

LATIN T-PARTICIPLES AND T-DERIVATIVES: A NEW ANALYSIS  
Donca Steriade, *MIT*

I present an analysis of the Latin syncretism case that inspired Aronoff's 1994 theory of morphemes, its antecedent in Matthews 1972 and other work on rules of referral, thematic spaces and related morphomic devices (Stump 1999, Zwicky 1985).

The Latin syncretism is the identity between the stems of deverbial derivatives containing *t*-initial suffixes (e.g. agent nouns in *-tōr-*, *-trīc-*, event/result nouns in *-tiōn-*, *-tū-*, *-tūra*, adverbs in *-tim* etc.) and the stems of perfect participles (*t*-participles) of corresponding verbs. (1) illustrates this identity. It is syntactically arbitrary but systematic:

(1) Latin deverbial forms employing the *t*-stem

<i>infectum</i> stem	<i>duc-</i>	<i>caed-</i>	<i>iubē-</i>	<i>fer-</i>
perfect ( <i>t</i> -)participle	<i>ductus</i>	<i>caesus</i>	<i>iussus</i>	<i>lātus</i>
agent noun	<i>ductor</i>	<i>caesor</i>	<i>iussor</i>	<i>lātor</i>
event noun	<i>ductiō</i>	<i>caesiō</i>		<i>lātiō</i>
event/result noun	<i>-ductūr-a</i>	<i>caesūr-a</i>		<i>-lātūr-a</i>
intensive verb			<i>iussō</i>	<i>lātō</i>
adverb	<i>-ductim</i>	<i>caesim</i>		

I show that the Latin stem syncretism is not arbitrary from all points of view. It is phonologically conditioned. It belongs to a well-documented class of similarity-driven syncretisms: stems or whole words that are lexically related and partly similar become, on occasion, strictly identical. Nor is it true that Latin stems, including that of *t*-participles, are meaningless or syntactically unrestricted, as Aronoff and later work on morphemes claim: if we go beyond the realm of the *t*-derivatives in (1) we observe that the *t*-stems are subject to syntactic restrictions explicable only if the participial *t*-stems are exponents of specific aspectual and voice values. A new analysis in these terms does justice to the complete distribution of all Latin verb stems, participial and otherwise, in derivation and inflexion. The less restrictive morphomic analysis is not needed here.

#### References

Aronoff, Mark. 1994. *Morphology by Itself*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Matthews, P.H. 1972 *Inflectional morphology: a theoretical study based on aspects of the Latin verb conjugation*, Cambridge University Press.

Stump, Gregory 1993 "On rules of referral", *Language*, 69, 449ff

Zwicky, Arnold 1985 "How to describe inflection," in M.Niepokuje et al. (eds.) *Proceedings of the 10th regional meeting of the Berkeley Linguistic Society*, 372ff.