3.1 Allgemeine Angaben zum Teilprojekt C2

3.1.1 Titel: Case and Referential Context: Argument Realisation and Referential Context
Deutscher Titel: Kasus und referenzieller Kontext: Argumentrealisierung und referenzieller Kontext
Kurztitel: Kontext

3.1.2 Fachgebiete und Arbeitsrichtung:
Semantics and morphology; language typology

3.1.3 Leiter/in:
Prof. Dr. von Heusinger, Klaus, 22.09.1962
Universität Stuttgart
Institut für Linguistik / Germanistik
Keplerstr. 17
70174 Stuttgart
Telefon:+49-(0)711-685-83140
Telefax:+49-(0)711-685-83141
E-Mail: Klaus.vonHeusinger@ling.uni-stuttgart.de

Ist die Stelle des Leiters/der Leiterin des Projektes befristet?
☑ nein  ☐ ja, befristet bis zum _________
☐ eine weitere Beschäftigung ist vorgesehen bis zum _________

3.1.4 In dem Teilprojekt sind vorgesehen:

- Untersuchungen am Menschen oder am menschlichen Material  ☐ ja ☑ nein
  Die erforderliche Zustimmung der zuständigen Ethikkommission liegt dem Antrag zum Teilprojekt in Kopie bei  ☑ ja ☐ nein
- klinische Studien  ☐ ja ☑ nein
- Tierversuche  ☐ ja ☑ nein
- gentechnische Untersuchungen  ☐ ja ☑ nein
- Untersuchungen an humanen embryonalen Stammzellen  ☐ ja ☑ nein
  Die gesetzliche Genehmigung liegt vor  ☐ ja ☑ nein
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3.1.5 Bisherige und beantragte Förderung des Teilprojektes im Rahmen des Sonderforschungsbereichs (Ergänzungsausstattung)

Das Teilprojekt wird seit 07/2006 im Sonderforschungsbereich gefördert.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Haushaltsjahr</th>
<th>Personalmittel</th>
<th>Sachmittel</th>
<th>Investitionsmittel</th>
<th>Gesamt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006/2</td>
<td>44,1</td>
<td>0,8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>44,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>88,2</td>
<td>3,5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>91,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>88,2</td>
<td>3,5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>91,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>88,2</td>
<td>1,5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>89,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010/1</td>
<td>44,1</td>
<td>0,7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>44,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zwischen-</td>
<td>352,8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>362,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>summe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010/2</td>
<td>50,1</td>
<td>0,375</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50,475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>100,2</td>
<td>2,75</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>102,95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>100,2</td>
<td>0,75</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100,95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>100,2</td>
<td>2,75</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>102,95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014/1</td>
<td>50,1</td>
<td>0,375</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50,475</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Beträge in Tausend EUR)

3.2 Zusammenfassung

Short summary: The project investigates the impact of semantic-pragmatic features such as animacy, definiteness, specificity and topicality on case marking of verbal arguments. Our investigation of feature architectures which are relevant for Differential Object Marking in Mongolian, Romanian, Spanish, Turkish and Uzbek has shown that DOM is triggered not only by the properties of the object, but emerges from the interaction of these with properties of the verb. In phase 2, we will investigate the impact of this interaction on semantically induced case assignment in argument alternations.


Extended summary: The project investigates semantic-pragmatic conditions on case assignment to NP arguments of verbs. In phase 1, the project focused on the role of referential context in Differential Object Marking (DOM). Under the term “referential context” we understand a structured architecture of semantic-pragmatic features such as the intrinsic feature of animacy, and discourse related semantic features of NP arguments such as definiteness, specificity, topicality and referential persistence. In phase 1 of the SFB we determined detailed feature architectures which model the interaction of different factors of referential context triggering DOM in Mongolian, Romanian, Spanish, Turkish and
Uzbek. Our empirical studies showed that DOM is induced not only by the properties of the object but emerges from the interaction between properties of the object and properties of the verb. This interaction shows up both synchronically and diachronically. However, we did not achieve a full understanding of this interaction because verbal semantics seems to influence DOM only as a secondary factor, i.e. only if particular semantic features of the direct object are present. Our aim in phase 2 is to explore the impact of the interaction between verbal semantics and the properties of NPs on semantically induced case marking. We will extend our analysis to other types of semantically triggered case variation in Direct Object/Oblique Alternations, in Dative Alternation and Locative Alternation. In such alternations, the same nominal semantic features as in DOM constructions play a role, while the role of verbal semantics is more prominent and better described in the literature. Our project brings two new perspectives into the discussion on argument alternations: (a) the sensitivity of argument alternations to universal semantic scales and feature architectures and (b) the combination of argument alternations with DOM.

To account for the interaction between verbal semantics and the semantic properties of NP arguments (i) we will test the application of feature architectures we developed in the first phase of the project in Direct Object/Oblique alternations, (ii) we will analyze the interaction of DOM with argument promotion devices provided by Dative Alternation and Locative Alternation, and (iii) we will evaluate different approaches to argument encoding such as approaches based on event decomposition, aspectual, type-shift and entailment-based approaches. We will elaborate the notion of Affectedness, considered by Hopper and Thompson (1980) to contribute to increased Transitivity in a clause, since we think that this notion provides a useful conceptual link between verbal semantics and semantic properties of NP arguments and should be a crucial ingredient of a theory of argument encoding. Our long-term goal is to develop a theory that models the influence of the referential context on case assignment. We believe that our investigations will enable us to develop ingredients for this theory, and that the method of cross-linguistic comparison we use will contribute to the ongoing exploration of the principled relation between verbal semantics and case assignment.

3.3 Bericht über die bisherige Entwicklung des Teilprojekts

3.3.1 Bericht

Kenntnisstand und Ausgangsfragestellung bei der letzten Antragstellung

The term Differential Object Marking (DOM) is used to describe the phenomenon, found in many languages, that case marking of a direct object depends on certain semantic-pragmatic conditions. Whether this marking is obligatory, optional or ungrammatical is claimed to depend upon semantic factors such as animacy, definiteness or topicality which are ranked along universal implicational scales like the Animacy Scale in (1), the Referentiality Scale combining definiteness and specificity in (2), and the Topicality Scale in (3). A language cuts across each scale at one particular point - the language-specific transition point. In a number of languages DOM is obligatory for highly individuated objects, i.e. objects which are high on the animacy and/or referentiality and/or topicality
scale. The challenge for linguistic theory is that there are multiple features triggering DOM. We combined these features under the term referential context and assumed that referential context is an architecture of semantic-pragmatic features which are responsible for the specification of underspecified lexical forms in context. Our goal was to find out how features of referential context interact and how they contribute to the specification of an underspecified lexical form of nouns in the context.

(1) Animacy Scale: human $>$ animate $>$ inanimate

(2) Referentiality Scale: personal pronoun $>$ proper noun $>$ definite NP $>$ indefinite specific NP $>$ indefinite non-specific NP $>$ incorporated bare NPs

(3) Topicality Scale: + topic $>$ - topic

DOM has been investigated from functional, optimality theoretical and syntactic perspectives. Comrie (1975) and Bossong (1985) e.g. give a functional description of the phenomenon with reference to the scales. Aissen (2003) brings together scales and the preference type of a particular language in an optimality theoretical analysis in which two scales are combined via harmonic alignment. Analyses such as Brugè and Brugger (1996) focus on the syntactic side of DOM. However, all existing analyses concentrate on one or two features triggering DOM in particular languages. A comprehensive comparative analysis was not available when the project started.

**Ergebnisse unter Hinweis auf die Publikationen aus den Teilprojekten, ange-wandte und ggf. neu entwickelte Methoden**

We conducted detailed analyses of DOM in Mongolian, Turkish, Romanian, Spanish, Uzbek and Hindi. The analyses were based on grammars, corpus studies, questionnaires and interviews. The most important findings we gained are:

(i) *Feature architectures*: While in most languages, the same features of referential context (like animacy, definiteness, and specificity) appear to play a role for DOM, languages rank these features differently. We have developed detailed feature architectures which model the interaction of different features of referential context in particular languages.

(ii) *Theoretical concept of specificity*: We argued that specificity as a feature involved in DOM is distinct from partitivity. We further developed the notion of specificity in terms of referential anchoring and argued that NPs can be anchored in different local domains.

(iii) *New DOM triggers*: We found that differentially marked indefinite objects in Romanian tend to have a higher “referential persistence” in the following discourse. In the case of indefinites this feature is related to but distinct from the notion of specificity and may be understood as an additional feature on Topicality Scale.

(iv) *Diachronic development of DOM and optionality*: We showed that optionality can be considered to be a reflex of diachronic change. Our diachronic studies revealed that particular steps in the development of DOM from one category to another on the Referentiality Scale are facilitated by intervening “transitional” categories, such
as topicality, and specificity. At stages where such categories come into play DOM is optional.

(v) Interaction of DOM and verbal semantics: We find that certain semantic properties of the verb interact with nominal semantic features in triggering DOM. This can be shown both synchronically and diachronically. This finding suggests that DOM not only expresses nominal properties of the object but also properties of the relation between verb and object. However, the interaction between verbal and nominal semantic features is not fully understood.

(vi) Motivation for case marking: The comparison of differential object marking with differential subject marking revealed that differential case marking applies not only to the subject and object belonging to the same verbal predicate but can also apply to a subject of a subordinate clause to distinguish it from the subject of the main clause.

A more detailed presentation of our findings is given below.

(i) Feature architectures: We conducted very detailed investigations of DOM systems in Spanish (von Heusinger, 2008; von Heusinger and Kaiser, submitted), Mongolian (Guntsetseg, in preparation, 2009, 2008) and Uzbek (von Heusinger and Klein, 2009, submitted) and compared them with systems described in the literature for other languages like Hindi and Turkic languages. To account for language-specific patterns and cross-linguistic variation we discussed in Klein and de Swart (submitted) feature architectures as a unified representational format. Two representative examples of feature architectures capturing a complex interaction between different factors triggering DOM are given in Figure 1 from Mongolian and Figure 2 from Spanish.

As Figure 1 shows, DOM in Mongolian depends primarily on definiteness. If the direct object is realized as a personal pronoun, proper name or definite NP, DOM is obligatory. The marking of indefinite NPs is optional in the sense that the marked form indicates additional semantic features. The situation in Mongolian is representative of other DOM languages we studied: we always find cases of obligatory DOM, other cases where it is
excluded and optional cases of DOM. Languages differ in the sets of feature values for which they require, admit or forbid DOM. In case of optionality additional features come into play and can trigger DOM. Thus, the case morpheme in a given language does not mark a single feature, but rather it can signal different semantic features of referential context. For instance, the accusative marker -\((i)g\) on direct objects in Mongolian (a) does not signal additional features if the NP is definite, (b) signals the feature [scopally specific] for indefinite NPs irrespective of animacy or (c) the feature [epistemically specific] for animate indefinite NPs. However, in addition to these features, the feature of discourse persistence (cf. (iii) below) can trigger DOM independent of the NP type.

Feature hierarchies of the type we used above facilitate cross-linguistic comparison of DOM systems and typological generalizations. The generalization evolving from our comparison of feature architectures in different languages is that the ranking of features is language-specific, e.g. in Spanish, as is shown in Figure 2, animacy has priority over definiteness, whereas in Mongolian the priority is reversed.

Another important finding in our investigation of feature interactions was that case markers that qualify as markers of DOM in some contexts may not have this function in other contexts. In Turkish and Romanian we observed that the validity of case markers as markers of DOM can be overruled by formal requirements of the grammar. Thus in Turkish, as shown in Kornfilt and von Heusinger (2009), factors like distance to the verb and the presence of a nominal agreement suffix\(^1\) override the otherwise robust correlation between overt case marking and specificity. An analogous example can be found in Romanian: as we showed in Chiriacescu (submitted b), the comparative construction appears to formally require PE-marking irrespective of animacy or other semantic features of the referential context.

(ii) *Theoretical concept of specificity*: In our investigation of DOM in Mongolian and Romanian we saw that the categorial distinction ± specific integrated in the Referentiality Scale in (2) is insufficient to describe specificity-depending DOM on indefinite NPs. This motivated us to further develop the theory of specificity. On the basis of specificity marking in Romanian, Spanish and Turkish in Kornfilt and von Heusinger (2009) and von Heusinger (2007) we suggested the more flexible concept of referentially anchored specificity, according to which a specific indefinite introduces a new discourse item that has a (pragmatically salient) link to an already given discourse item. Specific indefinites thus receive a representation containing an underspecified link to an anchor in the context. The investigation of specificity marking in Russian in Geist (2008) and in Russian vs. Romanian in Geist and Onea (2007) brought additional evidence in favor of an understanding of specificity as relative referential anchoring. We showed that in Russian different indefinite pronouns used as determiners, which according to the literature mark specificity, encode different types of anchoring. In the diachronic study of DOM in Romanian in von Heusinger and Onea (2008) we found additional evidence for the assumption that specificity has not just ± value, as the Referentiality Scale in (2) suggests, but subdivides into categories that build an additional scale depending on the type of the anchor. Specificity in terms of anchoring to the speaker (i.e. epistemic specificity) is more referentially stable and must be placed higher on the scale than specificity in terms of anchoring to other items in the

\(^{1}\)If an NP lacks a lexical nominal head an agreement morpheme shows up instead and this morpheme, in turn, requires an overt case marker.
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clause. This subdivision of specificity was supported by diachronic Romanian data which suggested that epistemic specificity was marked earlier than specificity in terms of anchoring to other items. Another important finding concerning the category of specificity documented in Kornfilt and von Heusinger (2009) was that partitivity has to be distinguished from specificity (contra Enç (1991) and that the accusative case marker in Turkish expresses specificity rather than partitivity. The fine-graining of semantic categories we pursued in the investigation of specificity was further explored in the domain of definiteness in Wespel’s (2008) dissertation.

(iii) **New DOM triggers**: In our studies of DOM in Romanian (Chiriacescu and von Heusinger, 2009; Chiriacescu, to appear, Chiriacescu, in preparation) we investigated the impact of the larger discourse on DOM marking. We identified the discourse trigger of DOM, which we call “referential persistence”, a term introduced by Givón (1983). We showed that besides animacy, definiteness and specificity, referential persistence can trigger case marking of post-verbal indefinite direct objects. In Chiriacescu (2009) and von Heusinger and Chiriacescu (2009) we showed that referential persistence designates a discourse pragmatic property that is weaker than topicality and reconstructs the informal description of “importance for the subsequent discourse”. Objects marked by case for referential persistence are taken up more frequently in the subsequent discourse than their unmarked counterparts.

(iv) **Diachronic development of DOM and optionality**: In our study of the diachronic development of DOM in Spanish (von Heusinger, 2008) and Romanian (von Heusinger and Onea, 2008) we observed that DOM started from elements high on the Referentiality Scale such as personal pronouns and spread steadily to elements low on this scale such as indefinite NPs. Data from diachronic corpora show that this expansion of DOM toward the right of the Referentiality Scale (2) was driven by intervening “transitional” categories, such as topicality and specificity. These transitional categories are only active for the category of NP to which DOM is developing: topicality for definite NPs, specificity for indefinite NPs. On such transitional stages we attested optionality in DOM.

(v) **Interaction of DOM and verbal semantics**: The impact of verbal semantics on DOM, sometimes subsumed under the concept of Transitivity and Affectedness, was recognized in the literature but hasn’t been given a systematic analysis. We addressed this issue in our study of DOM in Spanish (von Heusinger, 2008; von Heusinger and Kaiser, submitted). First we reduced the complex notion of Affectedness to one distinct feature that was easy to control: We posited a scale of verb classes according to their preference to take animate direct objects with high transitivity verbs on the left side of the scale and low transitivity verbs on the right side: high transitivity verbs (class 1) have a high preference for human direct objects, class 2 has no preference, and low transitivity verbs (class 3) have a preference for inanimate direct objects.

(4) **Scale of verb classes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class 1</th>
<th>Class 2</th>
<th>Class 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[+ human] &gt; [± human] &gt; [(±)/-animate]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>matar</em> ‘kill’</td>
<td><em>ver</em> ‘see’</td>
<td><em>poner</em> ‘put’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>herir</em> ‘hurt’</td>
<td><em>hallar</em> ‘find’</td>
<td><em>tomar</em> ‘take’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We observed that in Spanish, the lexical class of the verb correlates with DOM in the following way (note that generally only human direct objects are case marked): class 1 verbs require obligatory DOM (with human direct objects) while class 2 verbs allow for variation and with class 3 verbs DOM is dispreferred. Further support for the scale in (4) came from our diachronic study. In von Heusinger (2008) we showed that the lexical semantics of the verb was an additional driving force in the diachronic evolution of DOM in Spanish, cf. Figure 3 from von Heusinger (2008).

Figure 3: Percentage of DOM comparing verb classes 1-3 with definite and indefinite human direct objects (Bible translations of 1+2 Samuel and 1+2 Kings)

This figure shows that the distribution of DOM depends on (I) the timeline, (II) the position on the Referentiality Scale, and (III) the verb class. We can see that DOM diachronically expanded rightwards on the scale of verb classes. Definite and indefinite objects of the higher-transitivity verbs (class 1 matar/herir) were marked earlier than the objects of lower-transitivity verbs (class 2 ver/hallar and 3 poner/tomar). The dependency of DOM on verb classes suggests that the case marker not only expresses nominal properties of the object, but also properties of the relation between verb and object. Similar effects of verb semantics can be observed in other DOM languages like Mongolian and Uzbek.

(vi) Motivation for case marking: In the typological literature two main functions of case marking are distinguished (Comrie, 1989): the Distinguishing Function and the Identifying Function of case. According to the Distinguishing Function, DOM contributes to distinguishing the object from the subject in a clause if the object is too similar to the subject in individuation. By contrast, the Identifying Function motivates case marking as an indication that the direct object is a highly individuated, strong object. We considered the Distinguishing and the Identifying Function as motivation for differential case marking. The typical context of DOM (highly individuated subject and an individuated object) does not allow for comparing these two theoretical positions since both predict marking of individuated objects. We investigated the problem of the function of case marking in the domain of Differential Subject Marking (DSM). For DSM the Distinguishing and the Identifying strategies make different predictions and thus can be teased apart more easily, cf. de Hoop and Narasimhan (2005). According to the Identifying strategy, case marking
applies if the subject is high on the individuation scales (1)-(3). Under the Distinguishing strategy, subjects with a low degree of individuation should receive case marking in order to be distinguished from objects. Our previous collaborative work on DSM in Turkish (von Heusinger and Kornfilt, 2005) has shown that differential case marking of objects and subjects in this language has an Identifying Function; the genitive case as a DSM marker in embedded sentences is used to mark definite and indefinite subjects if the subject is specific, i.e. high on the Referentiality Scale.

In Guntsetseg and Klein (2009); Klein et al. (submitted) and von Heusinger et al. (submitted) we investigated the case marking strategy in DSM in Mongolian. DSM in Mongolian differs from standard cases like Turkish, because in Mongolian it applies across clause boundaries. DSM shows up on the subject of embedded clauses if it is adjacent to the subject of the matrix clause, cf. (5). While the matrix subject occurs in the nominative, the embedded adjacent subject can occur in the nominative or with the accusative case marker.

(5) **Bold** Tuya(-g) yav-sn-i daraa yav-na. (Mongolian)
   Bold.Nom Tuya(-ACC) go-Pst-Gen after go-Fut
   ‘Bold will go after Tuya went.’

We conducted a detailed empirical study of the conditions for case marking with accusative case and case omission (nominative) on embedded subjects. In 3 questionnaires, we tested 1300 Mongolian speakers. The results show that the omission of the accusative on embedded subjects depends on the animacy and on the definiteness of the embedded subject relative to the actual matrix subject: the accusative is more likely to be omitted if the embedded subject is lower in referentiality than the matrix subject, but is hard to omit if the embedded subject is higher than the matrix subject. We concluded that the motivation for such case marking is just to distinguish the embedded subject from the actual matrix subject in cases where the embedded subject is equal or higher in referentiality than the matrix subject. This is an unexpected result since normally case markers are assumed to either distinguish arguments of the same predicate from one another or to identify semantic or pragmatic properties of some argument independently of other arguments of the predicate. If our conclusion is correct then the distinguishability of the arguments proposed in the literature for a transitive relation under the term “Distinguishing Function of Case” should be complemented by the distinguishability of two subjects (or agents) belonging to different clauses. The requirement to morphologically distinguish two adjacent subjects may be due to processing factors.

**Methods**

In our work we relied on grammars and comprehensive linguistic data elicited from native speakers. We tested our hypotheses using linguistic corpora and developed written questionnaires and web questionnaires. Questionnaires are a conventional method of testing syntactic hypotheses. However, applying them to testing semantic/pragmatic differences proved difficult since in judging semantic information informants need to provide very subtle intuitions. To learn more about the optimal design of questionnaires and statistical methods of evaluation we took advantage of expertise of Sam Featherston (SFB 441, Tübingen), who worked as a Gastwissenschaftler at the Institute for Linguistics for 3 months.
Probleme und Schwierigkeiten bei der Umsetzung des Arbeitsprogramms
In the Bewilligung, we were asked to extend our data basis to head-marking languages. To satisfy this requirement we employed Udo Klein who investigated Bantu and Romance languages in his dissertation on “Encoding of argument structure in Romanian and Siswati” at King’s College London (Klein, 2007). Evaluating the results of his dissertation and the results of our workshop “Case Marking in Bantu and Romance” we realized that DOM is of primary interest for the aims of our project and we have access to more DOM languages for cross-linguistic comparison.

Bezüge zu und Kooperationen mit anderen Arbeiten im Sonderforschungsbe-reich
We profited from discussions with project A1 about concepts of definiteness and topicality. These features of referential context play a crucial role in triggering DOM. We also discussed possibilities of testing referential persistence - the feature we discovered in Romanian as a DOM trigger. In order to discuss the impact of information structure on DOM in a broader context A1 and C2 organized a workshop on “Focus at the Syntax-Semantics Interface”.

With B1 our collaboration was both theoretical and methodological. On the theoretical level we discussed the issue of incremental specification of nominal features in context, and on the methodical level we shared experience in the development of questionnaires for testing semantic hypotheses, which was a new methodology for both projects. We had a discussion with B4 on nominal categories, which led to a joined seminar “Semantik und Pragmatik: Semantic Minimalism” in Winter Semester 07/08.

C1 and C2 are both interested in referential categories like specificity and definiteness. We discussed with C1 interactions between specificity and definiteness and the impact of these features on morphological marking in languages that exhibit the so-called double definiteness.

The results of our analysis of DOM marking in Romanian as a marker of referential persistence (Chiriacescu, to appear; Chiriacescu and von Heusinger, 2009; von Heusinger and Chiriacescu, 2009) were used as one topic for the new project C4.

Vergleiche mit Arbeiten außerhalb des Sonderforschungsbereichs
We collaborated with experts in particular languages and language families: for South Asian languages with Miriam Butt in Konstanz, for Spanish with Manuel Leonetti in Madrid, for Turkic languages with Jaklin Kornfilt in Syracuse, USA and Marcel Erdal in Frankfurt. We discussed DOM and DSM in Altaic languages with the audience of the “Workshop on Altaic Formal Linguistics” in London 2008 and in Nagoya 2009.

To broaden our knowledge about DOM in other languages we organized two workshops on “Case Marking in Bantu and Romance” and “Differential Case Marking”, where we discussed DOM in Bantu, Romance languages, Finnish, Manipuri and Russian with our collaborators. To further deepen our understanding of the DOM system in Romance and Altaic languages we organized separate workshops on “Differential Marking in Romance” and on “The DP structure of Altaic languages”.

We discussed two linguistic issues with international experts: theories of grammar to explain the multiple factors involved in DOM and the treatment of optionality. Concerning theories of grammar we collaborated with the research group on Optimal Communication at the faculty of linguistics of the Radboud University Nijmegen, chair Prof. Helen de
Hoop. In our joined workshops we discussed advantages and disadvantages of different theories of grammar, in particular rule-based approaches and Optimality Theory. Peter de Swart, a collaborator of the Nijmegen group, visited our institute for 3 months in 2008 to prepare a joined publication (Klein and de Swart, submitted).

We collaborated with Miriam Butt and the members of her SFB project “The role of semantic fields in the development of postpositions and Case Markers” in Konstanz on the topic of semantics of DOM in South Asian languages. To get new insights into the treatment of optionality in case marking we organized workshops on “Transitivity and Case Alternations” and “Case Variation”, to which we invited the German experts Beatrice Primus and Elisabeth Stark as well as the international experts Judith Aissen, Arto Anttila, Jòhanna Barðdal, Andrej Malchukov and Åshild Næss.

### 3.3.2 Liste der aus dem Teilprojekt seit der letzten Antragstellung entstandenen Publikationen

#### I. Begutachtete Veröffentlichungen

Chiriacescu, S., to appear. DOM in Romanian and the referential form - mental accessibility interplay. Bulletin of the “Transilvania” University of Brasov 2 (51)


#### II. Eingereichte Veröffentlichungen (mit Datum der Einreichung)


#### III. Nicht begutachtete Veröffentlichungen


Dissertationsprojekte


IV. Patente

Does not apply
3.4 Geplante Weiterführung des Teilprojekts (Ziele, Methoden, Arbeitsprogramm)

In the first phase of the project we investigated factors of referential context triggering differential marking of objects. We focused on referential properties of NPs: inherent semantic properties such as animacy, as well as discourse properties like definiteness, specificity, topicality and referential persistence. Our investigations were led by the consideration that in a DOM-language different hierarchically organized features have impact on the morphosyntactic marking of direct objects in a transitive clause. However, our empirical studies have shown that semantic features of NP arguments are not the sole trigger of DOM but that DOM emerges from the interaction of NP features with properties of the verb. We did not achieve a full understanding of this interaction in the domain of DOM because verbal semantics seems to influence DOM only as a secondary factor, the main factor being semantic properties of NPs: verbal semantics influences the synchronic and diachronic distribution of DOM only if particular semantic features of the direct object are present. We think to achieve a better understanding of this interaction if we extend our analysis to other types of alternations such as the Direct Object/Oblique Alternation, Dative Alternation and Locative Alternation. In such argument alternations the features we identified for DOM have an impact on the morphosyntactic realization of arguments while the role of verbal semantics is more prominent and better described in the literature. Our project brings two new perspectives into the discussion on these argument alternations: (i) sensitivity of argument alternations to universal semantic scales or feature architectures - a topic we investigated in detail in phase 1, and (ii) the combination of argument alternations with DOM. We believe that the method of cross-linguistic comparison we use will contribute to a deeper understanding of the principled relation between the semantics of the verb, properties of the arguments and case assignment. Our aim in phase 2 is to develop ingredients for a semantic theory that can capture the interaction of verbal and nominal semantic features in the morphosyntactic encoding of arguments. We will collaborate with other SFB projects interested in verb semantics and verbal classes (B4, B5, B6), as well as with project B1, which is interested in the explanation of alternate argument encoding in nominalizations. We will discuss the relevance of information structure on argument realization with A1. With C4 we will collaborate on the interface of sentence level and discourse level features.

We think that the key concept under which verbal semantics and semantic properties of NP arguments can be related is the concept of Affectedness, which also plays a crucial role in the restrictions on voice formation addressed in project B6. We will elaborate the notion of Affectedness and use it to determine principles of interaction between the semantics of the verb and the semantic properties of its arguments.

3.4.1 Stand der Forschung

Some verb classes in a single language, as well as similar classes across languages, display systematic argument alternations. The term “argument alternation”\(^2\) has been understood as a property of some predicates to allow two alternate case assignments to

\(^2\) The alternation concept assumed in this project can be subsumed under the broader term “voice” as used in Siemund and Hole (2006) or “voice alternation”.
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arguments\textsuperscript{3}. We will focus on semantically induced alternations of arguments of verbs. We will look at Direct Object/Oblique alternation (I) and at Dative Alternation and Locative Alternation (II). Finally, we will examine theories of argument alternation and explore the notion of Affectedness (III).

I. Direct Object/Oblique Alternations with transitive verbs

(i) Alternations involving changes in grammatical functions. This type of alternation is highly relevant for the investigation of the relation between semantic properties of arguments and event semantics, since the morphosyntactic marking of objects as direct vs. oblique is assumed to correlate with a slight meaning difference in the verb.

According to Keenen and Comrie (1977) independently motivated grammatical function hierarchy in (1), direct objects (DO) are ranked higher, i.e. are less oblique than indirect objects (IO). In terms of markedness, reference to more oblique arguments is more marked. For example, in English, direct object NPs are not morphologically marked, while indirect objects can, in some constructions, get oblique marking with prepositions, cf. (2).

(1) \text{SUBJ} > \text{DO} > \text{IO} > \text{OBL}

(2) a. John ate \textit{the apple}. (direct object DO)
   b. John ate \textit{at the apple}. (oblique object OBL)

In the literature, such alternations have been described as involving shifts in Affectedness of the object and in aspectuality (cf. Tenny (1994), among others). The semantic difference induced by DO vs. OBL marking in (2) can be characterized in the following way: while in (2a) the direct object is completely affected and the event is interpreted as telic, in (2b) it is only partially affected and the event is atelic.

(ii) Another type of argument alternation is assumed to involve only changes in case with no changes in grammatical functions, i.e. the NP showing the case variation qualifies as the direct object independent of the case assigned to it. Examples of such alternations are genitive/partitive alternations in Finnish and Estonian analysed in Ackerman and Moore (2001) and Kiparsky (1998) and genitive/accusative alternation in Russian (cf. Paducheva, 2006). We will focus on the latter since here referential properties of the argument such as animacy, definiteness, specificity and topicality seem to interact and to influence case marking (cf. Timberlake, 1975).

In Russian, the canonical case of direct objects is accusative. However, under certain conditions, the genitive case can be used as an alternative.\textsuperscript{4} The so-called Genitive Alternation is attested with negated transitive verbs and with some intensional verbs like \textit{zhdat’} ‘wait’, cf. (3).

(3) a. \textit{Petja zhda\textit{l}} \textit{pis’ma}. (Borschev et al., 2007)
   Petja waited-for letter.Gen
   ‘Petja was waiting for a letter.’ (indefinite non-specific)

\textsuperscript{3}We use the notion “case” for case markers, functional elements like prepositions or particles - the means which languages use to distinguish arguments from each other

\textsuperscript{4}This genitive marking should not be confused with the grammaticalized DOM in this language. In Russian, some masculine animate nouns in singular and all animate nouns in plural used as direct objects get an obligatory DOM-suffix which is morphologically genitive.
b. *Petja zhdal pis'mo.

Petja waited-for letter.Acc

‘Petja was waiting for a/the letter.’ (indefinite specific or definite)

What is the correct characterization of the semantic difference between the genitive in (3a) and the accusative in (3b)? According to the case hierarchy posited by Blake (1994) for accusative languages genitive is lower in the hierarchy than accusative.

(4) NOM > ACC > GEN > DAT > LOC > ABL/INST > OTHER

This scale aligns with Transitivity: according to Hopper and Thompson (1980) genitive can be a signal of lower transitivity than accusative. The difference between the two argument realizations in Russian described in the literature is in line with this observation. The genitive NP is assumed to be “less individuated” or “less referential” than the accusative NP. It is referentially demoted. However, the type of the precise semantic contrast seems to depend on the semantic properties of the NP and on other factors. Contrasts in terms of definiteness, specificity and topicality of the object have been attested.

Borschev et al. (2007) and Partee and Borschev (2004) capture the insight about the decreased individuation of genitive-marked objects of intensional verbs by assuming that accusative represents an ordinary e-type argument, whereas a genitive NP is interpreted as property-type <e,t>. Thus, the assignment of genitive to NPs triggers a type shift. The so-called property-type hypothesis is in line with the assumptions made by de Hoop (1992, 2003) on partitive object NPs in Finnish, and corresponds to Zimmermann’s (1993) proposal of treating non-specific arguments of intensional verbs as properties of type <s,<e,t>>.

II. Argument Alternations with ditransitive verbs

Dative Alternation and Locative Alternation have been argued to involve changes in the semantic properties of NP arguments. Depending on the case assigned in a particular construction the argument may shift in prominence relative to its co-arguments. For example, in both constructions in (5) according to Givón (1979); Neidle (1988); Partee (2005) and Partee and Borschev (2006) there is a preference for the direct object to be referential and for the oblique object to be non-referential. In (5b) where the MATERIAL argument hay is realized as a direct object, it is referential (definite or indefinite) but in (5b) where it is realized as an oblique object it is almost obligatorily non-referential. In addition to the difference in referentiality there is also a difference in Affectedness and telicity between the two constructions. According to Laffut (1997), among others, the instrumental construction has a holistic effect on the LOCATION: the truck is understood to be in some sense completely affected by the event and the event is telic. In the locative-construction a corresponding implication of completeness does not systematically arise (but is not excluded).

(5) a. The farmers loaded the truck with (*?the/*?some) hay. [instrumental-constr.]
b. The farmers loaded (the/some) hay on the truck. [locative-construction]

(6) a. The student sent the letter to the dean. [PO-construction]
b. The student sent the dean the letter. [DO^5-construction]

In Dative Alternation constructions such as (6), corpus studies of English in Bresnan et al.

5Note that in context of Dative Alternation the abbreviation DO is used for Double Object.
von Heusinger (2007) identified fourteen parameters of NPs that have a quantitative influence on the choice between PO and DO. These include semantic features of the NPs such as animacy, definiteness, pronominality and givenness, but also the relative length of constituents. According to these corpus studies, the first object in the PO and the DO construction is more discourse accessible as well as more definite, pronominal and shorter than the second object. Animacy seems to have priority over other features. It blocks the double object-construction (DO) if the recipient is not animate as shown in (7).

(7) a. A student sent the letter to the university. [PO-construction]  
   b. *A student sent the university the letter. [DO-construction]

Studies on Dative Alternation in discourse show that the distribution of the constructions is largely governed by information structure considerations: the choice of DO/PO allows focused constituents to be shifted to the right and topical ones to the left, satisfying a functionally motivated tendency (cf. Arnold et al., 2000, among others). Besides features like animacy, givenness/definiteness and topicality, the literature on Dative Alternation also uses the notion of Affectedness to describe the difference between the PO and the DO case frames (Green, 1974; Larson, 1988): the recipient realized as dative argument is interpreted as being affected, but it does not have that interpretation when expressed as a PO object. To conclude, the choice of DO or PO construction has different effects on the interpretation of arguments, which can be summarized in terms of “promotion” or “demotion” of particular arguments. There is a controversial discussion of the question whether the differences in the case frame DO vs. PO as devices of promotion/demotion of arguments also correlate with a systematic difference in the verb meaning.

III. Theoretical perspectives on argument encoding and Affectedness

Argument alternations have been given a great number of analyses in the literature. Many analyses of argument alternations trace back differences in case frames to differences in the verb meaning modelled in terms of event decomposition, cf. Harley (2003), Krifka (1999, 2004), Levin and Rappaport Hovav (2005) for Dative Alternation, Iwata (2008) for an overview of analyses of Locative Alternation, and Adams (2001) for Direct Object/Oblique Alternation. The following event structures have been assumed for Dative Alternation constructions:

(8) a. CAUSED MOTION: ‘x cause z to go to y’ (y is a spatial goal)  
   b. CAUSED POSSESSION: ‘x cause y to have z’ (y is a recipient)

It is assumed that the DO-construction in (6b) and (7b) is associated with the caused possession event structure. In this structure, the argument y has the theta role POSSESSOR, which requires it to be human, hence the ungrammaticality of (7b). However, it is not clear how asymmetries in semantic properties of arguments like definiteness, pronominality and topicality follow from the decompositions in (8). According to event decomposition analysis in (8), arguments y and z differ with respect to the degree of embedding in the event structure. For example in (8a), the direct object argument z, which is high in definiteness and topicality, is embedded more deeply in the event structure than it is in (8b), where it is less definite and topical. It is unclear why the asymmetry in the semantic properties of NP arguments should correlate with the degree of their embedding in the event structure and why this correlation should be this way and not the other way round.

In the recent work on Dative Alternation, semantic-pragmatic aspects of case variation
gain in importance, while differences in verb meaning get relativized. Levin (2008) and Rappaport Hovav and Levin (2008) argue against a one-to-one relation between a particular case frame and a particular event structure. They assume that while the DO variant is only associated with a caused possession event structure, the PO variant in English can be associated either with caused possession or with caused motion. That is, spatial goals may only be realized as prepositional objects, while the recipient may be realized as dative or as prepositional object, the choice being governed solely by information structure considerations. However, it remains unclear how the case assignment to arguments depending on information structure can be captured. To conclude, the event decomposition account cannot straightforwardly capture the correlation between some referential properties of NP arguments and particular case frames.

Much work has been done on the interaction between verbal semantics and referential properties of NPs in the domain of telicity in both functionalist and formal frameworks (Hopper and Thompson (1980); Krifka (1989, 1998); Tenny (1987, 1994), among others). It is a well-known fact that telicity bears on the case-marking of arguments (cf. e.g. genitive/partitive alternation in Finnish analysed in Kiparsky (1998)). Krifka (1989) shows that in the domain of telicity there are similarities between the meaning of nominal and verbal expressions, insofar as the mass vs. count distinction in the nominal domain is reflected in the atelic vs. telic distinction in the verbal domain. He explicitly describes these similarities in formal representations and spells out homomorphisms from NP arguments to events which yield mapping between events and NP arguments. However, the phenomenon of reference transfer from NP to the whole VP formally analysed by Krifka is restricted to verbs that take incremental theme as arguments, i.e. it only applies to NP arguments which undergo incremental change of state in the event described by the verb, cf. (2a). No reference transfer of this type is attested with other verb types such as verbs of (non-incremental) change of state kill or break.

Another way to account for semantically induced argument encoding is provided by the so-called entailment-based accounts such as Ackerman and Moore (2001), Beavers (2006, to appear) and Primus (1999), among others. These authors propose that what is crucial is how two co-arguments of a given verb or two different realizations of one argument of a given verb are related in terms of the entailment relations that hold between the arguments’ thematic roles. In such an approach the asymmetries in referential properties of arguments are not traced back to the event structure but are captured in terms of the entailment relations that hold between thematic roles of arguments independent of their position in the event structure. Such entailment-based approaches build on the idea in Dowty (1991) that a verb associates with each argument a set of entailments which describe the role of the argument in the event. If a participant can be realized as either a direct or oblique argument of a verb its entailments as a direct object differ from entailments as an oblique object.

The type-shifting account suggested for the treatment of Genitive Alternation in Russian by Borschev et al. (2007) and Partee and Borschev (2004) presented above is another way to account for differences in referential properties of NP arguments depending on case assignment. However, as we will see below in 3.4.5 such type-shift cannot be applied to all instances of Genitive Alternation. The type shift from <e> to <e,t> radically changes the status of NP from referential to non-referential. Reduced referentiality induced by genitive, however, doesn’t always mean a total lack of referentiality.
In this project, we will compare and evaluate different theoretical perspectives on semantically induced case assignment. One notion that may be crucial for further progress in this domain is the notion of Affectedness. As we have shown above in the description of different argument alternations, Affectedness is often appealed to in the discussions of different phenomena of argument realization. It is assumed to be a prototypical property of objects (Dowty, 1991; Fillmore, 1968). Moreover, Affectedness is widely assumed to influence morphosyntactic marking of objects of transitive verbs (Hopper and Thompson, 1980; Malchukov, 2005; Tsunoda, 1985). It is known to determine telicity (Krifka, 1989; Tenny, 1987, 1994). Furthermore, it has repeatedly been proposed as a conditioning factor on grammatical processes like passivisation and reflexivization (cf. Jaeggli, 1986). However, Affectedness is often used as a merely intuitive concept. In syntactically oriented literature, it is analysed as a feature having a ± value (cf. Anderson, 2006; Bosse et al., 2008). In the typological and semantic literature, it is assumed that Affectedness is gradable and has to be understood as “the degree to which an action is transferred to a patient”, (Hopper and Thompson, 1980, 252). It comprises different aspects of involvement of the direct object in the event expressed by the verb. Different hierarchies of Affectedness have been proposed depending on different criteria: the change of state of the patient, movement of a theme along some path, and the saliency or animacy of the potential object. For example, Tsunoda’s 1985 Affectedness hierarchy in (9) is based on change of state of the patient. The patient is maximally affected for verbs at the left end of the scale, but it is less affected for verbs on the right side of the scale.

(9) Affectedness hierarchy (Tsunoda 1985)

Effective action > Perception > Pursuit > Knowledge > Feeling > Relation > Ability
resultative: kill, break +attained: see, wait know like possess good at
non-resultative: eat, hit -attained: look

Based on cross-linguistic studies, Tsunoda shows that this Affectedness scale is reflected in transitive case frames and in passivization. Verbs on the left side are more likely to take the transitive case frame and to undergo passivization, whereas verbs on the right side are more likely to take an intransitive/oblique case pattern and to resist passivization. A similar Affectedness hierarchy is given in Malchukov (2005). Malchukov (2005) and Tsunoda (1985) use the intuitive concept of Affectedness proposed by Hopper and Thompson (1980) and they do not define what sorts of changes constitute more of an effect than others. To overcome these shortcomings, Beavers (to appear) proposes a scalar analysis of change where every degree of Affectedness can be separated from the others by linguistic tests. He conceives Affectedness as a transition of a theme along a path or scale that defines the change.

Finally, Næss (2003) argues that the crucial parameter which Affectedness depends on is saliency. She assumes that actions with animate objects are more saliently affected than inanimate ones. Thus, kill entails higher Affectedness than break because the former has more dramatic consequences for humans. In our work in phase 1 of the SFB we accounted for saliency by pinning down the parameter of animacy to selectional properties of the verb, and posited a scale of Affectedness depending on this parameter, cf. section 3.4.1). We showed that this scale has effects for otherwise optional cases of DOM in Spanish, Mongolian and Uzbek, and on the diachronic development of DOM in Spanish.

To conclude, although Affectedness is frequently evoked in work on argument realiza-
tion, no unified linguistic concept of Affectedness exists yet.

### 3.4.2 Ausgangssituation

The project builds on findings of phase 1, which we described in section 3.3. In phase 2, the project will primarily focus on the question which arose in phase 1 concerning the interaction of verbal semantics and semantics of NP arguments. We will also try to extend feature hierarchies we developed in phase 1 for DOM to other instances of case alternation. In examining the motivation for case assignment we will build on the finding that alternation in case assignment can be triggered not only by language internal factors such as particular semantic features but also by language external processing factors (e.g. length of constituents, adjacency of identically marked NPs).

### 3.4.3 Fragestellung

The main question is what impact referential context as a structured architecture of semantic features has on the case assignment to arguments. In phase 1 we observed that referential properties of NPs are not the only trigger for alternation in case assignment but that the semantics of the verb has an impact on it as well. The question is how the semantic properties of the verb and the properties of the NP interact in giving rise to a particular case assignment. We want to explain the language-particular differences in this interaction and determine the universal principles behind it.

### 3.4.4 Ziele

Our long-term goal is to develop a semantic model that can account for semantically induced case assignment to arguments. While in phase 1 we focused on the semantics of argument NPs and the domain of investigation was restricted to Differential Object Marking, in phase 2 we will consider the interaction between semantic properties of NPs and the semantics of the verb. To understand the principles governing this interaction we will extend the domain of investigation to other semantically induced case alternations: Direct Object/Oblique Alternations with transitive verbs and argument alternations with ditransitive verbs. We will evaluate different theoretical perspectives on argument encoding. The main goal of phase 2 of the project will be to deepen our understanding of the interaction between semantic properties of the arguments and verbal semantics, and to develop ingredients for a semantic model which can account for such interactions and their role in case assignment. The subgoals of this project concern three different areas we outlined in the state of the art in section 3.4.1:

I. Direct Object/Oblique Alternations with transitive verbs

Subgoals:

- to determine the relation between different types of semantic contrasts triggered by this alternation;
- to explore the relation between verbal semantics and oblique encoding of arguments in different languages and to establish cross-linguistic principles behind it;
- to determine different types of Affectedness involved in oblique marking;
• to establish the difference between this type of alternation and DOM.

II. Argument alternations with ditransitive verbs
Subgoals:
• to compare DOM with argument promotion devices provided by argument alternation constructions;
• to determine language-specific and cross-linguistic principles of interaction between DOM and these constructions;
• to test the applicability of the feature architectures we developed in phase 1 in the domain of argument alternations.

III. Theoretical perspectives on argument encoding and Affectedness
Subgoals:
• to compare and evaluate different theoretical perspectives on semantically triggered argument encoding;
• to elaborate the concept of Affectedness in order to make it useful for capturing the interaction of verbal semantics and semantic properties of NPs;
• to develop theoretical tools needed to capture the interaction of verbal semantics and semantic properties of NPs.

The project will contribute to the ongoing cross-linguistic exploration of the principled relation between predicate semantics and argument encoding.

3.4.5 Methoden und Arbeitsprogramm

Methoden
We will pursue two lines of investigation, empirical and theoretical. On the empirical side we will study the interaction of semantic properties of NPs with verbal semantics. We will test our hypotheses via linguistic corpora, conduct questionnaire studies and discuss data with the language experts with whom we established fruitful collaborations in phase 1. The empirical investigations in the project will have a comparative character since we think that it is the best way to attain reliable and representative results. We will mainly focus on Mongolian, Turkish, Romanian, Spanish and Russian. Other Altaic, Romance and Slavic languages as well as German and English will be used for comparison. We chose Mongolian, Turkish, Romanian and Spanish as our main languages since we worked on these DOM languages in detail in phase 1. In the next phase we want to study the combination of DOM with other argument promotion devices provided by argument alternations in these languages. Russian has rich case morphology and flexible word order and it exhibits many different instances of argument alternations. Moreover, in Russian referential properties of arguments are influenced by verbal aspect, which makes it especially important for our study of the interaction between verbal semantics and semantic properties of NPs. While we have native-language competence in Mongolian, German, Romanian and Russian, for Turkish we will rely on cooperation with Jaklin Kornfilt, for Spanish on text corpora and on our contacts with Manuel Leonetti. On the theoretical side we will evaluate and compare theories of argument alternation and argument encoding, and elaborate the notion of Affectedness. We will discuss these topics with experts such as John Beavers, Miriam Butt, Helen de Hoop and Beatrice Primus.
Arbeitsprogramm

I. Direct Object/Oblique Alternations with transitive verbs

(i) Alternations involving changes in grammatical functions. As we have seen above, in this type of alternation, the encoding of the argument depends more obviously on the event-based properties of this argument than is the case with DOM. Studying this type of alternation we expect to learn more about the relation between the encoding of arguments and their role in the event structure.

We will focus on the difference in semantic contrasts induced by direct/oblique marking associated with different verbs. As observed in Beavers (2006) verbs of ingesting like eat involve a contrast in holistic Affectedness (10a/b), verbs of cutting cut/struck/sliced involve a contrast just in Affectedness (11a/b), and verbs of contact by impact hit/kick induce a contrast in surface contact (12a/b).

(10) a. Marie ate her cake. (cake completely affected)
    b. Marie ate at her cake. (cake affected)

(11) a. John cut/struck/sliced the tire. (tire affected)
    b. John cut/struck/sliced at the tire. (tire not necessarily affected)

(12) a. John hit/kicked the wall. (wall impinged, not affected)
    b. John hit/kicked at the wall. (wall not necessarily impinged)

(Beavers, to appear)

The fact that Direct Object/Oblique Alternations can exhibit different types of contrasts suggests (i) that there are different types of Affectedness involved and (ii) that the DO/OBL markers are underspecified and the specification of their semantic impact depends on the verb class. According to Beavers (to appear) different degrees of Affectedness can be distinguished. Verbs of ingesting like eat have an incremental theme argument which seems to have the highest degree of Affectedness of the three classes. In turn, objects of cutting verbs are more affected than the object of verbs of contact by impact. In all alternations in (10)-(12) the oblique marker signals a decrease in Affectedness relative to the respective direct object. We will consider these observations within the scope of our elaboration of Affectedness as a linguistic notion.

While in English the same oblique marker (preposition at) is used in all three cases, in other languages different markers have been employed for different types of contrast. In Mongolian, in the type of alternation in (10) the direct object is marked with accusative while the oblique object is marked with the ablative case, the contrast in (11) cannot be expressed via case alternation, and in the alternation in (12) the direct object is marked with accusative und the oblique object is realized as prepositional object. We want to determine the relation between the type of oblique marking and the type of contrast(s) induced by it depending on the verb class in different languages. We will collaborate with B5, which will investigate Direct Object/Oblique Alternation in French. Another task will be to determine different types and degrees of Affectedness involved in oblique marking and to compare them with the classes established in Beavers (to appear).

Russian has another morphosyntactic strategy to express different contrasts with re-

---

6Since in the oblique variant in (11) and (12) the activity is understood as attempted without necessarily having been carried out this type of alternations have been called Conative Alternation (Levin, 1993, 41), (Levin and Rappaport Hovav, 2005, 187).
pect to Affectedness. The difference between (10a) and (10b) can be expressed by verbal aspect as shown in (13): perfective aspect induces complete Affectedness of the object, while the object of the verb in imperfective aspect needs not be completely affected. Alternations such as (11) and (12) with the same object cannot be expressed in Russian either by aspect or by case. However, in general direct/oblique encoding of arguments in this language often depends on animacy. For example, animate arguments of verbs of contact by impact are realized as direct objects while inanimate arguments tend to be realized as prepositional obliques, cf. (14). Similar restrictions on the argument encoding can be observed in German, cf. (15).

(13) a. Masha s”-ela svoj pirog. (cake completely affected)
   Masha PERF-eat her cake.ACC
   ‘Masha ate her cake.’

b. Masha ela svoj pirog. (cake affected)
   Masha eat.IMPERF her cake.ACC
   ‘Masha ate at her cake.’

(14) a. Ivan udaril brata / *po bratu.
   Ivan hit.PERF brother.ACC / at brother.DAT
   ‘Ivan hit his brother.’

b. Ivan udaril *stenu / po stene.
   Ivan hit.PERF wall.ACC / at wall.DAT
   ‘Ivan hit at the wall.’

(15) a. Peter schlug seinen Freund /*auf seinen Freund.

b. Peter schlug auf den Tisch /*den Tisch.

This observation suggests not only that languages have developed special morphosyntactic tools to express different types and degrees of Affectedness but also that for some languages, particular types of Affectedness are more relevant than the others. For example, while Russian and German are sensitive to Affectedness in terms of saliency or animacy of the object, in English Affectedness in terms of change of state and surface contact seems to be more relevant. We will explore such language-particular differences and will try to establish general principles behind them.

(ii) Alternations involving only changes in case with no changes in grammatical functions. Another much-discussed phenomenon of argument alternation we want to consider is Genitive Alternation in Russian such as in (16) and (3) above.

(16) a. Oni ne postroili gostinicy. (Paducheva, 2006)
   they NEG build hotel.Gen
   ‘They didn’t build a/the hotel.’ (a specific or definite hotel)

b. Oni ne postroili gostinicu.
   they NEG build hotel.Acc
   ‘They didn’t build a hotel.’ (non-specific indefinite hotel)

(17) a. Ja ne videla gostinicy / Ninya.
   I NEG saw hotel.Gen / Nina.Gen
   ‘I didn’t see a/the hotel / Nina.’ (the hotel / Nina is not available in the visual field)
b. *Ja ne* videla gostinicu / Ninu.
    I NEG saw hotel.Acc / Nina.Acc
    ‘I didn’t see a/the hotel / Nina.’ (the hotel / Nina is available in the visual field)

The semantic effect of genitive in negated sentences is difficult to capture. Many authors point to the intuition that it has a similar impact on the NP as genitive alternation under intensional verbs as in (3): in both constructions genitive triggers reduced referentiality. Partee and Borschev (2007) discuss the application of the type-shift analysis to genitive of negation, which they have proposed for genitive in intensional contexts. However, the problem with such an account is that in case of genitive under negation in (16) and (17) the construction is not intensional. Although the meaning of the object marked with genitive is shifted in terms of referentiality, i.e. the NP is referentially demoted, we think that this referential demotion cannot be captured in terms of type shift from individual $<e>$ to a property $<e,t>$. At least two arguments can be found against the property-type hypothesis (see also the discussion in Partee and Borschev (2007)). First, NPs in genitive of negation can be picked up by anaphoric pronouns, indicating that NPs in genitive may establish discourse referents, which is not the case with property-type arguments. Second, proper names, demonstratives and other prototypically referential NPs participate in accusative/genitive alternation under negation and remain referential even in genitive. We conclude that although the property-type hypothesis can account for genitive NPs in intensional contexts, it is too radical for genitive NPs under negation. Thus, it seems that there is more than one kind of ‘reduced referentiality’ indicated by the genitive: precise semantic impact of the genitive marker as a marker of reduced referentiality is underspecified. Its particular effect on the interpretation of an NP depends on the local context (intensional vs. negative) and the type of the NP.

We think it is important to better understand the relation between genitive marked NPs and verbs. It has been observed in the literature (Borschev et al., 2007; Mustajoki and Heino, 1991; Paducheva, 2006) that the interpretation of the semantic effect of genitive marking under negation in Russian strongly depends on the type of verbal predicate. Thus, genitive not only concerns objects in contrast to what has been previously assumed. With verbs of creation such as *stroit* ‘build’ in (16), the genitive-marked object is interpreted in such a way that its existence is not presupposed cf. (16a), while the referent of the accusative object in (16b) is presupposed to exist, even if only in some other possible world, such as a world of existing plans. With negated perceptual verbs like *videt* ‘see’ in (17), the difference between genitive and accusative is not in the availability or non-availability of an existential presupposition but the presence or absence in the visual field of the speaker (cf. Borschev et al., 2007).

Interestingly, the conditions for genitive marking are the direct opposite of the conditions for DOM. While in DOM the differential case marker is used to indicate high individuation of the object, the genitive in Russian indicates a decrease in individuation. Moreover, while DOM-marking primarily applies to NPs high on the individuation scales like definite NPs, genitive in Russian seems to apply more easily to indefinite and abstract NPs that are low on the referentiality scale (cf. Timberlake, 1975). We want to determine what features of referential context are involved in genitive marking and how these features interact with verbal semantics. With the help of corpus studies and judgment
studies we will attempt to understand the interaction of different features of referential context involved in genitive marking. We will also profit from the work done in the NSF project on Genitive Alternation (2004-2008) by Barbara Partee and her project collaborators. While Partee’s work focuses on semantic properties of arguments, our project will consider the interaction between properties of arguments and semantics of the verb. We will systematically look at the interaction of genitive marking with different semantic classes of verbs, capture the interaction of different features in the form of a feature architecture and compare it with feature architectures we determined for DOM. Furthermore, we will compare the motivation for genitive marking to the motivation for DOM (Distinguishing Function vs. Identifying Function). Finally, we plan a cooperation with project B1 on a similar topic: case variation “inflectional genitive vs. von-phrase” with nominalizations. We will test whether the feature architectures we developed in phase 1 can be applied to this variation.

II. Argument alternations with ditransitive verbs

We will analyse Dative Alternation and Locative Alternation constructions in the DOM languages we studied in the first phase. Since these constructions are used to promote one argument over the other, the question arises how DOM, which signals high prominence/referentiality of arguments, interacts with such devices of argument promotion.

For example, besides DOM, Mongolian exhibits Dative Alternation. However, in both the PO and the DO constructions the relative order of objects is not fixed, so the recipient/goal argument may precede or follow the theme. The differences in word order can be assumed to contribute to differences in information structure. Thus, the two levels of argument promotion which in English are fulfilled by the case frame DO vs. PO are divided in Mongolian: word order contributes to promotion on the information structure level and the case frame PO/DO to promotion in referentiality. The combination of DOM with PO and DO construction shows different results. While an indefinite object with a DOM may occur in both PO-constructions (18a,b), DOM is dispreferred in DO-constructions (18c,d), and is even worse if the direct object appears in a more topical position as in (18d).

(18)  a. *Bi zahiral ruu neg mail-ig ilgee-sen.* [PO-construction 1]
    I dean to a mail-ACC sent-PST
    ‘I sent a mail to the dean.’

    b. *Bi neg mail-ig zahiral ruu ilgee-sen.* [PO-construction 2]
    I a mail-ACC dean to sent-PST
    ‘I sent a mail to the dean.’

    c. #$Bi zahiral-d neg mail-ig ilgee-sen.* [DO-construction 1]
    I dean-DAT a mail-ACC sent-PST
    ‘I sent the dean a mail.’

    d. ##*Bi neg mail-ig zahiral-d ilgee-sen.* [DO-construction 2]
    I a mail-ACC dean-DAT sent-PST
    ‘I sent the dean a mail.’

Thus, DOM seems to interact with other devices of argument promotion such as the particular case frame provided by the construction and the word order. PO-constructions assumed to promote the direct object are compatible with DOM, which in these examples indicates promotion of the argument. The DO-constructions, which are generally assumed to demote the direct object seem to be incompatible with DOM. This is even more pro-
nounced in (18d) where the word order also contributes to promoting the direct object. No such conflict emerges in the PO-constructions (18a) and (18b), since DOM and the PO case frame have the same function of promoting the direct object. The placement of the direct object into a more topical position in (18b) just increases this effect. Interestingly, the incompatibility of DOM with the DO case frame in (18c) and (18d) holds only for optional DOM, which we found with indefinite NPs in our previous work. Definite NPs which are obligatory marked with DOM in Mongolian can occur in constructions like (18d), cf. (19).

(19)   Bi ene mail-ig  zahiral-d  ilgee-sen.
       ‘I sent this mail to the dean.’

Such interactions between DOM, the case frame provided by the construction and word order variations should be accounted for in the semantic theory of argument encoding. We want to answer the following questions: (i) What are the conditions for DOM marking of direct objects in ditransitive clauses in comparison to transitive clauses? (ii) What features or feature hierarchies are involved in ditransitive argument alternations and how do they differ from the feature hierarchies we determined for DOM? and (iii) What features of referential context are determined by the construction and what by the DOM marking?

The precise nature of the interactions between features of referential context and semantic determinants of particular constructions requires further investigation through a systematic examination of argument alternations. Besides Dative Alternation we will examine Locative Alternation as well. We will draw on existing work on these alternations, systematize the observations on semantic properties of alternate constructions and empirically test the interaction of such constructions with DOM in different languages. Our preliminary observation is that different DOM languages exhibit different restrictions on the interaction between argument alternations and DOM. For example in Turkish in contrast to Mongolian, the DO construction is compatible with indefinite direct objects without DOM but only if the object immediately precedes the verb. We will explore such language-particular restrictions on the interaction between DOM and ditransitive case frames. Semantic hypotheses will be refined and tested using experimental methods.

III. Theoretical perspectives on argument encoding and Affectedness

We will evaluate how well different approaches to argument encoding capture the interaction between verbal semantics and the semantic properties of NP arguments. We will focus on the semantic side of the phenomenon and expect fruitful discussions on theories of argument realization with more syntactically oriented approaches within the SFB such as in B1, B4 and B6.

We will compare event decomposition accounts with aspectual approaches, entailment-based and type-shift approaches to argument encoding. We will test their application in the explanation of the empirical generalizations that emerge in our work on argument alternations (see I and II above). As we have shown in section 3.4.1, event decompositions represent structural differences between co-arguments but they cannot straightforwardly capture asymmetries in the semantic prominence of arguments. We think that event decomposition accounts can be augmented with a richer account.

We will exploit different perspectives in developing theoretical tools for capturing the interaction of verbal semantics and referential properties of NPs in different types of ar-
argument alternation. We plan to collaborate with project B5 on Direct Object/Oblique Alternation and with B4 where alternations like the Locative Alternation are dealt with in terms of different verbal constructions from roots. With B5 we will also discuss the correlation between argument encoding and verb meaning, especially the following questions: To what extent is the meaning of a verb allowing for different argument realizations underspecified? Do we have to assume a systematic polysemy or shifts in verbal meaning depending on the type of argument encoding?

We think that the notion of Affectedness, considered by Hopper and Thompson (1980) to contribute to increasing of Transitivity in a clause, provides a useful conceptual link between verbal semantics and the semantic properties of NP arguments. However, although Affectedness has been involved in the explanation of different linguistic phenomena, there is no uniform semantic concept of it. To develop a more precise linguistic definition of this concept, we will explore the notion of Affectedness, its relation to argument encoding and to our own notion of referential context. Affectedness will be a crucial ingredient in our theory of semantically triggered case assignment. We expect fruitful discussions on its role in grammar with project B6.

Combining our results from phase 1 concerning DOM with our investigations in phase 2 will enable us to develop ingredients for a theory that can capture semantically induced case assignment to arguments.

Schedule
2010/2: Systematising the semantic-pragmatic parameters inducing case alternations, developing the main hypotheses for empirical testing, examining the factors that trigger Genitive Alternation in Russian, study of argument alternations in Mongolian, literature research on argument alternations in other languages of the project.

2011: Empirical studies of argument alternations: developing a questionnaire to test hypotheses about interaction of DOM with Dative Alternation and Locative Alternation in DOM languages, developing a questionnaire to test conditions on Genitive Alternation in Russian; investigating Direct Object/Oblique Alternation in different languages, comparison between Mongolian and Turkish in collaboration with J. Kornfilt.

2012: Evaluation of empirical results: formulation of empirical generalizations and consideration of implications for a theory of argument encoding, organization of a workshop on semantically induced argument encoding; examination of the interaction between DOM and Dative Alternation/Locative Alternation in Spanish and Romanian, discussions with M. Leonetti on Spanish data and with S. Chiriacescu on Romanian data. Elaboration of the notion of Affectedness: comparison of different notions of Affectedness, examining the relevance of Affectedness for argument encoding in Mongolian, Russian and German, discussion with J. Beavers on the semantic notion of Affectedness.

2013: Examination of theories of argument encoding: Comparison of different approaches to argument encoding, discussions on entailment-based approaches with B. Primus; integration of the notion of Affectedness into the theory of argument encoding; discussions on case assignment strategies with H. de Hoop and on the typological perspective on semantically triggered case with M. Butt; developing ideas for the next phase of the project.

2014/1: Publication of main results, bringing together different theoretical perspectives on argument encoding, preparation of data collected in the project for public access.
3.5 Stellung innerhalb des Sonderforschungsbereichs

3.5.1 Stellung zum Gesamtkonzept des SFBs

The project addresses issues that are at the centre of the research program of the proposed SFB: specification of an underspecified linguistic form on the basis of contextual information from different modules of grammar. This general question will be investigated on the basis of contrastive analyses of argument alternations on different dimensions of context. We assume that lexically underspecified information in nouns is enriched and specified by contextual information and the interaction with verbal semantics.

3.5.2 Interaktion mit anderen Teilprojekten

With A1 we share interest in information structure: The information status hierarchy used in A1 is relevant to the question of argument prominence we are interested in. The projects will discuss the relevance of the specificity types we identified in phase 1 for the information status of NPs and prosody.

With B1 we share interest in the correlation between argument structure and the case of arguments. We will actively collaborate in the work concerning the form of the genitive (inflectional genitive vs. von-phrase). The hypothesis to test is whether the form of the genitive is influenced by individuation scales and feature hierarchies we determined and tested in the first phase of our project. We think that we will profit from discussions with B1 of the issue of optionality and variability in morphosyntactic marking. With B3, B4, B5 and B6 we share the general interest in argument alternations. With B6 we hope to actively collaborate on the role of Affectedness in grammar, its semantics and its impact on morphosyntactic realization of arguments. We will concentrate on the semantic ingredients of this concept and expect fruitful discussion with B6 which considers the syntactic role of it. We plan to collaborate with B4 where alternations like the Locative Alternation are dealt with in terms of different verbal constructions from roots and with B5 on issue of correlation between argument encoding and verb meaning in Direct Object/Oblique Alternation.

With C4 we will collaborate with respect to topicality and on the interface of sentence level and discourse level features. With D6 we share a general interest in semantics of verbs and expect fruitful theoretical discussion on models of the representation of verbal meaning.

3.6 Abgrenzung gegenüber anderen geförderten Projekten der Teilprojektleiterinnen und Teilprojektleiter

The principal investigator works in the project “Spezifizität als grammatische Kategorie zwischen Intentionalität und Indexikalität” that is funded by the Fritz-Thyssen Stiftung and the VolkswagenStiftung (10/2008 - 9/2010). The goal of this project is to write a monograph on the category of specificity. This is related to some of the subgoals we pursued in phase 1, but is clearly different from phase 2.
### 3.7 Ergänzungsausstattung für das Teilprojekt

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bewilligung 2010/1</th>
<th>2010/2</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P1) Entg.- Gr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV-L E13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29.400</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV-L E13 50%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.700</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>StHi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zus.:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>44.100</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014/1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1) Entg.- Gr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV-L E13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>58.800</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV-L E13 50%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29.400</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>StHi</td>
<td></td>
<td>12.000</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zus.:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.200</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sachmittel**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kleingeräte (bis EUR 10.000,-)</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbrauchsmaterial</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Versuchstiere</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reisen</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonstiges</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>375</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) P = Personalmittel
### 3.7.1 Personal im Teilprojekt

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name, akad. Grad, Dienststellung</th>
<th>engeres Fach des Mitarbeiters</th>
<th>Institut der Hochschule</th>
<th>Bisherige Förderperiode im SFB tätig von (Monat/Jahr) bis (Monat/Jahr)</th>
<th>Entgeltgruppe</th>
<th>Beantragte Förderperiode Mitarbeit im Teilprojekt in Wochenstunden (beratend:B)</th>
<th>Entgeltgruppe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Klaus von Heusinger, Prof. Dr., Universitätsprofessor</td>
<td>Allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft, Semantik, Typologie</td>
<td>ILG, Universität Stuttgart</td>
<td>07/2006-06/2010</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Sofiana Chiriacescu, M.A., wiss. Mitarbeiterin</td>
<td>Germanistik, Anglistik</td>
<td>ILG, Universität Stuttgart</td>
<td>06/2008-12/2008</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Ljudmila Geist, Dr., wiss. Assistentin/Mitarbeiterin</td>
<td>Semantik, Slawistik</td>
<td>ILG, Universität Stuttgart</td>
<td>07/2006-06/2010</td>
<td>s.u.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Dolgor Guntsetseg, M.A., wiss. Mitarbeiterin</td>
<td>Typologie</td>
<td>ILG, Universität Stuttgart</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>19,75</td>
<td>TV-L E13 50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Edgar Onea, Dr. wiss. Mitarbeiter</td>
<td>Germanistik, Philosophie</td>
<td>ILG, Universität Stuttgart</td>
<td>09/2007-08/2009</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Fortsetzung auf nächsten Seite)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name, akad. Grad, Dienststellung</th>
<th>engeres Fach des Mitarbeiters</th>
<th>Institut der Hochschule</th>
<th>Bisherige Förderung im SFB tätig von (Monat/Jahr) bis (Monat/Jahr)</th>
<th>Entgeltgruppe</th>
<th>Beantragte Förderperiode: Mitarbeit im Teilprojekt in Wochenstunden (beratend:B)</th>
<th>Entgeltgruppe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6) Evgeny Baranovskiy, stud. Hilfskraft</td>
<td>Softwaretechnik</td>
<td>ILG, Universität Stuttgart</td>
<td>07/2006-10/2008</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10) Tatjana Titze, stud. Hilfskraft</td>
<td>Germanistik</td>
<td>ILG, Universität Stuttgart</td>
<td>07/2006-12/2006</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ergänzungsausstattung**


(Fortsetzung auf nächsten Seite)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name, akad. Grad, Dienststellung</th>
<th>engeres Fach des Mitarbeiters</th>
<th>Institut der Hochschule</th>
<th>Bisherige Förderung im SFB tätig von (Monat/Jahr) bis (Monat/Jahr)</th>
<th>Entgeltgruppe</th>
<th>Beantragte Förderperiode: Mitarbeit im Teilprojekt in Wochenstunden (beratend:B)</th>
<th>Entgeltgruppe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

(Fortsetzung auf nächster Seite)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name, akad. Grad, Dienststellung</th>
<th>engeres Fach des Mitarbeiters</th>
<th>Institut der Hochschule</th>
<th>Bisherige Förderung im SFB tätig von (Monat/Jahr) bis (Monat/Jahr)</th>
<th>Entgeltgruppe</th>
<th>Beantragte Förderperiode: Mitarbeit im Teilprojekt in Wochenstunden (beratend:B)</th>
<th>Entgeltgruppe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17) Anna Theresa Bender, stud. Hilfskraft</td>
<td>Germanistik</td>
<td>ILG, Universität Stuttgart</td>
<td>10/2006-03/2007</td>
<td>8,75 Std</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19) Alexei Chibakov</td>
<td>Linguistik</td>
<td>ILG, Universität Stuttgart</td>
<td>08/2009-09/2009</td>
<td>10 Std</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Fortsetzung auf nächster Seite)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name, akad. Grad, Dienststellung</th>
<th>engeres Fach des Mitarbeiters</th>
<th>Institut der Hochschule</th>
<th>Bisherige Förderung: im SFB tätig von (Monat/Jahr) bis (Monat/Jahr)</th>
<th>Entgeltgruppe</th>
<th>Beantragte Förderperiode: Mitarbeit im Teilprojekt in Wochenstunden (beratend:B)</th>
<th>Entgeltgruppe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>wiss. Mitarbeiterin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22) Ayla Kayabas (Kaplan), stud. Mitarbeiterin</td>
<td>Computerlinguistik</td>
<td>ILG, Universität Stuttgart</td>
<td>01/2009-12/2009</td>
<td>5 Std</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Fortsetzung auf nächster Seite)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Fortsetzung auf nächster Seite)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name, akad. Grad, Dienststellung</th>
<th>engeres Fach des Mitarbeiters</th>
<th>Institut der Hochschule</th>
<th>Bisherige Förderung im SFB tätig von (Monat/Jahr) bis (Monat/Jahr)</th>
<th>Entgeltgruppe</th>
<th>Beantragte Förderperiode: Mitarbeit im Teilprojekt in Wochenstunden (beratend:B)</th>
<th>Entgeltgruppe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28) Dildora Niyazmetowa, stud. Hilfskraft</td>
<td>Germanistik/Linguistik</td>
<td>ILG, Universität Stuttgart</td>
<td>05/2007-03/2009</td>
<td>7,75 Std</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Fortsetzung auf nächster Seite)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name, akad. Grad, Dienststellung</th>
<th>engeres Fach des Mitarbeiters</th>
<th>Institut der Hochschule</th>
<th>Bisherige Förderung</th>
<th>Entgeltgruppe</th>
<th>Beantragte Förderperiode: Mitarbeit im Teilprojekt in Wochenstunden (beratend:B)</th>
<th>Entgeltgruppe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33) Andrea Voit, stud. Hilfskraft</td>
<td>Politik, Anglistik</td>
<td>ILG, Universität Stuttgart</td>
<td>10/2008</td>
<td>4 Std</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35) N.N. (vorauss. John Varsami)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>ILG, Universität Stuttgart</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>20 Std</td>
<td>stud. HK</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Stellen, für die Mittel neu beantragt werden, sind mit X gekennzeichnet)
Aufgabenbeschreibung von Mitarbeiterinnen und Mitarbeitern der Grundausstattung für die beantragte Förderperiode

zu 1) Prof. Dr. Klaus von Heusinger  
Principal investigator. Responsibilities include development of a semantic model, study of argument alternations in Spanish and Turkish.

Aufgabenbeschreibung von Mitarbeiterinnen und Mitarbeitern der Ergänzungsausstattung für die beantragte Förderperiode

zu 12) Dr. Ljudmila Geist  
since 07/2006 associated with the project. Responsibilities include investigation of argument alternations in Russian and comparison with other Slavic languages, elaboration on the notion of Affectedness, comparison of theories of argument alternation, development of a semantic model for semantically induced case assignment.

zu 13) Dolgor Guntsetseg M.A.  
Ph.D. student since 07/2006, she will complete her dissertation on DOM in Mongolian by the end of phase 1 of the SFB; native language: Mongolian. Responsibilities include analysis of argument alternations in Mongolian and comparison with DOM, also comparison of conditions on semantically induced case assignment in Mongolian and Turkish.

zu 35) John Alex Varsami (student research assistant)  
Native languages: Romanian, German; other languages: English, French, Russian. He will be responsible for the time-consuming collection of data and data evaluation, literature and data research, help in organisation of workshops and conferences, search for informants.

3.7.2 Aufgliederung und Begründung der Sachmittel  
(nach Haushaltsjahren)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2010/2</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014/1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Für Sächliche Aufwendungen stehen als <strong>Grundausstattung</strong> voraussichtlich zur Verfügung:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.500</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Für Sächliche Aufwendungen werden als **Ergänzungsausstattung** beantragt (entspricht den Gesamtsummen „Sachmittel“ in Tabelle 3.7):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2010/2</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014/1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>375</td>
<td>2.750</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>2.750</td>
<td>375</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Alle Angaben in EUR)

Kleingeräte

We apply for three PCs/Notebooks for the two researchers in the project and one student research assistant (5000 EUR/GA).
Begründung zur Ergänzungsausstattung der Sachmittel

Reisemittel
Travel money (4200 EUR/year) is applied for centrally. Each researcher should be able to present research results in international and national conferences. International conferences: Association for Linguistic Typology, SALT, NELS, WAFL and other specific workshops. National: DGfS, Sinn und Bedeutung. Depending on where these conferences are located, costs vary.

Projektspezifische Reisemittel
Dolgor Guntsetseg will spend 2x4 weeks in Mongolia, in order to conduct empirical research (eliciting judgments from informants, data collection via questionnaires). The travels are necessary to acquire the data needed for the theoretical research in the project. We apply for 2000 EUR in 2011 and 2013.

Sonstiges
We apply for 750 EUR/year for expenses with respect to interviewing informants. This is necessary for collecting data.

3.7.3 Investitionen (Geräte über 10.000,- EUR brutto und Fahrzeuge)

Does not apply
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