Article / Artigo

What Portuguese as a Foreign Language tells us about forms of address: an analysis of discourses of legitimation

O que Português Língua Estrangeira nos diz sobre formas de tratamento: uma análise de discursos de legitimação

Rita Faria ID

Universidade Católica Portuguesa, Portugal

rita.faria@ucp.pt

https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9854-7164

Abstract

This study examines how didactic materials of Portuguese as a Foreign Language (textbooks, grammars) describe forms of address in European Portuguese and the discourses they postulate to legitimise verbal addressive behaviour, in particular when it comes to the pronoun *você*. The main findings are: textbooks and grammars legitimise the usage of *você* whilst excluding *vós,* despite the fact that some acknowledge the ambiguous status of *você* as neither a T nor a V form; the complexity and instability of the system of forms of address means that they are present in textbooks primarily apropos of other linguistic content (grammatical items such as verb conjugations, speech acts such as requests, introductions, greeting), usually precluding the field of Portuguese as a Foreign Language from postulating clear, transparent explanations guiding foreign learners in how to address others.

Keywords: Addressive behaviour • Pragmatics • Fluidity • Standard Portuguese

Resumo

Este estudo centra-se em materiais didácticos de Português Língua Estrangeira (manuais, gramáticas) de modo a analisar como estes apresentam as formas de tratamento em português europeu, bem como os discursos que estes materiais postulam e que legitimam comportamentos verbais de tratamento do

LINHA D'ÁGUA

interlocutor, em particular o uso do pronome *você*. As principais conclusões são: os manuais e gramáticas analisados legitimam o uso de *você*, excluindo *vós*, apesar de algum deste material reconhecer a ambiguidade deste pronome, categorizado como nem T, nem V; a complexidade e a instabilidade do sistema de formas de tratamento significa que estas últimas estão presentes nos manuais indiretamente, por via de outros conteúdos linguísticos (áreas gramaticais como conjugação de verbos, atos de fala como pedidos, apresentações, cumprimentos), o que normalmente não permite explicações claras e transparentes sobre o tratamento linguístico.

Palavras-chave: Formas de tratamento • Pragmática • Fluidez • Português padrão

Introduction

Forms of address in European Portuguese (henceforth European Pt.) are the site of a "linguistic struggle" (Watts, 2003), whereby speakers disagree on the basic tenets governing their use. The contentious nature of Portuguese forms of address is acknowledged by the considerable literature on the subject (Carreira, 1997, 2001, 2003, 2005; Cook, 2013, 2019; Duarte, 2010, 2011; Faraco, 2017/1996; Gouveia, 2008, 2017; Hammermüller, 2020; Hummel, 2019, 2020; Lara; Guilherme, 2018; Lopes, 2019; Lopes; Mota, 2019; Lopes et al., 2021; Marques; Duarte, 2019; Oliveira, 1994, 2009, 2013, etc.), highlighting not only the grammatical intricacy of a threefold system of address encompassing pronominal, verb and nominal forms but also its pragmatic and discursive complexity, mainly crystallised in the pronoun *você*.

In view of this complexity and the mismatch between grammar and discourse it evinces, this paper makes a contribution to the study of forms of address in European Pt. by analysing how these forms are present in textbooks and other didactic materials (grammars and exam compilations) pertaining to the field of Portuguese as a Foreign Language (henceforth PFL). Given that the aim of textbooks and didactic materials in the classroom is to facilitate a route to objective language learning (Littlejohn, 1998), these materials are vital aids in the process of helping foreign learners navigate complex aspects of the language, such as forms of address. In the process of doing so, textbooks effectively establish a "discourse of legitimation" (Van Leeuwen, 2008) and authority framing the use of forms of address, in other words, telling speakers how and when to use these forms and to whom they should be used. This study focuses on this discourse of legitimation in order to further our understanding of the deeply interpersonal linguistic items that are forms of address in European Pt.

The following section examines and discusses the most important literature supporting this research and discusses the challenges that the current system of address in European Pt. poses for the field of PFL. Section 2 puts forwards the methodology and the corpus of analysis, followed by a discussion of the results before concluding with final remarks.

1 Literature Review: forms of address in European Portuguese and its challenges for the field of Portuguese as a Foreign Language

Forms of address in European Pt. highlight a mismatch between grammar and discourse in the sense that the tripartite distinction of pronominal, nominal and verb forms effectively consists of the use of the morphological 3rd person with an addressive (that is, a 2nd person) meaning in order to discursively represent the interlocutor. Carreira (1997, 2001, 2003, 2005) therefore differentiates between an "elocutive" dimension (the speaker – I/We), a "delocutive" dimension (the third person(s) to whom the speaker refers – They) and an "alocutive" meaning designating interlocutors, those whom the speaker addresses – You. The intricacy of the Portuguese system lies in the fact that the delocutive (or morphological) 3rd person often bears an "alocutive", or addressive, 2nd person meaning, thus offering "a prime example of the codification of indirectness" (Carreira, 2005, p. 313) and allowing for a granulated linguistic rendering of interlocutors. In our view, it is this possibility of a nuanced linguistic representation of the interlocutor, offering an array of variegated choices, that leads to disagreement amongst speakers and originates a "discursive struggle" (Watts, 2003), effectively preventing consensus about the criteria that govern or should govern forms of address (especially when it comes to the pronoun *você,* to which we shall return later).

Following Cintra's 1972 seminal work on Portuguese forms of address, the tripartite morphological system now in place is as follows (Table 1):

Table 1. Bound forms of address in European Pt.

Form:	Singular	Plural
Pronominal	*Tu* + 2nd p. *Você* + 3rd p.	*Vocês* + 3rd p.
Verb	2nd p. *pro-drop*	3rd p. *pro-drop*
Nominal	Nominal form + 3rd p.	Nominal form + 3rd p.

Source: based on Cintra (1972).

The Table 1 includes only "bound" forms, following Braun's 1988 terminology – that is, syntactically bound forms which are "integrated parts of sentences", unlike syntactically free forms such as vocatives, which come from outside the sentence. It says nothing about the pragmatics of forms of address, which is a cumbersome affair mainly because Portuguese address cannot be subsumed under the T/V distinction posited by Brown and Gilman (1960),

whereby T forms denote familiarity and V forms include distance and/or polite forms. Clearly, there seem to be other factors at play triggering the need for a tripartite system, preventing a clear-cut, neat distinction between familiarity and polite distance. So much so that Cook (1997, 2013, 2019) postulates a dimension of neutrality (N) to add to the T and V forms – a "mode of neutrality" whose fundamental *raison d'être* would be the avoidance of T and V and a strategic "out", thus minimising commitment to addressive behaviour of familiarity, or indeed distance and/or politeness. Due to its "semantic void" (Cook, 2013) yet clearly addressive meaning, the pronoun *você* would be a likely candidate to the N platform.

As Cintra (1972) elucidates, the proliferation of addressive nominal forms brings enormous consequences to the system of European Pt. address, paving the way for the aforementioned discursive struggle. Nominal forms are not only responsible for a dominant 3rd p. effectively surpassing the literal, grammatical 2nd p. address conveyed by *tu* and respective 2nd p. verbs, but are also the reason for the existence of the pronoun *você*, a grammaticalised form derived from the phonological reduction and the semantic bleaching of the original *Vossa Mercê. Você* is therefore a hybrid, described by Cintra (1972) and Cunha and Cintra (1984) as a "pronoun of address" in order to distinguish it from canonical personal pronouns (such as *tu*). Another consequence of the expansion of nominal forms which, Cintra (1972) informs us, started as early as the 14th century, is the obsolescence of the 2nd p. plural pronoun *vós,* which originally doubled as a V form, similarly to the system still maintained in French, but which is now "increasingly rare and regionally restricted" (Oliveira, 2013, p. 291) in Portuguese. However, and to complicate matters further, *vós* not only remains as a dialectal 2nd p. plural feature in parts of Portugal, its V semantics is still an affordance to which some speakers resort in specific situational settings (about the current usage of *vós*, see Manole (2021) and Marques and Duarte (2019)). As Hammermuller (2020) highlights, even the form *vossemecê*, an antecedent of *você* before it became fully contracted, is kept in some local varieties as a V pronoun; further corroborating the intricate interplay between morphology and pragmatics affecting Portuguese forms of address is the case of the unstressed accusative pronoun *vos* and the 2nd p. plural genitive pronoun *vosso/vossos* – whilst the loss of *vós* caused the respective loss of 2nd p. plural verb forms (Martins, 2016), it left its correspondent 2nd p. plural accusative and possessive pronouns behind (Manole, 2021).

Attempting to underpin the pragmatic criteria governing these forms of address, or how they are realised in discourse in real-life situations, is thus no easy task not only due to the aforementioned grammatical changes establishing the domain of an addressive 3rd person but also because of two other aspects: the "substantive" semantics (Cintra, 1972) of nominal forms applicable to a variety of different contextual settings and interlocutors, on the one hand, and the ambiguous status of *você,* on the other. The origins of this pronoun as a nominal form explain the grammatical agreement with the 3rd p., which we would not expect from an alocutive pronoun, and pose an initial difficulty for any foreign learner of the language. The now tenuous connection to the substantive semantics of a nominal form also explains why *você* is not a T form, although its status as a V form (if V is taken to denote politeness) is also doubtful. Indeed,

Braun (1988, p. 43) highlights *você* as evidence for the fact that the V dimension does not always mark politeness, since this pronoun, clearly not a T form, is nevertheless unsuitable to communicate politeness:

> In standard Portuguese, the V pronoun *você* is not particularly polite, when opposed to third person "verbal" address or indirect address […]. It is frequently associated with inferiority or juniority on the addressee's part […]. Hence, defining V pronouns on the basis of politeness is not always adequate.

The fact that the usage of *você* may index the "inferiority or juniority" of the addressee can begin to explain the connotations of impoliteness sometimes associated to this form. Norrby and Warren (2012) correctly elucidate:

> … speakers of the same language do not necessarily share the same sociolinguistic rules. Instead, people tend to operate according to a range of personal options, and different groups in society might abide by different norms of use. (Norrby; Warren, 2012, p. 227)

We venture to guess that this is what happens with the usage of the pronoun *você* and explains the discursive struggle it originates – most speakers would agree it is not a T form, but when entering the realm of the V dimension, *você* seems not V enough for some, whilst perfectly acceptable as a V form for many other speakers. Different speakers follow different "personal options" and, on a larger scale, different sociolinguistic rules depending on which social group they identify with. It is because *você* seems so permeable to these dissimilar understandings that many scholars highlight the potentially impolite or offensive undertones of this form: Oliveira (2013, p. 306) defines *você* as a V pronoun which is nevertheless "conventionally considered impolite by many speakers, who generally avoid its use"; Carreira (2003) avers that this pronoun "often provokes muted or explosive tensions", especially when used to address "middle-aged and elderly speakers or speakers from higher social strata;"[1] Duarte (2011, p. 87) states that "in varieties closer to the standard norm, *você* is almost unacceptable and generally felt to be rude or at least not polite" ("Nas variedades mais próximas da norma, o «você» é quase inadmissível, geralmente sentido como grosseiro ou, pelo menos, pouco cortês").

Cunha and Cintra (1984) do not allude to any offensive or impolite tones of *você* but reiterate the parameter of social class and make it clear that the acceptability of this form is restricted to the following contexts:

> É este último valor, de tratamento igualitário ou de superior para inferior (em idade, em classe social, em hierarquia), **e apenas este**, o que você possui no português normal europeu, onde só excepcionalmente – e em certas camadas sociais altas – aparece usado de forma carinhosa de intimidade. No português de Portugal **não é ainda possível**, apesar de certo alargamento recente do seu

---

[1] The original text in French extracted from Carreira (2003) is: "[...] l'extension de l'emploi de você au Portugal, surtout parmi les jeunes et dans des couches socialement inférieures voire moyennes, provoque souvent des tensions sourdes ou explosives chez des allocutaires d'âge moyen ou avancé ou chez des allocutaires de couches sociales plutôt élevées."

emprego, usar *você* de inferior para superior, em idade, classes social, ou hierarquia. (Cunha; Cintra, 1984, p. 211)

[It is this last meaning, of address between equals or from superior to inferior (in age, in social class, in hierarchy), **and this meaning only**, that *você* has in normal European Portuguese, where only exceptionally - and in certain high social strata - it is used as an affectionate form of intimacy. In Portuguese from Portugal **it is not yet possible** to use *você* from inferior to superior in age, social class or hierarchy, despite a recent expansion of its usage.]

The assertive nature of the excerpt above is a prime example of prescriptive language, in particular when it states that a certain addressive behaviour (in this case, *você* from inferior to superior) is "not possible." It also highlights the apparent fluidity of forms of address in European Pt. and the difficulty in underpinning the parameters governing their usage – while attempting to provide strict, prescriptive contexts regulating the usage of *você,* the excerpt allows for the caveats that this usage has been expanding and that in certain upper-class circles it is used as a familiarity term.

Cook (2013, p. 213), however, prefers to focus on the fact that the status of *você* has indeed been expanding because it "has been improving for decades" – that this form is still in frequent use today seems to attest to this somewhat pragmatic amelioration of *você,* although any attempt to define its semantics of politeness or indeed impoliteness faces the (for now) unsurmountable problem that the interpersonal and pragmatic criteria governing the usage of *você* are simply too unstable to underpin (this is the conclusion to which Guilherme and Bermejo (2015) and, similarly, also Lara and Guilherme (2018) come when attempting to establish the politeness of *você*).

In view of this, the most sensible observation about this pronoun comes from Gouveia (2008, p. 94), who avers that "there is no easy consensus pertaining to the definition and description of the contexts of the usage of *você* and the social variables associated with them" ("não se chega facilmente a um consenso relativamente à definição e descrição dos contextos de uso de você e das variáveis sociais a eles associados."). Perhaps the reason such consensus has not been reached has something to do with what the same author puts forward in 2017 – that the usage of forms of address in contemporary European Pt. is often governed by individual choices pertaining to performative identities overruling pre-established normative parameters effectively framing and controlling interpersonal relationships. This is not too different from the patterns of negotiation described by Oliveira (1994, 2009, 2013), which are also founded on an acknowledgement of a "paradigm shift from essentialist to constructivist notions of identity" (Oliveira, 2009, p. 418). More performative identities cannot always conform to conventionalised, normative modes of addressing others – hence:

[…] when "a speaker feels that the address forms being exchanged no longer adequately represent the developing relationship between the two, she may make use of one or more strategies of negotiation, thus instigating a move from conventionalized to negotiated usage. (Oliveira, 2009, p. 421)

LINHA D'ÁGUA

The challenge that the system of address forms in European Pt. currently faces is thus the reconciliation between a pull for more individual, negotiated addressive behaviours corresponding to specific interactions where identities are performed and a pull for the maintenance of a complex morphology–pragmatics interface where the abundance of choice and the presence of the V semantics of nominal forms allows for the conventionalised expression of deference, rank and normative politeness in general. These two different driving forces (negotiation and performativity on the one hand, norm and convention on the other hand) are well encapsulated by Faraco (2017/1996, p. 120) when he refers to a "crisis of address" affecting the Portuguese system and further adds a quote by Brown and Gilman (1960) clarifying that "[i]n a fluid society crises of address will occur more frequently than in a static society." Faraco (2017/1996) echoes Cintra's 1972 explanation for this "fluidity" by mentioning the V semantics of nominal forms allowing for "specialised" address, which pronominal address, specifically *você,* renders impossible, conducive as it is to a levelling out of addressive behaviour. This should make us pay renewed attention to Carreira's (2003) aforementioned observation that, on a par with age, it is social class that encumbers the usage of *você*. In our view, this form is often rejected or avoided perhaps because it can be seen as strategic avoidance of the deference which would be conveyed by a specialised nominal form containing, for example, titles and/or honorifics.

Similarly, Hummel (2020) reinforces the importance of social class and age by analysing the common Portuguese saying that *você* "belongs in a stable" ("*você* é de estrebaria") and concluding that, because *você* can be in competition with the form *tu* for a value of solidarity amongst equals of a younger age, older speakers of higher social strata were prompted to reject the form so as to emphasise their different status:

> Você also acquires a special value of solidarity (in competition with the use of tu?) among (mostly younger) equals that prompted older generations and/or many higher status individuals to label this as estrebaria. (Hummel, 2020, p. 274)

In keeping with the importance of social class and social roles, Lopes (2019) points out that the reason why *você* has become a non-marked, semantically neutral form in Brazil has to do with social changes promoting class mobility starting in the 1930s (see also Lopes; Mota (2019) and Lopes et al. (2021) for a further elaboration of the changes to the Brazilian and Portuguese systems of address) – not so in Portugal, where the consequences brought by the 1974 "Carnation" Revolution have not yet caused such social transformation and mobility which are enough to tone down or indeed "neutralise" the complex interpersonal relations reflected in an equally complex system of linguistic address.

The European Pt. system of forms of address is therefore complex not only from the lenses of its intricate morphology–pragmatics interface but also from the perspective of the interpersonal criteria, such as age and prominently social class, which interfere with its actual realisation in real-life interactions. As regulators of intersubjective relations (Duarte, 2010, p. 135), forms of address are thus a matter of interest in the process of teaching and learning

Portuguese as a foreign language. Oliveira (1994, p. 32) correctly points out that people are not only aware of and note how they are addressed, but they also tend to notice an "abrupt departure from the norm"; therefore, forms of address in European Pt. should be "concerns of foreigners, who must learn to pay as much attention to these issues as native speakers do". Indeed, Duarte (2010) argues that forms of address are an education/pedagogic issue not specifically for PFL, but in the realm of Portuguese as a First Language itself, given the linguistic instability causing the uncertainty amongst speakers discussed elsewhere in this study. Silva and Wiśniewska (2021), who also analyse forms of address in PFL textbooks used in Poland, aver that the triadic partition of the Portuguese system (*tu* for intimacy, *você* as a transition form – neither T nor V – and nominal forms for politeness) must be "clearly" and "explicitly" taught to learners; the question remains whether textbooks are able to do so.

If navigating the system of address is no easy task for native speakers, it is certainly no smooth sailing for foreign learners either. A case in point is Botelho de Amaral's 1947 observations cited in Odber de Baubeta (1992; my emphasis):

> Considero que a língua portuguesa é rica demais quanto a formas, fórmulas, jeitos e processos de tratamento [...] porque **a abundância de obstáculos não apenas se opõe aos estrangeiros dispostos a aprender a falar ou a escrever o nosso idioma** [...] **inclusivamente, dificulta o acesso dos próprios Portugueses ao conhecimento seguro** ou correcto da técnica de tratamento. (Botelho de Amaral, 1947, in Odber de Baubeta, 1992, p. 105)

> [I believe that the Portuguese language is too rich in forms, formulae, manners and processes of address [...] because **the abundance of obstacles not only opposes foreigners willing to learn how to speak or write our language** [...] it also hinders **the access of the Portuguese themselves to the safe, correct knowledge** of the addressive technique.]

This state of insecurity of both native and foreign speakers concerning how to address others in European Pt. comes from the aforementioned lack of consensus of how to use these forms, which in turn may derive from the fact that Standard European Portuguese is itself unsure of how to frame (and hence, teach) forms of address. Before proceeding any further, this study focuses on European Pt. and thus a consideration of the challenges posited by the pluricentric nature of Portuguese falls beyond its scope. However, a "pluricentric codification of a (increasingly) pluricentric language" (Soares da silva, 2020, p. 679) in an increasingly globalised world is undoubtedly a challenge that studies in the field of PFL must address, specifically when it comes to forms of address (see also Banza, 2021, Soares da Silva, 2014, Soares da Silva, 2018, and Soares da Silva et al., 2011, who discuss this very same challenge).

Given this state of fluidity and change, and the tension between the two aforementioned pulls – convention and norm, performativity and negotiation – one does indeed wander how exactly can a standard norm begin to describe a system containing the sort of "morphological misfit" that *você* is and, moreover, accept and codify the alocutive addressive meaning of the 3rd p. Accepting the latter would mean accepting the following:

Vocês	façam	já	os	vossos	trabalhos de casa.
You – pl. form of *você* + 3rd p. pl.	*do* - Subjunctive, 3rd p. pl.	*now*	*the*	*your* – 2nd p. pl. possessive pronoun	*homework.*

(You do your homework now.)

The sentence above will sound familiar to most speakers of European Pt. and certainly to speakers of Standard European Pt. Very few would indeed object to the glaring mismatch between 3rd p. subjunctive verb form (often described as the "imperative" since the almost-disappearance of the pronoun *vós* and 2nd p. plural verb forms has also eliminated 2nd p. plural imperative forms) and 2nd p. plural genitive pronoun – and we would venture to guess that even speakers who do object to such mismatch do utter sentences such as the above, despite themselves. After all, and as Castro (2003, p. 2) notes, "only writers float above sins against the norm" ("só os escritores flutuam acima dos pecados contra a norma") – not common speakers of the real world.

Echoing the Saussurean distinction between *langue* and *parole*, Soares da Silva (2020, p. 679) therefore draws attention to the discrepancy found between an "ideal, prescriptive norm", that is, the "educated norm" which prescriptive grammars such as Cunha and Cintra (1984) aim to encapsulate, and another linguistic norm, more related to *parole,* corresponding to "what is customary or usual in a given linguistic community or communicative situation, thus constituting a real or objective norm." The author adds that "both senses of the norm are interwoven" (Soares da Silva, 2020, p. 680).

The problem we face is that these two norms do not seem very interwoven in European Pt. when it comes to forms of address – the ideal/prescriptive/*langue* standard norm has been severely disrupted by the changes of its system of address, with the domain of the 3rd p. largely upsetting its morphological paradigms. In the realm of the communicative/*parole* linguistic norm, however, the uncertainty of usage has been somewhat resolved – speakers resort to the pronoun *você* freely, to subjunctive forms with a directive meaning so as to resolve the lack of a grammatical imperative mode, and to 2nd p. plural pronouns indexed to 3rd p. grammatical subjects, although the ambiguous pragmatic status and the (im)politeness values attributed to the form *você* hinder full resolution. This explains why prescriptive Standard European Pt. maintains the pronoun *vós* (found in Cunha and Cintra (1984), for example) despite its obsolescence and archaic flavour – doing otherwise would clearly be too much to bear as grammatical coherence would be lost (let us remind ourselves that Cunha and Cintra (1984) describe *você* as a pronoun of address and thus outside the canonical paradigm of personal pronouns to which *vós* belongs).

However, and in a country such as Portugal, free of linguistic conflicts, Castro (2003) interestingly observes that the fixation of a standard norm in the linguistic community can be relatively flexible:

> [...] não creio que uma sociedade como a portuguesa, bastante aberta, homogénea no sentido de não ser constituída por grandes minorias, e recheada de recursos comunicativos modernos, aceitasse submeter-se a uma norma rígida e militantemente accionada, a menos que isso servisse uma causa. (Castro, 2003, p. 4)

> [I do not believe a society such as the Portuguese, quite open, homogeneous in the sense that it is not constituted of large minorities, and full of modern communicative resources, would accept to submit to a rigid, militantly triggered norm, unless it were to serve a cause.]

Furthermore, it is worth noting that Bermejo (2018, p. 4) states that the European Portuguese norm precludes the communication of politeness when it levels out the difference between the V semantics of *vós* and the informality of the form *vocês* ("La norma elimina la oposición vós – vocês y nivela en este último cualquier tratamiento de cortesía") and indeed this language has never managed to obtain a replacement for the V pronoun of address it lost, at least in its standard variety.

The problem of developing the linguistic competence of foreign learners against a backdrop of such uncertainty and at the intersection of grammar and pragmatics is thus challenging. For full linguistic competence, learners must not only master the "abstract" and "decontextualized" knowledge of phonology, morphology, syntax and semantics but also put this knowledge into effective use in order to achieve pragmatic competence – "the ability to use language effectively in order to achieve a specific purpose and to understand language in context" (Thomas, 1983, p. 92). As Thomas (1983) proceeds to explain, grammaticality can be judged according to objective, prescriptive rules and thus all that a grammatical error says of a speaker is that she or he is "less than a proficient speaker" of the language. However, pragmatic competence deals with "probable" rather than definite rules – not knowing how to apply the categorical grammatical knowledge in real-life settings is tantamount to pragmatic failure which, in Thomas's view (shared by this study) can be more penalising to speakers as it "reflects badly on him/her as a person."

What is the field of PFL to do with this discrepancy of norms – is it to teach the prescriptive, ideal standard to which foreign learners should be given access, in which case *vós* should be taught to these speakers and risk pragmatic failure to an extent? Or should Portuguese as a Foreign Language follow a communicative norm allowing learners to cope with real-life interactions, even if that means committing "sins" against grammatical formal agreement? In other words, *langue* or *parole*?

This is the question to which we hope to answer – by examining how PFL materials have attempted to resolve this issue will provide invaluable insights as to how forms of address are conceptualised and understood as discursive and grammatical items and how they can equip foreign learners to linguistically frame their interpersonal relations by being able to critically opt for the addressive behaviour which they feel best suit their needs.

2 Forms of address in Portuguese as a Foreign Language didactic material

This section examines how forms of address are portrayed and framed in materials pertaining to the teaching and learning of European Portuguese, preceded by a description of the methodological steps this examination entailed. A small corpus of 19 items was constituted and is available in Attachment 1 – 14 are textbooks (group A), divided by the CEFR level to which they pertain, whereas group B comprises 5 didactic items such as grammars and exam compendiums. An effort was made so that the corpus integrate material reflecting all CEFR levels.

2.1 Methodology

The methodological premise of our examination is Van Leeuwen's 2008 analysis of discourse as a "recontextualised social practice." Social practices – such as teaching and learning in institutional settings, for example – are "socially regulated ways of doing things" (Van Leeuwen, 2008, p. 6). As such, these social practices are founded in particular discourses which determine how, and to what extent, they are regulated. A recontextualised social practice is thus a practice which has been codified, regulated, organised – in other words, recontextualised – by means of discourse. Textbooks and other supporting material, which we examine here, are examples of how the social practices of teaching and learning a foreign language have been regulated and undergone transformations when recontextualised as academic/textbook discourse. More specifically, the social practice of addressing others in European Pt. is rendered by means of specific, regulated discourses when it becomes textbook material, and it is these discourses with which this study is concerned.

A particular type of recontextualisation, Van Leeuwen (2008) informs us, is legitimation, that is, how certain social practices are legitimised, approved (or, indeed, disapproved of – de-legitimised) when recontextualised as discourse:

> … recontextualization involves not just the transformation of social practices into discourses about social practices, but also the addition of contextually specific legitimations of these social practices, answers to the spoken or unspoken questions "Why should we do this?" or "Why should we do this in this way?" (Van Leeuwen, 2008, p. 105)

The particular kind of legitimation involved in the discourse of textbooks and didactic material in general is "Authorisation", that is, "legitimation by reference to the authority of tradition, custom, law, and/or persons in whom institutional authority of some kind is vested" (Van Leeuwen, 2008, p. 105) and, within Authorisation, "Expert Authority": "[i]n the case of expert authority, legitimacy is provided by expertise rather than status" (Van Leewuen, 2008, p. 107). Indeed, textbooks are seen as authorities in the field due to the expertise they carry – learners take the directive contents of textbooks at face-value, adhering to the norms,

instructions and explanations found in those textbooks because the latter represent the authority of academic, educated expertise. The "contextually specific legitimations" of the discourse of foreign language didactic materials can be found, for example, in the directive and assertive nature of these texts, often resorting to the imperative to provide instructions students should follow, or to the indicative to ascertain facts about the target language that students must learn and accept as immovable truths. As Van Leeuwen (2008, p. 107) further elaborates, "[n]o reasons need to be provided, no other answer to the question of 'Why should I do this?' than a mere 'because Dr. Juan says so.' " – or because the textbook says so.

Due to the discourse of legitimation and authority they postulate, textbooks act as the aforementioned "vital aid" to teachers and learners alike (Littlejohn, 1998) and perhaps some of the greatest advantages they offer is "security for students", providing them with a "road map" to safely follow, whilst also providing teachers with a set of consistent materials to teach and an objective basis of evaluation (Graves, 2000, p. 174). Graves (2000, p.176) proceeds to explain that she often encounters the view that "a textbook is sacred and not to be tampered with," when in fact textbooks (such as syllabuses or lesson plans) are written documents to which "too much power" is often given. Whilst they remain important aids, their usefulness depends on how the students use them and how the decision-making power of the teacher adapts the textbook to the amelioration of the activities of teaching and learning (see also Nunan, 1991 and McGrath, 2016 for in-depth examinations of textbooks, textbook selection and syllabus design).

This becomes a particularly sensitive issue when the learning of a foreign language is at stake as that necessarily implies the interplay and the communication of at least two different cultures and languages, that is, the target language and culture are to be articulated with the language(s) and culture(s) of learners. Foreign language textbooks are thus prime *loci* of intercultural practices where attention to stereotype avoidance must be paid (Ahmed; Narcy-Comes, 2011) and cultural bias (and indeed gender bias, to which Gharbavi, 2012 alerts) must be prevented (Khodadady; Shayesteh, 2016).

As linguistic regulators of interpersonal relations establishing verbal addressive behaviours, forms of address are therefore a key linguistic and cultural aspect of European Pt. which we would expect textbooks and other didactic material to tackle so as to facilitate the competence of foreign learners when addressing others in their everyday verbal interactions. In their positive view of textbooks, Hutchinson and Torres (1994, p. 327) highlight the "vital management role" textbooks play and argue that they "create a degree of order" in the "complex and messy matter" that is education and that, we would add, forms of address in European Pt. demonstrably are. What this study would like to examine is the extent to which PFL textbooks imprint "a degree of order" to the usage of forms of address in order to guide students on "how to do it."

This "degree of order" facilitated by textbooks is therefore undoubtedly related with the voice of an expert authority and to the legitimation of the discursive practices they propose.

LINHA D'ÁGUA

Resorting to Bernstein's notion of "framing", which describes "the form of control of communication within a context" (Bernstein, 1990, p. 13), Dendrinos (1997, p. 226) thus draws a useful distinction between "instruction texts" ("textos instrucionais") and "instrumental texts" ("textos instrumentais") although in our view somewhat counter-intuitively, she defines the former as containing "the object of instruction, the linguistic elements that students must learn" and the latter, the "instrumental texts" as those conveying information and instructions in order to help students produce adequate speech acts. Dendrinos (1997) adds that instrumental texts "openly exercise authority over students" (p. 227) by issuing directives effectively telling them what to do. How strong these directives are, and the degree of autonomy conceded to the student, is related to framing – "[w]here framing is weak, the acquirer has a greater degree of regulation over the (…) interactional (…) principles that constitute the communicative context." (Bernstein, 1990, p. 31), meaning that the student obtains a greater degree of control over the task at hand (an example of an academic task of weak framing is the writing an opinion text, for example). In contexts of strong framing, "the transmitter controls the selection, organization, pacing, criteria of communication" (Bernstein, 1990, p. 31) and therefore the linguistic choices of students are reduced to a minimum given they are controlled by the directives of the text (a good example would be a task of "fill in the blanks with words from the box").

The framework that we set up for our analysis did not focus on PFL textbooks as complete educational tools, but it was narrowed down to a specific aspect of linguistic content that these textbooks may or may not include, which is forms of address in European Pt. The methodological framework was therefore devised in order to allow for an uncomplicated, practical approach to this partial facet of textbooks and didactic materials. We resort to Dendrino's distinction between instrumental and instruction texts but based on the following definitions:

Instrumental texts are taken to be those that are instrumental for the effective learning of students, that is, those that contain the linguistic elements that students must learn. For example: "Cumprimentar. Olá, boa tarde, D. Teresa. Como está? Bem, obrigada. E o Dr. João?" [Greeting. Hello, good afternoon, D. Teresa. How are you? Very well, thank you. And you, Dr. João?] - Textbook A.1 (see Attachment 1). It is worth noting that under "instrumental text" we include explanatory texts which explain the linguistic elements that must be learnt and thus act in support of the instructions allowing students to successfully complete textbook activities. For example: "How do you address someone correctly in Portuguese? Well… it's complicated. Among classmates and young people, you will choose the informal 'tu'" (Textbook A.1). Instrumental-Explanatory texts tend to be submitted to weak framing, as they are designed to provide students with useful information about the target language that they themselves must interpret and use at will (or not).

Instruction texts are taken to be the texts of a directive nature containing the instructions which guide students to tackle instrumental texts. For example: "complete the dialogues with the following words. Como está, até logo," etc. (Textbook A.1).

Each of these can be submitted to a strong or weak framing. **Table 2** below summarises our framework of analysis:

Table 2. Methodological framework

SOCIAL PRACTICE:	Addressing others in European Pt.	
LINGUISTIC ITEM:	Forms of address	
DISCOURSE RECONTEXTUALISATION:	Discourse of legitimation → Authority → Expert	
Contextually specific legitimations:		
Instrumental and instruction texts in PFL didactic materials, prominently textbooks		
FRAMING	INSTRUMENTAL TEXTS	INSTRUCTION TEXTS
strong	Cumprimentar. Olá, boa tarde, D. Teresa. Como está? Bem, obrigada. E o Dr. João?" [Greeting. Hello, good afternoon, D. Teresa. How are you? Very well, thank you. And you, Dr. João?] Textbook A.1	Complete the dialogues with the following words. Como está, até logo," etc. Textbook A.1
weak	How do you address someone correctly in Portuguese? Well… it's complicated. Among classmates and young people, you will choose the informal 'tu'. Textbook A.1	Apresente aos seus colegas uma figura famosa do seu país. Fale da sua atividade, tendo os textos que leu como exemplo para a sua apresentação. [Introduce a famous person from your country to your classmates. Talk about what they do, using the texts you have read as examples for your presentation.] Textbook A.8

Source: elaborated by the author.

2.2 Results and discussion

The first aspect of our perusal was the instrumental – explanatory type of texts to ascertain whether PFL material contains a metalanguage on forms of address designed to clarify its usage and if so, which criteria were proposed governing that usage. The results are as follows (**Table 3**):

LINHA D'ÁGUA

Table 3. Explanatory-Instrumental texts in the corpus

Item (see Att.1)	Explanatory-Instrumental content – summary:
A1[2] p. 23	Forms of address are "complicated", "tricky"; The Portuguese have a "fancy for titles": "if you are familiar with one person but not so close as to address them by you, the politest alternative is to use a combination of their first name (no title) and the third person singular (as though you were talking about someone else (…))." "Formal pronoun": used to address someone you don't know or older to show deference; *Você*: tricky" – ok to use if you don't know the person; once you know their name, "você" "will sound rude"; often used in advertising; "or it is strategically avoided altogether." Nominal forms *Dona, Srª, Sr.*: to use when the person is "somewhat older". Nominal forms – titles (*Doutora, Engenheiro, Professor...*): to use "if it is clear what the status of the person is (normally related to their job)."
A3 p. 26	A 2ª pessoa é <u>informal</u>. A 3ª pessoa é, normalmente, <u>formal</u>. [2nd person is <u>informal</u>. 3rd person is usually <u>formal</u>.]
A5 p. 146	*Tu* and *Você*: "No Português do Brasil, o pronome pessoal *tu* é de uso regionalizado. Usa-se você no lugar de *tu* como forma de tratamento informal." [In Brazilian Portuguese, the personal pronoun *tu* is used regionally. *Você* is used instead of *tu* as a form of informal address]
A12 p. 10	Existem em Portugal várias forma de tratamento. [There are different forms of address in Portugal.] *Tu*: informal; "usa-se normalmente com família, amigos e crianças. Pode-se usar com colegas ou pessoas conhecidas quando estas propõem o tratamento." [It is normally used with family, friends and children. It can be used to address colleagues or people you know when they suggest that form of address.] *Você*: formal; "é uma forma que se usa quando se conhece alguém e não há um grande grau de formalidade ou informalidade. Se se sabe o nome da pessoa, é sempre preferível usá-lo." [It is a form you use when you know someone and there is not a great degree of formality or informality. If you know the person's name, it is always preferable to use it.] *O Senhor/A Senhora*: formal+; "é a forma que se deve usar quando não se conhece uma pessoa ou há um grande grau de formalidade. [...]" [It is the form you should use when you do not know a person or there is a high degree of formality.] Título ou Posição [Title or Occupation/Position]: formal ++; "Dr(ª) = Doutor (a) (economistas, advogados, médicos, professores) [...]."[economists, lawyers, doctors, teachers...] *O/A Senhor(a)* + Title or Occupation/Position: formal +++; *Senhor Doutor*.

---

[2] Textbook A1 is written in English and in Portuguese, therefore no added translation is necessary.

LINHA D'ÁGUA

B15 p. 113	*Tu*: "forma de intimidade no Português europeu" [form of intimacy in European Pt.]
	Você: "usa-se no Português do Brasil. Em Portugal generalizou-se esta forma no tratamento de igual para igual, ou de superior para inferior (em idade, classe social ou hierarquia). Não é possível usar *você* de inferior para superior em idade, classe social ou hierarquia." [It is used in Brazilian Portuguese. In Portugal, it has become the generalised address amongst equals or from superior to inferior (in age, social class or hierarchy). It is not possible to use *você* from inferior to superior in age, social class or hierarchy]
	O senhor, *a senhora*: "formas de respeito e cortesia, opondo-se, portanto, a *tu* e *você*. [...] Bastante generalizado em Português é o título de Doutor." [Forms of respect and politeness, thus opposing *tu* and *você*. [...] Quite common in Portuguese is the title *Doutor* ("Doctor").]
	Outras formas de tratamento usuais em Portugal antecedidas de artigo [other current forms of address in Portugal preceded by article]: *O José*, *o Silva*, *o tio*, *a minha amiga*...
B18 pp. 43-44	*Você* and *vocês*: forms of address and not pronouns, but they are often used as subject pronouns, especially in Brazilian Portuguese.
	Você: a little more formal, but not formal enough to address either someone you have never met before or a superior, in which case you should use *o senhor* or *a senhora*.
	Tu: only used when addressing friends, relatives and children.
	Vós: it is now considered an old-fashioned or regional form of address, and is usually replaced by *vocês*.
	Vocês works as the plural of both *tu* and *você*.

Source: elaborated by the author.

Interestingly, textbook A1 mentions a "formal pronoun" but never explicitly commits to any such pronoun; in fact, it proceeds by informing the reader that *você* is tricky and can be "strategically avoided." These explanations come with a clear effort to provide a cultural framework for forms of address and inform foreign learners that the Portuguese "have a fancy" for titles. In addition, these texts are included under the section "real world language: Portuguese in use/ Things you should know." Textbook A1 thus clearly frames forms of address as the kind of learning content which, unlike grammatical items, is not categorical and only "probable" as it has to do with real-world communicative, pragmatic and cultural criteria that can be difficult to grasp. This may be the reason why A3, for example, refers to formality and informality as to the 2nd and 3rd persons respectively but includes no explanation as to *você*.

A5 includes an explanation of the usage of *você* in Brazil so as to distinguish it from the Portuguese *tu*, although no specific information about *você* in European Pt. is provided. However, this is part of an effort to include a pluricentric perspective in the textbook, as other units make reference to different varieties of Portuguese.

A12 presents a number of interesting choices, starting with the semantics of negotiation, when it posits that *tu* is acceptable at the suggestion of interlocutors. *Você* is described as "formal" but also as an adequate form in settings with are neither formal nor informal; nominal forms and titles are thus presented as markers of heightened formality, to distinguish them from

LINHA DÁGUA

the reduced formality of *você* – or indeed inexistent formality, since for some reason this pronoun should be avoided when the name of the addressee is known.

The similar explanations that A12 and A1 offer for *você* are noteworthy – both agree that it is best to avoid this form once you know the addressee's name, which means that on the whole, and although that is not said in so many words, the recommendation is to avoid *você*. Both textbooks constitute interesting cases of expert authority– once the name is known, *você* should be dropped, with no further elaboration as to the reason why (which admittedly would perhaps be too lengthy and strenuous a task to include in a textbook, given the previously discussed backdrop of addressive behaviour in European Pt.).

B5 follows Cunha and Cintra (1984) and, opting for a strong framing, posits a criteria of either equality or, contrary to this, "superiority" to explain the usage of *você*. The problem we find with this explanation is ascertaining who counts as "superior" to others in terms of social class, for example, and once (or if) we establish who is superior and who is inferior, how such criteria can be rendered in suitable classroom discourse to be grasped by foreign learners. Furthermore, when B5 states that "it is not possible to use *você* from inferior to superior in age, social class or hierarchy", it is issuing the kind of assertive speech act specific to the discourse of authoritative legitimation expected from textbooks – B5 states that a certain addressive behaviour is not possible when in fact what is possible is that those same addressive practices happen in everyday interactions of the real world without necessarily much friction.

B18 is the only item mentioning *vós* whilst explaining the ambiguous status of *vocês* (neither T nor V). This ambiguity affects its plural form *vocês*, the plural of both *tu* and *você*.

All in all, the items from **Table 3** agree that *tu* is undoubtedly a T form and that the field of politeness is covered by nominal forms and the multifarious combinations they allow (first name, title and first name, title, etc.). *Você* is indeed conceptualised as neither T nor V – A1 and A12 propose avoidance of the form once the name of the addressee is known and B5 defines *você* (and *tu*) in opposition to the polite, respectful address conveyed by nominal forms.

The second methodological step was to examine both instrumental and instruction texts pertaining to forms of address. The latter are inevitably present in PFL didactic material even if only in the form of the personal pronouns necessary to verb conjugation, and thus particular attention was paid as to what pronouns are proposed to be the subject of verb forms; in fact, when only personal pronouns are presented as instrumental texts, it means that this was the most relevant information pertaining to address found in that particular item.

The results are summarised in **Table 4**:

Table 4. Instrumental and Instruction Texts in the corpus

Item (see Att.1)	Instrumental Texts – Examples:	Instruction Texts – Examples:
A1	Cumprimentar. Olá, boa tarde, D. Teresa. Como está? Bem, obrigada. E o Dr. João? [Greeting. Hello, good afternoon, D. Teresa. How are you? Very well, thank you. And you, Dr. João?] Personal pronouns for verb conjugation: *Eu, Tu, (Você), Ele/Ela/, Nós, Vocês, Eles/Elas.*	Complete the dialogues with the following words. Como está, até logo, etc.
A2	Boa noite. D. Fátima. Como está? Bem, obrigada, Dr. Sousa. [Good evening, D. Fátima. How are you – 3RD. P. SING. PRO-DROP? Very well, thank you, Dr. Sousa.] Personal pronouns for verb conjugation: *Eu, Tu, Você/Ela/Ele, Nós, Vocês/Elas/Eles.*	Repare nos exemplos. Complete o quadro. [Pay - SUBJUNCTIVE, 3RDP. SING. attention to the examples. Fill in - SUBJUNCTIVE, 3RD P. SING. the table.] E você? Já foi a alguma tourada? Qual é a sua opinião sobre a tourada? [And you/*você*? Have you been – 3RDP. SING. to a bullfight? What is your – 3RDP. SING. POSSESSIVE PRONOUN opinion about bullfighting?]
A3	Bom dia! Como está? Bem, obrigado. E a senhora? [Good morning! How are you – 3RD. P. SING. PRO-DROP? Very well, thank you. And how are you (How is the lady?)] Personal pronouns for verb conjugation: *Eu, Tu, Você, o Senhor, a Senhora, /Ele/Ela, Nós, Vocês, os Senhores, as Senhoras, Eles/Elas.*	Olhe para as fotografias. Pergunte quem é e responda. [Look – SUBJUNCTIVE, 3RD.P. SING. at the photographs. Ask - SUBJUNCTIVE, 3RD.P. SING who it is and answer - SUBJUNCTIVE, 3RD.P. SING.]
A4	Como é que eu me chamo? Você chama-se Maria. [What's my name (How am I called?) You/*você* are called Maria.] Personal pronouns for verb conjugation: *Eu, Tu, Ele/Ela/Você, Nós, Eles/Ela/Vocês.*	Fazer perguntas para as respostas. Completar o diálogo. [Ask – INFINITIVE questions to the answers. Complete – INFINITIVE the dialogue.]
A5	Personal pronouns for verb conjugation: *Eu, Tu, Você/Ele/Ela, Nós, Vocês/Eles/Elas.*	Responda às perguntas sobre os diálogos. [Answer - SUBJUNCTIVE, 3RD.P. SING. the questions about the dialogues.] Acha que o clima está a mudar nos últimos anos? [Do you think– 3RD P. PRO-DROP climate has been changing in the last few years?]

A6	Formas de saudação: [Greeting] Formal – Como está? Bem, obrigado. E o senhor? [Formal – How do you do? I am well, thank you. And you/*o senhor*?] Informal – Olá! Estás bom? Estou, e tu? [Informal – Hi! How are you – 2ND P. SING. PRO-DROP? I'm ok, and you/*tu*?] Formas de apresentação: [Introductions] Mais formal – Bom dia, Sr. Doutor. Muito prazer. Muito prazer, minha senhora. [More formal – Good morning, Mr. Dr./*Sr. Doutor*. Nice to meet you. Nice to meet you, *minha senhora.*] Mais informal – Oi, tudo bem? Tudo bem, e tu? [More informal – Hi, are you ok? I'm ok, and you/*tu*?] This is a vocabulary textbook with no verb conjugation.	Complete o diálogo. [Complete - SUBJUNCTIVE, 3RD.P. SING. the dialogue.] Faça a correspondência. [Make- SUBJUNCTIVE, 3RD.P. SING. the correspondence.]
A7	Fazer pedidos: Ajudava-me, por favor? Podias ajudar-me, por favor? Podia fazer-me um favor? Fazias-me um favor? Importava-se de me fazer um favor? [Making requests: Would you help 3RD P. PRO-DROP me, please? Could you help 2ND P. PRO-DROP me, please? Would you mind 3RD P. PRO-DROP doing me a favour?] Personal pronouns for verb conjugation: *Eu, Tu, Ele/Ela/Você, Nós, Eles/Ela/Vocês.*	Complete o texto com os verbos no tempo correto. [Fill in - SUBJUNCTIVE, 3RD.P. SING the text with the correct tenses of verbs.] Faça as perguntas corretas. [Ask - SUBJUNCTIVE, 3RD.P. SING the correct questions.] O que é que você fazia habitualmente nas férias de verão quando era criança? [What did you/*você* usually do in the summer holidays when you were a child?]
A8	Personal pronouns for verb conjugation: *Eu, Tu, Você/Ela/Ele, Nós, Vocês/Elas/Eles.*	Seja sincero e responda às questões do teste. Que tipo de pessoa é você? [Be honest and answer que questions. What kind of person are you/*você*?] Complete o diálogo. [Fill in - SUBJUNCTIVE, 3RD.P. SING the dialogue.]
A9	(This textbook follows a communicative approach centred on everyday situations and topics; it does not focus on specific grammatical items such as verb conjugations)	Ligue cada verbo às expressões. [Connect - SUBJUNCTIVE, 3RD.P. SING the verb to the expressions.] Complete com ... [Fill in- SUBJUNCTIVE, 3RD.P. SING with...]
A10	(Like A9, A10 is centred on a communicative approach; it focuses on listening/oral skills in particular.)	E você, gosta de cozinhar? Complete a seguinte frase, dando a sua opinião pessoal. [And you/*você*, do you like to cook? Complete - SUBJUNCTIVE, 3RD.P. SING. the following sentence and provide your own opinion.]

LINHA DÁGUA

A11	Para saber mais sobre Portugal, é importante que você conheça alguns dados sobre a realidade deste país nos dias de hoje. [To know more about Portugal, it is important that you/*você* know some facts about life in this country nowadays.] Personal pronouns for verb conjugation: *Eu, Tu, Ele/Ela/Você, Nós, Eles/Ela/Vocês.*	Responda às perguntas. [Answer - SUBJUNCTIVE, 3RD.P. SING the questions.] Escreva o diálogo. [Write - SUBJUNCTIVE, 3RD.P. SING the dialogue.]
A12	See Table 3	
A13	(No specific instrumental texts involving the need for forms of address, directly or indirectly explained.)	E você, é feliz no emprego? [And you/*você*, are you happy at work?] Construa uma frase usando cada uma das expressões [...]. [Write - SUBJUNCTIVE, 3RD.P. SING a sentence using each of the expressions.]
A14	No tables with conjugated verbs, but exercises to fill in blanks with appropriate verb forms agreeing with *eu, tu, ele/ela, você, nós, eles/elas, vocês.*	Ouça as perguntas sobre o diálogo e responda. [Listen to - SUBJUNCTIVE, 3RD.P. SING questions about the dialogue and answer - SUBJUNCTIVE, 3RD.P. SING]
B15	See Table 3	
B16	Personal pronouns: *Eu, Tu, Você, o Senhor, a Senhora, Ele/Ela, Nós, Vocês, os Senhores, as Senhoras, Eles/Elas.* Personal pronouns for verb conjugation: *Eu, Tu, Você/Ele/Ela, Nós, Vocês/Eles/Elas.*	Escreva os seguintes verbos na forma correta. [Write - SUBJUNCTIVE, 3RD.P. SING the following verbs in the correct form.]
B17	Verb conjugations are presented with no pronouns but only five verb forms, corresponding to 1st, 2nd, 3rd p. singular, and 1st and 3rd p. plural.	Complete com a forma correta dos verbos. [Complete - SUBJUNCTIVE, 3RD.P. SING with the correct form of the verbs.]
B18	See Table 3	
B19	Compilation of PFL exams to practice – the relevant aspects are in instruction texts.	From B2 exams: A tua professor de português pediu-te para escreveres um texto [...]. Escreve um texto. [Your 2ND P. SING. POSSESSIVE PRO. Portuguese teacher has asked you to write a text [...]. Write SING. IMPERATIVE a text.] Vai ouvir uma reportagem [...]. Depois da audição, complete o texto. [You are going to listen- 3RD P. SING. PRO-DROP to an item of news [...]. After listening, complete - SUBJUNCTIVE, 3RD.P. SING the dialogue.]

LINHA DÁGUA

		No seu país há diferenças muito grandes entre a escola de hoje em dia e a escola do tempo em que você era criança? [In your 3RD P. SING. POSS. PRO. country, are there many differences between school nowadays and school when you were a child?]

Source: elaborated by the author.

A general observation is the pervasiveness of the alocutive 3rd p. in instruction texts and its full impact on the tense paradigm in European Pt. – the profusion of subjunctive forms in the table is due to the aforementioned fact that the subjunctive tense has emerged as a substitute for the kind of formal and plural imperative mode that disappeared as a result of the obsolescence of the V-address and literal 2nd p. plural pronoun *vós* and respective verb forms.

Table 4 shows that all didactic PFL materials examined chose a communicative approach to address by excluding *vós* and including the pronouns *você/vocês* as subjects for 3rd p. verb conjugation. A3 interestingly chooses to include the nominal forms *a senhora/o senhor,* as does B16 when conveying personal pronouns. Presumably, and given that many didactic items chose not to include explanatory information about address behaviour in European Pt. (as shown in **Table 3**), it will be up to teachers to provide the necessary explanations as to why these pronouns and nominal forms (or nominal forms presented as pronouns, which is how B16 presents *o senhor/a senhora*) require 3rd p. verb agreement but are in fact pragmatic and discursive 2nd p. forms. This ambiguity might be why A1 chooses to have *você* in brackets.

A5 attempts a slight pluricentric approach when it devotes a unit (Unit 11) to the differences between Brazilian Portuguese and European Portuguese; in fact, one of the objectives of this unit is "the usage of você" ("uso de você") which is indeed different in these two countries. However, nothing in the proceeding unit broaches this topic. Again, this is the kind of content the textbook puts forward as of pedagogic interest but leaves to the teacher to fill in.

A6 is an interesting case due to its complete avoidance of *você;* despite devoting specific sections to greeting and introductions, and categorising them into a formality/informality scale, it does not contemplate *você.* In one of the exercises it even includes the informal address form *pá*, explains that the latter is an abbreviated form of *rapaz* now free of its gendered origins, but does not touch *você.*

A7 broaches forms of address by conveying the necessary information to make requests in Portuguese and it is noteworthy that 3rd p. *pro-drop* address accompanies increasing complexity of form, to the extent that the politeness formulae conveyed become indeed more complex in form: "Fazias-me um favor?" – "Importava-se de me fazer um favor?".

An interesting aspect pertaining to forms of address emerging from **Table 4** is the metalanguage of textbooks itself, specifically how they address their readers, which sometimes constitute the only relevant information on forms of address – some materials skirt around an expressed pronoun (which would have to be either *você* or *tu*) and use 3rd p. *pro-drop* forms (for example, A3, A6, A9) whereas others use *você* explicitly (for example, A2, A7, A8, A10, A11, A13, A14). A4 prefers to simply use the infinitive in order to preserve the directive nature of the instruction and neutralise any kind of choice pertaining to forms of address. Finally, item B19 displays the only example of an instruction text where *tu* is used, which appears to be something of an oddity. This item displays three different address possibilities – *tu* and 2nd p., 3rd p. *pro-drop,* and *você*, although the latter is extracted from an exam model used in Brazil where *você* usage is much less encumbered than in Portugal.

All in all, PFL materials recognise the instability of the system of address in European Pt., either by explicitly acknowledging it and offering explanations or simply by attempting to "standardise" 3rd p. address by including its alocutive, or addressive, meaning as part of a 2nd p. verb conjugation, leaving any further explanation about the intersection of morphology and pragmatics up to teachers. In so doing, the discourse of PFL materials effectively legitimises the pronoun *você* and the alocutive 3rd person.

Conclusion

This study examined how forms of address in European Pt. are framed in authoritative discourses such as PFL didactic materials in order to ascertain how the complexity of these forms is legitimised and which address behaviour the field of PFL believes should be postulated and followed by foreign learners. There are two caveats to this research that in fact constitute research avenues for the future – firstly, studies that are larger in scope should consider the pluricentric nature of Portuguese and attempt to include forms of address in different varieties of the language; secondly, it would be useful to include Portuguese as a First Language in this research, particularly in view of the fact that whilst the latter includes *vós*, PFL seems to have a more communicative approach to address, including *você* at the expense of *vós* – at first glance, Portuguese as a First Language seems to choose *langue* whereas PFL favours *parole.* Similarly, it would be relevant to include textbooks in use in an international context outside Portugal to further our understanding of forms of address and how they are legitimised in school discourses.

The first conclusion to which this study has come is that most PFL materials thus legitimise the usage of *você* to the extent that they include this form in verb conjugations and use it to address their readers, despite the fact they also acknowledge the ambiguous status of *você* and the clear difficulties in positing parameters for the usage of a form defined as neither T nor V and neither informal nor formal.

Most scholars therefore agree that particular attention must be paid to find clear, transparent ways to help foreign learners navigate the complex system of address in European Pt., as shown in section 1 of this study, but such concerns are not necessarily reflected in the didactic materials that are supposed to help students do so. This begs the question of whether PFL materials should indeed concern themselves with linguistic aspects which are simply too fluid or too context-dependent to warrant the kind of categorical, authoritative discourse expected from textbooks. It is not that PFL materials ignore forms of address altogether – section 2.2 has shown that they do not and that some even devote particularised explanations of how to address others in Portugal. However, most didactic items examined in this study include forms of address as part of instrumental texts almost "by proxy," that is, most textbooks include forms of address when *en route* to introduce other linguistic content (personal pronouns, verb conjugation or communicative activities such as introducing self and others, making requests or greeting others). In general terms, there is not a narrowed-down focus on forms of address and the communicative challenges they posit.

In our view, this can mean one of two things. Optimistically speaking, it may mean that the "crisis of address" in European Pt. has actually been resolved and that the discursive struggle over these forms and the pull between norm and individual performativity exist only as a preserve of scholarly bubbles that concern themselves with such matters.

An alternative to this view, and perhaps more in line with the empirical perceptions of anyone having to conduct their everyday interactions in European Pt in variegated contexts, is that forms of address remain an unresolved item at the intersection of grammar and pragmatics. Consequently, they remain a source of concern to speakers due to the fluidity of their usage and the uncertainty they generate. This seems a more realistic explanation as to why PFL materials, in general, seem averse to include forms of address as a specific linguistic item to be the object of teaching and learning – the fluidity of their usage and the sociolinguistic factors affecting such usage, prominently social class, do not conform to the fixity that a standard variety aims to achieve.

It thus seems that it is up to the PFL teachers to do a considerable part of the legwork when it comes to forms of address. To some extent, the teaching of any linguistic item depends on individual perspectives which are particular to the identity of each teacher – as Graves (2000, p. 176) eloquently puts it, teachers are "not only musicians, but also piano tuners, composers and conductors" and not mere conveyors of textbook material. Linguistic regulators of interpersonal relations, such as forms of address, are particularly sensitive items to which some speakers react very strongly, however, and thus an attempt should be made to find objective methods to support teachers in their endeavour to help foreign learners avoid pragmatic failure in their communicative efforts.

This is of course easier said than done. Until the dust settles and both speakers and the Standard norm know what to do with *você* and the 3rd p., then a critical awareness of the complex pragmatic – discursive – grammar interplay reflected in forms of address is perhaps

the best (and only) skill we can offer foreign learners. A note for the future is that perhaps this critical thinking pertaining to the intercultural and interpersonal consequences of forms of address should bridge the gap between the real world made up of real speakers and school discourses and be the subject of pedagogic textbook units devoted to this matter in particular.

References

AHMED, F.; NARCY-COMBES, M. An Analysis of Textbooks from a Cultural Point of View. *Tesol Journal,* v. 5, p. 21-37, 2011.

BANZA, A. P. Uma língua; muitas vozes: para uma política linguística pluricêntrica do português. In: HABLER, G.; SCHÄFER-PRIEB, B. (ed.). *Contatos linguísticos na sequência da expansão portuguesa*. Berlin: Peter Lang, 2021. p. 15-32.

BERMEJO, V. L. Imperativos y cortesía en las lenguas romances de la Península Ibérica. *Bulletin of Hispanic Studies*, v. 95, p. 1-23, 2018.

BERNSTEIN, B. *The structuring of pedagogic discourse*. London: Routledge, 1990.

BRAUN, F. *Terms of Address*. Problems of Patterns and Usage in Various Languages and Cultures. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 1988.

BROWN, A.; GILMAN, R. The Pronouns of Power and Solidarity. In: SEBEOK, T. A. (ed.). *Style in Language*. [s.l.]: MIT Press, 1960.

CARREIRA, M. H. *Modalisation linguistique en situation d'interlocution*: proxémique verbale et modalités en portugais. Louvain-Paris: Peeters, 1997.

CARREIRA, M. H. *Semântica e discurso*, estudos de Linguística Portuguesa e Comparativa (Português/Francês). Porto: Porto Editora, 2001.

Carreira, M. H. Les formes allocutives du portugais européen: évolutions, valeurs et fonctionnements discursifs. In: Coloquio Pronombres de Segunda Persona y Formas de Tratamiento en las Lenguas de Europa. Plenary talk. Paris: Instituto Cervantes de Paris, 2003. Available at: https://cvc.cervantes.es/lengua/coloquio_paris/ponencias/pdf/cvc_araujo.pdf. Accessed on: 18 November 2022.

CARREIRA, M. H. Politeness in Portugal; how to address others. In: HICKEY, L.; STEWART, M. (ed.). *Politeness in Europe*. Clevedon/ Buffalo: Multilingual Matters, 2005. p. 306 – 315.

CASTRO, Ivo. O linguista e a fixação da norma. *Actas do XVIII Encontro Nacional da Associação Portuguesa de Linguística*, Lisboa: APL, p. 1-18, 2003.

CINTRA, L. F. L. *Sobre Formas de Tratamento na Língua Portuguesa*. Lisboa: Livros Horizonte, 1972.

COOK, M. Uma Teoria de Interpretação das Formas de Tratamento na Língua Portuguesa. *Hispania*, v. 80, n. 3, p. 451-464, 1997.

COOK, M. Portuguese Pronouns and other Forms of Address, from the Past into the Future – Structural, Semantic and Pragmatic Reflections. *Ellipsis,* v. 11, p. 267-290, 2013.

COOK, M. N-V-T, a framework for the analysis of social dynamics in address pronouns. In: Bouissac, P. (ed.). *The Social Dynamics of Pronominal Systems:* a comparative approach. Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2019. p. 17-34.

CUNHA, C.; CINTRA, L. F. L. *Gramática do Português Contemporâneo*. Lisboa: Edições João Sá da Costa, 1984.

DUARTE, I. M. Formas de tratamento: item gramatical no ensino de Português Língua Materna. In: BRITO, A. M. (ed.). *Gramática*: História, Teoria, Aplicações. Porto: Fundação da Universidade do Porto, 2010. p. 133–147.

DUARTE, I. M. Formas De Tratamento Em Português: Entre Léxico e Discurso. *Matraga,* v. 18, n. 28, p. 84-101, 2011.

DENDRINOS, B. Prática Ideológica em textos pedagógicos no ensino do Inglês como Língua Estrangeira. In: PEDRO, M. E. (ed.). *Análise Crítica do Discurso*. Lisboa: Editorial Caminho, 1997. p. 225-260.

FARACO, C. A. O tratamento você em português: uma abordagem histórica. *LaborHistórico,* v. 3, n. 2, p. 114-132, 2017/1996.

GHARBAVI, A. A Content Analysis of Textbooks: Investigating Gender Bias as a Social Prominence in Iranian High School English Textbooks. *English Linguistics Research*, v. 1, n. 1, p. 42-49, 2012.

Gonçalves, L. Formas de Tratamento na Língua Portuguesa e na Língua Chinesa. In: GROSSO, M. J.; CLETO, A. P. (ed.). *O Português na China*: Ensino e Investigação. Lisboa: Lidel, 2014. p. 218 – 226.

GOUVEIA, C. As dimensões da mudança no uso das formas de tratamento em Português Europeu. In: DUARTE, I.M.; OLIVEIRA, F. (ed.). *O fascínio da linguagem*. Porto: Faculdade de Letras da Universidade do Porto, 2008. p. 91-100.

GOUVEIA, Carlos. "Tu como marca interpessoal de superioridade e de distância em Português Europeu" in Symposium "Próximos ou distantes? Formas de tratamento nas diferentes variedades do português". *VI SIMELP-Simpósio Muncial de Estudos de Língua Portuguesa,* Plenary Talk. Santarém: Escola Superior de Educação do Instituto Politécnico de Santarém, 2017. (Personal correspondence with the author).

GUILHERME, A.R.B.; BERMEJO, V. L. Quão cortês é você? O pronome de tratamento você em Português Europeu. *LaborHistórico*, v. 1, n. 2, pp. 167-180, 2015.

GRAVES, K. *Designing language courses*: a guide for teachers. London: Heinle & Heinle, 2000.

HAMMERMÜLLER, G. Retracing the historical evolution of the Portuguese address pronoun *você* using synchronic variationist data. In: HUMMEL, M.; LOPES, C. S. (ed.). *Address in Portuguese and Spanish*. Berlin/ Boston: De Gruyter, 2020. p. 251-289.

HUMMEL, M. The diachronic expansion of Pt. vossa mercê > você and Sp. vuestra merced > usted. *Working Papers em Linguística*, v. 20, n. 2, p. 24-59, 2019.

HUMMEL, M. Diachronic research on address in Portuguese and Spanish. In: Hummel, M.; Lopes, C. S. (ed.). *Address in Portuguese and Spanish*. Berlin/ Boston: De Gruyter, 2020.p. 7-70.

HUTCHINSON, T.; Torres, E. The textbook as agent of change. *ELT Journal,* vol. 48, n. 4, p. 315-328, 1994.

KHODADADY, E.; SHAYESTEH, S. Cultural and linguistic imperialism and the EIL movement: evidence from a textbook analysis. *Issues in Educational Research*, v. 26, n. 4, p. 604-620, p. 2016.

LARA, V.; GUILHERME, A. The politeness of você in European Portuguese. *Studies in Hispanic and Lusophone Linguistics,* v. 11, n. 2, p. 337-336, 2018.

LITTLEJOHN, A. The analysis of language teaching materials: Inside the Trojan horse. In: TOMLINSON, B. (ed.). *Materials development in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998. p. 190-126.

LOPES, C. R. A formação dos sistemas de tratamento em português: mudança e avaliação. *LaborHistórico*, v. 5, p. 257-294, 2019.

LOPES, C. R.; MARTINS, A. L. N.; SOUZA, J. P. F. A origem da acepção negativa de você no português europeu: os contextos de uso de Vossa Mercê em cartas oitocentistas. *LaborHistórico,* v. 7, p. 93-126, 2021.

LOPES, C. R.; MOTA, M. A. A percepção e a aceitabilidade de formas de tratamento no português europeu (PE): uma abordagem experimental. *Working Papers em Linguística*, v. 20, n. 2, p. 135-174, 2019.

MANOLE, V. O legado da perda: o pronome vós no português europeu atual. *Romania Contexta II*, v. 2, p. 119-132, 2021.

MARQUES, M. A.; DUARTE, I. M. Formas de tratamento e preservação da face em interações verbais online. *Revista da Associação Portuguesa de Linguística*, v. 5, p. 236-249, 2019.

MARTINS, A. M. Introdução: O português numa perspetiva diacrónica e comparativa. In: Martins, A. M.; Carrilho, E. (ed). *Manual de linguística portuguesa*. Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter, 2016, p. 1-39.

MCGRATH, I. *Materials evaluation and design for language teaching*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2016.

NORRBY, C; WARREN, J. Address Practices and Social Relationships in European. *Languages. Language and Linguistics Compass* v. 6, n. 4, p. 225–235, 2012.

NUNAN, D. *Language teaching methodology:* a textbook for teachers. New York: London: Prentice Hall, 1991.

ODBER DE BAUBETA, P. A. Modes of address: translation strategies or the black hole. *Ilha do Desterro*, v. 28, p. 87-107, 1992.

OLIVEIRA, S. M. Winning friends and influencing people abroad: Using native speakers' communicative strategies. *Intercultural Communication Studies*, v. 4, n. 1, p. 23-44, 1994.

OLIVEIRA, S. M. Negotiating Identity, Conflict, and Cooperation within a Strategic Model of Address. In: DENIS, A.; KALEKIN-FISHMAN, D. (ed.). *The ISA handbook in contemporary sociology:* conflict, competition, cooperation. London: Sage, 2009. p. 416-432.

OLIVEIRA, S. M. Address in computer-mediated communication. In: HERRING, S. C.; STEIN, D.; VIRTANEN, T. (ed) *Pragmatics of computer-mediated communication.* Handbooks of Pragmatics, v. 9. Bonn: Walter de Gruyter, 2013. p. 291-314.

SILVA, Z. B.; WIŚNIEWSKA, J. Formas de tratamento nos manuais de Português Língua Estrangeira: uma abordagem na perspetiva da metalinguagem semântica natural. *Romanica Cracoviensia*, v. 4, p. 87–99, 2021.

SOARES DA SILVA, A. The pluricentricity of Portuguese: a sociolectometrical approach to divergence between European and Brazilian Portuguese. In: SOARES DA SILVA, A. (ed). *Pluricentricity*: language variation and sociocognitive dimensions. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton, 2014, p. 143-188.

SOARES DA SILVA, A. *O português no mundo e a sua estandardização*: entre a realidade de uma língua pluricêntrica e o desejo de uma língua internacional. Braga: Centro de Estudos Humanísticos da Universidade do Minho; Editora Húmus, 2018.

SOARES DA SILVA, A. Normative Grammars. In: LEBSANFT, F. & TACKE, F. (ed). *Manual of Standardization in the Romance Languages*. Berlin; Boston: De Gruyter, 2020, p. 679 – 700.

SOARES DA SILVA, A.; TORRES, A.; GONÇALVES, M. (eds.). *Línguas Pluricêntricas*, Variação Linguística e Dimensões Sociocognitivas. Braga: Universidade Católica Portuguesa, 2011.

THOMAS, J. Cross-Cultural Pragmatic Failure. *Applied Linguistics* v. 4, n. 2, p. 91 – 111, 1983.

VAN LEEUWEN, T. *Discourse and practice*: new tools for critical discourse analysis. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.

WATTS, R. J. *Politeness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

Appendices

Appendix 1 – Corpus. List of Portuguese as a Foreign Language textbooks and other didactic materials

A. Textbooks

CEFR levels A1/A2:

1. Abrantes, A. M. *Ora Viva! Curso Rápido de iniciação ao português língua estrangeira/ Portuguese Crash Course for Beginners.* Lisboa: Lidel, 2019.
2. Tavares, A. *Português XXI* 1. A1. Lisboa: Lidel, 2012.
3. Kuzka, R.; Pascoal, J. *Passaporte para Português* 1. A1/A2. Lisboa: Lidel, 2014.
4. Oliveira, C.; Ballman, M. J.; Coelho, M. L. *Aprender Português 1.* A1/A2. Lisboa: Texto Editores, 2017.
5. Tavares, A. *Português XXI 2.* A2. Lisboa: Lidel, 2012.
6. Rosa, L. M. *Vamos Lá Começar!* A1/A2/B1. Lisboa: Lidel, 2017.

CEFR levels B1/B2:

7. Oliveira, C.; Coelho, L. *Aprender Português 2. Português para Estrangeiros.* B1. Lisboa: Texto Editores, 2007.
8. Tavares, A. *Português XXI 3.* B1. Lisboa: Lidel, 2014.
9. Lemos, H. *Português em Direto.* B1/B2. Lisboa: Lidel, 2013.
10. Santos, S. G. 2015. *Falar pelos Cotovelos.* B1/B2. Lisboa: Lidel, 2015.
11. Oliveira, C. ; Coelho, L. *Aprender Português 3. Português para Estrangeiros.* B2. Lisboa: Texto Editores, 2013.

CEFR levels C1/C2:

12. Henriques, T. S.; Freitas, F. *Qual é a Dúvida?* B1/B2 – C1/C2. Lisboa: Lidel, 2011.
13. Malcata, H. *Hoje em Dia...* C1/C2. Lisboa: Lidel, 2016.
14. Malcata, H. *Português Atual 3.* C1/C2. Lisboa: Lidel, 2018.

B. Didactic Materials

15. Arruda, L. *Gramática de Português Língua Não Materna.* Porto: Porto Editora, 2016.
16. Coimbra, I. ; Coimbra, O. M. *Gramática Ativa 1.* A1/A2/B1. Lisboa: Lidel, 2011.
17. Coimbra, I.; Coimbra, O. M. *Gramática Ativa 2.* B1+/B2/C1. Lisboa: Lidel, 2012.
18. Hutchinson, A. P. & Lloyd, J. *Portuguese. An Essential Grammar*. London: Routledge, 1996.
19. Pascoal, J. L.; Brandão, T. O. *Exames de Português B2. Preparação e Modelos.* Lisboa: Lidel, 2012.