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3.2 Bericht über die Entwicklung des Teilprojekts

3.2.1 Bericht

Project C1 *The syntax of modification and its interaction with nominal structure* was primarily concerned with ambiguity in the nominal domain, especially in the context of adjective-noun modification patterns across languages. A secondary concern of the project was the cross-linguistic marking of definiteness and related concepts, which interacts with modification in a significant way.

3.2.1.1 Kenntnisstand bei der letzten Antragstellung

In the literature, it has often been observed that languages differ with respect to the position of the adjective, which can either precede or follow the noun they modify. One instance of a language with adjectives in (almost exclusively) prenominal position is English (1). The Romance languages, on the other hand, favor adjectives in postnominal position, cf. French (2).

(1) the grey cat

(2) le chat gris

While the preferences for prenominal position (English) and postnominal position (French) are clear, in both language types, we find classes of adjectives, such as *mere or former*, that seem to be strictly limited to the prenominal position (though see the discussion of French later). In English, on the other hand, some adjectives can also appear in postnominal position, in particular, adjectives which are either morphologically derived from verbs by means of the suffix –able/-ible, e.g. *the stars visible/the visible stars*, or which are participles used as adjectives, or adjectives formed with theaspectual prefix *a-*, e.g. *alive, asleep*.

It is widely assumed that the position of the adjective with regard to the noun has a reflex on the interpretation of the adjective. For instance, *the visible stars vs. the stars visible* illustrates such an alternation: the only interpretation available for the adjective in postnominal position is
an interpretation in terms of a temporal property. While this interpretation is also present in prenominal position, the adjective in prenominal position also allows an interpretation in terms of an intrinsic property ascribed to the noun. Thus, in English, the prenominal position is ambiguous. In the Romance languages, on the other hand, the postnominal position is assumed to be ambiguous in its interpretation. This is reflected in contrasts such as in the Italian example *un buon attaccante* (a good forward – good at playing forward) vs. *un attaccante buono* (a good forward who is either good at playing forward or a good-hearted person). Here, the prenominal position is said to be non-intersective whereas the postnominal position is ambiguous between an intersective and a non-intersective interpretation (cf. Alexiadou 2001, Cinque 2005).

According to Cinque, several other types of ambiguity pattern like the adjective *buono*: the individual-level vs. stage-level ambiguity (*visible stars* vs. *stars visible*), the restrictive vs. non-restrictive ambiguity (*acts unsuitable* vs. *unsuitable acts*), the specific vs. non-specific ambiguity (*nearby house* vs. *house nearby*), and the modal vs. implicit relative clause interpretation (*every possible candidate* vs. *every candidate possible*).

### 3.2.1.2 Ausgangsfragestellung
Initially, the project aimed at providing an answer to the following questions:
- How is ambiguity in modification to be understood: lexically, structurally, or as a combination of both?
- What is the internal morpho-syntactic structure of modifiers?
- How does the syntax of modification interact with nominal structure?
- How does nominal structure relate to the morphological and semantic features of modifiers?
- What explains the cross-linguistic differences in the morpho-syntactic properties of modifiers?

C1 was conceived as focusing on both *adjectival patterns/simplex modification* and *patterns including participles/complex modification*.

The main hypothesis was that languages show two types of modification, which form the basis of the ambiguity observed in the data:

(3) 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direct modification</th>
<th>Indirect modification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>permits intersective and non-intersective modifiers</td>
<td>permits intersective modifiers only</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Indirect modification is accommodated under the relative clause analysis, cf. Alexiadou & Wilder (1998). A different pattern was assumed for so-called direct modifiers. The idea was that the different interpretations that are available for one and the same adjective are associated with two different syntactic patterns for modification. Note here that the link to the structure of relative clauses becomes obvious if we consider Greek modification patterns, as in (4). In Greek, some adjectives appear post-nominally but only when they are preceded by an extra article (this phenomenon has been labelled Determiner Spreading (DS)). Interestingly, in DS constructions adjectives which are ambiguous in pre-nominal position are no longer ambiguous:

(4)  

| a. | ta orata asteria ine poli makria | ambiguous |
| 1. | the visible stars are very far away |
| 2. | stars which are generally visible, are very far |
| b. | ta asteria ta orata ine poli makria | unambiguous |
| 1. | the stars the visible are very far |
| 2. | #stars, which are generally visible, are very far |
2. stars, which happen to be visible now, are very far

The Greek pattern led to the secondary concern of the project, namely to examine the nature of
double definiteness and the semantic contribution of multiple determiners. To this end Scandina-
vian and Romanian data were taken into consideration.

Following the recommendation of our reviewers, the focus of the project changed slightly
and the part on adjectival modification was re-directed into primarily providing a typology of the
behavior of Romance adjectives. Still the project was able to pursue some of its other goals suc-
cessfully.

3.2.1.3 Ergebnisse und ihre Bedeutung unter Hinweis auf die Publikationen aus den Teilprojek-
ten, angewandte und ggf. neu entwickelte Methoden, ggf. offene Fragen

In the presentation that follows, we group our results into the following areas: i) ambiguity of
adjectival modification in Romance languages, ii) the structure of the DP, iii) the role of mul-
tiple determiners, iv) the internal structure of adjectives and v) participial modifiers.

i) Adjectival modification in Romance

A. Accounting for the behavior of French adjectives

In the Italian examples in (5), we see that Italian generally allows pre-nominal and post-nominal
placement of adjectives to disambiguate between the two readings of the adjective (Cinque
2005). (5) illustrates the ambiguity between the individual-level vs. stage-level interpretation.
Cinque suggested that the pattern is very systematic:

(5) a. Le invisibili stelle di Andromeda sono molto distanti  (unambiguous)
the invisible stars of Andromeda are very distant
‘A’s stars which are generally invisible, are very far’  (individual-level)
#’A’s stars, which happen to be invisible now, are very far’(stage-level)
b. Le stelle invisibili di Andromeda sono molto distanti  (ambiguous)
‘A’s stars which are generally invisible, are very far’  (individual-level)
‘A’s stars, which happen to be invisible now, are very far’  (stage-level)

This behavior was confirmed by a number of other Romance languages, e.g. Spanish and Roma-
nian (Marchis & Alexiadou to appear). However, while the distribution of ambiguity in Spanish
and Romanian is in line with the Italian examples given above, this pattern does not seem to hold
for French, as the following examples (6) show (Gengel, submitted).

(6) a. Les étoiles invisibles d’Andromède sont très lointaines.  (individual-level)
The stars invisible of Andromeda are very far-away
‘A’s stars which are generally invisible, are very far
‘Of every part of Switzerland, and even from foreign
countries, people had come to see the invisible object.’

In (6), both the prenominal and postnominal position only display the individual-level reading –
in contrast to Italian (cf. (5) above), the ambiguity between a stage-level and individual-level
interpretation does not seem to hold. In this example, French thus differs from other Romance
languages in that it is more restricted in interpretation than its Italian and Spanish counterparts.
As Gengel (submitted) shows, the behavior of French is different from the other Romance languages. Table 1 summarizes this for the adjective in (6). The table is indicative of a more general pattern: crucially, while in other Romance languages adjectives are ambiguous in postnominal position, French lacks this ambiguity. This pattern is repeated across adjectival classes.

**TABLE 1 Romance Data:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Prenominal Position</th>
<th>Postnominal Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>Le <strong>invisibile</strong> stelle di Andromeda sono molto distanti. (individual-level)</td>
<td>Le stelle <strong>invisibile</strong> di Andromeda sono molti distanti. (ambiguous)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Las <strong>invisibles</strong> estrellas de Andromeda están muy lejanas. (individual-level)</td>
<td>Las estrellas <strong>invisibles</strong> de Andromeda están muy lejanas. (ambiguous)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romanian</td>
<td><strong>Invizibilele</strong> stele ale Andromedei sunt foarte îndepartate. (individual-level)</td>
<td>Stelele <strong>invizibile</strong> ale Andromedei sunt foarte îndepartate. (strong preference for individual-level)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>De tous les points de Suisse, et même de l’étranger, on était accouru pour voir ... l’<strong>invisible</strong> objet. (individual-level)</td>
<td>Les étoiles <strong>invisibles</strong> d’Andromède sont très lointaines. (individual-level)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This behavior is indeed puzzling. Assuming that the ambiguity found in other Romance languages can be accounted for in terms of two distinct syntactic structures (cf. Alexiadou 2001, Cinque 2005 for alternatives), the French data seem to contradict that. In order to account for the French data, a post-syntactic explanation for the availability of both adjectival positions was developed within the framework of Distributed Morphology. More specifically, we claimed that the distribution of both cases in (5) and (6) can be derived via Local Dislocation (Gengel, submitted), as schematised in (7) and (8) below.

(7) *possibles* (ambiguous) *candidats* (*N*)

From its assumed base position, the prenominal position, as illustrated in (7), the adjective is moved to the next available position, which is the position immediately following the noun, as indicated in (8).

(8) *possibles candidats* (*N*)

This results in the configuration in (9), which is the other surface word order available for the adjective *possible* in French.

(9) *candidats* (*N*) *possibles*

Local Dislocation (cf. Embick & Noyer 2001) is a postsyntactic operation and thus crucially does not affect the interpretation of the adjective. Moreover, as a post-syntactic operation, Local Dis-
location may be influenced by prosodic or stylistic considerations, which are more pronounced in French than in the other Romance languages, due to its specific prosodic pattern (cf. Féry (2001), Gengel (submitted)). Given that French adjectives are either non-ambiguous, as in the case of *invisible*, or remain ambiguous in both positions, as in the case of the adjective *possible*, this dislocation movement (to the nearest available position of the same kind) offers a derivation that takes into account the lack of change in interpretation in the two adjectival positions – which would not be expected under a purely syntactic account. In addition to the derivation of unambiguous adjectives in French, the Local Dislocation operation can also offer an explanation for the availability of both the prenominal and postnominal position for adjectival participles in French.

**B. Internal vs. external ambiguity of adjectives in Italian**

In English, sentences as in (10) are ambiguous between an internal/attributive reading of the adjective (11a), and a so-called external reading, which has an adverbial paraphrase as in (11b), see Bolinger (1967). We refer to this latter reading as OCs here.

(10) [DP The / An occasional sailor] strolled by.
(11) a. Someone who sails occasionally strolled by. = internal/attributive reading  
     b. Occasionally, a sailor strolled by. = external/adverbial reading

In C1 we detected a similar ambiguity for Italian (Alexiadou & Campanini submitted). Such an adverbial reading is possible only with the determiner *qualche* 'some', which is not specified for gender and selects a grammatically singular NP, but can be (and mainly is) plural in meaning (see Zamparelli 2008).

(12) [Gli affari andavano male per Mario.]  
[Business was bad for Mario.]  
   Solo qualche occasional cliente entrava nel suo negozio.  
   Only 'some' occasional customer entered his shop.  
   a. Occasionally, a customer entered the shop. = adverbial reading  
   b. Someone who occasionally shops (an occasional customer) entered the shop. = attributive reading

In order to capture the adverbial reading of the Italian determiner + adjective combination, and to explain why it is the case that different determiners in English and Italian give rise to such interpretations, we explored an analysis by assuming that the extended projection of the noun phrase contains at least three functional layers relating to definiteness and plurality, see (13), see Hey-cock & Zamparelli (2005), cf. Borer (2005):
Pl/Class is the projection where plural denotation is constructed. The fact that OCs are licensed mainly by definite and indefinite (singular) articles in English and only by qualche in Italian is related to the fact that these elements have been independently argued to be merged in PIP.

ii) The structure of the DP

Already the phenomenon discussed in the previous paragraph makes it clear that one cannot abstract away from the internal structure of the noun phrase in the context of adjectival modification. The picture in (13) is the one that our project came to confirm, by looking at different phenomena.

In particular, it proved to offer an account of the phenomenon of noun phrase ellipsis. Based on data from the Romance languages, in particular, NP Ellipsis with the indefinite article (cf. Bernstein 1993), we have argued that NP Ellipsis (NPE) is licensed by the presence of a classifier phrase in the nominal structure, see Borer (2005). More specifically, the Classifier phrase in ellipsis encodes the concept of partitivity (following Sleeman’s 1996 analysis of partitivity). As we have shown, this analysis can be extended to cover English NPE with one-insertion (Alexiadou & Gengel, to appear a, b; cf. Barbiers 2005), and Dutch and German NPE (Alexiadou & Gengel, to appear a, b; cf. Corver & van Koppen 2006; Lobeck 1995).
In addition, Scandinavian data provide interesting support for this picture. As Lohrmann (submitted) argues, ClassP, bears the feature [ind], *individuation*, and functions as a classifier which individuates nouns. In case of plural marking, the declensional affix is inserted here, in singular DPs ø is inserted. Nouns enter the derivation as non-classified (i.e. neither count nor mass) and are individuated by movement to the head of ClassP, which adds a ‘kind/type-reading’. Nouns that are to be interpreted as mass nouns remain in situ.

Data from Greek mass nouns and nominalizations and their pluralization properties suggest that Number is not a unified projection, and there should be two kinds of number: one instantiated in a functional layer above nP, and one realized on nP (Alexiadou 2009).

iii) The role of multiple determiners

Since ambiguity is resolved in Greek in the context of multiple determiners, we investigated such multiple occurrences in Scandinavian and Romanian. For Greek, Tsakali (2008) argued that doubling determiners are markers of familiarity. The situation of doubling doubling determiners in Scandinavian and Romanian is, however, different.

In Scandinavian, Lohrmann (submitted) shows that in (14) the two determiners have different semantic contributions:

(14)  
\[
\text{den rolig-a film-en} \quad \text{(Swedish)}
\]
\[
\text{DEF funny-W film-DEF}
\]
\[
\text{“the funny film”}
\]

Double marking of definiteness in the Scandinavian double definiteness languages is not superfluos but mirrors the semantic contribution of the respective morphemes. In particular, the semantic content of the suffixed article can be characterized as ‘specific reference’, thus including that the denotation of N+DEF yields a referential reading and that the denotation is identifiable and locatable for the hearer. The preadjectival article introduces a ‘discourse referent’ that contains a new ‘discourse variable’. But even the weak adjectival ending has a semantic contribution: it individuates the relevant members in the A+N denotation. The corresponding syntactic structure for Scandinavian DPs is thus the following.

(15)  
\[
[\text{DP2 [disc]} \ [\#P \ [FP \ AP \ [F' \ [ident] \ [DP1 \ [sref] \ [ClassP \ [ind] \ NP]]]]]]
\]

The move to split definiteness features in the DP is further explored in Alexiadou (2008) who compares Somali noun phrases to their Scandinavian counterparts and notes interesting parallels.

Marchis & Alexiadou (to appear) investigated doubling of determiners in Romanian, see (16):

(16)  
\[
\text{fluture-le (cel) frumos}
\]
\[
\text{butterfly-the cel beautiful}
\]

Unlike doubling articles in Greek, the presence of *cel* is not obligatory when the adjective occurs in post-nominal position. When it is present, however, a semantic effect arises, namely the adjective is interpreted as unambiguously restrictive. *cel* differs from Greek determiner spreading in that it does not only precede adjectives but also PPs or other modifiers:

(17)  
\[
a. \text{ casa cea de piatră}
\]
\[
\text{house.the cel of stone}
\]
b. *to spiti to apo petra
the house the from stone

Moreover, cel always follows the definite noun. Greek doubling, however, permits word order permutations (Alexiadou & Wilder 1998 for discussion and references). We maintained the idea that cel phrases are reduced relatives but we claimed that their function is that of appositive specification clauses. Semantically, in such a clause the second element specifies the first, and necessarily the second is a logical subset of the first element. The semantics crucially involves set intersection, thus giving the restrictions on the adjectives. In addition this structure explains the fact that the adjective is never ambiguous, it is always generated in the predicative position of the relative clause. It also explains why the adjective cannot be iterated, since the NP can receive only one specification (and be modified by only one appositive relative) and why it appears in post-nominal position, which is the standard one for apposition.

A manuscript by Alexiadou dealing with multiple determiners across languages is in preparation.

iv) The internal structure of adjectives

In view of the fact that sometimes ambiguity arises in the context of a particular noun, as in (18), where the adjective in (18b) is interpreted as the agent of the event described by the derived nominal. The two further differ in that only the adjective in (18a) can appear in a predicative position. We investigated the properties of denominal adjectives in Greek, Spanish and Romanian:

(18)  
   a. the Italian bag  
   b. the Italian invasion

Our point of departure were so-called ethnic/group adjectives (EAs), viz. adjectives that refer to sets of individuals sharing a particular trait of nationality, origin or other geographical feature as in (18) (Bartning 1980, Levi 1978 and Postal 1969). The prominent property of such adjectives is that they display a noun-like behavior, most prominently they encode the external argument role assigned to them by the modified noun, and in this regard they can be assumed to be in complementary distribution with genitives.

In Alexiadou & Stavrou (to appear) we argued that relational adjectives that encode a theta role from the modified noun are (morphologically) formed during the syntactic derivation in a way that renders their internal make up transparent for semantic interpretation. Our analysis is cast within the Distributed Morphology framework. Specifically, we proposed that ethnic adjectives as in (18b) are generated as DPs in Spec,nP, the position where possessors are introduced, see e.g. Delsing (1993), Cardinaletti (1998), Alexiadou (2001). This projection is similar to the light v/Voice in the verbal domain. In Greek such adjectives contain the affix -ik, that attaches to the stem referring to a group ethnicity:

(19) [DP [AgrP a - ik- [nP ital-]]]  
Greek
italian

In this position the adjective receives the agent theta role, along the lines of Kratzer (1994) and Chomsky (1995). Assuming that only DPs can be arguments (Longobardi 1994) would lead us to suggest that the adjective is generated as a DP. But the structure of the DP is minimal in the sense that it is similar to that of mass nouns, i.e. it simply contains a D head and the root (see Borer (2005); cf. Marchis (2009)). This is presumably the reason why such nouns are interpreted
as having plural (= group) denotation.

The next thing we consider is the transformation that creates an adjective out of a bare DP. In the general spirit of Marantz (1997, 2001), the noun underlying the EA moves (from nP) to AgrP. The movement of the noun in Spec, nP can be seen as parallel to the movement of clitics which move as heads and as maximal projections at the same time (Chomsky 1995; Cardinaletti 1998). It is also akin to Case-driven movement of arguments. Assuming that a DP unvalued for Case is ill-formed at morphological structure, we proposed, building on Marchis (2009), that there are two ways this can be made more precise in a structure like (19): either via movement to Agr, in which case the DP is spelled-out as an adjective, or in the case of a full genitive DP, via long distance Agree with FP (Chomsky 2001). Thus the derivational suffix -ik- in Greek and the genitive are realizations of a Case-checking relationship within a particular domain, in agreement with Marantz (1991), who views case realization as a morphological property of the clause as a whole. This corresponds to the two ways DPs can surface within a relational nominal (cf. Fabregas 2007). The movement option is available only to the DP with the deficient structure, similarly to what has been proposed by Cardinaletti & Starke (1997) for clitics. Denominal predicative adjectives (18a), in contrast, are not formed in the syntax but are morphologically derived.

Marchis (in preparation) offers a comprehensive analysis of denominal adjectives in Spanish and Romanian along similar lines. An important aspect of her work is to show how differences in the internal structure of the nominal source of these adjectives can account for their semantic and syntactic properties.

v) Participial modifiers

Finally, in this part of the project we just touched upon differences in the behavior of adjectival participles in Greek, see Alexiadou & Anagnostopoulou (2008). Greek has two participial constructions that can be used in an adjectival function: the -menos and the -tos participles:

(20) a. vras-o ‘boil-1sg’ vras-men-os vras-t-os “boiled”
    b. psin-o ‘gril-1sg psi-men-os psi-t-os “grilled”

There are several semantic and syntactic differences between the two constructions and in fact -menos participles are ambiguous between a target state and a resultant state interpretation (see Anagnostopoulou 2003 and Alexiadou & Anagnostopoulou 2008). We argued that the internal syntactic structure of the participles differs: a) -tos participles are pure statives and involve root attachment of the affix, b) -menos target states involve a v layer, as they have event implications while c) -menos resultant states include a Voice layer in addition to the vP one, as they can be modified by agent PPs.

Adopting these tools, we analysed the internal structure of Romanian supines, nominalizations that have a participial source, and determined that the source of the Romanian supine is the resultant state participle (Alexiadou, Iordachioaia & Marchis to appear).

3.2.1.4 Bezüge zu und Kooperationen mit anderen Arbeiten im Sonderforschungsbereich

Project C1 worked most closely with project B1, as both projects are interested in the internal structure of the noun phrase, and in fact the results obtained within these two projects complement each other. Within area C, we interacted with project C2 in determining the semantic features of determiners, discussing relevant data and typological generalizations. Lastly, within area A, we collaborated with A1 concerning the investigation of the role of Focus in NP Ellipsis and other linguistic environments. To this end, a co-taught research seminar (Riester, Gengel, Onea) was held during the Winter Semester 2008/2009.
3.2.1.5 Vergleiche mit Forschungen außerhalb des Sonderforschungsbereichs und Reaktionen der wissenschaftlichen Öffentlichkeit auf die eigenen Arbeiten

The work produced here in Stuttgart complements work by Cinque, work done on the Scandinavian DP and work on participial constructions carried out in UMass and UPenn. Our results, by pointing out shortcomings of previous analyses offer new solutions to old problems and add a considerable typological perspective to the discussion concerning the structure of the DP. In several domains, e.g. Italian external readings of adjectives, or Romanian supines, we were able to make new factual discoveries.

The fact that papers presenting the results of our work have been accepted at a number of international conferences (see below) reflects the positive reaction our research received.

Marchis, Mihaela & Artemis Alexiadou. 2007. On the properties of the cel adjectival construction in Romanian. Going Romance Conference 2007 Amsterdam
Marchis, Mihaela. 2009a. On the properties of Relational adjectives in Romanian and Spanish. 
*19th Colloquium on Generative Grammar*, University of the Basque Country, April 2009.
Marchis, Mihaela. 2009b. Relational adjectives in Romance. *Annual Conference of the English 
Department of the University of Bucharest*, June 2009.

The principal investigator of this project has received invitations to present her work at international conferences, and has been invited by Marcel den Dikken to contribute a chapter on Ad- 
verbial and Adjectival Modification for the *Cambridge Handbook of Generative Syntax*.

Invited talks (Alexiadou):
The fine properties of (in)definiteness spreading. NORMS meeting Tromsø, September 2006.
On the distribution of multiple determiners in the Greek DP. Workshop on micro-variation within 
Reduplication and doubling contrasted: implications for the structure of the D/AP. Kick-off con- 
fERENCE on functional categories and the analytic languages, Leiden, October 2008.
Form-meaning asymmetries in the noun phrase: the case of Number. Workshop on Converging 

Kirsten Gengel received an invitation to present her work on ellipsis and the structure of the DP 
at the University of Leiden:
2006.

3.2.1.6 Schwierigkeiten und Probleme bei der Durchführung des Teilprojekts

A considerable difficulty that emerged concerns our research on French adjectives. With respect 
to the ambiguities found in the other Romance languages (cf. the discussion above), a closer in- 
vestigation of the French data revealed a highly idiosyncratic behavior with a number of adjectives, 
thus casting doubts on the hypothesis that the generalizations established in Cinque (2001 
et seq.) holds for all Romance languages. Given that variation in speaker judgment was consid- 
erable (in the literature as well as in personal communication, cf. e.g. the generalizations in Wilmet 
1981 vs. Goes 1995), the factors determining the distribution of adjectives in the French lan- 
guage do not seem to be solely semantic or syntactic criteria. While Local Dislocation (Gengel to 
appear) accounts for some of these cases, further examples may only be explained on the basis of 
a combination of factors such as number of syllables, whether complement of adjectives vs. 
complements of the noun are included, coordination of adjectives or nouns, or the overall fre- 
cency of the adjective, which ultimately seem to determine adjectival placement. However, 
even taking all these factors into account does not yield clear predictions on how a specific adjective 
would be distributed in a specific environment. Gengel (submitted) provides a detailed over- 
view of these data, indicating where French differs from the other Romance languages, and 
which of the above-mentioned factors may contribute to a positional preference in the distribu- 
tion of a given adjective.

3.2.1.7 Gründe für die Beendigung des Teilprojekts

In view of the fact that the reviewers recommended that the project should produce a typology of 
Romance adjectives, the submitted results of this work conclude the core of our investigation 
(Gengel submitted). Moreover, we were able to deal with our secondary concerns, structure of 
the noun phrase, structure of the adjectives and multiple determiners and these results will be 
presented in Lohrmann’s (forthcoming dissertation), Marchis’s (forthcoming dissertation) and
Alexiadou's work on doubling. Thus, while a number of issues, of course, remain open, the report here summarizes and concludes our research.

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

**Begutachtete Veröffentlichungen.**


**Eingereichte Veröffentlichungen (Datum der Einreichung)**


Alexiadou, A. & C. Campanini. On the adverbial reading of infrequency adjectives and the structure of the DP.

Gengel, K. [to be submitted]. Romance Adjectival Distribution: A critical approach to Cinque’s Generalizations. (Working Title)


**Nicht begutachtete Veröffentlichungen**


**Bibliographie**

Alexiadou, A. & C. Campanini. submitted. On the adverbiale reading of infrequency adjectives and the structure of the DP.
Corver, N. & M. van Koppen. 2006. Let’s Focus on Noun Ellipsis. GLOW.


---

### 3.3 Bewilligte Mittel für die laufende Förderperiode

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Haushaltsjahr</th>
<th>Personalmittel</th>
<th>Sachmittel</th>
<th>Investitionsmittel</th>
<th>Gesamt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bis 201X/1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201X/2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201X/1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3.3.1 Personal im Teilprojekt

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name, akad. Grad, Dienststellung</th>
<th>engeres Fach des Mitarbeiters</th>
<th>Institut der Hochschule oder der außeruniv. Einrichtung</th>
<th>im SFB tätig von (Monat / Jahr) bis (Monat / Jahr)</th>
<th>Entgeltgruppe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grundausstattung</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wissenschaftl. Personal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(einschl. Hilfskräfte)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nichtwissenschaftl. Personal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ergänzungsausstattung</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wissenschaftl. Personal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(einschl. Hilfskräfte)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nichtwissenschaftl. Personal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3.1.2 nichtwissenschafl. Personal 1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ergänzungsausstattung**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.3.1.3 wissenschafl. Personal 1) (einschl. Hilfskräfte)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.3.1.4 nichtwissenschafl. Personal 1)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

(Stellen, für die Mittel neu beantragt werden, sind mit X gekennzeichnet)

1) Bitte durchnumerieren und Aufgabenbeschreibung nachfolgend erläutern