

# How does a concessive value emerge?

CORINNE ROSSARI

## 13.1 Introduction

The notion of concession is frequently related to the notion of counter-expectation (Lakoff 1971), counter-implication (Morel 1996), or counter-argumentation (Anscombe and Ducrot 1977).<sup>1</sup> These different notions are used to represent more or less the same intuition according to which a concession takes place when two states of affairs expressed in two connected utterances are not congruent. The markers connecting them are considered as conveying conventionally a concessive value. Among those, it is possible to find conjunctions and conjunctive adverbs such as Fr. *mais*, *cependant*, *pourtant*, *toutefois*, which all correspond approximately to 'but'.

In a diachronic perspective, the question addressed in this chapter concerns the origin of the concessive value, since this is considered here as a pragmatic value derived from different semantic values: causal for *pourtant*, temporal for *cependant*, or derived from manner adverbials for *toutefois*, as noted by Marchello-Nizia (2008). The grammaticalization theory (Traugott 1995a; 1999; Traugott and Dasher 2002) complemented by the notion of pragmaticalization, theorized in Dostie (2004), are used as theoretical frameworks to explain how from a semantic meaning whose scope is the content of the utterance, the marker acquires a pragmatic one whose scope is the utterance.<sup>2</sup> The basic key to explaining this process of evolution is that discourse markers (DMs) acquire their pragmatic function through an increasing subjectivity in the way they are used, as theorized in Traugott (1999: 189) for *in fact*:

Adverbial path for subjectification  
VAdv > IpAdv > DM  
Least subjective → Most subjective

<sup>1</sup> Only one seminal reference per notion is quoted.

<sup>2</sup> For an overview of grammaticalization theory applied to French, see Marchello-Nizia (2006).

The new pragmatic meaning results from the conventionalization of an inference, described by Traugott and Dasher (2002) as the Invited Inferencing Theory of Semantic Change. The repeated occurrence of the adverbial in one particular context helps a concessive inference to emerge. In a succeeding step, the grammaticalization process allows the adverbial to endorse the inference as a conventionalized feature. In other words, the context guides the access to an inference, which becomes part of the lexical value of an item. Marchello-Nizia (2008) uses such a framework to explain the emergence of the concessive value endorsed by the French adverbial *cependant* ‘however’. She shows that *cependant*, which originally indicated a simultaneity between two states of affairs, has acquired a concessive value by occurring in more subjective contexts. In such contexts there is at the same time simultaneity and opposition between the utterances expressing the states of affairs.

The polyphony framework conceived by Ducrot (1984) lends further support to the notion of concession. In such a framework, the concession takes place when a speaker alludes to the point of view of an *énonciateur* ‘enunciator’<sup>3</sup> that the speaker accepts but does not endorse. She subsequently introduces a point of view that she endorses. This analysis is presented by Ducrot (2001), who describes the polyphonic structure of an excerpt such as:

- (1) *Certes la France a de bonnes pistes...*  
 ‘Sure, France has good slopes...’

The context is the following: two friends are talking about their holidays. The first friend would like to go to France, because there are good slopes. The second friend would prefer to go skiing in Switzerland.

According to Ducrot’s analysis, the concessive value of this sequence results from two different interpretations of *énonciateur* ‘enunciator’, *attitude* ‘attitude’, and *point de vue* ‘point of view’.

- The first speaker has uttered the content *p* (*La France a de bonnes pistes* ‘France has good slopes’) as an argument among others for the conclusion *C* (*Allons en France* ‘Let’s go to France’). The sequence *certes p* uses two points of view: (POV<sub>1</sub>) which corresponds to the content *p* and (POV<sub>2</sub>) which concerns the way this content is used in the discourse, i.e. *p* is an argument for *C*.
- The first speaker has uttered *p* as the unique argument for the conclusion *C*. The sequence *certes p* then uses three points of view: (POV<sub>1</sub>) which corresponds to the content *p*; (POV<sub>2</sub>) which indicates that *p* is an argument for *C* and (POV<sub>3</sub>) which indicates that *p* is a sufficient argument for *C*. In this case, the speaker

<sup>3</sup> The French quotations are translated by the author, who apologizes for the possible imprecision due to the language transfer of the concepts labelled in French.

does not have the same attitude towards the three points of view: she has an attitude of agreement for POV<sub>1</sub> and POV<sub>2</sub>, and an attitude of disagreement for POV<sub>3</sub>.

By this analysis the concessive value is related to the polyphonic interpretation of the *certes p* sequence. The markers that occur in this configuration are correlates. The most usual pair of correlates in French is *certes, ... mais* 'sure, ... but'. But other markers are possible for introducing the first sequence: *en effet/effectivement/soit/d'accord* etc., as noted by Garnier and Sitri (2009: 125), referring to Morel (1980):

*Certes* appartient à un paradigme d'adverbes comme *bien entendu, bien sûr, d'accord, soit, oui, en effet, effectivement, certainement, assurément, sans doute* catégorisés comme adverbes de validation ou adverbes modaux qui, comme lui, peuvent apparaître dans le premier terme d'un système concessif [...].

'*Certes* pertains to a paradigm of adverbs such as *bien entendu, bien sûr, d'accord, soit, oui, en effet, effectivement, certainement, assurément, sans doute* categorized as validation adverbs or modal adverbs, which, like *certes*, can occur in the first segment of a concessive system[...]

In such cases, as indicated in the quotation above, these markers have the property of expressing validation in a dialogic context. The concessive value thus possibly relies on the dialogic properties of the first marker of the sequence.

Among the markers that can occur in this position, the origin of the concessive value of *certes* in particular has been analysed as the result of the strengthening function that the adverbial has primarily endorsed. According to Anscombe (1980: 118), *certes* was at first only used to strengthen an assertion:

Le simple fait de renforcer une assertion, c'est par là même signaler que cette assertion avait besoin de l'être, et qu'elle pouvait donc être combattue. C'est de cette façon qu'une marque de renforcement devient une marque de concession.

'The simple fact of strengthening an assertion is in itself an indication that this assertion needed to be strengthened, and thus that it could be contested. It is in this way that a marker of strengthening becomes a marker of concession.'

Rodríguez Somolinos (1995), who studied the diachronic evolution of this adverb, confirms this analysis. She notices that *certes* has no polyphonic value in prior uses. Its function was to strengthen an assertion which was not linked to the utterance of a former point of view. The polyphonic value, which gives rise to the concessive meaning, is subsequent to this function (though Rodríguez Somolinos does not date it). Garnier and Sitri (2009) also apply this analysis.

So the question involved in addressing the origin of the concessive value is twofold: either it concerns the marker linking the *p* and *q* sequence, such as *p, cependant q*, and the concession is viewed as a counter-implication; or it concerns the marker introducing the *p* sequence and the concession is viewed as a polyphonic phenomenon. This chapter will focus on polyphonic constructions. First the exact

contribution of each marker will be determined, before addressing the question of the emergence of the concessive value they convey.

### 13.2 Dialogic and monologic use of concessive markers

Any concessive marker used in correlation with *mais* ‘but’ may occur in dialogic contexts, as already noticed by Rossari (2008) and Garnier and Satri (2009). More precisely, such contexts can be defined as ‘dialogic structures’, according to the sense given in the Geneva model of discourse presented in Roulet, Fillettaz, and Grobet (2001): structures composed of moves that can be (but do not have to be) uttered by two different speakers and which share illocutionary links (e.g. a question and its answer). In such structures, these markers can constitute in themselves complete illocutionary acts of agreement. In this respect, they share the fifth property listed by Ghezzi in Chapter 2, being simultaneously lexemes and utterances.

- (2) Éraсте: Vous êtes un coquin.  
 Mascarille: **D’accord**. (Molière, *Dépit amoureux*: 420)<sup>4</sup>  
 ‘Éraсте: You are a crook.  
 Mascarille: **Indeed.**’

In this dialogue other adverbials could be used:

- (3) Vous êtes un coquin.  
**En effet/Effectivement/Certes/Soit.**

Any of these adverbials can be used in correlation with *mais* in monologic structures. According to Roulet et al. (2001), in monologic structures, moves uttered by the same speaker share interactive links, such as argument, counter-argument, conclusion, or reformulation (p. 172).

- (4) **Certes** je ne vauх pas les deux autres, **mais** je t’aime autant. (Sand, *Correspondance*: 183–973)  
 ‘Sure, I am not as good as the other two, **but** I love you as much.’

The first move of this sequence is a counter-argument in relation to a conclusion expressed in the second move. Any of the markers of the previous dialogic structure could be used instead of *certes* in (4).

- (5) **D’accord/En effet/Effectivement/Soit**, je ne vauх pas les deux autres, **mais** je t’aime autant.

<sup>4</sup> The examples come from the FRANTEXT database. Any use that seems natural in contemporary French, regardless of date, is also taken into account. The English translation generally corresponds word-by-word-to the French, as it is relevant to stay as close as possible to the original.

The fact that these markers have both uses (monologic and dialogic) raises the question of their value in each configuration. Do they have the same value or do they endorse a different value in monologic and dialogic configurations? Even if it is clear that concessive interpretation is only possible in the monologic configuration, it is assumed here that the markers have the same value in both discourse patterns. This is not to imply that any of them necessarily convey the same meaning, or that they are always substitutable for each other.

### 13.3 Discourse features of the polyphonic conception of concession

Before proceeding to the semantic analysis of each marker, I will give a definition of discourse features of the sequence conveying a concessive interpretation. This definition relies on the tools of Carel (2011: 296ff.) in her theory of argumentative polyphony. She assumes that any content can be associated with a ‘mode de présentation dans le discours’ (‘way of presentation in discourse’). To define the latter, she employs notions specifying the centrality of the content in the discourse flow and the way it is uttered, i.e. the *ton* ‘tonality’. Three of these notions will be used here: two concerning the centrality of some content in the discourse flow and one the tonality in which some content is presented. The notion of *accordé* ‘accepted’ or *pris en charge* ‘endorsed’ relate to the first parameter; the notion of *conçu* ‘conceived’ relates to the second. They are defined as follows:

Un contenu est présenté comme *accordé* quand il est introduit et accepté sans constituer pour autant le centre du texte. Il est présenté comme *pris en charge* quand il est mis au centre du texte. Un contenu est énoncé sur le mode du *conçu* quand le locuteur déclare concevoir le contenu à l’occasion même de son énonciation. (Carel, to appear)

‘A content is presented as **accepted** when it is introduced and accepted without constituting the focus of the discourse. It is presented as **endorsed** when it is the focus of the discourse. A content is uttered in a “conceived way”, when the speaker says that he framed it simultaneously to the enunciation act.’

The configuration which gives rise to a concessive interpretation has the following characteristics. It is formed by two constituents:

- a content said (*p*)
- a content said (*q*)

which are differently presented in the discourse as:

- the (*p*) content is:
  - *accordé* ‘accepted’ by the speaker
  - *conçu* ‘conceived’ by another speaker
- the (*q*) content is *pris en charge* ‘endorsed’ by the speaker.

The ideal configuration making visible the concessive interpretation is exemplified by the following discourse:

- (6) L1: Je trouve Lucie gentille. [The content *Lucie gentille* is presented as conceived by L1]  
 L2: Lucie est gentille, c'est incontestable, mais elle est déjà mariée. [The content *Lucie gentille* is accepted, i.e. is not introduced by L2 as the focus of the discourse. The content *Lucie déjà mariée* is endorsed, i.e. introduced as the focus of the discourse.]  
 'L1: I think that Lucy is nice.  
 L2: Lucy is nice, this is unquestionable, but she is already married.'

Such a configuration is compatible with any of the markers listed in (2) and (3):

- (7) L1: Je trouve Lucie gentille. (*p*)  
 L2: Certes/En effet/Effectivement/D'accord/Soit, Lucie est gentille (*p*), mais elle est déjà mariée. (*q*)  
 'L1: I think that Lucie is nice.  
 L2: [Certes/En effet/Effectivement/D'accord/Soit], Lucie is nice, but she is already married.'

All of them keep intact the properties that they have in their dialogic use. They can all be used to express the agreement of the speaker in relation to the content conceived by the first speaker:

- (8) Je trouve Lucie gentille. (*p*)  
 Certes/En effet/Effectivement/D'accord/Soit.

The difference from the dialogic structure is that, in the monologic one, the second speaker adds, after *p*, new information that expresses the reason why the latter content is accepted and not endorsed. In terms of Sperber and Wilson's (1986) frame of relevance theory, one could say that *p* is accepted because it is less relevant than *q*. Any monologic configuration in which these adverbials can be used corresponds to this general pattern. In this regard, if one refers to the difference made in the introduction between discourse and pragmatic markers, the correlates *certes/en effet* etc. ... *mais* can be considered as both a pragmatic marker and a discourse marker. They focus on discourse structure by specifying a discourse relation of counter-argumentation, but they also focus on interaction alluding to a potential prior discourse.

According to this analysis, the concessive value in polyphonic sense is free from any kind of opposition between *p* and *q* contents. The contrast, which gives rise to

the concessive value, concerns the manner of presentation of *p* and *q*, not their argumentative orientation. Such an assumption raises the question of the semantic contribution of the second marker of the concessive sequence: in particular, how is it possible to take into account the contribution of *mais*—which is considered to be—the emblematic marker of argumentative opposition in the seminal paper by Anscombe and Ducrot (1977)? And, further, how are we to explain the necessity of *mais* in such structures, if it does not serve to underline an opposition? Both questions will be discussed in the two following sections.

### 13.4 The independence of concessive value from an argumentative opposition

It is assumed here that the contribution of *mais* in a concessive construction is to indicate that there is a contrast between the way in which *p* and *q* are presented in the discourse. This assumption is based on four clues.

First, in some configuration, a concessive interpretation is available and *mais* does not underline any kind of opposition.

- (9) **un pauvre diable de protestant me disait, il y a quelques jours, après combien d'autres, qu'on voyait en moi beaucoup de haine. Les paroles de cet homme, d'ailleurs bienveillant, me sont revenues, ce matin, je ne sais pourquoi. Oui, c'est vrai, je suis plein de haine depuis mon enfance, et nul n'a aimé les autres hommes plus naïvement que je n'ai fait. Mais j'ai abhorré les choses, les institutions, les lois du monde. J'ai haï le monde infiniment, et les expériences de ma vie n'ont servi qu'à exaspérer cette passion.** (Bloy, *Journal* 1, 177)

**'A poor devil of a Protestant told me a few days ago, after many others, that one could see in me a lot of hate. The words of this man, who was otherwise kind, came back to me this morning. Yes, it is true, I have been full of hate since my childhood, and no one has loved other men more naively than I have. But I have abhorred the things, the institutions, and the laws of this world. I have hated the world without end, and the experiences of my life have but strengthened this passion.'**

This excerpt illustrates the discourse pattern of concession. The content in bold *je suis plein de haine depuis mon enfance* = *p* is presented as conceived by a first speaker who is identified as *un pauvre diable de protestant*. This content is also presented as accepted by the speaker, as underlined by the use of *oui, c'est vrai*. It is followed by content presented as endorsed, introduced by *mais*, which confirms what is said in the *p* sequence: *j'ai abhorré les choses, les institutions, les lois du monde. J'ai haï...* It is clear that in such a configuration, the contribution of *mais* does not concern an argumentative opposition. Instead, it is possible to say,

following Carel (2011: 333), that ‘it indicates that the first segment is only *accordé* “accepted”’. It is even possible to say that the role of *mais* is limited to signalling that the previous content is not endorsed.

Second, any marker which is able to underline the contrast regarding the way the two items of content are presented could occur in concessive configurations. For instance, in the following discourse, *toujours est-il que, il reste que, en attendant* ‘it remains that’ has the same function as *mais*, underlining the fact that the constituent it introduces is the one which counts, according to the speaker.

- (10) ‘Qui?—où?—le Roi !—Je ne le vois pas;—je vous jure que je ne l’aperçois pas.’  
 ‘Il faut que vous soyez aveugle.’  
 ‘C’est bien possible. **Toujours est-il que** je ne vois qu’une foule tumultueuse d’idiots et de fous qui s’empresstent de se prosterner devant un gigantesque caméléopard, et qui s’évertuent à déposer un baiser sur le sabot de l’animal. (Baudelaire, *Nouvelles histoires extraordinaires*, 250)  
 “Who? Where?—the King! I don’t see him; I swear to you that I don’t see him.”  
 “You must be blind.”  
 “It is possible. **The fact remains that** I only see a tumultuous crowd of idiots and fools who hasten to prostrate themselves before a huge cameleopard [giraffe], and strive to plant a kiss on the hoof of the animal.”
- (11) Si mon oncle t’a mis là-dedans, c’est qu’il avait ses raisons. Il se trompe peut-être. Personne n’est infallible. **Toujours est-il que** ton devoir est de lui obéir. (Gibeau, *Allons z’enfants*, 23)  
 ‘If my uncle involved you in this, he had his reasons. He is mistaken perhaps. Nobody is perfect. **The fact remains that** your duty is to obey him.’
- (12) J’y attache la plus grande importance, sachant quelle résonance prennent souvent de telles rencontres. Certes, les circonstances ne leur confèrent pas le caractère dramatique qu’elles avaient eu en d’autres temps et les facilités actuelles de déplacement les banalisent. **Il reste que**, . . . , les séjours à Paris de beaucoup de chefs d’État . . . forment la trame et l’illustration de notre redressement mondial. (De Gaulle, *Le Renouveau (1958–1962)*).  
 ‘I attach the greatest importance to it, knowing what resonance these meetings often have. Of course, the circumstances do not give them the dramatic character they had in other times, and today’s ease of travel renders them commonplace. **The fact remains that** . . . the sojourns in Paris of many heads of state . . . form the basis and the demonstration of our international recovery.’
- (13) Quand ils auront été échaudés une ou deux fois, ils apprendront peut-être à se taire . . . **en attendant**, tout le monde est au courant dans le village, et on n’a pas souvent du monde venant du dehors dans cette région. (Triolet, *Le Premier accroc coûte deux cents francs*, 359)

‘When they have been frightened once or twice, they will perhaps learn to keep quiet... **the fact remains that** everybody is informed in the village, and outsiders don’t often visit this region.’

In these configurations, which have all a concessive interpretation, *mais* could be used with the same function:

- (14) C’est bien possible. **Mais** je ne vois qu’une foule tumultueuse d’idiots et de fous qui s’empressent de se prosterner devant un gigantesque caméléopard, et qui s’évertuent à déposer un baiser sur le sabot de l’animal. (See (10))  
 ‘It is possible. **But** I only see a tumultuous crowd of idiots and fools who hasten to prostrate themselves before a huge cameleopard, and strive to plant a kiss on the hoof of the animal.’
- (15) Si mon oncle t’a mis là-dedans, c’est qu’il avait ses raisons. Il se trompe peut-être. Personne n’est infailible. **Mais** ton devoir est de lui obéir. (See (11))  
 ‘If my uncle involved you in this, he had his reasons. He is mistaken perhaps. Nobody is perfect. **But** it is your duty to obey him.’
- (16) Certes, les circonstances ne leur confèrent pas le caractère dramatique qu’elles avaient eu en d’autres temps et les facilités actuelles de déplacement les banalisent. **Mais**, les séjours à Paris de beaucoup de chefs d’État... forment la trame et l’illustration de notre redressement mondial. (See (12))  
 ‘Of course, the circumstances do not give them the dramatic character they had in other times and today’s ease of travel renders them commonplace. **But** the sojourns in Paris of many heads of state... form the basis and the demonstration of our international recovery.’
- (17) Quand ils auront été échaudés une ou deux fois, ils apprendront peut-être à se taire... **mais**, tout le monde est au courant dans le village, et on n’a pas souvent du monde venant du dehors dans cette région. (See (13))  
 ‘When they have been frightened once or twice, they will perhaps learn to keep quiet... **but** everyone is informed in the village, and outsiders don’t often visit this region.’

Third, *mais*, in non-concessive structures, can be used without any relation or counter-argumentation. For instance, the *mais* labelled ‘mais de surréalisation’ by García Negroni (2003) is clearly non-adversative.

- (18) Soirée, venons à l’essentiel, avec Gary. Très en forme, très paisible, ayant une mine superbe et n’ayant plus aucun problème d’élocution. Peut à nouveau faire de la moto. Beau, **mais** beau!... Plus beau encore... (Lagarce, *Journal 1977-1990*, 53)  
 ‘Evening, back to basics, with Gary. In very good shape, very calm, looking splendid, and without any problem with speaking. Able again to ride a motorbike. Handsome, **but** handsome!... Still more handsome...’

The idea of contrast between two ways of introducing *p* and *q* in the discourse can account for such a use of *mais*. The first *beau* ‘handsome’ is presented as agreed and the second as endorsed. The contrast conveys the hyperbolic interpretation according to which the protagonist is considered particularly attractive.

Other uses of *mais* share this non-adversative value. In some sequences, *mais* introduces an adjunction to some previous utterance whose function can vary. In the following example, *mais* re-introduces the object *mot* ‘word’ afterwards to strengthen it.

- (19) Oui, vous aurez un mot, **mais** rien qu’un mot. J’ai du monde. (Lespinasse, *Letters à M. de Guibert (1769–1776)*, 2)  
 ‘Yes, you will have a word, **but** nothing but a word. I have guests.’

Here again, *mais* marks a contrast between the two occurrences of ‘word’.

Last, the use of *mais* is necessary in some configurations involving a counter-argumentative interpretation, whereas in others still involving a counter-argumentative interpretation it is not.

- (20) **C’est vrai que** c’est attachant, un enfant (*p*), **mais** le plaisir se paie cher: en charges, en limitations de ressources et de libertés (*q*). (Bazin, *L’école des pères* 87)  
 ‘It’s true that it is endearing, a child, **but** the pleasure comes at a high price in commitments, in limitations of means and of freedoms.’
- (21) ‘Mama, ça y est, j’ai un amoureux je te dis, c’est lui mon amoureux.’  
 ‘C’est pas vrai!’ protesta Olivier.  
 ‘**C’est vrai que** c’est pas vrai (*p*), **mais** t’es mon amoureux quand même, mon amoureux pour de rire (*q*)!’ (Sabatier, *David et Olivier*, 15)  
 “‘Mummy, that’s it, I have a lover, I say, he is my lover.’”  
 “It’s not true,” protested Olivier.  
 “**It’s true that** it’s not true, **but** you are still my lover, my pretend lover!”

The use of *c’est vrai que* ‘it is true that’ indicates that *p* has already been conceived. Thus it produces a contrast concerning the way of presentation of *q*. Such a contrast must be marked by *mais*. Therefore, the suppression of *mais* produces a problem of coherence.

- (22) <sup>5</sup> **C’est vrai que** c’est attachant, un enfant, le plaisir se paie cher: en charges, en limitations de ressources et de libertés. (See (20))  
 ‘It is true that it is endearing, a child, the pleasure comes at a high price in commitments in limitations of means and of freedoms.’
- (23) ?**C’est vrai que** c’est pas vrai, t’es mon amoureux quand même, mon amoureux pour de rire! (See (21))  
 “‘It’s true that it’s not true, you are still my lover, my pretend lover.’”

<sup>5</sup> ‘?’ indicates that the sequence is not very natural.

The fact that *mais* cannot be removed in such contexts (where the counter-argumentative interpretation is clearly accessible) remains unexplained if *mais* does not mark the contrast between the way in which *p* and *q* are introduced in discourse. *Il est vrai que* indicates that *p* is previously conceived. It thus does not have the same discourse status as *q*. The speaker has to indicate how she takes into account the *p* content. *Mais* allows her to do that by presenting *p* and *q* on two different enunciative levels.

When there is no marker attributing to *p* a particular discourse status, the counter-argumentative relationship can be obtained with or without *mais*:

- (24) Que voulez-vous que je vous dise? L'homme est mauvais, l'homme est difforme. Le papillon est réussi, l'homme est raté. Dieu a manqué cet animal-là. (Hugo, *Les Misérables*, 529)  
'What do you want me to say? Man is evil, man is deformed. The butterfly is a success, man is a failure. God failed with that animal.'
- (25) Que voulez-vous que je vous dise? L'homme est mauvais, l'homme est difforme. Le papillon est réussi, **mais** l'homme est raté. Dieu a manqué cet animal-là.  
'What do you want me to say? Man is evil, man is deformed. The butterfly is a success, **but** man is a failure. God failed with that animal.'

Such a contrast shows that the contribution of *mais* does not concern the counter-argumentative relationship, but the way in which *p* and *q* are taken into account by the speaker. When *p* is presented by a marker such as *certes*, *peut-être* etc. as already conceived, *p* and *q* have to be presented as pertaining to two different enunciative levels. Thus, the use of *mais* is necessary. Otherwise, this contrast has not to be specified, and the counter-argumentative relationship can be inferred from the content of *p* and *q*.

### 13.5 The function of the first marker

If a concessive interpretation is due to one particular discourse configuration, what sort of contribution does the adverbial occurring in the initial constituent bring? It helps the understanding of *p* as conveying a content which has been conceived by a previous speaker. If such an interpretation is given by the context, the concessive interpretation is accessible without any marker. Let us go back to the ideal configuration illustrated by (7). In such a configuration, the use of a marker in the initial constituent is not requested for the concessive interpretation:

- (26) L1: Je trouve Lucie gentille. (*p*)  
L2: Lucie est gentille (*p*), **mais** elle est déjà mariée (*p*).  
'L1: I think that Lucie is nice.  
L2: Lucie is nice, **but** she is already married.'

The dialogic structure allows one to understand  $p$  uttered by the second speaker as conceived by the first. But the fact that the second speaker endorses  $q$  and accepts  $p$  has to be marked. Such an indication cannot be inferred without any marking:

- (27) L1: Je trouve Lucie gentille. ( $p$ )  
 L2: Lucie est gentille ( $p$ ), elle est déjà mariée ( $q$ ).  
 'L1: I think that Lucie is nice.  
 L2: Lucie is nice, she is already married.'

The second speaker has to signal that there is a contrast regarding the way of presentation between the two constituents of her utterance. Therefore a marker is required at their juncture. It can be *mais*, but also a marker such as *toujours est-il que*, *en attendant*... as discussed above:

- (28) L1: Je trouve Lucie gentille. ( $p$ )  
 L2: Lucie est gentille ( $p$ ), **en attendant / toujours est-il** qu'elle déjà mariée ( $q$ ).  
 'L1: I think that Lucie is nice.  
 L2: Lucie is nice, it **remains true that** she is already married.'

When there is no dialogic context that allows one to understand the first constituent as already conceived by a previous speaker, a marker has to convey this indication. Some adverbials indicating an agreement in a dialogic structure (*certes*, *soit*, *d'accord*) can convey by themselves such a function in a monologic structure; others need a larger context to be correctly interpreted (*en effet*, *effectivement*):

- (29) **Certes/D'accord/Soit/?En effet/?Effectivement/**, Lucie est gentille, mais elle est déjà mariée. [...]  
 'Lucie is nice, but she is already married'

To sum up, the markers occurring in the first constituent can help the understanding of  $p$  as content previously conceived, but they do not contribute to this function in the same way: *en effet* and *effectivement* need a larger context to convey such information, whereas *certes*, *soit*, and *d'accord* can convey it by themselves.

### 13.6 Different nuances of the concessive value according to the selected marker

#### 13.6.1 Certes, en effet, and effectivement

The role of the marker occurring in the first constituent can help the understanding of  $p$  as a content conceived by a first speaker. But the markers differ in relation to the clues that help the understanding of  $p$  as conceived. Some markers need more contextual clues than others.

With *en effet* or *effectivement*, the clues for *p* as content ‘conceived by the first speaker’ have to be more accessible than with *certes*.

- (30) M. de Sacy s’approche: ‘Ne crains rien, mon garçon. Ce n’est pas ta faute. **Certes**, tu n’aurais pas dû faire feu sans un ordre. Mais ce n’est pas toi qui as fait ricocher la balle; c’est le Bon Dieu.’ (Yourcenar, *Le Labyrinthe du monde*, 1224)  
 ‘Mr de Sacy comes close: “Don’t be afraid, my boy. It is not your fault. To be **sure**, you shouldn’t have shot without an order. But it is not you who made the bullet ricochet; it is God.”’

The use of *effectivement* or *en effet* needs a richer context to be accessed as natural:

- (31) M. de Sacy s’approche: ‘Ne crains rien, mon garçon. Ce n’est pas ta faute. ?[*En effet/Effectivement*], tu n’aurais pas dû faire feu sans un ordre. Mais ce n’est pas toi qui as fait ricocher la balle; c’est le Bon Dieu.’

If the structure is integrated in a dialogic context, the use of the adverbial becomes fully natural:

- (32) Je n’aurais jamais dû faire feu sans ordre! M. de Sacy s’approche: ‘Ne crains rien, mon garçon. Ce n’est pas ta faute. *En effet/Effectivement*, tu n’aurais pas dû faire feu sans un ordre. Mais ce n’est pas toi qui as fait ricocher la balle; c’est le Bon Dieu.’  
 ‘I should not shoot without an order. Mr de Sacy comes close: “Don’t be afraid, my boy. It is not your fault. **Indeed**, you shouldn’t have shot without an order. But it is not you who made the bullet ricochet; it is God.”’

It is easier for *certes* to present *p* as conceived than for *effectivement* or *en effet*. This characteristic is due to the dialogic properties of *certes*. When used as an answer to an assertion, *certes* conveys the idea that the state of affairs that it confirms is already salient in information state, as shown in Rossari (2008). For instance, in the following dialogue, *certes* indicates that the question is to be interpreted as rhetorical. It conveys a state of affairs that is obvious, in the view of the second speaker.

- (33) L’espoir de vie des hommes, eh bien, dans cette contrée, elle est de 25 ans. Celle des femmes de 18.  
 Mais n’y a-t-il pas eu des mesures prises contre la famine? **Certes, certes**. On nous les raconte. On nous les décrit. (D’Eaubonne, *L’indicateur du réseau*, 136)  
 “The life expectancy of men in this country is 25 years. That of women is 18.”  
 “But have no measures been taken to combat the famine? **Certainly, certainly**. They tell us there are, they describe them.”’

The fact that measures have been taken to combat the famine is presented by *certes* as obvious. With *en effet* or *effectivement* the interpretation is very different. The question is not understood as rhetorical:

- (34) L'espoir de vie des hommes, eh bien, dans cette contrée, elle est de 25 ans. Celle des femmes de 18.

Mais n'y a-t-il pas eu des mesures prises contre la famine? **En effet/Effectivement.** On nous les raconte. On nous les décrit.

"The life expectancy of men in this country is 25 years. That of women is 18."

"But have no measures been taken to combat the the famine?" "**Indeed.** They tell us there are, they describe them".'

The use of the markers is thus difficult to interpret in such a context. When they are used to react to a question, they indicate that the addressee shares the same doubt as the speaker. This is very clear in the following configuration:

- (35) 'Je ne sais pas trop où les poser.'  
 'Foutez-les sur la caisse, dit l'Asperge, voyant mon hésitation.'  
 'Mais ils sont mouillés et ça risque de... faire des ronds, laisser des traces, je veux dire.'  
 'Et alors?'  
 'Et alors? **En effet.**' (Benoziglio, *Cabinet portrait*, 25)  
 "I don't know where to put them."  
 "Stick them on the box," said Asperge, seeing my hesitation.  
 "But they are wet and it might make... circles, traces, I mean."  
 "So?"  
 "So? **Indeed.**"'

With *en effet*, the speaker indicates that she shares the doubt expressed by *et alors?* She restates the question to underline the fact that she has no answer either.

Taking into account their dialogic use makes it possible to explain the markers' function in the concessive structure. *Certes* indicates that there is some information already available in common. Such an allusion enables one to understand the configuration as conveying the first content as previously conceived. As such content is already available, it is not presented as central in discourse and can therefore be interpreted as accepted.

*En effet* or *effectivement* do not share this property. In a dialogic context such as (35), they indicate that the speaker shares the doubt of the addressee. They do not indicate that the state of affairs alluded to by the question is already available in information state, but that the doubt expressed by the question is shared, as already noted in Rossari (2008). More abstractly, it means that the information state represented by the utterance of the first speaker is compatible/coherent with the addressee's representation (second speaker). With such a function, more clues than *certes* are required in concessive structures to indicate that *p* has already been conceived, as shown by the contrast between (30), (31), and (32).

But *en effet* and *effectivement* have another particularity in relation to *certes*. They can introduce constituents as mere justification of previous ones. How can this characteristic be explained in relation to their dialogic functioning? It is possible to show that such configurations consist of shortened concessive structures. When *p* is not followed by *mais*, the contrast between content accepted and content endorsed disappears. As discussed above, such a contrast governs the choice of *mais* (cf. the comments on (20, 21) vs (22, 23)). Since *en effet* and *effectivement* do not themselves confer on *p* an interpretation of conceived content, they only convey a confirmative value (as in their dialogic use) in relation to a previous constituent *x*. The constituent *p* is then understood as the reason motivating the confirmation of *x*. This is clearly exemplified in the following:

- (36) **J'ay veu le livre des passions du Pere Senaut de l'oratoire. En effet il escrit bien (*p*), mais les morales chrestiennes du Père Yves, Capucin, qui a fait 4 volumes françois de la theologie naturelle [ ... ] n'en cedent rien audit Senaut (*q*).** (Mersenne, *Correspondance: t. 10, 1640–1641, 775*)  
 'I have seen the book of passions of Father Senaut of the oratory. Indeed he writes well, but the Christian morals of Father Yves, Capucin, who has written 4 French volumes of natural theology ... are as good as those of Father Senaut.'
- (37) **On dira sans doute que ces peuples ne seront pas toujours en guerre. En effet, il y aura des intervalles de paix (*p*): mais dans ces intervalles, on ne réparera pas tous les maux que la guerre aura faits ...** (Condillac, *Le Commerce [ ... ], 4*)  
 'It will doubtless be said that these peoples will not always be at war. Indeed, there will be intervals of peace, but at such times one will not heal all the injuries inflicted by the war ...'
- (38) **J'ay veu le livre des passions du Pere Senaut de l'oratoire. En effet il escrit bien.**  
 'I have seen the book of passions of Father Senaut of the oratory. Indeed he writes well.'
- (39) **On dira sans doute que ces peuples ne seront pas toujours en guerre. En effet, il y aura des intervalles de paix.**  
 'It will doubtless be said that these peoples will not always be at war. Indeed, there will be intervals of peace'

Examples (36) and (37) show the concessive functioning of *en effet*. The sequence in bold allows one to situate *p* in a discourse where a previous speaker could have conceived such a content. The concessive interpretation can thus emerge: *p* is interpreted as previously conceived and is also interpreted as accepted thanks to the use of *mais* that introduces the contrast with *q* (which is endorsed).

When *mais* and *q* are suppressed, the concessive value disappears. The adverbial is understood as a confirmation of a previous information state that is represented by the sequence in bold. In such a state, there is a hypothesis which can be reconstructed, such as: ‘I have read books of passions/such peoples are not always at war, said *x*.’ The *p* content is then understood as the reason motivating the confirmation of *x* expressed by *en effet*. Such an interpretation is available in (38) and (39).

Such a functioning is particularly exemplary to illustrate the plurality of the discourse planes on which a marker can operate. *En effet* and *effectivement* operate on three planes which can be more or less salient according to the context they occur in. When they introduce a justification, they seem more concerned with the textual level of discourse organization; when they introduce a concessive sequence, with the social cohesion dimension because of the allusion to a prior discourse; and when they express an agreement, with the personal stance dimension. But all three levels are always co-present in the functioning of these markers.

### 13.6.2 D'accord or soit

When used in a dialogic structure, *d'accord* or *soit* act on the illocutionary force of the previous utterance. Such an illocutionary functioning make them always allude to some previous request when used in monologic structures. The use of *d'accord* in (40) shows the property of this adverbial in alluding to a previous request.

- (40) Mélanger, c'est ma tendance, dans la première partie vous avez vu. Aucun ordre, tout est mélangé, incestueux **d'accord** c'est ma structure mentale (*p*), ... je le sens. (Angot, *L'inceste*, 91)

‘I tend to mix, you’ve seen it in the first part. No order, everything is mixed, incestuous **all right**, it is my mental structure... I feel it.’

*Soit* could be used instead of *d'accord* with the same function:

- (41) Mélanger, c'est ma tendance, dans la première partie vous avez vu. Aucun ordre, tout est mélangé, incestueux **soit** c'est ma structure mentale (*p*), [...] je le sens.

‘I tend to mix, you’ve seen it in the first part. No order, everything is mixed, incestuous **all right**, it is my mental structure... I feel it.’

By using *soit* or *d'accord*, the speaker indicates that she shares the diagnostic about an incestuous quality in her mental structure. The use of *d'accord* is then consistent with a concessive interpretation, by building a potential request that could be expressed as ‘you have to accept that your mental structure has an incestuous quality’, to which it reacts. The *p* content is thus presented as previously conceived. This is why *d'accord* or *soit* can give rise to a concessive interpretation in contexts where *en effet*, *effectivement*, or *certes* could not:

- (42) Tu veux me parler? **Soit! Mais** devant Joë, cette fois!  
(Martin du Gard, *Un taciturne*, 1349)  
'You want to talk to me? **OK! But** in front of Joë, this time!'
- (43) Là, je refusai tout net. Le type aux longs cheveux eut un sourire énigmatique:  
'Tu le refuses aujourd'hui? **D'accord. Mais** dès que ma chronique sera parue  
dans *Rock et Folk*, tu reviendras le chercher en courant!' (*Manœuvre*, 1985)  
'Right there, I **flatly** refused. The guy with long hair smiled mysteriously. "You  
refuse it today? **All right. But** as soon as my feature appears in *Rock and Folk*,  
you'll be running back to get it!"'
- (44) Tu veux me parler? ? [**En effet/Effectivement/Certes!**] **Mais** devant Joë, cette fois!
- (45) Tu le refuses aujourd'hui? ? [**En effet/Effectivement/Certes**] **Mais** dès que ma chronique sera parue dans *Rock et Folk*, tu reviendras le chercher en courant!

The use of *d'accord* or *soit* allows the speaker to express an agreement regarding the illocutionary act expressed in her own question: the desire of the hearer to speak to her in (42) and the refusal of the hearer to do something expressed in the question (43). The other adverbials (*en effet/effectivement/certes*) are not interpreted as conveying an agreement concerning the illocutionary act expressed by the question. Their use therefore seems strange.

To sum up, even if these markers can operate simultaneously on different levels of discourse organization, they differ in relation to their capacity to mark 'speaker or addressee relatedness' (see Chapter 2, this volume). *D'accord* and *soit* allow the speaker to refer to the illocution of the message whereas *en effet*, *effectivement*, and *certes* allow reference to the content of it. The illocutionary feature gives the former markers the property of generating concessive interpretation in any monologic structure.

### 13.7 Diachronic perspectives

Does concessive interpretation result from a diachronic change in the meaning or functioning of the marker? This study has assumed that concessive markers, those which introduce the first constituent, convey the same value in monologic structures that they do in dialogic ones. What about this hypothesis in a diachronic perspective? Have these markers had a prior dialogic use of agreement? The case of *certes* and *soit*, whose concessive value seems the most conventionalized, will be examined here. This analysis is based on four constructions from the 16th century, found in FRANTEXT, which correspond to two different realizations of dialogic (a and b) and monologic (c and d) uses:

- (a) *soit/certes* as autonomous constituents (preceded and followed by a point) in dialogic structures;
- (b) *soit/certes* directly followed by *mais* in dialogic structures;
- (c) *soit/certes* directly followed by *mais* in monologic structures (= *p, soit/certes, mais q*);
- (d) *soit/certes* not directly followed by *mais* in monologic structures (= *soit/certes p, mais q*). The latter pattern corresponds to the regular concessive sequence.

For each construction mentioned above, one example of early use and one example of most recent use is given.

- (a) Example of early uses of *soit* (1661):

- (46) Valère: Mais quoi? L'honneur de vous connoître  
Est un si grand bonheur, est un si doux plaisir,  
Que de vous saluer j'avois un grand desir.  
Sganarelle: **Soit.** (Molière, *L'École de maris*, 379)  
'Valère: But what? The honour of knowing you is such a delight, such a  
sweet pleasure that I really wanted to greet you.  
Sganarelle: **So be it.**'

- (a) Example of recent uses of *soit* (1959):

- (47) 'Ayez pitié au moins de votre mère.' Stavroguine, regardant sa mère, puis Gaganov. '**Soit.** Je vais m'expliquer. Mais je le dirai en secret à M Gaganov, qui me comprendra.' (Camus, [Dostoïevski] *Les Possédés*)  
"Have pity at least on your mother." Stavroguine, looking at his mother, then at Gaganov. "**So be it.** I will give an explanation. But I will give it in secret to Mr. Gaganov, who will understand me."

- (b) Example of early uses of *soit* (1761):

- (48) Et comme il convient que je fasse respecter le nom que je vais porter, je m'engage de passer six mois, à commencer dès demain, dans une maison religieuse [...] Fait à \*Paris le \* 22 octobre \* 1755. Signé Defresne. [...] Réponse. **Soit, mais** cette retraite momentanée me paroît bien inutile... (Chevrier, *Le Colporteur*, 93)  
'And since I have to uphold the name I will bear, I commit to spending six months from tomorrow in a religious house [...] Written in Paris on 22 October 1755. Signed Defresne. Answer. **So be it, but** this temporary retirement seems to me quite useless...'

(b) Example of recent uses of *soit* (2010):

- (49) ‘Antoine, écoutez-moi, deux minutes encore!’  
 ‘**Soit, mais** allez-y droit ou je vous plante là.’ (Garat, *Pense à demain*, 81)  
 “‘Antoine, listen to me, two more minutes!’  
 “OK, but get to the point or I leave immediately.”’

(c) Example of early uses of *soit* (1738):

- (50) ‘Où je ris, chante, et bois: le tout, par complaisance.’  
 ‘Par complaisance, **soit. Mais** vous ne savez pas?’ (Piron, *La Métromanie*, 139)  
 “‘Where I laugh, sing, and drink: all three by kindness.’  
 “By kindness, so be it. But you don’t know?”’

(c) Example of recent uses of *soit* (2006):

- (51) C’est une table rectangulaire, **soit, mais** c’est aussi une Table Ronde. (Roubaud, *Nous, les Moins-que-Rien Fils aînés de Personne* 78)  
 ‘It’s a rectangular table, OK, but it’s also a Round Table.’

(d) Example of early uses of *soit* (1867):

- (52) Aïrolo: Ça sent le renfermé. On est captif ici. Cette enceinte me fâche. Protégé, mais coffré. **Soit**, le gibet me lâche, mais la prison me tient . . . (Hugo, *Théâtre en liberté: Mangeront-ils?*, 484)  
 ‘Aïrolo: It smells musty. We are prisoners here. This fortress disturbs me. Protected, but shut in. True, I’m free of the gallows, but prison still holds me . . .’

(d) Example of recent uses of *soit* (2010):

- (53) **Soit**, c’est une idée des plus saugrenues que de se rendre là-bas en contrebande **mais**, après tout, elle est peu ou prou dans son droit de connaître le Mesnil: elle n’y entre pas en voleuse, puisqu’il appartient à sa famille. (Garat, *Pense à demain*, 408)  
 ‘OK, it is a most eccentric idea to turn up there in secret, but, after all, she is more or less within her rights to get to know Mesnil: she doesn’t go there as a thief, since it belongs to her family.’

The occurrences of *soit* as an autonomous unit are exclusively dialogic until the 18th century. Its earliest monologic occurrences are those where it is directly followed by *mais* and where it concerns a constituent previously expressed by a first speaker, as in (50). Such sequences convey a strong dialogic interpretation. In monologic configurations, the most frequent position for *soit* is the final one (*p, soit, mais q*), still used in contemporary French (see (51)). This also emphasizes its dialogic value: after expressing *p*, the speaker signals her agreement with what she has just said, and then adds *q*. It is rare to find it in the classical concessive configuration *certes, p, mais q*. The first occurrences are from the 19th century (see (52)).

The general tendency is the following: *soit* is more frequently used in dialogic structures, until the 18th century. This use continues in contemporary French, but it is enriched by uses of the (d) type, whose first occurrences are from the 19th, as in (52). Such a function is consistent with its verbal lexical source (*être* ‘to be’). As discussed in Chapter 2, the markers that derive from verbs are good candidates to convey intersubjective values and meanings. The occurrence of *soit* in dialogic structure in prior uses may be the result of its deverbal morphology. The same tendency can be noticed for *d’accord* (54), which derives from a verbal phrase (*être d’accord* ‘agree’). It is never used in regular concessive configuration (*d’accord, p, mais q*) before the 20th century:

- (54) Emmanuel, [...] je n’avais pas compris combien c’était important pour toi. C’était important pour toi aussi. Pour nous. **D’accord**, c’était important, **mais** il faut que tu comprennes qu’il n’y a pas que toi... (Carrère, *Un roman russe*, 244)  
 ‘Emmanuel, [...] I did not understand how important it was for you. It was important for you too. For us. I **agree**, it was important, **but** you have to understand that there is only you ...’

(a) Example of early uses of *certes* (1885):

- (55) La solution politique, la voici: réconcilier ces deux frères. Est-ce possible?  
**Certes.** (Hugo, *Choses vues*, 1335)  
 ‘The political solution, here it is: reconcile these two brothers. Is it possible?  
**Certainly.**’

(a) Example of recent uses of *certes* (1996):

- (56) ‘Alors, Borinka, tu reconnais? J’avais raison?’  
 ‘**Certes.**’ (Schreiber, *Un silence d’environ une demi-heure*, 540)  
 ‘‘So, Borinka, you admit? I was right?’’  
 ‘‘**Sure**.’’

(b) Example of early uses of *certes* (1910):

- (57) ‘Ne trouvez-vous pas l’odeur de ce jardin bien délicieuse?’  
 ‘**Certes, mais** ce mur... (Milosz, *L’Amoureuse initiation*, 144)  
 ‘‘Don’t you find the smell of this garden absolutely delightful?’’  
 ‘‘**Certainly, but** this wall...’’

(b) Example of recent uses of *certes* (1997):

- (58) Achille: Oui, mais il n’est pas question de toi là-dedans, ni de moi.  
 Aristote ne raisonne que sur des figures abstraites  
 La Tortue: **Certes, mais** nieras-tu être le champion de la rapidité? (Roubaud, *Mathématique: récit*, 172)  
 ‘Achille: Yes, but it is not about you, there, or me. Aristotle reasons only on abstract figures.  
 La Tortue: **Certainly, but** would you deny being the champion of speed?’

(c) Example of early uses of *certes* (1552):

- (59) Ô homme vieulx, les soubdars desormais Jeunes et fors te lassent **certes, mais**  
Ta vigueur est resoluë, ... (Rabelais, *Tiers livre*, 87)  
'O, old man, the soldiers now Young and strong dishearten you, **certainly, but**  
your strength is resolute'

(c) Example of recent uses of *certes* (2011):

- (60) En quelques mois, quelques semaines, je couche avec quatre femmes qui,  
chacune à sa manière, m'aiment. Femmes fantômes **certes, mais** elles ont  
leur mot à dire sur moi. (Dobrovsky, *Un homme de passage*, 149)  
'In a few months, weeks, I sleep with four women, each of whom loves me  
in her own way. Ghost women, **to be sure, but** they all have something to say  
about me.'

(d) Example of early uses of *certes* (1515):

- (61) **Certes**, je ne sçay, dit l'oste, **mais** à mon advis il me semble que se sont trois  
Alleemens. (Vigneulles, *Les Cent Nouvelles nouvelles*, 25).  
'Surely, I don't know, says the host, **but** in my opinion it seems to me that  
they are three Germans.'

(d) Example of recent uses of *certes* (1989):

- (62) Personne ne pourra savoir si j'ai ou non tiré. **Certes**, il manquera un trou dans  
la cible, **mais** ce sera parce que je l'aurai ratée. (Juliet, *L'Année de l'éveil*, 269)  
'Nobody will be able to know if I shot or not. **Certainly**, a hole will be missing  
on the target, **but** that will be because I'd missed.'

This brief overview of the occurrences of *certes* shows that before the 19th century, unlike *soit*, it is always used with an assertion. The assertion can be reduced to *oui* or *non* from the earliest occurrences to the most recent:

- (63) Nicot: Et pourquoy? ne cognoit il pas mieux que le medecin ce qui luy est bon,  
et ce qu'il pourroit bien manger?  
Aubert: **Non certes**. (Brués (1557) *Les Dialogues de Guy de Brués* [...], 272)  
'Nicot: And why? Doesn't he know better than the doctor what is good for  
him, what he might eat?  
Aubert: No, **certainly not**.'
- (64) Ai-je même le droit de demander la Vérité, si je considère cette vérité comme  
un gain? **Non certes**. Si cette Vérité devient pour moi quelque chose dont je  
puisse tirer vanité? Non, non. (Queneau, *Journaux 1914-1965*, 475)  
'Do I have the right to the Truth, if I consider this truth a benefit? **Certainly**  
**not**. If this Truth becomes for me something that I can take pride in? No, no.'

The regular concessive sequence, *certes p, mais q*, occurs already in the 16th century (see (61)). In this respect too, *certes* is different from *soit*, since the latter occurs in regular concessive structures only in the 19th century (see (52)). In more recent uses (from the 19th century) *certes* can occur as an autonomous constituent to express a dialogic agreement (see (55)). In approximate the same period, it can be found followed directly by *mais* (see (57)).

These observations correspond exactly to what is assumed in the diachronic analysis of Rodríguez Somolinos (1995): *certes* is equivalent to *certainement*, differing from it on account of the frequency of the uses where it is combined with *mais*. The co-occurrence *certainement + mais* is ten times less frequent than that of *certes + mais*, but it is as old (from the 16th century).<sup>6</sup> Such functioning is consistent with its adverbial lexical source. As pointed out by Ghezzi in Chapter 2, markers that are derived from adverbs ‘seem to be more related to discourse structuring values’. The occurrence of *certes* in monologic structure in prior uses may be the result of its adverbial origin. However, whichever their original tendency, both *soit* and *certes* have acquired uses that cancel it: *soit* has developed monologic uses and *certes* dialogic ones.

### 13.8 Synthesis of diachronic perspective

It seems then that there is no evolution in the meaning of these markers, but rather an evolution in the way they are used in discourse. The monologic use is prior to the dialogic one for *certes*; the contrary for *soit*. This is due to their core meanings: *certes* is a sentence adverbial serving to strengthen an assertion, and *soit* is an illocutionary adverb serving to express an agreement. The development involves their exploitation in discourse: a dialogic adverb (such as *soit*) tends to be used in a monologic way, and a monologic one such as *certes* tends to be used dialogically. Their concessive use is not the result of an evolution in their meaning, but the result of their integration in one peculiar discourse configuration which corresponds to the definition given for the concessive interpretation illustrated by (6).

### 13.9 Conclusion

The concessive value of a discourse results from a contrast between content presented as previously conceived and thus accepted, and content presented as endorsed. The correlate markers help to access this interpretation, by giving to *p* the status of already conceived for the first marker (*certes, en effet, effectivement,*

<sup>6</sup> e.g. in response to the search for *certes, mais, and certainement, mais*, there are 844 occurrences in FRANTEXT for the former and 76 for the latter.

*d'accord, soit*) and the status of accepted for *p* and endorsed for *q* for the second marker (usually *mais*). None of the markers can be considered as in itself conveying a concessive value, but any one of them helps it to emerge, by assigning to *p* and *q* the right discourse status.

The markers introducing the *p* sequence differ, on the one hand, in relation to the illocutionary or content level of the utterance to which they react and, on the other, in relation to the way they react to the information state expressed by the addressee's utterance. *Certes* indicates that information state represented by the previous utterance is obvious (probably because of its strengthening value), whereas *en effet* and *effectivement* indicate that the speaker shares the same information state. *D'accord* and *soit* react to the illocutionary force of the utterance.

The synchronic and diachronic analysis of these markers show that linguistic change is not only a question of pragmaticalization (including or not grammaticalization), but a wider phenomenon which relies *inter alia* on the stylistic habits of speakers—such as a seemingly recent one consisting in the colouring of a speaker's own discourse with dialogic features.

### 13.10 Appendix: French text sources

- Angot, Chirstine (1999). *L'inceste*. Paris: Librairie générale française.
- Baudelaire, Charles (1857). *Nouvelles histoires extraordinaires* [trad.], 1857. Paris: Gallimard.
- Hervé-Bazin, Jean-Pierre (1970). *L'école des pères*. Paris: Les Éd. du Seuil.
- Benoziglio, Jean-Luc (1980). *Cabinet portrait*. Paris: Éd. du Seuil.
- Bloy, Léon (1900). *Journal 1: Mon journal: 1896–1900*. Paris: Mercure de France.
- Brués, Guy de (1557). *Les Dialogues de Guy de Brués contre les nouveaux académiciens*. Baltimore: John Hopkins Press.
- Camus, Albert (1959). Dostoïevski, Fiodor Mikhaïlovitch, *Les Possédés* [adaptation], Paris: Gallimard.
- Carrère, Emmanuel (2007). *Un roman russe*. Paris: P.O.L.
- Chevrier, François-Antoine (1761). *Le Colporteur: histoire morale et critique*. London: J. Nourse, s.d..
- Condillac, Etienne Bonnot de (1776). *Le Commerce et le gouvernement considérés relativement l'un à l'autre: t. 2*. Amsterdam and Paris: Jombert et Collot.
- D'Eaubonne, Françoise (1980). *L'indicateur du réseau: contre-mémoires*. Paris: Encre.
- De Gaulle, Charles (1970). *Le Renouveau (1958–1962)*. Paris: Plon.
- Dobrovsky, Serge (2011). *Un homme de passage*. B. Grasset.
- Garat, Anne-Marie (2010). *Pease à demain*. Arles: Actes Sud.
- Gibeau, Yves (1952). *Allons z'enfants*. Paris: Calmann-Levy.
- Hugo, Victor (1862 [1881]). *Les Misérables*. Paris: Laffont.
- Hugo, Victor (1867). *Théâtre en liberté: Mangeront-ils?*. Paris: Laffont.
- Hugo, Victor (1885). *Choses vues*. Paris: Laffont.
- Juliet, Charles (1989). *L'Année de l'éveil*. Paris: Gallimard.

- Lagarce, Jean-Luc (2007). *Journal 1977-1990*. Besançon: les Solitaires intempestifs.
- Lespinasse, Julie de (1776). *Lettres à M. de Guibert (1769-1776)*. Paris: Charpentier.
- Martin du Gard, Roger (1932). *Un taciturne*. Paris: Gallimard.
- Mersenne, P. Marin (1641). *Correspondance: t. 10: 1640-1641*. Paris: Éd. du CNRS.
- Milosz, Oscar (1910). *L'Amoureuse initiation*. Paris: Silvaire.
- Molière (1661). *L'École des maris*. Paris: Hachette.
- Molière (1663). *Dépit amoureux*. Paris: Hachette
- Piron, Alexis (1738). *La Mètromanie*, Paris: Garnier.
- Queneau, Raymond (1940). *Journaux 1914-1965*. Paris: Gallimard.
- Rabelais, François (1552). *Tiers livre*. Paris: Champion.
- Roubaud, Jacques (1997). *Mathématique: récit*. Paris: Les Éd. du Seuil
- Roubaud, Jacques (2006). *Nous, les Moins-que-Rien, Fils aînés de Personne: 12 (+ 1) autobiographies*. Paris: Fayard.
- Sabatier, Robert (1985). *David et Olivier*. Paris: Albin Michel.
- Sand, George (1831). *Correspondance: 1831*. Paris: Garnier.
- Schreiber, Boris (1996). *Un silence d'environ une demi-heure*. Paris: Le Cherche Midi.
- Triolet, Elsa (1945). *Le Premier accroc coûte deux cents francs*. Paris: Denoël.
- Vigneulles, Philippe (1515). *Les Cent Nouvelles nouvelles*. Geneva: Droz.
- Yourcenar, Marguerite (1988). *Le Labyrinthe du monde: III Quoi? L'Éternité*. Paris: Gallimard.