

**Influence of MacCorquodale's Critique of Chomsky's Review  
of Skinner's Verbal Behavior**  
*Comments by David C. Palmer*  
*Smith College*

We believe that MacCorquodale's paper offers a sufficient response to Chomsky's review, but it was not influential. First, it appeared 11 years after Chomsky's review, and cognitive science had delivered its verdict by then. Second, it appeared in a behavioral journal that was not widely read by cognitive scientists. MacCorquodale originally submitted the paper to *Language*, the journal that had published the review, and where it would have reached many readers who had presumably been persuaded by Chomsky, but the paper was rejected.

Considering the notoriety and influence of Chomsky's review, the editorial decision not to publish a rejoinder by a scholar of MacCorquodale's stature is remarkable. Fortunately, the avowed reasons for the rejection are known. When MacCorquodale submitted the manuscript to *JEAB*, he included a copy of his rejection letter from *Language*, and the editorial correspondence of the former journal has been preserved. The critical passages of the editorial letter are these:

When [your paper] first arrived on my desk, I read it and found it interesting, but felt that a lot of its arguments were not strictly new, that I had read them somewhere, or at least heard them discussed at scholarly meetings. However, I then sent the paper to a consultant for an independent evaluation. For the past 2 months I have been trying, by repeated letters and long-distance calls, to get your manuscript back from that consultant, and still have had no success. He did give me his appraisal of your paper by phone, and it pretty much coincided with my own; so I want to return it to you. But Professor X repeatedly promises to return the manuscript to me, and yet does nothing. This weekend I am leaving for 4 months at the University of Hawaii; when and if the manuscript comes back to this office, my secretary will send it to you. I can only express my regrets [etc.]

We leave it to our readers to draw their own conclusions about the integrity of the editorial decision.