



GLOW Newsletter #69, Fall 2012

Edited by Marc Richards

Addresses:

GLOW Newsletter

Marc Richards
Institut für Linguistik
Goethe-Universität Frankfurt
Grüneburgplatz 1
60629 Frankfurt
Germany
richards@em.uni-frankfurt.de

GLOW Bureau

Utrecht Institute of Linguistics OTS
Utrecht University
PO Box 85253
3508 AG Utrecht
The Netherlands
Phone + 31 30 253 9163
Fax + 31 30 253 6406
glow@let.uu.nl

<http://www.glow-linguistics.org/>

Contents

A Note from the Editor	3
GLOW Renewal Notice	4
The 36th GLOW Conference 2013 in Lund: Calls for Papers & Submission Guidelines	
<i>Main Colloquium</i>	5
<i>Submission Guidelines</i>	5
<i>Workshop 1: Bilingualism</i>	7
<i>Workshop 2: Syntactic variation and change</i>	11
<i>Workshop 3: Diachronic workings in phonological patterns</i>	13
<i>Workshop 4: Acquisition of syntax in close varieties</i>	15
Minutes of the GLOW General Assembly 2012 held in Potsdam	17
Treasurer's Report 2011	20

A Note from the Editor

Dear GLOW Members,

We're Lund-bound for GLOW 2013, and as ever, the following pages of Fall-flavoured Newsletter are here to guide you through the abstract-submitting side of things. Please adhere strictly to the formatting guidelines on pp.5-6 unless you want to fall at the first hurdle...

The 36th GLOW Colloquium, which will run from April 3-5 and include a single poster session, is reverting to a state of themelessness again, so submissions are welcome on any subject within the broad domain of generative linguistics. Those who prefer their topics a little more focussed, however, should find themselves equally well catered for by the four workshops taking place on 2 and 6 April, which cover a wide range of specific research questions in biolinguistics, diachronic phonology, and syntactic microvariation from the perspectives of both language change and acquisition.

Like last year, the date for submitting your abstracts by is November 15th, and the place to submit them is [EasyChair](#). Don't forget, too, to renew your GLOW memberships if they've expired (details on p.4), and to nominate any candidates you'd like to suggest for the Board positions coming up for election in 2013 (see p.18, item 7).

Marc Richards.

GLOW Renewal Notice

Renewal is for the calendar year 2013, taking effect with the Spring issue of the GLOW Newsletter. Payment should reach us by January 1, 2013, especially if you intend to attend the annual GLOW Colloquium in April. GLOW is continuing to offer four-year student memberships for €30. This is an incredibly good deal, so please encourage eligible people to take advantage of it. We also offer 5- and 10-year memberships at reduced prices.

Membership dues

The current membership dues, as agreed at the Amsterdam General Assembly, are:

Student/Unemployed:	€ 11.50
Student (4 year)	€ 30 (a once-per-lifetime deal)
Regular (1 year)	€ 25
Regular (5 year)	€ 110
Regular (10 year)	€ 200
Regular (life)	€ 400

Modes of Payment:

- By Credit Card (Eurocard/MasterCard/Access/CarteBancaire/Visa);
- By remittance to
 - Dutch Postal Account #91.44.68;
 - Bank Account no. 43.97.10.340, ABN-AMRO Bank, Tilburg,NL

Whichever mode of payment you choose, please mail the completed membership form (available from the [GLOW website](#)) to the GLOW Bureau at the address in Utrecht (on p.1 above). If you pay by credit card, you can also fax the form to +31 30 253 64 06.

N.B.: If you wish to benefit from the GLOW membership discount for GLOW's official journal, *The Linguistic Review*, and/or for certain books published by Mouton de Gruyter, please follow the instructions on the order form (you now send the order directly to the publisher, Mouton, and not to GLOW).

GLOW XXXVI (2013)

Generative Linguistics in the Old World 36

The 36th GLOW Conference will take place at Lund University from 2nd to 6th April 2013 (Colloquium: April 3-5; Workshops: April 2 & 6).

Host

SOL, Centre for Languages and Literature, Lund University;
supported by The Birgit Rausing Language Programme

Venue

SOL, Centre for Languages and Literature, Lund University

Main Colloquium

April 3–5, 2013

THEME: FREE

Organizers:	The Grimm group, SOL
Contact:	glow36@nordlund.lu.se
Keynote speaker:	Anders Holmberg, Newcastle University
Deadline for submission:	November 15, 2013
Notification of acceptance:	January 20, 2013
Submission of abstracts:	https://www.easychair.org/conferences/?conf=glow36
Website:	http://conference.sol.lu.se/en/glow-36/

Talks and posters: Abstracts are invited for oral presentations lasting 45 minutes + 15 minutes of discussion. In addition, GLOW 36 will be holding a poster session. When submitting an abstract, the author(s) should indicate whether they wish to be considered for an oral presentation only or would also be willing to present a poster. Financial reimbursement will be limited to oral presentations.

Selection: 20 papers will be selected for oral presentation and an additional 30 papers will be selected for the poster presentation.

Submission Guidelines

Submission procedure: All abstracts (including abstracts for the workshops) must be submitted online through *EasyChair*:

<https://www.easychair.org/conferences/?conf=glow36>

The abstract deadline is **November 15, 2012, 23:59 CET**.

Notifications of acceptance/rejection will be sent out on January 20, 2013.

Format: Abstracts (for oral presentations and posters) must not exceed two A4 pages in length. This includes data and references. Submissions must be consistent with the following format:

- 2.5 cm (1 inch) margins on all four sides. On A4 paper, these margins produce a 160mm x 247mm text box. Submitters whose computers are set up for other paper sizes should adjust their margins accordingly to produce a text box of this size. This is especially important for the legibility of the Spring Newsletter.
- Font size no smaller than 12pt, with single line spacing; no more than 50 lines of text per page, including examples. Preferred font: Times New Roman.
- Examples must be integrated throughout the text of the abstract, rather than collected at the end.
- Nothing in the abstract, the title, or the name of the document should identify the author(s).
- At most two submissions per author, at most one of which can be single-authored. The same abstract may **not** be submitted to both the Colloquium and a workshop.
- Only submissions in **pdf** format will be accepted.

Important note: Named abstracts and the Spring Newsletter

Two abstract copies should be submitted, one anonymous (for the selection procedure) and one named (for publication of accepted abstracts in the Spring Newsletter). In case any problems arise, please contact the organizers (glow36@nordlund.lu.se) and the Newsletter Editor (richards@em.uni-frankfurt.de).

It is particularly important for publication/distribution purposes that all non-standard (non-open source) fonts in the named version of accepted abstracts be either properly embedded into the pdf file or else avoided altogether.

GLOW 2013 Workshop I

April 2

BIOLINGUISTICS

Organizer:	Anna Maria di Sciullo (Université du Québec à Montréal)
Contact:	disciullo4@gmail.com
Invited speakers:	Robert Berwick, MIT Charles Yang, University of Pennsylvania
Deadline for submission:	November 15, 2013
Notification of acceptance:	January 20, 2013
Submission of abstracts:	https://www.easychair.org/conferences/?conf=glow36

This workshop addresses fundamental questions on the properties of the Language Faculty from a biolinguistic perspective, with particular attention on how this perspective contributes to further understanding of linguistic phenomena with large empirical coverage.

The study of the relation between humans' biology and the Language Faculty is central in Biolinguistics (Lenneberg 1967; Chomsky 1983, 2005; Jenkins 2000, 2004; Gallistel, 2009; Di Sciullo et al 2010; Berwick and Chomsky 2011; Di Sciullo and Boeckx 2011). While theoretical hypotheses about this relation have emerged in the generative enterprise since its beginnings, recent developments directly address the issue in terms of the properties of the 'language organ'. Different hypotheses about the properties of the generative procedure giving rise to the discrete infinity of language are still under discussion, and their connection with biology is open to important cross-disciplinary work (Hauser, Chomsky and Fitch 2002; Piattelli-Palmarini and Uriagereka 2008; Larson 2011; Lasnik 2011, 2012; Arsenijević and Hinzen 2012). Advances have been made in human–animal studies to differentiate human language from animal communication (Jarvis 2004; Fitch and Hauser 2004; Friederici 2009; Fitch 2010). Contributions from neuroscience also point to the exclusive properties of the human brain for language (Moro 2010; Friederici et al. 2011; Patel 2008, 2012). Studies of genetically based language impairments also contribute to our understanding of the properties of the language organ (Ross and Bever 2004; Bishop et al. 2005; Hancock and Bever 2012; Patel et al. 2008; Wexler 2003). This workshop invites contributions showing how theoretical and experimental works on the biological basis of language shed light on core linguistic phenomena.

The relation between language variation and biology is another important area of research in biolinguistics, as variation is a constant in the observable biological world, as it is in language variation and historical evolution (Cavalli-Sforza and Feldman 1981; Lewontin 2000). Theoretical approaches to language variation stemming from works on population genetics, and syntactic approaches to language phylogeny, have opened new horizons for the study of language variation, and more broadly for language development, including its development in the child (Bever 1981; Longobardi and Guardiano 2011; Niyogi 2006, Niyogi and Berwick 2009; Di Sciullo 2011, 2012, Biberauer, Holmberg and Roberts 2012). Recent works on the poverty of the stimulus bring additional arguments to the biological nature of language, and they address central issues related to deterministic/probabilistic theories of language learning and language variation (Berwick et al 2011; Yang 2002, 2008, 2011). Other works address the

question of why parameters emerge and why resetting of parameters occurs, and consider the role of external, environmental factors in language variation and change. This workshop invites contributions with large empirical coverage that address fundamental questions of language development and language variation and their technical instantiations as feature-valuing, symmetry-breaking, functional flexibility, as a distinctive instance of variation and development in the natural world.

The relation between Language as a computational procedure and principles reducing complexity has been part of the research agenda in the generative enterprise since the 1950's. Framed within biolinguistics, the principles of efficient computation are natural laws affecting the properties of the operations and the derivations of the (Narrow) Language Faculty (Chomsky 2005, 2011). They apply to Merge (No Tampering Condition), as well as to the derivational procedure (minimal search, phases, Agree), to the SM interface (Pronounce the Minimum, Chomsky 2011), and to the CI interface (Reference Set, Reinhart 2006; Local Economy, Fox 1999). They reduce the specific properties of the Language Faculty, while they affect all aspects of the generative procedure. Several questions arise regarding the properties of the so-called 'third factor' in language development, including the following: How do the principles of efficient computation address classical computational notions of complexity, such as Kolmogorov's 1965 definition, as well as novel notions of complexity? How are they related to natural laws? What is their relation to the Strong Minimalist Thesis? This workshop invites contributions with large empirical coverage that address fundamental questions about principles of efficient computation in the study of the biology of language.

References

- Arsenijević, B. and W. Hinzen. 2012. On the absence of X-within-X recursion in human grammar. *Linguistic Inquiry* 43(3): 423–440.
- Berwick, R. C. and N. Chomsky. 2011. The Biolinguistic Program: The Current State of its Evolution. In A.M. Di Sciullo and C. Boeckx (eds.). *The Biolinguistic Enterprise: New Perspectives on the Evolution and Nature of the Human Language Faculty*. 19–41. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Berwick, R. C., P. Pietroski, B. Yankama, and N. Chomsky. 2011. Poverty of the Stimulus Revisited. *Cognitive Science* 35: 1207–42.
- Bever, T.G. 1981. Normal Acquisition Processes Explain the Critical Period for Language Learning. In Diller, K.C. (ed.). *Individual differences and universals in language learning aptitude*, 176–198. Newbury House.
- Biberauer, T., A. Holmberg, and I. Roberts. 2012. A Syntactic Universal and its Consequences. Ms. University of Cambridge.
- Bishop, Dorothy V. M., Caroline V. Adams, and Courtenay F. Norbury. 2005. Distinct genetic influences on grammar and phonological short-term memory deficits: Evidence from 6-year-old twins. *Genes, Brain and Behavior* 5, 158–169.
- Cavalli-Sforza L. and M. Feldman. 1981. *Cultural Transmission and Evolution*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Chomsky, N. 1975. *Reflections on Language*. New York: Pantheon.
- Chomsky, N. 1980. Discussion. In Piattelli-Palmarini, M. (ed.). *Language and Learning. The Debate between Jean Piaget and Noam Chomsky*. 73–83. London: Routledge.
- Chomsky, N. 1988. *Language and the Problems of Knowledge*. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.

- Chomsky, N. 2005. Three Factors in Language Design. *Linguistic Inquiry*. 36: 1–22.
- Chomsky, N. 2011. Poverty of Stimulus: Unfinished Business. Lecture presented in the Lecture Series ‘Sprache und Gehirn – Zur Sprachfähigkeit des Menschen’ organized by Angela D. Friederici in the context of the Johannes Gutenberg endowed professorship. Summer 2010.
- Di Sciullo, A. M. 2011. A Bilingualistic Approach to Variation. In A.M. Di Sciullo and C. Boeckx (eds.). *The Bilingualistic Enterprise: New Perspectives on the Evolution and Nature of the Human Language Faculty*. 305–328. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Di Sciullo, A. M. 2012. An Evolutionary Developmental Universal: Evidence from the Morpho-Syntactic Evolution of the Nominal domain. Paper presented at the Typology and Universals in Word-Formation Conference.
- Di Sciullo, A. M. and L. Jenkins. 2012. Bilingualistics and the Nature of the Language Faculty. To appear in *Language*.
- Di Sciullo, A. M., M. Piattelli-Palmarini, K. Wexler, R. C. Berwick, C. Boeckx, L. Jenkins, J. Uriagereka, K. Stromswold, L. Cheng, H. Harley, A. Wedel, J. McGilvray, E. van Gelderen, and G. T. Bever. 2010. The Biological Nature of Human Language. *Bilingualistics* 4: 4–34.
- Fitch, W. T. 2010. *The Evolution of Language*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Fitch, W. T. and M.D. Hauser. 2004. Computational Constraints on Syntactic processing in Nonhuman Primates. *Science* 303: 377–380.
- Fox, D. 1999. *Local Economy*. Cambridge, Mass: The MIT Press.
- Friederici, A. D. 2009. The brain differentiates hierarchical and probabilistic grammars. In Piattelli-Palmarini, M., J. Uriagereka, and P. Salaburu (eds.). *Of Minds and Language: A dialogue with Noam Chomsky in the Basque country*. 184–194. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Friederici, A. D., J. Bahlmann, R. Friedrich, and M. Makuuchi. 2011. The Neural Basis of Recursion. *Bilingualistics* 5(1-2): 87–104.
- Friedrich, R., and A. D. Friederici. 2009. Mathematical Logic in the Human Brain: Syntax. PLoS ONE, 4(5): e5599.
- Gallistel, C. R. 2009. The foundational abstractions. In Piattelli-Palmarini, M., J. Uriagereka, and P. Salaburu. (eds). *Of minds and language: A dialogue with Noam Chomsky in the Basque country*. 58–73. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hancock, R. and T. G. Bever. 2012. Genetic Factors and Normal Variation in the Organization of Language. Ms. University of Arizona at Tucson.
- Hauser, M. D., N. Chomsky, and W.T. Fitch. 2002. The faculty of language: What is it, who has it, and how did it evolve? *Science* 298: 1569–1579.
- Jarvis, Erich D. 2004. Learned Birdsong and the Neurobiology of Human Language. *Annals of the New York Academy of Science* 1016: 749–777.
- Jenkins, L. 2000. *Bilingualistics*. Cambridge, Mass: The MIT Press.
- Jenkins, L. (ed.). 2004. *Variation and Universals in Bilingualistics*. Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- Kolmogorov, A. N. 1965. Three approaches to the quantitative definition of information. *Problems in Information Transmission* 1.1–7.
- Larson, R. K. 2011. Clauses, Propositions and Phases. In A.M. Di Sciullo and C. Boeckx (eds.). *The Bilingualistic Enterprise: New Perspectives on the Evolution and Nature of the Human Language Faculty*. 366–391. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lasnik, H. 2011. What kind of computing device is the human language faculty? In A.M. Di Sciullo and C. Boeckx (eds.). *The Bilingualistic Enterprise: New Perspectives on the Evolution and Nature of the Human Language Faculty*. 354–365. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Lasnik, H. 2012. A Surprising Consequence of Single Cycle Syntax. In A.M. Di Sciullo (ed.). *Towards a Bilingual Understanding of Grammar: Essays on Interfaces*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Lenneberg, E. H. 1967. *Biological Foundations of Language*. New York: Wiley.
- Lewontin, R.C. 1974. *The Genetic Basis of Evolutionary Change*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
- Lewontin, R. C. 2000. *The Triple Helix: Gene, Organism, and Environment*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.
- Lightfoot, D. 1982. *The Language Lottery: Toward a Biology of Grammars*. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.
- Lightfoot, D. 1999. *The Development of Language: Acquisition, Change, and Evolution*. Malden, Mass: Blackwell.
- Lightfoot, D. 2006. *How New Languages Emerge*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Longobardi, G. and C. Guardiano. 2011. The Bilingual Program and Historical Reconstruction. In A.M. Di Sciullo and C. Boeckx (eds.). *The Bilingual Enterprise. New Perspectives on the Evolution and Nature of the Human Language Faculty*. 266–304. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Moro, A. 2010. *The Boundaries of Babel: The Brain and the Enigma of Impossible Languages*. Cambridge, Mass: The MIT Press.
- Niyogi, P. 2006. *The Computational Nature of Language Learning and Evolution*. Cambridge, Mass: The MIT Press.
- Niyogi, P. and R. C. Berwick. 2009. The proper treatment of language acquisition and change in a population setting. *PNAS* 106(25):10124–10129.
- Piattelli-Palmarini, M. and J. Uriagereka. 2008. Still a bridge too far? Bilingual questions for grounding language on brains. *Physics of Life Reviews* 5: 207–224.
- Patel, A. D. 2008. *Music, Language, and the Brain*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Patel, A. D. 2012. Advancing the comparative study of linguistic and musical syntactic processing. In P. Rebuschat, M. Rohrmeier, J. Hawkins, and I. Cross (eds.). *Language and Music as Cognitive Systems*. 248–253. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Patel, A. D., E. Gibson, J. Ratner, M. Besson, and P. Holcomb. 1998. Processing syntactic relations in language and music: An event-related potential study. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience* 10: 717–733.
- Patel, A. D., J. R. Iversen, M. Wassenaar, and P. Hagoort. 2008. Musical syntactic processing in agrammatic Broca's aphasia. *Aphasiology* 22: 776–789.
- Reinhart, T. 2006. *Interface Strategies*. Cambridge, Mass: The MIT Press.
- Ross, D. S. and T. G. Bever. 2004. The time course for language acquisition in biologically distinct populations: Evidence from deaf individuals. *Brain and Language* 89: 115–121.
- Wexler, K. 2003. Lenneberg's dream: Learning, normal language development and specific language impairment. In Y. Levi and J. Schaeffer (eds.). *Language Competence across Populations: Toward a Definition of Specific Language Impairment*. 11–61. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Yang, C. 2002. *Knowledge and Learning in Natural Language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Yang, C. 2008. The Great Number Crunch. *Journal of Linguistics*. 44: 205–228.
- Yang, C. 2011. Usage unevenness in child language supports grammar productivity. *BU Conference on Language Development*.

GLOW 2013 Workshop II

April 2

SYNTACTIC VARIATION AND CHANGE

Organizers:	David Håkansson (Uppsala), Ida Larsson (Stockholm), Erik Magnusson Petzell (Stockholm)
Contact:	ida.larsson@nordiska.su.se
Invited speaker:	Marit Westergaard, University of Tromsø
Deadline for submission:	November 15, 2013
Notification of acceptance:	January 20, 2013
Submission of abstracts:	https://www.easychair.org/conferences/?conf=glow36

Since the introduction of the principles-and-parameters theory of universal grammar (Chomsky 1981), comparative studies of syntactic phenomena have been a constant domain of inquiry from both a synchronic and a diachronic point of view. A dominant hypothesis during the 80s and early 90s was that linguistic variation is due to varying settings of parameters that determine clusters of surface properties (see e.g. Rizzi 1982, Baker 1989, Holmberg & Platzack 1995 for synchronic studies and e.g. van Kemenade 1987, Falk 1993 and Roberts 1993 for diachrony). The hypothesis predicts there to be clusters of surface effects of these deep-lying parameters in the languages of the world. However, few attempts to identify universally valid macroparameters have been completely successful, and in many cases, grammatical properties do not seem to be linked to each other in the way that was originally suggested; the linguistic reality is simply too complex to be governed by a limited set of macroparameters (see e.g. Newmeyer 2004, Roberts & Holmberg 2005 and Baker 2008 for discussion).

Over the last decades, the focus of interest has changed from macroparameters to microvariation, and considerable progress has been made in microcomparative work on closely related languages (or dialects) (see e.g. Kayne 2000). Large projects such as ASit on Italian dialects, FRED on English dialects, SAND on Dutch dialects, and ScanDiaSyn on Scandinavian (to name but a few) have collected a large amount of new data that has enriched the theoretical discussion of a wide range of syntactic phenomena (including e.g. doubling, negative concord, noun phrase syntax and verb placement).

The questions of synchronic syntactic variation and parameters are obviously closely tied to questions of syntactic change. However, the diachronic origin of the observed microvariation has received rather little attention. Theoretically oriented research on syntactic change has focused on questions regarding the relationship between acquisition and change (e.g. Lightfoot & Westergaard 2007), as well as grammaticalization in terms of economy principles (e.g. van Gelderen 2004). An old matter of dispute is the question of how the gradualness of change from a diachronic perspective is represented in the formal and intrinsically non-gradual grammatical system: in terms of competing grammars (Kroch 1989 etc.) or as variation within one single grammar (Koopman 1990, Lightfoot 1991 etc.). There have, however, been few explicit attempts to address the problem of the apparent gradience of on-going change within the microcomparative paradigm.

A better understanding of both synchronic and diachronic variation, and the relation between the two, is clearly a prerequisite for more general theoretical insights in the field of syntactic change. Earlier historical studies on syntactic change now need to be re-evaluated and framed in different terms, and the variation revealed in the

synchronic dialect studies needs to be related to diachrony. The results from the dialect projects clearly raise the questions: how did the observed differences between closely related varieties emerge, and how can they be explained?

The workshop will provide a forum for discussing questions of syntactic variation and change. We hereby call for abstracts for papers that address the questions of how syntactic differences between varieties emerge, and how they can they be explained. Priority will be given to papers that address theoretical issues of linguistic change on the basis of microcomparative (historical as well as contemporary) data.

References

- Baker, M. 1989. *Incorporation: a Theory of Grammatical Function Changing*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Baker, M. 2008. The Macroparameter in a Microparametric World. In: T. Biberauer (ed.), *The Limits of Syntactic Variation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. Pp. 351–374.
- Chomsky, N. 1981. *Lectures on Government and Binding*, Dordrecht: Foris.
- Falk, C. 1993. *Non-Referential Subjects in the History of Swedish*. Diss. Lund: Institutionen för nordiska språk.
- Gelderen, E. van. 2004. *Grammaticalization as Economy*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Holmberg, A. & C. Platzack. 1995. *The Role of Inflection in Scandinavian Syntax*. New York & Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kayne, R. 2000. *Parameters and Universals*. Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press.
- Kemenade, A. van. 1987. *Syntactic Case and Morphological Case in the History of English*.
- Koopman, W. 1990. *Word Order in Old English with Special Reference to the Verb Phrase*. Diss. Amsterdam.
- Kroch, A. 1989. Reflexes of Grammar in Patterns of Language Change. *Language Variation and Change* 1:199–244.
- Lightfoot, D. 1991. *How to Set Parameters: Arguments from Language Change*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Lightfoot, D. & M. Westergaard. 2007. Language Acquisition and Language Change: Inter-relationships. *Language and Linguistics Compass* 1:396–416.
- Newmeyer, F. 2004. Against a parameter-setting approach to language variation. *Linguistic Variation Yearbook* 4:181–234.
- Rizzi, L. 1982. *Issues in Italian Syntax*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Roberts, I. 1993. *Verbs and Diachronic Syntax. A Comparative History of English and French*. Dordrecht, Boston & London: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Roberts, I. & A. Holmberg. 2005. On the role of parameters in Universal Grammar: a reply to Newmeyer. In: H. Broekhuis, N. Corver, R. Huybregts, U. Kleinhenz & Jan Koster (eds.), *Organizing Grammar. Linguistic Studies in Honor of Henk van Riemsdijk*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

GLOW 2013 Workshop III

April 6

DIACHRONIC WORKINGS IN PHONOLOGICAL PATTERNS

Organizers:	Marc van Oostendorp (Leiden/Meertens Instituut), Tobias Scheer (Nice-Sophia Antipolis)
Contact:	scheer@unice.fr
Invited speaker:	Patrick Honeybone, University of Edinburgh
Deadline for submission:	November 15, 2013
Notification of acceptance:	January 20, 2013
Submission of abstracts:	https://www.easychair.org/conferences/?conf=glow36

In 2013, linguists commemorate the 100th anniversary of Ferdinand de Saussure's death. It is therefore an important year regarding the split of the diachronic vs. synchronic study of sound patterns. Saussure is known for having introduced the synchronic perspective into the study of language with his *Cours de Linguistique Générale*, after having made ground-breaking contributions to diachronic phonology (e.g. in his *Mémoire*).

Some 60 years after the publication of the *Cours*, the field swung to the exact opposite extreme of the spectrum, compared with where Saussure started out from: in early generative phonology, all patterns had a synchronic explanation, albeit one which often mimicked the history in derivational terms. More recently, some voices have proposed the virtual opposite of this, viz. that all explanation of patterns is diachronic. But even among those who agree that synchronic and diachronic explanations are necessary, there is no agreement as to where to draw the line, and no criterion could thus far be identified that would allow the linguist to tell, for a given pattern, whether it is the result of (1) synchronic phonological computation, (2) synchronic non-phonological computation (allomorphy), or whether it represents (3) distinct lexical recordings. The typical analysis will assume that regular and productive patterns are due to (1), whereas exceptions and non-productive alternations are the result of idiosyncratic history that today appears as (2) and (3). By contrast, usage-based accounts assume that the synchronic system is nothing but a list of exceptions: all regularities arise in diachronic development.

Another, related, aspect is the way in which diachronic evolution could, or should be (a) used and (b) represented in the synchronic computational system of phonology. It is obvious that there is no such thing as diachronic computation: no brain-based system takes an input of, say, the 14th century and computes an output of the 21st century. Computation is only synchronic. So the question arises as to how innovation comes into being and, once it has occurred, enters the synchronic computational system: two widely held (and conflicting) views are based on acquisition (misperception) on the one hand, and on social group identity (sub-groups want to be different) on the other. Both are based on non- (or pre-) grammatical phonetic variation.

But even if computation is only synchronic, there are ways to implement diachronic processes directly in the synchronic system (and hence not relegate them to allomorphy or the lexicon). In *The Sound Pattern of English*, for example, the electri[k]–electri[s]-ity alternation is made of two rules: $t \rightarrow \widehat{ts} / _i$ that has been present since the 11th century, and one that changes \widehat{ts} to s without context, added later on in the development of English. In purely surface-based theories this is more difficult to do, but

in the work of many, a theory like OT is now also equipped with a derivational component (including intrinsic or extrinsic ordering).

Finally, an issue regarding the usage and representation of diachronic events in phonological study is eventual unattested intermediate stages: through how many intermediate stages has an attested form gone that is related to an older attested form? This diachronic distance is a relevant question for example when forms of the same etymological item that occur in different dialects are compared: an implicit assumption is often not only that there is a common ancestor, but also that the differences observed represent a single phonological process. This caveat is still more acute since there is no agreement as to what counts as a minimal (or atomic) diachronic change (called *the quantum* by Lass). It may also be asked, in this context, what status diachronically related forms have that appear in typological surveys that are designed to show what phonological computation can and cannot do. For example, in Greek, reconstructed **odwos* turned into a later *o:dos* and is often used to demonstrate that this kind of compensatory lengthening, where the trigger and the target are separated by a segment, is possible. This is based on the assumption that speakers' knowledge was involved in this phenomenon, something that may need to be shown independently.

Presentations addressing the abovementioned issues, or related topics, are welcome at the workshop. It is assumed that they are informed of earlier debates regarding the diachronic question, namely in the context of the 70s, where the most serious challenger to the mainstream was Natural (Generative) Phonology.

GLOW 2013 Workshop IV

April 6

ACQUISITION OF SYNTAX IN CLOSE VARIETIES

Organizers:	Petra Bernardini, Jonas Granfelt, Gisela Håkansson, Tanja Kupisch (all at Lund University)
Contact:	Tanja.Kupisch@rom.lu.se
Invited speaker:	Jason Rothman, University of Florida
Deadline for submission:	November 15, 2013
Notification of acceptance:	January 20, 2013
Submission of abstracts:	https://www.easychair.org/conferences/?conf=glow36

Much work in the acquisition of syntax and morphology has focused on cross-linguistic differences and/or cross-linguistic influence in two or more *typologically distinct* languages. Acquisition scenarios and comparative studies of *typologically similar* languages are a comparatively under-researched area, although they raise a number of questions, which have, so far, not been answered or not even been addressed:

- How does the acquisition of two typologically similar languages or varieties differ from the acquisition of two typologically distinct languages?
- Does typological similarity facilitate or inhibit acquisition?
- In which developmental stage or at what proficiency level is facilitation or inhibition expected to occur?
- Does typological similarity prevent language attrition and incomplete acquisition? (Polinsky 1997, Montrul 2008)
- Does typological similarity inhibit language separation in bilingual first language development, as expected under the Autonomy Hypothesis (Meisel 1989, Genesee 1989)?
- As for factors determining cross-linguistic influence, can typological proximity override language dominance or proficiency?
- Is perceived typological similarity (Kellermann 1983) more important than linguistic typological similarity? (Rothman 2011)
- Which (additional) methodological challenges does research on typologically similar languages pose?

The aim of this workshop is to bring together formally-oriented research in the acquisition of syntax and morphosyntax of two typologically similar languages (e.g. Spanish and Italian or Danish and German) or varieties (e.g. Venetian and standard Italian). We invite contributions concerning all kinds of acquisition scenarios, such as simultaneous bilingualism, early L2 acquisition, adult L2 acquisition, L3 acquisition, and language attrition. Papers dealing with the early bilingual acquisition of mutually understandable languages (or varieties of one language) and L3 acquisition are especially welcome.

References

- Genesee, F. (1989). Early bilingual development: One language or two? *Journal of Child Language* 16, 161–179.
- Kellerman, E. (1983). Now you see it, now you don't. In S. Gass & L. Selinker (eds.), *Language transfer in language learning*, pp. 112–134. Massachusetts: Newbury House Publishers.
- Meisel, J. M. (1989). Early differentiation of languages in bilingual children. In K. Hyltenstam & L. K. Obler (eds.), *Bilingualism across the lifespan: Aspects of acquisition, maturity and loss*, pp. 13–40. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Montrul, S. (2008). *Incomplete Acquisition in Bilingualism. Re-examining the Age Factor*. [Series on Studies in Bilingualism] Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Polinsky, M. (1997). American Russian: Language loss meets language acquisition. E. Wayles Browne, N. Dornisch, N. Kondrashovva & D. Ze (eds.), *Annual Workshop on Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics: The Cornell Meeting (1995)*, pp. 370–406. Ann Arbor, MI: Michigan Slavic Publishers.
- Rothman, J. (2011). L3 syntactic transfer selectivity and typological determinacy: the typological primacy model. *Second Language Research* 27 (1). 107–127.

Minutes of the GLOW General Assembly (Business Meeting) held in Potsdam on 29 March 2012

by Jeroen van Craenenbroeck

0. Welcome

Sjef Barbiers (GLOW chairperson) welcomes everyone to the business meeting.

1. GLOW 2012: Conference in Potsdam

Gisbert Fanselow (Congress President 2012) expresses his satisfaction with how the conference is proceeding, as well as his gratitude for the funding the local organizers received from the research institute and the university.

There were just over 100 submissions for the colloquium, and about the same number for the workshops. This drop in the number of submissions (compared to last year) might be due to:

- the presence of a theme;
- the choice of theme;
- competition from SALT/OCP/etc.

Moreover, due to the low average quality of the abstracts, the committee decided to only select 18 presentations for the main session.

The Chairperson congratulates the Congress President and the other local organizers on the flawless organization of the conference.

2. GLOW 2013

Halldór Sigurðsson (Congress President 2013) gives a brief presentation on GLOW 2013 in Lund. The 2013 GLOW Colloquium in Lund will take place on April 3-5, 2013. It will have no theme, but it will have an invited speaker, namely Anders Holmberg. Local organizers (apart from the Congress President, Halldór Sigurðsson) include Lars-Olof Delsing, Gunlog Josefsson, Verner Egerland, Valéria Molnar, Marit Julien, Fabian Beijer, Eva Klingvall, and Christer Platzack.

There are four workshops (on 2 and 6 April, 2013):

1. Variation and change (organizers: David Håkansson, Ida Larsson, Erik Magnusson Petzel);
2. Acquisition of close varieties (organizers: Petra Bernardini, Gisela Håkansson, Jonas Granfelt, Tanja Kupisch);
3. Biolinguistics (organizer: Anna Maria di Sciullo);
4. Diachronic phonology (organizers: Marc van Oostendorp and Tobias Scheer).

3. Future GLOW Colloquia

Forthcoming venues are as follows:

2014: Brussels

2015: Paris 8 (possibly in collaboration with the École Normale Supérieure)

2016: Seville

2017: possibly in Hungary (Budapest)

Marc Van Oostendorp proposes to organize GLOW and OCP at the same time in 2015 in Paris (whether consecutively, in parallel, or partially in parallel). One might even consider also including a third conference on formal semantics.

David Adger tentatively raises the possibility of London as a future GLOW-venue.

4. Treasurer's report 2011

The Chairperson discusses a provisional version of the 2011 treasurer's report. For 2012 GLOW has €28,135.98 which it can freely spend. This favorable financial situation is mainly due to a large donation GLOW received last year and to the fact that the GLOW Newsletter is now only distributed electronically.

The Chairperson discusses the possibility of organizing a GLOW Summer School with this money (or alternatively, to collaborate with an existing summer school such as EGG).

5. Summer schools

LISSIM asks for \$2,000 and EGG for €2,500. The chairperson points out that the application for funding from LISSIM was much more transparent about what the money would be used for, what the total budget of the summer school is, what the other sources of funding are, etc.

The Board proposes to give €1,500 each to LISSIM and EGG. It considers these initiatives to be extremely important and wants to continue to support them.

6. *The Linguistic Review*: Overview of special GLOW issues

Three years ago the Board decided to revive the link between GLOW and *The Linguistic Review* by publishing a selection of the presentations held at GLOW in a special issue of TLR. The TLR issue from GLOW Wrocław will appear later this year; it contains six papers that were presented at the 2010 GLOW Colloquium. The TLR issue from Vienna on the other hand has accrued a considerable delay; its current status is unclear.

The TLR issue from Potsdam will proceed as follows: shortly after the Colloquium, the local organizers together with the Board will propose a list of possible authors and send it to TLR. The Potsdam issue should appear in 2013.

TLR editor Harry van der Hulst has expressed his happiness about the renewed connection between TLR and GLOW.

7. Changes to the Board

The congress president for 2012 is Halldór Sigurðsson. The Newsletter Editor (Marc Richards) and Member D (Maria Rosa Lloret) are up for re-election this year; there are no other candidates. Member A (Anna Cardinaletti) has served for two terms and hence will step down. There is one candidate for this position, namely Roberta D'Alessandro.

Next year, Member B (Lida Veselovska) will have served for two terms and hence will step down. At this point, there is one candidate for this position: Mojmir Dočekal. Similarly, Member C (Viola Schmitt) will have served for two terms next year and hence will step down.

Moreover, in 2013 the terms of the Chairperson (Sjef Barbiers), Secretary (Jeroen van Craenenbroeck) and Treasurer (Maaike Schoorlemmer) are also up, though it looks like the current occupants of these positions will be candidates for re-election. That said, the Board invites alternative candidates for the positions of Chairperson, Secretary and Treasurer to step forward (although with respect to the latter, the Board notes that for practical reasons the person occupying this position should be situated in Utrecht).

The Chairperson briefly commemorates Gunnar Hrafn Hrafnbjargarson, who died in a tragic accident last year, and he thanks Pavel Iosad for having taken over the position of Website Manager.

The General Assembly agrees with the proposed (re-)elections. The current composition of the GLOW Board is thus as follows:

The complete GLOW Board for 2012-2013		
Congress President	Halldór Sigurðsson	2011-2012
Chairperson	Sjef Barbiers	2011-2013
Secretary	Jeroen van Craenenbroeck	2011-2013
Treasurer	Maaïke Schoorlemmer	2011-2013
Newsletter Editor	Marc Richards	2012-2014
Journal Editor	Harry van der Hulst	
Website Manager	Pavel Iosad	2011-2013
Member A	Roberta D'Alessandro	2012-2014
Member B	Lida Veselovska	2011-2013
Member C	Viola Schmitt	2011-2013
Member D	Maria Rosa Lloret	2012-2014
Advisory Member 1	Henk van Riemsdijk	
Advisory Member 2	Martin Everaert	
Co-opted member (Phonology)	Tobias Scheer	2011-2013

8. Further issues

8.1 Relations with SLE and EASSH

The Societas Linguistica Europaea (SLE) is working on a European counterpart of the LSA. GLOW wants to be a part of such an enterprise, while at the same time retaining its independence and unique identity. The Chairperson has had some preliminary contacts with Dik Bakker (Board member of SLE) regarding the possibility of GLOW becoming a member of SLE. The Board proposes that the Chairperson contact the current chairman of SLE (Ian Roberts) and that a delegation from GLOW should meet with a delegation from SLE to discuss the possible forms an SLE–GLOW collaboration could take.

EASSH (European Alliance for Social Sciences and Humanities) is an organization which unites universities, research institutes, funding agencies, lobbying agencies etc. related to the humanities and social sciences at the European level. The Chairperson proposes that GLOW become a member of EASSH; the General Assembly agrees.

8.2 Other

Peter Svenonius points out that the fact that the conference booklet contains all the abstracts provides a good compensation for the fact that the Spring Newsletter no longer appears in printed form.

Treasurer's Report 2011

by Maaïke Schoorlemmer, 24 March 2012.

Provisional: Figures in **boldface** will not change; remaining figures might change (conservative estimates)

Revenues (in €)	
Membership dues	800
Donations	200
Interest	6000
Total Revenues	7000

Expenses (in €)	
Chamber of commerce	150
Interest	
Bank costs	50
Contribution EGG/ African summer schools	2500
Total Costs	2700

Result 2011:

€7000 - €2700 = €4300

Balance (in €)

Balance December 31, 2010	71785.98
Result 2010	4300.00
Balance December 31, 2011	76085.98
Unaccounted for	

Reservations And Dues (in €)

Reservation in case of liquidation (legally required)		1500
Reservation for calamities		25000
Reservation due to long-term memberships:		12450
Multi-year members (€30 per year /member until 2018):	2190	
Lifetime members (€30 until 2028):	10260	
Debt to UiL OTS printing Newsletter 2007+2009 +2010		9000
LISSIM Summer school 2011		1000
Total reservation:		47950

Freely available in 2012: €76085.98 - €47950 = €28135.98