ELSEVIER

(Semi-)autonomous subordination in Dutch: Structures and semantic–pragmatic values

CrossMark

An Van linden [*], Freek Van de Velde

*Department of Linguistics, University of Leuven & Research Foundation Flanders – FWO,
Blijde-Inkomststraat 21, Postbus 3308, B-3000 Leuven, Belgium*

Abstract

This article presents an analysis of autonomous and semi-autonomous subordination patterns in Dutch, some of which have so far gone unnoticed. It proposes a four-way classification of such constructions with the general subordinator *dat* ('that'), drawing on Internet Relay Chat corpus data of Flemish varieties. Generalizing over the four types and their various subtypes distinguished here, we find that they all share the semantic property of expressing interpersonal meaning, and most of them also have exclamative illocutionary force. We propose a diachronic explanation for this shared semantic–pragmatic value in terms of the concept of hypoanalysis, and assess to what extent our proposal meshes with extant ellipsis accounts of the patterns studied.
© 2013 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.

Keywords: Subordination; Insubordination; Interpersonal meaning; Exclamative force; Hypoanalysis; Dutch

1. Introduction

Traditionally, subordination is taken to imply a hierarchical organization of clauses: subordinate clauses, as the term suggests, 'depend' on main clauses, that is, they function as a constituent of their main clause. Their 'secondary' status vis-à-vis the main clause is typically reflected by the absence of their own illocution (Lehmann, 1988; Verstraete, 2005). While this is all uncontroversially true for typical uses of subordinate clauses, there seem to be some patterns that defy this traditional analysis. Subordinate clauses can occasionally be found to function (semi-)autonomously. In some of these cases, the main clause has shrunk to a single word, in other cases, the main clause has disappeared, and in yet other cases, the main clause is not even recoverable. In this article, we will focus on a range of autonomous and semi-autonomous subordination patterns in Dutch introduced by the general subordinator *dat* ('that'), some of which have largely escaped the attention of linguistic scholars. We put forward a typology of four basic types (each with their respective subtypes), and we hypothesize a shared origin in terms of Croft's (2000) concept of 'hypoanalysis'.

A first type is formed by constructions that feature (fully) autonomous subordinate *dat*-clauses, as illustrated in (1a) (cf. Verstraete et al., 2012). Constructions like (1a) lack any explicit matrix element, and have been labelled 'insubordinated' constructions in Evans (2007, see also 1993). In particular, insubordinated constructions use markers normally associated with subordination, but function as independent clauses (Evans, 2007:367). A comparison of (1b), which illustrates a full-fledged complex construction, with (1c), with main clause construal, shows that complementizer *dat* and verb-final word order, also present in (1a), are markers of subordination in Dutch.

---

[*] Corresponding author. Tel.: +32 16324780; fax: +32 16324767.
E-mail addresses: An.Vanlinden@arts.kuleuven.be (A. Van linden), Freek.Vandevelde@arts.kuleuven.be (F. Van de Velde).

(1)   (a)   Dat   hij   dat   nog   mocht   meemaken!
          CONJ he   that PRT   could   experience
          'I never thought he would live to experience this!' (IC)[1]

      (b)   Het   is   prachtig   dat   hij   dat   nog   mocht   meemaken!
          it   is   great   CONJ he   that PRT   could   experience
          'It is great that he was able to experience this!' (C)

      (c)   Hij   heeft   dat   nog   mogen   meemaken.
          he   has   that PRT   may.PRS   experience
          'He was able to experience this' (C)

A second type concerns constructions in which a single matrix constituent is followed by a *dat*-clause which functions as its propositional complement. In the literature, examples have been noted with the matrix constituent being a (semantically specific type of) adjective or adverb, cf. (2) (see e.g. Bos, 1963; Aelbrecht, 2006).

(2)   Misschien/   Goed   da   Kris   komt!
      perhaps/   good   CONJ Kris   comes
      'It is a good thing that/maybe Kris is coming!' (Aelbrecht, 2006:1, our translation)

Within this second type, which we will refer to as 'semi-insubordination', we believe that in addition to the adjectival and adverbial subtypes, a third subtype can be distinguished, which has so far gone unnoticed. This subtype has a nominal element preceding the *dat*-clause, and is illustrated in (3).

(3)   Een   opluchting   dat   ik   weer   wedstrijden   kan   spelen
      a   relief   CONJ I   again games   can   play
      'It is a relief that I can play games again' (IC)

A third type of (semi-)autonomous subordination patterns involves what we propose to label 'cleft-like' constructions. Like the semi-insubordination patterns (cf. (2)–(3)), they have one element preceding the *dat*-clause, but this element bears a very different relation to the following *dat*-clause than the ones in (2)–(3).

(4)   Vuil   dat   het   er   was!
      dirty CONJ it   there was
      'That place was terribly dirty!' (Haeseryn et al., 1997:1435, our translation)

(5)   Lummel   dat   je   bent!
      lout   CONJ you   are
      'You are such a lout!' (De Rooij, 1967:108, our translation)

The functional equivalents of these constructions in (4′) and (5′) suggest that the element preceding the *dat*-clause conceptually belongs to the propositional content of the *dat*-clause, but has been put in sentence-initial position to enhance the exclamative force of the utterance, just like the cleft constituent in a cleft construction receives extra emphasis or prominence (Davidse, 2000). Note that what is topicalized in (4) and (5) is only the head of the constituent in (4′) and (5′); the elements functioning as degree modifiers of these heads are left out, as the cleft-like construction intrinsically expresses degree modification. It has been noted that the topicalized element is not restricted to the category of adjectives or nouns (cf. (4)–(5)), but belongs to a wide range of parts of speech (cf. Bos, 1963) or constituents. The generalization here is that the cleft-like construction can front any element that can be topicalized in Dutch clauses; another topicalization strategy, for instance, yields constructions like *Vuil was het er*. 'That place was DIRTY.', involving the topicalized element in clause-initial position and V2-word order.

(4′) Het   was   er   ontzettend   vuil
      it   was   there awfully   dirty
      'That place was awfully dirty! (Bos, 1963:191)

---

[1] The sources of our examples are marked with the abbreviations IC (own corpus of internet material), C (constructed examples), and CONDIV (CONDIV Corpus). The abbreviations used in the glosses include: CONJ:conjunction, DIM:diminutive, GEN: genitive, INTERJ:interjection, NEG:negation, PRS:present, PRT:particle, REL:relativizer.

(5′) Je   bent een echte lummel!
     you   are   a   true   lout
     'You are a true lout!' (C)

The fourth type we distinguish in this article is special in that it has no full subordinate clause following the *dat*-subordinator. This final, 'clauseless' type has in turn two subtypes, depending on whether there is a vestigial main clause or not. This is exemplified in (7) and (6), respectively. Note that in (6) there is no main clause and no subordinate clause. In the analysis we propose, all we have here is the independent use of a conjunction, which fulfils the function of a speech act.

(6)   <Roland> Ja, Armand is gene gemakkelijke, zo'n slecht karakter.
        <bambi>   Oeh!   Dadde.[2]
                       INTERJ CONJ
        'R: Yes, Armand is not an easy person, such a bad character. B: Yes, you can say that again!' (IC)

(7)   <LordLeto> poes: en gaat ons intiem dineetje volgende week nog door?:))
        <poes>   lord: tuurlijk   da   :-PP
                   lord   of.course CONJ
        'L: Poes, is our intimate dinner still on next week *smile*[3]? P: Of course! *tongue out*' (CONDIV, IRC, Leuv 5)

Generalizing over these four types, we find that they all share the semantic–pragmatic property of expressing interpersonal meaning (Evans, 2007; Boogaart, 2010; Boogaart and Verheij, 2013), which is here taken to encompass deontic, directive, epistemic, and evaluative meaning (cf. McGregor, 1997:74, 209–251), as well as discursive meanings.[4] The various types of interpersonal meaning almost invariably go together with exclamative illocutionary force; that is, most of the (semi-)autonomous subordination constructions studied here are only felicitous in exclamative contexts. In accordance with Morel (1995), Beyssade and Marandin (2006), and König and Siemund (2007:317), we take exclamatives here to exhibit the features listed in (8).[5]

(8)   (a) Prosodically, they have exclamative intonation, i.e. typically a ''falling intonation contour and a focus on either the basic argument or the (scalar) predicate or both'' (König and Siemund, 2007:317);
     (b) Pragmatically, they are characterized by a high degree of emotional involvement on the part of the speaker;
     (c) They are often introduced by a modal particle or interjection;
     (d) The hearer is merely a witness of the speaker's expression; no hearer uptake necessarily expected.

While this article is primarily concerned with the synchronic description of an underdescribed area of Dutch syntax, it also offers historical data in support of our diachronic explanation for this shared property of interpersonal meaning. In doing so, we draw on Croft's (2000) concept of 'hypoanalysis'. The idea is that in specific contexts subordinate *dat*-clauses happened to express interpersonal meaning, like in (9) (for historical examples, see section 6), and that language users came to reinterpret this meaning as an inherent semantic property of the construction with the subordinating conjunction (*dat*), which paved the way for the emergence of the (semi-)autonomous subordination patterns studied here.

(9)   Dat   ik dat nog mocht   meemaken, had ik nooit gedacht!
     CONJ I   that PRT could   experience   had I   never thought!
     'I had never thought that I would be able to experience this!' (C)

---

[2] Note that the subordinator has a deviant form here, as it is augmented with a schwa, and an idiomatic translation, which we will come back to in section 5. The deviant form is substandardly attested in plain subordinated clauses as well: (…) **dadde** *ze em verbeij gelôôpe bènne* (WNT, s.v. verknoersen) (literally: 'that they him past run have', i.e. 'that they overlooked him'). See also numerous examples in the RND dialect atlas responses, available at: http://www.meertens.knaw.nl/sand/zoeken/lijst_met_testzinnen.php.

[3] The emoticons used in the IRC material are rendered in the translation by a paraphrase marked off by asterisks.

[4] In fact, the interpersonal value of these constructions was already recognized as early as 1910, by the Dutch linguist Van Ginneken, as Boogaart and Verheij (2013) point out.

[5] We stick to the features in (8) rather than the (stricter) set of five features proposed by Michaelis and Lambrecht (1996:239) and Michaelis (2001:1041) to define exclamatives as a distinct sentence type.

In this sense, hypoanalysis closely resembles grammaticalization, as it often proceeds through the process of pragmatic strengthening (Traugott and Dasher, 2002), and that it only takes place in specific contexts (Traugott, 2003; Himmelmann, 2004).[6] As a consequence, in other contexts the grammaticalizing – and in this case also 'hypoanalysed' – element or construction may still retain its original meaning, like in contexts of speech or thought representation, for instance, where canonical subordinate *dat*-clauses generally do not have interpersonal meaning. All of this gives rise to the old and new meanings or functions co-existing in time, a phenomenon called 'layering' by Hopper (1991), and attested in all kinds of form-function change. With its distinct explanatory value, we believe that our proposal in terms of hypoanalysis is complementary to Evans's (2007) hypothesis of diachronic ellipsis. At the same time, however, it takes issue with a purely synchronic ellipsis account of semi-insubordination patterns, as proposed by Aelbrecht (2006).

More generally, this article homes in on the distinction between subordinate clauses and main clauses. This distinction has typically been treated as a basic contrast, but typologically informed studies have moved some way to putting this delineation into perspective. The papers in Nikolaeva (2007), for instance, show that in a widely diverse set of languages the distinction between finiteness and non-finiteness on the one hand, and that between main and subordinate clause on the other are not straightforward (see also Cristofaro, 2003). Similar conclusions have been drawn in recent work on the basis of English and Dutch data in the domains of adverbial relations (Verstraete, 2007), speech and thought representation (Vandelanotte, 2009), relative clauses (Rutten, 2010), and epistemic/evidential parentheticals (Boye and Harder, 2007). This article aims to contribute to the debate by discussing a set of (semi-) autonomous subordination patterns, which often go unnoticed in reference grammars or detailed descriptions of the Dutch language.

It should be noted that some of the patterns studied seem to be typical of Flemish (i.e. Belgian Dutch) dialects, which may explain their limited treatment in the literature. While informants' grammaticality judgments for Netherlandic Dutch or the standard language do not yield unequivocal results, Flemish varieties seem to make more liberal use of (semi-) autonomous subordination (see De Schutter, 1990:44). The data used in this article are drawn from the Internet Relay Chat (IRC) material in the CONDIV Corpus (Grondelaers et al., 2000), which is assumed to resemble spoken language most closely, including dialectal features. For our typology (sections 2–5) only the Flemish subpart of the corpus (comprising 8,207,007 tokens) has been mined. For the section on hypoanalysis (section 6), further examples have been drawn from the Netherlandic subpart (6,965,291 tokens) as well.[7] In addition to the CONDIV data, we use a collection of Dutch internet material (marked with IC), and examples we – two native speakers of Flemish Brabantic varieties – constructed ourselves (marked with C).

The structure of this article is as follows. Sections 2–5 discuss the four main types of (semi-)autonomous *dat*-clause patterns in Dutch presented above, and their various subtypes. They focus on insubordinated, semi-insubordinated, cleft-like and clauseless *dat*-clause constructions respectively. In section 6, we will capture the shared semantic–pragmatic value of the patterns in our typology in terms of hypoanalysis, taking also historical data into account. In section 7, finally, we will formulate our conclusions and some questions for further research.

2. Patterns of insubordination

The first type of (semi-)autonomous patterns we distinguish is that of insubordinated constructions. These formally look like subordinate *dat*-complement constructions, but function as independent clauses (cf. Evans, 2007). A detailed analysis of complement insubordination in Dutch is presented in Verstraete et al. (2012), who develop a typology of seven distinct construction types in three semantic domains, namely the deontic, evaluative and discursive domain. Their typology is constructional in the sense that the semantic (sub)types are paired with distinct formal markers (cf. Goldberg, 1995). Examples from our own corpus data are given in (10)–(13).

(10)   <pater_f> leve di berti zijn werkdag
         <pater_f> dat   er   nog   vele   mogen   volgen
                    CONJ there PRT   many   may.PRS follow
         'P: Long live Berti's working day! I wish many of those may follow!' (CONDIV, IRC, Vlaan 7)

The insubordinated expression in (10), featuring the modal auxiliary *mogen* ('may'), conveys a wish: the speaker hopes that Berti will have many working days ahead of him. In Verstraete et al.'s (2012:129) typology, optative constructions like

---

[6] We will come back to the relation between hypoanalysis and grammaticalization in the concluding section.

[7] For each example from the CONDIV corpus, the chat channel it has been taken from is indicated. A list of the abbreviations used and more information on these chat channels can be found in Grondelaers et al. (2000). The examples are rendered without any editing, including typos and emoticons.

(10) form a subtype of the uncontrolled deontic type: ''the speaker expresses their commitment to the desirability of a particular S[tate] o[f] A[ffairs] beyond the control of the [modal] addressee (if there is one),[8] but does not intervene in its realization.'' To this description we want to add that – with a high degree of emotional involvement on the part of the speaker, and their exclamative intonation – such insubordinated wishes have exclamative illocutionary force, which has also been noted by Haeseryn et al. (1997:1434). A more detailed account for why optative constructions like (10) are exclamative in nature is given in Grosz (2012).

(11)　　<zarra>　　tenshin: ga ze daar eens uit hun bed halen
　　　　<Tenshin>　no way
　　　　<Tenshin>　dat　ze　　het　alleen　doen
　　　　　　　　　　　CONJ　they　it　　alone　do
　　　　'Z: Tenshin, go and get them out of bed! T: No way. They should do it all by themselves!' (CONDIV, IRC, Vlaan 1)

The expression in (11) also belongs to the deontic domain, but – in contrast to (10) – it exemplifies controlled deontic meaning, in that the addressee is construed as having control over the realization of the SoA in the *dat*-clause, and the speaker intervenes by telling the addressee (not) to realize it (Verstraete et al., 2012). Again, the speaker is highly emotionally involved: in his reaction to the face-threatening act of his interlocutor, he emphatically refuses to carry out the action imposed on him. As such, this example has exclamative value as well.

(12)　　<Bram>　Bill Gates is godver een ferm crapuul
　　　　<fireb>　lamer
　　　　<fireb>　dat　je　　dat　nu　　pas　weet!
　　　　　　　　　CONJ　you　that　now　PRT　know
　　　　'B: Bill Gates is damned scum. F: Lamer, I can't believe you realize this only now!' (CONDIV, IRC, Vlaan 3)

The insubordinated expression in (12) expresses purely evaluative meaning, in that it conveys the speaker's attitudinal assessment of an actual (or more precisely, presupposed) SoA, whereas deontic examples involve the speaker's commitment to potential SoAs (cf. Verstraete, 2007:43–46; Van linden and Davidse, 2009; Van linden, 2012; Verstraete et al., 2012). The speaker in (12) conveys their surprise in finding out that the interlocutor is really late in understanding that Bill Gates is scum. Such evaluative constructions expressing unexpectedness on the part of the speaker typically contain scalar elements, like *pas* in (12) (Verstraete et al., 2012), and have exclamative intonation.

In (13), finally, an example is given of what Verstraete et al. (2012) have called a 'discursive' type of insubordination. This type is used to elaborate on a topic that has been introduced in earlier discourse; the example in (13) gives more details about the content of the movie introduced in the first line (*die film* 'that movie').

(13)　　<orkaantje>　ik herionner mij niks van maar ik weet dat ik de ene lachkick na
　　　　　　　　　　　de andere had tijdens die film:))
　　　　<frru|tt>　　cheech en chong kick ass!
　　　　<orkaantje>　cheech en chong still smokin g:))
　　　　<orkaantje>　in almsterdam:))))))))
　　　　<frru|tt>　　heheh
　　　　<orkaantje >　dat　ze　　daar　op　die　boot　vanalles　　　gaan　eten:)
　　　　　　　　　　　CONJ　they　there　on　that　boat　of.everything　go　　eat
　　　　<orkaantje>　fungus mungus en hasjflappen enzo:))
　　　　'O: I don't remember anything, but I know I had one fit of laughter after the other during that movie *smile*. F: Cheech and Chong [a comedy duo] kick ass. O: Cheech and Chong still smoking *smile*. O: In Amsterdam *smile*. F: *laughter*. O: So they went to eat all sorts of things on that boat. O: Fungus mungus and hash turnovers etc. *smile*.' (CONDIV, IRC, Belg 3)

Arguably, examples like (13) do not instantiate insubordination proper, as they still show conceptual dependency on a previous turn (cf. Verstraete et al., 2011). Instead, we propose to account for them in terms of turn-continuation strategies that involve dependency extending beyond the sentence level (cf. Mithun, 2008), as has been suggested

---

[8] The term 'addressee' is used here to refer to the participant to whom a deontic judgement or general evaluation applies, regardless of whether this is the interlocutor, as in (12), or a third person, as in (11) (cf. Verstraete et al., 2012).

for similar Swedish structures (e.g. Lehti-Eklund, 2002; Anward, 2003; Linell, 2005, all cited in Lindström and London, 2008).

As Verstraete et al. (2012) note, *dat*-complement insubordination is extremely widespread in the Dutch language, especially in informal spoken varieties, and in Flemish varieties more so than in Netherlandic ones. Their typology includes constructions that had been discussed before (e.g. the optative and evaluative type have been mentioned in De Rooij (1965:117–121), Van der Horst (1984:108, 114), Haeseryn et al. (1997:1434), Boogaart (2010), and Foolen (2012)), but also analyses quite a number of previously undescribed patterns. For more details on *dat*-complement insubordination in Dutch, for example on the specific formal markers associated with the semantic subtypes, we thus refer the reader to their work.

3. Patterns of semi-insubordination

The second type of constructions we are concerned with in this article consist of a subordinate *dat*-clause that is preceded by a just one element which seems to function at matrix clause level. Crucially, this element conveys the speaker's attitudinal (including epistemic) assessment of the propositional content expressed in the *dat*-clause. The various formal subtypes are illustrated in (14). A semantic classification will be developed towards the end of this section.

(14) (a) misschien   da'k   als bob   stomdronken toch
           maybe   CONJ.I as   designated.driver   dead.drunk   nevertheless
           binnen   zal   mogen:-)))
           inside   will   may
           'Maybe, as a designated driver I will nevertheless be allowed to get in dead drunk *smile*.'
           (CONDIV, IRC, Brug 1)

      (b) <xphile> LordLeto:hoe kunde in pine naar de laatste mail gaan van ne folder ? […]
           < `` >   xphlie: andersom sorteren ?:)
           <xphile> aha
           <xphile> cool
           <xphile> stom   da'k   daar nie aangedacht heb; `
                     stupid CONJ.I there not thought.of   have
           'X: LordLeto, how can you go to the last e-mail in a folder in Pine? ``: Xphile, by sorting the other way round? X: Oh yeah, cool! It is so stupid that I haven't thought of this myself *wink*.' (CONDIV, IRC, Leuv 3)

      (c) chance   dat   mijne radio hier nog opstaat
           good.luck   CONJ my   radio here PRT is.on
           'Luckily my radio is still on (here).' (CONDIV, IRC, Antw 2)

The types in (14a) and (14b) have received some attention in the literature. For the adverbial subtype in (14a), it has been observed that it is restricted to sentential adverbs (Aelbrecht, 2006:3), expressing attitudinal meaning. Semantically, these adverbs fall into two further types (cf. Bos, 1963:175–180, who speaks of 'assertion particles' versus 'emotion particles'). The first type, illustrated in (14a), expresses the speaker's assessment of the degree of truth of the propositional content of the *dat*-clause, i.e. it expresses epistemic modal meaning (see Palmer, 1979:ch. 3, 2001:24–35; Bybee et al., 1994:179–180; Van der Auwera and Plungian, 1998:81; Nuyts, 2006:6). The second type, by contrast, takes the truth of the propositional content of the *dat*-clause for granted, and expresses the speaker's value judgement of this content, i.e. it conveys purely evaluative ('non-modal', cf. Van linden, 2012:ch. 2) meaning. In (15), for example, the speaker, *Mormeltje*, evaluates the fact that *Gonzy* is not massaging her with his feet in terms of likeablity (Nuyts, 2005, 2006): she thinks it is fortunate that he is using his hands and not his feet.[9,10]

---

[9] In Nuyts (2005, 2006), attitudinal assessments in terms of likeability are regarded as expressing 'boulomaic' modality. In his view, this category indicates "the degree of the speaker's (or someone else's) liking or disliking of the state of affairs" (2006:12).

[10] Aelbrecht (2006:3–4) refers to Cinque's (1999) hierarchy of adverbs to indicate which types are found in the construction focused on in this section. She does not recognize the evaluative subtype in (15), but she notes three speaker-oriented adverb types located in the "higher Mod-nodes". Specifically, she lists "Mod$_{epistemic}$ (*wellicht* 'perchance', *allicht* 'most likely', and *blijkbaar* 'apparently'), Mod$_{irrealis}$ (*misschien* 'perhaps'), and Mod$_{necessity}$ (*uiteraard* 'indeed', *(na)tuurlijk* 'naturally', *zeker en vast* 'definitely', *alleszins* 'absolutely' and *ongetwijfeld* 'undoubtedly')" (2006:3–4). However, she does not further motivate this three-way classification, with the distinction between Mod$_{epistemic}$ and Mod$_{irrealis}$ getting a – in our view – rather theory-internal feel.

(15)   <Gonzy>   mormeltje: neen, ik kaart met mijn voeten en masseert jou met mijn handen
        <Boozer>   zu moet da
        <Mormeltje> gelukkig   dat   je   nie   met je   voeten   masseert:))
                       fortunately CONJ you   not   with your   feet   massage
        'G: Mormeltje, no, I'm playing cards with my feet and I'm massaging you with my hands. B: That is how it should
        be. M: Fortunately you are not massaging with your feet! *smile* (CONDIV, IRC, Vlaan 2)

The epistemic adverbs further categorize into adverbs that express the speaker's conviction of the truth, i.e. the so-called 'certainty adverbs' (cf. Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer, 2007), such as *uiteraard* and *(na)tuurlijk* 'of course, indeed' (cf. (16)), and those that express lower degrees of certainty such as *waarschijnlijk* 'probable' and *misschien* 'maybe' (cf. (14a)), which we will refer to here as 'uncertainty adverbs'.[11] Bos (1963:177–179) – without using this terminology – already distinguished between these two epistemic types, observing that the certainty adverbs come with ''expressive'' (cf. Bolinger, 1961:32) or exclamative intonation, whereas the uncertainty adverb constructions typically have ''assertion intonation'' (Bos, 1963:178).[12] Her finding nicely squares with Simon-Vandenbergen and Aijmer's (2007) conclusion that certainty adverbs not only express epistemic meaning, but also function rhetorically in marking expectation and counter-expectation. It is especially the latter function, due to identifying an extreme value on the epistemic scale (cf. Michaelis, 2001), that lends exclamative force to semi-insubordinated constructions with certainty adverbs such as *(na)tuurlijk* in (16).

(16)   <|brutus|>   pitu... waar in Kortrij
        <pitufina>   Rollegem
        <pitufina>   kent ge da?
        <pitufina>   bij bellegem
        <|brutus|>   tuurlijk   da   ik   da   ken
                       of.course CONJ   I   that know
        'B: Pitu, where in Kortrijk? P: Rollegem. Do you know it? Close to Bellegem. B: Of course I know it!'
        (CONDIV, IRC, Vlaan 8)

Expressions with uncertainty adverbs like (14a) are equally interpersonal in meaning as (16), but do not have exclamative force, as they identify a non-extreme (but intermediate) value on the epistemic scale.

In addition to adverbs, the semi-insubordinated pattern is also found with adjectives, like in (14b). Similarly to the adverbs, they express the speaker's evaluation of the propositional content coded by the *dat*-clause. In the same vein, Aelbrecht (2006:4) notes that the adjectives belong to the Mood$_{evaluation}$-node in Cinque's (1999) hierarchy of adverbs, which can be assumed to hold for adjectives as well (Cinque, 1994). She gives the following list of adjectives that are possible in the semi-insubordinated construction – without, however, adducing evidence or stating the source of her examples: *logisch* 'logical', *evident* 'evident', *nogal wiedes* 'goes without saying', *ondenkbaar* 'unthinkable', *spijtig* 'regrettable', *vreemd* 'strange', *jammer* 'unfortunate', *grappig* 'funny', *dom* 'stupid' and *goed* 'good' (Aelbrecht, 2006:4).[13] Another example with an adjective from the same class is given in (17).

---

[11] It should be noted that adverbs that comment on the conditions for truth, that is, which state ''the sense in which the speaker judges what he says to be true or false'' (Quirk et al., 1985:621) are excluded in the semi-insubordinated construction, e.g. *eigenlijk* 'actually' and *feitelijk* 'factually'.

[12] However, Bos (1963:179) also notes that when the adverb expresses certainty on the part of the speaker about the proposition in the *dat*-clause, the semi-insubordinated construction is not possible, e.g. with *zeker* 'surely', *zonder twijfel* 'without a doubt' and *uiteraard* 'of course'. We agree that especially with the first two forms the construction is not felicitous, but we also believe that adverbs which do occur in the semi-insubordinated construction, like *(na)tuurlijk* in (16), for example, do express epistemic certainty. Other examples include:

(i)   Sowieso   dat   m'n slaapkamer er   later zo uitziet.
        in.any.case CONJ my bedroom   there later so looks.like
        'My bedroom is later definitely going to look like this' (IC)
(ii)   Doffis   da   da   beter glijdt in teflon
        Surely (French: *d'office*) CONJ that better glides in teflon
        'No doubt it glides better with teflon' (IC)

This means that we have no explanation for why certain certainty adverbs can occur in the semi-insubordinated construction while others cannot. One factor that may play a role is style or register clash. The adverbial *zonder twijfel* does not belong to the informal registers that form the natural environment for semi-insubordination.

[13] We can confirm that our CONDIV corpus data do include examples with *logisch* 'logical', *nogal wiedes* 'goes without saying', *spijtig* 'regrettable', *vreemd* 'strange', *jammer* 'unfortunate', *dom* 'stupid' and *goed* 'good'. Examples with *evident* 'evident', *ondenkbaar* 'unthinkable', and *grappig* 'funny' turned up in our IC material.

(17)   <EVA_>   spicer dees keer valt het nog meer . . . lisa wilde 8,5 weken te vroeg komen en marco
wilde 28 weken te vroeg komen

        <bbibber> eva: eigenlijk toch wel raar   dat er   zo'n   medicatie   bestaat he

        Eva actually PRT PRT strange CONJ there such.a medication exists   INTERJ

        'E: Spicer, this time turns out better than expected; Lisa wanted to come 8.5 weeks early and Marco
wanted to come 28 weeks early. B: Eva, actually it is rather strange that such medication exists, isn't
it?' (CONDIV, IRC, Vlaan 8)

Example (17) features the adjective *raar* 'strange'. It also shows that adjectives in this construction can be preceded by a string of adverbs and particles, such as *eigenlijk toch wel*, which all have scope over the entire construction.

Bos (1963:179–180) gives examples with *lekker* 'nice' and *fijn* 'nice', but she – mistakenly – analyses these as evaluative adverbs such as *gelukkig* 'fortunately' and *helaas* 'unfortunately', rather than adjectives. More generally, her analysis points to a feature of Dutch grammar relevant to our study, namely that adjectives and adverbs are not distinguished morphologically. However, they show different syntactic behaviour. Adjectives can typically be used both attributively and predicatively, whereas adverbs generally cannot (*pace* Diepeveen and Van de Velde, 2010). Constructions such as (14b) can be paraphrased predicatively as *het is stom dat*. . . 'it is stupid that . . .', whereas adverbial constructions such as (14a) can only be paraphrased with the 'pro-clause form' (see Schachter and Shopen, 2007:32–33 for this term) *zo* 'the case' (literally 'so'): *het is misschien zo dat*. . . 'it is maybe the case that. . .' (cf. Aelbrecht, 2006:1–2).[14] Some forms nevertheless show both types of behaviour, such as *waarschijnlijk* 'probable, probably' and *mogelijk* 'possible, possibly'.

In any case, what is characteristic of the unambiguously adjectival semi-insubordinated construction is that the propositional content to which the speaker expresses their commitment is presented as presupposed true, just like in the construction with purely evaluative adverbs. Very often, the SoA referred to in the propositional content assessed by the speaker has already taken place or is taking place at the moment of attitudinal assessment, which – in this construction – invariably coincides with the moment of speech. Examples are in (14b) and (17). However, this does not need to be the case. In (18), for instance, the SoA referred in the proposition has not yet taken place, but it is bound to take place on the next day (cf. Van linden and Davidse, 2009:177–181; Van linden, 2012:56–62).

(18)   <Slof> Goe da't   morgen   master meeting is . . .

        good CONJ.it tomorrow master meeting is

        t' gaat hoog tijd worden:)

        'S: It is good that a master meeting will be held tomorrow. It is getting high time *smile*.'

        (CONDIV, IRC, Hass 1)

The data also show a different type of adjective occurring in the semi-insubordinated construction, which has not been noted before. An example is given in (19).

(19)   <Pifke>   eef dan zijn we met 2:))

        <Evaatje> pifke blij   da'k   nie alleen ben. . . da lucht   enorm   op [. . .]

        pifke happy CONJ.I not alone am   that relieves enormously PRT

        'P: Eef, then we make two, *smile*. E: Pifke, I am happy that I am not alone. That is an enormous relief!' (CONDIV, IRC, Belg 7)

Adjectives like *blij* 'happy' in (19) do not evaluate a particular propositional content as such, but specify the psychological state of the speaker towards a particular content, in this case towards the fact that the speaker is not the only one. (Note also the translation with 'I am ADJ' rather than 'it is ADJ', since the 'emotive' or 'affective' adjectives are typically predicated of humans rather than situations or events, cf. Biber et al., 1999:672–673.) Other

---

[14] Another adverb that fits in this structural template is the negation *niet*, as in (i).

(i) Niet dat   hij je   af zal snauwen . . .

    not   CONJ he you at will snarl

    'Not that he will snarl at you . . .' (Bos, 1963:174, our translation)

Examples like (i) have a distinct semantic-pragmatic value: they express ''a rejection of conclusions derived from contextual assumptions'' (Delahunty, 2006:213, for English *not that*-clauses). Cases like (i) will not be treated in any further detail in this article.

examples in the CONDIV corpus include the adjectives *opgelucht* 'relieved', *fier* 'proud', and *bang* 'afraid', with the latter occurring mostly in interrogatives. Like the evaluative adjectives, the affective adjectives combine with presupposed *dat*-clauses only.[15]

So far, we have reviewed and expanded on the few descriptions that are available for the semi-insubordinated patterns with adverbs and adjectives. For the third subtype we present here, illustrated in (14c), however, there is – to our knowledge – no previous study to discuss. The construction in (14c) features a noun in initial position, which is not accompanied by any determiner.[16] In addition, this nominal type also includes instances with a determinerless nominal preceded by an intensifying adverb (*Echt dood- en doodzonde dat* . . . 'It is really a pity that . . .'), or an emphasizing adjective (*Puur toeval dat* . . . 'It is sheer chance that . . .'), as well as examples like (3) with an indefinite determiner (*Een opluchting dat* . . . 'It is a relief that. . .'), and examples like (20) with negative determiner *geen* 'no'. It should be noted that – unlike in the cases of the adverbial and adjectival patterns – the *dat*-clause in (14c) and (20)–(23) could also be analysed as an appositional or noun complement clause.

(20) <Waliwalkr> nijn ge moet ni halfnaakt achter uwe pc zitten he
        <nijntie>   wali ik zit hier in een skipak
        <Waliwalkr> amaai dat moet nagal een zicht zijn,

geen	wonder	dat	de	kuismadam	de	deur	laat	openstaan
no	wonder	CONJ	the	cleaning.lady	the	door	leaves	stand.open

'W: Nijn, you shouldn't be sitting at your pc half naked. N: Wali, I am wearing a ski suit. W: wow, that must be a lovely sight! No wonder the cleaning lady leaves the door open!' (CONDIV, IRC, Vlaan 4)

In (20), the initial constituent *geen wonder* 'no wonder' miratively qualifies the propositional content of the *dat*-clause (cf. Chafe, 1986): the speaker thinks it is unsurprising that the cleaning lady leaves the door open when a person is sitting at their pc in a ski suit (cf. Matthijs et al., ms for English counterparts).

Variety is also found in constructions with the noun *kans* 'chance', in which the speaker evaluates the degree of truth of the content coded by the *dat*-clause.

(21) <Pooky> IK GA NAAR DE SNEAK!
      <Pooky> kans   dat   het ''apt pupil'' is!
                chance CONJ it   apt   pupil is
'P: I am going to the Sneak (preview). Maybe they'll show ''Apt Pupil''!' (CONDIV, IRC, Leuv 3)

(22) <WoWDaN> If most car accidents occur within five miles of home, why doesn't everyone move 10 miles
                away?
      <CCC}>   ik vind dat iedereen op 5 mijl van wowdan moet gaan leven,

Grote	kans	dat	hij	in	zo'n	ongeval	betrokken	raakt	dan:-)
large	chance	CONJ	he	in	such.a	accident	involved	gets	then

     <WoWDaN>

grote	kans	dat	wowdan	een	van	die	mensen	dan
large	chance	CONJ	Wowdan	one	of	those	persons	then

overhoop	rijdt	zeker	:p
upside.down	drives	PRT	

---

[15] It should be noted, however, that with expressions of fear, the propositional content of the *dat*-clause is not presupposed true. Rather, expressions of fear semantically combine epistemic and affective components, as has been noted in the literature on apprehension (e.g. Lichtenberk, 1995).

[16] The distribution of determiners with nouns in Dutch is similar to that in English and German, in that singular count nouns are obligatorily preceded by a determiner in most syntactic contexts, whereas non-count (mass) nouns are not. The absence of the determiner in examples like (14c) can be accounted for in two ways. A first option is to analyse the nouns as non-count, which is the default for *chance* ('good luck') in (14c) and *schrik* ('fear') in (23), and which is possible, e.g. in a coercion reading, for *kans* ('chance') in (21)–(22) (see sentences like *Ze heeft kans op een medaille* 'she has a medal chance'). Alternatively, the latter nouns can be analysed as count nouns, and the absence of the determiner can be motivated by the – fairly recent – tendency of nominals in topicalized predicate position to occur in bare form (Van der Horst and Van der Horst, 1999; Hoeksema, 2000, from which the following example is taken).

(i) Vraag   is alleen hoelang   de vakbonden dit   blijven accepteren
    question is only   how.long the unions   this keep   tolerate
    'The question is only how long the unions will keep tolerating this' (Hoeksema, 2000:114)

'C: I think that everyone has to go and live within five miles of Wowdan's place; Chances are high that he gets involved in such an accident. W: Rather, chances are high that Wowdan runs over one of those people *tongue out*' (CONDIV, IRC, Vlaan 2)

In (21), the nominal element consists of a noun only, without any determiner. The speaker thinks it is possible that they are showing the movie 'Apt Pupil' in the sneak preview programme of the local cinema. In (22), the speakers express more certainty than in (21) by modifying the noun *kans* with the qualitative adjective *groot* 'large': they think chances are high that the propositional contents of the *dat*-clauses will actualize.

In addition to the epistemic and evaluative examples shown above, the corpus data also include instances with nouns designating a psychological state, such as *schrik* 'fear' in (23). Note that the construction as a whole functions as an interrogative.

(23)   <VLinderke> frisk jong ge deed mij een hartattack krijgen!!!!
         <Frisk>   ben er terug
         <VLinderke> oef
         <Frisk>   hoe bedoelt ge
         <Frisk>   schrik da   ik ging bellen of wa?
                          Fear CONJ I went call   or what
         'V: Frisk, mate, you gave me a heart attack! F: I am back. V: Phew! F: What do you mean?
         Were you afraid that I was going to call you or what?' (CONDIV, IRC, Hass 3)

Other 'affective' nouns occurring in the nominal semi-insubordinated constructions found in the CONDIV corpus include *opluchting* 'relief' (cf. (3)), *teleurstelling* 'disappointment', and *spijt* 'regret'.

The examples in (14c) and (20)–(23) show that the nominal type is semantically very close to the other semi-insubordinated patterns. We distinguished three semantic subtypes, i.e. epistemic, evaluative and affective constructions. For the first subtype, we have only found examples with the noun *kans* 'chance', expressing uncertainty. Constructions expressing certainty, for example with *noodzakelijkheid* 'necessity', *evidentie* 'obviousness', or *zekerheid* 'certainty' are not attested and do not seem felicitous to us. For the evaluative subtype, the semantic range of nouns is restricted to those that can categorize propositional contents according to the speaker's personal stance, for example as instances of *geluk*, *chance* 'good luck', *toeval* 'coincidence', *pech* 'bad luck' or *zonde* 'pity'. The third subtype involves nouns that designate a psychological state, such as *spijt* 'regret' or *schrik* 'fear' (but not *verdriet* 'sorrow' or *woede* 'anger', for instance). All of this implies that the nominal type alternates with some but not all subtypes of adverbial and adjectival semi-insubordinated patterns.

In conclusion, the three formal subtypes of semi-insubordinated constructions, i.e. the adverbial, adjectival and nominal type, all express interpersonal meaning in that the element(s) preceding the *dat*-clause convey(s) the speaker's attitudinal assessment of the propositional content expressed in the *dat*-clause; in interrogative constructions such as (23), the speaker solicits the hearer's agreement on this assessment (cf. Verstraete, 2007:60–63). Arguably, in case of the affective adjectives and nouns, this evaluation is expressed more indirectly, with the speaker's psychological state indexing their evaluation of the propositional content of the *dat*-clause. The semantic subtypes per formal type are summarized in Table 1. The numbers between brackets refer to the examples in the discussion above.

4. Cleft-like constructions

The third type of (semi-)autonomous subordination patterns we discuss here is formed by what we call 'cleft-like' constructions. Like the semi-insubordinated patterns, described in section 3, these constructions have one element preceding the *dat*-clause. However, this element conceptually belongs to the propositional content of the *dat*-clause rather

Table 1
The semantic range of the formal types of semi-insubordinated constructions.

Formal subtype	Epistemic (degree of truth)		Evaluative (presupposed SoA)	Affective (typically presupposed SoA)
	Uncertainty	Certainty		
Adverbial	(14a)	(16)	(15)	–
Adjectival	–	–	(14b), (17)–(18)	(19)
Nominal	(21), (22)	–	(14c), (20)	(3), (23)

than that it expresses the speaker's evaluation of the propositional content of the *dat*-clause. As noted in section 1, they are typically exclamative expressions (see also Haeseryn et al., 1997:1435–1436)[17]. More precisely, they express the speaker's surprise at the quantity or intensity of the topicalized element. They thus share a semantics of degree modification, which entails selection restrictions on the nature of the topicalized element. Nevertheless, it should be borne in mind that the cleft-like construction can front any element that can be topicalized in Dutch clauses (see section 1). The following examples show the formal similarity between a cleft-like construction in (24) and a genuine cleft construction in (25).

(24)   Een zand dat er   in de sla   zit
            a   sand that there in the lettuce sits
            'There is so much sand in the lettuce' (Haeseryn et al., 1997:1435)

(25)   <lolita_> blue: t waren u   oogskes dat   em deden bij   mij
                       Blue   it were   your eyes.DIM CONJ.it him did   with me
                       he
                       INTERJ
            'Blue, it was your eyes that made all the difference with me.' (CONDIV, IRC, Vlaan 4)

The example in (25) is an *it*-cleft, with a fully expressed matrix clause (*het waren je oogjes* in standard Dutch). The postverbal matrix constituent *u oogskes* conceptually belongs to the *dat*-clause, functioning as subject (cf. Davidse, 2000): *u oogskes deden het em bij mij* 'your eyes made all the difference with me'. The example in (24), however, does not have a full matrix clause preceding the *dat*-clause, but just one element. This element – like the post-copular NP in (25) – receives extra focus in the construction and conceptually belongs to the *dat*-clause. In addition, it is understood to also take up the syntactic function of subject of the (in this case, existential) *dat*-clause. This is why we propose to label constructions like (24) 'cleft-like' constructions. (Note that authentic cleft constructions do not necessarily have any exclamative – or more generally, interpersonal – value.) In what follows, we discuss a number of subtypes, building on the descriptions in Bos (1963) and Haeseryn et al. (1997). In essence, the subtypes only differ in the type of element that is topicalized; they all share the same semantics of degree modification, speaker's surprise, and exclamative illocutionary force.

    A first subtype has an adverb in topicalized position, like *snel* 'quickly' in (26). Crucially, this adverb is not attitudinal in nature, but representational, functioning at clausal level in modifying the verb phrase *gaat* 'goes'. The speaker uses this construction to express their surprise at the speed of the IRC-discussion, or rather its slow pace, as there is some irony involved.

(26)   <antares> en   snel   dat   dat hier weer gaat...
                     and quickly CONJ that here again goes
            'and it goes so quickly again here!' (CONDIV, IRC, Vlaan 6)

As Bos notes (1963:180–181), this construction is restricted to representational ('referential', in Bos's terminology) adverbs that express a characteristic or quantity that can be intensified. Morphologically, the adverbs can have degrees of comparison. In the construction, however, they cannot be modified by scalar degree modifiers, such as *tamelijk* 'rather', *vrij* 'fairly' or *min of meer* 'more or less'; nor can they occur in the comparative or superlative degree. Rather, it is the construction as such that takes on an intensifying function, as can be inferred from the translation of (26).

(27)   das hier al een gans tropisch paradijs op mijn kamer.
            Warm dat   da   hier is
            hot   CONJ that here is
            'It is already a total tropical paradise in my room. It is so hot in here!' (CONDIV, IRC, Vlaan 9)

    The second type, illustrated in (27), features an adjective (*warm* 'hot') in topicalized position (cf. Haeseryn et al., 1997:1435). More generally, the cleft-like construction can contain adjectives of any of the semantic types proposed in Dixon (1977), expressing dimension, physical properties (cf. (27)), colour, human propensities, age, value or speed – unlike the adjectival semi-insubordinated construction, which is restricted to adjectives of the value type (see section 3). Essentially, the adjective in constructions like (27) designates a quality, allows for predicative alternation,

---

[17] They even exhibit the semantically stricter criteria for exclamatives posited by Michaelis and Lambrecht (1996).

and accepts degrees of comparison; that is, the construction is restricted to 'scalar unbounded' adjectives (Paradis, 2001).[18] Like in the case of the adverbial type in (26) and for the same reason, however, it can only occur in the positive degree (for the exceptional superlative form with prefix *aller-*, see Bos, 1963:182–183).[19] Interestingly, Bos (1963:182) notes that the subordinator *dat* alternates with *als* 'like, if' (realized as *as* in (27′)). An even wider variation with respect to the conjunction is found in cleft-like semi-insubordination with a noun, as will be discussed in section 6.

(27′) vuil   asseter   was
       dirty CONJ.it.there was
       'It was so dirty in there!' (Bos, 1963:182, our translation)

The next types of cleft-like construction feature non-finite verb forms in topicalized position. The example in (28) starts with an infinitive, whereas the one in (29) starts with a past participle (cf. Haeseryn et al., 1997:1435).

(28)   <kraaitje> bram: die deschim-lamer zeker in geen velden en
                    wegen te bespeuren op td?
        <Wimlee> kraai, jawel
        <Wimlee> kraai, en   zaaaaagen dat   i.e. deed, argh
                  Kraai, and nag   CONJ he   did   argh
        'K: Bram, this 'the shadow' lamer is nowhere to be found on TD for sure? W: Kraai, yes he is. W: Kraai, and he was nagging terribly, argh!' (CONDIV, IRC, Vlaan 4)

The representation of vowel lengthening in the topicalized infinitive *zagen* 'nag' and the final interjection *argh*, which expresses annoyance, make it very clear that the speaker thinks the third person referred to in the cleft-like construction in (28) was nagging with surprising intensity. More generally, this infinitival type is restricted to verbs designating processes that can be modified for intensity or quality (copular verbs or auxiliary verbs are thus excluded, cf. Bos, 1963:186). Like in the types discussed above, the cleft-like construction itself lacks an overt degree modifier, but the expression as a whole gets a degree modification interpretation. The *dat*-clause in (28) contains a finite form of the light verb *doen* 'do'. In addition, it can feature a range of tense and modal auxiliaries (*zullen* 'will', *moeten* 'must', *kunnen* 'can', as well as complement-taking predicates patterning with infinitival complements (*zien* 'see', *horen* 'hear', *durven* 'dare', *leren* 'learn') (cf. Bos, 1963:186).

The example in (29) has the past participle *gefaald* 'failed' in topicalized position. Semantically, the same restriction holds as for the infinitival type: the verb has to designate a process whose intensity or quality can be graded (cf. Bos, 1963:187). The perfect auxiliary (*hebben* 'have' or *zijn* 'be') appears as the finite verb form of the *dat*-clause.

(29)   <Promille>   T is weer weekend
        <Wiseguy1>   en de examens zijn GEDAAN
        <Wiseguy1>   —————————————— 4JOEPIE

        <Wiseguy1>   En   gefaald da   wij   hebbe
                     and failed   CONJ we   have
        'P: It is weekend again. W: And the exams are over. Yippee! And we failed so terribly!'
        (CONDIV, IRC, Vlaan 5)

Bos (1963:185–186) also notes a third non-finite verb form in this construction, namely the present participle (this type is not described in Haeseryn et al., 1997). The participle has to function as a secondary predicate for the construction to be grammatical, e.g. *snuivend dat hij de gang doorstapte!* 'he walked through the hallway terribly snorting with rage' (C). Copular *dat*-clauses with the participle functioning as a complement to the subject are excluded (e.g. **snuivend dat hij was* 'he was snorting so much') (cf. Bos, 1963:186–186). However, this verbal subtype is not attested in the corpus data, and not easy to find on the Internet.

---

[18] The construction can also coerce a scalar unbounded reading onto non-scalar bounded adjectives, such as e.g. *zwanger* 'pregnant'.
[19] Bos (1963:182) notes that in addition to the copular *zijn* 'be', five more copulas are possible (*worden* 'become', *blijven* 'remain', *blijken* 'appear', *lijken* 'seem', *schijnen* 'seem'). By contrast, the copulas *dunken* 'seem', *toeschijnen* 'seem' and *voorkomen* 'seem' are not that felicitous.

Another type noted by Bos (1963), but for which we cannot adduce additional evidence either, has a prepositional phrase (PP) in topicalized position (this type is also not described in Haeseryn et al., 1997). We repeat her examples in (30a–b), which we think are grammatical.

(30) (a) In   een   huis   dat   ze   wonen!... meesterlijk!
            in   a   house   CONJ   they   live   masterly
            'The house they live in is a masterpiece of craftsmanship!' (Bos, 1963:187, our translation)
      (b) In   een   prachtig huis   dat   ze   wonen!
            in   a   splendid house   CONJ   they   live
            'They live in such a splendid house!' (Bos, 1963:187, our translation)

Bos (1963:187) notes that an example like (30a), with no adjective modifying the noun of the PP, is incomplete without a kind of afterthought expressing the speaker's evaluation, in this case exemplified by the qualification *meesterlijk* 'masterly'. In cases like (30b), which do contain an adjective attributing a gradable quality to the noun in the PP, this final comment is not necessary. (However, to our native speakers' intuition, the afterthought in (30a) is not strictly necessary either.) Again, the cleft-like construction adds a meaning of degree modification and exclamative force to the whole.

The final type of cleft-like construction we discuss involves topicalized nouns or NPs. In line with Bos (1963), we make a distinction between constructions with copular *dat*-clauses and those with non-copular *dat*-clauses. The first type is illustrated in (31) and (32).

(31) lamer   dat   em   is
      lamer   CONJ   he   is
      'He is such a lamer!' (CONDIV, IRC, Belg 2)
(32) <|Panter> dikke poep, moehaaaaa
      <|Panter> juist een vrouwe poepke
      <Gette>   vettige gast   da   ge   zijt
                 dirty   bloke CONJ you   are
      'P: Fat ass, *laughter*. Just like a woman's bum. G: You are such a dirty bloke!' (CONDIV, IRC, Belg 6)

In both (31) and (32), the topicalized noun or NP specifies a gradable characteristic of the subject of the copular *dat*-clause. What is different is that in (32), the NP serves as a vocative, since the copular clause has a second person subject. This vocative subtype always has determinerless NPs in topicalized position (Bos, 1963:184), and a first or second person subject as well as a present indicative finite verb form of *zijn* ('be') in the *dat*-clause (cf. Paardekooper, 1963; De Rooij, 1967; Haeseryn et al., 1997:1436). Incidentally, the non-vocative example in (31) also has a determinerless NP, but this need not be the case (cf. Bos, 1963:184).

Examples of the second nominal cleft-like construction, with a non-copular *dat*-clause, are given in (33) and (34).

(33) <waxw3azl3> pech   da   die   heeft... stats: 10 meiskes, 3 jongens:)
                   Bad.luck   CONJ that.one has   stats 10 girls   3 boys
      'Such bad luck he has... stats: 10 girls, 3 boys *smile*.' (CONDIV, IRC, Hass 4)
(34) Een   boeken dat   hij   heeft!
      A   books   CONJ   he   has
      'So many books he has!' (Haeseryn et al., 1997:1435)

In (33), the speaker ironically comments that another person (probably male) has so much bad luck to have 10 girls and just 3 boys in his course. In (34), the speaker expresses their surprise at the number of books the *he*-person has. The two examples differ in terms of determination of the nominal head: (33) has a determinerless NP, whereas (34) illustrates the special use of singular indefinite determiner *een* with a plural head, which is restricted to exclamative expressions (Haeseryn et al., 1997:194), and has an approximative meaning. In both cases, the cleft-like construction expresses the speaker's surprise at the high quantity of the referent of the nominal preceding the *dat*-clause.

We conclude that the cleft-like construction is a productive topicalization construction with a strong semantics of degree modification and exclamative illocutionary force, allowing for various formal types of elements being topicalized. The topicalized element is followed by a *dat*-clause, in which the element is understood to fulfil a particular syntactic function. We distinguished different subtypes according to the constituent type or part of speech of the topicalized element, which are summarized in Table 2. The numbers between brackets refer to examples given in the above discussion.

Table 2
Formal range of the cleft-like construction, and the semantic properties of the types of topicalized elements.

Type of constituent or part of speech	Subtype (topicalized element or *dat*-clause)	Semantic properties of topicalized element
Adverb (26)	–	- Referential adverbs expressing a characteristic or quantity that can be intensified - Positive degree - No degree modifiers
Adjective (27)	–	- Adjectives designating a quality, allowing for predicative alternation, and accepting degrees of comparison - Positive degree - No degree modifiers
Verb	Infinitive (28) Past participle (29) Present participle	- Verbs designating processes that can be modified for intensity or quality - No degree modifiers
Prepositional phrase (30)	–	The expression typically contains a degree modifying expression, either in the PP or in an afterthought
Noun/NP	With copular *dat*-clause (31)–(32) With no copular *dat*-clause (24), (33)–(34)	Nouns or NPs specifying a gradable characteristic (also vocatives) Nouns or NPs designating a referent that can be quantified or modified in terms of degree

5. Clauseless *dat*-constructions

The last type of (semi-)autonomous subordination that we discuss in this article is different from the previous three in that the expression of the *dat*-clause is restricted to the subordinator itself, resulting in a sort of aposiopesis, a figure of speech in which content is suppressed, but can be completed by the addressee (see also Boogaart, 2010 for reference to aposiopesis in the context of insubordination). We distinguish between two subtypes, depending on whether there is a vestigial main clause or not. Examples are in (36) and (35) respectively.[20]

(35)   \<Axe_Babe\> baaikens:-)
         \<Lenzz\>   sluu
         \<blinky\>   slukes axe
         \<blinky\>   wow is die rap weg
         \<Lenzz\>   dadde
                       CONJ
         'A: Bye *smile*. L: Bye. B: Bye bye, Axe. Wow, if ever she's gone quickly! L: You can say that again!'
         (CONDIV, IRC, Vlaan 1)

(36)   \<JiNXkZ\>   ja se als ik nu ni omnipage aant downe was adde het gehad
         \<BigG_\>   zedder morgenavond?
         \<JiNXkZ\>   tuurlijk   datte
                       of.course   CONJ
         \<JiNXkZ\>   im allways here:p
         'J: Well, if I had been downloading Omnipage, you would have gotten it. B: Will you be here tomorrow evening? J: Of course. I'm always here *tongue out*.' (CONDIV, IRC, Antw 3)

---

[20] As the conjunction *dat* is homonymous (or, from a historical perspective, polysemous) with the demonstrative *dat*, it is difficult to say with certainty whether examples like (6) and (35) really feature the conjunction. In principle, it is possible to read (35) as an ellipsis of *Dat is zo!* ('That is the case!'), *Dat is hij inderdaad!* ('That he is indeed!') or maybe even *Zeg dat wel!* ('You can say that!'), in which *dat* is the demonstrative. We will come back to this issue below.

Clauseless *dat*-constructions typically show a phonetically 'heavier' version of the subordinator *da(t)*, like *dadde* in (35) and *datte* in (36).[21] The subtype without matrix element (cf. (6) and (35)) expresses the speaker's emphatic agreement to their interlocutor's previous turn, which itself typically has exclamative illocutionary force (e.g. 'Wow, if ever she's gone quickly!' in (35)). In spoken language, the subordinator would get an exclamative high-fall intonation, which arguably explains why the subordinator is phonetically enhanced to have two syllables (see also footnote [21]). The subtype with matrix element (cf. (7) and (36)) typically conveys the speaker's emphatic positive answer to their interlocutor's question in the preceding turn, not the least because of the presence of a certainty adverb. In spoken language, the construction would get a high-fall intonation, with a high pitch on the first syllable of the adverb and a fall on its second syllable and the subordinator. (Note that therefore there is no need for the *dat*-form to be bisyllabic; monosyllabic *da* is attested in (7).) Especially examples like (36) indicate that the *dat*-forms function as subordinators (*tuurlijk dat ik er zal zijn* 'of course I will be here') rather than demonstratives, in which case the intonation pattern would be different (low-mid high), or the adverb would follow the *dat*-form, like in (37), which typically comes with a mid high-fall intonation.

(37)   A: Wat wil je het liefst eten? (pointing to a set of food items)
         B: Da   natuurlijk (pointing to one food item)
              that   of.course
         'A: What would you like to eat best? B: that, of course.' (C)

In addition to *(na)tuurlijk*, other certainty adverbs are found in the second clauseless subtype as well, such as *zeker* 'surely' and *vaneigens* 'obviously' in (38).[22]

(38)   <Marconi>   we gaan eens een pint moeten pakken tesamen als da maar zo ver is:-)
         <Teletubbi> vaneigens dadde
                        obviously   CONJ
         'M: We should go and have a beer together if it is just that far *smile*. T: Yes, obviously!'
         (CONDIV, IRC, Belg 4)

The corpus data and our native speaker intuitions indicate that this second subtype is only possible with certainty adverbs, and its formal and functional similarity with the semi-insubordinated constructions with certainty adverbs (see e.g. (16) in section 3) suggests that it can be regarded as a clauseless counterpart of that semi-insubordinated subtype, and, as suggested by an anonymous referee, even as an ellipsis thereof. For the first clauseless subtype (cf. (35)), by contrast, we cannot really hypothesize a 'clause-containing' counterpart, as its function is very different from those associated with the patterns of insubordination discussed in section 2.

The discussion above has pointed to two types of clauseless *dat*-construction, which are clearly embedded in conversational settings, with the speaker reacting to the interlocutor's previous turn. Both types express interpersonal meaning, which has by now been identified as a characteristic shared by all the types of (semi-)autonomous subordination patterns we are concerned with in this article.

6. Hypoanalysis

In the previous sections, an overview has been given of several subtypes of (semi-)autonomous subordinate *dat*-clauses in Dutch. The use of such constructions is widespread, but their emergence remains, in essence, a mystery. What drives speakers of Dutch to use a subordinate pattern, introduced by what is the most canonical subordinating conjunction in Dutch, *dat*, in non-subordinate contexts?

---

[21] These forms also occur outside this construction, but then they are agreeing conjunctions (which are not uncommon in Dutch dialects, see e.g. Barbiers et al., 2005). The problem is that the forms in *-e* agree with *plural* subjects, which is not the case in (35)–(36), casting doubt on the idea that the forms in (35)–(36) are agreeing conjunctions. Alternatively, the forms could be emphatic forms of the demonstrative pronoun (see Schönfeld/Van Loey, 1970:136), but then we lose the connection between (35)–(36) and the clause-containing structures in (10) and (16), and ignore the obvious formal and functional similarity. A third explanation for the occurrence of the heavier forms is to consider them the result of rhythmic principles. Support comes from other contexts in which Dutch appears to eschew monosyllabic utterances. Imperatives like *Ga!* ('Go!') or *Geef!* ('Give!') are markedly less felicitous than *Ga weg!* ('Go away!') and *Geef hier!* ('Give here!') (see Oosterhof, 2012; Den Dikken, 1998).

[22] The Rhineland dialect of German has the (fixed) expression *sicher dat(t)* (literally 'sure that', meaning 'of course') which seems to be very similar to the clauseless pattern with certainty adverb illustrated in (36) and (38). We thank one of the anonymous referees for pointing this out to us.

Intuitively, the various patterns discussed in sections 2–5 can be treated as instances of 'ellipsis', as they all have a (partly) 'missing' or 'suppressed' main clause. It should be made clear, however, what is exactly understood by ellipsis: does this assume that the missing main clause is always recoverable? Does it have to be uniquely recoverable, or are we allowed some leeway in reconstructing the main clause? Is the main clause synchronically covertly present, at some underlying level or deep structure (which seems to be the line of thought developed in Aelbrecht, 2006), or does ellipsis have to be understood as a historical process, such that insubordination started out with fully expressed main clauses, which later were occasionally dropped, so that we ended up with a new 'construction' (which is the account proposed in Evans, 2007 and adopted in Verstraete et al., 2012)?

We believe that a synchronic account in terms of ellipsis, in which (semi-)insubordinated clauses have a main clause at some underlying level, is not a particularly helpful way of explaining the various constructions discussed in this article. If it is understood as a diachronic process, ellipsis is arguably more plausible, but then it is a rather mechanistic take on what happens. It does not tell *why* language users decided to drop the main clause. We propose a more detailed account, arguing that (semi-)autonomous subordination came about by a process of hypoanalysis. As will be argued in this section, an account in terms of hypoanalysis can help us understand the connection between the various phenotypical instances of (semi-)autonomous subordination as well as the semantic and pragmatic motivations for the language user to do away with the main clause. In this respect, the hypoanalysis account should be seen as complementary to a diachronic view on ellipsis and as an alternative to a synchronic view on ellipsis.

Hypoanalysis is defined by Croft (2000:126–130) as a form-function reanalysis such that a contextual semantic/functional property is reinterpreted as an inherent property of a syntactic unit. Croft gives several examples of hypoanalysis. A first example is the reanalysis of present indicatives as subjunctives and futures. As shown in detail by Haspelmath (1998) for a number of areally and genetically diverse languages, the rise of a new present form can oust the older form, which may survive in subordinate clauses. As subordinate clauses are often associated with subjunctives, the surviving older present comes to be interpreted as a subjunctive.

Another example of hypoanalysis is the German umlaut, which started off as a phonological process, but was reinterpreted as a plural marker, as the umlaut often happened to be realized in plural contexts (see also Lass, 1990:98–99). The German umlaut is a mutation of the root vowel under the influence of an /i/ or a /j/ in the following suffix. The product of this i-mutation was later phonologized, cf. (39).

(39)   Old High German *gast* ('guest'), plural *gast-i*
        Middle High German *gast*, plural *gest-e*
        Modern German *Gast*, plural *Gäste*

The umlaut of the root vowel was reinterpreted as a marker of plurality, and extended to contexts that historically had no /i, j/ suffix, such as in (40) (example from Lass, 1990:99).

(40)   Old High German *boum* ('tree'), plural *boum-e*
        Modern German *Baum*, plural *Bäume*

In the case of German umlaut as well, a chance contextual feature was incorporated in the inherent semantics of the marker.

In what follows, it will be argued that Dutch *dat* (semi-)autonomous subordination may have arisen through a process of hypoanalysis as well. The idea is that the interpersonal meanings that the constructions discussed in sections 2–5 carry in present-day Dutch originally were a contextual feature of some subordinate clauses, like for example in the Middle Dutch expressions in (41)–(46).[23] These examples have a fronted subordinate *dat*-clause, with a short and often formulaic matrix clause expressing an interpersonal notion.[24] The construction is quite common in Middle Dutch poetry.

(41)   Dat   wij van rouwen niet ontzinnen Dat es wonder
        CONJ we of   grief   not lose.mind that is wonder
        'That we don't lose our minds in grief, that is a wonder'

---

[23] The Middle Dutch examples in (41)–(46) have been drawn from the *cd-rom Middelnederlands* ('cd-rom Middle Dutch'), compiled by the *Instituut voor Nederlandse Lexicologie* ('Institute for Dutch Lexicology') in collaboration with AND Publishing Technology bv, Den Haag: Sdu, 1998.

[24] We would like to thank one of the referees for drawing our attention to the importance of the fronted position of the subordinate clauses.

(42)   Dat   God ghedoocht, dat es groot wonder!
     CONJ.it God tolerates   that is   great wonder
     'That God tolerates this, that is a great wonder'

(43)   Dat ic in mine sinne blive, Dat es wonder alte   groet.
     CONJ I in my   mind stay that is wonder all.too great
     'That I keep my mind, that is a great wonder'

(44)   Dat ghi soe langhe leeft, dats   mi leet.
     CONJ you so long   live   that.is me sorrow
     'That you live so long, that hurts me'

(45)   Dat ghi siit coninc dat es scade.
     CONJ you are king   that is   pity
     'That you are king, that is a pity'

(46)   Dat ghi dit zwijcht: dats   mijn begheren.
     CONJ you this be.silent that.is my   wish
     'That you be silent about this, that is my wish'

The interpersonal nature of these constructions derives from different sources. In (41)–(43), the matrices with *wonder* qualify the propositions coded by the preposed *dat*-clauses in terms of mirativity, i.e. as ''unexpected'' (DeLancey, 2011:369) (see also Matthijs et al., ms on *(no) wonder* constructions in the history of English). Apart from mirativity, the short matrix clauses can also convey attitudinal assessment by expressing regret, as in examples (44)–(45). More generally, these examples indicate the degree of the speaker's liking or (in these cases especially) disliking of a state of affairs (Nuyts, 2006:12) that is presupposed to be true (cf. Van linden, 2012:ch. 2) (see also example (15) above). Third, the interpersonal meaning can derive from the attitudinal assessment of a potential state of affairs in terms of desirability, as in (46) (see Lemke, 1998; Van linden, 2012:ch. 2).

The interpersonal nature of the examples (41)–(46) is not only clear from the semantics of the matrix clause, but also links up with the fronted position of the subordinate clause: fronting of subordinate clauses is not straightforward, neither in Dutch, nor in other languages, as syntactically heavy constituents (such as finite clauses) prefer sentence-final position. Fronting requires a special pragmatic motivation (see Dik, 1997:403 on the Principle of Pragmatic Highlighting). The interpersonal, and in some cases exclamative nature of the subordinate clauses in (41)–(46) provides such a motivation. We argue that this originally contextual feature was later reanalysed as being encoded by the (fronted) subordinate construction introduced by the (default) conjunction *dat*, which paved the way for the emergence of the range of (semi-)autonomous subordination patterns discussed in sections 2–5. As fronting was unusual, and required pragmatic highlighting, and as the matrix clause was formulaic, often served metric or rhyming purposes and did not contribute significantly to the proposition, the conspicuous subordinate pattern could be reanalysed as a separate construction, 'encoding' interpersonal meaning. As a result of this hypoanalysis, the construction could be used to express interpersonal meaning, even in the absence of other contextual clues of its semantic–pragmatic value, like a mirative or modal matrix clause. More specifically, the examples in (41)–(46) might have been the actual source constructions of the insubordination patterns discussed in section 2.

The hypoanalysis account explains (i) why the instances of (semi-)autonomous subordination have a common semantic–pragmatic denominator, in that they all carry interpersonal import, and often have exclamative illocutionary force, (ii) why some cases defy an analysis in terms of synchronic ellipsis, either because the supposed matrix clause is not uniquely recoverable or not recoverable at all, (iii) why earlier examples of (semi-)autonomous subordination without interpersonal overlay are currently ungrammatical, and (iv) why we find examples of *dat* without a subordinate clause, as exemplified in section 5. We will now look at each of these arguments in detail.

(i) Shared semantic–pragmatic value. An account of (semi-)autonomous subordination in terms of synchronic ellipsis leaves unexplained why the constructions in sections 2–5 share interpersonal value. For examples like the ones given in section 3, the interpersonal meaning and exclamative nature can be ascribed to the adverb or the predicate and the construction type, but under a strictly syntactic ellipsis account, it is not clear why the ellipsis fails to occur with non-interpersonal adjectives or adverbs. Why are examples like (47)–(48) ungrammatical?

(47)   *Gisteren dat   hij dat   gezegd heeft
     yesterday CONJ he that said   has
     'He said it yesterday' (C)

(48)   *dat hij per ongeluk bij de buren   heeft aangebeld
     CONJ he by accident by the neighbours has   rung
     *'that he accidentally rung at the neighbours' doorbell' (C)

The ungrammaticality of these sentences is more easily modelled under a hypoanalysis account: the (semi-) insubordinated constructions involve the integration of the interpersonal contextual meaning in the semantics of the subordinate clause introduced by conjunction *dat*, in much the same sense as the plurality meaning has rubbed off onto the phonological umlaut in German. In other words: we are dealing with an attested pathway of language change, which can account for a semantic constraint of the construction that is harder to stipulate under a syntactic ellipsis account.

(ii) Non-recoverability of (parts of) suppressed main clause. While they look like elliptical clauses, not all instances of insubordination allow an unequivocal reconstruction of the suppressed main clause (see also Evans, 2007; Verstraete et al., 2012). Basically, there are two reasons why the recoverability of the main clause may be problematic: either there are several main clauses that seem to fit, so that it is unclear how to reconstruct the matrix clause precisely, or a main clause reconstruction might simply be impossible.

Let's first look at the situation in which various main clause reconstructions are possible, all of which are grammatically compatible. This means that the matrix clause is not uniquely recoverable (Quirk et al., 1985:884: ''verbatim recoverability''), which is a necessary condition for ellipsis sensu stricto to take effect. Our dataset features several examples, such as (49), for instance.

(49)   <Retaxis-> gisteren iemand tegengekomen die cursus 'verkoopstechnieken Windows 98' ging volgen
          <ialone>   hoofdingen maken enzo
          <Retaxis-> echtwaar:)
           <sdog> dat   ze   nen keer een cursus emacs geven . . .
                     CONJ they a   time a   course emacs give
      'R: Yesterday I met someone who was going to take a Windows 98 sales techniques course. I: Making headings and so on. R: Really *smile*. S: They should organize a course on emacs. . .'
      (CONDIV, IRC, Vlaan 2)

Possible main clauses for (49) include expressions with first-person subjects (*ik hoop* 'I hope'; *ik zou willen* 'I would like'; *wij wensen* 'we wish'), third-person subjects (*ze zouden beter maken* 'they'd better make sure') and impersonal subjects (*het wordt tijd* 'it is high time'; *het is wenselijk* 'it is desirable'). Of course, all these matrix reconstructions are grammatically and semantically similar, so they might not be very compelling instances for non-recoverability for those who are happy to relax the strict Quirk et al. (1985) criterion.

Still, there are a number of examples were the ellipsis account is more problematic. In some cases reconstruction of a main clause is almost impossible, like for (50).

(50)   <Slaper> xena hoe kan ik alles downloaden
          <Xena>   slaper: ja duh: ik weet niet welke client je gebruikt en ik ken niets van M$ ftp clients
          <Xena>   slaper: lees de docs van je client dus
          <Slaper> welke client
          <Xena>   slaper: je ftp client?
          <Slaper> heb ik ni eens denk ik
          <Xena>   [. . .] slaper: hoe ben je dan geconnect met die url ?
          <fleurke> slaper, 'k peis dat jij van het zelfde calibre van mij zijt;)
          <Xena>   fleurke: maar newbier;)
          <Slaper> via den internet explorer
          <Xena>   djeez
          <Xena>   dat   hij maar een linux cd koopt
                     ONJ he PRT a   linux cd buys
          <fleurke> hehe
      'S: Xena, how can I download everything? X: Slaper, yeah duh, I don't know which client you use and I don't know anything about M$ ftp clients. So, read your client's docs. S: Which client? X: Slaper, your ftp client? S: Don't have any, I think. X: Slaper, how are you connected to this url? F: Slaper, I think you are the same like me *smile* X: Fleurke, but more of a newbie *wink*. S: via internet explorer. X: Jezus, he should buy himself a linux cd. F: *laughter*' (CONDIV, IRC, Vlaan 2)'

In (50), *Xena* gives *Slaper* the advice to buy a linux cd. The advice is not formulated as an imperative, but rather as a third person declarative in an insubordinated clause. In principle the illocution can be made explicit by using a performative verb, but the result *Ik adviseer dat hij maar een linux koopt* ('I advice that. . .'), is ill-formed. The reason appears to be the

presence of the modal particle *maar*, which has a mitigating effect on the illocution in (51) (see Vismans, 1994), but is not felicitous in mandative or volitional subordinate clauses, cf. (52).[25]

(51)   Kom   maar
        come   PRT
        'You can come' (C)
(52)   Ik wil   dat hij (*maar) komt
        I   want CONJ he PRT   comes
        'I want him to come' (C)

Examples like (50) show that the insubordinated construction can no longer be seen as synchronic ellipsis. While ellipsis may be the historical origin of the construction (as conjectured by Evans, 2007), examples like (50) constitute 'switch contexts' (Heine, 2002), in which the pattern is no longer compatible with its historical origin and has taken on a new function.

   (iii) Earlier non-interpersonal uses of (semi-)autonomous subordination. The present-day Dutch patterns of (semi-)autonomous subordination all involve interpersonal meaning, but if we look at earlier stages of the language, the constructions were not subject to the same constraints as today. As is clear from the Middle Dutch examples in (53)–(58), the initial constituent of the (precursor of the) cleft-like construction does not have to express scalar or evaluative meaning.

(53)   Met Firapeel dat si   ghinghen
        with Firapeel CONJ they went
        'They went with Firapeel' (Middle Dutch, Van der Horst, 2008:553)
(54)   Ane sinen hals dat hine   hinc
        on his   neck CONJ he.him hung
        'He hung it on his neck' (Middle Dutch, Van der Horst, 2008:553).
(55)   Toet pylatus dat si   quamen
        up.to Pilate CONJ they came
        'They came to Pilate' (Middle Dutch, Van der Horst, 2008:781)

Other Middle Dutch examples already show the interpersonal, c.q. mirative meaning that has become associated with the construction in present-day Dutch (see section 4). Examples (56)–(57) can easily be read with a exclamative connotation and in example (58), such a meaning is undeniably present.

(56)   Met ghemake datsi   vloten
        with ease   CONJ.they floated
        'They floated smoothly' (Middle Dutch, Van der Horst, 2008:554)
(57)   Haestelike datse   quamen
        hurriedly CONJ.they came
        'They came in a hurry' (Middle Dutch, Van der Horst, 2008:781)
(58)   Ay, hoe scone   dat tscip   vloot!
        PRT how beautifully CONJ the.ship floated
        'My, how beautifully the ship floated' (Middle Dutch, Van der Horst, 2008:554)

These Middle Dutch data are interesting in a number of respects. First, the fact that examples like (53)–(55) are ungrammatical in present-day Dutch support the hypoanalysis account. The interpersonal meaning is now part and parcel of the whole construction, and not just a contextual feature any longer. Second, it is telling that the Middle Dutch example (58) with mirative meaning still needs a degree marker (c.q. *hoe*) to make this meaning explicit, whereas in present-day Dutch, this explicit marker is no longer needed, see (26) in section 4, as the exclamative meaning is now encoded in the subordinate *dat*-construction itself.

   (iv) Clauseless dat constructions. The hypoanalysis account also helps to explain patterns with a bare conjunction, discussed in section 5. This pattern only makes sense if the interpersonal value has become encoded in the semantics of

---

[25] Note that particle *maar* can be used in subordinate clauses when it is used as a focus particle. This is not the intended meaning in the examples at issue, however.

the subordinate construction, and in the conjunction in particular: the constructional frame carries the interpersonal value (illocution), and the lexically underspecified parts of the construction supply the propositional content. In the absence of such lexical material, all we are left with is the frame, and its interpersonal meaning. In the cases at hand, see (6) and (35), it expresses emphatic consent or confirmation on the part of the speaker.

Additional evidence for our line of argument is the observation that other subordinators are subject to the same kind of hypoanalysis. Parallel to (35), example (59) has subordinator *of*, which introduces embedded polarity questions. There is a regional distribution such that *dadde/datte* is used in Flemish Dutch, whereas *en of* is primarily used in Netherlandic Dutch. They both convey the same meaning. The fact that we observe another (default) conjunction in the same context, supports the analysis that *dadde/datte* is a conjunction, rather than a demonstrative (see footnotes 20,21).

Other conjunctions which are hypoanalysed in this way are *en*, *als* and *dus*, as Boogaart (2011) points out. Examples of these are well represented in our corpus data, cf. (60)–(62).[26]

(59)   \<Atemi\>   gezellig is het hier
         \<dragon__1\> en   of!
                     and if
        'A: It's cosy in here. D: It sure is!' (CONDIV, IRC, Cafe 5)

(60)   \<Beaves\> das toch niet eerlijk ik naar school en jullie vrij
         \<marchelle\> ja   en?
                    yes and
      'B: that's not fair: I have to go to school and you have a day off. M: yes, and...?' (CONDIV, IRC, Caiw 1)

(61)   Ja,   áls! Dat heb ik 1 keer meegemaakt.
        yes if
        'Yes, if [that happens]! I have experienced this once.' (IC)

(62)   \<Tgo\>   zebaz, schrijf je jouw naam zeker als zzzebaazzztiaan?
        \<zebaz\>   goh scherp zeg
        \<Kay\>   Tgo schrijf je jouw naam als tgo?
        \<Tgo\>   ja   dus?
                        yes so?
        \<Tgo\>   Kay, heb ik ooit gezegd dat Tgo een afkorting was van mijn naam?
        \<Soeperman\> The greatest Organ?
      'T: I bet zebaz you write your name as zzzebaazzztiaan. Z: wow, how smart! K: Tgo, do you write
      your name as tgo? T: Yes, so? T: Kay, did I ever mention that Tgo was an abbreviation of my
      name? S: The greatest Organ?' (CONDIV, IRC, Digi 1)

Regional variation with regard to which subordinators are involved in the hypoanalysis process is not restricted to clauseless *dat* (section 5), but is also attested in the cleft-like construction discussed in section 4 (see example (27′)), repeated here for convenience's sake in (63).

(63)   vuil   asseter   was
        dirty   CONJ.it.there was
        'It was so dirty in there!' (Bos, 1963:182, our translation)

An even wider variation with respect to the complementizer is found in cleft-like constructions with a noun, as illustrated in (64). The construction has received some notice in the Dutch linguistic literature (Paardekooper, 1963; De Rooij, 1967). Particular attention has been paid to the nature of the *dat* element. In the standard language, both the grammatical conjunction *dat* and the relative pronoun *die* are possible, see (64)–(65).[27] It seems that Dutch has conflated two constructions here. Such cases of multiple inheritance or multiple source constructions, are not uncommon across languages (see Van de Velde et al., 2013) and in the history of Dutch (Van de Velde and van der Horst, 2013).

---

[26] Informal spoken Dutch has, moreover, other constructions with 'unfinished' subordinated clauses, such as *wat is dit voor foto is die niet afgedrukt of...* (what is this for photo is that not printed or 'what kind of photo is this? Is it not printed or what?'), from Van der Wouden and Foolen (2011:316), who give other examples as well.

[27] Alternatively, *dat* can also be analysed as a neuter relative pronoun. The choice of the neuter form *dat* instead of the common gender form *die* can be explained by the pejorative meaning of *idioot* (see also *de mens* vs. *het mens*), as one referee points out. A problem for this alternative analysis is that this use of the neuter gender is reserved for pejorative reference to female referents, whereas *idioot* here is masculine.

(64)   Idioot die   je   bent
          idiot   REL you are
          'You are such an idiot!' (IC)

(65)   Idioot dat   je   bent
          idiot   CONJ you are
          'You are such an idiot!' (IC)

There seems to have been some hesitation on the part of the language user on what kind of subordinator they should use in this construction. Working on historical and dialect data, De Rooij (1967) shows that apart from the conjunction *dat* and the relative pronoun, the conjunction *als* and the locative (relative/demonstrative) pronoun *daar* are also attested:

(66)   Arme wurmen als ghy zijt
          Poor   worms   as   you are
          'Poor worms you are' (De Rooij, 1967:118, our translation)

(67)   kwajongen daar je   bent
          rascal   there you are
           'You are such a rascal' (De Rooij, 1967:118, our translation)

What we see here is that hypoanalysis, just like more well-known form-function changes such as grammaticalization, can seize on different source elements to form a new construction. With respect to (semi-)autonomous subordination, we see that whatever the exact source element is in a particular dialect of Dutch, it is always a semantically rather unspecific conjunction: *dat*, *of*, *als*, introducing the hypoanalysed construction.

To sum up, the shared semantic–pragmatic value of the (semi-)autonomous subordination patterns discussed in sections 2–5, the non-recoverability of main clauses in (49) and (50), the current ungrammaticality of earlier attested patterns like (53)–(55) and the occurrence of bare conjunctions with interpersonal meaning all point to the actualization of a form-function shift, and can thus be seen as counterarguments to a synchronic ellipsis account. The (semi-)autonomous subordination patterns form a cluster of constructions in their own right, and should not be seen as derived or incomplete. By drawing on hypoanalysis, the changes at issue can be seen as conforming to other cases of language change which have been well-documented. The 'misattribution' of a contextual feature to a construction frequently occurring in such contexts is then nothing to be surprised about. For these reasons, we believe that hypoanalysis is a crucial concept in understanding the circumstances under which the 'ellipsis' that led to (semi-)autonomous subordination took place.

True enough, we are currently not in the position to make hard and fast claims about the diachrony of the constructions under discussion. With the exception of the occasional mention of relevant historical data, no diachronic studies have hitherto been undertaken into the use of (semi-)autonomous *dat*-clauses, and the relationship and emergence of the constructions studied here remain as yet unclear, as Van der Horst (2008) points out. This is partly due to practical reasons: (semi-)autonomous subordination is first and foremost a feature of spoken language, and as such it is hard to come by in traditional historical written corpora. Second, the pattern is lexically underspecified. The only fixed element which provides a grip for electronic queries is the conjunction *dat*, which is hopelessly polysemous. To this can be added difficulties in determining the clausal boundaries in historical texts, in the absence of reliable punctuation.

7. Conclusion

In this article, we have taken a closer look at (semi-)autonomous subordination patterns involving *dat*-clauses in Dutch, especially in Flemish varieties. Examining authentic corpus data closely resembling spoken language, we discovered a number of new patterns in Dutch grammar and we were able to link four major types of constructions together, which have been treated separately in the few descriptions available. Table 3 summarizes the typology of Dutch (semi-)autonomous *dat*-subordination we arrived at. Its second column indicates that the various subtypes of the four major types are of a different nature, i.e. constructional, formal or semantic.

Detailed study of the conversational context and discourse settings of the corpus data has pointed to a semantic–pragmatic characteristic shared by the constructions included in the typology, i.e. they convey interpersonal meaning. This observation led us to propose an explanation for why ellipsis took place, if ever it played a role in the emergence of the (semi-)autonomous *dat*-subordination patterns (cf. Evans, 2007). (Note that it is not compatible, however, with the synchronic ellipsis account proposed for some semi-insubordination patterns by Aelbrecht, 2006.) Our diachronic proposal involves Croft's (2000) concept of hypoanalysis. In particular, we believe that the interpersonal meaning typical

Table 3
Typology of (semi-)autonomous *dat*-subordination in Dutch.

Major type	Nature of subtypes	Subtypes	Examples and further subtypes
Insubordination (cf. Verstraete et al., 2012)	Constructional: form-meaning pairings	Deontic	Controlled (11) Non-controlled (10)
		Evaluative	(1a), (12)
		Discursive	(13)
Semi-insubordination	Formal: type of initial element	Adverbial	(2), (14a), (15)–(16)
		Adjectival	(2), (14b), (17)–(19)
		Nominal	(3), (14c), (20)–(23)
	Semantic	Epistemic	Uncertainty (2), (14a), (21)–(22) Certainty (16)
		Evaluative	(2), (14b–c), (15), (17)–(18), (20)
		Affective	(3), (19), (23)
Cleft-like constructions	Formal: type of topicalized element	Adverbial	(26)
		Adjectival	(4), (27)
		Verbal	Infinitive (28) Past participle (29) Present participle
		Prepositional	(30)
		Nominal	Copular *dat*-clause (5), (31)–(32) Non-copular *dat*-clause (24), (33)–(34)
Clauseless constructions	Formal: presence or absence of element preceding *dat*	Absence of matrix element	(6), (35)
		Presence of matrix element	Certainty adverbs (7), (36), (38)

of the constructions studied originally was a contextual feature of some subordinate *dat*-clauses, see examples (41)–(46), and was later reanalysed as being encoded by the subordinate construction introduced by *dat*. In addition to the shared semantic–pragmatic value of the constructions in the typology in Table 3, further evidence for this form-function reanalysis came from the non-recoverability of (parts of) the suppressed main clause, earlier non-interpersonal uses of the cleft-like construction, the very grammaticality of current clauseless *dat* constructions, and the clauseless use of other subordinators in Dutch as well. The 'misattribution' of a contextual feature to a construction frequently occurring in such contexts has also been noted in other cases of language change which have been well-documented (e.g. Haspelmath, 1998; Croft, 2000).

While corroboration by attested historical data is of course the golden standard, the scarceness of such data does not by definition preclude investigation into the diachronic emergence of a construction. The structure and the phenotypes of the set of constructions that we find in the present-day language can at times falsify diachronic hypotheses. This has been frequently applied in language typology, for languages with a less venerable textual tradition than, for instance, the Indo-European languages. For (semi-)autonomous subordination, the arguments repeated above are all suggestive of a process of hypoanalysis. We leave it to future research to provide further substantiation.

Additional evidence may also come from other (Indo-European) languages whose current grammar features constructions similar to the ones studied here. Adverbial semi-insubordination is attested in, for example, Swedish (*Kanske att* ... 'maybe that'), French (*Peut-être que* ... 'maybe that') and Spanish (*Tal vez que* ... 'maybe that', *Por supuesto que* ... 'certainly that'). Complement insubordination is also abundant in German (Verstraete et al., 2010; Panther and Thornburg, 2011), but only marginal in English (e.g. Quirk et al., 1985:841–842). It remains to be seen whether the other types of (semi-)autonomous subordination described for Dutch also occur in these languages, and whether their historical records allow for a more detailed study of the emergence of these constructions.

Finally, the diachrony of the patterns of (semi-)autonomous subordination studied here also warrants further theoretical reflection. With an assumed origin in complex sentences comprising a full-blown matrix clause and a (preposed) subordinate *dat*-clause, the changes giving rise to the constructions in Table 3 go against the directionality observed for a number of grammaticalization processes within the domain of clause-combining, in which it is main clause construal in paratactic organization that gives rise to subordination patterns rather than the other way around (Hopper and Traugott, 1993:ch. 7). Should the changes discussed here then rather be seen as instances of degrammaticalization? If so, the current classification of degrammaticalization certainly needs to be enhanced to accommodate these changes. In Norde's (2009, 2010) proposal, for instance, degrammaticalization is observed to take place at three 'levels of observation' (Andersen, 2006), namely at content level ('degrammation'), content-syntactic level ('deinflectionalization') and at

morphosyntactic level ('debonding'). The changes leading to (semi-)autonomous subordination prompt us to bring in at least one more level, namely that of syntax at clause-combining level. However, it may be questioned whether it is desirable at all to range the constructions studied here with instances of degrammaticalization, and we'd rather refrain from taking a position in this matter. Alternatively, we do believe that the changes giving rise to the four major types of (semi-)autonomous subordination can be regarded as processes of constructionalization (cf. Trousdale, 2010), yielding constructions in their own right (cf. Verstraete et al., 2012), whose meaning is not always predictable from its constituent parts (cf. Goldberg, 1995:4; 1996:68). For the cleft-like construction, the historical examples presented in (53)–(58) in section 6 can be interpreted to form stages in such a process of constructionalization. Similarly for the examples in (41)–(46), which are likely precursors of full insubordination. However, the concept of 'constructionalization' applies to instances of grammaticalization as well as lexicalization, depending on whether the changes show increasing schematicity or decreasing schematicity (Trousdale, 2010). With 'schematicity' still being a vague notion – and arguably not be the best criterion to distinguish between grammaticalization and lexicalization (cf. Diewald, 2010) – explaining the changes at hand in terms of constructionalization does not solve the theoretical problem, but merely shifts it. We leave it to future research and theorizing to assess in what ways the changes presented here require rethinking processes of language change and their directionality.

Acknowledgements

References

Aelbrecht, Lobke, 2006. IP-ellipsis in Dutch dialects: X + that-clause. In: Van de Weijer, J., Los, B. (Eds.), Linguistics in the Netherlands 2006. Benjamins, Amsterdam, pp. 1–14.

Andersen, Henning, 2006. Grammation, regrammation, and degrammation. Tense loss in Russian. Diachronica 23 (2), 231–258.

Anward, Jan, 2003. *Att*. Språk och stil 13, 65–85.

Barbiers, Sjef, Bennis, Hans, De Vogelaer, Gunther, Devos, Magda, Van der Ham, Margreet, 2005. Syntactische Atlas van de Nederlandse Dialecten, (Syntactic Atlas of the Dutch Dialects).vol. I. Amsterdam University Press, Amsterdam.

Beyssade, Claire, Marandin, Jean-Marie, 2006. The speech act assignment problem revisited: disentangling speaker's commitment from speaker's call on addressee. In: Bonami, Olivier, Cabredo Hofherr, Patricia (Eds.), Empirical Issues in Syntax and Semantics, vol. 6. pp. 37–68., http://www.cssp.cnrs.fr/eiss6/index_en.html.

Biber, Douglas, Johansson, Stig, Leech, Geoffrey (Eds.), 1999. Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English. Longman, London.

Bolinger, Dwight, 1961. Generality, Gradience and the All-or-None. Mouton, The Hague.

Boogaart, Ronny, 2010. De Verzuchtingsinfinitief. Vaktaal 23, 9–10.

Boogaart, Ronny, 2011. Over insubordinatie gesproken! Presentation at the University of Leuven.

Boogaart, Ronny, Verheij, Kim, 2013. Als dát geen insubordinatie is! De pragmatiek van zelfstandige conditionele zinnen. In: Janssen, Theo, Noordegraaf, Jan (Eds.), Honderd jaar taalwetenschap. Artikelen aangeboden aan Saskia Daalder bij haar afscheid van de Vrije Universiteit. Nodus Publikationen, Amsterdam/Münster, pp. 13–28.

Bos, Gijsberta, 1963. Een verwaarloosd zinstype. In: De Groot, A.W., Schulting, H. (Eds.), Studies op het gebied van het hedendaagse Nederlands. Mouton, The Hague, pp. 174–194.

Boye, Kasper, Harder, Peter, 2007. Complement-taking predicates. Usage and linguistic structure. Studies in Language 31 (3), 569–606.

Bybee, Joan, Perkins, Revere, Pagliuca, William, 1994. The Evolution of Grammar: Tense, Aspect and Modality in the Languages of the World. University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

CD-Rom Middelnederlands, 1998. Instituut voor Nederlandse Lexicologie i.c.w. AND Publishing Technology. Sdu, Den Haag.

Chafe, Wallace, 1986. Evidentiality in English conversation and academic writing. In: Chafe, W., Nichols, J. (Eds.), Evidentiality: The Linguistic Coding of Epistemology. Ablex, Norwood, NJ, pp. 261–272.

Cinque, Guglielmo, 1994. On the evidence for partial N movement in the Romance DP. In: Cinque, G., Koster, J., Pollock, J.-Y., Rizzi, L., Zanutti, R. (Eds.), Paths Towards Universal Grammar. Georgetown University Press, Georgetown, pp. 85–110.

Cinque, Guglielmo, 1999. Adverbs and Functional Heads: A Cross-linguistic Perspective. Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Cristofaro, Sonia, 2003. Subordination. Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Croft, William, 2000. Explaining Language Change. An Evolutionary Approach. Longman, Harlow.

Davidse, Kristin, 2000. A constructional approach to clefts. Linguistics 38, 1101–1131.

De Rooij, Jaap, 1965. Als - of - dat. Enkele conjuncties in ABN, dialect en Fries. Van Gorcum, Assen.

De Rooij, Jaap, 1967. Lummel dat je bent. Tijdschrift voor Nederlandse Taal- en Letterkunde 83, 108–121.

De Schutter, Georges, 1990. De studie van de syntaxis van Nederlandse en Friese dialecten. Taal & Tongval, Themanummer 3, 10–47.

Delahunty, Gerald, 2006. A relevance theoretic analysis of *not that* sentences: ''Not that there is anything wrong with that''. Pragmatics 16 (2/3), 213–245.

DeLancey, Scott, 2011. The mirative and evidentiality. Journal of Pragmatics 33, 369–382.

Den Dikken, Marcel, 1998. Speaker-oriented particles in Dutch imperatives. Glot International 3 (9/10), 23–24.

Diepeveen, Janneke, Van de Velde, Freek, 2010. Adverbial morphology: how Dutch and German are moving away from English. Journal of Germanic Linguistics 22, 381–402.

Diewald, Gabriele, 2010. On some problem areas in grammaticalization theory. In: Stathi, K., Gehweiler, E., König, E. (Eds.), Grammaticalization: Current Views and Issues. Benjamins, Amsterdam, pp. 17–50.

Dik, Simon C., 1997. In: Hengeveld, Kees (Ed.), The Theory of Functional Grammar. Part 1: The Structure of the Clause. 2nd ed. Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin.

Dixon, Robert M.W., 1977. Where have all the adjectives gone? Studies in Language 1 (1), 19–90.

Evans, Nicholas, 1993. Code, inference, placedness and ellipsis. In: The Role of Theory in Linguistic Description. Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin, pp. 243–280.

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

Foolen, Ad, 2012. The relevance of emotion for language and linguistics. In: Foolen, A., Lüdtke, U.M., Racine, T.P., Zlatev, J. (Eds.), Moving Ourselves, Moving Others. Motion and Emotion in Intersubjectivity, Consciousness and Language. Benjamins, Amsterdam, pp. 347–368.

Goldberg, Adele, 1995. Constructions: A Construction Grammar Approach to Argument Structure (Cognitive Theory of Language and Culture). University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

Goldberg, Adele, 1996. Construction grammar. In: Brown, K., Miller, J. (Eds.), Concise Encyclopedia of Syntactic Theories. Pergamon, New York, NY, pp. 68–71.

Grondelaers, Stefan, Deygers, Katrien, Van Aken, Hilde, Van den Heede, Vicky, Speelman, Dirk, 2000. Het ConDiv-corpus geschreven Nederlands. Nederlandse taalkunde 5, 356–363.

Grosz, Patrick Georg, 2012. On the Grammar of Optative Constructions. Benjamins, Amsterdam.

Haeseryn, Walter, Romijn, Kirsten, Geerts, Guido, De Rooij, Jaap, Van den Toorn, Maarten, 1997. Algemene Nederlandse spraakkunst, 2nd ed. Nijhoff, Groningen.

Haspelmath, Martin, 1998. The semantic development of old presents. New futures and subjunctives without grammaticalization. Diachronica 15 (1), 29–62.

Heine, Bernd, 2002. On the role of context in grammaticalization. In: Wischer, I., Diewald, G. (Eds.), New Reflections on Grammaticalization. Benjamins, Amsterdam, pp. 83–101.

Himmelmann, Nikolaus, 2004. Lexicalization and grammaticization: opposite or orthogonal? In: What Makes Grammaticalization? A Look from its Fringes and its Components. Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin, pp. 21–42.

Hoeksema, Jack, 2000. Verplichte topicalisatie van kale enkelvouden: *de feit is dat*-constructie. Tabu 30 (3/4), 113–142.

Hopper, Paul J., 1991. On some principles of grammaticalization. In: Traugott, E.C., Heine, B. (Eds.), Approaches to Grammaticalization. Volume I: Focus on Theoretical and Methodological Issues. Benjamins, Amsterdam, pp. 17–35.

Hopper, Paul J., Traugott, Elizabeth C., 1993. Grammaticalization. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

König, Ekkehard, Siemund, Peter, 2007. Speech act distinctions in grammar. In: Shopen, T. (Ed.), Language Typology and Syntactic Description: Vol. I: Clause Structure. 2nd ed. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 276–324.

Lass, Roger, 1990. How to do things with junk: exaptation in language evolution. Journal of Linguistics 26, 79–102.

Lehmann, Christian, 1988. Towards a typology of clause linkage. In: Haiman, J., Thompson, S.A. (Eds.), Clause Combining in Grammar and Discourse. Benjamins, Amsterdam, pp. 181–225.

Lehti-Eklund, Hanna, 2002. Om *att* som diskursmarkör. Språk och stil 11, 81–118.

Lemke, Jay L., 1998. Resources for attitudinal meaning. Evaluative orientations in text semantics. Functions of Language 5 (1), 33–56.

Lichtenberk, Frantisek, 1995. Apprehensional epistemics. In: Bybee, J., Fleischman, S. (Eds.), Modality in Grammar and Discourse. Benjamins, Amsterdam, pp. 293–327.

Lindström, Jan, London, Anne-Marie, 2008. Constructing reasoning. The connectives *för att* (causal) *så att* (consecutive) and *men att* (adversative) in Swedish conversations. In: Leino, Jaakko (Ed.), Constructional Reorganization. Benjamins, Amsterdam, pp. 105–152.

Linell, Per, 2005. En dialogisk Grammatik? In: Samtal och grammatik. Studier i svenskt samtaksspråk. Studentlitteratur, Lund, pp. 231–328.

Matthijs, Lennart, Davidse, Kristin, Van linden, An, Brems, Lot, ms. The development of mirative *no wonder*-constructions. University of Leuven.

McGregor, William B., 1997. Semiotic Grammar. Clarendon Press, Oxford.

Michaelis, Laura, 2001. Exclamative constructions. In: Haspelmath, M., König, E., Oesterreicher, W., Raible, W. (Eds.), Language Typology and Language Universals. De Gruyter, Berlin, pp. 1038–1058.

Michaelis, Laura, Lambrecht, Knud, 1996. Towards a construction-based theory of language function: the case of nominal extraposition. Language 72 (2), 215–247.

Mithun, Marianne, 2008. The extension of dependency beyond the sentence. Language 84 (1), 69–119.

MNW: Middelnederlandsch Woordenboek, 1998. SDU, 's-Gravenhage. Cd-rom version of Eelco Verwijs and Jacob Verdam, 1885–1952. Middelnederlandsch Woordenboek. Nijhoff, 'sGravenhage.

Morel, Mary-Annick, 1995. L'Intonation exclamative dans l'oral spontane. Faits de Langues 6, 63–70.

Nikolaeva, Irina (Ed.), 2007. Finiteness. Theoretical and Empirical Foundations. Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Norde, Muriel, 2009. Degrammaticalization. Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Norde, Muriel, 2010. Degrammaticalization: three common controversies. In: Stathi, K., Gehweiler, E., König, E. (Eds.), Grammaticalization: Current Views and Issues. Benjamins, Amsterdam, pp. 123–150.

Nuyts, Jan, 2005. The modal confusion: on terminology and the concepts behind it. In: Modality: Studies in Form and Function. Equinox, London, pp. 5–38.

Nuyts, Jan, 2006. Modality: overview and linguistic issues. In: The Expression of Modality. Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin, pp. 1–26.

Oosterhof, Albert, 2012. Een verkennende studie naar stilistische en grammaticale factoren bij lidwoordomissie in koppen. Paper presented at the BKL-taaldag, Liège, 19 May 2012.

Paardekooper, Petrus C., 1963. Stommeling dat je bent. De Nieuwe Taalgids 56, 160–164.

Palmer, Frank R., 1979. Modality and the English Modals. Longman, London.

Palmer, Frank R., 2001. Mood and Modality (Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics), 2nd ed. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Panther, Klaus-Uwe, Thornburg, Linda, 2011. Emotion and desire in independent complement clauses. A case study from German. In: Brdar, M., Gries, S., Žic Fuchs, M. (Eds.), Cognitive Linguistics. Convergence and Expansion. Benjamins, Amsterdam, pp. 87–114.

Paradis, Carita, 2001. Adjectives and boundedness. Cognitive Linguistics 12 (1), 47–65.

Quirk, Randolph, Greenbaum, Sidney, Leech, Geoffrey, Svartvik, Jan, 1985. A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language. Longman, London.

Rutten, Gijsbert, 2010. Continuative relative clauses in the history of Dutch: a case of constructional grammaticalization. Paper presented at *Gramis*, Brussels, 11–13 November 2010.

Schachter, Paul, Shopen, Timothy, 2007. Part-of-speech systems. In: Shopen, T. (Ed.), Language Typology and Syntactic Description: Vol. I: Clause Structure. 2nd ed. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 1–60.

Schönfeld, Moritz, Van Loey, Adolphe, 1970. Historische grammatica van het Nederlands. Thieme, Zutphen.

Simon-Vandenbergen, Anne-Marie, Aijmer, Karin, 2007. The semantic field of modal certainty: a study of English adverbs. Topics in English Linguistics, vol. 56. Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin.

Traugott, Elizabeth C., 2003. Constructions in grammaticalization. In: Joseph, B.D., Janda, R.D. (Eds.), The Handbook of Historical Linguistics. Blackwell, Oxford, pp. 624–647.

Traugott, Elizabeth C., Dasher, Richard D., 2002. Regularity in Semantic Change. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Trousdale, Graeme, 2010. Issues in constructional approaches to grammaticalization. In: Stathi, K., Gehweiler, E., König, E. (Eds.), Grammaticalization: Current Views and Issues. Benjamins, Amsterdam, pp. 51–71.

Van de Velde, Freek, van der Horst, Johannes, 2013. Homoplasy in diachronic grammar. Language Sciences 36, 66–77.

Van de Velde, Freek, De Smet, Hendrik, Ghesquière, Lobke, 2013. On multiple source constructions in language change. Studies in Language 37 (3), 473–489.

Van der Auwera, Johan, Plungian, Vladimir, 1998. Modality's semantic map. Linguistic Typology 2, 79–124.

Van der Horst, Johannes M., 1984. Over vorm en inhoud van bijzinnen. In: Vorm en funktie in tekst en taal: bundel opstellen verschenen ter gelegenheid van de voltooiing van het honderdste deel van het Tijdschrift voor Nederlandse Taal- en Letterkunde. Brill, Leiden, pp. 154–179.

Van der Horst, Johannes M., 2008. Geschiedenis van de Nederlandse syntaxis. Leuven University Press, Leuven.

Van der Horst, Johannes M., Van der Horst, Kees, 1999. Geschiedenis van het Nederlands in de twintigste eeuw. SDU, The Hague.

Van der Wouden, Ton, Foolen, Ad, 2011. Pragmatische partikels in de rechterperiferie. Nederlandse Taalkunde 16 (3), 307–322.

Van linden, An, 2012. Modal adjectives: English deontic and evaluative constructions in diachrony and synchrony. Topics in English Linguistics, vol. 75. De Gruyter Mouton, Berlin.

Van linden, An, Davidse, Kristin, 2009. The clausal complementation of deontic-evaluative adjectives in extraposition constructions: a synchronic–diachronic approach. Folia Linguistica 43 (1), 175–217.

Vandelanotte, Lieven, 2009. Speech and thought representation in English: a cognitive-functional approach. Topics in English Linguistics, vol. 65. Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin.

Verstraete, Jean-Christophe, 2005. Two types of coordination in clause combining. Lingua 115, 611–626.

Verstraete, Jean-Christophe, 2007. Rethinking the coordinate–subordinate dichotomy: interpersonal grammar and the analysis of adverbial clauses in English. Topics in English Linguistics, vol. 55. Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin.

Verstraete, Jean-Christophe, D'hertefelt, Sarah, Van linden, An, 2010. Atypical deontic and evaluative meanings in Dutch complement insubordination. Australia Linguistic Society. Brisbane, 7–9 July 2010.

Verstraete, Jean-Christophe, Van linden, An, D'hertefelt, Sarah, 2011. A semantic typology of complement insubordination. Association for Linguistic Typology 9th Biennial Meeting. Hong Kong, 2011 July, pp. 21–24.

Verstraete, Jean-Christophe, D'hertefelt, Sarah, Van linden, An, 2012. A typology of complement insubordination in Dutch. Studies in Language 36 (1), 123–153.

Vismans, Roel, 1994. Modal Particles in Dutch Directives: A Study in Functional Grammar. IFOTT, Amsterdam.

An Van linden is a postdoctoral researcher in the Department of Linguistics at the University of Leuven (Belgium). Her research interests include the analysis of clause combining, mood and modality, information structure and grammaticalization in the NP, from a diachronic and a synchronic perspective, in the Germanic languages (with a special focus on English) as well as in typologically diverse languages. She recently started documenting Harakmbut, an unclassified language from the Peruvian Amazon. Currently she is employed by the Research Foundation Flanders (FWO).

Freek Van de Velde is a postdoctoral research fellow at the University of Leuven. His main interests lie in the field of synchronic and diachronic morphosyntax of the Germanic languages, with a special focus on Dutch. He has taught courses on language variation and change in Leuven, Ghent, Münster and Cologne. After finishing his PhD on the syntactic structure and the development of the noun phrase, he worked on several projects dealing with the interpersonal nature of language and with general mechanisms of language change. Currently he is employed by the Research Foundation Flanders (FWO).