

Some comparative remarks on the adverbial particle *po* and its Central Rhaeto-Romance cognates*

Nicola Munaro (Venice)

Abstract

In this article I undertake a comparative survey of the distributional and interpretive properties of the adverbial particle *po/pa* across the Dolomitic region, trying to shed light on the diachronic process of grammaticalization it has undergone in some Central Rhaeto-Romance varieties; in doing so, I crucially refer to the role this particle plays in determining the epistemic state of the discourse participants. Its grammaticalization as an interrogative marker can be more precisely characterized as the loss of the capacity to quantify the degree of overlap between the speaker's and the addressee's background knowledge (or the clash between the speaker's expectation/presupposition and the real state of affairs). In this sense, as a neutral interrogative marker, the particle *pa* simply marks a default (or conventionalized) degree of matching between the common ground shared by the two interlocutors.

1 Introduction

In this article I will sketch a comparative survey of the distributional and interpretive properties of the particles *po/pa* across the Dolomitic region; by comparing the syntactic behaviour and semantic contribution of this particle in different dialectal areas, I will try to better characterize the diachronic process of grammaticalization as an interrogative marker this particle has undergone in some Central Rhaeto-Romance varieties (cf. the analogous destiny of *denn* in Bavarian).¹ In doing so, I will crucially refer to the (loss of the) role this particle plays in determining the epistemic state of the discourse participants, which relates directly to the definition of modal particle as an element that conveys in-

* This study was carried out within the project Rethinking, Understanding Modal particles (RUM), which obtained funding by the PNRR – Missione 4 “Istruzione e ricerca” – Componente C2 Investimento 1.1 “Fondo per il Programma Nazionale di Ricerca e Progetti di Rilevante Interesse Nazionale (PRIN)” – Decreto Direttoriale n. 104 del 02-02-2022 – CUP H53D23004410006 (University of Venice). This manuscript reflects only the authors' views and opinions, neither the European Union nor the European Commission can be considered responsible for them. A preliminary version of this work was presented at the workshop *Ways of expressing modality – German modal particles from a comparative perspective* (Ca' Foscari University of Venice, November 15th–16th 2021) and at the 16th *Cambridge Italian Dialect Syntax-Morphology Meeting* (University Federico II of Naples, September 14th–16th 2022). I would like to thank the audiences of these two events as well as two anonymous reviewers for insightful comments and remarks. The usual disclaimers apply.

¹ For a general overview of the geographical distribution and the main structural features of the Central Rhaeto-Romance dialects, the interested reader is referred to Videsott/Videsott/Casalicchio (2020).

formation about the speaker's attitude or the epistemic condition of the interlocutors, without contributing to the descriptive content of the utterance (cf. Zimmermann 2012). From the syntactic point of view, the particles under analysis display however a clearly different behaviour, because Bellunese *po* appears almost exclusively in peripheral positions, while Rhaeto-Romance *pa* occurs generally in clause internal position.

The paper is structured as follows: in section 2 I provide a detailed description of the use of *po/pa* in interrogative clauses across different Dolomitic Rhaeto-Romance dialects, presenting in section 3 previous accounts of the grammaticalization process this particle has undergone diachronically in some of these varieties; in section 4 I investigate the use of the particle *po* in the dialects of the Bellunese area, trying to characterize its semantic-pragmatic import in different contexts, which amounts to an evaluation of the epistemic state of the discourse participants, comparing the background knowledge of speaker and hearer; in section 5 I provide further empirical evidence on additional functions of *pa* and of a few etymologically related sentential particles in some Central Rhaeto-Romance dialects; section 6 concludes the article with some summarizing remarks.

2 The particle *po/pa* in Rhaeto-Romance interrogatives

Building on previous studies on this topic, in this section I explore the distributional and interpretive properties of the particles *po/pa* in interrogative contexts across the Central Rhaeto-Romance varieties.

Hack (2011: 63) reports the existence of the following minimal pair attested in two different subvarieties of Fassano, namely Fassano Cazet in (1a) and Fassano Moenat in (1b):

- (1) a. Ke temp e-l **pa**?
 what weather is-it pa
 b. Ke temp e-lo **po**?
 What weather is-it po
 ‘What’s the weather like?’

On this basis she argues that the two forms *po* and *pa* (as well as two other related particles attested in Badiotto and Gardenese and discussed in section 5 below) are simply phonetic variants of the same lexical item, deriving etymologically from the (grammaticalization of the) Latin locative/temporal adverb *post* (cf. Pellegrini 1972). I will submit here that this assumption is essentially correct.²

2.1 Fodom and Ampezzano

In Fodom and Ampezzano, two Rhaeto-Romance varieties spoken in the Northern part of the province of Belluno, the particle *pa* can have a “connecting function” (Hack 2014: 54), where the speaker refers to a previous context shared with the addressee, which leads to the question containing the particle; consider the following contrast in Fodom:

² The subvariation between different varieties of Fassano cannot be dealt with in this article and I will simply use the macro-label Fassano to refer to the relevant examples.

- (2) a. Olà vas-to?
 where go-you
 ‘Where are you going?’
- b. Olà vas-to **pa**?
 where go-you pa
 ‘Where are you going (now) (since x has happened)?’

(Hack 2011: 65f.)

Both (2a) and (2b) are interpreted as standard questions, as the speaker is simply asking for new information, but in (2b) the particle establishes a relationship/connection between the question and the previous context (Hack 2011: 65). This function is similar to the temporal value of its ancestor POS(T), but it expresses a logical posteriority rather than a temporal posteriority. In particular, the connecting function of *pa* in (2b) may bear on a prior discourse, shared knowledge or expectations/presuppositions that form part of the common ground of the conversation participants.

Other modal values conveyed by the particle *po* in this dialectal group are exemplified in the following non-standard interrogatives in Ampezzano (cf. De Lorenzo 2005):

- (3) a. Ce faje-o **po** ancora par piazza?!
 what do-you Po still for square
 ‘What are you doing still around?’
- b. Te dezides-to **po** a vienì?!
 you decide-you Po to come
 ‘Come on, hurry up!’
- (4) Son-e **po** boi da Ruà su in son?!
 are-we po good to arrive up in Top
 ‘Are we able to reach the top?’

All of the utterances in (3–4) are interpreted as non-canonical questions in the sense of Munaro/Obenauer (2002), Obenauer (2004); more precisely, (3a–b) express the speaker’s surprise/dismay/disapproval concerning the state of affairs he is witnessing (which conflicts with his expectations), while (4) can be considered a rhetorical question expressing the speaker’s skepticism about the ability of the subject to reach the top.

2.2 Fassano

According to Hack (2011), in Fassano the particle *pa* appearing in *wh*-questions does not seem to perform a particular function from the interpretive point of view:

- (5) a. Che as-te **pa** fat?
 what have-you pa done
- b. Che as-te fat?
 what have-you done
 ‘What have you done?’

Both (5a) and (5b) are grammatical, hence the particle is not obligatory; on the other hand, they have the same interpretation, hence the particle does not perform a modal function of sort.

Benincà (1996) reports for Fassano the following examples, where *pa* either follows the cluster formed by inflected verb and inverted subject pronoun (6a), or precedes the pronominal subject and the inflected verb (6b), in which case it is in complementary distribution with the complementizer *che* (6c):

- (6) a. Olà as-to **pa** magnat
 where have-you pa eaten
- b. Olà **pa** tu as magnat?
 where pa you have eaten
- c. Olà che tu as magnat?
 where that you have eaten
 ‘Where have you eaten?’

Interestingly, as pointed out by Benincà (1996), *pa* cannot precede the cluster formed by inflected verb and inverted subject pronoun:³

- (7) *Olà **pa** as-to magnat?
 Where pa have-you eaten

For Fassano main *wh*-questions, Poletto (2000) identifies the four alternative syntactic structures reported in (8), pointing out that *pa* is incompatible with the complementizer *che*, as witnessed by the ungrammaticality of (9):

- (8) a. Olà vas-to?
 where go-you
- b. Olà vas-to **pa**?
 where go-you pa
- c. Olà **pa** tu vas?
 where pa you go
- d. Olà che tu vas?
 where that you go
 ‘Where are you going?’
- (9) a. *Olà che **pa** tu vas?
 where that pa you go
- b. *Olà **pa** che tu vas?
 where pa that you go

As discussed by Dohi (2020), in Fassano the particle *pa* can also optionally appear in polar questions, and the presence of the particle in (10a) seems to convey a slight emphasis on the question:

³ Moreover, the verbal cluster is incompatible with the complementizer *che* irrespectively of their linear order:

- (i) a. *Olà che as-to magnat?
 where that have-you eaten
- b. *Olà as-to che magnat?
 where have-you that eaten

For insightful remarks on the categorial status of the particle *pa* in Fassano, the reader is referred to Benincà (1996).

- (10) a. Rùes-te **pa** doman?
 arrive-you *pa* tomorrow
 b. Rùes-te doman?
 arrive-you tomorrow
 ‘Do you arrive tomorrow?’

According to the native speakers, the inflected verb *rues-te* preceding *pa* is emphasized by the presence of the particle.

So, in Fassano *pa* can be optionally added to an interrogative clause, apparently without contributing a significant interpretive import to the utterance.⁴

2.3 Badiotto

Poletto (2000) reports that Badiotto displays an interesting asymmetry between constituent questions and polar questions with respect to the presence of *pa*, which is obligatory in standard *wh*-questions and in non-standard polar questions. So, *pa* appears obligatorily in the standard *wh*-question in (11a), while its absence triggers a non-standard interpretation, like in (11b), where the speaker expresses his/her surprise/disapproval/disagreement about the fact that the addressee is leaving or about the place where he/she is going to:⁵

- (11) a. Ulà vas-t **pa**?
 where go-you *pa*
 ‘Where are you going?’
 b. Ulà vas-t?!
 where go-you
 ‘Where (the hell) are you going?!’

The same point is made in Poletto/Zanuttini (2003), who observe that (12a) is a standard *wh*-question, while in (12b) it is the *wh*-phrase which is prosodically focalized:

⁴ However, according to Poletto (2000) in Fassano the presence of *pa* always turns the question into a rhetorical one, although there is considerable variation among speakers and (sub)varieties:

- (i) a. Vasto **pa**?
 go-you *pa*
 ‘Are you going (or not)?’
 b. Che asto **pa** fat?
 what have-you *pa* done
 ‘What (on earth) have you done?’

⁵ An anonymous reviewer points out to me that in examples like (11b) and (12b) the absence of *pa* entails that the speaker already knows the answer and expresses his/her strong surprise or disagreement, underlining the relevance of the ‘shared knowledge’ between the two discourse participants.

- (12) a. Can vas-te **pa** a Venezia?
 when go-you pa to Venice
 ‘When are you going to Venice?’
 b. CAN vas-te a Venezia?!
 WHEN go-you to Venice
 ‘When (the hell) are you going to Venice?!’

According to Poletto/Zanuttini (2003), this contrast confirms their hypothesis that the presence of *pa* signals that the entire sentence is in focus; when *pa* is absent, then another constituent receives contrastive focus, as marked by the intonational prominence of the *wh*-item in (12b).

Conversely, in polar questions the non-standard interpretation is associated with the presence of *pa*, like in (13a), which conveys the speaker’s dismay about the fact that the addressee is going to Venice, while the absence of *pa* triggers a standard interpretation, like in (13b):

- (13) a. Vas-t **pa** a Venezia?!
 go-you pa to Venice
 ‘Are you going to Venice?!’
 b. Vas-t a Venezia?
 go-you to Venice
 ‘Are you going to Venice?’

Summing up, in order to trigger a standard interpretation, in Badiotto *pa* is obligatory in *wh*-questions and not admitted in polar questions:

- (14) a. Ulà vas-te * (**pa**)?
 where go-you pa
 ‘Where are you going?’
 b. Và-les (***pa**) a Roma?
 go-they pa to Rome
 ‘Are they going to Rome?’

2.4 Gardenese

Gardenese is the Rhaeto-Romance variety where the particle displays the most functional use; in *wh*-questions *pa* works like in Badiotto, as it is used obligatorily to obtain the standard interpretation, while its absence implies an emphasis on the *wh*-operator (cf. Hack 2014):

- (15) a. Can compr-i **pa** n liber?
 when buy-they pa a book
 ‘When do they buy a book?’
 b. CAN compr-i n liber?
 WHEN buy-they a book
 ‘WHEN do they buy a book?’

The function of *pa* in *wh*-questions in Gardenese is therefore the same as in Badiotto, where it marks the focus, according to Poletto/Zanuttini (2003). Unlike in Badiotto, however, in Gar-

denese the presence of the particle *pa* is compulsory also in standard polar questions (cf. Hack 2011, 2014), so that its absence produces ungrammaticality, as witnessed by (16b):⁶

- (16) a. Vëni-el **pa** nce Tone?
 comes-he *pa* also Tone
 ‘Is Tone also coming?’
 b. *Vëni-el nce Tone?
 comes-he also Tone

Hence, in Gardenese *pa* marks obligatorily all standard interrogative clauses, namely both polar and *wh*-questions:

- (17) a. Ciant-el **pa**?
 sings-he *pa*
 ‘Is he singing?’
 b. Ciuldì ciant-el **pa**?
 why sings-he *pa*
 ‘Why is he singing?’

According to Poletto (2000), if the particle is absent, the interrogative sentence is interpreted as a rhetorical question, that is, as a non-standard question.

I will suggest that in a variety like Gardenese, as a neutral interrogative marker *pa* simply marks a default (or conventionalized) degree of matching between the shared common ground of the two discourse participants; in particular, we can analyze *pa* as a canonical question marker, adopting Farkas’ (2020) notion of canonical question as characterized by the default assumptions of speaker ignorance and addressee competence about the propositional content of the question.⁷

Summing up, in this section we have seen that in Fodom/Ampezzano *pa* displays a connecting function with previous discourse or shared knowledge, in Fassano it can optionally appear in interrogative contexts without relevant interpretive effects, in Badiotto it marks canonical *wh*-questions and non-canonical polar questions, and finally in Gardenese it appears obligatorily in all canonical interrogatives.

3 The grammaticalization path across Central Rhaeto-Romance

Hack (2011, 2014) shows that the dialectal varieties of Dolomitic Rhaeto-Romance can be subdivided into four groups depending on the use of *pa* in interrogative clauses; she claims that the different functions performed by *pa* in the different varieties suggest the existence of a grammaticalization process with different intermediate stages and that every variety of Dolomitic Rhaeto-Romance instantiates a stage of this diachronic process.

According to this analysis *pa*, deriving from Latin *pos(t)*, had initially only local, temporal, and logical functions; at a certain point it has taken up a modal/discourse-functional value

⁶ The same behaviour is reported by Trotzke/Monforte (2019) for the particle *al* in Basque, which marks neutral polar questions; leaving out *al* results in a biased interpretation of the polar question.

⁷ For an interesting implementation of Farkas’ (2020) framework on the basis of empirical data from different Central and Southern Italian dialects, the reader is referred to Bianchi/Cruschina (2022).

through which the speaker could express its attitude towards the described event. While Fodom and Ampezzano remain by now in this stage, Fassano has developed the conventionalized use where the particle lost its semantic-pragmatic contribution, but it is not obligatory yet. Eventually *pa* becomes obligatory in *wh*-questions in Badiotto and in all interrogative contexts in Gardenese.

Hack (2014), building on Abraham (1991), proposes for the particle *pa/po* the following grammaticalization path:

- (18) Localistic > temporal > logical >
 illocutive/discourse functional > *wh*-question marker > general question marker

A very similar diachronic grammaticalization process has been proposed by Bayer (2012) for the German particle *denn*, which has developed into a pure *wh*-interrogative marker in Bavarian, where it appears as the clitic element *-n*.⁸

Dohi (2020) checks the validity of (18) against a more detailed diachronic survey of the different Rhaeto-Romance varieties, and gets to the following conclusions.

In Gardenese the validity of this scheme is confirmed, since both in *wh*-questions and in polar questions *pa* changes its status from modal particle to obligatory interrogative marker. It is extremely plausible that speakers of Gardenese have “copied” onto polar questions the function performed by the particle in *wh*-questions, reanalyzing it as a general interrogative marker.

In Badiotto *pa* follows Hack’s scheme in *wh*-questions with a certain delay with respect to Gardenese; the concurring presence of other modal particles suggests that grammaticalization is not the only factor determining the distribution of the particle. In polar questions the diachronic evolution of *pa* shows an unpredicted tendency leading to the disappearance of the particle. In this variety the reanalysis of *pa* as interrogative marker has not taken place, unlike in Gardenese.

In Fassano the loss of interpretive value does not entail the obligatory use in *wh*-questions. Beside this, the sinking frequency of *pa* in the 20th century suggests that it will not become an interrogative marker (unlike in Gardenese or Badiotto). In polar questions, like in Badiotto, the particle seems to be progressively disappearing.

Summing up, the loss of modal value in *wh*-questions takes place in all the three investigated varieties, while the extension of obligatory *pa* to polar questions does not take place in all dialects. The following scheme represents more adequately the grammaticalization of the particle *pa* in the Dolomitic Rhaeto-Romance varieties according to Dohi (2020: 176):

⁸ According to Bayer (2012), in Bavarian the clitic element *-n* appearing in *wh*-clauses is deprived of its special modal particle semantics and operates more or less like a pure *wh*-interrogative marker; the grammaticalization path identified by Abraham (1991) is prolonged due to further reduction of *denn* toward a pure marker of root *wh*-questions. The concomitant cline from the categorial status as maximal projection XP to a lexical head X^o, to a functional head X^o and finally to a clitic element is fully consistent with a well-attested diachronic process of reanalysis. For a more recent assessment of the role and the syntactic status of the particle *'n* in Bavarian the reader is referred to Bayer (2025).

(19)

	Loss of modal value	Obligatoriness in <i>wh</i> -questions	Extension to polar questions
<i>Fodom/Ampezzano</i>	-	-	-
<i>Fassano</i>	+	-	-
<i>Badiotto</i>	+	+	-
<i>Gardenese</i>	+	+	+

The survey of the diachronic data confirms that the particle *pa* tends to be used more and more frequently and to lose its pragmatic value. Nonetheless, according to Dohi (2020), in Fassano and Badiotto it is not the case that the particle is going to become obligatory in all interrogatives; hence, it is not possible to assume that every dialect represents an intermediate stage of a single grammaticalization process; on the contrary, we must hypothesize different evolutionary trends for each variety.

4 The particle *po* in the Bellunese area

As discussed extensively by Munaro/Poletto (2005, 2008), in the dialects of the Bellunese area, in particular Pagotto, the particle *po* can be used in a variety of contexts with different interpretive shades.⁹ In polar interrogatives it can have the “connecting function” identified by Hack (2011, 2014) if it appears in clause final position, as in (20a); exactly like in (2b) above, the connecting function of *pa* may bear on a prior discourse, shared knowledge or expectations/presuppositions that form part of the common ground of the conversation participants. In clause initial position, like in (20b), it has a counter-expectational flavour in the sense of Giorgi (2018), and expresses a remarkable degree of surprise of the speaker on the given state of affairs:

- (20) a. E-la partida **po**?
 is-she left po
 ‘Has she left then?’
- b. **Po**, é-la partida?!
 po is-she left
 ‘Has she really left?!’

As pointed out by Hinterhölzl/Munaro (2015), in *wh*-interrogatives *po* can express different degrees of surprise, depending on the position it occupies in the sentence, which corresponds to different degrees of shared knowledge between speaker and hearer; in particular, the higher the position occupied by the particle, the greater the degree of the speaker’s surprise, so that (21a) has a strongly counter-expectational flavour, while (21c) is only slightly counter-expectational and rather conveys a prosecutive entailment:

⁹ Unless otherwise indicated, the Bellunese data reported in this section are due to the native competence of the author.

As witnessed by (27) and (28), in this function the presence of *po* is particularly frequent with the *wh*-item *parché* (cf. also Hack 2011), possibly due to the close semantic relation between the interpretive properties of ‘why’ and the pragmatic import of surprise/disapproval questions (cf. Munaro/Obenauer 2002); the examples in (27) are from Pagotto and Falcadino respectively, while the ones in (28) are from Ampezzano:

- (27) a. *Parché po* (é-la partida)?
 why po (is-she left)
 ‘Why (has she left)?’
 b. *Parché po* magné-o ‘n pom?
 why po eat-you an apple
 ‘Why are you eating an apple?’
- (28) a. *Parcé po*, no aaràe abù da 'l fei?!
 why po not would-have had to it do
 b. *Parcé* no aaràe abù da 'l fei, **po**?!
 why not would-have had to it do po
 ‘Why on earth shouldn’t I have done it?’

Essentially, the difference between the standard interrogative reading and the interpretive import of these utterances amounts to the distinction between a speech act which is interpreted as a genuine request for an informative answer from the addressee, as opposed to a speech act whose aim is the expression of an emotionally salient attitude of the speaker with respect to the event described by the propositional content.

In the dialects of the Bellunese area *po* can also be used in imperatives, where it conveys a substantial reinforcement of the order; this exhortative shade derives presumably from the fact that speaker and hearer share common knowledge of a situation which leads to unavoidable performing of the relevant action:¹⁰

- (29) a. **Po**, vèrdi la finestra!
 po open the window
 b. Vèrdi la finestra **po**!
 open the window po
 ‘Come on, open the window!’

¹⁰ Hack (2011) reports the following example from Fodom, where *pa* is used in an exclamative context with a similar exhortative entailment:

- (i) Fè **pa** polito
 do pa well
 ‘Behave well!’ (2nd sing.)

Furthermore, in total exclamatives *po* can convey a slightly adversative nuance, deriving from the disconfirmation of the speaker's expectation, as witnessed by the following example from Ampezzano:¹¹

- (30) **Po,** s'i lo sa d'ùte!
 po if they-it-know all
 'But if everybody knows about it!'

Summing up, in the Bellunese area *po* appears only in directive speech acts, i. e. questions/answers and imperatives, the clause types which involve the presence of an addressee and his/her reaction to the utterance, a reaction which can be verbal (in interrogatives) or non-verbal (in imperatives).

Its function seems to be the one of evaluating the epistemic state of the discourse participants, signalling that there is a complete overlapping of the background knowledge of speaker and hearer; the background knowledge of the two discourse participants is then related to the speech situation, which may be in contrast with such shared knowledge, giving rise to the surprise effect described above. In this sense, *po* displays a degree of grammaticalization which is far weaker than the one of Rhaeto-Romance *pa*, in particular of Gardenese *pa*; as suggested in the previous section, *pa* marks the interrogative speech act in which it appears as a canonical one, where the background knowledge of speaker and hearer crucially do not coincide.

5 Additional evidence from Central Rhaeto-Romance

In Badiotto the particle under investigation appears in two different forms, *pa* and *pö*, which are likely to be etymologically related (cf. Dohi 2020), and have different distributional properties.

Poletto/Zanuttini (2003) claim that the function of *pö* is the disconfirmation of a presupposition, as it signals that the propositional content denoted by the sentence in which it occurs contradicts some proposition which is already in the discourse; they observe that

¹¹ Interestingly, the particle *po* in Bellunese can not appear in *wh*-exclamative clauses, either sentence finally or sentence internally/initially:

- (i) * **[Po]** Che bela machina **[po]** che te à comprà **[po]**!
 [po] what beautiful car [po] that you-have bought [po]

According to Hinterhölzl/Munaro (2015), this incompatibility might be due to the fact that the semantics of the *wh*-exclamative and the contribution of the particle are the same, namely to signal that there is a gap between the speaker's expectation (or between a standard expectation) and the actual state of affairs. Related to this, Hinterhölzl/Munaro (2021) argue that non-canonical *wh*-questions and *wh*-exclamatives involve the expression of surprise about an unexpected state of affairs; however, they exhibit a difference in illocutionary force: while non-canonical questions constitute directive speech acts which request the hearer to provide an explanation for the unexpected state of affairs, *wh*-exclamatives are more akin to assertions, since they are used to indicate the speaker's surprise about the difference between the expected state of affairs and the actual one. These interpretive differences are syntactically codified by the presence and absence of Verb Second in German and by a difference in the final landing site of the *wh*-element in standard questions, non-canonical questions and *wh*-exclamatives in Italian.

pö can appear in this counter-expectational function both in imperatives, like (31), and in emphatic statements, like in (32):

- (31) a. Fàl **pö** ch'al é na buna idea!
do-it pö that it is a good idea
'Do it, it's a good idea!'
- b. Va **pö** tres adërta fora!
go pö always straight ahead?
'Keep going straight ahead!'
- c. Tèt **pö** n dé de vacanza!
Take pö a day of vacation
'Take a day off for vacation!'
- (32) Al é **pö** bun!
It is pö good
'Sure it's good!'

Pö seems therefore to perform the function of contradicting a presupposition, but, unlike *po*, it appears only in imperatives and (total) exclamatives, the clause types which do not entail a verbal interaction with the addressee.¹²

According to Dohi (2020), the particle *pu*, which is equally argued to derive from Latin *post*, is more frequently attested in Gardenese, where it can appear in imperatives and optatives (and apparently also interrogatives):

- (33) a. Va **pu** sce te posses jì!
go pu if you-can go
'Go if you can!'
- b. **Pu** (Maria) scot sën!
pu (Mary) listen now
'(Mary), listen now!'
- c. Fossel **pu** vëira!
were-it pu true
'I wish it was true!'

Its function seems to be to disconfirm an expectation or a presupposition, hence its semantic-pragmatic contribution is similar to the one of *pö* in Badiotto.

¹² According to an anonymous reviewer, *pö* can also be used in other contexts, like the following statements, where it still disconfirms a presupposition:

- (i) a. Al à **pö** dit ch'an dess ti scrì.
'He has said that we have to write to him.'
- b. I à **pö** scialdé la stiüda, porchël podunse sté chilò.
'I have warmed up the living room, hence we can stay here.'

The same holds for Badiotto *pa*, as witnessed by the following examples:

- (ii) a. Marta è **pa** jüda t'America.
'Marta has gone to America.'
- b. I n' à **pa** nia ciamò cialfé tüa lëtra.
'I haven't received your letter yet.'

As for Badiotto *pa*, Poletto/Zanuttini (2003) propose that its function is to signal that the entire sentence is focused. Differently from *pö*, *pa* can appear in every basic clause type, namely it appears obligatorily in standard *wh*-interrogatives, but can also appear in polar interrogatives, as we have seen above; moreover, it can appear in imperatives, triggering a ‘stronger order’:

- (34) a. Fàl **pa** ch'al é na buna idea!
do-it pa that it is a good idea
‘Do it, it’s a good idea!’
b. Va **pa** tres adërta fora!
go pa always straight ahead
‘Always go straight ahead!’

As noted by Poletto (2000), *pa* can appear also in exclamative contexts:

- (35) a. Al é **pa** bun!
it is pa good
‘It is good indeed!’
b. Ci bel ca l’è **pa!**
how nice that it-is pa
‘How nice it is!’

Summing up, *pa* seems to be rather a semantically empty dummy element marking a reinforcement of the illocutionary force of the clause (type) in which it appears, with broad focus on the whole propositional content: it appears in declaratives/statements, turning them into total exclamatives, or in polar questions, turning them into special questions, or still in imperatives, giving rise to a stronger order.¹³

¹³ Both Coniglio (2008) and Cardinaletti (2011) suggest that Italian *poi*, etymologically related to the particles under investigation, can work in some cases as a modal particle. Indeed, some of the usages described above, and in particular the presuppositional meaning, are also attested with *poi*. According to the more recent investigation of Cruschina/Cognola (2021), as a discourse marker “*poi* can help to close off a whole discourse chunk, indicating the conclusion with respect to a previous discourse unit (or, indeed, with respect to the whole previous discourse) which is presented as a premise to the current statement”; they claim that it is especially in questions that *poi* indicates the conclusion and the end result from an argumentative succession or from previous knowledge, as illustrated in (i):

- (i) a. È partito **poi**? (Treccani)
‘Did he finally leave?’
b. S’è convinto **poi**? (Treccani)
‘Was he convinced at last?’

According to Cruschina/Cognola (2021), in the function of contrasting the current utterance with prior specific presuppositions on the part of the hearer and/or the speaker and by directing the hearer to an update of the common ground, *poi* typically occurs in negative sentences and in counter-expectational biased polar interrogative sentences introduced by *ma* ‘but’, as in (ii):

- (ii) a. Ma Telecom ha **poi** così bisogno di alleati italiani? (La Repubblica)
‘Does Telecom really need Italian partners?’
b. Ma siete **poi** sicuri che i giocatori selezionati non hanno fatto meglio? (La Repubblica)
‘Are you really sure that the selected players didn’t do better?’

They point out that *poi* usually requires a reference to a preceding communicative situation, where an event was believed to take place, exactly like in the examples (2b) and (20a) above; through his/her utterance “the speaker

6 Conclusion

In this article I have carried out a comparative survey of the distributional and interpretive properties of the particles *po/pa* across the Dolomitic region; by investigating the syntactic and semantic behaviour of this particle in different dialectal areas, I have tried to better characterize the diachronic process of grammaticalization as an interrogative marker this particle has undergone in some Central Rhaeto-Romance varieties. A comparative survey of the distributional and interpretive properties of the particle *po/pa* across the Dolomitic area reveals that its grammaticalization as an interrogative marker in some varieties can be more precisely characterized as the loss of the capacity to codify the epistemic state of the discourse participants, more precisely, to measure the degree of overlapping between the speaker's and the addressee's background knowledge (or the clash between the speaker's expectation/presupposition and the real state of affairs). We can conclude that, as a neutral interrogative marker, *pa* simply marks a default (or conventionalized) degree of matching between the shared common ground of the two interlocutors, which amounts to the canonical question reading as defined by Farkas (2020).¹⁴ On the contrary, Bellunese *po* evaluates the epistemic state of the discourse participants, signalling in some cases that there is a complete overlapping of the background knowledge of speaker and hearer; hence, it displays a degree of grammaticalization which is far weaker than the one of Central Rhaeto-Romance *pa*, in particular of Gardenese *pa*; as suggested above, Gardenese *pa* marks the interrogative speech act in which it appears as a canonical one, where the background knowledge of speaker and hearer crucially do not coincide.

then brings up this pending event at a later time confirming or asking about its truth, inviting a settlement and a conclusive resolution of the open issue”:

- (iii) a. L'ha **poi** scritto quel romanzo? (La Repubblica)
 ‘Did he eventually write that novel?’
 b. Raccontami di te, piuttosto: hai **poi** regolarizzato la tua posizione? (CORIS)
 ‘Tell me about you, instead: Did you finally regularize your position?’

According to Cruschina/Cognola (2021), this usage is typical of polar questions, where *poi* presupposes previous knowledge and qualifies the information requested in the interrogative speech act as ‘already given’; in this particular function *poi* triggers the presupposition of background information as part of the previous discourse, as shared knowledge or as inferred assumptions from previous knowledge. They claim that, in its use as a modal particle, which correlates with a conclusive meaning, *poi* does not necessarily imply a contrast with a previous argument or presupposition, as it may have the function to request a confirmation of an expectation or a presupposition, which can be based on pragmatic inferences. For further discussion of these issues, the reader is also referred to Cognola/Cruschina (2021), who provide a formal account of the interpretive properties of *poi* in standard Italian and analyze *poi* in polar interrogatives as an element that does not interfere with the common ground and whose function is to signal the communicative goals of the interlocutors; more precisely, they propose that *poi* is associated with a verum focus, namely a focus on the truth value of the whole sentence.

¹⁴ Farkas (2020) argues that the commonly assumed felicity conditions on canonical questions follow from the semantics and the basic conventional discourse effects of unmarked interrogatives; she further argues that special interrogative forms can be used to signal special conventional discourse effects that bring about the weakening or overriding of these default assumptions.

References

- Abraham, Werner (1991): “The grammaticalization of the German modal particles”. In: Traugott, Elizabeth Closs/Heine, Bernd (eds.): *Approaches to Grammaticalization*. Vol 2. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, Benjamins: 331–380.
- Bayer, Josef (2012): “From modal particle to interrogative marker: a study of German *denn*”. In: Brugè, Laura et al. (eds.): *Functional heads*. Oxford, Oxford University Press: 13–28.
- Bayer, Josef (2025): “On the syntactic status of ‘n in Bavarian wh-questions”. *Bavarian Syntax. The Left Clausal Periphery*. Berlin, Mouton de Gruyter: 191–211.
- Benincà, Paola (1996): “Agglutination and inflection in Northern Italian dialects”. In: Parodi, Claudia et al. (eds.): *Aspects of Romance Linguistics: Selected Papers from LSRL 24*. Washington D. C., Georgetown University Press: 59–72.
- Bianchi, Valentina/Cruschina, Silvio (2022): “Variation at the syntax-pragmatics interface: Discourse particles in questions”. *Languages* 7/3: 183.
- Cardinaletti, Anna (2011): “German and Italian modal particles and clause structure”. *The Linguistic Review* 28: 493–531.
- Cognola, Federica/Cruschina, Silvio (2021): “Between time and discourse: A syntactic analysis of Italian *poi*”. *Annali di Ca’ Foscari – Serie occidentale* 55: 87–116.
- Coniglio, Marco (2008): “Modal particles in Italian”. *University of Venice Working Papers in Linguistics* 18: 91–129.
- Cruschina, Silvio/Cognola, Federica (2021): “From connective adverb to modal particle: A generative analysis of *poi*”. *Studi italiani di linguistica teorica ed applicata*. L.1: 52–68.
- De Lorenzo, Karim (2005): *On the syntax of wh-interrogatives and sentential particles in Ampezzan*. Bachelor thesis, Ca’ Foscari University of Venice.
- Dohi, Atsushi (2020): *La particella pa nelle varietà del ladino dolomitico con particolare attenzione al fassano*. PhD thesis, Tokyo University of Foreign Studies.
- Farkas, Donka (2020): *Canonical and non-canonical questions*. Manuscript, University of California at Santa Cruz/Princeton University.
- Giorgi, Alessandra (2018): “*Ma non era rosso?*: On counter-expectational questions in Italian”. In: Repetti, Lori/Ordóñez, Francisco (eds.): *Romance Languages and Linguistic Theory 14: Selected Papers from LSRL 46*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, Benjamins: 69–84.
- Hack, Franziska Maria (2011): “Variazione sintattica in Italia settentrionale: le interrogative con la particella *po*”. *Quaderni di Lavoro ASIt* 12: 62–94.
- 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.
- Hinterhölzl, Roland/Nicola Munaro (2015): “On the interpretation of modal particles in non-assertive speech acts in German and Bellunese”. In: Bayer, Josef/Hinterhölzl, Roland/Trotzke, Andreas (eds.): *Discourse-oriented Syntax*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, Benjamins: 41–70.
- Hinterhölzl, Roland/Munaro, Nicola (2021): “On the illocutionary force of exclamatives and non-canonical questions in German and Italian”. In: Trotzke, Andreas/Villalba, Xavier (eds.): *Expressive Meaning across Linguistic Levels and Frameworks*. Oxford, Oxford University Press: 43–65.

- Munaro, Nicola/Obenauer, Hans-Georg (2002): “On the semantic widening of underspecified *wh*-elements”. In: Leonetti, Manuel/Fernández Soriano, Olga/Escandell-Vidal, Victoria (eds.): *Current Issues in Generative Grammar. 10th Colloquium on Generative Grammar, Selected Papers*. Alcalà, Universidad de Alcalà de Henares – UNED – Universidad Autónoma de Madrid: 165–194.
- Munaro, Nicola/Poletto, Cecilia (2005): “On the diachronic origin of particles in North-Eastern Italian dialects”. *Nordic Journal of Linguistics* 28.2: 247–267.
- Munaro, Nicola/Poletto, Cecilia (2008): “Sentential particles and clausal typing in Venetan dialects”. In: Shaer, Benjamin et al. (eds.): *Dislocated Elements in Discourse: Syntactic, Semantic and Pragmatic Perspectives*. London/New York, Routledge: 173–199.
- Obenauer, Hans-Georg (2004): “Non-standard *wh*-questions and alternative checkers in Pagotto”. In: Lohnstein, Horst/Trissler, Susanne (eds.): *The Syntax and Semantics of the Left Periphery*. Berlin, Mouton De Gruyter: 343–383.
- Pellegrini, Giovan Battista (1972): *Saggi sul ladino dolomitico e sul friulano*. Bari: Adriatica Editrice.
- Poletto, Cecilia (2000): *The higher functional field: Evidence from Northern Italian dialects*. Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Poletto, Cecilia/Zanuttini, Raffaella (2003): “Making imperatives: Evidence from central Rhaetoromance”. In: Tortora, Christina (ed.): *The Syntax of Italian Dialects*. Oxford, Oxford University Press: 175–206.
- Trotzke, Andreas/Monforte, Sergio (2019): “Basque question particles. Implications for a syntax of discourse particles”. *Linguistic Variation* 19.2: 352–385.
- Videsott, Paul/Videsott, Ruth/Casalicchio, Jan (2020): “Introduction”. In: Videsott, Paul/Videsott, Ruth/Casalicchio, Jan (eds.): *Manuale di linguistica ladina*. Berlin, Mouton De Gruyter: 1–32.
- Zimmermann, Malte (2012): “Discourse Particles”. In: von Stechow, Klaus/Maienborn, Claudia/Portner, Paul (eds.): *Semantics. An International Handbook of Natural Language Meaning*. Vol 2. Berlin, Mouton De Gruyter: 2011–2038. (= *Handbücher zur Sprach- und Kommunikationswissenschaft/Handbooks of Linguistics and Communication Science* 33.2).