,b), associated with a time and space in Portuguese history of dictatorship and economic underdevelopment. Emigrants have sometimes been criticized for leaving Portugal, acting in their own selfish interest and therefore draining or betraying the nation. Some also fear those in the diaspora both spread a poor image of Portugal abroad (Koven and Marques 2017). Others complain about what they see as emigrants' supposed contempt for Portugal as lesser than the countries where they currently reside. There is thus tension over the relative socioeconomic status of emigrants versus nonmigrants. Nonmigrant Portuguese often criticize diasporans' improved socioeconomic status, from rural poor to middle class (relative to Portugal), through a form of rivalry. Indeed, it is often the new middle class of Portuguese nonmigrants that most contests the legitimacy of diasporans' improved status (Gonçalves 1996), accusing them of being illegitimate social climbers. Challenges to diasporans' class identities often become conflated with challenges to their national identity. Many nonmigrants thus may critically contest the legitimacy and authenticity of diasporans' class and ethnonational identity, treating their visible and audible differences from nonmigrants as denials of an essential Portugueseness.

However, these ambivalences notwithstanding, both diasporic and nonmigrant Portuguese often operate under the assumption that diasporic and nonmigrant Portuguese are *supposed to* share an underlying "Portugueseness," as part of a larger Portuguese whole, through what Gal and Irvine (2019) call a scale of encompassment. Linked to a belief in an essential Portugueseness that transcends time and space (Noivo 2002), discussions about differences between diasporic and nonmigrant Portuguese often become tinged with morality. Portuguese living in France may often feel judged by nonmigrants when they "return" on vacation. Lubkemann (2002) discusses the "moral economy of the emigrant script," wherein those in Portugal expect emigrants to display loyalty to Portugal in particular ways. Diasporans are often scrutinized for how well they have fulfilled the script and to what extent they differ from nonmigrants, where difference is interpreted as intentional, disloyal abandonment or denial of an inherent, shared Portugueseness. This judgment is challenging for those who believe that, despite differences from nonmigrants, they are fulfilling the script, by faithfully returning to and expressing love for Portugal. Our analysis will show ways such struggles between diasporic and nonmigrant Portuguese play out in online interaction through indexically signaled strategies of addressivity, used to invite viewers to identify with a diasporic or nonmigrant position.

Moments of contest over diasporans' Portuguese identity are most likely to occur when diasporans and nonmigrants encounter one another during diasporans' summer vacations, the time of the year when many in France "return." These summertime "return" trips are a frequent focus of communicative activity, both off and online. (See Wagner 2017 for a parallel case in Morocco). Diasporans and nonmigrants often discuss difficult encounters with one another, across a range of

participant frameworks. For example, many diasporans share experiences about their trips to Portugal face-to-face (Koven 2004, 2007, 2013) and online (Marques and Koven 2017). For fellow diasporans, these narratives can evoke communal love and nostalgia for Portugal. However, as shown in JDS's vlog, many diasporans commiserate with one other over how nonmigrants view and treat them (Koven 2004, 2013). Nonmigrants may also complain to one another about diasporans. And diasporans and nonmigrants may directly confront each other about their mutual perceptions.

Beyond Da Silva's vlog, such complaints often focus on diasporans' emblematic use of material and semiotic capital acquired in France, from cars, to clothing, to language. Nonmigrant Portuguese attitudes toward diasporans' French influence parallel discussions of figures of personhood elsewhere, where participants' use of a global language may trigger accusations of undeserved pretentions to cosmopolitan, elite status (Reyes 2017; Nakassis 2017; Besnier 2011), in ways that are believed to challenge local social hierarchies. Both diasporans and nonmigrants often narrate events in which a diasporic visitor's use of French resulted in an angry confrontation with a nonmigrant (Koven 2013).

Participants' explanations for why diasporic visitors use French are highly perspectival. Diasporans may view their use of French as resulting from habit and from no longer being fully at ease in monolingual Portuguese. Nonmigrants, however, often interpret diasporans' French use as intentionally ostentatious pretense of no longer knowing Portuguese, their supposed "real" language. When nonmigrants complain about diasporans' supposedly pretentious verbal and nonverbal demeanor (Koven 2013), diasporans lament that rather than being welcomed "home" during summer trips, nonmigrants reject and shame them. These issues form the backdrop for JDS's vlog and responses to it, as he invites viewers to enter into these conflicts.

We will thus consider how participants construct themselves and address others as either diasporic Portuguese or nonmigrant Portuguese. We will also examine how others respond to these same participants who do and do not appear to share their diasporic or nonmigrant position. Our analysis will focus on the addressivity of the discourse in the vlog and comments—whom the vlog addresses, who responds to the vlog, and the addressivity strategies present in commenters' subsequent responses.

Case Materials

Both affiliation and divisiveness may be particularly apparent in online interactions surrounding ethnonational identification (Fabrício 2014). As others have noted (See Bernal 2014; Zhang and Zhao 2020), online interactions are rich settings for geographically dispersed participants to position themselves as members of diasporically defined groups relative to "homelands," however defined.

Although the Portuguese in France have remained relatively absent from mainstream media (see Wagner and Koven 2017 for a review of the idea of the invisibility of the Portuguese in France), Da Silva has been a high-profile Franco-Portuguese online performer. Those of Portuguese descent raised in France have recently been using online genres such as comedy (Koven and Marques 2015, 2017) and blogs (Fernandes 2007; Antunes da Cunha, 2009) to publicly claim particular versions of Portuguese diasporic ethnonational identity. With over 240,000 followers, Da Silva has used his vlog to gain a particular type of celebrity and visibility, not only for himself but also for the Portuguese in France. His style echoes that of a recent wave of online, male comedians of Portuguese descent raised in France (see Koven and Marques 2015, 2017), who perform a youthful, urban French spoof of nonmodern first-generation Portuguese emigrant personas through clothing and speech for example, by dressing in a young "French" style while imitating the Portuguese-influenced speech of older relatives. JDS' style is legible to those in the diaspora and in Portugal, if differently so, eliciting highly evaluative responses from both groups.

To many diasporans in France, he evokes their elders as beloved if somewhat other. To nonmigrants, he evokes a dated image of Portugal, while also representing emigrants' imagined ignorance and alleged ostentation.

Since this paper discusses these issues in the context of a vlog, we briefly review relevant scholarly discussions of vlogging. Vlogs are one of the most frequently viewed and appreciated online genres (Burgess and Green 2018). Different genres often have their specific types of addressivity (Bakhtin 1986). Indeed, vlogs are known for the ambiguity of their addressivity. They are generally monologues on subjects of broader public interest, but performed in ways that may seem intimate, affectively engaged, and intertextually reminiscent of face-to-face interaction (Werner 2012). Indeed although some have argued that vlogs lack clear addressees (Wesch 2009), they are usually highly interlocutory through their use of forms that reflect and create a relationship with assumed, if non co-present, viewers (Froebenius 2014). These very interactive features of vlogs may invite heightened forms of audience involvement (Werner 2012), leading to polarizing interactions and conflicts among commenters (Lange 2014; Bou-Franch and Blivitch 2012; Lee 2007).

JDS typically uses his vlog to humorously complain about everyday pet peeves, which include commonly discussed social issues in France and Portugal, from politics, to gender, to fast food. His vlogs therefore usually take the form of rants, a particular subgenre of vlog (Lange 2014; Werner 2012; Manning, 2008; Vrooman 2002). More generally, participants may actually seek out vlogged rants not in spite of, but *because* they often result in highly affective, divisive online interactions (Lange 2014). Indeed, vlog-based rants thrive on the frequently polarizing tenor of online interaction (Lee 2007; Lange 2014).

Da Silva's vlog-based rants invite viewers and commenters to take up sides through conflict-ridden commentary. He hails participants to react and respond, not as individual interactants, but as members of contentiously defined social categories (see Lee 2007; Blou-Franch and Blitvich 2014; Fabrício 2014). JDS thus mobilizes participants to sort themselves into and speak as representatives of two polarized social categories, who then continue to use the same strategies in the comments. Indeed, online participants frequently participate as members of polarized group identities, rather than as individuals.

We focus on interactions surrounding a vlog rant from August 2018 about diasporic Portuguese summer return trips to Portugal. This particular post elicited many likes, shares and over 800 follow-up comments on his open Facebook page, at the time of our analysis. The post and its follow-up comments involve interactions about and between those who speak as diasporans in France and nonmigrant Portuguese in Portugal.

Jonathan Da Silva's Vlog Post

JDS recorded and posted this vlog post in early August, a time when many diasporans may be in Portugal on vacation. Those who commented on the video appeared largely also to be diasporans and nonmigrants, witnessing the formers' annual arrival. The transcript and translation of the vlog post appear below. We have chunked the transcript up into sections to make it easier to analyze and discuss.

To analyze addressivity of the post and the comments, we consider those verbal forms through which participants signal to whom they are speaking. Although addressivity may be signaled in more and less denotationally explicit ways, from eye gaze, to parallelism, to deictics (Lempert 2011), we focus most heavily on deictics translatable as "you"/"your," and associated verb forms (Benveniste 1971; Brown and Gilman 1960; Morford 1997; Silverstein 1976; Wortham 1996), to include imperatives, as well as vocatives (De Carvalho 2013; Jaworski and Galasinski 2000; Lambrecht 1996; Levinson 1983; Walkley, 2010; Zwicky 1974). Other scholars have discussed the role of address forms to presuppose and establish audience. Television journalists may say, "We're so glad you're here with us today," to create contact with

a generic viewer (Vidali-Spitulnik 2010: 377). Of immediate relevance to our work, vloggers use second person pronouns and imperatives to reflect and create a relationship with assumed viewers (Froebenius 2014).

In the case of European French and Portuguese, the available address forms allow participants to distinguish between singular and plural addressees while also signaling their relationship with addressees and their identities as particular social types (Brown and Gilman 1960; Agha, 2006; Koven 2009; Morford 1997; Silverstein 2003), through interactional patterns of pronoun exchange and interpretation. Following Koven (2009), we briefly summarize European Portuguese and continental French paradigms for singular and plural address.

In European French, although shifts toward reciprocal "Tu" are emergent on social media (Credeville 2013), reciprocal "Vous" remains the norm between unacquainted strangers (Gardner-Chloros 1991, 2003-2004; Morford 1997; Pires 2004). Given this article's attention to strategies of plural and collective address, the challenge is to distinguish whether a given token of "Vous" refers to a singular addressee, with all its concomitant orders of indexicality (Morford 1997; Silverstein 2003), or a plural addressee, comprised of more than one person (De Fornel 1994, 1986).

However, as discussed elsewhere (Koven 2009), European Portuguese is not a binary T/V system (Braun 1988; Carreira 1997, Carreira 2004; Cintra 1972; Cook 1997, 2014; Oliveira 2005). Address form norms for singular and plural address display diversity within Portugal and the diaspora, with variation by region, generation, political orientation, and social class. To refer to a single addressee, participants may use a second person singular "Tu." They can also select a range of grammatically third person singular forms that function as address terms, including *Você*, name/title + third person verb, or third person-verb form and null subject (Cook 1997; Carreira 2004). Each reference to a single addressee may have multiple social indexicalities, a discussion of which goes beyond the scope of this article, with its focus on the distinction between singular and plural address (Duarte 2010).

To refer to a *plural* addressee, the focus of this article, speakers of European Portuguese have several options. They can select from the third person plural *Vocês* and third person plural verb form, proper names/titles plus third person plural verb, or third person plural verb form with a null subject. Plural address can also be detected through other verb forms such as possessives (*os seus/as suas*), dative object (*lhes*), and the personal infinitive which may be declined (*estarem/fazerem*). Further, although often considered archaic (Cintra 1972), second person plural forms of *Vós* also appear in our corpus as a way of addressing a pluralized addressee, whether through a subject, accusative object, or dative pronoun, possessive verb form (*o vosso*), or associated verb forms (Preto-Rodas 1972; Gouveia 2008).

Social actors use these different pronominal and verb forms in French and Portuguese along with other types of vocatives to recruit social actors to singular, plural, and collective addressee participant roles. Although deictic forms are our main focus, participants use other addressive strategies, such as language choices that partition the audience (Androtsoupolos 2014; Gumperz 1982), and stylized quotations that present primary addressees and expected overhearers as sympathetic or unsympathetic characters (Bakhtin 1981). For example, participants may stylize the speech of focal and nonfocal addressees, in ways that addressees can interpret the quotation as a form of mocking or shaming directed at them (Goodwin 1990; Miller et al 1996).

Through combinations of these addressive strategies, JDS describes, selects, enacts, and addresses diasporic and nonmigrants as collectivized types. His use of these strategies functions to invite viewers to experience themselves and others as representatives of one of the two categories.

Transcript 1: Jonathan Da Silva's Vlog Post
French= plain text
Portuguese= italics
Bold= Portuguese phonology in French

1	Bon. (ss) Là je suis triste, hein, triste, énervé, dépressi :f, inspirati :f, gastronopi :f, je suis tout en pif. ((last bit done with hand gestures as in a finger by finger count down))	Well. (ss). Here/now I am sad, eh, sad, irritated, depressive, inspirative, gastronopif, I am all "pif." ((last bit done with hand gestures as in a finger by finger count down))
2	Ben oui?, pa'ce que, là, on vient d'arriver en vacances?, on est tout content?, *'tamos aqui parece uns cristos?*,	Well yes?, because, here/now, we just arrived on vacation?, we are all happy?, *we are here, sitting pretty?*,
3	e déjà *directo as críticas, directo a puta das críticas*. Ah bah oui, voilà.	And already *right to the criticisms, right to the damn criticisms*. Oh well, yes, there you go
4	Ah, moi chuis parti dans un café hier. Normal, num, num bar chicha et voilà, j'étais tranquille,	Well, I went to a cafe yesterday. Normal, to a to a houka bar, and there you go, I was fine,
5	*já os via os Portugueses*, hein. E já, euh moi, qui m'énervent. *"Aí, Já vêm aí os Ave:cs, ((makes gesture of hand opening and closing, like a talking mouth throughout stylized quote)) os imigra:ntes, armados em ri:cos, e o cara:lho, puta que os pari:u "*	*I already saw them, the Portuguese people*, eh. And already, and what makes me mad, *"There, Here come the Avecs ((makes gesture of hand opening and closing, like a talking mouth throughout stylized quote)), the imigrantes, dressed up like rich people, and fuck, sons of bitches"*
6	*((gesture of thumb and index touching)) Oh! Oh os Portugueses!* Écoutez! *Nós, imigrantes*, hein, que *'stamos no caralho mais velho longe do nosso país*, hein. *Andamos a trabalhar onze meses, capai, capish*. Y a pas de café, y a pas de restaurant, y a pas *de caralho que ma foda*. Nous, on travaille onze mois *para ir para aqui aproveitar no nosso país*, hein,	*((gesture of thumb and index touching)) Oh! Oh, Portuguese people!* Listen! *We, immigrants*, eh, *who are fuck older far from our country*, eh. *We run around working eleven months, do you understand?* There is no cafe, there is no restaurant, there is no *fuck dammit*. We work for eleven months *to go to enjoy here our country*, eh,
7	pa'ce que j'entends beaucoup dire, *"Bom, em França, ou no estrangeiro, nós somos portugueses." Viemos para Portugal, somos france:ses, sui:ços, já não somos portugueses*.	Because I hear many say, *"Well, in France, or abroad, we are Portuguese." We come to Portugal, we are Fre:nch, Swi:ss, we aren't Portuguese anymore*.
8	*Vou dizer*, hein, *aos portugueses*, hein, Nous, *imigrantes, somos mais portugueses que alguns Portugueses que estão aqui*. Ah ben oui, *caralho, que ma foda*, hein? Parce que nous, on aime *o nosso país*, ((thumps chest)) hein.	I am going to say, eh, *to Portuguese people*, eh, We, em/*immigrants, we are more Portuguese than some Portuguese who are here*. Oh yeah, *fuck, damn it*, eh? Because we love *our country*, ((thumps chest)) eh.
9	C'est vrai qu'on est cons. *Somos burros, merda, de vez em quando*, hein. *'Tamos em França, falamos português, viemos para aqui, falar (xx)((hands clap)) francês*. Pourquoi qu'on est cons comme ça. En plus les prix?, ça augmente? *na feira* quand tu parles français, *passa de cinco a vinte logo*. ((hands clap)) Mais bon, *é a merda, que se foda*. ((smiles))	It's true that we are idiots. *We are dumb, shit, from time to time*, eh. *We are in France, we speak Portuguese, we come here, speak (xx)((hands clap)) French*. Why are we dumb like that. On top of that the prices?, they go up? *in the market* when you speak French, *goes from five to twenty right away*. ((hands clap)) But okay, *it's shit, fuck. ((smiles))*

JDS's post explicitly and implicitly beckons diasporans from France and nonmigrants in Portugal to recognize themselves in his rant, and respond in turn. It is multiaddressive in its shifts among different primary addressees and expected overhearers, speaking to fellow diasporans (for which nonmigrants become overhearers), speaking to nonmigrants (for which diasporans become overhearers), and then returning to address diasporans (with nonmigrants again in an overhearing capacity). It also shows collectivized addressivity, when Da Silva refers to and addresses recipients as if hailing *all* members of the category.

The vlog begins from a first-person singular perspective in section 1, where he first describes his individual experience and displays his current negative affect (*je suis*/I am). He implicitly addresses French-speaking diasporans with his initial use of

French (Androutsopoulos 2014; Gumperz 1982). He evokes for them an assemblage of recognizable styles, comprised of very colloquial, "young" French verbal and nonverbal demeanor with an "old" style evoking the first generation of Portuguese emigrants. More specifically, although he playfully uses parallel French words ending in "*if*," including the entirely made up, humorous word, "*gastronopif*," he does this with the rolled Portuguese "r." This layers his "young" French with a stylized Portuguese accent widely associated with the older first generation of Portuguese in France, an enregistered combination of styles associated with recent Franco-Portuguese online humor (See Koven and Marques 2015, 2017).

In section 2, he continues to speak in colloquial French as a diasporan to other diasporans. He evokes the widely recognized action of arriving in Portugal on vacation. His use of the deictic "*on*"/"we" may refer both to his immediate family, and to all diasporans who travel to Portugal, expanding the narrated event from an individual to a shared one. As such, he indexes a shared "we" of Portuguese diasporic identity (Marques and Koven 2017).

There is a footing shift in section 3, when he switches to Portuguese to metapragmatically characterize and partially enact the behavior of nonmigrants toward him and toward diasporic Portuguese in general, "right to the criticisms." He imitates nonmigrants with his hand gesture, which resembles a talking mouth. Here he evokes for other diasporans a supposedly typical nonmigrant action.

In section 5, he narrates an encounter with nonmigrants in a way that opposes all nonmigrant and diasporic Portuguese as two types or wholes (Gal and Irvine 2019). Rather than say *uns/alguns*/some Portuguese people, he says, "I saw the Portuguese people" (third person definite plural), referring to and lumping together all (nonmigrant) Portuguese (see Acton 2019 for a similar strategy in American English). What follows is the maximally reportable action: a stylized quotation of what nonmigrant types tell one another about emigrants, performed for the benefit of overhearing diasporans, at the expense of nonmigrants. The quote presents nonmigrants and migrants as broad collective groupings.

Other strategies make the quote display a diasporic stylization of a nonmigrant perspective, such as the use of *vêm*/come, putting nonmigrants in the deictic center (Hanks, 1990; Haviland 1996; Koven and Marques 2015). JDS also quotes nonmigrant figures using the derogatory term, "*os Avecs*." This nonmigrant term for diasporans in France comes from the French word "*avec*"/"with," signaling that diasporans speak French all the time. The present indicative verb tenses of the framing (that make me mad/*qui m'énervent*) and quoted speech (they come/*Já vêm*) highlight that these are habitual and/or generic actions and speech. This stylized quote renders diasporans and nonmigrants as social types, toward whom he aligns and disaligns, while inviting audience reaction.

JDS performs this stylized quote assuming that diasporans will recognize these generic nonmigrant figures and their associated speech activities of gossip and complaint about return migrants. However, he is also in a shadow conversation with nonmigrants, who can overhear diasporans' stylizations of them.

In section 6, he abruptly shifts to addressing nonmigrants. JDS calls out to nonmigrants by saying, "The Portuguese people/*Os Portugueses*," using the second person plural imperative "listen/*écoutez*." He no longer talks *about* or quotes, but *speaks directly to them*, as if they were all present online. The bulk of his speech then shifts to Portuguese. He uses a series of first person-plural forms (*we, our*) to refer to and include himself in the contrasting set of diasporic Portuguese. Although his main addressee is nonmigrants, he also addresses a sympathetic diasporic audience, for whom he performs what many *wish* they could say.

He then alternates between collective addressees, talking to diasporans and/or nonmigrants on behalf of all diasporans. In section 7, he indirectly quotes a nonmigrant Portuguese and French perspective on how diasporic Portuguese are seen in France and their host countries as Portuguese.

In section 8, he again shifts to directly hailing nonmigrants. As before, it is a retort to those whom he had quoted, who claim that migrants are not Portuguese. "We" are more Portuguese than some nonmigrants because of "our" love for Portugal. This is also a performance for diasporans of what many may wish they could say. As before, he enacts a rejoinder to the nonmigrant figures—those who say diasporans are not Portuguese. He declares that "we" are more Portuguese than some nonmigrants because of "our" love for Portugal. This provocative speech could mobilize diasporans and anger nonmigrants.

Finally, he again changes primary addressees in section 9, talking directly to fellow diasporans. He asks why "we" do the very things for which nonmigrant Portuguese criticize "us," such as speaking French. In so doing, he almost concedes that diasporic Portuguese are at fault, "we are dumb" (*cons/burros*). Again, although those in diaspora are the main addressees, nonmigrants become overhearers.

In these ways, JDS alternates between addressing diasporic and nonmigrant Portuguese, as if he were talking *about* and *to* all members of both groups. The key moments are his stylized quotation of nonmigrants, and his retort to nonmigrants, spoken as if directly addressing and challenging nonmigrant views of diasporic Portuguese as ostentatious and as not Portuguese. The addressivity of these retorts to nonmigrant Portuguese is more complex— addressing nonmigrants in general, as well as addressing diasporans as he speaks back to the earlier cited generic nonmigrant figures with a type of quoted speech of what diasporans would hypothetically like to say. He thus stages a hypothetical battle, hailing all nonmigrants to hear his challenge while also hailing diasporans to align themselves with his retort. As such, JDS addresses members of both groups while also transforming and inviting individual viewers to respond as members of larger collectivities. The struggle is not only between "us" and "them," but between "us" and "all of you." This establishes an interlocutory relation between groups into which online participants may find themselves hailed and moved to respond as if also speaking for and to members of the two categories. JDS's rant is a provocative call to diasporic and nonmigrant Portuguese.

Commenters

We follow other scholarship that examines the metadiscursive work in social media commentary, through which commenters take up and judge the original performance (Chun 2013; Chun and Walters 2011; Jones and Schieffelin 2009; Koven and Marques 2015, 2017), jointly engaged in a type of participatory spectacle (Androutsopoulos 2013). Analysis of interactions in comment sections can reveal the different ways in which commenters de- and recontextualize portions of the original (Bauman and Briggs 1990), as they cite and evaluate the original post along with one another's comments. In our analysis of the comments, we focus in particular on differently positioned commenters' patterns of addressivity.

We selected the first four hundred out of eight hundred comments for analysis. We then sorted comments into recognizably "diasporic" and "nonmigrant" positions, using the same strategies as participants to differentiate between the two (Gal and Irvine 2019). Although these strategies involve indexical, context-based signals, when participants sort one another into essential types, they treat them as signs of inherent difference (Gal and Irvine 2019). Diasporic Portuguese are identifiable to one another and to us through use of French, use of "we" to designate those living abroad, and explicit mention of country of residence, among other cues. Indeed, more than 2/3 of the comments (276/400 or 69%) appear to come from diasporans. Many such comments critique nonmigrants' criticism of diasporic Portuguese (55/276 or 19.9%). Nonmigrant positioning was also easy to recognize, though noting commenters' negative assessments of emigrants, referring to emigrants as "them," or "you people," use of Portuguese, etc. Although nonmigrant Portuguese represent less than a fourth of the comments (88/400 or 22%), two thirds of their comments critique

emigrants, often by directly addressing them. We discuss two illustrative examples, one from a nonmigrant and one from a disaporan, where one can see such strategies of multiaddressivity and collective addressivity.

Transcript 2

Nonmigrant Comment to Jonathan Da Silva and all Diasporans

Underlining: addressive forms

1	Pois, o problema, caro Jonathan da Silva, é que o que falas não é a realidade.	Well, the problem, dear Jonathan Da Silva, is that what you are talking about (sing.) is not the reality.
2	Senão vejamos: falas de patriotismo, que são mais portugueses que alguns portugueses,	Let's see: you speak (sing.) about patriotism, that you (plural) are more Portuguese than some Portuguese,
3	mas acontece que quando alguns de vós, emigrantes, chegam cá, a primeiríssima coisa que fazem é dizer "Ah, não, didon, isto na França é muito melhor. Aqui em Portugal é tudo atrasado, a França está muito mais à frente," ou "Ah, não, donc que a França tem médicos muito melhores, o sistema de saúde existe e é comparticipado "na totalidade" eu só quero ser tratado na França, aqui os médicos não são bons"	but it happens that when some of you, emigrants, arrive here, the very first thing that you do (pl.) is to say, "Oh no, well, that in France is much better. Here in Portugal everything is behind, France is much more advanced," or, "Oh no, well that France has much better doctors, the health system exists and is covered in totality, I only want to be treated in France, here the doctors aren't good"
4	(quando na realidade o NOSSO SNS é um dos melhores e mais organizados da Europa).	(when in reality OUR NATIONAL SECURITY SYSTEM is one of the best and most organized in Europe).
5	A questão de saberem falar perfeitamente português e começarem a falar francês pensando que ninguém entende francês, o que é manifestamente errado e só vos fica mal.	The question of knowing (pl.) how to speak Portuguese perfectly and starting (pl.) to speak French thinking that no one understands French, what is manifestly wrong and only makes you (plural) look bad.
6	Eu só pergunto, se os emigrantes que dizem "ah na França é muito melhor e os portugueses são atrasados," o que é que esses emigrantes vêm para cá fazer? Estorvar e "largar azeite"? Isso é ao monte.	I only ask if emigrants who say," Ah, in France it's much better and the Portuguese are behind," what are those emigrants coming to do here? "Show off"? There are so many.
7	A todos os outros, que respeitam o nosso país, e que vêm efectivamente aproveitar o melhor que Portugal tem para dar (e que é muito), e que respeitam todas as pessoas que vivem cá (sejam estas portuguesas ou de outras nacionalidades), essas pessoas, respeitadoras, sim, SEJAM BEM-VINDAS. (35 likes)	To all the others, who respect our country, and who come indeed to enjoy the best that Portugal has to give (and which is a lot), and who respect all the people who live here (whether they are Portuguese of other nationalities), these people, respectful, yes, PLEASE BE (pl.) WELCOME. (35 likes)

Like the original post, this nonmigrant commenter constructs, opposes, and addresses diasporans and nonmigrants while shifting from individual to collective address. In the first two sections, the commenter hails JDS as a singular addressee, with the potentially sarcastic "*caro Jonathan Da Silva*/Dear Jonathan Da Silva." The commenter then uses the second person singular verb forms, "*falas*"/"you speak." She then indirectly quotes JDS' earlier remark, "*que são mais portugueses que alguns portugueses*/that you are more Portuguese than some Portuguese." Here, however, with the use of the plural form *"são"* (you are, pl.), this commenter has transitioned from addressing JDS to addressing all diasporans, a strategy which continues until section 6. In section 3, with, "*alguns de vós, emigrantes, chegam cá, a primeiríssima coisa*

que fazem/some of you, emigrants, arrive here (pl.), the very first thing that you do (pl.)," she lists how a subset of plural "you" always negatively compare Portugal to France. In section 5, she continues with collective address with how "you" (plural) speak French with the pluralized personal infinitive forms (*saberem falar*, *começarem a falar)*, which makes "you" plural (*vós*) look bad.

Much like JDS's post, the commenter uses quotation to vividly enact imagined interactions between specific and collective actors. As seen with address terms, she first directly quotes JDS, before imaginatively quoting what all emigrants habitually say about France being supposedly more advanced (in sections 3 and 6). Section 4 is multiaddressive—it is both a retort to the quoted emigrant voice (about "OUR superior National Security system") and a statement of a supposedly timeless truth to all in the current interaction. Similarly, after she requotes the generic voice complaining that Portugal is behind France, she retorts to collectivized diasporan figures ("what are those emigrants coming to do here? Show off? There are so many like that"). Fusing quoted and quoting frames, she offers what she might say to such quoted diasporans, just as it could address those in the online interaction. We thus see her use this online interaction to both *stylize* and *talk to* all emigrants.

Diasporic Comment to Previous Nonmigrant Commenter and all Nonmigrants

Below we examine the addressivity in a diasporic comment. This commenter also moves from addressing one nonmigrant commenter ("*a minha senhora*"/"ma'am") to addressing and criticizing all nonmigrants. She also requotes portions of the original vlog as part of her rant. Finally, she addresses diasporans affirming her assertiveness to nonmigrants on behalf of herself and all in the diaspora.

Transcript 3

1	Minha senhora estou em França à 26 anos,	Ma'am, I have been in France for 26 years,
2	venho a Portugal 2 a 3 vezes pour ano, tenho casa em Portugal,	I come to Portugal 2-3 times a year, I have a house in Portugal,
3	sou tão portuguesa como os portugueses que vivem em Portugal,	I am as Portuguese as the Portuguese who live in Portugal,
4	mas que eu saiba somos um país livre	but as far as I know we are a free country
5	eu falo português para os portugueses mas também falo o francês com os meus filhos e os meu netos porque é a língua que falamos todo o ano	I speak Portuguese to Portuguese people but I also speak French with my children and my grandchildren because it is the language that we speak the whole year
6	e quem não quiser ouvir que tape os ouvidos	and who ever doesn't want to hear, close your ears,
7	sou tão Portuguesa como a senhora e muitos mais	I am as Portuguese as you, Ma'am, and much more
8	o vosso problema é pensarem que são mais portugueses que os outros	your (pl.) problem is to think (pl.) that you are (pl.) more Portuguese than others
9	alguns de vocês nem nunca saíram de Portugal e são incultos nem conhecem o nosso País	some of you have never left Portugal and are (pl.) uneducated don't even know (pl.) our country
10	e dou lhe um exemple sou açoriana e a primeira vez que vim a Portugal perguntaram veio de comboio ou de carro? Os Açores são uma ilha?	and I am giving you (sing.) an example I am Azorean and the first time that I came to Portugal they asked me did you come by train or car? The Azores are an island?
11	Pelo amor de Deus minha senhora deixem de criticar os outros porque falam uma língua ou outra	For the love of God, ma'am, stop (pl.) criticizing others because they speak one language or another
12	e já que são tão portugueses aprendem a história de Portugal e conheçam o nosso País e os nossos arquipélagos porque alguns são muito ignorantes.	and then you are (pl.) so Portuguese learn (pl.) the history of Portugal and get to know (pl.) our country and our achipelagos because many are very ignorant

13	Eu posso falar o Francês mas conheço o meu país e respeito o meu País a minha língua e a minha cultura. (16 likes)	I can speak French but I know my country my language and my culture (16 likes)

She refuses to be told by a previous commenter that she is not Portuguese, referring to Portugal as "our" and "my" country. She thus makes Portugal a larger whole, which encompasses all diasporic and nonmigrant Portuguese. In section 5, she explains why she and her family sometimes speak French, for reasons other than the arrogance and ostentation often assumed by nonmigrants. She then addresses unspecified nonmigrants with an imperative-like plural form of the subjunctive to "shut their ears" (*e quem não quiser ouvir, que tape os ouvidos* /whoever doesn't want to hear, close your ears). She later addresses a specific commenter "a *minha senhora*/ "ma'am" to whom she claims she is equally Portuguese—paralleling the construction in line 3. The "*senhora*"/"lady" then shifts to nonmigrant Portuguese in general. In sections 8 and 9, she addresses all nonmigrants, with deictic forms that signal address to a pluralized interlocutor (*o vosso problema é pensarem que são*/your (pl.) problem is to think (pl.) that you are (Pl.)).

As in the other comment, the most poignant part comes in sections 11 and 12, where she speaks to one "*senhora,*" to all nonmigrants, and to overhearing diasporic Portuguese. Note her use of the interjection, "*Pelo amor de Deus*"/"For the love of God," followed with the individuating "*minha senhora*"/ "ma'am." She then switches to a plural imperative to all nonmigrants online and in general—"*deixem de criticar*"/ "Stop (pl.) criticizing" others who speak another language (implicitly diasporans). She continues using plural forms that address nonmigrants as a group claiming that they are more ignorant of Portugal than diasporans. Echoing JDS, she argues that diasporans may be more Portuguese than nonmigrants. With these shifts from singular to plural forms, this comment implicitly addresses diasporic Portuguese as a collectivity, which they appear to applaud, as the comment received 16 likes.

Conclusion

These online diasporic and nonmigrant participants work to establish and respond to multiple audiences about the Portugueseness of those in the diaspora, a historically fraught topic. The vlog genre encourages participants to situate themselves in contentious online interaction with interlocutors, imagined to encompass all members of both groups. We examined deictically signaled participant frameworks of ethnonational discourse which involve constructions not only of imagined "we's" (Anderson 1991; Gumperz, 1982; Lee 1997; Silverstein 2000; Urban 2001) but also of the imagined collectivized "you's" such "we's" address. We speculate that the highly interlocutory nature of vlog-based interactions facilitates such collectivized addressivity. By jumping scale from interactions with specific online addressees to all imagined members of the diaspora or homeland, participants use this online platform to engage in a particular "fantasy of telecommunication" (Nozawa 2016), imagining they are addressing everyone in each category, as if all were simultaneously part of the same interaction.

In this vlog-based setting, participants orient to Portugal and France not only as places but also as types of digitally situated interlocutors, who may be more or less specific, generic, and collective. In our materials, the diaspora and homeland are populated by those one might not only talk *about*, but whom one might actually talk *to*, as imagined or actual interlocutors. Participants then treat each interaction as an opportunity to describe, stylize, and address one another as tokens of broad, essentialized types of Portuguese people. Our analysis of these materials provides a key example of how online participants produce a sense of shared and divided imagined ethnonational Portuguese belonging and exclusion in a particular genre of

online interaction. Participation in "light," ephemeral groups, such as those constituted online around shared interests and practices can provide sites where social actors are nonetheless interpellated into seemingly more perduring and consequential group identities (Blommaert and Varis 2015). Strategies of collective addressivity are an important way in which this interpellation can happen.

Interactions on social media can both demonstrate high levels of convergence (Jenkins and Deuz 2006), phatic alignment, and affiliation (Varis and Blommaert 2015) as well as divisiveness and polarization (Fabrício 2014; Lee 2007). As others have noted (Cisneros and Nakayama 2012; Klein 2012; Lange 2014; Brou-Franch and Blivitch 2014), online stranger sociality may provide fertile terrain for conflict to thrive and escalate in particularly divisive and inflammatory ways. It is also clear that vlogs, especially vlogged rants are one type of communicative genre that depends on heavy use of interlocutor-oriented strategies, such as collective addressivity, to engage viewers. Given the popularity of such genres, they may be key contemporary sites where participants invite others to recognize themselves, feel addressed, and then address others as embodiments of social types that can enter into imagined argument. In future work, we plan to explore how widespread such types of collective addressivity are, and the role that they play in allowing people to imagine and inhabit polarized communities online and offline. We will ask whether different genres and participant frameworks are unique or privileged sites for such work, as we continue to explore different ways in which the lives and experiences of diasporans are shaped by immediate and shadow interactions with those whom they address, across "host" and "home" societies.

Acknowledgments

Earlier versions of this article were presented at the 2019 meetings of the American Anthropological Association and the 2020 meetings of the International Communication Association. In addition to our gratitude to anonymous reviewers, we would also like to thank the following people for feedback on earlier versions of this paper: Chantal Tetreault, Erika Hoffman-Dilloway, Jennifer Reynolds, Sarah Hillewaert, Jennifer Sclafani, and Adrienne Lo. All remaining errors are our own.

Notes

1. In everyday speech, many participants conflate the pronunciation of *imigrante* and *emigrante* while clearly discussing emigration.
2. https://www.facebook.com/watch/?v=2132161620375021
3. The terms for this population are themselves contested, in both official and everyday discourse (De La Barre 2002; Pereira 2015a, 2017). "Emigration" has become pejorative, picking up the stigma of emigration itself. We use terms such as diaspora/emigration and diasporan/emigrant interchangeably in order to link to broader discussions in the social sciences about diaspora and (transnational) migration.
4. Indeed, while the phenomenon of online messages reaching multiple, sometimes incongruous audiences, has been called context collapse (Boyd 2014; Davis and Jurgenson 2014; Duguay 2014; Szabla and Blommaert 2018; Vitak 2012), we prefer multiaddressivity, as it links to notions of plural positionalities in discourse, noted by Bakhtin, Goffman, Irvine, and Lempert.
5. Such strategies of collective addressivity differ from merely addressing a plural addressee, which may not necessarily presuppose all members of a social category, but refer to and address a delimited number of people.
6. See Fabricio 2014 for a related discussion of online conflicts between Portuguese and Brazilians over Lusophone identities.
7. Such instances of an ethnonational Portuguese "we" are not unique to online settings. De Oliveira (2012) discusses instances where Portuguese readers claim Jose Saramago's Nobel Prize as "ours."
8. There are of course Portuguese diasporic communities in other parts of the world. Perhaps because of the size of the Portuguese population in France, the stereotypical image of

Portuguese abroad in Portugal has in recent decades been that of the Portuguese in France. In the 19th century, this figure was imagined in Brazil (Matozzi 2016).

References

Acton, Eric K. 2019. "Pragmatics and the Social Life of the English Definite Article." *Language* 95 (1): 37–65.

Agha, Asif. 2006. *Language and Social Relations*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Althusser, Louis. 2001/1970. "Ideology and Ideological State Apparatus (Notes Towards an Investigation)." In *Lenin and philosophy and other essays*. New York: Monthly Review Press.

Anderson, Benedict. 1991. *Imagined Communities: Reflection on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. New York: Versa.

Androutsopoulos, Jannis. 2013. "Participatory Culture and Metalinguistic Discourse: Performing and Negotiating German Dialects on YouTube." *Discourse* 2: 47–71.

Androutsopoulos, Jannis. 2014. "Languaging When Contexts Collapse: Audience Design in Social Networking." *Discourse, Context and Media* 4 (5): 62–73.

Antunes da Cunha, Manuel. 2009. "A (Re)apresentação de Si nos Blogues dos Lusodescendentes de França." In *8th Congresso LUSOCOM*, 182.

Baganha, Maria Ioannis, Góis Pedro. 1999. "Migrações Internacionais de e para Portugal: O Que Sabemos e para Onde Vamos?" *Revista Crítica de Ciências Sociais* 52 (53): 229–80.

Bakhtin, Mikhail. 1981. *The Dialogic Imagination*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Bakhtin, Mikhail. 1986. *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Bauman, Richard, and Charles Briggs. 1990. "Poetics and Performance as Critical Perspectives on Language and Social Life." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 19: 59–88.

Bell, Allan. 1984. "Language Style as Audience Design." *Language in Society* 13: 145–204.

Benveniste, Emile. 1971. *Problems in General Linguistics*. Miami: University of Miami Press.

Bernal, Victoria. 2014. *Nation as Network: Diaspora, Cyberspace and Citizenship*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Besnier, Niko. 2011. *On the Edge of the Global: Modern Anxieties in a Pacific Island Nation*. Stanford University Press.

Billig, Michael. 1995. *Banal Nationalism*. London: Sage.

Blommaert, Jan. 2010. *The Sociolinguistics of Globalization*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Blommaert, Jan. 2015. "Chronotopes, Scales, and Complexity in the Study of Language in Society." *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 44: 105-16

Blommaert, Jan. 2020. "Sociolinguistic Scales in Retrospect." *Applied Linguistics Review*, 1, no. ahead-of-print.

Blommaert, Jan, and Piia Varis. 2015. "Enoughness, Accent and Light Communities: Essays on Contemporary Identities." *Tilburg Papers in Culture Studies* 139: 1–72.

Bou-Franch, Patricia, and Pilar Garcés-Conejos Blitvich. 2014. "Conflict Management in Massive Polylogues: A Case Study from YouTube." *Journal of Pragmatics* 73: 19–36.

Bou-Franch, Patricia, Nuria Lorenzo-Dus, and Pilar Garcés-Conejos Blitvich. 2012. "Social interaction in YouTube Text-Based Polylogues: A Study of Coherence." *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication* 17 (4): 501–21.

Boyd, Michael. 2014. "(New) Participatory Framework on You Tube? Commenter Interaction in US political speeches." *Journal of Pragmatics* 72: 46–58.

Braun, Friederike. 1988. *Terms of Address: Problems of Patterns of Usage in Various Languages and Cultures*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

Brettell, Caroline. 2003. *Anthropology and Migration: Essays on Transnationalism, Ethnicity, and Identity*. Walnut Creek: Altamira.

Brown, Roger, and Alfred Gilman. 1960. "The Pronouns of Power and Solidarity." In *Style in Language*, edited by Thomas Sebeok, 253–76. Boston: MIT Press.

Bucholtz, Mary, and Kira Hall. 1960. "Language and Identity." In *A Companion to Linguistic Anthropology*, edited by A. Duranti, 369–94. Malden, MA: Wiley Blackwell.

Burgess, Jean, and Joshua Green. 2018. *Online Video and Participatory Culture*. John Wiley & Sons.

Cabral, Manuel Villaverde. 2003. "A Identidade Nacional Portuguesa: Conteúdo e Relevância." *Dados* 46 (3): 513–33.

Canagarajah, Suresh, and Peter De Costa. 2016. "Introduction: Scales Analysis, and Its Issues and Prospects in Educational Linguistics." *Linguistics and Education* 34: 1–10.

Carr, Summerson. 2011. *Scripting Addiction: The Politics of Therapeutic Talk and American Sobriety*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
Carr, Summerson, and Michael Lempert. 2016. *Scale*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Carreira, Maria Helena Araújo. 1997. *Modalisation Linguistique en Situation D'interlocution: Proxémique Verbale et Modalités en Portugais* (Vol. 37). Louvain: Peeters Publishers.
Carreira Araújo, Maria. 2004. "Les Formes Allocutives du Portugais Européen : Évolutions, Valeurs et Fonctionnements Discursifs." *Franco-British Studies* 2004: 35–45.
Carvalho, Ana Sofia Abreu de. 2013. "An Overview of Vocatives in European Portuguese." *Linguistica Atlantica* 32: 52–8.
Charbit, Yves, Marie-Antoinette Hily, and Michel Poinard. 1997. *Le Va-et-Vient Identitaire : Migrants Portugais et Villages d'Origine*. Paris: Éditions de l'Harmattan.
Chun, Elaine. 2013. "Ironic Blackness as Masculine Cool: Asian American Language and Authenticity on YouTube." *Applied Linguistics* 34: 592–612.
Chun, Elaine, and Keith Walters. 2011. "Orienting to Arab Orientalisms: Language, Race, and Humor in a YouTube Video." In *Digital Discourse: Language in the New Media*, edited by Crispin Thurlow and Kristine Mroczek, 251–73. New-York: Oxford University Press.
Cintra, Luís Filipe Lindley. 1972. *Sobre "Formas de Tratamento" na Língua Portuguesa: (Ensaios)*. Lisbon: Livros Horizonte.
Cisneros, J. David, and Thomas Nakayama. 2012. "New Media, Old Racisms: Twitter, Miss America, and Cultural Logics of Race." *Journal of International and Intercultural Communication* 8 (2): 108–27.
Cody, Francis. 2011. "Publics and Politics." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 40: 37–52.
Cook, Manuela. 1997. "Uma Teoria de Interpretação de Tratamento na Língua Portuguesa." *Hispania* 80 (3): 451–64.
Cook, Manuela. 2014. "Beyond T and V - Theoretical Reflections on the Analysis of Forms of Address." *American Journal of Linguistics* 3 (1): 17–26.
Credeville, Anne-Elisabeth. 2013. "À *Tu* et à *Vous*, ou la Diachronie des Pronoms d'Adresse à l'Ère du Numérique." *Annales des Mines- Réalités Industrielles* 2: 25–8.
Davis, Jenny L., and Nathan Jurgenson. 2014. "Context Collapse: Theorizing Context Collusions and Collisions." *Information, Communication and Society* 17 (4): 476–85.
De la Barre, Jorge. 2002. "Luso-descendant : Le Terme en Question." *Recherches en Anthropologie au Portugal* 9 (1): 13–22.
De Villanova, Roselyne, Carolina Leite, and Isabel Raposo. 1994. *Maisons de Rêve au Portugal*. Creaphis Editions.
Dick, Hilary. 2010. "Imagined Lives and Modernist Chronotopes in Mexican Nonmigrant Discourse." *American Ethnologist* 37 (2): 275–90.
Dick, Hilary. 2018. *Words of Passage: National Longing and the Imagined Lives of Mexican Migrants*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
Dori-Hacohen, Gonen. 2014. "Establishing Social Groups in Hebrew: 'We' in Political Radio Phone-In Programs." In *Constructing Collectivity: 'We' across Languages and Contexts*, edited by S. Pavlidou, 187–206. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Dos Santos, Irene Strijdhorst. 2010. *Les Brumes de la Mémoire : Expérience Migratoire et Quête Identitaire de Descendants de Portugais de France*. Doctoral thesis. Paris: École des Hautes Etudes en Sciences Sociales.
Duarte, Isabel Margarida. 2010. "Formas de Tratamento: Item Gramatical no Ensino do Português Língua Materna." In *Gramática: História, Teorias, Aplicações*, edited by AM Brito, 133–46. Porto: Universidade do Porto.
Duguay, Stefanie. 2014. "'He has a Way Gayer Facebook than I Do': Investigating Sexual Identity Disclosure on a Social Networking Site." *New Media and Society* 18 (6): 891–907.
Fabricio, Branca Falabella. 2014. "The Pragmatics of Entextualizing a Digital Lusophone Territory." *Working Papers in Urban Languages and Literacies* 134: 2–17.
Feldman-Bianco, Bela. 1992. "Multiple Layers of Time and Space: The Construction of Class, Ethnicity, and Nationalism among Portuguese Immigrants." *Annals of New York Academy of Science* 145–74.
Fernandes, Martine. 2007. "'Miki-le-toss ou Comment Repérer un Guech en Quelques Leçons' : l'Identité Ethnique 'Tos' en France à Travers les Blogs de Jeunes Lusodescendants." *PORTAL Journal of Multidisciplinary International Studies* 4 (2).
Flowers, Katherine. In Press. "Upscaling and Downscaling: Negotiating Scale in the English Only Movement." *Journal of Sociolinguistics*.
Fornel, Michel de. 1986. "Sociopragmatique des Pronoms Personnels et Inférence Conversationnelle." *Études de Linguistique Appliquée.* 63: 22–39.

Fornel, Michel de. 1994. "Pluralisation de la Personne et Variation Pronominale." *Faits de Langue* 3 (1): 185–92.
Froebenius, Maximiliane. 2014. "Audience Design in Monologues: How Vloggers Involve their Viewers." *Journal of Pragmatics* 72: 59–72.
Gal, Susan. 2006. "Contradictions of Standard Language in Europe: Implications for the Study of Practices and Publics." *Social Anthropology* 14: 163–81.
Gal, Susan, and Judith T. Irvine. 2019. *Signs of Difference: Language and Ideology in Social Life*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
Gal, Susan, and Kathryn Woolard. 2001. *Languages and Publics: The Making of Authority*. Manchester: Saint Jerome's.
Gardner-Chloros, Penelope. 1991. "Neither Tu nor Vous: Principles and Paradoxes in the Usage of Allocution Pronouns in Contemporary French." *Journal of French Language Studies* 1 (2): 139–55.
Gardner-Chloros, Penelope. 2003–2004. "The Historical Development of T/V in French and English: Parallels and Divergences". *Franco-British Studies*. 33–34: 90–8.
Gelman, Susan. 2003. *The Essential Child: Origins of Essentialism in Everyday Thought*. New York: Oxford University Press.
Goffman, Erving. 1979. "Footing." *Semiotica* 25 (1–2).
Gonçalves, Albertino. 1996. *Imagens e Clivagens: Os Emigrantes Face aos Residentes*. Porto: Afrontamento.
Goodwin, Marjorie Harness. 1990. *He Said-She-Said: Talk as Social Organization among Black Children*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
Gouveia, Carlos. 2008. "As Dimensões da Mudança no Uso das Formas de Tratamento em Português Europeu." In *O Fascínio da Linguagem*, edited by IM Duarte and F Oliveira, 91–100. Porto: Universidade do Porto.
Gumperz, John. 1982. *Discourse Strategies*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
Habermas, Jurgen. 1991. *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
Hanks, William. 1990. *Referential Practice: Language and Lived Space among the Maya*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Haviland, John. 1996. "Projections, Transpositions, and Relativity." In *Rethinking Linguistic Relativity*, edited by J. Gumperz and S. Levinson, 271–324. New York: Cambridge.
Irvine, Judith T. 1996. "Shadow Conversations." In *Natural Histories of Discourse*, edited by G. Urban and M. Silverstein. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Jaworski, Adam, and Dariusz Galasínski. 2000. "Vocative Address Forms and Ideological Legitimization in Political Debates." *Discourse Studies* 2 (1): 35–53.
Jenkins, Henry, and Mark Deuze. 2006. *Convergence Culture*. vol. 259. New York: New York University Press.
Jones, Graham, and Bambi Schieffelin. 2009. "Talking Text and Talking Back: My BFF Jill from Boob Tube to YouTube." *Journal of Computer Mediated Communication* 14 (4): 1050–79.
Klein, Adam. 2012. "Slipping Racism into the Mainstream: A Theory of Information Laundering." *Communication Theory* 22: 427–48.
Klimt, Andrea, and Stephen Lubkemann. 2002. "Argument across the Portuguese-speaking World." *Diaspora* 145–62.
Koven, Michele. 2004. "Transnational Perspectives on Sociolinguistic Capital among Luso-descendants in France and Portugal." *American Ethnologist* 31 (2): 270–90.
Koven, Michele. 2007. *Selves in Two Languages: Bilinguals' Verbal Enactments of Identity in French and Portuguese*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Koven, Michele. 2009. "Managing Relationships and Identities through Forms of Address: What French-Portuguese Bilinguals call their Parents in each Language." *Language and Communication* 29 (4): 343–65.
Koven, Michele. 2013. "Speaking French in Portugal: An Analysis of Contested Models of Emigrant Personhood in Narratives about Return Migration and Language Use." *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 17 (3): 324–54.
Koven, Michele. 2016. "Essentialization Strategies in the Storytellings of Young Luso-Descendant Women in France: Narrative Calibration, Voicing, and Scale." *Language and Communication* 46: 19–29.
Koven, Michele. 2019. "Narrating Desire for Place: Chronotopes of Desire for the Portuguese Homeland Before and After "Return"." In *Discourses of Identity in Liminal Places and Spaces*, edited by Roberta Piazza, 42–63. New York: Routledge.

Koven, Michele, and Isabelle Simões Marques. 2015. "Performing and Evaluating (Non)-modernities of Portuguese Migrant Figures on YouTube: The Case of Antonio de Carglouch." *Language in Society* 44 (2): 213–42.
Koven, Michele, and Isabelle Simões Marques. 2017. "Enacting the Multiple Spaces and Times of Portuguese Migration to France in YouTube Humor: Chronotopic Analysis of Ro et Cut's Vamos a Portugal." *Interdisciplinary Journal of Portuguese Diaspora Studies.* 6: 95–118.
LaDousa, Chaise. 2014. "Subject to Address in a Digital Literacy Initiative: Neoliberal Agency and the Promises and Predicaments of Participation." *Signs and Society* 2 (2): 203–29.
Lambrecht, Knud. 1996. "On the Formal and Functional Relationship between Topics and Vocatives. Evidence from French." In *Conceptual Structure, Discourse, and Language*, 267-88. Stanford: CSLI Publications.
Lange, Patricia. 2014. "Commenting on YouTube Rants: Perceptions of Inappropriateness or Civic Engagement?" *Journal of Pragmatics* 73: 53–65.
Lee, Ben. 1997. *Talking Heads: Language, Metalanguage, and the Semiotics of Subjectivity*. Chapel Hill: Duke University Press.
Lee, Eun-Ju. 2007. "Deindividuation Effects on Group Polarization in Computer-Mediated Communication: The Role of Group Identification, Public Self-Awareness, and Perceived Argument Quality." *Journal of Communication* 57 (2): 385–403.
Lempert, Michael. 2009. "On Flip-Flopping: Branded Stance-Taking in US Electoral Politics." *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 13 (2): 222–47.
Lempert, Michael. 2011. "Avoiding 'the Issues' as Addressivity in US Electoral Politics." *Anthropological Quarterly* 84 (1): 187–207.
Lempert, Michael. 2016. "Interaction Rescaled: How Buddhist Debate Became a Diasporic Pedagogy." In *Scale*, edited by S. Carr and M. Lempert. Berkeley: University of California Press.
Lempert, Michael, and Michael Silverstein. 2012. *Creatures of Politics: Media, Message, and the American Presidency*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
Leppänen, Sirpa, and Ari Häkkinen. 2012. "Buffalaxed Superdiversity: Representations of the Other on YouTube." *Diversities* 14 (2): 17–33.
Levinson, Steven. 1983. *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Lourenço, Eduardo. 1992. *O Labirinto da Saudade: Psicanálise do Destino Português*. Lisbon: Dom Quixote.
Lubkemann, Stephen C. 2002. "The Moral Economy of Portuguese Postcolonial Return." *Diaspora: A Journal of Transnational Studies* 11 (2): 189–213.
Manning, Paul. 2008. "Barista Rants about Stupid Customers at Starbucks: What Imaginary Conversations Can Teach Us about Real Ones." *Language and Communication* 28 (2): 101–26.
Marques, Isabelle Simões, and Michele Koven. 2017. "'We are Going to Our Portuguese Homeland!' French Luso-descendants' Diasporic Facebook Conarrations of Vacation Return Trips to Portugal." *Narrative Inquiry* 27 (2): 286–310.
Matozzi, Martina. 2016. *Portugueses de Torna-viagem. A Representação da Emigração na Literatura Portuguesa*. Doctoral Thesis. Coimbra: Universidade de Coimbra.
McIntosh, Janet. 2018. "Essentialism." *In The International Encyclopedia of Anthropology*." Edited by Hilary Callan. Malden MA: John Wiley and Sons.
Miller, Peggy J., Heidi Fung, and Judith Mintz. 1996. "Self-Construction through Narrative Practices: A Chinese and American Comparison of Early Socialization." *Ethos* 24 (2): 237–80.
Morford, Janet. 1997. "Social Indexicality in French Pronominal Address." *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 7 (1): 3–37.
Morgan, Marcyliena. 1991. "Indirectness and Interpretation in African-American Women's Discourse." *Pragmatics* 1 (4): 421–51.
Nakassis, Contantine. 2017. *Doing Style: Youth and Mass Mediation in South India*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Noivo, Edite. 2002. "Towards a Cartography of Portugueseness: Challenging the Hegemonic Center." *Diaspora: A Journal of Transnational Studies* 11 (2): 255–75.
Nozawa, Shunsuke. 2016. "Life Encapsulated: Addressivity in Japanese Life Writing." *Language and Communication* 46: 95–105.
Oliveira, Sandi Michele de. 2005. "Retrospective on Address in Portugal." *Journal of Historical Pragmatics* 6 (2): 307–23.
Pavlidou, Theodossia-Soula. 2014. *Constructing Collectivity: 'We' across Languages and Contexts*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Pereira, Victor. 2010. "Do Povo à Comunidade. Os Emigrantes no Imaginário Português." In *Como se Faz um Povo: Ensaios em História Contemporânea de Portugal*. Edited by J. Neves, 139-52. Lisbon: Tinta-da-china.

Pereira, Victor. 2015a. "Portuguese Migrants and Portugal: Elite discourse and Transnational Practices." In *A Century of Transnationalism: Immigrants and their Homeland Connections*, edited by N. Green and R. Waldinger, 56–83. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
Pereira, Victor. 2015b. "'Portugalidade' para Exportação? Emigração e 'Comunidades Portuguesas'." In *Este País não Existe: Textos contra Ideias-Feitas*, edited by Bruno Monteiro and Nuno Domingos, 23–32. Rainha and Neves: LDA.
Pereira, Victor. 2017. "La mémoire de l'émigration portugaise: une memoire de héros?" *Hommes et Migrations* 1317–1318: 37–43.
Pires, Mat. 2004. "Usage and Strategic Functions of the Tu-Form in Written French." *Langage et Société* 108 (2): 27–56.
Preto-Rodas, Richard. 1972. "Some Examples of Pronominal Confusion in Modern Peninsular Portuguese." *Hispania* 55 (2): 327–30.
Reyes, Angela. 2004. "Asian-American Stereotypes as Circulating Resource." *Pragmatics* 14 (2–3): 173–92.
Reyes, Angela. 2017. "Inventing Postcolonial Elites: Race, Language, Mix, Excess." *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 27 (2): 210–31.
Rodrigues-Ruivo, Jorge. 2001. *Portugais et Population d'Origine Portugaise en France*. Paris: Éditions de l'Harmattan.
Sardinha, João. 2011. "'Returning' Second-Generation Portuguese-Canadians and Portuguese-French: Motivations and Senses of Belonging." *Journal of Mediterranean Studies* 20 (2): 231–54.
Schegloff, Emanuel. 2001. "Discourse as an Interactional Achievement III: The Omnirelevance of Action." In *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*, edited by D. Schiffrin, D. Tannen, and H. Hamilton, 229–49. Malden, MA: Wiley Blackwell.
Serrão, Joel. 1971. *Emigração Portuguesa: Sondagem Histórica*. Lisbon: Livros Horizonte.
Silva, Augusto Santos. 2018. "Como abordar a identidade nacional portuguesa?" *Todas as Artes* 1 (1).
Silverstein, Michael. 1993. "Metapragmatic Discourse and Metapragmatic Function." In *Reflexive Language*, edited by John Lucy, 33–58. New York: Cambridge University Press.
Silverstein, Michael. 1976. "Shifters, Linguistic Categories, and Cultural Description." In *Meaning in Anthropology*, edited by Keith Basso, and H. Selby, 11–55. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.
Silverstein, Michael. 2000. "Whorfianism and the Linguistic Imagination of Nationality." In *Regimes of Language: Ideologies, Polities, and Identities*, edited by Paul Kroskrity, 85–138. Albuquerque: School of Advanced Research.
Silverstein, Michael. 2003. "Indexical Order and the Dialectics of Sociolinguistic Life." *Language and Communication* 23 (3–4): 193–229.
Szabla, Malgorzata, and Jan Blommaert. 2018. "Does Context Really Collapse in Social Media Interaction?" *Applied Linguistics Review* 11 (2): 251–79.
Uitermark, Justus. 2002. "Rescaling, 'Scale Fragmentation' and the Regulation of Antagonistic Relationships." *Human Geography* 26 (6): 743–65.
Urban, Greg. 2001. *Metaculture: How Culture Moves through the World*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
Varis, Piia, and Jan Blommaert. 2015. "Conviviality and Collectives on Social Media: Virality, Memes, and New Social Structures." *Multilingual Margins* 2 (1): 31–45.
Vidali-Spitulnik, Debra. 2010. "Milennial Encounters with Mainstream Television News: Excess, Void, and Points of Engagement." *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 20 (2): 372–88.
Vitak, Jessica. 2012. "The Impact of Context Collapse and Privacy on Social Network Site Disclosures." *Journal of Broadcasting and Electronic Media* 56 (4): 451–70.
Vrooman, Steven. 2002. "The Art of Invective: Performing Identity in Cyberspace." *New Media and Society* 4 (1): 51–70.
Wagner, Lauren. 2017. *Becoming Diasporically Moroccan*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
Wagner, Martine, and Michele Koven. 2017. "Luso-France: Cultural Productions by and about the Portuguese and Luso-Descendants in France." *Interdisciplinary Journal of Portuguese Diaspora Studies* 6: 7–20.
Walkley, Amelia. 2010. "Typing Friendship into Being: Vocatives in Facebook Wall-to-Wall Conversations." Bachelor of Arts Thesis. University of Sydney.
Warner, Michael. 2002. "Publics and Counterpublics." *Public Culture* 14 (1): 49–90.
Werner, Erich Alan. 2012. "Rants, Reactions, and other Rhetorics: Genres of the YouTube Vlog." Doctoral Dissertation, The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.
Wesch, Michael. 2009. "YouTube and You: Experiences of Self-Awareness in the Context Collapse of the Recording Webcam." *Explorations in Media Ecology* 8 (2): 19–34.

Wortham, Stanton. 1996. "Mapping Participant Deictics: A Technique for Discovering Speakers' Footing." *Journal of Pragmatics* 25 (3): 331–48.
Wortham, Stanton. 2012. "Beyond Macro and Micro in the Linguistic Anthropology of Education." *Anthropology and Education Quarterly* 43 (2): 128–37.
Yeh, Rihan. 2018. *Passing: Two Publics in a Mexican Border City*. University of Chicago Press.
Zhang, Leticia-Tian, and Sumin Zhao. 2020. "Diaspora Micro-influencers and COVID-19 Communication on Social Media: The Case of Chinese-speaking YouTube Vloggers." *Multilingua* 1, no. ahead-of-print.
Zwicky, Arnold. 1974. "'Hey, Whatsyourname!'" *Chicago Linguistic Society* 10 (78): 7–801.