HENRY MAX HOENIGSWALD

Henry Hoenigswald (1915–2003) was one of the many refugees from Germany who arrived in the United States in the late 1930s and succeeded in finding their way into the academic world of their new country. The start was not auspicious. Henry's university education (in Germany, Switzerland, and Italy) had been continuously interrupted through no wish of his own. When he left Europe in 1939 he was only twenty-four, and for his first several years in the US held a series of temporary positions. In 1948, however, he was appointed to an associate professorship at the University of Pennsylvania, which was to become his permanent home.

From that moment onward, his career was accompanied by success and recognition: he became a full professor in 1959 and chaired his department from 1963 to 1970; he was Collitz Professor at the Georgetown Summer Institute (1955), and president of the LSA (1958) and of the American Oriental Society (1966–67); he was elected to membership in the American Philosophical Society (1971), the American Academy of Arts and Sciences (1974), the National Academy of Sciences (1988) and to a corresponding fellowship of the British Academy (1986), and held a number of visiting professorships in Europe and America; he received honorary doctorates from Swarthmore College (1981) and the University of Pennsylvania (1988); and for his seventieth birthday he was presented with an important festschrift edited by George Cardona and Norman Zide (1987), and in 1986 an issue of the *Journal of the American Oriental Society* (106.2) was dedicated to him. This reads like an academic rags-to-riches story. In fact, there is more to it, but the sequence of events cannot be ignored. Henry's intellectual development and achievements make better sense if looked at in the context of the political situation of the period, his family circumstances, and the position of linguistics in the United States and in Europe in the late 1930s and 1940s.[1]

[1] What follows is based on disparate sources. There are in print at least three different (brief) accounts by Henry himself of his thought and biography: Hoenigswald 1980, 1991, and Swiggers 1997. Hoenigswald 1997 is what Henry wrote (with many hesitations) about his father for a symposium about him; Hoenigswald 1999 is another brief and poignant note by Henry about his father prepared for the publication of Richard Hönigswald's correspondence with his unfortunate and courageous friend, the theologian Ernst Lohnmeyer (Otto 1999). Hallett et al. 2002 includes a brief account by Henry of his wife's life. Henry's CV and list of publications are kept in the archives of the American Philosophical Society in Philadelphia; I have been able to use this material through the kindness of Professor Martin Ostwald, one of Henry's closest friends, to whom we also owe a brief personal memoir for the American Philological Association (Ostwald 2003). A list of publications from 1937 to 1999 was kept online by the University of Texas but is no longer maintained; a list through 1985 is printed in Cardona & Zide 1987. Thanks to Henry's daughters, I have also seen some notes by Henry about his family. Hoenigswald 2004a,b, and Hoenigswald & Woodard 2004 appeared posthumously. Henry's friend and colleague George Cardona gives a detailed account of Henry's life and works in his impressive memoir for the National Academy of Sciences (Cardona 2007); a shorter warm account by his old student George Dunkel, now professor in Zurich, appeared in *Kratylos* in 2007. For the rest I have depended on personal memories and correspondence (I first met Henry in 1961), and on the extensive literature on Richard Hönigswald (e.g. Grassl 1998). Grassl & Richart-Willmes 1997 has on the cover a touching photograph of the boy Henry in a sailor suit together with his father. A memorial meeting was held at the University of Pennsylvania in September 2003 and I have reproduced here parts

https://doi.org/10.1353/lan.0.0068 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Perhaps we may start from the end or, rather, the middle. By the late 1960s Henry was considered one of the main exponents of historical linguistics in the US. But the term needs definition. There was a long tradition of Indo-European studies in Europe that went back to the nineteenth century, when the first chairs of *Vergleichende Sprachwissenschaft* and then *Indogermanische Sprachwissenschaft* were created in Germany. In the US scholars like William Dwight Whitney at Yale (1827–1894) absorbed that tradition, as did in the next generation Benjamin Ide Wheeler at Cornell and then Berkeley (1854–1927) and Maurice Bloomfield at Johns Hopkins (1855–1928), who also had German training. Even Edward Sapir and Leonard Bloomfield were trained in Germanic philology and Indo-European and absorbed most of their views about historical linguistics from that tradition. But all of these scholars produced work that is recognizably different from that of their European counterparts, starting with Whitney, whose books had a more descriptive and theoretical aspect and were influential both on the next German generation and on the young Ferdinand de Saussure. Yet in Germany, until the Second World War at least, the traditional comparative grammar of Indo-European dominated; the type of formal linguistics developed in eastern Europe had little or no influence, and the same could be said of Saussure's *Cours* (Hoenigswald 1991:9). The emphasis was on the reconstruction of the parent language and on the technical analysis of later developments; textbooks about *Laut- und Formenlehre* of the various Indo-European languages multiplied. There were, of course, more general or methodological discussions, but, after the neogrammarian revolution of the 1870s, they were of secondary importance in the standard academic set up. Idealism, whatever form it took, was more associated with Romance than with Indo-European, and its impact was limited.

The success of Indo-European studies was both understandable and legitimate. It was supported by the spectacular results that the subject had had and continued to have: the discovery of a method that allowed linguists to define language families and to analyze their history, or to reconstruct through comparison both the main features of a parent language that had never been recorded and the way in which its development had occurred. But it was also made possible by the education system of Germany and other European countries. Genealogical comparison and reconstruction naturally depended on the study of the earliest phases of the languages compared, and the traditional teaching of the German Gymnasium guaranteed the learning of the classical languages, that is, of some of the most ancient evidence needed for the comparison and reconstruction of Indo-European. In this context it is less surprising, perhaps, that as a schoolboy Henry was in a position to develop an interest in Indo-European reconstruction. As he reported himself, he had a school teacher who knew something about Indo-European, and what he heard induced him to buy a short historical grammar of Greek. And one year he was given Karl Brugmann's *Kurze Vergleichende Grammatik* (first edn. 1904) as a birthday gift, a highly technical book that discussed the reconstructed forms of Indo-European and their development into the eight branches of the family that were known at the time (Indo-Aryan, Armenian, Greek, Albanian, Italic, Celtic, Germanic, and Balto-Slavic). After that he knew that he 'wanted to be a classicist, or, even better, a linguist' (Hoenigswald 1980:23).

---

of what I said then. I am also writing a shorter account that will appear in the *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* and will use parts of the same material, especially in the final section.

I must apologize for the delay with which this memoir appears; for a number of years I found it impossible to write with the required objectivity about two persons, Gabi and Henry, who belonged to a different generation but were my closest friends.

https://doi.org/10.1353/lan.0.0068 Published online by Cambridge University Press

This statement confirms what we would have known anyway: for the German teenager in 1930 or thereabouts, to be a linguist meant to be an Indo-Europeanist. Indeed, this is what Henry became, and Indo-European reconstruction and classical linguistics or philology were subjects that remained very close to his heart and to which he returned again and again with remarkable results. Of some 150 papers that he published, almost 40 percent concern Greek, Italic, Indo-Iranian, or reconstructed Proto-Indo-European (to the branches of which we need to add Etruscan). The majority (c. 46 percent), however, concern general questions of historical linguistics or, less frequently, the history of linguistics. He also wrote more than 100 reviews, which again show a very slight preponderance of general subjects. There is no doubt that Henry's wider reputation was based on his work in the theory of historical linguistics, but his substantive work was equally appreciated. Two things then need to be explained: First, how could a schoolboy be fascinated by a reference book that most people would call as dry as dust? Second, why was someone trained as a classicist and Indo-Europeanist induced to move toward uncharted territories while not abandoning, and indeed being very successful at, his original vocation?

We may start with the first question. The teenager's background was not entirely usual. The family had complex multilingual origins, as was common in the Jewish (and sometimes non-Jewish) families of the Austro-Hungarian empire. Henry knew of a great grandfather Josef Hönigswald (1815–1852), perhaps of Bohemian (i.e. Czech) origin, who was an innkeeper in Oroszvár (Karlburg) in Hungary and was said to have died in indigence of scurvy. His son Heinrich (1842–1909) managed to escape from poverty and study medicine (the standard Jewish profession) at Vienna; he then became a doctor and health officer in Ungarisch-Altenburg (Magyaróvar), where clearly he belonged to the circle of notables that included the local abbot. He married a Jewish girl, Marie Goldberg (1844–1913), from Komorn (now Komárno), whose brother was also a doctor, and we know that Heinrich was a well-read, liberal, internationally minded man who, however, never succeeded in learning Hungarian well.

Heinrich and Marie had two sons, only one of whom survived: Richard Hönigswald (1875–1947). Richard, whose German always had an Austrian tinge and who knew Hungarian well, became a productive and famous neo-Kantian philosopher. Jewish orthodoxy cannot have been very strong in the family, since Richard was educated first with the Piarist Friars in Altenburg and then with the Benedictine fathers in Györ (Raab). He too studied medicine in Vienna and completed his qualifications and his doctorate in this field in 1902. But in spite of this long apprenticeship he never practiced except for a period of compulsory hospital service during the First World War. Immediately after receiving his medical doctorate, Richard moved to Germany and matriculated in the university of Halle-Wittenberg, where he obtained a doctorate in philosophy magna cum laude in 1904. Three events followed: his marriage (soon dissolved) to a cousin; his acceptance into the reformed evangelical church (probably necessary for anyone who aimed at an academic career); and his move first to Graz and a year later to Breslau (Wrocław), which at the time was part of Prussia and of Germany, though at some stage it had had a Polish-speaking population.

At the University of Breslau Richard started teaching even before obtaining the venia legendi in philosophy, which he received in 1906 for a work entitled *Beiträge zur Erkenntnistheorie und Methodenlehre*. Teaching continued, but in spite of his successes both in teaching and research he had to wait until 1916 to become Professor Extraordinarius. Meanwhile, in 1914 he married one of his students, the eighteen-years-younger Gertrud Grunwald, the daughter of Max Grunwald, a judge from a Silesian family that had a wine business. She must have been a progressive young woman, with a strong

https://doi.org/10.1353/lan.0.0068 Published online by Cambridge University Press

interest in the history of art, having studied in both Breslau and Freiburg im Breisgau, an emancipated, well-read, arts-and-crafts person. A few months after the marriage, Gertrud converted to the reformed evangelical faith, and four months later Richard, together with his wife, applied for citizenship. This was first refused on the grounds that Richard was of Jewish descent and too old to do military service, but was eventually granted (March 17, 1915) under pressure from the university.

On April 17, 1915, the couple's first and only child, Heinrich Max Franz Hönigswald, was born; the name Henry Hoenigswald to which we are accustomed dates from the move to the United States in 1939. On the same day that Henry was born, his father was called for war service in the Breslau hospital, though this did not prevent him from continuing to teach at the university. Unfortunately, the years of Richard and Gertrud's marital happiness were cut short. In 1921, at the age of 27, Gertrud died of lung tuberculosis, having been sick for only a few weeks. Heinrich was just six at the time, and as all the grandparents were dead, Richard looked after the child himself with the help of a cook and a maid. The other surviving relatives were either geographically or emotionally remote, and for the child the loneliness must have been overpowering, though he did not complain and tried to conceal the problems from his father.

As Henry put it much later, Richard was spectacularly successful. His courses between 1906 and 1930 covered a very wide range of topics—history of philosophy, ancient philosophy, logic, psychology, epistemology, Leibniz, Spinoza, Hobbes and political philosophy, Kant, philosophy of science, pedagogy, and so on (Grassl 1998)—and began to attract students not only from Breslau but also from other universities. He clearly had great charisma, and he attracted a following of devoted students (Hoenigswald 1997:429). He published works on epistemology, linguistic philosophy, the foundations of mathematics, and the history of philosophy, and they reveal an astonishing productivity. In 1929, after twenty-three years in Breslau, he received an immensely prestigious call to the chair of philosophy in Munich; the final short list included him, Ernst Cassirer, and Nikolai Hartmann. Richard moved there with his son in 1930. In that same year he also married for the third time, again to a Breslau student, Hilde Bohn, who was thirty years his junior.

At this stage Heinrich was fifteen and had been educated in Breslau at the Johannes Gymnasium, a municipal foundation for boys that had a tradition of liberal scholarship and where there was a number of Jewish students. Heinrich moved to a Humanistisches Gymnasium in Munich in 1930, and here he made friends, was appreciated, and obtained the Abitur with distinction in 1932. He had long known what he wanted to do and joined Munich University with, as his father put it, the old, absolutely fixed plan to study comparative linguistics (Otto 1999:51f.); in his first semester his courses were in German syntax, Hittite, Etruscan, and Latin.

Let us now return to my first question. Clearly, Henry's childhood and education were not entirely run of the mill. While the extended family may not have made much impact on him, it was a multilingual, multinational Jewish family that had moved from business or manual work to medicine and from there to academe. His mother's death when he was a child must have made him more of an introverted, thoughtful child than he would have been otherwise. The ties with his famous father were incredibly strong. In his correspondence, Richard again and again refers to the teenager's linguistic interests but also to his ability to understand the transcendental problem (e.g. Otto 1999: 42f.), to follow his father's philosophical endeavors (ibid., 52), and to discuss anything that was of interest to him. Richard also counts Heinrich as his best friend, 'mein Stolz und mein Glück' (ibid., 40). It is striking to hear that before his third marriage, he had

https://doi.org/10.1353/lan.0.0068 Published online by Cambridge University Press

asked Henry, who must have been thirteen or fourteen at the time, for his advice (ibid., 40). It is impossible to doubt the reciprocal devotion that joined father and son, but the atmosphere cannot have been 'normal' for a growing boy. In Richard's letters we read of Henry's reading, studying, and visiting museums (ibid., 37); and Henry remembered that his father would take or send him to the opera, beginning with six hours of Meistersinger when he was nine. The impression one gains is of an intellectual hothouse where the standard boyish amusements were certainly not forbidden but probably not thought of and consequently not encouraged.

We cannot know, of course, why linguistics became the chosen subject, but in this context the excitement provoked by his birthday gift of Brugmann's book is less surprising; reading every type of work, however technical, must have been part of Henry's daily life. At school he was learning the classical languages, and a technical grammar of Indo-European, just like a historical grammar of Greek, made sense of the language rules that at the time were the fundamental part of classical learning. There was more: the book appeared to provide a methodology for further work that had a sort of mathematical rigor, that is to say the sort of rigor that later appealed so much to both Henry and his colleague Zellig Harris.

Munich life must have been interesting, and both the father, with his new wife, and the son, with his new level of independence, no doubt enjoyed it. In the one year he had at the university, Henry was able to follow the courses of Ferdinand Sommer, a well-known Indo-Europeanist, classicist, and Hittitologist, and those of a young Privatdozentin, Eva Fiesel, who was becoming an authority in Etruscology. His contemporaries included the somewhat older Ernst Risch, who was to become professor at Zurich and a life-long friend. This situation did not last, though nobody could have predicted how quickly it was to change. In April 1933 a new law established that all civil servants of non-Aryan origin had to be dismissed or sent into compulsory retirement. University professors were civil servants, and thus the law applied to Richard Hönigswald, in spite of his conversion. An attempt to give him exceptional status was supported by a number of colleagues in Germany and abroad but rejected by others, including Martin Heidegger. The outcome was predictable: *zwangsweise Ruhestandsversetzung*. Richard was debarred from teaching and pensioned in September 1933. Eva Fiesel, who was not a professor, was simply dismissed. Students and colleagues mounted a protest courageously supported by Sommer, but it was in vain.

Henry could not continue to study at a German university, so he found his way to Zurich, where for a year he was welcomed by Manu Leumann, an eminent classicist and Indo-Europeanist who also had more general interests; there he met again Ernst Risch. But this arrangement was only temporary. Henry never spoke of his pre-war trials, but I once met him in Zurich in 1992 looking grim, while staring at a view of the city from a panoramic spot. A very rare outburst followed: he had come to the same spot on the day in 1934 that he was told that he would not be allowed to remain in Switzerland any longer. The country needed to preserve its neutrality, but Henry's world was falling down around him. His next stop was Padua, where Giacomo Devoto, trained in Germany and France, was professor of *glottologia* and worked in Indo-European, Italic, and the history of the Italian language. Henry learned Italian, and he followed Devoto to Florence in 1935. In 1936 he finally managed to take his first degree, the Italian *laurea* or doctorate, which required four years of training and a short dissertation. Henry wrote about the history of Greek word formation, a subject that belonged very much in the tradition of the Zurich school. The thesis was never published (as is customary for the Italian *tesi di laurea*), but Henry's first three articles (in Italian)

https://doi.org/10.1353/lan.0.0068 Published online by Cambridge University Press

published in 1937 and 1938 dealt with the same subject, as did his first English article (Hoenigswald 1940).

At the time Italy had no extensive graduate programs, but Henry was able to stay at Florence University for another year while taking a *Corso di perfezionamento*, that is, writing some more advanced work. At the same time, no doubt on Devoto's recommendation, he was hired on the staff of the Istituto di Studi Etruschi (now Istituto Nazionale di Studi Etruschi e Italici) where he worked from 1936 to 1938; his first article on Etruscan punctuation appeared in 1939 in *Studi Etruschi*, the periodical of the institute. But by that time, the Italo-German axis was having its effect, and Mussolini began to encourage antisemitism. In July 1938 the so-called *Manifesto della Razza* discriminated against all non-Aryan Italians; in September a decree expelled all Jewish foreigners from Italy. The fact that both Henry's parents had converted did not help, and once again he had to prepare to depart—this time returning to Germany, since there was nowhere else he could go while trying to obtain entry to the US.

Meanwhile, things in Germany had worsened. Not much more than a year after Richard had been debarred from teaching, his wife gave birth to a daughter Gertrud (now Trudy Glucksberg), who was born nineteen years after Henry. Richard had kept writing and two books were published in Switzerland, but after that his works remained unpublished; he could not teach, and only very few people had the courage to keep in touch. In 1938 he was deprived of his doctorate; and after Kristallnacht he was arrested and sent to Dachau, a concentration camp. He had tried for six years prior to this time to get an entry permit to the United States without success, but (largely thanks to his wife) an entry permit finally became possible and he received an invitation from the University of Scranton in Pennsylvania, which apparently led to his release after a month of captivity. He thus survived Dachau, having lost thirty pounds of weight in a month. Three months later, together with his wife, son, and daughter, he left Germany (and all that he possessed) to move to Switzerland, where friends had offered to support them for a few months while they recovered and before they left for the US. They eventually reached New York in June 1939. Henry had to remain in Switzerland with an extended visitor visa, while he pulled out all stops to obtain a permit to enter the US; he finally succeeded and landed in New York in October 1939. Being in the US meant safety but also a fairly miserable existence; they lived on the money earned by Richard's wife, who initially made small dolls. The immediate family was safe, but they were cut off from friends and the rest of the extended family until the end of the war. A list that Henry made later of the relatives whom he had either met or knew of includes six names with the simple gloss 'murdered'.

Henry found a position for a while at Yale as research assistant to Edgar Sturtevant, a distinguished Indo-Europeanist; he was also at different times lecturer and instructor there (1939–42, 1944–45). There followed from 1942 a series of temporary appointments: lecturer, instructor at Hartford Seminary Foundation (1942–43, 1945–46); lecturer at Hunter College (1942–43, 1946); lecturer in charge of Army specialized training at the University of Pennsylvania (1943–44); and P-4, Foreign Service Institute in the Department of State (1946–47). In 1947–48 he held an associate professorship at the University of Texas at Austin, and in 1948–49 he returned to Philadelphia as associate professor at the University of Pennsylvania. At this point, nine years after he had reached the US, he could feel that the horrors were over. There is a copy of a brief note to Bernard Bloch dated October 25, 1948, with an unqualified statement: 'Things here are going wonderfully'.

https://doi.org/10.1353/lan.0.0068 Published online by Cambridge University Press

And yet not everything was cheerful: in 1947 he had lost his father. Richard had never really come to terms with America, even though he took American citizenship in 1944. At the start he did not speak English and could not teach, his link with Scranton University was only nominal and short lived, and though he kept writing he did so in German and remained isolated—Henry must have been one of the rare interlocutors. Richard died shortly before his seventy-second birthday while visiting his son in New Haven. At least he had the satisfaction of knowing that in Munich there were unofficial plans afoot to call him back, plans that he intended to reject on personal and factual grounds (Grassl 1998:239). Years later German philosophers developed a considerable interest in his work; ten volumes of his Nachlass were published between 1957 and 1977, and there is now an extensive and increasing secondary literature about his thought as well as some reprints of earlier work (see Grassl 1998, Grassl & Richart-Willmes 1997, Schmied-Kowarzik 1997).

On the positive side, the thirty-three-year-old Henry felt that he was safe; he too had become an American citizen in 1945, his career was progressing well, and he now had a family of his own. In 1944 he had married Gabrielle (Gabi) Schöpflich (1912–2001). Gabi too came from Munich, though she had also studied at Berlin; like Henry she had had to leave Munich, where she was studying classics, and had moved to Italy. They had again overlapped in Florence: when Henry was working with the linguist Giacomo Devoto, Gabi was working with the classicist Giorgio Pasquali—both to be counted among the very best Italian scholars of the time. She took her first degree in classics at Florence in 1935 and then earned her living teaching at a school for German refugees. Like Henry, she was expelled from Italy and had to return to Germany. In 1940 she eventually reached New York, where she earned enough as a cleaning woman to survive, until she obtained a scholarship to do an M.A. at Bryn Mawr. After her marriage to Henry, she alternated school teaching and part-time university teaching and research in classics (at Swarthmore, Bryn Mawr, and the University of Pennsylvania) while bringing up their two daughters, Frances and Ann (Hallett et al. 2002). She and Henry shared a world of scholarship, general culture, and political views. Much later both of them relished their frequent contacts with their grandchildren, Ann's two sons. For all those who knew them, Henry was unthinkable without Gabi and vice versa.

I doubt that before his return to Philadelphia Henry felt sufficiently secure from a personal point of view; intellectually, it was a different story. Excitement and contentment—the two things are not in contradiction—must have set in much earlier at Yale. Some forty years later Henry tried to describe the feeling of acquired freedom and safety together with the excitement of the new approaches and new learning that he encountered when he arrived at New Haven:

> Quite aside from the inextricable connection (for me) with my escape to personal freedom, I wish I could convey the headiness of the experience—no amount of picture-painting of my old-world inter-war background as I have attempted it can describe it. Some of the exhilaration, of course, we all shared. I wouldn't have had the courage of Arch Hill to quote Wordsworth to the effect that to be young in that dawn was very heaven, but the feeling is just about right; and if it was more pronounced for some more than for others, I must have been near the top. (Hoenigswald 1980:25)

Still later, speaking in German at a meeting in honor of his late father, he commented:

> In his last years he did me the undeserved honour to discuss with me language and linguistics. This was at a time when I was granted the equally undeserved and unbelievable luck to breathe for the first time the air of American linguistics—exactly in the historical moment when it was going through its maximum flowering. I was, in other words, 'des Gottes voll'. (Hoenigswald 1997:431)

https://doi.org/10.1353/lan.0.0068 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Here we have the answer to my second question: what prompted Henry to develop an interest in the theory of historical linguistics? Of course, it might have happened anyway. Contact with his father had made Henry more than aware of theory and methodology, but it is striking that in spite of his father's statements he always protested that he had no serious understanding of Richard's philosophy or indeed of philosophy in general. He turned to theory because of the all-powerful effect of his first encounter with American structuralism and indeed with American linguistic thinking. He knew he was fortunate in having Yale as his first port of call in the US, and for Yale all through his life he kept a form of loyalty and affection that was matched only by what he felt for the University of Pennsylvania. At Yale he found active and eminent Indo-Europeanists like Franklin Edgerton, the Sanskritist, Edgar Sturtevant, and Albrecht Goetze, the Assyriologist and Hittitologist. Eduard Prokosch, the Germanist, had died in 1938 but his memory was still alive. Even more important, Yale was becoming a major center of linguistic thinking. Edward Sapir had taught there from 1931 until his premature death in February 1939, and his presence was still felt and his students were still there; Leonard Bloomfield arrived in 1940, and scholars like Mary Haas and George Trager worked there; Benjamin Lee Whorf was a frequent visitor; and Bernard Bloch was hired in 1943, and he and Henry became firm friends. There was, on the one hand, solid work in the old tradition—with some considerable originality and awareness of new data and new findings, and on the other, fieldwork and concern with a series of descriptive problems that merged with theoretical and methodological problems as they did, for example, in Bloomfield. For the newly arrived Henry, fieldwork, description, and theory were all new. For a thoughtful man who had concentrated on technical Indo-European work, it must have felt as if the world expanded under his eyes. Just as all physical constraints and fears had been removed, intellectual constraints or limitations also disappeared. Decades later Henry reminisced (1991:10):

> Bloomfield . . . was a theorist of an entirely new kind, and he had a deep understanding of our scholarly past. His impact was overwhelming, and it was from him (and from others somewhat like him) that I learned what I know of my trade. This is why I could not begin to pass myself off as an émigré emissary of the old-world tradition in classics. I wish I could. I admire it.

There was neither rejection of, nor loss of interest in, the old linguistic work; on the contrary, there was the realization that that too fitted into a larger program: 'what was exciting beyond words was the way in which old things fell into place' (Hoenigswald 1980:25). General questions needed to be asked and answered, but how was this to be done?

In those Yale years Henry discovered phonetics, phonemics, and the anthropological approach to linguistics; he sat in on Bloomfield's seminar on Menomini and became excited about morphophonemics, but he also read seriously Bloomfield's *Language* and concentrated on the historical part, asking himself what it was that historical linguists were really doing. Later he referred to the 'overwhelming influence of Bloomfield', whom he considered his 'teacher-guide and inspiration' (Swiggers 1997:42): 'I got my real introduction to linguistics—my ideas, if I may call them that—from Bloomfield and from the whole Bloomfield atmosphere which at the time dominated the United States' (ibid.).

Of course, even if he had wanted to, Henry could not have remained a pure Indo-Europeanist. He had to teach a fairly wide range of subjects, and for the war work he wrote two volumes of a basic course in spoken Hindustani (Hoenigswald 1945–47). After he came to know Paul Thieme, the Sanskritist who taught at Yale from 1954 to 1960, he loved to reminisce (with amusement and no bitterness) that what he did for

https://doi.org/10.1353/lan.0.0068 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the American troops, Thieme did for the German army. Nor was Henry considered a pure historical linguist. Many years after he had left, he was invited back to Yale in 1961–62 to teach in two successive semesters graduate courses in phonetics and phonemics—theory and description, no history.

Perhaps the clearest statement of how Henry saw himself in the 1940s and 1950s came from Henry himself, in the long interview/discussion with Pierre Swiggers that was published in a supplement to *Orbis* in 1997:

> At that time it was mainly a question of generations; the older people didn't get interested in what was innovated and the innovators were not interested in the existing work, that also has to be said—that's part of it. I was probably one of the few who tried to understand both. (Swiggers 1997:55)

In the decade after his arrival in the US we begin to see in Henry's published work both the continuation of the old philological interests and the appearance of the new concerns. Together with articles about Etruscan, Italic, and Latin, and an article on Hindi (clearly the product of his teaching for the government), there are contributions to *Studies in Linguistics*, the somewhat maverick mimeographed periodical started by George Trager, that concern internal reconstruction or sound change; and after a first article in *Language* (1940) about Greek compounds (again a Leumann-like subject discussed very much as Leumann would have done and with equal brilliance), we find in *Language* two very different articles, one about sound change (1946) and one about the comparative method (1950). This is the new Henry, who goes even further than the papers in *Studies in Linguistics*, and is very much the same person who will go on to write the book on *Language change and linguistic reconstruction* (1960).

The first article is an attempt at a classification of sound change that does not appeal to causes, as was customary at the time, and consequently avoids the risk of getting into a vicious circle, where the classification is justified by the causes and the identification of the causes is based on the classification. Instead, Henry classifies sound change according to the effect it has on the structure of the language; first he distinguishes between nonphonemic change and phonemic change, and then he defines the latter further: phonemic change with no loss of contrast, unconditioned merger with loss of contrast, conditioned merger with loss of contrast, and so forth. Most of this is now commonplace, but it was not at the time; indeed the very fact of distinguishing between contrasting sounds and sounds in complementary distribution when studying Indo-European or even the classical languages was practically unheard of. Martinet's work, which is very different but shares some of the same assumptions, belongs in the mid-1950s. Also new was one of the final observations: we are told that the proposed 'analysis of sound changes and their effect on the pattern of a language rests on such general linguistic assumptions as the regularity of phonetic change and the phonemic principle, and is therefore believed to be applicable to any kind of language structure' (Hoenigswald 1946:142). Claims to universality had been made throughout the history of Indo-European studies, but they were normally justified on the basis of somewhat nebulous metaphysical principles or of an inadequate inductive typology. Here we have a far more explicit statement. There is more. Henry's article appeared in an issue of *Language* (222) dedicated to Sturtevant where, predictably, the vast majority of articles were concrete examples of historical research; the exceptions were two descriptive articles about the phonemes of Sanskrit (by Murray B. Emeneau) and those of Serbo-Croatian (by Carleton Hodge). Henry's article on sound change and linguistic structure was entirely sui generis.

https://doi.org/10.1353/lan.0.0068 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Henry's new style is even more obvious—and there is more self awareness—in the 1950 article, also published in *Language*, on 'The principal step in comparative grammar'. Here we recognize the beginning of much future work. The intention is to formalize the first basic procedures followed by comparativists, or more specifically Indo-Europeanists, in reconstructing the parent language. This had not been done and 'the reason is no doubt that the matter has been considered too humble even to require formulation' (1950:357). Take an example: the standard reconstructions attribute to Indo-European a set of dental stops **t*, **d*, **dh*. This is based on a number of regular correspondences between Indo-European languages; more specifically, if we assume that, for example, Indo-Iranian is represented by Sanskrit and Germanic is represented by Gothic, we have (i) In-Ir. *t*, Gmc. *t* (as in Skt. *ásti*, Go. *ist* 'is'), (ii) In-Ir. *t*, Gmc. *d* (Skt. *pitár-*, Go. *fadar* 'father'), (iii) In-Ir. *t*, Gmc. *þ* (Skt. *bhrātar-*, Go. *broþar* 'brother'), (iv) In-Ir. *d*, Gmc. *d* (Skt. *dehī-* 'wall', Go. *deigan* 'knead'), (v) In-Ir. *d*, Gmc. *t* (Skt. *véda*, Go. *wait* 'I know'), and (vi) In-Ir. *dh*, Gmc. *d* (Skt. *mádhya-*, Go. *midjis* 'middle').

Why these six sets? They are chosen because they share partial phonetic likeness in one or the other language; thus (i), (ii), and (iii) share In-Ir. *t*; (i) and (v) Gmc. *t*; (ii), (iv), and (vi) Gmc. *d*; and so forth. Why do we reconstruct three and not six sounds for Indo-European from these correspondences? Because some of the correspondences are in complementary distribution: (i) occurs after [s], (ii) before accented syllables, and (iii) in the other environments. Of (iv) and (v) the former occurs only when there is an aspirate in the following syllable, but, for example, (v) and (iii) contrast, that is, occur in the same environment. Similarly, (iv) and (vi) are in complementary distribution, but (v) and (vi) contrast. In other words the six sets of correspondences can be arranged into three contrasting groups {i, ii, iii}, (v), and {iv, vi}. Anyone trained in a form of American structuralism will recognize this type of argumentation. Henry was well aware of it:

> If the formulation here proposed for the principal procedure in comparative reconstruction sounds unfamiliar to historical linguists (who have nevertheless consistently used the procedure), it clearly reminds us of certain formulations in descriptive phonology. Phonemes have been defined as classes of sounds which are phonetically similar and not in contrast—i.e., chiefly, in complementary distribution. The second criterion is matched in historical work while the first is paralleled, not too incongruously, by the criterion of partial likeness . . . In short, when we use the reconstructive method of the nineteenth-century scholars we are in fact describing the phonemic system of the proto-language. (Hoenigswald 1950:263f.)

This is the primary claim, but the account goes on to consider less obvious instances where alternative decisions are possible and a choice can only be made on economy principles or, occasionally, cannot be made; this is perhaps the most original part. The final conclusion is a prelude to most of Henry's later work: 'The phonemic principle was implicit in the neo-grammarian assumption of regular sound-change; formal syntactic definitions of meaning were implicit in Paul's statement of semantic change. The fundamental unity of diachronic and synchronic thinking is beyond doubt' (1950:364).

In 1960 Henry published the book that is generally considered his major work, *Language change and linguistic reconstruction*; its influence was considerable at the time, and the book is still often used and quoted. From the reviews, the esteem in which Henry was held and how important his work was deemed to be are clear, but there were occasional expressions of disappointment: it was felt that the book did not give a complete picture of historical linguistics and was difficult to follow. The latter is doubtlessly true; the book is very technical and one may say mathematical in its approach. Fred Householder, in his *IJAL* review of the book, both accepted, and forcefully

https://doi.org/10.1353/lan.0.0068 Published online by Cambridge University Press

reacted to, the former objection. What did people expect, he argued, a practical manual of procedure—how to become the perfect etymologist? Or did they want an account of all other views, if possible favoring their own? In fact, he stated, we have what we should have expected: 'a full development and exposition of Hoenigswald's own theories and principles, many of which have been already exposed to the public eye, but are here presented as an organized coherent whole' (Householder 1962:69).

This is correct and in a sense reveals the way in which Henry had distanced himself from his European origins; had he still been in Germany, the accepted style would have been to start with a 'history of the question' and twenty pages of references. The 1960 book of course includes references and footnotes, but the tone is that of someone who follows his own specific line of thought and is only interested in pursuing it to the end. The book is most emphatically not a textbook or an introduction to historical linguistics; it is rather an attempt at formalizing in a coherent fashion the phenomena of language change: once again, what happens, not why it happens. We are told that this is feasible if we concentrate on the notion of replacement: all language change is a form of replacement (of morphs, of phonemes, etc.) and thus the question becomes how to describe and classify replacement. Note that for Henry this 'humble' problem is the primary question, not that (so often discussed) of the causes of replacement. The discussion is conducted in distributional terms. Clearly Henry is now influenced not only by Bloomfield but also by his colleague and life friend Zellig Harris. We say that Old English *eme* is replaced by *uncle* because the two morphs occur in corresponding discourses (contexts) in different phases of the language; the fact that *eme* and *uncle* are phonologically different does not prevent them from fulfilling the same functions or having the same meaning. Replacement can then be classified in terms of the two linguistic structures concerned, and we can speak of one-to-one replacement or morphemic merger or morphemic split, and so on. Given the approach taken, it is natural that the discussion of morphemic replacement precedes that of phonemic replacement, and that of morphemic and phonemic replacement precedes that of the comparative method. In contrast with the standard accounts of the contemporary historical linguists, the whole discussion is conducted on the assumption that any form of historical treatment presupposes the description of two synchronic stages, one of which may be reconstructed. Few, if any, linguists would now accept the form of distributionalism underlying most of the discussion, but it is noticeable how frequently references to Hoenigswald 1960 still appear in any discussion of subjects such as the comparative method, internal reconstruction, sound change, and linguistic change in general; one may look for instance at the papers on these subjects in the *Handbook of historical linguistics* (Joseph & Janda 2003).

Henry's search for formalism continued through the whole of his life; in addition to a number of papers, it led to his last solely authored book, *Studies in formal historical linguistics* (1973), where some of the same problems are discussed in greater detail: How do we reconstruct intermediate stages in the history of a language? How do we establish relative chronology? What are the formal properties of tree diagrams? The last subject involves a comparison between the properties of trees used in textual criticism and those used in linguistic reconstruction. The preface acknowledges the two major influences: Zellig Harris and Henry Hiż, Henry's two colleagues (and close friends) at the University of Pennsylvania.

After that Henry published a series of edited, or more often coedited, volumes as well as numerous articles on substantive problems of historical linguistics (mainly Indo-European, Greek, and Italic). The former are wide ranging, on *Indo-European and*

https://doi.org/10.1353/lan.0.0068 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Indo-Europeans (with George Cardona and Alfred Senn; Cardona et al. 1970), *The European background of American linguistics* (1979), *Biological metaphor and cladistic classification* (with Linda Wiener, 1987), *General and Amerindian ethnolinguistics: In remembrance of Stanley Newman* (with Mary Ritchie Key; Key & Hoenigswald 1989). Three of these volumes were motivated by separate events: the third in a series of conferences dedicated to Indo-European studies (1970); the celebrations for the fiftieth anniversary of the LSA (1979); and a memorial for one of the last scholars who had worked with Boas, Sapir, and Bloomfield (1989).

The 1987 volume, by constrast, was very much due to Henry's initiative. He had become interested in cladistics and in the comparison between linguistic family trees and evolutionary biological trees. He organized two meetings on the subject and published the proceedings with the help of the biologist Linda Wiener; it was an extraordinarily successful interdisciplinary venture that created a great deal of interest and began a series of comparisons between biology and linguistics. This was not the first example of an imaginative new proposal, even if the pioneering aspect of Henry's work is not sufficiently well known. In 1966, when his reputation as the most formalistic and mathematically minded of all historical linguists was at its peak, he wrote a proposal for an extension of the field of study of descriptive linguistics: we must describe and understand not only what goes on in language, but also how people react to what goes on and what they say goes on (talk about language). He also warned that it would be a grave mistake 'to dismiss these secondary and tertiary modes of conduct merely as sources of error' (Hoenigswald 1966:20). The study of folk linguistics that he advocated is close to ethnography of speech and ethnolinguistics, two disciplines that later obtained proper recognition.

At the same time, Henry's numerous articles, written both before and after his retirement, return periodically to some open questions that clearly fascinated him. They may look like small contributions to specific and separate problems, short occasional papers, but often they turn out to be subtly related and to aim at major conclusions. Take, for instance, a series of separate Indo-European and philological articles that were written between 1953 (a first article on semivowels) and 2004 (a posthumous paper on the word status of *Hellespontos*; Hoenigswald 2004b). They discuss the status and role of semivowels in Indo-European or Greek, the possibility or otherwise of overlength in Vedic and Homeric Greek, what we learn from meter about word ends in Vedic and Greek, Greek word accent, the status of enclitics, and so on. A magnificent paper (Hoenigswald 1994) delivered to the 1992 Zurich Fachtagung of the Indogermanische Gesellschaft, organized by his old student George Dunkel, brings it all together. Epic meter preserves clear traces of an older syllabification system where overlength—that is, for instance, a sequence of long vowel and two consonants (V:CCV) or short vowel and three consonants (VCCCV)—is avoided. Successive studies analyze the later developments, the slow replacing of the old system, the conservative traits of the meter and its capacity for renewal, the interplay between the comparative method and internal reconstruction, the way in which a number of sound changes appear to conspire toward preserving the status quo, and so forth. It is a masterly example of how philology—the superior knowledge of texts, their background, and their transmission—can combine with linguistic awareness to reach results that otherwise would be unimaginable. If put together, the various steps have a mathematical elegance that is unsurpassed, but this paper could have been written only by an accomplished classicist. Henry, of course, put it better than I can:

https://doi.org/10.1353/lan.0.0068 Published online by Cambridge University Press

> This, then, is the picture. An archaic syllable structure is the background. Features of it are accessible to orthodox comparative reconstruction, which has in its power to discriminate between retentions from the protolanguage and innovations in the descendants. The urge to simplify the reconstruction and to remove anomalies by internal reconstruction of an earlier state is well nigh irresistible . . . We are greatly helped by metrical prosodies and by the uncanny symbolic relationship that exists between meter and sound structure, as phonological properties are preserved, stylized and codified into metrical constraints. We must be especially grateful to possess that evidence, and to have it tell us so much about things of which we otherwise know little: word seams, compounding seams, enclisis and the rest. (Hoenigswald 1994:146f.).

Other papers follow the same pattern; they are apparently disconnected, but if looked at in their correct order and their ensemble, they have a coherent and original story to tell. Nowhere is this more apparent than in Henry's publications on the history of nineteenth-century linguistics, a subject in which he became increasingly interested. His initial starting point was the desire to understand what the actual working practice of the great historical linguists was—not what they said they were doing, but what they were actually doing. Each successful discipline creates its own foundation myths; we must show them for what they really are and discount them before we can understand how and why the discipline has progressed. Historical accounts of past work and attempts at formalization of both past and current analyses are inextricably tied together in Henry's work. As he pointed out more than once, he saw two kinds of scholars among our forebears: on the one hand the Brugmanns and the Kieckers, that is, the neogrammarians and their descendants, who thought that method was important but the correct method had been discovered in the golden 1870s and simply needed to be applied again and again; and on the other the Wackernagels and the Schulzes, the great independent comparativists and classicists, who 'surrendered themselves to the data' and said 'nothing about concepts and methods, on the plea that if you do your work well you don't have to talk about it, and that gentlemen learn by example rather than precept' (Hoenigswald 1980:23). One is taken aback in reading that Henry, the man who did the most to define the methodology of historical linguistics, states that 'for some reason the Wackernagels were more attractive than the Brugmanns'. On reflection, however, this is to be expected. What the neogrammarians said they were doing was not in fact what they were doing—that needed to be extracted from their substantive work and that is what Henry wanted to do.

It is in this context that one of the most important observations emerges. The battle cry of the neogrammarians—'sound laws suffer no exceptions', or, in other words, the regularity principle—had caused violent dissensions, attacks, and counterattacks at the end of the nineteenth century, and the discussions had continued in the twentieth century. How could the principle be demonstrated? Was it an empirical principle, or a postulate as Wundt had argued? Was phonemic analysis sufficient to make sense of it, as Leonard Bloomfield maintained? And yet in their concrete work of reconstruction or historical analysis, schools at the opposite end of the spectrum argued in the same way and reached the same conclusions, based on a tacit acceptance of the regularity principle. Henry repeatedly argued that this was to be expected because the principle is in fact a tautology. All change is sound change. When we say that Old English *eme* is replaced by *uncle* we state that a phonological sequence is replaced by another. How do we identify sound change or, if we prefer, sound replacement and contrast it with, for example, morphological replacement? The only way is to notice what is regular and what is not.

> It would have been best to agree . . . not that all sound changes are discovered to be regular, but rather that regular changes are also called sound changes, regularity being essentially a term for phonological

https://doi.org/10.1353/lan.0.0068 Published online by Cambridge University Press

> statability. Whether it is fruitful to single out phonological statability as a criterion to partition the known change processes is another question. It must be said that, by any pragmatic test, it was extremely fruitful. Quite a few tautologies are. (Hoenigswald 1978:26)

This insight has often been misunderstood or ignored, but at least in the context of neogrammarians' thought it seems to me compelling (see also Hale 2003:343); it has the elegance and simplicity of all correct conclusions.

In 1991, in a brief paper meant for a group of classicists, Henry contrasted the numerous refugee classicists of the 1930s and 1940s with the few historical linguists who came over. The former—great scholars like Werner Jaeger, Kurt von Fritz, Friederich Solmsen—felt themselves innovative and kept their distance from parts of the American classical establishment; the reverse was true for the latter. Of them it could be said that they 'were on occasion treated, even mistreated, as old-fashioned, subjective, obscurantist, and not sufficiently in tune with the burst of concern with language which had just occurred in America' (Hoenigswald 1991:10). Henry attributed this view to 'chroniclers to whom the history of scholarship is simply an arena for schools and conspiracies', but he implicitly agreed that it was partly correct. If so, this accounts for the impact of his work at a time when the emphasis was on description and theory rather than on diachrony: he gave respectability to historical work by showing that it could be formalized in a way that was acceptable to the prevailing form of linguistic thought, while at the same time demonstrating to the new generation of American linguists that text-based data could be as informative as fieldwork. When the young Wallace Chafe wrote an article on internal reconstruction in Seneca, an Iroquoian language (Chafe 1958), he was in fact starting from Henry's earlier analyses of the comparative method and internal reconstruction, even if these were based on Indo-European. Later on, Henry's work was to have a different sort of impact—in some parts of Europe at least. Historical and comparative linguists (myself included) who had been trained in the traditional style discovered, thanks to Henry, that there was much to be learned from an attempt to make explicit what they were actually doing. It did not matter that by that time distributionalism was on the wane; what mattered was the explicitness requirement.

In 1985 Henry retired from his professorship at the University of Pennsylvania. He had been in the same department continuously since 1948, and in what for a long time was a very small department he had acted as a linking factor. George Cardona (2007: 13) remembers that in 1965 the department 'was a small close-knit group of scholars who not only regularly met to exchange ideas but frequently also attended one another's seminars. Henry was central to this group'. In 1971, when I was a visiting professor for a semester, I had the impression that I was moving in a vast circle of Henry's friends: the whole department of linguistics (faculty, staff, students), most of the classicists, people in oriental studies, in the museum, the library, the administration. In fact, in spite of his shyness Henry had a gift for friendship that he shared with Gabi; both of them, in different ways, were capable of unbelievable warmth. The people they had first met at Yale remained firm friends for all their lives: Bernard Bloch, Rulon Wells, and Isidore Dyen were only a few of them. Retirement did not mean the end of the contacts. Henry was often invited to give lectures in the US and abroad, and both Henry and Gabi were inveterate attenders of conferences; he had more than once been a visiting member of departments abroad (Poona in 1955, Kiel in 1968, Oxford in 1976–77), and in 1986 he was a visiting professor at the University of Leuven. More importantly, he kept working. He had started a book on analogy that he intended to dedicate to the memory of Zellig Harris. The book was never finished because he felt, as he put it, that it was too difficult and that perhaps he had become a prisoner of his own formalisms.

https://doi.org/10.1353/lan.0.0068 Published online by Cambridge University Press

A few articles give an indication of his way of thinking, but we shall never know what the finished product would have been like. Even so, after 1985 Henry published more than forty papers (not counting reviews, personal items, contributions to lexica, obituaries, and so on), contributed extensively to the *Lexicon grammaticorum* (Stammerjohann 1996), and was the historical linguistics editor for both editions of the *International encyclopedia of linguistics* (Bright 1992 and Frawley 2003).

Gabi died in August 2001 after long months of sickness; for Henry the blow was devastating and he survived her by less than two years. He left their large and beautiful house in Swarthmore and moved to senior housing in Haverford with only a few books. It did not make much difference. Like his father, he continued to work till the end.

When Henry wrote in 1991 that he admired the old classical tradition or, as he had said earlier, that 'the men of 1876 [the neogrammarians] inspire admiration and intellectual intimacy; one KNOWS them' (1978:31), or when he expressed his devotion to Bloomfield, this admiration was genuine. He was a profoundly modest man who preferred to attribute his views to his teachers or his predecessors than to claim priority. To assess Henry's research and his contribution to linguistics is difficult if one does not also consider his personality. Of his father, who clearly had a very profound influence on him, he said that he was never unsure of himself 'except, as we all are, deep down' and wrote that he seemed to be able to push aside all doubts and uncertainties (Hoenigswald 1997:430). Henry was different; he was often unsure of himself both superficially and deep down, and that resulted in a form of shyness. It was clear that his father had rhetorical power and charisma; in his public lectures he charmed, enchanted, and inspired his audience. By contrast—and I suspect the contrast was deliberate—when lecturing, Henry avoided all form of rhetoric, and occasionally his lectures were too compressed to be easy to follow. In 1950 Bernard Bloch, with the outspokenness of a close friend, wrote to him that he found his paper on the comparative method extremely interesting, much more so than his oral presentation of it. No doubt that was right; I listened to the Zurich paper that I mentioned above, but did not realize how brilliant it was until I saw it in print. And yet, as George Dunkel reported (2007:232), his students found Henry's lectures riveting and warmed to his good humor, his tolerance, and the strength of his argumentation. In writing he had a gift for pithy, memorable expressions, but his distaste for cant and rhetoric occasionally was his undoing. He once confessed that he envied those who could write a twenty-page article. He did it too, but then went through a process of cutting and paring until the statement was reduced to the bare bones. His style gained, but occasionally clarity suffered. The fear of indulging in rhetoric, in highfaluting statements, or in prolixity was too great.

On reflection, it is extraordinary how in Henry the scholar dovetailed with the man. He was often silent and wasted no words (occasionally his recurrent cough seemed to be his best way of communication). Yet he was a man of strong feelings. His piety toward his predecessors, strongly felt and strongly expressed, was part of a wider attitude toward things and people. He was seriously and honestly humble when it came to himself and immensely generous to others. Again and again he would say: 'I admire him/her enormously'. But he was not uncritical and did not always resist an impish sense of humor. Of a colleague he wrote: 'he is here on another errand of mercilessness'; of an official event: 'some of the scientists were very good; the humanities mostly soft and mushy as usual, all kinds of people putting their worst foot/feet forward'. He was able to see the nuances, to admire people whose weaknesses he also recognized. He was also ready to spend untold time making sure that the qualities he admired in others were recognized, that the right appointments were made, and that the right institutions

https://doi.org/10.1353/lan.0.0068 Published online by Cambridge University Press

were protected. For Bloomfield he spoke of loyalty. Loyalty is indeed a quality that he possessed to an obsessive degree: loyalty to his family, his students, his colleagues, and the institutions to which he belonged. The University of Pennsylvania, the Linguistic Society of America, the American Philosophical Society, and Swarthmore can tell their story, and so can a number of his friends, I more than most. What he did for Gabi in her last year was a supreme testament of loyalty and devotion matched only by her loyalty to him and by their daughters' loyalty to them both. At a lower level, the time he spent in working on items for the *Lexicon Grammaticorum* or the *International encyclopedia of linguistics* was again a form of loyalty, this time to the subject that he loved and in which he believed with total conviction.

Henry was no stranger to negative reactions—on the contrary. Fundamentalism, wherever he met it, bigotry, and dishonesty depressed him deeply. He could become furious (perhaps excessively so) both against some constricting forms of political correctness and against the increasing dishonesty and thoughtlessness that he saw as pervading modern political life. This is understandable: he had seen at first hand the collapse of all that he held dear, and he was aware of the dangers. I am told by Martin Ostwald that during the McCarthy period he spoke freely and forcefully against all inroads on freedom; Gabi and he were supporters of Amnesty International and the American Civil Liberties Union; the League of Women Voters often met in their house. The events of his youth had left their trace, but it is typical of him that when asked about that period, he preferred to talk about the headiness of his new experiences at Yale. I have no doubt that what dictated his reactions against any illiberal policy in the present was partly the terror of a renewal of past attitudes and events, but in contrast with this there was the superhuman generosity with which he looked at the past. There is little one can say in favor of those linguists who in the 1930s supported Hitler's racial policy either by providing him with pseudolinguistic arguments or by not reacting to the use he made of their subject. Yet Henry found it possible to point out that the policy of silence, of nonreaction, did not always have despicable motives. It was in his view a question of style, not of moral behavior. Scholars were reluctant to engage in the defense of scholarship against external misuse just as they were reluctant to spell out methods and procedures. Possibly so, but this is not the standard victim's reaction.

Henry died at the Quadrangle in Haverford, Pennsylvania, on June 16, 2003. At least three of his articles appeared posthumously and one short paper remains unpublished. There may be more, but the four contributions I know of are significant. The first (Hoenigswald & Woodard 2004) is a long chapter about Indo-European written for the *Cambridge encyclopedia of the world's ancient languages*, which the editor, Roger Woodard, dedicated to Henry's memory. The second (Hoenigswald 2004b) is a festschrift article that brings to a conclusion and partly corrects the long series of contributions on semivowels, prosody, meter, word end, and so forth summarized in, and anticipated by, the Zurich paper (1994). The third article (Hoenigswald 2004a) is the payment of a long-standing debt; it concerns the Etruscan alphabet and is dedicated 'dis manibus Eva Fiesel 1891–1937'. As an undergraduate in Munich Henry had studied Etruscan with Eva Fiesel and so had Gabi; after her dismissal from the university, Fiesel had escaped to America in 1934 and had taught at Bryn Mawr before dying of cancer in her forties. Henry had always felt that he had not done enough to remember her. And finally, in the last three months of his life when he was eighty-eight and very ill, Henry made a superhuman effort to write a last paper that he intended to present at the 2003 East Coast Indo-European Conference at Harvard that honored Calvert Watkins on his retirement. He could not go, but I was able to tell him on the day before

https://doi.org/10.1353/lan.0.0068 Published online by Cambridge University Press

he died that the paper had been read on his behalf. The four papers speak for themselves: they were Henry's final acts of loyalty to his friends and to the subjects in which he had been trained in his youth. [ANNA MORPURGO DAVIES, *University of Oxford.*]

REFERENCES

BRIGHT, WILLIAM (ed.) 1992. *International encyclopedia of linguistics*. 4 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

BRUGMANN, KARL. 1904. *Kurze vergleichende Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen*. Strassburg: Trübner.

CARDONA, GEORGE. 2007. Henry M. Hoenigswald, 1915–2003: A biographical memoir. *National Academy of Sciences: Biographical Memoirs* 89.180–205.

CARDONA, GEORGE; HENRY M. HOENIGSWALD; and ALFRED SENN (eds.) 1970. *Indo-European and Indo-Europeans: Papers presented at the third Indo-European conference at the University of Pennsylvania*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

CARDONA, GEORGE, and NORMAN H. ZIDE (eds.) 1987. *Festschrift for Henry Hoenigswald on the occasion of his seventieth birthday*. Tübingen: Narr.

CHAFE, WALLACE L. 1958. Internal reconstruction in Seneca. *Language* 35.477–95.

DUNKEL, GEORGE E. 2007. Henry Max Hoenigswald (1915–2003). *Kratylos* 52.230–33.

FRAWLEY, WILLIAM J. (ed.) 2003. *International encyclopedia of linguistics*. 2nd edn. 4 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

GRASSL, ROSWITHA. 1998. *Der junge Richard Hönigswald: Eine biographisch fundierte Kontextualisierung in historischer Absicht*. Würzburg: Königshausen & Neumann.

GRASSL, ROSWITHA, and PETER RICHART-WILLMES. 1997. *Denken in seiner Zeit: Ein Personenglossar zum Unfeld Richard Hönigswalds*. Würzburg: Königshausen & Neumann.

HALE, MARK. 2003. Neogrammarian sound change. In Joseph & Janda, 343–68.

HALLETT, JUDITH P. et al. 2002. Remembering Gabriele Schoepflich Hoenigswald. *Cloelia* 30.21–24.

HOENIGSWALD, HENRY M. 1940. Pan-compounds in early Greek. *Language* 16.183–87.

HOENIGSWALD, HENRY M. 1945–47. *Spoken Hindustani I and II*. New York: Holt. [First published in 1945 by the Linguistic Society of America and the Intensive Language Program of the American Council of Learned Societies.]

HOENIGSWALD, HENRY M. 1946. Sound change and linguistic structure. *Language* 22.136–43.

HOENIGSWALD, HENRY M. 1950. The principal step in comparative grammar. *Language* 26.357–64.

HOENIGSWALD, HENRY M. 1953. ῥα, δέδαε, δασύς, and the semivowels. *Language* 29.288–92.

HOENIGSWALD, HENRY M. 1960. *Language change and linguistic reconstruction*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

HOENIGSWALD, HENRY M. 1966. A proposal for the study of folk-linguistics. *Sociolinguistics: Proceedings of the UCLA Sociolinguistics Conference 1964*, ed. by William Bright, 18–26. The Hague: Mouton.

HOENIGSWALD, HENRY M. 1973. *Studies in formal historical linguistics*. Dordrecht: Reidel.

HOENIGSWALD, HENRY M. 1978. The *annus mirabilis* 1876 and posterity. *Transactions of the Philological Society* 1978.17–35.

HOENIGSWALD, HENRY M. (ed.) 1979. *The European background of American linguistics: Papers of the third golden anniversary symposium of the Linguistic Society of America*. Dordrecht: Foris.

HOENIGSWALD, HENRY M. 1980. A reconstruction. *First person singular: Papers from the Conference on an Oral Archive for the History of American Linguistics*, ed. by Boyd H. Davis and Raymond O'Cain, 21–28. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

HOENIGSWALD, HENRY M. 1991. Henry M. Hoenigswald. *Classical World* 85.9–11.

HOENIGSWALD, HENRY M. 1994. Meter and phonology: The chronological interpretation of idealized reconstructions. *Früh-, Mittel, Spätindogermanisch: Akten der IX. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft vom 5. bis 9. Oktober 1992 in Zürich*, ed. by George E. Dunkel, Gisela Meyer, Salvatore Scarlata, and Christian Seidl, 135–48. Wiesbaden: Reichert.

https://doi.org/10.1353/lan.0.0068 Published online by Cambridge University Press

HOENIGSWALD, HENRY M. 1997. Zu Leben und Werk von Richard Hönigswald. *Schmied-Kowarzik* 1997.425–35.

HOENIGSWALD, HENRY M. 1999. Erinnerung an den Vater. In Otto, 23–24.

HOENIGSWALD, HENRY M. 2004a. Etruscan studies: Zeta in ancient Italy. *General Linguistics* 41.259–84.

HOENIGSWALD, HENRY M. 2004b. 'Ελλήσποντος. *Indo-European perspectives: Studies in honour of Anna Morpurgo Davies*, ed. by J. H. W. Penney, 178–81. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

HOENIGSWALD, HENRY M., and LINDA F. WIENER (eds.) 1987. *Biological metaphor and cladistic classification: An interdisciplinary perspective*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

HOENIGSWALD, HENRY M., and ROGER D. WOODARD. 2004. Indo-European (with a discussion of syntax by James P. T. Clackson). *The Cambridge encyclopedia of the world's ancient languages*, ed. by Roger D. Woodard, 534–50. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

HOUSEHOLDER, FRED W. 1962. Review of Hoenigswald 1960. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 28.69–79.

JOSEPH, BRIAN D., and RICHARD D. JANDA. 2003. *The handbook of historical linguistics*. Oxford: Blackwell.

KEY, MARY RITCHIE, and HENRY M. HOENIGSWALD (eds.) 1989. *General and Amerindian ethnolinguistics: In remembrance of Stanley Newman*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

OSTWALD, MARTIN. 2003. In memoriam: Henry M. Hoenigswald (1915–2003). *APA Newsletter* 26.5.32.

OTTO, WOLFGANG (ed.) 1999. *Aus der Einsamkeit—Briefe einer Freundschaft: Richard Hönigswald an Ernst Lohnmeyer*. Würzburg: Königshausen & Neumann.

SCHMIED-KOWARZIK, W. (ed.) 1997. *Erkennen—Monas—Sprache: Internationales Richard Hönigswald Symposion, Kassel 1995*. Würzburg: Königshausen & Neumann.

STAMMERJOHANN, HARRO (ed.) 1996. *Lexicon grammaticorum: Who's who in the history of world linguistics*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

SWIGGERS, PIERRE. 1997. Languages, language history and the history of linguistics: From structure to transformation between Europe and America: An interview with Henry Hoenigswald. *Language and linguists: Aims, perspectives and duties of linguistics* (Orbis Supplementa 9), ed. by Pierre Swiggers, 41–59. Leuven: Peeters. [Originally published in *Orbis* 38.233–50, 1995.]

https://doi.org/10.1353/lan.0.0068 Published online by Cambridge University Press