LETTERS TO *LANGUAGE*

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.

M. B. Emeneau's impact on linguistics and allied areas

April 10, 2006

To the Editor:

I read the obituary on Murray Barnson Emeneau (MBE) written by William Bright (*Language* 82.2.411–22, June 2006), kindly made available to me in an advance version, and felt that any description of Prof. Emeneau would be incomplete without an account of the huge impact his works have had on linguists worldwide. A scholar's preeminence in any field is determined not only by the numerous contributions made by him to the discipline, but also and to a greater extent by the number of researchers who use these works as reference in their domain. Therefore, as a part of a centenary tribute to the scholar organized in Mysore in early 2005, the task of citation indexing was taken up to cover all his works, limiting the task to the available references and citing documents, and to bring together his bibliography and its citation in one place.

'Citation indexing' indicates the relationship that exists between the citing and the cited documents and provides an organized list of cited articles, each of which is accompanied by a list of citing articles identified by a source citation. This study mainly answered two questions: How many times was each of Emeneau's works cited? And, who cited which work of his and where? The exercise generated an interesting set of results, and a brief summary of my study is as follows.

1. In a span of approximately sixty years, MBE contributed 217 journal articles and 73 books. More than 70% of his contributions came during the first half of the eight decades starting from the 1930s. Within that, the maximum came in the 1960s. The years and numbers of contributions are as follows: 1930–39 (34), 1940–49 (56), 1950–59 (51), 1960–69 (71), 1970–79 (38), 1980–89 (31), 1990–99 (17), and 2000–2005 (6).

2. The following authors have cited MBE more than ten times: M. B. Emeneau (255), that is, self-citation; Bh. Krishnamurti (119); P. S. Subramanyam (75); M. S. Andronov (44); H. F. Schiffman (33); H. S. Ananthanarayana (32); Inder Singh (24); B. Gopinathan Nair (23); M. C. Shapiro (19); Sanford B. Steever (19); Kamil V. Zvelebil (19); William Bright (14); R. Balakrishnan (13); Colin P. Masica (13); K. Meenakshi (13); S. Sakthivel (13); Rao G. Sambasiva (12); Thomas Burrow (10); and S. V. Shanmugham (10). This ranked list of citing authors indicates that MBE influenced Dravidianists such as Krishnamurti, Subramanyam, Andronov, and Schiffman, sociolinguists Shapiro and Steever, areal typologists such as Masica, and, of course, the Sanskritists Hock, Ananthanarayana, and others.

3. While MBE debuted in the decade of the 1930s, citations of his articles began during the 1940s, numbering just 3, and gradually increased to 278 in the 1970s. The details yearwise are: 1940–49 (3), 1950–59 (10), 1960–69 (175), 1970–79 (278), 1980–89 (268), 1990–99 (262), and 2000ff. (215).

4. Of the 1,204 works that have cited MBE, 610 are books, 497 are journal articles, and 97 are meeting/conference proceedings. Out of 497 citing journal articles, the *International Journal of Dravidian Linguistics* tops the list with 121 citations followed by: *Indian Linguistics* (57), *Journal of the American Oriental Society* (51), *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* (34), *Praci Bhasha Vijnan* (33), *Journal of Tamil Studies* (29), *Pondichery Journal of Dravidian Studies* (24), *Bulletin of the Anthropological Survey of India* (24), *Lingua* (17), *Anthropological Linguistics* (14), *Bulletin of the Deccan College Research Institute* (12), and the rest are below 10 articles. Among the citing journals, though Indian journals top the list, when we take the total citing journals into consideration, we find a larger share of foreign journals than Indian in the ratio of 19 : 13.

5. Of MBE's books, *A Dravidian etymological dictionary* (written with T. Burrow; 1961, 2nd edn. 1984) is the most cited, 133 times. And of his journal articles, the most referred-to article is 'India as a linguistic area' (*Language* 32.3–16, 1956), with 117 citations. From this we can infer that just as scientific theories are based on axioms propounded centuries ago, MBE's versatile and classic contributions are referred to even today in linguistic research.

The full details of this research in the form of a bibliography and citation index are avail-

https://doi.org/10.1353/lan.2006.0151 Published online by Cambridge University Press

able at http://www.ciil.org/Main/Emeneau/mainindex.htm, which is updated regularly.
DR. B. A. SHARADA
[sharada@ciil.stpmy.soft.net]

Editor's reply: I thank Dr. Sharada for this further illuminating look at the scholarship of this outstanding and inspiring scholar. May we all have such an impact on the field!

More on the future of *Language*

April 29, 2006

To the Editor:

I have a comment on the 'Levinson-Joseph' exchange in the March issue of *Language* (81.1, 2006). It seems to me that the debate so far does not fully appreciate the dramatic consequences of the new possibilities offered by communication technologies. What we see happening is that print 'publications' are becoming in effect 'depublications': as long as a paper or book manuscript is on the author's website, it is publicly available and anyone can make use of it. As soon as it is 'published', it is no longer public—its copyright has been privatized and potential readers have to pay money to access it, because the author has to take it off her/his website. In many cases, fortunately, the manuscript version of the paper can stay on the website (or on an archive site), and many or most readers take it from there, though libraries still buy printed copies of journals that are used less and less.

This is patently an absurd system, and it will not last long. Either with or without the leadership of the LSA (in the field of linguistics), the system will change sooner or later. More and more open-access online journals will arise, and while initially they will not have the prestige of the established titles, after a while their inherent advantages will drive the old restricted-access print journals out of business.

So it seems to me that the LSA should make a much bolder move than founding one new electronic journal, conceived of as a subsidiary publication: the LSA should turn *Language* into an open-access journal and create a whole range of more specialized (equally open-access) journals along the lines suggested by Levinson: *Language (Sound Systems)*, *Language (Syntax)*, *Language (Meaning and Use)*, *Language (Sociolinguistics)*, and so on.

Such a move would benefit everyone, except for the shareholders of commercial publishing corporations. Let me briefly address the two most common objections to a wholesale transition to open-access publication: the importance of the 'imprimatur' of peer review, and the economic side.

Peer review is not linked to the print medium, and current developments are undermining this system. Personal websites and open archives (e.g. ROA, Semantics Archive, LingBuzz) are so easy to set up, but they let everything in. The result is a problematic advantage for the work of well-known scholars, whose very names suggest relevance and quality. Innovative work by younger scholars has a hard time in this system. So I'm arguing that with regard to peer review, we should not compare the old print system and free electronic publication in general, but the mushrooming 'wild' system and a controlled peer-reviewed open-access system.

Many of the costs of publishing in science have long been carried by the scientists themselves (especially peer review and editorial decision-making), and other services such as typesetting and advertising can now be done more effectively by the scientists and their assistants themselves. It is especially with regard to server capacity and archiving (and more generally computational support) that new costs arise, but I think many university administrators would be happy to provide such support in return for the possibility of saving on journal subscriptions.

What is paradoxical is that virtually all of the value of science publications is created by the scientists, but the perceived prestige of publications is associated with journal titles (or sometimes publisher names) owned by non-scientists who can exploit this value for their purposes.

So what we should do is create new prestigious publication outlets ourselves, allied with our university administrators. And the LSA is ideally placed to start this process.

MARTIN HASPELMATH
[haspelmath@eva.mpg.de]

Editor's reply: This is an intriguing view, and I especially find appealing the endorsement of Stephen Levinson's suggestion of a series of focused journals (as long as I don't have to edit them!). I am still concerned about peer-review and costs, but recognize that we are perhaps standing at the entrance to a very different era in academic publishing from what we have been used to. Transitions are never easy, and I trust that letters such as this one and Levinson's will encourage the open and frank discussion that is needed here.

https://doi.org/10.1353/lan.2006.0151 Published online by Cambridge University Press

M. B. Emeneau—A remembrance
July 15, 2006
To the Editor:

Alas, the grand master Murray Emeneau has left us (see William Bright's obituary in *Language* 82.2.411–22, June 2006). One day in the fall of 1963, in my first semester as a graduate student at Berkeley, I was waiting for someone in a corridor of Dwinelle Hall when Murray happened to emerge from his office a couple of feet away. A few pleasantries were exchanged, in the course of which I chanced to drop a word about my interest in Irish. Ducking back into his office, Murray reemerged with a venerable copy of Julius Pokorny's *Altirische Grammatik*. Would I like to have it? Taken back, I could only stammer, 'Of course! Th-thank you!'. He handed me the book, adding to the gift, with the hint of a mischievous patrician smile, just one condition: 'Read it!'. And read it I did. And the experience led directly to my very first publication ('Old Irish morphophonemics and ordered process rules', *Lingua* 16.238–54, 1966) as well as a career-long obsession with phonology. God hold you, good Murray.

JOSEPH L. MALONE
[jm390@columbia.edu]

Editor's reply: I find these personal reminiscences fascinating; I appreciate having the opportunity to publish them!

CORRECTION

In the published version of 'Knowledge of grammar includes knowledge of syntactic probabilities' by Susanne Gahl and Susan Garnsey (*Language* 82.2.405–10, June 2006), references to page numbers in the preceding discussion note by Frederick J. Newmeyer were not updated after final pagination in the typesetting and proofing process. We apologize for any confusion this may have caused our readers.

The following corrections should be noted: the reference in the second paragraph of p. 405 to p. 2 should be to p. 399; the one at the top of p. 408 to p. 8 should be to p. 401; that in the last paragraph of p. 408 to p. 11 should be to p. 403; the reference in the third paragraph of p. 409 to p. 12 should be to p. 403; the one in n. 3 on p. 409 to p. 12 should be to p. 403; and finally, the page numbers in the Newmeyer 2006 reference on p. 410 should be *Language* 82.399–404.

https://doi.org/10.1353/lan.2006.0151 Published online by Cambridge University Press