**A cross-linguistic analysis of semantic features of Italian *poi*; Camuno *po*; and German *doch***

In this presentation, I compare the Italian discourse particle *poi* and its etymological Camuno counterpart *po*, to German *doch.* According to Krifka (2013), *doch* requires a “propositional discourse referent” to be interpreted. I argue that said anchoring requirement is shared by all discourse particles, while their semantic values determine their language-specific features.

German *doch* presupposes the incompatibility of two propositions part of the common ground, i.e., it rejects a proposition considered to be true by the interlocutor (1a), or by the speaker at some point in the past (b):

(1)          a. A: Malte ist is nicht not nach to Utrecht Utrecht gefahren.

                  ‘A:Malte didn’t go to Utrecht. B: He DID go to Utrecht’

 [Egg/Zimmerman, 2012 [4],226]

 b.         Ich habe morge doch n Zeit.

          ‘I do have time tomorrow (I originally thought I wouldn’t)

Conversely, Italian *poi* refers to an event that it is initiated, but had not yet taken place, at a point preceding the utterance time. At the utterance time, the presupposition is that the event either took place/it is certainly taking place or not, without expressing any contrastive value.

(2)       a.         Gianni e Maria hanno poi comprato una casa?

‘Did Gianni and Maria buy a house (they were considering doing it) in the end?’

b.         Hanno poi comprato una casa.

 ‘They ended up buying a house (we talked about it before)’

Finally, Camuno *po* is an epistemic particle (in the sense of McCready/Zimmermann, 2011), i.e., it refers to an event evaluated against the speaker’s beliefs. The proposition is maximally (3a) or minimally (3b) likely to be true for the speaker, which assumes them to be part of the common ground.

(3)    a.         Mario l’ è a laurà po                *Declarative, maximally true*

                           ‘He’s at work (of course)’

                b.         i a majat kè po?                            *Interrogative, minimally true*

                            ‘what did they eat? (surely something unexpected)’

Both *poi* and *po* derive from Latin *post* ‘afterwards’, which expresses temporal ordering and can have an additive reading, while *doch* derives from Proto-Germanic *\*þauh* ‘though’, which expresses contrasts. The semantic import of the particles differs according to their lexical values. A generalization can be proposed: discourse particles are characterized by requiring a propositional discourse referent, which is evaluated epistemically or not, according to the lexical items' language-specific semantic and pragmatic properties.
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