

The discursive effects of Spanish impersonals *uno* and *se*: a case study of the phenomena of speaker inclusion and female-only reference¹

In this article, I will compare the discursive functioning of Spanish constructions with *uno* and *se*, which both allow for keeping the agent/experiencer out of focus and for expressing genericity. I will first briefly introduce the main features of both constructions, before presenting their pragmatic effects, as well as their (inter)subjective effects, in more detail. This paper will focus especially on situations where the genericity is restricted, either because the speaker is not included or because only women are represented. Thus, the tension between genericity and specificity will become clear, and the similarities and differences between both constructions will be examined, both from a more formal point of view and from the perspective of the expression of (inter)subjectivity.

1. Spanish *uno* and *se*: an introduction

Spanish has a wide range of constructions that allow for keeping the agent or experiencer out of focus, through varied strategies (see among others Kärde 1943, Gómez Torrego 1992, Fernández Soriano & Táboas Baylín 1999, Devís Márquez 2003 for an overview). To the extent in which this defocused agent or experiencer is the speaker or hearer, these strategies hold a unique position in the expression of subjectivity, resp. intersubjectivity². In this paper, I will focus on constructions with *uno* and *se*. Though their syntactic properties are very different (as will be shown), both constructions can be compared from a communicative-functional approach (cf. Malchukov & Siewierska 2011: 2), in that they defocus the agent. In line with Siewierska (2008: 121), “defocusing is used in the sense of diminishing the

¹ I am grateful to the reviewers of the paper for their interesting suggestions. All remaining errors are, of course, entirely my responsibility.

² I use the following concept of subjectivity: “The term subjectivity refers to the way in which natural languages, in their structure and their normal manner of operation, provide for the locutionary agent’s *expression of himself and his own attitudes and beliefs*’ associated with social stance and identity)” (Lyons 1982: 102, based on Benveniste 1966). Intersubjectivity is then understood as the expression of attention to the attitudes and beliefs of the hearer (Closs Traugott 2003).

prominence or salience from what is assumed to be the norm”. Constructions with *uno* and *se* realize this through different strategies.

Uno ‘one’ can be used as a numeral or as an indefinite pronoun. We will be concerned with the latter use, where the agent is more vague or ‘underelaborated’ in Siewierska’s terms. This pronoun can occupy a variety of syntactic positions, including subject (1), object (2), prepositional object (3), even with gerunds and infinitives (4). Its semantics implies animacy and even human or human-like behavior. As we will see, it is therefore more easily linked to the speaker and to the expression of subjectivity.

- (1) *Si **uno** estaba con un maestro, entonces ya no podía estar con los demás.* (Macro-corpus ALFAL Mexico)
‘When **one** was with a teacher, then one could not anymore be with the others.’
- (2) *Ya los años le hacen **a uno** sabio.* (CORLEC conversations)
‘Already the years make **one** wise.’
- (3) *Entonces, uno psicológicamente trata de sugestionarlo de que el pensamiento de **uno** y sus razonamientos son verdaderos y son básicos (...)* (Macro-corpus ALFAL Bogotá)
‘Then, one psychologically tries to influence him that the thinking of **one** and his reasoning are true and basic (...)’
- (4) *No hay un placer igual a sentarse **uno** a leer.* (Macro-corpus ALFAL Bogotá)
‘There is no pleasure equal to **one** sitting down to read.’

The pronoun *se* can be used in many different ways (Martín Zorraquino 1979, García 2009), including in reflexive, middle (Maldonado 1999) and passive constructions. However, it always occupies the same syntactic slot with respect to the VP and is, as such, much less mobile than *uno*. In the reflexive use, the agent and patient are coreferential. In all other uses, though, the agent or instigator does not receive a place in the VP, either because the action is conceptualized as having an internal energy – as is the case for the middle voice (Maldonado 1999) – or because the agent is not part of the scene. This study will be limited to cases where the agent is not part of the scene yet where we can imagine an agent for the action expressed through the predicate. This means that reflexive uses or middle uses will not be taken into account but an example as (5), where an agent for *se cobraba* can be imagined (in this case employees), is included.

(5) *En África, **se cobraba** el cincuenta por ciento más.* (CORLEC conversations)

‘In Africa, 50% more **was being earned**.’

Yet, an impersonal reading of *se*-constructions is only possible with verbs that are not inherently pronominal. By contrast, verbs that are always used pronominally, necessarily take *uno* for the expression of impersonal readings (6) and cannot take a second *se* in order to obtain an agent defocussing reading (7). The pronominal construction is, of course, grammatical but has no defocussing reading. As the aim of this article is to analyze the alternation *uno* – *se*, utterances with pronominal verbs have not been included in the analysis, since they do not enter into alternation with *uno*.

(6) *Desde que **uno se levanta** hasta que **uno se acuesta**.* (Macro-corpus-ALFAL Madrid)

‘From the moment **one gets up** till when **one goes to sleep**.’

(7) *Desde que **se levanta** hasta que **se acuesta**.* (constructed exemple)

‘From the moment **he/she gets up** till when **he/she goes to sleep**.’

The fact that *uno* and *se* realize their defocussing through different formal means is reflected among others in Gómez Torrego’s description of *uno* as ‘semantic impersonality’ versus *se* as ‘syntactic impersonality’ (Gómez Torrego 1992). However, I will refrain from using the term impersonality for the following reasons. On the one hand, impersonality covers very different phenomena in different linguistic traditions and languages (see Malchukov-Siewierska 2011 for an overview). On the other hand, impersonality suggests the absence of a person, which is exactly the opposite of the main purpose of this article, namely the study of constructions where a human is involved yet kept out of focus and its consequences for the expression of (inter)subjectivity and stance.

2. Corpus

Though the syntax of both constructions has been extensively studied, often from a theoretical point of view, data-driven research is lacking, especially as to the pragmatics of both constructions. The data for this study have been taken from spoken Spanish language corpora, namely the *Macro-corpus de la Norma lingüística culta de las principales ciudades del mundo hispánico* (Macro-corpus-ALFAL) and the *Corpus del Español centro-peninsular*

(CORLEC). The ALFAL-corpus consists of interviews conducted for sociolinguistic purposes, focusing on the interlocutor's biography and professional history (in a broad sense). The CORLEC corpus includes various subtypes of spoken language. For the purpose of this study, the informal conversation, TV-interviews and TV-debates subsections were employed.

The overall frequency of both constructions in Spanish is very different, the constructions with *se* being much more frequent than those with *uno* (see De Cock 2010, in press). This is mainly due to the fact that the construction with *se* is also the preferred passive voice in Spanish, whereas the periphrastic passive voice is a marked option. However, frequency may vary greatly according to the genre (see Gelabert-Desnoyer 2008 and De Cock 2010, in press, forthcoming.a for data concerning the lower frequency in parliamentary debate if compared to various other genres). Nevertheless, also less frequent uses are worthy of attention since they highlight particular features of the construction (see also De Cock forthcoming.a on some specific readings of person reference). Therefore, this paper will not focus on the most frequent uses (but see De Cock in prep. for a more elaborate quantitative analysis) but rather on the discursive effect of some specific cases that are marked (in terms of low frequency). As a result of the sparseness of the data for some specific uses, especially those with *uno*, the corpus data will be supplemented with other real-life examples.

3. From defocussing to generalizing

Both defocussing constructions have been associated with generic readings. Neither the construction with *se* nor the construction with *uno* explicitly posit genericity, as would be the case for *todo el mundo* ('everyone') or *cada uno* ('everyone'), yet in the Spanish linguistic literature, both constructions have been linked to generic readings, also through terminological proposals such as 'omnipersonal' (Martínez 1989). Both constructions defocus the human involved and, by reducing the specificity of a human agent or experiencer, give way to a generic reading, though this reading is not necessarily automatic. Mainly syntactic features have been analyzed as triggers for a generic reading (see de Miguel Aparicio 1992 and Gómez Torrego 1992 for mainly syntactical and aspectual factors). In the case of *se*, the absence of an expressed agent creates an ellipsis, which may lead to the generic reading that any agent would act this way or that any experiencer would have the same experience. As such, the expression of subjectivity seems erased from the experience and a more

personalized stance is avoided. The use of different types of ellipsis for arbitrary readings of the subject or subject defocussing is attested cross-linguistically (Malchukov-Siewierska 2011, Da Milano forthc.). This genericity does not imply universality and, indeed, may be limited in many ways, e.g. via time and space adjuncts (see de Miguel Aparicio 1992, De Cock forthc.b) or various pragmatic factors (De Cock in prep.). *Uno*, however, may be used as syntactic subject and may as such take up the role of the agent or experiencer. The possibility of its acquiring a generic reading is then not related to the absence of an agent or experiencer but to the semantics of *uno* ‘one’.

We will look into the generic reading by focusing on two specific uses of *uno* and *se*. On the one hand, situations where, by means of the (linguistic) context, it becomes clear that the speaker is not included in the reference established by *uno* and *se*. On the other hand, the use of feminine form *una* and of feminine concordance in *se*-constructions, as a case where women may oscillate between adopting a more exclusively feminine stance vs. an entirely generic stance.

4. Speaker inclusion and exclusion

In this section, we will look into the inclusion or exclusion of the speaker, as a means to analyze to which extent we can speak of a truly generic use. The egocentricity of language (see Kecskes-Mey 2008) (or, at least, of some languages) may urge us to interpret agent-defocussing strategies as speaker-referring. Especially *uno* has been very strongly associated to the concept of self-reference or, at least, personal experience (among others Kärde 1943: 3555, Fernández Ramírez 1987, Martínez 1989: 60, Mendikoetxea 1999, Flores-Ferrán 2009), whereas this is much less the case for constructions with *se*. Explanations as to why this may be the case are lacking in the literature. I argue that these links may be motivated at a cognitive level with the overall egocentricity of language. Indeed, many phenomena, including the use of deixis, illustrate that the speaker takes him/herself as starting point for any argumentation or description (various contributions in Kecskes – Mey 2008). The importance of interaction participants for the interpretation of impersonals has been documented also for Finnish (Helasvuo & Vilkuna 2008).

It seems that the presence of an undefined or underelaborated human, as in *uno*, establishes a stronger link with the most directly available human, the speaker. As such, its functioning is more closely linked to the expression of subjectivity. Keeping the human agent or instigator entirely out of the scene, as is the case in constructions with *se*, seems to loosen the desire to interpret the speaker as involved, and profiles the utterance as non-subjective (nor subjective, nor intersubjective). The fact that *uno* is preferred for the expression of mental or emotional states, as in (8), goes along the same lines (Kärde 1943: 34). Conversely, the construction with *se* is associated with genres that require a more neutral stance, such as (written) academic discourse or, in general, the expression of general rules (9).

- (8) *Bueno, a mí esto me parece, en primer lugar, cuando hay que recurrir (...) a esta (...) enfervorización mítica de las muchedumbres, entonces, desde el punto de vista racional, uno piensa que es que los medios lógicos para resolver el conflicto, los medios materiales eh... no están verdaderamente a punto (...) (CORLEC-TV debates)*
 ‘Well, to me it seems that, in the first place, when one has to use (...) this (...) mythical shaking up of the crowds, then, from a rational point of view, **one** thinks that it is that the logical means to solve the conflict, the material means eh... are not really ready.’
- (9) *Ese verbo **no se dice nunca** en presente. (CORLEC-Conversation)*
 ‘This verb **is never said** in the present tense.’

Yet, in some uses of *uno* and *se*, it is clear that the speaker is not the main referent or is downright not included, which goes against the expectations – especially for *uno*. Gelabert-Desnoyer (2008: 418-421) documented some cases of ‘other-referential’ *uno* in parliamentary discourse and newspaper interviews. I will focus on how we can establish the reference of *uno* and *se* and, more specifically, what favors or licenses other-referential uses. In (10), the fact that in the preceding context the grandfather is mentioned, moreover in combination with the same verb (*gustar*) makes it clear that *uno* is referring to him and not to the speaker’s personal experience. This reference is, then, established in the linguistic context. In (11), by contrast, no such explicit mention is made in the nearby context. However, the speaker is presented at the beginning of the debate as a journalist and lecturer specialist in the topic of drugs addiction and drugs mafia. Thus, his contextual identity (Kerbrat-Orecchioni 2005:157) is established as that of an expert in the matter, not that of a drugs addict. This leads us to interpret the *uno* in (11) not as self-referring.

- (10) *Bueno, a sudar tinta porque al abuelo no le ha gustado Barcelona. No le ha gustado. Sí. No, es que... es que no... es que **no puede gustarle a uno** eh... de la forma que... que tienes que vivir allí.* (CORLEC conversations)
 ‘Well, to sweat blood (litt.: ink) because grandfather hasn’t liked Barcelona. He didn’t like it. Yes. No, it’s... its’ that no.... it’s that **one may not like** eh.... the way that... that you have to live there.’
- (11) *Hacemos que la vida del toxicómano, si **uno libremente decide serlo** es su problema, pero que sea una buena vida.* (CORLEC debates)
 ‘We make that the life of a drugs addict, if **one freely decides to be it**, it’s his problem, but that it is a good life.’

In both cases, the broader linguistic context of the conversation or debate shows that the speaker sympathizes with the person referred to by means of *uno*. This becomes obvious by the pleas for respect or understanding for the situation of respectively the grandfather (10) and the drugs addict (11). *Uno*’s traditional description as a speaker experience that can be extended to others (*Nueva gramática de la lengua española* - NGLE 2009: 1132), is then stretched a bit further. The speaker can narrate an experience of someone else, while still suggesting it could be extended to others or, at least, that others (including the speaker himself) should be able to imagine themselves in the same position and to show empathy. Such strategies of showing solidarity demonstrate intersubjective functions, in that they include the speaker and hearer in the experience that is narrated, and increase the expressive power of utterances (Scheibman 2007).

As already pointed out, the construction with *se* is much less associated with the speaker than that with *uno*. Nevertheless, it may be interpreted as including the speaker for the reasons mentioned above. Further evidence is that grammaticalized constructions with *se* include the speaker, whilst also seeking the involvement of the audience, e.g. *se sabe* ‘it is (generally) known’ or *se supone* ‘it is supposed, supposedly’ (12). However, *se*-constructions need not include the speaker, as illustrated in (13). The speaker compares manual olive picking in previous times with the current day technique of knocking the branches and harvesting the fallen olives. The speaker exclusion becomes clear in the wider context through the use of *ahora* ‘now’ as opposed to preceding past experience narration. Moreover, the use of a non-specific 3rd person plural in *ponen* ‘they put’ and *varean* ‘they knock, implies speaker

exclusion. As a result, the following action of cleaning (*se limpia*) is also interpreted as not including the speaker.

- (12) *Pero... se supone que todos los niños deben de venir a y cuarto. Se supone, y nunca. Nunca es..* (CORLEC conversations)

‘But... **it is supposed** that all the children have to come at fifteen minutes past. **It is supposed**, and never. Never it is the case...’

- (13) *Ahora ponen plásticos, vanean un poco el olivo y caen todas las aceitunas en el plástico y luego ya se limpia un poco.* (CORLEC conversations)

‘Now they put plastics, they knock the branches of the olive tree a bit and all the olives fall on the plastic and then already **they clean them** a bit.’

Thus, we see that the tendency to include the speaker may be countered quite easily by contextual factors, even with *uno* which was traditionally described in terms of speaker inclusion. With *uno*, the speaker suggests identification or empathy with the experiencer/agent, though, which is not the case in constructions with *se*. *Uno* has then a much stronger intersubjective effect than *se*.

5. Women only: how generic are female-only forms?

A second subcase is the expression of genericity in a feminine form, more concretely by means of *una* or by means of feminine concordance in *se*-constructions. As in the previous section, the genericity is not universal, since the feminine form limits the potential reference to the subset of females. As we will see, the interaction with the use of masculine forms (which are also used for gender-neutral reference) by women is in addition highly revealing of the tension between self-reference and generic readings realized through both constructions. Moreover, the feminine form *una* is particularly interesting since a feminine form of the indefinite pronoun is absent in various other languages, e.g. English *one*, French *on*, German *Man*, Dutch *men*.

Quantitative research of *una* is difficult in view of its extremely low frequency in corpora. The examples discussed in this section are therefore not only taken from the CORLEC and Macrocorpus-ALFAL corpora but also from other sources (such as weblogs and social

media). They show that the use of *una* fully explores the differences between extralinguistic reference and the representation of that reference as developed by the speaker. Current-day descriptions of the use of *una* have gone some length to incorporate the pragmatic functioning of *una*. Thus, whereas earlier work, states that *uno* becomes *una* when the speaker is a woman (e.g. Kärde 1943: 36), both the NGLE (2009) and Butt & Benjamin (1988) adopt a more nuanced view.

NGLE points out that “es normal el uso del femenino *una* cuando una mujer pretende resaltar su subjetividad o destacar su opinión propia”³ (NGLE 2009: 1132). *Una* can then be self-referring or extend to women in general. It is argued that in Mexico, Central-America and some areas of the Carribean, the use of *uno* for self-reference is habitual (NGLE 2009: 1133). Butt and Benjamin, on the other hand, consider that “a woman uses *una* if the pronoun refers to herself but *uno* if no self-reference is intended” (Butt & Benjamin 1988: 417). Both works, then, suggest that self-reference privileges the use of *una* whereas generic reference privileges the use of *uno*. Butt & Benjamin take a different position on the geographical variation and point out some examples of Latin-American authors who use both *uno* and *una*, in order to counter the idea that *uno* is privileged in Latin-American Spanish. It should be noted that of the authors they mention, namely Vargas Llosa, Arrufat and Benedetti, only Arrufat has spent considerable time in the Carribean (namely Cuba), the area related to the use of *uno* for female-only reference by the NGLE. In general, it is virtually impossible to carry out a reliable study of the spread of *uno* vs. *una* in the Spanish-speaking world, because of the previously mentioned sparseness of data for the feminine form.

Example (14), from a Peruvian speaker, would illustrate the tendency of privileging *uno* in Latin-America. The author narrates her personal experience concerning discrimination against women and uses various feminine forms to do so (*retrasada*, *aceptada*, *niña*) yet resorts to masculine *uno* and not to *una*.

(14) *Yo nunca he sentido ninguna discriminación, créame. He oído frecuentemente... decía la gente que por ser mujer **uno está retrasada** en algo o no está aceptada. Nunca, ni de niña, sentí ninguna diferencia, ni con mis hermanos.* (Macro-corpus ALFAL La Paz)

‘I never felt no discrimination whatsoever, believe me. I’ve heard often... people said that

³ “The use of feminine *una* is normal when a woman wishes to her subjectivity or distinguish her own opinion.”

for being a woman **one is kept behind** in something or isn't accepted. Never, not even as a little girl, did I feel any difference, nor with my brothers.'

However, similar examples may be found by European speakers, e.g. (15) taken from a discussion concerning women's rights and violence against women, that is, topics where the female identity is highly relevant. This intervention illustrates the complex discursive functioning and the interaction between self-reference and generic reference. Given the rather emotional nature of this woman's intervention as a whole and her previous use of the feminine form of the 1st person plural, *nosotras* 'we', it seems strange that she uses *uno* instead of *una*. This may be motivated, though, by the desire to also involve male viewers in her stance and to project her own subjective experience onto the hearers as well. Indeed, throughout this debate, one of the main issues is whether men and women take a different stance on women's position and representations in society. The female speaker's use of *uno* may then be an attempt to (re)connect with male interlocutors, and to present a stance that may be shared by men as well, as opposed to only by women.

(15) *Bueno, yo... a mí me parece que la primera concienciación nos corresponde a nosotras, las mujeres. A mí me parece que mientras se sigan prestando, pues eso que ya lo veis ahora mismo, ¿no?, los anuncios en la televisión...programas... en los que **uno siente** vergüenza de ser mujer, como... como es ese de Tele 5 de por las noches, un día en semana. (CORLEC debates)*

'Well, I... to me it seems that the first becoming aware is up to us, women. To me it seems that as long as they keep on lending themselves, well, that which you see right now, isn't it? Television advertisement, programs, in which **one feels** ashamed of being a woman, as is the one on Tele 5 in the evenings, one day in the week.'

However, this attitude is by no means general. In a similar reaction to a campaign against violence against women, a female participant reacts on Facebook (16). In this case, she clearly follows the campaign's discourse of focusing on violence against women and highlighting women's fear of attack (possibly also narrating a personal experience) through the use of feminine forms.

(16) *Que tiene narices que en pleno siglo XXI aun **vaya una** con miedo por la noche.*

(facebook message)

‘It’s outrageous that in full 21st century **one** still **goes** with fear at night.’

It is clear that the distinction between self-referring *uno/una* and generic *uno/una* is hard to establish because of the complex nature of *uno*. Indeed, its discursive effect is precisely that an experience may be extended to others (cf. NGLE 2009: 1132). The use of *uno* by women, is then not problematic, even for female-only reference, but rather directly linked to the discursive effect accomplished by the nature of *uno*. The fact that female speakers may also resort to using masculine *uno* is further evidence of the fact that interlocutor inclusion is being sought by means of the indefinite pronoun.

Further, even more indirect evidence, is the fact that the sequence *una mismo* ‘one self’ may be found in blogs and discussion forums. This sequence would be considered downright ungrammatical in view of the non-concordance between feminine *una* and masculine *mismo* by the majority of native speakers and the totality of grammatical literature, yet the mere fact that this type of concordance error is being made suggests that, at least to some native speakers, the link between genericity and gender is not as neat. Indeed, the representation in the interlocutors’ mind is perhaps not clearly delimited or there might even be a diachronic change on-going. However, such diachronic evolution would be even harder to prove, given the sparseness of contemporary data and the even more considerable sparseness in diachronic data, due to the relatively limited historical source and the virtual absence of female authors in diachronic corpora.

The construction with *se* does not have a feminine equivalent as such, that is, *se* has no feminine form. However, gender concordance can occur in its predicate, e.g. feminine *contenta* ‘happy’ (17). As a result, the construction as a whole may be used for female-only reference. The fact that gender expression is situated at construction-level and not at word-level may explain why this female-only use has remained virtually undescribed in the literature. The construction can be found quite amply, though, once again mainly related to topics that are typically represented as specific for women, such as bodily health, pregnancy.

(17) *Ya sabemos, cada vez más, que cuando se es feliz y **se está contenta**, dentro del cuerpo no se necesita nada.* (<http://blogs.laverdad.es/anamariatomas/2012/07/27/gorda-si-que->

pasa/)

‘We already know, every time more, that when **one is** happy and **content**, in the body, one doesn’t need anything.’

Once again, we see that a masculine form may be used with predicates that are typically associated to females, e.g. *se está embarazado* ‘one is pregnant’ in (18). In a case like (18), this is due to the fact that pregnancy is described in a very general way. In some other cases, it may be related to the tendency of considering both mothers and fathers to be pregnant when expecting a child. This is of course not the case for (18), where it is clearly the physical aspects of pregnancy that are at stake.

(18) *Estas diferencias hacen necesaria la aparición de políticas que busquen garantizar (...) [el] derecho a sentarse en el transporte público si se está embarazado (...)*
(<http://aliciaenelpaisdelasmascarillas.wordpress.com/2011/06/29/caballero-es-distinto-de-machista-marimacha-es-distinto-de-feminista-todo-va-en-los-detalles/>)

‘Those differences make necessary the appearance of policies that seek to guarantee (...) the right to sit down in public transport if **one is pregnant** (...)’

Women may then use masculine forms when narrating female-only experiences, if they wish to present the situation in more general terms and appeal to the male audience as well. This shows then that not the reference itself is at stake, but the representation that women wish to transmit.

6. Conclusions

It has become clear in this study that both *uno* and *se* may be used to conceptualize an experience as generic yet also personal. In order to illustrate this, I have focused on two specific cases where this tension is particularly clear. On the one hand, I have shown that in many cases an experience is represented that is not the speaker’s, even with *uno*, which is traditionally considered as including the speaker’s experiences. I have shown that various contextual factors allow for establishing the reference. *Uno*, with a human subject singled out, does imply speaker empathy even when the speaker is not included, as opposed to the construction with *se*. As such, *uno* expresses more clearly subjectivity (to the extent in which

it involves the speaker) and intersubjectivity (since it attempts to also include the hearer). On the other hand, I have looked into the specific case of the representation of women-specific experiences. It is clear that these are not only represented in the feminine form but also in masculine or mixed forms. This shows the desire to move away from a subjective, exclusively female, to a more intersubjective construction of women-specific experiences. As such, they reveal the tension between the extralinguistic gender reality and the constructed gender, and, ultimately, the overall tension between extralinguistic reference and the representation constructed by the speaker.

Corpora and sources

CORLEC = *Corpus del Español centro-peninsular*, directed by Professor Francisco Marcos Marín in the Universidad Autónoma de Madrid with the support of the Agencia Nacional para el Desarrollo de Programas del V Centenario (1990-1993).

Macro-corpus ALFAL = *Macro-corpus de la Norma lingüística culta de las principales ciudades del mundo hispánico*. Asociación de Lingüística y Filología de América Latina.

Tomás, Ana María. 2012. *Gorda, sí. ¿Qué Pasa?*

<http://blogs.laverdad.es/anamariatomas/2012/07/27/gorda-si-que-pasa/> [page last accessed on August 2nd 2013]

X. *Caballero es distinto de machista, marimacha es distinto de feminista. Todo va en los detalles*

<http://aliciaenelpaisdelasmascarillas.wordpress.com/2011/06/29/caballero-es-distinto-de-machista-marimacha-es-distinto-de-feminista-todo-va-en-los-detalles/> [page last accessed on August 2nd, 2013]

References

Benveniste, Emile (1966) De la subjectivité dans le langage. In : Emile Benveniste (ed.), *Problèmes de linguistique générale*. Paris: Editions Gallimard, pp. 258-266.

Butt, John, & Benjamin, Carmen. 1988. *A New Reference Grammar of Modern Spanish*. London: Arnold.

- Da Milano, Federica. Ms. *Referential ambiguity of personal pronouns in Japanese (and other East-Asian languages)*.
- De Cock, Barbara. 2010. *A discourse-functional analysis of speech participant profiling in spoken Spanish*. Unpublished PhD KULeuven.
- . In press. *Profiling discourse participants: forms and functions in Spanish conversation and debates*. Amsterdam – Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- . Forthc.a. Register and referential ambiguity of personal pronouns: A cross-linguistic analysis.
- . Forthc.b. *Spanish spatial deictic adverbs: interpretation and discourse functioning with depersonalizing constructions*. In: Da Milano, Federica – Zublena, Paolo (eds.). *Space and language: on deixis*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- . In prep. Impersonals in context: a multivariate analysis of Spanish *uno* and *se*. In: Glynn, Dylan – Krawczak, Karolina (eds.). *Modality and Intersubjectivity. Corpus studies in epistemic structuring*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- de Miguel Aparicio, Elena. 1992. *El aspecto en la sintaxis del español: perfectividad e impersonalidad*. Madrid: Ediciones de la Universidad Autónoma de Madrid.
- Devís Márquez, Pablo. 2003. La impersonalidad y las denominadas construcciones impersonales en español. *Zeitschrift Für Romanische Philologie* 199(3): 393-442.
- Fernández Ramírez, Salvador. 1987. *Gramática española* 3.2. Madrid: Arco Libros.
- Fernández Soriano, Olga, & Susana Táboas Baylín. 1999. Construcciones impersonales no reflejas. In: Ignacio Bosque & Violeta Demonte (eds.), *Gramática descriptiva de la lengua española* 2: 1723-78. Madrid: Espasa Calpe.
- Flores-Ferrán, Nydia. 2009. Are you referring to me? The variable use of *UNO* and *YO* in oral discourse. *Journal of Pragmatics* 41(9): 1810-1824.
- García, Erica C. 2009. *The motivated syntax of arbitrary signs: cognitive constraints on Spanish clitic clustering*. Studies in functional and structural linguistics 61. Amsterdam - Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Gelabert-Desnoyer, Jaime. 2008. Not so impersonal: intentionality in the use of pronoun *uno* in contemporary Spanish political discourse. *Pragmatics* 18(3): 407-24.
- Gómez Torrego, Leonardo. 1992. *La impersonalidad gramatical: descripción y norma*. Madrid: Arco Libros.
- Haverkate, Henk. 2004. Gramática y pragmática: categorías desfocalizadores en español. *Spanish in Context* 1(1): 21-40.

- Helasvuo, Marja-Liisa & Vilkuna, Maria. 2008. Impersonal is personal: Finnish Perspectives. *Transactions of the Philological Society* 106(2): 216-245.
- Kärde, Sven. 1943. *Quelques manières d'exprimer l'idée d'un sujet indéterminé ou général en espagnol*. Uppsala: Appelbergs Boktryckeriaktiebolag.
- Kecskes, Istvan & Mey, Jacob. 2008. *Intention, Common Ground and the Egocentric Speaker-Hearer*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Kerbrat-Orecchioni, Catherine. 2005. *Le discours en interaction*. Paris: Armand Colin.
- Lyons, John. 1982. Deixis and subjectivity: *Loquor, ergo sum?* In: R. J. Jarvella & W. Klein (eds.), *Speech, place and action: studies in deixis and related topics*, 101-24. Chichester: Wiley.
- Malchukov, Andrej & Siewierska, Anna (eds.). 2011. *Impersonal constructions. A cross-linguistic perspective*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Maldonado, Ricardo. 1999. *A media voz. Problemas conceptuales del clítico 'se'*. México: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México.
- Martín Zorraquino, María Antonia. 1979. *Las construcciones pronominales en español*. Madrid: Gredos.
- Martínez, José. A. 1989. *El pronombre (vol.2)*. Madrid: Arco Libros.
- Mendikoetxea, Amaya. 1999. Construcciones con *se*: medias, pasivas e impersonales. In: Ignacio Bosque & Violeta Demonte (eds.), *Gramática descriptiva de la lengua española 2: 1631-1722*. Madrid: Espasa Calpe.
- NGLE: Real Academia Española & Asociación de Academias de la Lengua Española. 2010. *Nueva Gramática de la Lengua Española*. Madrid: Espasa.
- Scheibman, Joanne. 2007. Subjective and intersubjective uses of generalizations in English conversations. In: Robert Englebretson (ed.), *Stancetaking in discourse*, 111-37. Amsterdam - Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Siewierska, Anna. 2008. Introduction: Impersonalization: an agent-based vs. subject-based perspective. *Transactions of the Philological Society* 106(2): 115-137.
- Traugott, Elisabeth C. 2003. From subjectification to intersubjectification. In: Raymond Hickey (ed.), *Motives for language change*, 124-39. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.