Workshop

Mitigation and Mirativity in CG Management

19 and 20 November 2026,

University of Tübingen, Brechtbau/Neuphilologicum

Wilhelmstraße 50, 72074 Tübingen, Room 215

Organization team:

Prof. Dr. Sarah Dessì Schmid, Prof. Dr. Inga Hennecke, Prof. Dr. Wiltrud Mihatsch & Prof. Dr. Evelyn Wiesinger (PIs)

Ivica Bakmaz, Patricia Dasí Sanchis, Yannick Piechotta & Valentín Torres (PhD students)

This workshop is funded by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation) – SFB 1718 – 538184825.

Programme

Wednesday, 18 November 2026

20:00	*Kickoff dinner* *Restaurant: Neckawa* *Wöhrdstraße 25, 72072 Tübingen*

Thursday, 19 November 2026 (room 215)

09:00 – 09:30	Welcome and introduction
09:30 – 10:30	**Kate Beeching** Counter-expectation, mirativity and mitigation: the case of *en fait*
10:30 – 11:00	*Coffee break*
11:00 – 12:00	**Laura Kornfeld** *De repente* as a mitigator and a mirative marker in colloquial Spanish
12:00 – 13:00	**Andrea Sansò & Ilaria Fiorentini** From allocution to mirativity and mitigation: the pragmatic career of some Italian allocutives
13:00 – 14:30	*Lunch* *Buffet at Brechtbau*
14:30 – 15:30	**Jeanne Vigneron-Bosbach** French DM *genre*: From Taxonomic noun, Mitigator to Mirative marker?
15:30 – 16:00	*Coffee break*
16:00 – 17:00	**Martina Wiltschko room 027** From synchronization to common ground. The view from the acquisition of interactional language
17:00 – 18:00	**Andrea Beltrama room 027 (online presentation)** From mansplaining to gaslighting. How Common Ground (mis)management generates social stereotypes.
19:30	*Conference dinner* *Restaurant: Historische Weinstube Forelle* *Kronenstraße 8, 72070 Tübingen*

Programme

Friday, 20 November 2026 (room 215)

09:00 – 10:00	**Susana Rodríguez Rosique** Exploring the relations between coordination and counter-expectation in information management: The mirative value of *¿¡y eso!?* in Spanish
10:00 – 11:00	**Caterina Mauri & Antonia Russo** Mirative replies: rejection and confirmation in common ground management
11:00 – 11:30	*Coffee break*
11:30 – 12:30	**Nicolás Rivera** Turn-medial *puta* as an addressee-oriented epistemic marker in Chilean Spanish talk-in-interaction
12:30 – 14:00	*Lunch* *Restaurant: Flavours of India* *Mohlstraße 26, 72074 Tübingen*
14:00 – 15:00	**Patricia Dasí Sanchis, Inga Hennecke, Wiltrud Mihatsch & Valentín Torres** From mitigation to focussing – and back?
15:00 – 16:00	**Ivica Bakmaz, Sarah Dessì Schmid, Yannick Piechotta & Evelyn Wiesinger** When Mirativity Meets Mitigation: Triggering Non-Default Updating of the Common Ground
16:00 – 16:30	Closing discussion
18:00 – 19:30	City tour of Tübingen
19:30	*Dinner* *Restaurant: Ratskeller* *Haaggasse 4, 72070 Tübingen*

Abstracts

Beeching, Kate: Counter-expectation, mirativity and mitigation: the case of *en fait* 1

Beltrama, Andrea: From mansplaining to gaslighting. How Common Ground (mis)management generates social stereotypes 4

Fiorentini, Ilaria & Sansò, Andrea: From allocution to mirativity and mitigation: the pragmatic career of some Italian allocutives 6

Kornfeld, Laura: *De repente* as a mitigator and a mirative marker in colloquial Spanish 8

Mauri, Caterina & Russo, Antonia: Mirative replies: rejection and confirmation in common ground management 11

Dasí, Patricia; Hennecke, Inga; Mihatsch, Wiltrud & Torres, Valentín: From mitigation to focussing – and back? 14

Rivera, Nicolás: Turn-medial *puta* as an addressee-oriented epistemic marker in Chilean Spanish talk-in-interaction 16

Rodríguez Rosique, Susana: Exploring the relations between coordination and counter-expectation in information management: The mirative value of *¿¡y eso!?* in Spanish 20

Vigneron-Bosbach, Jeanne: French DM *genre*: From Taxonomic noun, Mitigator to Mirative marker? 24

Wiltschko, Martina: From synchronization to common ground. The view from the acquisition of interactional language 27

Beeching, Kate: Counter-expectation, mirativity and mitigation: the case of *en fait*

Counter-expectation, mirativity and mitigation: the case of *en fait*

Kate Beeching

University of the West of England, Bristol, UK

Beltrama & Hanink (2019) suggest that hedging discourse markers, such as *like*, may be pressed into service to express mirativity. Drawing on an analysis of the uses of French *en fait* in four comparable spoken corpora dated 1968, 1988, 2001 and 2014, this presentation explores the relationship between mitigation and mirativity, and the cognitive and metaphorical processes through which a linguistic item can undergo univerbation, semantic bleaching and pragmatic enrichment to evolve from counter-expectation to mitigation (and other uses).

The presentation starts with some brief definitions of what is meant by discourse-pragmatic markers and an overview of sociolinguistic and corpus methods of tracing language change, with a specific focus on previous studies of *like* in English and *quand même* (=all the same/though) in French (Beeching, 2016, 2005). An extension of mirativity understood as a reactive category (as illustrated in Dessi Schmid et al 2025) to a more proactive one as posited by Aikhenvald (2012) is then proposed. Furthermore, procatalepsis (Beeching, 2009) is introduced as an explanatory framework through which to understand the relationship between adversative or concessive expressions, counter-expectation, hedging and boosting.

The new data adduced for *en fait* show that rates of occurrence were 16 times more frequent in 2014 than in 1968, that the core adversative or oppositive function, used for self- or other-correction, has diminished in favour of more elaborative, reformulative, reinforcing, stalling, resumptive and hedging uses. Position in the argument structure has moved progressively from medial to initial to final, and functional development is consistent with Traugott's (1982) unidirectionality theory of semantic change, from propositional to textual to (inter)subjective meanings.

From a propositional point of view, opposition to a previously expressed opinion can be expressed with *en fait* either as a self- or other-correction. This can lead to the expression of new information (mirativity). *En fait* also functions, oppositionally, at a textual (metalinguistic) level to flag a textual correction aka a reformulation and thus has connections with stalling and with elaboration and resumption. Finally, at an expressive subjective and intersubjective level, opposition to an (unspoken/implicit) expectation, can lead, via the cardinal concessive cognitive reflex, to *en fait* being used for enhancement or attenuation.

This study builds on the work done by Mauri and Russo (2025) on 'altro che X' which proposes (p. 143):

> an expanded interpretation of mirativity, encompassing not only surprise triggered by a specific entity or event (first-level mirativity), but also surprise triggered by some expectation regarding the validity or invalidity of an entity or event (second-level).

A similar diachronic development can be posited for *en fait* as for *altroché*, noted by Mauri and Russo (p. 160) as follows:

> We thus observe an increasing degree of intersubjectivity and counter-expectation, connected to the gradual loss of an explicit antecedent to be rejected, as is summarized in (21):
>
> (21) rejecting an antecedent that was explicitly asserted in previous discourse > rejecting an antecedent that is only accessible from the context > rejecting an antecedent that coincides with an expectation.

We can, however, go a step further, in the case of *en fait.* By invoking the Cardinal Concessive, the cognitive reflex inherent in the classical figure procatalepsis and the case of *quand même*, we argue that a linguistic item with a counter-expectational force can be recruited to boost or hedge an assertion. We can thus extend (21) by saying:

> rejecting an antecedent that coincides with an expectation > hinting at a potential counter-expectation > (process of procatelpsis) booster /mitigator.

In conclusion, the evidence we have adduced in the case of *en fait* suggests that mirativity (new information) and mitigation (hedging/attenuation) can indeed both be flagged by this evolving PM – but that these functions are arguably at best only distantly related from a semantic point of view.

References

Aikhenvald, Alexandra (2012). The essence of mirativity. *Linguistic Typology* 16(3): 435–485.

Beeching, Kate (2005). Politeness-induced semantic change: the case of *quand même*. *Language Variation and Change 17*: 155–180.

Beeching, Kate (2009). Procatalepsis and the etymology of hedging and boosting particles. In: Maj-Britt Mosegaard Hansen & Jacqueline Visconti (eds.), *Current Trends in Diachronic Semantics and Pragmatics.* Emerald: Studies in Pragmatics 7: 81–105.

Beeching, Kate (2016). *Pragmatic Markers in British English. Meaning in Social Interaction.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Beltrama, Andrea, Hanink, Emily A. (2019). Marking imprecision, conveying surprise: *Like* between hedging and mirativity. *Journal of Linguistics* 55: 1–34.

Dessì Schmid, Sarah, Momma, Lydia, & Wiesinger, Evelyn (2025). Mirativity in Romance: Speaker-oriented vs. hearer-oriented expressions of Unexpectedness. In: Susana Rodriguez Rosique (ed.), *Expressing Surprise at the Crossroads. Mirativity, Exclamativity and Cooptation in Romance Languages.* Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter, pp. 229–245.

Mauri, Caterina & Russo, Antonia (2025). The mirative values of Italian *altro che*. In: Susana Rodríguez Rosique (ed.), *Expressing Surprise at the Crossroads. Mirativity, Exclamativity and Cooptation in Romance Languages.* Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter, pp. 143–175.

Rosique Rodríguez, Susana (ed.) (2025). *Expressing Surprise at the Crossroads. Mirativity, Exclamativity and Cooptation in Romance Languages*. Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter.

Traugott, Elizabeth Closs (1982). From propositional to textual and expressive meanings: some semantic-pragmatic aspects of grammaticalization. In: W.P. Lehmann & Y. Malkiel (eds.), *Perspectives on historical linguistics (Amsterdam studies in the theory and history of linguistic science IV Current issues in linguistic theory, Vol 24).* Amsterdam: Benjamins, pp. 245–272.

Beltrama, Andrea: From mansplaining to gaslighting. How Common Ground (mis)management generates social stereotypes

From *mansplaining* to *gaslighting.* How Common Ground (mis)management generates social stereotypes.

Andrea Beltrama

University of Delaware

Conversational stereotypes — i.e, social representations distinctively linked to uncooperative conversational behavior — are increasingly prominent in public discourse. These include, for example, *mansplaining*— i.e., a man providing unnecessary and unwelcome explanations to a woman — or *gaslighting* — i.e., a speaker causing the listener to systematically doubt their feelings and judgments, and ultimately their own perception of reality. The pervasiveness of these phenomena raises an intriguing question for discourse pragmatics: what particular conversational choices and epistemic assumptions on the part of a speaker make these patterns of behavior distinctive, and thus socially recognizable?

In this talk, I propose that both mansplaining and gaslighting can be understood as distinct instantiations of *Common Ground mismanagement* — a phenomenon observed when at least one interlocutor hinders the process of knowledge accrual and communal inquiry that typically underlies felicitous conversations. In the case of mansplaining, I suggest that Common Ground mismanagement results from one interlocutor systematically aiming to add redundant, uninformative propositions to the Common Ground. In the case of gaslighting, I suggest that mismanagement results from one interlocutor acting so as to ensure that the Common Ground always contains inconsistent propositions, thus making knowledge accrual a logically impossible task.

Looking at the broader picture, I argue that there is much to gain from analyzing patterns of uncooperative behavior by applying the same analytical tools that we normally utilize to model cooperative discourse structure and development — including (and starting from) the notion of Common Ground.

Fiorentini, Ilaria & Sansò, Andrea: From allocution to mirativity and mitigation: the pragmatic career of some Italian allocutives

From allocution to mirativity and mitigation: the pragmatic career of some Italian allocutives

Ilaria Fiorentini & Andrea Sansò

Università di Pavia | Università degli Studi di Salerno

Allocutives – forms whose primary function is to establish or maintain contact with an addressee – are cross-linguistically prone to bleach into general-purpose discourse markers once the contact-establishing function becomes redundant (Kleinknecht & Souza 2017). This paper argues that this redundancy is not a mere precondition for semantic loss, but the very mechanism that licenses two apparently opposite functional extensions: mirative marking, whereby the allocutive signals the unexpectedness or heightened relevance of the associated utterance, and mitigation, whereby the same form softens the illocutionary force of an assertion, a disagreement, or a topic shift. We propose that both developments arise as invited inferences (Traugott & Dasher 2002): when an allocutive is uttered in a context where attention-getting is unnecessary – contact already being established – the addressee is prompted to reinterpret its presence as procedurally meaningful in some other way. Depending on prosodic, positional and sequential cues, this reanalysis proceeds either toward emphasis/mirativity (comparable to the expressive uses documented for English I mean, Brinton 2008) or toward attenuation, softening a face-threatening or dispreferred move.

We substantiate this account with corpus data on Italian ragazzi/ragazze and raga (a shortened form of ragazzi/e 'guys'), tracked through the KIParla corpus (www.kiparla.it). Alongside its allocutive core and its well-documented turn- and topic-management functions, these allocutives show two functionally distinct extensions relevant here. First, a mirative use, in which the form – often co-occurring with other expressive markers such as cioè – flags an unexpected or noteworthy state of affairs (e.g. CEH RAGA C'È SANDOKAN...). Second, a mitigating use, in which raga softens a disagreement, a correction, or the abrupt closure of a topic (e.g. no raga, a me i questionari mettono un'ansia), functioning much like other allocutive-derived hedges cross-linguistically (cf. Portuguese pá, Morleo 2022).

We suggest that mirativity and mitigation, rather than being unrelated endpoints, constitute two poles of a single inferential pathway rooted in the same structural configuration: redundant allocution licensing a "something more is meant here" inference, whose polarity (intensifying vs. softening) is resolved contextually. This proposal aims to contribute both to the typology of allocutive-to-discourse-marker pathways and to the broader theoretical discussion on the relationship between mirativity and mitigation as pragmatic categories.

Kornfeld, Laura: *De repente* as a mitigator and a mirative marker in colloquial Spanish

De repente as a mitigator and a mirative marker in colloquial Spanish

Laura Kornfeld

Universidad de Buenos Aires/CONICET

In this talk, I aim to explore the processes of grammaticalization involving *de repente* across different colloquial Spanish dialects. Dictionaries define *de repente* as an adverbial locution meaning 'suddenly', 'abruptly', 'without thinking', as in (1.a), where it functions as an aspectual VP-adjunct. Beyond this primary sense, *de repente* has expanded into a mirative marker across several colloquial Spanish dialects (including Peninsular Spanish), as shown in (1.b):

(1) a. Juan llegó **de repente**, 'John arrived suddenly'

b. **De repente**, tiene novia y trabaja, 'Unexpectedly, he has a girlfriend and a job'

In examples like (1.b), *de repente* introduces new information that causes surprise or contradicts the expectations of an unprepared mind — that is, core features characterizing mirativity according to Aikhenvald (2012: 437). As a mirative marker, *de repente* displays distinct grammatical properties: for instance, it systematically appears in a clause-peripheral position (typically sentence-initially) rather than within the VP; it takes wide scope over negation (e.g., *De repente, Juan no llegó,* 'Unexpectedly, John does not arrive' vs. *Juan no llegó de repente* 'John does not arrive suddenly'); it lacks Aktionsart restrictions, while as an aspectual adjunct it combines mainly with telic events (cf. 1.b vs. ??/**Tiene novia y trabaja de repente,* 'He has a girlfriend and a job suddenly').

Furthermore, in different American countries (in particular, Uruguay, Chile and Venezuela) *de repente* also functions as a mitigator. In these cases, *de repente* can attenuate the propositional content of an utterance, acting in (2.a) as a *bush* (following well-established terminology, cf. Caffi 2007: 98), or soften a directive speech act (i.e., *hedge*), for instance a suggestion (2.b) or a command (2.c):

(2) a. En el primer tiempo **de repente** nos faltó un poquito de paciencia, 'In the first half, **de repente** we lacked a bit of patience'.

b. **De repente** podemos abrir un Drive o Dropbox, '**De repente** we can open a Drive or Dropbox'

c. **De repente** poné una foto del caño de la dirección y te decimos qué es, '**De repente** post a photo of the steering column, and we'll tell you what it is.'

In the pragmatic literature, the overt expression of surprise has been regarded as a form of impoliteness or a face-threatening act (FTA) that challenges the hearer's expectations and beliefs, often linked to disapproval, rejection or other similarly impolite speech acts (cf. for instance Hickey 1991). However, presenting certain declarative statement or proposal as a surprising idea can also be an effective device for politeness: it weakens the speaker's commitment to their propositional content or softens the illocutionary force of the speech act, protecting the speaker's face while enabling the hearer to easily reject the idea or proposal. In fact, the phenomenon of *de repente* may point to a pattern of grammaticalization in Spanish, given that a near-synonymous locution, *de pronto*, is also occasionally employed as a mitigator in different dialects that do not use *de repente* in this way, as found in the CREA corpus (RAE 2023). However, in these varieties (including Argentine, Colombian, or Peninsular Spanish), *de pronto* seems less frequent and less grammaticalized than *de repente* (for instance, it cannot occur in imperative contexts such as 2.c).

In sum, by analyzing the different uses of *de repente*, this talk aims to make an empirical contribution to the descriptive grammar of Spanish dialects, while simultaneously contributing to the theoretical discussion about the interactions between the grammatical and semantic-pragmatic domains of mitigation and mirativity.

References

Aikhenvald, Alexandra (2012). The essence of mirativity. *Linguistic Typology 16(3)*: 435–485.

Caffi, Claudia (2007). *Mitigation*. Amsterdam: Elsevier.

Hickey, Leo (1991). Surprise, surprise, but do so politely. *Journal of Pragmatics 15(4)*: 367–372.

Real Academia Española [RAE] (2023). *Corpus de referencia del español actual* (CREA). Online version: https://corpus.rae.es/creanet.

Mauri, Caterina & Russo, Antonia: Mirative replies: rejection and confirmation in common ground management

Mirative replies: rejection and confirmation in common ground management

Caterina Mauri & Antonia Russo

University of Bologna

Mirativity encompasses the linguistic expression of surprise and unexpectedness (Aikhenvald 2012). Mirative replies do more than accept or reject a proposition: they also make visible expectations about what an interlocutor should know, believe, or consider plausible. This talk investigates how these expectations are negotiated in Italian interaction, focusing on the relationship between mirative rejection, mirative confirmation, and uses in which surprise gives way to reassurance, emphasis, or affiliation.

The analysis draws on conversational data from the KIParla corpus and builds on the distinction between first-level mirativity, targeting an unexpected state of affairs, and second-level mirativity, targeting an unexpected epistemic position attributed to another participant (Mauri & Russo 2025). Italian constructions such as *macché*, *come no*, *ma scherzi*, and *figurati* illustrate how replies operate simultaneously on propositional content and on expectations concerning its accessibility or acceptability. A speaker may reject a proposition while presenting it as implausible that the interlocutor could endorse it; conversely, a speaker may confirm a proposition while treating the interlocutor's uncertainty as unexpected. Propositional agreement can thus coexist with a challenge to the epistemic position displayed in the preceding turn.

We examine this interaction between polarity and expectations through a sample of mirative replies extracted from KIParla, comprising both polarity-reversing and polarity-preserving uses (Farkas & Bruce 2010; Andorno & Rosi 2015). Rather than treating these constructions as interchangeable markers of surprise, we consider how their interpretation depends on the preceding contribution and on the perspective attributed to the interlocutor, drawing on Heritage's (2012) account of epistemic positioning in interaction. This approach makes it possible to distinguish the acceptance of content from the negotiation of whether that content should already be shared or treated as obvious.

Particular attention is devoted to the boundary between mirativity and interpersonal functions. When an interlocutor expresses concern about taking up someone's time, *ma figurati* can dismiss the assumption that the interaction constitutes an imposition. Rejecting an attributed expectation here supports reassurance and affiliation. Related uses of *come no* in granting permission and of *ma va* in discouraging further solicitude show how these forms participate in managing interpersonal expectations, even when surprise is no longer foregrounded.

These patterns motivate a hypothesis of functional extension from the rejection of an unexpected assumption, through reassuring or emphatic replies, to routine politeness and affiliative feedback. We discuss this possible pathway alongside the pragmatic reversal described for Italian *per favore*, whereby a politeness formula acquires confrontational uses (Fedriani 2019). Historical directionality remains a question to be tested, while the synchronic evidence identifies contexts in which mirative and interpersonal interpretations overlap. The resulting account connects mirativity and mitigation through the management of attributed expectations, showing how the same reply resources can challenge an interlocutor's position, restore alignment, or sustain an already shared perspective.

References

Aikhenvald, Alexandra (2012). The essence of mirativity. *Linguistic Typology 16(3)*: 435–485.

Andorno, Cecilia, & Rosi, Fabiana (2015). Short replies in Italian: Sì/no and other markers between polarity and agreement. *Journal of Pragmatics* 87: 105–126.

Farkas, Donka F., & Bruce, Kim B. (2010). On reacting to assertions and polar questions. *Journal of Semantics 27(1)*: 81–118.

Fedriani, Chiara (2019). A pragmatic reversal: Italian *per favore* 'please' and its variants between politeness and impoliteness. *Journal of Pragmatics 142*: 233–244.

Heritage, John (2012). Epistemics in action: Action formation and territories of knowledge. *Research on Language and Social Interaction 45(1)*: 1–29.

Mauri, Caterina, & Russo, Antonia (2025). The mirative values of Italian 'altro che'. In: Susana Rodríguez Rosique (ed.), *Expressing Surprise at the Crossroads: Mirativity, Exclamativity and Cooptation in Romance Languages*. Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter, pp. 143–178.

Dasí, Patricia; Hennecke, Inga; Mihatsch, Wiltrud & Torres, Valentín: From mitigation to focussing – and back?

From mitigation to focussing – and back?

Patricia Dasí Sanchis, Inga Hennecke, Wiltrud Mihatsch, Valentín Torres

University of Tübingen

Mitigation and focussing expressions seem to be pragmatically opposed linguistic resources. While mitigators weaken the illocutionary force of speech acts, focus markers rather do the opposite and may strengthen speech acts. Nevertheless, cross-linguistically there are numerous expressions which show both functions.

In our talk we will first give a crosslinguistic overview of analyses of expressions which may both mitigate as well as strengthen speech acts - some of which may appear in mirative contexts. The best-known case is English *like* (see Underhill 1988), which first developed mitigating uses via approximation as in (1):

(1) They had like scraped her. D'Arcy (2005: 171)

Like has then adopted focussing functions compatible with mirative contexts (Beltrama/Hanink 2019). Further cases are type-noun based mitigators such as Spanish *tipo*, Italian *tipo* and French *genre*. (Mihatsch 2020).

In the second part of our talk we will discuss Spanish mitigators which have developed focussing uses, notably *como*, *tipo* and *medio*, but also others. Based on a qualitative corpus analysis we will try and sketch possible bridging contexts leading from mitigation to focussing, which seem to be linked to rhematic positions and which seem to be related to basic functions relevant for common-ground updates. In the third part of our talk we will present and discuss two expressions which diverge from this picture. We will present and discuss a counterexample which develops mitigating uses from intensifying and focussing uses, namely colloquial Argentinian *ah re.* We will try and analyse plausible contexts of transition. We will further discuss the paraverbal click or "tsk" sound, which neither starts out as a mitigator nor as a focus marker, but may appear in both contexts in our Spanish data.

We will conclude with general remarks about the three types of development and the links between mitigation and focussing, which in turn may lead to mirative uses. We do not consider this link as a case of bidirectional change, but as a consequence of two distinct paths linked to different bridging contexts, with the tsk-sound as a special case.

References

Beltrama, Andrea, & Hanink, Emily A. (2019). Marking Imprecision, Conveying Surprise: *Like* between Hedging and Mirativity. *Journal of Linguistics 55(1)*: 243–243.

D'Arcy, Alexandra (2007). *Like* and language ideology: Disentangling fact from fiction. *American Speech 82*: 386-419.

Mihatsch, Wiltrud (2020). A semantic-map approach to pragmatic markers: the complex approximation / mitigation / quotation / focus marking. (Peninsular Spanish (*tipo, así, como*) and European Portuguese (*tipo, assim, como*). In: Isabel Margarida Duarte & Rogelio Ponce de Léon Romeo (eds.), *O Português como Referência Contrastiva*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, pp. 137–162.

Underhill, Robert (1988). Like Is, like, Focus. *American Speech 63(3)*: 234–46.

Rivera, Nicolás: Turn-medial *puta* as an addressee-oriented epistemic marker in Chilean Spanish talk-in-interaction

Turn-medial *puta* as an addressee-oriented epistemic marker in Chilean Spanish talk-in-interaction

Nicolás Rivera

Universitat Pompeu Fabra

In this talk, I will examine the epistemic functions of the discourse particle *puta* when used in turn-medial position in Chilean Spanish talk-in-interaction. This form (literally translatable as 'whore') can encode various types of meaning depending on its syntagmatic relations and the language variety in which it is used. Significantly, its derogatory function when used as an expressive noun or adjective (in the sense of Gutzmann 2019) sharply contrasts with its use as a discourse particle. In this latter function, it serves as a mirative. This is exemplified in (1) and (2).

(1) a. *Puta* as a stand-alone reaction

01 Marle y el año pasado yo partí el año refriá (...)
and last year too I started the year with a cold (...)

y en primero también
and first [year of college] too

03 Anto ((giggles)) pu(h)ta(h) Marle(h)
PRT, Marle

AMERESCO_SCL_004_03_18

(2) b. *Puta* at the beginning of a response

01 Driver ¡ahh! ¿no tiene sencillo?
Ah! you don't have change?

02 Client °no nada°
No, nothing

03 Driver puta de diez mil (.) ¿tú no tení m'hija? (.) ¿dos de cinco?
PRT, [a bill] of ten thousand. Don't you have, dear, two fives?

AMERESCO_IQQ_007_11_12

In both examples, *puta* acts as a particle that conveys negative affectivity towards a proposition shared by the addressee, which roughly translates into attitudes related to sadness, anger, pettiness, etc. (and therefore being similar to the meaning conveyed by other swear words). In these cases, *puta* is used as a reaction to a prior turn whose content is unexpected for the speaker. In this sense, the particle acts similarly to response markers in that it directly targets information contained in the prior turn, therefore exhibiting anaphoric properties (Krifka 2013; Wiltschko 2024).

Besides this reactive function, *puta* can be used between utterances within the same turn, as exemplified in (3).

(3)

01 Ana eh sabes que, puta si quieren tirar van a tirar porque hueón

You know what, PRT, if you guys want to hook up, you'll hook up because, man,

02 están pololeando y la huevada. (.) y ya no tienes que como que
you're dating and all that. And you don't have to, like,

03 estar conociendo gente, e invitarlos a comer ¿cachái? a salir
meet new people, and invite them to eat, you know? Or go out.

AMERESCO_TCO_008_03_20

In this case, the use of *puta* signals newsworthy information to the addressee. In this position, the negative affective component is less salient than in the turn-initial examples in (1-2). Thus, the particle exhibits different use-conditions that seem to, at least partially, depend on its position within the conversation sequence. This positionally sensitive functional variation of *puta* makes it similar to other Spanish mirative particles described in the literature (Sánchez-López 2019; Dessì Schmid et al. 2025).

I propose that the functional variation of the discourse particle reflects a functionalization path. Its use in the turn-medial position corresponds to its latest stage of functionalization, which has led to semantic bleaching. This functionalization is evidenced by the loss of gender and number morphosyntactic features (see Cavirani-Pots 2020), the loss of its anaphoric property, and the distributional patterns that allow it to appear virtually anywhere in a turn of talk. Its contribution to common ground as a resource for signaling newsworthy information is the common thread throughout this functionalization process. In this sense, *puta* follows a path that is similar to other functionalized particles (e.g., Sansò 2022; Carivani et al. 2024; Posio & Rosemeyer 2024).

In this work, I aim to discuss the complexities of functionalization; the importance of context in defining the grammatical properties of discourse particles; and the utility of using naturally occurring spoken data to shed light on complex pragmatic phenomena.

References:

Cavirani, Edoardo, Cavirani-Pots, Cora, & Wyngaerd, Guido Vanden (2024). Two ways to be expressive: The case of Italian expressives *cazzo* and *merda*. Presentation at *Functional categories, dimensions of meaning, and expletiveness.* Barcelona: UAB.

Cavirani-Pots, Cora (2020). *Roots in Progress*. PhD thesis. Leuven: KU Leuven.

Dessì Schmid, Sarah, Momma, Lydia, & Wiesinger, Evelyn (2025). Mirativity in Romance: Speaker-oriented vs. hearer-oriented expressions of Unexpectedness. In: Susana Rodriguez Rosique (ed.), *Expressing Surprise at the Crossroads. Mirativity, Exclamativity and Cooptation in Romance Languages.* Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter, pp. 229–245.

González, Sebastián, & San Martín, Abelardo (2018). Los marcadores discursivos de relleno en el habla santiaguina: análisis pragmático y sociolingüístico. *Lenguas Modernas 51*: 99–122.

Gutzmann, Daniel (2019). *The Grammar of Expressivity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Krifka, Manfred (2013). Response particles as propositional anaphors. *Semantics and linguistic theory 23(1):* 1–18.

Posio, Pekka, & Rosemeyer, Malte (2025). Dialogical and monological functions of the discourse marker *bueno* in spoken and written Spanish. *Linguistics 63*(4): 1143–1170.

Sánchez-López, Cristina (2019). ¿Son las partículas oracionales categorías semiléxicas?. *Revista Española de Lingüística 49*(1): 23–48.

Sansò, Andrea (2022). Discourse markers from processes of monologization: Two case studies. In: Miriam Voghera (ed.), *From speaking to grammar*. Bern: Peter Lang, pp. 201–225.

Wiltschko, Martina (2024). The syntax of talking heads. *Journal of Pragmatics 232*: 182–198.

Rodríguez Rosique, Susana: Exploring the relations between coordination and counter-expectation in information management: The mirative value of *¿¡y eso!?* in Spanish

Exploring the relations between coordination and counter-expectation in information management: The mirative value of *¿¡y eso!?* in Spanish

Susana Rodríguez Rosique

Universidad de Alicante

This paper deals with the mirative value of *¿¡y eso!?* in Spanish, through which the speaker conveys surprise towards a suddenly discovered situation, as is shown in (1) and (2):

(1) H4: yo quería ser arquitecto // yy–/ mm–/ al final / se me quitó la idea de ser arquitecto → / me metí en Ingeniería el año pasado / y dije *¿qué hago aquí*? ↓ 'I wanted to be an architect... but in the end, I gave up on the idea... I started Engineering last year... and thought, "What am I doing here?"'
H3: [(risas)] 'laughter'
H2: [puf (soplido)] 'phew (exhale)'
H4: [a los tres días dije →] / *¿qué hago aquí?* ↓ (risas) // y me fui 'After three days, I said, "What am I doing here?" (laughter) — and I left.'
H2: qué gracia → y–/ 'That's funny. And…'
H4: y tenía clarísimo que quería hacer Traducción 'and I was absolutely certain that I wanted to study translation'
H2: **¿y eso?** ↑ // ((o s–/)) es decir →/ porque de Ingeniaría a Traducción [hay un largo camino] 'How come? I mean / because going from Engineering to Translation [is a long road]'
(GestINF, Int. 6, min. 33:16)

(2) H3: por cierto / ¿creéis que la tierra es plana?↑ / ¿o no? ↓ 'By the way, do you think the Earth is flat? Or not?'
H1: [anda ya (entre risas)] 'Oh, come on (laughing)'
H2: [(risas) anda ya →] '(laughing) come on'
H1: [**¿y ESO**↑?] 'How come'?
(GestINF, Int. 2, min. 09:47)

The structure is compositionally formed by *y* 'and' – the coordinate maker *par excellence* in Spanish – and *eso* 'that' – a neuter demonstrative pronoun. Concerning the connective *y*, coordinate markers are conventionally linked to addition (Jiménez Juliá 1995; RAE / ASALE [2009] 2025). However, when connecting propositions, *y* can be pragmatically reinforced (Levinson 2000) and related to different meanings along a continuum of causality (Couper-Kuhlen and Kortmann 2000). In fact, all the structures from (3) to (6) are coordinate sentences conveying addition, but they pragmatically mean either a sequential – (3) –, causal – (4) –, conditional – (5) –, or contrastive – (6) – meaning, as their respective paraphrases show:

(3) Entró y cerró la puerta [>>+ Entró y después cerró la puerta]
'He entered and closed the door [>>+ He entered and then closed the door]'
(4) Llovió y cancelaron el partido [>>+ Como llovió, cancelaron el partido]
'It rained, and they cancelled the match [As it rained, they cancelled the match]'
(5) Paga tres y llévate cuatro [>>+ Si pagas tres, te llevarás cuatro]
'Pay for three and get four [>> + If you pay for three, you'll get four]
(6) Es guapo y es idiota [>>+ Es guapo, pero es idiota]
'He's handsome and he is an idiot' [>>+ He is handsome, but he is an idiot]

Whereas the connection between *and* and *but* has been traditionally assumed (cf. Grice [1957] 1989), and coordinate structures are conceived of as a productive source for the emergence of contrastive strategies, it seems that the contrastive meaning triggered in (6) is more intuitive

and less elaborated than the contrastive meaning encapsulated by adversative markers. Indeed, contrast in (6) does not emerge between utterances, but between situations (Malchukov 2004).

Regarding the pronoun, although Spanish demonstrative system exhibits a triadic configuration – the schema *est-, es-, aquel-* seems to be rooted in the distribution of personal pronouns *yo – tú – el-/la* –, some authors have proposed a dyadic explanation (Eguren 1999; Delbecque 2013; Maldonado 2020): there exists a clear opposition between proximity (*est-*) and distance (*aquel-*), while *es-* places in an intermediate space. Furthermore, despite the non-existence of neuter referents in Spanish, the demonstrative system has a neuter form (*esto, eso, aquello*), which increases the vagueness in the process of reference and thus requires stronger joint attention (Gutiérrez Rexach and Zulaica 2007; Achard 2011). In fact, the neuter demonstrative may invoke nominal referents, but it may also retrieve sentences and even a set of sentences or discourse segments (Pérez 2014; Zulaica 2018). The dyadic distribution has also been vindicated for the neuter subsystem when retrieving discursive material (De Cock 2013): while *aquello* remains outside the system, *esto* and *eso* share the division of labor – *esto* refers to the speaker's discourse and *eso* refers to the addressee's discourse.

This paper departs from data extracted from corpus GestINF – used as a control corpus – to analyze the interactional function of the mirative structure *¿¡y eso!?*. GestINF (Rodríguez Rosique and Cifuentes Honrubia, online) constitutes an audiovisual corpus that was created with the aim of both capturing the bidirectional relation between informational configuration and linguistic structure and isolating the strategies of information management used by the participants in conversation.

As shown in (1) and (2), *¿¡y eso!?* expresses a surprise meaning that falls under the umbrella of mirativity, understood as the natural trend in languages to distinguish between information that forms part of the speaker integrated picture about the world and information that does not belong to that system (DeLancey 1997). More specifically, *¿¡y eso!?* conveys surprise towards a suddenly discovered situation, which counts as the semantic core of mirativity (Aikhenvald 2012).

The relevant questions now are 1) what is the relevant situation retrieved by *¿¡y eso!?*; 2) how it is construed; and 3) which are its implications for the interactional function of the structure. Firstly, *¿¡y eso!?* exhibits a broader scope than that attributed by literature to the demonstrative when used in isolation: it refers not to nominal referents, clauses, or discourse segments, but rather to a situation. This situation has just been recounted (1) or brought about (2) by the addressee, and the speaker reacts to it with surprise, as it lies outside their horizon of expectations (*erwartungshorizont*). Secondly, the addressee emerges as the protagonist of the situation, either because they are the main character in the account (1) or because they are the one who triggered that scenario (2). Thirdly, the mirative value of the structure urges the interlocutor to provide a response explaining the situation.

From a more general perspective, the apparent fragmentary nature of *¿¡y eso!?* is merely a clue for tracing its progressive displacement from sentence grammar to the domain of interaction (Wiltschko 2021; Heine 2023; Rodríguez Rosique and Antolí Martínez 2025; Haselow and Kaltenböck 2026).

References

Achard, Michel (2001). French *ça* and the Dynamics of Reference. *LACUS Forum 27, Speaking and Comprehending*: 49–62.

Aikhenvald, Alexandra (2012). The essence of mirativity. *Linguistic Typology 16(3)*: 435–485.

Couper-Kuhlen, Elizabeth, & Kortmann, Bernd (2000). *Cause, condition, concession and contrast*. Berlin, New York: De Gruyter.

De Cock, Barbara (2013). Entre distancia, discurso e intersubjetividad: Los demostrativos neutros en español. *Anuario de Letras. Lingüística y Filología 1(2)*: 5–36.

DeLancey, Scott (1997). Mirativity: the grammatical marking of unexpected information. *Linguistic Typology 1(1)*: 33–52.

Delbecque, Nicole (2013). Anclaje experiencial y epistémico de los demostrativos no situaciones en español. *Anuario de Letras, Lingüística y Filología 1(2)*: 87–169.

Grice, Paul P. (ed.) [1957] (1989). Meaning. In: *Studies in the way of words*. Cambridge, London: Harvard University Press, pp. 213–223.

Gutiérrez-Rexach, Javier, & Zulaica Hernández, Íker (2007). Abstract Reference and Neuter Demonstratives in Spanish. In: António Branco et al. (eds.), *Proceedings of DAARC 2007. The 6th Discourse Anaphora and Anaphor Resolution Colloquium*. Oporto: Centro da Linguistica da Universidade do Porto, pp. 25–30.

Haselow, Alexander, & Kaltenböck, Gunther (eds.) (2026). *Language in Social Interaction: Studies in Interaction Management, Social Behavior and Grammar in Interaction*. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Heine, Bernd (2023). *The Grammar of Interactives*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Jiménez Juliá, Tomás (1995). La coordinación en español: Aspectos teóricos y descriptivos. (Verba. Anuario Galego de Filoloxia. Anexos 39). Universidad de Santiago de Compostela.

Levinson, Stephen C. (2000). *Presumptive meaning. The theory of generalized conversational implicature*. Cambridge, London: The MIT Press.

Malchukov, Andrej (2004). Towards a semantic typology of adversative and contrastive marking. *Journal of Semantics 21(2)*: 177–198.

Maldonado, Ricardo (2020). Deixis in Spanish research. In: Dale A. Koike & Cesar F. Brasdefer (eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of Spanish Pragmatics*. New York: Routledge, pp. 55–72.

Pérez Álvarez, Bernardo (2014). Funciones discursivas de *esto*, *eso* y *aquello* en un corpus oral. *Anuario de Letras. Lingüística y Filología 2(1)*: 101–140.

Real Academia Española y Asociación de Academias de la Lengua Española [RAE / ASALE] [2009] (2025). *Nueva Gramática Descriptiva de la Lengua Española*. Barcelona: Plantea.

Rodríguez Rosique, Susana, & Antolí Martínez, Jordi (eds.) (2025). *The Grammar of Interaction. Epistemicity, information management and discourse*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Rodríguez Rosique, Susana, & Cifuentes Honrubia, José Luis (coords.). *Corpus GestINF*. Universidad de Alicante: Biblioteca Virtual Miguel de Cervantes. https://www.cervantesvirtual.com/portales/proyecto_gestinf/corpus/.

Wiltschko, Martina (2021). *The Grammar of Interactional Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Zulaica Hernández, Íker (2018). A denotation-driven reanalysis of the Spanish neuter pronominal system. *Lingua 213*: 91–116.

Vigneron-Bosbach, Jeanne: French DM *genre*: From Taxonomic noun, Mitigator to Mirative marker?

French DM *genre*: From Taxonomic noun, Mitigator to Mirative marker?

Jeanne Vigneron-Bosbach

University of Poitiers, FoReLLIS

This presentation will focus on the DM *genre* which comes from a taxonomic noun and further developped as a discourse marker (DM) involving Mitigation among other functions (Mihatsch & Hennecke 2022). Its grammaticalization and pragmaticalization have been well described (Rosier, 2002 Dufaye 2014, Vigneron-Bosbach 2016, Isambert 2016, André 2023, Mihatsch 2024, Vigneron-Bosbach 2024). Its function as a mitigator is part of its polyfunctionality, and it presents quite similar features to English *like* (Fleishmann & Yaguello 2004, Vigneron-Bosbach 2016), Spanish *tipo*, or Italian *tipo* (Mihatsch & Hennecke 2022). I would like to focus on less described uses such as (1) :

(1) 'Les produits laitiers sont nos amis pour la vie'. **Genre** je vais être pote avec un yaourt. (écrit, internet)

In such contexts, *genre* displays a function of 'polemic marker' (Dufaye 2014, Vigneron-Bosbach 2016) where two different point of views come in contrast: the first proposition 'les produits laitiers sont nos amis pour la vie', according to the speaker, can imply the statement following *genre* 'jevais être pote avec un yaourt' (I'm going to be friends with a yoghurt). This second statement is nonetheless seen as surprising, and furthermore ridiculous (i.e. a yoghurt is no living creature and therefore cannot become a friend). *Genre* materializes the opposition between two contasted points of view and forefronts the speaker's negative comment on the first statement.

(2) UI19: et ben non en fait pour s- enfin en tout cas pour elle cette fille qui s'appelle Géraldine ça lui venait pas euh elle a fait je l'ai vu faire plein de soirées chez elle alors que on était on était potes on se voyait souvent et tout
ch_CD2: oui
UI19 : avec tous ses amis et **genre** euh et **genre** j'étais pas invité quoi (ESLO2_ENT_1019)

In this second example, the expectations of the speaker (we hung out, we were friends, therefore she will invite me to her parties) are thwarted. This contrast seems to be expressed by *genre* and relies on common ground with the interlocutor.

I would like to discuss how Mirativity can shed a new light on DM *genre* and help better understand how its uses as a mitigator interact with its uses marking unexpectedness (Dessì Schmid, Momma & Wiesinger 2025). This investigation could also facilitate the further understanding of genre evolution path, in comparison with *like*.

References

André, Virginie (2022). Etude Micro-diachronique de genre dans un corpus d'interactions entre 2006 et 2019 : variations sociolinguistiques, valeurs pragmatiques et interactionnelles. *Langages 226*: 133–147.

Chauveau-Thoumelin, Pierre (2018). Exemplification and ad hoc categorization: The genre-construction in French. *Folia Linguistica, 39(1)*: 177–199.

Dessì Schmid, Sarah, Momma, Lydia, & Wiesinger, Evelyn (2025). Mirativity in Romance: Speaker-oriented vs. hearer-oriented expressions of Unexpectedness. In: Susana Rodriguez Rosique (ed.), *Expressing Surprise at the Crossroads. Mirativity,*

Exclamativity and Cooptation in Romance Languages. Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter, pp. 229–245.

Dostie, Gaétane (2004). *Pragmaticalisation et marqueurs discursifs. Analyse sémantique et traitement lexicographique*. Bruxelles: De Boeck Duculot.

Dufaye, Lionel (2014). GENRE ou le scenario d'une grammaticalisation. *Linx 70–71*: 51–65.

Fleischmann, Suzanne, & Yaguello, Marina (2004). Discourse markers across languages? Evidence from English et French. In: Carol Moder & Aida Martinovic-Zic (eds), *Discourse analysis across languages and cultures*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 129–147.

Isambert, Paul (2016). Genre: une mode récente mais qui vient de loin. *Journal of French Language Studies 26*: 85–96.

Marchello-Nizia, Christiane (2006). *Grammaticalisation et changement linguistique*. Bruxelles: De Boeck Duculot.

Mihatsch, Wiltrud (2024). Emplois et émergence des marqueurs d'approximation du français en tant que marqueurs méta-énonciatifs. In: Cristina Petras & Daciana Vlad (eds), *Marqueurs métalinguistiques: émergence, discours, variation*. Lausanne, Berlin: Peter Lang, pp. 17-37.

Mihatsch, Wiltrud, & Hennecke, Inga (in print). *Type-noun based pragmatic markers in Romance languages between cooptation and regrammaticalization*. Amsterdam: DMTM publication, Benjamins.

Mihatsch, Wiltrud, Hennecke, Inga, Kisiel, Anna, Kolyaseva, Alena, Davidse, Kristin, & Brems, Lieselotte (eds) (2023). *Type Noun Constructions in Slavic, Germanic, and Romance Languages - Semantics and pragmatics on the move*. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Mihatsch, Wiltrud, & Hennecke, Inga (2022). From taxonomic to pragmatic uses of French genre: Degrees of prosodic prominence as indicators of pragmaticalization. In: Hélène Vassiliadou & Marie Lammert (eds), *A Crosslinguistic Perspective on Clear and Approximate Categorization*. Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, pp. 299-338.

Steuckardt, Agnès (2007). Usages polémiques de la reformulation. *Recherches linguistiques 29*, Metz: Presses universitaires de Metz, pp. 55-74.

Rosier, Laurence (2002). Genre : le nuancier de sa grammaticalisation. *Travaux de linguistique n° 44*: 79-88.

Vigneron-Bosbach, Jeanne (2024). Genre, du nom au marqueur: parcours vers le métalinguistique. In: Cristina Petras, Sonia Berbinski, Daciana Vlad, & Raluca Balaţchi (eds), Marqueurs métalinguistiques: émergence, discours, variation. *Linguistic Insights n° 309*, Lausanne, Berlin: Peter Lang, pp. 167-192.

Vigneron-Bosbach, Jeanne (2019). Des marqueurs de (re)formulation. *Actes du colloque "La Reformulation"* (June 2017). University of Uppsala, Sweden.

Vigneron-Bosbach, Jeanne (2016). Analyse contrastive des marqueurs genre en français, like en anglais et so en allemand dans des corpus d'oral et d'écrit présentant un faible degré de planification. *Doctorate in linguistics*, Univerity of Poitiers, France.

Vigneron-Bosbach, Jeanne (2015). Des spécialistes du (discours) direct ?. *Revue électronique d'études sur le monde anglophone 12.2*. http://erea.revues.org/4375.

Wiltschko, Martina: From synchronization to common ground. The view from the acquisition of interactional language

From synchronization to common ground. The view from the acquisition of interactional language

Martina Wiltschko

ICREA/Universitat Pompeu Fabra

Mitigators and Miratives (just as discourse markers more generally) are used to mark a departure from canonical common ground updates. Roughly, canonical common ground updates can be characterized as follows.

> **Canonical common ground update (CCGU)**
> A speaker (S) knows a proposition (p), has good reasons to assume that their addressee (A) does not know that p but that p might be of interest to A. S asserts that p. A accepts p as true. As a result, p is part of the Common Ground shared between S and A.

While details regarding the formulation of these conditions vary according to frameworks, their essence is widely assumed. Mitigators mark a departure from the canonical preconditions for assertions, while miratives mark a departure from canonical updates by marking the unexpectedness of p.

Assuming that CCGU captures a pattern of conversational interaction (and perhaps universally so), the question arises as to why it should hold. In other words, why do the conditions that define CCGU count as default such that they license unmarked assertions while any departure from CCGU must be marked? This is the question I explore in this talk.

I start by establishing that this is not a trivial question and that CCGU is not a logical necessity, nor can it be reduced to frequency. In fact, the ubiquitous use of mitigators and miratives indicates how common departure from CCGU is in conversational interaction. Moreover, even a cursory exploration of the early conversational interactions a child is exposed to reveals that CCGU does not constitute the most frequent scenario. This begs the question as to how knowledge of CCGU is acquired?

I suggest that CCGU does not need to be acquired but that it belongs to our core cognition and as such is reflected in our linguistic system. Specifically, I argue that at its core lies our innate capacity for synchronization, which is already present in early infancy. That is, I suggest that the construction of common ground is a special and elaborate form of synchronization made possible through our linguistic capacity. I shall trace a possible developmental path from pure synchronization, via joint attention and turn-taking to CCGA by exploring the development of interactional language, including early emotive markers, backchannels and confirmationals.