Abstract:
We focus on the second person pronominal variation of the singular *tu* and *você* in the subject position in Coité do Nóia/AL speech community, in order to analyze how this variation occurs and which social and linguistic factors favor it. Therefore, we followed the theoretical-methodological assumptions of the Theory of Linguistic Variation and Change (Labov, 2008) and, to discuss the existing relations in communicative situations, the Theory of Power and Solidarity (Brown; Gilman, 1960) was considered. Our sample is stratified according to sex/gender and age variables, with a total of 36 informants, who provided 18 dialogues. For the statistical analysis of the data, we used the computer program *GoldVarb X* (Sankoff; Tagliamonte; Smith, 2005). Our data showed 11% of *tu* and 89% of *você*, with this variation being conditioned by the variables age relations, pronominal parallelism, sex-age relations, and the meager achievements of the pronoun *tu* favored in the following contexts: youth/youth and adult/adult relations; *tu* is preceded by *tu* in the same discursive sequence; in relations between same-sex/gender speakers – male/male and female/female – and among younger (18-35 year old) speakers.
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INTRODUCTION

The pronominal form você emerged from the popularization of the honorific form Vossa Mercê, which was initially used as a reference to the king. With its popularization, Vossa Mercê has undergone some phonetic changes until the common você used these days, changing from Vossa Mercê, to Vosmecê until arriving at você. These phonetic changes are considered by Vitral (1996) as a grammaticalization process, i.e., a name (Vossa Mercê) comes to be transformed into a pronoun (você). Nowadays, besides pronoun tu, conserved by the Latin pronoun table as the singular second person, pronoun você also has a reference to the singular second person, which has been the purpose of study in various areas of Brazilian Portuguese.

The mapping performed by Scherre et al. (2015) presents research from different parts of the country, showing how the variants tu and você tend to behave in the different regions of the country. The data shows that você along with its variants ôcê and ê, is more predominant in the Midwest of the country, while the predominance of the pronoun tu is more common in North and South regions. Regarding the Southeast and Northeast regions, you can see that there is ample competition between the two pronoun forms, with changes in preferences between one form and the other according to the community of speech researched and linguistic and/or social factors.

Regarding the sociolinguistic description referring to the Northeast by Scherre et al. (2015), we realize that there is a scarcity of research in some states, for example, Alagoas. Observing the existing lack of studies on the variation related to the singular second person tu and você in Alagoas, motivated us to develop a study of this variation, in order to gain greater knowledge of the use of the studied variants and understand how it is inserted in the community of researched speech in order to collaborate with the development of sociolinguistic studies, serving as a research aid for the use of language, as Martins and Abraçado (2015) pointed out.

According to that, the use of tu and você in subject position in the city of Coité do Nóia, located in Alagoas agreste, was analyzed. Therefore, we follow the theoretical and methodological assumptions of the Theory of Linguistic Variation and Change (LABOV, 2008) and to discuss the relations in communicative situations through the address forms in the community; we also considered the Theory of Power and Solidarity,
in accordance with Brown and Gilman (1960). We adopted the methodology of Variationist Sociolinguistics (TARALLO, 2004; GUY; ZILLES, 2007; LABOV, 2008), following some basic steps, namely the definition of dependent and independent variables, delimitation of the research sample, collection, transcription and quantification of data, as well as description and interpretation of the results.

The aim of our study is to analyze the variation of pronouns of the singular second person *tu* and *você*, in order to establish a correlation between the society and the linguistic structure, as to understand its realization. Thus, we performed a quantitative analysis of data in order to answer the following questions: is there a variation of pronouns *tu* and *você* in the studied community? Assuming the existence of variation, is there a conditioning of the linguistics variables verb agreement, type of report, type of reference and pronoun parallelism? Is this variation conditioned by the social variables gender and age? Do the relations between the interlocutors influence the choice of these linguistic variants?

As provisional answers to the above questions, we proposed the following hypothesis: it was assumed that pronoun *tu* coexists with pronoun *você* in the speech of the community of Coité do Nóia; linguistic variables, type of report, type of reference, pronoun parallelism and verb agreement influence the pronoun choice made by speakers; social factors sex, age range, relation between sex, relation between age and relation between interlocutors, such as husband/wife, friend/friend, brother/brother, neighbor/neighbor, acquaintance/acquaintance, mother/son, boyfriend/girlfriend conditioned that variation.

This study is structured as follows: beyond this introduction, which shows the initial considerations of the research; we deal with the implementation of *tu* in Brazilian Portuguese; the next section draws an overview of the sociolinguistic variation studies of *tu* and *você* in northeastern Brazil, focusing on how these pronouns behave in the state of Alagoas; then we comment on aspects concerning the community speech studied and the methodology used in data collection; after that, next section presents and discusses the results obtained; and finally the discussions raised are concluded, highlighting the most important points of the analysis.

**Pronoun Você in Brazilian Portuguese**

Pronoun form *você* originated from the honorific form *Vossa Mercê* (Your Mercy), which arose between the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries with *Vossa + Name* (mercê) structure, being initially used uniquely for treatment to the king, extolling his qualities and superiority. With the development of economic and social structure, society went through a period of reorganization, in which a new social class – the bourgeoisie – had emerged. On the rise, the high bourgeoisie became the new aristocracy and, from these changes, new linguistic customs have emerged.
In the second half of the fifteenth century, Vossa Mercê form ended up being widespread, expanding its social use for treating distant people and ceasing to be used exclusively in reference to those who stood about, while the way for treating the king was replaced by other nominal forms. Thus, the form Vossa Mercê was spread not only by the nobility, but also by the bourgeoisie, going to be used as a formal reference, opposing the way pronoun tu was perceived as informal.

From the popularization of the use of Vossa Mercê form, some phonetic changes surfaced until the arrival of the form used today. Vitral (1996) considers these changes as a grammaticalization process, i.e., a name (Vossa Mercê) becomes a pronoun (você), which currently is at process of variation with oço and cê forms in some regions of the country. Thus, we can consider that, in some varieties of Brazilian Portuguese, besides pronoun tu, conserved by the Latin pronoun table as the singular second person, it is also possible to have pronoun você in reference to an interlocutor.

Treatment is the way by which the speaking subject addresses his interlocutor. Until around 1500, Portuguese knew, like French, just the familiar tutoyer or respectful vouvoyer. But, from that date, there are formulas like ‘vossa graça’, ‘vossa excelência’ (‘your grace’, ‘your excellence’), followed by third person. The most frequent is vossa mercê (‘your mercy’), which, while passed to você by phonetic erosion (vossa mercê > voacê > você), lost, by semantic erosion, its respectful treatment of value, to take over family treatment (TEYSSIER, 2001, p. 60).1, 2

Regarding the form você, Rumeu (2004) points out that this pronominal form of treatment allows us to realize syntactic features that approach not only the form of the personal pronoun, exercising syntactic function and subject position, but also preserves the traces of the original nominal, i.e. the form Vossa Mercê, thus keeping the co-referentiality of grammar to the third person.

According to Lopes (2003, p. 11),

There is a gradual emergence of nominal address forms that come to replace the universal courteous treatment você, at first by the rise of the nobility and later the bourgeoisie which required a different treatment. This propagation, starting first from the top then moving its way down, is spread by the community as a whole and the forms lose their initial semantic conception if some forms are grammaticalized more rapidly than others, as is the case of vossa mercê > vosmecê > você. By the fact that the nominal forms take the verb to the singular

---

1 The original text will be reproduced in the respective footnote.
2 O tratamento é a maneira pela qual o sujeito falante se dirige ao seu interlocutor. Até por volta de 1500, o português conhecia, como o francês, apenas o tuteamento familiar ou o voseamento respeitoso. Mas, a partir dessa data, surgem fórmulas do tipo ‘vossa graça’, ‘vossa excelência’, seguidas da terceira pessoa. A mais frequentes é vossa mercê, que, ao mesmo tempo que passava a você por erosão fonética (vossa mercê > voacê > você), perdia, por erosão semântica, o seu valor de tratamento respeitoso, para assumir o de tratamento familiar”.
third person, there was a reduction of the inflection paradigm that lost, as pointed out by Duarte (1995), ‘the property to license and identify null subjects’.3

Regarding the variation of *tu* and *você* over time, Machado (2011) brings a study of the address forms used in the Brazilian theater between the XIX and early XXI century. In the sample analyzed by the author in relation to the second person, 4070 examples were found in the subject position, as follows: *tu, você, vós, Vossa Mercê* and *senhor(a)*. Through her study, as can be seen in Graph 1, it’s possible to see that, from 1918, *tu* start to appear less often, while *você* gained more space in use of the singular second person.

![Graph 1 – Utilizations of *tu* and *você* in Brazilian plays](image)

Source: Machado (2011, p.74).

Thus, it is possible to see that by the early twentieth century there was a strong presence of *tu*, which was competing with *você*, which had a lower frequency. However, from 1918, the author shows a difference in the use of *tu* and *você* in Brazilian plays analyzed, with a reversal of use, that is, although still existing, the *tu* goes on to show a decrease in use, while the use of *você* is the preferred pronoun form, demonstrating a high percentages of use.

---

3 Há uma emergência gradativa de formas nominais de tratamento que passam a substituir o tratamento cortês universal vós, num primeiro momento pela ascensão da nobreza e mais tarde da burguesia que exigia um tratamento diferenciado. Essa propagação, que começa de cima para baixo, se dissemina pela comunidade como um todo e as formas perdem sua concepção semântica inicial, gramaticalizando-se – algumas de forma mais acelerada que outras, como é o caso de vossa Mercê > vosmecê > você. Pelo fato de as formas nominais levarem o verbo para a terceira pessoa do singular, houve a redução do nosso paradigma flexional que perdeu, como já apontou Duarte (1995), ‘a propriedade de licenciar e identificar sujeitos nulos’."
The study by Souza (2012) shows results similar to those of Machado (2011). In Graph 2 it is possible to see that, until 1890, pronoun você had lower frequency than pronoun tu. However, from then on, a transitional period is seen, in which, until 1930 the two pronominal forms are used in relatively the same frequency, keeping balance. After 1930, it decays, while the use of você is high.

![Graph 2 – Utilizations of tu and você in family letters](image)

Source: Souza (2012, p. 96).

These studies show us that there have been many changes in Brazilian pronoun framework with regard to the singular second person, and, despite the conservation of tu, there was the emergence of você derived from Vossa Mercê, which now coexists with tu. Through the exposed studies, its observed that the relations tu/você went through three stages to reach the twenty-first century. At first, tu appeared more often than você, then, tu and você are balanced and finally, você becomes used more frequently.

Martins et al. (2015), when submitting a socio-diachronic analysis of the implementation of pronoun form você in personal letters of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries belonging to the states of Bahia, Pernambuco and Rio Grande do Norte, they punctuate that, in the northeast, unlike what occurs in the study of south and southeast, pronoun você already has a high percentage of use in the first half of the twentieth century, with pronoun tu, being more productive in a social and discursive context that presents greater intimacy between the speakers, supporting the argument that the use of tu and você in Brazilian varieties is strongly conditioned to the type of relations established between speakers.
VARIATION BETWEEN *TU* AND *VOCÊ* IN THE NORTHEAST REGION

Despite the presentation of grammatical tradition (CEGALLA, 2008; CUNHA; CINTRA, 2008; BECHARA, 2015), in the context of personal pronouns, only pronoun *tu* in reference to singular second person, it does not rule out the use of the form *você* in the language, classifying it as a treatment pronoun used to refer to someone who belongs to a family environment or to a more informal speech, but it can also be used outside the field of intimacy, as it was used in its original form *Vossa Mercê*. The use of singular second person pronouns *tu* and *você* have been studied in various regions of the country, revealing that there is a predominance in the use of *você*, but that the pronoun *tu* is part of several linguistic varieties of Brazilian Portuguese.

Scherre et al. (2015), taking into account the percentage of these pronouns used and the agreement consistency between the pronoun and the verb, proposed the existence of six subsystems of second-person pronouns in Brazilian Portuguese, as can be seen in Figure 1. The authors point not only that *você* is present in the speech of Brazilians, being used more widely used than *tu*, which also has its present use in much of the country, but also that, in areas where *tu* is not the first option of the community, it is more difficult to register it in sociolinguistic interviews, what does not occur when *tu* is the first option of the community to reference the interlocutor.

Source: Scherre et al. (2015, p. 142) [translated].

**Figure 1** – Mapping of pronouns *tu* and *você* in Brazilian Portuguese

With all the inherent problems in the registration of second-person pronouns, we will have the opportunity to see that pronoun ‘*tu*’ is more difficult to capture in areas where it does not seem to be the first form of the community, for example, in Rio de Janeiro and Brasilia.
In Rio Grande do Sul, on the other hand, ‘tu’ emerges easily and naturally, even in sociolinguistic interviews (SCHERRE et al., 2015, p. 135).

In Northeast Region, the variation between the pronouns of the singular second person *tu* and *você* presents different behaviors, with some regions showing higher percentage of *tu*, while others show the predominance of the pronoun *você*. Table 1 presents a panorama of the use of these pronouns in some studies in Northeastern Brazil, which shows that there is a predominance of the pronoun *você* in most of the research observed, as in Herênio (2006), Alves (2010), Nogueira (2013), Rocha et al. (2016), Silva (2017) and Vitório (2018), while only three of the nine studies considered showed higher usage of the pronoun *tu*, as in Carneiro (2011), Alves (2015) and Guimarães (2014).

**Table 1** – Variation between *tu* and *você* in the Brazilian Northeast

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sociolinguistics Studies</th>
<th>TU</th>
<th>VOCÊ</th>
<th>CÊ</th>
<th>SENHOR(A)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maranhão</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herênio (2006)</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maranhão</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alves (2010)</td>
<td>38,4%</td>
<td>61,6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maranhão</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carneiro (2011)</td>
<td>69,32%</td>
<td>30,69%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maranhão</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alves (2015)</td>
<td>78,5%</td>
<td>14,1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5,4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceará</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guimarães (2014)</td>
<td>50,9%</td>
<td>49,1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nogueira (2013)</td>
<td>4,6%</td>
<td>88,03%</td>
<td>2,33%</td>
<td>5,04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rocha; Santos; Souza (2016)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alagoas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silva (2017)</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alagoas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vitório (2018)</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Elaborated by the authors.

---

SCHERRE et al. (2015) have observed that ‘tu’ is more difficult to capture in areas where it does not seem to be the first form of the community, for example, in Rio de Janeiro and Brasília. In Rio Grande do Sul, on the other hand, ‘tu’ emerges with ease and naturalness, even in sociolinguistic interviews. 

---

*“Com todos os problemas inerentes ao registro dos pronomes de segunda pessoa, teremos a oportunidade de ver que o pronome ‘tu’ é mais difícil de captar em áreas em que ele não parece ser a primeira forma da comunidade, como, por exemplo, no Rio de Janeiro e em Brasília. No Rio Grande do Sul, por sua vez, o ‘tu’ emerge com facilidade e naturalidade, mesmo em entrevistas sociolinguísticas.”*
In Alagoas State, there are research papers of Silva (2017) and Vitório (2018). By analyzing the variation of você and cê in the community dialect of Alagoas’ sertão, based on the sample of the project *A Língua Usada no Sertão Alagoano – Lusa*, which consists of 96 sociolinguistic interviews of the DID type (VITÓRIO, 2017), Silva (2017) does not only observe, in the sample analyzed, that there were only three occurrences of tu pronouns, as shown in (1), (2) and (3), which, according to the author, may reflect that this pronoun is not the first community option, thus the DID type interviews do not favor its use, but also that você is the preferred pronoun, with a percentage of 94% compared to only 6% of cê.

(1) depois tu vai editar é? L9
(2) armaria tu é doído é? L19
(3) eu lembro que naquela ladeira ali embaixo que tu conhece né? L96

(SILVA, 2017, p. 130)

The author also points out that the variation of você and cê is conditioned by the variables schooling and formal parallelism, with the variant cê being more frequent among high school speakers (RW .72) and in formal parallelism contexts – cê preceded by cê in the same discursive sequence (RW .83). Taking this data into account, the author argues that the variation in the singular second person fits in the sixth subsystem proposed by Scherre *et al.* (2015) – the subsystem você/tu without agreement, in which the use of the forms você/cê/ocê and tu is part of it – with tu having 1% to 90% without agreement.

Vitório (2018) analyzes the change in tu and você in Maceió, building on the restriction and evaluation problems proposed by the Theory of Variation and Change (LABOV, 2008). From a synchronic sample of 72 sociolinguistic DID interviews and stratified according to the variables sex/gender, schooling and age, the author presents a percentage of 98% of você against only 2% of tu usage, revealing that, in production data, você was the preferred pronoun to represent the singular second person-2SP, which seems to indicate that tu is not the first form for the community.

Regarding the perception of data, from a linguistic attitudes test that included nine hypothetical situations set in Maceio and was divided through the ascending asymmetrical, descending asymmetrical and symmetrical relations, the author presents percentages from 65% for você, 16% for tu, 5% for cê and 14% for other forms. This result shows that in perception data, você is the wildcard pronoun in treating the other party, with tu being the pronoun selected in situations involving [+ intimacy] between the parties, such as the relations friend-friend.

From these studies the focus on the variations of tu and você in the speech community of Coité do Nóia/AL was established. Our basic hypothesis is that there is a variation of these pronouns in the community under study, with você being the wildcard...
pronoun of reference for the singular second person, while use of *tu* occurs in contexts that relate specifically to situations expressing intimate relations between interlocutors. The results of Silva (2017) and Vitório (2018) led to the hypothesis that DID type interviews do not favor the utilization of *tu* in Alagoas, which lead us to opt for a collection of D2 type data – dialogues between two informants.

**COMMUNITY SPEECH AND SAMPLE CONSTITUTION**

The Theory of Variation and Linguistic Change arises from the proposal of Weinreich, Labov and Herzog (2006), which ruptures the previous models to consider language as a heterogeneous system and ordered subject to variation and change, being that variation and change would be subjects for linguistic studies. Considering the heterogeneity of the language, the authors acknowledge that the language choices made by speakers are not only linked to linguistic factors, but also social factors; therefore, the system tends to change according to the changes in society. Therefore, the place to analyze the variation is in the speech community.

The speech community is not defined by any marked agreement in the use of linguistic elements, but by participating in a set of shared norms; those standards can be seen in types of explicit evaluative behavior and the uniformity of abstract patterns of variation that are invariant with respect to private usage levels (Labov, 2008, p. 150).

To analyze the variation of the pronouns *tu* and *você* in subject position, the selected community of speech was Coité do Nóia and it was assumed that “there is a uniform set of attitudes towards language that is shared by almost all the members of the speech community, be it in the use of a stigmatized form, be it a prestigious language in question” (Labov, 2008, p. 176), defining thus what kind of community speech the individual belongs to.

According to Santos (2014) and Salustiano (2015), initially called Sítio de Coité before their emancipation on September 21, 1963, Coité do Nóia belonged to the municipality of Limoeiro de Anadia. For Salustiano (2015), the population of Sítio de Coité was formed by Indians, slaves and patriarchal families. The economic base revolved around agriculture, with cotton and cassava plantations, as well as cattle raising. The place name Coité do Nóia has its origin connected to the Nóia family, one of the first families to settle in the region, but also to the Coité fruit (calabash), which was abundant in the locality.

---

5 “A comunidade de fala não é definida por nenhuma concordância marcada no uso de elementos linguísticos, mas sim pela participação num conjunto de normas compartilhadas; estas normas podem ser observadas em tipos de comportamento avaliativo explícito e pela uniformidade de padrões abstratos de variação que são invariantes no tocante a níveis particulares de uso”.
Coité do Nóia is located in the central region of the state of Alagoas, 130 km from Maceió, capital of the state, as shown in Figure 2. Inserted as mesoregion agreste, the city covers an area of 88,759 square kilometers and is limited to the north the municipality of Igaci, to the south to Limoeiro de Anadia and Arapiraca, west of Taquarana and east of Arapiraca and Igaci. According to data from the last census of the IBGE/2010, the city has an estimated population of 10,926 inhabitants, 3,737 of these living in urban area and 7,189 in the countryside, provided with 24 villages, like Alagoinha, Poço da Abelha and Pereira Novo.

Figure 2 – Map of Alagoas

In order to get a rough description of the linguistic reality of the speech community, some criteria for the selection of the informants for the sample constitution was established: being born in Coité do Nóia without leaving the city for more than five years and having an elementary school education level. The sample was stratified according to the sex/gender (male and female) variables as well as the age group (18-35 years and 40-55 years). 9 informants per cell were selected, obtaining a total of 36 respondents. The number of informants was chosen so that we could establish dialogue between informants, enabling interaction between the sexes and ages.

The dialogues were conducted by the informants themselves through a list of thematic topics on various subjects such as childhood games, dating, fighting, friends, work, study, transportation, marriage, profession, parties, relations with family members, gossip, church, violence and vacation. 18 dialogues were collected that aimed to control the interaction between the different sexes and age ranges, as it was believed that the relations between the sexes, the relations between age and the type of relations between the interlocutors condition the use of the pronoun form chosen by them.
Data collection took place between May and September 2018, being held in the urban area and rural area in Coité do Nóia. The contact with the informants occurred mostly in three different times. At first, the invitation is carried out to the informant for him to participate in the research and, for the dialogues to happen, suggestions were asked from other informants that fitted in our stratification and who could talk to him; fathers, as well as friends, cousins, husbands, boyfriends, neighbors and acquaintances were chosen. Then the second informant was contacted, in which assistance in the research was asked for. Upon acceptance, a third encounter was planned so that the dialog between the participants could be done in the location they had chosen.

Before the recording started, the Statement of Consent was presented. After this procedure, a list of words was presented to informants so they could become more familiar with them and bring forth any doubts. At the request of the informants, most of the dialogues were conducted with a recorder left behind by the researcher, while they walked away to make the informants feel at ease and as not to present any inhibition as they talked. After the transcripts of the interviews, the sample obtained was analyzed and the important data for the constitution of the corpus were selected, noting all occurrences of the singular second person pronouns in subject position, considering the forms tu, você and cê were expressed.6

**DESCRIPTION AND DATA ANALYSIS**

Considering the existence of the variation of pronouns from the singular second person tu and você in the subject position in the city of Coité do Nóia, obtained after analysis and observation of the data, a total of 520 utilizations in the sample of the speech community, representing 57 pronoun utilizations of tu and 463 pronoun utilizations of você. These data in percentages reveal 11% of tu against 89% of você, as we can see in Graph 3, on the next page, showing that, in the speech community studied, despite the variation between the two pronoun forms, the variant você was the most the selected form.

In general, these percentages obtained go in the same margin of studies conducted by Mota (2008), Alves (2010), Santos (2012) and Nogueira (2013), showing that, despite the occurrence of the two pronominal forms, there is a larger tendency of the speaker to use the pronoun você when referencing his interlocutor, revealing that, in Coité de Nóia speech community, você is the wildcard pronoun for treatment to the interlocutor. The preference for você in the community study also confirms the findings of Silva (2017) and Vitório (2018) for Alagoas speech communities, showing that você is the preferred pronoun. The highest percentage of tu in Coité de Nóia – 11% compared

---

6 In the description and analysis of data, the utilizations of você and cê were imagined.
to studies of Silva (2017) and Vitório (2018) – can be associated with the research methodology used in this study, which prioritized the type D2 sociolinguistic sample.

In the groups of social and linguistic factors controlled in the data analysis – sex/gender, age, type of report, type of reference, pronoun parallelism, relation between sexes, the relation between age, type of relation between the partners, symmetrical or asymmetrical relations and verb agreement – only the variables, by order of relevant statistic, relations between age ranges, pronominal parallelism, relation between sexes and age range were considered statistically significant after the result of GoldVarb X.

The variables types of reporting, reference types, relations between the parties, symmetric and asymmetric relations and verb agreement presented knockouts, since, in general reference, the relations between mother and child and the asymmetrical relations did not make use of the *tu* pronoun, with *você* being the pronoun selected in these contexts of use. As for the variable verbal agreement, the use of the pronoun *tu* only occurred with the verb in the singular third person 3SP, which may indicate that in the community under study, considering the meager mentions of *tu* and its utilization only with the verb in 3SP, is situated in the sixth subsystem proposed by Scherre *et al.* (2015, p. 143):

The **subsystem você/tu without agreement** just doesn’t have a representative in the South, at least for now, gathered from the interpretation realized. In the Midwest, its represented by the Federal District; in the Southeast, by the states of Rio de Janeiro, São Paulo and
Minas Gerais; in the Northeast, by the states of Maranhão and Bahia; and in the North, by the states of Roraima and Acre.\footnote{“O subsistema você/tu sem concordância só não tem representante na região Sul, pelo menos por ora, pela nossa interpretação. Na região Centro-Oeste, é representado, nos dias atuais, pelo Distrito Federal; na região Sudeste, pelos estados do Rio de Janeiro, São Paulo e Minas Gerais; na região Nordeste, pelos estados do Maranhão e Bahia; e, na região Norte, pelos estados de Roraima e Acre”.}

In general, the subsystem você/tu fails to occur only in the South, being presented in all other regions of the country. In this subsystem, the percentage of use of the forms você/cê/ocê and tu may vary depending on the linguistic and social variables, and the interactional context of paramount importance in choosing one form or another, so the language choices can vary as well according to the research sample methodology.

**Relation between Age Ranges**

We look at how linguistic choices of speakers are performed observing the relation between their age range and interlocutor’s one, since these choices can be changed depending on the age range that the speaker has and the other party, meaning that there may be differences in the relations between same age ranges and different age ranges. For analysis, the factors youth/youth adult/adult and youth/adult were selected and assumed that, in greater solidarity relations, i.e., in relations between equals, as in youth/youth and adult/adult, the use of tu would be higher, while in relations with less solidarity and more power, as in youth/adult, this use would be reduced. In Table 2, we observe how the change occurred.

**Table 2 – Variations between tu and você in relation to age ranges**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TU</th>
<th>Você</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Occurrences</td>
<td>Perc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>young/young</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adult/adult</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>young/adult</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: prepared by the authors

According to the obtained data, it was found that although você presents itself with the highest percentage in the three factors in relations between the same ages, like youth/youth, and adult/adult, there is a greater tendency in the occurrence of tu. The youth/youth relations and adult/adult have a higher relative weight (RW) of tu, with...
respectively .55 and .70, while the youth/adult relations had its high RW more for você, with .83. These results show that there is a tendency that, in relations between equals, as in youths/youths and adult/adult, the pronoun tu occurs, while in youth/adult, it is more likely to use você. This data confirms our hypothesis that the singular second-person pronoun choice can be conditioned by the relations between age ranges.

**Pronoun Parallelism**

According to Omena (1996, 2003) and Lopes (1998), the pronominal parallelism concerns the tendency of the speaker to repeat the same linguistic form in the sequence of his speech, considering that the choice of a form conditions its next utilization, causing repetition in the same pronominal form. The study by Loregian-Penkal and Menon (2012) demonstrates that there is a tendency for pronouns to maintain the general principle of parallelism, that is, it is believed that a mark leads to its repetition throughout the speech. For the analysis of this variable, the isolated utilization factor was considered, such as (4), first in the series, as (5), preceded by tu, like (6), and preceded by você, like (7).

(4) *Bom — e você faz o quê?* L34
(5) *É:: no estudo que você estudou você aprendeu alguma coisa no passado?* L24
(6) *Na sala de aula - tu lembra disso assim? tu se lembra ainda? na sala de aula ai chegava a diretora todo mundo se levantava pra aplaudir que ela chegou oia.* L30
(7) *O meu - o meu também foi bem puxado - bem é - a sua profissão que você exerce - é - você gosta dela?* L24

**Table 3 – Variation tu and você in relation to the pronoun parallelism**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TU</th>
<th>Vocé</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ocurrences</strong></td>
<td>47</td>
<td>306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Perc.</strong></td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RW</strong></td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>353</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>isolated utilization</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>first in the series</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>preceded by tu</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>preceded by você</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Elaborated by the authors.

As shown in Table 3, the results show that the first pronoun form chosen conditions the following forms. Thus, it was found that the pronoun tu has a higher frequency of use in the factor preceded by tu with 80% of utilization and RW of .98, revealing that this linguistic context favors the most the choice of this pronoun, whereas
the pronoun você presents 99% of use in the factor preceded by você and RW .97. These results show us the maintenance of the general principle of pronominal parallelism, for, according to Loregian-Penkal and Menon (2012), a mark leads to the repetition of the same mark in the same discursive context.

**Relations between Genders**

To better understand the use of the pronouns tu and você, the relations between the informants were analyzed considering the relations between the sex/gender variable. In order to verify if there are differences in the use of second person pronouns when referring to the interlocutor in relation to the gender/gender of the informants, since we believe that men and women adopt different linguistic behaviors when addressing interlocutors of the same sex and of different sex. For that, three factors were selected, namely, woman/woman, man/man and man/woman and the following results were obtained, as we can see in the Table 4.

**Table 4 – tu and você variation in relation to sex**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>tu</th>
<th>você</th>
<th></th>
<th>tu</th>
<th>você</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ocurrences</strong></td>
<td><strong>Perc.</strong></td>
<td><strong>RW</strong></td>
<td><strong>Ocurrences</strong></td>
<td><strong>Perc.</strong></td>
<td><strong>RW</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>man/man</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>woman/woman</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>man/woman</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Elaborated by the authors.

The use of the pronoun tu was higher in relations where the sex/gender of the informants are equal, that is, in the addressing of man/man and woman/woman, the informants tend to use this pronoun, presenting a RW of .55 in male/male relations and .66 in female/female relations. In the relations between man/woman, the pronoun tu has a RW of .26, showing that, in this context, the use of the pronoun tu can be considered more symmetrical and more supportive, considering that it is more used among informants of the same sex/genre.

These results show us that there is a greater probability for the use of tu to occur in relations between equals, especially in relations between women, while você is more likely to occur in relations between different sexes, characterizing it as an asymmetric relation. We believe that these results occur because, in relations between equals, there is greater solidarity, which causes the use of T, and, in relations between different, because there is a greater relations of power, it causes the use of V, as pointed out by Brown and Gilman (1960).
Age Range

Although selected as the last statistically significant variable in the *tu* and *você* variation in Coité do Nóia speech community, the age group is of paramount importance for the analysis of variable linguistic phenomena, as it allows the researcher, in an apparent time analysis, to verify if the linguistic variation corresponds to a stable variation or if it corresponds to a change in progress (LABOV, 2008). For data analysis, two age ranges were selected, namely, 18 to 35 years old and 40 to 55 years old, and it was assumed that the pronoun *tu* is more frequent among 18-35-year-old speakers.

**Table 5** – Variation between *tu* and *você* in relation to the age ranges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Range</th>
<th><em>TU</em></th>
<th></th>
<th><em>VOCÊ</em></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ocurrences</td>
<td>Perc.</td>
<td>RW</td>
<td>Ocurrences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 – 35 years old</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 – 55 years old</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Elaborated by the authors.

Regarding the use of the pronoun *tu*, it was found that the first age group (18 to 35 years old) has 19% with .80 RW and the second age group (40 to 55 years old) has only 3% with .20 RW, revealing that the use of *tu* tends to be favored among younger speakers. Our results corroborate the analysis of Dias (2007), Mota (2008), Paredes Silva (2008), Andrade (2010) and Alves (2010), who point out the younger people favoring the pronoun *tu*, which may be an indication that this variant is being implemented in the speech community, revealing a process of change in progress.

**Conclusion**

In this research, the variation of the second-person singular pronouns *tu* and *você* was analyzed in the position of subject in the speech of informants from the city of Coité do Nóia / AL, trying to describe how this variation occurs in this speech community. To do so, we resorted to the theoretical and methodological assumptions of the Theory of Variation and Linguistic Change (WEINREICH; LABOV; HERZOG, 2006; LABOV, 2008), which postulates that language is endowed with an ordered heterogeneity and establishes a relation between language and social context in which it is inserted, as well as to the postulates of Theory of Power and Solidarity (BROWN; GILMAN, 1960).

To achieve the proposed objectives, data were collected from 36 informants with elementary education stratified according to the variables sex/gender and age range.
To this end, 18 dialogues were elaborated between these informants so that a closer sample of the linguistic reality of the studied speech community could be obtained. After statistical analysis of the data, it was found that, in the speech of Coité, there is a variation between the pronouns *tu* and *você*, with results that represent 11% of *tu* and 89% of *você*, showing that the use of *você* is the most used form in speech community studied. We also observed that this variation does not occur at random, but is conditioned by linguistic and social factors.

Among the groups of linguistic and social factors selected for the realization of this study, only the groups – relations between age ranges, pronominal parallelism, relations between sexes and age ranges – were considered as statistically significant by GoldVarb X, with sex being considered as not statistically significant. The groups of factors, type of report, type of reference, verbal agreement, and symmetrical and asymmetrical relations, presented knockouts.

The first variable considered to be statistically significant was the relations between the age ranges. For data analysis, three types of relations were considered, namely, youth/youth, adult/adult and youth/adult. Our results indicate that there is a tendency that, in symmetrical relations, that is, youth/youth, the use of *tu* is high, while in asymmetric relations, as an adult/youth person, there is a probability of greater occurrence of the pronoun *você*.

The second variable selected as statistically significant was pronominal parallelism. For the analysis of this variable, four factors were considered, namely, isolated realization, first in the series, preceded by *tu* and preceded by *você*, and it was found that the data confirm the general principle of parallelism, since the use of a form tends to condition the use of the following forms in the same discursive sequence. Thus, the pronoun *tu* presented a higher frequency of use when preceded by *tu*, and *você* presented a higher frequency of use when preceded by *você*.

The third variable considered statistically significant was the relations between sex/gender, for the analysis of this variable, we considered the relations man/man, woman/woman and man/woman. The results show that the *tu* is more likely to occur in relations between equals, especially in relations between female informants, while *você* tends to occur in relations where there is interaction between informants of different sexes – man/woman.

The fourth statistically significant variable was the age group. The data show that the pronoun *tu* is more likely to occur in the speech of younger people, while the pronoun *você* is more frequent in the speech of older informants, revealing that there are signs of a change in progress through the implementation of the use of the *tu* among the younger speakers.

The gender variable was considered by the program as not statistically significant, with men and women showing the same linguistic behavior in relation to the use of *tu*.
and você. As variables that presented knockouts, we had the type of report, type of reference, the type of relation between the interlocutors, the verbal agreement and the symmetrical and asymmetric relations.

With regard to the type of report, we observed that the informants use the pronoun tu only in their own reports and, in the case of third-party reports, the informants use only the pronoun você. Regarding the type of reference, the results show that the use of the pronoun tu occurs when in a specific reference, whereas the use of the pronoun você occurs in both forms, being more used in generic references.

In the type of relation between the interlocutors, it was observed that the pronoun tu had its highest frequency of use in relations that have a greater degree of intimacy among the speakers, such as brother/sister, friend/friend and boyfriend/girlfriend, not being used in the mother/child relation. In symmetrical and asymmetric relations, it was observed that tu only occurred in symmetric relations, showing that this pronoun tends to be used in relations that have more intimacy between the interlocutors. As for verbal agreement, tu only occurred with the verb in 3SP, which leads us to argue that we are situated in the sixth subsystem proposed by Scherre et al. (2015).

We hope to have contributed to the understanding of the variable use of second-person singular pronouns tu and você in Coité do Nóia/AL, in order to assist in the sociolinguistic mapping of the state of Alagoas. We believe in the importance of this study not only for the description of the language in use, but also for the teaching of Portuguese, enabling teachers to know about the linguistic and extralinguistic conditions of this variation. We also believe that this study, combined with others, can contribute to future sociolinguistic studies and research related to the use of language.
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