GLOW 36

Generative Linguistics in the Old World 36

The 36th GLOW will take place at Lund University from 2nd to 6th April 2013 (Colloquium April 3–5, workshops April 2nd and 6th).

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, 2012
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 slots 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 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, 23:59 CET**.

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

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. 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.

Additional note: Named abstracts and the Spring Newsletter

If your paper is accepted for presentation at GLOW 36, you will be asked to submit a non-anonymous version of your abstract for publication in the GLOW Spring Newsletter. In case any problems should arise, please contact the organizers (glow36@nordlund.lu.se) and the Newsletter Editor (richards@em.uni-frankfurt.de).

It is particularly important for publication purposes that all non-standard (nonopen 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, UPenn
Deadline for submission:	November 15, 2012
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 a 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 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 the 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 the 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 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 on 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 SM (Pronounce the Minimum, Chomsky 2011), and CI (Reference Set, Reinhart 2006; Local

Economy, Fox 1999) interfaces. 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 with the Strong Minimalist Thesis? This workshop invites contributions with large empirical coverage that address fundamental questions on 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 Entreprise: 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 & 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. 2011. Poverty of Stimulus: Unfinished Business. Lecture presented in the Lecture Series 'Sprache und Gehirn – Zur Sprachfahigkeit des Menschen' organized by Angela D. Friederici in the context of the Johannes Gutenberg endowed professorship. Summer 2010.

Chomsky, N. 2005. Three Factors in Language Design. *Linguistic Inquiry*. 36: 1–22.

Chomsky, N. 1988. *Language and the Problems of Knowledge*. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.

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. 1975. *Reflections on Language*. New York: Pantheon.

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. 2011. A Biolinguistic Approach to Variation. In A.M. Di Sciullo and C. Boeckx (eds.). *The Biolinguistic Entreprise: New Perspectives on the Evolution and Nature of the Human Language Faculty*. 305–328. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Di Sciullo, A.M. and L. Jenkins. 2012. Biolinguistics 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. *Biolinguistics* 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. *Biolinguistics* 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-Palmirini, 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. *Biolinguistics.* Cambridge, Mass: The MIT Press.
Jenkins, L. (ed.). 2004. *Variation and Universals in Biolinguistics*. 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 Biolinguistic 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 Biolinguistic Enterprise: New Perspectives on the Evolution and Nature of the Human Language Faculty.* 354–365. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Lasnik, H. 2012. A Surprizing Consequence of Single Cycle Syntax. In A.M. Di Sciullo (ed.). *Towards a Biolinguistic Understanding of Grammar: Essays on Interfaces*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Lenneberg, E.H. 1967. *Biological Foundations of Language*. New York: Wiley.
Lewontin, R.C. 2000. The Triple Helix: Gene, Organism, and Environment. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.
Lewontin, R.C. 1974. *The Genetic Basis of Evolutionary Change*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
Lightfoot, D. 2006. How New Languages Emerge. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Lightfoot, D. 1999. *The Development of Language: Acquisition, Change, and Evolution.* Malden, Mass: Blackwell.
Lightfoot, D. 1982. *The Language Lottery: Toward a Biology of Grammars*. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.
Longobardi, G. and C. Guardiano. 2011. The Biolinguistic Program and Historical Reconstruction. In A.M. Di Sciullo and C. Boeckx (eds.). *The Biolinguistic 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? Biolinguistic questions for grounding language on brains. *Physics of Life Reviews* 5: 207–224.
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. 2008. *Music, Language, and the Brain.* New York: Oxford University Press.
Patel, A.D., J.R. Iversen, M. Wassenaar, and P. Hagoort. 2008. Musical syntactic processing in agrammatic Broca's aphasia. *Aphasiology* 22: 776–789.
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.
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, 2012
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 the 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, 2012
Notification of acceptance:	January 20, 2013
Submission of abstracts:	https://www.easychair.org/conferences/?conf=glow36

In 2013, linguists celebrate the 100th anniversary of Ferdinand de Saussure's death. It is therefore an important year regarding the split of 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 into 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 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, of 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 1) used and 2) 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 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 relegating 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 → t͡s /_i that is present since the 11th century, and one that takes t͡s 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 now is 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 are 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 often is 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 of 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, 2012
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 morpho-syntax 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

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.

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.

Polinsky, M. (1997). American Russian: Language loss meets language acquisition. E.Wayles Browne, N. Dornisch, N. Kondrashowva & D. Ze (eds.), *Annual Workshop on Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics: The Cornell Meeting (1995)*, pp. 370–406. Ann Arbor, MI: Michigan Slavic Publishers.

Montrul, S. (2008). *Incomplete Acquisition in Bilingualism. Re-examining the Age Factor*. [Series on Studies in Bilingualism] Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Rothman, J. (2011). L3 syntactic transfer selectivity and typological determinacy: the typological primacy model. *Second Language Research* 27 (1). 107–127.