

1 Introduction. ‘Deponency’ is a convenient term for morphological mismatches, but it is also a term without an accepted definition. Traditionally, the term applies only to a set of verbs in Latin; any further use of the term involves some kind of metaphorical extension of its salient features. However, Latin deponents have a number of peculiar properties, the full range of which one seldom finds elsewhere. Below we offer a definition which picks out the features of Latin deponents that are of primary theoretical interest, distinguishing the defining characteristics of deponency from the contingent characteristics which may vary across individual examples.

Deponency in Latin can be characterized as in (1), where we pick out six key points for elaboration, which are numbered to match the following sections.

(1) *Deponency in Latin*

Deponency is a **mismatch between form and function**.^[82] Given that there is a **formal morphological opposition**^[83] between **active and passive**^[84] that is the **normal realization** of the corresponding functional opposition,^[85] deponents are a **lexically-specified set**^[86] of verbs whose passive forms function as actives. **The normal function is no longer available.**^[87]

We take the salient feature of deponent verbs in Latin to be the first point: there is an apparent mismatch between morphological form and grammatical function. The other points define parameters of potential typological variation.² Below we expand on these points.

2 ‘A mismatch between form and function.’ By form we mean an inflected word form, by function we mean some identifiable grammatical role or set of roles; a mismatch occurs where the word form is used in some function incompatible with its normal function.

In principle, a mismatch can be identified syntagmatically or paradigmatically. **Syntagmatically**, a mismatch can be identified by comparing the morphosyntactic values needed to describe a word form with the syntactic values needed to describe its

¹ The work presented here was funded by the ESRC under grant number RES-000-23-0375. Their support is gratefully acknowledged

² Other authors have extended the term according to different criteria. For example, Kemmer (1993: 22 and 251, fn. 19) treats deponency as a kind of defectiveness, defining deponents as verbs which have overt marking for middle voice, but lack a morphologically unmarked non-middle counterpart. (This interpretation assumes that the Latin morphological passive has two functions, passive and middle, and that deponents are functionally equivalent to the latter.) A form-function mismatch is not part of the definition, as she assumes that deponents are inherently middle, and so the middle/passive morphology is in fact justified. However, at a purely morphological level, this seems to be a mischaracterization of the Latin paradigm. Deponents contain a mixture of (middle-)passive and active forms; if they were truly *media tantum*, we should expect to find only the (middle-)passive forms. The deponents of Modern Greek, on the other hand, *do* conform to this expectation.

role in the text. In the example given in the foreword to this volume, the form *hortantur* ‘they exhort’ is morphologically passive, but when used in a sentence it functions as an active.³ **Paradigmatically**, a mismatch can be identified by comparing the inflected forms of a lexeme. For example, alongside passive forms, deponent verbs have a number of active forms (the supine, future infinitive, present and future participle, and the gerund) so that in terms of the paradigm as a whole, there is an opposition of passive and active forms in the deponent paradigm. However, there is no corresponding opposition of voice, e.g. *hortor* ‘I urge (someone)’, *hortans* ‘urging (someone)’. With a normal transitive verb, however, the opposition of active and passive morphology is invariably associated with an opposition of voice, e.g. *amor* ‘I am loved (by someone)’, *amans* ‘loving (someone)’. That is, deponent verbs display a mixture of passive and active forms, but without the corresponding voice opposition. Thus, even within the confines of the paradigm of a single lexeme, one can conclude that something is amiss.

3 ‘A formal morphological opposition.’ The term ‘morphological opposition’ implies that we are looking at word forms. Of course, what is construed as a word form may vary with the observer, e.g. there are approaches which would treat certain combinations of otherwise independent words as single forms with respect to morphological rules. In practice this is limited to instances where there is direct evidence for a morphological paradigm in the conventional sense, i.e. where

³ The *syntactic* diagnostics for voice distinctions in Latin are not absolute, but there are clues. Passives involve object promotion (or the equivalent thereof) and so are intransitive, the exception being a small number of constructions involving two accusative objects, e.g. *aliquem sententiam rogor* ‘ask somebody his opinion’ yields a passive which still has *sententiam* ‘opinion’ as the accusative object:

qu-i utinam omn-es ante me senti-am rog-arentur
 who-NOM.PL would.that all-NOM.PL before me opinion-ACC.SG ask-3PL.IMPRF.SBJV.PASS
 ‘Would that all of them were asked their opinion before me.’
 (Cicero, *Fifth Philippic*)

Passives allow expression of the agent by a prepositional phrase, but active intransitives do not. Finally, a phenomenon we can call ‘voice attraction’ was in force for a certain period in the history of Latin. During the Classical period (Hofmann and Szantyr 1965: 288), the auxiliary verbs *coepi* ‘begin’ and *desino* ‘cease’ match the voice of the main verb. However, the correspondence is not based directly on morphological voice: only true passives and impersonal passives (Kühner 1955: 677) induce passive morphology on the auxiliary:

veter-es oration-es a plerisque leg-i sunt desitae
 old-NOM.PL speeches-NOM.PL by most.ABL.PL read-INF.PRS.PASS cease.
 ‘the old speeches were no longer read by most people’ [literally ‘were ceased to be read’]
 (Cicero, *Brutus* 32, 123, cited by Ernout and Thomas 1953: 208)

Deponents, however, induce active morphology:

qu-em cum egredient-em insequ-i coep-issem
 who-ACC.SG when go.out.PTCP.PRS-ACC.SG follow-INF.PRS.PASS begin-PLUPRF.SBJV.ISG
 ‘when I began to press upon [literally, ‘follow’] him, as he was departing’
 (Cicero, *Oratio de Haruspicum responso* 1, in Yonge’s translation)

However, it should be noted that ‘middle’ passives (i.e. passives with a reflexive sense and the like) behave like deponents in this respect.

periphrastic forms make up only part of the paradigm, as with the Latin periphrastic perfect.

Of course, this does not mean that we do not recognize the possibility of mismatches where the exponent is a bona fide syntactic construction rather than a morphological form: e.g. does the use of expletive subjects represent a mismatch between semantics and syntax? The limitation of our investigation to morphology is a heuristic matter: it may turn out that there are interesting parallels between morphological and syntactic mismatches (conversely, there may be some revealing differences).

4 ‘Active and passive.’ Latin deponents involve a voice opposition, and prior extensions of the term ‘deponent’ have tended to focus on features involved in voice- and valency-changing operations. However, if what interests us is specifically the form-function mismatch as such, there is no reason to limit it to this area of grammar. Potentially, any grammatical category may be involved, provided the criteria above are met. The papers found within this volume explore a range of different features, both verbal and nominal. Further, categorical features, i.e. word class membership, can be seen in the same light: if two word classes in a language are morphologically distinct, a mismatch can be identified if its syntactic behaviour is that of one word class while its morphological characteristics are those of another (see Spencer, this volume).

In order to speak sensibly about mismatches, the grammatical category involved should have some observable correlates. These are most obvious in the case of syntactic relations, e.g. verb valency or agreement: thus, if a formally intransitive verb form takes a direct object, or a formally plural noun takes singular agreement, something is evidently amiss. Some arguably semantic categories also provide sufficient evidence, e.g. tense, where there may be no direct syntactic correlate, but the structure of the surrounding context may provide good clues about what to expect. In all these cases there are overt indicators in the surrounding text.

Naturally, not all grammatical categories are associated with anything overt that can be identified. This is particularly true of semantic categories. For examples, some authors have spoken of mismatches between alienable and inalienable possession markers (e.g. Noonan 1982: 82 on Lango, Schütz 1985: 463 on Fijian). However, the relevance of this distinction is confined to the lexical item that manifests it, so there is nothing in the text one can point to as a diagnostic. This is not to say that construing such examples as mismatches is invalid, simply that the confidence with which one could make such an assertion is low, and the chances of convincing the sceptical are slim. Nevertheless, paradigmatic irregularities allow us to identify mismatches even with such less-than-obvious categories. One example comes from Keres, which has both stative and non-stative intransitive verbs, which differ inflectionally (the latter taking object affixes for their sole argument).

(2) Person prefixes in Keres, non-modal forms (Miller 1965: 100)

	stative	non-stative
1	sgu-	s-
2	gəʒ-	ʃ-
3	gj-	g- or s-

The distinction between the two classes is semantic, and there are no obvious syntactic correlates that one can point to.⁴ The verb ‘to be lying down’ displays the peculiarity that it inflects as a stative with its singular/dual stem and as a non-stative with its plural stem.

(3)	səđuʔai	skũikai	
	s-jũuʔai	sgu-Ji’ikaiD	
	1-lie.down.SG/DU	1-lie.down.PL	
	‘I am lying down’	‘we are lying down’	(Miller 1965: 64)

Here we can speak of a mismatch, without having to specify exactly what the function of the category is. That is, whatever the function of the stative ~ non-stative opposition, number is not a parameter which should have any effect on it, judging by the behaviour of the rest of the system.

5 ‘Normal realization.’ Deponent verbs in Latin, though a sizeable class (e.g. 291 are found in the works of Cicero; Flobert 1975: 588), are nevertheless exceptional: the association of passive morphology with passive voice otherwise obtains for the vast majority of verbs. Therefore there is some justification for distinguishing between normal and exceptional behaviour, with deponents being exceptional. However, it is possible to imagine a situation where there was no obvious basis for distinguishing between normal and exceptional behaviour. One example involves transitivity marking in Ngiyambaa. Ngiyambaa has three conjugation classes: the L-, R- and Y-conjugations:

(4) Ngiyambaa conjugation classes (Donaldson 1980: 158)

	L-conjugation	R-conjugation	Y-conjugation
IPV	-: ~ -ya:	-ra:	-DHa ~ -ga
PST	-(i)yi	-yi	-NH <i>i</i>
PRS	-ɽa ~ -ya	-na	-NH <i>a</i>
IRR	-laga	-raga	-yaga
PURP	-li	-ri	-giri

Transitive verbs of the L- and R- conjugations regularly form intransitive counterparts by switching to the Y-conjugation:

⁴ Statives may be derived or underived. Derived statives fall into three classes: (i) so-called passives with the prefix *qja ʔa-*, (ii) inchoatives with the suffix *-duN*, and (iii) a small set of verbs with the suffix *-nú* indicating characteristic behaviour (of a person).

		object					
		1SG	1PL	2SG	2PL	3SG	3PL
subject	1SG			nekcen-iceek'	nekcen-ic' o'	nekcen-esek'	nekcen-es' o'
	1PL			nekcen-icoh	nekcen-ic' o'	nekcen-esoh	1PL ACTIVE
	2SG					nekcen-ese' m	2SG ACTIVE
	2PL	nekcen-a'					2SG ACTIVE
	3SG	nekcen-e' n, nekcen-ep'e' n	nekcen-oy, nekcen-oy-oh, nekcen-oy-og-oh			3SG ACTIVE	3SG ACTIVE, 3PL PASSIVE
	3PL	nekcen-epaahl, 1SG PASSIVE		2SG PASSIVE		3PL ACTIVE	3PL ACTIVE, 3PL PASSIVE

Table 1: Yurok transitive verb paradigm 'meet' (Blevins forthcoming)
 Note that some of the cells have alternative forms

Robins (1958: 69) suggests that these passive forms are '...used in syntactic structures appropriate to an active verb...'. In fact, the evidence is somewhat mixed; nevertheless, there are two arguments in favour of Robins's assertion.

First, the behaviour of nominal arguments with these verb forms is closer to that found with the other transitive verb forms. With transitive verbs (9), where the subject is third person, a 1SG or 2SG object pronoun takes a distinct object form (*nekac* '1SG' and *kelac* '2SG', versus the default forms *nek* and *ke'l*); the subject pronoun takes the default form. In normal passive constructions (10), a 1SG or 2SG (logical) object is in the default form, and the agent, if overtly expressed, is typically marked by the preposition *mehl*.

(9) Transitive construction (Robins 1958: 21)

yo' nekac ki newoh-pe'n
 3SG 1SG.OBJ FUT see-3SG>1SG
 'He will see me.'

(10) Passive construction (Robins 1958: 50)

nek kic teykelewom-oy-ek' mehl leyes
 I PRF bite-PASS-1SG by snake
 'I have been bitten by a snake.'

Where one of the morphologically passive transitive forms is used, both object and subject behave as they do with transitive verbs: a 1SG or 2SG object appears in a distinct object form, while an overtly expressed agent is unmarked.

(11) *Passive form in transitive construction* (Robins 1958: 77)

'no-too'mar kelac nimi k'enroks-ey-e'm
 1-friend 2SG .OBJ not trust-PASS-2SG
 'My friends don't trust you.'

Second, the form for a 1PL object has characteristics of the passive, though with further complications which lead to its being distinct from the real passive, at least in some cases (Robins 1958: 71). One difference involves conjugation class. Any Yurok verb falls into one of two conjugation classes, the e-class and o-class. Among other things, they differ in the way their passive stems are formed: e-class verbs suffix *-ey*, the o-class suffixes *-oy*. All o-class verbs (naturally), and most e-class verbs form their 1PL object form with the passive suffix proper to the o-class; thus the passive stem of the e-class verb 'meet' is *nekceney-*, but its 1PL object stem is *neckenoy-*. Thus, the 1PL object stem is identifiable as a passive stem, but for e-class verbs it is not equivalent to the lexeme's own passive stem. The other difference involves the inflectional endings. The 1PL passive has the ending *-oh*, while the 1PL object form has three possible endings: (i) zero, (ii) *-oh*, like the passive, or (iii) a doubled version of the passive ending, namely *-oh-oh* → *-ogoh* (Blevins forthcoming). Thus, the 1PL object form may be a dedicated transitive form, but still contains all the morphological components of the passive. This shows that one cannot simply say that a syntactic alternation to passive occurs in this context.

6.2 Lexical-paradigmatic deponency (semi-deponency). The two types of deponency that we have described – lexically conditioned in the case of Latin, and paradigmatically conditioned in the case of Yurok – are not mutually exclusive. That is, paradigmatically conditioned deponency could itself be lexically conditioned. This is precisely what happens in the class of verbs known in Latin as semi-deponents, which are deponent only for part of their paradigm, e.g. present tense *audeo* ‘I dare’ has the form of an active, but perfect *ausus sum* ‘I have dared’ has the form of a passive.

In many of the examples of semi-deponency that we have found, the deponent portion of the paradigm coincides with the locus of a stem alternation. Thus in Latin, semi-deponents are deponent for their perfect values, which coincides with a distinct stem (the perfect passive or supine stem). A particularly striking example of the interdependence of stems and semi-deponency comes from Takelma, an extinct isolate once spoken in Oregon. In this language, transitive verbs are morphologically distinct from intransitives. In (12), intransitive and transitive suffixes of the aorist and future are compared. The transitive forms illustrated are construed as having a third person object. First and second person objects are indicated by further suffixes.

(12) Takelma subject-marking suffixes (Sapir 1922: 164, 170)

	aorist		future	
	intransitive ⁶	transitive	intransitive	transitive
1SG	-t ^h eʔ, -teʔ	-(à)ʔn	-t ^h e:, -te:	-(à)n
1PL	-(p ^h)ik ^h	-(á)nak ^h	-(p ^h)ikam	-(a)nakàm
2SG	-t ^h am, -tam	-(á)t ^h	-t ^h aʔ, -taʔ	-(a)taʔ
2PL	-t ^h ap ^h , -tap ^h	-(á)t ^h p ^h	-t ^h apaʔ, -tapaʔ	-(à)t ^h paʔ
3	-Ø, -t ^h	-Ø	-t ^h a:, -ta:	-(á)nk ^h

There are a number of different types of semi-deponent verbs, which are intransitive (they take neither overt objects nor object markers), but take transitive subject markers for part of the paradigm. Consequently, these forms look like transitive forms with a third person object. In the first type (13), there is an anomalous stem augment *-n* in the first person singular and plural, and these forms are inflected as transitives; the other forms as intransitive.

(13) Takelma semi-deponent verb, type 1 (aorist): ‘work’

1SG	hekwêhak ^{hw} -n-aʔn
1PL	hekwêhak ^{hw} -n-anák ^h
2SG	hekwêhak ^{hw} -tam
2PL	hekgwêhak ^{hw} -tap ^h
3	hekwêhak ^{hw}

(Sapir 1922: 182)

A second type displays the stem augment only in the aorist, but not in the other tenses; consequently, it is deponent only in the first person in the aorist:⁷

(14) Takelma semi-deponent verb, type 2: ‘be lean in one’s rump’ (Sapir 1922: 183)

	aorist	future
1SG	ti:-k’alâs-n-aʔn	ti:-k’âlsi-te:

A third type inflects as a transitive in all persons of the aorist, as an intransitive elsewhere:

(15) Takelma semi-deponent verb, type 3: ‘listen’ (Sapir 1922: 183)

	aorist	future
1SG	ta:-skek’iy-àʔn	ta:-skêk’i-t ^h e:

Note that, unlike types 1 and 2, the deponent forms of type 3 lack a stem augment. Nevertheless, the aorist is a locus for stem alternations. For regular verbs, the aorist stem is typically distinct, characterized by a morphologically heterogeneous set of devices (including reduplication). Curiously, the semi-deponent verbs of this class that Sapir cites do *not* in fact have an observable stem alternation in the aorist. In effect, the stem alternation is manifested by deponency itself.

The fourth type is of particular interest. Some intransitive verbs are suppletive for plural subjects, whereby the singular stem inflects as an intransitive, and the plural stem as a transitive. For at least one verb, ‘be seated’, this suppletion is optional. Where the stem is non-suppletive, intransitive conjugation is maintained in the plural:

Takelma semi-deponent verb, type 4: be seated (Sapir 1922: 94-95)

1SG	šũʔwili:-t ^h eʔ	
1PL	xali:ya-nâk ^h	suppletive plural
	šũʔwili:p ^h -ik ^h	non-suppletive plural

⁶ Takelma has two classes of intransitives (I and II); Sapir characterizes the difference as follows: ‘...the main characteristic of Class II intransitives...is that they denote conditions and processes, while Class I intransitives are in great part verbs of action.’ (p. 164). The suffixes here are class II, which is the only one which participates in semi-deponency.

⁷ Sapir states that only the first person forms display this behaviour; unfortunately, he does not provide examples of other forms.

These examples of semi-deponency suggest that stems can be viewed as having the same properties as lexemes: just as a given lexeme can specify for idiosyncratic behaviour, so can individual stems of individual lexemes. This impression is strengthened when we consider a fifth pattern, which bridges the gap between stem-based and lexeme-based deponency, namely use of a deponent auxiliary. This occurs in the future: alongside a synthetic future form, there is a periphrastic future involving an auxiliary (*kuluk^v* - ‘intend, desire’) which is always inflected as a transitive, regardless of the transitivity of the main verb. For example, in (16), the auxiliary takes the 2SG transitive aorist ending, even though the main verb ‘die’ is intransitive.⁸

(16) lohòk^h ti kulukw-át^h
 die Q intend-2SG[>3]
 ‘Do you intend to die?’

This phenomenon is especially interesting in the way it interacts with what Sapir calls the passive, but which is really an indefinite subject construction (which Sapir himself points out.) Morphologically, the ‘passive’ involves a distinct suffix (-*an* in the examples below), which can be taken as standing in for the subject, plus object markers where applicable. In principle, the passive can only be formed from transitive verbs. However, Sapir (1922: 185) points out that ‘[i]nasmuch as all active periphrastic futures are transitive in form, passive futures [...] can be formed from all verbs, whether transitive or intransitive’ and gives examples such as *hoita kulukw-àn* ‘it will be danced’ or *wê:kiau kulukw-àn* ‘it will be shined’ (= ‘it was going to be daylight’). Significantly, this sort of impersonal construction with intransitives is only possible in the periphrastic future.⁹

On the other hand, there is at least one example of semi-deponency in which stems do not play a determining role, namely Latin *fiō* ‘become, be done’, which mixes active and passive inflection. The verb is peculiar in a number of respects, not the least that it functions as the passive of the present stem forms of *faciō* ‘make, do’. However, what concerns us here is not this,¹⁰ but the fact that its mixture of active and passive forms does not correlate with a stem alternation. As with any Latin verb, the present, imperfect and future are all formed from the same stem, but the present infinitive, and only the present infinitive, inflects as a passive, while the other forms inflect as actives.

⁸ Sapir supposes that, morphologically, the verb stem in the periphrastic future can be interpreted as a verbal noun (*thus do:m gulugw-àn* ‘I shall kill him’ ≈ ‘killing (him), I will it’), which may account for the transitive morphology, at least etymologically.

⁹ Another example of auxiliary-based semi-deponency comes from Ika, a Chibchan language of Columbia, where the future auxiliary has subjects treated morphologically as objects (Frank 1990). Similarly, Bickel and Nichols (2001) describe certain ‘super-light’ verbs in Belhaare (Kiryanti, Tibeto-Burman) and Chechen (Nakh-Dagestanian), typically modals, which are lexically specified to inflect as intransitives or transitives, regardless of the transitivity of the main verb.

¹⁰ Because of the odd status of *fiō*, somewhere between passive and active, it is not clear which morphology should be expected (indeed, the question probably makes little sense). Either way, the switch in morphology is not correlated with any switch in its syntactic or semantic behaviour.

(17) Latin ‘become, be done’

	active morphology	passive morphology
PRS IND	fī-t	
IMPRF IND	fī-ēbat	
FUT IND	fī-et	
PRS SBJV	fī-at	
IMPRF SBJV	fī-eret	
IPV PRS	fī	
IPV FUT	fī-tō	
INF PRS		fī-erī

The alternation between active and passive morphology in *fiō* must be described in terms of the morphosyntactic values, since it does not correlate with a stem alternation.

7 ‘The normal function is no longer available.’ The passive forms of Latin deponent verbs have not merely adopted a new voice value, they have abandoned their expected voice value. This means that there is a gap in the paradigm of any deponent verb that might require a passive form. Schematically, the defectiveness of the deponent paradigm is represented in (18), where *exponent A* is used for category *Y*, whose normal exponent is *exponent B*, and no exponent is available to express category *X*.

(18) Deponency + defectiveness

	normal paradigm	deponent paradigm
category X	exponent A	exponent A
category Y	exponent B	exponent A

Though this is normally taken as a defining feature of deponency, it is possible to imagine a paradigm which has all the requisite characteristics, but where this gap is filled. There are three logical possibilities: polarity, heteroclisis and syncretism.

7.1 Polarity. Polarity involves a mirror-image mismatch. In Hetzron’s (1967) formulation, polarity occurs ‘...when there exist two grammatical categories (*signifiēs*) *X* and *Y*, and two corresponding exponents (*signifiānts*) *A* and *B*, then value *X* can sometimes be assumed by *A*, while *B* denotes *Y*; and sometimes *X* is expressed by *B*, and then it is necessarily *A* that represents *Y*.’ Schematically:

(19) Polarity

	normal paradigm	deponent paradigm
category X	exponent A	exponent B
category Y	exponent B	exponent A

Note that the first part of Hetzron's definition (up to 'expressed by *B*') defines a mismatch. The corollary mismatch makes it polarity. The most familiar example, treated by Hetzron, comes from Semitic. In Common Semitic, as reflected in Classical Arabic and in Hebrew, the normal morphological opposition between masculine and feminine agreement morphology, as found on adjectives, is switched with the numerals 3-10, which also mark gender. To show this is not just an isolated phenomenon, we illustrate polarity below with an example from the Uto-Aztecan language Tübatulabal, described by Voegelin (1935).

Every verb in Tübatulabal has two stems, telic and atelic. The telic (perfective) is '... used for an action (e.g., 'to take a bite') or condition (e.g. 'it got green') performed or arrived at in an instant (perfective without tense commitment), and for this reason the action or condition is generally, though not necessarily, felt to be completed at the time of talking.' (Voegelin 1935: 94). The atelic (imperfective) is '...sometimes used when an action requires some duration for its performance ('to eat'), but frequently the atelic is quite vague in respect to aspectual meaning.' The difference between the two aspectual stems has a number of inflectional ramifications, in particular: (i) atelic stems are bound forms, telic stems may occur unsuffixed, and (ii) a number of suffixes are specific to either the atelic or telic stem.

The stem alternation is effected by reduplication. For the vast majority of verbal lexemes, the atelic is the basic stem and the telic the reduplicated stem. Reduplication targets the vowel of the initial syllable, accompanied by phonologically regular alternations of voicing and nasal harmony.

(20) Typical aspectual stem alternations in Tübatulabal

atelic	telic	
ela-	eʔela	'jump'
tik-	itik	'eat'
tana-	andana	'get down'
pa:abi-	a:ba:abi	'be tired'
yuʔudz-	uyuʔuts	'throw'

(Voegelin 1935: 95, 102)

However, there is a small group of verbs (around 30) for which it is the telic stem which is morphologically basic, and the atelic is formed from it by reduplication:

(21) Reversed aspectual stems in Tübatulabal (Voegelin 1935: 95-96)

atelic	telic		atelic	telic	
a:dza:ya:w-	tsa:ya:u	'yell'	i:ciy-	ci:i	'rock a cradle'
apatsa:h-	patsa:h	'shell nuts'	indɨwa-	tɨwa	'summon'
anaŋ-	naŋ	'cry'	ɨci:b-	ci:p	'whittle'
anab-	nap	'throw'	i:cilu:b-	cilu:p	'split wood'
a:na:yuw-	na:yuw	'be tired'	i:ciug-	ciuk	'comb'
aʔay-	ai	'pick up'	ôôlo:h-	tôlo:h	'groan'
a:ya:n-	ya:n	'sing'	ôcôlo:ŋ-	côlo:ŋ	'snore'
acag-	ca:k	'roast'	ô:yôm-	yô:m	'copulate'
andaŋ-	taŋ	'kick'	okuc-	ku:c	'grow'
aha:idž-	ha:itc	'chew'	owuba-	wuba	'whip'
imbiŋw-	pɨŋw	'roll string on thigh'	uyugʊʔ-	yugʊʔ	'cut'
imil:d-	mil:t	'scold'	ondomu:ga-	tomu:ga	'dream'
itsixk-	tsixk	'prick'	ondoma:w-	toma:u	'fail'
ih:i:b-	hi:p	'massage'	otoc-	tu:c	'grind'
ih:i:d-	hi:t	'pluck feathers'	ononŋ-	nonŋ	'pound'

Voegelin observes that there are no obvious shared semantic features that would justify regarding them as inherently telic. Instead, it must be lexically specified for these items that the normal morphological relationship is reversed.

7.2 Heteroclisis. Heteroclisis is the mixture of different inflection classes within a single paradigm. For example, the Latin *balneum* 'bath' declines as a second declension noun in the singular and a first declension noun in the plural.

(22) Latin heteroclitc noun 'bath'

	second declension		first declension	
	singular	plural	singular	plural
NOM	balne -um	-a	-a	balne -ae
ACC	balne -um	-a	-am	balne -ās
GEN	balne -ī	-ōrum	-ae	balne -ārum
DAT	balne -ō	-īs	-ae	balne -īs
ABL	balne -ō	-īs	-ā	balne -īs

Deponency can interact with heteroclisis to yield a non-defective paradigm: in place of the missing forms, the expected forms of another inflection class are found, as schematically represented in (23), where the deponent forms belong to inflection class 1, and the normal forms belong to inflection class 2.

(23) Deponency + heteroclisis

	normal paradigm, class 1	normal paradigm, class 2	deponent paradigm
category X	exponent A ₁	exponent A ₂	exponent A₂
category Y	exponent B ₁	exponent B ₂	exponent A ₁

As a concrete illustration of this we can take Gothic. As in other Germanic languages, Gothic has two conjugation classes, strong and weak. Strong verbs form their preterite (past tense) through ablaut, with a distinction between the vowel of the singular and dual/plural. Weak verbs form their preterite through a dental suffix (-t, -d or -s). In addition, the person-number endings of strong and weak verbs are at least partly different.

The so-called preterite-present verbs have present tense forms which inflect as the preterite of strong verb, displaying the characteristic singular ~ dual/plural vowel ablaut, and the distinctive preterite person-number endings. They have preterites as well, but these are formed according to the regular pattern for weak verbs. Below (24), a portion of the relevant paradigms is given, showing indicative forms.

(24) Gothic verb types (Birkmann 1987: 94)

		strong verb 'grip'	weak verb 'have'	preterite present 'know'
present indicative	1SG	grip-a	hab-a	wait
	2SG	grip-is	haba-is	wais-t
	3SG	grip-iþ	haba-iþ	wait
	1PL	grip-am	hab-am	wit-um
	2PL	grip-iþ	haba-iþ	wit-uþ
	3PL	grip-and	hab-and	wit-un
	1DU	grip-os	hab-os	wit-u
	2DU	grip-ats	hab-ats	wit-uts
preterite indicative	1SG	graip	habai-da	wis-sa ¹¹
	2SG	graip-t	habai-des	wis-seis
	3SG	graip	habai-da	wis-sa
	1PL	grip-um	habai-dedum	wis-sedum
	2PL	grip-uþ	habai-deduþ	wis-seduþ
	3PL	grip-un	habai-dedun	wis-sedun
	1DU	grip-u		
	2DU	grip-uts		

Thus, the finite paradigm of preterite presents consists entirely of preterite forms, but from two different conjugation classes: the strong preterite forms serve for the present, and hence can be characterized as deponent, while the weak preterite forms serve for the preterite.

7.3 Syncretism. Finally, it is possible to imagine that a particular exponent retains its normal function under deponency alongside the irregular function, resulting in syncretism. This is schematically represented in (25).

(25) Deponency + syncretism

	normal paradigm	deponent paradigm
category X	exponent A	exponent A
category Y	exponent B	exponent A

One such example comes from the Nakh-Dagestanian language Tsez, described by Corbett (this volume). The nouns *xex-bi* 'children' and *ɣana-bi* 'woman' always decline as plurals, but can be used as singulars as well, as evidenced by agreement:

¹¹ The weak preterite has a dental stop as its first element. In early Germanic, a sequence of two dental stops yielded two dental fricatives, hence the sequence -ss- in 'know'.

(26) Singular and plural use of *xexbi* ‘child’ (Comrie 2001: 381-383)

<i>singular</i>		<i>plural</i>	
howda xex-bi	Ø-ik’i-s	howziri xex-bi	b-ik’i-s
this child-PL.ABS	I-go-PST.WIT	these child-PL.ABS	I.PL-go-PST.WIT
‘This child went.’		‘These children went.’	

In their use as a singulars, the plural nouns *xex-bi* and *yana-bi* are deponent. However, in contrast to the other patterns discussed above, this does not preempt their use as ordinary plural forms.

8 Conclusion. The theoretical interest of deponent verbs in Latin is clear: morphological forms are not simply a blind reflection of the categories they represent. Instead, morphology may operate at cross-purposes with morphosyntax, without apparently hindering the functioning of the system of correspondences. But the language-specific peculiarities of Latin deponents have prevented any general acknowledgement of their broader significance; few languages have phenomena which match in all the particulars. However, as the papers in this volume show, morphological mismatches can be found in many different languages, affecting a wide range of grammatical categories. By teasing apart the definition of deponency in Latin, I hope to have shown how broadly the notion can be applied, and to have provided a typological framework for discussing them.

References

- Bickel, Balthasar and Johanna Nichols. 2001. Syntactic ergativity in light verb complements. *Proceedings of the 27th Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*. Berkeley: University of California.
- Blevins, Juliette. Forthcoming. Periphrastic agreement in Yurok. *Periphrasis and paradigms*, ed. by Farrell Ackerman, James P. Blevins and Gregory T. Stump. Stanford: CSLI Publications.
- Birkmann, Thomas. 1987. *Präteritopräsentia*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer.
- Comrie, Bernard. 2001. How independent is Tsezic morphology? *CLS 37: The Panels: 2001: Proceedings from the Parasessions of the 37th Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society* [volume 37-2], ed. by Mary Andronis, Christopher Ball, Heidi Elston and Sylvain Neuvel, 367-383. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.
- Donaldson, Tamsin. 1980. *Ngiyambaa: the language of the Wangaaybuwan*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ernout, Alfred and François Thomas. 1953. *Syntaxe latine* (second edition). Paris: Klincksieck.
- Flobert, Pierre. 1975. *Les verbes déponents latins des origines à Charlemagne*. Paris: Société d’Édition ‘Les Belles Lettres’
- Frank, Paul. 1990. *Ika syntax* (Studies in the Languages of Colombia 1). Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics.
- Hetzron, Robert 1967. Agaw numerals and incongruence in Semitic. *Journal of Semitic Studies* 12.169–193.

- Hofmann, Johann Baptist and Anton Szantyr. 1965. *Lateinische Syntax und Stilistik* (Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft 2, 2, 2). Munich: C. H. Beck.
- Kemmer, Suzanne. 1993. *The middle voice*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Kühner, Raphael. 1955. *Ausführliche Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache* (part 2, 1, revised by Andreas Thierfelder). Hamburg: Hahn.
- Miller, Wick R. 1965. *Acoma grammar and texts*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Noonan, Michael. 1992. *A grammar of Lango*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Robins, R. H. 1958. *The Yurok language*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Sapir, Edward. 1922. The Takelma language of south-western Oregon. *Handbook of American Indian languages* [vol. 2], ed. by Franz Boas, 1-296. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.
- Schütz, Albert J. 1985. *The Fijian language*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- Voegelin, Charles F. 1935. *Tübatulabal grammar*. Berkeley: University of California Press.