On the grammaticalization of ('t) *schijnt* 'it seems' as an evidential particle in colloquial Belgian Dutch¹

Julie Van Bogaert & Timothy Coleman
Ghent University

Comparing ('t) *schijnt* to (zo) *schijnt het* (lit. 'so seems it'), the parenthetical use of the verb *schijnen* 'seem', we argue that ('t) *schijnt* is best analysed as an evidential particle. Although both parenthetical and particle uses of *schijnen* have been subject to particulization, viz. grammaticalization towards particlehood, this grammaticalization path is bifurcated; while ('t) *schijnt* is best accounted for by the matrix clause hypothesis, (zo) *schijnt het* fits the parataxis hypothesis and is less grammaticalized, not having reached particle status yet. The possible further grammaticalization of (zo) *schijnt het* into a more particle-like element is discussed on the basis of recent developments in Netherlandic Dutch, suggesting that distinct grammaticalization paths may lead to similar outcomes. This study calls attention to the need to allow for a certain flexibility of categories when considering cases of grammaticalization such as those affecting *schijnen*, bearing in mind that each individual instance of ('t) *schijnt* or (zo) *schijnt het* can be more or less central to the idealized categories of matrix clause, parenthetical or particle.

Keywords: grammaticalization; particles; parentheticals; Dutch; evidentiality

1. Introduction

This article is concerned with ('t) *schijnt* 'it seems', an evidential expression in colloquial Belgian Dutch. This particular use of the Dutch verb *schijnen* 'seem', exemplified in (1), has hitherto not received any attention in

¹ The authors wish to thank the editor of *Folia Linguistica*, Hubert Cuyckens, and two anonymous reviewers for their constructive comments on an earlier version of this article.

the literature. In comparing *schijnen* to its German cognate *scheinen*, for instance, de Haan (2007: 142) makes no mention of ('t) *schijnt*. Citing an example from Diewald (2001), he argues that *scheinen* is more grammaticalized than *schijnen* because German allows for a construction like (2) while, according to de Haan, there is no such use of *schijnen* in Dutch. The occurrence of constructions such as (1) in colloquial registers of Belgian Dutch clearly contradicts de Haan's position. This oversight on the part of de Haan, a native speaker of Netherlandic Dutch, is more than likely due to the fact that ('t) *schijnt* is a feature of informal Belgian Dutch.²

- (1) a. *Gij moest mij nog eens bellen 't schijnt.* (Corpus Gesproken Nederlands, CGN-VL)
'You were going to call me, I believe.'
- b. *ggg nee dat is dus schijnt echt de kelder dus van het Sint-Lucasinstituut* (CGN-VL)
'No so that is really, as I'm told, the cellar of St Luke's Institute.'
- (2) *Er ist, scheints, nicht zuhause.* (Diewald 2001: 99)
'He is, it seems, not at home.'

This article examines various grammaticalization paths of the verb of appearance *schijnen* and in particular compares the form ('t) *schijnt* to well-established parenthetical constructions with *schijnen*. It argues that ('t) *schijnt* should be regarded as an evidential particle rather than as a parenthetical, all the while recognizing both the flexibility of such categories and the existence of synchronic layers (Brems 2011) in the grammaticalization process of parenthetical and particle constructions with *schijnen*.

On the basis of data from the Corpus of Spoken Dutch (*Corpus Gesproken Nederlands*, CGN), a description of the structural and semantic features of ('t) *schijnt* will be presented which allows us to compare this expression with Dutch parentheticals. This study shows that, in spite of similarities in outcome of the grammaticalization from verb of appearance or cognition to parenthetical and eventually particle, a further refinement needs to be made within the grammaticalization path according to whether the grammaticalizing element behaves according to the matrix-clause hypothesis or the parataxis hypothesis.

² In Van Bogaert & Leuschner (forthcoming), the grammaticalization paths of Dutch ('t) *schijnt* and German *scheint*('s) are compared.

This article has the following structure. In Section 2, the two grammaticalization paths that have been described for verbs of appearance (i.e. English *seem*, *appear*, *turn out* and their equivalents in other languages) will be discussed, viz. auxiliatation and "particulization" (Schoonjans 2012). In the light of this, the characteristics of Dutch ('t) *schijnt* will be discussed in Section 3 and compared to parenthetical constructions with *schijnen* in terms of degrees and paths of grammaticalization. The conclusions are presented in Section 4.

2. Grammaticalization paths with verbs of appearance

For verbs of appearance such as *schijnen*, two grammaticalization paths have been described. One is the development of *schijnen* into an auxiliary-like evidential; the other is the grammaticalization of *schijnen* into an evidential particle. The following sections will introduce each of these developments.

2.1. Auxiliation

In the literature, the development of verbs of appearance in the Germanic languages into auxiliary-like elements, i.e. their auxiliatation (Kuteva 2001), has received considerable attention (de Haan 1999, 2007, Diewald 2001, Gisborne & Holmes 2007, Diewald & Smirnova 2010, Vliegen 2011a). Focussing on the use of these verbs in infinitival constructions, as in (3), such accounts tend to invoke grammaticalization (and subjectification) as explanatory principles.³ Indeed, in (3), *schijnen* does not function as a main verb but as a marker of evidentiality, which has scope over the entire sentence including the main verb *doen* 'do': *schijnen* qualifies the proposition

³ The infinitival construction is also referred to as a construction involving "(Subject-to-Subject) raising" (see van der Auwera & Noël 2011), which entails that in (3), the subject *zij* has been "raised" to the position of the matrix clause subject from the complement clause in the corresponding sentence with subject extraposition (i).

(i) *Het schijnt dat zij dat ieder jaar doen.*
'It seems that they do that every year.'

However, in order to stay clear of any transformational implications and because of Diewald & Smirnova's (2010) rejection of the diachronic development from complementation to raising (in German), the term "infinitival" will be used in this article.

“They do that every year.” In fact, as shown by the English glosses, *schijnen* can encode various evidential meanings ranging from inference (possibly based on direct perception) to hearsay (see also the discussion of the equivalent pattern with *scheinen* + *zu*-infinitive in German as a highly grammaticalized evidential construction in Diewald & Smirnova 2010).

- (3) *Zij schijnen dat ieder jaar te doen.* (CGN-VL)
 ‘They seem to do that every year.’/ ‘They are said to do that every year.’

The following is a brief diachronic account of the development of *schijnen* into an auxiliary-like evidential, based mainly on De Haan (1999) and Vliegen (2011a, 2011b). Most historical uses still occur in present-day Dutch; this coexistence of “older” and “newer” uses representing various stages along an item’s grammaticalization path has been referred to as “divergence” (Hopper 1991).⁴

Initially, *schijnen* was used as a fully lexical, intransitive verb meaning ‘to shine, to give off light’ and taking celestial bodies (4) and later also gems (5) as subjects. This meaning was then broadened to refer to physical objects becoming visible (6) (de Haan 1999: 81).

- (4) *Die mane scheen scone ende claer.* (de Haan 2007: 142)
 ‘The moon shone bright and clear.’
- (5) *een carbonkelsteen, die so claer omtrent hem sceen* (Vliegen 2011a: 126; 2011b: 232)
 ‘a carbuncle that shone so brightly’ (lit. ‘that shone so clear around’)
- (6) *haer arme, . . . , haer been, haer hooft, daer bloet dor sceen* (de Haan 1999: 81)
 ‘her arms, her leg, her head, where blood was visible’

The next step consisted in attributing a particular property (e.g. “holiness”) to a person or entity (7). While this attribution was initially based on (vis-

⁴ Many scholars refer to this phenomenon as “layering” (Hopper 1991), although this interpretation does not conform to Hopper’s definition of layering. For Hopper, “layering” refers to “the prominent fact that very often more than one technique is available in a language to serve similar or even identical functions. This formal diversity comes about because when a form or set of forms emerges in a functional domain, it does not immediately (and may never) replace an already existing set of functionally equivalent forms, but rather the two sets of forms co-exist” (1991: 23), while divergence entails that “when a lexical form undergoes grammaticalization, for example to an auxiliary, clitic or affix, the original form may remain as an autonomous lexical element and undergo the same changes as any other lexical items. The Principle of Divergence results in pairs or multiples of forms having a common etymology, but diverging functionally” (1991: 24).

ual) perception of a person or thing, *schijnen* lost even more of its connection to the visual world and came to denote an impression that need not be based on sensory observation (8).

- (7) *nonne die ooc heilich scinen* (de Haan 1999: 81)
'nuns who also appear holy'
- (8) *ende hoe selke altoes schinen dolende* (Vliegen 2011a: 127)
'and how such (people) always seem to wander'

This abstract, evidential meaning can be realized by three different constructions: a copular construction (7)–(8), a biclausal construction consisting of an impersonal matrix clause with the dummy subject *het* 'it' and a finite complement clause introduced by the complementizer *dat* 'that' functioning as an extraposed subject (9), and an infinitival construction (with the infinitival particle *te* in present-day Dutch, but occasionally with a bare infinitive in older language stages) (9).

- (9) *De naem van desen mantel is ypocrisie ende is gheuoert mit vellen van vossen al schijntet van buyten datse mit lammeren geuoert is.* (Vliegen 2011b: 236)
'The name of this coat is hypocrisy and it is lined with fox skins although it seems from the outside that it is lined with lambskin.'
- (10) *Nochtan waren fonteynen niet verre vanden mueren daer die poorters scenen te sceppen heymelijc watere.* (Vliegen 2011a: 128)
'However, there were wells not far from the walls where the burghers seemed to secretly take water.'

It is as yet not fully clear how these different evidential constructions relate to each other diachronically. The infinitival construction exemplified in (3) and (10) is generally taken to represent the most advanced stage in the verb's auxiliatization process, but there is less agreement on its source construction: whereas De Haan (1999) assumes that the infinitival construction has developed from the complement-taking construction in (9), Vliegen (2011b) and Duinhoven (1997: 161–164) rather argue that the infinitival construction emerged from the copular construction in (7) and (8) – which is also the grammaticalization path hypothesized for German *scheinen* in Diewald (2001: 101) – while van der Horst (2008: 669–670) remains agnostic on this issue. The details of this discussion need not concern us here, however, as the present article does not aim to further document the path travelled by *schijnen* on its way to evidential auxiliarihood,

but rather focusses on a different grammaticalization path, which post-dates the rise of evidential meanings in *schijnen*, viz. the particulization of ('t) *schijnt*.

2.2. Particulization

Besides the auxiliiation path, verbs of appearance like *schijnen* have followed an alternative grammaticalization path resulting in the emergence of evidential parentheticals and, going even further down the grammaticalization cline, evidential particles. Schoonjans (2012) refers to this grammaticalization process from verb to particle as particulization. The two paths distinguished for verbs of appearance like *schijnen* are in line with the two grammaticalization paths for cognitive verbs distinguished by Nuyts (2000) and Taverniers (to appear). On the one hand, verbs such as *schijnen* may grammaticalize into operator-like elements, viz. auxiliaries, and on the other hand they may come to be used as free-floating elements with an adverb-like distribution, viz. parentheticals and particles. Particles are short – often monosyllabic – words which are prosodically and syntactically integrated and do not carry stress (Weydt 1969, van der Auwera & Vandeweghe 1984, Helbig 1994, Aijmer & Simon-Vandenbergen 2003). Being devoid of lexical content, they can generally be omitted without affecting the propositional content or grammaticality of a construction (Weydt & Ehlers 1987, Helbig 1994). Schoonjans (2012) points out that some particles have developed from parentheticals. Burton-Roberts (2006: 179) defines a parenthetical (P) as “an expression of which it can be argued that, while in some sense ‘hosted’ by another expression (H), P makes no contribution of the structure of H”. The syntactic relation of parentheticals to their host clause is somewhat ambivalent; they are related to their host clause by linear adjacency without having a syntagmatic link to it (Kaltenböck 2005: 21). Their function is to add a speaker-based comment to the host clause. Strictly speaking, only medial occurrences are parenthetical in the true sense of the word, but in the literature, clause-final and even clause-initial uses are often included in the definition (cf. Kaltenböck 2007). The type of parenthetical we are concerned with in this study can be specified as a comment clause (Quirk et al. 1985: 1112–1118, Biber et al. 1999: 197). Comment clauses have a corresponding non-parenthetical use in which they function as the matrix clause in a complementation structure (Huddleston & Pullum 2002: 895).

In Section 3 we detail how *schijnen* has evolved towards particlehood following two distinct particulization paths, one of which can be accounted for by the matrix clause hypothesis and the other by what we will call the parataxis hypothesis. Here, we outline how these hypotheses first introduced in the development of epistemic parentheticals from epistemic verbs (such as *think*) may inform, and extend to, the development of verbs of appearance and of Dutch *schijnen* in particular.

2.2.1. *The matrix clause hypothesis*

In their seminal work on English parentheticals such as *I think*, *I guess* and *I believe*, Thompson & Mulac (1991a, 1991b) distinguish increasing degrees of grammaticalization, as illustrated by *I think in* (11) to (13) (from Thompson & Mulac 1991a: 313):

- (11) I think that we're definitely moving towards being more technological.
- (12) I think ∅ exercise is really beneficial, to anybody.
- (13) It's just your point of view you know what you like to do in your spare time I think.

In (11), *I think* makes up a matrix clause introducing a complement clause by means of the complementizer *that*. The sentence in (12) is an example of zero complementation, which is considered to be indicative of the reanalysis of a bi-clausal into a monoclausal structure, whereby *I think* acts as an epistemic phrase or "fragment" (Thompson 2002) providing an epistemic evaluation of the ensuing proposition rather than functioning as the subject and verb of a matrix clause denoting a spatiotemporally locatable act of "thinking" (see also Verhagen's 2005 theory of the intersubjective semantics of complementation constructions, which attributes a primarily evaluating or perspectivizing function to several subtypes of matrix clauses). In its most grammaticalized use (13), *I think* is used as an epistemic parenthetical in medial or, as in example (13), final position.⁵ Thompson & Mulac's corpus study adds support to the idea that frequency of occurrence promotes grammaticalization (Bybee & Hopper 2001; Haspelmath 2002;

⁵ In this respect, Thompson & Mulac (1991b: 315) point out that the "epistemic verbs together with their subjects behave very much like unitary epistemic morphemes in other languages, to the point of being 'transportable' to positions other than that which they would occupy if they were only functioning to introduce a complement".

Bybee 2003); it is the most frequently used subject–verb combinations that tend to occur most often with the zero complementizer and it is these sequences that account for the largest share of parenthetical occurrences. Note that while the development of *I think* may not be a “textbook case” of grammaticalization (it involves a phrase rather than a lexical item, and is characterized by little or no phonetic and/or morphological reduction in the written language), it can be argued to have the necessary properties. As Thompson & Mulac (1991b: 324) point out, *I think* undergoes a process where a lexical phrase comes to be used as a distinct category with a more restricted meaning and with a more constrained morphosyntactic coding.

An oft-cited example of advanced grammaticalization along the path suggested by the matrix clause hypothesis is the evidential particle *glo* in Afrikaans. Deriving from Dutch *geloof ik* (lit. ‘believe I’), the parenthetical *glo ek* was phonetically and morphologically reduced to *glo’k* and ultimately the cliticized subject was elided altogether, resulting in the evidential monomorphemic element *glo* (Thompson & Mulac 1991b: 318, de Haan 1999: 83, 2001: 6–7, Boye & Harder 2009: 19).

- (14) *Sy boeke was glo baie populêr vroeër.* (de Haan 2001)
 ‘His books are said to have been very popular before.’

From the point of view of grammaticalization, the reduction of *glo ek* to *glo* involves “phonological attrition” or “erosion” as well as “coalescence”, i.e. an increase in bondedness (Lehmann 1985: 307–308). Attrition has both a formal (phonological) and a semantic dimension. Semantically, the concrete (lexical) meaning of “holding a conviction” expressed by the full verb *glo/geloven* is “bleached” (Traugott 1982, Sweetser 1988, Traugott 1988) to the abstract (grammatical) meaning of marking indirect evidence. Formally, advanced cases of grammaticalization, such as the deverbalization of *glo* into a particle (de Haan 2001: 12), are characterized by morphological degeneration and result in monosegmental elements (Lehmann 1985: 307). *Glo* thus meets de Haan’s (1999: 75, our italics) definition of an evidential as “a *morpheme* which shows the source of evidence a speaker has for his or her utterance”. According to Ponelis’s (1991: 307) grammar of Afrikaans, *glo* has become the unmarked “hearsay” qualifier in present-day Afrikaans.

A parallel development to Afrikaans *glo* has been documented in German, notably in southern varieties, where parenthetical *glaube ich* (lit. ‘believe I’) is not only reduced to *glaub’ ich*, but also to *glaub(e)*, as in (15) (Imo 2011, Schoonjans 2012). This shows that although in English, the particulization of *I think*-type matrix clauses has not progressed beyond the

parenthetical stage, this grammaticalization path has the potential to go even further into particlehood. This is also what happened to ('t) *schijnt*, as will be demonstrated.

- (15) *Also wär ich erwachsen, dann würde ich das glaub kaufen.* (Schoonjans 2012: 783)
'So if I were an adult, I would I believe buy it.'

Both Imo (2011) and Schoonjans (2012) emphasize the indeterminacy of *glaub(e)* constructions; they are situated somewhere in between the idealized categories of parentheticals, modal adverbs and modal particles and their exact position in this "continuous space" (Schoonjans 2012) depends on the context of use of the individual occurrence.

Thompson & Mulac's usage-based model for the emergence of *I think*-type parentheticals is commonly referred to as the "matrix clause hypothesis" (Brinton 2008: 36) seeing that it posits the matrix clause use of *I think* and similar expressions as the source construction for later parenthetical uses. Heller & Howe (2008) extend this hypothesis from verbs of cognition like *think* and *suppose* to the English verbs of appearance *seem*, *appear* and *turn out*. In (16)–(18) it is illustrated how the construction with obligatory subject extraposition can be regarded as the starting point for the grammaticalization of parenthetical *it seems*, and by extension *it appears* and *it turns out*.

- (16) It seems that there is no other way for me to get your attention.
(17) Suddenly it seems humans are encountering mountain lions from Texas to Canada.
(18) It's a nation ravaged by chaotic civil war and in this war, it seems, anything goes. (Heller & Howe 2008)

Although erosion of the subject may affect *I think*-type parentheticals (Van Bogaert 2010: 408–409), especially in spoken registers, this phenomenon is more prevalent with appearance verb parentheticals, probably due to the subject *it* being impersonal and thus referentially empty. The newspaper data used in Heller & Howe (2008) and Howe & Heller (2010) show that this "*it*-deletion" is not restricted to spoken English.⁶

⁶ Although Heller & Howe's (2008) data did not contain any cases of subject omission in non-initial position, the following internet example shows that parenthetical *it turns out* may also omit the subject *it*.

- (i) *Jamie is a bit of a nerd herself when it comes to nutrition, turns out.* (<http://www.bodybuilding.com>, last accessed 15 November 2011)

- (19) In four of the six movies he had roles in last year, Jude Law played the kind of man who cheats. Turns out they weren't much of a stretch. (Heller & Howe 2008)

2.2.2. *The parataxis hypothesis*

Although according to Palander-Collin (1999) there is diachronic evidence for the emergence of parenthetical *I think* following the matrix clause hypothesis, Thompson & Mulac's model has been contested by historical linguists. Brinton (1996: 246–254) observes that Thompson & Mulac's (1991) three structures, viz. complementation with *that* (11), without *that* (12) and parenthetical uses (13), all occur in Middle English. On the basis of quantitative evidence from Middle English, she calls the diachronic development implied by the matrix clause hypothesis into question. Brinton adduces two characteristics of Middle English epistemic parentheticals as evidence for a different syntactic development. First, she points to the occurrence of parentheticals containing a demonstrative or personal pronoun that anaphorically refers to the host clause.

- (20) *He took me certeyn gold, that woot I weel.* (Brinton 1996: 249)
'He gave me a certain amount of gold, that I know well.'

A second construction providing evidence against the matrix clause hypothesis is the use of parentheticals beginning with *as* and *so*.

- (21) *for thrittene is a covent, as I gesse.* (Brinton 1996: 250)
'for thirteen is a convent, as I guess' [= 'which I guess']

Brinton considers both types of parentheticals as part of the same development and proposes a model starting with a sentential relative clause with *this/that* as a postposed relative pronoun. As can be seen below, the loose connection between the appositional relative clause and its host can be interpreted as a case of parataxis. In Middle English, a wider variety of relative pronouns began to be used, including *it*, *thereof*, *as* and *so*. Next, either the anaphoric form was lost, giving rise to forms like *I gesse* or *I suppose*, or *as* grammaticalized as a subordinator introducing an adverbial clause. This grammaticalization allowed the parentheticals to become syntactically mobile. When used clause-initially, a form like *I think* below is ambiguous between being a parenthetical and a matrix clause with zero complementizer. Seeing that in Brinton's (1996) alternative proposal, the starting point is a paratactic construction with an anaphoric element, it will

be dubbed the "parataxis hypothesis". On this view, unlike in Thompson & Mulac's model, the matrix clause use of *I think* is a later development rather than the source construction of the parenthetical use.

Stage I: *They are poisonous*. That I think.

Stage II: *They are poisonous*, {that I think, I think that/it, as/so I think}.
= 'which I think'

Stage III: *They are poisonous*, I think or

They are poisonous, as I think = 'as far as I think, probably'

Stage IV: I think, *they are poisonous*. *They are*, I think, *poisonous*.

(Brinton 1996: 252)

Fischer's (2007) account of the historical origins of English parentheticals largely coincides with Brinton's. While Fischer holds that *as I think* should not be analysed as a relative clause, it is still paratactic, with *as* functioning as an adverbial derived from an anaphoric demonstrative pronoun. However, due to a lack of extant data, it is difficult to conclusively ascertain the validity of either one of the rivalling hypotheses.⁷ In the following section, we will evaluate the applicability of the matrix clause and parataxis hypotheses to ('t) *schijnt* and other particulized constructions with *schijnen*.

3. ('t) *Schijnt* in (Belgian) Dutch

3.1. Data

For this study, the Corpus of Spoken Dutch (*Corpus Gesproken Nederlands*, CGN) was used, containing data from both the Netherlands (CGN-NL) and Belgium (CGN-VL). In all, the CGN contains 9 million words, just over a third of which are Belgian Dutch (CGN-VL). As a first step, we extracted the particle-like uses of ('t) *schijnt* illustrated in (1a) and (1b) above, through a lexical query for the string *schijnt*. Manual inspection of the results generated 34 examples; 32 of these are drawn from the Belgian component of the

⁷ As for the diachronic validity of the matrix clause hypothesis and specifically the purported increase in zero complementation, which, according to the matrix clause hypothesis facilitates parenthetical use, Shank, Van Bogaert & Plevoets (to appear) and Van Bogaert, Shank & Plevoets (to appear) examine the diachrony of *that/zero* complementizer alternation by means of logistic regression analysis. These studies show that except for *guess*, the cognitive verbs examined exhibit a gradual decrease in zero use over time.

corpus, which confirms that we are dealing with a feature that is typical of Belgian Dutch.⁸ As a next step, we extracted *all* forms of the verb *schijnen* from the Belgian part of the corpus, in order to get a sense of the range of (verbal as well as particulizing) uses of *schijnen* in this language variety and of their relative frequencies. This resulted in 397 occurrences, 15 of which were discarded because they were structurally incomplete, that is to say false starts and unfinished utterances, which were impossible to classify. In what follows, we will first give an overview of the frequency distributions of the various constructions with *schijnen* in the corpus, we will focus on the properties of the 382 tokens of *schijnen*, examine how ('t) *schijnt* differs from prototypical Dutch parentheticals with *schijnen* and assess the applicability of the matrix clause and parataxis hypotheses to the two types of constructions.

3.2. Structural patterns with *schijnen*

Table 1 presents the frequency distribution of *schijnen* in the Belgian component of the CGN. By far the most frequently used construction is the one with subject extraposition (n=129 or 33.8%), followed by the infinitival construction (n=79 or 20.7%), illustrated in (22) and (23) respectively.

- (22) 't *Schijnt* dat dat 't beste hout is. (CGN-VL)
'It seems that that's the best wood.'
- (23) *uh* dat *schijnt* een soort natuurpark te zijn (CGN-VL)
'Uh that seems to be some sort of a nature reserve.'

Third in frequency is the adverbial construction *naar het schijnt* 'as it seems' (n=68 or 17.8%). The majority of these (n=31 or 45.6%) occur in medial position, as in (24), followed by clause-initial uses (n=23 or 33.8%), which, like all sentence-initial adverbials in Dutch, require inverted word order in the ensuing clause (25). As for the internal structure of the string *naar het schijnt*, *naar* can be analysed as a (now rather archaic) conjunction. As such, *naar het schijnt* is a subordinate clause that corresponds to the *as I think/as it seems* parenthetical pattern proposed as Stage 3 in the parataxis

⁸ In addition, the Netherlandic Dutch data contain a number of occurrences that look like sentence-final ('t) *schijnt* with complete erosion of the subject, as in (i), but further down in this article, it will be argued that this is a different kind of *schijnen*.

(i) *ja want uh zij is zwanger schijnt* (CGN-NL)
'Yes because uh she is pregnant, I'm told.'

Table 1. Constructions with *schijnen* in CGN-VL

Construction type	N	%
Extrapolation	129	33.8
Infinitival	79	20.7
<i>Naar</i>	68	17.8
Intransitive	41	10.7
Particle	32	8.4
Reply	15	3.9
Copula	9	2.3
Parenthetical	6	1.6
Particle/copula	2	0.5
<i>Naar</i> /extrapolation	1	0.3
Unclear	2	0.5
TOTAL	382	100

hypothesis (see Section 2.1.2). However, for the current analysis, *naar het schijnt* in present-day Dutch will be assigned to a specific adverbial subcategory rather than being included in a more comprehensive parenthetical category, the main arguments for this analysis being the aforementioned ability to occur clause-initially and the use of inversion when occurring in this position.

- (24) *want die zijn naar 't schijnt heel goed ook hè* (CNG-VL)
'because those are also supposed to be really good, aren't they'
- (25) *het uh naar het schijnt was was 't een wispelturig kind en in en in geen enkel opzicht briljant* (CNG-VL)
'Apparently it was a fickle child and not in any way brilliant.'

Fourth in frequency (n=41 or 10.7%) is the intransitive use of *schijnen* as a full verb meaning 'to shine'. The particle use, ('t) *schijnt*, is the fifth most frequent construction (n=32 or 8.4%). The next constructional type is the independent use of 't *schijnt* as a reply to a previous speaker's turn (26). This aligning use is often preceded or followed by other markers of concurrence, notably *ja* 'yes' and *hè* (corresponding to a tag question in English); this type of ('t) *schijnt* thus has scope over a previous speaker's utterance. In (26), ('t) *schijnt* provides an evidential modification of the preceding claim that "it was beautiful"; the second speaker indicates that s/he shares this opinion on the basis of hearsay evidence. This aligning use of ('t) *schijnt* is assigned to a separate category because particles cannot usually carry the

kind of informational and phonological prominence that this independent use entails. If we do consider this “follow-up” use (Andersen 2001, Van Bogaert 2006) as instantiations of the particle use of (*t*) *schijnt*, the number of particle tokens amounts to 47 (12.3%) instead of 32 (8.4%). Note as well that this type of (*t*) *schijnt* has not been classified with the extraposition uses in view of the absence of a notional subject taking the form of a complement clause.

- (26) *'t Was mooi. – Ja 't schijnt. (CGN-VL)*
 ‘It was beautiful. – Yes, so I’ve heard.’

The copular use of *schijnen*, as in (27), accounts for 2.3% of the data. Six tokens (1.6%) can be classified as parentheticals (28); its characteristics will be elucidated in Section 3.4 and compared to those of (*t*) *schijnt*. Finally, a number of occurrences are amalgamations of two constructions; at first sight, (29) is a copular construction, but that construction would require *ze* ‘she’, rather than the impersonal *'t*, to encode the female referent, so we may be dealing with a kind of ellipsis here ([*ze is*] *'t schijnt nochtans een goei*).⁹

- (27) *Snoep kiezen scheen moeilijk behalve voor mij. (CGN-VL)*
 ‘Picking candy seemed difficult, except for me.’
- (28) *Achter in den hof ligt er nog nen dooie schijnt het meneer de rechter. (CGN-VL)*
 ‘In the backyard there’s another dead body they say your honour.’
- (29) *'t schijnt nochtans een goei (CGN-VL)*
 ‘She’s supposed to be good though.’

In all of the constructions listed, except in the intransitive ‘shine’ use of *schijnen*, an evidential meaning is present, i.e. the marking of a source of information on the basis of which the speaker makes his/her assertion (see Willett 1988). *Schijnen* is chiefly used as a hearsay evidential, indicating that the speaker is reporting what s/he has heard from others. *Schijnen* as a copula, then, often denotes an inference based on direct observation, which sometimes has the implication of a false impression (30). Infinitival *schijnen* may also express an inferential meaning; in (31), the speaker comes to

⁹ An anonymous reviewer suggests that the use of *'t* to refer to a female referent may be a case of impersonalization rather than being the result of amalgamation, in which case we would be dealing with a straightforward example of the copula construction.

the conclusion, on the basis of his observation of the host's drinking, that the host is no longer paying attention to the count's stories. From the CGN data, it appears that infinitival *schijnen* with an inferential meaning is typical of more formal and written styles.¹⁰ This purported effect of genre and register, however, as well as possible regional differences in the range of evidential meanings of *schijnen* (Belgium vs. the Netherlands), falls outside the scope of the present article. In any case, the alternation between a hearsay and inferential meaning does not affect ('t) *schijnt*, which is consistently used as a hearsay evidential. In (32), ('t) *schijnt* marks the news about Ellen's stay in hospital as hearsay information, which is subsequently specified as coming from Wouter.

- (30) *Die pad gaat op haar poten staan gaat een dreighouding aannemen schijnt groot maar is niet groter. (CGN-VL)*
 'That toad gets up on its hind legs, assumes a threatening pose, seems big but isn't any bigger.'
- (31) *De gastheer bediende zich zo gretig van de Verdicchio-wijn dat hij de verhalen van de graaf na enige tijd nog nauwelijks scheen te volgen. (CGN-VL)*
 'The host helped himself to the Verdicchio wine so avidly that after a while he hardly seemed to be following the count's stories.'
- (32) *En uhm Ellen die heeft nen tijd in 't ziekenhuis gelegen 't schijnt. Dat heeft Wouter toen nog gezegd. (CGN-VL)*
 'And uhm Ellen was in hospital for a long time, I believe. Wouter told me that.'

3.3. ('t) *Schijnt* and the matrix clause hypothesis

3.3.1. Degrees of particulization

By analogy to English (Thompson & Mulac 1991b, Heller & Howe 2008) and German (Imo 2011, Schoonjans 2012), and consistent with the matrix clause hypothesis, we can distinguish three uses of ('t) *schijnt*, each taking up a position on a grammaticalization cline from matrix clause to evidential particle.

- (33) *'t schijnt dat dat 't beste hout is (CGN-VL)*
 'It seems that that's the best wood.'

¹⁰ The Corpus of Spoken Dutch contains 625,000 words of written texts that are read aloud.

- (34) *'t is voor een goed doel 't schijnt* (CGN-VL)
'It's for a good cause it seems.'
- (35) *maar die moet 't schijnt ook wel uh vrij vlot Nederlands gesproken hebben* (CGN-VL)
'But he must have, as I've heard, spoken Dutch quite fluently.'

In line with the matrix clause hypothesis, the extraposition construction, as in (33), is posited as the source construction for particulized uses. Proceeding further along the grammaticalization cline, a problem arises for the Dutch analogue of English matrix clauses without a complementizer, as in (12). Indeed, a notable difference between Dutch and English, and also between Dutch and German, resides in the use of the complementizer *dat* 'that'. In contemporary Dutch, unlike in English, zero complementation is not readily acceptable.¹¹ In German, complement-taking predicates introducing complement clauses without an overt complementizer are not uncommon. Auer's (1998, cited in Imo 2011) term for such complement clauses, viz. "abhängiger Hauptsatz" (dependent main clause), captures their ambiguous status: the complement clause takes main clause word order, as in (36). In such sentences, Imo (2011: 167) argues, the complement clause is syntactically no longer dependent on the matrix clause and this type of *ich glaub(e)* is indeterminate between matrix clause and discourse marker status. Although present-day Dutch does not readily allow for this type of complementation pattern with *schijnen*, it can be attested in earlier stages of Dutch, as examples (37) and (38), taken from Vliegen's (2011a, 2011b) sixteenth-century data, show.

- (36) *Ich glaube, es wird heute regnen.* (Imo 2011: 167)
'I think it will rain today.'
- (37) *'t Scheen, Iupiter wilde ons daar ellendig vernielen.* (Vliegen 2011b: 236)
'It seemed, Jupiter wanted to miserably destroy us there.'

¹¹ Dutch grammars do distinguish a pattern in which a complement clause (with main clause word order) is combined with a matrix clause without a complementizer, but this so-called *semi-direct speech construction* is only rarely found with the matrix clause *preceding* the complement clause (as in i), as opposed to the much more frequent pattern with the matrix clause following the complement clause (as in ii) (Haeseryn et al. 1997: 1099):

- (i) *Hij zei, hij verkoos Londen boven Parijs.*
'He said, he preferred London to Paris.'
- (ii) *Hij verkoos Londen boven Parijs, zei hij.*
'He preferred London to Paris, he said.'

- (38) *Tschijndt sy sijn vol liefden /en charitateni.* (Vliegen 2011a: 129)
'It seems they are full of love and charity.'

In the CGN-VL data, two instances of initial ('t) *schijnt* followed by a "complement clause" with main clause word order can be found, as in (39). Significantly, the only two examples of 't *schijnt* retrieved from the Netherlandic component of the corpus are also of this type.

- (39) *ja want 't schijnt te veel vitaminen worden toch afgebroken in uw lichaam*
hé (CGN-VL)
'Yes because I've heard that excess vitamins are broken down in your body anyway.'
- (40) *met die overstroming natuurlijk want 't schijnt duizenden mensen zitten d*
zitten d'r uh vast in bomen en zo (CGN-NL)
'Because of that flood of course, as I'm told that thousands of people are trapped in trees and stuff.'

While these two cases were included in the total of 32 particle instances of ('t) *schijnt* reported in Table 1 above, they represent an initial stage of particulization. Following Imo (2011), the use illustrated in (39) and (40) can be analysed as being a hybrid between matrix clause and discourse marker and can thus be situated just to the right of the matrix clause pole on the cline from matrix clause to particle.¹²

Attested much more frequently in the CGN-VL data is the clause-final use of ('t) *schijnt* illustrated in (32) and (34) above, which accounts for 15 out of the 32 particle instances. In the literature on Dutch word order, the clause is usually analysed in terms of three topological fields, defined on the basis of the position of the finite and non-finite verbs (= the left bracket and the right bracket, respectively). In main clauses, what comes before the finite verb, i.e. the subject or another topicalized element, is called the *front field*. The *middle field* is the part of the clause between the two verb positions and the *end field* is the part of the clause following the right bracket. There are additional fields for extra-clausal participants to the left and the right of the clause proper, viz. left-dislocation and right-dislocation. In embedded clauses, all verbs are grouped in the right bracket, the left bracket is filled by the subordinator, and there is no front field (see e.g. Zwart 2011: 33–79 for an elaborate English-language introduction to the topological structure of

¹² Discourse markers can be defined as "sequentially dependent elements which bracket units of talk" (Schiffrin 1987: 31) and serve pragmatic, i.e. interpersonal and textual, functions (Imo 2011: 172).

the Dutch clause; see also Haeseryn et al. 1997: 1221–1400 for an even more extensive discussion). Placed on the periphery of the clause, the use of (*t*) *schijnt* as in (32) above can be regarded as syntactically rather unintegrated. Prosodically, however, all fifteen occurrences of clause-final (*t*) *schijnt* are part of the intonation domain of their host clause, being latched onto it without a pause and exhibiting no pitch movement, which means that (*t*) *schijnt* is in end position rather than being right-dislocated (on the difference between both positions, see also van der Wouden 2009). Thus, our data did not contain any examples of what Imo (2011: 178) refers to as an “incremental discourse marker”, which has its own tone contour and has been defined by Ford (2002) as a

nonmain-clause continuation after a possible point of turn completion. That is, an increment will be defined here as any nonmain-clause continuation of a speaker’s turn after that speaker has come to what could have been a completion point, or a ‘transition-relevance place’, based on prosody, syntax and sequential action. (Ford 2002: 16, cited in Imo 2011: 175)

Arguably, the use of a comma in (41) and of parentheses in (42) – both additional examples culled from an online message board – reflects the prosodic pattern of an increment, but the fact remains that all tokens of final (*t*) *schijnt* in the CGN data are unmistakably pronounced without boundary markers and without being accented.¹³ In spite of a total absence of “incremental discourse marker” uses of (*t*) *schijnt* in the spoken data, it is plausible that such “afterthought uses” of (*t*) *schijnt* as in (41) and (42) may constitute an intermediate step between matrix clause use, as in (33), and sentence-final parenthetical use, as in (34).

- (41) *enkel KUL pruttelt nog wat tegen, schijnt* (<http://www.fkserv.ugent.be>, last accessed 23 January 2012)
‘Only KUL are still grumbling a bit, it seems.’
- (42) *een van zijn geliefdkoosde vragen is (schijnt): vergelijk oikos met familia wat zijn dan allemaal de verschillen?* (<http://www.fkserv.ugent.be>, last accessed 23 January 2012)
‘One of his favourite questions is, as I’ve heard: compare oikos and familia – what are the differences?’

¹³ It seems conceivable that, influenced by prescriptivism, language users are more prone to mark off elements they feel are syntactically peripheral by means of punctuation while they would pronounce them as prosodically integrated.

Another pattern is represented by (43), which is not to be confused with the hybrid matrix clause/discourse marker use discussed above as it represents a more advanced degree of grammaticalization. ('t) *Schijnt* is in clause-initial position here, too, but the clause has inverted word order: the subject *talen* 'languages' follows the finite verb *sterven* 'die'. This shows that rather than being a peripheral element detached from the clause, ('t) *schijnt* is an integral part of it, impacting its word order: in (43), ('t) *schijnt* is in the front field, within the clause boundaries, and Dutch being a Verb Second-language, the front field can no longer accommodate the subject, too, which then occupies the first part of the middle field. In the "hybrid" cases in (39) and (40) above, by contrast, ('t) *schijnt* is outside of the clause proper and the subject is in its canonical front field position. Three instances of the type exemplified in (43) are present in the CGN-VL-data. Note that Vliegen (2011a, 2011b) does not cite any examples of this clause-initial adverb-like use of ('t) *schijnt* in his historical data.

- (43) 't *schijnt sterven daar talen af* (CNG-VL)
'I'm told that languages are dying out there.'

When ('t) *schijnt* occurs in medial position (35), finally, it is both prosodically and syntactically fully integrated into the clause. There is a tendency for ('t) *schijnt* to occur in the front of the middle field, also known as the "pre-middle field", characterized by Schelfhout, Coppen & Oostdijk (2004: 339) as "the canonical position for subjects, clitics and particles". The CGN-VL data contain seven such instances.¹⁴

Note that we do not claim here that ('t) *schijnt* has become a fully-fledged member of the set of *modal particles* in Dutch, a sub-class that is usually defined rather narrowly in the relevant literature, as consisting of those "flavouring" elements which serve to indicate the speaker's mood or attitude towards the proposition and which are notoriously hard to translate due to their lack of propositional meaning (see e.g. van der Wouden 2002, Vismans 1995; see also the abundant literature on the similar class of so-called *Abtönungspartikeln* in German). Indeed, ('t) *schijnt* differs from

¹⁴ The frequencies reported in the main text of this article add up to 27: two instances of ('t) *schijnt* occur in a peripheral position to the left of the clause proper (e.g. 39), three instances in front field position (e.g. 43), seven in middle field position (e.g. 35) and fifteen in end field position (e.g. 34). In addition, there are four instances where ('t) *schijnt* is ambiguous between the front field and middle field positions because there is no finite verb – we are dealing with spoken language data, after all – and one instance where it is in an atypical position within the subject NP (to be discussed in footnote 15).

prototypical modal particles in several respects: it does not *only* occur in the middle field of the clause, it can serve as the answer to a question, etc. However, as stressed by van der Wouden (2002: 22–23), while the bulk of the existing literature on particles has focussed on modal particles, focus particles, or answering particles, the class of Dutch particles is definitely not limited to these three relatively well-defined sub-classes, but includes various other, hitherto largely unnoticed, sub-classes: one instance he mentions is *warempel* ‘actually, surprisingly’, which could be considered a *mirative* particle. We would contend that the heterogeneous class of Dutch particles includes at least one evidential particle, viz. (’t) *schijnt*. In any event, (’t) *schijnt* seems similar enough to Afrikaans *glo* and German *glaub(e)* – and to many of the items listed under the rubric of particles in Wiemer’s (2010: 90–104) overview of “hearsay” markers in the languages of Europe, including Spanish *dizque*, Modern Greek *léi*, Polish *jakoby*, etc. – to be considered a member of the same broad class of evidential particles, which is of course not to say that all of these forms display the exact same set of structural and semantic properties.

One of the characteristics of evidential particles outlined in Wiemer (2010: 94–95) is that they display variable scope. This applies to (’t) *schijnt* as well. While in all of the instances retrieved from the CGN, (’t) *schijnt* has scope over the entire clause¹⁵ – showing this to be the unmarked case – examples where it has narrower scope can be found on the internet, see (44) and (45). In both cases, *tschijnt* occurs within an NP and has scope over an attribute of the noun. As shown in Schoonjans (2012: 785–786), German *glaub(e)* displays very similar scopal behaviour.

- (44) *en in de ❤️ vertel ik je later wel nog eens! 😊 en bij u? met de (tschijnt vre grote) Mathias?* (http://nl.netlog.com/_Make_It_Happen/guestbook/&or der=ASC&commentVertical=NO&page=5)
 ‘And I’ll tell you another time how I’m doing in my love life. And how about you, with your (supposedly very tall) Mathias?’

¹⁵ There is one possible exception, viz. (i) below, where *schijnt* is in an atypical position in-between the subject and the finite verb. This may be just another instance of clausal scope, but it could also be argued that *schijnt* functions within the subject NP and has scope over the estimate *vijftig procent* ‘fifty percent’ – the semantic difference between both interpretations is subtle at best.

- (i) *ja dus als je xxx gewoon maar uhm langs die berberdorpen rijdt dus die uh die mensen dus vijftig procent van de bevolking schijnt is daar werkloos* (CGN-VL)
 ‘Yeah so if you simply drive by those Berber villages, so those uh those people . . . so fifty percent of the population, they say, are unemployed.’

- (45) *Vandaag probeer ik op een tschijnt sfeervol marktje vol handicrafts en juwelekes in Recoleta te geraken.* (<http://atilla.waarbenjij.nu/reisverslag/1563567/tgif>)
 'Today, I'm trying to get to a supposedly ambient little market in Recoleta with lots of handicrafts and jewellery.'

3.3.2. Phonological attrition and coalescence

Like English and German verbs of appearance and cognition, and like Afrikaans *glo* (see Section 2.1.1), Dutch ('t) *schijnt* has undergone coalescence and phonological attrition. The reduction and cliticization of the subject pronoun *het* to 't in Dutch is quite widespread in all contexts and with all kinds of verbs, but its complete erosion, as in (46) is more noteworthy. The result is a unverbated and ultimately monomorphemic element which as such meets Lehmann's (1985: 307) and de Haan's (1999: 75) above-mentioned criteria for (advanced) grammaticalization and evidential status respectively.

- (46) *ggg nee dat is dus schijnt echt de kelder dus van het Sint-Lucasinstituut* (CGN-VL)
 'No so that is really, as I'm told, the cellar of St Luke's Institute.'

Table 2 provides an overview of the use of the various realizations of the non-referential subject pronoun HET, viz. *het*, 't and zero, for each construction that may occur with such an "empty" subject.¹⁶ The column headed "sum" gives the total number of occurrences of each construction type. One case of demonstrative *dat* functioning as an impersonal subject (47) was found and was listed separately.

- (47) *Dat schijnt dat dat helpt als ge daar vijftien keer langsgaat.* (CGN-VL)
 'They say that that helps if you go by there fifteen times.'

Except for parentheticals, all of the constructions in Table 2 have a preference for the reduced form 't. The zero form is especially frequent with particles (n=7 or 21.9%). In contrast to English, where *it*-deletion is associated with clause-initial uses of *it seems/appears/turns out* (Heller & Howe 2008, Howe & Heller 2010), i.e. in the extraposition construction, Dutch shows a different preference: eight out of eleven zero occurrences in the CNG-VL

¹⁶ The classification in Table 2 is based on the transcriptions in the CGN. Transcription practices as to how HET is transcribed may vary from one transcriber to another.

Table 2. Subjects by construction

	het	't	Ø	dat	Total
Extraposition	29 22.5%	97 75.2%	2 1.5%	1 0.8%	129 100%
<i>Naar</i>	16 23.5%	52 76.5%	0 0%	0 0%	68 100%
Particle	2 6.2%	23 71.9%	7 21.9%	0 0%	32 100%
Reply	0 0%	14 99.3%	1 6.6%	0 0%	15 100%
Parenthetical	5 83.3%	0 0%	1 16.7%	0 0%	6 100%
Particle/copula	0 0%	2 100%	0 0%	0 0%	2 100%
<i>Naar</i> /extraposition	0 0%	1 100%	0 0%	0 0%	1 100%
Unclear	1 50%	0 0%	1 50%	0 0%	2 100%

data appear in medial or final position as opposed to only two in the extraposition construction and one reply use.

As seen in Section 2.1.1, the reduction of *het* to *'t* and zero can be regarded as a case of phonological attrition in the grammaticalization process of (*'t*) *schijnt*. Vliegen's (2011a, 2011b) historical data show that there used to be a tendency to attach the reduced *'t* to the verb in spelling – which was a common orthographic practice in the Middle Dutch period – resulting in the single chunk *tschijn(d)t*. Note that in several of the examples culled from informal written sources on the Internet, e.g. (44) and (45), *tschijnt* is written as one word as well.

- (48) *Tschijnt dat hi van duechden scrijft menich sermoen.* (Vliegen 2011a: 129; 2011b: 236)

'It seems that out of virtue he writes many a sermon.'

- (49) *Tschijndt sy sijn vol liefsten /en charitaten.* (Vliegen 2011a: 129)

'It seems they are full of love and charity'

As also mentioned in 2.1.1, in addition to phonological attrition (i.e. erosion), the cliticization and reduction of *het schijnt* through *'t schijnt*/*tschijnt*

to *schijnt* reflects the process of coalescence, which entails that “syntactic boundaries become morphological boundaries and finally disappear” (Lehmann 1985: 308). The impersonal subject HET, being a mere placeholder and thus semantically empty, is a rather unprototypical subject, which aids in its reanalysis into one unit with the verb *schijnt*. This loss of argument structure and univerbation is not the only sign of deverbalization; ('t) *schijnt* as a particle has in addition lost its inflectional properties, being fixed in the simple present form without having any temporal reference. The modified example (50) is therefore ungrammatical.

- (50) a. *ggg en de Stefaan zei uh had 't schijnt geantwoord van amai gij kent de Ludo niet zeker?* (CGN-VL)
 'And Stefaan said uh had it seems replied like wow you don't know Ludo, I suppose?'
 b. **ggg en de Stefaan zei uh had 't scheen geantwoord van amai gij kent de Ludo niet zeker?*
 'And Stefaan said uh had it seemed replied like wow you don't know Ludo, I suppose?'

In spite of these clear indications of deverbalization/particulization, grammatical persistence (Torres Cacoullos & Walker 2009), the grammatical counterpart to Hopper's (1991) lexical persistence, prevents ('t) *schijnt* from completely abandoning its ties with the verb *schijnen*. This point is made by both Imo (2011) and Van Bogaert (2011) with regard to German *glaub(e) ich* and English *I think*-type parentheticals respectively; the form ('t) *schijnt* can still be used as a matrix clause introducing a complement clause. We thus endorse Imo's (2011: 186) position that *glaub(e) ich*, and by extension ('t) *schijnt*, “has by no means proceeded so far as to lead to any fixed construction in which the verb has lost all of its “verbiness” (i.e. its ability to demand a complement) and given up its – albeit vague – association with a matrix clause”. This grammatical persistence tallies with the flexibility of the *glauben* and *schijnen* constructions mentioned earlier, which allows expressions with *glauben* or *schijnen* to straddle categories. The grammatical indeterminacy of *schijnen*-constructions is consistent with an emergent conception of grammar, which views constructions as “open”, such that “their structure never reaches a point of closure and completion” (Hopper 2004: 19).

3.4. Particle vs. parenthetical: ('t) *schijnt* vs. (zo) *schijnt het*

As was noted in Section 3.2, *schijnen* can be used in a parenthetical construction, too, as in (28) above and (51) below. In this section, we will discuss the properties of Dutch parentheticals and demonstrate that the particularizing uses of ('t) *schijnt* discussed in the previous sub-section should be regarded as distinct from the construction in (51).

- (51) *Dat schermt ook fijn af schijnt het.* (CGN-VL)
'That also makes for a nice partition, it seems.'

In Schelfhout, Coppen & Oostdijk (2004), a distinction is made between two types of Dutch parentheticals or "finite comment clauses". The first type, illustrated in (52), is composed of a verb of cognition followed by its subject and the second type (53) consists of a copula verb and its subject. Both types can optionally be preceded by *zo*.

- (52) *Moet toch wel werk zijn dat voldoening geeft denk ik.* (CGN-NL)
'Must be a job that gives a lot of satisfaction, (so) I think.'
- (53) *De Treffers speelt een gewonnen wedstrijd zo lijkt het.* (CGN-NL)
'The Strikers are playing a game they've already won, (so) it seems.'

Parentheticals with *schijnen* are of the second, copular, type. Besides *schijnt het*, illustrated in (51) above, the pattern with *zo* is also possible (54), although no occurrences have been attested in the CGN.

- (54) *In het oude Egypte (13e eeuw v.Chr) werden schijndode drenkelingen aan de voeten opgehangen en op de maag gedrukt. Farao Ramses II werd zo gered, zo schijnt het.* (<http://www.realert.nl>, last accessed 17 July 2013)
'In ancient Egypt (thirteenth century BC) people rescued from drowning who seemed dead would be suspended upside down and pressed on the stomach. Pharaoh Ramses II was rescued in this manner, it is said.'

While Wiemer's (2010) typological overview of hearsay markers in the languages of Europe posits distinct formal categories for particles on the one hand and parentheticals on the other, he also stresses that, from a functional point of view, the two are hardly distinguishable, and that in many individual cases, the decision whether to classify a marker as a particle or a parenthetical is really arbitrary. In fact, one of the instances he quotes of such an in-between form is Alemannic German *schins*, as in (55), which is of course relevantly similar to ('t) *schijnt* in Belgian Dutch.

- (55) *Vermutlich, weil das Senioren-Konzert in Dübendorf zu Ende war, Herr Woody. Dort waren ja schins nicht alle gleich zufrieden mit dem Gebotenen.*

'Presumably because the concert for the elderly people in Dübendorf was finished, Mister Woody. Apparently not everybody was equally content with what they had presented.' (Campionatischer, 7 August 2006, cited in Wiemer 2010: 104)

In this respect, our comparison of ('t) *schijnt* and (zo) *schijnt het* should not be taken to suggest that there is a dichotomous partitioning between particles and parentheticals, with the two forms situated on opposite sides of the dividing line. Rather, we will point towards a number of formal and semantic differences between both forms, some of which suggest that, on the grammaticalization cline from parenthetical to particle, ('t) *schijnt* is situated closer to the particle end than (zo) *schijnt het*, in that the latter form appears to be less integrated in the clause and to have retained more of its verbal characteristics.

A first difference between (zo) *schijnt het* and ('t) *schijnt* relates to their internal word order; (zo) *schijnt het* makes use of inversion while ('t) *schijnt* follows the canonical word order pattern. Secondly, there are some prosodic differences. In line with what Schelfhout, Coppen & Oostdijk (2004: 341) state about Dutch parentheticals, (zo) *schijnt het* is several syllables long and tends to be set apart from the intonation pattern of the clause. ('t) *Schijnt*, by contrast, is monosyllabic, unstressed and prosodically integrated into the clause (cf. Section 3.3.1 above: even when ('t) *schijnt* occurs clause-finally in CGN-VL, it is part of the intonation domain of its host clause).¹⁷

Thirdly, and related to the previous point, parentheticals and particles relate differently to their host clause from a syntactic point of view.

¹⁷ Dehé (2009) points out, against common assumptions about the prosody of parentheticals, that English comment clauses like *I think* have a variety of prosodic realizations. Although for this reason, prosodic integration and lack of pitch movement cannot serve as a strict definitional requirement for a construction to qualify as a particle, it should be noted that being phrased separately and carrying stress is not an uncommon prosodic profile for parentheticals while being much more marked for particles. Wichmann (2012) underscores that functional items, by default, are unstressed, but can exceptionally be stressed for special (pragmatic) effect. It is hence not entirely unthinkable, though rather marked, for a speaker to pronounce ('t) *schijnt* as a separate intonational phrase when they wish to highlight that they are only relying on hearsay information (and therefore cannot fully commit to the assertion they are making).

Schelfhout, Coppen & Oostdijk (2004: 331) designate a parenthetical as an “intercalation”, that is, “the interruption of a running sentence by syntactic material that cannot be analysed directly as (an) immediate constituent(s) of that sentence”. Associated with this is a certain positional freedom: comment clauses may occupy various positions in the clause, while having a strong preference for clause boundaries and the positions following the left bracket. The number of *(zo) schijnt het* examples in the CGN is too small – viz. eight instances in the entire corpus, including both national varieties – to allow for a detailed quantitative comparison with the topological possibilities of *(’t) schijnt*; still, as a first observation, it can be mentioned that in six out of eight examples, *schijnt het* occurs at the end of the clause, after the right bracket (i.e. in extraposition or right-dislocation).¹⁸ By comparison, as we have seen in Section 3.3.1, only fifteen of the thirty-two instances of *(’t) schijnt* in CGN-VL occur clause-finally and the sample includes at least eleven instances where *(’t) schijnt* unambiguously occurs either clause-medially, tightly nested in the middle field, or clause-initially, triggering subject inversion (which is a clear sign of syntactic integration in the clause). The frequencies are too low to allow for meaningful statistical comparison, but they at least suggest that *(’t) schijnt* and *(zo) schijnt het* display different word order preferences, associated with differences in syntactic integration. All the same, as stated in Section 3.3.1, *(’t) schijnt* definitely does not display the same degree of syntactic integration as prototypical *modal particles*, in that it does not have a syntactically fixed position: *(’t) schijnt* is clearly not *confined* to the middle field.

Fourthly, *(’t) schijnt* never occurs with adverbial *zo* while this is a structural option for Schelfhout, Coppen & Oostdijk’s (2004) type 2 parentheticals, to which *(zo) schijnt het* belongs. At first blush, the presence of *zo het schijnt* in Vliegen’s (2011b: 237) historical data (56) and in contemporary Dutch (57) seems to vitiate this argument. However, in these cases, *zo* needs to be regarded as a conjunction of comparison (cf. ‘as it seems’) – similar to present-day *zoals (het schijnt)* and *naar* in the above-mentioned

¹⁸ The two clause-medial examples of *(zo) schijnt het* are not only syntactically but also prosodically integrated into the clause. The example below is one of these two instances, which both occur in the Belgian part of the corpus.

- (i) *en van die andere jonge leerkrachten één die schijnt het vorig jaar ook al wist dat ze niet meer moest terugkomen.* (CGN-VL)
 ‘and as for the other young teachers one who, as I’ve heard, already knew last year that she couldn’t come back [after the summer vacation]’

lexicalized adverbial phrase *naar het schijnt* – while *zo* in the present-day parenthetical *zo schijnt het* is an anaphoric manner adverbial (cf. 'it seems like this'). This kind of anaphoric elements is typical of parentheticals.

- (56) *Die motelen Marien beelde staende up d'Hoofbrugge . . . en hebben zij (zoot schijnt) niet connen ghebreken, maer tkindekin hebben zij den hals afgheclopt.* (Vliegen 2011b: 237)
 'They have not been able to destroy the copper statue of the Virgin Mary on the Hooftbridge, as it seems, but they have knocked off the head of the Child.'
- (57) *Juist deze partijen hebben het in het afgelopen jaar zwaar te verduren gehad en hebben – zo het schijnt – niet alleen geen middelen, maar ook geen durf meer om een sociaal bewogen theatervoorstelling te programmeren.* (<http://www.gielvandam.nl/theater/lakon>, last accessed 17 July 2013)
 'These parties in particular had a hard time last year and not only do they lack – so it seems – the means, but also the guts to programme a socially committed theatre production.'

As a fifth difference, it can be observed that parenthetical (*zo*) *schijnt het* displays a wider range of evidential meanings than ('t) *schijnt*, which, as we have observed above, has specialized as a hearsay marker. This specialization as a hearsay marker constitutes evidence for the advanced degree of grammaticalization that ('t) *schijnt* has reached. Cross-linguistically, hearsay evidentials develop from inferentials rather than the other way around, and in the layered, typologically motivated model of Functional Discourse Grammar (Hengeveld & Mackenzie 2008), reportatives (i.e. hearsay evidentials) are located in a more outer layer of the system than inferentials. In (28), (54) and (51) above, (*zo*) *schijnt het* expresses hearsay just like ('t) *schijnt*, but, in addition, it can be used to express inferential and direct perception meanings. A case in point is (58), where (*zo*) *schijnt het* is very close in meaning to *zo lijkt het* as used in (53).

- (58) *Toch apart dat mijn profielmap op de d-schijf steeds up-to-date is, zo schijnt het, en op de c-schijf niet.* (<http://www.mozbrowser.nl>; last accessed 6 August 2013)
 'Kind of remarkable that my profile folder on the D drive is always up to date, it seems, but not on the C drive.'

This shows that *zo schijnt het* has not specialized to the same extent as ('t) *schijnt*, but has preserved a larger part of the evidential semantic potential of the verb *schijnen*. Finally, there are two additional properties which sug-

gest that, compared to (*t*) *schijnt*, (*zo*) *schijnt het* has retained more of its verbal characteristics. Unlike (*t*) *schijnt*, (*zo*) *schijnt het* is not restricted to the simple present, as shown in (59). Further, (*zo*) *schijnt het* can take an experiencer, as in (60), which can be related to the argument structure of the *schijnen* verb.¹⁹

- (59) *Haar humor en levenslust spaarde ze voor haar beroep, zo scheen het.*
(<http://justguidoooohh.com/2011/02/>, last accessed 17 July 2013)
'She would save her sense of humour and zest for her profession, so it seemed.'
- (60) *Zonder voortdurende afleiding, zo schijnt het mij, kan men tegenwoordig niet leven.* (<http://www.groene.nl>; last accessed 17 July 2013)
'Without continuous distraction, so it seems to me, it is impossible to live these days.'

In sum, (*t*) *schijnt* and (*zo*) *schijnt het* can be seen to display quite different syntactic, semantic and prosodic properties, which justifies the analysis of the former form as being situated closer to the particle end of the cline, while the latter form has retained more characteristics of a parenthetical comment clause.

3.5. The matrix clause hypothesis vs. the parataxis hypothesis

When we interpret the characteristics of the particle (*t*) *schijnt* and the parenthetical (*zo*) *schijnt het* in the light of the matrix clause and parataxis hypotheses, we can make the following observations. In view of its canonical word order, (*t*) *schijnt* fits the matrix clause hypothesis better than (*zo*) *schijnt het*. It would be more difficult to argue that *het schijnt* as used in the extraposition construction has become syntactically mobile and at the same time reversed its word order, thus giving rise to (*zo*) *schijnt het*. Instead, (*zo*) *schijnt het* is better accounted for by the parataxis hypothesis; in line with *so I think* in Brinton's (1996) proposal (see 2.1.2), *zo* is an anaphoric element that is coreferential with an accompanying host clause. The presence of this adverbial proform also accounts for the inverted word order; Dutch clauses starting with an adverbial, must use inversion. Thus,

¹⁹ An anonymous reviewer points out that *schijnen* with an experiencer is rather marked and that the corresponding construction with *lijken*, viz. *zo lijkt (het) mij*, is much more common. This is consistent with our own intuitions. Still, examples such as (56) do occur, while the addition of an experiencer to the particle (*t*) *schijnt* is absolutely impossible.

two different grammaticalization paths can be posited for ('t) *schijnt* and (zo) *schijnt het* respectively, along with two ways in which particulization may progress; the particle ('t) *schijnt* is the result of a grammaticalization process captured by the matrix clause hypothesis while the parenthetical (zo) *schijnt het* exemplifies the path of the parataxis hypothesis.

While (zo) *schijnt het* does not seem to be affected by the kind of phonological attrition and coalescence that reduced *het schijnt* to its monomorphemic particle form, a pattern with *schijnen* and also *lijken* 'seem' has recently been observed in Netherlandic Dutch, which, on the face of it, is identical to Belgian Dutch *schijnt* with complete omission of the subject. Van Oostendorp (2012) cites the following occurrence of clause-final *lijkt* in a Dutch newspaper in a context where one might expect to find (zo) *lijkt het* (61), as well as providing a similar (constructed) example with *schijnt* (62). Van Oostendorp observes that patterns like these have emerged in spoken Netherlandic Dutch, while still being rather rare in written sources. The Dutch component of the CGN contains nine occurrences of this type of *schijnt*; four of them are separated from the host clause by a pause, as in (63), and five are prosodically integrated, as in (64). Example (65), in addition to being separated from its host clause by a pause, also carries a pitch accent, which lends this instance of *schijnt* even more prosodic prominence.

- (61) *Nu loopt hij breedgeschouderd door de smalle buurtsuperpaadjes. Een aanvallend type, lijkt. Grote, open handen.* (van Oostendorp 2012)
'Now he is walking broad-shouldered through the narrow local alleyways. An aggressive kind of person, it seems. Large, open hands.'
- (62) *Jansen kan zich daar niet in vinden, schijnt.*
'Jansen doesn't agree with that, it seems.'
- (63) *En die lui maken trouwens wel winst. schijnt.* (CGN-NL)
'And those folks are making a profit by the way. They say.'
- (64) *'t Is ja de oudste stad van Duitsland schijnt* (CGN-NL)
'It's yeah the oldest city in Germany, they say.'
- (65) *Ja is te gevaarlijk. Schijnt.* (CGN-NL)
'Yeah is too dangerous. It seems.'

Although more research is needed on this type of *schijnt* in Netherlandic Dutch, we propose that it is distinct from the ('t) *schijnt* construction that this article has been primarily concerned with. Netherlandic Dutch

schijnt will be considered as a further step down the parataxis grammaticalization path; in other words, it is seen as resulting from the reduction of the subject *het* in the parenthetical *schijnt het*, as van Oostendorp also suggests. The fact that Netherlandic Dutch *schijnt* does not alternate with the form *'t schijnt* and the low frequency of the extraposition construction in Netherlandic Dutch add support to the analysis of Netherlandic Dutch *schijnt* as a reduced form of the parenthetical (*zo*) *schijnt het* (rather than as a particle or being associated with *het schijnt* in an extraposition construction); in the Belgian data, the extraposition construction accounts for 33.8% (n=129) of all occurrences of *schijnen* as opposed to a mere 9.2% (n=43) in Netherlandic Dutch. Further substantiation of this hypothesis comes from example (66), which shows that the reduced form *schijnt* can still be inflected – though it should immediately be added that this is the only example of this kind in the CGN.

- (66) *Was heel leuk scheen hè?* (CGN-NL)
'Was quite fun, I've heard, wasn't it?'

To conclude, these recent findings suggest that two distinct grammaticalization paths may lead to a similar output, as visualized in Figure 1 and Figure 2.²⁰ Although CGN-NL does not contain any occurrences of clause-medial *schijnt*, internet data and anecdotal attestations in the spoken media show that *schijnt* may be used in this position. The low incidence of this highly integrated use of *schijnt* as compared to Belgian Dutch suggests that Netherlandic *schijnt* is not quite as grammaticalized as Belgian Dutch (*'t*) *schijnt*, although a more detailed investigation of frequency and evidential semantics would be required to confirm this.

- (67) *En aspartaam die in al die "light" versies zit, staat niet op die lijst? Dat is schijnt nog ongezonder dan de suiker die in de "enige echte" zit.* (forums.marokko.nl/archive/index.php/t-4202799.html; last accessed 17 July 2013)
'And aspartame, which is in all those "light" versions, is not on the list? That's supposed to be even healthier than the sugar that's in the "real thing".'

²⁰ In each of the boxes in the figures, the first example sentence is adapted from the following utterance from the CGN:

- (i) *'t Schijnt dat 't veel goedkoper is.* (CGN-VL)
'It's supposed to be a lot cheaper.'

The decision whether to place the subject (*'t*) in parentheses was based on the actual occurrence of the zero subject pattern in the CGN data. The second example repeats a relevant example from the foregoing analysis.

Figure 1. The particulization of ('t) *schijnt* following the matrix clause hypothesis

Figure 1 gives a schematic overview of the grammaticalization steps along the particulization path from the matrix clause *het schijnt* in the extraposition construction to the most particle-like use of ('t) *schijnt*, i.e. as a syntactically and prosodically fully integrated particle in the pre-middle field. The further ('t) *schijnt* moves down the grammaticalization cline, the more it loses its clausal and verbal properties. Through phonetic reduction and coalescence, the subject–verb sequence *het schijnt* is reduced, morphologically fixed and unverbated into *schijnt*. As shown in Table 2, the extraposition construction displays the strongest tendency to use the non-reduced form of the subject *het* while complete erosion is a hallmark of the particle use. As suggested in Section 3.3, ('t) *schijnt* as an “incremental discourse marker” may have been a step in the grammaticalization process, coming between matrix clause use and clause-final particle use; no attestations of this pattern were found in the CGN, however; hence the lighter shading. The clause-initial, particulized use of ('t) *schijnt* prefacing a main clause with canonical word order, as illustrated by (39) in 3.3, can be considered akin to a clause-initial rather than incremental discourse

Figure 2. The particulation of *schijnt* following the parataxis hypothesis

marker. It shares lack of syntactic integration with the incremental use of ('t) *schijnt* and resembles the matrix clause use in framing an ensuing proposition. The other clause-initial use of ('t) *schijnt* discussed in 3.3, i.e. the one followed by inversion, should be regarded as more grammaticalized and more syntactically integrated; considering its effect on the word order of the clause, triggering inversion, it forms an integral part of the syntax of the clause.²¹

Figure 2 represents the development of the parenthetical (zo) *schijnt het* from a paratactic construction to its most particulated use as *schijnt* in Netherlandic Dutch.²² In line with Brinton's (1996) model for the develop-

²¹ In view of insufficient diachronic information about the development of these two clause-initial particulated uses of ('t) *schijnt*, their positions in the model are contingent and speculative.

²² An anonymous reviewer points out that, rather than having evolved from a clause-final particle, the clause-medial particle may also be the result of reduction of the clause-medial integrated parenthetical. Thus, full reduction would have occurred in both medial and final

ment of English parentheticals like *I guess* and *I think*, the parataxis path starts with a construction in which *zo schijnt het* is syntactically independent from its host, but semantically linked by virtue of the (obligatory) anaphoric adverb *zo*. When used as a clause-final parenthetical, (*zo*) *schijnt het* comes to be seen as a peripheral element of the host clause. Integration into the "core" of the host clause as a clause-medial parenthetical makes (*zo*) *schijnt* less peripheral and enhances its potential to function as an integral part of the host clause rather than an appended comment. In view of these implications of syntactic position for the morphosyntactic status and integration of the particularizing construction, medial instantiations are considered to be more grammaticalized than final ones. Therefore, although neither clause-medial nor clause-final (*zo*) *schijnt het* is prosodically integrated, its occurrence inside its host clause rather than on the periphery testifies to a higher level of syntactic integration. When *schijnt het* is in addition incorporated into the prosody of its host, it has edged a little closer towards particlehood, but cannot be regarded as a proper particle since it is not sufficiently phonologically and morphologically reduced. We therefore refer to it as an integrated parenthetical. An additional development from the clause-final parenthetical (*zo*) *schijnt het*, represented by the right-hand branch of the diagram in Figure 2, is the reduced form *schijnt*, which evolves from being a syntactically and prosodically unintegrated parenthetical through a reduced yet equally unintegrated form to a prosodically integrated clause-final particle and ultimately a fully integrated clause-medial particle. As mentioned above, sporadic evidence can be found that *schijnt* has taken the final step to a both prosodically and syntactically fully integrated clause-medial particle *schijnt*. However, in view of its scant occurrence in Netherlandic Dutch, it can be considered as less grammaticalized than its Belgian Dutch counterpart.

4. Conclusion

In this article, we have provided a description of a hitherto neglected pattern with the verb of appearance *schijnen* as commonly used in colloquial registers of Belgian Dutch. The pattern ('t) *schijnt* was characterized as an evidential particle for semantic, structural and prosodic reasons. Indicating that the speaker is relying on someone else's words to make his/her claim, position.

(*t*) *schijnt* needs to be considered as a hearsay evidential. As for its internal structure, (*t*) *schijnt* has unverbated into a fixed, uninflected form, and with regard to external structural properties, i.e. its relation with the host clause, its tight integration into the pre-middle field, the preferred position of modal particles, can be noted. Prosodically, (*t*) *schijnt* is integrated and unstressed by default.

From the description of (*t*) *schijnt*, it has become apparent that it is of a different nature from the parenthetical (*zo*) *schijnt het*, which has inverted rather than main-clause word order, may optionally occur with *zo*, is syntactically less integrated and has prosodic separation as one of its unmarked prosodic realizations.

These differences between the particle and the parenthetical use of *schijnen* suggest that (*t*) *schijnt* has evolved along a different grammaticalization path from (*zo*) *schijnt het*, viz. that of the matrix clause hypothesis while (*zo*) *schijnt het* is better accounted for by the parataxis hypothesis. Both (*t*) *schijnt* and (*zo*) *schijnt het* are cases of particulization, a (bifurcated) grammaticalization path that *schijnen* has followed in addition to auxiliatation. Pending more substantial research on Netherlandic Dutch *schijnt*, we tentatively put Belgian Dutch (*t*) *schijnt* forward as more grammaticalized; on the basis of the data currently available, the fully integrated, clause-medial use of Netherlandic Dutch *schijnt* is still quite rare.

This study of (*t*) *schijnt* constitutes another example of the indeterminacy of categories as applying to complement-taking, parenthetical and related constructions as discussed by Imo (2006, 2011) and Schoonjans (2012) with regard to German *glauben*. Hence, any given occurrence of *schijnen* can be placed closer to or farther away from any one of the idealized categories of matrix clause, parenthetical, particle, adverbial or discourse marker within a “continuous space” (Schoonjans 2012), such that the boundaries between the prototypes that serve as benchmarks remain essentially fuzzy.

As research by Dehé and Wichmann (2010a, 2010b) has shown for English comment clauses and matrix clauses like *I think* and *I believe*, prosody can be key in distinguishing the various functional profiles that these expressions may have; depending on their prosodic profile, they may function as matrix clauses, comment clauses or discourse markers and speakers use distinct prosodic patterns to disambiguate these functions and their associated meanings. More sophisticated research into the

prosody of *schijnen*-constructions as well as parentheticals and particles in Dutch would help shed more light not only on their indeterminate category membership, but also on the degrees of grammaticalization of their various instantiations, as current research by each of the aforementioned authors suggests.

References

- Aijmer, Karin & Anne-Marie Simon-Vandenberg. 2003. The discourse particle *well* and its equivalents in Swedish and Dutch. *Linguistics* 41: 1123–1161.
- Andersen, Gisle. 2001. *Pragmatic markers and sociolinguistic variation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Auer, Peter. 1998. Zwischen Parataxe und Hypotaxe: 'Abhängige Hauptsätze' im gesprochenen und geschriebenen Deutsch. *Zeitschrift für germanistische Linguistik* 26: 284–307.
- Biber, Douglas, Stig Johansson, Geoffrey Leech, Susan Conrad & Edward Finegan. 1999. *Longman grammar of spoken and written English*. London: Longman.
- Boye, Kasper & Peter Harder. 2009. Evidentiality: Linguistic categories and grammaticalization. *Functions of Language* 16: 9–43.
- Brinton, Laurel J. 1996. *Pragmatic markers in English: Grammaticalization and discourse functions*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Brinton, Laurel J. 2008. *The comment clause in English: Syntactic origins and pragmatic development*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Brems, Lieselotte (2011). *Layering of size and type noun constructions in English*. Berlin: de Gruyter Mouton.
- Burton-Roberts, Noel. 2006. Parentheticals. In Keith Brown ed., *Encyclopedia of language and linguistics*, 2nd edn. Oxford: Elsevier, 179–182.
- Bybee, Joan L. 2003. Mechanisms of change in grammaticalization: The role of frequency. In Brian D. Joseph & Richard D. Janda, eds. *The handbook of historical linguistics*. Oxford: Blackwell, 602–623.
- Bybee, Joan L. & Paul J. Hopper, eds. 2001. *Frequency and the emergence of linguistic structure*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- de Haan, Ferdinand. 1999. Evidentiality in Dutch. *Berkeley Linguistics Society* 25, 74–85.
- de Haan, Ferdinand. 2001. The relation between modality and evidentiality. *Linguistische Berichte* 9: 201–216.
- de Haan, Ferdinand. 2007. Raising as grammaticalization: The case of Germanic SEEM-verbs. *Italian Journal of Linguistics/Rivista di Linguistica* 19: 129–150.

- Dehé, Nicole. 2009. Clausal parentheticals, intonation phrasing and prosodic theory. *Journal of Linguistics* 45: 569–615.
- Dehé, Nicole & Anne Wichmann. 2010a. The multifunctionality of epistemic parentheticals in discourse: Prosodic cues to the semantic-pragmatic boundary. *Functions of Language* 17: 1–28.
- Dehé, Nicole & Anne Wichmann. 2010b. Sentence-initial *I think (that)* and *I believe (that)*: Prosodic evidence for uses as main clause, comment clause and discourse marker. *Studies in Language* 34: 36–74.
- Diewald, Gabriele. 2001. *Scheinen*-Probleme: Analogie, Konstruktionsvermischung und die Sogwirkung aktiver Grammatikalisationskanäle. In Reimar Müller & Marga Reis, eds. *Modalität und Modalverben im Deutschen*. Hamburg: Helmut Buske, 87–110.
- Diewald, Gabriele & Elena Smirnova. 2010. *Evidentiality in German: Linguistic realization and regularities in grammaticalization*. Berlin: de Gruyter Mouton.
- Duinhoven, A. M. 1997. *Middel nederlandse syntaxis: Synchroon en diachroon*. Deel 2: *De werkwoordgroep* [Middle Dutch syntax: Synchrony and diachrony. Part 2: The verbal group]. Groningen: Martinus Nijhoff.
- Fischer, Olga. 2007. The development of English parentheticals: A case of grammaticalization? In Ute Smit, Stefan Dollinger, Julia Hüttner, Günther Kaltenböck & Ursula Lutzky, eds. *Tracing English through time: Explorations in language variation*. Vienna: Braumüller, 99–114.
- Ford, Cecilia E. 2002. Constituency and the grammar of turn increments. In Cecilia E. Ford, Barbara A. Fox & Sandra A. Thompson, eds. *The language of turn and sequence*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Gisborne, Nikolas & Jasper Holmes. 2007. A history of English evidential verbs of appearance. *English Language and Linguistics* 11: 1–29.
- Haeseryn, Walter, Kirsten Romijn, Guido Geerts, Jaap de Rooij & M. C. van den Toorn. 1997. *Algemene nederlandse spraakkunst* [A comprehensive Dutch grammar]. Groningen: Nijhoff.
- Haspelmath, Martin. 2002. Grammatikalisierung: Von der Performanz zur Kompetenz ohne angeborene Grammatik. In Sybille Krämer & Ekkehard König, eds. *Gibt es eine Sprache hinter dem Sprechen?* Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 262–286.
- Helbig, Gerhard. 1994. *Lexikon deutscher Partikeln*. Leipzig: Langenscheidt.
- Heller, Brooke & Chad Howe. 2008. Raising parentheticals as discourse particles. Paper presented at New Reflections on Grammaticalization 4, University of Leuven. 16–19 July.
- Hengeveld, Kees & J. Lachlan Mackenzie. 2008. *Functional discourse grammar: A typologically-based theory of language structure*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hopper, Paul J. 1991. On some principles of grammaticalization. In Elizabeth C. Traugott & Bernd Heine, eds. *Approaches to grammaticalization*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 17–35.

- Hopper, Paul J. 2004. The openness of grammatical constructions. *Chicago Linguistic Society* 40: 239–256.
- Howe, Chad & Brooke Heller. 2010. Turns out they weren't much of a stretch: Variable patterns of structural persistence. Paper presented at New Ways of Analyzing Variation (NWAV) 39, University of Texas at San Antonio. 4–6 November.
- Huddleston, Rodney & Geoffrey K. Pullum. 2002. *The Cambridge grammar of the English language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Imo, Wolfgang. 2006. "Da hat des kleine *glaub* irgendwas angestellt" – ein *construct* ohne *construction*. In Susanne Günthner & Wolfgang Imo, eds. *Konstruktionen in der Interaktion*. Berlin: de Gruyter Mouton, 263–291.
- Imo, Wolfgang. 2011. Clines of subordination: Constructions with the German 'complement-taking predicate' *glauben*. In Ritva Laury & Ryoko Suzuki, eds. *Subordination in conversation: A cross-linguistic perspective*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 165–190.
- Kaltenböck, Gunther. 2005. Charting the boundaries of syntax: A taxonomy of spoken parenthetical clauses. *Viewz (Vienna English Working Papers)* 14: 21–53.
- Kaltenböck, Gunther. 2007. Position, prosody and scope: The case of English comment clauses. *Vienna English Working Papers* 16: 3–38.
- Kuteva, Tania. 2001. *Auxiliation: An inquiry into the nature of grammaticalization*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lehmann, Christian. 1985. Grammaticalization: Synchronic variation and diachronic change. *Lingua e stile* 20: 303–318.
- Nuyts, Jan. 2000. Tensions between discourse structure and conceptual semantics: The syntax of epistemic modal expressions. *Studies in Language* 24: 105–135.
- Palander-Collin, Minna. 1999. *Grammaticalization and social embedding: I THINK and METHINKS in Middle and Early Modern English* (Mémoires de la Société Néophilologique de Helsinki, 55). Helsinki: Société Néophilologique.
- Ponelis, F. A. 1991. *Afrikaanse Sintaksis*. Pretoria: J. L. van Schaik.
- Quirk, Randolph, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech & Jan Svartvik. 1985. *A comprehensive grammar of the English language*. London: Longman.
- Schelfhout, Carla, Peter-Arno Coppens & Nelleke Oostdijk. 2004. Finite comment clauses in Dutch: A corpus-based approach. *Journal of Germanic Linguistics* 16: 331–349.
- Schiffrin, Deborah. 1987. *Discourse markers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schoonjans, Steven. 2012. The particulization of German complement-taking mental predicates. *Journal of Pragmatics* 44: 776–797.
- Shank, Christopher, Julie Van Bogaert & Koen Plevoets. To appear. A multifactorial analysis of *that*/zero alternation: A diachronic study of the grammaticalization of the zero complementizer construction with *think*, *guess* and *under-*

- stand*. In Jiyoung Yoon & Stefan Th. Gries, eds. *Construction Grammar beyond English: Current corpus-based approaches*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Sweetser, Eve E. 1988. Grammaticalization and semantic bleaching. *Berkeley Linguistics Society* 14: 389–405.
- Taverniers, Miriam. To appear. Interpersonal grammatical metaphor as double scoping and double grounding. *Word* 59.
- Thompson, Sandra A. 2002. “Object complements” and conversation: Towards a realistic account. *Studies in Language* 26: 125–164.
- Thompson, Sandra A. & Anthony Mulac. 1991a. The discourse conditions for the use of the complementizer *that* in conversational English. *Journal of Pragmatics* 15: 237–251.
- Thompson, Sandra A. & Anthony Mulac. 1991b. A quantitative perspective on the grammaticalization of epistemic parentheticals in English. In Elizabeth Closs Traugott & Bernd Heine, eds. *Approaches to grammaticalization*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 313–339.
- Torres Cacoullos, Rena & James A. Walker. 2009. On the persistence of grammar in discourse formulas: A variationist study of *that*. *Linguistics* 47: 1–43.
- Traugott, Elizabeth Closs. 1982. From propositional to textual and expressive meanings: Some semantic-pragmatic aspects of grammaticalization. In Winfried P. Lehmann & Yakov Malkiel, eds. *Perspectives on historical linguistics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 245–271.
- Traugott, Elizabeth Closs. 1988. Pragmatic strengthening and grammaticalization. *Berkeley Linguistics Society* 14: 406–416.
- Traugott, Elizabeth C. & Bernd Heine, eds. 1991. *Approaches to grammaticalization*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Van Bogaert, Julie. 2006. *I guess, I suppose* and *I believe* as pragmatic markers: Grammaticalization and functions. *BELL New Series* 4: 129–149.
- Van Bogaert, Julie. 2010. A constructional taxonomy of *I think* and related expressions: Accounting for the variability of complement-taking mental predicates. *English Language and Linguistics* 14: 399–427.
- Van Bogaert, Julie. 2011. *I think* and other complement-taking mental predicates: A case of and for constructional grammaticalization. *Linguistics* 49: 295–332.
- Van Bogaert, Julie & Torsten Leuschner. To appear. Dutch (*'t*) *schijnt*/German *scheint*(*'*)s: On the grammaticalization of evidential particles. *Studia Linguistica*.
- Van Bogaert, Julie, Christopher Shank & Koen Plevoets. To appear. The diachronic development of zero complementation: A multifactorial analysis of zero/that alternation with *think, suppose* and *believe*. *Corpus Linguistics and Linguistic Theory*.
- van der Auwera, Johan & Dirk Noël. 2011. Raising: Dutch between English and German. *Journal of Germanic Linguistics* 23: 1–36.

- van der Horst, Johannes M. 2008. *Geschiedenis van de Nederlandse syntaxis* [The history of Dutch syntax]. Leuven: Leuven University Press.
- van der Auwera, Johan & Willy Vandeweghe. 1984. Inleiding [Introduction]. *Antwerp Papers in Linguistics* 35: 7–15.
- van der Wouden, Ton. 2002. Partikels: Naar een partikelwoordenboek van het Nederlands [Particles: Towards a particle dictionary of Dutch]. *Nederlandse Taalkunde* 7: 20–43.
- van der Wouden, Ton. 2009. *Ik zou weleens willen weten waar dat woord staat trouwens*: Aantekeningen over zinsfinale bijwoorden [*I'd like to know about the position of that word, by the way*: Notes on sentence-final adverbs]. In: Ronny Boogaart, Josien Lalleman, Marijke Mooijaart & Marijke van der Wal, eds. *Woorden wisselen. Voor Ariane van Santen bij haar afscheid van de Leidse universiteit* [Exchanging words: For Ariane Van Santen]. Leiden: Stichting Neerlandistiek Leiden, 143–156.
- van Oostendorp, Mark. 2012. Het nieuwe 'lijkt' [The new 'seems']. *Neder-L: Elektronisch tijdschrift voor de neerlandistiek*. <http://nederl.blogspot.be/2012/02/het-nieuwe-lijkt.html>.
- Verhagen, Arie. 2005. *Constructions of intersubjectivity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Vismans, Roel. 1995. Dutch modal particles, historical evidence and Functional Grammar. In Betty Devriendt, Louis Goossens & Johan van der Auwera, eds. *Complex structures: A functionalist perspective*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 303–324.
- Vliegen, Maurice. 2011a. Evidentiality. Dutch seem and appear verbs: *blijken, lijken, schijnen*. *Linguistics in the Netherlands* 28: 125–137.
- Vliegen, Maurice. 2011b. Scheinbar identisch: Niederländisch *schijnen*, Deutsch *scheinen*. In Wilfried Kürschner, Reinhard Rapp, Jürg Strässler, Maurice Vliegen & Heinrich Weber, eds. *Neue linguistische Perspektiven*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 231–244.
- Wichmann, Anne. 2012. Prosody and grammaticalization. Paper presented at New Reflections on Grammaticalization 5, University of Edinburgh. 16–19 July.
- Wiemer, Björn. 2010. Hearsay in European languages: Toward an integrative account of grammatical and lexical marking. In Gabriele Diewald & Elena Smirnova, eds. *Linguistic realization of evidentiality in European languages*. Berlin: de Gruyter Mouton, 59–130.
- Willett, Thomas. 1988. A cross-linguistic survey of the grammaticalization of evidentiality. *Studies in Language* 12: 51–97.
- Weydt, Harald. 1969. *Abtönungspartikel*. Berlin: Gehlen.
- Weydt, Harald & Klaas-Hinrich Ehlers. 1987. *Partikel-Bibliographie*. Bern: Peter Lang.
- Zwart, C. Jan-Wouter. 2011. *The syntax of Dutch*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

sity Press.

Authors's addresses:

Julie Van Bogaert
Department of Linguistics
Ghent University – FWO Vlaanderen
Blandijnberg 2
B-9000 Ghent
Belgium
Julie.VanBogaert@UGent.be

Timothy Coleman
Department of Linguistics
Ghent University
Blandijnberg 2
B-9000 Gent
Belgium
Timothy.Coleman@UGent.be

Submitted: 12 September 2012
Revision invited: 3 February 2013
Revision received: 30 September 2013
Accepted: 4 November 2013