On inflectional and derivational diminutives

1. Outline:
This talk argues for two different positions for diminutives. The first one is in the inflectional domain of the noun, between nP and NumP/DivP. The second one directly merges with the root. Therefore, it can occur below xP (with xP in the sense of Marantz 2001), for example below nP and vP. The two positions differ with respect to **i)** productivity; **ii)** compositionality of meaning; and **iii)** strategy of word-formation. These effects are defined in terms of syntactic structure.

2. Main data:
In Italian, morphemes such as *–ino* and *–etto* can be used both to diminutivize a noun ((1), labeled DIM_{SIZE}) and to derive a new lexeme ((2), labeled DIM_{LEX}). DIM_{SIZE} always gives predictable meanings, viz. smallness. Therefore, it is odd to combine it with an augmentative (3). Furthermore, it is completely productive; any noun may have a diminutive. In contrast, DIM_{LEX} yields unpredictable or specific meanings and shows many lexical gaps. It does not qualify an independent noun, nor does it necessarily imply small size. This is shown by its compatibility with augmentatives (4). Moreover, DIM_{SIZE} and DIM_{LEX} can occur simultaneously (5).

3. Proposal:
We propose the structure in (6) for *pan-in-ett-o* 'small sandwich'. This structure involves the initial merger of a root with a projection LexP, which harbors bound affixes such as DIM_{LEX} (*-in-* in this case). This merger yields meaningful, possibly non-compositional items. LexP may then merge with different xP's, which in turn can be modified by inflectional material. In the case of a nominal structure (as in (6)), these inflections include Size (in this case *-ett-* DIM_{SIZE}, but we assume AUG_{SIZE} is inserted at this level, too) and/or Number (singular *-o* in (6)).

4. Predictions:
The structure in (6) makes the following *cross-linguistic* predictions: **i)** there can be languages that, unlike Italian, formally distinguish between the two types of diminutives; **ii)** as in examples (4) and (5), both positions can be filled at the same time in other languages; and **iii)** the material in LexP could be oblivious to the category above it, whereas the material in SizeP is only licensed as nominal inflection.

Prediction 1: Two different realizations of diminutives
There are at least two strategies of diminutivization in Modern Hebrew: one is through concatenation of *–on* (Concat.Dim in (7)), and the other is templatic reduplication (Temp.Dim in (7)). The reduplicated diminutive is lexical: it applies to a closed group of roots ('pig' and 'onion', but not 'donkey') and may have a specific interpretation. This behaviour is typical of Lexical material, which we position in LexP. We thus expect this strategy to reflect direct merger with the root. Indeed, it is assumed that templaticity results from direct merger of a template morpheme with the root.

In contrast, the suffix *-on* is always compositionally diminutive (unlike Italian *-in-*) and is fully productive (=has no lexical gaps). Given these properties, it clearly realizes SizeP (rather than LexP); it is in the noun's inflectional domain.

We thus observe that Modern Hebrew, like Italian, has two positions for diminutive formation: LexP and SizeP. These two positions are realized using two radically different morphological strategies: concatenation and templatic reduplication. Size-related concatention is excluded from LexP in Modern Hebrew, and SizeP cannot be realized templatically.

Prediction 2: The two diminutives can co-occur.
We have shown that the two positions can be realized simultaneously for Italian (cf. (4-5) above); we predict this will be so for Modern Hebrew as well. Indeed, *xazarzir-on* 'small piglet', which uses both strategies simultaneously, is perfectly licit.

Prediction 3: LexP can be the base for either nP or vP; SizeP only modifies nP
Non-concatenative morphology: The verbs in (8) belong to paradigm II, which has a vocalization {i,e}. These verbs have corresponding templatic action-nouns with the vocalization {i,u}. This noun is not derived from the verbal form, as might be assumed by

their shared vowel [i]. First of all, they may have idiosyncratic meanings, as those in (8a,b). Secondly, as (8c,d) show, there are QiTuL nouns (where Q,T,L corresponds to the consonants) with no existing verb. Finally, some verbs (8e,f) with the vocalization {**o**,e} belong to the same paradigm as {i,e} (as shown by their common prefix *me-* in the present). But the action nouns of theses verbs *do not* share the first vowel with the verbal form; instead they have the regular{**i**,u}vocalization.

Thus, the vowel [i] of the nominal form is independent of the [i] of the verbal form. We conclude that the verbal QiTeL and nominal QiTuL are not derived from each other; rather, both are derived from the discontinuous stem QvTvL. The lexical category is expressed by the vocalization {i,e} (=verb) or {i,u} (=noun).

Back to diminutives: The roots √lxš (*laxaš* 'to whisper') and √cxk (*caxak* 'to laugh') can be modified by a reduplicating morpheme and appear in paradigm II. In this case, they have a discontinuous stem QvT**L**v**L** with a diminutive meaning (9). This stem is marked for diminutive but not for category: it serves as the base for both the verbal form QiTLeL and the nominal form QiTLuL. We thus have a diminutive positioned below the category-assigning head. The items in (9) should therefore be viewed as having a diminutive morpheme lower than the category assigning head, i.e. in the position referred to as LexP above. The relevant structures are presented in (10).

In contrast, cases were not found in which anything resembling the diminutive suffix *–on* appears in such diminutive verbal formation. This follows naturally from the claim that *-on* is part of nominal inflection and can only occupy SizeP.

Back to Italian: We now predict that the structure [$_{\text{LexP}}$ dim. [√]] could serve as the base for either nouns or verbs in Italian as well. This is indeed the case. We have seen that *-ett-* is diminutive in (5) above. In (11b), it is used non-compositionally with the root √fischi-. The verb in (11c) includes both √fischi- and *-ett-*, but it cannot be derived from the noun, as it is not restricted by the latter's meaning. Both the noun and the verb must be viewed as derived from [$_{\text{LexP}}$ dim. [√fischi]], just like the diminutive verb and noun in Hebrew. [1]

5. Summary: Two diminutives, same cross-linguistics structure

The two languages differ only in one respect: Modern Hebrew exhibits different morphological strategies in the different positions, whereas Italian uses the same strategy of concatenation in both. This difference follows from the discontinuous character of roots in Semitic languages; the structure, however, is universal. In both languages, **meaning is predictable beyond nP.** At least certain aspects of *form*, as shown by the two morphological strategies of Modern Hebrew, are also predictable beyond nP.

Having established the existence of the LexP position, the question is raised as to the exact status of the items that realize LexP. Unlike SizeP, LexP may be occupied by morphemes other than diminutives/augmentatives (such as the derivational Italian suffix *-egg-* in (12)); it is thus not the diminutive nature of the morpheme that allows it to realize LexP.

Time permitting, we discuss the significance of LexP for the different realizations of Italian theme vowels. Finally, a more general characterization of LexP (following Acquaviva's (2008) treatment of L-nodes) is advanced as a closing remark.

[1] This is the same argument used in the famous (e.g. Marantz 2001) opposition of *to hammer* (from √hammer) vs. *to tape* (from the noun *tape*); only the latter verb contains the meaning of the corresponding noun. The difference is that here even morphologically complex structures (at the proposed LexP level) can be pre-categorial.

Examples:

(1) nas-ino
nose-DIM$_{SIZE}$
'little nose'

(2) pan-ino
bread-DIM$_{LEX}$
'sandwich'

(3) *? nas-in-one
nose-DIM$_{SIZE}$-AUG$_{SIZE}$

(4) pan-in-one
bread- DIM$_{LEX}$-AUG$_{SIZE}$
'big sandwich'

(5) pan-in-etto
bread-DIM$_{LEX}$-DIM$_{SIZE}$
'small sandwich'

(6) [$_{NumP}$ o [$_{SizeP}$ -ett- [$_{nP}$ [$_{LexP}$ –in [√pan]]]]]

(7)

	Noun		*Temp.Dim.*$_{SIZE}$		*Concat.Dim*$_{LEX}$	
a.	xazir	'pig'	xazarzir	'piglet'	xazir-on	'small pig'
b.	bacal	'onion'	bcalcal	'small type of onion'	bcalon	'small onion'
c.	xamor	'donkey'	*xamarmor		xamor-on	'small donkey'

(8)

	Verb	*Participle*		*Action noun*	
a.	gidel	me-gadel	'grow'	gidul	'growing/tumor'
b.	cimek	me-camek	'shrink'	cimuk	'shrinking/raisin'
c.	-	-		sikuy	'chance'
d.	-	-		biyuv	'gutter'
e.	r**o**ken	me-r**o**ken	'empty'	r**i**kun	'emptying'
f.	p**o**cec	me-f**o**cec	'explode'	p**i**cuc	'explosion'

(9)

	Verb	*Participle*	*Action noun*	
a.	lixšeš	me-laxšeš	lixšuš	'whisper repeatedly and quietly'
b.	cixkek	me-caxkek	cixkuk	'giggle'

(10) a. [$_{vP}$ {i,e} [$_{LexP}$ ParII;dim. [√cxk]]] → cixkek 'to giggle'
b. [$_{vP}$ {i,u} [$_{LexP}$ ParII;dim. [√cxk]]] → cixkuk 'a giggle'

(11) a. fischi-o 'a whistle (the sound)'
b. fischi-ett-o 'a whistle (the object used e.g. by referees in football)'
c. fischi-ett-are 'to emit short whistles repeatedly (not necessarily with a *fischietto*)'

(12) a. bors-a 'handbag'
b. borse-ggi-o 'the act of mugging'
c. borse-ggi-are 'to mug (not just a *borsa*)'

Partial bibliography

Acquaviva, Paolo. (2008) 'Roots and lexicality in Distributed Morphology'. Paper given at the Fifth York-Essex Morphology Meeting (http://ling.auf.net/lingBuzz/000654).

Arad, Maya. (2003) Locality constraints on the interpretation of roots. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 21:736-778.

Borer, Hagit. (2005) *In name only.* Oxford: OUP.

Lowenstamm, Jean. (2008) On Little n, ROOT, and Types of Nouns: in *The Sounds of Silence: Empty Elements in Syntax and Phonology*, eds. Jutta Hartmann, Veronika Hegedus, Henk van Riemsdjik. Amsterdam: Elsevier.

Marantz, Alec. (2001) 'Words and Things'. Ms., MIT.

Stump, Gregory. (1993) How peculiar is evaluative morphology? *Journal of Linguistics* 29:1–36.

Wiltschko, Martina. (2006) *Why should diminutives count?* In: Broekhuis, Hans et.al. (eds.) Organizing grammar. Linguistic Studies in Honor of Henk Van Riemsdijk. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter: 669-679.