

Andrea Calabrese

On the origins of the Latin (and Romance) third stem.

In this paper I will investigate the historical development of the PIE adjectival passive suffix **-tó-*, and of the PIE agentive and action/result nominal suffixes **-tér/tor*, **-ti-/*-tu-*, into Latin (and eventually Romance). In PIE, these suffixes are reconstructed as being directly added to the root, as shown by the fact they triggered ablaut alternations in the latter (cf. Ringe 2006, a.o.). In Latin, however, they became characteristically added to the *perfectum* verbal base (Root+TV, otherwise athematic, depending of conjugations or roots). Concomitantly their initial consonant was analyzed as the exponent of the perfect participle, thus acquiring its contextual allomorphy (-s-, otherwise -t- depending of the verb). Aronoff's (1994) Latin third stem was thus formed. The Romance languages, in particular Italo-Romance, essentially preserve the Latin situation.

As in current analysis of adjectival passives and of agentive and action/result nominalizations (Embick 2014, Alexiadou 2000, a.o.) I assume that these constructions contain an Asp node directly adjoined to the root. This is the situation shown by their surface morphology in PIE as preserved in Classical Greek (and partly in Vedic Sanskrit). After discussing the PIE situation, I will argue that a very simple morpho-syntactic innovation explains the development of the Latin situation: The addition of an ornamental v^0 node to the roots occurring in these constructions in the morphology. In this way, the latter acquired verbal, in particular participial properties (due to the presence of the aspectual node), in surface morphology, although not from the syntactico-semantic point of view. This led to a major restructuring in Latin surface inflectional and derivational morphology in which surface participial morphology occurred in a multi-form variety of syntactico-semantic featural configurations. I will detail the steps of this restructuring, and show how the surface morphology (and morphophonology) of nominalizations and related participles can be readily accounted for. I will also show how the same analysis can be easily extended to the related Romance forms.

I will conclude with a discussion of the theoretical significance of the central aspects of the proposed analysis, and with a critical assessment of alternative analyses.