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For the formation of the perfect, Latin shows a morphological split: while the active conjugation has synthetic forms (1b), the passive conjugation exhibits analytic forms, (1d). Moreover, there is always a correspondence between the occurrence of \(-r\) morphology in the *infectum* paradigm (unaccomplished aspect), and analytic perfect in the *perfectum* paradigm (accomplished aspect), (compare 1a-b vs.1c-d):

(1) a. neco  b. necevi  c. necor  d. necatus
  kill-1sg  kill-perf.1sg  kill-1sg\(-r\)  killed-ppt  BE-1sg
  “I kill” “I killed/I have killed” “I was killed” “I have been killed”

Deponents constitute a particular case. These verbs are not passive, but always exhibit \(-r\) morphemes in the *infectum* paradigm (2a vs. 2c), and have analytic forms in the *perfectum*, (2b vs. 2d):

(2) a. miror  b. miratus  c. *miro  d. *miravi
  to be astonished-1sg\(-r\)  astonished-ppt  BE-1sg
  “I am astonished” “I was astonished/I have been astonished”
  to be astonished-1sg  to be astonished-perf.1sg

The purpose of this paper is twofold. Firstly, it will be illustrated that the occurrence of \(-r\) and of periphrastic perfect forms in Latin can be understood under a unified syntactic account. Secondly, it will be shown that the Latin data provide us with consistent evidence for considering \(v\) not as a single projection, but as a field of projections.

In the literature, the occurrence of \(-r\) morphology has often been considered as not encoding any salient syntactic difference. More specifically, while for passives \(-r\) reflects passive syntax, in the case of deponent verbs \(-r\) is Root-determined and not structurally motivated. Under this account, there is thus no syntactic dissimilarity between transitives (e.g. *neco*) and deponents (e.g. *miror*) (Embick 2000). This view follows a tradition that considers deponents as a case of syntax-morphy morphology mismatch (Draeger 1878, Baldi 1976, Baerman 2006, Baerman et al. 2007, Weisser 2010, a.o.), claiming that this class is too heterogeneous for a unified account.

In this study, it will be shown that this approach raises both empirical and theoretical issues.

Differently, we wish to propose that the occurrence of \(-r\) morphology reflects a specific argumental configuration, whereby the S-argument is not first merged in [Spec, VoiceP], but in a lower position in the structure. It will be shown that a number of syntactic-semantic properties of \(-r\) forms descend from this first merge position. In this way, the occurrence of the analytic perfect can be explained as the *perfectum* counterpart of the *infectum* \(-r\).

The core claim is that the contrast between (1a) and (1c, 2a) has to do with a different organization of arguments within the verbal domain. In the case of (1a), the clause is structured as in (3):

(3) [TP[Asp/MoodP[VoiceP[vP [VP]]]]]

A key role is played by *Voice*, a functional head that hosts the agentive External Argument (EA) in its Specifier (Alexiadou 2004, Alexiadou & Anagnostopoulou 1999, 2003, Alexiadou, Anagnostopoulou & Schäfer 2006 et seq., Kratzer 1996 et seq.). In this case, \(v\) encodes transitivity and it is thus compatible with the selection of *Voice* (Harley 2008, Harley 2012 and related work). Therefore, there is a prototypically agentive EA in [Spec, VoiceP] and, possibly, an ACC direct object. At the morphological level, \(-r\) does not show up, (4):

(4) C. Oppianicum  fratem  necavit  [Cic. Cl. XXX 52, 8]
  C. Oppianicum-m.sg.ACC.  brother-m.sg.ACC.  kill-perf.3sg
  “He killed the brother, Gaium Oppianicum”

Adopting a theta-role classification (based on Baker 1988, Christenen 2008, Platzack 2008, Ramchand 2008), *Voice* can be defined as the locus for the assignment of the A-family of 0-roles [Agent], [Instrument], [Holder of state], all characterized by a certain grade of agentivity (in the terms of Reinhart 2000, 2002 et seq.). Conversely, in the case of (1c, 2a) syntax encodes an inactive construction (in the terms of Alexiadou & Anagnostopoulou 1999, 2004 et seq.):

(5) [TP[Asp/MoodP [vP [VP]]]]
The absence of Voice corresponds to an absence of agentivity. In (5), the S-argument is, in fact, merged lower down in the structure and consequently assumes a B/C-0-role, characterized by lack of agentivity. This fact is crucial for triggering –r morphology. In this case, v encodes inactive syntax, which is incompatible with the selection of Voice. Under this configuration, the B-family of 0-roles is assigned to the EA within v-field: [Initiator], [Experiencer], [Goal], [Beneficiary], [Location], [Materiality], [Patient], [Possessor]. Notice that each 0-role is structurally differentiated, as it corresponds to a specific position in the structure. In this sense, v has to be understood as a complex field encoding different inner aspectual properties of diverse verbs (based on Folli&Harley 2005; Pyllkkännen 2008, Ramchand 2004, 2008 et seq.), (6):

(6) [Initv][Expv][Beneficiaryv][Goalv][Possessorv][Locationv][Materialityv][Patientv]]

The C-0-roles, [Path], [Theme] are also discharged in this inactive configuration, in the case that the S-argument is merged as IA (passives and unaccusative deponents). Therefore, -r always reflects inactive syntax. Yet, diverse –r structures differ with each other as for specific properties, which define the exact point of insertion of the S-argument and its 0-role.

This analysis, based on a gradience approach to structural-semantic distinctions (see also Sorace 1995, 2000 et seq.), makes it possible to capture all Latin verbal constructions in an exhaustive way. On the one hand, A-0-roles cover all transitive cases. On the other hand, the B/C-classes correspond to all -r types detected in the literature (Gianollo 2005, 2010, Delbrück 1987, Lazzeroni 1990, Kemmer 1993, a.o.): passives (e.g. necor “I am killed”), reflexives (e.g. lavor “I wash myself”), anti-causatives (e.g. dilabor “I melt”), impersonals (e.g. fatetur “one says”), spontaneous events (e.g. morior “I die”), movement (e.g. proficiscor “I leave”), benefactives (e.g. utor, “I use”), reciprocals (e.g. ampector “I embrace”); Verba affectum (e.g. reor “I think”, vereor, “I fear”, loquor “I speak”), perception (e.g. conspicor “I glimpse”). This hypothesis seems thus to be supported by much empirical evidence.

Deponents selecting an accusative argument do not constitute a counterexample to this proposal, as they also generally pertain to the inactive domain. Their Accusative argument is not a true theme, but expresses the stimulus of the subject’s affection (see also Anagnostopoulou 1996, 1999 et seq.), (7). An interesting parallelism emerges between these constructions and Icelandic quirky subject cases, see (8). This seems to suggest the quirky nature of the object, possibly carrying a default, or inherent, Accusative (Sigurðsson 2004, Gisli Jónsson 2012):

(7) [Quinctius] miratur subitum adventum [Liv. XXXIX 30,10]
Quinctius-m.sg.NOM. is astonished-1sg-r sudden arrival-m.sg.ACC.

“Quinctius is astonished for the sudden arrival”

(8) Hún skelfist høttuna [Sigurðsson 2004]
She-NOM. is terrified. danger.the-ACC.

‘She is terrified/horrified by the danger.’

Deponents thus structurally differ from transitives (contra Embick 2000) and constitute strong empirical evidence in favour of our proposal instead.

Under this analysis, the morphological split of the Latin perfect follows straightforwardly. The analytic perfect can be, in fact, understood as the perfectum counterpart of infectum –r. In the case of perfect inactive syntax, a –tu- participle, related to the stative/inactive domain (Flobert 1975; Cyrino 2009; Ledgeway 2012) is selected together with Aux BE, the Latin inactive auxiliary verb (Pinkster 1987, Cennamo 2001, 2008 et seq., Ledgeway 2012).

Therefore, the occurrence of –r morphology and of the analytic perfect have to be seen as the morphological expression of an inactive argumental syntax. At the theoretical level, these data support the analysis of v as a functional field encoding different properties of diverse verbal items.