EINAR HAUGEN

A cedar of Lebanon has fallen, a Ponderosa redwood of sociolinguistics, a pillar of the linguistically informed social history of immigrant and ethnic America. It is the measure of Einar Haugen's greatness that the above epithets require additional ones, e.g., a scion of general linguistics, the doyen of Scandinavian languages and literatures, and a leader in language pedagogy, if the true versatility and immense stature of the man are to be fully appreciated. Indeed, it is far beyond my own more narrowly focused competence to do full justice to Einar Haugen's diverse achievements and attainments. I will limit my comments to his sociolinguistic contributions, on the one hand, and to characteristics of his interpersonal relationships, on the other.

I am aware that a focus such as mine leaves much out, but I am consoled, as I hope the reader will be, by the ready availability of many unimpeachable sources via which the picture of the 'total Einar Haugen' can be filled out. First and foremost, Einar himself reflected on his life and work, particularly on the intellectual climate of his early years in the profession (see his 'On the making of a linguist', in Davis and O'Cain 1980) and on his immigrant-community childhood (see his 'Personal reflections on growing up bilingual' in Ornstein and St. Clair 1979). Furthermore, several of his students and colleagues have honored him with festschriften in which his selfless stimulation and assistance are gratefully acknowledged (see, for example, Firchow, Grimstad, Hasselmo and O'Neil 1972a and Naess and Skard 1971). In addition, there are several collections of his own writings, whereby readers can easily sample some of his most lasting contributions (e.g., Firchow, Grimstad, Hasselmo and O'Neil 1972b, with a full bibliography through to 1971; Dil 1972, which also contains a full bibliography; and Haugen 1987). Finally, all of the standard references, including *Who's Who in America, Who's Who in American Education, Hvem er hvem* (Oslo), *Dictionary of American Scholars*, and others, provide lengthy accounts of his major positions, publications, honors and travels. But, although all of the above may be usefully consulted, those who knew Haugen best will agree completely with the view of Firchow, Grimstad, Haselmo and O'Neil (1972a: 8) that 'no mere listing of his work and his honors can suggest the measure of the man'. *A yidishe neshome iz nit optsushatsn* (a Jewish soul can never be fully appreciated) is a Yiddish proverb that can and must be generalized to all of humanity, and particularly to all creative geniuses—and Haugen was clearly among them. But this view engenders several problems of its own. Even after recognizing its pessimism about being able to fully appreciate a human soul, it also offers no guidance as to how a more complete evaluation can be attained. My attempt to do so will be frankly subjective.

My introduction to Einar Haugen occurred in 1955 and was almost accidental in nature. It led to my reading his monumental *Norwegian Language in America* (1953). The book (actually 'books', because it was originally published as two volumes) was recommended to me by Leybush Lehrer, a director of the institu-

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0097850795053896 Published online by Cambridge University Press

tion now known as YIVO Institute for Jewish Research (previously called the Yiddish Scientific Institute-Yivo). The Institute had decided in 1955—after long debates—to change its English name and I asked Lehrer if other ethnic research institutes had undergone the same process. Lehrer, an omnivorous reader of the social science literature in several languages, told me that he was aware of the discussion of this topic in the first volume of Haugen's work (the sociohistorical volume), which he praised very highly. Of course, when I read the volume, I found not only that it covered much more than that, but that I had to devote months (and did so gladly, both intellectually and emotionally) to reading and annotating it in its entirety. It was not only a fine combination of history and sociolinguistics (now we would refer to this volume as 'macrosociolinguistics') but it captured, both insightfully and poignantly, the pathos of the language struggle among Norwegians in America, the anguish of language loss, the logic and emotion on both sides of the argument over whether it was possible or desirable to remain Norwegian via English, and the virtuosity of the writers and editors whose books, articles and editorials fashioned and communicated the disparate views encountered in primary and secondary Norwegian-American settlement areas throughout the United States. Above and beyond Haugen's masterly ability to capture an era and to present it in all of its living complexity (an ability he displayed again and again, see particularly his *Language conflict and language planning: The case of Modern Norwegian,* 1966), was an even rarer ability. His sociology and his methodology for analyzing sociological data were both exemplary. These characteristics are rarities in sociolinguistic publications even today, some forty years later.

In his autobiographical sketch (in Davis and O'Cain 1980:133–43) Haugen related how he taught himself linguistics in the late twenties and early thirties, since 'linguistics was not taught anywhere in the United States, only philology; like most of my generation ... [I am a] self-made linguist'. Haugen describes which books, which professors, which experiences (including his bilingual childhood) and which colleagues and conferences contributed most to his finally becoming a linguist at all and a linguist 'skeptical toward the new structuralism' at that. In this same sketch (p. 137), he also expressed his 'disappointment to find no trace of this exciting development' (i.e., the development whereby many other such skeptics appeared in the mid thirties) in a number of excellent surveys of American linguistics. How much more disappointed must we be that even Haugen has left no account of how he acquired his sociological interests and skills. His skills in collecting and performing secondary analyses on United States census data, at the national, state, and local tract levels, and doing so across all of the major Scandinavian immigrant languages (so that what was unique and what was similar with respect to Norwegian could be discovered and documented) remain exemplary to this very day. His sociological data and analyses revealed a scholar 'hard-nosed about overly abstract theories and [one who] preferred data to speculation' (Davis and O'Cain 1980:137). This work fostered in Haugen a lifelong conviction that 'speakers were absolutely not ''ideal'' and their societies were not ''homogeneous'' ' (p. 138). Since my generation too had been trained neither in sociology nor in sociolinguistics, Haugen's

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0097850795053896 Published online by Cambridge University Press

sociological emphases fostered in at least some of us the conviction that we could embark on a long and difficult path such as his, to teach ourselves much of what had to be learned, and, if we did our job as well as he had done his, good work could be produced as a result. Unfortunately, we are still waiting today, sixty years after Haugen's pioneering autodidactism, for embryonic sociolinguists to be TRAINED in BOTH linguistics and sociology.

When I gave what must have been the first American course in the sociology of language (Human Relations and Language 2, spring 1960, University of Pennsylvania; Human Relations and Language 1, given in the fall semester of 1959 having been devoted to the psychology of language), Haugen's *Norwegian language in America* was my text. A year later I began working on a nationwide inquiry into the maintenance of immigrant languages in the United States and Haugen was one of the few people to whom I regularly sent copies of my quarterly progress reports. By then, his exhaustive *Bilingualism in the Americas* (1957) had become another truly vital handbook for me, literally leading me to hundreds of studies that were relevant for the conceptualization of my research. I had still not met Haugen and, indeed, I somewhat dreaded doing so. His comments on my flow of reports and preliminary chapters (revised and later published as my *Language loyalty in the United States* 1966) frequently harped on the fully acknowledged fact that he had already mentioned or written about the matters that I was dealing with and that I either merely agreed with his findings and conclusions or, more rarely, disagreed with them.

However, we were already fated not only to meet, and for a prolonged period at that, but to interact agreeably and constructively as well. We were both fellows during 1963–64 at the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences (Stanford, CA); we attended the semi-weekly Language Group presentations (Floyd Lounsbury, another fellow that year also attended, as did, from time to time, Joseph Greenberg, Sue Ervin [later Ervin-Tripp], and John Gumperz, coming to the sessions from their nearby home universities) and almost invariably lunched together as well. Here I discovered that Haugen's bark was definitely worse than his bite. We also both interrupted our idyllic fellowship year two months earlier than was absolutely necessary—a highly unusual thing to do—in order to expose ourselves to the harsh ('barely bearable') July and August climate of Bloomington, Indiana. But that was where the LSA Linguistic Institute was being held and where the SSRC's Seminar on Sociolinguistics was convened, under the chairmanship of Charles A. Ferguson. Neither Haugen nor I would have missed this seminar for the world, for individuals with sociolinguistic interests were mighty few and far between and those who cared to refer to themselves as 'sociolinguists' were even fewer. Haugen wrote his introduction to my *Language loyalty* there and it definitely solidified a friendship (which included our respective spouses as well) and a seemingly endless array of shared interests which lasted for the ensuing thirty years. Gella and I would always watch Einar and Eva and say to each other 'That's how we will be, we hope, twenty years from now'. They were good models in every way.

We met them frequently after they moved to Harvard (in 1964, right after the Linguistic Institute), because Einar and I both became members of the

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0097850795053896 Published online by Cambridge University Press

SSRC's Committee on Sociolinguistics and Eva would often accompany him[1] on his semiannual visits to New York to attend the committee's meetings. Haugen's role was a particularly useful one, since the committee often seemed to be dominated by individuals with exclusively ethnographic interests and Haugen, always suspicious of any exclusivistic and monomethodological school of thought, labored valiantly in support of more interdisciplinary and multifocused efforts on the committee's agenda. An example of Haugen's approach, although one not drawn from the committee's work, is his three-page letter[2] of May 20, 1966, to William Mackey, the officially designated 'conference planner', concerning what ultimately became the 1967 Moncton International Conference on Methods and Theories in the Description and Measurement of Bilingualism (see Kelly 1969). Not only were most of these suggestions adopted, but, characteristically, they called upon a highly varied 'cast of characters' in terms of disciplinary, theoretical and methodological points of view.

As is the case for many of us, conference going was almost a way of life for Einar and often for Einar and Eva together. They both enjoyed the interaction with colleagues, friends, and students that conferences facilitated. In addition, Einar also enjoyed an animated difference of opinion, either privately with one person or another, or publicly, from the floor or from the platform, or both. Although he could be very cutting, he held no animus after the storm had passed and I never knew him to argue ad hominem. He always showed respect for his opponent and, very often, even a touch of humor.[3] I remember best two of his animated 'battles for the truth'. The first was his argument with me at a Georgetown Roundtable (preserved in politely edited print in the 1970 volume of the *Monograph series on languages and linguistics*) over the legitimacy of the concept of interference in a nonprescriptivist sociolinguistic analysis. I was strongly opposed and he strongly in favor. We both survived and so did our friendship as well as our respective points of view.

Haugen's reaction to an English Only spokesperson at a subsequent Georgetown Roundtable was much sharper and more to my liking. In the absence of an official record, I rely on my memory in this connection. Haugen introduced his comments with the declaration, 'I guess I'm the only one here who is old enough not to be afraid to call this what it is,' and proceeded to call the English Only position 'racist, prejudiced and discriminatory', an approach that 'delighted in punishing immigrants for the nation's inability to satisfy the immigrants' eagerness to acquire English'. Haugen's prowess in intellectual debate

[1] It must not be overlooked that Eva contributed greatly to Einar's scholarly productivity by editing and proofreading his articles and books. She also helped him maintain his many professional contacts and invariably took care of the practical aspects of their considerable travelling. She was regularly the first to read and react to the early drafts of Einar's publications. In addition of course, Eva developed and pursued (as she does to this very day) many research interests of her own.

[2] All letters from Einar Haugen that are referred to in this essay are on deposit in the Joshua Fishman and Gella Schweid Fishman Archive, Special Collections, Stanford University, Stanford, CA.

[3] I am assured by former students that there was no trace of any combativeness in Einar's classes. Even his conference 'interventions' became quite mellow in his later years.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0097850795053896 Published online by Cambridge University Press

led some of his students to jokingly suggest that 'If somewhere there is a Valhalla for veterans of linguistic battles, then Einar Haugen will occupy a prominent place in it' (Firchow et al. 1972a). Nevertheless, he was a 'happy warrior' and usually remembered each conference, the normal arena for his battles, quite positively. On June 16, 1975, he wrote to me after one such conference that 'it was a meeting full of happy surprises, including the company of Anwar Dil and a number of younger people working in this field. My original reluctance to go so far and have so little to say, since I had no time to prepare a paper, was dissipated by the general conviviality of the occasion and its serendipities.' And, indeed, Haugen had a knack not only for starting a good argument but for engaging wholeheartedly in the banter and the fun that make conferences less dreary than they might otherwise be. He often liked to assume an Old World persona and offer a toast and, with Eva's mild prompting, 'do the Norwegian thing' (a series of toasts and blessings, intermixed).

Haugen was also exceedingly good at giving of his time to students and to colleagues. I have already mentioned that he read (and critiqued) the draft chapters of my *Language loyalty,* much before we met and equally before I had attained any recognition in the sociolinguistic enterprise. I know, from letters written to Eva by various of his students, that he was equally if not more helpful with his students as well. One of them, who became an eminent linguist in his own right, reminisces, 'More than Einar may have realized, he was such an important influence on so many of us, even working in fields very far from [his]. I owe my first major publication in *Language*, a piece on language contact, to his encouragement of a seminar term paper.' Another, who did not become a linguist, 'recalls, with pleasure, evening gatherings at [the Haugens'] house, meeting a wide assortment of interesting people'. Yet another, now a leader in American higher education, says, 'He was a fine mentor and helped me so much during a formative time in my life. I remember our many discussions about my thesis and other topics. I remember him as a vital force at so many conferences and meetings. I remember the many fine times in ... [the Haugen] house.' Perhaps these are the kinds of things that most professors do (or did), but it should be remembered that Haugen did these things while engaged in prodigious research, publication, committee memberships, and elected offices. He served as President of the LSA in 1950; from 1955 to 1962 he was a member of the Standing Committee on Research. Even the son of a colleague in a faraway country, whose university library lacked most of Haugen's publications, could ask for help with a term-paper topic and, in reply get a letter saying, 'I enclose the relevant pages in *Bilingualism in the Americas* in xerox. Since the references are in the bibliography at the end, I am mailing you under separate cover an old copy of the book itself which I hope you will deposit in the library of the university ... with my compliments, when you no longer need it yourself.' Little wonder then, that he is remembered by students, as 'such a warm, generous, welcoming person; ... he was like a father to many of us'.

Autodidact, scholar, and friend of America's immigrant languages, interdisciplinary advocate, polemicist and good friend almost simultaneously, devoted teacher who 'raised up' many students who idolized him, prodigious researcher,

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0097850795053896 Published online by Cambridge University Press

world traveler, lecturer and writer in such a wide variety of fields that each one of them could easily have constituted the life work of a more ordinary person ... but Haugen was even more than the sum of the above parts. He always strove (and succeeded far more than almost anyone I know), to derive from meticulous attention to his own background, his own childhood experiences of foreign and immigrant individuals, their society and culture, the empirical findings and theoretical generalizations that had the widest possible relevance. Rarer still, he never distanced himself from his origins, neither those in the American midwest nor those in the 'old country' from which his parents had come. His Norwegianness was by no means a platonic love affair, thoroughly intellectualized and conducted from a safe distance or via rare forays. Norway rightfully regarded him as a native son and awarded him the highest tributes for the attention he lavished on Norwegian language, literature, and sociolinguistics for well over half a century, from his *Beginning Norwegian* in 1937 to his *Ole Bull* in 1993 (written together with his daughter Camilla). Yet he was not only a scholar of truly international significance (would that not have been enough to warrant our sincere gratitude and recognition?), but also one who derived much of that significance precisely by pondering the deeper, more general implications of his Norwegian data. The general theory and study of language maintenance and language shift derives substantially from his work *The Norwegian language in America*. The study of language planning (both status planning and corpus planning) is significantly indebted to his *Language conflict and language planning: The case of Modern Norwegian*. He demonstrated via his own life and work that ethnic and area studies are not provincial backwaters, not preserves of the rejected or the self-isolated, but that they are as scintillating and as productive of widely significant theories, ideas, and methods as any of the more prestigious disciplines and areas of specialization within them. The lessons he had learned from his early fieldwork, in which he taped Norwegian-American speech and interviewed informants concerning the schools, churches, periodicals, clubs, and choirs of Norwegian-American immigrants and their children, examined letters and diaries and read hundreds of their books and journals—these lessons never left him. When he thought of language, he thought of speakers and writers like the ones he had gotten to know personally. This led him to conclude that dogmatic structural formalism (whether of the older or of the newer kinds) was missing more than it was finding. He concluded that, 'With Labov I believe that sociolinguistics is a kind of linguistics. Any historical account that relegates it to the fringes is a travesty' (Davis and O'Cain 1980).

In March of 1992, Einar wrote to me that he 'was recently embarrassed by a request from Bob Stockwell for information about Dwight Bolinger, whose obituary he is supposed to write [published in *Language* 69:99–112]. It's strange how little one can recall of the life of people one has known. He was a quiet person, cheerful and pleasant, who had taught at various schools before he came to Harvard. But our fields diverged and I haven't much I can say about him.' In this same letter, written only a little more than two years before he died (on June 20, 1994, at the age of 88), Haugen also admitted that 'age and

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0097850795053896 Published online by Cambridge University Press

infirmity have interfered with my activities of late, but I am still able to sit down by my typewriter and greet my friends.' Einar, however, was definitely not the kind of person one easily forgets, even if one's field does not overlap substantially with his. He was too tall, too striking in appearance, too quick-witted, sharp-tongued, productive and devoted to strong convictions to be forgotten. He was of the generation that made themselves into linguists, without the benefit of university training or degrees in that area, but, who because of that (rather than just in spite of that) were among the most stimulating, insightful, courageous, and unforgettable linguists of the lot. A generation comes and a generation goes. The founding generation of sociolinguists—those of us who spent the summer of 1964 together in Bloomington—is beginning to move out. Those who remain will never forget Einar Haugen, nor will the larger circle of his former students and colleagues. His contributions, however, are great enough so that future generations of linguists, sociolinguists, sociologists of language, and, of course, Scandinavian area, language and literature specialists will certainly learn of him too. They will all find, as did so many of his contemporaries, that their explorations of his works will be well rewarded indeed.[4] [Joshua A. Fishman, *Yeshiva University* and *Stanford University*.]

REFERENCES

DAVIS, BOYD H., and RAYMOND O'CAIN, eds. 1980. First Person Singular: Studies in the History of Linguistics. v. 21. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
DIL, ANWAR, ed. 1992. The Ecology of Language. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
FIRCHOW, EVELYN S.; KAAREN GRIMSTAD; NILS HASSELMO; and WAYNE O'NEIL, eds. 1972a. Studies for Einar Haugen. The Hague: Mouton.
——. 1972b. Studies by Einar Haugen. The Hague, Mouton.
FISHMAN, JOSHUA A. 1966. Language Loyalty in the United States. The Hague: Mouton.
HAUGEN, EINAR. 1937. Beginning Norwegian. New York: F. S. Crofts.
——. 1953. The Norwegian Language in America. 2 vols. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
——. 1956. Bilingualism in the Americas. University, AL: University of Alabama Press.
——. 1966. Language Conflict and Language Planning: The Case of Modern Norwegian. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
——. 1980. On the making of a linguist. In Davis and O'Cain, 133–43.
——. 1987. The Blessings of Babel. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
——, and CAMILLA CAI. 1993. Ole Bull: Norway's Romantic Musician and Cosmopolitan Patriot. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
KELLY, L. G., ed. 1969. Description and Measurement of Bilingualism. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
NAESS, HARALD S., and SIGMUND SKARD, eds. 1971. Studies in Scandinavian-American Interrelations: Dedicated to Einar Haugen. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
ORNSTEIN, JACOB, and ROBERT ST. CLAIR (eds) 1979. Bilingualism and bilingual education: New readings and insights. San Antonio: Trinity University Press.

Linguistics Department
Stanford University
Stanford, CA 94305

[4] I am indebted to Stig Eliasson, Charles Ferguson, and Eva Haugen for valuable comments and assistance in connection with these remarks.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0097850795053896 Published online by Cambridge University Press