DWIGHT L. BOLINGER

Dwight L. Bolinger died on February 23, 1992, in Palo Alto, California, where he had lived for nineteen years after his retirement from Harvard in 1973, the year during which he served as the forty-eighth President of the Linguistic Society of America. Two years later he served as first president of The Linguistic Association of the U.S. and Canada, an organization to which he remained especially dedicated because of the compatibility between his views and theirs about the role of functionality in linguistic structure. He was eighty-four years old upon his death. He had known for almost a year that he was dying of cancer. Toward the end he suffered excruciating pain, but until March of 1991, when the cancer and the treatment for it made him too weak, he did not stop working at the same desk on the same old Olympia typewriter where he had worked throughout those years in Palo Alto. His files contained over 50,000 4 × 6 cards with fully quoted citations of anything he had read that he thought he might later like to refer to or include in his own writing. They sat in an alcove, converted from a closet, directly behind his swivel typing chair. They also contained voluminous citations of phrases he had collected by direct observation, carefully annotated as to time, place, speaker. (On the night he was taken to the Stanford hospital, he was listening to, and commenting on, the intonation of a policeman who was interviewing a victim of a traffic accident in the adjacent cubicle.) On the right as he faced his Olympia was a window looking into his backyard garden, neatly kept as part of his early morning routine. On the desk there were several pairs of woolen gloves to ease his arthritis, with the tips of the fingers cut out to make typing possible while wearing them. He complained of the cool occasionally damp weather of the Stanford area, preferring it hot. Not counting two revised editions of *Aspects of language* (1968[1], 1975[2], 1980[3]), working there beside the window, he wrote six books, edited three more, and wrote just over one hundred articles and scholarly reviews. All this was AFTER he retired.

There is a great deal to be said about Bolinger personally as well as professionally, because he was much loved by a large number of his peers. During the memorial services at the cemetery, numerous speakers commented warmly on what an incredibly responsible and helpful correspondent he was: when people wrote to him they got an answer, usually by return mail, and often just the kind of answer that they found immediately helpful. If I do not record some of these personal stories now, they will never be known to many people who will cherish them. I will therefore recount for the readers of *Language* more than just his professional accomplishments, trying to capture a sense of the man as well as the scholar. But first the basic facts of his life.

Dwight LeMerton Bolinger (he preferred just the middle initial; the full middle name appears only in library catalogs which insist on that sort of detail) was born in Topeka, Kansas, on August 18, 1907. His father was Arthur Joel Bolinger, then an attorney, later a farmer, and still later a probate and mag-

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0097850793032035 Published online by Cambridge University Press

istrate judge in Versailles, Missouri. His mother was Nellie Gertrude Ott. She died when Dwight was eight; but she left a haunting impression on her only son: she was musical, playing the piano and the church organ, and he attributed his talent for music and pitch perception to her. In 'First person, not singular' (1991; see E323) he wrote, 'I was born to write music, and somewhere along the line I got mislaid.' He often used musical analogies, not only in intonation studies but even in syntax. In discussing degrees of grammaticality and acceptability, i.e. the fact that intuitive judgments can differ, he wrote in the Foreword of his book on the phrasal verb that

> 'Being one's own informant is like being a composer. One listens for hints and then invents and judges for fitness at the same time, expecting that others will resonate... [The reader] is bound to find fault with some of the harmonies, but I ask him then to weigh them in terms of better or worse rather than right or wrong ... We [may] differ then in the precise location of the boundary, but not in its relationship to the whole' (1971:xv).

This view of acceptability judgments, though not well established at that time, has subsequently become the standard of the profession.

Harking back to his being 'mislaid' as a musician, it was not his mother who mislaid him, but her early death; his father remarried and moved with his new wife to Kansas City and then to an unsuccessful stint on a farm near Stover, Missouri, where one of Dwight's half-sisters was born. Finally they settled down in Versailles, where Dwight's other half-sister and his half-brother were born. In the normal course of events Dwight should have gone on to grow up in Versailles, but he did not think the school system there would prepare him for college at Washburn, where he was determined to study. In any case he and his stepmother did not get on well; he ran away from home at the age of sixteen, going to live with his grandparents in Topeka and later in Springfield, Ohio, where he graduated from high school in 1925. The next year he taught in a one-room country school south of Stover, Missouri, where he devised his own system of phonics for the teaching of reading.

Preparing for Washburn after his year of teaching, needing money for the purpose, and hearing that it was easy to come by in the oil fields of the Texas Panhandle, during the summer he drove down into the Texas Panhandle with an uncle and had an experience which was later so vivid in his memory that he wrote it up while in college, for an intercollegiate literary contest. Whether he won anything in the contest is not on any record I have encountered, but the essay itself has been preserved. Without details, the experience included being deserted by the relative he had driven there with (the uncle literally got angry over some imagined affront, drove off without him, and did not come back!). He was totally and completely alone, with no money, no food, no way to get in touch with anyone (not even a dime to put into a pay phone to call collect), out in the middle of the Panhandle. He had nothing to eat for three days, slept in various hiding places so as not to be picked up for vagrancy—such as the corner of a lumberyard between two piles of lumber until the night watchman rousted him—and on the third day without food he managed to trade an old fountain pen for seventy-five cents with which to send a telegram asking for money from home. The necessary $15 arrived later that day and he bought

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0097850793032035 Published online by Cambridge University Press

a train ticket that got him home safely. His essay recounting these events was evidently written early in his college career, but he had already developed the rhythmic prose style for which he has always been known. Here is a sample from that essay:

> 'We tried to work the town that day, but without success. Any man who has ever sold knows that no salesman can sell when he has to; we had to work to eat and we had to eat to work, and we couldn't do either.'

After his adventures in the Texas Panhandle, he indeed returned to Topeka to matriculate at Washburn College, from which institution both of his parents had graduated. In those days it was was somewhat unusual for both parents to have college degrees. In his family it was simply assumed, not least of all by Dwight, that he would go on to higher education. His grades were virtually straight As.[1] He received his B.A. in 1930, majoring in Spanish with a minor in music theory. He subsequently returned to Washburn to teach Spanish for six years (1937–43), after he completed his Ph.D. at Wisconsin. In 1964 he returned as distinguished alumnus to Washburn when they conferred on him an honorary D. Litt. During his six years on the faculty at Washburn, he spent 1940–1941 teaching Spanish at the Colegio de San Luis in Cartago, Costa Rica. He went there in the expectation that he would be teaching Latin (high-school level), but they already had a Latin teacher and so he taught Spanish—to Costa Ricans, with whom he honed his skills in the explication of Spanish syntax. Almost forty years later, a year before his cancer was diagnosed, he returned to Cartago with his son and daughter-in-law to see again the place to which his early career had taken him. He located the house where they had lived, and had the pleasure of talking again with a number of former students. It was a trip filled with fun and fond memories rekindled.

After his B.A., still not knowing exactly how he wanted to focus his career (he gave up music reluctantly, largely because he could not afford the cost of a decent musical education and he did not have the performance skills to earn scholarships at music conservatories), he went to the University of Kansas for an M.A. in Spanish, conferred in 1932, his thesis on Pío Baroja, a Spanish novelist. Then he went to the University of Wisconsin, Madison campus; he continued to work on Baroja and indeed completed his dissertation on the topic. Nothing on Baroja, however, appears among the titles of his publications. Nor was there any linguistic content in his graduate education. Late in his life he recalled an incident that reflects both his modesty and his sense of humor. Like most graduate students of his day, he had to pass reading examinations in German. A book was handed to him by the examiner, open to a casually selected passage chosen for him to translate. One glance at it convinced Bolinger he could not handle it. He 'accidentally' dropped the book, and when he picked it up the examiner opened it to a different passage. Bolinger was lucky: this passage he could deal with.

At Wisconsin he worked under Antonio G. Solalinde as a graduate assistant,

[1] I have seen his transcripts; in his first year only, there are Bs in gym, in astronomy, and in music harmony; the rest indeed are all As, straight through school.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0097850793032035 Published online by Cambridge University Press

collecting citations for a medieval Spanish dictionary, and that was the beginning of his interest in lexical questions, an interest which he pursued to the end of his life. The earliest fruit of his lexical interest is recalled in the fiftieth anniversary issue of 'Among the new words' (Algeo & Algeo 1991). This regular column of the journal *American Speech* (*AS*) was initiated by Bolinger in September of 1937 (he was one year out of his Ph.D.) four years before he moved it to *AS* and the sponsorship of the American Dialect Society in 1941, and he himself viewed it as his first outlet for publication. In its first three years, before moving the column to *AS*, he wrote twenty-six columns for the journal called *Words*, recording some 560 neologisms. He continued to edit the column for three years and then turned it over to I. Willis Russell, who did it for the next forty-two years. Bolinger is credited by the Algeos (1991:73) with setting the tone and aims of the column that have been so successfully pursued through its history down to this day, first by Russell and after his death in 1985 by the Algeos. He wrote, in the first installment,

> [This department] will endeavor to set down, from month to month, the new words and new idioms as they appear, warm from the presses; to fix, as closely as possible, the date of their coinage; and to define them, giving examples' (1937:133).

He himself viewed his initiation of the column as a sort of exemplification of the uniformitarian hypothesis and a rebellion against dry-as-dust philological studies, interpreting his own intentions this way some 44 years later:

> 'If the nature of language was the same at all times and everywhere, surely one could learn more about its developments by watching them happen than by waiting for some future stopping place that never really arrives' (1991[E322]:78).

And with characteristic modesty (a hackneyed phrase, but truly earned), he asserted about turning the work over to Russell, 'If I can claim to have succeeded in any way by initiating ANW, I declare that the real success was my successors.'

During his first summer vacation while he was studying at Wisconsin, he made a trip to Arizona to visit his mother's sister, who had become something of a replacement mother to him after his own mother's early death. While there he decided to take a trip to Los Angeles with the intention of consulting a professor of Spanish whose work he admired. On that trip—in fact at a social event at USC—he met Louise Schrynemakers, a graduate student in French at USC who had immigrated from Belgium with her family after World War I and become a naturalized citizen. A full year of courtship by mail followed (he did not see her again until he went back to Los Angeles for the wedding), with Dwight's eloquence culminating in a marriage proposal by mail to which Louise responded, in effect, 'Come to California and we'll see.' After he arrived, she accepted. (I am told that many years later their daughter Ann proposed to her husband Derrick by long-distance telephone, Palo Alto to Ayr, Scotland. It runs in the family. The union of Ann and Derrick McClure, now a senior lecturer in English at Aberdeen University, produced three handsome Scottish grandsons of whom Dwight was prouder than I can recount without tears.) Dwight and Louise were married in the summer of 1934 in Los Angeles. Like Dwight,

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0097850793032035 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Louise had a strong artistic leaning, developing into an excellent amateur painter over the years. She was also the critic to whom Dwight submitted his every word before anyone else saw it: she commented extensively, and did much of the final typing for him. Their son Bruce was born while Dwight was completing his doctorate, their daughter Ann twelve years later. After almost 52 years of marriage, Louise died six years before Dwight did, also of cancer. His great book *Intonation and its uses* (1989, A311) is dedicated

To the memory of L.
And all that was.

Turning back, now, to his early career and the experiences that brought him more and more into the functionalist view of linguistics for which he is best known: after six years of teaching at Washburn he went for the academic year 1943–44 to Yale on a Sterling Fellowship. The account of how he came by that fellowship is amusing. Seeing the advertisement, he thought how he might dazzle the judges and came up—for the first time, not having written a word on the subject prior to that—with the idea of combining his interest in music with his interest in language: obviously, intonation. Though what he wrote in that application does not survive in any record I have found, it apparently dazzled the judges after they got a chance to read it. They almost missed that chance, because he lost the envelope while riding his bike to the post office and was not going to bother to make out a new application because he did not think he had a serious chance of winning. Louise retraced his route, found the envelope where it had dropped from his pocket in the street, and mailed it, and he got the award. The account he has published of how he spent his time during that year (Bolinger 1991, E323:33) is rather sad, however. Bloomfield, Bloch, Trager, and other linguists of distinction were there, though some were away at times in connection with wartime language programs of military service. (Bolinger was not inducted into the service because of wild swings of blood pressure when he was under stress; the examining physician didn't know what to make of the readings he was getting, and declared him 4-F.) His account of his first visit to Bernard Bloch's office is typical: 'Later he was a rare friend, but at that moment, with wisps of Kansas straw protruding from behind my ears, I could tell from the look on his face that he held out little hope for my future' (1991, E323:33). In any case he was left quite on his own in that mother-lode of structuralism; he had little contact with any kind of linguistics that year except what he found for himself in the library. The history of intonation studies over the next ten years might have been very different if there had been more interaction with Bloch and others. As it was we later went through a cycle of extreme Bloch-Trager-Smith point-phonemicization of tones followed by clever Bolinger counterexemplification and demonstrations that intonation must be described by devices that allow for nondiscrete continua. But if they had really talked at Yale, we might have missed all that fun, which would have been a pity indeed.

From Yale Bolinger went straight to his new post at the University of Southern California (USC), becoming Chair just two years later and remaining in

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0097850793032035 Published online by Cambridge University Press

that job for the next thirteen years. His approach to teaching Spanish, and his main contributions to that enterprise other than his textbooks and especially his work on the joint project *Modern Spanish* (1960, C135), about which more below, is captured best in the *Essays on Spanish: Words and Grammar* (1991, E319). The essence of his approach was to look for parallels in English to illuminate something that was unfamiliar in Spanish—essentially piecemeal 'contrastive grammar'. He demonstrated many brilliant insights in this work, and in his introductions to the articles collected in the 1991 *Essays* he provides an interesting commentary on the points that he himself, from a later perspective, felt were of particular value. For instance, in his introduction to the paper entitled 'The syntax of *parecer*' (Bolinger 1972) he remarks:

> 'Some time before generativists began talking about "tough movement", "raising", and "subject hopping" in cases like
>
> It is tough to convince John.
> John is tough to convince.
>
> where the second is supposed to be a transformation of the first, I had noted the same phenomenon and labeled it "absorption," using the metaphor of a subject in the lower clause being absorbed into the higher clause. (What determines the success of a label?)' (1991, E319: 25)

In his 'Linear modification' article (1952, D92) and in an early paper on word order in Spanish (1954, C107:218), he carved out the position he always thereafter advocated on the relevance of linear position. Commenting on these papers many years later (1991, E319:218), he noted that 'the concepts of theme and rheme (or topic and comment), presupposition, and focus have since become familiar, but at the time were novel, at least in American linguistics'. In reading comments like this, one senses, I fear, that Bolinger felt himself to have been less than fully appreciated by his linguistic contemporaries. And probably in syntax he was. But not in Spanish pedagogy, certainly; nor later in English intonation, although his early work had certainly been ignored in the heyday of the Bloch, Trager, Smith, Hill, Hockett analysis of English intonational contours into 4 discrete levels of pitch, 4 levels of stress, and 4 types of junctures.

But when stress and accent studies were abruptly redirected in 1974 (by Liberman 1974) and pitch accents were made respectable as a level intermediate between tones and contours (by Pierrehumbert 1980), it is fair to say that Bolinger's advocacy from the late 1940s onward of a view which is very close in many key respects to the current one was fully acknowledged and appreciated. One scholar who has repeatedly, from his dissertation onwards, acknowledged in his own work extensive indebtedness to Bolinger's theoretical essays, examples, and critical comments is D. Robert Ladd. He has encapsulated the Bolinger intonational contribution very clearly in a review of Bolinger 1986 (A294), the first book that Bolinger published on intonation (after about 40 years of work, and about 20 key papers):

> 'The cornerstone of B's theory is the notion of PITCH ACCENT. He himself was the first (1958) to use this term to refer to a prosodic element which is simultaneously a marker of prominence and a building block for intonation contours. In the last several years, this concept has ceased

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0097850793032035 Published online by Cambridge University Press

> to be an idiosyncrasy of B's and has become virtually standard; along the way, some of the theoretical ideas it implies have progressed from the status of interesting heresies to that of received knowledge. In particular ... the key in successfully applying autosegmental formalisms to European intonation systems was Pierrehumbert's 1980 recognition of pitch accents as a level of organization between contours and the primitive tones of which they are composed' (Ladd 1987:639).

The last book that he wrote was a companion to this one, as the title indicates: *Intonation and its uses: Melody in grammar and discourse* (1989, A311). It is his strongest defense of his most controversial claim, namely, as Ladd puts it, 'intonational features, including accent placement, are beyond grammar and are directly linked to emotion. This has not really been integrated into mainstream research, and one of the important goals of [*Intonation and its parts*] was to restate this unifying idea' (1990:806). Going on, Ladd points out that 'the focus of [*Intonation and its uses*] is squarely on the link between intonation and emotion, leaving little doubt that B views this as his central contribution' (1990:806). Higher or rising pitch, Bolinger insists, signals emotional involvement of some more intense nature, and lower or falling pitch signals relative disinvolvement. He provides a rich, almost endlessly varied, potpourri of examples and elegantly sensitive semantic readings. While the focus of Ladd's review article is to show that at least the accent placement hypothesis cannot be correct in the form Bolinger claims for it—there must be intervening rules of grammar to account for examples which cannot be made to conform to the universal hypothesis—we can only conclude now that the jury is still out; Bolinger died before he could reply to those who thought he had overstated his case. We all know that if this argument can be made with total conviction, Bolinger was the one to have made it.

Bolinger's confidence in his position concerning the nature of intonation had been solidly fixed during 1956–57, when, after more than ten years of teaching Spanish at USC, he had taken the opportunity of another fellowship combined with sabbatical and spent the entire year doing highly sophisticated experiments on stress and intonation at Haskins Laboratories. A veritable flood of papers on intonation followed immediately upon that experience; items A126, A127, and A130 in his bibliography were all initiated or brought to completion during that year, with six more papers and a book appearing within two more years.

But his interest in teaching Spanish had not abated: it was during the year after he returned from Haskins that he undertook what was surely the most challenging textbook-writing task of his career. He wrote several other outstanding textbooks, but the MLA-sponsored *Modern Spanish* was the result of an unbelievably successful job of diplomacy within scholarship. I know something of how it went because in the beginning I too was involved. To give a sense of the skillful and persuasive tact of which Bolinger was capable, I want to recall a story of little real consequence but of considerable public debate at the time; then I will return to his work for the Modern Language Association, where this same tact played such a key role in producing one of the model textbooks of several generations.

In August of 1952, when he had been in California for only a few years—

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0097850793032035 Published online by Cambridge University Press

but was already Chair of the Department of Spanish and Italian at USC—he was appointed by Mayor Bowron to a select committee, headed by Calvin Smith, President of the Southern California Broadcasters Association. This committee—or 'jury', as it was referred to in the newspapers of the day—was given the task, awesome by contemporary standards in the sense that it had become a major issue of 'political correctness', of deciding what the officially correct pronunciation of the name of the city should be. The announcement of their recommendation was to be made at the Los Angeles birthday luncheon on September 4, and the press, the broadcasters, and the local political community both Anglo and Hispanic agreed to take the jury's decision as binding. Most of the other jury members were figures of local and even national distinction in their fields—people like the president of the state bar, the manager of the biggest radio station, a famous professor of theater arts at UCLA, members of pioneer Hispanic families, the head librarian of the Los Angeles Public Library, and so on. Distinguished though the others were, only two members of the committee had serious scholarly knowledge on which to base a decision, namely Francis Christensen, a professor of English from USC, and Bolinger.

Linguists know only too well the pitfalls of trying to teach phonetics to lay persons. The inside details of the jury discussions are not reported, but Bolinger seems to have gained the confidence of the rest of the jury, and his position, shared by Christensen, prevailed. Because Bolinger was the one who actually devised the 'phonetic' representation that was released to the press, he is the one who is quoted in virtually all published accounts of these events. From a linguistic point of view, the real possibilities, no matter how they came to be represented in the press, were, of course, only these three: [losáŋxeles], [lasǽndʒələs], and [lasǽŋgələs]. The third version, with [g], was favored by the mayor and most Anglo natives of Southern California who expressed opinions in the polls (over a thousand of them, not counting columnists). Hispanics predictably preferred the first version because it is correct Spanish. Bolinger apparently persuaded the jury, contrary to the two opinions most favored in the polls, that 'Loss-An-juh-less' should be recommended, and there are headlines all over the newspapers of early September 1952 citing Bolinger as the one responsible for 'the phonetic syllables' and quoting him as saying that, 'from a Spanish language standpoint, the pronunciation is not as much at variance with the true Spanish as that employing the hard "g". (*Los Angeles Times*, September 13, 1952). What he had done was diplomatically persuade the jury to accept the pronunciation which is in accord with English orthographic traditions. It should be added that he was consistent: for his own name he preferred [bálənd͡ʒər] though his son prefers and has always insisted on [bóliŋər].

To return to the MLA, William Riley Parker, the Secretary-Treasurer of the MLA and editor of *PMLA*, along with Theodore Andersson (Director of the MLA's Foreign Language Program) and Kenneth Mildenberger (who later became Chief of the Language Development Section of the U.S. Office of Education), had called a conference in New York City to try to bring about some concrete reforms in the teaching of foreign languages in America. The invited participants included some seventeen professors of Spanish whose names are

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0097850793032035 Published online by Cambridge University Press

recorded in the published book (*Modern Spanish*, 1960:i), but in particular they included Bolinger and five others who, under his firm but tactful guidance, did the actual work of writing the text. Furthermore, they did it in just one summer together at the University of Texas (1958), followed by endless correspondence for the next year or so. They were all strong-minded, established scholars and teachers in their own rights: J. Donald Bowen, my own collaborator and colleague from the Language Teaching Branch of the Foreign Service Institute, Department of State, who represented our joint efforts there; Agnes M. Brady of the University of Kansas; Ernest F. Haden of the University of Texas; Lawrence Poston, Jr., of the University of Oklahoma; and Norman P. Sacks of Oberlin. It may be that of the many achievements I admire in Bolinger's career this one comes at the top. The book they produced is a model of coherent methodology and exquisite clarity of exposition. It shows no sign of having been produced by a committee. Bill Parker had this to say in the introduction:

> 'One of the most valuable lessons I learned when Director ... was the potentiality of cooperative solutions to all sorts of problems vexing the profession. I can give many examples of how such solutions were found, but none so heart-warming, none involving the active participation of so many able people, as this book *Modern Spanish*. Since I was present at its inspiring beginning—having called the conference that recommended cooperative production of the book—it is most gratifying to be allowed now to commend the results to you.'

I am certain that all who worked on it would agree that the success of the coöperative enterprise was due overwhelmingly to Bolinger's leadership.

In the spring of 1958, just two years before he left USC permanently, Bolinger's distinction was acknowledged by his colleagues at USC through a tradition known as The Graduate School Annual Research Lecture. This was a truly gala event, with formal dining in a great hall followed by the lecture itself. The guest of honor was permitted to invite his family and a couple of non-USC faculty colleagues; the other guests were local faculty and university dignitaries, donors and the like. Bolinger invited William E. Bull and me; we had been working with him on a Department of Education grant to improve the methods and materials available for Spanish instruction. His lecture was about 'Machines that talk'. It was one of my first exposures to the synthetic use of sound spectrograms to generate speech. As I noted above, he had spent most of the previous year at Haskins Laboratories, and a whole series of papers were about to appear, based on experiments performed during that year that devastated much of the conventional wisdom about stress and pitch and intonation. The lecture was designed for a lay audience. Every step was carefully prepared; there was no need to back up at any point and explain some concept which might unexpectedly be needed for the audience to follow the argument. By the end of an hour and a half of the most beautifully crafted presentation you can imagine, every one in the audience had a state-of-the-art understanding of speech synthesis. To this day I have not heard a better lecture, ever, by anyone.

Bolinger moved from USC to Colorado in 1960, wanting especially to work with the French phonetician Pierre Delattre, with whom he had collaborated at Haskins Laboratories. After Delattre's premature death, Bolinger moved to Harvard in 1963, in the midst of the greatest linguistic turmoil of this century.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0097850793032035 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Chomsky was overturning all of the theories which Bolinger had not accepted anyway. But Bolinger was antiformalist. The theories Chomsky proposed were anathema to him, even though he admired Chomsky personally, indeed quite extravagantly—especially with respect to the wide range of liberal political views on which they were in complete accord. He joined in the linguistic fun around Cambridge by thinking up counterexamples. He was wonderful at counterexamples. Many years after he left Harvard, he wrote of himself, 'Somebody said a few years ago that my chief contribution to linguistics was that of generating an inexhaustible supply of minimal pairs—that would make me a kind of sorcerer's apprentice of the counterexample' (1991, E323:35). A few years after he retired he collected his syntactic-counterexample papers, along with some revisions and a couple of new papers, in *Meaning and form* (1977, D241), which was dedicated mainly to showing that Chomsky's kinds of theories were wrong: not particular details, but in principle. He did not believe in assigning a common deep structure to ANY pair of sentences that differed on the surface; he did not believe in empty semantic elements (*it* or *there* used as expletives); and he did not believe that lexical items that looked alike were not somehow really alike—e.g., prepositions and their matching 'particles'. His slogan was, 'One form for one meaning, and one meaning for one form' (1977, D241:x). Certainly most establishment generative grammarians were unpersuaded by these theses, and even more—as Geis (1979:687) reported in *Language*—by Bolinger's unwillingness 'to state his objections and alternative proposals with as much clarity as did those whose analyses he believes to be wrong', but Bolinger spoke the clear sentiment of a whole school of opposition to the dominant theory.

Bolinger had a gift for English style of which he was justly proud. This obituary will never be finished if I begin quoting favorite examples of the grace and wit of his style, but I have chosen one which appeared in *The Topeka State Journal*, his hometown newspaper, on August 8, 1953. They knew, in Topeka, what sort of a writer they had had amongst them—but just imagine a quote like this in a local newspaper! (It had earlier appeared in a 1953 issue of *The American Scholar*.)

> 'A language might be likened to a machine with two economies. The economy of social effort which is that of maintaining existing contrasts and keeping the machine in repair; and the economy of individual effort which is that of letting it float into a homogeneous state of bliss that will tax the speaker least when he tries to remember what he wants to say. As speakers, regularity is what makes us happiest, and our children are working hard at it every day with their self-created as well as propagated 'I doed it' and 'you was a orange'.

The conflicting demands of external conformity and internal ease have never been better stated.

Bolinger had a strong sense of responsibility to the public. He was at various times involved in direct political actions, but probably his most important expression of academic responsibility to the public welfare appeared in his noted book *Language—The loaded weapon* (1980, D262). Randolph Quirk's review of it strikes me as expressing exactly the right spirit of appreciation:

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0097850793032035 Published online by Cambridge University Press

> 'Confident in the unshakable respect of his peers, he can engage himself in issues like the jargon of psychobabble or the tautology of 'the reason is because', without giving the impression of a dowager on an afternoon's charitable slumming. He can sympathetically explore Korzybski's General Semantics without the fear of being thought to have fallen for its exaggerated and misleading claims. He can frankly endorse the goals of therapy without losing sight of (or seeming to lose interest in) the goals of theory... From so gentle a man, the loaded gun image is perhaps something of a surprise... and it is a measure of just how seriously Bolinger takes our plight at the receiving end of linguistic sniping, whether from the sharpshooters in advertising and politics or from the dumdum bullets of the shamans, knocking the life out of language they claim to 'defend from corruption' (1981:21).

In a review of the same book which is otherwise not especially flattering, another British scholar, Geoffrey Sampson, assesses Bolinger's place in American linguistics in a manner that is, I think, essentially correct (I omit Sampson's expressions of his own antiformalist biases):

> 'Dwight Bolinger has an honoured place among the American linguists who have been active in recent decades. He was almost alone in never yielding to ... fashion ...; instead, he repeatedly drew our attention to the fact that real language is messily complex, full of quirks which can hardly be made to fit anyone's formal framework, and that some of the most interesting properties of language—intonation, for instance—are ones that the fashionable theories ignored completely' (1981:269).

For this book Bolinger received the 1981 Orwell Award from the National Council of Teachers of English. The plaque was displayed prominently on the wall of his study, not far from the window open to his garden. He received other awards: in1973 he was elected Fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences; he became a Corresponding Member of the Royal Spanish Academy in 1988, and a Corresponding Fellow of the British Academy in 1990.

After the news of Bolinger's death was circulated through the electronic medium of the Linguist Network the day after he died, many tributes appeared over the next few days, from students and colleagues and even casual acquaintances. I am sure I could not persuade the editor of this journal that they should all be printed here, and it would be invidious to select among them; they were all eloquent and deeply touching, and the colleagues who wrote them will know they were appreciated. One of them, however, became more 'official', as it were: Geoffrey Nunberg's piece was run on the National Public Radio program 'Fresh Air' the Wednesday after Bolinger's death (and at other times around the country). In it he compared the immediately-published obituaries of Bolinger with those of S. I. Hayakawa, who died a couple of days later. Knowing the media, one can infer the differences, and I will not labor the obvious. But Nunberg's conclusion drawn from those differences is a worthy one:

> 'At times the book [*Language—The loaded weapon*] sounds like Hayakawa's *Language in action*—and in fact Bolinger is one of the few linguists I know of who has discussed Hayakawa's work seriously. The difference is that Bolinger never lost faith that the remedy for abuses of speech was more speech. He wrote that people had to reassert the public ownership of language; ... [it should] "take its place alongside of diet, traffic safety, and the cost of living as something that everybody thinks about and talks about."
>
> 'I don't know why Bolinger's popular writings never got the attention that Hayakawa's

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0097850793032035 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Language in action did. Maybe it's because he lacked Hayakawa's gifts as a controversialist. It would be hard to imagine him interrupting somebody he disagreed with, much less pulling the plug on them. Nor was he much of a hand at the keening derision of the pop grammarians. He did the best he could with civility and good sense, and I suppose he won as large a readership as he could have reasonably expected. Maybe every age gets the linguists it deserves.'

In the end, one must say of Dwight Bolinger as Chaucer did of the Clerk of Oxford, 'And gladly wolde he lerne and gladly teche'. It has been said of others in our time, but never more deservedly. [ROBERT P. STOCKWELL, *UCLA*.]

SELECTED PUBLICATIONS OF DWIGHT L. BOLINGER

A full bibliography assembled by Bolinger himself was published in 1991 (in *Essays on Spanish: Words and grammar*, item E319 below). It contains 312 entries, the latest dated 1989. Section E below is numbered to complete that list, including everything that appeared between 1989 and 1992, together with four items that are forthcoming.

The main body of publications listed below (sections A through D) includes all of his scholarly books and four textbooks, along with a selection of what I view as being his most representative research papers. All his papers are being housed as the Dwight L. Bolinger Papers in the special collections section of the Stanford University Library, available there to any scholar desiring access.

A. INTONATION:

(53) 1945. The minimizing downskip. American Speech 20.40–45.
(71) 1948. The intonation of accosting questions. English Studies 29.109–14.
(88) 1951. Intonation: Levels versus configurations. Word 7.199–210.
(110) 1955. The melody of language. Modern Language Forum 40.19–30.
(113) 1955. Intersections of stress and intonation. Word 11.195–203.
(121) 1957. English stress: The interpenetration of strata. The study of sounds, 295–315. Tokyo: Phonetic Society of Japan.
(126) 1957. Disjuncture as a cue to constructs. (With Louis J. Gerstman.) Word 13.246–55.
(127) 1957. On certain functions of accents A and B. Litera 4.80–89.
(130) 1958. A theory of pitch accent in English. Word 14.109–49.
(210) 1972. Accent is predictable (if you're a mind-reader). Language 48.633–44.
(212) 1972. Intonation: Selected readings. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.
(249) 1978. Intonation across languages. Universals of human language, vol. 2, Phonology, ed. by Joseph H. Greenberg, 471–524. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
(279) 1982. Intonation and its parts. Language 58:505–33.
(284) 1983. Intonation and gesture. American Speech 58.156–74.
(290) 1985. Two views of accent. Journal of Linguistics 21:79–123.
(294) 1986. Intonation and its parts: Melody in spoken English. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
(311) 1989. Intonation and its uses: Melody in grammar and discourse. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

B. ENGLISH SYNTAX AND SEMANTICS:

(128) 1957. Interrogative structures of American English. Publication of the American Dialect Society #28. University, AL: University of Alabama Press.
(148) 1961. Syntactic blends and other matters. Language 37.366–81.
(165) 1965. Forms of English: Accent, morpheme, order. Ed. by Isamu Abe and Tetsuya Kanekiyo. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press and Tokyo: Hokuou.
(169) 1965. The atomization of meaning. Language 41.555–73.
(175) 1967. Adjectives in English: Attribution and predication. Lingua 18.1–34.
(177) 1967. The imperative in English. To honor Roman Jakobson, ed. by Morris Halle, Horace G. Lunt, Hugh McLean, and Cornelis H. van Schooneveld, 335–62. The Hague: Mouton.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0097850793032035 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(201) 1971. Semantic overloading: A restudy of the verb *remind*. Language 47.522–47.
(203) 1971. The phrasal verb in English. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
(204) 1972. That's that. The Hague: Mouton.
(211) 1972. Degree words. The Hague: Mouton.
(248) 1978. Asking more than one thing at a time. Questions, ed. by Henry Hiz, 107–50. Dordrecht: Reidel.

C. Spanish syntax and semantics:

(73) 1948. Intensive Spanish. Philadelphia: Russell Press.
(80) 1950. The comparison of inequality in Spanish. Language 26.28–62.
(107) 1954. Meaningful word order in Spanish. Boletín de filología 8.45–56. Santiago: University of Chile.
(115) 1956. Spanish review grammar. New York: Holt.
(135) 1960. Modern Spanish. (With J. Donald Bowen, Agnes M. Brady, Ernest F. Haden, Lawrence Poston, Jr., and Norman P. Sacks.) New York: Harcourt, Brace & World.

D. Style, usage, and general linguistics:

(92) 1952. Linear modification. PMLA 67.1117–1144.
(139) 1960. Linguistic science and linguistic engineering. Word 16.374–91.
(140) 1961. Generality, gradience, and the all-or-none. The Hague: Mouton.
(181, 228, 266) 1968[1], 1975[2], 1980[3]. Aspects of language. New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich.
(217) 1973. Truth is a linguistic question. Language 49.539–50.
(241) 1977. Meaning and form. London & New York: Longman.
(262) 1980. Language—The loaded weapon. London & New York: Longman.

E. Supplement to Bolinger 1991 (E319):

(313) 1988. Reiconization. World Englishes 7.237–42.
(314) 1989. Review of Refurbishing our foundations, by Charles F. Hockett. Language 65.602–6.
(315) 1990. Accent in prototypical 'Wh' questions. Meanings and prototypes: Studies in linguistic categorization, ed. by Savas L. Tsohatzidis, 307–14. London & New York: Routledge.
(316) 1990. Review of Oxford advanced learner's dictionary of current English, by A. S. Hornby. International Journal of Lexicography 3.133–45.
(317) 1990. The Doolittling of English. English Today 22.25–28.
(318) 1990. Re-marking the English reciprocal: Commutation versus mutuality. Development and diversity: Language variation across time and space, ed. by Jerold A. Edmonson, Crawford Feagin, and Peter Mühlhaüsler, 265–72. Dallas, TX: Summer Institute of Linguistics.
(319) 1991. Essays on Spanish: Words and grammar. Ed. by Joseph H. Silverman. Newark, DE: Juan de la Cuesta Hispanic Monographs. (Reprint of earlier collection of papers with new introductions to them by Bolinger.)
(320) 1991. The dimensions of accent. Pragmatics and language learning, ed. by Lawrence F. Bouton and Yamuna Kachru, 9–28. Urbana-Champaign: University of Illinois Press.
(321) 1991. Accent on *one*: Entity and identity. Journal of Pragmatics 15.225–35.
(322) 1991. Among the new words: Looking back. In Among the new words, by John Algeo and Adele Algeo. American Speech 66.77–9.
(323) 1991. First person, not singular. First person singular II, ed. by Konrad Koerner, 21–45. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
(324) 1991. The teaching of intonation: Classroom experiences to theoretical models. (With Ann Cesaris.) Crosscurrents in second language acquisition and linguistic theories, ed. by Thom Huebner and Charles A. Ferguson, 291–303. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
(325) 1991. Sound symbolism. Oxford international encyclopedia of linguistics, ed. by William O. Bright, vol. IV, 28–30. New York: Oxford University Press.
(326) 1992. About furniture and birds. Cognitive Linguistics 3.111–17.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0097850793032035 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(327) 1992. Adverbial nouns in English and Spanish. Scripta philologica in honorem Juan M. Lope Blanch, 21–41. Mexico, D. F., Instituto de investigaciones filológicas, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de Mexico II.
(328) 1992. 'Born to speak' and 'Some traits of language', Chapters 1 and 2 of Aspects of Language, ed. with Japanese annotations by Masachiyo Amano and Akira Murata. Tokyo: The Eihosha Ltd.
(329) 1992. Shifts of attachment. Language and civilization: A concerted profusion of essays and studies in honour of Otto Hietsch, ed. by Claudia Blank. 594–98. Frankfurt: Peter Lang.
(330) Forthcoming. Meaning. An encyclopaedia of the linguistic sciences, ed. by V. Prakasam. Allied Publishers, Ltd: New Delhi.
(331) Forthcoming. The double triangle: Two kinds of vowels in English. The sounds of American English (Publication of the American Dialect Society, 79), ed. by Arthur J. Bronstein.
(332) 1992. The role of accent in extraposition and focus. Studies in Language 16.2.
(333) Forthcoming. Oddments of English. Journal of English Linguistics.
(334) 1979.[2] White sail (a poem). Linguistic muse, ed. by Donna Jo Napoli. Carbondale, IL: Linguistic Research Institute.
(335) 1992. Three days as a vagrant in the Panhandle. Amarillo, TX: Amarillo Globe-News, December 8, 9, 10, 1992.

REFERENCES

ALGEO, JOHN, and ADELE ALGEO. 1991. Among the new words. American Speech 66: 1.71–81.
BOLINGER, DWIGHT L. 1937. The living language. Words 3:6.133.
——. 1972. The syntax of *parecer*. Papers in linguistics and phonetics to the memory of Pierre Delattre, ed. by Albert Valdman, 65–76. The Hague: Mouton.
GEIS, MICHAEL. 1979. Review of Meaning and form, by Dwight L. Bolinger. Lg. 55.684–87.
LADD, D. ROBERT. 1987. Review of Intonation and its parts, by Dwight L. Bolinger. Lg. 63.637–43.
——. 1990. Intonation: Emotion vs. grammar. Review article on Intonation and its uses, by Dwight L. Bolinger. Lg. 66. 806–17.
LIBERMAN, MARK. 1974. The intonational system of English. Cambridge, MA: MIT dissertation.
PIERREHUMBERT, JANET. 1980. The phonology and phonetics of English intonation. Cambridge, MA: MIT dissertation.
QUIRK, RANDOLPH. 1981. Review of Language: The loaded weapon, by Dwight L. Bolinger. London Review of Books, 19 February 1981.21.
SAMPSON, GEOFFREY. 1981. Quin quereme. New studies in modern languages 4.269–70.

Department of Linguistics
UCLA
Los Angeles, CA 90024

[Received 15 July 1992;
revision received 20 October 1992.]

[2] This item is out of chronological order because it came to the attention of both Bruce Bolinger and myself after the numbering of the papers in Dwight Bolinger's own list was fixed by virtue of having been published in item 319.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0097850793032035 Published online by Cambridge University Press