GEORGE LEONARD TRAGER

George Leonard Trager, a member of our Society since 1931 and its president in 1960, died on Monday, August 31, 1992, in Pasadena, California.*

George was born Thursday, March 22, 1906, in Newark, New Jersey. His parents, Leon and Anna, had come to this country from Russia via Germany, where his father had been trained as an engineer. As a child, George acquired Russian at home, German both there and in the neighborhood, and English in the neighborhood and at school. According to Edith Trager Johnson, at a tender age 'he was precociously adept' in all three languages. He was successful enough in the public schools of Newark to receive a New Jersey state scholarship that covered all tuition and fees at Rutgers University, where he enrolled in 1922. His original intended major was chemistry, but that was soon changed to Romance languages, and with that major he graduated on schedule in 1926.

For the next year George taught in the public schools of Newark, apparently without making the school authorities, the children, or himself very happy. Then he got a position as Assistant Professor of Modern Languages and Head of the Romance Language Department at Midland College in Fremont, Nebraska, where he stayed for two years. This was followed by a year as a Teaching Fellow at Brown University, assisting in French. However, during all or part of this three-year period he was also enrolled at Columbia—probably in the Extension Department, because he was awarded the AM in Romance Philology in 1929. Returning to the city in 1930, he worked for a year with Columbia University Extension, and then, for 1931–34, as a Research Associate of the International Auxiliary Language Association.[1] In 1932 Columbia awarded him the PhD. His dissertation, written under the direction of H. R. Muller but also with some guidance from Louis H. Gray, was *The use of the Latin demon-*

* At this late date, so long after George Trager's professionally active years, the collecting of reliable facts for this account has not been easy. It would have been impossible without the assistance of the people I am about to mention—none of whom is to be blamed for any errors of fact that may remain. George's former wife, now Edith Trager Johnson, deserves first mention. Two of his former students at Buffalo, M. Estellie Smith and Joan G. Fickett, were of special help. My thanks also to Harold C. Conklin; J Milton Cowan; Robert A. Hall Jr; Barbara M. Henning, Executive Assistant to the President, American Council of Learned Societies; Mary Ritchie Key; Penny Lee; Wendy Leeds-Hurwitz; Martha L. Mitchell, University Archivist at the Brown University Library; G. Thomas Tanselle, Vice President of the John Simon Guggenheim Memorial Foundation; and members of the Secretariat and Editorial Staff of our Society.

I have also drawn freely on my own correspondence files and, of course, on my personal memories.

[1] The head of the IALA at the time was Alice V. Morris. She also arranged for the writing and publishing of Language Monographs 6 (1930) and 10 (1932), the first by Edward Sapir, the second by Sapir and Morris Swadesh. Thus there may have been some contact even at this early date between Trager and those two.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0097850793070456 Published online by Cambridge University Press

stratives up to 600 A.D., as the source of the Romance article.[2] In that same year he married Sadie Grabelsky (born Saturday, January 20, 1906).

At some point in his association with Columbia, George was exposed to the influence of the anthropologist Franz Boas. The experience was seminal: it laid the foundations for his early and lasting conviction that linguistics, properly oriented, is not just a branch of anthropology but a crucially important part, capable of shedding both methodological and interpretive light on all the rest of that field of science.

George joined the Linguistic Society early enough in 1931 to be listed among new members in the June issue of *Language*. That summer the Linguistic Institute was held at the College of the City of New York. Both Bernard Bloch and Martin Joos were in attendance, training for work on the New England Atlas, and George may have met one or both of them at that time. That George and Bernard had met at least by the 1934 LSA meeting in Philadelphia is certain. 'Meanwhile,' says Martin (1986:50), 'his IALA earnings enabled him to bring out our Monograph 13,' dated 1933, which was also his first publication in Slavic linguistics.

In 1934, according to Edith, George made his one and only—and unsuccessful—'foray into politics, running in Newark for alderman on the Socialist ticket.' In the fall he went to Adams State College in Alamosa, Colorado, where for two years he taught all the foreign-language courses. It was while serving there that he began his fieldwork with the language of Taos pueblo, which lies about a hundred miles to the south (the automobile routes between Alamosa and Ranches of Taos both still had lengthy unpaved sections, but the contemporary road maps show them as navigable 'in dry weather'; there is no rail connection). With one of his three informants he established a close and rewarding friendship; for cultural reasons George never published this coworker's name, and the same considerations force our present salute to him to be anonymous.

In 1936 George began a fairly extended period of association with Yale University. For the first year he was a Research Fellow in Linguistics, with no stipend, but the Department of Anthropology gave him a grant for fieldwork at Taos for the summer of 1937. For 1937–38 he was Lecturer in Phonetics. For 1938–39 he held a Sterling Fellowship in Slavic Linguistics, and also received a Study Aid from the American Council of Learned Societies for the study of Slavic in Europe; from letters we know that in December of 1938 he was in Paris, somewhat later in Tartu, Estonia. For the summer of 1939 he was Instructor in Slavic at the Linguistic Institute, University of Michigan. For 1939–40 he was back at Yale with the same dual support (Sterling Fellowship and ACLS Study Aid); the Sterling Fellowship continued for 1940–41, and he was also Lecturer in Phonetics that year. In the summer of 1941 he was on the staff of the Linguistic Institute held at the University of North Carolina in Chapel Hill; he and Edgar E. Sturtevant jointly offered the general introductory course in linguistics that was a standard feature of the Institutes of that period.

[2] Muller was not a member of our Society, but Gray was one of the Signers of the Call.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0097850793070456 Published online by Cambridge University Press

For 1941–42 he held a Guggenheim Fellowship for the study of the dialects of Slovene ('Windish') immigrants in eastern Pennsylvania; after three months of gathering material in the field he returned to New Haven, where he remained, eventually on the Yale faculty, through the fall semester of 1942–43.

In the Yale Graduate School, in those years, the fields of Anthropology and Linguistics were very close, as might be expected given the presence (until his death in 1939) of Edward Sapir. So the orientation George had acquired earlier from Franz Boas was reinforced, as he came into close association not only with Sapir but with such anthropological leading lights as Leslie Spier, George P. Murdock, Cornelius Osgood, and visiting professors Robert H. Lowie and Bronislaw Malinowski, the sinologist George A. Kennedy, as well as with the linguists Franklin Edgerton, Edgar Sturtevant (who was repeatedly his sponsor with the ACLS), Murray Emeneau, Morris Swadesh, Benjamin Lee Whorf, later on Isidore Dyen and Ralph L. Ward, and, after 1941, Leonard Bloomfield. My own Yale years were 1936–39, and that was when George and I first met. I remember, in a course in practical phonetics given mainly by Swadesh, George coming in and dictating Russian words for us students to transcribe phonetically, as data for trying to work out the phonemic system. That classroom mock-up of field procedure, used also by Swadesh, was exactly what I myself came to do later at Cornell.

George's collaboration with Benjamin Whorf on historical-comparative Azteco-Tanoan began in 1937, the year their paper on the subject appeared. That was their only joint publication, but Whorf's influence is obvious in some of George's subsequent work, and Penny Lee tells me that the Whorf Papers in the Yale University Manuscripts and Archives include some unpublished coöperative material from 1937–38. Further planned collaboration was cut short by Whorf's untimely death in 1941.

George's joint work with Bernard Bloch may have begun as early as 1934. It continued by correspondence during the years when George was at Yale and Bernard at Brown (Bernard came to Yale, bringing with him the editorial office of *Language,* in 1943; the New Haven sojourns of the two overlapped only for a few months). Their primary concern at the outset was phonetics and the design of a phonetic alphabet more complete and accurate than that of the IPA; this is reflected in some of George's publications, and in some joint ones, of the period. But they also turned their attention to phonemic theory, especially to the phonemic analysis of English.

On these latter topics the correspondence soon spread to others. I still have remnants of a file of (mainly) three-way letters among George, Bernard, and myself, from the late 1930s and very early 1940s. In the present (1990s) state of affairs—when many universities have as many linguists as could be found at one spot in those days only at Linguistic Institutes, when every department of linguistics has its own publication series, and when any scholar with nimble fingers can do his own desktop publishing—it may be hard to conceive of our situation in the 1930s and 1940s with nothing but manual typewriters, mimeographs, and card files. But at the time that was how we had to work.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0097850793070456 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The early multidirectional correspondence had two outcomes. We wanted to replace multiple carbon copies of letters by some sort of informal journal that would focus on tentative ideas worthy of joint pondering rather than on elegant finished pieces. After three years of discussion, in March 1942 a Bulletin went out announcing such a journal; it was signed by Bernard Bloch, Isidore Dyen, Mary R. Haas, me, Henry Hoenigswald, Martin Joos, George, and Ralph L. Ward. The name chosen was *Studies in Linguistics* (hereafter *SiL*); I was to be editor, George chief consultant, and Martin publisher (that is, cutter of mimeograph stencils) and distributor. But Pearl Harbor had happened, I had been drafted, and the burden fell on the other two. George became editor. Martin continued in his role through 1947; thereafter *SiL* was solely George's (except, as we shall see, for crucial help from within his household).[3]

The other outcome of our furious three-way correspondence around 1940 was a pair of articles in *Language:* the famous—or infamous—'Syllabic phonemes of English' by George and Bernard, in 1941, and my own 'A system of descriptive phonology', of 1942, which (with their blessing) tried to set forth the theoretical and methodological foundation on which their treatment rested. The former was the first printed presentation of 'Trager's /h/', as I am going to call it: a proposed English phoneme that subsumes [h] as the prevocalic and presemivocalic allophone, as in *how, when,* and *hue,* but also a centering voiced glide as postvocalic allophone, as in *yeah* and *law,* interpreted as /yéh/ and /lóh/. The number of 'simple vowels' of American English was reduced to six; others were complex nuclei consisting of one of those six plus /w/, /y/, or /h/. The sequelae can easily be followed in articles or references in ensuing issues of *Language*—both the widespread, and often violent, negative reaction and the readjustments (e.g. from six to nine simple vowels) made by the original proposers.

It was also in these papers that the notion of phonemic juncture was first given systematic attention. That was my contribution, but it deserves mention here because Trager's /h/ and 'Hockett's juncture' both continued to play a prominent role in George's theorizing throughout his scholarly career.

During his last years at Yale, when the war had begun and many of us were about to be engaged in the preparation and use of language-teaching materials for defense purposes, George participated in two important projects.

One was the preparation, with Bernard Bloch and Leonard Bloomfield, of an *Outline of linguistic analysis* (1942), intended as an aid to anyone taking on the wartime job of analyzing an alien language and preparing teaching materials for it.

The other (also 1942) was a strictly preliminary mimeographed version (never published) of an *Introduction to Russian*. In methodology, this was an important

[3] Many years later, in 1975, when Adam Makkai and some others were planning a new journal, we asked George's family if we could pick up the now abandoned name. They did not want that, and so we settled on *Forum Linguisticum*. Given my role as cofounder of *SiL*, I think we could have insisted. But I have become very glad that we did not, because the identification of *SiL* and George L. Trager now remains as an unalloyed memorial.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0097850793070456 Published online by Cambridge University Press

precursor of the wartime Spoken Language Series prepared under the aegis of the American Council of Learned Societies and published by the War Department for military use, by D. C. Heath (Romance) and by Henry Holt (all the others), for civilians. As Felicia Harben Trager wrote in 1971, 'No one, least of all GLT, would now think of a book like this one as a suitable text for learning a language; yet it was the first of many to emphasize rote learning of spoken material, to use transcription exclusively before introducing the regular writing system, and to teach grammar by examples in sentences rather than by precept.' So it paved the way; the rest of us learned from both its merits and its defects.

At the time, however, the *Introduction* was the source of some contention. As might be expected, some of its innovations were puzzling or even offensive to traditional Slavicists. More seriously, there was question about George's Russian, which was felt to deviate too much from any current standard. Quite a number of us were engaged in wartime language work, particularly in New York and Washington, and some of the young hotheads—including me—took sides, engaging in intemperate commentary that stemmed more from personal loyalties than from objective facts. I mention the matter only because I want to quote from a letter Leonard Bloomfield wrote to me on March 25, 1945, at the height of my own petulance:

> '... I am very fond of [George]. I will say only this against [him]: he did not follow his informants, merely setting aside forms that he concluded were non-colloquial or non-standard; instead, he quarreled with them and overruled them and put in his own impossible forms. I can say this to you because I repeatedly tried to convince him about it, and especially because I do regard George, under normal conditions (not in Russian), as a very fine observer and as a brilliant synthesizer. He simply allowed an accidental and personal eccentricity (in his case, stubbornness) to foul up his work.'

That passage tells us a little about the intellectual interplay between Trager and Bloomfield, but it must be supplemented. Of course, like all of us George had deep respect for Bloomfield; as he wrote in 1946 (p. 461), '[his] contributions to all kinds of linguistics have been so great that all of us linguists are basically Bloomfieldians.' And yet, especially after direct contact at Yale in the early 1940s, he came to have reservations both about Bloomfield's linguistic theories and, more especially, about Bloomfield's attitude toward the work of others. In a letter to me of March 1941 he said, 'I hear that Bloomfield has been accusing you of going metaphysical on us. That, of course, is right in line with his usual attitude toward attempts at clarification of basic principles, though why he should react that way to others' attempts when he himself does that sort of thing and does it well, is more than I can figure out.' Bloomfield contributed the chapter on syntax in the *Outline of linguistic analysis* of 1942, mentioned above; George disapproved because Bloomfield was basing his syntax on meaning. When George published 'The verb morphology of spoken French' in 1944, he believed he was applying exactly the rigorous methods proposed by Bloomfield. But Bloomfield responded, the following year, with his paper 'On describing inflection', in which he covers the same French facts (actually in a rather sloppy manner, not up to his usual standard) and offers

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0097850793070456 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the comment on Trager's treatment that 'a less rigorous statement may be more useful even for scientific purposes.' George waited until 1955 to publish his own revision, but in it there is little concession to Bloomfield's criticisms. Bloomfield had said to me he thought of George as a 'brilliant synthesizer', but it would seem that he never said it to George.

George's strongest expression of disagreement with Bloomfield appeared in 1946—on the heels of his assertion that "all of us linguists are basically Bloomfieldians':

> '... in his book *Language*, and in his lectures and in conversations with colleagues, he has, it is my impression, rather tended away from precise and explicit formulation and codification of doctrine. The actual codifying and formulation of descriptive theory and techniques have been been much more explicitly carried out by other linguists, beginning with Sapir's "Sound Patterns in Language," ...'

Yet the two really had, at bottom, the same attitude about the difficulty and the vital importance of the task of observing and describing languages, and of trying to understand what language is and what it does. In the chastising letter to me of March 1945 cited above, Bloomfield says also, '... the main thing is, don't jump at conclusions. It takes a lot of evidence before we can know even a little with any certainty.' And George, in a letter to me of August of the same year: 'The older I grow the more convinced I become that one needs to know a great deal about a language before one can do serious work beyond the external schematizing that one can start with with just a little data.'

Well before the dates of those letters, during 1943, George had lost his Yale position and had moved to the Board on Geographical Names of the Department of the Interior, in Washington, DC. That was not a job to his liking; his letters of the time (and remembered viva voce remarks to friends) made quite clear his attitude toward civil-service officialdom and officiousness. Yet here, as in other circumstances, he made the most, professionally, of what was available. This he had done while in Alamosa not only by beginning his lifelong study of Taos but also by observing, and reporting on, various features of the English of Spanish speakers and of the Spanish of English speakers. Now, while at the Board, he focuses on problems of transliteration and of bibliographical classification. Neither of these is linguistics, yet both are facilitated by linguistic expertise, and it is a help to us in our primary enterprise to have matters in these ancillary fields sensibly organized. The analysis of writing systems, and the ways in which orthographies correlate with the languages being written, became an enduring interest, yielding a valuable detailed survey in his book of 1972.

At the end of the 1945–46 fiscal year George left the Board on Geographical Names, spent part of the summer at the Linguistic Institute in Ann Arbor, and then went to the University of Oklahoma at Norman, where he stayed for two years. A grant from the American Philosophical Society enabled him to spend the month of June, 1947, at Taos.

By this time, George's collaborative affiliation with Bernard Bloch, so important to both at the beginning of the decade, had been fading, as their theo-

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0097850793070456 Published online by Cambridge University Press

retical perspectives diverged more and more (there is no trace of Trager's /h/ in Bernard's 'Postulates' of 1948). But a new collaborative pairing, this time with Henry Lee Smith Jr ('Haxie'), was developing. For two successive summers, in 1947 and 1948, George returned from Norman to Washington to participate in the work of the School of Language Training of the Foreign Service Institute, Department of State, of which Haxie was director. During 1948 he received an inquiry from Harvard, but without follow-up. That was just as well: Haxie had managed to arrange for him to stay on at the School of Language Training.

On Friday, February 24, 1950, without warning, Sadie died. George was sustained in his loss by their children, George Jr and Jane, and surely by the fact that, at long last, he had a professional appointment which was both stimulating and reasonably secure. A donation realized from Sadie's personal effects was used to cover most of the cost of publishing volume 8, number 4 of *SiL*.

A year later, George married Edith Crowell. Edith had been one of his students at Oklahoma, subsequently earning her doctorate, with a dissertation on Kiowa, at the University of Pennsylvania under Henry Hoenigswald and Zellig Harris; since 1947 she had been secretary-treasurer of *SiL*.

The association with the Foreign Service Institute lasted (with various titles) until 1956, when both George and Haxie went to the University of Buffalo to establish that institution's Department of Anthropology—the only anthropological program in the country that centered on language, in conformity with George's ideal.[4]

There can be no question but that the years of George's association with Haxie were professionally his happiest and most productive—as also Haxie's. George had pretty much abandoned Slavic linguistics upon leaving Yale, but most of his other interests continued. The two worked together on the analysis and description of English (Trager & Smith 1951), on Indo-European cladistics and chronology, and on fundamental linguistic theory. On the last, George was perhaps the main source of ideas, but Haxie absorbed, tested, and elaborated them; his independent brilliance should not be underestimated. Even those books and papers that were not published under both names (for example, Smith 1956, 1967) were, at bottom, joint efforts. The exception is George's continued work on Tanoan: during the Buffalo years he spent several summers and one sabbatical doing fieldwork at Taos.

On English, the joint research ranged beyond the ordinary scope of phonetics and phonemics to systematize stress, intonation, and juncture, and beyond that

[4] A year after this move, in 1957, there appeared the volume of *Readings in linguistics* that Martin Joos had prepared under the aegis of the American Council of Learned Societies. The volume included nothing from George's pen. In view of George's importance in the development of 'American structuralism', of which the volume was supposed to be a survey, and especially because of Martin's earlier close association with him, Hymes & Fought (1981:85) found the omission strange. Their combing of the literature, for the most part remarkably thorough, had somehow overlooked the explanation given by George himself in *SiL* 13.34–36: as a matter of principle he frowned on multiauthor collections, and had instructed Martin to leave him out.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0097850793070456 Published online by Cambridge University Press

into the realm of 'paralanguage'—variations of voice quality and the like that are manifested as we speak but are not ordinarily thought of as governed by language habits (Trager 1958). Even beyond that; they worked first on language and culture with Edward Kennard and with Edward T. Hall (who later wrote the widely read *The silent language*); then with Ray L. Birdwhistell on what the latter dubbed 'kinesics': the communicative functions of the gestures and more subtle body motions that typically go along with talking. George thought of all this as part of the extension of linguistic methods and results to the analysis of other phases of human culture.

In Indo-European, George and Haxie attempted some regrouping of the languages and a new estimate of the chronology (Trager & Smith 1950), and George proposed a revision of our picture of the proto sound system: Trager's /h/, as I called it earlier in this account, is not only posited throughout Germanic but is traced all the way back to the parent language, where George saw it as one of the so-called laryngeals.[5]

The joint work on aspects of language other than the sound system led them to a new view of overall language design. In place of the traditional duality of sound (phonology) and meaning (grammar), as encapsulated by Saussure in his classic definition of the sign, as codified in Bloomfield's 'Postulates' (1926), and as reflected in Martinet's 'double articulation', they proposed three compartments, having to do respectively with sound, shape, and meaning. The first includes phonetics and phonemics; the second includes morphophonemics, morphology, and syntax; the third constitutes semology. The criteria for these three they saw as applying also to many (or all) other aspects of human conduct, and some of their writings deal with this (e.g. Trager 1949, 1965), though in a way I find rather obscure. As for the analysis of a language, they believed that semantic considerations play, or should play, no part in either of the first two compartments. Even syntax (as they defined it in their scheme) should involve, at most, the recognition of meanings as same or different (hence George's disapproval of Bloomfield's semantically based syntax in the 1942 *Outline of linguistic analysis*, mentioned earlier).

George also managed, in these years, to produce a massive basic treatise on language, of which the first third, the general survey, appeared in 1972; the second and third parts, dealing respectively with the Indo-European family and with the rest of the world's languages, remain still in typescript.

Given the technical nature of much of George and Haxie's work in these years, it is difficult to understand why, for his Presidential Address to the LSA in 1960, George chose such a nontechnical, presumably popularizing style. (The title, 'Linguistics is linguistics', was one at which George had poked fun twenty years earlier when it was used by Alan H. Fry.) Only toward the end does the address introduce—and even then only in rather turgid outline—the new notion of language design that he and Haxie were developing. Bernard Bloch, who

[5] Most of this is in the unpublished second volume of his final work, the first volume of which appeared as Trager 1972a. This volume is also said to contain a thorough updating of the earlier brief analysis of English (Trager & Smith 1951).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0097850793070456 Published online by Cambridge University Press

throughout his editorship of *Language* scrupulously avoided imposing his own linguistic views on contributors, would not publish it. So George issued it in 1963 as Occasional Paper no. 10 of *SiL*.

Of course, the program at Buffalo also trained some newcomers to our field, including Harvey Sachs, M. Estellie Smith (who edited the Festschrift for George that appeared in 1973), Joan G. Fickett (who has become an authority on American Black English, supplementing the account of 1975 by much more research, as yet unpublished), and Felicia Harben, of whom more in a moment. As for colleagues, the anthropologist David B. Stout (died 1968) was with them from the beginning; for the year 1958–59 Wallace Chafe was on the faculty.

In 1961 George and Edith were divorced. Their three children, James, Geoffrey, and John, went with Edith to California. Later in the year George married Felicia Harben, a graduate student in linguistics at Buffalo who subsequently (1968) was awarded the doctorate for a dissertation on Picurís, a close relative of Taos in the Tanoan language family.

Drastic changes came about when, in 1966, the University of Buffalo became the University of the State of New York at Buffalo. Departments were reorganized; the anthropology program was taken over by 'real' anthropologists (as administrators judge such things, in terms of degrees and of status in learned societies); Haxie moved—not unhappily—to the Department of English, where he was still serving at the time of his death in 1972; and George left for Southern Methodist University in Dallas. That institution had, as an adjunct, the Fort Burgwin Research Center at Ranches of Taos, New Mexico, and George hoped both he and Felicia would be able to make use of that facility for their continuing fieldwork. Matters did not work out as well as had been hoped, and in 1971 they moved to the Department of Anthropology at Northern Illinois University in DeKalb, where some of the arrangements promised to be better. From the beginning of their marriage they had worked together; in time, Felicia took over the editorship of *SiL*, and it was she who prepared the annotated bibliography of George's publications and other writings that appeared in 1971 as Occasional Paper no. 12 of *SiL*.

But then sudden disaster struck once more. On Monday, February 21, 1972, almost without forewarning, Felicia died, leaving George not only with her unfinished research but also with two small children, Edward and Anne.

George stayed on in DeKalb for two years more. Then he retired from his university position and moved, with the children, to Ranches of Taos, proposing to establish the household there with convenient access to his Taos language informants. But that turned out to be impossible. The blows he had suffered were too severe, and he became increasingly unable to cope. In 1975, George Jr (his oldest son) came to Taos and took him and the two young children back to California, where they were appropriately provided for.

George's name, with the Taos address, lingers in the LSA Bulletin through the 1977 issue. Then it disappears.

That was almost the end of George's professional life, but not quite. In the 1970s, while Mary Ritchie Key was investigating paralanguage and kinesics

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0097850793070456 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(see Key 1975), she frequently consulted him, first at Taos and then in California. And in 1990 Penny Lee, an Australian scholar who was researching the unpublished letters and other manuscript material of Benjamin Lee Whorf, arranged to interview him. She reported that she found George alert and able to recall useful bits from his intimate, though brief, association with Whorf of fifty years earlier; his help will be acknowledged when her research results are published. There may have been other such events in George's sad last years, but these are the only ones known to me.

For his final five years George was cared for by his son John (Edith's youngest). After his death, a memorial meeting was held, on November 6, 1992, at the University of California, Irvine. And, through the agency of Mary Ritchie Key, it is in the Special Collections of the Library of that institution that George's books and manuscript materials have found a permanent haven.

In our many hours together in earlier years, the topic of our talk was almost always language. In retrospect it seems to me that George had few truly intense outside interests. He did, as Felicia reports (1971:33), attempt some poetry and fiction, but mostly of a sort related to ongoing linguistic or cultural interests. Edith tells me he occasionally enjoyed preparing a 'Chinese' meal, but obviously with no great passion. To music, which affords so many of us emotional solace and inspiration, he had an active aversion; he characterized it for me once as 'a succession of unnecessary noises'. But I suppose it is only idle speculation to guess that, given some such anchor to windward, he might have been able to bear up under the final cruel blows of the early 1970s.

The temper of our academic field at present is not such as to allow an even-handed survey and assessment of George's work, but a brief comment is in order. Throughout his professional career his linguistics was not only consistent but also persistent—or stubborn, if you prefer Bloomfield's blunt term. And if his persistence was sometimes about the wrong things, it was also often justified. He was always ready to alter his views provided he was presented with convincing evidence that he should. For example, early on he believed that morphophonemics belongs, with phonemics, in phonology; partly under my influence, he later changed that opinion. And a glance through his bibliography reveals that a surprising number of his later papers are revisions of earlier ones, reflecting fresh insights.

In the long run it will doubtless turn out that most of George's ideas, like the majority of the bright innovative notions of any of us, were flawed. But the basic right of a scientist is the right to be wrong. The investigator who finds that a line of inquiry is a blind alley at least frees the rest of us from having to explore the same path. The one who turns out to have been right for the wrong reasons, as by accident, may deserve few plaudits, but the one who is wrong for the right reasons has earned a niche in our hall of fame.

CHARLES F. HOCKETT, *Cornell University and Rice University*

REFERENCES

In 1971, Felicia H. Trager prepared a complete annotated bibliography of George's writings to that date, published as *SiL* Occasional Paper 12. It seems unnecessary to be equally complete here.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0097850793070456 Published online by Cambridge University Press

So the following list includes only works explicitly referred to in the text, plus the few items from his pen that appeared after the publication of the 1971 bibliography.

SiL continued through volume 25 (dated 1975), with, as usual, bibliographical notes by George, and there was one more Occasional Paper (Fickett 1975).

BLOCH, BERNARD. 1948. A set of postulates for phonemic analysis. Lg. 24.3–46.
BLOOMFIELD, LEONARD. 1926. A set of postulates for the science of language. Lg. 2.153–64.
——. 1945. On describing inflection. Monatshefte für deutschen Unterricht 37.8–13.
FICKETT, JOAN G. 1975. 'Merican: An inner city dialect: Aspects of morphemics, syntax, and semology. SiL Occasional Paper 13.
HALL, EDWARD T. 1959. The silent language. Garden City, NJ: Doubleday.
HOCKETT, CHARLES F. 1942. A system of descriptive phonology. Lg. 18.3–21.
HYMES, DELL, and JOHN FOUGHT. 1981. American structuralism. The Hague: Mouton. (Reprinted from Current Trends in Linguistics, vol. 13, part 2, 1975.)
JOOS, MARTIN. 1986. Notes on the development of the Linguistic Society of America, 1924 to 1950. Privately printed in Ithaca, NY.
—— (ed.) 1957. Readings in linguistics: The development of descriptive linguistics in America since 1925. Washington, DC: American Council of Learned Societies.
KEY, MARY RITCHIE. 1975. Paralanguage and kinesics (nonverbal communication). Metuchen, NJ: The Scarecrow Press.
SAPIR, EDWARD. 1930. Totality. Language Monograph no. 6 of the LSA.
——, and MORRIS SWADESH. 1932. The expression of the ending-point relation in English, French, and German. Language Monograph no. 10 of the LSA.
SMITH, HENRY L. JR. 1956. Linguistic science and the teaching of English. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
——. 1967. The concept of the morphophone. Lg. 43.306–41.
SMITH, M. ESTELLIE. 1972. Studies in linguistics in honor of George L. Trager. The Hague: Mouton.
TRAGER, FELICIA H. 1971. An annotated bibliography of the publications and writings of George L. Trager through 1970. SiL Occasional paper 12.
TRAGER, GEORGE L. 1942. Introduction to Russian. Mimeographed for classroom use only, Yale University.
——. 1944. The verb morphology of spoken French. Lg. 20.131–41.
——. 1946. Changes of emphasis in linguistics: A comment. Studies in Philology 43.461–64.
——. 1949. The field of linguistics. SiL Occasional Paper 1.
——. 1955. French morphology: Verb inflection. Lg. 31.511–29.
——. 1958. Paralanguage: A first approximation. SiL 13.1–12.
——. 1963. Linguistics is linguistics. SiL Occasional Paper 8.
——. 1965. A schematic outline for the processual analysis of culture. Buffalo, NY: SUNY at Buffalo.
——. 1972a. Language and languages. San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Company.
——. 1972b. Felicia Harben Trager, 1931–1972 (Obituary). SiL 22.2.
——. 1975. Language nomenclature. SiL 25.1–8.
TRAGER, GEORGE L., and BERNARD BLOCH. 1941. The syllabic phonemes of English. Lg. 17.223–46.
——, ——. 1942. Outline of linguistic analysis. With a chapter on syntax by Leonard Bloomfield. Special Publication of the Linguistic Society of America.
TRAGER, GEORGE L., and HENRY L. SMITH JR. 1950. A chronology of Indo-Hittite. SiL 8.61–70.
——, ——. 1951. An outline of English structure. SiL Occasional Paper 3.

145 North Sunset Dr
Ithaca NY 14850

[Received 10 September 1993.]

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0097850793070456 Published online by Cambridge University Press