



**GLOW Newsletter #75, Fall 2015**

Edited by Marc Richards

**Addresses:**

**GLOW Newsletter**

Marc Richards  
School of English  
Queen's University Belfast  
2 University Square  
Belfast BT7 1NN  
United Kingdom

**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.gw@uu.nl](mailto:glow.gw@uu.nl)

<http://glow.wp.hum.uu.nl/>

# Contents

<b>GLOW Renewal Notice</b>	3
<b>The 39<sup>th</sup> GLOW Conference 2016 in Göttingen: Calls for Papers &amp; Submission Guidelines</b>	
<i>Main Colloquium</i>	4
<i>Submission Guidelines</i>	4
<i>Workshop 1: Perspectivization</i>	6
<i>Workshop 2: Phonological and Syntactic Reconstruction of Speech Acts</i>	8
<b>Minutes of the GLOW General Assembly 2015 held in Paris</b>	9
<b>Treasurer's Report 2014</b>	13

## GLOW Renewal Notice

Renewal is for the calendar year 2016, taking effect with the Spring issue of the GLOW Newsletter. Payment should reach us by January 1, 2016, 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

### 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 *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 XXXIX (2016)

## Generative Linguistics in the Old World 39

The 39th GLOW Conference and annual meeting will take place in Göttingen from the 5th to the 8th of April 2016. It will be hosted by [LinG – Linguistics in Göttingen](http://www.uni-goettingen.de/en/510338.html). It will consist of the Main Colloquium (from Tuesday 5th April to Thursday 7th April) followed by two thematic workshops (on Friday 8th April). The topic of the Colloquium is free. The two thematic workshops are:

- (a) Workshop I: *Perspectivization*
- (b) Workshop II: *Phonological and Syntactic Reconstruction of Speech Acts*

## Main Colloquium

April 5–7, 2016

**THEME: FREE**

**Website:** <https://www.uni-goettingen.de/en/510338.html>

**Contact person:** Hedde Zeijlstra

**Contact e-mail:** [glow2016@uni-goettingen.de](mailto:glow2016@uni-goettingen.de)

**Mailing list:** Sign up for updates at  
[https://listserv.gwdg.de/mailman/listinfo/glow2016\\_info](https://listserv.gwdg.de/mailman/listinfo/glow2016_info)

**Abstract submission deadline:** November 1, 2015

The Main Colloquium of GLOW 39 welcomes abstracts on any topic or subfield of generative linguistics, including (but not limited to) phonology, morphology, syntax, and semantics. Presentations will be 45 minutes long plus 15 minutes of discussion.

In addition, there will be **two poster sessions**.

## Submission Guidelines

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

<https://www.easychair.org/conferences/?conf=glow39>

On the submission page you can choose to submit an abstract for the Main Colloquium or for one of the workshops.

The abstract deadline is **November 1, 2015**.

**Format:** All abstracts submitted for GLOW 39 – for the Main Colloquium and workshops alike – should adhere strictly to the following guidelines:

- Abstracts must not exceed two A4 pages in length (including data and references), have one inch (2.5 cm) margins on all sides, be set in Times New Roman with a font size no smaller than 12pt, and single line spacing.
- Examples, tables, graphs etc. must be integrated into the text of the abstract, rather than collected at the end.
- The abstract must be completely anonymous. 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 Main Colloquium and a workshop.
- Only submissions in **pdf** format will be accepted.
- Abstracts are to be submitted via the GLOW 39 *EasyChair* page: <https://www.easychair.org/conferences/?conf=glow39>.

### **Important note: Named abstracts and the Spring Newsletter**

Abstracts should be anonymous in the first instance. If your paper is accepted for presentation at GLOW 39, you will be required to submit a non-anonymous version of your abstract (with name and affiliation) for publication in the Spring Newsletter. Please therefore make sure that you send the named version of your abstract to the conference organizers as soon as you receive word of your acceptance.

**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 2016 Workshop I

April 8, 2016

## PERSPECTIVIZATION

**Organizers:** Anke Holler  
Edgar Onea  
Thomas Weskott

**Invited speakers:** Jesse Harris (ULCA)  
Stephen Wechsler (UT Austin)

**Deadline for abstracts:** November 1, 2015

**Website for submissions:** <https://www.easychair.org/conferences/?conf=glow39>

**Description of theme:** Perspectivization is an inextricable property of linguistic expressions: examples vary from rather obvious lexical instances like deictic vs. intrinsic readings of spatial expressions to more elusive discourse-level cases of perspective-dependence like point-of-view narration (Cantrall 1974), or free indirect discourse (Banfield 1982). On a more general and somewhat philosophical level, one might say that epistemic perspectivization is the hallmark of the subjectivity of human experience, and that linguistic reflexes of perspectivization are the means by which privileged first-person experiences of speakers and hearers may become part of the common ground. While its generality and the wide range of issues it covers may be part of the fascination the notion of perspectivization instils, it is probably also the reason why this notion, thus broadly construed, has so far evaded the grasp of formal semantics and pragmatics. By way of example, while phenomena related to spatial perspectivization might reasonably be formalized with recourse to some formal rendering of Buehler's notion of *origo* (Wunderlich 1991; Bierwisch 1996), it is far from clear whether this notion should play a role in a formal treatment of more specific phenomena like (anti-)logophoricity (Sells 1987), or the availability of *de re* vs. *de se* readings in control constructions (Landau 2014).

The aim of this workshop is twofold: on the theoretical side, we want to address the question of what the basic building blocks of perspectivized content are, and how the interpretation of perspectivized linguistic expressions is to be conceived of at the syntax-semantics interface. For example, is some notion of *origo* lying at the heart of perspectivization? Can this notion be reconciled with more technical notions like centered worlds? Do we need concept generators (Percus & Sauerland 2003) to account not only for *de se* readings, but for perspectivized content in general?

On the empirical side, we think that psycholinguistics has made some progress in providing evidence for some of the theoretical terms mentioned above, and how the processing of perspectivized expressions might be understood. However, we think there is still a lot of ground to be covered. By way of analogy to the theoretical questions above, we might ask whether some kind of an (analogous) spatial representation of an *origo* is the basis of perspectivized mental representation? Or do we have to assume more complex, specialized representations and mechanisms that enter into the online construction of perspectivized content? Are these processes specific to language, or do they borrow from more general cognitive mechanisms (e.g. from social cognition)? We are confident that psycholinguistic evidence from language processing, as well as language acquisition, can help to refine our understanding of what perspectivization really is.

**Call for papers:** We invite contributions that help to clarify the formal underpinnings of the notion of perspectivization in its different guises. On the theoretical side, we are especially interested in treatments of perspectivization that address the role of syntactic, lexical and pragmatic factors in the compositional derivation of perspectivized content. We also invite contributions from experimental psycholinguistics which address the question of how perspectivized content is construed online, how it is acquired, and which cognitive resources this construction process is tapping into. Topics to be addressed include, but are of course not limited to, the following:

- analogies and differences between spatial (locational/path-related) and epistemic perspectivization;
- *de re/de se* readings of pronouns in and outside of embedding contexts;
- sequence of tense and “temporal anchoring”;
- the role of particles as a litmus test for perspectivization;
- point-of-view narration: degrees of “directness” (DD, FID, ID) and their relation to theories of quotation, and to Kaplan’s ban on monsters;
- the role of epithets, expressives, and other “judge-dependent” expressions in the construction of perspective.

# GLOW 2016 Workshop II

April 8, 2016

## PHONOLOGICAL AND SYNTACTIC RECONSTRUCTION OF SPEECH ACTS

**Organizers:** Guido Mensching  
**Invited speakers:** Liliane Haegeman (Ghent)  
Shigeru Miyagawa (MIT)  
Pilar Prieto Vives (Universitat Pompeu Fabra)

**Deadline for abstracts:** November 1, 2015

**Website for submissions:** <https://www.easychair.org/conferences/?conf=glow39>

**Description of theme:** This workshop aims to bring together linguists investigating speech acts or illocutionary acts, such as assertions, questions, and orders (for a definition of speech acts, see Bierwisch 1980; Sadock & Zwicky 1985; Recanati 1987; Krifka 2014). The workshop is particularly interested in the relations among speech acts as well as their syntactic and phonological encodings. Do different speech acts show specific phonological and/or syntactic patterns? As to the phonological side, one important topic is the intonation contour of speech acts (cf. D'Imperio et al. 2002; Gili-Fivela 2013; Vanrell et al. 2013; Truckenbrodt 2004, 2015). What speech act-specific intonation contours do different languages exhibit, and how is the variation to be understood? How do phonological features contribute to the perception and interpretation of speech acts?

**Call for papers:** The workshop will address topics such as the following: syntactic encodings of speech acts (negative imperatives, clause-type features, etc.); the (non-) embeddability of speech acts (cf. Sadock & Zwicky 1985; Reis 1997; Speas & Tenny 2003; Haegeman & Hill 2010; Coniglio 2011; Miyagawa 2012; Munaro & Poletto 2003, 2009; Castroviejo 2006; Potts 2003; but see Crnic & Trinh 2009 and Krifka 2014 for some speech act-embedding predicates); and the licensing of certain movement phenomena in speech acts (e.g. topic movements; see Frascarelli & Hinterhölzl 2007). Another important question is whether speech acts have a more complex syntactic structure, which could be taken as an argument for a special syntactic projection (cf. Speas & Tenny 2003; Haegeman 2014). This workshop will be of interest to a broad audience working on the syntax and/or phonology of speech acts.



## **Minutes of the GLOW General Assembly (Business Meeting) held in Paris on 16 April 2015, 17.30-18.30**

by Jeroen van Craenenbroeck

### **1. Opening**

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

### **2. GLOW Paris 2015**

Isabelle Roy (Congress President 2014-2015) gives an overview of the preparation for and organization of GLOW 38. The local organizers received a record number of 272 abstracts for the Main Colloquium (and an additional 33 for the semantics workshop and 17 for the phonology workshop). From these, 18 were selected for oral presentation, with four alternates. In addition, 18 abstracts were accepted as posters. The overall acceptance rate is 13.23%. Each of the 272 abstracts was sent to four external reviewers. Abstracts were reviewed and scored on a scale from -3 (definite reject) to +3 (definite accept); the median score was 0. The selection committee (consisting of three GLOW Board members and four local organizers) then read and scored 49 abstracts selected on the basis of the external reviews (weighted by reviewer's confidence): all abstracts with an average score of 1.5 or higher (25 abstracts) and 24 abstracts with an average score higher than 0 and with the highest standard deviation (indicating substantial inter-reviewer disagreement).

Some suggestions made by the Paris local organizers:

- (i) The abstract submission deadline for GLOW should be earlier in the Fall; the current schedule is too tight for local organizers and the GLOW Board, who have to digest too many abstracts in too little time.
- (ii) There was a fairly high number of reviewers who declined to review for GLOW or who didn't want to review beyond a certain number (e.g. three). As a result, Paris had to go for four external reviewers instead of five. Sjef Barbiers proposes that we combine lists of (good and bad) reviewers from SuB, SALT, other conferences, and make that combined list available to next year's organizers.
- (iii) There were too few reviewers with expertise in Chinese, Korean, acquisition, and psycholinguistics.
- (iv) It would be very useful to have a more detailed overview of the interests and specializations of the reviewers.

Sjef Barbiers thanks the organizers, stresses that the organization is running smoothly, and expresses his satisfaction about the quality of talks.

### **3. Future GLOWs**

#### GLOW 2016: Göttingen

Hedde Zeijlstra (Congress President 2015-2016) gives some more information about GLOW 39, which will take place in Göttingen on April 5-8, 2016. There will be a three-day, non-thematic Main Colloquium without invited speakers on April 5-7, and two workshops on April 8 (topics: perspectivization, and phonological and syntactic reconstruction of speech acts). The conference fee will be between 50 and 60 euros and the reimbursement to the speakers between 150 and 400 euros. The official conference website is <http://linguistics.uni-goettingen.de/glow2016>.

#### GLOW 2017: The Netherlands

This GLOW will hopefully be in combination with OCP and *Sinn und Bedeutung* (negotiations are still underway). The idea is to have three separate conferences, but with ample room for interaction and cross-conference contacts.

#### GLOW 2018: Budapest

Katalin É Kiss officially announces the candidacy of Budapest for GLOW 2018 (which will be 30 years after the previous GLOW in Budapest).

#### GLOW 2019 and beyond

There are no clear candidates for later GLOWs. London (QMUL) might be an option, but we should also keep southern Europe in mind.

### **4. Treasurer's Report 2014**

Sjef Barbiers goes over the treasurer's report. There are roughly 11,000 euros to be spent freely this year. Alarming, though, the available budget of GLOW is going down: the membership fees yield insufficient funds to continue the current course of action (e.g. current rate of sponsoring schools) in the long run.

### **5. GLOW Schools**

GLOW has received two funding requests from summer schools: from LISSIM (for 3500 euros) and from GLEE (for 2500 euros). The GLOW Board proposes to support these schools to the amount of 1000 euros each and stresses their importance for the field and for supporting students who don't have the means to participate in Western conferences or schools. At the same time, though, it should be made clear to these schools that GLOW cannot continue to support them on a structural basis, and that they should start looking for ways of becoming financially independent.

Hedde Zeijlstra thanks GLOW on behalf of EGG/GLEE for the support granted to the summer school.

The possibility of organizing another GLOW Spring School is discussed. The first edition (in 2014 in Brussels) was a success: many of the students also attended the conference. At the same time, it required a substantial financial investment from GLOW, which might be alleviated next time by not offering scholarships and/or by raising the tuition fees. The idea would be to turn the GSS into a bi- or triannual event. Hedde Zeijlstra expresses an interest in organizing a GSS, possibly in collaboration with Leipzig (timing: 2016 or 2017). Sjef Barbiers asks for the support of the Assembly to pursue this idea and to report back later. He unanimously gets support for this.

### **6. GLOW Asia**

Pritty Patel reports on the progress made w.r.t. GLOW Asia. The goal is to make GLOW Asia more parallel to GLOW Europe, i.e. a more structured, organized and financially independent organization with a yearly conference. Progress is going well, but slowly: several people have come forward in support/aid of the project (e.g. Rajesh Bhatt, Myriam Butt). Pritty Patel will continue to develop this project and will report back to the European GLOW community.

### **7. *The Linguistic Review***

The special issue of TLR with a selection of papers from GLOW Brussels should appear later this year. Regarding GLOW Paris, Isabelle Roy is enthusiastic about making a special issue from GLOW Paris and agrees to take up this task.

## 8. Changes to the Board

Every year, several positions come up for renewal. Nominations are normally sent directly to the Chair, who accepts until January 1st. The GLOW Board wishes to remind GLOW members to be thinking about who they would like to represent them on the Board in the future, and to nominate those people in good time. Sjef Barbiers particularly urges everyone to think about this situation post-2017.

For the coming year, the Board has made or received the following nominations:

- Hedde Zeijlstra (Congress President, Göttingen)
- Sjef Barbiers (re-election for Chairperson)
- Jeroen van Craenenbroeck (re-election for Secretary)
- Sergio Baauw (Treasurer)
- Alexis Dimitriadis (re-election for Website Manager)
- Mojmir Dočekal (re-election for Member B)
- Sarah Zobel (re-election for Member C)
- Tobias Scheer (re-election for Co-opted Member for Phonology)
- Pritty Patel (re-election for Co-opted Member for GLOW Asia)

Sjef Barbiers thanks Maaike Schoorlemmer for the many years she served as Treasurer of GLOW.

All the changes to the Board are unanimously accepted. The current composition of the GLOW Board is as follows:

<b>The complete GLOW Board for 2015-2016</b>		
Congress President	Hedde Zeijlstra	2015-2016
Chairperson	Sjef Barbiers	2015-2017
Secretary	Jeroen van Craenenbroeck	2015-2017
Treasurer	Sergio Bauw	2015-2017
Newsletter Editor	Marc Richards	2014-2016
Journal Editor	Harry van der Hulst	
Website Manager	Alexis Dimitriadis	2015-2017
Member A	Roberta D'Alessandro	2014-2016
Member B	Mojmir Dočekal	2015-2017
Member C	Sarah Zobel	2015-2017
Member D	Clàudia Pons Moll	2014-2016
Advisory Member 1	Henk van Riemsdijk	
Advisory Member 2	Martin Everaert	
Co-opted member (Phonology)	Tobias Scheer	2015-2017
Co-opted member (GLOW Asia)	Pritty Patel	2015-2017

## 9. Further issues

A number of issues are discussed:

Ora Mathushansky asks why there are no parallel sessions at GLOW. Sjef Barbiers is not averse to the idea, but points out the many ramifications such a move would have (audience size, reimbursement costs, etc.). There have been parallel

sessions at GLOW in the past, though, so it is certainly not unthinkable.

Elena Anagnostopoulou expresses a preference for the selection system of earlier GLOWs: a main colloquium with a theme and a selection committee that read all abstracts. Re. selection, Sjeff Barbiers responds that we have good experiences with the reviewing procedure of the past couple of years, and describes and defends the two-tier selection mechanism that GLOW has been using the past couple of years. Re. theme, Sjeff Barbiers points out that there are pros and cons. During those earlier GLOWs there were maybe fewer specialized conferences than there are now, and in that respect a general conference might be welcome. At the same time (a point made by Norbert Corver), if you want a strongly theoretical conference, it might be good to set a theme.

Ora Mathushanksy raises the issue of phonology at GLOW. Sjeff Barbiers acknowledges that OCP and Manchester have taken over the role of a central phonology conference, but at the same time, the fight against ‘theory-less linguistics’ is a shared one between syntax and phonology, and there are still shared topics. If the one-time collaboration between GLOW and OCP in 2017 turns into something more structural, then a natural division of labour (syntax/phonology) might arise between those two conferences.

A partially related point that is discussed is the question of possible overlap between GLOW, NELS, and WCCFL. Isabelle Roy points out that there was a substantial overlap between the abstracts submitted to NELS and WCCFL and those submitted to GLOW (with the top ones getting accepted at both conferences). The assembly discusses the possibility of mentioning something about this in the abstract submission guidelines, but decides against it. The rule of thumb (suggested by Sabine Iatridou) is that it is okay to submit the same abstract to GLOW on the one hand and NELS/WCCFL on the other, but not to both NELS and WCCFL.

A final issue (brought up by Sabine Iatridou and Elena Anagnostopoulou) concerns the high conference fee for GLOW in recent years. For many linguists (both students and faculty) these sums are exceedingly high. Isabelle Roy and Jeroen van Craenenbroeck (part of the organizational team of GLOW 2014 Brussels) point out that the speaker reimbursements weigh very heavily on the budget. Sjeff Barbiers suggests leaving the level of the conference fee to the judgement of the local organizers, but stresses that it is an issue that should be kept in mind.

Sjeff Barbiers thanks everyone for coming and closes the business meeting.

## GLOW Treasurer's Report 2014

by Maaïke Schoorlemmer, 9 April 2015.

<b>Revenues (in €)</b>	
Membership dues	1826.92
Advance	10,343.79
Interest	272.87
Transport	544.26
<b>Total Revenues</b>	<b>12,987.84</b>

<b>Expenses (in €)</b>	
Bank costs	222.50
Debt payment to Utrecht University	9000.00
Contribution GLOW Spring School	2060.00
Contribution EGG/LISSIM 2014 (1500 each)	3000.00
Transport	544.26
<b>Total Expenses</b>	<b>14,826.76</b>

### Result 2014:

€12,987.84 - €14,826.76 = **-€1838.92**

### Balance (in €)

Balance December 31, 2013	75,088.27
Result 2014	<b>1838.92</b>
Balance December 31, 2014	73,249.35
Unaccounted for	0.00

### Liquidity 2015 (in €)

Freely available in 2015: €73,249.35 - €61,893.98 = **€11,355.37**

<b>Balance January 1, 2015</b>			<b>73,249.35</b>
<b>Reservations and Dues</b>			<b>61,893.98</b>
Reservation in case of liquidation (legally required)		1500.00	
Reservation for calamities		25,000.00	
Reservation due to long-term memberships:		17,040.00	
Multi-year members (€30 per year /member until 2023):	4080		
Lifetime members (€30 until 2032):	12,960		
GLOW 2017 reservation		10,343.79	
Workshop Greece reservation		7890.19	
<b>Total reservation:</b>		<b>61,893.98</b>	
<b>Freely available in 2015</b>			<b>11,355.37</b>