

Arbeitspapier 109

Fachbereich Sprachwissenschaft

Universität Konstanz



Klaus von Heusinger

Italian Nominalization of -ata:

Derivation and the Structure of the Lexicon

Konstanz, Januar 2002

Italian Nominalization of -ata:

Derivation and the Structure of the Lexicon

Klaus von Heusinger, University of Konstanz

klaus.heusinger@uni-konstanz.de

1. Introduction*

Italian nominalizations with *-ata* can be derived from verbal or nominal bases. They form single individuated events that are expressed by their bases, as illustrated in (1). The nominalization *telefonata* is derived from the denominal *telefonare*, documented in 1918 for the first time (see Sabatini & Coletti 1997). Derivations in *-ata* from a nominal base *N* denote single events or results according to certain patterns or “templates”. They can denote single events of a *hit by N*, as in (2); events that are *characteristic for N*, as in (3); a *period of N*, as in (4), a result in form of a *capacity that is contained in N*, as in (5); to name only 4 out of a list of 6-10 productive patterns for *-ata* (see section 3.2 for a more comprehensive list):

- (1) *telefonata* (< *telefonare* “to call by telephone”) “telephone-call” (1918)
- (2) *ombrellata* (< *ombrello* “umbrella” (1841)) “event of hitting with an umbrella”
- (3) *bambinata* (< *bambino* “child” (18th cent)) “event typical for a child, puerility”
- (4) *giornata* (< *giorno* “day” (13th cent)) “time of a day”
- (5) *forcata* (< *forca* “fork” (15th cent)) “forkful”

* This article is the intermediate result of a project on Italian nominalization that was initiated by Christoph Schwarze. Firstly I would like to thank him for long discussions and encouraging and constructive comments. I also like to thank Silvia Guidolin, Carmen Kelling, Judith Meinschäfer, Heike Necker, Vieri Samek-Lodovici, Marie-Therese Schepping and Niko Spak-Dolt for comments and helpful suggestions. I also profited by presenting the material at the workshop *Nominalisierungen* at the University of Tübingen in April 2001 and at the conference *The Lexicon in Linguistic Theory* at the University of Düsseldorf in August 2001. Special thanks for the organizers and the audience for comments and suggestions.

A single derivation in *-ata* can be assigned different meanings. For example, *fermata* can denote the event of stopping, the place of stopping or the time period of a stop, as in (6); and *barcata* may either refer to the load that can be carried by a boat or to a large quantity in general, as in (7). Even if these differences in meaning can be derived by general principles of meaning variation or meaning change, such as metonymy, figurative use, construals or coercion, the two meanings of *forcata* in (8) cannot be derived from each other. Rather, they must follow from two independent patterns, namely the ones illustrated in (2) and (5): (i) *a hit by N* and (ii) *a capacity that is contained in N*. Besides lexicalized forms, the suffix *-ata* very productively forms new nominalizations from verbal as well as from nominal bases, as illustrated in (9) and (10):

- | | | |
|------|---|--|
| (6) | <i>fermata</i> (< <i>fermare</i> “to stop”)
(17 th cent) | (i) “the event of stopping”
(ii) “the location where a stop is usually done”
(iii) “the time period of a stop” |
| (7) | <i>barcata</i> (< <i>barca</i> “boat”)
(18 th cent) | (i) “boatload”
(“quantity that can be carried by a boat”)
(ii) “large quantity” |
| (8) | <i>forcata</i> (< <i>forca</i> “fork”)
(15 th cent) | (i) “stroke with a fork”
(ii) “forkful
(quantity that can be carried by a fork”) |
| (9) | acceptable new forms
(deverbal) | <i>aggirata</i> < <i>aggirare</i> “to revolve”
<i>analizzata</i> < <i>analizzare</i> “to analyze” |
| (10) | acceptable new forms
(denominal) | <i>abitata</i> < <i>abito</i> “habit, custom, tendency”
<i>amantata</i> < <i>amante</i> “lover” |

While nominalizations from verbal bases generally denote an instance of an event described by the meaning of the base, derivations in *-ata* from nominal bases have much greater variety of denotations. They can either follow one of the above mentioned patterns, but they are also free to denote another kind of pragmatically salient type of event. However, it seems that they always denote an instance of an event. I, therefore, assume that there is a common function or common *lexical meaning* of the suffix *-ata*, which can be described as *forming a single event*. Besides this core meaning, the *conceptual structure* of the base restricts the particular meaning of the derived nominalization.

The particular meaning of a non-lexicalized form not only depends on the lexical meaning of the suffix, but also on the pragmatic and contextual circumstances. While the pragmatic and contextual information is to be described for each utterance separately, this paper investigates the contribution of the suffix to the meaning of the derivation and its interaction with the conceptual information of the base. In particular, I address to following questions with respect to the suffix *-ata*:

- Is there a core lexical meaning of the suffix *-ata* for all different patterns?
- How can we describe the differences between the derivations from nominal bases?
- Which conceptual properties of the base determines the particular meaning of the derived nominalization?

The paper is organized as follows: In section 2, I discuss the historical origin of the suffix *-ata* in Italian, which is of Latin origin and can also be found in other Romance languages. In section 3, I present more descriptive data on the derivations in Italian and the different groups of derivations as well as the discussion of the form of the suffix. In section 4, I discuss the argument structure. In section 5, I describe the conceptual information of the base in terms of selectional restrictions, and in section 6, I present a compositional process in which the representations of the bases are combined with different patterns of the suffix. Sorted variables in the representation for the different patterns must match with the selectional restrictions of the base. Section 7 gives a short summary.

2. The diachronic development

2.1 The suffix *-ata* in Romance languages

The suffix *-ata* in Italian is a common suffix in Romance languages, such as in Italian, Occitan, Spanish, French, Catalan, etc., as illustrated in (11). Parallel derivations in these language can undertake similar meaning shifts, as illustrated in the shift from the event-reading (“entering”) to the result-reading (“entry”) of it. *entrata* (13th cent.) and its equivalents in other Romance languages, as in (12):

- | | | | |
|------|------|--------------------------------|--|
| (11) | it. | <i>andata</i> “going, journey” | <i>chiamata</i> “call” |
| | occ. | <i>arribada</i> “arrival” | <i>casada</i> “hunt” |
| | spa. | <i>buscada</i> “search” | <i>llamada</i> “call” |
| | fr. | <i>échappée</i> “escape” | <i>traversée</i> “the crossing, traverse” ¹ |
| (12) | it. | <i>entrata</i> | |
| | fr. | <i>entrée</i> | “entering” > “entry” |
| | spa. | <i>entrada</i> | |

We also find the different patterns form nominalized forms from nominal bases: in (13a), the derivation refers to an amount that can be transported by the base,

¹ In French, the original suffix *-ata* changed to *-ée*, as illustrated in (i):

(i) lat. *armata* > *armede* > *armee* > nfr. *armée* cf. it. *armata*, spa. *armada*

It was only in the 15th and 16th century that loan words from Italian and Occitan with the suffix *-ade* entered French again. Some native forms were replaced by the loan forms as in *crevade* (instead of an already established *crevee*), *ambassade* (*ambassee*), *boutade* (*boutee*), etc. (Collin 1918, 13f).

in (13b) the derivation refers to the time period of a day, while in (13c) the nominalization describes an event of a knife-stabbing:

- (13a) fr. *bouchée*, it. *boccata*, spa. *bocada* “mouthful”
(13b) fr. *journée*, it. *giornata*, spa *jornada* “day long”
(13c) it. *coltellata*, spa. *cuchillada*, occ. *coltelada* “stab with a knife”
cat. *espadada* “stab with a sword”

2.2 The Latin source of the pronouns

It is uncontroversial that the common Romance suffix goes back to a Latin form. Yet it is controversial how its form and its function developed. There are two main positions: Meyer-Lübke (1890) assumes that *-ata* has developed from the perfect participle by change of the semantic function. On the contrary, Collin (1918) argues that the suffix *-ata* has taken over the functional load from the Latin suffix *-tus*, while changing the form *-tus* into the form *-ata* by some intermediate steps.

2.2.1 Meyer-Lübke: the participial source of *-ata*

The formal identity of the suffix *-ata* with the feminine singular and the neuter plural of the perfect participle strongly suggest a close relation, even an identity. Therefore, Meyer-Lübke (1890), among others, suggested that the nominalizing suffix *-ata* was derived from the participle by syntactic ellipsis and some change of the semantic function of this form. Simplified, he argues that the adjectival use of participle *collecta* in *collecta pecunia* (“collected money”) in (14) developed into a nominal use when the syntagma lacked its head noun, which had only little semantic content.² In a second semantic shift, the function of the perfect participle was changed step by step. Generally, the perfect participle denotes a perfective or resultative state in the passive: *collecta* “that what was collected”. First the form lost the passive aspect and then the perfective one, forming verbal nouns of the type “collecting”, as in (15):³

- (14) Ellipsis of the head noun
lat. *collecta pecunia* > *collecta* Ø > *collecta*
“the collected money” > “the collected (one)” > “the collected”
(15) Loss of passive and perfective marking
lat. *collecta* “the collected” > “collecting”

² Other head nouns with little or no semantic content are lat. *res* or *causa* (“thing”, “cause”).

³ Meyer-Lübke (cited in Collin 1914, 456): “Ital. *veduta* bedeutet also zuerst ‘das Gesehene’, dann durch Zeitverschiebung: ‘das, was jederzeit gesehen wird’, und man erhält anstatt des Begriffes der vollendeten Handlung den Begriff des Präsens. Zuletzt, in dem ‘der eigentlich passivische, objektive Sinn’ verloren geht und durch einen subjektiven, aktivischen ersetzt wird, bedeutet es nicht nur ‘die Ansicht’, d.h. was gesehen wird, sondern auch das Gesicht, d.h. zunächst die Art, wie man sieht, und schließlich die Tätigkeit des Sehens.”

2.2.2 Collin: the transformation of *-tus* into *-ata*

Collin (1918) criticizes the participle approach as too complicated in the shift of meaning described above. He argues that the suffix *-ata* fills exactly the functional load of the old Latin suffix *-tus*. Thus, he concludes that *-ata* replaces *-tus* in its function by some intermediate steps of formal changes that are well motivated. Originally, Latin had two suffixes to form event nominals from verbal bases: the suffix *-(t)io* formed verbal nouns with feminine gender, and *-tus, -sus* which formed verbal nouns that were masculine in the 4th declension. In earlier times there was a semantic difference between the two forms: while derivations of *-(t)io* primarily denoted events, those of *-tus* tended to refer to results.⁴ However, in later times both derivations were used in the same way, thus producing parallel forms, as illustrated in (16). Collin assumes three steps of changing the form of *-tus* to *-ata* while keeping the semantic function. In the first step, the gender of the *-tus* forms was reanalyzed as neuter. Most nouns of the 4th declension used to be masculine (thus ending in *-tus*), with a small minority being neuter (ending in *-tum*). However, the similarity of the neuter forms with the neuter form of the 2nd declension motivated a reanalysis of the original masculine forms towards neuter form. This reanalysis is also supported by the same form in the accusative singular for masculine and neuter. An additional motivation was the neutral singular of the perfect participle and the supinum:

- (16) *abortio* - *abortus/abortum* “miscarriage”
 accessio - *accessus/accessum* “approaching, approach”
 cantio - *cantus/cantum* “singing, song”
- (17) Shift of the gender and declension class
 abortio [fem] - *abortus* [masc., 4th decl.] / *abortum* [neutr. 4th decl. 2nd decl.]

A second step is constituted by the common usage of the neuter plural instead of the singular, but with a collective or singular meaning. In a third step it is assumed that the neuter plural (with its singular meaning) is reanalyzed as a feminine singular of the first declension yielding the suffix *-ata* as feminine singular for forming event nominals, like the older forms of *-tio* and *-tus, -sus*. (Collin 1914, 1918).⁵

⁴ Derivations of *-(t)io* outnumbered those by *-tus* by 5 to 1 in classical texts. This was partly because *-(t)io* was the first choice for forming loan-translations from Greek in academic writing. Ruh (1956, 83) notes that the Greek words *eulogia, epistrophê, empneusis, sympatheia*, were translated into Latin *benedictio, conversio, conversio, compassio*. Cicero complained about the large number of new forms in Latin, even though he himself contributed a large list of new loan-translations (cf. Lindquist 1936, 40). Collin (1918) notes that *-tus* was quite common in vulgar speech, as it can be seen from inscriptions.

⁵ Appel (1883, 42; cited in Collin 1918, 47): “Eodem modo, quo illa collectiva, alia neutra, cum pluraliter saepe usurparentur, in femina ideo conversa sunt, quod, quae proprie ex multis partibus constabant, in unam notionem coaluerunt. Ad hoc genus pertinent: *dicta, promissa, responsa*.”

- (18) Shift of grammatical number and reanalysis as feminine singular
 lat. *promissum* > *promissa* > fr. *la promesse* “promise”
 lat. *debitum* > *debita* > fr. *la dette*, span. *la deuda* “debts”
 lat. *responsum* > *responsa* > fr. *la réponse* “response”

2.3 The origin of denominal forms of *-ata*

The suffix *-ata* is productively used for forming event nominals from verbal bases from the very beginning of the Romance languages. It forms event nouns that denote one instance of the verbal action: “la fonction primitive de suffixe en roman a dû être d'exprimer l'action verbale d'une façon absolue: de former des *nomina actionis*” (Collin 1918, 125).

This pattern is very productive, and it can be formed from a great variety of verbal bases.⁶ Thus the verb *camminare* allows a nominalized form *camminata*, which then can be combined with a light verb meaning more or less what the base verb means. The form *entrata* from the verb *entrare* “to enter” has a event meaning, but also shows a more resultative reading (“entry”), as illustrated in (20):

- (19) *camminata* “walk”
fare una camminata “to go for a walk”
 (20) *entrata* (13th cent.) “entry, entrance”
ha fatto un'entrata trionfale “He entered with triumph”
l'entrata dell'albergo “the entrance to the hotel”

Besides this very productive pattern, an additional derivational pattern came into existence: the suffix *-ata* started to form nominalizations from nominal bases. This derivation developed by reanalysis of forms that either might have been derived from a denominal verb or directly from the nominal base of the that verb, as in (21) and (23). In the next step, it was possible to derive directly from a nominal base, as in (22) or (24), where the same pattern is used: *a hit with N* and *the amount of Y transported by N*.⁷

- (21) it. *martellata* (14th cent) “hammerblow”
 < *martellare* “to hammer” (< *martello* “hammer” (14th cent))
 < *martello* “hammer”
 (22) it *ombrellata* (19th cent) < *ombrello* “umbrella”
 **ombrellare*

⁶ Certain verbs do not allow nominalizations of *-ata*. See Mayo et al. (1995, 912).

⁷ This development can also be stated for other Romance languages, such as French in (i) and (ii) (Collin 1918):

- (i) fr. *montée* “ascending slope” < (i) ofr. *monter* or < (ii) ofr. *mont*
 (ii) ofr. *buce* (ca 1120) > *buchiee* > nfr. *bouchée* “mouthful, bite”
 ofr. *puing* (ca 1180) > *poignee* > nfr. *poignée* “fist-ful”

- (23) it. *beccata* (14th cent) (i) “peck”, (ii) “beakfull”
 < *beccare* “to peck” (<*becco* “beak” (14 cent.)) or
 < *becco* “beak”
- (24) it. *boccata* (14th cent.) “mouthful”
 < *bocca* “mouth”
 **boccare*

Additional patterns for the suffix *-ata* developed: *a space of time*, as in (25), *an iteration of an architectonic detail*, as in (26), *a meal based on the referent of the nominal base*, as in (27), and *an action typical for that group of persons described by the nominal base*, as in (28):

- (25) it. *giornata* (13th cent) “daytime” < *giorno* “day”
 (26) it. *arcata* (14th cent.) “arcade” < *arco* “arc”
 (27) it. *cipollata* (15th cent) “meal prepared from onions” < *cipolla* “onion”
 (28) it. *ragazzata* (16th cent.) “childish action” < *ragazzo* “child”

The deverbal derivation with *-ata* shows a quite coherent function: it forms nominalized derivations that denote “one instance of the event described by the verbal base”. However, the denominal use of *-ata* exhibits a large variety of functions, as illustrated in (21)-(28) (see also section 3.2). It is not obvious that there is one basic function. The discussion in the literature, rather assumes that the denominal nominalization suffix *-ata* shows the same variety of functions as the derivation of denominal verbs. Collin (1918, 134) summarizes: “Pour moi, je crois plutôt que la grande variété de sens de notre suffixe s'explique par le rôle varié joué par le radical dans les verbes dénominatifs qui ont donné naissance à la formation analogique.” In connection with denominative verbs, Collin (1981, 135) quotes Behaghel (1900, 1): “Sie [= denominative verbs] dienen im allgemeinen zur Bezeichnung der Handlung, des Vorgangs, der bei Erwähnung des vom Hauptwort bezeichneten Begriffs am leichtesten inis Bewusstsein eintritt.” and Bladin (1911, 57): “Every action can be designated by a verb derived from the very noun, the idea of which most easily enters the mind of the person wanting to state the fact.”

It is interesting to note, that Clark & Clark (1979, 787, (23)) formulate very similar conditions for forming denominal verbs (their “INNOVATIVES”):

- (29) The INNOVATIVE DENOMINAL VERB CONVENTION. In using an innovative denominal verb sincerely, the speaker means to denote
- (a) the kind of situation
 - (b) that he has good reason to believe
 - (c) that on this occasion the listener can readily compute
 - (d) uniquely
 - (e) on the basis of their mutual knowledge
 - (f) in such a way that the parent noun denotes one role in the situation, and the remaining surface arguments of the denominal verb denote other roles in the situation.

3. Derivations of -ata in Italian

3.1 Productivity

The Italian suffix *-ata* forms substantives in the feminine (sg. *-a*, pl.: *-e*) which denote a single or individualized event (*nomen vicis*) or certain types of resultatives. The derivations are easily set into the plural. The suffix is very productive both from verbal as well as nominal bases. There are lexicalized forms and spontaneous forms, which are either acceptable or not.⁸ It seems that the main reason that *ata*-derivations from verbal bases are not acceptable due to lexical blocking. There are several suffixes that can derive nominalizations from verbal bases, as illustrated in (31).

(30) Deverbal nominalizations of -ata (=V-nominalizations)

(i) lexicalized forms

abbassata “reduction” (1913) < *abbassare* “to lower”
allargata “widening” (18th cent.) < *allargare* “to widen”

(ii) acceptable new forms

aggirata < *aggirare* “to revolve”
analizzata < *analizzare* “to analyse”

(iii) non-acceptable forms

**abbandonata* < *abbandonare* “to abandon”
 but: *abbandonamento* “abandoning”
 **abilitata* < *abilitare* “to qualify, to pass”
 but: *abilitá* “ability”, *abilitazione* “qualification”

(31) Possible nominalizations from verbal bases (Scalise 1986, 174)

	<i>a</i>	<i>ata</i>	<i>enza</i>	<i>zione</i>	<i>ura</i>	<i>aggio</i>	<i>mento</i>
<i>revoca(re)</i>	+	-	-	-	-	-	-
<i>mangia(re)</i>	-	+	-	-	-	-	-
<i>preferi(re)</i>	-	-	+	-	-	-	-
<i>amministra(re)</i>	-	-	-	+	-	-	-
<i>arde(re)/arso</i>	-	-	-	-	+	-	-
<i>boicotta(re)</i>	-	-	-	-	-	+	-
<i>suggeri(re)</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	+

There are selectional restrictions on the derivations from verbal bases: static verbs, modal verbs, aspectual verbs, and certain types of “psychological” verbs cannot form *ata*-nominalizations (Mayo et al. 1995, 912).

⁸ Examples from Vieri Samek-Ludovici (1998), who extracted a list from the *Lessico di frequenza dell'italiano parlato* (De Mauro, Mancini, Vedovelli, Voghera 1993). The judgements are his own (and not uncontroversial).

- (36) N-ata: event or action typically performed by N or *acting as N*
ragazzata, bambinata, Clintonata, Fellinata, gattata, animalata, agentata, caprata, adultata, amicata, amministratorata, arabata, artistata, autorata, bestiata
- (37) N-ata: *quantity that can be carried by/in N*
aulata, armadiata, barcata, boccata, bracciata, borsata, bustata, camerata, camionata, cartellata
- (38) N-ata: *period of time of N*:
giornata, annata, aprilata, dicembrata, gennaiata
- (39) N-ata: *meal prepared on the base of N*: *fungata, carciofata, cipollata*
- (40) N-ata: object constructed by the *repetition of N*: *arcata, colonnata, facciata*
- (41) N-ata: *weather verb*: *acquata, albata*

Scalise (1986, 209) presents the categorization (42) of the different patterns. He summarizes his observations: “Quando *-ata* si aggiunge a nomi presenta una grande varietà di parafrasi (6i-vi), ma quando si aggiunge a verbi ha solamente una parafrasi (6viii), che è diversa da quelle date per i nomi.”

- (42) Scalise (1986, 209)

(i)	<i>piede</i>		<i>pedata</i>	“colpo di N”
(ii)	<i>cucchiaino</i>		<i>cucchiata</i>	“quantità contenuta in N”
(iii)	<i>cretino</i>		<i>cretinata</i>	“atto da N”
(iv)	<i>cancello</i>		<i>cancellata</i>	“insieme di N”
(v)	<i>anno</i>		<i>annata</i>	“successione di N”
(vi)	<i>arancio</i>		<i>aranciata</i>	“prodotto di N”
(vii)	<i>guardare</i>		<i>guardata</i>	“singolo atto di N”

3.3 The form of the suffix

It is controversial if we have only one suffix for verbal and nominal bases, or if there are two suffixes, *-a* for the verbal bases, and *-ata* for nominal bases. The latter position is taken by Scalise. If we assume that there is only one suffix, it is not so clear what its form looks like: *-ata*, *-ta* or only *-a*. I first present the analysis for the derivations from the verb and then I discuss the approaches to derivations from nominal bases.

3.3.1 Analysis of V-nominalizations⁹

V-nominalizations are formed by suffixing a feminine *-a* suffix to the past participle of the verb, yielding a feminine nominal form, as illustrated in (43)

(43) Derivation of V-nominalizations

1. Base (+ theme vowel) V		<i>ferm-a</i>
2. Past participle	[[V] +PP] _{pastpart}	<i>fermat-</i>
3 Deverbal nominalization	[[V] +PP] _{pastpart+a} N	<i>fermata</i>

The analysis is supported by the fact that V-nominalizations of this type follows the form of the participles in the different conjugation classes of Italian, as illustrated in (44), and also the irregular forms, as illustrated in (45) (for more discussion see Samek-Lodovici 1997, Ippolito 1999):

(44) Past participle and nominalization in “-ata”

conj.	verbal base	past participle	nominalization
-are	<i>sal-a-re</i> “to salt”	<i>sal-at-o</i>	<i>sal-at-a</i>
-ere	<i>batt-e-re</i> “to beat”	<i>batt-ut-o</i>	<i>butt-ut-a</i>
-ire	<i>dorm-i-re</i> “to sleep”	<i>dorm-it-o</i>	<i>dorm-it-a</i>

(45) Irregular past participle and nominalization in “-ata”

verbal base	past participle	nominalization
<i>compar-i-re</i> “to appear”	<i>compar-s-o</i>	<i>compar-s-a</i>
<i>corr-e-re</i> “to run”	<i>cor-s-o</i>	<i>cor-s-a</i>
<i>prend-e-re</i> “to take”	<i>pre-s-o</i>	<i>pre-s-a</i>

I am not totally convinced by this argument since the irregular forms go back to the Latin forms, and they might probably be determined by phonological rules that apply to verbal as well as nominal forms.

3.3.2 Analysis of N-nominalizations

There are two options for the analysis of N-nominalizations in *-ata*: the first option is taken by Scalise (1986), who assumes that the V-nominalizations are formed by a suffix *-a*, while the N-nominalization are formed by a different suffix *-ata*. However, this analysis would separate the nominalizations into two subtypes with two different derivational processes.¹⁰ Therefore, Samek-Lodovici (1997), Ippolito (1999), among others, have suggested that N-nominalizations are derived by the same suffix *-a* as the V-nominalization. They assume an additional derivation from the nominal base to a (virtual) verbal base, according to the

⁹ This section based on Samek-Lodovici (1997, 3-4).

¹⁰ Samek-Lodovici (1997, 22): “Italian a-nominalizations constitute one of the strongest challenge to Aronoff’s (1979) Unitary Base Hypothesis, because they productively allow for both verbal and nominal bases. This work argues that contrary to appearance, every morphological step within the derivation of a-nominalization satisfies Aronoff’s Unitary Base Hypothesis.

following schema (46) and the examples (21)-(24), repeated in (47): for the derivation of *martellata*, we assume a nominal base *martell(-o)* (“hammer”), which is then transformed into a verbal base *martell_V*. This is also documented by the verb *martellare* “to hammer”. Then the perfect participle is formed: *martellat*, the N-nominalization is formed, and finally the feminine agreement marker *-a* is attached to it. The same derivation holds for *beccata*. We assume the same steps for the derivation *bocc-ata*, even though the intermediate verbal forms are not documented nor do they seem to be accepted forms of Italian.

(46) Derivation of N-nominalizations

1. Base N
2. Derivation to V (+ theme vowel) [N]_V
3. Past participle [[N]_V + PP]_{pastpart}
- 4 Deverbal nominalization [[N]_V + PP]_{pastpart+a}[N]

(47)

1 N	<i>martell_N</i> - “hammer”	<i>becc_N</i> - “beak”	<i>bocc_N</i> - “mouth”
2 V	<i>martell_V</i> - (<i>martellare</i>)	<i>becc_V</i> - (<i>beccare</i>)	<i>bocc_V</i> - (<i>*boccare</i>)
3 Vpp	<i>martell-at-</i> (<i>martellato</i>)	<i>becc-at-</i> (<i>beccato</i>)	<i>bocc-at</i> (<i>*boccatto</i>)
4 Nom	<i>martell-at-a_N</i> “hammerblow”	<i>becc-at-a_N</i> (i) “peck” (ii) “beakfull”	<i>bocc-at-a_N</i> “mouthful”

To sum up, there are different analyses of the nominalizations in *-ata*. I do not take a position here, rather I follow Mayo et al (1995, 913):

“We can either assume, between the base noun and the derived noun, an intermediate derived verb and its participle – even if this verb is not lexicalized, as in (87) – or we can assume that the derivation is more direct, as in (88), and that the corresponding verb, if already lexicalized, is derived independently. Then we would have, as examples:

(87) [telefono]_N -> [telefonare]_V -> [telefonato]_P -> [telefonata]_N

[occhio]_N -> [²occhiare]_V -> [²occhiato]_P -> [occhiato]_N

(88) [telefono]_N -> [telefonata]_N

[telefono]_N -> [telefonare]_V

[occhio]_N -> [occhiato]_N

It is not necessary here to decide between the alternatives (they are indeed two parallel path to the same goal in the case of *telefonata*). For the sake of simplicity we shall assume the more direct derivations shown in (88), using a single derivational operator that leads directly from a noun to an event.”

Still, we have to account for the contribution of the suffix *-ata* to the meaning of the derivation. I investigate this contribution at the level of argument structure and different lexical representations.

4. Argument-structure of *ata*-nominalizations

Samek-Lodovici (1997, 1999) after Grimshaw (1990), observes that the argument structure of the base is still available in the nominalization. He provides light verb constructions with the necessary arguments - thematic transfer (Samek-Lodovici 1997, 15ff):

4.1 Thematic transfer

Thematic transfer can be illustrated by comparing complex predicates arising from the nominalization of intransitive verbs, such as *camminare* ("to walk") in (48), and complex predicates from unaccusative verbs, such as *cadere* ("to fall") in (31). In both cases, the argument slot of the light verb *fare* is filled with the theta role provided by the nominalization. Thus, the subject in (30) is an agent, and a theme in (49):

(48) fare [una camminata]
do a walking
fare(X) — camminata(agent)

|—————|
(49) fare [una brutta caduta]
do a bad fall
fare(X) — caduta(theme)

The assumption of thematic transfer, and therefore the assumption of an argument structure in nominalizations, is supported by the alternation between *fare* and *dare*. The verb *lavare* takes an agent and a theme. In (50) only one role is transferred, so *fare* is used. In (51) two roles are available such that *dare* is used.

(50) fare [una bella lavata di camicie]
do a beautiful washing of shirts
fare(X) — lavata(agent, theme)

|—————|
(51) dare [una lavata] [a-lle camicie]
do a washing to-the shirts
dare(X, Y) — lavata(agent, theme)

————— ————
|—————|

Samek-Lodovici (1997, 16) concludes “the complex predicate of V-nominalizations involves a transfer of the thematic roles originally associated with the underlying verbal bases. This transfer determines what light verb is selected and the thematic roles the latter assigns.”

Samek-Lodovici (1997, 16f.) extends this analysis to N-nominalizations. He assumes that they also have an argument structure which is provided by the intermediate (virtual) verb. Therefore, in (52) and (53), the light verb *dare* is selected since two roles are available:

- (52) *dare* [una ginocchiata] [a qualcosa]
to give a knee-ATA to something “to hit something with the knee”
- (53) *dare* [una martellata] [a qualcosa]
to give a hammer-ATA to something “to hit something with a hammer”

In contrast to derivations with the pattern of *hitting with N*, derivations of the type *acting like N* as *bambinata*, form a complex predicate with *fare*. This indicates that they only provide one argument, namely the agent.

- (54) *fare* [una bambinata]
to do a child-ATA “to make an action typical of a child”

4.2 Contribution of the suffix *-ata*

Ippolito (1999, section 3.1) points out that the nominalization receives aspectual properties from the suffix, rather than from the light verb:

“For example, according to Vendler's verb classification, the verb *guardare* “to look” is an activity verb, and as such, can be modified by *for*-adverbials, as shown in (38a). Crucially, the *ata* nominalization *guardata* in (38b) forces an accomplishment interpretation, incompatible with *for*-adverbials. I would like to suggest that the telic component present in the light verb + *ata* nominalization comes from the nominalization itself, in particular from its aspectual head.”

- (55a) L'ho guardato per cinque minuti
[=38a] “I looked at him for five minutes”
- (55b) *Gli ho dato una guardata per cinque minuti
To-him I gave a look-*ata* for five minutes
“I gave him a look for five minutes”

The same is true for the an *ata* nominalization in (56a), as shown by the contrast in (56b)

- (56a) *Gli ho dato una coltellata per trenta secondi
To-him I gave a knife-ata for thirty seconds
“I gave him a stab for a minute”
- (56b) *Gli ho dato una coltellata [in] trenta secondi
To-him I gave a knife-ata in thirty seconds
“I gave him a stab in a minute”

Thus Ippolito concludes that the telicity cannot come from the light verb *dare*, but from the suffix *-ata*.

5. Conceptual patterns and selectional restrictions

Nominalizations of *-ata* are quite productive: formed from verbal bases, they denote an instance of an event described by the verb. Formed from a nominal base, they show a great variety of meanings. This variety is comparable to the meaning variations of denominal verbs. However, lexicalized forms follow a closed set of patterns, as illustrated in section 3.2. This closed set of patterns also influences the production and the interpretation of spontaneous new forms, as it will be shown below.

The question is which factors may restrict or determine the pattern applied. In the following I concentrate on four patterns, the *hit with N*, *acting as N*, *capacity of N to transport*, and *meal made of N*. A simplified observation is that conceptual properties of the nominal base determine which of the potential pattern can be applied and which not. The conceptual properties, i.e. properties under which we perceive certain objects, are represented as semantic features of the lexical entries. We can now give a schematic representation of the different patterns, as in (57). E.g., the hit-pattern denotes an event that consists of the structure: *hit(e,x,y,N)*, where the base *N* is in the Instrument slot of that predicate (or event). The object we can hit with must be solid and not too large (otherwise we were not able to hit with it), therefore the base must have the semantic features [+solid] and [+small]. Similar observations lead to the characterization given in (57):

(57) The Structures of the patterns to form nominalizations with *-ata*

Pattern	predicate structure	semantic role of N	semantic features of N	referential argument
hit with N	hit(e, x, y, with N)	Instrument	+solid, +manageable	e (event)
acting as N	acting(x, as N)	Agens	+ human	e (event)
capacity of N	transport(x, y, with N)	Instrument (capacity)	-human, +capacity ¹¹	theme (amount that is carried)
meal made with/of N	prepare(x, y, with/of N)	Instrument / Base	+eatable	y: result of the event

It seems that we can assign to each pattern a characteristic set of semantic features. If this is correct, we should be able to predict from the semantic features of the base the potential pattern of an *ata*-nominalization. This is born out in (58), where I give the semantic features for *libro*, *ragazzo*, *bocca*, *fungo*, *becco* and *barca*, predicting the pattern of the nominalization. The prediction is confirmed by the lexicalized forms of these bases (see above section 3.2, and index).

(58) conceptual properties of nominal bases for lexicalized forms in *-ata*

base	human	eatable	capacity	solid	manag eable	Type of <i>-ata</i>
<i>libro</i>	-	-	-	+	+	hit
<i>ragazzo</i>	+	-	-	-	-	acting
<i>bocca</i>	-	-	+	-	+	capacity
<i>fungo</i>	-	+	-	-	+	meal
<i>becco</i>	-	-	+	+	+	cap., hit
<i>barca</i>	-	-	+	+	-	capacity

(59) conceptual properties of nominal bases for spontaneous forms in *-ata*

base	human	eatable	capacity	solid	manag eable	Type of <i>-ata</i>
<i>sedia</i>	-	-	-	+	+	hit

¹¹ Cf. Collin (1918, 189): “[...] le primitif est *un instrument d’une certaine capacité*.”

In the next step I propose to make predictions for potential patterns for spontaneous forms (i.e. non-lexicalized forms). The base *sedia* “chair” has the semantic features +solid +small (relative small). Therefore, one would expect that the form *sediata* denotes a “hit with a chair”. The result of an internet search has provided the following text (60), which confirms the predictions. This text is very informal and close to spontaneous speech. It is interesting to note that there is another *-ata* form from the verb *sedere*, namely, *seduta* “sitting, meeting” (see 6):

(60) Road Dogg e Steve Blackman si affrontano per il titolo hardcore, azione molto violenta come sempre. **DDT di Dogg ma Blackman reagisce con una sedziata in testa che gli vale il pin vincente.** X-Pac che commentava l'incontro con Jim Ross e Jerry Lawler, dice che lui e Road Dogg hanno discusso su chi sia il miglior wrestler singolo tra loro 2, e che dopo stasera, sfiderà Blackman a Smackdown per il titolo hardcore.

“(...) Dogg reacted to Blackman with a “sedziata” on the head that was worth the victory-PIN...”

(Source: <http://www.geocities.com/Colosseum/Track/5544/riw2407.html> WWF Raw Is Review - By Erik Ganzerli, Edizione del 24.07.2000)

(61) *seduta* “sitting, meeting” from *sedere* “to be seated, to be sitting”

6. Lexical representations

I assume that the suffix *-ata* has the following functions:

- (i) it changes the categorial properties of the base to [N, fem],
- (ii) it shifts the referential argument to the event argument (or some resultative one)
- (iii) it characterizes the event as a single event or an instance of an event.¹²
- (iv) it requires additional restrictions which are determined by the conceptual structure of the base¹³ determined by the conceptual structure of the base

In the following, I confine the discussion to the conceptual information of the base that restricts the patterns that are associated with nominalizations in *-ata*.

¹² Cf. already Collin (1918, 153) and quotations therein (e.g. Meyer-Lübke 1890)

¹³ Schwarze (2001, 15ff) argues that *ata*-nominalizations are rather underspecified in their meaning. They need additional information from the conceptual system: “Dove trova il parlante la risoluzione delle variabili create dall’oparatore *-ata*? Le informazioni necessarie a questo scopo non fanno parte del lessico definito come componente della grammatica mentale, bensì del sistema concettuale.”

The common function of the suffix is to refer to a single event of the type of the base. This is best seen in the case of a verbal base, generally described in (62). An event is called individualized (or “instance of P”) if every event e' that is a P does not overlap (or is not identical) with e . So we can have two instances of stabbing, but they do not overlap. They are rather distinguishable, and therefore we can count them (cf. Krifka 1989 for the kind of formalism). We can combine the lexical meaning of *entra-re* with the suffix, yielding the nominalization in (62a):

(62) **(instance)** V-ata: “single event of V”

ata: $\lambda e P [P(e) \ \& \ \text{INDIV}(e)]$

$P \ e \ \text{INDIV}(e) \quad P(e) \ \& \ e' [P(e') \quad \neg \ e'' [e'' \ e \ \& \ e'' \ e']]$

(62a) *entra + ata*

$e \ x \ \text{enter}(e, x) \ \lambda e \ P [P(e) \ \& \ \text{INDIV}(e)]$

$\lambda e [\text{enter}(e, x) \ \& \ \text{INDIV}(e)]$

For nominalizations from a nominal base, I assume the same common function of the suffix, but additional restriction of the kind of the predicate P . Thus we get several patterns that differ in they way the predicate P is spelled out. It is the thematic structure, the argument role of the base and the conceptual restriction on that argument (represented by selectional restrictions).

(63) **(hit)** N-ata: Event of hitting with N or “hitting with N”

$P = \text{hit}(e, x, y \text{ with } N)$

ata: $N \ \lambda e [\text{hit}(e, x, y \text{ with } N) \ \& \ \text{INDIV}(e)]$

N: +solid + small

(63a) *libr-ata*

$\lambda x [\text{book}(x)] \ N \ \lambda e [\text{hit}(e, x, y \text{ with } N_{[+solid, +small]}) \ \& \ \text{INDIV}(e)]$

$\lambda e [\text{hit}(e, x, y \text{ with } \text{book}) \ \& \ \text{INDIV}(e)]$

(64) **(acting)** N-ata: Event typically performed by N or “acting as N”

$P = \text{act}(x, \text{ as } N)$

ata: $N \ \lambda e [\text{act}(x, \text{ as } N) \ \& \ \text{INDIV}(e)]$

N: +human

(64a) *ragazz-ata*

$\lambda x [\text{child}(x)] \ N \ \lambda e [\text{act}(x, \text{ as } N_{[+human]}) \ \& \ \text{INDIV}(e)]$

$\lambda e [\text{act}(x, \text{ as } \text{child}) \ \& \ \text{INDIV}(e)]$

(65) **(capacity)** N-ata: Capacity that can be carried by/in N

$P = \text{transp}(x, y, \text{ with } N)$

ata: $N \ \lambda y [\text{transp}(e, x, y \text{ with } N) \ \& \ \text{INDIV}(e)]$

N: +container

(65a) *bocc-ata*

λx [**mouth**(x)] N λy [transp(x, y, in N_[+container]) & INDIV(e)]
 λy [transp(x, y, in mouth) & INDIV(e)]

(66) (**meal**) N-ata. Meal prepared on the base of N:

P = prep(x, y, with N)

ata: N λy [prep(x, y, with N) & INDIV(e)]

N:₊eatable

(66a) *fung-ata*

λx [**mushroom**(x)] N λy [prep(x, y, with N_[+eatable]) & INDIV(e)]

λy [prep(x, y, with **mushroom**) & INDIV(e)]

7. Summary

The investigation of the productivity of Italian deverbal and denominal nominalizations in *-ata* has shown the following points:

- The suffix *-ata* very productively forms nominalizations from verbal and from nominal bases
- The suffix has a common function:
 - categorial function: nouns in the feminine gender
 - describing an individualized event or instance of an event
 - describing events in which the base is pragmatically salient
- The notion of “pragmatically salient” can be spelled out in certain patterns for denominal derivations.
- These patterns are generally found in lexicalized forms. But they are also prominent patterns for spontaneous derivations
- The choice of such a pattern depends on other factors from the conceptual appearance of the objects associated with the base.
- The conceptual appearance of objects are encoded in semantic features associated with the base
- A more complex conceptual structure, interaction with other items or relation between different items must be investigated.

References

Alexander, Luther H [1912] 1966. *Participial Substantives of the -ata Type in the Romance Languages with Special Reference to French*. Reprint [of the edition] New York 1912. New York: Ams Pr.

Appel, Ernst 1883. *De genere neutro intereunte in lingua latina*. Dissertation Erlangen.

Aronoff, Mark 1979. *Word Formation in Generative Grammar*. Cambridge/Mass.: MIT Press.

- Bierwisch, Manfred 1989. Event-Nominalizations. Proposals and Problems. In: W. Motsch (ed.). *Wortstruktur und Satzstruktur*. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1-73.
- Clark, Eve & Clark, Herbert 1979. When nouns surface as verbs. *Language* 55, 767-811.
- Collin, Carl S 1914. Zur Geschichte der Nomina actionis im Romanischen. *Archiv für lateinische Lexikographie und Grammatik* 13, 453-473.
- Collin, Carl S 1918. *Étude sur le développement de sens du suffixe -ata (it. -ata, prov., esp., port. -ata, fr. -ée, -ade) dans les langues romanes, spécialement au point de vue du français*. Lund : Lindstedts.
- Ehrich, Veronika 1991. Nominalisierungen. In: A. von Stechow & D. Wunderlich (eds.). *Semantik. Ein internationales Handbuch der zeitgenössischen Forschung*. Berlin: de Gruyter, 441-458.
- Ehrich, Veronika & Rapp, Irene 2000. Sortale Bedeutung und Argumentstruktur: ung-Nominalisierungen im Deutschen. *Zeitschrift für Sprachwissenschaft* 19, 245-303.
- Grimshaw, Jane 1990. *Argument Structure*. Cambridge/Mass.: MIT Pr.
- Ippolito, Michaela 1999. On the Past Participle Morphology in Italian. In: *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics* 33, 111-137.
- Jackendoff, Ray 1990. *Semantic Structures*. Cambridge/Mass.: MIT-Press.
- Jackendoff, Ray 1996. Semantics and Cognition. In: S. Lappin (ed.). *The Handbook of Contemporary Semantic Theory*. Oxford: Blackwell, 539-559.
- Jackendoff, Ray 1997. *The Architecture of the Language Faculty*. Cambridge/ Mass.: MIT Press.
- Kaufmann, Ingrid 1995. *Konzeptuelle Grundlagen semantischer Dekompositionsstrukturen. Die Kombinatorik lokaler Verben und prädikativer Komplemente*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Krifka, Manfred 1989. Nominal Reference, Temporal Constitution and Quantification in Event Semantics. In: R. Bartsch & J. van Benthem & P. van Emde Boas (eds.). *Semantics and Contextual Expressions*. Dordrecht Foris, 75-115
- Lindquist, Axel 1936. Studien über Wortbildung und Wortwahl im Althochdeutschen. *PBB [= Beiträge zur Geschichte und Sprache der deutschen Literatur]* 60, 1-132.
- Meyer-Lübke, Wilhelm 1890. *Italienische Grammatik*. Leipzig: Reisland.
- Pustejovsky, James 1991. The Syntax of Event Structure. *Cognition* 41, 47-81.
- Ruh, Kurt 1956. *Bonaventura deutsch. Ein Beitrag zur deutschen Franziskaner-Mystik u. -Scholastik*. Bern: Francke.
- Sabatini, Francesco & Coletti, Vittorio 1997. *DISC: Dizionario Italiano Sabatini Coletti*. Ed. in CD-ROM, versione 1.1. Firenze: Giunti Multimedia.
- Samek-Lodovici, Vieri 1997. *A Unified Analysis of Noun- and Verb-based Italian Nominalization in -ata*. Arbeitspapier 80. Fachgruppe Sprachwissenschaft. Universität Konstanz.
- Samek-Lodovici, Vieri 1999. *The Internal Structure of Arguments. Evidence from Italian Nominalization-based Complex Predicates*. Arbeitspapier 102. Fachgruppe Sprachwissenschaft. Universität Konstanz.
- Scalise, Sergio [1986] 1990. *Morfologia e lessico. Una prospettiva generativista*. Bologna: Il Mulino.
- Schwarze, Christoph [1988] 1995. *Grammatik der italienischen Sprache*. 2. verb. Aufl. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Schwarze, Christoph 2001. *Aspetti semantici della formazione delle parole*. Arbeitspapier 106. Fachbereich Sprachwissenschaft. Universität Konstanz.
- Stiebels, Barbara 1996. *Lexikalische Argumente und Adjunkte. Zum semantischen Beitrag von verbalen Präfixen und Partikeln*. *Studia grammatica* 39. Berlin: Akademie Verlag.
- Wunderlich, Dieter 1997. CAUSE and the structure of verbs. In: *Linguistic Inquiry* 28. 27-68.

Appendix: Conceptual data-base

1. Description

This very small fragment of a prototype of a conceptual base should illustrate that the conceptual structure of the base determines the pattern of *ata*-nominalizations. In section 5 we have categorized four types of patterns with respect to the conceptual structure of their base (cf. (58)):

(1) conceptual properties of nominal bases for lexicalized forms in *-ata*

base	human	eatable	capacity	solid	manag.	Type of <i>-ata</i>
<i>libro</i>	-	-	-	+	+	hit
<i>ragazzo</i>	+	-	-	-	-	acting
<i>bocca</i>	-	-	+	-	+	capacity
<i>fungo</i>	-	+	-	-	+	meal
<i>becco</i>	-	-	+	+	+	cap., hit
<i>barca</i>	-	-	+	+	-	capacity

Further, we assume a very small sample of conceptual properties, namely those properties that determine the pattern of *ata*-derivations: The property to be a human or not, to be eatable (also after some processing), the property of being able to contain or transport something (= \pm capacity), the property to be solid, and the property to be manageable (= mang). This is a very relational concept since it depends on the actor what is manageable or not. The original feature \pm small was somewhat more absolute, but this caused more problems. We can now repeat the patterns and their conceptual features of the bases. The features in the doubled lined boxes are the relevant ones.

2. Conceptual properties and pattern

	1. Type <i>hit with N</i>	2. Type <i>acting as N</i>	3. Type <i>capacity of N</i>	4. Type <i>meal</i> <i>prepared on</i> <i>the base of N</i>
human	-	+	-	-
eatable		-		+
capacity		-	+	
solid	+			
manag	+	-		

For the time being, it is not so clear to me whether the negative features exclude the application of a pattern or not. For example, the [-human] in the first type – this can also follow from the assumption that we do not use human to hit with.

In the following I give examples for each type: first three examples for lexicalized forms, then three examples for spontaneous forms that are acceptable, and finally some examples for non-acceptable forms. All this judgements are according to the list of Samek-Lodovici (1998). He extracted a list from the *Lessico di frequenza dell italiano parlato* (De Mauro, Mancini, Vedovelli, Voghera 1993). The judgements are his own (and not uncontroversial). The non-acceptable forms cannot assigned to a certain pattern, while the acceptable forms can often be assigned to more than one pattern.

(3) Types of ata-nominalizations and examples

Type of <i>ata</i>	lexicalized	acceptable spontaneous forms	non-acceptable spontanouns forms
1. Type <i>hit with N</i>	<i>becco</i> “beak, bill” <i>braccio</i> “arm” <i>forca</i> “fork”	<i>cappa</i> “cape” <i>catena</i> “chain” <i>sedia</i> “chair”	<i>lira</i> “lira”
2. Type <i>acting as N</i>	<i>ragazzo</i> “child” <i>bambino</i> “child” <i>coglione</i> “dickhead”	<i>autore</i> “author” <i>fratello</i> “brother” <i>genitore</i> “parent”	<i>cane</i> “dog”
3. Type <i>capacity of N</i>	<i>barco</i> “boat” <i>bocca</i> “mouth” <i>braccio</i> “arm”	<i>aula</i> “lecture room” <i>busta</i> “envelope” <i>camion</i> “lorry, truck”	<i>carta</i> “paper, card”
4. Type <i>meal prepared on the base of N</i>	<i>cipolla</i> “onion” <i>limone</i> “lemon”	<i>agnello</i> “lamb” <i>formaggio</i> “cheese” <i>fungo</i> “mushroom”	<i>caffè</i> “coffee”

In the following I present first the lexicalized forms, the acceptable, and then the non-acceptable forms. All forms will appear with the

- 1. nominalized form ***beccata*** + English gloss **“peck”**
- 2. the base form ***becco*** + English gloss **“beak, bill”**
- 3. the conceptual structure as a list of features
- [\pm human] [-human]
- [\pm eatable] [-eatable]
- [\pm capacity] [+capacity]
- [\pm solid] [+solid]
- [\pm manag] [+manag]
- 4. the matching patterns \Rightarrow 1. hit with N
- \Rightarrow 3. capacity of N

2. Lexicalized Forms

Lexicalized forms are those ata-nominalizations that can be found in dictionaries. The one used here is DISC (see references). The entry is given on the right site (Unfortunately, for problems of incompatibility the text is not quite clear). The entry often list additional readings (or patterns), which can not be discussed here because of lack of space. Furthermore, the entry might show obsolete meanings or uses.

2.1 Type 1: *hit with N*

beccata (14th cent)
“peck”

becco “beak, bill”

[–human]

[–eatable]

[+capacity] 3

[+solid] 1.

[+manag] 1.

1. hit with N

3. capacity of N

beccata [bec-ca-ta] **sostantivo f.**

1. Colpo di becco, quantità di cibo assunta col becco

2. **estens.** Puntura di insetto > fig. punzecchiatura, battuta offensiva; in partito, **in teatro**, intervento del pubblico che riprende un attore

deriv.: di *beccare* con *-ata* ▶ sec. XIV (2)

bracciata (14th cent)
“armful”

braccio “arm”

[±human]

[–eatable]

[+capacity] 3

[+solid] 1.

[+manag] 1.

1. hit with N

3. capacity of N

bracciata [brac-ci-a-ta] **sostantivo f.**

1. Quantità di materiale che può essere contenuta tra le braccia || fig. a bracciare, in grande quantità

2. Movimento che il nuotatore compie con ciascun braccio per avanzare lo spazio percorso con ognuno di tali movimenti

3. **ant.** Abbraccio

4. **non com.** Colpo inferto col braccio

diminutivo **bracchetta**, **bracciatina**

deriv.: di *braccio* con *-ata* ▶ sec. XIV

forcata (15th cent)
“forkful”
“stroke with a fork”

forca “fork”

[-human]
[-eatable]
[+capacity] 3
[+solid] 1.
[+manag] 1.
1. hit with N
3. capacity of N

2.2. Type acting as N

ragazzata (16th cent)
“childish action”

ragazzo “child”

[+human] 2
[-eatable]
[±capacity]
[±solid]
[-manag]
2. acting as N

bambinata (18th cent)
“childish action”

bambino “child”

[+human] 2
[-eatable]
[±capacity]
[±solid]
[-manag]
2. acting as N

forcata [for.ca.ta] sostantivo f.

1. Colpo di forca
2. Quantità di paglia, fieno ecc. che si può sollevare con la forca, una f. di paglia.

☐ deriv. di *forca* con -ata • sec. XV

ragazzata [ra.gaz.za.ta] sostantivo f.

Azione degna di un ragazzo, compiuta cioè senza riflessione, in modo avventato è stata una f. alla sua età fa errore delle f. || che ragazzata!, che sciocchezza, che stupidaggine!

☐ deriv. di *ragazzo* con -ata • sec. XVI

bambinata [bam.bi.na.ta] sostantivo f.

1. Cosa, azione, discorso da bambino ☐
bambinaggine
2. estens. Cosa facile: ho imperato presto; è una b. comportamento immaturo.
☐ ragazzata

☐ deriv. di *bambino* con -ata • sec. XVIII

coglionata (1970)
 “foolish act, bullshit”
 dire una coglionata
 “to talk a load of balls”

coglione “...”, 2. “dickhead”

[+human] 2
 [-eatable]
 [±capacity]
 [±solid]
 [-manag]

2. acting as N

2.3. Type capacity of N

barcata (18th cent)
 “boatload”

barco “boat”

[-human]
 [-eatable]
 [+capacity] 3
 [+solid]
 [-manag]

3. capacity of N

boccata (14th cent)
 “mouthful”

bocca “mouth”

[±human]
 [-eatable]
 [+capacity] 3
 [-solid]
 [-manag]

3. capacity of N

coglionata [co-gliw:na-ta] **sostantivo f.**

volg.: Spoglio grossolano e stafa una c. rifiutare quell'offerta anche stupidaggine non dire coglionate!

☐ deriv. di coglione con -ata • a.: 1970

barcata [bar-ca-ta] **sostantivo f.**

1. Quanto può caricare e trasportare una barca

2. fig.: Grande quantità: avere una b. di problemi, di soldi

☐ deriv. di barca con -ata nell'accezz. 2.: confluenza semantica di barca e barca • sec. XVII

boccata [boc-ca-ta] **sostantivo f.**

1. Quantità che può essere contenuta nella bocca una b. di minestra, di rumo prendere una boccata d'aria, uscire per una breve passeggiata

2. ant. Schiatta dato sulla bocca

☐ lat. volg. *buccaja, deriv. di class. bucca “bocca” • sec. XIV

bracciata (14th cent)
“armful, stroke”

braccio “arm”

[?human, + capacity]

[±human]
[-eatable]
[+capacity] 3
[-solid]
[-manag]

3. capacity of N

bracciata [brac-ci-a-ta] **sostantivo f.**

1. Quantità di materiale che può essere contenuta tra le braccia. || fig. a bracciare, in grande quantità
2. Movimento che il nuotatore compie con ciascun braccio per avanzare lo spazio percorso con ognuno di tali movimenti
3. ant. Abbraccio
4. non com. Colpo inferto col braccio.

diminutivo **bracchetta**, **bracciatina**

deriv. di *braccio* con -ata • sec. XIV

2.4. Type meal prepared on the base of N (= meal of N)

cipollata (15th cent)
“dish made of onions”

cipolla “onion”

[-human]
[+eatable] 4
[-capacity]
[±solid]
[±manag]

4. meal of N

cipollata [ci-pol-la-ta] **sostantivo f.**

1. Pietanza a base di cipolle
2. fig. Con valore spregiativo, opera artistica mal composta, goffa

deriv. di *cipolla* con -ata • sec. XV

limonata (17th cent)
“lemonade”

limone “lemon”

[-human]
[+eatable] 4
[-capacity]
[-solid]
[±manag]

4. meal/
drink of N

limonata [li-mo-na-ta] **sostantivo f.**

1. Bevanda preparata con succo di limone e acqua, perlopiù con l'aggiunta di zucchero, spremuta di limone, bibita aromatizzata al limone di ampia diffusione commerciale
2. Soluzione farmaceutica liquida contenente acido citrico e utilizzata come purgante
3. region. Nel f. popolare, serie di effusioni sentimentali

deriv. di *limone* con -ata • sec. XVI

3. Acceptable spontaneous forms

Since the following forms are spontaneous forms, they are not listed in a lexicon. They might be included in some time or they might just disappear. Therefore, I give only the base, its meaning, the conceptual structure and the pattern. The meaning of the derivation can be inferred from this.

3.1 Type 1: *hit with N*

<i>cappata</i> <i>cappa</i> “cape”	<i>catenata</i> <i>catena</i> “chain”	<i>sediata</i> <i>sedia</i> “chair” (see p. 16)
[–human] [–eatable] [–capacity] [+solid] 1. [+manag] 1.	[–human] [–eatable] [–capacity] [+solid] 1. [+manag] 1.	[–human] [–eatable] [±capacity] [+solid] 1. [+manag] 1.
1. hit with N	1. hit with N	1. hit with N

3.2 Type 2: *acting as N*

<i>autorata</i> <i>autore</i> “author”	<i>fratellata</i> <i>fratello</i> “brother”	<i>genitorata</i> <i>genitore</i> “parent”
[+human] 2 [–eatable] [–capacity] [–solid] [–manag]	[+human] 2 [–eatable] [–capacity] [–solid] [–manag]	[+human] 2 [–eatable] [–capacity] [–solid] [–manag]
2. <i>acting as N</i>	2. <i>acting as N</i>	2. <i>acting as N</i>

3.3 Type 3: *capacity of N*

<i>aulata</i> <i>aula</i> “lecture room”	<i>bustata</i> <i>busta</i> “envelope”	<i>camionata</i> <i>camion</i> “lorry, truck”
[–human] [–eatable] [+capacity] 3 [±solid] [–manag]	[–human] [–eatable] [+capacity] 3 [+solid] [–manag]	[–human] [–eatable] [+capacity] 3 [+solid] [–manag]
3. capacity of N	3. capacity of N	3. capacity of N

3.4 Type 4: meal prepared on the base of N

<i>agnellata</i> <i>agnello</i> “lamb”	<i>formaggiata</i> <i>formaggio</i> “cheese”	<i>fungata</i> <i>fungo</i> “mushroom”
[–human]	[–human]	[–human]
[+eatable] 4	[+eatable] 4	[+eatable] 4
[–capacity]	[–capacity]	[–capacity]
[±solid]	[±solid]	[±solid]
[±manag]	[±manag]	[±manag]
4. meal of N	4. meal of N	4. meal of N

4. Non-acceptable spontaneous forms

In some cases an ata-nominalization is not acceptable, even though there might fit a pattern, as in **lirata*. The reasons can be different: May be a hit with a coin is not a real hit, or the base *lira* is rather conceived as an abstract measurement. In the case of **canata*, one could imagine a hit with a dog or a behavior as a dog – but both interpretation would need much more contextual confirmation. The case of **cartata* is of particular interest since it is a minimal pair with *bustata* in 3.3. However, *busta* (“envelope”) is conceptualized as a container or as having the capacity, while *carta* (“card”) is not. **caffata* could be a meal or a drink of coffee, but it seems that the base *caffè* already means that and therefore blocks this derivation.

<i>*lirata</i> <i>lira</i> “lira”	<i>*canata</i> cane “dog”
[–human]	[–human]
[–eatable]	[–eatable]
[–capacity]	[–capacity]
[+solid] 1	[±solid]
[+manag] 1	[±manag]
1. hit with a lira-coin	??
<i>*cartata</i> <i>carta</i> “paper, card”	<i>*caffata</i> <i>caffè</i> “coffee”
[–human]	[–human]
[–eatable]	[+eatable] 4.
[–capacity]	[–capacity]
[–solid]	[–solid]
[+manag]	[–manag]
???	4. <i>*meal of coffee</i>