

## Editorial

As I was saying (January 1974, Vol. 1, No. 1, Editorial), there has been a gap in the academic coverage of child language studies, which it was hoped that *JCL* would fill. Twelve volumes and 7000 pages later, the gap has begun to be filled; but only begun, for it was a rather large hole. . . .

This is my second editorial for *JCL*, and my last, for the Journal changes hands after this issue. An opportunity for a brief retrospect, therefore.

My first editorial expressed three main hopes: to pay close attention to methodological issues; to publish a diversity of theoretical approaches, especially from within linguistics; and to publish regular material on languages other than English. How have we got on?

I think we have done quite well with the first aim. The main thrust of our editorial comments, in corresponding with authors, has been to obtain clarification of analytical criteria; and in almost all cases our initiatives have been responded to constructively and sympathetically. Our *METHOD* sections are among the largest in the business, as a consequence, and personally I now find it a lot easier to compare the work of different authors. In addition, about 30 papers have been published whose aims were totally or largely concerned with methodological issues.

The second aim has been fairly successful, as far as linguistics and psychology are concerned, where the range of papers clearly illustrates our eclectic platform. On the other hand, one of the expectations of the 1972 Florence Symposium, where the idea for the Journal was launched, was that there would be a considerable interdisciplinary input, and this has not been achieved. We have had hardly any submissions from such fields as sociology, anthropology or neurology so far.

We have been less successful with the third aim. It is true that, of the 366 papers and notes we published in the first 10 volumes, 66 were wholly or partly devoted to languages other than English – but, I would prefer to say, this was only 66, and many of these were very short items. For the record, the languages were Chinese, Czech, Dutch, Estonian, French, German, Hebrew, Hindi, Hungarian, Italian, Japanese, Latvian, Maori, Polish, Portuguese, Russian, Serbo-Croatian, Spanish, Tagalog, Tamil, Telugu and Turkish. That leaves another 5,000 or so to cover. I am a little surprised that we have not had more submissions on other languages. The bias towards English is understandable, but disconcerting in a subject which claims an interest in establishing universals. Similarly, only five papers on bilingualism, in all that time.

This is no place for a content analysis. That can now be done by anyone who is interested, as the Index for Vols. 1–10 has been published as part of

our last issue. It may be of interest to note, however, that among the predominant themes treated were: semantic and lexical topics (71 papers), followed by comprehension (59), syntax (56), phonology (41), interaction (especially motherese) (39), cognitive issues (24), acquisitional strategies (23), pragmatics (19), perception (19) and morphology (15). At the opposite extreme, I am struck by the fact that we have published so little on such topics as babbling (5), connectivity/cohesion (3), intonation (5), metalinguistic issues (4), individual differences (5), word order (9) and the area of bilingualism, already noted. There is, evidently, no shortage of things for the next editorial team to be getting on with.

The new team is led by Alan Cruttenden and his colleagues from the University of Manchester. It is a pleasure to welcome them to the Journal, and I wish them every success. But before this editor allgone, I must place on record my own real debt of gratitude to my associate editors, Michael Garman and Paul Fletcher, who have been deeply involved in all matters connected with the Journal's production. I am grateful, too, for the help I have received from the members of the reading and advisory committees, and from the production department of C.U.P., who have produced such elegant work on the basis of such messy editorial copy. Thanks to such support, the editorial task has been much easier than I expected, when I accepted the short straw thrust in my direction at the Florence Symposium. The journal's circulation is now around 2000, where it has been for some time – an impressive stability, given the effects of the economic recession. I have no doubt that the Journal will continue to grow under its new direction, and I wish it well.

DAVID CRYSTAL