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Particular characteristics and meanings/uses have been attributed to V1- and Wo-VE-sentences (cf. Önnerfors 1997, Pasch 1999, Günthner 2002 e.g.): They are claimed to receive a causal/concessive interpretation. V1-clauses are said to be interpreted causally, Wo-VE-clauses concessively. The modal particle *doch* is supposed to be obligatory or at least very typical for these sentence types. This fact has been related to the assumption that both sentences presuppose their contents. However, at the same time, one component of the meaning usually ascribed to *doch* (contradiction, adversativity) cannot be made out. For that reason, the question is still unsolved why *doch* favours this environment so strongly.

By referring to corpus data and acceptability judgments, I will question such characteristics. In particular, I will argue against the presupposed status of the utterances’ contents and that this is why *doch* occurs so often in this context. The strict association of V1 & a causal interpretation and Wo-VE & a concessive reading turns out to be too strong an assumption. With Önnerfors (1997), I will claim that *doch* is indirectly responsible for the causality by assuming that a causal default interpretation is decisive. In contrast to his analysis, my modelling of doch provides an explanation for doch facilitating (even if not coding) the causal reading. Based on the contribution I attribute to the particle, its meaning can be assumed to be transparently present. Above that, it also allows to derive certain stylistic effects (expressivity, emotional involvement) which other authors have vaguely referred to, but which has not been spelled out so far.
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