On the type of concession expressed by concessive complementizers and bipartite concessive constructions in German: A synchronic and diachronic account

Elena Karagjosova
Freie Universität Berlin

elenakar@zedat.fu-berlin.de

I present a synchronic and diachronic analysis of the German bipartite concessive constructions *zwar...aber*, *wohl...aber*, *schon...aber* and the concessive complementizers *obzwar*, *obwohl*, *obschon*. Morphologically, the concessive complementizers are the result of compounding the originally conditional and concessive complementizer *ob* with the frequently co-occurring concessive adverbs/particles *zwar, wohl, schon*, a process that took place in early NHG (cf. Deutsches Wörterbuch). The adverbs/particles *zwar, wohl, schon* have on the other hand evolved from MHG adverbs of affirmation and exhibit sychronically both concessive and epistemic interpretations (cf. Duden). In spite of their related origin and morphological build-up, the two groups of concessives differ with respect to the type of concessive relation they express: while the bipartite constructions are restricted to the "concessive opposition" type (Spooren 1989; cf. also Anscombre & Ducrot 1989), the concessive complementizers express exclusively the "denial of expectation" (Lakoff 1971) type of concession. The difference between the two types of concession is captured in Lenke & Stede (1997) in terms of the different inferences they invite. I suggest that the denial-of-expectation interpretation of the three concessive complementizers may be due to the contribution of the originally conditional element *ob* which invites the inference of a "conditionally based" (Pasch et al. 2003) concessive relation between the verbalized propositions. On the other hand, the three bipartite constructions rely on an "additively based" (ibid.) adversative relation between two coordinated clauses, which invites the inference of some non-verbalized proposition C that resolves the incompatibility between the asserted propositions in terms of them implying different consequences for the truth of C. I further suggest that an analysis in terms of a distinction between subordination (conditionally based concession) and coordination (additively based concession) is able to explain two prominent exceptions from the behavior of the two groups of concessives.

References: • Anscombre, J.-C. & O. Ducrot. 1989. Argumentativity and informativity. In M. Meyer (ed.), *From metaphysics to rhetoric*, 71–87. Dordrecht: Kluwer. • *Deutsches Wörterbuch von Jacob Grimm und Wilhelm Grimm* (http://dwb.uni-trier.de/de/). • *Duden* (https://www.duden.de/). • Grote, B., N. Lenke & M. Stede. 1997. Ma(r)king concessions in English and German. *Discourse Processes* 24(1). 87–117. • Lakoff, R. 1971. If's, and's, and but's about conjunction. In C. J. Fillmore & D.T. Langendoen (eds.), *Studies in linguistic semantics*, 114–149. New York: Holt, Rhinehart and Winston. • Pasch, R. et al. 2003. *Handbuch der deutschen Konnektoren*. Berlin: de Gruyter. • Spooren, W. 1989. *Some aspects of the form and interpretation of global contrastive relations*. PhD thesis, University of Nijmegen.