



## UvA-DARE (Digital Academic Repository)

### Attributive past participles in Dutch

Elffers, E.; de Haan, S.; Schermer, I.

**Publication date**

2012

**Document Version**

Final published version

**Published in**

Between West and East: Festschrift for Wim Honselaar on the occasion of his 65th birthday

[Link to publication](#)

**Citation for published version (APA):**

Elffers, E., de Haan, S., & Schermer, I. (2012). Attributive past participles in Dutch. In R. Genis, E. de Haard, J. Kalsbeek, E. Keizer, & J. Stelleman (Eds.), *Between West and East: Festschrift for Wim Honselaar on the occasion of his 65th birthday* (pp. 125-166). (Pegasus Oost-Europese studies; No. 20). Pegasus.

**General rights**

It is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), other than for strictly personal, individual use, unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

**Disclaimer/Complaints regulations**

If you believe that digital publication of certain material infringes any of your rights or (privacy) interests, please let the Library know, stating your reasons. In case of a legitimate complaint, the Library will make the material inaccessible and/or remove it from the website. Please Ask the Library: <https://uba.uva.nl/en/contact>, or a letter to: Library of the University of Amsterdam, Secretariat, Singel 425, 1012 WP Amsterdam, The Netherlands. You will be contacted as soon as possible.

# ATTRIBUTIVE PAST PARTICIPLES IN DUTCH \*

Els Elffers, Sies de Haan, Ina Schermer

## 1 Introduction

One of the ways in which the Dutch past participle can be used is as an attributive adjunct to a substantive. In, e.g., *de gestolen auto* ‘the stolen car’ and *de ontplofte granaat* ‘the exploded shell’, *gestolen* and *ontplofte* are attributive past participles (APPs).<sup>1</sup>

Not all past participles can be used attributively. Thus, *gebilde* in *\*de gebilde jongen* ‘the cried boy’ and *geblafte* in *\*de geblafte hond* ‘the barked dog’ are unacceptable in Dutch.

In this introductory section, we shall first present several earlier accounts of restrictions on the attributive use of past participles, including some recent ones. Next, we shall review a number of phenomena that seem to violate these theories. In the remainder of the article, we shall discuss these refractory phenomena more extensively, and try to account for them in, mainly, semantic and pragmatic terms.

### 1.1 Existing theories on the Dutch APP

APPs have always been part and parcel of Dutch grammatical tradition. Geerts et al. say that the past participle can be used “in the function of an adjective”, as in *verloren voorwerpen* ‘lost objects’ and *het getrouwde paar* ‘the married couple’ (Geerts et al. 1984: 452).<sup>2</sup> Den Hertog states that the past participle (like the present participle) is an adjectival form of the verb “through which the ‘activity’ notion can be used in the same functions as the adjective, without losing its verbal character” (Den Hertog 1973<sup>3</sup> [1892-1896] part III: 197; our translation from Dutch, as all those that follow). As to the APP, he points out that not all verbs have this function. One group of exceptions is formed by “the past participles of intransitives with *hebben* (have)” (op. cit. 202). The examples mentioned above,

*\*de gehuilde jongen* ‘the cried boy’ and *\*de geblafte hond* ‘the barked dog’, belong to this category.

In his authoritative study on the Dutch perfect formed with the past participle, Kern, like Den Hertog, establishes a connection between the possible occurrence of an APP and a conjugation with *hebben* ‘have’ or *zijn* ‘be’ for intransitives (Kern 1912: 16 ff). Kern sketches a semantic analysis accounting for the incompatibility of APPs and intransitives conjugated with *hebben*. According to Kern, the basic function of the past participle of intransitives has been, from way back, to indicate “having got into a certain state and still being in that state”. In view of this interpretation, we can understand that APPs cannot occur with intransitives conjugated with *hebben*, which do not indicate a ‘change of state’ (the so-called IMMUTATIVE INTRANSITIVES): *\*de gehuilde jongen* ‘the cried boy’, *\*de gebloeiide bloem* ‘the flowered flower’. In the case of intransitives conjugated with *zijn*, which do indicate a change of state (MUTATIVE INTRANSITIVES), APPs are always possible (e.g. *het gestorven kind* ‘lit. the died child’).

In modern linguistic theory, the above-mentioned relations have been reconstructed within the conceptual framework of the government-binding version of Generative Grammar (GB). The two types of intransitive verbs are referred to within GB theory as UNERGATIVES and UNACCUSATIVES (or ERGATIVES). The first are intransitive verbs denominating events that do not express a change of state (immutative verbs), such as *dansen* ‘dance’, *huilen* ‘cry’, *lachen* ‘laugh’, *blaffen* ‘bark’ and *bloeien* ‘flower’, the second are intransitive verbs that do express a change of state, with an implied goal (mutative verbs)<sup>3</sup>, like *sterven* ‘die’, *arriveren* ‘arrive’, *trouwen* ‘marry’, *ontploffen* ‘explode’ and *zinken* ‘sink’ (e.g. Broekhuis 1992: 92-99). Just as in traditional grammar, GB theory associates this semantic difference with the syntactic differences regarding auxiliary selection – unaccusative verbs are conjugated with *zijn*, unergatives with *hebben* – and regarding the choice of APPs: APPs can occur with unaccusative verbs (*de gearriveerde man* ‘lit. the arrived man’), but not with non-ergative verbs (*\*de gelachen vrouw* ‘the laughed woman’).

A special group, already recognized as such in traditional grammar, is formed by intransitive movement verbs that can take *hebben* as well as *zijn*, depending on

the difference in meaning ‘change of state with an implied goal or not’ (*De jongen heeft gelopen/De jongen is naar school gelopen* ‘The boy has walked/The boy is walked to school’). In these cases, APPs are only acceptable with the meaning ‘change of state’: *de naar school gelopen jongen* ‘lit. the to school walked boy (the boy who walked to school)’ versus *\*de gelopen jongen*, lit. *\*the walked boy*.

### 1.2 Counterexamples and questionable cases

All earlier theories suggest that the Dutch APP construction is unconditionally acceptable with transitive verbs (cf. the above examples *de gestolen auto* ‘the stolen car’ and *verloren voorwerpen* ‘lost objects’). In the case of intransitive verbs, on the other hand, there is a restriction: only mutatives, which are conjugated with *zijn*, allow the APP construction. Intransitive verbs that can be used as mutatives and as immutatives, usually verbs indicating movement, allow APP only when used as mutatives.

There appear to be counterexamples to these regular patterns, in the form of unexpected *unacceptable* APP constructions. To mention a few examples:

Unacceptable or questionable APP with transitive verbs

- (1) a #de geziene ster  
‘the seen star’
- (1) b #de gebrachte cadeautjes  
‘the brought presents’
- (1) c #het gemaakte vuur  
‘the made fire’
- (1) d #de gedragen tas  
‘the carried bag’
- (1) e #de gegroete buurman  
‘the greeted neighbour’

Unacceptable or questionable APP with mutative intransitive verbs

- (2) a #de gekomen gasten  
‘the come guests’

- (2) b #de doorgelopen agent  
‘the walked on policeman’
- (2) c #de gebleven medewerkers  
‘the remained staff members’
- (2) d #de overgegane kinderen  
‘the gone up children’
- (2) e #de gestopte man  
‘the stopped man’

Unacceptable or questionable APP with mutatively used intransitive movement verbs which can also be used immutatively

- (3) a #het over het Kanaal gezwommen meisje  
‘the across the Channel swum girl’
- (3) b #de over de hei gewandelde jongen  
‘the across the moor walked boy’
- (3) c #het over de weg gelopen paard  
‘the across the road walked horse’
- (3) d #de naar school gefietste jongen  
‘the to school cycled boy’
- (3) e #het door de gang geholde kind  
‘the through the corridor run child’

In this article we shall try to account for these counterexamples. Note that in groups 1 and 2 we are dealing with “bare” APPs, without added sentence parts. The APPs in group 3, on the other hand, must contain a direction adjunct, because the verbs in question cannot be used as mutatives without such an adjunct.

In the case of the counterexamples we must note that the *degree* of non-acceptability is often less strong than in the case of examples like *\*de gehuilde jongen* ‘the cried boy’, which is why we marked them with # rather than \*. We feel the *gehuilde jongen* to be plainly unacceptable; this sometimes goes for the examples of 1 – 3 as well, but sometimes “questionable” is a better qualification.

In our experience, many examples evoke reactions like “it should be acceptable/it is easily interpretable, but, yes, you just don’t say that”, but also “I think maybe it is possible”.

### 1.3 Set-up of the article

The article is organized as follows. In section 2, we present two different kinds of data, as further exploration of and empirical support for our observations about APP RESTRICTIONS, as we call the phenomenon of non-acceptable APPs *outside* the familiar group of immutative intransitives. These data were taken from corpus studies and from an inventory of native speaker informants’ judgements. In section 3, we expound our views regarding the past participle and attribution, leading up to a further characterization of the semantic-pragmatic function of the Dutch APP.

This is the setting for our attempt, in sections 4 and 5, to explain, after a further investigation of the phenomena, why some APPs of transitive and mutative-intransitive verbs cannot or only marginally function in this way. As for Dutch, we cannot elaborate on earlier analyses, but for English, Bolinger (1967) and Ackerman & Goldberg (1996) have tried to account for a number of similar phenomena. We will develop our own vision partly in the context of their ideas.

Finally, in section 6, we discuss constructions with mutative movement verbs of type 3 in section 1.2, i.e. cases like *#het over het Kanaal gezwommen meisje* ‘the across the Channel swum girl’, which at first seemed to elude our explanation.

In section 7 we present a summary, suggesting also a few issues for further study.

## 2 Empirical support

In order to obtain a better insight into the problem of APP restrictions, we used two other kinds of data in addition to our own intuitive judgements: those from corpus studies (Google and a book pilot) and the judgements of a group of informants. Let us briefly introduce the two methods.

## 2.1 Google and book pilot

All instances in this article of Dutch APP constructions of types 1-3 that were deemed unacceptable by us have been submitted to a Google search. In each case the number of hits was small (<10), which has been interpreted as supporting our view that they are indeed less acceptable.

This method presupposes that acceptable APP constructions should yield large numbers of hits. This usually appears to be the case, cf. *de ingepakte cadeautjes* ‘the packed presents’ (2920) vs. *de gebrachte cadeautjes* ‘lit. the brought presents’ (1), *het gedoofde vuur* ‘the extinguished fire’ (1660) vs. *het gemaakte vuur* ‘lit. the made fire’ (5), *de gearriveerde gasten* ‘lit. the arrived guests’ (564) vs. *de gekomen gasten* ‘lit. the come guests’ (1).

The test constructions should be semantically plausible, and contain current lexical elements, so as to minimize the possibility of other than APP factors causing low frequencies. In our opinion, the instances tested meet these requirements.<sup>4</sup>

Of the 15 APP constructions in 1 – 3, nine scored 0 hits, for the other six the number was five or less. Appendix 1 presents the results of the complete Google investigation.

For the book pilot investigation, we itemized the APP constructions in two novels, *Het Pauperparadijs* (2008) by Suzanna Jansen and *Duel* (2010) by Joost Zwagerman. This test enabled us to get a better idea of the occurrence of our construction in present-day (standard) Dutch.

In *Het Pauperparadijs* (233 pages) we found 147 occurrences, in *Duel* (91 pages) the construction was found 88 times – an average of 1 APP per 1.35 pages. In written language, then, it is a reasonably current construction. In about 60% of the cases, we have a bare APP, in about 40%, the APP is accompanied by other sentence parts (see, e.g., *zijn door duizenden kunstwerken getrainde blik* ‘lit. his by thousands of works of art trained look (his eye, sharpened by looking at thousands of works of art)’ (*Duel*, 16), *de met hout betimmerde voorgevel* ‘lit. the with wood timbered façade’ (*Het Pauperparadijs*, 51). It seems to us that these more elaborate APP clusters occur only in written language, both in pre- and post-position – an example of the latter is *een ooievaar van hout, versierd met roze*

*slingers* ‘a stork of wood, decorated with pink garlands’ (*Het Pauperparadijs*, 65). As for the bare APPs (e.g. *de gebruikte penselen* ‘the used brushes’, *zijn geparkeerde auto* ‘his parked car’ (*Duel*, 15 and 23), we think nearly all of them are found in spoken language as well.

## 2.2 Informants’ verdicts

A group of 16 second-year students of General Linguistics, all of them native speakers of Dutch, were given a list of sentences for assessment. Their options were threefold: *acceptable*, *questionable*, *unacceptable*. The words that were thought to have caused a decrease in acceptability had to be underlined.

Our material comprised 51 sentences with one APP construction each, spread over APPs of transitive and mutative-intransitive verbs and mutatively used intransitive movement verbs. Ten sentences of each group contained an APP construction that we thought was unacceptable or questionable, seven sentences an acceptable one. The unacceptable or questionable constructions were the same as the ones mentioned in this article (marked with #), with some other examples added.

The results were the following – all but one of the sentences with an acceptable APP construction were judged acceptable by all or the great majority of the students (13 or more). The 30 unacceptable or questionable cases showed a more diffuse picture. In most cases (17), a majority of the students found them unacceptable or questionable because of the APP construction, while a minority, from 1 to 6 students, considered them acceptable. In 13 cases a majority (8 or more) found them acceptable. This majority was, however, much smaller than in the case of the acceptable sentences: only in a few cases were 13 or more students involved.

Although, then, the verdicts on the unacceptable and questionable cases are variable, there is a tendency that is clearly different from what we found in the – more homogenous – judgements on the acceptable cases. In Appendix 2, the scores for all of the sentences submitted are listed.



### 2.3 APP restrictions – unmistakable but not easy to categorize

On the basis of the three kinds of data used (our own judgements, results of a Google search and informants' judgements) we find that APP restrictions indeed exist. At the same time we had to conclude that judgements were not unequivocal. As to allegedly unacceptable APPs, there are always few occurrences in Google, but in some case more than in others. The number of informants judging a construction unacceptable is not constant either. But the generally accepted idea that the Dutch APP construction is unacceptable only with immutable intransitives is definitely open to question. Exactly which other APP constructions are unacceptable or less acceptable, and why, is the object of our investigation here.<sup>5</sup>

## 3 The semantic-pragmatic function of the APP

Two key notions play a part in this discussion: 'past participle' and 'attributive' – we shall examine some existing views here. For both we present our own position; this then results in a conception of APP that shapes the framework within which we can try to find an explanation for the APP restrictions we observed.

### 3.1 The category 'past participle'

The past participle is characterized by a "dual identity" (Van der Horst 1995: 201). It is a language element that shares (morpho-)syntactic features with the verb and the adjective. In classical Greek-Latin grammar this duality, which characterizes the present participle as well, was a reason to regard the participle as a separate part of speech, which also helps to account for the term *participium* (Matthews 1994: 41). From the 16<sup>th</sup> up to the 19<sup>th</sup> century, we also find this view in the works of Dutch grammarians who based themselves on this classical grammatical tradition.<sup>6</sup>

Later on, the participle came to be regarded in Dutch grammar as a flexion form of the verb. Within the system of characteristics of participles, grammarians have, since the 19<sup>th</sup> century, considered the link with the verb as more essential than the relation with the adjective.<sup>7</sup> No doubt this view is also rooted in the use of the past participle as the main verb in perfect and passive – cf. Den Hertog's

pronouncement that the participle is an adjectival form of the verb which enables “the ‘activity’ notion to be used in the same functions as the adjective without losing its verbal character” (Den Hertog 1973<sup>3</sup> [1892-1896] part III: 197). In APP this verbal character is most pronounced, says Den Hertog, when it is accompanied by adverbial adjuncts in combinations like *de gisteren bij mijn buurman gestolen voorwerpen (zijn bij de bank van lening teruggevonden)* ‘lit. the yesterday at my neighbour’s stolen objects (were at the pawnshop found back)’ (op. cit. 201). Sentence elements with a different function can also have this additional effect, e.g. the indirect object in *het mij gegeven boek* ‘lit. the me given book’.<sup>8</sup>

Occasionally, past participles used as adjectives lose their verbal characteristics and become (deverbal) adjectives, homonymous with the “verbal” past participle, as in the case of *gezien* ‘seen’, ‘popular’, *gemaakt* ‘made’, ‘affected’, and *gejaagd* ‘hunted’, ‘agitated’.

Within diachronic linguistics the prevailing notion in 19<sup>th</sup>-century historical comparative grammar was that the past participle is originally an adjective, which attained a verbal character only after the analytical perfect and passive were developed:

Unser sogenanntes Part. Perfecti ist von Hause aus ein reines Adjektivum, das erst allmählich in das Verbalsystem eingliedert ist und an dem Genus- und Tempusunterschied bis zu einem gewissen Grade Anteil gewonnen hat.  
(Paul 1902:162)

More recent discussions about the diachrony of the past participle attribute a dual character to its first appearance already in Indo-European. Beekes has demonstrated how participles had verbal usages already in the earliest stages of Indo-European (Beekes 1990: 126). PIE had few or no subclauses; the relations that were later expressed in subclauses were then expressed by participles or verbal nouns. That the past participle had verbal valency at an early stage becomes apparent from the development of periphrastic perfects, that is, of participle constructions with an equivalent of *hebben* as auxiliary, a development that took place already in Hittite, according to Beekes. In Latin, too, a perfect with *habere*

was developed. There are, then, sufficient grounds for regarding the past participle as a verbal form with adjectival usages.

Kern's terms *mutatief* and *immutatief* refer to a difference in "Aktionsart", a difference relating to the internal temporal structure of the verbal event. In the case of a mutative verb, the event denoted by the verb results in a change in situation of the patient participant. The completion of this change implies that the event has reached an inherent finishing point. In the case of an immutative there is no situational change and no related finishing point. This difference has proved to be relevant for the possible choice of an APP construction with intransitives. Let us explain why this is the case.

Unlike finite verb forms, non-finite forms such as the past participle do not indicate a deictic reference to the speech situation. The past participle does not present the verbal situation in its time space, but in a perspective from outside, as a complete whole (cf. *het gevallen glas* 'the fallen glass', *de gehate politicus* 'the hated politician').<sup>9</sup> Another aspect of the past participle is the presentation of the verbal event from the perspective of a participant included in it as patient (De Haan 1997: 92-93). Summarizing, we refer to the dual categorial meaning of the past participle with the term PATIENT SITUATION.

The representation of a verbal event by means of the past participle as a patient situation has different consequences in APPs for mutatives and immutatives, whereby the transitive/intransitive difference also plays a part.

An instance of an APP of a mutative transitive verb is *een geladen geweer* 'a loaded gun', meaning a gun into which someone at a certain moment put one or more bullets (which are still there). The patient situation here relates to a completed verbal event. Depending on context and situation, the event of loading evoked by *een geladen geweer* can play a part or not at all.

An instance of an APP of an immutative transitive verb is *een bij de teugel geleid paard* 'a by the reins led horse', meaning a horse that someone for a time holds by the rein and causes to walk.<sup>10</sup> The patient situation here relates to an event still in progress, that is, again, to a greater or lesser extent evoked.

With an APP of a mutative intransitive verb, as in *de verpieterde geranium* 'the withered geranium', the patient situation relates to a completed verbal event that

does not in this case happen to the object participant, but to the subject participant of the verb, which now fulfils the patient role. When the verb has an agent meaning, such as *vertrekken* ‘to leave’, (cf. *de vertrokken gasten*, ‘lit. the left guests’), the APP has a *medial* meaning: besides the patient perspective, the agent perspective is present as well; the guests are both object and originator of the situation change. For the formation of the APP, however, the patient perspective is essential.

It is generally thought that immutative intransitive verbs constitute the only case in which an APP construction is not possible, cf. *\*de geblafte hond* ‘the barked dog’ and *\*de gehuilde jongen* ‘the cried boy’. The impossibility to use the participles of *blaffen* and *huilen* as APP in this case is caused by the fact that the verbal event does not contain a patient participant to whom the event can happen. There is therefore no question of a patient situation.

### 3.2 Attribution

In the APP, the past participle, i.e. an element with the meaning discussed in the previous section of ‘patient situation’, enters into an attributive relation with a substantive, with or without other constituents. Other parts of speech, too, can enter into this kind of relationship – pre-eminently the adjective.

Theories about attribution are of two kinds: (i) theories in which attribution is equated with, or reduced to predication, and (ii) theories that regard attribution and predication as essentially different.

In Generative Grammar especially, examples of type (i) can be found.<sup>11</sup> Thus, in Dirven (1971) and in Van Gestel (1986), both devoted fully to attribution and predication, it is assumed that attributive constructions are implicitly predicative constructions. For example, *the tall boy* is regarded as a nominalization of *the boy is tall*. In analyses based on logic, too, there is no difference between attribution and predication. The sentence *Er ligt een rood papiertje* ‘There lies a red paper’ is represented as *Ex (Rx & Px & Lx)*, i.e. *there is an entity (x) for which it is true that it is red, is a (piece of) paper and lies*.

For our investigation these theories are impracticable. We do not dispute that there are similarities between predication and attribution, but our focus is on

possible differences. The reason for this is that the past participles and nouns that in combination produce unacceptable or questionable APP constructions can without any problem enter into predicative relations, cf. *De ster is gezien* ‘The star has been seen’, *De cadeautjes zijn gebracht* ‘The presents have been brought’ etc.<sup>12</sup>

Type (ii) theories differentiate between predication and attribution, for instance by emphasizing the functional difference: only with predication can we speak of a real sentence, or of a real speech act. In 19th-century psychologizing definitions, but, also in e.g. Van der Lubbe (1968<sup>3</sup>: 66), we find the claim that attribution and predication can both be characterized as a connection between concepts. However, in the first case, the connection has been made before, in the second, the connection is made actively during the formation of the sentence. In the words of Jespersen (1968<sup>10</sup>[1924]: 115): “The former is a lifeless, stiff combination, the latter has life in it”. Seuren (1969: 140) and Dirven (1971: 120) reformulate Jespersen’s statement in terms of the opposition “with/without its own performative character”.

This theory, too, is of little use to us: if the essential function of both predication and attribution is the connection of two concepts, with a difference only in time or in the presence / absence of a performative element, then the connection itself must in both cases be possible or impossible.

A different view on the distinction, also to be found in Jespersen (op. cit. 116), is more promising: in the case of e.g. *a silly person* we are talking of one – composite – element, “one denomination, a composite name for what conceivably might just as well have been called by a single name” (in this example: *a fool*); in the case of *The person is silly*, on the other hand, we are talking about a separate nominal element *the person*, to which through a second element something new, the being silly, has been added. This idea, in a more elaborate version, is also to be found in more recent work, e.g. in Siegel (1979) and Taylor (1992). These authors hold that the adjective in predications is extensional or “referent-modifying”: in *The person is silly*, a quality is ascribed to the referent of an NP. In attributions, the adjective is intensional, “reference-modifying”. *The silly person*, like *the person*, refers to a *category* of entities, be it a different one: ‘silly persons’ vs. ‘persons’. In

*the silly person*, in other words, the categorial meaning ‘person’ is changed into a new categorial meaning by *silly*.

This distinction between predication and attribution looks plausible and forms a good starting-point for our investigation. It is possible for a modifying element within a nominal category to have to meet other semantic and/or pragmatic demands than a predicative element in a sentence. For now, we assume that the attribution relation is of a “reference-modifying” character.<sup>13</sup> APP (im)possibilities will be analysed with this assumption as a guiding principle.

A point further to be specified is that of the scope of the notion ‘attribution’. Our proposal is based on the following two assumptions:

(i) In view of our focus on semantic/pragmatic functions, we count relative clauses, too, among the attributive elements. Both in *the silly person* and in *the person who is silly*, we claim that there is a “reference-modifying” element with *person*.<sup>14</sup> An exception is formed by the so-called amplifying relative clauses, which form a special intonation unit, as in *Victor, die mijn oudoom is* ‘Victor, who is my great-uncle’. Here, we support the traditional view that such a relative clause is a separate second predication, a sort of parenthetical clause (cf. Van den Toorn 1979<sup>6</sup>: 145-158).

(ii) We also regard post-adjuncts in the form of an adjective or APP with a unique-referent NP (e.g. *Jan, doodsbang/geïntimideerd, liep snel weg* ‘John, mortally afraid,/intimidated, walked away rapidly’), traditionally sometimes called “predicative additions”, as predicating. With non-uniquely referring NPs, however, these post-adjuncts are attributive. Post-positioned adjectives are rare in modern Dutch, but APP constructions, especially the more elaborate ones, occur regularly, as we can see in our book pilot, in post-position in written language (25 out of 147 in *Het Pauperparadijs*, 6 out of 90 in *Duel*). In principle, these APPs can in all cases also be placed in pre-position. The choice between the two positions seems to be determined by (i) the complexity of the APP cluster: the APPs always contain additional elements, (ii) the presence of other adjuncts to the noun. A typical example is *een bijna huwelijks dispuut, gedomineerd door persoonlijke kwetsuren* ‘an almost marital conflict, dominated by personal injuries’ (*Duel*, 78).<sup>15</sup>

Finally, we must point out that ‘reference-modifying’ is a much broader notion than ‘restrictive’. This term, traditionally often applied to (non-amplifying) relative clauses, as well as to APPs and other attributive adjuncts, is misleading as a *general* function indicator.<sup>16</sup> In *the silly person*, *silly* may, it is true, serve to make the listener identify the right person among various persons, but in actual practice this hardly ever occurs. Thompson (1988) investigated this for adjectives (from various languages) in spoken texts. Her conclusion for English was that

The referent-*distinguishing* function turns out to be an extremely rare function in conversational language, a fact which is contrary to expectation and which could not have been arrived at by examining one’s intuitions. (Thompson 1988: 178)

In nearly all cases in her material, the attributive adjective was used together with the noun, to introduce a referent of a particular category. From our book pilot study it appears that in practice, the Dutch APP does not implement the restrictive function in written texts either. Neither in *Het Pauperparadijs* nor in *Duel* did this function apply even once. For our investigation this is important: some APP restrictions disappear in made-up contexts that impose a purely restrictive function upon them, cf. *Wij zijn op zoek naar de gedragen tas, niet naar de ópgeborgen tas* ‘lit. We are looking for the carried bag, not for the locked away bag’. In view of the marginal character of this function we shall not pursue this possibility here; APPs that are acceptable only in this kind of context will be regarded as unacceptable.

### 3.3 The function of the APP

In summary, it appears that the APP can be defined as an element which through reference-modification (possibly with other elements) can form a new semantic category with a noun. The semantic contribution by the APP then consists in qualities of the patient situation mentioned by the past participle. In the unacceptable cases, the APP cannot perform this function. In the case of the immutative intransitive participles this is due to the fact that, unlike all other past participles, there *is* no patient situation from which qualities can be derived. For our examples we shall have to look for other factors that block this function.

#### 4 The cause of APP restrictions

In this section, we shall, first, look at the Dutch APP restrictions that we came across a little more closely. Next, we shall look at two earlier analyses of more or less similar phenomena in English (Bolinger 1967 and Ackerman & Goldberg 1996) – in partial disagreement with these analyses, we will present our own position in section 5.

##### 4.1 Closer examination of the phenomena

In 3.1 two properties of the past participle were mentioned that are relevant for a proper characterization of the APP restrictions: first, the past participle can, as APP, occur together with other elements, second, it can undergo meaning specialization, by which it becomes a (deverbal) adjective, homonymous with the “verbal” past participle. Both phenomena are relevant to our investigations, in the sense that APP restrictions vanish or decrease if the APP occurs in larger constructions or if it undergoes meaning specialization. In the former case, clustering with other elements produces more acceptable constructions; cf. *#de doorgelopen agent* ‘the walked on policeman’ vs. *de inmiddels/na het ongeluk doorgelopen agent* ‘lit. the meanwhile/after the accident walked on policeman (The policeman who had meanwhile walked on/who walked on after the accident)’. In the latter case APP restrictions simply disappear (cf. *#de geziene ster* ‘the seen star’ vs. *de geziene politicus* ‘the popular politician’; *#het gemaakte vuur* ‘the made fire’ vs. *een gemaakte manier van spreken* ‘an affected manner of speaking’.)

Partly as a continuation of these observations, we mention a few other factors that appear to influence the acceptability of APPs:

(i) *Derivation or composition*

Not only syntactic, but also morphological additions can, it appears, remove APP restrictions, even when the result does not in its interpretation deviate much from the simple form – cf. *#de gekomen gasten* ‘the arrived guests’ vs. *de binnengekomen gasten* ‘lit. the entered guests’; *de gebrachte cadeautjes* ‘lit. the brought presents’ vs. *de weggebrachte cadeautjes* ‘the delivered presents’.<sup>17</sup>



(ii) *Pregnant interpretations in polysemy*

As it turns out, it is not only far-reaching meaning specializations such as in deverbal adjectives like *gezien* ‘popular’ that remove APP restrictions; the same effect can also be obtained by less drastic meaning specializations within a polysemous cluster. Thus, besides *#de doorgelopen agent* ‘lit. the walked on policeman’, there is the unproblematic *de doorgelopen verf* ‘lit. the run paint’ – obviously, *doorgelopen* in the sense of ‘walked on’ is not suitable for the APP role, but the more pregnant interpretation ‘dissolved or spread’, where the verbal event leaves clearly visible traces, is.

Google helped us to discover similar cases. Against 1 hit for *#de gekomen gasten* ‘lit. the come guests’, we found 74 hits for *de gekomen Christus* ‘lit. the come Christ’, where *gekomen* has a pregnant religious meaning. Even where all interpretations yield acceptable APPs, the more pregnant interpretations prove to be by far the most frequent. Thus, in nearly all Google instances of APPs with *weggelopen* ‘run away’, the participle has the meaning ‘fled from home, eloped’; only rarely is it used in the sense of simply walking away.

(iii) *Strong polysemy; “light verbs”*

In our instances of APP restrictions, we frequently find strongly polysemous verbs such as *komen* ‘come’, *blijven* ‘remain’, *maken* ‘make’, *zien* ‘see’, *brenge* ‘bring’. With these verbs, the polysemy appears not only in lexical variation, but sometimes also in syntactic variation (functioning as main verb and as auxiliary), and in idiomatic variation: many belong to the category of “light verbs”, verbs appearing frequently in idiomatic combinations where they have only little semantic weight (cf. *tot rust komen* ‘calm down, come to rest’, *ruzie maken* ‘quarrel, make a row’.) In general, these verbs seem to be ill-suited to the APP function, as a rule both in idiomatic and in non-idiomatic usage: cf. *#de gemaakte ruzie* ‘the made row’, *#het gemaakte vuur* ‘the made fire’, *#het gemaakte horloge* ‘the made/repaired watch’.

(iv) *(In)definiteness of the NP; the importance of scenarios*

So far, we have used examples of APPs in definite NPs. In a great many cases, the factor ‘(in)definiteness’ is not material for the acceptability: alongside, e.g., *de ontplofte granaat* ‘the exploded shell’, *#het over het Kanaal gezwommen meisje* ‘the

across the Channel swim girl' and #*de gegroete buurman* 'the greeted neighbour', we have *een ontplofte granaat* 'an exploded shell', #*een over het Kanaal gezwommen meisje* 'an across the Channel swim girl' and #*een gegroete buurman* 'a greeted neighbour'. However, there are cases where there is a difference, notably between definite and non-specific indefinite NPs. Compare in this respect the following examples:

- (4) a De binnengebrachte man werd meteen naar de poli heelkunde vervoerd.  
'lit. The brought in man was immediately to the polyclinic surgery taken.'
- (4) b #Heb jij wel eens een binnengebrachte man gezien?  
'lit. Have you ever a brought in man seen?'
- (5) a De voorgestelde straatnaam werd uiteindelijk verworpen.  
'The proposed street name was ultimately rejected.'
- (5) b #Ik heb nog nooit een voorgestelde straatnaam met hem besproken.  
'lit. I have never a proposed street name with him discussed.'

4a and 5a are acceptable sentences within the scenario of, e.g., a traffic accident and a street name committee respectively, 4b and 5b, in which the indefinite NPs refer not to a specific but to any member of the NP category are unacceptable. 4c and 5c, in which the indefinite NPs refer to a specific referent within a definite scenario, are, however, acceptable:

- (4) c [Het ziekenhuis was in rep en roer. In de hal werden gewonden opgevangen.] Een binnengebrachte man werd meteen naar de poli heelkunde gebracht.  
[The hospital was in commotion. In the hall, wounded persons were received.] 'lit. A brought in man was immediately to the polyclinic surgery taken.'
- (5) c [Alles werd getraineed door de straatnaamcommissie. Besluiten werden steeds weer herroepen.] Een voorgestelde straatnaam werd drie keer opnieuw aan de orde gesteld.  
[Everything was delayed by the street name committee. Resolutions were

constantly reversed.] ‘lit. A proposed street name was three times over brought up.’

Apparently, there are APPs that cannot very easily be used, together with a noun, for the creation of a new category. Within a specific scenario, however, they can help to create an ad hoc category. Accordingly, they can occur only in specifically referring NPs.<sup>18</sup>

In (i) – (iv) we sketched the contours of the Dutch APP restrictions a little more specifically. If we look at the differences between unacceptable and acceptable APP constructions, there seem to be reasons to tentatively assume that the unacceptable cases often show a form of “content deficit”, a deficit that clearly does not figure in parallel predicative constructions, and which can be resolved by adding (possibly implicit) meaningful material or by further specifying the meaning. A theory about APP restrictions will have to do justice to these findings and to further explicate this idea of “content deficit”.

#### 4.2 APP restrictions in specialist literature

In section 1.3, we remarked that no earlier efforts have been made to explain Dutch APP restrictions. The phenomenon has, it is true, been observed, be it on a very limited scale and without closer analysis. Thus, Zaenen (1993: 140-141) mentions the examples \**de gegane jongen* ‘the gone boy’, ?*de naar huis gegane jongen* ‘lit. the home gone boy’ and \**de gebleven jongen* ‘the stayed boy’, remarking that *de weggebleven jongen* ‘lit. the stayed away boy’ is acceptable, and that in general additions make the APP more acceptable. This is also remarked by Van der Wal (1986:224) in connection with the examples *een vaak gehoord geluid* ‘a frequently heard sound’, *een vroeger gezien tafereel* ‘lit. a once seen scene’ and *de naar Amsterdam gevoerde man* ‘lit. the to Amsterdam transported man’, where omission of the adverbial adjuncts would make them unacceptable.<sup>19</sup> Broekhuis (1997: 42) claims that *het de weg over gelopen paard* ‘lit. the the road crossed horse (the horse that crossed the road)’ and *de over de hei gewandelde jongen* ‘lit. the across the moor walked boy (the boy who walked across the moor)’ are not

“entirely acceptable” for everyone, but, unlike the present authors, he himself finds them acceptable.<sup>20</sup>

As far as we know, Bolinger (1967) and Ackerman & Goldberg (1996) are the only publications in which, independently from each other, a few more APP restrictions are discussed, and an attempt at explanation is made. Both articles deal with the English APP, which in many but not all respects is comparable with its Dutch counterpart. Thus, possibilities for English APPs to intransitive verbs are much more restricted than in Dutch – they do not play an important part in the articles referred to.<sup>21</sup> But apart from that, they have so much in common that the analyses by Bolinger and Ackerman & Goldberg are definitely relevant for us.

In part, the examples with APP restrictions in the two articles are mutually comparable, and, moreover, comparable with our Dutch examples. Thus, Bolinger discusses *#sent goods* vs. *labelled goods*, while Ackerman & Goldberg review *sent letters* vs. *recently sent letters*. The acceptable counterparts are in both cases representative of the author’s approach: Bolinger has variants with APP-N-combinations (e.g. *#a scratched head* vs. *a scratched surface*, *#rung bells* vs. *dented bells*); Ackerman & Goldberg have variants with added adverbial adjuncts (e.g. *#built house* vs. *recently built house*; *#paid physician* vs. *well-paid physician*).

In Bolinger’s theory, an APP is acceptable when it expresses a sufficiently *characterizing* property – this is most obviously the case when the verbal event “leaves a mark on something [...] When one scratches one’s head the result is not *#a scratched head*, but when one scores a glass surface the result is *a scratched surface*” (op. cit. 9). This contrast can be compared with the contrast we found between *#de doorgelopen agent* ‘the walked on policeman’ and *de doorgelopen verf* ‘lit. the run paint’, where in the acceptable case we also see a “mark” left by the verbal event on the referent of the NP.

Ackerman & Goldberg refer for their explanation to Frame Semantics. They argue that an unacceptable APP like *paid* in *#paid physician* is implied by the semantic frame of the noun, in this case *physician*. Since physicians are normally paid, *paid physician* is insufficiently informative (by the same token, *paid escort* is acceptable). By adding an adverb like *well*, we make the total construction sufficiently informative, and therefore acceptable.

Ackerman & Goldberg furthermore identify APP restrictions of a different nature, which appear in pairs of APPs of near-synonymous verbs, of which one, according to Ackerman & Goldberg, has a less “specific” meaning than the other. The APP restriction then obtains for the less specific variant, e.g. *#given funds* vs. *donated/sacrificed funds*; *#taken item* vs. *stolen item*, *#told secret* vs. *disclosed secret*, *#changed design* vs. *altered design*. For an explanation they refer here to a so-called PARADIGMATIC INFORMATIVENESS CONSTRAINT, which demands that with this kind of alternatives the choice always has to be for the APP of the more specific verb.<sup>22</sup>

### 4.3 Evaluation

The articles discussed deal with phenomena that are very similar to, sometimes even identical with our Dutch examples.<sup>23</sup> We recognize the differences in acceptability as well as the factors playing a part here: addition of meaningful material and meaning specialization. Both Bolinger and Ackerman & Goldberg, moreover, ascribe APP restrictions to a form of “content deficit”.

If we look a little more closely at the way in which Bolinger and Ackerman & Goldberg work this out, however, we have a few reservations, in both cases. Bolinger’s view is plausible as long we restrict ourselves to cases where “characterizing” can be made explicit in terms of “leaving a mark”. But, as Bolinger himself remarks, “‘leaving a mark’ is only the unhewn side of characterization” (op. cit. 9). With innumerable verbal events that accept APPs quite readily, there is no question of perceptible traces. In the case of a contrast such as *lost jewels* vs. *#found jewels* and *deposited money* vs. *#withdrawn money* (Bolinger’s examples), “characterization” must therefore relate to something more abstract; the same goes for numerous Dutch cases like *#de gegroete buurman* ‘the greeted neighbour’ vs. *de uitgescholden buurman* ‘the abused neighbour’ and *#de gedragen tas* ‘the carried bag’ vs. *de gestolen tas* ‘the stolen bag’. Bolinger does not deal very convincingly with such cases. He ultimately explains “characterizing” in general terms like “interesting”, “striking”, “exceptional”, terms that are vague and, moreover, inadequate. A great many ordinary APP constructions do show very normal, predictable and by no means exceptional characteristics, cf. constructions

like *de geparkeerde auto* ‘the parked car’, *de gekookte rijst* ‘the boiled rice’, *de betaalde rekeningen* ‘the paid bills’.<sup>24</sup>

It is precisely constructions of this type that also argue against the explanation Ackerman & Goldberg give for the “content deficit” factor. Thus, just like Bolinger’s account, a formulation in the terminology of Frame Semantics also predicts that in these cases the APP is unacceptable, on account of redundancy due to predictability through the semantic frame of the noun: a car has to be parked, rice is generally boiled etc. The other way round things also go wrong: APPs that are not implied by the semantic frame of the noun can still end up in unacceptable constructions, cf. the English examples #*found jewels* and #*a scratched head* and Dutch examples like #*de gegroete buurman* ‘the greeted neighbour’, #*de doorgelopen agent* ‘the walked on policeman’.

In the case of Ackerman & Goldberg’s second type of APP restrictions, dealing with the semantically more specific members of clusters of near-synonymous alternatives, it seems that they are on the right track in the sense that what is needed here is really a special type of explanation. Both in English and in Dutch, APP constructions can be found that are hardly different in interpretation, but of which one member is unacceptable. Parallel to the English examples, we find Dutch cases, e.g. #*de gebrachte cadeautjes* ‘the brought presents’ vs. *de afgeleverde cadeautjes* ‘the delivered presents’, #*de gekomen gasten* ‘the come guests’ vs. *de gearriveerde gasten* ‘lit. the arrived guests’ (cf. also the derivation and composition examples in 4.1).

Little is to be gained here by appealing to substantial differences in content. Still, Ackerman & Goldberg assume a difference in “semantic specificity”. This entails contradictions – on the one hand, by presenting the examples in groups and by appealing to the Paradigmatic Informativeness Constraint, Ackerman & Goldberg suggest there to be a choice (limited by the Constraint) between in principle interchangeable variants – while on the other hand, the very appeal to “semantic specificity” suggests that we are really dealing with different meanings. The Paradigmatic Informativeness Constraint, then, implies that certain meanings cannot be captured in words: the speaker has to provide more detailed information than he has evidence for: “even in contexts in which the speaker

knows no more than simply that an item was taken [...], one still cannot describe the item as a taken item [...]" (op. cit. 28). Ackerman & Goldberg acknowledge that this consequence is surprising, without drawing any conclusions from it.

## 5 An alternative analysis

In spite of our objections, we think that there is some truth in both the theories discussed. We agree with Bolinger's suggestion that the APP must somehow be "characterizing". The same goes for Ackerman & Goldberg's suggestion that apart from this semantic/pragmatic factor, there is also a further restriction on the use of APPs in that, in near-synonymous cases, the APP construction with the least clear-cut meaning often seems to be unacceptable. For both suggestions, however, we opt for an alternative explanation. Our first tentative hypothesis about Dutch APP restrictions is the following:

### **(I) Dutch APPs are acceptable only if they denote a relevant and reconstructable patient situation.**

Hypothesis I is in fact a pragmatically oriented elaboration of the general notion, discussed in 3.1, that APPs denote a patient situation, and that APPs like *#de gebuilde jongen* 'the cried boy' are not possible because with immutable intransitives there is no patient situation. Our hypothesis implies that the patient situation not only has to exist, but also, within the communicative context, has to be relevant and reconstructable.

The hypothesis implies that the vague notion 'content deficit' from 4.1 needs to be elaborated in two ways. We start with the explanation in terms of 'relevance', the factor we think is responsible for most of the APP restrictions.

### 5.1 Relevance

By 'relevance' we are not referring to the Gricean notion, current in linguistics, which plays a role in the MAXIM OF RELOCATION "be relevant", and which applies to *all* language use. Our notion 'relevance' is more specific in that it requires conditions to be met for attribution that need not be fulfilled in the case of predication. Given the reference-modifying role played by attributive elements,

what is at stake here is the formation of *relevant semantic categories*. This calls for a type of relevance that concerns cognitive and cultural factors which determine how we structure and conceptualize the reality surrounding us.<sup>25</sup> In the case of predication, the part played by these factors is far less important. The semantic contribution of predication is often not of a categorizing nature, but rather consists in providing information about incidental events.

In the case of APPs, the meaning of the verb is presented, not as an event but as a patient situation. Now, not all patient situations supply qualities that play a role in the way we structure reality. Incidental and casual patient situations are less promising in this respect than more “characterizing” patient situations, i.e. situations that are of importance in the world we live in, for instance because membership of the category systematically claims our attention or leads to certain actions. That is why *doorgelopen verf* ‘lit. run paint’ as a conventional category is more easily imaginable than *doorgelopen agent* ‘lit. walked on policeman’ and *scratched surface* more easily than *scratched head*. Observable “marks” of the verbal action increase the possibility of relevance, but they are not essential: what counts ultimately is the role of certain categorial distinctions in cognition and culture.

Van der Horst (1995:180) illustrates this type of relevance with examples, albeit in reference to another linguistic phenomenon. What is important, he says, is that

*...pinned up, close-cropped and dyed* are culturally accepted and regular conditions of *hair*, while *washed, taken off and exercised* are not, or not in the same way, conditions of *hands, dresses and dogs*. In our culture, we differentiate between pinned-up hair, close-cropped hair, and plaited hair, while only rarely is the difference between taken-off and not-taken-off dresses relevant, or that between exercised and non-exercised dogs.<sup>26</sup>

It is precisely this cultural irrelevance that causes the APP constructions *#de gewassen handen* ‘the washed hands’, *#de uitgetrokken jurk* ‘the taken off dress’, and many other cases discussed here, to be less acceptable.

One factor reducing the relevance of patient situations (and hence the acceptability of the APPs in question) is the *agent-perspective* in predicating parallels. *He scratched his head, Hij waste zijn handen* ‘He washed his hands’, *Zij*



*trok haar jurk uit* ‘She took her dress off’, *Zij droeg de tas* ‘She carried the bag’ are all of them in the first place sentences describing an action performed by an agent. In fact, the patient as a separate element to which something happens is not in the picture. In these cases the corresponding APPs are only rarely acceptable.

So far, we have regarded relevance as related to categories that are conventional (within a culture). However, relevance can also have an ad hoc nature. Some APP constructions, such as *de binnengebrachte man* ‘lit. the brought-in man’, discussed earlier, do not correspond to a relevant conventional category – this accounts for their unacceptability when used non-specifically. The content deficit vanishes, as we showed in 4.1, when the construction is embedded in a specific ad hoc scenario of an *event* nature. This does not happen because *binnengebrachte man* suddenly becomes a relevant conventional category in that context, but because within a specific and temporally limited scenario it is a relevant ad hoc category.

Incidentally, by no means all APP constructions that do not represent a conventionally relevant category acquire so much ad hoc relevance through a specific scenario that the construction becomes acceptable. Thus, *de doorgelopen agent* ‘lit. the walked on policeman’ remains dubious, even in an ad hoc scenario of, e.g., a traffic incident ignored by the policeman.<sup>27</sup>

Ad hoc relevance also explains why the addition of lexical material can make a content deficit disappear. This works even in the latter example: if we replace *#de doorgelopen agent* by *de gisteren na het ongeluk doorgelopen agent* ‘lit. the yesterday after the accident walked on policeman’, we get an acceptable construction, due to a relevant ad hoc category.

## 5.2 Reconstructability

The factor ‘reconstructability’ relates to the possibility for a listener in a communicative situation to discover the content intended by the speaker. A content deficit caused by this factor implies, with APP constructions, that the lexical means supplied through the APP to reconstruct the intended patient situation during sentence comprehension give insufficient guidance to the correct interpretation. This factor is more basic than relevance. We are dealing here with APPs of strongly polysemous verbs such as *komen* ‘come’, *blijven* ‘remain’, *maken*

‘make’, *zien* ‘see’, *brenge* ‘bring’. In 4.1, we argued that APPs of this type of verbs are seldom acceptable.

Reconstructability is also involved in the case of the unacceptable members of the clusters of near-synonymous alternatives discussed by Ackerman & Goldberg. Here, too, the APPs are derived from strongly polysemous verbs such as, e.g., *give* and *take*.<sup>28</sup> The acceptable members are all non-polysemous. From an interpretative point of view, there is hardly any difference between #*given funds*, #*gekomen gasten* ‘come guests’, #*gemaakt vuur* ‘made fire’, #*geziene ster* ‘seen star’ and the acceptable counterparts *donated funds*, *gearriveerde gasten* ‘lit. arrived guests’, *aangestoken vuur* ‘kindled fire’, *waargenomen ster* ‘observed star’. The non-acceptability is caused here by the fact that in the given communicative situation the APP is difficult to reconstruct, due to the strong polysemy of the verbs in question.

In predicative constructions, this kind of polysemy is unproblematic, because predication differs from attribution on two counts.

In the first place, predicating sentences often contain so much semantic material supplementing the polysemous verb, that, for a correct interpretation, the verb is, as it were, hardly necessary. An incomplete sequence like *Alle uitgenodigde gasten - X- ook echt* ‘All invited guests really did -X-’ will in many cases be almost fully understandable, even without specification of the verb *komen* ‘come’, which the hearer can derive on the basis of the information supplied in the rest of the sentence. Because of this, the polysemy of the verb is not a problem – the context guides the hearer to the right interpretation. In #*de gekomen gasten* ‘the come guests’, the hearer has to make do without this kind of extra information. *Gekomen* here has to fulfil the attributive task all by itself – because of the strong polysemy, it is not capable of doing that.<sup>29</sup>

Secondly, NPs are “semantic islands”, which means that no interaction with their semantic surroundings is possible.<sup>30</sup> Consequently, those surroundings cannot facilitate the reconstruction of the intended patient situation. With a predicating use of, e.g., *maken* ‘make’, the context may help (cf. *Op de camping maakte hij een vuur* ‘On the campsite he made a fire’ / *Hij maakt het kapotte horloge* ‘lit. He makes the broken watch’). In the case of attribution, contextual data

cannot “break open” a polysemous APP, i.e. cannot lead the hearer to the intended interpretation. In a sentence like *#Het gemaakte horloge loopt nu weer goed* ‘The made watch runs now again well’, the APP construction is therefore as dubious as it would be without a facilitating context.<sup>31</sup>

Even when, strictly speaking, strong polysemy is out of the question, the reconstructability requirement may apply. Verbs like *stoppen* ‘stop’ and *ophouden* ‘stop’ have a clear basic meaning ‘discontinue doing something’. But, depending on what is discontinued, they refer to completely different events (‘pragmatic polysemy’). Constructions like *#de gestopte man/#de opgehouden man* ‘the stopped man’ therefore do not provide sufficient support either and are seen as unacceptable.

### 6 Increased agentivity: the APP of movement verbs

The APPs of intransitive movement verbs such as *fietsen* ‘cycle’, *glijden* ‘glide’, *hollen* ‘run’, *lopen* ‘go/walk/run’, *rijden* ‘ride’, *springen* ‘leap’, *varen* ‘sail’, *vliegen* ‘fly’, *wandelen* ‘walk’, *zwemmen* ‘swim’ are a special case. These verbs have at least two meaning aspects: they indicate a movement as well as the type of movement involved. Because of this, the verbs can be used both as mutatives and as immutatives, as already observed in 1.1. In case of the former, the movement is conceived of as a place shift of the subject referent, the verb being conjugated with the time auxiliary *zijn* ‘be’ (Honselaar 1987, Beliën 2008); in the latter instance, the movement is purely conceived of as a type of action, with *hebben* ‘have’ as its time auxiliary. The mutative use is triggered by the presence of direction adjuncts, as in 6a and 7a:

- (6) a Het meisje is over het Kanaal gezwommen.  
       ‘lit. The girl is swum across the Channel.’  
       ‘The girl has swum across the Channel.’
- (7) a De jongen is naar Groningen gewandeld.  
       ‘lit. The boy is walked to Groningen.’

Direction can also be part of the meaning of the verb, as in *dalen* ‘descend’:

- (8) a Het vliegtuig is gedaald.  
 ‘lit. The plane is descended.’

We find immutative counterparts in 6b, 7b and 8b:

- (6) b Het meisje heeft gezwommen.  
 ‘The girl has swum.’  
 (7) b De jongen heeft gewandeld.  
 ‘The boy has walked.’  
 (8) b Het vliegtuig heeft gedaald.  
 ‘The plane has descended.’

Example 8b may look strange without a context, but can be found, for example, in a report on a test programme, to indicate that a plane has completed one or more descending/landing movements (Honselaar 1987: 56).

The past participles of mutatively used movement verbs might be expected to appear, like the past participles of other mutative verbs, as APPs, cf. 6c:

- (6) c #Het over het Kanaal gezwommen meisje werd uitbundig toegejuicht.  
 ‘The across the Channel swum girl was loudly cheered.’

This possibility was in fact mentioned in Broekhuis (1997), an article discussing the difference between unaccusative and unergative verbs. The possibility of using the past participle attributively is, says Broekhuis, one of the characteristics of (telic) unaccusative verbs. He illustrates this with the following examples: #*de over de hei gewandelde jongen* ‘the across the moor walked boy’, #*het de weg over gelopen paard* ‘the across the road run horse’.

As remarked earlier, we find these APP constructions hardly acceptable, just like the APP construction in 6c (cf. 3a – 3c in 1.2). Comparable cases are 9, 10 (cf. 3d and 3e in 1.2) and 11:

- (9) #De naar school gefietste jongen kwam nog net op tijd.  
 ‘The to school cycled boy came just in time.’  
 (10) #Het door de gang geholde kind was geheel buiten adem.  
 ‘The down the corridor run child was out of breath.’

- (11) #Een uit de rij gedanste ballerina verstoorde de symmetrie van de choreografie.  
 ‘An out of the line danced ballerina disturbed the symmetry of the choreography.’

Why these APP constructions are unacceptable cannot be explained in terms of a lack of reconstructability or relevance of the patient situation involved. The verbs in question are not polysemous, and we see no reason to assume that the APP constructions has no relevance – conventional or ad hoc – in the given context.<sup>32</sup> Broekhuis speaks of “somewhat awkward, heavy constructions” (1997: 42), a verdict that seems to refer to the internal structure of the nominal groups. However, groups like *de in de sloot gereden automobilist* ‘lit. the into the ditch driven driver (the driver who drove into the ditch)’ and *de naar de kant gedobberde bootjes* ‘the to the bank drifted boats’ (the little boats that had drifted to the bank), which have the same internal structure, strike us as much more normal, suggesting that other factors are involved.

Our first step was to find out, with the aid of Google, in how far our conclusions about this type of APP constructions were shared by other people. The participles *gezwommen* ‘swum’, *gewandelde* ‘walked’, *gelopen* ‘gone/walked/run’, *gefietsde* ‘cycled’ and *gedanste* ‘danced’ do occur as APPs, but only with nouns that are object participants in the transitive counterparts of the verbs, i.e. nouns like *afstanden* ‘distances’, *routes* ‘routes’, *tochten* ‘trips’, *kilometers* ‘kilometres’, *race* ‘race’, *tijd* ‘time’, *wedstrijden* ‘races’, *records* ‘records’, *baantjes* ‘laps’, *balletten* ‘ballets’ etc., never with nouns referring to subject participants as the examples above.<sup>33,34</sup>

This suggests that the type of nominal referent is relevant, and in this connection it seems plausible to try and find an explanation for the unacceptable APP constructions in the fact that the verbs in question can *also* be used as immutative intransitives.

Immutatives are typically used to present an action from the agent perspective, whereas mutatives take a patient perspective: the past participle tells us that a patient came to be in a certain situation as a result of the verbal event (cf. section

3.1 and De Haan 1991 and 1997). In 6a, then, the girl that ended up being on the other side of the Channel as a result of her swimming is represented as a patient. But, as observed in 3.1, in case of agentive immutative intransitives, the APP has a medial meaning: we see the girl *also* as agent: the swimming is an action performed by her, as becomes clear from 12:

- (12) Het meisje is met taaie volharding over het Kanaal gezwommen.  
 ‘lit. The girl is with dogged perseverance across the Channel swum.’

There is nothing wrong with this sentence, whereas in 6c use of the same participle yields an awkward result. The patient perspective evoked by the participle is, at the semantic/pragmatic level, “thwarted” by a predominant agent perspective. Because we are inclined to ascribe an agentive role to the subject of a sentence like 6c, the immutative use of the movement verb comes into play, causing the patient perspective to be relegated to the background. And with APP use, this is felt to be disturbing, since past participles of immutatives cannot be used attributively, due to the absence of a patient situation. Thus, whereas 6b (*het meisje heeft gezwommen*) and 7b (*de jongen heeft gewandeld*) are perfectly acceptable, we do not find *\*het gezwommen meisje* ‘the swum girl’, *\*de gewandelde jongen* ‘the walked boy’, any more than *\*het gehuilde meisje* ‘the cried girl’ alongside *het meisje heeft gehuild* ‘the girl has cried’. The unacceptability of examples such as 6c and 9-11 can be accounted for by the influence of the immutative use of the verbs and the accompanying predominant agent perspective.

In certain cases the influence of a predominant agent perspective also appears from the auxiliary selection. Thus, in Beliën (2008), there is a discussion of 13 – found on the internet –, in which, in spite of the presence of a direction adjunct, the auxiliary *hebben* is used.

- (13) Het meisje had in het zwembad gedoken.  
 ‘lit. The girl had into the swimming pool dived.’

The movement ‘diving into the swimming pool’ is here represented as a kind of action, which is plausible in the context of the sentence, because the implication is

that the girl did something “unlawful”: diving into the swimming pool was prohibited. In 13, then, the verb is actually used immutatively: the agent perspective is predominant and the patient perspective has disappeared into the background. Therefore, the same factor that causes the unacceptability of 14 determines the choice of auxiliary normal with immutatives in 13:

- (14) #Het in het zwembad gedoken meisje kreeg een standje van de badmeester.  
 ‘lit. The into the swimming pool dived girl was reprimanded by the attendant.’

When there is no reason to interpret a nominal group with the APP of a mutatively used movement verb agentively, no -disturbing- thought of immutative use is evoked. This appears, for instance, from the acceptable examples *de in de sloot gereden automobilist* ‘lit. the into the ditch driven driver’ and *de naar de kant gedobberde bootjes* ‘lit. the to the bank drifted boats’; it is unlikely for a driver to have driven his car into the ditch on purpose, so it does not seem natural to see him as an agent; and boats are by definition not agentive. Sentences 15 and 16 are acceptable for the same reason.

- (15) De in de fuik gezwommen vissen spartelden hevig.  
 ‘lit. The into the trap swum fishes floundered wildly.’
- (16) De naar binnen gedwarrelde sneeuwvlokken smolten onmiddellijk.  
 ‘lit. The inside whirled snowflakes melted immediately.’<sup>35</sup>

These considerations lead us to a modification of hypothesis I about Dutch APP restrictions. We now propose the following hypothesis:

**(II) Dutch APPs are acceptable only if they present a relevant and reconstructable patient situation; APPs of mutatively used movement verbs are acceptable only if the referent of the APP construction is not interpreted as an agent.**

Because pragmatic factors are involved, judgments about acceptability or non-acceptability of APPs are not always self-evident; thus, 17 might be adduced as a counter-example to our hypothesis:

- (17) De naar de nooduitgang gestrompelde bezoekers vonden daar de deur gesloten.  
 ‘lit. The to the emergency exit hobbled visitors found there the door closed.’

In our opinion, this sentence contains an acceptable APP, although it is tempting to ascribe the visitors an agent function: if you go anywhere consciously it is to an emergency exit. Although this is certainly true, the hobbling itself is not done on purpose; it is, in fact, an awkward manner of moving that might rather be regarded as the opposite of a deliberate action. In some cases it may not be easy to distinguish between a conscious and an unconscious action – is *schuifelen* ‘shuffle’ in the same class as *stropelen* ‘hobble’ or is it more agentive? Depending on the answer, the judgement about 18 may differ:<sup>36</sup>

- (18) ?Het naar de bank geschuifelde echtpaar ging moeizaam zitten.  
 ‘lit. The to the settee shuffled pair sat down with difficulty.’

This, however, does not in any way detract from the hypothesis as such.

## 7. Conclusion

In the preceding sections we have tried to improve our understanding of a phenomenon that, for Dutch at least, had not been investigated before and which is not very straightforward observationally. Hypothesis II enumerates a number of factors that we think play a part in the restrictions on the Dutch APP: *relevance* and *reconstructability* of the patient situation and – for the APPs of movement verbs – *agentivity* of the referent of the APP construction. In Appendix 1, we have indicated the factor that we think is relevant for the APP constructions we found unacceptable or questionable in this article and in the student questionnaire.

In some cases, we were not successful: the unacceptability of *#de overgegane kinderen* ‘the gone up children’ (cf. example 2d) and the questionnaire examples *de opgestane jongen* ‘the stood up boy’ and *de gegroeide bomen* ‘the grown trees’ we cannot as yet explain by appealing to the factors mentioned – further investigation is needed here. This also goes for many other points.<sup>37</sup> First, the



partial fuzziness of the data requires further refinement of the observational methods. Furthermore, the explanatory factors used in our analysis appeal to general cognitive and cultural notions that have to be further specified.

In another respect, too, this investigation requires further refinement. The direction adjuncts with the APPs of movement verbs are one case in point – both the nature and the position of the preposition seem to influence the acceptability here: constructions with *over* ‘over’ and *door* ‘through’, for instance, are in general less acceptable than constructions with *op* ‘on’ and *onder* ‘under’ - cf. *#de door de kamer gekropen insluiper* ‘lit. the through the room crept burglar’ vs. *?de onder het bed gekropen insluiper* ‘lit. the under the bed crept burglar’. The constructions are less acceptable with post-positions than with pre-positions. Even a non-agentive construction like *#het de lijn over gerolde balletje* ‘lit. the the line over rolled ball’ is not acceptable. These phenomena have not been sufficiently investigated – they require more detailed examination.

There are also various links with other themes meriting further investigation, as comparable factors play a role. We mentioned the *krijgen* ‘get’ passive (in note 17), the ‘X has - direct object - predicative adjunct’ construction (in note 26) and the auxiliary selection with movement verbs (in section 7).

Finally, it seems advisable, given the parallels with English (and with French, mentioned only briefly in notes 15 and 16), to compare the Dutch APP with similar constructions in other languages.

## Appendix 1

### Unacceptable or dubious APP constructions: Google hits and analysis

List 1 contains the Dutch APP constructions in this article that are considered unacceptable or dubious by the authors, categorized and for each category given in the order of presentation. List 2 contains the APP constructions, considered unacceptable or dubious by the authors, that were presented to the group of informants and do not feature in list 1, categorized and for each category given in the order of presentation (see Appendix 2). Under “Google” we give the number of occurrences found with Google. Under “analysis” the type of unacceptability in terms of Hypothesis II is indicated for each construction. IR is for “insufficient

relevance”: the APP construction does not indicate a relevant semantic category. P is for “polysemy”: the APP construction cannot be reconstructed because of the polysemy of the verb (this includes “pragmatic polysemy”, see p.14). A is for “agentivity”: there is an APP of a movement verb which is used mutatively but with the predominant agent perspective of immutatives. A question mark indicates that the nature of the unacceptability is not clear.

## Unacceptable or questionable APP constructions Google Analysis

### List 1

#### *APP constructions of transitive verbs*

# de geziene ster	0	P
#de gebrachte cadeautjes	1	P
# het gemaakte vuur	5	P
#de gedragen tas	1	IR
#de gegroete buurman	0	IR
# de uitgetrokken jurk	0	IR
#de gewassen handen	64	IR
# het gemaakte horloge	1	P

#### *APP constructions of mutative intransitive verbs*

# de gekomen gasten	1	P
# de doorgelopen agent	0	IR
#de gebleven medewerkers	0	P
# de overgegene kinderen	1	?
# de gestopte man	2	P
# de opgehouden man	0	P

#### *APP constructions of mutatively used intransitive movement verbs*

#het over het Kanaal gezwommen meisje	0	A
#de over de hei gewandelde jongen	0	A
#het de weg over gelopen paard	0	A
#de naar school gefietste jongen	0	A
# het door de gang geholde kind	0	A

#de naar Groningen gewandelde jongen	0	A
#de uit de rij gedanste ballerina	0	A
#het in het zwembad gedoken meisje	0	A

**List 2***APP constructions of transitive verbs*

# de betaalde dokter	0	IR
#een binnengebrachte man	0	IR
#de geluide klok	6	IR

*APP constructions of mutative intransitive verbs*

#de opgestane jongen	1	?
#de opgehouden regen	2	P
#de gegroeide bomen	7	?
#de opgesprongen voorzitter	0	IR
#de opgevallen sollicitante	0	IR

*APP constructions of mutatively used intransitive movement verbs*

#de rond de kerk gereden wielrenners	1	A
#de langs zij gevaren fotografe	0	A
#de van de brug gesprongen atleet	0	A

**Appendix 2****Informants' responses**

The 51 sentences listed below were submitted via email to 30 second-year students of General Linguistics, 16 of whom responded. They were asked for each sentence whether they found it *acceptable*, *questionable* or *unacceptable*, and if they found a sentence dubious or unacceptable, to what word(s) they thought this was to be attributed.

For each sentence, we indicate whether we as authors find it *acceptable* (A) or *unacceptable/questionable* (U/Q), and how many students found the sentence *acceptable* (A), how many *questionable* (Q) and how many *unacceptable* (U). In

## ATTRIBUTIVE PAST PARTICIPLES IN DUTCH

two cases, a student found a sentence not acceptable for a different reason than the APP – we counted these answers with the acceptable APPs.

One student did not judge sentences (2 – 11) – for these sentences the total number of student responses is 15.

Nr	Sentence	Authors' judgment (A or U/Q)	Number of students rating the sentence as		
			A	Q	U
1	Over de geziene ster werd nog lang nagepraat.	U/Q	12	4	0
2	Gelukkig is het weggelopen meisje opgespoord.	A	15	0	0
3	De in de sloot gereden automobilist bleek geen rijbewijs te hebben.	A	12	2	1
4	Vanwege de gegroeide onrust werden er snel maatregelen genomen.	A	7	7	1
5	Iedereen zocht een plaats rond het gemaakte vuur.	U/Q	13	2	0
6	De rond de kerk gereden wielrenners werden gediskwalificeerd.	U/Q	6	6	3
7	Jammer hè, die doorgelopen verf.	A	13	2	0
8	De gedragen tas was te zwaar voor Oma.	U/Q	2	5	8
9	De naar de kant gedobberde bootjes waren moeilijk te bereiken.	A	15	0	0
10	De gegroete buurman ging tevreden zijn huis binnen.	U/Q	8	5	2
11	De gearriveerde logees zochten hun kamer op.	A	14	0	1
12	De langs zij gevaren fotografe probeerde het zeiljacht goed in beeld te krijgen.	U/Q	9	6	1
13	De ontplofte granaat zorgde voor veel opschudding.	A	15	0	1
14	De van de brug gesprongen atleet kwam plat op zijn buik terecht.	U/Q	15	1	0
15	Ik heb de doorgelopen agent na afloop geïnterviewd.	U/Q	6	5	5
16	De gebleven medewerkers moesten de nieuwelingen instrueren.	U/Q	6	7	3

17	Het in het zwembad gedoken meisje kreeg een standje van de badmeester.	U/Q	9	6	1
18	Heb jij de gebrachte cadeautjes al gezien?	U/Q	7	7	2
19	De overgegangene kinderen werden gefeliciteerd.	U/Q	3	4	9
20	De op de grond gegleden jurk werd voorzichtig opgeraapt.	A	15	1	0
21	De binnengekomen personen bleken broers van de bewoner te zijn.	A	14	2	2
22	Is de gestopte man uitgestapt?	U/Q	3	9	4
23	De in de fuik gezwommen vissen spartelden hevig.	A	13	2	1
24	Niemand wist iets over de weggebleven jongen.	A	14	1	1
25	Hij nam beleefd afscheid van de betaalde dokter.	U/Q	3	7	6
26	Voor de gekomen gasten stond een welkomstdrankje gereed.	U/Q	10	4	2
27	Een uit de rij gedanst ballerina verstoort de symmetrie van de choreografie.	U/Q	8	3	5
28	De kleedster zag de uitgetrokken jurk liggen.	U/Q	13	3	0
29	Het aangestoken vuur brandt goed.	A	16	0	0
30	De naar de nooduitgang gestrompelde bezoekers vonden daar de deur gesloten.	A	12	4	0
31	Het gemaakte horloge loopt nu weer goed.	U/Q	15	0	1
32	De uitgescholden winkelier kreeg hulp van een voorbijganger.	A	14	1	1
33	Het door de gang geholde kind was geheel buiten adem.	U/Q	1	8	7
34	Ik heb nog nooit een binnengebrachte man gezien.	U/Q	6	6	4
35	De geluide klok dateert uit 1780.	U/Q	8	7	1
36	De naar school gefietste jongen kwam nog net op tijd.	U/Q	9	5	2
37	Er was nog veel onduidelijkheid over de waargenomen komeet.	A	16	0	0
38	De opgestane jongen ging zijn tanden poetsen.	U/Q	5	5	6

## ATTRIBUTIVE PAST PARTICIPLES IN DUTCH

39	Het gedaalde vliegtuig kwam in een dikke wolkenlaag terecht.	A	14	1	1
40	Zij legde de betaalde rekeningen op het bureau.	A	16	0	0
41	Vanwege de opgehouden regen hervatten we de wandeling.	U/Q	10	4	2
42	Het de weg over gelopen paard veroorzaakte een verkeersopstopping.	U/Q	6	8	2
43	Ik laat de gegroeide bomen binnenkort snoeien.	U/Q	10	5	1
44	De binnengebrachte man werd meteen naar de poli heelkunde vervoerd.	A	15	1	0
45	De uit de zak gerolde pruimen waren een attractie voor de wespen.	A	16	0	0
46	De opgesprongen voorzitter riep op tot kalmte.	U/Q	14	1	1
47	Hij deed de boeken in de meegenomen koffer.	A	15	1	0
48	De over de hei gewandelde jongen was de weg kwijtgeraakt.	U/Q	5	5	6
49	De opgevallen sollicitante werd toch niet uitgenodigd.	U/Q	3	6	7
50	De ingepakte cadeautjes werden voor de kinderen klaargelegd.	A	16	0	0
51	Het over het Kanaal gezwommen meisje werd uitbundig toegejuicht.	U/Q	9	4	3

**Notes**

\*) The authors would like to thank Piet Verhoeff cordially for his translation of the article into English.

1 Throughout the paper examples will be followed by a literal translation (preceded by “lit.” in those cases where this results in an ungrammatical or questionable English construction). Only in those cases where, on the basis of a literal translation of a (grammatical) Dutch construction, the meaning of the Dutch construction may not be clear, will an additional English translation be added.

2 In Haeseryn et al. (1997: 110), the 2<sup>nd</sup> completely revised edition of Geerts et al. (1984), in the discussion of the uses of the past participle, the attributive use is not mentioned. The examples from the 1<sup>st</sup> edition given here are regarded in the 2<sup>nd</sup> edition as illustration of the tenet that many past participles have become adjectives.

3 For the same difference in meaning there are other terms, too, such as *perfective/imperfective* and *telic/atelic*. For this terminology see Pinkster (1984, 275-287). The terms *mutative* and *immutative* we have taken from Kern (1912).

4 For examples 1a-e and 2a-e we have decided to search for complete APP combinations, so: *de gebrachte cadeautjes* ‘the brought presents’ rather than *de gebrachte* ‘the brought’. By using the latter method, we could have removed the risk of unforeseen effects of specific APP-N combinations completely, it is true, but at the same time we might have included unwanted APPs with idiomatic adjectival meanings (e.g. *gezien* ‘seen’ in the sense of ‘popular’), as well as substantivized APPs (e.g. *de gegroete* ‘the greeted (one)'). For 3a-e we looked only at the APP-N combination, without the direction adjunct, to keep the frequency from becoming unreasonably low. An exception was made for the construction, discussed in section 6, *het in het zwembad gedoken meisje* ‘the in the swimming pool dived girl’: the direction adjunct is here added so as to exclude cases with idiomatic *in elkaar gedoken* ‘huddled up’. The Google corpus keeps changing; some trial tests at different times, however, yielded hardly different results. For most of our constructions, therefore, one test was found sufficient.

5 One type of APP restrictions we have left out of consideration, viz. the cases where the APP corresponds with a transitive verb that has no passive: e.g. *#de gekregen boeken* ‘the received books’, *#het geweten adres* ‘the known address’, *#het gemogen koekje* ‘the allowed biscuit’. We think that conceivably these two deficiencies are related, focusing here, then, on cases where only the APP is unacceptable.

6 See Bakker en Dibbets (1977: 27).

7 In modern linguistics, the double nature of the past participle is analysed with the notion ‘transcategorical’. See Booij (2002: 71-76).

8 See Booij (2002: 71-76).

9 Cf. Comrie (1976: 16 ff) on perfective and imperfective aspects, notions relevant for the opposition past participle/present participle in Dutch.

10 See Kern (1912: 16 ff) on these examples.

11 This theory has a long tradition. In Chomsky (1966), the attribution-predication identity is the most concrete example in his argument in favour of a direct connection between the Port Royal grammar (1660) and generative grammar. The theory has held out through the ages. According to, i.a., Paul 1920<sup>5</sup>[1880]: 140), the attribute is “nichts anderes als ein degradiertes Prädikat”. In Van de Velde (2009), too, where the approach is structuralistic, and where there is, consequently no question of reduction, attribution is treated predicatively. An attributive adjunct that is not *predicable*, as in *donkere kamer* ‘dark room’, *burgerlijk ingenieur* ‘civil engineer’, is equated with the first member of a compound as in *roodhuid* ‘redskin’ or *sneltrain* ‘fast train’. See also note 13.

12 Heuristically, this datum is important: unacceptable APPs are always seen against the background of *possible* corresponding predications.

13 We follow Jespersen in assuming the function difference is *always* present. In Bolinger (1967), for instance, reference modification comes up for discussion only in cases like *the criminal lawyer*, *the true poet*, etc., where reduction of attribution to predication is problematic (*#the lawyer is criminal*; *#the poet is true*). Siegel’s study (1979) is ambivalent in this respect. Taylor (1992) is a consistently elaborated study of the function difference in a cognitive linguistic framework.

14 That, by the side of many unacceptable APPs, there are acceptable relative clause constructions (cf. *#de gebrachte cadeautjes – de cadeautjes die gebracht zijn*; ‘the brought presents – the presents that were brought’), cannot, then, be ascribed to the distinction attribution-predication; see note 31.

15 This relation between place and size of the Dutch APP is in agreement with a more general order principle, Behaghel’s well-known “Gesetz der wachsenden Glieder”. The French APP material in Lapierre (1998: ch.3) (derived mainly from scholarly texts) shows a somewhat comparable regularity. The French APP always has end position, and can appear with and without comma intonation. The instances without comma intonation correspond roughly with the Dutch preposed APPs (cf. *les hypothèses proposés* ‘the suggested hypotheses’); with comma intonation we find

instances where the Dutch APP would also usually be postposed (cf. *un phénomène complexe, soumis à de nombreuses conditions* ‘a complex phenomenon, subjected to numerous conditions’): just as in Dutch, these are “heavy” constructions.

16 In Lapiere (1998), too, the premise is that APPs have a restrictive function.

17 In Coleman (2011), restrictions on the past participle in the *krijgen* ‘get’ passive are discussed. That construction also proves to have a predilection for PP’s of particle verbs, cf. #*Hij kreeg het pakketje gezonden* ‘he got the parcel sent’ vs. *Hij kreeg het pakketje toegezonden* ‘he got the parcel sent to’; #*Hij kreeg zijn loon betaald* ‘he got his wages paid’ vs. *Hij kreeg zijn loon uitbetaald* ‘he got his wages paid to’. Conceivably, *krijgen*-PP restrictions are in part of the same nature as APP restrictions.

18 Because of the dependence on scenarios, low Google scores are to be expected in these cases. That turns out to be true. *De voorgestelde straatnaam* ‘the proposed street name’ yielding 7 hits, as against 0 for *een voorgestelde straatnaam* ‘a proposed street name’ tallies with our assumption that there are restrictions on the indefinite variant especially.

19 The unacceptable instances in Zaenen and Van der Wal yield 0 Google hits, with the exception of *een gehoord geluid* ‘a heard sound’: 10 hits. These instances have not been included in Appendix 1.

20 The few Google hits for these APP constructions refer exclusively to publications by Broekhuis – they have therefore been left out of account in the Google counts presented in Appendix 1. Broekhuis’ examples are discussed more in detail in section 6.

22 Except for the much more restricted APP potentialities of English mutative intransitives (in connection with *have* as the only time auxiliary), the main points of difference are: (i) the possibility for the English bare APP to be postposed (without comma intonation), sometimes with restrictions or meaning differences; (ii) the much more restricted possibilities for the English APP to appear together with added sentence parts.

22 Here, too, the addition of an adverbial adjunct can revoke the unacceptability, cf. *freely given funds, surreptitiously taken item*. Ackerman & Goldberg account for this from the fact that because of the adjuncts the total gains in semantic specificity.

23 Some English examples have no direct Dutch counterparts, e.g. *gezonden goederen* ‘# sent goods’ is acceptable, although less so than *verzonden goederen* ‘sent goods’. We ascribe this to idiosyncratic lexical differences.

24 The English counterparts (*the parked car, the cooked rice, the paid bills*), are also straightforward.

25 On the subject of categorization, there is a vast quantity of philosophical and psychological literature. The first two chapters of Lakoff (1987), *The importance of categorization* and *From Wittgenstein to Rosch*, offer a good and linguistically oriented survey.

26 In the passage in question, Van der Horst discusses the difference between the ambiguous sentence *Zij heeft het haar opgestoken* ‘She has the hair put up’ (dressing action and coiffure) and non-ambiguous sentences like *Zij heeft haar handen gewassen* ‘She has her hands washed’, *Zij heeft haar jurk uitgetrokken* ‘She has her dress taken off’. Categorization is involved here just as much as with APP. The restrictions are stronger here, however, possibly because the Dutch construction “X has – direct object – predicative adjunct” is much more marginal than the APP construction. The fact that *uitgelaten* in *uitgelaten honden* (*exercised dogs*) is possible as an APP construction, but does not have a predicative adjunct interpretation in *Zij heeft de hond uitgelaten* ‘She has the dog exercised’ may be due to this difference.

27 For ad hoc categories see Lakoff (1987: 45-46) and Barsalou (1983). The possibility of an ad hoc relevance is one of the factors making APP restrictions a somewhat intangible subject. Judgements about acceptability are influenced among others by the creativity of the judge to find a relevant ad hoc scenario.



28 Ackerman & Goldberg also give examples of unacceptable APPs with *tell* ‘vertellen’ and *change* ‘veranderen’. In Dutch, *het vertelde verhaal* ‘the told story’ and *het veranderde ontwerp* ‘the changed design’ are acceptable. The English verbs are indeed more polysemous than the Dutch ones, cf. expressions without Dutch counterparts with *vertellen* or *veranderen* like *tell one from another*, *you never can tell*, *change the baby*, *change money*.

29 These verbs form an excellent illustration of how, by the addition of a particle, the content deficit is revoked (see section 4.1). The particle verbs do not show strong polysemy (cf. *de binnengekomen gasten* ‘the entered guests’).

30 cf. Taylor (1992: 30 ff).

31 *Het horloge dat gemaakt is/de gasten die gekomen zijn* ‘the watch that has been repaired’/‘the guests that have come’ are acceptable. Contextual information, presented through embedding the APP into an *event* introduced by the subclause, can increase reconstructability. In a somewhat similar way, where imperfect *relevance* is the cause of unacceptability, conversion into a relative clause can increase relevance – relevant ad hoc categories then originate within a temporal scenario, and certainly when the clause contains an imperfect, cf. *de agent die doorliep* ‘the policeman who walked on’/ *de buurman die gegroet werd* ‘the neighbour who was greeted’, etc.

32 The verb *lopen* ‘go/walk/run’ is polysemous, but a similar construction with the non-polysemous verb *draven* ‘run’, *het de weg over gedraafde paard* ‘the across the road run horse’ is just as unacceptable as *het de weg over gelopen paard*..

33 *Geholde* ‘run’ only occurs as the APP of a verb derived from the adjective *hol* ‘hollow’, as in *een geholde leuning* ‘a hollowed banister’.

34 *Een uit de rij gedanste koe* ‘a from the line danced cow’ is an exception; see note 36.

35 *Het de weg over gelopen paard* ‘the across the road run horse’ is unacceptable, because the horse can be seen as agent: it crossed the road of its own accord. The fact that *over* is used as a postposition may also reduce the acceptability of this example (see section 7).

36 A quite special discovery through Google shows that *dansen* ‘dance’, too, can be used to describe an unwitting made movement. While the APP *gedanste* in 9 is unacceptable, we discovered through Google *een uit de rij gedanste koe* ‘a from the line danced cow’. The phrase occurred in the account of a lawsuit in which the plaintiff claims damages because her car has been damaged by a collision with a cow that broke away from a herd that was being driven across the road. *Dansen* ‘dance’ is a graphic description of the skipping movements of a cow, but is not therefore conscious dancing.

37 Constructions with *overgegane* ‘gone up’ and *opgestane* ‘risen’ are doubly special because of their incapacity to become acceptable when they are extended with other parts of speech: *de naar groep 4 overgegane kinderen* ‘the to group 4 gone up children’ and *de gisteren vroeg opgestane jongen* ‘the yesterday early risen boy’ are likewise unacceptable. For all three “recalcitrant” APPs it can be said that a more pregnant meaning increases acceptability. For *gegroeide* ‘grown’ cf. the questionnaire example *de gegroeide onrust* ‘the grown unrest’. Investigation of the Google examples has shown that constructions with *opgestane* ‘risen’ of the type *de opgestane Heer/Christus* ‘the risen Lord/Christ’ occur frequently – even the only hit for *de opgestane jongen* ‘the risen boy’ has this religious connotation (cf. the example *de gekomen Christus* ‘the come Christ’ in 4.1). *Overgegane* ‘passed over’ appears to occur frequently in spiritualistic contexts, as in *de overgegane zielen* ‘the passed over souls’.

## References

- Ackerman, F., Goldberg, A.E. 1996. ‘Constraints on adjectival past participles.’ In: Goldberg (ed.), 17-30.  
 Bakker, D.M., Dibbets, G.W.R. (eds.) 1977. *Geschiedenis van de Nederlandse taalkunde*. Den Bosch.  
 Barsalou, L.W. 1983. ‘Ad-hoc categories.’ *Memory and Cognition*, vol. 11, 211-227.

## ATTRIBUTIVE PAST PARTICIPLES IN DUTCH

- Beekes, R.S.P. 1990. *Vergelijkende taalwetenschap. Tussen Sanskrit en Nederlands*. Utrecht.
- Beliën, M. 2008. *Constructions, constraints, and construal. Adpositions in Dutch*. Utrecht.
- Bolinger, D. 1967. 'Adjectives in English: attribution and predication.' *Lingua*, vol. 18, 1-34.
- Booij, G.E. 2002. *The morphology of Dutch*. Oxford.
- Broekhuis, H. 1992. *Chain-government: issues in Dutch syntax*. Leiden.
- Broekhuis, H. 1997. 'Twee typen subject.' *Nederlandse Taalkunde*, vol. 2, 35-66.
- Chomsky, N. 1966. *Cartesian linguistics. A chapter in the history of rationalist thought*. New York etc.
- Collema, T. 2011. 'The (expanding?) semantic range of the Dutch "krijgen"-passive.'  
[http://users.ugent.be/~tcollema/Publications%20&%20Presentations\\_bestanden/Leiden2011.pdf](http://users.ugent.be/~tcollema/Publications%20&%20Presentations_bestanden/Leiden2011.pdf).
- Comrie, B. 1976. *Aspect. An introduction to the study of verbal aspect and related problems*. Cambridge etc.
- Davis, S., Mithun, M. (eds.) 1979. *Linguistics, philosophy and Montague Grammar*. Austin.
- Dirven, R. 1971. *Some problems of attribution and predication in English syntax*. Leuven.
- Elffers-van Ketel, E.H.C. et al. (eds.) 1997. *Grammaticaal spektakel. Artikelen aangeboden aan Ina Schermer-Vermeer bij haar afscheid van de Vakgroep Nederlandse Taalkunde aan de Universiteit van Amsterdam*. Amsterdam.
- Geerts, G. et al. 1984. *Algemene Nederlandse Spraakkunst*. Groningen/Leuven.
- Gestel, F. van 1986. *X-bar grammar. Attribution and predication in Dutch*. Dordrecht.
- Goldberg, A. E. (ed.) 1996. *Conceptual structure, discourse and language*. San Diego.
- Haan, S. de 1997. 'Grammaticale status en betekenis van het voltooid deelwoord in het Nederlands.'  
 In: Elffers-van Ketel et al. (eds.), 89-101.
- Haeserijn W. et al. 1997<sup>2</sup>. *Algemene Nederlandse spraakkunst*, tweede, geheel herziene druk. Groningen/Deurne.
- Hertog C.H. den 1973<sup>3</sup> [1892-1896]. *Nederlandse spraakkunst*, deel III, derde bewerkte druk. Amsterdam.
- Honselaar, W. 1987. 'Zijn vs. Hebben in het samengesteld perfectum.' *De nieuwe taalgids*, vol. 80, 55-69.
- Horst, J.M. van der 1995. *Analytische taalkunde*. Groningen.
- Jansen, S. 2008. *Het pauperparadijs. Een familiegeschiedenis*. Amsterdam.
- Jespersen, O. 1968<sup>10</sup> [1924]. *The philosophy of grammar*. London.
- Kern, J.H. 1912. *De met het participium praeteriti omschreven werkwoordsvormen in 't Nederlands*. Amsterdam.
- Lakoff, G. 1987. *Women, fire and dangerous things*. Chicago etc.
- Lapierre, L. 1998. *Le participe passé en français. Sa syntaxe et ses fonctions dans le texte de spécialité*. Frankfurt am Main etc.
- Lepschy, G. (ed.) 1994. *History of linguistics Volume II: Classical and medieval linguistics*. Londen/New York.
- Lubbe, H.F. A. van der O.F.M. 1968<sup>3</sup>. *Woordvolgorde in het Nederlands. Een synchrone structurele beschouwing*. Assen.
- Matthews, P.H. 1994. 'Greek and Latin linguistics.' In: Lepschy (ed.), 1-133.
- Paul, H. 1902. *Die Umschreibung des Perfektums im Deutschen mit 'haben' und 'sein'*. München.
- Paul, H. 1920<sup>5</sup> [1880] *Prinzipien der Sprachgeschichte*. Halle a. S.
- Pinkster, H. 1984. *Latijnse syntaxis en semantiek*. Amsterdam.
- Pustejovsky, J. (ed.) 1993. *Semantics and the lexicon*. Dordrecht.
- Seuren, P. 1969. *Operators and nucleus. A contribution to the theory of grammar*. Cambridge.
- Siegel, M. 1979. 'Measure adjectives in Montague Grammar. In: Davis and Mithun (eds.), 223-262.

- Taylor, J.R. 1992. 'Old problems: adjectives in Cognitive Grammar.' *Cognitive Linguistics*, vol. 3, 1-35.
- Thompson, S.A. 1988. 'A discourse approach to the cross-linguistic category 'adjective'.' In: Thompson (ed.), 167-185.
- Thompson, S.A. (ed.) 1988. *Explaining language universals*. Oxford.
- Toorn, M.C. van den 1979<sup>6</sup>. *Nederlandse grammatica*. Groningen.
- Velde, F. van der 2009. *De nominale constituent: structuur en geschiedenis*. Leuven.
- Wal, M.J. van der 1986. *Passiefproblemen in oudere taalfasen*. Dordrecht.
- Zaenen, A. 1993. 'Unaccusativity in Dutch: integrating syntax and lexical semantics.' In: Pustejovsky (ed.), 129-161.
- Zwagerman, J. 2010. *Duel*. Amsterdam etc.