

**Addresses:**

**GLOW Newsletter**

David Adger/Peter Svenonius  
Linguistics  
Queen Mary, University of London  
London E1 4NS  
United Kingdom  
[d.j.adger@qmul.ac.uk](mailto:d.j.adger@qmul.ac.uk)  
[peter.svenonius@hum.uit.no](mailto:peter.svenonius@hum.uit.no)

**GLOW Bureau**

Utrecht Institute of Linguistics OTS  
Utrecht University  
Trans 10  
NL 3512 JK Utrecht  
The Netherlands  
Phone + 31 30 253 6006  
Fax + 31 30 253 6000

**<http://glow.uvt.nl>**

# Contents

<b>A Note from the Editors</b>	4
<b>GLOW Renewal Notice</b>	5
<b>The 31<sup>st</sup> GLOW Colloquium 2008 in Newcastle</b>	
Call for papers, general session . . . . .	6
Workshop 1: Categorical Phonology and Gradient Facts . . . . .	8
Workshop 2: Evidentiality . . . . .	9
Workshop 3: DP types and Feature Syntax . . . . .	10
Workshop 4: Language Contact . . . . .	12
Workshop 4: Principles of Linearization . . . . .	13
<b>Minutes of the GLOW General Assembly held in Tromsø</b>	15
<b>Treasurer's Report</b>	18

## A Note from the Editors

Dear GLOW Members,

Polish your dancing shoes, ready your liver, (but leave any coal behind): next stop is Newcastle, Party Capital industrial hub of Northern England.

**The deadline for this year is NOVEMBER 1st (like last year).**

We would like to speed up the production of the Spring newsletter by having everyone submit the camera-ready copy at the same time as the anonymous copy for review. This means if you are submitting an abstract, you will send **two** copies: one with a name and affiliation (optionally also e-mail address) on the line or lines under the title of the abstract, and one without. It's as simple as that.

We reiterate here the rules for abstracts for the colloquium:

“Abstracts may not exceed two pages of text with at least a one-inch margin on all four sides (measured on A4 paper) and must employ a font not smaller than 12 point. Each page may include a maximum of 50 lines of text. Abstracts may include an extra page for references (not examples), but this third page will not be published in the Spring newsletter.”

The 50-line limit includes examples. It is there to prevent people from using tricks like changing the line height in order to cram more ink onto the page.

Abstracts (both the anonymous one and the onymous one) should be submitted on the Newcastle GLOW website (see call for papers below). Only electronic submissions which conform to the guidelines stated here will be considered.

As you will see from the minutes, a number of GLOW Board positions are coming up for renewal or replenishment (Newsletter Editors, Website Manager, members A and D). If you wish to nominate someone for a position, please notify the Secretary, Uli Sauerland (uli@alum.mit.edu), by the first of February 2008. Nominations after that date cannot be included in the Spring Newsletter.

Remember that registration for a GLOW colloquium requires membership in GLOW. People attending the colloquium who are not members of GLOW will be required to join.

The deadlines for the colloquium are:	Abstracts:	November 1 <sup>st</sup> , 2007
	Glow Dues:	January 1 <sup>st</sup> , 2008
	Board Nominations:	February 1 <sup>st</sup> , 2008

— David Adger and Peter Svenonius

## GLOW Renewal Notice

Renewal is for the calendar year 2008, taking effect with the Spring issue of the GLOW newsletter. Payment should reach us by January 1, 2008. 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.

### Membership dues

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

Student/Unemployed:	€ 11.50
Student (4 year)	€ 30 (may only be chosen once in a lifetime)
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 #43.97.10.340, ABN-AMRO Bank, Tilburg/NL

Whichever mode of payment you choose, please mail the membership form to the GLOW bureau at the new address in Utrecht (address at the start of the newsletter).

Members from the former socialist countries of central and eastern Europe, including the former Soviet Union Republics, can apply for a waiver of the dues. If you want to make use of this option, please write to the chair of the GLOW Board (e-mail: artemis@ifla.uni-stuttgart.de), but do send the Membership Form to the GLOW Bureau anyway.

N.B.: If you wish to benefit from the GLOW membership discount for GLOW's official journal, *The Linguistic Review*, and/or for the books from the *Studies in Generative Grammar* and *Linguistics Models* series published by Mouton de Gruyter, please follow the instructions on the order form, which changed two years ago (you now send the order directly to the publisher, not to GLOW).

## **GLOW 2008**

The 31<sup>st</sup> GLOW Colloquium, March 26-28

Workshops, March 25 and 29

and Poster Session

**At Newcastle University**

**Centre for Research in Linguistics and Language Sciences**

**Newcastle upon Tyne, UK**

**Deadline for two-page abstracts: November 1, 2007**

**Invited speakers:** Luigi Rizzi (Siena) and Arto Anttila (Stanford)

Theme of the Colloquium: Free

- Abstracts are invited on any topic in generative grammar (phonology, morphology, syntax, or semantics) for a 45-minute presentation (excluding discussion).
- Abstracts should be submitted online, in PDF format, without the name of the author(s), to:  
<<http://www.netskills.ac.uk/projects/glow2008/pasha/register/index.cgi>>  
Following this link you need to first register as a submitter, and then submit your abstract following the instructions given.
- The same guidelines, address, and deadline apply to the workshops. You will be asked to select whether the abstract is submitted to the Colloquium (phonology or other), or one of the workshops.

**Deadline for submissions: November 1, 2007.**

Abstracts may not exceed two pages of text with at least a one-inch margin on all four sides (measured on A4 paper) and must employ a font not smaller than 12 point. Each page may include a maximum of 50 lines of text, including examples. Examples should **not** be collected on a separate page. Abstracts may include an extra page for references (not examples), but this third page will not be published in the spring newsletter.

Submitters whose computers are not envisioning A4 paper should adjust their margin sizes in order to achieve a text box similar to that on A4 with 1" margins (e.g. those using the American 8<sup>1</sup>/<sub>2</sub>" x 11" size should use wider left and right margins (1.13" or 2.85 cm), and may use smaller top and bottom margins (0.6" or 1.5 cm)). This is especially important for the printing of the spring newsletter.

There are [abstract templates](http://www.hum.uit.no/GLOW/templates/templates.htm) for your convenience if you choose to use them, available at <http://www.hum.uit.no/GLOW/templates/templates.htm>. They will assist you in meeting the above requirements.

Speakers at the Colloquium will be partially reimbursed for their expenses.

For the Colloquium, you may submit one single-authored and one co-authored abstract, or two co-authored abstracts but not with the same co-authors. The same principle applies to the workshops. You may NOT submit the same abstract to the Colloquium and to one of the workshops.

For further information follow links or write to [glow31@newcastle.ac.uk](mailto:glow31@newcastle.ac.uk)

The following workshops are part of GLOW 2008:

Tuesday, March 25 (30-minute papers)

- Categorical phonology and gradient facts
- Evidentiality
- DP types and feature syntax

Saturday, March 29 (45-minute papers)

- Language Contact
- Principles of Linearization

See below for details.

**Poster Session:** Authors whose abstracts are shortlisted but not selected for the Colloquium or one of the workshops will have the opportunity to present their paper as a poster.

# Workshop 1: Categorical phonology and gradient facts

March 25, 2008

Organisers: S.J. Hannahs, Marc van Oostendorp and Ricardo Bermudez-Otero

Under a traditional view of sound systems of natural language, phonology deals with categorical facts, whilst gradient phenomena are delegated to the phonetics. Furthermore, given the 'push forward' nature of our model of grammar, the prediction is made that gradience should be essentially invisible to the grammar. In recent years, however, this division of labour has been questioned. It has become clear that at least certain types of gradience are somehow accessible to grammatical, phonological processes. This workshop invites papers on all aspects of this discussion: both empirical studies bearing on the issue as well as new theoretical interpretation of established facts.

Several types of gradience are relevant for the current debate. First, there is the type of gradience typically associated with phonetics: the difference between sound A and B is not absolute, but relative. Rather than A being unequivocally [+F] and B [-F], the one seems to display more phonetic characteristics of F than the other. It has been argued, for instance, that syllable final devoicing is 'incomplete' in at least some languages, and that this shakes the foundations of formal phonology. Similarly, 'deletion' of segments does not always seem to lead to the disappearance of all phonetic cues of the original segment, even if the deletion interacts with other phonological processes.

Another type of gradience involves grammaticality judgements. Even though generative linguists have for a long time assigned subtle grammaticality judgements (\*, '?', '?\*', '???', etc.) to the data they were working with, these judgements did not receive a very precise theoretical interpretation. Within most frameworks, it is not clear for instance what grammatical mechanism would be responsible for the differences between '?' and '?\*'. Furthermore, it is not clear at all that these judgmental marks really constitute a scale with fixed points; they rather seem to reflect again a gradient scale; the challenge is how to account for this.

It has been pointed out, furthermore, that the subtlety of grammaticality judgments in certain cases corresponds to other gradient aspects of reality, such as the frequency distribution of words in the lexicon or sociolinguistic and stylistic parameters. This opens up many important (old but unsolved) theoretical questions as to the relation between grammar and those extragrammatical factors.

All in all, it seems fair to say that recent times have uncovered many challenges to the traditional, algebraic view of phonological structure. This workshop aims to address the question how to deal with those challenges, as well as those imposed by potential other interpretations of the notion gradience, and how to incorporate them into a theoretical model which is sufficiently flexible and restrictive.

Abstracts are invited for a 30 minute presentation (plus 15 for discussion). Abstracts should be anonymous, in PDF format, and submitted online to <http://www.netskills.ac.uk/projects/glow2008/pasha/register/index.cgi> For abstract guidelines and deadline, see above under the Colloquium call for papers.

## Workshop 2: Evidentiality

March 25, 2008

Organiser: Uli Sauerland

**Invited Speaker:** Eric McCready, Aoyama Gakuin University, Tokyo

Evidentiality is the expression of the source of evidence in an utterance. Different morphological means can be used to express evidentiality: While in English, evidentiality is, for the most part, expressed by adverbial expressions ("according to") and clausal embedding ("I saw"), in other languages modals (Dutch, German, French, ...) or aspectual morphology (Bulgarian, Turkish, ...) can take on evidential meaning, or even specialized evidential morphology exists in the form of affixes or particles (Japanese, Amazonian lang., Quechua, Tibetan, ...). Evidentiality as a category of crosslinguistic study is therefore established by similarity of meaning and therefore should be based on a detailed understanding of the semantics of evidentiality in individual languages. At present, there exist a couple of detailed semantic studies of evidentiality in individual languages and some broad typological overviews, but a lot of work still needs to be done. This workshop provides a forum for those working on evidentiality from a semantic perspective.

The broad goal of the workshop is to understand and explain what kind of category "Evidentiality" is. Is it a purely semantic/pragmatic category like "speaker-oriented"? Or can we predict semantic or syntactic properties of a morpheme when we know that it is an evidential? --Other than its evidentiality, of course. From this broad goal, the following issues arise as themes for either the detailed study of evidentiality in an individual language or cross-linguistic work:

- syntax-semantics correspondences concerning evidentiality
- scopal properties of evidentiality markers
- interaction of evidentiality with clausal semantics
- comparison of evidentials and related categories (epistemics, evaluatives, speech acts, ...)
- interaction of evidentiality with tense/aspect/mood systems

In semantics and pragmatics, notions such as perspective, speech acts, the semantics-pragmatics interface, as well as cross-linguistic variation have recently been recognized as important topics. Evidentials are in the cross-hairs of all of these developments. Therefore, the semantic tools for addressing evidentials are available now, and at the same time, the study of evidentials might lead to further progress in the understanding of these broader semantic issues. This, too, we hope this workshop will help accomplish.

Abstracts are invited for a 30-minute presentation (plus 15 for discussion). Abstracts should be anonymous, in PDF format, and submitted online to <<http://www.netskills.ac.uk/projects/glow2008/pasha/register/index.cgi>> For abstract guidelines and deadline, see above under the Colloquium call for papers.



## Workshop 3: DP types and feature syntax

March 25, 2008

Organiser: Abdelkader Fassi Fehri

Nominal expressions (including pronouns, proper names, (in)definites, quantifiers, or possessives) exhibit various syntactic, morphological, and semantic properties that make them potentially distinguishable, in terms of their internal feature make-up, the constructions in which they are found, and the properties of languages which use them. It is conceivable that an integrated feature system can type them appropriately so that the internal syntax of each distinct expression is built up minimally (and non-redundantly), and that features become transparently sorted out as interpretable (in prototypical cases), or formal, otherwise. If e.g. personal pronouns are typically referring Ds, with less significant Number, Class or *n* features, then the fact that they resist being used as predicates (being either arguments or vocatives), or resist quantification (*\*all us*; *\*tous nous*) is expected. As a semantic type, they are  $\langle e \rangle$ ; neither  $\langle e, t \rangle$ , nor  $\langle \langle e, t \rangle, t \rangle$ . Such a specification presumably bars their co-occurrence with definite articles, if the latter are essentially type shifters. Finally, as bound variables, the core feature they realize (i.e. Person) is formal.

Proper names, on the other hand, have distributions that come close to those of pronouns. Being a prototype of  $\langle e \rangle$ , they are expected to occur as arguments (and vocatives), but not as predicates. They also resist quantification. But other properties set them apart from pronouns. They are compatible with definite articles, they have *n* substance, and they are not bound, being R-expressions. Even if Person is postulated in their structure, it cannot be their core/prototypical feature. The latter is then yet to be discovered.

Definite and indefinite descriptions occur as arguments, and normally resist vocatives, although not predication. Unlike pronouns and proper names, their reference is clearly complex, in the sense that both the content of D and that of *n* significantly contribute to their denotation or their typing. Put in other terms, they are typically characterized by a type shifting property. Pronouns and proper names are not type shifters. Moreover, (in)definites are *n* variables, whereas (referring) pronouns and proper names are constant Ds and *ns*, respectively.

Feature syntax conditions phrasal DP syntax, and accounts for intra- and inter-linguistic variation. For example, bare determination with individual denotation is subject to variation which involves Move. Syntactic possessors often resist articles, and ‘definiteness spreading’ compensates the lack of article expression. Merge or Move of attributes yields quite general Ezafe effects. Possessor extraction appeals to peripheral/discursive DP features, etc.

Addressed to syntacticians, semanticists, variationists, and diachronists, the workshop will focus on the content and motivation of an integrated DP feature system, able to derive DP typology and variation in minimal terms, as well as give insights in the properties of narrow syntactic operations, driven by Agree, EPP, or EF, as well as natural semantic typing.

Contributions highlighting significant features of Arabic (or comparative Semitic) DP syntax are especially welcome.

Abstracts are invited for a 30-minute presentation (plus 15 for discussion). Abstracts should be anonymous, in PDF format, and submitted online to <<http://www.netskills.ac.uk/projects/glow2008/pasha/register/index.cgi>> For abstract guidelines and deadline, see above under the Colloquium call for papers.

## Workshop 4: Language Contact

March 29, 2008

Organisers: Isa Buchstaller, Karen Corrigan, Ghada Khattab, William van der Wurff

**Invited speaker:** Michel DeGraff, MIT

Language contact has been studied from many angles for a long time now. As a result, there is a wealth of empirical material available, ranging from detailed case studies of specific contact situations, contemporary and historical, to psycholinguistic investigations involving made-up languages. There are also various general models of contact-induced linguistic phenomena, some of them oriented to social/situational factors of contact situations, others focused on syntactic, phonological or semantic phenomena, and yet others exploring the interconnections between the two.

However, important questions remain. In particular, there is a so-far unresolved tension between contact-induced properties of languages and the dominant generative view of the formation of I-languages, which postulates the presence of a homogeneous input. The aim of this workshop is to stimulate discussion of the ways in which this tension can be resolved and – more broadly – the ways in which the sometimes bewildering variety of contact phenomena can be reduced to more basic principles, which also operate in situations approximating homogeneity.

Specific questions that we would encourage speakers to engage with include the following:

- is it possible to reduce linguistic phenomena involving language contact entirely to general processes operating in the formation of I-languages or do additional processes need to be postulated?
- what are the underlying determinants of the various ‘borrowing hierarchies’ that have been observed in contact situations?
- what is the role of lexical properties in the process of contact-induced change?
- what generalisations can be made about the relation between social/situational aspects of cases of language contact and their formal linguistic properties?
- what is the role of quantitative methods in developing models of contact-induced change?
- what is the explanation for parallelisms observed between processes of acquisition and attrition?

All of these questions can be asked about contact situations involving mutually unintelligible languages but they also apply to situations where there is contact between closely related varieties, which in actuality may be the more frequent type of contact. It is at this point that issues in the study of language contact merge with issues in the study of what has been called language-internal change. Contributions aiming to shed light on the differences and similarities of these phenomena will also be welcome.

Abstracts are invited for a 45-minute presentation (excluding discussion). Abstracts should be anonymous, in PDF format, and submitted online to <http://www.netskills.ac.uk/projects/glow2008/pasha/register/index.cgi> For abstract guidelines and deadline, see above under the Colloquium call for papers.

## Workshop 5: Principles of Linearization

March 29, 2008

Organisers: Theresa Biberauer and Ian Roberts

Current generative syntactic theory generally assumes that the syntactic operations Merge and Move generate hierarchical structures oblivious of linear order. According to the T-model grammar, linear order is a matter of how the structures derived by narrow syntax are spelled out on the PF wing of the grammar. The challenge is, then, to account for the word-order variation found among the languages of the world, while observing, and explaining, apparently universal constraints on this variation. Most famously, word-order variation conforms to the Greenbergian universals according to which head-complement order is typically ‘harmonic’ within a language, or at least within extended projections. Also famous are certain left-right asymmetries, such as the one encoded in Greenberg’s Universal 20.

Such asymmetries are part of the rationale for Kayne’s (1994) antisymmetry theory. According to Kayne, cross-linguistic word-order variation is an effect of parameters governing movement in the (narrow) syntax in conjunction with the LCA (if A asymmetrically c-commands B then A precedes B). In much recent minimalist theory, the parameters are formalized as movement-triggering features (EPP-features) on functional heads. Though hugely influential, the LCA remains controversial, in particular the idea that rigid head-final orders are derived by repeated applications of leftward “roll-up” movement.

In a radical version of the T-model grammar, narrow syntax is completely universal so that all word-order variation is a matter of ‘P-syntax’. A way to achieve this, explored in work by J. Bobaljik, among others, is to assume that word-order variation is a matter of which copies/chain-links are spelled out. While this is relatively easy to implement in simple cases like *wh*-movement, it is less obvious how to implement it, for example, in the case of head-final orders derived by repeated massive roll-up or, more generally, for structures derived via remnant movement.

In early P&P theory, cross-categorial harmony was straightforwardly explained as a consequence of the setting of the head-complement parameter. It is not as obvious how to explain it in the EPP-based theory (it will follow if all heads in an extended projection have an EPP-feature, or if none do, but which principles determine this?). On the other hand, disharmonic word orders (for instance T-VP combined with O-V) are a problem for the head-complement parameter, but less of a problem for the EPP-based theory. The non-existence (or extreme rarity) of certain disharmonic orders, such as T-VP combined with TP-C, or V-O combined with VP-Aux is a problem for all extant theories, however, including theories explaining word-order universals in terms of constraints on parsing: why would V-O-Aux be any harder to derive (or parse) than Aux-O-V, or O-V-Aux, both of which are robustly attested?

A recent, fruitful line of enquiry, pursued by H. Lasnik among others, is on ellipsis as a means to circumvent constraints on linearization, as when ellipsis of the VP circumvents the violation of English word order incurred by object movement in the pseudogapping construction (*She ate more bacon than John did egg* [<sub>VP</sub> eat *t*]),

Investigation of possible implementations and constraints of this repair strategy provides an interesting new approach to principles of linearization.

Phase theory obviously also has consequences for linearization, and may provide the explanation for unexpected asymmetries and gaps. It has been used (for example, by Fox and Pesetsky 2005, among others) to explain shape-preservation effects. The question, though, is how phase-level linearization should be formulated (is spelled-out structure still accessible for movement, for example?), and what its empirical advantages and disadvantages are? Furthermore, the currently unresolved question of which heads “qualify” as phase-heads and which do not also seems to be central here, as does the long-standing problem of precisely how adjuncts are integrated and linearized.

Questions raised by the above remarks that the workshop addresses include:

- What are the advantages and disadvantages of the “classical” LCA?
- What are the advantages of “roll-up” accounts of rigidly head-final languages? Non-rigidly head-final languages (e.g. those which permit “leaking” of a subset of constituents in some/all phrasal contexts)? “Mixed” word-order languages?
- Why are some mixed/disharmonic orders rare, while others are apparently nonexistent?
- What is shape preservation? How can it be accounted for?
- What do properties of ellipsis tell us about principles of linearization?
- What role(s) do phases play in determining linearization?

Abstracts are invited for a 45-minute presentation (excluding discussion). Abstracts should be anonymous, in PDF format, and submitted online to <http://www.netskills.ac.uk/projects/glow2008/pasha/register/index.cgi> For abstract guidelines and deadline, see above under the Colloquium call for papers.

## **Minutes of the GLOW general assembly held in Tromsø on April 13, 2007**

Prepared by Peter Svenonius and Uli Sauerland

### *1. Future Venues*

For funding reasons, some institutions have expressed a desire to get a commitment from GLOW longer than the two years in advance that we have normally approved colloquium venues. The Assembly agreed to approved venues three years in advance, and approved Nantes for 2009 (contingent on a positive communication from Nantes, which was subsequently received) and Wroclaw for 2010.

The planned venues for GLOW colloquia until 2010 are therefore the following.

2008 Newcastle  
2009 Nantes  
2010 Wroclaw

After that, interest has been expressed by Reykjavík and Vienna, and also Lund for 2013. Since the organizers in Reykjavík are celebrating the 100th anniversary of the University of Iceland in 2011, they have a strong preference for 2011, and therefore the presumed sequence is the following:

2011 Reykjavík  
2012 Vienna  
2013 Lund

If you are interested in hosting a GLOW colloquium in the future please contact the board.

### *2. Newcastle meeting*

Anders Holmberg presented information for the 2008 colloquium in Newcastle. (This information is provided here as a matter of record; updated information is found at the beginning of this newsletter.)

Dates: workshops March 25, main conference: March 26-28, 2008

Deadline for Submissions: November 1st, 2007

Topic of the main conference (unanimously approved): no topic

Invited Speakers: Luigi Rizzi (Siena) and Arto Antilla (Stanford)

Proposed workshop topics:

1. Language Contact
2. Syntactic Doubling (invited speaker: Sjef Barbiers)
3. Categorical Grammar and Gradient Facts

In addition, there is a possibility that there will be additional workshops on the 29th.

### *3. Abstract Review*

Peter Svenonius summarized the abstract review process applied at the CASTL Tromsø colloquium. Tromsø used the abstract reviewing software Pasha, and recommended it. 100 reviewers were assigned ten abstracts each, each abstract received five scores, and anomalous scoring patterns were flagged for further inspection. The procedure is described in more detail on the Tromsø GLOW XXX website. As was recommended at the general assembly in Barcelona in 2006 (see the minutes of the assembly there), reviewers' comments were passed along to authors.

The main complaint was that reviewers felt that the 0-10 scoring point system was overly open to different interpretations.

The assembly agreed that the procedure used was generally sound and that it should be improved with characterizations of the different scores used. It was pointed out that the 10-point scale was originally divided into 1-6 points for quality and 1-4 points for adherence to theme; therefore, in the absence of a theme, it might be logical to use a 1-6 point scale instead of 1-10 (or 0-10, as was the case in Tromsø). The decision about whether to do so was left up to the Newcastle organizers.

### *4. GLOW Bureau*

The GLOW Bureau is now in Utrecht and in operation. However, there have been some complications in the transition. One problem is that the GLOW secretary there is only available for GLOW business one day per week which leads to a terrific slow-down of certain kinds of communication. The result has been that the Spring newsletter was very late this year, and the Board apologized for that and promised to discuss the situation with Martin Everaert in Utrecht.

### *5. Treasurer's report*

Hans Broekhuis presented the treasurer's report. There is a shortfall compared with previous years, which we assume is due to people forgetting to renew their memberships since the fall newsletter was not mailed but only posted as a website.

### *6. Summer schools*

EGG Summer School: In Brno, July 30 to August 10, 2007

Barcelona Linguistic Institute: August 18-30, 2008

African Summer School: Organized by Enoch Aboh and Chris Collins, in Ghana in 2008

Enoch Aboh described his and Chris Collins' plan to organize a summer school in Ghana in 2008 (originally planned for 2007, now delayed until 2008). Through a cooperation with NYU (Collins' home institution), they have secured the use of facilities (classrooms and dormitories) in Accra. Teachers have volunteered to travel to Ghana with their own funds, so the main expenditure will be to fund students from

Africa to travel to the school. They are trying to work out a way to select students from across Africa, to keep the school down to a manageable size.

The Board determined that €6500 could be offered per year to support summer schools. The EGG had requested support for 4 years, but given the shortfall this year, the Board recommended a more cautious two-year commitment. The assembly approved support for EGG at the level of €2500 per year for two years, and €2000 each for the Barcelona and African summer schools. The assembly also approved using money from the Teun Hoekstra fund to support African student travel to the African summer school. To learn how to contribute to the Teun Hoekstra fund, see the GLOW website.

### *7. Elections*

The board nominated Maaïke Schoorlemmer for Treasurer and Lida Veselovska for Member B. The board asks for 2008 for the members to nominate volunteers for board offices and to contact the secretary Uli Sauerland with nominations.

The following elections were all unanimous:

- Congress President (2007-2008): Anders Holmberg
- Chairperson (2007-2009): Artemis Alexiadou
- Secretary (2007-2009): Uli Sauerland
- Treasurer (2007-2009): Maaïke Schoorlemmer
- Member B (2007-2009): Lida Veselovska
- Member C (2007-2009): Viola Schmitt
- Coopted Member (Phonology) (2007-2009): Marc van Oostendorp

The assembled membership thanked Peter Svenonius for serving as the Congress President 2006-2007, Bozena Rozwadowska for serving as Member B 2001-2007, and Hans Broekhuis for serving as Treasurer 2001-2007. The following board positions were continued:

- Newsletter Editors (2006-2008): David Adger and Peter Svenonius
- Website Manager (2006-2008): Craig Thiersch
- Member A (2006-2008): Anna Cardinaletti
- Member D (2006-2008): Ricardo Bermudez-Otero
- Journal Editor: Harry van der Hulst
- Advisory Member: Henk van Riemsdijk
- Second Advisory Member: Martin Everaert



## Treasurer's Report 2006 (presented at 2007 GLOW)

by Hans Broekhuis

<b>Revenues</b>	
Membership dues	3.692,26
Teun Hoekstra Fund	205,00
Interest	1.256,61
<b>Total Revenues</b>	<b>5.153,87</b>

<b>Expenses</b>	
Chamber of commerce	26,20
Costs transfer for payments and additional costs paid to the bank	29,71
Newsletter	3080,60
Summerschool Stuttgart	5000,00
Summerschool Stuttgart (contribution by THF)	1540,27
Contribution GLEE*	2500,00
<b>Total Costs</b>	<b>12176,78</b>

Balance December 31, 2005	51,329.24
Total Revenues - Total Costs	7022,91
Unaccounted for	0,00
<b>Balance December 31, 2006</b>	<b>44.306.33</b>

### **Reservations: € 45300**

<b>Reservation in case of liquidation (legally required)</b>	<b>1.500,00</b>
<b>Reservation for calamities:</b>	<b>25.000,00</b>
<b>Reservation due to long-term memberships:</b>	
Until 2008:	4.400,00
Until 2009:	3.040,00
Until 2010:	2.000,00
Until 2011:	990,00
Until 2013:	1.200,00
Until 2015:	200,00
Until 2016:	200,00
lifetime:	6.800,00
<b>Total:</b>	<b>18.830,00</b>

### **Freely available: Minus € 1023,67**

\* GLEE will also be supported by GLOW in 2007