

Abstract. The paper discusses four cognate adverbial particles in Camuno, Italian, Romanian, and Spanish. These are modal particles that mark the content of a proposition as trivial, obvious, or already part of the common ground. The semantic import of the particles is modeled by reversing a common treatment of scalar adverbs like *even*: the particles indicate that the hosting proposition is the most likely with respect to the set of its focus alternatives. In terms of licensing conditions, anti-mirative particles are generally employed in mirative contexts where speakers signal their surprise over the mismatch between their expectations and the actual state of affairs in the utterance world.

Keywords. discourse particles; romance languages; semantics; mirativity

1. Introduction. In this paper, I discuss four cognate modal particles derived from the Latin *post* ‘afterwards’ in Camuno (*po*), Italian (*poi*), Romanian (*păi*), and Spanish (*pues*). In particular, I describe their use to mark the host proposition as unsurprising, trivial, or immediately verifiable based on shared common ground, world knowledge or contextual cues. I label this use as *anti-mirative*, which can be defined as the counterpart of mirativity (DeLancey 1997, 2001) which, conversely, is used to signal surprise over *p*.

Our goal is to describe a previously unnoticed pattern in Romance languages both in terms of semantic import to the proposition and to identify their prototypical contexts of use.

The article is organized as follows: Section 2 describes the relevant use and discuss the concept of anti-mirativity and the categorization of the particles as modal. Section 3 provides a description of the semantic properties and of the pragmatic licensing conditions for the particles. Finally, Section 4 concludes the article.

2. Pattern under discussion. The cognate particles described here derive from Latin *post* ‘afterwards’, and can have several meanings when used as temporal or additive adverbials, and discourse markers. These uses only partially overlap and are thus not discussed here (but see Cruschina (2021) for Italian, Stenstrom (2006) for Spanish Bota (2023) for Romanian).

The sample data in this article come from a combination of previous literature, corpora, and original informal data collection in consultation with native speakers. Information regarding dialectal and areal differences in use, which are attested, has not been collected. The aim of the paper is in fact to describe this typological pattern in general terms

In this section, I provide a general overview of the meaning of the different particles, before discussing their classification as modal particles and the idea of anti-mirativity in 2.2 and 2.3 respectively.

2.1. ANTIMIRATIVE PARTICLES. The particles discussed here can have several different meanings, only partially overlapping crosslinguistically. However, when used as modal particles, they all introduce a presupposition that I label “anti-mirative” (henceforth: AM) which can be informally described as the marking of information that is factual and immediately verifiable by all

* I would like to thank my consultants and informants, in particular Anda Neagu, Miguel Hernández Alonso, and Lidia Minelli. This paper has also benefited from useful discussion with the audience at LSA. Author: Matteo Fiorini, University of Central Arkansas(mfiorini@uca.edu).

participants to the conversation (Fiorini 2022, 2023). Throughout the paper, I use examples in the four languages under discussion to provide a representative sample. However, unless explicitly noted, the claims made for one are valid in the others.

2.1.1. ITALIAN AND CAMUNO: ‘POI’ AND ‘PO’. Camuno is a dialect of Eastern Lombard that serves here as a representative of the use of AM-particles which are attested, but not discussed for reasons of space, across the north-eastern portion of the Alpine region (for useful overviews see Hack 2014; Dohi 2019). Based on previous analyses (Coniglio 2008; Cognola & Cruschina 2021), *poi* in standard (and specifically central and southern regional varieties of) Italian may not trigger an anti-mirative reading. In other words, while the Italian data are accepted by all consultants, they may result from contact with other Romance varieties spoken in the area. The interpretation and properties of *poi* and *po* are, consequently, almost completely overlapping.

The distribution of *po* and *poi* is less restricted than in the other languages discussed here. Any portion of a sentence can virtually enter its scope. The only restriction is on the sentence-initial position, which is not available to the anti-mirative reading (but possible with others). Depending on phonological constraints, the particle can scope over the constituent preceding it (when stressed) or following it (when unstressed)¹. The following examples from Camuno show that the particle can associate with the entire sentence (1-a) and embedded clauses (1-b), or single constituents (1-c):

- (1) a. [l’ a fat tʃa al kunitʃ] po.
 CL.3SG have.3SG.PRS do.PRT here the rabbit *po*
 ‘S/he made rabbit (why would you think otherwise?!).’
- b. i a dit ke [l a fat tʃa al kunitʃ] po!
 CL.3PL have.3SG.PRS say.PRT that CL.3SG have.3SG.PRS do.PRT here the rabbit *po*
 ‘They told me that (, of course,) s/he made rabbit yesterday.’
- c. l a fat tʃa [co i verz] po al kunitʃ ʒer hera!
 CL.3SG have.3SG.PRS do.PRT here with the cabbage *po* the rabbit yesterday evening
 ‘S/he made rabbit WITH CABBAGE yesterday (what else could it be?!).’

The distribution, summarized in (2) is the same as the one attested in Italian:

- (2) [Franco ha detto che [ha preparato [il coniglio] {poi} con le
 Franco have.3SG.PRS say.PRT that have.3SG.PRS prepare.PRT the rabbit *poi* with the
 verza] {poi} quando l’ ho incontrato] {poi}
 cabbage *poi* when CL.3SG have.1SG.PRS meet.PRT *poi*
 ‘When I met him, Franco told me that he made rabbit with cabbage.’

Using the particle, the speaker marks the proposition as trivial, obvious, or immediately-verifiable based on shared knowledge (3-a) or contextual cues (3-b):

- (3) a. dato che eravamo a Parigi, abbiamo visitato il Louvre poi
 since that be.1PL.IMP at Paris have.1PL.PRS visit.PRT the Louvre *poi*
 ‘Since we were in Paris, of course we visited the Louvre.’ ITALIAN

¹ There are some interpretative differences between stressed and unstressed *po* in Camuno, discussed in Fiorini (2023), that do not affect the core meaning of the particle.

- b. arda ke nigo! al pioar po!
 look what clouds CL.3SG rain.3SG.FUT *po*
 ‘Look at the clouds! It’s going to rain (for sure).’

CAMUNO

According to the speaker in (3-a), the Louvre is the museum one would most likely visit when in Paris, while the presence of clouds in (3-b), in the mind of the speaker, indicates beyond doubt imminent rain. The two propositions are thus marked as obvious by *po*.

Finally, the particle is often used in questions, to express heightened curiosity in the answer (4):

- (4) a. chi hai salutato poi?
 who have.2SG.PRS greet.PRT *poi*
 ‘who did you greet (I can’t see anyone)?’

ITALIAN

- b. e-t majat ke po?
 have be.3SG.PRS=CL.2SG.PRS eat.PRT what *po*
 ‘Why on earth did you eat (I’ve never seen you so sick!)?’

CAMUNO

The host interrogative is interpreted similarly to echo questions, but without the commitment of the speaker towards a specific answer which would be the more likely, but it is not possible in the utterance world (Fiorini 2024).

2.1.2. SPANISH: ‘PUES’. The distribution of *pues* in Spanish, when used as an anti-mirative particle, is often restricted to the clause-initial position, and it is generally followed by an intonational break. The particle can be used in conjunction with other particles, including polarity ones like in (5), where the speaker signals that the fact that they have hobbies is obviously true.

- (5) a. tienes algún hobby?
 have.2SG.PRS any hobby
 ‘do you have any hobby?’
 b. pues sí tengo varios
pues yes have.1SG.PRS many
 (Of course) I do! I have many! (Stenstrom 2006:168)

The scope of *pues* is always propositional, and can also appear sentence-finally, as in (6)

- (6) mi hijo me ama pues
 my son me loves *pues*
 ‘My son loves me (obviously)’ [Retrieved from *Corpus del Español*, Davies (2016)]

In both examples, the particle marks the relevant proposition as trivial or obvious based on the beliefs of the speaker about the world, which are assumed to be shared with their interlocutor.

As for *po* and *poi*, *pues* can be used in interrogative structures, indicating a particular interest in the answer, considering the utterance context (7):

- (7) a. eso no es un deporte.
 that NEG be.3SG.PRS a sport
 ‘Come on, that is not a real sport.’

- b. qué es pues?
 what is *pues*
 ‘What is it then?’ [adapted from (Camus 2020:12, 18c)]

In (7), the speakers are talking about handball which is of course a sport. When (a) asserts the opposite, (b) uses *pues* to communicate that the implicit proposition *handball is a sport* is obviously true and, consequently, that they cannot find a plausible alternative. Indeed the conversation continues with (a) stating that *el balonmano es al fútbol lo que el pimpón al tenis.*, that is ‘handball is to football what ping-pong is to tennis’ revealing an unexpected and non-standard use of the concept of sport (cf. Camus 2020: 12).

2.1.3. ROMANIAN ‘PĂI’. Finally, in Romanian the use of *păi* or its variant *pă* seems to differ in different dialects Bota (2023). However, native speakers of other areas seem to generally accept the anti-mirative reading in (8):

- (8) a. nu i-a fost frică?
 NEG 2SG.DAT-have.3SG be.PST.PTCP fear
 ‘Werent you afraid?’
 b. păi da ce
păi yes what
 ‘Well, of course!’ [adapted from (Bota 2023:174, 8)]

In the exchange above, the interlocutor would be surprised if the speaker would not have been afraid, given the context (a wolf was strolling close-by). The latter confirms that they are indeed afraid, marking through the anti-mirative particle how this is fully expected based on the utterance context.

2.2. AM AS MODAL PARTICLE. Modal particles (often labeled *discourse particles*) are grammatical elements that make a non-truth conditional contribution (Thurmayr 1989) to a proposition *p*. That is, they are not concerned with the at-issue content of *p*, but rather provide information about the attitude of the speaker towards it. Consequently, they are often discussed as triggers of presupposition related to the speaker’s epistemic or doxastic evaluation of *p* (Zimmermann 2011; Kaufmann & Kaufmann 2012; Grosz 2020). In this sense, they are fundamentally different from discourse markers like English *anyway*, *by the way*, *well...*, *actually:*, or *uhuh*. While both classes are related to some type of discourse management, discourse markers establish relations between different parts of a conversation with no necessary connection with the utterance context, especially with a function of reminder to a previously introduced proposition and generally used to establish discourse coherence (Coniglio 2008; Cognola & Cruschina 2021; Fiorini 2022; Kehler 2022). Conversely, modal particles affect the discourse mainly by introducing epistemic or doxastic presuppositions regarding the speaker, the addressee, and the utterance context (Bayer et al. 2015; Grosz 2020).

They are classified as markers of modality because they are consistent with Giannakidou (1998); Giannakidou & Mari (2021)’s “Nonveridicality Axiom”. That is, they signal a reduced commitment towards the truth of the prejacent proposition (de Haan 1999; Giannakidou & Mari 2021; Krifka 2024) since, at the utterance time, the speaker is entertaining both *p* and $\neg p$. This is the direct manifestation of the definitional property of modality to “relativize [...] sentence meaning to a set of possible worlds (Kiefer 1988:107). (Abraham 1991, 2020) identify this as the fundamen-

tal ability of modal particles as devices to negotiate the truth value of p .

From a semantic point of view, modal particles take scope over propositions or speech acts, while discourse markers over non-propositional discourse elements (Degand et al. 2013; Diewald 2013). The distinction is visible, for instance, in the different uses of *poi* in Italian in (9). In (9-a) *poi* functions as a discourse marker, while in (9-b) as a modal particles.

- (9) a. Poi magari non lo vuole nemmeno
poi maybe NEG CL.3SG want.3SG.PRS even
'Then maybe (s)he doesnt even want it.
- b. Non lo vuole nemmeno poi
NEG CL.3SG want.3SG.PRS even *poi*
'(S)he doesnt even want it, *obviously!*'

The meanings associated with the different particles discussed here when functioning as discourse markers vary, while their import as modal particles (i.e., the object of this study) is the same.

2.3. ANTIMIRATIVITY. In their seminal work, DeLancey (1997, 2001) defines mirativity simply as the marking of new and unexpected information. More recently, Aikhenvald (2012) lists five possible mirative meanings: Sudden discovery, revelation or realization; Surprise; Unprepared mind; Counter-expectation; and New Information².

Although its status as a separate grammatical category from epistemicity is still somewhat debated (see Hill 2012; Friedman 2012), the term is now standardly adopted in the literature. In contrast, there is no consensus on what the category of mirativity exactly includes. According to Aikhenvald (2012), to qualify as mirative, grammatical elements must express the semantic values listed above and be morpho-syntactically encoded. Relevant to this article, the heterogeneous array of strategies employed in Romance languages to express surprise (see Cruschina 2012, 2022; Rodriguez Rosique 2025) would not qualify as fully grammaticalized mirative markers. The issue is outside the scope of this article, but, for the sake of our argument, I assume that since the literature shows that mirativity is indeed marked through different strategies crosslinguistically, they are ascribed to the mirative category (see Zhuang 2023: 40-46, for a discussion).

Here, I build on the notion of mirativity and introduce the label of *anti-mirativity* to identify the function of the particles discussed here. The label indicates an attitude towards the proposition diametrically opposed to the mirative one. That is, the content of the prejacent is judged trivial and immediately verifiable based on world knowledge, share common ground, and cues present in the utterance context. The presupposition introduced by anti-mirative particles is one for which their host proposition is factual and uncontroversial, based on the definitions in (10):

- (10) a. **Factuality**: a proposition p is factual *iff* p is true in the world w and “verifiable on the spot (Gutzmann, 2015).
- b. **Uncontroversiality**: a proposition p is uncontroversial *iff* factual, and it is not challenged in the utterance context w , i.e., p is not under consideration by any of the participants of a conversational event in w (Lindner 1991; Zimmermann 2011; Grosz 2020).

² While the term has been popularized by (DeLancey 1997:et seq.), the separate (and somehow hyperhonymic) notion of *admirativity* has been used to describe a variety of strategies to mark the speaker’s surprise in different languages (see Friedman 2005, 2012; Aikhenvald 2012)

Anti-mirativity is thus concerned with the speaker’s doxastic evaluation of the proposition (see also Fiorini 2022, 2023), and licensed by an assumed mismatch with the state of affairs of the utterance world.

3. Semantic Import.

3.1. ANTI-MIRATIVE PARTICLES IN ALTERNATIVE SEMANTICS. The analysis I propose relies on the longstanding intuition about the correlation between a set of alternatives to a relevant proposition p evoked (but not created) by focalization, noted since Halliday (1967) and Jackendoff (1972). In particular Hamblin (1973) explicitly suggests that questions denote a set of propositions formalized as answerhood conditions as in (11) and (12):

- (11) a. *Who smokes?*
 b. $\exists x: x \in \llbracket \text{smoke} \rrbracket^f$
- (12) a. $f(x) : f \in \llbracket \text{smoke} \rrbracket^f \wedge x \in \llbracket \text{who} \rrbracket^f$
 b. $\text{smokes}(x) = \{\text{Michael smokes; Angela smokes; Andy smokes; ...}\}$

Rooth (1985) extends this characterization, formalizing it as “Alternative Semantics” (for an overview, Rooth 2016). The basic assumption of this framework is that any object α has an ordinary semantic value (marked by a superscript \circ) and a focus semantic value (represented via a superscript f), (13):

- (13) a. $\llbracket \text{JOHN smokes} \rrbracket^\circ = \text{John smokes (PREJACENT PROPOSITION)}$
 b. $\llbracket \text{JOHN smokes} \rrbracket^f = \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{Mary smokes} \\ \text{Alejandra smokes} \\ \text{Asia smokes} \\ \dots \end{array} \right\}$ (FOCAL ALTERNATIVES)

Focus associate particles such as *only*, *even*, and *also* associate with the focalized portion of the proposition (Rooth 1985, 2016; Tancredi 1990; Erlewine & Kotek 2018).

Their role is to introduce the additional presuppositions listed in (14):

- (14) a. ONLY: p is true and all the alternative propositions are false.
 b. EVEN: p is true and less likely than all alternative propositions.
 c. ALSO: p is true and so it is at least one of its alternative propositions.

I argue that AM-particles introduce the same kind of presupposition (15):

- (15) p is true and is more likely than all alternative propositions.

Building upon these observations, we can thus describe the meaning of AM-particles as the counterpart of focus associate particles, in particular, the *even* type.

Traditionally, the import of an adverbial particle like *even* is formalized as in (16), adapted from Giannakidou (2007: 660)³:

- (16) a. The Dean invited even Bill.
 b. i. $\exists x[x \neq \text{Bill} \wedge C(x) \wedge \text{invited}(\text{Dean}, x)]$, and
 ii. $\forall x[x \neq \text{Bill} \rightarrow \text{likelihood}(\text{inviting}(\text{Dean}, x)) > \text{likelihood}(\text{inviting}(\text{Dean}, \text{Bill}))]$

³ Alternative versions may differ in formalization (Kay 1990; Chierchia 2013; Greenberg 2015, 2017), but are functionally equivalent to (16) for the purpose of this study. Crosslinguistic differences require additional discussion, but are out of the scope of this paper (for an overview, Greenberg 2020)

Erlewine (2018) proposed a formalization in terms of alternative semantics to capture the presupposition introduced by *even*, which can be adapted to account for the counterpart introduced by anti-mirative particles (17):

$$(17) \quad \forall x \in \{p\}^f [x \neq \{p\}^o \rightarrow \{p\}^o > \text{likely } x] \cdot p$$

Consider the example from Romanian in (18):

- (18) a. ai făcut tema?
 have done homework
 ‘did you do the homework?’
 b. păi normal că am făcut-o
păi of.course that have done.it
 ‘Of course I did it!’

In (18), *păi* add the presupposition for which having done the homework is the most likely alternative to *p*. In other words, of the possible alternatives evoked by the question, according to the speaker, *p* is the most likely one in the utterance context. This characterization captures the meanings of AM-particles in the other languages discussed here such as Italian (19) and Spanish (20):

- (19) dato che eravamo a Parigi, abbiamo visitato il Louvre poi
 since that be.1pl.imp at Paris have.1pl.prs visit.prt the Louvre *poi*
 ‘Since we were in Paris, of course we visited the Louvre.’
 (20) pues como el avión sale a las seis, nos levantaremos temprano.
pues since the plane leave.3sg.prs at the six we wake=up.1pl.fut early
 ‘Well, since our plane leaves at six, we’ll get up early.’

In both examples, the speaker asserts *p* and, by using the AM-particle, marks it as the obvious alternative to all others in the relevant set.

The reading is also confirmed by speakers’ intuition when asked to identify the ideal context of use for *pues* in (21)⁴:

- (21) a. Pues, qué otro habría podido ser?
pues what else could have been?
 b. Mi hermana me pregunta si nuestro gato ha derretido un vaso que había en la mesa.
 Es obvio que ha sido así.
my sister asks me if our cat has broken a glass that was on the table. It is obvious that that is the case
 (Eden Robbins, p.c.)

Again, the alternative propositions to *p* (i.e., the cat broke the glass) for the set of alternatives with the form *it was x that broke the vase* are less likely than *p*. In this case, we can further observe that *pues* is felicitous also when it is not hosted by *p*. This has to do with the licensing conditions discussed in the next questions, that can be analyzed in terms of QUD (in line with Zhang 2022).

⁴The example comes from an in-progress study designed with Eden Robbins to test the use and availability of the AM reading in different Spanish speaking communities.

An analysis in terms of alternative semantics is thus able to capture the core presuppositional import of AM-particles to the proposition. Moreover, it can explain the use in question in which the most likely proposition is only, in the mind of the speaker, the only available one, resulting in the emphatic/biased reading described above (for a discussion, Fiorini 2024).

3.2. LICENSING CONDITION. As mentioned in 2.2, the use of AM-particles is related to the doxastic evaluation of the proposition by the speaker. This fact can be captured by an analysis in terms of expressive presupposition (Sauerland 2007; Schlenker 2007), which is a type of presupposition that involves three indexical components referring to the speaker, the addressee, and the situation in the utterance context. Since the speaker is the only authority regarding their beliefs about both the addressee and the context, the presupposition is self-verifying (Grosz 2020; Fiorini 2022).

I argue that this is the type of presupposition that license AM-particles, as proposed for other languages (Schlenker 2007; Grosz 2020; Fiorini 2022). In particular, AM-particles trigger the presupposition in (22), modeled after the analysis of German *ja* in Grosz (2020):

(22) $\llbracket AM \rrbracket^g: \lambda p_{\langle s,t \rangle}. g(s_0) \text{ believes that } g(h_0) \text{ actively considers the possibility of } \neg p \text{ in } g(w_0)$

(22) states that AM-particles are licensed if the speaker ($g(s_0)$) believes that the hearer ($g(h_0)$) is not committed to the truth of p . That is, the speaker initially considers the proposition to be factual and uncontroversial but, at the utterance time, they assume or learn that the state of affairs is different.

Therefore, AM-particles are often licensed in mirative context; situations in which the speaker is surprised by the mismatch between their evaluation of p and the one by the hearer (23):

(23) ROMANIAN

- a. de ce ai plecat aa devreme de la petrecere
 Q why HAVE.2SG leave.PRT so early from at party
 ‘Why did you leave the party so early?’
- b. pãi eram obosit, nu se vedea?
 pãi be.IMP.1SG tired NEG REFL see.IMP.3SG
 ‘Well, I was tired/wasn’t it obvious?’

In (23), the speaker is surprised by the hearer’s question since they assumed that the latter was aware of the reason for leaving the party. The speaker’s expectation for the proposition p , *I left the party because I was tired*, was for it to be uncontroversial. However, the question itself suggests that the hearer is considering an alternative proposition, licensing the use of *pãi* to signal how p is the most likely alternative in the context, and the hearer *should* share the same evaluation⁵. For instance, the hearer knows how much the speaker likes to party, how important was for them to attend, and that they had a long day at work.

The same licensing presupposition holds in non-mirative contexts. These are cases like the ones reported in 2 for Italian and Spanish, in which the speaker uses an AM-particle to negotiate the truth of p (24-a) or generally softened their commitment by seeking (and expecting) confirmation of their evaluation (24-b). As discussed earlier, both are defining properties of modal items (de Haan 1999; Giannakidou & Mari 2023; Krifka 2024).

⁵ Krifka (2008) introduces the idea of “common ground management” to discuss cases in which an expression concern the way the common ground should be according to the speaker.

- (24) a. piove, dovremo poi prendere l' ombrello, no?
rain.3SG must.1PL.FUT *poi* take.INF the umbrella
'It's raining, we should take an umbrella, shouldn't we?' ITALIAN
- b. pues creo que deberamos ir al aeropuerto dos horas antes del
pues believe.1SG that should.1PL go.INF to.the airport two hours before of.the
vuelo
flight
'I think we should go to the airport two hours before the flight.' SPANISH

In (24-a), the speaker is marking *p* as the most reasonable (i.e., the most likely) proposition given the state of affairs. However, using *poi* the speaker is also showing to be open to the possibility of a change of mind. For instance, the hearer may point out that they will be traveling by car and that it will not be raining anymore by the time they reach their destination. In (24-b), conversely, the speaker uses *pues* to seek confirmation by their interlocutors that *p* is indeed the best alternative in the utterance world.

4. Conclusion and future research. The paper sketches an analysis for modal particles in certain Romance languages that can mark a proposition as trivial, obvious, or unsurprising. To identify this use, I employ the label of “anti-mirativity” to capture the core meaning of AM-particles as the exact counterpart of mirativity which, conversely, signals counter-expectation and surprise.

I propose an analysis within the framework of alternative semantics that mirror previous accounts concerning with focus semantic particles and, in particular, *even*. The latter introduces the presupposition for which the prejacent *p* is true but the least likely in the utterance context. Conversely, AM-particles introduce the presupposition for which *p* is instead the most likely in the utterance context.

From a pragmatic standpoint, the particles are licensed in contexts in which the speaker assumes that their evaluation is shared by all participants in a conversation, that is, that *p* is uncontroversial. However, at the utterance time, they believe the hearer may be considering $\neg p$ and the speaker is surprised by such mismatch between their expectations regarding the beliefs of the hearer and the state of affairs. I argue that this can be formalized in terms of expressive presupposition, as proposed by Grosz (2020) for the German particle *ja*.

A number of questions remain open, the most important concerning dialectal and areal variation in the availability of the AM-interpretation which, impressionistically, seems to be present in all relevant languages.

Furthermore, in some cases AM-particles may trigger a conversational implicature that the relevant proposition is exclusive. That is, the alternative propositions would not simply be less likely, but fully excluded.

Overall, a quantitative analysis will shed some light on these and other facts related to use, extension, and possible asymmetries between languages.

For the time being, the analysis presented here can capture the interpretation of declarative and interrogative structures hosting AM-particles from both a semantic and a pragmatic point of view.

Furthermore, it introduces the idea of anti-mirativity, which could be adopted to better characterized other grammatical devices used to convey a similar meaning crosslinguistically.

References.

- Abraham, Werner. 1991. Modal particle research: the state of the art. *Multilingua* 10. 9–15.
- Abraham, Werner. 2020. Modal Particles between Context, Conversation, and Convention. *undefined*.
- Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. 2012. The essence of mirativity. *Linguistic Typology* 16(3). <https://doi.org/10.1515/lity-2012-0017>.
- Bayer, Josef, Roland Hinterhölzl & Andreas Trotzke. 2015. *Discourse-oriented Syntax*. John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Bota, Marinela. 2023. Functii si valori discursive ale marculatorului pai in textele dialectale. In *Studii i cercetri lingvistice*, 174–181.
- Camus, Bruno. 2020. Notes on Extended Uses of pues in Basque Country Spanish. *Isogloss. Open Journal of Romance Linguistics* 6. 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.5565/rev/isogloss.64>.
- Chierchia, Gennaro. 2013. *Logic in Grammar: Polarity, Free Choice, and Intervention*. Oxford University Press Oxford 1st edn. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199697977.001.0001>.
- Cognola, Federica & Silvio Cruschina. 2021. Between time and discourse: A syntactic analysis of Italian poi. *Annali di Ca Foscari. Serie orientale* 55. 87–116.
- Coniglio, Marco. 2008. Modal particles in Italian. *University of Venice working papers in linguistics* 18(1). 91–130.
- Cruschina, Silvio. 2012. *Discourse-Related Features and Functional Projections*. New York: Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199759613.001.0001>.
- Cruschina, Silvio. 2021. The greater the contrast, the greater the potential: On the effects of focus in syntax. *Glossa: a journal of general linguistics* 6(1). <https://doi.org/10.5334/gjgl.1100>.
- Cruschina, Silvio. 2022. Focus and focus structures in the romance languages. In Mark Aronoff (ed.), *Oxford Research Encyclopedias*, Oxford: Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780199384655.013.649>.
- Davies, Mark. 2016. Corpus del Español: Web/Dialects. <http://www.corpusdelespanol.org/web-dial/>.
- Degand, Liesbeth, Bert Cornillie & Paola Pietrandrea (eds.). 2013. *Discourse Markers and Modal Particles: Categorization and description*. John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/pbns.234>.
- DeLancey, Scott. 1997. Mirativity: the grammatical marking of unexpected information 1(1). 33–52. <https://doi.org/10.1515/lity.1997.1.1.33>.
- DeLancey, Scott. 2001. The mirative and evidentiality. *Journal of Pragmatics* 33(3). 369–382. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166\(01\)80001-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(01)80001-1).

- Diewald, Gabriele. 2013. Same same but different: Modal particles, discourse markers and the art (and purpose) of categorization. In Liesbeth Degand, Bert Cornillie & Paola Pietrandrea (eds.), *Discourse Markers and Modal Particles: Categorization and description*, vol. 234 Pragmatics & Beyond New Series, 19–46. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company. <https://doi.org/10.1075/pbns.234>.
- Dohi, Atsushi. 2019. *La particella pa nelle variet del ladino dolomitico con particolare attenzione al fassano*: University of Trento Dissertation. <http://eprints-phd.biblio.unitn.it/3522/>.
- Erlewine, Michael Yoshitaka. 2018. The syntax and semantics of focus particles.
- Erlewine, Michael Yoshitaka & Hadas Kotek. 2018. Focus association by movement: evidence from Tanglewood. *Linguistic Inquiry* 49. 441–463.
- Fiorini, Matteo. 2022. Italian poi as a trigger of expressive presupposition. *Proceedings of the Linguistic Society of America* 7(1). 5269. <https://doi.org/10.3765/plsa.v7i1.5269>.
- Fiorini, Matteo. 2023. A pragmatic characterization of po in Camuno. In Sam Gray, Quain, Lucas Fagen, Stephanie Reyes & Irene Tang (eds.), *Proceedings of the Chicago Linguistics Society*, 79–88.
- Fiorini, Matteo. 2024. Biased interrogatives in Camuno. *Open Linguistics* 10(1). 20240015. <https://doi.org/10.1515/opli-2024-0015>.
- Friedman, Victor. 2005. Admirativity: between modality and evidentiality. *STUF - Language Typology and Universals* 58(1). 26–37. <https://doi.org/10.1515/stuf-2005-580105>.
- Friedman, Victor A. 2012. Perhaps mirativity is phlogiston, but admirativity is perfect: On Balkan evidential strategies. *Linguistic Typology* 16(3). <https://doi.org/10.1515/lity-2012-0019>.
- Giannakidou, Anastasia. 1998. *Polarity Sensitivity as (Non)Veridical Dependency* Linguistik Aktuell/Linguistics Today. Amsterdam Philadelphia: John Benjamins Pub. Co.
- Giannakidou, Anastasia. 2007. The Landscape of EVEN. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 25(1). 39–81.
- Giannakidou, Anastasia & Alda Mari. 2021. *Truth and Veridicality in Grammar and Thought: Mood, Modality, and Propositional Attitudes*. University of Chicago Press. <https://doi.org/10.7208/chicago/9780226763484.001.0001>.
- Giannakidou, Anastasia & Alda Mari. 2023. The Italian futuro as a non-biased epistemic necessity: a reply to Ippolito and Farkas. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 46(6). 1269–1284. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10988-023-09383-4>.
- Greenberg, Yael. 2015. Even, Comparative Likelihood and Gradability. In *Proceedings of the 20th Amsterdam Colloquium*, 147–56.
- Greenberg, Yael. 2017. A Novel Problem for the Likelihood-Based Semantics of Even. *Semantics and Pragmatics* <https://doi.org/10.3765/sp.9.2>.

- Greenberg, Yael. 2020. An Overt Even Operator over Covert-Based Focus Alternatives: The Case of Hebrew BIXLAL. *Journal of Semantics* 37(1). 1–42. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jos/ffz010>.
- Grosz, Patrick G. 2020. Discourse Particles. In *The Wiley Blackwell Companion to Semantics*, 1–34. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118788516.sem047>. <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/9781118788516.sem047>.
- de Haan, Ferdinand. 1999. Evidentiality and Epistemic Modality: Setting Boundaries. *Southwest Journal of Linguistics* 83–101. Edition: 18.
- Hack, Franziska Maria. 2014. The particle po in the varieties of Dolomitic Ladin grammaticalisation from a temporal adverb into an interrogative marker. *Studia Linguistica* 68(1). 49–76. <https://doi.org/10.1111/stul.12022>.
- Halliday, Michael A.K. 1967. Notes on transitivity and theme in English: part 2. *Journal of Linguistics* 3(2). 199–244.
- Hamblin, Charles L. 1973. Questions in Montague English. *Foundations of Language* 10(1). 41–53.
- Hill, Nathan W. 2012. Mirativity does not exist: dug in Lhasa Tibetan and other suspects. *Linguistic Typology* 16(3). <https://doi.org/10.1515/lity-2012-0016>.
- Jackendoff, Ray S. 1972. *Semantic interpretation in generative grammar*. Cambridge, Mass. : MIT Press. <http://archive.org/details/semanticinterpre0000jack>.
- Kaufmann, Magdalena & Stefan Kaufmann. 2012. Epistemic particles and performativity. *Semantics and Linguistic Theory* 22. 208. <https://doi.org/10.3765/salt.v22i0.2635>.
- Kay, Paul. 1990. Even. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 13(1). 59–111. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00630517>.
- Kehler, Andrew. 2022. Coherence Establishment as a Source of Explanation in Linguistic Theory. *Annual Review of Linguistics* 8(1). 123–142. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-linguistics-011619-030357>.
- Kiefer, Ferenc. 1988. Modal particles as discourse markers in questions. *Acta Linguistica Hungarica* 38(1/4). 107–125.
- Krifka, Manfred. 2008. Basic notions of information structure. *Acta Linguistica Hungarica* 55(3-4). 243–276. <https://doi.org/10.1556/ALing.55.2008.3-4.2>.
- Krifka, Manfred. 2024. Structure and interpretation of declarative sentences. *Journal of Pragmatics* 226. 51–63. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2024.04.002>.
- Lindner, Katrin. 1991. *Wir sind ja doch alte bekannte. The use of German ja and doch als modal particles* Pragmatics & Beyond New Series. John Benjamins Publishing Company. <https://doi.org/10.1075/pbns.12.07lin>. Pages: 163 Publication Title: Discourse Particles: Descriptive and theoretical investigations on the logical, syntactic and pragmatic properties of discourse particles in German.

- Rodriguez Rosique, Susana (ed.). 2025. *Expressing Surprise at the Crossroads: Mirativity, Exclamativity and Cooption in Romance Languages*. De Gruyter. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783111386683>.
- Rooth, Mats. 2016. Alternative Semantics. In Caroline Fry & Shinichiro Ishihara (eds.), *The oxford handbook of information structure*, 19–40. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Rooth, Mats Edward. 1985. *Association with Focus (montague grammar, semantics, only, even)*: University of Massachusetts Amherst Dissertation.
- Sauerland, Uli. 2007. Beyond unpluggability. *Theoretical Linguistics* 33(2). <https://doi.org/10.1515/TL.2007.016>.
- Schlenker, Philippe. 2007. Expressive presuppositions. *Theoretical Linguistics* 33(2). <https://doi.org/10.1515/TL.2007.017>.
- Stenstrom, Anna-Brita. 2006. The Spanish Discourse Markers o sea and pues and their English Correspondences. In Karin Aijmer & Anne-Marie Simon-Vandenberg (eds.), *Pragmatic Markers in Contrast*, 155–172. BRILL. https://doi.org/10.1163/9780080480299_011.
- Tancredi, Christopher. 1990. Syntactic association with focus. In *Proceedings from the First Meeting of the Formal Linguistic Society of Mid-America*, Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Thurmair, Maria. 1989. *Modalpartikeln und ihre Kombinationen*. DE GRUYTER. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783111354569>.
- Zhang, Linmin. 2022. The presupposition of even. *Semantics and Linguistic Theory* 1. 249. <https://doi.org/10.3765/salt.v1i0.5355>.
- Zhuang, Lingzi. 2023. *The surprise factor: A semantic theory of mirativity*: Cornell University Dissertation.
- Zimmermann, Malte. 2011. Discourse particles. In Klaus Von Heusinger, Claudia Maienborn & Paul Portner (eds.), *Semantics Volume 2*, 2012–2038. De Gruyter Mouton. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110255072.2012>.