VOCÊS VÃO SAIR A BEM OU A MAL: AN EXAMINATION OF (IM)POLITE FORMS OF ADDRESS ONLINE IN EUROPEAN PORTUGUESE

*(*Vocês vão sair a bem ou a mal*: Uma Análise de Formas de Tratamento (In)Delicadas* Online *em Português Europeu)*

Rita Faria [1]
(Universidade Católica Portuguesa/CECC - Lisboa)

RESUMO
O presente artigo analisa formas de tratamento em português europeu online *e o seu potencial para transmitir ou reforçar agressão verbal. Tomando como ponto de partida um vídeo filmado em janeiro de 2019 no Bairro da Jamaica, nos subúrbios de Lisboa, em que forças policiais agridem fisicamente vários residentes, constituíram-se dois* corpora *agregando comentários publicados na plataforma* YouTube *e em jornais* online *portugueses. As principais conclusões são: as formas de tratamento constituem estratégias linguísticas de facilitação de agressão verbal e de indelicadeza; as plataformas* online *constituem contextos discursivos específicos, não devendo ser estudadas de forma homogénea; noções de identidade e de cognição são aspetos fundamentais a desenvolver no âmbito de investigações futuras sobre formas de tratamento.*
Palavras-chave: *Formas de tratamento. Português europeu. (In)delicadeza. Agressão verbal.*

ABSTRACT
This article examines forms of address in European Portuguese online and their potential to convey, or facilitate, verbal aggression. Departing from an incident at Bairro da Jamaica in the outskirts of Lisbon, in January 2019, where police were filmed attacking residents, two corpora are constituted based on comments left on YouTube and online Portuguese broadsheets. The analysis of the data shows that forms of address are important devices to facilitate verbal aggression and impoliteness; that online platforms cannot be seen homogeneously but rather as specific contexts imposing specific discursive constraints; and that issues of identity and cognition are fundamental aspects to be developed in future research attempts into forms of address.
Keywords: *Forms of address. European Portuguese. (Im)politeness. Verbal aggression.*

RESUMEN

El presente artículo analiza las formas de tratamiento en portugués europeo en línea y su potencialidad para transmitir o reforzar agresión verbal. Tomando como punto de partida un video grabado en enero de 2019 en el Bairro da Jamaica, en los suburbios de Lisboa, donde las fuerzas de seguridad agredieron físicamente a varios residentes, se establecieron dos corpus de comentarios publicados en la plataforma Youtube y en varios diarios en línea portugueses. Las principales conclusiones a las que se llega son: las formas de tratamiento componen estrategias lingüísticas de facilitación de agresión verbal y de grosería (indelicadeza, incorrección); las plataformas online crean contextos discursivos específicos, no debiendo ser estudiados de forma homogénea; nociones de identidad y de cognición son aspectos fundamentales que deben ser desarrollados en el ámbito de investigaciones futuras sobre formas de tratamiento.

Palabras clave: *Formas de tratamiento. Portugués europeo. (In) delicadeza (In) corrección. Agresión verbal*

[1] Rita Faria is Assistant Professor at Universidade Católica Portuguesa, Lisbon, where she teaches undergraduate and graduate courses in Portuguese as a Foreign Language, EFL and Discourse. She is interested in (im)politeness, forms of address with a focus in Portuguese, verbal aggression, literature and aggression and (im)politeness and fiction. E-mail: ritafreire_faria@hotmail.com

Recebido em: dezembro 2019
Aceito em: dezembro 2019
DOI: 10.26512/les.v20i3.28640

INTRODUCTION

Forms of address are prime linguistic means to direct discourse to specific interlocutors. Their usage is twofold – it depends on particular features of the addressee such as age, occupation, status, as Brown and Gilman (1960) classical work on pronouns of address has illustrated; but perhaps more importantly, forms of address depend on how these categories are interpreted by the speaker so as to render them into what she perceives is an adequate form of address. This is therefore a sensitive matter given that speakers are in effect choosing to display their own representations and evaluations of the addressee, despite how intuitive or lithe they think their address behaviour may be.

Braun (1988, p. 7) defines forms of address as “words and phrases used for addressing” and as such they encompass not only pronouns of address but also nominal and verb forms. Braun (1988, p. 7) is also quick to point out that forms of address “designate the collocutor(s), but not necessarily so, since their lexical meaning can differ from or even contradict the addressee's characteristics”, as is the case with terms of endearment, for example; the conclusion is thus that “meaning […] is hardly separable from address usage.” (BRAUN, 1988, p. 254).

Underlining the lexical meaning of a form as intertwined with its potential address meaning is relevant because it brings to the fore the importance of speakers’ communicative goals which shape their address behaviour. Serrano (2017) analyses different uses of the Spanish pronouns tú and usted to arrive at the important conclusion that the meaning of address forms and behaviours cannot be ascertained outside the communicative context and respective communicative goals of interactants:

> […] speakers not only select one or another form on the basis of possible conditioning external factors but most importantly, they choose the meaning they consider to be more appropriate for the accomplishment of their communicative goals (SERRANO, 2017, p. 97).

The latent social and addressive meanings of forms are thus often exploited by speakers in order to meet specific communicative needs, which are rendered all the more important due to the fact that address is a matter of choice. If, from a range of grammatically sound forms, speakers choose the address which they find more convenient, then this means they often engage in linguistic negotiation departing from conventional social meanings so as to arrive at a form of address

appropriate to their communicative goals. Oliveira (2009) thus emphasises the importance of negotiation in address behaviour – forms of address can be used creatively, departing from conventionalised usages to eventually settle, via sociolinguistic negotiation instigated by one or more participants, on a form of address that both interactants find appropriate (i.e., a form of address which "adequately represent[s] the developing relationship between the two" – OLIVEIRA, 2009, p. 421).

In view of the rich potential offered by forms of address to convey negotiated, creative meanings which may supersede their semantic meanings so as to better render specific communicative goals, the aim of this article is to examine the role of forms of address in European Portuguese in the realm of computer-mediated communication (CMC), namely their potential to convey or facilitate verbal aggression. European Portuguese (EP) knows a plethora of linguistic address (verb, nominal and pronominal bound forms) and perhaps due to the vast range of forms available to them, speakers of EP often find themselves entangled in a "linguistic struggle" (WATTS, 2003) over the meaning and adequacy of address forms. Similarly, the realm of CMC, where anonymity and lack of familiarity make social factors and social indexing less relevant than in face-to-face situations, offers a rich ground to study address behaviours and how the latter may facilitate the pursuit of specific communicative goals, primarily aggression.

The departure point of this examination is an incident occurred at Bairro ("neighbourhood") da Jamaica, situated in the outskirts of Lisbon, in January 2019. Police were called in to the neighbourhood to apparently resolve a fight amongst two residents. A video which quickly became viral shows officers "beating, pushing and dragging anyone who came into their path" (The Guardian)[2] and sparked a heated debate on social media, providing ample grounds to examine linguistic (im)politeness and verbal aggression in their relation to address behaviours. Therefore, this article aims to provide an insight into how forms of address in European Portuguese can play a pivotal role in communicative situations of (im)polite, aggressive behaviour. To this effect, we examine the usage of forms of address in online discussion boards (namely comments left on online newspapers and Youtube) on the aforementioned incident at Bairro da Jamaica.

The following section focuses on a discussion of the notions of aggression and impoliteness and of computer-mediated communication, followed by an examination of the current system of linguistic address in EP. Further, the collection of data, the constitution of the corpora and their respective coding categories will be explicated, previous to the scrutiny of forms of address as evinced in the data and their facilitation of aggressive behaviour (or not). The article will close with

[2] The Guardian, "Lisbon's bad week: police brutality reveals Portugal's urban reality", 31st January 2019.

an attempt to tie the “loose ends” that this research will necessarily leave hanging so as to provide pointers to future research, namely an examination of how a cognitive perspective, based on intersubjectivity, can be fruitful when considering the usage and representations mediated by forms of address.

1 (IM)POLITENESS, AGGRESSION AND CMC

Studies on (im)politeness have grown exponentially since Brown and Levinson’s seminal book published in 1987, *Politeness. Some Universals in Language Usage.* Theirs is an examination of politeness taken as an implicature (“Linguistic politeness is therefore implicated in the classical way, with maximum theoretical parsimony, from the CP” – BROWN; LEVINSON, 1987, p. 5) and equated to facework, a notion borrowed from Goffman (1967). Brown and Levinson (1987) take face to be the “public self-image” (p. 61) of an individual speaker, cleft into two sets of wants: negative face (the want to freedom of action and to non-imposition) and positive face (the desire to be appreciated and approved of). Politeness would be linguistic facework destined to preserve both the positive and negative facets of individual face wants (positive politeness and negative politeness respectively). Thus, in the presence of a “face-threatening act” or FTA, that is, any linguistic act that could potentially damage the hearer’s face, politeness would act as a palliative device that would allow for the FTA to be performed, albeit with redress.

Although not focusing on impoliteness or aggression, Brown and Levinson draw attention to an important aspect of politeness as facework, namely the role of politeness as a device for social control and to offset aggression. The need for linguistic politeness would be based in the assumption that verbal aggression and impoliteness are latent, possible and should thus be offset:”… politeness, like formal diplomatic protocol (for which it must surely be the model) presupposes that potential for aggression as it seeks to disarm it […].” (BROWN; LEVINSON, 1987, p. 1)

We find this particular observation to be relevant for the analysis of forms of address – forms which, *par excellence,* can show deference, respect or politeness towards the addressee in very much socially controlled, conventionalised ways for the sake of diplomacy and harmonious conviviality; but also forms which offer the potential to disrupt the aforementioned social control when used in ways which offset expectations deriving from social norms. This seems to hold especially true in languages such as European Portuguese where, due to its complex system of

address, and as Carreira (2003) remarks, forms of address and realisations of politeness go “hand in hand”[3].

The influence of Brown and Levinson’s framework still holds sway in politeness studies and possible reasons for that are their clusters of politeness strategies, of easy applicability to various datasets (the authors claimed their framework encompassed “universals in language usage” and was therefore suited to the study of politeness in any natural language) as well as a robust theoretical grounding (politeness is a neat implicature derived from the Cooperative Principle and thus a rational deviation arising from the need to communicate politeness at the expense of conversational maxims). However, these theoretical postulates are perhaps too neat to encapsulate such an interpersonal and context-sensitive phenomenon such as politeness. As Watts (2005, p.xii) puts it, “[t]here was a certain uneasiness about the rationalist, individualistic approach to politeness which saw it as a set of strategies to achieve social goals with a minimum of social friction.” Context clearly did not play enough of a role under Brown and Levinson and was reduced to three variables, P (Power), D (Distance) and R (the magnitude of the imposition of the FTA in a given culture), whilst also excluding speakers’ own evaluations and meanings attributed to politeness.

To somehow respond to this theoretical failing, Eelen (2001) first introduces the crucial distinction between first-order politeness (or politeness1) and second-order politeness (or politeness2) to differentiate between speakers’ own evaluations and meta-judgements on politeness from academic, technical definitions of the phenomenon. Researchers such as Mills (2003), Locher (2004), Locher; Watts (2005), Locher; Watts (2008), Watts (2003), Watts *et al*. (2005) therefore emphasise the discursive, emergent nature of politeness (taken here as politeness1) and “the contested nature of politeness norms across cultures” (TERKOURAFI, 2005, p. 238). The discursive view of both politeness and impoliteness is encapsulated under the notion of “relational work” put forward by Locher; Watts (2005), a wide spectrum of verbal behaviour describing “the ‘work’ individuals invest in negotiating relationships with others” (LOCHER; WATTS, 2005, p. 10) and raging from “direct, impolite, rude or aggressive interaction through to polite interaction, encompassing both appropriate and inappropriate forms of social behaviour” (LOCHER; WATTS, 2005, p. 11) – hence the term (im)politeness to better convey this continuum. From a purely relational view, “[t]here is […] no linguistic behaviour that is inherently polite or impolite.” (LOCHER; WATTS, 2008, p. 78). Furthermore, the discursive nature of (im)politeness means it can only be examined in particular exchanges, at a “micro-level” (TERKOURAFI, 2005) and as a situational “contextual judgement” (SPENCER-OATEY, 2005, p. 97). This precludes any attempts

[3] “[...] le choix de la forme d'adresse adéquate et l'expression de politesse vont, en effet, de pair.”.

at predictions or generalisations, thus severely impeding the role of the researcher, who cannot go beyond the observation of particularised social interactions.

Although a relational, discursive view of (im)politeness has the merit of emphasising speakers' own evaluations – and crucially, also perceptions – of what politeness and impoliteness are, it denies the possibility of any theory of (im)politeness. Under this relational view, examinations of (im)politeness cannot, and should not, go beyond the surface level and are therefore rendered an epistemological impossibility. A more balanced view is clearly needed, not only to allow the researcher to actually examine instances of (im)politeness and arrive at justified conclusions, but also to take into account that some behaviours, supported by particular usages, fall into "shared conventions of meaning" (CULPEPER, 2011, p. 123) which allow speakers (and researchers) to evaluate these behaviours and usages as polite or impolite across the board, i.e. even out of context:

> […] perhaps the most compelling evidence requiring us to re-think […] the discursive approach is intuitive – the commonplace fact that people have opinions about how different expressions relate to different degrees of politeness or impoliteness *out of context*, and often opinions which are similar to others sharing their communities. (CULPEPER, 2011, p. 124)

The view of (im)politeness followed in this paper is therefore aligned with what Culpeper (2011) points out – that (im)politeness is both a semanticised behaviour, in that it can be encoded in the semantic meaning of forms (to this extent, some forms can be inherently (im)polite); and that it is also a pragmatic phenomenon, context-dependent and subjected to participants' own interpretation of what, in a particular context, counts as (im)polite. This is therefore a dualist position, as Culpeper (2011) further elaborates – semantic and pragmatic (im)politeness are "inter-dependent opposites on a scale. (Im)politeness can be more determined by a linguistic expression or can be more determined by context […]: it is the interaction between the two that counts" (CULPEPER, 2011, p. 125).

Culpeper's (2011) balanced position means that much of the work posited by Brown and Levinson (1987) can be safeguarded; indeed, in his vast work on impoliteness (CULPEPER 1996, 2005, 2011, 2016 for example), the author draws on Brown and Levinson's set of strategies as counterparts to impoliteness and defines a taxonomy of impoliteness – bald-on-record impoliteness, negative impoliteness, positive impoliteness, off-record impoliteness and withhold politeness (CULPEPER 1996, 2005, 2016). As we shall see, this taxonomy is particularly valuable for this study as it will allow us to pinpoint a relevant impoliteness strategy found in the data, namely "exclude the other/dissociate from other", destined to damage the addressee's positive face.

There are, however, two caveats which Culpeper (2016) carefully explains about his exploration into impoliteness "strategies": firstly, that strategies are equated to "ways of achieving particular goals in interaction that are conventional for a particular community" (CULPEPER, 2016, p. 424). This echoes the aforementioned "dualist position", since a strategy is essentially pragmatic, applying to particular goals in particular contexts, but also routinely used and "conventional". The second caveat is what Culpeper (2016, p. 435) describes as a "most heinous crime", which is "when performing an analysis of impoliteness strategies, or politeness for that matter, […] to simply count them up on the assumption that if the strategy is there, it necessarily is performing impoliteness." In other words, the researcher cannot take the presence of impoliteness strategies at face value and simply assume that impoliteness has surfaced because participants happen to resort to some, or all, of these strategies. A careful study of context needs to be conducted so that evaluations of impoliteness can be issued *a posteriori.* This is possible if, as Blitvich (2010a, p. 541) elucidates, the researcher can "demonstrate that his/her interpretation is (i) analogous to participants' assessments and (ii) valuable within an im-politeness theoretical framework." Furthermore, Mullany's (2008, p. 237) important consideration on the role of the analyst is of note:

> Provided that analysts are careful about the claims they make, using all verbal, non-verbal material and […] what they consider to be the most justifiable reading of what has taken place within an interaction, then it is perfectly acceptable for analysts to play a role in judging whether or not (im)politeness has taken place.

Safeguarding the role of the researcher is of paramount importance in an ever-expanding field of engorging literature as is the study of (im)politeness. Not only does the debate on (im)politeness show no signs of reaching consensus but it also postulates disparate stances on how researchers should go about examining (im)politeness1. More importantly, pinpointing exact cases of (im)politeness1 without interference from the researcher's evaluations would be arduous because "interlocutors do not wear their intentions on their sleeves" (CULPEPER *et al.*, 2003, p. 1552). Not only are intentions and speakers' own assessments of difficult access but we must also call into question the need to access them at every research juncture. As stated before, if the researcher thoroughly examines the material available, if she is culturally in tune with the community examined, and if the departing point of the research is indeed data-driven and based on naturally elicited data coming from speakers of a certain community, then the researcher's judgements of what is aggressive and/or impolite should bear enough validity.

So far, the term "aggression" seems to have been included under the "umbrella term" of impoliteness, which "covers all kinds of evaluative meanings (e. g., warm, friendly, considerate, respectful, deferential, insolent, aggressive, rude)" (SPENCER-OATEY, 2005, p. 97). A similar

position is taken by Watts (2003) and Locher; Watts (2005), which see aggression as a facet of impoliteness; Bousfield (2008, p. 132) defines impoliteness as "intentionally gratuitous" and performed with "deliberate aggression, that is, with the face threat exacerbated, 'boosted', or maximised in some way to heighten the face damage inflicted." Under this light, aggression is a "heightened" facet of impoliteness, the latter requiring both intention and perception, that is, "for impoliteness to be considered successful impoliteness, the intention of the speaker (or 'author') to 'offend' (threaten/damage face) must be understood by those in a receiver role" (BOUSFIELD 2008, p. 132). This stance is different from Culpeper-based models on impoliteness (and presumably aggression), as these contemplate the possibility of a mismatch between the intention of the speaker and the perception of the hearer: "Impoliteness comes about when: (1) the speaker communicates face attack intentionally, or (2) the hearer perceives and/or constructs behaviour as intentionally face-attacking, or a combination of (1) and (2)" (CULPEPER, 2005, p. 38).

In Archer's (2008) view, which calls for further clarification between impoliteness and aggression, it is possible to distinguish between the two whilst keeping Culpeper's taxonomy of impoliteness. For Archer (2008), aggression is a wider phenomenon which encompasses face attack which is to some extent "sanctioned" or expected (Archer applies these notions to courtroom datasets, where a degree of face attack is not uncommon); impoliteness would be an intensified facet of aggression, driven by a sense of personal spite. Culpeper's taxonomy of impoliteness is thus seen as a taxonomy of aggression or face aggravation which, depending on context, can turn into impoliteness. Archer's (2008) distinction between verbal aggression and impoliteness draws from Culpeper *et al.* (2003), which in turn resort to Goffman's (1967) threefold distinction between face that is intentional, incidental and unintended. Impolite behaviour thus falls under "an offence which aims at aggravating the face of the intended recipient" (CULPEPER *et al.*, 2003, p. 1550) and which corresponds to an "offending person" who "may appear to have acted maliciously and spitefully, with the intention of causing open insult" (GOFFMAN, 1967, p. 14 *apud* CULPEPER *et al.*, 2003, p. 1550). For Archer (2008, p. 189), it is a "personal sense of spite", and consequently intentionality, which would define impoliteness and distinguish it from verbal aggression.

Before we go any further, a clarification is in order. We do not believe that fixed notions of impoliteness, politeness and verbal aggression are within our reach, nor do we believe they are desirable. Each dataset examined warrants a rethink and a repositioning of our (perhaps long) held views of what counts as (im)politeness, and frameworks and methodologies should thus be adaptable to working notions of given concepts instead of essentialist ones, as Janicki (2017) puts it. She suggests a "non-essentialist standpoint requiring that we abandon the chase after correct

definitions […] and that we remain satisfied with working definitions, which will differ depending on the purposes in an individual project" (JANICKI, 2017, p. 164).

Since our purpose is to study the potential of forms of address in EP to facilitate or convey verbal aggression, we find the notion of aggression as a generalised attitude constituting face attack and aggravation to be useful; following Archer (2008), verbal aggression is sanctioned but it does not mean it is "neutralised" – the FTA is clearly performed, only in a context where it is expected to some extent (and we find that in the realm of CMC aggression is to be expected, albeit not neutralised nor necessarily ratified). Impoliteness is here understood to be an aggravated facet of aggression, communicated with intent to be spiteful and offensive.

Much like (im)politeness studies, the field of CMC has grown considerably, concentrating on how language is used and strategically deployed online. Herring (2004, 2007) warns against "technical determinism" in order to not take CMC as homogeneously produced; she sees the medium of CMC as heavily relational, where speakers form virtual communities by exploiting the technological affordances available such as anonymity and asynchrony. A number of studies focusing on CMC, identity, face and (im)politeness have emerged (ANGOURI; TSELIGA, 2010; DOBS; BLITVICH, 2013; GRAHAM, 2007; KERBRAT-ORECCHIONI, 2014; LOCHER, 2010; LORENZO-DUS *et al.*, 2011; UPADHYAY, 2010, etc.) but what we find most useful are Locher's (2014) important remarks about computer-mediated discourse, which emphasise that online interactions are "ultimately conducted by the same people who engage in offline interaction and who draw on this experience" (LOCHER, 2014, p. 571). When applied to the examination of forms of address online, this important realisation explains why languages which know a T/V[4] distinction of forms of address do not necessarily resort to T forms online and sometimes prefer to maintain the status-quo of address, i.e., conventionalised V forms suitable to offline address amongst mutually unfamiliar interactants (see Kretzenbacher; Schupbach, 2015, for example, who arrive at this conclusion; see also Clyne *et al.*, 2009 for a discussion of how the medium, namely computer-based, can affect usage and perception of forms of address).

A second, but no less important, consequence deriving from Locher's remarks is that CMC should be seen as a layer of context like any other. To put it into practical terms, if we take Fairclough's (2001, p. 21) definition of what context is, we see it includes not only the social interactions where texts are produced and interpreted, but also the social conditions of production and interpretation, which in turn are constrained by orders of discourse and ultimately by the social order. CMC should be seen as an integral part of these social conditions of production and

[4] The T/V distinction is posited by Brown and Gilman (1960, p. 254) who, based on the Latin pronouns *tu* and *vos*, define T pronouns as "familiar" and V forms as "polite."

interpretation, that is, a layer of context informing interactants of certain socially determined discursive practices (which, as Fairclough (2001, p.24) clarifies, does not preclude creativity). It is because CMC also provides social conditions of production and interpretation of discourse that speakers use it to pursue communicative goals such as aggression, whilst resorting to a range of linguistic devices that relevantly include forms of address – and they do so online and offline.

2 The data: forms of address in EP, collection, coding and analysis

2.1. Forms of address in European Portuguese

Forms of address in EP comprise pronominal, nominal and verb forms and they constitute the research core of this article. In the Middle Ages, the system of address in Portugal followed the lines of the French pronouns, encompassing *tu* as T address and *vós* as V address. As Cintra (1972) importantly elucidates, the grand entrance of nominal forms in the language, initially as deferential address to the King *(Vossa Mercê, Vossa Senhoria, Vossa Excelência)* from the 14th century onwards, caused a shift of great proportions towards nominal forms and the widespread usage of the third person, so much so that the available options for address encountered in European Portuguese today are the following:

Figure 1 – Bound forms of address in European Portuguese:

Form:	**SINGULAR**	**PLURAL**
PRONOMINAL	**TU** + 2p.: **Tu queres** um café? *Would you* (2p.sg.) *like a coffee?*	**VOCÊS** + 3p.pl.: **Vocês querem** um café? *Would you* (3p.pl.) *like a coffee?*
	VOCÊ + 3p.: Você quer um café? *Would you* (você) *like* (3p.sg.) *a coffee?*	
NOMINAL	**NF [Nominal Form** - First name, kinship term, term of endearment, title, honorific, etc.] + 3p.sg.: **A senhora compreende** (3p.sg.) o que **lhe** (3p.sg.) digo? *Does the lady understand* (3p.sg.) *what I'm telling her?*	**NF** + 3p.pl.: ***As senhoras compreendem*** (3p.pl.) *o que lhes* (3p.pl.) *digo?* *Do the ladies understand* (3p.pl.) *what I'm telling them?*
VERB	Ø 2p.sg.: **Queres** (2p.sg.) um café? *Would you* (Ø) *like* (2p.sg.) *a coffee?*	Ø 3p.pl.: **Querem** (3p.pl.) um café? *Would you* (Ø) *like* (3p.pl.) *a coffee?*
	Ø 3p.sg.: **Quer** (3p.sg.) um café? *Would you* (Ø) *like* (3p.sg.) *a coffee?*	

What is immediately clear from the table above is a significant divide between morphology and pragmatics allowing for a myriad of addressive nuances which have already been well noted by Carreira (1997, 2001, 2003). The grammatical second person, which should be the most immediate way to encode the deictic second person (the addressee), is entirely residual and survives only as a

T form in the singular, either in the pronoun *tu* or in the second person singular verb form. The original second person plural pronoun *vós*, which in the Middle Ages also accumulated functions of politeness, now survives as dialect, having been eliminated from the standard norm and taking with it the semantics of deference it once had. In effect, this gave nominal forms and the third person free reign to invade the system of address and to introduce a new, destabilising element in the system, the pronoun *você.* The latter is the grammaticalised form of *Vossa Mercê*, introduced in the language in the 14th century but rapidly declining in the social scale. The downgrading of the form was probably responsible for its gradual semantic bleaching and phonological reduction until it reached the fixed form *você*. Not only does this pronoun explain the advancement of the third person and other nominal forms in the EP address system but it also demonstrates that the latter is indeed the locus of "linguistic struggle" (WATTS, 2003) over the meaning of forms of address and how (and to whom) they should be used. In fact, the form *você* is often described as "offensive", especially when used towards an elderly person or someone of a higher social status, an opinion shared by Braun (1988, p. 95: "Addressing someone with nonreciprocal você mostly means regarding the addressee as inferior"); Cunha and Cintra, 1998; Carreira, 2003; Duarte, 2011; Oliveira (1994, 2009, 2013), for example. In our view, the potentially offensive meaning attributed to *você* means that some EP speakers might feel a sense of discomfort when addressed by this form because they perceive it as incompatible with the view they have taken of their own public persona – therefore, incompatible with their face wants. In an interesting article applying Relevance Theory to politeness, Jary (1998) examines the context variables postulated by Brown and Levinson, P, D and R, to demonstrate that whenever speakers do not agree on the socially determined values of these variables, they will choose a linguistic form which does not fulfil the interlocutors' expectations – these forms "would constitute evidence that the speaker ranked one of the three variables in a manner incompatible with the hearer's assumptions about their mutual cognitive environment" (JARY, 1998, p. 5).

In our view, the problem that many speakers see in the usage of *você* (if they see a problem at all, that is) is precisely this – the pronoun evinces incompatible rankings of social and cultural values amongst interlocutors, a discrepancy usually arising because the recipient of *você* sees it as evidence that his or her own social ranking is not deemed sufficiently high to warrant the deferential semantics of a nominal form (title or honorific, for example).

However, some authors see little reason to fuss over *você* – Cuesta and Luz, writing as early as 1971, state that this pronoun, probably due to the convenience it offers for address amongst equals, would easily "gain ground" (CUESTA AND LUZ, 1971, p. 483); more recently, Lara and Guilherme (2018) have examined three different corpora of EP and find that the usage of *você*

shows signs of abating as it is a residual, and not a preferred, pronoun of address in the data. They also add that “we have not found instances of pejorative *você*, in spite of the fact that the literature states that this reading is currently possible” (LARA AND GUILHERME, 2018, p. 349). Albeit undeniably interesting and deserving further research, these findings apply to the specific corpora examined and in our view do not necessarily indicate “a decreasing use” of *você* in EP*;* secondly, it should come as no surprise that no instances of a pejorative use of *você* were found – what the available literature on the subject states is that the form *você* can lend itself to interpretations of impoliteness and can therefore be considered offensive, and not that this form is used with deliberate impolite tones. In other words, the offensive potential of *você* is a perlocutionary effect depending on interpretation *a posteriori*, more than being used strategically and pejoratively to cause offense (which, we would agree, does not seem likely).

In view of this, the more enlightened conclusion to derive is that “there is not a consensus as to the use of *você* and its respective context and to the social variables which govern it[5]” (GOUVEIA, 2008, p. 94, our translation). This is an important elucidation because what the form *você* clearly demonstrates is “de-tradionalised and de-ritualised social relations” occurring after the Carnation Revolution of 1974 and the considerable social and cultural transformations it entailed. Not only did the Revolution cause a considerable shift in interpersonal relations which are now “contextually built based on a greater equality in the status of social actors”[6] (GOUVEIA, 2008, p. 97, our translation) but it also eroded the semantics of nonreciprocal, asymmetric deference of old social mores. This is further reinforced by the pronoun *tu,* which also signals “de-traditionalised” and “de-ritualised” social relations – Gouveia (2017) shows how *tu* can be used to signal “superiority and distance by someone who feels situationally and morally superior, despite the fact they are not socially superior”[7] (GOUVEIA, 2017, p. 5, our translation). The emergence of new social contexts where “performative identities” (GOUVEIA, 2017, p. 6, our translation) are enacted with the help of forms of address is thus an important point to which we shall come back later.

These reflections on the change and instability of EP forms of address show they are far from being static linguistic items, but can be used creatively to reshape identities and social relations. That is why Oliveira’s (1994, 2009) model of negotiation is important as it underlines the interpersonal negotiation in which speakers often engage so as to settle on forms of address accomplishing their specific communicative goals, or the identity they wish to claim. Address forms

[5] “… não se chegar facilmente a um consenso relativamente à definição e descrição dos contextos de uso de você e das variáveis sociais a eles associados.” (GOUVEIA, 2008, p. 94).

[6] “… em que as relações interpessoais se constroem contextualmente a partir de uma base de maior igualdade em termos de estatuto entre os actores sociais.” (GOUVEIA, 2008, p. 97).

[7] “…tu está a ser usado como marca interpessoal de superioridade e de distância por quem, não sendo socialmente superior, se sente situacional e moralmente superior.” (GOUVEIA, 2017, p. 5).

should thus be seen as "variable at the level of the individual, rather than determined by one's demographic profile" (OLIVEIRA, 2009, p. 430).

It is also the aforementioned notion of "de-ritualisation" of address which explains why the current EP system of address cannot be subsumed under a T/V distinction. Carreira (2003), Hammermueller (2003) and Oliveira (1994, 2009), for example, all agree that the pro-drop option in EP (eliding the expression of the subject which is embedded in the verb form) is a convenient "avoidance" strategy as it precludes the sensitive, sometimes difficult choice of an expressed subject. This would therefore warrant the need to consider a triadic division for the Portuguese system, something that Cook (1997, 2013) substantiates with her proposal of the triad T, V and N (neutrality). The facet N would correspond to the third person singular verb form, thus described because it provides "a noncommittal platform while still considering V and T shades of formality or informality" (COOK, 2013, p. 278). In the sense that it "bypasses" T and V but retains elements of both, the pronoun *você,* which "appears to be successfully shedding its former negative overtones" (p. 286), is a possible candidate to occupy the N stage.

We agree that dyad T/V does not adequately account for the current EP system of address and that the introduction of an N facet is therefore warranted. However, the concept of "neutrality" and its potential candidates, namely third person verb forms, beg more discussion – surely that a verb form devised to avoid address in the first place cannot be pragmatically "neutral". In this sense, perhaps neutrality could be approximate to some kind of morphosyntactic "neutral" criterion where the subject is absent and the verb bears minimum inflection. There is also the problem of establishing whether a verb form can constitute an actual form of address – if the interaction grows in length and complexity, interlocutors are bound to choose more specific forms of address; it seems doubtful that a pro-drop verb form can sufficiently satisfy speakers' communicative needs in multifaceted, socially complex interactions. Perhaps *você* can indeed occupy the N stage at some point in the future, but it remains to be seen.

We do not believe any static solutions can be offered to adequately examine the system of address in EP. The latter needs to be taken for what it currently is – a complex set of different linguistic choices entailing different sociolinguistic values shaped by social and cultural principles which, due to a period of mounting social change, are on the move and escape attempts to encapsulate them in fixed social orders, rituals or traditions.

2.2. The data: collection and coding.

The data we have collected for this examination of EP forms of address consists of two different corpora constituted for our specific research purposes. This section explains the procedure followed and the ensuing coding categories used to analyse the datasets collected.

Departing from the aforementioned incident at Bairro da Jamaica, we collected 420 publicly available comments left on two YouTube videos using YouTube Comment Scraper: “Bairro da Jamaica Fogueteiro - Repressão policial”[8], which is a live recording of police intervention as it happened in the actual neighbourhood; and “Pedras e tiros na Baixa, no confronto dos moradores do Bairro da Jamaica com a polícia[9]”, which shows footage of a demonstration, and ensuing brawls with the police in downtown Lisbon, a few days after the incident. In addition, we manually collected 421 comments left on publicly available articles about the incident at Bairro da Jamaica published in online versions of the Portuguese broadsheets Público, Diário de Notícias and Observador (a list of the articles used can be found in Attachment 1). We collected a total of 841 comments, divided into two corpora, the YouTube Corpus (YTC) and the Newspaper Corpus (NC). Each comment is therefore identified by indicating the corpus to which it belongs (NC or YTC), followed by the number it has been attributed within each corpus. No editing or corrections were introduced – comments and excerpts are quoted as collected. We have selected comments which generated responses so as to study forms of address as they are used in interactions. Although all the comments were publicly available, names that seem to convey participants’ real identities (first name and surname, for example) were changed so as to keep the data fully anonymised.

Each comment was scanned for address and coded according to the categories displayed in figure 2, using the software MaxQDA. We followed an utterance-based method insofar as every utterance from each comment was examined and coded; this meant that the same comment could be coded several times to account for different strategies of address deployed. Although our examination is qualitative, as we are interested in analysing the variation and nuances of address, percentages were established based on the number of comments for each corpus; any information of a quantitative nature acts merely as confirmation of the qualitative modulation of the corpora.

The coding categories used to annotate the corpus were the following:

Figure 2 – Coding categories applied to the corpora:

INDIRECT ADDRESS
NO ADDRESS
ADDRESS:

[8] Available at: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-L7yXmApL4o
[9] Available at: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=b161BW5GZdw&t=2s

Singular: NF Senhora Senhor; NF Embed; Vocative; 2p sing verb; 3p sing verb; Você; Tu;

Plural: Nós (We); Vocês; 3 p.pl. verb;

Differently from Braun (1988, p. 12), who sees indirect address when "nominal variants are used as bound forms", we used this category to pinpoint cases when interlocutors talk about the addressee as if she or he is not present or cannot read the comment. This means the addressee is signalled as a referent (DICKEY, 1997) and not by means of a bound form of address. For example:

NC.239: Fala o Anjo Caído das *núvens do privilégio branco. *(Thus speaks the Fallen Angel from the clouds of white privilege).*

Even if not used abundantly in neither of the corpora, Indirect Address is an important category considering the affordances of the medium where data is elicited, i.e. online polylogues. As defined by Kerbrat-Orecchioni (2004, p. 4), polylogues are "multi-participant interactions" whose minimal unit is a trilogue, that is, at least three participants. In CMC, even if interactions are conducted on a one-to-one basis, polylogues necessarily entail the presence of an audience, that is, other potential interactants who form a vast "perceptual range" (DOBS; BLITVICH, 2013; LORENZO-DUS *et al.*, 2011) of potential participants. Therefore, indirect address is a clever strategy to direct discourse to a particular addressee and effectively flagging him or her whilst avoiding direct address.

No Address is included in the coding categories to identify comments which merely used the software optionality of replying to a previous comment without engaging in any relational work, thus discarding the usage of bound forms of address. Conversely, the broad category of Address was used to annotate comments that fell under the sub-codes described in figure 2: nominal forms (NF) *o senhor, a senhora*, which were looked at independently from other embedded NFs due to their widespread usage in EP; syntactically embedded NFs; vocatives; expressed pronouns *você, tu, vocês;* and pro-drop second and third persons singular and third person plural verb forms. The first person plural *nós* (we) was residual in the corpora but describes inclusive address such as:

NC.274: "Racismo marxista"? Estamos muito criativos... *("Marxist racism"? We're very creative...)*

The category of Address is useful to compare with instances of No Address so as to gauge the level of engagement in the corpora. The number of comments coded with Address will not necessarily match the number of segments coded with the Address sub-codes (vocatives, embedded NFs, etc.) and this is because several utterances within the same comment often resorted to differentiated nuances of address. Thus, if we add all the sub-codes under Address, the number of coded segments will surpass the instances of Address, as the latter category simply indicates the number of comments (not utterances, or segments) where forms of address, in general, were found.

2.3. The data: analysis

This section displays our findings of forms of address in the datasets collected and their relation to verbal aggression. The forms of address found in each of the corpora are the following:

Figure 3 – Forms of address in the corpora:

	Newspaper Corpus		**YouTube Corpus**	
	No. coded segments	%	No. coded segments	%
INDIRECT ADDRESS	6	1.4	17	4
NO ADDRESS	145	34.4	73	17.3
ADDRESS:	165	39.1	297	70.7
Singular				
NF Senhora Senhor	8	1.9	2	0.4
NF Embed	19	4.5	2	0.4
Vocative	43	10.2	104	24.7
2 p.sg. verb	26	6.1	239	56.9
3 p.sg. verb	100	23.7	13	3.09
Você	20	4.7	5	1.1
Tu	4	0.9	34	8
Plural				
Nós (We)	1	0.2	0	0
Vocês	4	0.9	38	9.04
3 p.pl. verb	3	0.7	43	10.2

The first realisation emerging from the corpora is the heavily interactional, interpersonal character of the YouTube corpus (YTC), showing a clear preference for the expression of forms of address in detriment of No Address. The Newspaper Corpus (NC) is more balanced in terms of

these two categories – it does show a preference for address, but the weight of coded segments under No Address is significantly more relevant than in the YTC. As we shall see, this sets the tone for verbal aggression to ensue – the YTC is more relational, and also much more aggressive, than the NC.

Another important facet is the usage of 2p.sg., which is the preferred form of address in the YTC, conveyed by its usage of pro-drop and the expressed *tu;* inversely, the NC resorts to the 3p.sg. and nominal forms more extensively, as well as to the form *você.* Unlike the YTC, the NC seems to choose conventional forms deemed adequate to address mutually unfamiliar participants in the offline world, which is indeed a reminder that the language deployed in CMC is not necessarily dissimilar from it.

The clear preference for vocatives found in the YTC is determining for the examination of address and verbal aggression, as we shall see. On the one hand, this preference merely emphasises the heavily relational, interpersonal character of the YTC to which we have already alluded; on the other hand, an examination of the vocatives found in this corpus, as opposed to those in the NC, clearly illustrates that the preference for address in the YTC is also a preference for verbal aggression, as show in Figure 4:

Figure 4 – Vocatives in the corpora:

YouTube Corpus:	Newspaper Corpus:
Insults and slurs: Racista *(racist)*; Filha da puta *(son of a bitch)*; Palhaço *(clown)*; Burra, burrinho *(donkey – stupid)*; Otário de merda *(shitty idiot)* Racistas brancos sem cor *(colourless white racists)*; Infeliz *(disgraceful)*; Aborto da sociedade *(abortion of society)*; Ignorante *(ignorant)*; Branco de merda *(shitty white)*; Seu merda *(you shit)*; cabrão *(big bastard)*; Sua esquerdista patética *(you pathetic leftie)*; seus esquerdalhos *(you lefties)*; Seu acéfalo *(you brainless)*; negroid salgadinha *(salty negroid);* amante de pretos *(black person lover)*; abutre nojento *(disgusting vulture)*; macaco, macaca *(monkey [male, female])*,etc. **Terms of endearment (sarcastic):**	**First name (FN):** Zé, Sérgio, Cristina, Gabriel, José, Daniel, Manel, etc. **Conventional forms:** Caro/Cara *(Dear)*/ Caríssimo + FN: Cara Cristina *(Dear Cristina);* Caro Luís *(Dear Luís),* etc. Caro amigo *(dear friend)* Senhor + FN *(Senhor Joaquim)* **Insults:** Anarco-comuna *(anarchist-commie)* Coitado *(pitiful)* **Honorifics (sarcastic):** Saiba Vossa Excelência... *(May I inform Your Excellency...)*

Amorzinho, morzão *(variations of "love")*; fofa *(sweetie)*.	

The difference is striking. The vocatives employed in the YTC are overwhelmingly comprised not only of insults but also of slurs (figure 4 displays illustrative examples). As Archer (2015, p. 83) explains, "slurs constitute more than just an emotional outburst […]. This is because the paradigmatic aim of slurs is to associate T(arget) negatively with an ethnically-/gender-loaded descriptive feature X – where X (from S's perspective) might be T's inferior ethnicity, […]etc." It is indeed the ethnic loading of slurs which is of relevance in the YouTube corpus as there can be no doubt they are used to direct aggression to particular targets. Furthermore, the significant presence of insults and slurs in this corpus (relevantly coupled with the use of 2p.sg.) also means that aggression crosses over to full-fledged impoliteness – it is difficult to conceive that the particular vocatives displayed in figure 4 were not driven by a sense of spite. It is also difficult to conceive that such insults and slurs do not bear the potential to cause negative emotions on addressees, emotion being an important part of the effects of impoliteness noted by a number of scholars (BLITVICH, 2010b; KIENPOINTNER, 2008; CULPEPER; 2011; CULPEPER; HARDAKER, 2017). Furthermore, the nature of CMC means that it is unlikely that the participants in the YTC corpus know each other personally, thus eliminating the possibility of resorting to insults and slurs for banter, or for usages "by in-group members to express affection for or approval of another" (ARCHER, 2015, p. 82). The vocatives employed in the YTC are therefore an impactful rendition of the verbal aggression, and impoliteness, found in this corpus.

The Newspaper Corpus presents a very different range of options, much of them aligned with conventional forms of address appropriate to mutually unfamiliar equals, hence the usage of first names and conventionalised formulae such as "dear…" Interestingly enough, the NC contains a meta-evaluation of forms of address and their connection to politeness, showing how address in EP is indeed connected to notions of politeness1:

NC.292: Vou ser cortês (não sei porque é que não existe a palavra "cortesa" já agora) e começar com um "caro". *(I'm going to be polite (I don't know why the word "cortesa"* [polite, feminine] *doesn't exist by the way) and start with "dear.").*

This does not mean that aggression is absent from the NC; it means it is residual, rarer and more subdued than in the YTC.

A very relevant difference in both corpora is the resort to plural address forms. The latter is residual in the NC, but the usage of *vocês* and the 3p.pl. is more significant in the YTC. The employment of these plural forms establishes a clear Portuguese – African divide, that is, a division between speakers who claim a belonging to a culturally construed notion of Portugal based on its colonial past and speakers who subscribe to this notion whilst criticising it for the evils it perpetrated in Africa. For example:

YTC.203: se voces nao tivessem vindo colonizar os nossos lados nada disso teria acontecido voces atrevidos querem tudo mas tudo perdem , pais de roubalheira *(If you* (vocês) *hadn't come colonising our lands nothing like this would have happened, you* (vocês) *[are]cocky, you want* (3p.pl.) *everything but you lose all, country of thieves.)*
YTC.350: vocês é que tomam medicamentos porque África é um poço de doenças desde a Ébola até à aids. Vocês africanos é que sempre quiseram escravizar e mandar na terra dos outros *(You* (vocês) *are the ones who take medicine because Africa is a pool of diseases from Ebola to aids. You Africans are the ones who have always wanted to enslave and rule other people's land.)*

These comments illustrate the profoundly aggressive, ethnically charged character of the YTC and the employment of plural forms of address to heighten an "us vs them" divide along ethnically loaded lines, which to us fall into the pits of racism and xenophobia. Any claims to identity evinced in this corpus are construed along these lines, with participants who identify as white Portuguese brandishing their nationality as means to exclude specific targets, namely other speakers who they perceive to be from African descent. For example:

YTC.341: Vocês vão sair a bem ou a mal, vais perder a guerra, não não aceitamos ser vossos escravos. Tu vais pagar todos os abusos que tentaste fazer e vieste fazer na terra dos brancos! É meu, sim, e já era dos meus antepassados, antes de mim (*Right or wrong, you're* (vocês) *going to leave, you're going to lose the war, no, we don't accept being your slaves. You're* (tu) *going to pay for all the abuse you* (2p.sg.) *tried to do and did in the land of white people! It's mine, yes, and it belonged to my ancestors before me.)*

This establishes an evident strategy of (im)politeness which gives this article its title and to which we have previously alluded, "exclude the other from an activity. Disassociate from the other" (CULPEPER 2005, 2016). Not only is it an attack to the addressee's positive face wants, whereby the speaker fully conveys that the recipient is not welcome, but this strategy is also an exclusion

from identity rights which some speakers in the YTC actively deny others. As Perelmutter (2018, p. 147) notes, “[i]n attempting to exclude undesirable outsiders, questions of identity come to the forefront […] ”; claims to identity and inclusion and exclusion from a sphere of identity rights seem to be a prominent reason for the extensive resort to verbal aggression found in the YTC corpus.

2.4. The data: main conclusions

Given the ethnically loaded character of the YTC, the importance of the researcher’s assessments is an important conclusion to derive from data analysis. It is in fact the presence of a researcher which allows for impoliteness of xenophobic and racist tones to be called out for what it is, even if speakers may not be interested or willing to do so.

The core of our data analysis and constitution of the corpora was an examination of the potential of forms of address to achieve specific communicative goals, namely verbal aggression and impoliteness. In our view, the comparison of the two corpora leads to this exact conclusion – forms of address, although they do not and cannot act as semantic encoders of aggression, seem to be facilitators or “open doors” to the deployment of aggressive, impolite language. The usage of 2p.sg. in the YTC is so extensive, and so obviously disparate from its residual usage in the NC, that we could go as far as to say we are dealing with a phenomenon of “convergence” and “accommodative behaviour” (DICKEY, 1997; HAVERKATE, 1983), whereby speakers try to accommodate their linguistic behaviour to that of their interlocutors, using the same forms of address. However, these are strategies usually employed to gain acceptance and reinforce solidarity; what we find in the YTC corpus is that the convergence towards *tu* and 2p.sg. is employed to reinforce verbal aggression and conflict[10]. In this light, these specifics forms do not encode aggression, but they act as facilitators of aggression insofar as, in the aforementioned (im)politeness scale postulated by Culpeper (2011), they lean towards the pragmatic, context-sensitive end of the scale, as opposed to the semanticised end where (im)politeness is encoded in particular forms. That is why considerations of aggression in the YTC had to encompass the usage of 2p.sg. coupled with that of impolite vocatives and had to be examined against the backdrop of a different CMC corpus, so as to better understand the pragmatic context where impoliteness and aggression arise.

The difference between the YouTube corpus and the Newspaper Corpus also emphasises the need to take into account the contextual constraints imposed by particular online platforms, that is, CMC cannot be taken as a homogeneous layer of context; particular online platforms with

[10] Although they were working on very different contexts, Gilman and Brown (1958) provide an important elucidation of the role of pronouns of address in social conflicts and the effects of *tu* not as solidarity but rather as offence.

particular specificities create unique conditions for the production and reception of discourse. What we find in the NC is forms of address much alike the ones which European Portuguese speakers use and receive in their everyday social encounters: first names, third person verb forms, the pronoun *você*. The form *tu* and second person singular verb forms are residual, mirroring the offline world where these forms are usually reserved for intimate, friendly and/or familiar situations. However, the widespread use of *tu* and the second person singular in the YTC shows that not only are forms of address used for specific purposes, mainly those of aggression, but they also depend on the context in which they are used. YouTube seems to be a platform which encourages different forms of address to those found in other online platforms, namely newspaper comment boards; this explains why negotiation of address was not significant in the corpora. Address behaviour was driven by the discursive context of each platform, which on YouTube is geared towards aggression. More importantly, this also shows that, depending on their communicative needs and goals, speakers can use forms of address to perform their own claims to specific identities, much like what Gouveia (2017) alludes to. In the YTC, this was mostly achieved by creating a divide between "us" and "them" resorting to plural forms of address.

FINAL REMARKS

We would like to use this section to briefly highlight future research strands which we find can be fruitful in the field of forms of address, aggression and impoliteness.

Firstly, identity seems to be a crucial aspect related to address and impoliteness requiring the kind of expanded analysis that the scope of this article cannot encompass. The examination of address in the YTC seems to show that participants use particular addressive strategies to not only claim an identity for themselves but also to exclude others from it. A genre approach to impoliteness and identity as postulated by Blitvich *et al*. (2013) and Blitvich (2010c) seems adequate here. The authors study the emergence of impoliteness in particular institutional genres such as reality TV and news interviews respectively, to claim that "impoliteness ensues when the identities and positioning we are trying to construct are not verified by interlocutors" (BLITVICH *et al*., 2013, p. 155), thus postulating an interesting link between impoliteness and identity. In certain institutional genres, "[i]mpoliteness emerges as the marker that establishes the difference between the in-group and the out-group" (BLITVICH, 2010c, p. 81), which seems very similar to what participants in the YouTube corpus attempt to do – using verbal aggression and impoliteness to deny others the identity rights they claim for themselves.

Finally, we find that a cognitive perspective on forms of address, which to some extent was already expounded by Oliveira (2013), would be important to illuminate particular usages of address and their pragmatic impact. Previously in this article we have attempted to explain how a relevance-theoretical perspective of address, namely of the form *você*, can help to clarify some of the uncertainties which speakers feel when deciding on the adequacy of forms of address. To reinforce what we claimed in the introduction to this article, address is always a matter of choice – a choice of how to represent the addressee. Therefore, to utter a form of address is to voice a mental representation of the "other". This is a crucial aspect of linguistic address and the reason why we feel the concept of intersubjectivity, as developed by the philosopher Edmund Husserl in the field of Phenomenology, can be of use.

It falls beyond the scope of this article to provide a detailed explanation of Husserl's works and his theory of intersubjectivity; for now, we shall concentrate on the premise of Phenomenology that knowledge is mediation - what we know is the representation of things and people, a representation created in the mind resulting from the interaction with other subjective minds. In this view, forms of address are prime linguistic and cognitive means of representation of interlocutors. In other words, they can be seen as "cognitive entries" into the experiences of the subjective mind, allowing the latter to cognitively frame representations of the addressee based on a set of social and cultural values (perceptions of social status, age, occupation, etc.). The negotiation and creativity of forms of address and their "de-ritualised" usage to which so many scholars we have quoted in this article allude (GOUVEIA, 2008, 2017; OLIVEIRA, 1994, 2009) can be seen as instances of intersubjectivity. To provide a practical, and hopefully illustrative, example: think of a student who, after graduating and obtaining her PhD, becomes a professor at a university where she encounters an old professor of hers. In this new social context, they are now colleagues and the older professor instigates a negotiation of forms of address – how about the ex-student using the professor's first name when addressing her? Many speakers of EP have been in this situation, instigated to resort to a form of address they feel might not adequately convey the social nuances of distance and hierarchy of interpersonal relations. The discomfort which potentially ensues is described by Brown and Gilman (1960, p. 270), who provide a very similar example, as "the tyranny of democratic manners." However, and tyrannical though it may seem, the shift of address from a deferential "Professor" to a more solidary first name is a necessary cognitive move to replace an old subjective representation of deference and inequality with a new one of solidarity and equality. The shift in linguistic address is necessary for the ex-student to be able to cognitively reframe (or to represent) her old professor as a colleague, based on the new knowledge acquired on the nature of their

relationship. The cognitive potential of address thus allows speakers to use if for their own purposes – empathy or aggression, for example.

Future research into forms of address would thus profit from examining further nexus with aggression and (im)politeness with a view to explore crucial aspects of identity and cognition evinced in the usage of linguistic address.

REFERENCES

ANGOURI, J.; TSELIGA, T. "You Have No Idea What You Are Talking About!" From e-disagreement to e-impoliteness in two online fora. *Journal of Politeness Research*, v. 6, p. 57-82, 2010.

ARCHER, D. Slurs, insults, (backhanded) compliments and other strategic facework moves. *Language Sciences*, v. 52, p. 82-97, 2015.

ARCHER, D. Verbal aggression and impoliteness: Related or synonymous? In: BOUSFIELD, D.; LOCHER, M. A. (ed.). *Impoliteness in Language. Studies on its Interplay with Power in Theory and Practice*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 2008.

BLITVICH, P. G.-C. Introduction: The status-quo and quo vadis of impoliteness research. *Intercultural Pragmatics*, v. 7, n. 4, p. 535-559, 2010a.

BLITVICH, P. G.-C. The YouTubification of Politics, Impoliteness and Polarization. In: TAIWO, R. (Ed.). *Handbook of Research on Discourse Behavior and Digital Communication*: Language Structures and Social Interaction. Hershey: Information Science Reference, 2010b.

BLITVICH, P. G.-C. A Genre Approach to the Study of Im-politeness. *International Review of Pragmatics*, v. 2, p. 46-94, 2010c.

BLITVICH, P. G.-C.; BOU-FRANCH, P.; LORENZO-DUS, N. Identity and impoliteness: The expert in the talent show Idol. *Journal of Politeness Research*, v. 9, n. 1, p. 97-121, 2013.

BOUSFIELD, D. Impoliteness in the struggle for power. In: BOUSFIELD, D.; LOCHER, M. A. (ed.). *Impoliteness in Language*. Studies on its Interplay with Power in Theory and Practice. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 2008.

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.

BROWN, P.; LEVINSON, S. C. *Politeness.* Some universals in language usage. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.

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. Last accessed in: 27 July 2019.

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

CLYNE, M.; NORRBY, C.; WARREN, J. *Language and human relations*: styles of address in contemporary language. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

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.

CUESTA, P. V.; LUZ, M. A. M. *Gramática da Língua Portuguesa*. Lisboa: Edições 70, 1971.

CULPEPER, J. Towards an anatomy of impoliteness. *Journal of Pragmatics*, v. 25, p. 349-367, 1996.

CULPEPER, J. Impoliteness and entertainment in the television quiz show: The Weakest Link. *Journal of Politeness Research*, v. 1, p. 35-72, 2005.

CULPEPER, J. *Impoliteness.* Using Language to Cause Offence. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.

CULPEPER, J.; BOUSFIELD, D.; WICHMANN, A. Impoliteness revisited: with special reference to dynamic and prosodic aspects. *Journal of Pragmatics*, v. 35, p. 1545-1579, 2003.

CULPEPER, J. Impoliteness Strategies, In: CAPONE, A.; MEY, J. L. (ed.). *Interdisciplinary Studies in Pragmatics, Culture and Society*. Cham: Springer, 2016.

CULPEPER, J.; HARDAKER, C. Impoliteness. In: CULPEPER, J.; HAUGH, M.; KÁDÁR, D. Z. (ed.). *The Palgrave handbook of linguistic (im)politeness*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2017.

CUNHA, C.; CINTRA, L. F. L. *Gramática do Português Contemporâneo*. Lisboa: Edições João Sá da Costa, 1998.

DICKEY, E. Forms of address and terms of reference. *Journal of Linguistics*, v. 33, p. 255-274, 1997.

DOBS, A.; BLITVICH, P. G. C. Impoliteness in interaction: accounting for face-threat witness's responses. *Journal of Pragmatics*, v. 53, p. 112-130, 2013.

DUARTE, I. M. Formas de Tratamento em Português: entre léxico e discurso. *Matraga*, v. 18, n. 28, p. 84-10, 2011.

EELEN, G. *A Critique of Politeness Theories.* Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing, 2001.

FAIRCLOUGH, N. *Language and Power.* Harlow: Longman, 2001.

GILMAN, A.; BROWN, R. Who says "tu" to whom. *ETC: A Review of General Semantics*, v. 15, p. 169-174, 1958.

GOFFMAN, E. *Interaction Ritual*. Essays on Face-to-Face Behaviour. New York: Pantheon, 1967.

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.

GOUVEIA, C. 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).

GRAHAM, S. L. Disagreeing to agree: Conflict, (im)politeness and identity in a computer-mediated community. *Journal of Pragmatics*, v. 39, p. 742-759, 2007.

HAMMERMUELLER, G. Adresser ou eviter, c'est la question. Comment s'adresser quelque'un en portugais sans avoir recours à un pronom ou à une autre forme équivalente. 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_hammermueller.pdf.Last accessed in: 27 July 2019.

HAVERKATE, H. Strategies in Linguistic Action. *Journal of Pragmatics*, v. 7, p. 637-656, 1983.

HERRING, S. Computer-Mediated Discourse Analysis: An Approach to Researching Online Behavior. In: BARAB, S. A.; KLING, R.; GRAY, J. H. (ed.). *Designing for Virtual Communities in the Service of Learning*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

HERRING, S. A Faceted Classification Scheme for Computer-Mediated Discourse. *Language@Internet*, v. 4, 2007. Available at: https://www.languageatinternet.org/articles/2007/761. Last accessed in: 27 July 2019.

JANICKI, K. What is conflict? What is aggression? Are these challenging questions? *Journal of Language Aggression and Conflict*, v. 5, n. 1, p. 156-166, 2017.

JARY, M. Relevance theory and the communication of politeness. *Journal of Pragmatics*, v. 30, p. 1-19, 1998.

KERBRAT-ORECCHIONI, C. Introducing polylogue. *Journal of Pragmatics*, v. 36, p. 1-24, 2004.

KIENPOINTNER, M. Impoliteness and Emotional Arguments. *Journal of Politeness Research*, v. 4, n. 2, p. 243-265, 2008.

KRETZENBACHER, H. L.; SCHUPBACH, D. Communities of Addressing Practice? Address in Internet Forums Based in German-Speaking Countries. *In*: NORRBY, C.; WIDE, C. (ed.). *Address practice as social action*: European perspectives. Basingstoke: Palgrave Pivot, 2015.

LARA, V.; GUILHERME, A. The politeness of *você* in European Portuguese. *Studies in Hispanic and Lusophone Linguistics*, v. 11, n. 2, p. 337-366, 2018.

LOCHER, M. *Power and Politeness in Action:* Disagreements in Oral Communication. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 2004.

LOCHER, M. Introduction: Politeness and impoliteness in computer-mediated communication. *Journal of Politeness*, v. 6, p. 1-5, 2010.

LOCHER, M. Electronic discourse. In: SCHNEIDER, K. P.; Barron, A. (ed.). *Pragmatics of Discourse.* Berlin: Mouton, 2014.

LOCHER, M.; WATTS, R. J. Politeness Theory and Relational Work. *Journal of Politeness Research,* v. 1, n. 1, p. 9-33, 2005.

LOCHER, M.; WATTS, R. J. Relational work and impoliteness: Negotiating norms of linguistic behaviour. *In*: BOUSFIELD, D.; LOCHER, M. A. (ed.). *Impoliteness in Language. Studies on its Interplay with Power in Theory and Practice*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 2008.

LORENZO-DUS, N.; BLITVICH, P.G.-C.; BOU-FRANCH, P. On-line polylogues and impoliteness: The case of postings sent in response to the Obama Reggaeton YouTube video. *Journal of Pragmatics*, v. 43, p. 2578-2593, 2011.

MILLS, S. *Gender and Politeness.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

MULLANY, L. “Stop Hassling Me!” Impoliteness, Power and Gender Identity in the Professional Workplace. *In*: BOUSFIELD, D.; LOCHER, M. A. (ed.). *Impoliteness in Language*. Studies on its Interplay with Power in Theory and Practice. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 2008.

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.

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.

PERELMUTTER, R. Globalization, conflict discourse, and Jewish identity in an Israeli Russian-speaking online community. *Journal of Pragmatics*, v. 134, p. 134-148, 2018.

SERRANO, M. J. Going beyond address forms. Variation and style in the use of the second-person pronouns *tú* and *usted*. *Pragmatics*, v. 27, n. 1, p. 87-114, 2017.

SPENCER-OATEY, H. (Im)Politeness, Face and Perceptions of Rapport: Unpackaging their Bases and Interrelationships. *Journal of Pragmatics*, v. 34, n. 5, p. 529-545, 2005.

TERKOURAFI, M. Beyond the micro-level in politeness research. *Journal of Politeness Research*, v. 1, n. 2, p. 237-262, 2005.

UPADHYAY, S. R. Identity and impoliteness in computer-mediated reader responses. *Journal of Politeness Research*, v. 6, p. 105-125, 2010.

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

WATTS, R. J. Linguistic politeness research: Quo vadis? *In*: WATTS, R. J.; IDE, S.; EHLICH, K. (ed.). *Politeness in Language*: Studies in its History, Theory and Practice. 2. ed. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 2005.

ATTACHMENT 1 - LIST OF NEWSPAPER ARTICLES FROM WHICH COMMENTS WERE COLLECTED:

Do bairro da Jamaica para o bairro do mundo Gany Ferreira – OBSERVADOR, 10.02.2019

Houve violência policial excessiva no bairro da Jamaica? O vídeo amador descodificado em 7 momentos – OBSERVADOR, 25.01.2019

Bairro da Jamaica. PSP abre processos disciplinares a dois agentes – OBSERVADOR, 29.03. 2019

As selfies de Marcelo na “visita-relâmpago” ao bairro da Jamaica – OBSERVADOR, 04.02. 2019

O que a polémica do Bairro da Jamaica abafa. Enquanto o centro direita não evoluir para além do discurso securitário para denunciar clara e inequivocamente a injustiça social que representa o racismo, esta questão ficará sempre refém da esquerda – Marta Mucznik, OBSERVADOR, 24.01.2019

Marcelo foi ao Bairro da Jamaica nesta manhã e voltará para a festa dos moradores – PÚBLICO, 04.02.109

Estrearam-se numa manifestação por causa do Jamaica. “Podia ser a minha mãe” – PÚBLICO, 27.01.2019

Quando a Jamaica sobe a Avenida da Liberdade — João Miguel Tavares, PÚBLICO, 24.01.2019

Agressão da PSP "parece completamente desnecessária", diz perita de Comité Antitortura – PÚBLICO, 26.01.2019

Sindicatos da PSP acusam BE e SOS Racismo de incitamento à violencia – PÚBLICO, 24.02.2019

"Só senti a bala": protesto contra intervenção da PSP no Seixal acaba com tiros de borracha na baixa de Lisboa – PÚBLICO, 22.01.2019

É fácil bater na polícia — Manuel Soares, PÚBLICO, 13.02.2019

Diário: "A alma nacional coçou-se durante toda a semana a propósito de um incidente no bairro da Jamaica. Parece que ninguém olhou bem para o vídeo." — Vasco Pulido Valente, PÚBLICO, 02.02.2019

Se "até tens amigos negros", pergunta-lhes — Rui Tavares, PÚBLICO, 28.01.2019

"Se a polícia entrasse aqui com respeito receberia respeito" – PÚBLICO, 22.01.2019

The Guardian escreve reportagem sobre violência no Bairro do Jamaica e chama-lhe a "realidade urbana portuguesa" – OBSERVADOR, 01.02.2019

PSP investiga violência entre polícias e moradores no Bairro da Jamaica – Diário de Notícias, 22.01.2019

Marcelo visitou o Bairro da Jamaica e deu um beijo à mãe de Hortêncio — Diário de Notícias, 04.02.2019

"Forças de segurança estão num plano diferente da sociedade", disse Marcelo sobre Bairro da Jamaica – Diário de Notícias, 05.02.2019

Mamadou Ba continua a receber ameaças e pede proteção policial – Diário de Notícias, 25.01.2019