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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 synchronically 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.
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