Concessive patterns in interaction: Uses of zwar…aber ('true…but')-constructions in everyday spoken German

Susanne Günthner

Abstract

   As Couper-Kuhlen and Thompson (1999, 2000) and Barth (2000); Barth-Weingarten (2003) argue based upon English data, concession in everyday spoken language is common; however the means used to make concessions differ from those in written English. This also holds for spoken German.

This paper takes an interactional perspective on the use of the 'bi-partite connective' *zwar...aber* ('*true...but*') as a communicative practice for marking concessive relations in everyday spoken German. Through empirical analysis, I will show how participants deploy several variants of this concessive pattern as a resource to make concessions in everyday interactions:

• What are the formal characteristics and interactive functions of *zwar...aber* ('*true...but*')-constructions in everyday German interaction?

• What kind of formal and functional variations are found in everyday uses of *zwar...aber* ('*true...but*')-constructions?

• What is the additional interactive benefit participants derive from the use of the complex connective *zwar...aber* ('*true...but*') as opposed to the simple conjunction *aber* ('*but*')?

The following analysis of concessive practices in German interaction aims at improving the understanding of the ways in which participants use concessive constructions with the correlative connective *zwar...aber* ('*true...but*') as communicative resources for accomplishing social actions in the process of everyday talk.

1. Introduction

   Interactionally oriented approaches such as 'on-line syntax' (Auer, 2000, 2009), 'emergent grammar' (Hopper, 1987, 1998; Auer and Pfänder, 2011), as well as 'dialogical perspectives of grammar in interaction' (Linell, 2001, 2009; Du Bois, 2011; Günthner, Imo and Bücker, 2014) have given rise to new perspectives from which grammatical structures in everyday interaction can be analyzed. In focussing on language use as it unfolds in real time and with close attention to participants' reactions, these studies have led to a radical change in the conceptualization of grammar. Instead of treating grammar as a mental construct which speakers call on when producing spoken and written sentences, interactional approaches recontextualize grammar as it is used in the dialogical process in everyday interaction facilitating social activities.

The following analysis of concessive practices in German interaction aims at improving the understanding of how participants use concessive constructions as communicative resources.

Contrary to previous assumptions that concessive relations are rare in spoken language (e.g. Di Meola, 1997, p. 10), studies of spoken English (cf. Couper-Kuhlen and Thompson, 1999, 2000; Barth, 2000; Barth-Weingarten, 2003), German (cf. Günthner, 1996, 1999, 2000) and Swedish (cf. Lindström and Londen, 2013) show that participants in everyday conversations frequently produce concessive patterns. However, these linguistic patterns differ somewhat from those of written texts.

This paper takes an interactional perspective on the use of the 'bi-partite connective' or 'correlative connector' *zwar...aber* ('*true...but*')[1] as a communicative practice for marking concessive relations in everyday spoken German. Through empirical analysis, I show how participants employ variants of this bi-partite connective – with the *zwar* ('*true*')-part

---

[1] In German reference grammar and studies of German conjunctions, we find various terms used for the correlative connective *zwar...aber* constructions, such as "korrelativer Konnektor" ('*correlative connector*') (Pasch et al., 2003, p. 524), "diskontinuierlicher Konnektor" ('*discontinuous connector*') (Leuschner and Van den Nest 2012a, b), "zweiteiliges Konnektivum" ('*bi-partite connective*') (Primatarova-Miltscheva, 1986).

preceding the *aber* ('*but*')-part – as a resource for making concessions in everyday interactions. This process gives rise to the following questions:

• What are the formal characteristics and interactive functions of *zwar...aber* ('*true...but*')-constructions in everyday German interactions?

• What kind of formal and functional variations can we find in everyday uses of *zwar...aber* ('*true...but*')-constructions?

• What is the additional interactive benefit participants derive from the use of the complex connective *zwar...aber* ('*true...but*') as opposed to the use of the simple conjunction *aber* ('*but*')?

The analysis is based on a corpus of 91 everyday interactions (30 to 180 minutes in length), collected between 1989 and 2011 in different parts of Germany. They include informal face-to-face and telephone chats among friends and family members, office hours at university, genetic counselling sessions, radio phone-in programs, reality-TV series, as well as data from a seminar on intercultural communication hosted by a German airline. From this material, the formal and functional characteristics of 90 concessive *zwar*-utterances were examined. For this paper I have chosen a set of illustrative and representative examples for a detailed analysis of how participants apply this correlative connective to do concessive work, and thus, how grammar – viewed as a dynamic, context-sensitive system – is used in the process of everyday interaction.[2]

2. Making concessions with the bi-partite connective *zwar…aber* ('*true…but*')

The following segment from a telephone interaction illustrates a typical use of the correlative connective *zwar...aber* ('*true...but*') in German interaction. Nadja tells her friend Ina about the first night with her new boyfriend:[3]

Excerpt 1: nothing happened (telephone interaction)
```
165   Nadja:   ich hab mich die ganze zeit geFRAGT,
               I asked myself the whole time,
166            <<f> wA:RUM bin ich hIEr?>
               <<f> why am I here?>
167            was tUe ich mit diesem MA:NN;
               what am I doing with this man;
168            <<behaucht> du bist doch VÖllig beSCHEUert kleine
               nadja.>
               <<aspirated> you are totally crackbrained little
               nadja.>
169            was TUST du da,
               what are you doing here,
170            (0.5)
171            und wir ham auch wIrklich dann NUR geknutscht;
               and we really only made out then;
172            (-)
173            und ähm ich bin dann zwar BEI ihm geblieben,
               and um [true] then I stayed over at his place,
174            und hab bei ihm gePENNT,
               and slept there,
175            <<all> weil es wirklich sehr SPÄT schon war> (.) dann;
               <<all> because it really was already very late>(.)then;
176            (-)
177            <<len> aber das_da (.) LIEF (-) GA:R nichts.>
               <<len> but this_there (.) nothing happened at all.>
178   Ina:     weil DU das nicht wolltest,
               because you didn't want it to,
179            oder weil ER das nicht [wollte,]
```

```
                        or because he didn't want [it to  ]
     180  Nadja:                              [weil  ] wir es
               BEIde nicht wollten;
                                      [because ] we both
               didn't want it to;
```

Nadja's reconstruction of the first night at her new boyfriend's place contains a *zwar...aber* ('*true...but*')-construction, connecting two asymmetrically distributed units: the conceding *zwar*-move and the following *aber*-part. Both units are realized within the same turn. With the first part of this complex construction (i.e. the *zwar*-unit), Nadja acknowledges that she actually spent the night at her boyfriend's place: "und ähm ich bin dann zwar BEI ihm geblieben, und hab bei ihm gePENNT," ('*and um [true] then I stayed over at his place, and slept there,*'; ll. 173-174).[4] This acknowledging move is neither syntactically nor semantically complete, but does project an upcoming counter-move. This continuation is substantiated prosodically: The accent placement on "gePENNT," in combination with the fall-rise contour hints at an upcoming contrast and creates expectations of more to come. However, before Nadja advances to this foreshadowed continuation, she adds a clausal clue-on (Couper-Kuhlen and Ono, 2007), providing the reason for her staying at her boyfriend's place: "<<all> weil es wirklich sehr SPÄT schon war> (.) dann;" ('*<<all> because it really was already very late> (.) then;*'; l. 175). Only after this clausal expansion does Nadja proceed to the foreshadowed and potentially incompatible counter-position, introduced with the adversative conjunction *aber* ('*but*'): "<<len> aber das=da (.) LIEF (-) GA:R nichts.>" ('*<<len> but this=there (.) nothing happened at all.>*'; l. 177).

As this excerpt illustrates, the *zwar...aber*-construction forms a compound turn-constructional format (Lerner, 1996), consisting of a prosodically, syntactically, semantically and sequentially complex pattern, which is comprised of the concessive *zwar*-unit and the following adversative move, initiated by the adversative conjunction *aber*.[5]

With this strategy of first acknowledging one perspective (in the *zwar*-conjunct), before proceeding to contribute a counter-claim (in the *aber*-conjunct), the speaker highlights a dissonance between the two component positions and marks a "refocussing" from the first unit to the second one (Zifonun, Hoffmann and Strecker, 1997, p. 2405; Leuschner and Van den Nest, 2012b, p. 120). In this way, s/he not only delays the weightier argument, but draws the recipients' attention to it.

As König (1991, p. 193) points out, concessive connectives in many languages derive from "expressions originally used for emphatic affirmation", such as English *true*. German *zwar* forms a grammaticalized truncation of *ze ware* i.e. *es ist wahr* ('*it is true*'), which developed from the truth-asserting sentential adverb (like '*truly*', '*indeed*') into a correlative one, indicating a concessive relation. Until the 16th century, *zwar* could be used as a truth-asserting adverb (Leuschner and Van den Nest, 2012a, b),[6] however, with the strengthening of its

---

[4] The particle *zwar* may theoretically be positioned in either the "Vorfeld" ('*front-field*'), "Mittelfeld" ('*middle-field*'), the "Vor-Vorfeld" ('*pre-front-field*') or the "Nachfeld" ('*after-field*') (cf. Zifonun, Hoffmann and Strecker, 1997, p. 2409; Leuschner and Van den Nest 2012a, b). In our data, in 84 of the 90 uses of *zwar*, the particle is located in the "Mittelfeld" ('*middle-field*') as in "und ähm ich bin dann zwar BEI ihm geblieben, und hab bei ihm gePENNT," ('*and um [true] then I stayed over at his place, and slept there,*'; l. 173-174.). Cf. Günthner (i. pr.).

[5] As reference grammars indicate, in addition to the adversative conjunction *aber*, counter-moves following the *zwar*-unit may also be introduced by adverbs and particles such as *dennoch, nur, allein, doch, jedoch*, etc. However, in our data, we only find one case of *nur* introducing the second conjunct (other adverbs or conjunctions are not used). Cf. Günthner (i. pr.).

[6] Even today, we still find the asserting particle *zwar* in the complex connective *und zwar* (cf. Günthner, 2012b, 2015).

conceding function,[7] *zwar* evolved into a "forward-linking connective with concessive meaning" (König, 1991, p. 192) and acquired an "obligatory scope over two conjuncts" (Pasch et al., 2003, p. 58; Leuschner and Van den Nest, 2012b, p. 119). In Early Modern High German, *zwar* has reached a stage in which it "can no longer be used to solely assert the truth of its clause without some concession being expressed as well – and hence almost inevitable with a second conjunct being present" (Leuschner and Van den Nest, 2012b, p. 121).

Also in extract (1) NOTHING HAPPENED, the *zwar*-unit projects an upcoming 'second conjunct', i.e. the complex syntactic gestalt (initiated by the concessive *zwar*-part) is only completed after the production of the *aber*-move that follows. However, as this example reveals, *zwar...aber*-constructions in everyday spoken interactions cannot be reduced to simple bi-clausal structures; instead, speakers (cf. Nadja in line 175) may extend their *zwar*-segment by incrementally adding accounts, reformulations, modifications etc., before they advance to the foreshadowed counter-move.

Mann and Thompson (1992, p. 39), who analyze concessive relations within the framework of Rhetorical Structure Theory, argue that speakers make use of concessive relation:

> "to promote a particular belief or action in the presence of apparent contrary information. The belief or action being promoted is in the nucleus, and the apparent contrary information in the satellite. The speaker acknowledges the apparently contrary information, but then advances the nucleus anyway, showing that s/he does not regard the two as genuinely incompatible. This tends to remove the satellite as an obstacle toward favoring the nucleus".

This also holds for the *zwar...aber*-construction in extract (1) NOTHING HAPPENED: Nadja acknowledges the information provided in the "satellite" (the *zwar*-unit: "und ähm ich bin dann zwar BEI ihm geblieben, und hab bei ihm gePENNT,"; *'and um [true] I stayed over at his place, and slept there,'*; ll. 173-174), before she advances to her main point, introduced in the *aber*-unit ("<<len> aber das=da (.) LIEF (-) GA:R nichts.>"; *'<<len> but this=there (.) nothing happened at all.>'*; l. 177).

Despite the fact that the *zwar...aber*-construction represents a paratactic pattern with the two units showing main clause syntax, their argumentative and interactional weight is distributed asymmetrically: the *zwar*-part holds the argumentatively subordinate claim, whereas the *aber*-part provides the main point.[8] In the present example, the argumentative asymmetry is substantiated by the prosody: the information presented in the *aber*-unit is upgraded by means of a decrease in tempo, strong accentuation and lengthening on "GA:R".[9]

The concessive *zwar...aber*-construction in our data reveals parallels to the "cardinal concessive schema" described by Couper-Kuhlen and Thompson (1999, 2000) and Barth (2000); Barth-Weingarten (2003). However, in contrast to this schema, which "first and foremost [applies] to dyadic interactions" and requires two parties holding conflicting claims, with one party conceding and one to whom the concession is made (Couper-Kuhlen and

---

[7] In their "Deutsches Wörterbuch" ('German dictionary') Jakob and Wilhelm Grimm (1854-61/25.8.2014) claim that since the 17th century the adverb *zwar* has received a mainly conceding meaning, by contrasting two contents, clauses or terms. Hereby the second term is constructed as the more important and significant one. ("*zwar* ist besonders seit dem 17. jh. der träger eines gegenüberstellend unterscheidenden ausdrucks geworden (…). es stellt entweder ganze inhalte, ganze sätze einander gegenüber, oder einzelne begriffe, einzelne worte. der zweite begriff wird durch diese gegenüberstellung der wichtigere, bedeutsamere.")
(http://woerterbuchnetz.de/DWB/?sigle=DWB&mode=Vernetzung&lemid=GZ12561; 25.8.2014)

[8] Cf. also Zifonun, Hoffmann and Strecker (1997, p. 2410), Primatarova-Miltscheva (1986), Pasch et al. (2003), Rezat (2007, pp. 358f.), Becher (2011, pp. 200f.) and Leuschner and Van den Nest (2012a, b).

[9] Cf. Barth-Weingarten (2003, p. 72) and Lindström and Londen (2013, p. 341) on prosodic up- and downgrading in concessive constructions.

Thompson, 2000), *zwar...aber*-patterns are predominantly activated for self-concessions and generally consist of a two-part discourse pattern, realized within one turn:[10]

A:	self-conceding move:	"und ähm ich bin dann zwar BEI ihm geblieben,
		und hab bei ihm gepENNT,"
		'and um [true] I stayed over at his place, and slept there,'
	main point:	"<<len> aber das=da (.) LIEF (-) GA:R nichts.>"
		'<<len> but the=there (.) nothing happened at all.>'

Fig. 1

3. Forms and functions of *zwar…aber* (*'true…but'*)-constructions

Zwar...aber-constructions in spoken German interactions represent a routinized grammatical pattern. Participants use them to build a complex argumentative sequence in dealing with opposing claims of different argumentative weight. However, the data also show that even though participants orient to this pattern, is open to local contingencies and variations.

In our data, participants use the following variants of *zwar...aber*-constructions:

● Although participants mainly use the bi-partite connective *zwar...aber* (as in extract (1) NOTHING HAPPENED) for acknowledging a certain position before advancing to their main claim, we also find cases, in which speakers employ the *zwar...aber*-construction for making 'concessive repair' (Couper-Kuhlen and Thompson, 2005); i.e. for backing down from a challengeable claim or retracting an inappropriate inference (in 8 of the 90 cases in our data).

● The vast majority of *zwar...aber*-constructions in our data are same-speaker concessions (i.e. 'monadic concessions'; Couper-Kuhlen and Thompson, 1999; Barth, 2000). In rare cases though, participants make use of other-induced concessions (i.e.'dyadic concessions') with two parties having conflicting claims.

● As in extract (1) NOTHING HAPPENED, concessive *zwar...aber*-constructions form bi-partite structures with the *zwar*-part projecting an upcoming counter-unit (generally introduced with an adversative *aber*). However, we also find stand-alone *zwar*-concessions with the foreshadowed *aber*-part missing.

3.1. Self-concessions with zwar...aber ('true...but'): Acknowledging a position before advancing to a weightier counter-claim

The following segment is taken from a telephone conversation between Tina and her father (V). V advises his daughter about what to do with her tropical fish, as she cannot look after them for the next few months:

```
Excerpt 2: tropical fish (Muensterland: telephone interaction)
458  V:      ne da kÖnn' ha' HAben die ne chance.
             well there they can' ha' stand a chance.
459          aber sonst NICHT.
             otherwise no way.
460          NEIN.
             no way.
461  Tina:   (ja) da geb ich die lieber in lIEbevolle HÄNde ab;
```

---

[10] Although there is no prior assertion which is reasserted in speaker's main claim, one may argue that Nadja's main claim that "nothing happened", represents a modified and elaborated uptake of what she stated in line 171: "und wir ham auch wIrklich dann NUR geknutscht;" (*'and we really only made out then'*)*.* In my data, it is often a matter of degree, whether a prior statement can be treated as a possible precursor of the claim presented in the *aber*-move. (I.e. in contrast to the Swedish data analyzed by Lindström and Londen (2013), reassertions which recycle speaker's original statement without changes in form and content do not appear in my material.)

```
                        (yeah) then I´d rather know they are in good hands;
       462   V:         <<zustimmend> joa.>
                        <<agreeingly> yeah.>
       463   Tina:      joa.
                        yeah.
       464              im geschÄft (.) bekomm ich dafür zwar kein GELD?
                        at the petshop (.)[true] I won´t get any money for them?
       465              a:ber da WEIß ich,
                        but I can be sure,
       466              da wird das WASser regelmäßig kontrolliert;
                        that they will check the water regularly;
       467   V:         mhm,
       468   Tina:      da ist (.)
                        there is (.)
       469              da sind pro(.)fess:io:nElle (.) verKÄUfer;
                        there are professional (.) shop assistants;
       470              die wissen geNAU,
                        who know exactly,
       471              wieviel man da FÜTtern darf.
                        how much to feed them.
       472   V:         h° ja:hh.
                        h° yea:hh.
```

V explains that it is not advisable to set tropical fish into natural brooks or rivers, as there are only limited areas where they can survive for a short time, and outside these areas they have no chance of survival at all (ll. 458-460). In line 461, Tina responds by stating that she prefers to leave her fish '*in good hands*'. Subsequent to her father's agreement (l. 462), she outlines her reason for bringing her fish to a petshop. The conceding *zwar*-part ("im geschÄft (.) bekomm ich dafür zwar kein GELD?"; '*at the petshop (.) [true] I won´t get any money for them?*'; l. 464) implies a possible objection to her following main claim ("a:ber da WEIß ich, da wird das WASser regelmäßig kontrolliert; (…)"; '*but I can be sure, that they will check the water regularly; (…)*'; ll. 465f.). The argumentative and interactional weight of the two units conjoined by *zwar…aber* is distributed asymmetrically with the *zwar*-part carrying the argumentatively subordinate claim, and the *aber*-unit comprising Tina's main claim. The lengthening of the "*a:ber*" (l. 465), substantiates the weight put on her following statement. The *aber*-unit, which incorporates various reasons for her decision to leave her fish with a petshop, stretches over several TCUs (turn construction units) with no clear-cut boundary (ll. 465-471).

As our data indicate, *zwar…aber*-constructions in everyday spoken German are not confined to conjuncts on the level of constituents or clauses, but both units may be realized as segments of various length and complexity, expanding over several TCUs with no discernable boundary, and comprising various activities. This observation supports Hopper's (2004, p. 172) thesis, which holds that grammatical constructions are not fixed but "open"; i.e. they are "openly extendable and have fuzzy and negotiable boundaries and areas of overlap with other, structurally or functionally similar, constructions".

Both *zwar…aber*-constructions discussed so far ((1) NOTHING HAPPENED and (2) TROPICAL FISH) bear strong resemblance to the concessive discourse pattern Antaki and Wetherell (1999) call "show concession" and Lindström and Londen (2013) treat as "concession and reassertion". This cyclic pattern, in which the speaker first makes an assertion, then backs down from it, before s/he recycles her original standpoint, shows a three-part structure: (1.) "Saying something vulnerable to challenge" (Antaki and Wetherell, 1999, p. 8); i.e. the speaker presents a challengeable statement ("Move 1 assertion"; Lindström and Londen, 2013, p. 336). (2.) "Conceding something to that challenge" (Antaki and Wetherell, 1999, p. 9); i.e. the speaker provides a concession ("Move 2 concession"; Lindström and Londen, 2013, p. 336). (3.) "Qualifying that concession and reasserting what one first said"

7

(Antaki and Wetherell, 1999, p. 9); i.e. the speaker repeats her original claim ("Move 3 reassertion"; Lindström and Londen, 2013, p. 336).

Unlike this cyclic concessive pattern though, *zwar...aber*-constructions do not necessarily hold an initial claim, which is then reproduced in the *aber*-move; instead they mainly consist of a two-part discourse pattern:

A:	self-conceding move:	"im geschÄft (.) bekomm ich dafür zwar kein GELD?"
		ʿat the petshop (.) [true] I won´t get any money for them?ʿ
	main argument:	"a:ber da WEIß ich, da wird das WASser regelmäßig kontrolliert; (…)"
		ʿbut I can be sure, that they will check the water regularly; (…)ʾ

Fig. 2.

As the *zwar...aber*-constructions presented here demonstrate, this concessive practice is not restricted to argumentative contexts with conflicting claims among the participants. In fact, speakers often employ this construction as a rhetorical strategy invoking their reasoning processes: By taking potential counter-positions into account, which admittedly have some validity (like the fact that the petshop won't pay for the fish), but are argumentatively subordinate to the main claim, the speaker strengthens her own position. This rhetorical practice corresponds to what is treated as prolepsis by Quintilian (1972):[11] By acknowledging a possible perspective (in the *zwar*-move), which co-participants might draw, before advancing to a weightier counter-argument in the *aber*-move, the speaker dismisses potential opposing perspectives and, at the same time, strengthens her main argument.

Even though the *zwar...aber*-constructions in excerpt (1) and (2) function as 'same-speaker concessions' (Lindström and Londen, 2013) and thus represent a 'monadic type of concessive' (Couper-Kuhlen and Thompson, 1999, pp. 36f.), they are dialogically oriented: with their conceding move, speakers bring in 'dissonant voices', and thus align with possible assumptions or stances (such as 'something might have happened' in the case of Nadja in (1) or 'there's no gain in leaving the fish with a petshop because they won't pay in the case of Tina (2)), before they assert their main argument. In this respect, the *zwar...aber*-construction represents a "polyphonic" strategy (Bakhtin, 1981); i.e. two contrasting perspectives are presented within one turn: the potential perspective of others and the speaker's perspective.[12] In addition to its polyphonic character, the *zwar...aber*-construction magnifies the asymmetry between the two perspectives in favor of the second claim, provided in the *aber*-unit.

3.2. Concessive repair: modifying previous claims with zwar...aber-constructions

In addition to the use of *zwar...aber*-constructions for acknowledging a potential counter-position before advancing to the main point, speakers in my data also employ *zwar...aber*-constructions to back down from a prior claim or from possible inferences which might be drawn from their preceding statement. This use of *zwar...aber* as a strategy for retracting one's own claim, as it could lead to possible disagreement, corresponds to what Couper-Kuhlen and Thompson (2005, 2006) describe as "concessive repair".

---

[11] Cf. Ueding and Steinbrink (1986, p. 292); cf. also Barth-Weingarten (2003, p. 175).

[12] Based on their Swedish data, Lindström and Londen (2013, p. 333) assert that in the "concession and reassertion"-pattern, speakers often "reason with him- or herself about possible alternatives" or they may "incorporate what other people have said or might say or think on the matter, resulting in a move that displays a kind of internal dialogue or, to put it differently, interactionally constructed cognition". Cf. also Couper-Kuhlen and Thompson (2000) and Barth-Weingarten (2003) on the dialogical character of 'monadic concessions'.

The following extract, taken from the same reality TV-show, illustrates the use of *zwar...aber* as a repair strategy. Bea, Anni and Jan are talking about Mona, their former room/container-mate:

Excerpt 3: sweet person (reality TV-1; day 82, ID 198)

```
486  Bea:     mona war HÜ:BSCH,
              mona was pretty,
487           [und?   ]
              [and?   ]
488  Anni:    [ja die] die (    ) die mona war so [UNschein]bar.
              [yeah  ] (    ) mona was really quite [plain   ].
489  Jan:                                         [ja: aber-]
                                                  [yes but-]
490           (2.1)
491  Bea:     nee ich fAnd die - ich fAnd die toTAL süß;=
              no I thought she was - I thought she was incredibly
              sweet;=
492           =die MOna.
              =mona.
493           (1.3)
494           WIRklich.
              really.
495           (-)
496  Anni:    jA;=IST sie ja auch.
              yeah; she really is.
497           (.)
498  Bea:     hm=hm.
              uh huh
499  Jan:     JA?
              really?
500           (-)
501  Anni:    hm=hm.
              uh huh.
502  Bea:     hm=hm.
              uh-huh
503           h° SÜSser mEnsch.
              h° sweet person.
504           (1.3)
505           zwar_n bisschen DURSCHgeknallt,=[ne?]
              [true]_a bit whacky, =[isn't she?]
506  Anni:                                   [ge ]NAU;
                                    [exactly;   ]
507  Bea:     aber ich MEIN,
              but I mean,
508           das SIND se ja hier <<:-)> alle;>
              everyone in here is <<:-)>like that;>
509           (.)
510           die hier DRIN [sind.]
              those in [here. ]
511  Anni:                  [das  ] STIMMT.
                            [that's] right.
512           (---)
513  Jan:     naja mit DER art von mensch,
              well with that kind of person,
514           (-)
515  Bea:     <<f> kamst du GAR nicht zurEcht;=ne?>
              <<f> you didn't get on at all; = did you?>
516  Jan:     nee (b is) irgendWIE,
              no (b is) somehow,
517  Bea:     ist kein reaLIST gewesen;=ne?
              wasn't a realist; = was she?
```

```
518              die war [in_ner TRAUMwelt,]
                 she was [in a dreamland,]
```

Bea's positive evaluation of Mona as "HÜ:BSCH, und?" (*'pretty, and?'*; ll. 486-487.) is interrupted by Anni's reaction, in which she disagrees and describes Mona as rather "UNscheinbar" (*'plain'*; ll. 488). Bea, however, continues with her positive evaluation of Mona and now assesses her as "toTAL süß;" (*'incredibly sweet'*; l. 491). This time, Anni co-aligns: *'yeah; she really is.'* (l. 496). Subsequent to her agreement, Jan produces an astonished "JA?" (*'really?'*; l. 499), projecting an upcoming disagreement. (Already his overlapping "ja: aber" *'yeah but'* in line 489 contextualizes a possible disagreement.) As Jan withholds an affiliative response to his co-participants' evaluation of Mona as a *'sweet person'* (cf. the pause in line 504), Bea treats his lack of uptake as an indication that her assessment is precarious and thus, in need of re-working. With the following *zwar...aber*-construction (l. 505), she backs down from her assessment. In the *zwar*-part, she acknowledges that Mona is "n bisschen DURSCHgeknallt,=[ne?]" (*'[true]_a bit whacky, =[isn't she?]'*; l. 505) and thus, limits the validity of her prior evaluation, before she advances to the relativizing statement: "aber ich MEIN, das SIND se ja hier <<:-)> alle;>" (*'but I mean, everyone in here is <<:-)>like that;>'*; ll. 507-508).[13]

In the face of potential challenges by her co-participant, the speaker (Bea) mobilizes a complex *zwar...aber*-pattern in order to acknowledge a possible counter-perspective without having to abandon her positive assessment completely.

As Schütz and Luckmann (1984, pp. 123f.) point out, language use in face-to-face interaction is characterized by a maximal synchronization of production and reception, implying the coordination of constant feedback between speaker and recipient in the ongoing talk (Luckmann, 2007, pp. 178ff.; Auer, 1999, 2015; Günthner, 2012a). *Concessive repair sequences* are closely connected to the synchronization between speaker and recipient in face-to-face communication: Speakers may – in the absence of uptake by next speaker – retract their own evaluations and claims, and thus, respond to foreshadowed or possible challenges by their co-participants. In extract (3) SWEET PERSON we can observe how this dialogical coordination between speaker and recipients contributes to the negotiation of alignment in interaction.[14]

3.3. Dyadic uses of zwar...aber ('true...but')-concessions

Although the vast majority of *zwar...aber*-constructions in our data (88 out of 90) are same-speaker concessions (i.e. 'monadic concessions'; Couper-Kuhlen and Thompson, 1999; Barth, 2000), participants also make use of dyadic *zwar...aber*-patterns involving a first move by speaker A, to which speaker B responds with a conceding move and a following counter-argument. These dyadic *zwar...aber*-constructions, which allow a speaker to acknowledge her/his co-participant's point before advancing to a counter-claim, comply with the 'Cardinal Concessive Schema' introduced by Couper-Kuhlen and Thompson (1999, 2000) and elaborated by Barth (2000); Barth-Weingarten (2003):

A:	X	stating something or making some point/claim; "the initial claim X"
B:	X'	acknowledging the validity of this statement or point; "the conceding move X"
	Y	claiming the validity of a potentially contrasting statement or point; "the counterclaim Y"

---

[13] In some ways, *zwar...aber*-utterances functioning as concessive repair, come close to "corrective *obwohl*-constructions" (with main clause syntax), initiating self-corrections (Günthner, 1996; 1999; 2000): "sie ist ein bisschen durchgeknallt ist, obwohl ich meine das sind sie alle hier". In the case of self-corrections, *obwohl* carries main clause syntax.

[14] Cf. also Couper-Kuhlen, Thompson (2005, p. 282) and Barth-Weingarten (2003, p. 170) who argue, that "concessive repair" functions as an "alignment strategy".

10

Fig. 3.

The following excerpt, taken from a reality TV-program, illustrates a *zwar...aber*-construction in the form of a dyadic three-partite cardinal concessive schema. The television host (Otto) asks his guest Sonja about the father of her unborn child. Sonja, who is not sure who the father is, answers that she hopes it is Stefan and not Marco (Karl is another guest on the show):

Excerpt 4: fatherhood (TV-talkshow 96)[15]
```
135  Otto:    WEIß denn dieser mArco heißt er,=ne?
              does this marco know that's his name,= isn't it?
136           [der ANdere?            ]
              [the other guy          ]
137  Sonja:   [<<zustimmend> hm_hm.>]
              [<<agreeingly>> hm_hm.>]
138  Otto:    weiß DER denn davon,
              does he know,
139           dass er eventuell (-) [VAter ist?             ]
              that he might be (-) [the father?             ]
140  Sonja:                         [<<p, gedämpfte Stimme>ja;=der] WEIß
              es.>
                                    [<<p, hushed voice> yeah;=he] knows
              it.>
141           (.)
142  Otto:    UND?
              and?
143           wat SACHT_er?
              what does he have to say about it all?
144           (--)
145           JA;
              yeah
146  Karl:    <<all, p> FREUT sich auch;>
              <<all, p> is also looking forward to it;>
147           (-)
148  Sonja:   <<p, gedämpfte Stimme>> er FREUT sich zwar AUch,>
              <<p, hushed voice> [true] he is looking forward to it
              too,>
149           =ne?
              =you know?
150           Aber (0.5)
              but (0.5)
151           ich bin halt daFÜR,
              I would prefer,
152           oder WÜRD mich freuen,
              or would be happy,
153           wenn dat der STEfan wär;=ne?
              if it were stefan;=you know?
154           (--).hh
155  Otto:    GUT.
              okay.
156           (.)
157  Sonja:   [<<behaucht> JA:->]
              [<<aspirated> YEAH:->]
```

In line 146, Karl suggests a possible answer "<<all, p> FREUT sich auch;>" ('*<<all, p> is also looking forward to it;>*') to Otto's question (l. 143). Shortly afterwards, Sonja, the authorized speaker[16], takes over and acknowledges the validity of Karl's suggestion (l. 148).

---

[15] Cf. also Günthner (i. pr.).
[16] Cf. Heritage (2012) on epistemic authority.

In this conceding move, she repeats Karl's words and thus activates strong affinities between these two utterances, marking high dialogic resonance (Du Bois, 2011):

```
Karl            <<all, p> FREUT sich auch;>
                <<all, p> is also looking forward to it;>
Sonja           <<p, gedämpfte Stimme>> er FREUT sich zwar AUch,
                <<p, hushed voice>[true] he is also looking forward to it,>
```

However, the two utterances also reveal significant differences: the connective particle *zwar,* as well as the accented *AUch (too/also)* in combination with the rising intonation in Sonja's turn indicate "partitioning" (Couper-Kuhlen and Thompson, 2000, pp. 398f.) and, thus, contextualize an upcoming opposing move which carries a weightier claim. This counter-claim follows in line 150: "Aber (0.5) ich bin halt daFÜR, oder WÜRD mich freuen, wenn dat der STEfan wär;=ne?" ('*but* (0.5) *I would prefer, or would be happy, if it were Stefan;=you know?*'; ll. 150-153).[17]
Whereas the acknowledging *zwar*-unit, carried out in a low, hushed voice, shows prosodic downgrading, the modal particle *halt* in the *aber*-unit contextualizes this information as an obvious fact, not to be challenged and supporting Sonja's main claim.
This use of the *zwar...aber*-pattern illustrates how the rhetorical up- and downgrading of the two claims can be reinforced by applying lexical and prosodic devices.[18]
The concessions achieved by the *zwar...aber*-constructions discussed above could also have been made without the *zwar*-part:

Excerpt 1: nothing happened

```
Nadja:          und ähm ich bin dann BEI ihm geblieben,
                und hab bei ihm gepENNT,
                (…)
                aber das=da (.) LIEF (-) GA:R nichts.
```

Excerpt 2: tropical fish

```
Tina:           im geschÄft (.) bekomm ich dafür kein GELD?
                a:ber da WEIß ich,
                da wird das WASSer regelmäßig kontrolliert;
```

Excerpt 3: sweet person

```
Bea:            h° SÜSser mEnsch.
                (…)
                n bisschen DURSCHgeknallt,=[ne?]
                (…)
                aber ich MEIN,
                das SIND se ja hier <<:-)> alle;>
```

Excerpt 4: fatherhood

```
Sonja:          <<p, gedämpfte Stimme>> er FREUT sich AUch,>
```

---

[17] In my data, the degree of incompatibility between the two claims (presented in the *zwar*- and *aber*-move) varies: in some cases the incompatibility concerns a minor detail, in others it involves certain implicatures and in yet other cases, the incompatibility comes close to an outright negation.

[18] Actually, this use of the modal particle *halt* is not restricted to dyadically organized concessions; although in monadic *zwar...aber*-constructions speakers frequently use this modal particle in the *aber*-unit, contextualizing definiteness, plausibility and irreversibility. Cf. Thurmair (1989, p. 126); Hoffmann (2013, p. 416) on the particle *halt*.

```
=ne?
Aber (0.5)
ich bin halt daFÜR,
oder WÜRD mich freuen,
wenn dat der STEfan wär;=ne?
```

So why do speakers use this complex correlative connective instead of a simple *aber*-construction? What are the interactive functions of this bi-partite connective?

Our data point to the following answers: in comparison to a simple *aber*-conjunction, the correlative connective *zwar...aber* causes a stronger bracketing of the two units.[19] (I.e. on a tight-loose scale among German concessive connections, the *zwar...aber*-construction with the *zwar*-unit foreshadowing a counter-claim proves to be more closely tied than a regular main clause with a following conceding *aber*-unit.) The correlative particle *zwar* in the first unit already contextualizes "partitioning" (Couper-Kuhlen and Thompson, 2000, pp. 398f.); i.e. an upcoming opposing move and thus, leads her/his co-participants' attention to the following weightier claim.[20] In delaying the delivery of this foreshadowed claim, the correlative *zwar* helps keep the floor pending the upcoming stretch of discourse. Furthermore, this bi-partite connective is also convenient for the recipient: It simplifies her/his task of processing the information, as the *zwar*-unit – due to its projective force – limits the possibilities for interpretation and creates certain expectations.

Hence, *zwar...aber*-constructions are a sedimented rhetorical pattern for marking a speaker's reasoning process in conversation: with this bi-partite connector, speakers indicate that they are well aware of possible counter-perspectives (introduced in the *zwar*-part), however, as the validity of these claims is limited, they have reached a different conclusion, one which overrides the relevance of the perspectives outlined in the *zwar*-unit.[21]

3.4. Stand alone zwar-units: Concessive zwar-constructions without an aber-part

Our analysis illustrates how participants in everyday spoken interaction make use of *zwar...aber*-constructions as a routinized grammatical pattern with the concessive particle *zwar* foreshadowing a weightier counter-claim. As part of participants' shared communicative knowledge, routinized patterns are important tools with which to accomplish interactional work (Günthner, 2011a, p. 157). However, although participants gravitate toward sedimented patterns, their actual realization always takes place in the hic et nunc of ongoing interaction; i.e. grammatical constructions form highly contingent orientation patterns, which easily adapt to the ongoing interactive processes (Couper-Kuhlen and Thompson, 2005; Günthner, 2010, 2011a, b, c; Günthner and Hopper, 2010; Auer and Pfänder, 2011; Keevallik, 2011; Barth-Weingarten, 2014; Pekarek-Doehler, 2015). This also holds for *zwar...aber*-constructions as they unfold "in realtime discourse" (Silverstein, 1984, p. 182) where speakers are closely attuned to their co-participants' reactions (or lack thereof). One way speakers may adapt to local contingencies is by producing a conceding *zwar*-part without providing the expected counter-claim. This observation contradicts traditional assumptions concerning everyday uses of correlative conjunctions. Studies based on written data argue that the correlative particle *zwar* demands a following contrastive conjunct, introduced with an adversative connective or particle such as *aber, jedoch, allerdings, dennoch, doch, nur, gleichwohl,* etc. To drop the

---

[19] Cf. also Zifonun, Hoffmann and Strecker (1997, p. 2409).

[20] Cf. Zifonun, Hoffmann and Strecker (1997, p. 2408) who argue, that the function of the conjunction *aber* is that of a "redirection of the focus and the emphasis on the basis of discontinuity" ("Fokusumlenkung und Gewichtung [….] auf der Folge von Diskontinuität"; own translation; SG); cf. also Leuschner and Van den Nest (2012b, p. 137) who claim that *zwar...aber*-constructions reveal an interplay of "concession, argumentative refocussing and argumentative downgrading".

[21] Cf. also Leuschner and Van den Nest (2012a; b).

13

aber-part (i.e. the second conjunct) would make the sentence ungrammatical (Pasch et al., 2003, pp. 524, 527).

In contrast to these assumptions, participants of spoken interactions produce *zwar*-concessions which are neither followed by the projected *aber*-part nor by any other adversative conjunction or particle.[22] This might come as a surprise, as so far I have argued that the conceding *zwar*-move projects a following counter-move.

In the following extract – again taken from a TV-reality series – the speaker Herby omits the projected *aber*-unit; instead he relies on a shared understanding of the contrast involved.[23] Herby, Anna, Eri and Mary are talking about how they got to know their partners.

Excerpt 5: How I met my partner (BB 2-4)[24]

```
100   Herby:   =also meine ERste ehefrau,
               =well my first wife,
101            un mein ZWEIten, (.)
               and my second one, (.)
102            die ham MICH sozusagen (.) aufgerISSen, (.)
               they sort of (.) hit on me, (.)
103            <<all> oder wie ihr das NENNen wollt;> (.)
               <<all> or whatever you might want to call it;>(.)
104            °h die ERste hat mich im imbiss kennengelernt un_hat
               gesagt-
               the first one met me at a snack bar and said (.)
105            hie:r;
               here;
106            (-)
107   Anna:    willst_du AUCH ne (curry[wurst,)]
               would_you like to have a (curry [sausage too,)]
108   Herby:                           [TOLL,   ]
                                         [great,        ]
109            ((Herby, Anna und Mary lachen))
               ((Herby, Anna and Mary laugh))
110   Herby:   so:    (.)   so ÄHNlich [ja;]
               something like that (.) [yeah;]
111   Anna:                            [ja,]
                                        [yeah,]
112   Herby:   EHRlich;
               honestly;
113            un HIER-=
               and here-=
114            =ja wir haben da geGEssen nebenander;
               =yeah we were sitting beside each other eating;
115            un_auf einmal hat sie mich ANgebaggert-
               an_all of a sudden she hit on me-
116            un hat geSACHT;=
               and said;=
117            =wollen wir nich mal in die DISco,=
               =how about going to a disco,=
118            =UN ich so;=
               =and I was like;=
119            =ich hab zwar keine ZEIT,
               I [true/truely] have no time,
120            ich war auch in ARbei[tsklamotten,]
```

---

[22] Cf. Primatarova-Miltscheva (1986, p. 128) who shows that in her data of spoken German 18% of concessive *zwar*-sentences do not have a following *aber*-conjunct. She treats these 'non-correlative *zwar*-sentences' as 'ellipses'. Cf. also Leuschner and Van den Nest (2012b, p. 119) for missing second conjuncts in written German. In our data, we find 12 cases of stand-alone *zwar*-concessions.
[23] Cf. Couper-Kuhlen and Thompson (1999, p. 34) and Barth-Weingarten (2003, p. 130) on the absence of Y-moves in the cardinal concessive schema.
[24] Cf. Günthner (i. pr.).

```
                    I was wearing my work [clothes (.)]
121                 [((Anna, Eri und Mary lachen))    ]
                    [((Anna, Eri and Mary laugh))     ]
122    Herby:       dann (äh) nach HAUse,
                    then (uh) straight home,
123                 [schnell geDUSCHT,    ]
                    [took a quick shower,]
124    Eri:         [(kann gar nich SEIN,)]
                    [(can't be,)          ]
125    Herby:       sind_in die dIsse un_da [WAR das das;]
                    went to this club and that [was it that; ]
126    Eri:                                 [(          )]
127                 [((Anna und Mary lachen))            ]
                    [((Anna and Mary laugh)             ]
128    Herby:       [das hat dreizehn jahre geHALten das problem,]
                    [it lasted for thirteen years this problem,]
129    Eri:         ich AUCH, °hh
                    me too, °hh
130    Herby:       war GUT;
                    was good;
131                 und die ZWEIte frau hat_äh war eben: °h ne?
                    and the second wife had_äh was somewhat °h well?
```

In this episode, Herby recounts how he met his first wife. In line 118, he reconstructs his answer to her suggestion of going to a disco: the *zwar*-unit "=ich hab zwar keine ZEIT," ('*I [true/truely] have no time,*'; l. 119*)*, which is embedded in reported speech, presages a couter-claim. However, instead of providing the projected *aber*-move, Herby switches from the reported speech back to the narrative voice and provides the parenthetic information that he was still wearing his work clothes (l. 120). He then proceeds to recount how he got ready for the disco, and produces various "dense constructions" (Günthner, 2011b) – organized in short intonation phrases – such as "dann (äh) nach HAUse," ('*then (uh) straight home,*'; l. 122) and "[schnell geDUSCHT,]" ('*[took a quick shower,]*'; l. 123), contextualizing a rapid sequence of events. These fragmentary and infinitival constructions index sudden, reflex-like actions and stage emotionally charged events for their co-participants to "re-experience" (Goffman 1974/86, p. 506; Günthner, 2011b).

The gist of what is going on – despite his lack of time Herby does go to the disco with the woman – is cognitively available to his recipients, as their laughter in line 121 indicates. Instead of producing the foreshadowed counter-move, Herby proceeds to recount his subsequent actions. Despite his lack of time, he gets ready for the disco, showing the limited validity of the claim presented in the *zwar*-unit ("=ich hab zwar keine ZEIT,"; '*I [true/truely] have no time,*'; l. 119).

A closer look at the use of concessive *zwar*-units with 'omitted' *aber*-moves indicates that the units following the *zwar*-part often contain lexical elements, or include social actions which make counter-perspectives inferable – even if they are not explicitly verbalized. Even though stand-alone *zwar*-units may – from the perspective of a standardized grammar based on written German – be deemed 'ungrammatical' because a seemingly incomplete adverbial clause is used as an independent syntagma,[25] our data clearly demonstrate that co-participants have no problem dealing with these structures.

In the following extract, the acknowledging move starting in line 299 extends over several units and includes various communicative activities (e.g. backing of speaker's claim and a reported dialogue). In this process of relaying a past dialogue between the speaker and her boyfriend, the projected but dangling *aber*-part gets lost:

---

[25] This comes close to 'insubordination' as outlined by Evans (2007); except that the stand-alone *zwar*-unit is not a subordinate clause.

Excerpt 6: Claire: switching off all emotions (117-4)

```
289  Claire:   ich DENke-
                I think
290              FESTgestELLT (.) hat er das vielleicht schon
                 wÄhrend der äh zwei drei mOnate, (.)
                he may have already noticed during the first uh
                two three months, (.)
291              die wir dann ja eigentlich nu:r äh sexUELLen
                 kontAkt hatten,
                when we well were actually just uh having sex,
292              ohne dass ich (.) Irgendwas ZUgelassen hab-
                without me (.) getting involved in any way-
293              also ich hab wirklich mich äh (-) VOLLkommen
                 auf KALT gestellt,
                well I pretended to be uh (-) totally cool,
294              und geFÜHLSkalt;
                and emotionally cold;
294              und hab alle geFÜHle AUsgeschaltet.°hhh
                and switched off all emotion. °hhh
295              und so geTA:n; äh(-)
                and pretended; uh (-)
296              oder mir auch vorgeSPIELT,
                or tried to convince myself,
296              äh <<all> ich will ja nur mal meinen SPASS haben.>
                Uh <<all> I just want to have a good time.>
297              und den kann man mit ihm natÜrlich auch ganz GUT
                 ha:ben;
                and that´s what you can definitely have with him;
298              also das äh: will ich ja nicht beSTREIten,
                well I uh won´t deny that,
299              °h (-) hab zwar gewusst dass ich für ihn m=MEHR bedeute,
                °h (-) [true] I did know that I meant more to him,
300              das hat er mir-
                this to me he did-
301              <<f> er hat mir auch immer geSA:gt,
                <<f> he actually always told me,
302              dass er mich ganz TOLL findet;
                that he thought I was really great;
303              und dass er das alles so superSCHÖ:n findet;
                and that he thought everything was terrific;
304              und dAss das nicht AUFhören darf und äh?
                and that this should never end and uh?
305              h° ich hab da immer NUR äh (-) mmhm zu gesagt,
                h° and I always just answered him uh (-) saying mhm,
306              U:ND äh?
                and eh?
307  Isa:      das war aber mehr auch für dIch als SCHUTZ,
                but that was more like you protecting yourself,
308              als dass du das wirklich gedacht HÄTtest,
                you didn't really think that,
```

After her concessive move in line 299 (""°h (-) hab zwar gewusst dass ich für ihn m=MEHR bedeute,"; '°h (-) [true] I did know that I meant more to him,'), Claire continues by outlining how she knew that she "meant more to him" (ll. 299-304). In reconstructing her boyfriend's utterances in the form of indirect reported speech, she shows how much he adored her. His enthusiastic perspective is presented as a contrast to her own moderate and downgraded reaction: "h° ich hab da immer NUR äh (-) mmhm zu gesagt," ('h° and I always just answered him uh (-) saying mhm,'; l. 305). The "U:ND äh?" ('and eh?') in line 306 indicates a continuation problem. As Claire has lost the thread or her train of thought, Isa

takes over and suggests a possible reason for Claire's behavior (l. 307). After Isa's take-over, Claire does not return to her *zwar...aber*-pattern.

Even though Claire does not provide the projected *aber*-continuation and thus leaves the contrastive implication hanging, the concessive relation is still discernable: after mentioning that she had switched off all emotion in the relationship, or convinced herself that she had no deeper feelings for her boyfriend (l. 294-296), she initiates a concessive move which contains the conceding particle *zwar* ("°h (-) hab zwar gewusst dass ich für ihn m=MEHR bedeute,"; '°h (-) [true] I did know that I meant more to him,'; l. 299). She continues by portraying her minimal reaction "mhm" (l. 305) as a clear contrast to his declarations of affection, and thus, confirms her former statement that she was emotionally unavailable. Even though Claire changes her constructional orientation over the course of the production of an *zwar...aber*-construction and does not offer an explicitly marked counter-move – introduced by an adversative conjunction such as *aber* –, the contrast between her knowing how much she meant to her boyfriend and her own minimal reaction to his affectively loaded statements, is apparent.

In accordance with Leuschner and Van den Nest (2012a, p. 26), I want to argue that *zwar*-units without a following *aber*-part cannot simply be reduced to seemingly 'ungrammatical sentences'. Instead, interactional contingencies play a major role in the realization of stand-alone *zwar*-constructions. While talking, various things can happen for all sorts of reasons; i.e. incomings by co-participants, missing reactions from recipients, change of 'plan' to forestall possible disaffiliation, need for more planning time, etc.[26]

As our data reveal, participants in everyday spoken German produce stand-alone *zwar*-moves in specific situations. They are mainly used in contexts where the speaker is confident that her/his recipients can infer the missing counter-claim. We also find them in turns in which the *zwar*-unit extends over several TCUs and the speaker changes his/her constructional orientation halfway through the ongoing talk. In addition, they occur in cases when co-participants interrupt speaker's turn for further clarification and first speaker does not resume her/his original *zwar...aber*-construction.

Stand-alone *zwar*-units, thus, reveal how speakers in the ongoing process of interaction can re-arrange constructional patterns in novel and improvised ways.

4. Conclusion

In their introduction to the volume on "Cause, Condition, Concession, Contrast – Cognitive and Discourse Perspectives", Couper-Kuhlen and Kortmann (2000, p. 3) claim that spoken language is "first and foremost a tool for social action"; that in order to understand its form and functions, "it must be examined in its original habitat, i.e. in everyday interaction." Luckmann (1986) furthermore argues that those social actions which are relevant and meaningful to a community are often routinized and form communicative patterns, which speakers use in social interaction.

As our analysis reveals, the *zwar...aber*-construction is an example of just such a routinized grammatical format and a resource for implementing social actions in talk-in-interaction, i.e. for building a complex argumentative sequence by combining and assessing opposing perspectives. The *zwar*-unit not only delays speaker's major argument and draws the recipients' attention to it, but it also helps keep the floor pending the upcoming counter-claim. This division of the two units, explicitly cued by the correlative connective, is also convenient for the recipients, as it simplifies their task of processing the information.

In our data, speakers make use of several variants of concessive *zwar...aber*-constructions. Most frequently, they employ this complex pattern for self-concession and reveal the reasoning processes which have ultimately led them to their main claim. In a few cases, the

---

[26] Cf. Barth-Weingarten (2014, p. 352).

zwar...aber-construction is used dyadically for conceding a co-participant's conflicting claim before advancing to speaker's main point. Finally, speakers employ *zwar...aber*-structures to make concessive repair and thus, to back down from a prior claim that could lead to a potential disagreement.

Nonetheless, in all of the cases presented, the *zwar...aber*-construction functions as a sedimented practice to deal with implicit or explicit opposing perspectives of asymmetrical argumentative weight. With this strategy, speakers achieve alignment and intersubjectivity and contribute to the reciprocity of perspectives among the participants (Schütz and Luckmann, 1984).

Although participants in everyday talk orient to sedimented patterns – such as *zwar...aber*-constructions –, –, their actualization takes place in the course of the ongoing interaction. This becomes apparent in the case of stand-alone *zwar…*-utterances: these *zwar*-units, which are not followed by the foreshadowed *aber*-move, demonstrate how a given grammatical construction can be modified and adapted to local interactional needs which arise out of the moment-by-moment unfolding process of interaction. This observation hints at the fact that grammatical constructions are not just mentally-fixed form-function pairs which are applied unyieldingly in concrete discourse. Instead, they form orientation patterns and are "highly adaptive resource[s] for interaction" (Auer and Pfänder, 2011, p. 1) which are used and modified to fit the here-and-now of any given situation.

References

Antaki, C., Wetherell, M., 1999. Show Concessions. Discourse Studies 1 (1), 7-27.

Auer, P., 1999. Sprachliche Interaktion: Eine Einführung anhand von 22 Klassikern. Niemeyer, Tübingen.

Auer, P., 2000. On line-Syntax – oder: Was es bedeuten könnte, die Zeitlichkeit der mündlichen Sprache ernst zu nehmen. Sprache und Literatur 85 (31), 43-56.

Auer, P., 2005. Projection in Interaction and Projection in Grammar. Text 25 (1), 7-36.

Auer, P., 2009. On-line Syntax: Thoughts on the Temporality of Spoken Language. Language Sciences 31 (1), 1-13.

Auer, P., 2015. The Temporality of Language in Interaction: Projection and Latency. In: Deppermann, A., Günthner, S. (Eds.), Temporality in Interaction. John Benjamins, Amsterdam & Philadelphia, pp. 27-56.

Auer, P., Pfänder, S. (Eds.), 2011. Constructions: Emergent or Emerging? De Gruyter, Berlin & Boston.

Auer, P., Pfänder, S., 2011. Constructions: Emergent or Emerging? In: Auer, P., Pfänder, S. (Eds.), Constructions: Emergent or Emerging? De Gruyter, Berlin & Boston, pp. 1-21.

Bakhtin, M.M., 1981. Discourse in the Novel. In: Holquist, M. (Ed.), The Dialogic Imagination, University of Texas Press, Austin, pp. 259-422.

Barth, D. 2000. "that's true, although not really, but still": Expressing Concession in Spoken English. In: Couper-Kuhlen, E., Kortmann, B. (Eds.), Cause, Condition, Concession, Contrast: Cognitive and Discourse Perspectives. De Gruyter, Berlin & New York, pp. 411-437.

Barth-Weingarten, D., 2003. Concession in Spoken English: On the Realisation of a Discourse-Pragmatic Relation. Gunter Narr, Tübingen.

Barth-Weingarten, D., 2014. Dialogism and the Emergence of Final Particles: The Case of *and*. In: Günthner, S., Imo, W., Bücker, J., (Eds.), Grammar and Dialogism: Sequential, Syntactic and Prosodic Patterns between Emergence and Sedimentation. De Gruyter, Berlin & New York, pp. 335-366.

Becher, V., 2011. Von der Hypotaxe zur Parataxe: Ein Wandel im Ausdruck von Konzessivität in neueren populärwissenschaftlichen Texten. In: Breindl, E., Ferraresi, G.,

Volodina, A. (Eds.), Satzverknüpfung mehrdimensional: Zur Interaktion von Form, Bedeutung und Diskursfunktion in Geschichte und Gegenwart. De Gruyter, Berlin & New York, pp. 181-209.

Couper-Kuhlen, E., Kortmann, B., 2000. Introduction. In: Couper-Kuhlen, E., Kortmann, B. (Eds.), Cause, Condition, Concession, Contrast: Cognitive and Discourse Perspectives. De Gruyter, Berlin & New York, pp. 1-8.

Couper-Kuhlen, E., Thompson, S.A. 1999. On the Concessive Relation in Conversational English. In: Neumann, F.-W., Schülting, S. (Eds.), Anglistentag 1998 Erfurt: Proceedings. Wissenschaftlicher Verlag, Trier, pp. 29-39.

Couper-Kuhlen, E., Thompson, S.A., 2000. Concessive Patterns in Conversation. In: Couper-Kuhlen, E., Kortmann, B. (Eds.), Cause, Condition, Concession, Contrast: Cognitive and Discourse Perspectives. De Gruyter, Berlin & New York, pp. 381-410.

Couper-Kuhlen, E., Thompson, S.A., 2005. A Linguistic Practice for Retracting Overstatements: 'Concessive Repair'. In: Hakulinen, A. Selting, M. (Eds.), Syntax and Lexis in Conversation: Studies on the Use of Linguistic Resources in Talk-in-Interaction. John Benjamins, Amsterdam & Philadelphia, pp. 257-288.

Couper-Kuhlen, E., Thompson, S.A., 2006. "You know it's funny": Eine Neubetrachtung der "Extraposition" im Englischen. In: Günthner, S., Imo, W. (Eds.), Konstruktionen in der Interaktion. De Gruyter, Berlin & New York, pp. 23-58.

Couper-Kuhlen, E., Ono, T., 2007. 'Incrementing' in Conversation: A Comparison of Practices in English, German and Japanese. Pragmatics 17 (4), 513-552.

Di Meola, C., 1997. Der Ausdruck der Konzessivität in der deutschen Gegenwartssprache. Niemeyer, Tübingen.

Du Bois, J., 2011. Towards a Dialogic Syntax. Manuscript. University of California at Santa Barbara.

Evans, N., 2007. Insubordination and its Uses. In: Nikolaeva, I. (Ed.), Finiteness: Theoretical and Empirical Foundations. Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 366-431.

Goffman, E., 1974/86. Frame Analysis: An Essay on the Organization of Experience. Harper & Row, New York.

Grimm, J., Grimm, W., 1854-61. Deutsches Wörterbuch. Leipzig. Online-Version vom 25.08.2014.
[http://woerterbuchnetz.de/DWB/?sigle=DWB&mode=Vernetzung&lemid=GZ12561]

Günthner, S., 1996. From Subordination to Coordination? Verb-Second Position in German Causal and Concessive Constructions. Pragmatics 6 (3), 323-370.

Günthner, S., 1999. Entwickelt sich der Konzessivkonnektor *obwohl* zum Diskursmarker? Grammatikalisierungstendenzen im gesprochenen Deutsch. Linguistische Berichte 180, 409-446.

Günthner, S., 2000. From Concessive Connector to Discourse Marker: The Use of *obwohl* in Everyday German Interaction. In: Couper-Kuhlen, E., Kortmann, B. (Eds.), Cause, Condition, Concession, Contrast: Cognitive and Discourse Perspectives. De Gruyter, Berlin & New York, pp. 439-468.

Günthner, S., 2010. Grammatical Constructions and Communicative Genres. In: Dorgeloh, H., Wanner, A. (Eds.), Approaches to Syntactic Variation and Genre. De Gruyter, Berlin & New York, pp. 195-217.

Günthner, S. 2011a. Between Emergence and Sedimentation: Projecting constructions in German interactions. In: Auer, P., Pfänder, S. (Eds.), Constructions: Emergent or Emerging? De Gruyter, Berlin & Boston, pp. 156-185.

Günthner, S., 2011b. The Construction of Emotional Involvement in Everyday German Narratives - Interactive Uses of 'dense constructions'. Pragmatics 21 (4), 573-592.

Günthner, S., 2011c. *N be that*-Constructions in Everyday German Conversation: A Reanalysis of 'die Sache ist/das Ding ist' ('the thing is')-clauses as *projector phrases*. In:

Laury, R., Suzuki, R. (Eds.), Subordination in Conversation. John Benjamins, Amsterdam & Philadelphia, pp. 11-36.

Günthner, S., 2012a. 'Geteilte Syntax': Kollaborativ erzeugte *dass*-Konstruktionen. GIDI-Arbeitspapierreihe (Grammatik in der Interaktion) 43 (8). [http://noam.uni-muenster.de/gidi/arbeitspapiere/arbeitspapier43.pdf]

Günthner, S., 2012b. Eine interaktionale Perspektive auf Wortarten: das Beispiel *und zwar*. In: Rothstein, B. (Ed.), Nicht-flektierende Wortarten. De Gruyter, Berlin & Boston, pp. 14-47.

Günthner, S., 2015. A Temporally Oriented Perspective on Connectors in Interactions: *und zwar* ('namely/in fact')-constructions in everyday German conversations. In: Deppermann, A., Günthner, S. (Eds.), Temporality in Interaction. John Benjamins, Amsterdam & Philadelphia, pp. 237-266.

Günthner, S., i. pr. Zwar…aber-Konstruktionen im gesprochenen Deutsch: Die dialogische Realisierung komplexer Konnektoren im Gespräch. To appear in: Deutsche Sprache.

Günthner, S., Hopper, P.J., 2010. Zeitlichkeit & sprachliche Strukturen: Pseudoclefts im Englischen und Deutschen. Gesprächsforschung - Online-Zeitschrift zur verbalen Interaktion 11, 1-28. [www.gespraechsforschung-ozs.de]

Günthner, S., Imo, W., Bücker, J., 2014. (Eds.), Grammar and Dialogism: Sequential, Syntactic and Prosodic Patterns between Emergence and Sedimentation. De Gruyter, Berlin & New York.

Heritage, J., 2012. Epistemics in Action: Action Formation and Territories of Knowledge. Research on Language and Social Interaction 45 (1), 1-29.

Hoffmann, L., 2013. Deutsche Grammatik. Erich Schmidt, Berlin.

Hopper, P.J., 1987. Emergent Grammar. In: Berkeley Linguistic Society (Eds.), General Session and Parasession on Grammar and Cognition. University of Berkeley Press, Berkeley, pp. 139-157.

Hopper, P.J., 1998. Emergent Grammar. In: Tomasello M. (Ed.), The New Psychology of Language: Cognitive and Functional Approaches to Language Structure. Erlbaum Mahwah, pp. 155-175.

Hopper, P.J, 2004. The Openness of Grammatical Constructions. Chicago Linguistic Society 40, 153-175.

Keevallik, L., 2011. Pro-Forms as Projective Devices in Interaction. Discourse Processes 48 (6), 404-431.

König, E., 1991. Concessive Relations as the Dual of Causal Relations. In: Zaefferer, D. (Ed.), Semantic Universals and Universal Semantics. Foris, Berlin & New York, pp. 190-209.

Lerner, G.H., 1996. On the "Semi-Permeable" Character of Grammatical Units in Conversation: Conditional Entry into the Turn Space of Another Speaker. In: Ochs, E., Schegloff, E.A., Thompson, S.A. (Eds), Interaction and Grammar. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 238-276.

Leuschner, T., Van Den Nest, D., 2012a. Die zwar...aber-Relation im Gegenwartsdeutschen: Funktionsweise: Variation: Grammatikalisierung. Deutsche Sprache 40 (1), 2-31.

Leuschner, T., Van Den Nest, D., 2012b. Emergent Correlative Concessivity: The Case of German zwar...aber 'true ...but'. Belgian Journal of Linguistics 26, 116-142.

Lindström, J.K., Londen, A.-M., 2013. Concession and Reassertion: On a Dialogic Discourse Pattern in Conversation. Text & Talk 33 (3), 331-352.

Linell, P., 2001. Approaching Dialogue: Talk, Interaction and Contexts in Dialogical Perspectives. John Benjamins, Amsterdam & Philadelphia.

Linell, P., 2009. Rethinking Language, Mind, and World Dialogically. Information Age Publishing, Charlotte.

Luckmann, T., 1986. Grundformen der gesellschaftlichen Vermittlung des Wissens: Kommunikative Gattungen. In: Neidhardt, F., Lepsius, M.R., Weiß, J. (Eds.), Kultur und Gesellschaft. Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie, Sonderheft 27, pp. 191-211.

Luckmann, T., 2007. Lebenswelt, Identität und Gesellschaft: Schriften zur Wissens- und Protosoziologie. UVK, Konstanz.

Mann, W.C., Thompson, S.A., 1992. Relational Discourse Structure: A Comparison of Approaches to Structuring Text by 'Contrast'. In: Hwang, S.J., Merrifield, W.R. (Eds.), Language in Context: Essays for Robert E. Longacre. University of Texas, Arlington, pp. 19-46.

Quintilian, M.F., 1972. Quintilianus: Ausbildung des Redners. Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, Darmstadt.

Pasch, R. et al., 2003. Handbuch der deutschen Konnektoren: Linguistische Grundlagen der Beschreibung und syntaktische Merkmale der deutschen Satzverknüpfer. De Gruyter, Berlin & New York.

Pekarek-Doehler, S., 2015. Grammar, Projection and Turn-Organization: (*il) y a NP* 'there is NP' as a Projector Construction in French Talk-in-Interaction. In: Deppermann, A., Günthner, S. (Eds.), Temporality in Interaction. John Benjamins, Amsterdam & Philadelphia, pp. 173-200.

Primatarova-Miltscheva, A., 1986. Zwar...aber – ein zweiteiliges Konnektivum? Deutsche Sprache 14 (2), 125-139.

Rezat, S., 2007. Die Konzession als strategisches Sprachspiel. Winter, Heidelberg.

Schütz, A., Luckmann, T., 1984. Strukturen der Lebenswelt. Band 2. Suhrkamp, Frankfurt.

Selting, M. et al., 2009. Gesprächsanalytisches Transkriptionssystem 2 (GAT 2). Gesprächs-forschung – Online-Zeitschrift zur verbalen Interaktion 10, 353–402. [www.gespraechsforschung-ozs.de]

Silverstein, M., 1984. On the Pragmatic Poetry of Prose: Parallelism, Repetition, and Cohesive Structure in the Course of Dyadic Conversation. In: Schiffrin, D. (Ed.), Meaning, Forms and Use in Context. Georgetown University, Washington, DC, pp. 181–199.

Thurmair, M., 1989. Modalpartikeln und ihre Kombinationen. Niemeyer, Tübingen.

Ueding, G., Steinbrink, B., 1986. Grundriß der Rhetorik: Geschichte, Technik, Methode. Metzler, Stuttgart.

Zifonun, G., Hoffmann, L., Strecker, B., 1997. Grammatik der deutschen Sprache. Band 1-3. De Gruyter, Berlin & New York.