

THE EDITOR'S DEPARTMENT
Annual Report

Each year, at the time of the annual meeting of the Linguistic Society of America in January, the editor is asked to submit to the LSA Executive Committee a report on activities and issues pertaining to the running of the journal, to highlight new developments of note, and to address any matters deemed important by either the Executive Committee or the editor himself. Printed below, and taking the place of my more usual editorial comments in this section of the journal, is my second 'State of the Journal' report, summing up the events of my second year on the job. It is given here in essentially the form in which it was submitted to the Executive Committee in January, though with some informational updates indicated in footnotes, some errors corrected, some embellishments and elaborations added, and some minor editorial and typographical adjustments made as needed.

Brian D. Joseph
Columbus, Ohio
March 2, 2004

THE EDITOR'S REPORT

After the excitement of my first year in the editorship of *Language* in 2002, I worried that the second year might be something of a letdown; the truth, though, is that it has been anything but that. In a sense, the year was a bit tamer, in that I faced far fewer novel crises and far fewer instances where I felt I was going out on a limb with a particular decision. For the most part, it was a year of settling into routines, of feeling more comfortable in these routines, of maintaining successful policies and procedures from the previous year, and of trying to improve upon those aspects of running the journal that did not work previously as they should have. All in all, the past twelve months proved to be interesting and exciting in their own right, even without the sense of newness that our operation had had the year before.

As is the norm for *Language*, four issues appeared, the last two (September and December) appearing on time, after some unfortunate but unavoidable events delayed the publication of the March and June issues. We have settled into a cycle of beginning production (via the copyediting process) four months in advance of the target date for mailing an issue instead of the three-month 'window' we worked with last year, and this move, coupled with a flow of papers that has allowed for the development of a set of accepted papers destined for the June 2004 issue even as we are still working on preparing the March issue (so that additional acceptances in the next few months will be aimed at the September issue, and so on), promises to keep the journal on time for the years to come.¹

¹ This routine has continued over the few months since this report was submitted, with accepted papers entering the queue for the September and December issues (80.3 and 80.4, respectively).

These four issues contained 869 pages, with 540 devoted to 16 articles, 17 to 1 review article, 40 to 4 discussion notes, 42 to 4 obituaries, 51 to 18 book reviews (BRs), 123 to 163 book notices (BNs), and 56 to other sorts of material (letters: 1 page; Editor's Department columns: 16 pages for 4 pieces, including the annual Editor's Report; Recent Publications lists: 18 pages; index: 20 pages; slippage: 1 page). This compares favorably with the previous year overall, especially with regard to articles in both number and length—the average length of an article this past year was 33.75 pages, almost exactly the same as last year's length (34 pages) but far greater than was the case in the 1960s and into the 1970s. As noted last year, these totals are comparable to those of the past 8 years (see Mark Aronoff's Editor's Report in *Language* 78.2.394–97 (2002)), though a bit on the low side, where the average issue contained 20 articles that took up 564 pages on average and the average number of pages was 48 for BRs and 178 for BNs; as before, it is not clear to me that the newly emerging norm for article length is a negative, and in any case, it is certainly true that not very many of the papers that are submitted these days are under 25 pages in length in manuscript form; in fact, most are in the 40-to-50-page range.²

The ratio of 'substantive' pieces (articles, review articles, discussion notes, and obituaries) to review pieces (BRs and BNs) was thus 3.67:1 this year (as compared with 2.20:1 last year), meaning that while 31.2% of the pages in 2002 were BRs or BNs, only 21.4% were in 2003.³ Both types of pieces (article-type and review-type) serve useful functions, and it is not clear to me what the best balance between the two would be. I am inclined to think that the ratio in 2003 is closer to the ideal than that in 2002, although sometimes external factors, such as the ability of the author of an accepted article to get needed revisions done in a timely manner, play a role in whether more or fewer BRs and BNs are run in a particular issue.

The past twelve months proved also to be very busy in terms of the numbers of papers received in the office and the number decided upon—the relevant figures are given in Table 1, covering the period of November 1, 2002 to October 31, 2003 (as before, taking this as a cut-off date to allow for a reasonable and accurate tally to be made within the reporting deadlines—unlike last year, though, this now covers a full twelve-month period). Note that these figures include two review articles, as they are subject to refereeing and can be rejected, but do not count the four obituaries received and accepted in the period, as they are commissioned and not subject to formal review by anyone other than the editor.

Papers submitted since November 1, 2002	135
Papers acted on since November 1, 2002	130
Accepted	16
Returned for revisions with an invitation to resubmit	19
Rejected outright	94
Withdrawn	1

TABLE 1. Papers submitted and acted on Nov. 1, 2002–Oct. 31, 2004.

² It is a truism with regard to manuscript length, as also for coverage of topics in the journal, that we cannot publish what we do not receive (see Michael Cahill's letter to *Language*, 'An appeal regarding endangered languages', *Language* 80.1.1–2 (2004), and my reply to it).

³ My son, Adam Clark-Joseph, tells me that a two-proportion Z-test on these figures reveals a Z-score of 4.485 and a corresponding probability of $7.29 \times 10^{-4}\%$ that the proportion of review pages in 2002 is equal to that in 2003. My understanding of these statistics is that these two numbers therefore are significantly different from one another, so that the ratio from last year to this year has changed in a statistically significant manner. Whether this is a good or bad trend is a matter for discussion and interpretation (on which see below).

(Note that there is overlap between the papers submitted and the papers acted on, but the numbers do not (and could not) match—some (indeed most) submitted within the past twelve months were acted on within that period, but some are still in the review process; moreover, some acted on had been submitted in the previous year.) On average therefore *Language* received just slightly more than 11 papers per month, and nearly 11 final decisions were made each month; these numbers are up from last year's average of exactly 11 submissions per month and 9.5 decisions. Although the exact process that might go into the calculation of an acceptance figure is subject to various interpretations, just in terms of the final decisions made, only 12% were accepted, a more stringent threshold than last year when 16% were accepted. No matter how this is gauged, the figures point to a highly selective review process, in keeping with the high standards towards which *Language* aspires.

As is usual, the submitted papers spanned a broad spectrum of areas within the overall field of linguistics, though the representation is heavily concentrated in the traditional core areas of modern linguistics. The breakdown of areas is given in Table 2, based on our assessment (not the authors') in the editorial office of the primary area into which a paper fell. These categories are not intended to define the field overall in any way but rather they represent identifiable groupings emerging from the set of submissions. Many papers could legitimately be classified in more than one area, such as syntax or psycholinguistics for a paper on the processing of argument structure, so this is an imperfect measure at best, but I trust it is somewhat instructive.

Syntax	41
Semantics	19
Phonology	17
Historical Linguistics	8
Language Acquisition	7
Morphology	7
Psycholinguistics	6
Pragmatics/Discourse	6
Phonetics	4
Sign Language	4
Contact Linguistics	3
Creolistics	2
History of Linguistics	2
Metatheory	2
Computational Linguistics	1
Corpus Analysis	1
Language & Culture	1
Language Evolution	1
Language Reform	1
Linguistic Stylistics	1
Second Language Acquisition	1

TABLE 2. Submitted papers by area of specialization.

Similarly, among the 130 papers acted on, the breakdown by topic, based on the same process of assessment as to topic as with the submitted papers, is given in Table 3, with the number of acceptances, revise-and-resubmits (R&R), and rejections for each topical category.

	RECEIVED	ACCEPTED	R&R	REJECTED
Syntax	32	3	7	21 ^a
Semantics	21	1	7	13
Historical Linguistics	13	1	0	12
Phonology	11	1	2	8
Morphology	11	1	2	8
Psycholinguistics	8	2	0	6
Pragmatics/Discourse	7	1	0	6
Language Acquisition	6	1	1	4
Creolistics	3	1	0	2
Metatheory	3	0	0	3
Phonetics	2	1	0	1
Sign Language	2	1	0	1
Computational Linguistics	1	0	0	1
Contact Linguistics	1	0	0	1
Corpus Analysis	1	0	0	1
Field Linguistics	1	1	0	0
Forensic Linguistics	1	0	0	1
History of Linguistics	1	0	0	1
Language & Culture	1	0	0	1
Language Evolution	1	1	0	0
Language Reform	1	0	0	1
Linguistic Stylistics	1	0	0	1
Second Language Acquisition	1	0	0	1

TABLE 3. Papers acted on by area of specialization and decision.

^a + 1 withdrawal

To continue with *Language-by-the-numbers*, let me turn to the activity with regard to BRs, based on figures supplied by my book review editor extraordinaire, Stanley Dubinsky of the University of South Carolina.

In what proved to be a busy year for *Language* book reviews, the following activity was recorded:

In total, 557 items were received (70 journals and 487 books). Of those, 376 were assigned for some type of review (up from the 235 of the previous year), 78 full reviews were commissioned (up from 32 the previous year), and 298 BNs (again, up from the previous year's total of 203). As far as traffic into the review office is concerned, a total of 315 BRs and BNs were received, logged in, and processed, 27 of which were BRs and 288 BNs (up dramatically overall from the previous year where 149 were received and processed, 22 BRs and 127 BNs). One noteworthy point, not of the numerical kind, is that the procedure we now have in place for selecting books for full reviews, by which the associate editors are polled quarterly as to which books from those received seem to them to be the most important (the ultimate decisions being made by the editor and review editor acting on the advice of the associate editors), seems to be working extremely well. The associate editors seem happy to provide input and the added perspective they provide from their areas of specialization is welcome. Both the review editor and I moreover are pleased with the process of selecting reviewers for the books (starting with suggestions from the authors themselves but filtered through our own sense of who would be suitable) and feel that the review section is taking on an appropriate significance in the overall scheme of what the journal offers to its readers.

Summing up the year for *Language* of course goes well beyond the numerical breakdowns given here. In terms of policies, procedures, and production of the journal, this was a year of tweaking and fine-tuning existing or newly established elements of overall operations (e.g. a decision to list BNs in an alphabetical order based on the book author rather than the notice author, so as to make particular notices more easily found by

interested readers), so there is little of substance to report on that front. However, several issues and events involving the journal came up during the course of the past year that deserve comment.

The index to *Language* 1925–2000

2003 marked the appearance of the long-awaited *Twentieth-century index to Language*, covering the first 76 years of the journal's existence (and the entire twentieth century). Mark Aronoff and Meghan Sumner are to be commended for the hard work they put into creating this extremely useful research tool, first turning the 1974 50-year index and a later update into an electronic document and then adding the indices from all subsequent years. With an electronic version, moreover, it has been possible to complement the print version with an electronically searchable version that now resides on the *Language* website. My plan further is to supplement the web-version of the *Twentieth-century index* through the creation of a purely twenty-first-century electronic index (i.e. no print version) drawing on the material from the twenty-first-century volumes 77, 78, and 79, and to update that each subsequent year, so that up-to-date electronic indices of all of *Language* are always readily available.⁴

In addition, based on an idea that Margaret Reynolds had, some discussions have begun with JSTOR to develop the index into a 'metadata document' that will have active links from at least article entries to documents in the JSTOR archives. It is not clear at the moment how much work needs to be done and who will do it (JSTOR or the LSA or some combination) but the ultimate resulting index would be an extraordinary tool that would surely be widely used even beyond the extent to which the index and JSTOR are currently used. Discussions will continue on this front over the next several months.

These grandiose plans, however, are missing one key ingredient: the index as it currently stands, owing to the nature of the process by which it was created (scanning of the earlier indices in particular), has a number of errors (mostly from misreads in scanning) and inconsistencies in it (especially in formatting and in the information in various entries, mostly the result of different editorial practices over the years with the preparation of annual indices), as well as some unfortunate gaps and omissions (virtually all of Edward Sapir's listings were inadvertently left out, for instance!). Thus before any serious elaborations on or extensions to the index are undertaken, considerable effort is needed to fix the errors and omissions.⁵ The print version, of course, will remain as it is, but the electronic version can be corrected with time and effort (and thus with some expenditure of money). I therefore appeal to the Executive Committee to consider this request for the means to upgrade the index to make it fully usable.

Going along with corrections to the index is another related task, namely cleaning up the listings of the Tables of Contents from previous issues that are currently on the *Language* website (in fact, cleaning that up and making any needed corrections might be seen as a first step towards correcting the index) and also extending them beyond the current coverage, which goes back to 1977, all the way back to 1925. If the same sort of meta-document approach with links to JSTOR archives can be worked out for this (I have no idea personally what is involved), the webpage's Tables of Contents would be another valuable point of access to articles in *Language* over the whole of the journal's history. In any case, if any time and money are to be spent on fixing up

⁴ This twenty-first-century index is now available on the *Language* website (www.lsadc.org/language).

⁵ *Language* readers who have used the index can help in this effort by sending any errors and omissions they notice to me at language@ling.ohio-state.edu.

the index, then the webpage's contents listings should probably be included in the project as well.

Intellectual property and *Language*

Based on a request from Steven Bird and Gary Simons in connection with the copyright release on their article ('Seven dimensions of portability for language documentation and description', *Language* 79.3.557–82 (September 2003)) that they be permitted to lodge an electronic copy of the paper in a digital archive (to ensure access to it in perpetuity), I have initiated a review of the current copyright agreement. Paul Newman of Indiana University, who, in addition to being a distinguished linguist, has a law degree (J.D.) and has a professional (legal and academic) interest in intellectual property law, has kindly agreed to advise the LSA and *Language* in this matter. Further, though, following a suggestion from Margaret Reynolds, this review will be extended to a comprehensive one covering all aspects of intellectual property issues vis-à-vis *Language*, thus taking in our agreements with JSTOR and with Project Muse as well as our reprint policy. Dr. Newman has agreed to this and will try to complete the review by March 2004, thus allowing the Executive Committee in the spring to consider the development of a coherent and cohesive set of policies and procedures pertaining to all intellectual property rights involving the journal.

Responses to LSA long-range planning meeting on publications

The LSA held focus-group sessions this past summer at the LSA Institute (at Michigan State University) to discuss various aspects of the future of the LSA. One that was held on July 14, 2003, involving Secretary-Treasurer Sally McConnell-Ginet as facilitator, LSA President Ray Jackendoff, Secretary-Treasurer Designate Gregory Ward, and Anthony Aristar (Wayne State), Betty Birner (NIU), Jeanette Gundel (Minnesota), Bill Ladusaw (UCSC), Terry Langendoen (Arizona), and Alec Marantz (MIT) as invited attendees, focused on publications. I have been invited to give my reactions to some of the points that came up in that focus group. The questions are in italics, with my responses just below each one.

- *Would a lengthier journal improve its reputation?*

I feel it is safe to say that *Language* enjoys a strong reputation in the field, to judge for instance just from comments from various linguists—friends as well as mere acquaintances—that I have received during my term as editor. Nonetheless, even the best of reputations can be improved upon and maintaining high esteem is always a challenge. Still, I am not sure that merely adding pages to make for a lengthier journal would necessarily affect the reputation of the journal positively. As it is, *Language* contains a large number of substantive pages in each issue, covering both articles and full book reviews (which often treat a book's topic in an intellectually engaging way, evaluating and critiquing rather than just summarizing), and the pages are dense, so a lot of material is covered. Any added material would obviously, moreover, have to be of the same high quality as what is currently published.

- *Should a subscription to the journal be delinked from membership in the Society?*

I see nothing wrong with linking the journal to the Society and consider it entirely appropriate for a professional society to have an official journal of record that all members automatically have access to. While it is true that *Language* is available to members through libraries and now (increasingly) via electronic means through many universities (in the United States at least), I see a symbolic value at least in giving the journal to all LSA members in that it gives a focus and rationale for the journal's broad mandate in covering our discipline, representing the field as a whole rather than a

narrow specialist slice; that is, I see a real value in having a journal that is not tied to any particular theoretical persuasion or subdisciplinary specialty and aims rather to reflect what we as linguists have in common, and that goal is expressed through a linkage between membership in the Society and a subscription to the Society's journal.

- *Should BNs be eliminated (and provided through LinguistList or on the LSA or Language websites) with the resulting pages reallocated to articles? Is duplication of BNs (on LinguistList and in Language) desirable?*

It is true that the production of BNs constitutes a major drain on the time of a number of people, from me as editor to the review editor, the copyeditors, and my editorial assistants, but I would argue that they fulfill an important function and that putting them in a different venue such as the LinguistList would not achieve that function. What I like about the BNs is that they offer coverage of books that would not receive notice in the journal otherwise (other than a listing by title in 'Recent Publications'); in addition, they provide a venue for virtually anyone who is so inclined to hone their reading and writing skills with a piece in *Language*—although all BNs are carefully read and edited, only very rarely is one returned to an author for revision or even more rarely rejected altogether. There is thus a democracy to the BN section that I see as healthy for the field. Of course, the same could be said about BNs posted on the LinguistList, or on the *Language* website, but I would suggest that there is a difference between the two media. First, *Language*'s BNs are succinct and to the point, in large part owing to considerations of space and cost, in a way that LinguistList reviews are not. Admittedly, BNs are not deeply evaluative and are more descriptive in their orientation but I would argue that having both these printed notices and anything that might be found on LinguistList (or elsewhere on the web) is a positive step, in that multiple perspectives on a book are good for the field, whereas eliminating one of those perspectives would be a negative (and in the worst case, could lead to there being only a single voice anywhere reviewing a book).

While this might argue for putting the BNs on the *Language* website so that they would coexist with any on the LinguistList (just as a full review of a book in *Language* does not preclude a review in *Journal of Linguistics* or *IJAL*), a second point to be made here is that publication in *Language* has a permanence that even the latest web-based technology does not necessarily have at present. This is not to deny the enormous benefits and advantages of electronic access to information, but rather to say that print is not (yet) an outmoded technology, in my view.

Finally and most importantly, perhaps, I do not agree that a reduction of pages devoted to BNs would increase the number of pages devoted to articles. At no time in my two years have I rejected a paper because there is not enough room for it in a given issue nor have I accepted a paper merely to fill up an issue—I have tried to apply a consistent set of criteria defining what constitutes a high-enough quality paper to warrant publication in *Language* and extra pages to fill would not alter my approach to the task of editing at all. Having additional pages conceivably could get a few papers into print a bit earlier, perhaps one issue (i.e. three months) earlier, but the timetable for publication in part is determined by an author's ability to make revisions and corrections, and the editorial staff's ability to work on the paper; extra pages would not necessarily guarantee faster publication.

- *Should Language publish state-of-the-art articles?*

I have some experience with such articles, as I am a co-editor of the *Journal of Greek Linguistics (JGL)* and we have commissioned them for *JGL* covering approaches

to different areas within the study of Greek (e.g. phonology, syntax, semantics, morphology, etc.). These have been successful for *JGL*, but it seems to me that the focus of that journal (and maybe others like it) makes it possible to commission fairly focused state-of-the-art papers. To some extent, also, the commissioned review articles, which are generally based on a recently published book or cluster of books on a related theme, as well as the space available for discussion notes (which can pick up and react to an idea that is part of current conversation and discussion among linguists and not necessarily reacting to something in the journal itself), provide an outlet for state-of-the-art-like pieces. I see it in part as my responsibility to be on the lookout for 'hot' topics that can be addressed through review articles or discussion notes and to pursue those with appropriate authors when the opportunity arises. And, authors are free to suggest review articles to me, as several have in just the past two years alone; I do not always take them up on the suggestion, and consider each on a case-by-case basis, but the possibility is there. It may be that better publicizing of how review articles and discussion notes can be used to advance the field would help, and I will look into ways of doing just that.

- *Should the journal include more invited commentaries? Or is it better to do commentaries on a redesigned LSA (not LinguistList) website? Should authorship of commentaries be limited to members?*

The answer here is much like the answer to the previous question in that I see review articles and discussion notes as an existing venue for commentary, to be invited as I see fit. I see no reason why such pieces, if they are commissioned, should be limited to members (note that the submission of articles for consideration is restricted in that way but BRs, which are commissioned by invitation, are not).

- *How can we better enforce deadlines to address the problem of excessive delays in the publication timetable, e.g. by issuing guidelines for reviewing (shorter in length, quicker turn-around) or by generating daily (automatic) e-mail reminders after the deadline for review has passed?*

It is not clear to me what is meant by 'the problem of excessive delays in publication timetable'. The review process for *Language* is involved, to be sure, with a level of review by outside readers as well as by an associate editor before a paper reaches me for a final decision. In the best of circumstances, a normal review, allowing for a reasonable amount of time at each level, could take as little as 4 months, and we tell authors at the outset that our aim is to have a decision made within 6 months from the time of submission. On the whole we come close to that goal with most papers, as the overall review process on average for all submissions has taken 5.65 months in the past year. That is, most are dealt with within the 6-month period that authors are warned about when we acknowledge receipt of their paper. In my experience with other journals, 6 months is not excessive, and most authors, when told of the time frame, are generally accepting of it (only rarely has a paper been withdrawn because of the likely length of the review process, though we do not know if that period has discouraged any authors from submitting). We can do better, of course, and I readily admit that there are delays in coming to a final decision for some papers, partly as a result of my need to attend at times to other aspects of the production of the journal to ensure that issues get out on time and are filled with high-quality material. Still, we constantly do what we can to shorten the review period and streamline the procedure at all stages and will continue to monitor the overall process.

Reviewers are already given explicit guidelines as to what a review should entail, and these guidelines certainly do not suggest that a reviewer should write a lengthy

paper in response to the submission as a referee's report. Still, language can be added to the guidelines with hints as to a suitable page-length for the review (though in my experience, reviewers differ enormously in how detailed a report they file with us and I am not sure that any statement in the guidelines will affect how reports are written).

We do send out reminders to reviewers the week that their report is due and have met with good results from this; similarly, we have begun to be more aggressive about getting after reviewers whose deadline has passed. These reminders also allow us to identify possible problem areas with reviewers that we might not hear about otherwise. Still, speaking personally here, I cannot see how generating automatic daily reminders would achieve anything more than annoying the very people who are doing the journal and the profession a favor; I suspect that even if this works once with a given reviewer, it would be very likely that that reviewer would not agree to referee a paper for *Language* again. Thus we will not institute any such practice but will continue to be aggressive about chasing recalcitrant referees.

One aspect of the overall 'publication timetable' needs to be emphasized, for it is one area in which *Language's* practices are far from 'excessive' or problematic. Once a paper is accepted for publication, it generally appears in print, especially if the author is prompt about making any needed revisions, within 6 to 9 months. This compares favorably with my experience with other journals.

Obituary policy

This past year witnessed the publication of four obituaries of past presidents of the LSA and three more, possibly a fourth even, are scheduled for 2004. The practice in recent years has been (an informal 'policy' handed down to me orally by past editors) that obituaries are limited to past presidents and others deemed of historical significance by the editor, thus essentially leaving the decision up to the editor's discretion and judgment. I would like to discuss this practice with the Executive Committee to seek a reaffirmation of it—or if needed, a reformulation.⁶

Summing up, and some necessary acknowledgments

It has been clear to me from the beginning of my tenure in this position that my work as editor would not be possible without the valuable assistance of the associate editors, who provide a number of invaluable services to me, reading and assessing papers, recommending reviewers, and offering additional general advice when called upon to do so. They all deserve special thanks, and so I mention them here by name: Eugene Buckley, Stephen Crain, Donna Gerdts, Adele Goldberg, Kirk Hazen, Keith Johnson, James McCloskey, Norma Mendoza-Denton, Richard Oehrle, Donca Steriade, and Gregory Stump. Since Eugene, Donna, and Keith rotate off as of December 31, 2003, new appointments will be made for the coming year, to be announced once they are officially approved.⁷

As in the previous year, the behind-the-scenes efforts of a number of hard-working and dedicated individuals are critical to making the journal a success in many respects. The LSA Secretariat provides almost daily support involving both boosts to morale and aid with logistics, and thus Margaret Reynolds and Mary Niebuhr deserve special thanks in this report. The efforts of Frances Kelley, Mary Niebuhr, and Timothy Sergay,

⁶ Indeed, such discussion has now taken place and decisions remain at the discretion of the editor.

⁷ Technically speaking, the rotation of associate editors occurs only when the Executive Committee approves the new slate submitted by the editor. I am pleased to be able to announce that Jaye Padgett, Janet Pierrehumbert, and Natsuko Tsujimura have now joined the roster of associate editors beginning this year.

as well as my editorial assistants, merit particular recognition with regard to copyediting as they whip articles and other material into the strict *Language* format. Priscilla Mullins provided able proofreading assistance this year, as before, and David Clark-Joseph took care of maintaining the journal website, with fine results.

As was the case last year, special mention as well is needed for the extraordinary work of my office staff here in Ohio: Hope Dawson and Audra Starcheus did remarkable, mostly invisible, work, keeping the journal's business running smoothly and more on time than I could possibly do on my own. In this way, they have without a doubt served the journal, the Society, and the profession nobly. It is not an exaggeration to say that I could not have managed this year without them. Also, the fine work of the *Language* review editor, Stanley Dubinsky, has already been mentioned but can stand to be mentioned once again; the general support from his assistants Claudia Heinemann-Priest and Lan Zhang has similarly been invaluable.

And, last but certainly not least, as in past years, recognition of the reviewers is critical. I continue to be impressed with the professionalism that so many of the referees show in their reports and with the considerable expertise that they exhibit—in many cases, a paper about which I have no clue, owing to lapses in my own training and experience, is read and thoughtfully and productively assessed by my referees, in ways that go far beyond any insight I could muster on my own. They do the journal and the field an enormous service and I hereby publicly thank for their efforts the following referees, 201 in number, who submitted reports to our office between November 1, 2002 and October 31, 2003 (* indicates that the individual was responsible for more than one report):

Stephen Abney	Ted Briscoe	N. J. Enfield
Farrell Ackerman	Ellen Broselow	Thomas Ernst*
Judith Aissen	Noel Burton-Roberts	Nomi Erteschik-Shir
Cynthia Allen	Andrew Carstairs-McCarthy	Joseph Eska
Felix Ameka	Jack Chambers	Nicholas Evans
Henning Andersen	Sandra Chung	Patrick Farrell
Diana Archangeli	Herbert H. Clark	Paula Fikkert
Anthony Aristar	Daniel Collins	Charles Fillmore
Mark Aronoff	Bernard Comrie	Olga Fischer
Mark C. Baker	Cleo Condoravdi	Benjamin W. Fortson
Catherine Ball	Greville Corbett	Barbara Fox
Mark Baltin	Stephen Crain	John Frampton
Chris Barker	Sean Crist	Robert Frank
David Basilico	William Croft	Andrew Garrett
Outi Bat-El	Östen Dahl	Carol Genetti
Edwin Battistella	Mary Dalrymple	Donna Gerds*
Mary Beckman	William Davies	Brendan Gillon
Adriana Belletti	Alice Davison	Alessandra Giorgi
Giulia Bencini	Veneeta Dayal	Adele Goldberg
Emily Bender	Michel DeGraff	John Goldsmith
Nan Bernstein Ratner	Kenneth de Jong	Grant Goodall
Manfred Bierwisch	Marcel den Dikken	Helen Goodluck
Robert Binnick	Jeannette Denton	Joseph Grady
James P. Blevins	Madhav Deshpande	Georgia Green
Juliette Blevins*	Alexis Dimitriadis	Jane Grimshaw
Kathryn Bock	Laura Downing	Andrea Gualmini
Paul Boersma*	Paul Drew	Jeanette Gundel
Geert Booij	Kenneth Drozd	Takao Gunji
Brian Bowdle	Sheila Embleton	Martin Hackl
Chris Brew	Karen Emmorey	Hubert Haider

Friedrich Hamm*	Yo Matsumoto	Deborah Schiffrin
Jorge Hankamer	Lisa Matthewson	Michael Schober
Heidi Harley	James McCloskey	Daniel Schreier
Bruce Hayes	April McMahon	Scott Schwenter
Kirk Hazen*	Richard P. Meier	Peter Sells
Hans Henrich Hock	Jason Merchant	Joan Sereno
Hajime Hoji	Laura Michaelis	Jeff Siegel
José Hualde	Paola Monachesi	Halldor Sigurdsson
Elizabeth Hume	Pamela Munro	Antonella Sorace
Larry Hyman	James Myers	Margaret Speas
Sabine Iatridou	Scott Myers	Shari Speer
William Idsardi	Tsuguro Nakamura	Elizabeth Spelke
Michael Israel	Naomi Nagy	Andrew Spencer
Seizi Iwata	Terrance Nearey	Susan Steele
Lars Johanson	Paul Newman	Gregory Stump*
Christopher Johnson	Geoff Nunberg*	Peter Svenonius
Barbara Johnstone	Richard Oehrle*	Erik Thomas
John E. Joseph	Almerindo Ojeda	Sarah Thomason*
Paul Kay	Jaye Padgett	Michael Tomasello
Judy Kegl	Joe Pater*	Lisa Travis
Chris Kennedy	Elizabeth Pearce	Kees van Deemter
Edward Keenan	David Peterson	Harry van der Hulst
Ruth Kempson	Steven Pinker	Barbara Vance
James Kilbury	Ingo Plag	Shravan Vasishth
John Kingston	Maria Polinsky	Bert Vaux
Cecilia Kirk	William J. Poser	Brent Vine
András Kornai	Paul Postal	Benji Wald
Manfred Krifka	Geoffrey K. Pullum	Gregory Ward
D. Robert Ladd	Gilbert Rappaport	Thomas Wasow
Knud Lambrecht	Norvin Richards	Lindsay Whaley
Clara Levelt	Julie Roberts	Walt Wolfram
Beth Levin	Yvan Rose	Dieter Wunderlich
Jeffrey Lidz	John Robert Ross	Malcah Yaeger-Dror
Rochelle Lieber	Malcolm Ross	Shensheng Zhu
Diane Lillo-Martin	Jeff Runner	Anne Zribi-Hertz
Feng-hsi Liu	Louisa Sadler	Alessandro Zucchi
Maryellen MacDonald	Jerrold Sadock	

Respectfully submitted,
 Brian D. Joseph
 Columbus, Ohio
 December 10, 2003