

**Addresses:**

**GLOW Newsletter**

Marc Richards  
Institut für Linguistik  
University of Leipzig  
Beethovenstr. 15  
D-04107 Leipzig  
Germany  
[richards@uni-leipzig.de](mailto:richards@uni-leipzig.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](mailto:glow@let.uu.nl)

<http://glow.uvt.nl>  
<http://glow.uit.no>

# Contents

<b>A Note from the Editor</b>	4
<b>GLOW Renewal Notice</b>	5
<b>The 32<sup>nd</sup> GLOW Colloquium 2009 in Nantes: Calls for papers</b>	
Main session: On the Architecture of the Grammar: Y, if and how . . . . .	6
Workshop 1: The Lexicon (if any) . . . . .	9
Workshop 2: Modes of Composition . . . . .	10
Workshop 3: Acquisition at the Syntax–Semantics Interface . . . . .	11
<b>Minutes of the GLOW General Assembly held in Newcastle</b>	12
<b>Treasurer’s Report 2007</b>	16

## A Note from the Editor

Dear GLOW Members,

With Newcastle now behind us, autumn soon upon us, and the GLOW roadshow gearing up for next year's meeting at the University of Nantes (to be held from 16-18 April 2009 with workshops on the 15th), it is time for another Fall edition of the GLOW Newsletter, and time for a new editor too. David Adger and Peter Svenonius have done a sterling job over the last six years, and I would just like to thank them for all their editorial efforts. And now to begin mine...

Actually, apart from the name at the bottom of this page, nothing too much has changed. In particular, the guidelines and time-frame for submitting abstracts remain largely the same. The deadline for this year, like previous years, is **November 1st**. We will need named (and affiliated) copies of all accepted abstracts for the Spring Newsletter, so if you do not submit both versions (named and anonymous) together, please make sure you send me the named version of your abstract as soon as you get the good news.

The submission rules can be found on p.7, at the start of the call for papers, but here are the highlights:

“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. Examples should not be collected on a separate page. Abstracts may include an extra page for references (not examples).”

Note that the third page, if used, should be for references only; unlike previous years, we are now planning to include this page in the Spring Newsletter for all accepted *colloquium* abstracts (see section 6 of the Minutes, p.15). We also recommend that you integrate your examples into the text itself rather than saving them up till the end of the abstract; whilst the latter approach might increase the suspense, it only impairs readability, as reviewers have to flick back and forth between example and exposition.

Please ensure that you adhere strictly to these guidelines, else your abstract will not be considered. Not only does this ensure fairness but it'll also make the job of putting together the Spring Newsletter much easier.

A dedicated website and email address for submitting your abstracts will soon be online, so keep your eyes on <http://www.lettres.univ-nantes.fr/liling/glow32/>. You're also encouraged to check out the shiny new GLOW website at <http://glow.uit.no>, as redesigned and relocated by Gunnar Hrafn Hrafnbjargarson.

One additional thing this year that you should bear in mind when composing your abstracts: As you will see from the Call for Papers for the main session (pp.7-10), this year sees the long-awaited return of a themed colloquium, the topic being “On the Architecture of the Grammar: Y, if and how”. Needless to say, since the theme of the

colloquium is not free this year, you need to ensure that your submissions bear relevance to the topic at hand.

The GLOW Board positions coming up for renewal or replenishment in 2009 include Chairperson, Secretary, Treasurer and Members B and C – see section 9 of the Minutes, pp.15-16, for details and for some suggested nominations. If you would like to suggest anyone else for nomination for any of these positions, please notify the outgoing Secretary, Uli Sauerland (uli@alum.mit.edu), by the 1st of February 2009 for inclusion in the Spring Newsletter.

Finally, a reminder that you must be a GLOW member in order to register for and attend a GLOW colloquium. Details on how to become one can be found on p.6.

Here are the important dates again:	Abstracts:	November 1st, 2008
	Glow Dues:	January 1st, 2009
	Board Nominations:	February 1st, 2009

Marc Richards.

## GLOW Renewal Notice

Renewal is for the calendar year 2009, taking effect with the Spring issue of the GLOW newsletter. Payment should reach us by January 1, 2009. 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 (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 #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 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](mailto: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 a few years ago (you now send the order directly to the publisher, not to GLOW).

## GLOW 2009 COLLOQUIUM

### ON THE ARCHITECTURE OF THE GRAMMAR: Y, IF AND HOW

April 16-18, 2009

Invited speakers:

**Danny Fox, MIT**

**Paul Smolensky, John Hopkins University**

#### SUBMISSION GUIDELINES

Deadline for submissions: November 1, 2008.

Abstracts are invited for 45-minute presentations (excluding discussion) on the theme below. Abstracts should be submitted online (URL TBA), in PDF format, without the name(s) of the author(s).

Submission details (further details for submission will be available soon; see <http://www.lettres.univ-nantes.fr/ling/glow32/>):

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 8½" 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 GLOW newsletter.

You may submit one single-authored and one co-authored abstract, or two co-authored abstracts but not with the same co-authors. You may not submit the same abstract to the Colloquium and to one of the GLOW workshops.

Authors whose abstracts are shortlisted but not selected will have the opportunity to present their paper as a **poster**.

These guidelines apply to the workshops and colloquium alike.

## DESCRIPTION OF COLLOQUIUM THEME

Accounting for the link between sound and meaning means, among other things, describing how the articulatory-perceptual system works, describing how the system responsible for informational content works, and describing how the two manage to interact. The Y model is one model of the interaction. The classical Y model assumes the presence of a “syntactic” component that is the sole locus of recursive structure generation, and two distinct interpretive components between which syntax is the sole connecting link. Many fundamental architectural issues emerge in comparing the Y model with its alternatives.

### 1. *What is the precise articulation of the Y model?*

For instance, at how many points should we imagine that the external systems are able to access “syntactic” information? The question arises, in particular, in light of current variants of the Y model – e.g. multiple spell-out, continuous access to PF and LF, single-cycle grammar. What are the empirical and conceptual arguments against/for the classic Y model, and against/for its competitors today? When it comes to accounting for facts in terms of what is happening on a given branch, how much should be attributed to the “syntactic” portion of the branch and how much to the operation of the interpretive system? For example, in explaining how sentences with quantifiers receive their interpretation, one could posit that there is QR in the syntax, or that the interpretive system itself adjusts the structure or arrives at the interpretation via type shifting. Similar questions arise in cases where there is an apparent mismatch between syntactic constituents and prosodic constituents (Nespor and Vogel 1986, Truckenbrodt 1999, 2007). Does that readjustment take place on the syntax side or within the phonology? Likewise, in the domain of morphology, how much of word formation is accomplished in the “syntax” proper and how much is accomplished by other components?

### 2. *The architecture of the interacting systems that the Y model supposes*

Is syntax – as opposed to the mechanisms that give us phonological and semantic representations – the only mechanism that operates recursively? What evidence could bear on this issue? What are the consequences, for example, for theories of word formation, word meaning and the lexicon? Should the scope of syntax extend into the traditional lexicon / morphology domain, to account for recursive aspects of word meaning and formation (e.g. Marantz 1997, Harley & Noyer 1998, Alexiadou 2001, Hale & Keyser 2002, Borer 2005, Ramchand 2008)? If morphology is in the syntax, how can its distinctive character be derived (e.g., through to the insertion of morphophonological information into syntax, trading hierarchical structure for adjacency, Embick and Noyer 2001)? The same questions arise for other domains. For instance, it has been proposed that phonological words and phonological phrases (but not, for instance, syllables or words) can have recursive structure (Selkirk 1995, Gussenhoven 2005). It may be no coincidence that the word and the phrase interface with the syntactic structure most directly. If on the other hand there are different recursive components to language, in what respects do they resemble each other, in what respects do they differ, and why (Jackendoff 2002, Ackema and Neeleman 2007)?

### 3. *Syntax and the interpretative systems*

Within the Y model, the syntax feeds the systems of interpretation and realization. To what extent can syntax be seen as “subservient” to the external systems? To what extent is it the case that syntactic computation is motivated by the need to satisfy input conditions of the interfacing systems? On one extreme version of the position that syntax is “subservient” to the interpretive systems, the syntax produces all and only interpretable structures – there is a perfect match. What consequences would this have for our view of syntax? What evidence could bear on whether it is correct? To what extent can the syntax access information of the kind that the external systems provide? For instance, on the PF side, syntax has been argued to be sensitive to phonological content (Holmberg 2000, Chomsky 2001), linearization (Fox and Pesetsky, Moro 2000, Uriagereka 1999), prosody (Krifka 1998, Szendroi 2001, Jackendoff 2002), or morphological diacritics (Embick 2000). On the LF side, syntax has been argued to be sensitive to the meanings contributed by logical terms (Fox 2000). What aspects of meaning, if any, influence syntactic movement? Is there a limited look-ahead that allows syntax to be driven by effects on the output? What is evidence for the autonomy of syntax? What syntactic operations can be seen as readjustment processes to meet interface conditions that would otherwise be violated (be it on the PF or LF side)? Similar questions can be asked internal to the modules themselves – if the systems on the PF side comprise a morphological subsystem and a phonological subsystem, are they informationally encapsulated or do they “talk” to each other (Scheer 2008)?

4. *How do alternative models compare with the Y model* (for example, Jackendoff’s 2002 parallel architecture with multiple generative components)? Is the role of phonology and semantics purely interpretive? Can phonology and semantics interact in a way that is not mediated by syntax? In particular, what is the best account for the correlation between phonological phenomena such as intonation or destressing and aspects of semantic interpretation (Gussenhoven 2008, Szendroi 2005, Reinhart 2006)? In models that assume interaction between the interpretive components outside syntax, what kinds of interaction need to be assumed? What is the (strongest) evidence that the syntax feeds the external systems? Many of the analyses mentioned in (3) crucially make reference to how the interpretive systems would treat a particular structure that the syntax creates. Can the same facts be accounted for naturally by other (correspondence) approaches?

### *Selected References*

- Ackema, P., Neeleman, A. 2007. Morphology ≠ Syntax. In *The Oxford handbook of linguistic interfaces*, ed. G. Ramchand and C. Reiss. OUP.
- Alexiadou, A. 2001. *Functional structure in nominals: nominalization and ergativity*. John Benjamins.
- Borer, H. 2005. *Structuring sense*. OUP
- Chomsky, N. 2000. *New horizons in the study of language and mind*. MIT Press.
- Chomsky, N. 2001. Derivation by phase. In *Ken Hale: A life in language*, ed. M. Kenstowicz. MIT Press.
- Embick, D. 2000. Features, syntax, and categories in the Latin perfect. *Linguistic Inquiry* 31.
- Embick, D., Marantz, A. 2008. Architecture and blocking. *Linguistic Inquiry* 39.
- Embick, D., Noyer, R. 2001. Movement operations after syntax. *Linguistic Inquiry* 32.



- Gussenhoven, C. 2005. Procliticized phonological phrases in English: Evidence from rhythm. *Studia Linguistica* 59.
- Gussenhoven, C. 2008. Semantic judgments as evidence for the intonational structure of Dutch. *Prosody 2008*. In *Prosodic Phonology*, ed. M. Nespors and I. Vogel. Foris: Dordrecht.
- Fox, D. 2000. *Economy and semantic interpretation*. MIT Press.
- Fox, D., Nissenbaum, J. 1999. Extraposition and Scope: A case for overt QR. In *Proceedings of WCCFL* 18.
- Fox, D., Pesetsky, D. Cyclic Linearization and the typology of movement, ms., MIT.
- Hale, K., Keyser, J. 2002. *Prolegomenon to a theory of argument structure*. MIT Press.
- Harley, H., Noyer R. 1998. Mixed nominalizations, object shift and short verb movement in English. In *Proceedings of NELS* 28.
- Holmberg, A. 2000. Scandinavian stylistic fronting. *Linguistic Inquiry* 31: 445-483.
- Jackendoff, R. 2002. *Foundations of language*. OUP.
- Krifka, M. 1998. Scope-inversion under the rise-fall contour in German. *Linguistic Inquiry* 29.
- Marantz, A. 1997. No Escape from Syntax: Don't try morphological analysis in the privacy of your own lexicon. In Proceedings of the 21st Annual Penn Linguistics Colloquium: *Penn Working Papers in Linguistics* 4, Dimitriadis, A. et al. (eds.), pp. 201-225.
- Moro, A. 2000. *Dynamic antisymmetry*. MIT Press.
- Pinker, S., Jackendoff, R. 2005. The faculty of language: What's special about it? *Cognition* 95.
- Pustejovsky, J. 1995. *The generative lexicon*. MIT Press.
- Ramchand, G. 2008. *Verb meaning and the lexicon: A first phase syntax*. Cambridge Studies in Linguistics.
- Reinhart, T. 2006. *Interface strategies*. MIT Press.
- Roeper, T. 2004. Nominalization: how a nominal construction reveals primary principles. In *Handbook of Morphology*, ed. R. Lieber and P. Stekauer. Kluwer.
- Scheer, T. 2008. *A lateral theory of phonology. Part II*. Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter.
- Selkirk, E. O. 1995. The prosodic structure of function words. In *University of Massachusetts Occasional Papers in Linguistics 18: Papers on Optimality Theory*, ed. J. Beckman, L. Walsh Dickey and S. Urbanczyk. University of Massachusetts. Amherst: Graduate Linguistic Student Association.
- Szendroi, K. 2005. Focus movement (with special reference to Hungarian). In *The Blackwell Companion to Syntax*, Vol. II, Case 26.
- Truckenbrodt, H. 1999. On the relation between syntactic phrases and phonological phrases. *Linguistic Inquiry* 30: 219-255.
- Truckenbrodt, H. 2007. The syntax-phonology interface. In *The Cambridge Handbook of Phonology*, ed. Paul de Lacy. Cambridge: CUP.
- Uriagereka, J. 1999. Multiple spell-out. In *Working minimalism*, ed. S. D. Epstein and N. Hornstein. MIT Press.

**GLOW 2009 Phonology Workshop**  
**The Lexicon (if any)**

**April 15, 2009**

This workshop addresses issues relating to the necessity (or lack thereof) of a structured lexicon under contemporary approaches to phonology. Research in phonology in recent years has seen a shift towards “morphophonological” approaches, in the classical sense of the term. This shift, in turn, has a crucial impact on the architecture of the grammar itself, as conceived under alternative approaches to phonology.

We invite abstracts bearing on the issue of the status and the structure of the lexicon. Questions that that may be addressed include but are not limited to:

- Does a mechanism like GEN in Optimality Theory imply the absence of a lexicon? And if so, how does it generate the representations that are to be evaluated by the grammar?
- Within an exemplar-based framework, what is the nature of lexical representations? What is the nature of the ‘exemplars’ that are posited? How much ‘fine phonetic detail’ is stored and how does such a framework specify a prototype? What is the relevant structure of the lexicon that it entails?
- Within connectionist approaches, where structures and lexical representations are viewed as being built ‘dynamically’, do we still need to talk about a ‘structured lexicon’, stocking irregularity?
- Traditionally, the lexicon is seen as the repository of exceptions and phonological irregularity. What is the status of phonological irregularity today, or is this notion no longer operational?
- Theoretical models may rely on the manipulation of large-scale corpora, leading to changes in methods of investigation and the hypotheses concerning the architecture of the grammar. How is variation and, in particular, sociolinguistically conditioned (post-lexical?) variation integrated into current models, and what are the consequences for the architecture of the lexicon itself?
- What is the influence of the frequency of occurrence of a given linguistic unit on the nature of representations? What is the impact of such data on alternate conceptions of linguistic mechanisms?
- Within specific theoretical frameworks, what is the status or the form that is taken by lexical representations? Are they structured or not, syllabified or not, linearized or not? Are these structural aspects of representations only surfacing as by-products of unstructured representations?
- How do the lexicon and phonology interface? What kinds of interactions need to be assumed? How does phonology specify the structure of lexical representations? What is the influence of the lexicon on the phonological architecture?
- What is the influence of a strictly morphological component on the relations that might hold between phonology and the lexicon?

**GLOW 2009 Semantics Workshop**  
**Modes of Composition**

**April 15, 2009**

**Hosted jointly by LLING (EA 3827) and the Institut Jean Nicod**  
**Invited speaker TBA**

If the truth conditions that we associate with syntactic structures are computed compositionally, then how? A variety of composition rules have been motivated that supplement the simple Fregean rule of functional application. Heim and Kratzer 1998 discuss modification and predicate abstraction. Chung and Ladusaw 2004 motivate a rule of “predicate restriction.” Other researchers attach importance to function composition, particularly in variable-free approaches, where rules of this kind become central. What is the class of composition rules? What is the status of type-shifting and how many varieties are there? Could the impression that there are modes of composition that go beyond functional application in fact be due to the presence of unpronounced elements in syntactic structure? We invite submissions that address such questions, and in particular submissions that bring new empirical evidence to bear on them.

Sentences contribute more than their truth conditions. Are other aspects of sentence meaning, like their felicity conditions and their expressive content, computed compositionally as well, and if so how? Is it better to assume that the same interpretive procedure is responsible for generating truth-conditional and non-truth-conditional aspects of meaning, or is it better to assume that different processes are involved? The issue of how to compositionally generate non-truth-conditional aspects of meaning received one of its first in-depth treatments in Karttunen and Peters 1979, and has most recently been revived by Potts. We also hope for submissions that make progress on this issue and the questions surrounding it.

**GLOW 2009 Acquisition Workshop**  
**Acquisition at the Syntax–Semantics Interface**

**April 15, 2009**

**Invited speaker:**

**Colin Philips, University of Maryland**

The purpose of this workshop is to explore the issues that arise at the interface between syntax, semantics and pragmatics in language acquisition.

We are interested in acquisition research in any area at this interface – e.g. the syntax-semantics of quantification, quantifier scope interactions, negation and its interaction with polarity items or modality, questions, subordination, the syntactic/semantic/pragmatic constraints governing anaphora (bound anaphora vs. coreference), the morpho-syntax of noun phrases and their use and interpretation, the morpho-syntax and the semantics of tense and aspect.

We welcome, in particular, submissions bringing empirical evidence to bear directly on issues concerning the acquisition of syntax-semantics interface conditioned properties, how we should think of the syntax-LF mapping and, more generally, the syntax-semantics mapping in the course of language development, or the theoretical and methodological issues that the study of acquisition at this interface raises.

## **Minutes of the GLOW General Assembly held in Newcastle on March 27, 2008**

by Viola Schmitt and Artemis Alexiadou

### **1. Future venues**

The 32nd GLOW Colloquium will take place in Nantes, France on April 16th through April 18th 2009; the associated workshops will take place on April 15th.

The GLOW Colloquium 2010 will take place in Wroclaw, and the GLOW Colloquium 2011 will take place in Vienna. The University of Lund offered to organise the GLOW Colloquium 2013, and we would very much welcome offers to host the Colloquium in 2012.

### **2. Colloquium topic 2009**

The topic *The Architecture of Grammar*, which was proposed by the local organisers, was accepted as the topic of the 32nd Colloquium. In connection with the Colloquium there will be three workshops: i) Acquisition of syntax/semantics; ii) The relationship between phonology and the lexicon; iii) A workshop on semantics, topic to be determined by the local organisers and Philippe Schlenker.

### **3. 2008 GLOW conference in Newcastle and abstract selection**

Anders Holmberg as congress president briefly summarized the reviewing process for the Newcastle GLOW Conference. He pointed out that a full description of the reviewing process, as well as the number of abstracts and the list of reviewers were published in the Spring Newsletter.

Regarding the reviewing process, the abstracts were first sent out to reviewers. The aim of the organizers was to have 5 reviewers per abstract. This was achieved in most cases. A list of the best 40 abstracts plus the abstracts with disparate marks was compiled. These abstracts were then anonymously reviewed by the local organizers, as well as by Artemis Alexiadou and Ricardo Bermúdez-Otero, the representatives of the GLOW Board.

The list of reviewers used by the Newcastle organizers was almost identical to the list used for the Tromsø meeting in 2007. Some extra reviewers were added, especially for the workshops. As Tromsø had taken almost all Tromsø reviewers off that list, there was actually one reviewer from Tromsø for the Newcastle conference.

There were serious software problems with Pasha, hence a suggestion to future organizers is that either the person who wrote the software should be contacted, or alternative software should be used.

The general assembly suggested that the list of reviewers should be adjusted every year, so as to avoid overrepresentation of a certain field.

### **4. GLOW Bureau**

Treasurer Maaïke Schoorlemmer explained why certain problems occurred with the GLOW Bureau and pointed out that the GLOW Bureau is working on these problems.

### **5. Website**

The chairperson informed the general assembly about the website and presented the new website design by Gunnar Hrafn Hrafnbjargarson. The general assembly suggested that the website should be located where the website manager is.

## **6. Newsletter**

Newsletter editor Peter Svenonius made the following proposal. Abstracts that are submitted for the conference are 3-page abstracts: 2 pages are the maximum length for the abstract itself; a third page can be used for references. So far, the third page has never been printed in the newsletter, in order to prevent the newsletter from becoming too expensive. The newsletter editors proposed that the third page for abstracts that are accepted for the colloquium should be included in the newsletter, since it allows readers to see the references. Importantly, this does not mean that the abstracts themselves should be longer; the third page would still be for references only. Also, the third page would be included in the newsletter only for colloquium abstracts, not for workshop abstracts. This would keep the size and the costs of the newsletter reasonable. The general assembly approved of this proposal.

The editors further urged accepted authors to send their named version of the abstract directly to the editors, and it was recommended by the Newcastle organizers that the next call for papers should require that examples should be in the text, not at the end of the abstract, as this would make reviewing easier.

## **7. Treasurer's report**

Treasurer Maaike Schoorlemmer presented and explained the treasurer's report (which is to be found on page 18 of this newsletter). The chairperson informed the assembly that the report has been approved by the auditor of GLOW, Marjo van Koppen.

## **8. Summer Schools**

The Summer Schools supported by GLOW in 2008 are: i) EGG/GLEE, ii) the Barcelona summer school in linguistics, and iii) the African summer school. Concerning EGG/GLEE, Klaus Abels, as representative of EGG/GLEE, mentioned that the Summer School will take place from 27.7.2008 to 8.8.2008. The topic for syntax will be *Remnant Movement*; there is no topic for phonology. The commitment of the GLOW Board to continue supporting the summer school runs out in 2009; therefore, the EGG organizers should contact the GLOW Board.

The Barcelona summer school takes place from 18.8.2008 to 24.8.2008. The organizers of the Barcelona Summer School have inquired whether, in addition to supporting this Summer School, GLOW would also provide grants for students. The board's decision has been to not provide these grants. The board has also decided that if there is more money for Summer Schools, it will be used for the African Summer School.

Concerning the African Summer School, Enoch Aboh, as the representative for the organizers of the African Summer School in Ghana, said that since the organizers could not find any other big supporters besides GLOW, the Summer School will not take place in 2008 but is supposed to take place in 2009 in Ghana. More potential sponsors will be contacted. A conference will take place in 2008 in Ghana, but the money from GLOW will not be used for this purpose. The general assembly agreed that the money for the African Summer School 2008 should be frozen and made available to the African Summer School 2009.

## **9. Changes to the Board**

The congress president 2008-2009 is Hamida Demirdache, Nantes. The newsletter editor 2008-2010 is Marc Richards, Leipzig. The website manager 2008-2010 is

Gunnar Hrafn Hrafnbjargarson, Tromsø. Member A 2008-2010 is Anna Cardinaletti, Venice, and Member D 2008-2010 is Ricardo Bermúdez-Otero, Manchester.

The Board wishes to thank Anders Holmberg for serving as congress president (2007-2008), David Adger and Peter Svenonius for serving as newsletter editors for six years (2002-2008), and Craig Thiersch for serving as website manager for ten years (1998-2008). The Board expresses special thanks to Craig Thiersch, who set up the website of GLOW, a very important step for the visibility of GLOW.

The complete **GLOW** Board for 2008-2009:

Congress President 2008-2009	Hamida Demirdache
Chairperson 2007-2009	Artemis Alexiadou
Secretary 2007-2009	Uli Sauerland
Treasurer 2007-2009	Maaike Schorlemmer
Newsletter Editor 2008-2010	Marc Richards
Journal Editor	Harry van der Hulst
Website Manager 2008-2010	Gunnar Hrafn Hrafnbjargarson
Member A 2008-2010	Anna Cardinaletti
Member B 2007-2009	Lida Veselovska
Member C 2007-2009	Viola Schmitt
Member D 2008-2010	Ricardo Bermúdez-Otero
Advisory member I	Henk van Riemsdijk
Advisory member II	Martin Everaert
Coopted member: (Phonology) 2007-2009	Marc van Oostendorp

As you can see from the above table, the following positions will be up for election in 2009: Congress President, Chairperson, Secretary, Treasurer, and Members B and C. Maaike Schorlemmer (Treasurer), Lida Veselovska (Member B) and Viola Schmitt (Member C) have signalled their willingness to stand for re-election.

Artemis Alexiadou (Chairperson), Uli Sauerland (Secretary) and Marc van Oostendorp (Co-opted Member for Phonology), however, would like to end their GLOW Board Membership in April 2009. After a series of consultations, the Board decided to make the following suggestions for nominations for these positions: **Congress President 2009-2010**: Bozena Rozwadowska (Wroclaw); **Chairperson**: Sjef Barbiers (Meertens Institut); **Secretary**: Jeroen van Craenenbroeck (University College Brussels); **Co-opted Member for Phonology**: Tobias Scheer (University of Nice).

## **10. Miscellaneous**

Anders Holmberg pointed out that there tends to be confusion as to how to refer to the GLOW conference and the colloquium. The main session should be referred to as the GLOW colloquium, whereas the entire meeting, including the colloquium and the workshops should be called the GLOW conference; this terminology should be used consistently.



## Treasurer's Report 2007

by Maaïke Schoorlemmer, March 18, 2008.

<b>Revenues (in €)</b>	
Membership dues	4,612.07
Teun Hoekstra Fund	200.00
Transport	705.27
Interest	1,187.27
<b>Total Revenues</b>	<b>6,704.61</b>

<b>Expenses (in €)</b>	
Chamber of commerce	32.62
Transport	705.27
Costs transfer for payments and additional costs paid to the bank	16.12
Contribution GLEE	2,500.00
<b>Total Costs</b>	<b>3,254.01</b>

**Result 2007:** € 6,704.61 – € 3,254.01 = € **3,450.60**

Balance December 31, 2006	€ 44,306.33
Total Revenues – Total Costs	€ 3,450.60
Unaccounted for	0.00
Balance December 31, 2007	€ 47,756.93

### Reservations and Dues (in €)

Reservation in case of liquidation (legally required)		1,500	
Reservation for calamities:		25,000	
Until 2016 (€30 per year /member):	5,970		
Lifetime (€30 until 2025):	7,650		
Reservation due to long-term memberships:		13,620	
Debt printing Newsletter 2007		2,921	
Debt bank costs Postbank 2007		5	
Commitment Summer Schools 2008		6,500	
Subtotal:			49,546
Due Refund Stuttgart		516	
Subtotal:			516
<b>Total reservation:</b>			<b>49,030</b>

**Freely available:** € 47,756.93 – € 49,030 = € **-1,273.07**