Language accepts letters from readers that briefly and succinctly respond to or comment upon either material published previously in the journal or issues deemed of importance to the field. The editor reserves the right to edit letters as needed. Brief replies from relevant parties are included as warranted.

Response to Joseph's discussion note

December 31, 2010

To the Editor:

In his discussion note in *Language* 86.4 on the mission of this journal ('*Language* and the LSA: A reappraisal', pp. 806–9, 2010), Brian Joseph notes an opposing view that holds that not many readers pay much attention to articles outside their narrow areas of interest. I can see why someone might think that, but I'd be surprised if this were found to be a general view.

Language is the journal I turn to most often for articles and book reviews outside my own area, phonology. When I try to recall *Language* articles that made a big impression, most happen to fall outside my main areas of interest. An example from 86.4 is Irit Meir's piece on metaphor and Israeli sign language ('Iconicity and metaphor: Constraints on metaphorical extension of iconic forms', pp. 865–96), which I might never have picked up if it hadn't been in *Language*.

There's a reason why I turn to *Language* first for such articles. From past experience I know they'll be worth reading, thanks to the editorial policies Brian mentions in his note.

Maybe having a journal like this will someday be a luxury the LSA or the field can't afford, but as linguistics becomes more complex, the need for such a journal is likely to become greater. Possibly we pay a price for universal coverage in *Language* by not always having the latest breaking news in every subfield of linguistics. But I don't think the journal could have served me better than it has over the forty years I've been reading it.

WILL LEBEN
[leben@stanford.edu]

https://doi.org/10.1353/lan.2011.0003 Published online by Cambridge University Press