LEONARD BLOOMFIELD

LEONARD BLOOMFIELD died on April 18, 1949, at the age of 62, after nearly three years of crippling illness. He was a signer of the Call that led to the founding of the Linguistic Society, and the Society's President in 1935.

Bloomfield was born in Chicago on April 1, 1887, the son of Sigmund and Carola Buber Bloomfield. His aunt was Fannie Bloomfield Zeisler, a concert pianist of international repute; his uncle was Maurice Bloomfield, for many years Professor of Sanskrit and Comparative Philology in the Johns Hopkins University—like his nephew, one of the great figures in American linguistics, and the second President of the Linguistic Society.[1]

When Bloomfield was nine years old, his family moved to the village of Elkhart Lake, Wisconsin, where his father was proprietor of a hotel. Here the boy lived until he was old enough to go to high school, except for two winters spent in Europe with his family (1898–9 and 1900–1). The village school did not agree with him: it came to be a standing joke in his family that he found it hard, and that once he failed of promotion to a higher grade—perhaps because he disapproved of the teaching methods in use there.[2] In spite of these difficulties, and largely as a result of his mother's tutoring, he passed the high-school entrance examination required in those days and returned to Chicago to attend the North Division (now the Waller) School.

In 1903 he entered Harvard College, to be graduated three years later. The course that he liked best and found most valuable there was the one in daily themes, conducted by the late Professor Charles Townsend Copeland. Because it forced him to put something down on paper day after day, week after week through the year, knowing that every careless word and every awkward sentence would be mercilessly exposed, this course, he used to say, taught him not only to write but also to think.

At the age of nineteen, with his A.B. from Harvard, Bloomfield went to the University of Wisconsin to begin his graduate work and serve at the same time as Assistant in German. Here he met Eduard Prokosch, his senior by nine years, and fell at once under the spell of the older man's personality. The meeting was an important event in Bloomfield's life; for it marked the birth of his career as a linguist. The incident is charmingly described in Bloomfield's obituary of Prokosch:[3]

> . . . In the summer of 1906 I came, fresh out of college, to Madison, to be looked over for an assistantship. Desiring to earn an academic living, I had developed no understanding or inclination for any branch of science. The kindly Professor Hohlfeld delegated Prokosch, one of his young instructors, to entertain me for the day. On a small table in Prokosch's dining room there stood a dozen technical books (I seem to remember that Leskien's Old Bulgarian grammar was among them) and in the interval before lunch

[1] See the obituary of Maurice Bloomfield by George M. Bolling in Lg. 4.214–7 (1928).

[2] Personal communication from Mr. Grover Bloomfield of Milwaukee.

[3] Lg. 14.311–2 (1938).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0097850749113163 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Prokosch explained to me their use and content. By the time we sat down to the meal, a matter perhaps of fifteen minutes, I had decided that I should always work in linguistics.

After two years of teaching and study at Wisconsin, Bloomfield went to the University of Chicago, where he continued both activities under the direction of Professor Francis A. Wood. It was Wood who chose the subject for his dissertation: 'a semasiologic differentiation in Germanic secondary ablaut'. He received his doctorate from the University of Chicago in 1909. On March 18 of the same year he had married Miss Alice Sayers of St. Louis.

In 1913 and 1914 he further extended his knowledge of linguistics through study at the Universities of Leipzig and Göttingen; among the scholars with whom he worked in Germany were August Leskien, Karl Brugmann, and Hermann Oldenberg. But in spite of the veneration in which he held these men, it was always Prokosch whom he called his teacher. 'At the end of the two years of pupilhood [in Madison],' he wrote,[4] 'I knew no greater intellectual pleasure than to listen to Prokosch.'

Bloomfield's teaching career is shown in the barest outline by the following dates: 1909–10, Instructor in German, University of Cincinnati; 1910–13, the same, University of Illinois; 1913–21, Assistant Professor of Comparative Philology and German, University of Illinois; 1921–27, Professor of German and Linguistics, Ohio State University; 1927–40, Professor of Germanic Philology, University of Chicago; 1940–49, Sterling Professor of Linguistics, Yale University. In the summer of 1925 he served as Assistant Ethnologist in the Canadian Department of Mines; for three summers (1938, '39, and '40) he was on the staff of the Linguistic Institute in Ann Arbor.

At the time of his death he was a member of the following professional organizations: the Linguistic Society of America, the American Oriental Society, the American Philological Association, the American Ethnological Society, the Modern Language Association of America, the American Association for the Advancement of Science, the Society for the Advancement of Scandinavian Studies, the International Phonetic Association, the American Philosophical Society, and the Royal Danish Academy of Science. He was also one of the two American members of the Comité International Permanent de Linguistes.

Bloomfield's scholarly writings were at first concerned with rather small details of Indo-European (and especially Germanic) phonology and morphology. But soon his interest in the larger aspects of linguistic science came to be reflected in wider-ranging and more general studies. In 1914 he published his first inclusive survey of the field, *An introduction to the study of language*. His Tagalog texts appeared in 1917, a product of his increasingly varied research in languages outside the Indo-European orbit; and five years later, in a review of Michelson's work on Fox, he wrote the first of his many contributions to the descriptive and comparative study of the Algonquian languages.

Bloomfield's masterpiece is unquestionably his book *Language*, published in 1933: a work without an equal as an exposition and synthesis of linguistic science. He called it, in the Preface (vii), 'a revision of the author's *Introduction*

[4] Lg. 14.312.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0097850749113163 Published online by Cambridge University Press

to the Study of Language'; but it is in fact a new work in every detail of its plan and execution. Even the author's fundamental point of view is wholly different in the two books. In 1914 Bloomfield had viewed language from the position of Wilhelm Wundt, whose 'Völkerpsychologie' is accordingly reflected in the earlier book. By 1933, partly as a result of his association with the psychologist Albert Paul Weiss,[5] he had become a behaviorist. But what is more important, he had convinced himself, as he was later to convince so many others, that it does not matter what particular brand of psychology a linguist finds attractive, so long as he keeps it out of his linguistic writings. Because of this teaching, which now is a commonplace among American linguists, Bloomfield has been repeatedly charged with denying some of the most vital features of human behavior—as if an ethnologist who chose to describe social organization without reference to physiology should be accused of denying the circulation of the blood.

His absorbing interest in linguistics as a science did not prevent him from devoting himself also—more diligently than the majority of linguists—to its practical applications, especially in the teaching of reading and the study of foreign languages. In opposition to many scholars with far less understanding of science, he felt that scientific inquiry was by no means wholly its own justification, which lay rather in the hope that it might lead us ultimately 'toward the understanding and control of human events'.[6] Among the more utilitarian products of this conviction are his German beginners' book (1923, 2d ed. 1928) and his English primer, a complete course for teaching schoolchildren to read and write, based on the true relation of writing to speech and carefully planned to illustrate all regular spellings before proceeding to the irregular. This primer was used experimentally in Chicago parochial schools in the early 1940's and proved its worth in the classroom; but it was never published—partly because 'the basic teaching of our schools, in reading and writing, in standard language and composition . . . , is dominated still by educationists who, knowing nothing about language, waste years of every child's time, and leave our community semi-literate.'[7]

It was during the last war that Bloomfield's concern for foreign-language teaching bore fruit. The history of the Intensive Language Program is familiar to most members of the Linguistic Society: how it was organized in 1941 by the American Council of Learned Societies to train teachers and prepare textbooks of strategically important languages; how it supervised the methods of instruction in the Army Specialized Training Program throughout the country; and how it published, through the Linguistic Society, a series of practical manuals written by trained linguists and applying the latest results of our science to the problem of teaching foreign languages. What is not so widely known is the part

[5] Weiss's chief work, *A theoretical basis of human behavior* (Columbus, Ohio, 1924; rev. ed. 1929), had a profound influence on Bloomfield. See also the shorter statement of Weiss's view in Lg. 1.52–7 (1925), and Bloomfield's obituary in Lg. 7.219–21 (1931).

[6] *Language* 509. The whole last chapter of *Language* is an expression of this hope and a discussion of the special fields where it may be most directly realized.

[7] Lg. 22.3 (1946).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0097850749113163 Published online by Cambridge University Press

that Bloomfield played in these activities. Although he was not a member of the committees that nominally directed the Intensive Language Program, and remained by preference in the background of its operations, there is no one to whom the Program is more deeply indebted. The influence of his teachings is obvious in every phase of its work: many of the younger men and women who took part in it learned their trade from him or from his book *Language*; and he himself contributed no fewer than four works to the series which the Program sponsored. In 1942, when it was not yet clear what direction the Program would take, he wrote one of the Program's two booklets on descriptive methodology: his *Outline guide for the practical study of foreign languages*, a brief but lucid statement of how the linguist works with an informant. Later he wrote three of the practical manuals: two for Dutch and one for Russian, devoting months of gruelling work to the task. In addition, he found time and strength to prepare a grammatical introduction for the War Department's Russian dictionary.

Bloomfield's relation to the Linguistic Society was peculiarly intimate. He was a member (with George M. Bolling and Edgar H. Sturtevant) of the organizing committee that first conceived the possibility of an association devoted wholly to linguistics; he himself wrote the Call for the Organization Meeting,[8] as well as the first article published in LANGUAGE (1.1–5), setting forth the reasons for establishing a Linguistic Society. In the days of the Society's early struggle for recognition he was one of its most convinced and convincing supporters; when it had come to be internationally respected as a professional and scientific body, he continued to work for it with quiet devotion. It is not inappropriate that the last article from his pen is a summary of the Linguistic Society's development.[9]

Bloomfield's greatness as a scholar was not limited to any one branch or aspect of linguistics. He was intimately acquainted with much of the vast literature of our science; and what he once read remained active in his prodigious memory. This reading gave him a profound sense of indebtedness to earlier workers in the field: he would often emphasize the cumulative nature of science, which enables each new generation to begin where the old one left off. But the ties that linked him to his predecessors did not fetter his imagination, or prevent him from exploring new languages and new techniques. Few men have been at home in so many corners of linguistics. Trained as an Indo-Europeanist in the great tradition of the neo-grammarians, he had also a specialist's knowledge of at least four groups within the general field: Germanic, Indic, Slavic, and Greek. Moreover, with a breadth of understanding rare among scholars of similar background, he appreciated not only the value of comparative and historical grammar but that of descriptive grammar as well. His interest in the latter subject, and the depth of insight that he brought to it—both stemming perhaps from his intimate study of Pāṇini—are notably reflected in his book *Language*, where more than a third of his exposition is concerned with it.[10]

Nor did he confine himself within the bounds of Indo-European; he had a wide

[8] Printed in Lg. 1.6–7 (1925).

[9] Twenty-one years of the Linguistic Society, Lg. 22.1–3 (1946).

[10] Chapters 5–8 on phonemics, and chapters 10–16 on grammar (pp. 74–138, 158–280).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0097850749113163 Published online by Cambridge University Press

acquaintance with languages in other families also. His first-hand investigation of several Malayo-Polynesian languages was one of the pioneer works in a little-known field. And as everyone knows, his descriptive and comparative studies of the Algonquian languages are among the classics of American Indian research. Few anecdotes are more often told in support of the neo-grammarian hypothesis than Bloomfield's use of it to predict the discovery of a previously unattested consonant cluster in a Central Algonquian dialect.[11] The significance of his writings in this field has been fully explored elsewhere;[12] here it will be enough to point out the characteristic union of old and new in Bloomfield's work: the application of an established technique, developed in the comparison of Indo-European languages, to a linguistic family without written records—a family that many Indo-Europeanists have never heard of.

Bloomfield's profound influence on the development of our science was in some ways a paradox. He consistently discouraged would-be beginners in linguistics from entering the field, on the ground that they would find it impossible to make a living, yet the vogue that linguistics enjoys today is largely the result of his work in it. He had almost no students, yet most American descriptivists look up to him as their teacher. He despised all talk of schools and factions—'the blight of the odium theologicum',[13] yet many linguists regard themselves proudly as members of a school that bears his name. He avoided public discussion and only rarely engaged in controversy, yet his views on many controversial questions are well known and have become current doctrine. He kept himself as much as possible in the background, preferring his own work to the business of propaganda, yet no linguist of his generation had wider fame or was more universally revered.

His personality was not strongly magnetic. He was too unassuming to impose it on others, too withdrawn to enjoy the immediate satisfaction of dominating an audience. His influence, therefore, was not primarily a personal one. It is probable that many of those who count themselves his followers never saw him. That his teaching has nevertheless changed the course of linguistics in this country, that his approach and his method have come to be almost matters of orthodoxy to many students, is due to the tremendous impact of his book *Language* and of his other writings.[14] To appreciate that impact it is enough to recall the state of our linguistic methods before the appearance of *Language*. It was a shocking book: so far in advance of current theory and practice that many

[11] A note on sound-change, Lg. 4.99–100 (1928).

[12] Charles F. Hockett, Implications of Bloomfield's Algonquian studies, Lg. 24.117–31 (1948).

[13] Lg. 22.2.

[14] The following articles and reviews contain important general statements: A set of postulates for the science of language, Lg. 2.153–64 (1926); On recent work in linguistics, MPhil. 25.211–30 (1927); Linguistics as a science, Studies in Philology 27.553–7 (1930); review of Ries, Lg. 7.204–9 (1931); review of Herrmann, Lg. 8.220–33 (1932); review of Havers, Lg. 10.32–40 (1934); Language or ideas?, Lg. 12.89–95 (1936); review of Bentley, Lg. 12.137–41 (1936); Secondary and tertiary responses to language, Lg. 20.45–55 (1944); review of Bodmer, American Speech 19.211–3 (1944). See also his monograph, *Linguistic aspects of science* (Chicago, 1939).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0097850749113163 Published online by Cambridge University Press

readers, even among the well-disposed, were outraged by what they thought a needless flouting of tradition; yet so obviously superior to all other treatments of the subject that its unfamiliar plan could not be dismissed as mere eccentricity. Today, of course, the book no longer shocks anyone; more than any other work, it approaches the status of a standard text. Its innovations have become commonplace; some of its most novel features now seem slightly old-fashioned. The reason for this reversal is plain: not only did the book summarize and clarify the main results of our science up to the time of its publication, it also pointed the direction that linguistics was to take in the immediate future. It is not too much to say that every significant refinement of analytic method produced in this country since 1933 has come as a direct result of the impetus given to linguistic research by Bloomfield's book. If today our methods in descriptive analysis are in some ways better than his, if we see more clearly than he did himself certain aspects of the structure that he first revealed to us, it is because we stand upon his shoulders.

His own opinion of his book was characteristically modest. He thought of it as an elementary work, 'intended for the general reader and for the student who is entering upon linguistic work.'[15] In conversation he often referred to it as 'my high-school text', though surely no high-school student could read it through. Even professional linguists usually find it slow reading—not because it is obscurely written but because it so carefully says in every sentence exactly what it means, because every word is essential and every definition must be taken seriously. Bloomfield was regretfully aware that many readers found the book difficult, and acknowledged that the fault was his for not having written it more diffusely. He attributed his error to the lack of a popularizing tradition in linguistics. Only a series of better and better approximations to an ideal work, he used to say, would ultimately yield a satisfactory popularization. The object of such a work is admirably set forth in his own words, written six years before the appearance of his book:[16] 'Sound popularizing tries to lead the layman toward an understanding and appreciation of science, not to encourage his taste for the bizarre, irrelevant, and inaccurate.'

There can be no doubt that Bloomfield's greatest contribution to the study of language was to make a science of it. Others before him had worked scientifically in linguistics; but no one had so uncompromisingly rejected all prescientific methods, or had been so consistently careful, in writing about language, to use terms that would imply no tacit reliance on factors beyond the range of observation. To some readers, unaware of the danger that lies in a common-sense view of the world, Bloomfield's avoidance of everyday expressions may have sounded like pedantry, his rigorous definitions like jargon. But to the majority of linguists, the simple clarity of Bloomfield's diction first revealed in full the possibilities of scientific discourse about language. It was Bloomfield who taught us the necessity of speaking about language in the style that every scientist uses

[15] Preface, p. vii.

[16] In a review of Lokotsch, *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der amerikanischen (indianischen) Wörter im Deutschen*, MPhil. 24.489 (1927).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0097850749113163 Published online by Cambridge University Press

when he speaks about the object of his research: impersonally, precisely, and in terms that assume no more than actual observation discloses to him.

In his long campaign to make a science of linguistics, the chief enemy that Bloomfield met was that habit of thought which is called mentalism: the habit of appealing to mind and will as ready-made explanations of all possible problems. Most men regard this habit as obvious common sense; but in Bloomfield's view, as in that of other scientists, it is mere superstition, unfruitful at best and deadly when carried over into scientific research. In the opposite approach—known as positivism, determinism, or mechanism—Bloomfield saw the main hope of the world; for he was convinced that only the knowledge gained by a strictly objective study of human behavior, including language, would one day make it possible for men to live at peace with each other. The following statement is typical both of his confidence in the methods of science and of his hatred of superstition:[17]

> We have acquired understanding and the power of prediction and control and have reaped vast benefit in the domains where we have developed non-animistic and non-teleologic science. We remain ignorant and helpless in the domains where we have failed to develop that kind of science, namely, in human affairs, such as the correlation of incentive with the distribution of economic goods, or the disposal of conflicting national interests.
>
> The only exception here is our relatively good knowledge of the structure and history of languages, a body of knowledge which, against the predisposition and expectation of the discoverers, turned out to imply no animistic or teleological factors. Although this situation gives us no certainty, it offers a strong probability in favor of extending the methods that have been successful to replace those which have yielded no success. Mankind has always found such steps difficult and has resisted them with more than mere inertia. Obscurantism, the articulate vanguard of that resistance, has never employed rational argument, but only invective and, from the time of Galileo to our own, every degree of irrational sanction.

On May 27, 1946, at the summit of his career, Bloomfield suffered a stroke that put an end to his life as a productive scholar—to everything that gave satisfaction and purpose to his life as a man. For eight weeks he lay unconscious; then by slow degrees he began to regain his faculties—but never all of them. After many months he was able to walk again, supported by a cane and a companion's arm. After yet more months of creeping improvement, interrupted by a succession of minor strokes, he recovered so far as to be able to make short visits to his office in the Hall of Graduate Studies, where he would sit in a wheelchair at his littered desk and chat with friends. He could do no work. His eyes had been permanently affected by his illness, and his memory was impaired. When he received the first number of LANGUAGE for 1948, with its dedication to him, he was deeply touched; but he could not read it. For a time there was hope that he might one day be well enough to resume his teaching; then the slow improvement ceased, and his paralysis began to grow more general. During the last year of his life he became steadily weaker, until, four months before his death, he was again confined to his bed. He died peacefully. To those who saw him

[17] Lg. 20.55 (1944). Although this article (Secondary and tertiary responses to language) began as a jeu d'esprit, its latter half contains an admirable and wholly serious defense of the mechanistic position; see pp. 51–5 (omitting the long quotation).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0097850749113163 Published online by Cambridge University Press

during the three years of his empty survival, his death was not a new occasion for grief.

Throughout these years Bloomfield never complained. He rarely spoke of himself, and never to invite compassion or solicitude. That modesty which had prevented him from acknowledging his own true stature, and from taking seriously the tributes that he received from other scholars, now blinded him—perhaps mercifully—to the tragic significance of his uncompleted work. He gave the impression that his illness was a merely personal inconvenience, and therefore unimportant. In character he was unchanged. He lost none of his lively interest in the world about him, none of his warmth in human contacts, his fondness for conversation, his whimsical humor. But above all his other interests, what he liked best to talk about, then as always, was the study of language. Though he could no longer pursue it himself, he followed eagerly the work of his younger colleagues; and when they brought their problems to him, his criticism was no less trenchant, his advice no less clear-sighted than in the days of his own full vigor.

Leonard Bloomfield was unfailingly generous, a devoted worker in the cause of truth, an unrelenting fighter against reaction and stupidity. Above all, he was humane. We shall remember him with admiration for his greatness as a man of science, with love for his greatness as a human being.

BERNARD BLOCH, *Yale University*

The following list, based largely on a record in his own hand, is thought to be a substantially complete bibliography of Bloomfield's published writings. Items are listed chronologically by years; within each year, books and monographs are put first, reviews last.[18]

1909 Before dawn: A social drama (translation of Gerhart Hauptmann's Vor Sonnenaufgang, 1889), Poet Lore 20.241–315. [Also published as a separately bound book, with unchanged pagination; Boston: The Gorham Press.]

A semasiologic differentiation in Germanic secondary ablaut [University of Chicago dissertation], Part 1, MPhil. 7.245–88.

1910 A semasiologic differentiation in Germanic secondary ablaut, Part 2, MPhil. 7.345–82.

1911 The Indo-European palatals in Sanskrit, AJP 32.36–57.

Etymologisches, Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur [Paul und Braunes Beiträge] 37.245–61.

Review of Richard Loewe, *Deutsches Wörterbuch* (Sammlung Göschen No. 64, 1910), JEGP 10.122–9.

Review of Heinrich Schröder, Ablautstudien (Heidelberg, 1910), JEGP 10.131–5.

Review of Francis A. Wood, *Indo-European a : a^{z}i : a^{z}u: A study in ablaut and in word-formation* (Strassburg, 1905), JEGP 10.628–31.

[18] Titles of books and monographs are in italics. The following abbreviations are used: AJP—American Journal of Philology; IJAL—International Journal of American Linguistics; JEGP—Journal of English and Germanic Philology; Lg.—LANGUAGE; MPhil.—Modern Philology; MPhon.—Le Maître Phonétique; TAPA—Transactions of the American Philological Association. With a few minor exceptions, every item in this bibliography has been checked and verified by Julia Bloch.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0097850749113163 Published online by Cambridge University Press

1912 The *e*-sounds in the language of Hans Sachs, MPhil. 9.489–509.
A type of Scandinavian word-formation, Publications of the Society for the Advancement of Scandinavian Studies 1.45–53.
Review of Wilhelm Braune, *Althochdeutsche Grammatik*, 3. u. 4. Aufl. (Halle a/S, 1911), JEGP 11.269–74.
Review of Alfred Dwight Sheffield, *Grammar and thinking: A study of the working concepts in syntax* (New York and London, 1912), JEGP 11.619–24.
Review of Eduard Prokosch, *An introduction to German* (New York, 1911), Monatshefte für deutsche Sprache und Pädagogik 13.92.

1913 Review of Wilhelm Wundt, *Elemente der Völkerpsychologie: Grundlinien einer psychologischen Entwicklungsgeschichte der Menschheit*, 2. Aufl. (Leipzig, 1913), American Journal of Psychology 24.449–53.

1914 *An introduction to the study of language*, pp. x + 335; New York: Henry Holt and Company.
Sentence and word, TAPA 45.65–75.
Review of Sigmund Feist, *Kultur, Ausbreitung und Herkunft der Indogermanen* (Berlin, 1913), JEGP 13.472–5.

1916 Subject and predicate, TAPA 47.13–22.
Review of four works [Francis A. Wood, *Some parallel formations in English* (Göttingen and Baltimore, 1913); Elias Wessén, *Zur Geschichte der germanischen N-Deklination* (Uppsala, 1914); Karl Kärre, *Nomina agentis in Old English* (Uppsala, 1915); H. O. Schwabe, *The semantic development of words for eating and drinking in Germanic* (Chicago, 1915)], JEGP 15.140–4.
Review of Leo Wiener, *Commentary to the Germanic laws and mediaeval documents* (Cambridge, Mass., 1915), JEGP 15.299–304. [Added as a note to Alexander Green's review of this work in JEGP 15.293–9.]

1917 *Tagalog texts with grammatical analysis*, pp. 408 (University of Illinois Studies in Language and Literature, Vol. 3, Nos. 2–4); Urbana. [Part I: Texts and translations, pp. 1–122; Part II: Grammatical analysis, pp. 131–316; Part III: List of formations and glossary, pp. 317–408.]

1918 Physigunkus, MPhil. 15.577–602.

1922 Review of Edward Sapir, *Language: An introduction to the study of speech* (New York, 1921), The Classical Weekly 15.142–3.
Review of Truman Michelson, *The Owl Sacred Pack of the Fox Indians* (Washington, D. C., 1921), AJP 43.276–81.
Review of Otto Jespersen, *Language: Its nature, development and origin* (New York, 1922), AJP 43.370–3.

1923 *First German book*, pp. vi + 362; Columbus, Ohio: R. G. Adams & Co.

1924 The Menomini language, *Proceedings of the twentyfirst International Congress of Americanists* (First part, held at The Hague, August 12–16, 1924) 336–43; The Hague.
Review of Ferdinand de Saussure, *Cours de linguistique générale*, 2d ed. (Paris, 1922), Modern Language Journal 8.317–9.

1925 Why a Linguistic Society?, Lg. 1.1–5.
On the sound-system of Central Algonquian, Lg. 1.130–56.
Notes on the Fox language (Sections I–III), IJAL 3.219–32.
Einiges vom germanischen Wortschatz, *Germanica: Eduard Sievers zum 75. Geburtstage* 90–106; Leipzig.

1926 A set of postulates for the science of language, Lg. 2.153–64.

1927 On some rules of Pāṇini, Journal of the American Oriental Society 47.61–70.
On recent work in general linguistics, MPhil. 25.211–30.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0097850749113163 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Literate and illiterate speech, American Speech 2.432–9.
American English, MPhon. III. 5.40–2.
Notes on the Fox language (Sections IV–XI), IJAL 4.181–219.
The word-stems of Central Algonquian, *Festschrift Meinhof: Beiträge zur afrikanischen Sprachwissenschaft* 393–402; Hamburg.
What symbols shall we use? (with George M. Bolling), Lg. 3.123–9.
Review of P. W. Schmidt. *Die Sprachfamilien und Sprachenkreise der Erde* (Heidelberg, 1926), Lg. 3.130–1.
Review of Otto Dempwolff, *Die L-, R- und D-Laute in austronesischen Sprachen* (Berlin, 1925), Lg. 3.199.
Review of G. W. S. Friedrichsen, *The Gothic version of the Gospels: A study in style and textual history* (Oxford, 1926), JEGP 26.401–6.
Review of Otto Jespersen, *The philosophy of grammar* (New York, 1924), JEGP 26.444–6.
Review of Karl Lokotsch, *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der amerikanischen (indianischen) Wörter im Deutschen* (Heidelberg, 1926), MPhil. 24.489–91.
Review of Friedrich Maurer, *Untersuchungen über die deutsche Verbstellung in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung* (Heidelberg, 1926), MPhil. 24.491–3.
Note on Eric Rooth, *Altgermanische Wortstudien* (Halle a/S, 1926), MPhil. 24.500.

1928 *Menomini texts*, pp. xiv + 607 (Publications of the American Ethnological Society, Vol. 12); New York: G. E. Stechert & Co., Agents.
First German book, 2d ed., pp. xiii + 397; New York: The Century Co.
The story of Bad Owl, *Atti del XXII Congresso Internazionale degli Americanisti* (Roma, Settembre 1926) 2.23–34; Roma.
The Plains Cree language, *Atti del XXII Congresso Internazionale degli Americanisti* (Roma, Settembre 1926) 2.427–31; Roma.
A note on sound-change, Lg. 4.99–100.
Review of G. G. Kloeke, *De Hollandsche expansie in de zestiende en zeventiende eeuw en haar weerspiegeling in de hedendaagsche Nederlandsche dialecten* ('s Gravenhage, 1927), Lg. 4.284–8.
Review of Adolf Stender-Petersen, *Slavisch-germanische Lehnwortkunde: Eine Studie über die ältesten germanischen Lehnwörter im Slavischen in sprach- und kulturgeschichtlicher Beleuchtung* (Göteborg, 1927), JEGP 27.396–8.
Review of M. J. van der Meer, *Historische Grammatik der niederländischen Sprache*, 1. Band (Heidelberg, 1927), JEGP 27.550–1.
Note on L. Grootaers and G. G. Kloeke, *Handleiding bij het Nord- en Zuid-Nederlandsch Dialectonderzoek* ('s Gravenhage, 1926), MPhil. 25.376.
Note on Erich Maschke, *Studien zu Waffennamen der althochdeutschen Glossen* (Greifswald, 1926), MPhil. 25.504–5.
Note on Werner Salow, *Die deutsche Sprachwissenschaft in der Allgemeinen Deutschen Bibliothek: Ein Beitrag zur deutschen Philologie im Zeitalter der Aufklärung* (Greifswald, 1926), MPhil. 25.507.

1929 Notes on the preverb *ge-* in Alfredian English, *Studies in English philology: A miscellany in honor of Frederick Klaeber* 79–102; Minneapolis.
Otfridiana, JEGP 28.489–502.
Review of Bruno Liebich, *Konkordanz Pāṇini-Candra* (Breslau, 1928), Lg. 5.267–76.
Review (with Archer Taylor) of *Festskrift til Hjalmar Falk* (Oslo, 1927), MPhil. 26.367–9.
Note on Eduard Hartl, *Die Textgeschichte des Wolframschen Parzival*, 1. Teil (Berlin and Leipzig, 1928), MPhil. 26.373.
Review of H. de Boor, *Untersuchungen zur Sprachbehandlung Otfrids: Hiatus und Synaloephe* (Breslau, 1928), MPhil. 27.221–4.

1930 *Sacred stories of the Sweet Grass Cree*, pp. [iii] + 346 (Canada, Department of Mines: National Museum of Canada, Bulletin No. 60; Anthropological Series, No. 11); Ottawa: F. A. Acland.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0097850749113163 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Salic *litus*, *Studies in honor of Hermann Collitz* 83–94; Baltimore.
OHG *eino*, OE *ana* 'solus', *Curme volume of linguistic studies* 50–9 (Language Monograph No. 7); Baltimore.
Old English plural subjunctives in *-e*, JEGP 29.100–13.
German ç and x, MPhon. III. 8.27–8.
Linguistics as a science, Studies in Philology 27.553–7.

1931 Obituary of Albert Paul Weiss, Lg. 7.219–21.
Review of John Ries, Was ist ein Satz? (Prag, 1931), Lg. 7.204–9.
Review of Virgil Moser, *Frühneuhochdeutsche Grammatik*, 1. Band (Heidelberg, 1929), JEGP 30.407–8.

1932 The word, MPhon. III.10.41.
Review of Eduard Hermann, *Lautgesetz und Analogie* (Berlin, 1931), Lg. 8.220–33.

1933 *Language*, pp. ix + 564; New York: Henry Holt and Company.
The structure of learned words, *A commemorative volume issued by the Institute for Research in English Teaching on the occasion of the tenth annual conference of English teachers* 17–23; Tokyo.

1934 *Plains Cree texts*, pp. viii + 309 (Publications of the American Ethnological Society, Vol. 16); New York: G. E. Stechert & Co., Agents.
Review of Wilhelm Havers, *Handbuch der erklärenden Syntax: Ein Versuch zur Erforschung der Bedingungen und Triebkräfte in Syntax und Stilistik* (Heidelberg, 1931), Lg. 10.32–40.
Review of G. Pilhofer, *Grammatik der Kâte-Sprache in Neuginea* (Berlin, 1933) Lg. 10.63–4.

1935 *Language* (British edition), pp. ix + 566; London: G. Allen & Unwin, Ltd.
The stressed vowels of American English, Lg. 11.97–116.
Linguistic aspects of science, Philosophy of Science 2.499–517.

1936 On Laves' review of Dempwolff, Lg. 12.52–3.
Language or ideas?, Lg. 12.89–95.
Review of Arthur F. Bentley, *Linguistic analysis of mathematics* (Bloomington, 1932) and *Behavior, knowledge, fact* (Bloomington, 1935), Lg. 12.137–41.

1937 Notes on Germanic compounds, *Mélanges linguistiques offerts à M. Holger Pedersen* 303–7 (Acta Jutlandica, Vol. 9, No. 1); København.

1938 Initial [k] in German, Lg. 14.178–86.
Obituary of Eduard Prokosch, Lg. 14.310–3.
Review of Roger Williams, *A key into the language of America*, 5th ed. (Providence, 1936), New England Quarterly 11.416–8.

1939 *Linguistic aspects of science*, pp. viii + 59 (International Encyclopedia of Unified Science, Vol. 1, No. 4); Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Menomini morphophonemics, *Études phonologiques dédiées à la mémoire de N. S. Trubetzkoy* 105–15 (Travaux du Cercle Linguistique de Prague, Vol. 8); Prague.
Review of Louis H. Gray, *Foundations of language* (New York, 1939), The Modern Language Forum 24.198–9.

1941 Ideals and idealists, Lg. 17.59.
Proto-Algonquian *-i·t-* 'fellow', Lg. 17.292–7.
Review of Morice Vanoverbergh, *Some undescribed languages of Luzon* (Nijmegen, 1937), Acta Linguistica 2.129.

1942 *Outline guide for the practical study of foreign languages*, pp. 16 (Special Publication of the Linguistic Society of America); Baltimore.
Philosophical aspects of language, *Studies in the history of culture: The disciplines of the humanities* [presented to Waldo Gifford Leland] 173–7; Menasha, Wisconsin.
Linguistics and reading, The Elementary English Review 19.125–30, 183–6.
Outline of Ilocano syntax, Lg. 18.193–200.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0097850749113163 Published online by Cambridge University Press

1943 Meaning, Monatshefte für deutschen Unterricht 35.101–6.
Obituary of Franz Boas, Lg. 19.198.
Review of Mauricio Swadesh, *La nueva filología* (México, 1941), Lg. 19.168–70.

1944 *Colloquial Dutch*, pp. ix + 284 (War Department Education Manual EM 550); Madison, Wisconsin: Published for the United States Armed Forces Institute by the Linguistic Society of America and the Intensive Language Program [of the] American Council of Learned Societies. [Also published in a civilian edition, New York: Henry Holt and Company.]
Spoken Dutch: Basic course, Vol. 1, Units 1–12, pp. vii + 236 (War Department Education Manual EM 529); imprint as for *Colloquial Dutch*. [Also published (1945) in a civilian edition, New York: Henry Holt and Company.]
Secondary and tertiary responses to language, Lg. 20.45–55.
Review of Frederick Bodmer, *The loom of language* (New York, 1944), American Speech 19.211–3.

1945 *Spoken Dutch: Basic course*, Vol. 2, Units 13–30, pp. [ii] + [318] (War Department Education Manual EM 530); imprint as for *Colloquial Dutch*. [Also published in a civilian edition, New York: Henry Holt and Company.]
Handleiding voor de gids (for *Spoken Dutch: Basic course*), pp. ii + 34 (War Department Education Manual EM 531); imprint as for *Colloquial Dutch*.
Spoken Russian: Basic course (with Luba Petrova), Vol. 2, Units 13–30, pp. iii + [398] (War Department Education Manual EM 525); imprint as for *Colloquial Dutch*. [Also published in a civilian edition, New York: Henry Holt and Company.]
Grammatical introduction (unsigned) to Part II, Russian–English, *Dictionary of spoken Russian* 215–34 (War Department Technical Manual TM 30–944); Washington, D. C.: War Department.
About foreign language teaching, The Yale Review 34.625–41.
On describing inflection, *Festschrift für M. Blakemore Evans* 8–13 (Monatshefte für deutschen Unterricht, Vol. 37, No. 4/5); Madison, Wisconsin.

1946 *Spravočnik Rukovoditelä dlä Spoken Russian*, pp. 57 (War Department Education Manual EM 526); imprint as for *Colloquial Dutch*.
Algonquian, *Linguistic structures of native America* 85–129 (Viking Fund Publications in Anthropology, No. 6); New York.
Twenty-one years of the Linguistic Society, Lg. 22.1–3.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0097850749113163 Published online by Cambridge University Press