glow

Generative Linguistics in the Old World

Addresses:

GLOW Newsletter

Marc Richards
Institut für Linguistik
University of Leipzig
Beethovenstr. 15
D-04107 Leipzig
Germany
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

http://glow.uit.no

Contents

A Note from the Editor

Dear GLOW Members,

We'll be waltzing on over to Vienna next Spring for the 34th GLOW Conference. The Colloquium takes place on 28-30 April 2011, sandwiched between workshops on 27th April and 1st May. All the calls for papers and details of how to submit an abstract can be found in these here pages; please adhere strictly to the formatting instructions, and be sure to submit your abstracts to the correct place (the Colloquium and one of the workshops are using online submissions via EasyChair, like last year, whilst the other two workshops are soliciting submissions via e-mail). The deadline for the Colloquium and two of the three workshops is November 1st, 2010.

Two things of particular noteworthiness should be borne in mind when composing your abstracts this year. Firstly, the Viennese Colloquium has a theme: the division of labour between syntax and other components of the grammar, or more specifically, "How much Syntax is there in Grammar?". Whatever your response to this question – be it "none at all" or "nothing but", or somewhere in between – we're very keen to receive pertinent abstracts from all walks of linguistic life, not just syntacticians. Secondly, the colloquium programme will include poster sessions as well as the usual talking slots, so please make sure you specify during the submission process whether you'd be minded to present your paper if not orally then, well, murally.

As ever, a number of positions on the GLOW Board come up for renewal or replenishment in 2011 (see the table in the Minutes on p.13). Many of the incumbents are expected to stand for re-election, but additional nominations from GLOW members are always welcome and, as usual, should be sent to the Chair, Sjef Barbiers (sjef.barbiers@meertens.knaw.nl), by February 1st, 2011.

But before you nominate anyone, and certainly before you register to attend next year's conference, please check that your membership is still in date. Details of how to renew are on the following page; dues are due by January 1st, 2011.

Marc Richards.

GLOW Renewal Notice

Renewal is for the calendar year 2011, taking effect with the Spring issue of the GLOW Newsletter. Payment should reach us by January 1, 2011, especially if you intend to attend the annual GLOW Colloquium in April. GLOW is continuing to offer four-year student memberships for €30. This is an incredibly good deal, so please encourage eligible people to take advantage of it. We also offer 5- and 10-year memberships at reduced prices.

Membership dues

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

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

Modes of Payment:

• By Credit Card (Eurocard/MasterCard/Access/CarteBancaire/Visa);

• By remittance to
  - Dutch Postal Account #91.44.68;
  - Bank Account no. 43.97.10.340, ABN-AMRO Bank, Tilburg,NL

Whichever mode of payment you choose, please mail the completed membership form (available at http://glow.uit.no/membership/member10.pdf) to the GLOW Bureau at the address in Utrecht (address at the start of the newsletter). If you pay by credit card, you can also fax the form to +31 30 253 64 06.

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

GLOW XXXIV (2011)

The 34th GLOW Conference will be hosted by the University of Vienna, from 27th April to 1st May 2011 (Colloquium: April 28-30, 2011; Workshops: April 27 & May 1, 2011).

MAIN COLLOQUIUM – April 28-30, 2011

Colloquium topic: HOW MUCH SYNTAX IS THERE IN GRAMMAR?

Organizers: Clemens Mayr, Martin Prinzhorn, Chris Schaner-Wolles, Viola Schmitt

Topic outline: It is uncontroversial that language has both a sound and a meaning component. In addition to these two, a narrow syntactic component is postulated by linguists. But is narrow syntax a real, empirically identifiable subcomponent of the human ability to use language in the most general sense, or is it merely an analytical artefact? Are there principled grounds for separating "Merge" from prosody, implicature, presupposition, parsing, functional structure, the lexicon, morphology, phonology, stylistic movement, and binding theory? While there are various conceptual lines of reasoning to adopt a position on these issues, this position must always be backed up by empirical evidence. Are there mechanisms in the sound and meaning components that achieve the same results as Merge? And, if so, do they require an extra level of quasi-syntactic processes to achieve them? What do we know about how narrow syntax interfaces with these other systems? Abstracts relating to these questions but not limited to them are invited for presentation at GLOW 34. The questions may be addressed not only from the viewpoint of syntax, or current syntactic theories, but also from within phonology, morphology, semantics and pragmatics, vis-à-vis-syntax, as well as by psycholinguistics.

Talks and posters: Abstracts are invited for slots for oral presentations lasting 45 minutes + 15 minutes of discussion. In addition, GLOW 34 will be holding two poster sessions. 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. 30 papers will be selected for poster presentations.

Deadline for submission of abstracts: <u>November 1, 2010</u>

Notification of acceptance: <u>January 31, 2011</u>

Contact: University of Vienna, Institut für Sprachwissenschaft, Sensengasse 3a, 1090 Vienna. *Phone:* +43-1-4277-417 21. *Fax:* +43-1-4277-9417. *E-mail:* <u>glow34.linguistics@univie.ac.at</u>. *Website:* <u>http://glow.univie.ac.at/</u>

Submission Guidelines

Format: Abstracts (both for oral presentations and posters) must not exceed two pages in length (A4 or letter-sized). This includes data and references. Abstracts must have the following format: font not smaller than 12pt., single spacing, 1-inch/2,5-cm margins on all sides. Each page may include a maximum of 50 lines of text, including examples. Examples should not be collected on a separate page but integrated throughout the text of the abstract.

Submitters whose computers are not set up for 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 1/2" 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.

Submissions must be in PDF format. Deadline for submission: November 1, 2010.

Submissions are limited to two papers per author, only one of which may be single-authored. Nothing in the abstract, the title, or the name of the document should identify the author.

Submission procedure: All abstracts must be submitted online via

https://www.easychair.org/account/signin.cgi?conf=glow34.

(NB. In order to submit you will be asked to create an account.)

When submitting, it should be indicated which group the paper belongs to (i.e., syntax, phonology, etc.) by ticking the appropriate box. Also, keywords regarding the contents of the paper should be given.

Additional note: Named abstracts and the Spring Newsletter

Abstracts should be anonymous in the first instance; a named version (including affiliation(s)) may be submitted in addition to this anonymous version. Named (and affiliated) versions of all accepted abstracts will be published in the Spring Newsletter, so if you do not submit both versions (named and anonymous) together, please make sure that you send the named version of your abstract to the Newsletter Editor (richards@uni-leipzig.de) and/or to the conference organizers as soon as you receive word of your acceptance.

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

GLOW 2011 Workshop I

INTERVENTION EFFECTS FROM A SEMANTIC PERSPECTIVE

Date: April 27, 2011
Organizers: Doris Penka and Arnim von Stechow
Deadline for submission of abstracts: November 30, 2010
Notification of acceptance: January 31, 2011

Topic: This workshop focuses on the semantic component of intervention effects. Both semantic evidence to detect intervention effects and semantic explanations for intervention effects are of relevance. Of particular interest are semantic characterizations of interveners and the configurations excluded by intervention effects.

The questions that are of interest and will be addressed in the workshop include the following:

- In which areas do intervention effects arise? Are there phenomena that qualify as intervention effects but which haven't been classified as such yet?
- Do excluded constellations lead to semantic ill-formedness?
- Are interveners the same across the different phenomena?
- Can the elements that act as interveners be characterized in a unified way?
- Is it possible to give a unified explanation for intervention effects across different phenomena?

Submission guidelines: Abstracts addressing the topic are invited for 35-minute talks (plus 10 minutes for discussion). Abstracts must be anonymous and limited to two pages (using 1-inch margins on all sides and 12pt font size) including examples and references.

All abstracts should be submitted to the following e-mail address:

glow34.workshop.semantik@gmail.com.

Nothing in the abstract, the title, or the name of the document should identify the author. In the accompanying e-mail, please give your full name, your affiliation and the title of the abstract.

Contact: Please e-mail glow34.workshop.semantik@gmail.com.

GLOW 2011 Workshop II

PHONOLOGICAL MARKING OF FOCUS AND TOPIC

Date: April 27, 2011
Organizer: Edwin Williams
Deadline for submission of abstracts: November 1, 2010
Notification of acceptance: January 31, 2011

Topic: This workshop will take the semantic notions of topic and focus as given, and investigate the systems for phonologically marking them, especially concentrating on variation in how the marking is done across languages. For example, we have the shiftable pitch-accents of Germanic languages vs. the relatively fixed prosodic structures of Romance; on a broader scale, we have languages like Japanese that do not use pitch-accents to mark focus, but nevertheless mark focus phonologically, through phrasing and varying pitch range. The following empirical and analytic questions are put forward as central to the project of the workshop:

- Are there languages in which there is no prosodic reflex of contrastive focus or givenness?
- How do those languages which encode focus and givenness prosodically differ in the phonological and phonetic tools used to mark these notions?
- Do phrasing and prominence go hand-in-hand, or are they two orthogonal dimensions that interact with focus and givenness marking independently?
- Which comes first, focus or prominence; that is, is the mapping accent-to-focus or focus-to-accent?
- Are differences in focus marking paralleled by differences in topic marking?
- How does the marking of contrastive or "corrective" focus/topic differ from neutral focus/topic across languages?
- How do phonological means of marking topic or focus interact with syntactic and morphological means?

Comparative studies are especially encouraged, as well as studies of systems different from the well-known ones.

Submission guidelines: Abstracts must not exceed two pages in length (A4 or letter-sized). This includes data and references. Abstracts must have the following format: font not smaller than 12pt., single spacing, 1-inch/2,5-cm margins on all sides. Submissions must be in PDF format. Submissions are limited to two papers per author, only one of which may be single-authored. Nothing in the abstract, the title, or the name of the document should identify the author.

All abstracts must be submitted online via
http://www.easychair.org/conferences/?conf=glow34foc.

Contact: For questions regarding the workshop, please contact:
glow34.workshop.phonologie@gmail.com.

GLOW 2011 Workshop III

IDENTITY IN GRAMMAR

Date: May 1, 2011
Organizers: Martin Prinzhorn, Henk van Riemsdijk, Viola Schmitt
Deadline for submission of abstracts: November 1, 2010
Notification of acceptance: January 31, 2011

Topic: Few concepts are as ubiquitous in the natural world of humans as that of identity, a relation between two objects such that both have all the properties of the other. In linguistics, this concept is often appealed to, yet, in many cases, a much looser understanding of it is employed: Two objects will be considered identical at some level of linguistic representation if they share all, most, or the crucial features relevant at this level. It is within this understanding of identity that some grammatical processes have been argued to be – or seemingly are – sensitive to this particular relation.

Some examples in which sensitivity to identity in this sense manifests itself are fairly easy to find. For example, reduplication (cf. Raimy, 2000 and many others) in morpho-phonology creates sequences of identical syllables or morphemes. Similarly, copying constructions in syntax create an identical copy of a word or phrase in some distant position. This is typically true, for example, of verb topicalizations frequently found in African languages such as Vata (cf. Koopman, 1984), often referred to as 'predicate clefts', in which the verb is fronted but is pronounced again in its source position (cf. Kandybowicz, 2006 and references cited there). Such constructions as well as the observation that *wh*-copy constructions are frequently found in child language (see for example McDaniel et al., 1995), have also contributed to the so-called copy theory of movement according to which a chain of identical copies is created whose (non-) pronunciation is determined by principles of spell-out.

In many cases, however, what is at stake is not the coexistence of identical elements in a grammatical structure but rather its opposite, the avoidance of identity, a term due to Yip (1998). Haplology, the deletion of one of two identical syllables or morphemes, is a case in point. In addition to deletion, there are other ways to avoid sequences of two identical elements (XX): insertion of an epenthetical element (XX→XeX), dissimilation (XX→XY), creating distance (XX→X…X), or fusion (AA→Ā). In phonology and morphology, there is an abundance of identity avoidance phenomena, and some major principles such as the Obligatory Contour Principle (OCP, cf. McCarthy, 1986) are instrumental in accounting for them. But OCP-like principles have also been argued to be operative in syntax (cf. Van Riemsdijk, 2008 and references cited there).

Another identity avoidance effect that immediately comes to mind is Principle C of the Binding Theory (Chomsky, 1981): a referential expression can never co-refer with a c-commanding element. Principle C may thus be interpreted as a principle that avoids identity in some way and at some level. Still, while referential identity is clearly a necessary condition in order for Principle C to kick in, why does it apply in some cases but not in others?

In the examples alluded to above, questions immediately arise as to what exactly we mean by identity. And when we think about these issues a bit more, things are indeed far from obvious. It suffices to look at distinctive features in phonology: /i/ and /u/ are identical in that both are vowels, but they are different in that one is a front vowel and the other a back vowel. What counts for the calculus of identity: full feature matrices or subsets of features, and if the latter which subsets? Take a difficult problem from syntax. The so-called 'Doubly Filled Comp Filter' (DFC, cf. Chomsky and Lasnik, 1977 and much subsequent research) ostensibly excludes two positions that are close to one another (the complementizer head and its specifier position) if both are phonetically realized. Typically, the complementizer is an element such as *that*, while the specifier contains some *wh*-phrase, i.e. a DP, a PP, an AP or a CP, excluding such cases as **I wonder who that you saw.* Note however that many languages have a process whereby a finite verb is moved into the complementizer position, such as Subject Auxiliary Inversion in English. But whenever this happens, the DFC does not apply: *who did you see?* Could the relative identity between a *wh*-phrase and a 'nominal' complementizer such as *that* as opposed to the relative non-identity between the *wh*-phrase and a finite verb be responsible? Clearly, identity as understood in various places of grammatical research is a very problematic concept, and invoking it is never a trivial matter.

Similar issues arise in the domain of intervention constraints. Minimality, and in particular Relativized Minimality (Rizzi, 1990), involves the relative identity of the intervening element with the element that crosses past it. But again, what are the relevant properties? In Rizzi's book, it is proposed that the crucial property is A vs. Ā. But there are many indications that what counts as an intervener is tied to "lower-level" features. In Dutch, for example, the [+R] feature creates an intervention effect (cf. Van Riemsdijk, 1978) where the [+wh] feature does not.

In all of the examples given above, the notion of identity is used in a rather loose sense. The linguistic objects that are taken to stand in this relation merely share some features, but not all of them. Further, they only share features at a given level. To allow for a fruitful and more precise investigation of the phenomenon of identity sensitivity, the following issues and questions ought to be addressed:

First, we usually talk about identity on one level of linguistic representation: For instance, two morphemes can be phonologically identical but can be realized in different syntactic positions in the syntactic structure (as in *wh*-copying constructions). Similarly, in reduplication, two morphemes can be identical on a segmental level, but not on a prosodic level – or regarding their truth-conditional impact. If we talk about processes that are sensitive to identity, they will be sensitive to identity at one particular level. In (some types of) ellipsis, for instance, what is required is semantic identity, but not identity of formal (i.e. morphosyntactic) features. Processes that are sensitive to identity on a level L can either themselves be part of that level (like dissimilation in phonology) or part of a different level L' (such as ellipsis, if taken to be phonological deletion).

Further, if we refer to identity of objects on a particular level of linguistic representation, the question is whether grammatical processes such as those mentioned

above are sensitive to identity in the strict sense (where the objects have all the properties in common) or in a much looser sense, where they only share some, apparently relevant, properties. In addition, are we considering individuals or classes?

Moreover, at least for some of the levels of linguistic representation, we have to define what types of objects we are talking about. In order to answer this question, it is crucial to investigate which type of information is transparent at this level. Take for instance the copy theory of movement: Do the individual copies count as identical, even though they appear in different positions in the tree, i.e. does it suffice for them to share all the features to be treated as identical? If so, it could be argued that the requirement that all copies but one have to be deleted phonologically could be treated as an instance of identity avoidance – i.e. syntactically identical elements have to be dissociated on a phonological level. Note, however, that Gärtner (2002) points out that the copies under the copy theory of movement cannot be considered to be identical – each copy has a different position in the tree and, accordingly, different features will be unchecked.

Finally, assume that there are indeed processes that are sensitive to identity at a particular level: Then the question is, what is the domain of application? For instance, the DFC-filter only applies to elements in the same projection, specifically in a Spec-Head relation. Condition C, on the other hand, applies to a much larger domain.

If some progress can be made in answering at least some of these problems, the core question of this workshop can be made more precise: Are there grammatical processes that are sensitive to identity, do they operate across linguistic levels, and why do they not apply in all cases?

It is our hope that the workshop will contribute to a better understanding of at least some of these questions and perhaps even help to bring a few among the many puzzles nearer to a solution. Needless to say, bringing together linguists from all domains of grammatical theory is a bold and perhaps risky experiment. Participants are called upon to step out of their specialisms, to listen to and learn from colleagues who they rarely if ever talk to and to whose talks they would not normally go. We trust that open minds and keen alertness for interesting ideas will bring about an enriching experience for all.

Chomsky, Noam, and Lasnik, Howard. 1977. Filters and control. *Linguistic Inquiry* 8: 425-504.
Chomsky, Noam. 1981. *Lectures on government and binding*. Dordrecht: Foris Publications.
Kandybowicz, Jason. 2006. *Conditions on multiple spell-out and the syntax-phonology interface.* Doctoral dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles.
Koopman, Hilda. 1984. *The Syntax of Verbs*. Dordrecht: Foris Publications.
McCarthy, John. 1986. OCP effects: gemination and anti-gemination. *Linguistic Inquiry* 17: 207-263.
McDaniel, Dana; Chiu, Bonnie, and Maxfield, Thomas. 1995. Parameters for *Wh*-Movement Types: Evidence from Child Language. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 13: 709-754.
Raimy, Eric. 2000. The Phonology and Morphology of Reduplication. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Riemsdijk, Henk C. van. 1978. *A case study in syntactic markedness: the binding nature of prepositional phrases*. Lisse: The Peter de Ridder Press, later published by Foris Publications, Dordrecht and currently by Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin.

Riemsdijk, Henk C. van (2008). Identity Avoidance: OCP-effects in Swiss Relatives. In Robert Freidin, Carlos P. Otero and Maria Luisa Zubizarreta (eds.) *Foundational Issues in Linguistic Theory. Essays in Honor of Jean-Roger Vergnaud*, 227-250. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Rizzi, Luigi. 1990. *Relativized Minimality*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Yip, Moira (1998). Identity avoidance in phonology and morphology. In Stephen G. Lapointe, Diane K. Brentari and Patrick M. Farrell (eds.) *Morphology and its relation to phonology and syntax*, 216-246. Stanford, CA: CSLI.

Selection: Six papers will be selected for 30-minute presentations.

Submission guidelines: Abstracts must not exceed two pages in length (A4 or letter-sized). This includes data and references. Abstracts must have the following format: font not smaller than 12pt., single spacing, 1-inch/2,5-cm margins on all sides. Submissions must be in PDF format. Submissions are limited to two papers per author, only one of which may be single-authored.

All abstracts must be submitted to following e-mail address by November 1, 2010:

glow34.workshop.identitaet@gmail.com.

Nothing in the abstract, the title, or the name of the document should identify the author. In the accompanying e-mail, please give your full name, your affiliation and the title of the abstract.

Contact: Please e-mail glow34.workshop.identitaet@gmail.com.

Minutes of the GLOW General Assembly held in Wrocław on 15 April 2010
by Jeroen van Craenenbroeck

1. GLOW 2010
Congress president Bozena Rozwadowska recapitulated the funding and reviewing procedures of GLOW 2010. Finding sufficient funding for the conference had proven a difficult task, but thanks to a grant from the local government, the organizers were able to give partial reimbursement to the colloquium speakers. The reviewing process was very smooth: the reviewing software (EasyChair) worked well and the reviewers were very cooperative. GLOW chairperson Sjef Barbiers congratulated Bozena on a great conference.

2. Treasurer's report
Maaike Schoorlemmer presented her Treasurer's Report for 2009 (see p.16 below). There is approximately 1400€ to spend freely in 2010. This is less than previous years, indicating that the GLOW funds are slowly shrinking. GLOW needs to attract more members or ensure that existing members extend their membership—Maaike will send out renewal reminders to existing members.

3. Changes to the Board
The following election was made: the Congress President for 2010-2011 is Martin Prinzhorn, Vienna. Re-elections were made as follows: Gunnar Hrafn Hrafnbjargarson, Tromsø, as Website Manager (2010-2012); Marc Richards, Leipzig, as Newsletter Editor (2010-2012); Anna Cardinaletti, Venice, as Member A (2010-2012); and Maria-Rosa Lloret, Barcelona, as Member D (2010-2012).

The current composition of the GLOW Board is as follows:

The complete GLOW Board for 2010-2011		
Congress President	Martin Prinzhorn	2010-2011
Chairperson	Sjef Barbiers	2009-2011
Secretary	Jeroen van Craenenbroeck	2009-2011
Treasurer	Maaike Schoorlemmer	2009-2011
Newsletter Editor	Marc Richards	2010-2012
Journal Editor	Harry van der Hulst	
Website Manager	Gunnar Hrafn Hrafnbjargarson	2010-2012
Member A	Anna Cardinaletti	2010-2012
Member B	Lida Veselovska	2009-2011
Member C	Viola Schmitt	2009-2011
Member D	Maria Rosa Lloret	2010-2012
Advisory Member 1	Henk van Riemsdijk	
Advisory Member 2	Martin Everaert	
Co-opted member (Phonology)	Tobias Scheer	2009-2011

As can be seen from the table, the following positions will be up for (re-)election in 2011: Congress President, Chairperson, Secretary, Treasurer, Member B, Member C, and Co-opted Member (Phonology).

4.   Future GLOW venues

The 34rd GLOW Conference will take place at the University of Vienna, Austria, from April 28th to April 30th, 2011; the associated workshops will take place on April 27th and May 1st, 2011. The theme of the Colloquium is "How much syntax is there in grammar?" and the organizers are Clemens Mayr, Martin Prinzhorn, Chris Schaner-Wolles, and Viola Schmitt. There are no invited speakers, nor will there be a separate phonology session.

There are three workshops. The first takes place on April 27th, 2010. The theme of this workshop is "Intervention effects from a semantic perspective", the organizers are Doris Penka (Universität Konstanz) and Arnim von Stechow (Universität Tübingen) and the invited speaker is Sigrid Beck.

Workshop 2 also takes place on April 27th, 2010. It is organized by Edwin Williams (Princeton University) and revolves around the theme "Variation in the Intonation/Information interface". The invited speaker for this workshop is Lisa Selkirk.

The third workshop is organized by Martin Prinzhorn, Henk van Riemsdijk (Tilburg University), and Viola Schmitt and takes place on May 1st, 2010. The theme is "Identity in grammar", the invited speakers are Jonathan Bobaljik (UConn), Martin Hackl (MIT), Edwin Williams (Princeton University), and Moira Yip (UCL), and the invited chairs are Daniel Büring (UCLA), Marc van Oostendorp (University of Leiden), and Ede Zimmermann (University of Frankfurt).

The GLOW Colloquium 2012 will be held in Potsdam. The University of Lund will host the GLOW Colloquium 2013, and Brussels/Ghent will host the GLOW Colloquium 2014. A desire for the 2015 Colloquium to be held in a Southern European—preferably Italian—location was expressed.

5.   The Linguistic Review

GLOW Chairperson Sjef Barbiers described the relationship between GLOW and TLR and expressed a desire to strengthen the ties between the two. A selection of the papers presented at the GLOW 2010 colloquium will appear in TLR as a special issue.

6.   Summer schools (EGG, Africa, LISSIM, GLOW)

GLOW had received a formal request from the EGG Summer School 2010 for 3000€ and an informal request from the African Summer School 2011 for 3000€. The GLOW Board proposed to give 1000€ to EGG in 2010. It stressed that financing summer schools is important, but given the limited financial resources, it could not give EGG the full amount it had asked for.

7.   Strategic plans

GLOW explicitly does not want to be(come) a syntax-only conference, but wants to include (and if necessary reach out to) other subfields such as phonology, morphology, semantics, psycholinguistics, neurolinguistics, pragmatics, etc. Possible ways of achieving this are an explicit mission statement (a first draft of which will be drawn up by Sjef Barbiers and Henk van Riemsdijk), workshops in these fields, parallel sessions in these fields, Board members from these fields, widely advertising GLOW's interest in attracting researchers from these disciplines, etc.

8.   Relations with OCP, SuB, MMM; European Society of Linguistics

As a long-term goal, GLOW envisages cooperation (or even union) with other conferences and institutions such as OCP/SuB/MMM. Such cooperation could be interesting in the context of applying for ESF-funding (e.g. for 'networks' or for funding of individual lecturers). Maaike Schoorlemmer will look into the possibilities for this. GLOW will encourage the organization of generatively oriented workshops at the SLE conference.

9.   Assessment of the field of generative linguistics in Europe

GLOW will not attempt to inventorize the status of the field of linguistics in Europe, but wants to be more responsive to the needs of its members in case support is needed; if necessary it will also publish information about such issues on the GLOW website. More generally, the issue was raised to what extent GLOW could be more active in lobbying for the interests of generative linguistics in Europe.

10.   Cooperation with GLOW Asia

GLOW and GLOW Asia should link information to one another on their respective websites, thus strengthening the connection between the two.

11.   Questions from the audience

On behalf of EGG, Hedde Zeijlstra expressed his gratitude for the GLOW contribution to the EGG Summer School.

Treasurer's Report 2009

by Maaike Schoorlemmer, April 2010.

Revenues (in €)	
Membership dues	2804.72
Interest	213.73
Total Revenues	**€3018.45**

Expenses (in €)	
Chamber of commerce	26.14
Interest	16.71
Bank costs	21.09
Contribution EGG summer school	2500
Total Costs	**€2563.94**

Result 2009:
€3018.45 - €2563.94 = **€454.51**

Balance

Balance December 31, 2008	49600.03
Result 2008	454.51
Balance December 31, 2009	50054.53
Unaccounted for	0.01

Reservations And Dues (in €)

Reservation in case of liquidation (legally required)		1500
Reservation for calamities		25000
Reservation due to long-term memberships:		14340
Multi-year members (€30 per year /member until 2017):	4080	
Lifetime members (€30 until 2027):	10280	
Debt to UiL OTS printing Newsletter 2007+2009		6000
Debt to UiL OTS African Summer school 2009		2000
Total reservation:		**44340**

Freely available: €50,054.53 - €44,340 = **€1214.53**