

A Brief Note on the Scope of *Biolinguistics*

Cedric Boeckx & Kleanthes K. Grohmann

This issue is *Biolinguistics* 2.1 — the first issue of the second volume. Since the publication of our inaugural issue, we have received excellent submissions. We are pleased to announce that we are now in a position to fulfill our original plans to assemble four issues per volume, with the aspired publication times winter (March), spring (June), summer (September), and fall (December).

With the release of the first 2008 issue, we would like to highlight two key aspects of the journal. The first concerns the section called *Forum*. We intend this to be a space primarily devoted to state-of-the-art reports and position papers dealing with controversial issues. These reports are not always solicited; in fact, suggestions, ideally by potential authors, are always welcome. An example would be Jon Sprouse's contribution in *Biolinguistics* 1.

Concerning the position papers, we ideally envision an interactive platform in which colleagues are invited (but, as with reports, not necessarily solicited) to react on a given piece. For example, in this issue Bob Ladd, Dan Dediu, and Anna Kinsella raise important issues concerning our characterization of biolinguistic research stated in the Editorial to the first volume, in particular the “strong” and “weak” senses we understand current research to fall into.

We hereby cordially invite the readership of this new journal to respond to the forum contribution by Ladd, Dediu & Kinsella in any conceivable way — as a one-page reaction, as a full-fledged research paper, or anything in between. We would like to collect these and publish them in future Forum sections, and offer the authors of the original position paper to reply to their critics.

The second item we would like to stress here is our commitment to publish research in linguistic *theory*. In our views there already exist many excellent journals in which to publish detailed analyses of particular linguistic phenomena. We, at *Biolinguistics*, would like to focus more on studies that are concerned with fundamental theoretical constructs that help reveal the nature of the language faculty, and ultimately may help bridge the gap between biolinguistics in the weak sense and biolinguistics in the strong sense (our ultimate goal). We feel that the contributions by Juan Uriagereka in the first volume as well as those by Norbert Hornstein and Jairo Nunes and by K.A. Jayaseelan published in the

We cannot help but thank Terje Lohndal for extremely valuable editorial support. Since we are not supported by any publisher, all editorial work (including marking up submissions and creating proofs for publication) is done by the editors and members of the task team. It is thanks to the devotion of individuals like Terje that we can pursue our goals for *Biolinguistics*.



present issue offer nice examples of the sort of theoretical work we would like to publish. And as Stephen Crain and Drew Khlentzos' article shows (as well as several of the contributions in *Biolinguistics* 1), such investigations need not at all be restricted to syntax.

Cedric Boeckx
Harvard University
Department of Linguistics
Boylston Hall, 313
Cambridge, MA 02318
USA
cboeckx@fas.harvard.edu

Kleanthes K. Grohmann
University of Cyprus
Department of English Studies
P.O. Box 20537
1678 Nicosia
Cyprus
kleanthi@ucy.ac.cy