# J. Ik heb voorspeld (I/I) 

J-I

| 1 gedeeld | 2 gehoord | 3 getapt | 4 verhuisd | 5 geland |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 6 geklopt | 7 gemokt | 8 gerookt | 9 gerot | 10 getobd |

$\mathbf{J - 2}$. The reason that deriving the plain form from the past participle is not possible in all cases for this set of data is the fact that verb stems ending in a double/compound consonant (e.g., kunn-en) as well as stems ending in a consonant cluster consisting of a C and d (e.g., brand-en) create past participles with a final consonant cluster of the form Cd. Therefore, deriving backwards, a past participle form ending in -nd (e.g., gebrand) could derive either from a plain form with an -nd cluster (e.g., branden) or a plain form with a double/ compound consonant (e.g., *brannen). Similarly, geland may derive from landen or *lannen and gekund may derive from kunden or *kunnen.

All other hypothetically plausible ambiguities are not supported by examples in the given data and were, therefore, not admissible. For example, another ambiguity concerns a plain form with a double vowel. Evidence from long vowel plain forms is that the double vowel would stay the same, and this is indeed the case (e.g., leeren 'to learn' becomes geleerd). Therefore, a double vowel in the past participle could have come from a double vowel in the plain form. However, as there are no examples of this in the data, this is not an admissible example.
(With contributions from Aleka Blackwell)

