The Morphology of Daco-Romance Passives. Is There Anything to Say?

Martin Maiden, University of Oxford Research Centre for Romance Linguistics

The Romance languages famously lose the Latin apparatus of inflexional passive marking in its entirety and without trace. It tends to be taken for granted that there is nothing more to say: it is simply the case for all branches of Romance that they generally lack any kind of dedicated inflexional morphology associated with the expression of Voice. One of the most widespread structures deployed in Romance languages for the expression of the passive combines an auxiliary verb (usually 'be', sometimes others such as 'come', 'go', or 'want') with the past participle. Claims have been made for significant morphological differentiation between the forms of the past participle as used in analytic perfects and forms of the participle as used in passive constructions (see, e.g., Benucci 1993:78f. n24; Loporcaro 1998:157n167; Loporcaro, Pescia, and Ramos 2004; Carbutti 2016). Such situations are exceptional across the Romance languages, and it is generally assumed (e.g., Soare 2007; Maiden 2013) that there is no significant morphological differentiation between past participles as they appear in perfect constructions and in passives. In my paper I will examine this hypothesis in more detail for Daco-Romance, suggesting that while it appears valid as far as root allomorphy is concerned (a fact of some significance for general morphological theory, as I shall explain), it is less clearly the case for inflexional endings, as may be seen from the curious generalization (in Aromanian and various Romanian dialects) of final -*ă* into non-feminine past participles (*el a făcută* vs *el este făcut*/**făcută*), and in the introduction into past participles of the finite plural desinence -*ră* (*au făcutără* vs *sunt făcuți*/**făcutără*/**făcuțiră*). I shall conclude that in the exploration of exponents of voice in Daco-Romance, some thought should be given to morphological structure.

References
Benucci, F. (1993). 'Temporal periphrasis and clitics in central Romance languages'. *Catalan Working Papers in Linguistics* 3:51-83.
Carbutti, T. (2016) 'Polimorfismo del participio passato nei dialetti di Picerno e Tito'. In Del Puente, P. (ed.) *Dialetti: per parlare e parlarne. Atti del Quarto Convegno Internazionale di Dialettologia*. Potenza: Osanna, 25-38.
Loporcaro, M. (1998). *Sintassi comparata dell'accordo participiale romanzo*. Turin: Rosenberg & Sellier.
Loporcaro, M., Pescia, L., & Ramos, M. A. (2004). 'Costrutti dipendenti participiali e participi doppi in portoghese'. *RLR* 68:15-46.
Maiden, M. (2013). 'The Latin "third stem" and its Romance descendants'. *Diachronica* 30:492-530.
Soare, E. (2007). 'Romanian Participle: 3 Items with 1 Morphological Unit'. In Booij, G. *et al*. (ed.), *On-line Proceedings of the Fifth Mediterranean Morphology Meeting (MMM5)* 2005. University of Bologna. http://mmm.lingue.unibo.it/