MURRAY B. EMENEAU

Murray Barnson Emeneau died peacefully at the age of 101 at his home in Berkeley, California. Perhaps the last surviving student of Edward Sapir, Emeneau was the principal founder of the Linguistics Department at his university and of the Survey of California Indian Languages. He was known in India and internationally as a Sanskritist, as the world's most distinguished scholar of the Dravidian language family of India, and as the twentieth century's principal exponent of the concept of 'language area'.[1]

1. OVERVIEW. Emeneau was born on February 28, 1904 in Lunenburg, Nova Scotia. In high school he studied Latin, Greek, and German, and distinguished himself so much that he obtained a four-year scholarship at Dalhousie University (in Halifax, Nova Scotia), where he continued his classical studies. The continuing excellence of his performance won him a Rhodes Scholarship to Balliol College, Oxford University. From there he went in 1926 to Yale University, with a teaching appointment in Latin; but at the same time he began to study Sanskrit and comparative Indo-European with Franklin Edgerton and Edgar Sturtevant. His 1931 dissertation was on Sanskrit, and Emeneau was by this time a committed Indologist.

With jobs scarce during the Depression, Emeneau stayed on in New Haven, surviving on small research fellowships and attending additional classes—crucially, those of Edward Sapir, who was by then teaching 'the new linguistics' at Yale. As Emeneau wrote, 'I was exposed to methods of fieldwork on non-literary languages, including intensive phonetic practice and analysis of material, but especially to Sapir's approach to anthropological linguistics, in which language is only part of the total culture, but a most important part, since in it the community expresses in its own way, ''verbifies'' its culture' (1980:352).

But Leonard Bloomfield, whose book *Language* was published in 1933, was a presence on the Yale campus at the same time; and it was the school of structural linguistics founded by Bloomfield that became the model for Emeneau's later teaching and for his descriptive work in Indic and Dravidian linguistics. Another significant influence was Philip Kahclamat, a Wishram Chinook speaker brought by Sapir from Oregon; as Emeneau later wrote, 'what I learned [from Kahclamat] about massive consonant clusters rid me of any inhibitions I might have had when I came to deal with similar material in the Toda and Kota languages of South India' (1991:94–95). In later years, Emeneau was fond of citing Wishram forms like /łtpčkt/ 'they are coming this way from the water'.

By 1935, with no job prospects in the US for the anthropological Indological linguist that Emeneau had become, his teachers raised funds to send him to India for three

[1] In this obituary, as throughout Emeneau's works, the term INDIA and its derivatives refer not only to the present-day Republic of India, but to the Indian subcontinent. Note that one of Emeneau's collections of papers (1980) was published jointly by Stanford University Press and the Linguistic Research Group of Pakistan. A large part of the biographical data below is based on three autobiographical statements written by Emeneau himself (1980:350–54, 1988d:406–9, 1991). My thanks for help in writing this obituary go to Charles Bigelow, Andrew Garrett, George Hart, Bh. Krishnamurti, Lise Menn, Phyllis Savage, and Ram Karan Sharma.

https://doi.org/10.1353/lan.2006.0080 Published online by Cambridge University Press

years. Sapir recommended that he study Toda, a little-known 'tribal' language of the Dravidian family, spoken in the Nilgiri Hills of South India; and Sapir specifically suggested that this might lead to a study of comparative Dravidian. Emeneau in fact did major fieldwork on four Dravidian languages during this period—Toda, Kota, Kodagu (Coorg), and Kolami, as well as briefer work on Badaga and Brahui—and comparative Dravidian was indeed the field in which he was to become a world leader.

After teaching linguistics at Yale for a year, Emeneau was hired in 1940 as Assistant Professor of Sanskrit and General Linguistics at the University of California, Berkeley. (In 1941 he became a US citizen.) He rose to full Professor by 1946, and retired to Emeritus status in 1971. He was Chair of the Linguistics Department from 1953 to 1958, and of the Classics Department from 1959 to 1962. In 1948, when I first became his student, he was regularly teaching the undergraduate courses in general linguistics, phonetics and phonemics, morphology and syntax, comparative Indo-European, and Sanskrit; he also had a course in the Classics Department entitled simply 'India'. Among the academic honors that came his way were the presidency of both the Linguistic Society of America and the American Oriental Society; two Guggenheim fellowships; election to the American Philosophical Society and the American Academy of Arts and Sciences; and honorary doctorates from the University of Chicago, Dalhousie University, the University of Hyderabad, and Kameshwara Singh Darbhanga Sanskrit University in Bihar, India.

Emeneau had the pleasure of seeing four collected volumes of his essays published: one of his papers on language and linguistic area (1980); one of his Sanskrit studies (1988a); and two of his Dravidian studies (1967, 1994). Three collections of papers were dedicated to him: one of articles on California Indian languages (Bright 1964); one published in India in honor of his *śastipūrti*—his sixtieth birthday (Krishnamurti 1968); and one devoted to *Dravidian phonological systems* (Schiffman & Eastman 1975). In 2004, a group of papers in his honor was delivered at the 32nd All-India Congress of Dravidian Linguistics held at Warangal, Andhra Pradesh; these were published in the *International Journal of Dravidian Linguistics* honoring Emeneau (34.2, 2005). This issue also includes an updated bibliography of Emeneau's publications (Ramakrishna Reddy & Nagamma Reddy 2005), building on those in Emeneau 1980 and 1994. At the beginning of 2005, the 'Prof. M. B. Emeneau Centenary International Conference on South Asian Linguistics' was held at the Central Institute for Indian Languages in Mysore; several papers dealt specifically with Emeneau's work.[2] Later in 2005, the guest house at the new Dravidian University in Kuppam, Andhra Pradesh, was named Emeneau House.

Throughout his teaching career at Berkeley, and long into his retirement, Emeneau continued prolific research and publication on both Sanskrit and Dravidian—from philological, historical, descriptive, and anthropological viewpoints. A little-known aspect of his tenure at Berkeley is that, during the war years of 1943–1944, he researched and taught the Vietnamese language for the Army Specialized Training Program; this later resulted in several publications on the Vinh dialect (Emeneau & Taylor 1945, Emeneau 1947b, 1951).

Emeneau died on August 29, 2005, survived by his beloved stepdaughter Mrs. Phyllis Savage, of California. He has been buried next to his wife and family in Nova Scotia. His papers are now in the custody of the Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley.

2. CONTRIBUTIONS TO SANSKRIT STUDIES. Emeneau's 1931 doctoral dissertation at Yale was a critical edition of the *Vetālapañcaviṁśati* ('Twenty-five tales told by a

[2] The program and abstracts are available at http://www.ciil.org/announcement/MBE_programme.

https://doi.org/10.1353/lan.2006.0080 Published online by Cambridge University Press

vampire') by Jambhaladatta. Expanded and published in 1935, this work foreshadowed a continuing series of literary and philological studies, many of them focused on the realia of ancient Indic civilization, for example, 'The strangling figs in Sanskrit literature' (Emeneau 1949) and 'The composite bow in India' (1953). Franklin Edgerton's interest in the folktale tradition of India, revealed in Emeneau's dissertation, was also reflected in such publications as the series 'Studies in the folktales of India' (1943a,b, 1947a); in these works, Emeneau juxtaposed types of Sanskritic and Dravidian narratives, looking toward his later view of India as a cultural and linguistic area. A more purely literary work was his annotated English edition of Kālidāsa's famous play *Śakuntalā* (1962).

Throughout his career as a Sanskritist, Emeneau also produced works of a more strictly linguistic nature. A memorable paper, in which he applied the rigorous structuralism that he had learned from Leonard Bloomfield, was 'The nasal phonemes of Sanskrit' (1946). A more pedagogical work, but one unforgettable by Emeneau's Sanskrit students, was his booklet *Sanskrit sandhi and exercises* (1952). It should also be mentioned here that, once he had added Dravidian linguistics to his qualifications, he often explored Sanskrit etymologies in terms of possible Dravidian origins, as in his papers 'A Dravidian etymology of the Sanskrit proper name Nala' (1943c) and 'Some Indian etymologies' (1958).[3]

Prof. Ram Karan Sharma, who received his doctorate in Sanskrit at Berkeley under Emeneau's direction (and is now President of the International Association of Sanskrit Studies), has written an eloquent eulogy of his teacher, which is given in the appendix (translation by George Hart, transliteration by Brian Joseph).

3. CONTRIBUTIONS TO DRAVIDIAN LINGUISTICS. In addition to his work on Toda, Emeneau devoted his years in India to the study of other unwritten languages, especially Kota, a neighbor of Toda in the Nilgiri Hills; Kolami, in Madhya Pradesh; and Kodagu (Coorg), now in Karnataka state. He also did briefer work on Badaga, in the Nilgiris, and on Brahui, in Baluchistan. The first major publication resulting from this fieldwork was his *Kota texts*, in four volumes (1944–46), which also included a substantial structural sketch of the language and folktale analyses by Stith Thompson; the work won the praise of reviewers as diverse as Zellig Harris and Clyde Kluckhohn.

The year 1955 saw the publication of Emeneau's *Kolami: A Dravidian language*. Although based on only six weeks' fieldwork, this volume provided a rather detailed grammar plus a 112-page etymological vocabulary, with cognates from all the literary and nonliterary languages known to Emeneau at the time. This was, in fact, a trial run for his magnum opus, coauthored with Prof. Thomas Burrow of Oxford University: *A Dravidian etymological dictionary* (Burrow & Emeneau 1961; 2nd. edn., 1984). Rather modestly hidden in the introduction of the second edition (pp. xii–xiii) is a table of 'phonetic correspondences' and reconstructed proto-phonemes. This path-breaking work contains some 5,600 etyma (in the revised edition), plus 309 pages of indices (in English and sixty-two other languages). Although Burrow and Emeneau were better qualified to make proto-Dravidian reconstructions than most users of the dictionary, they shared a certain caution and conservatism which allowed them to reconstruct proto-phonemes, but not proto-words. This did not detract from their accomplishment; the dictionary was a magisterial work, launching a new era in Dravidian linguistics. In

[3] A recent summary of Emeneau's contributions to Sanskrit studies is Ananthanarayana 2005.

https://doi.org/10.1353/lan.2006.0080 Published online by Cambridge University Press

subsequent years, Emeneau continued innovative research on comparative Dravidian; an example from his later years is 'Proto-Dravidian *c- and its developments' (1988b).[4]

One of Emeneau's earlier publications, based on his fieldwork in the Nilgiris, was a study of the vowels of Badaga (1939), in which he reported a typologically very unusual feature: a three-way contrast of nonretroflexed, half-retroflexed, and fully retroflexed vowels. This feature was called into question by some subsequent workers on Badaga; but phonetic fieldwork by Peter Ladefoged, decades later, confirmed that the contrasts of vowel retroflexion, though by then obsolescent, had nevertheless been a reality (Ladefoged & Maddieson 1996:313–14).

4. WORK ON TODA. Emeneau's fieldwork with the Todas, apart from its contribution to his studies in historical Dravidian, clearly constitutes the centerpiece, in three volumes, of his descriptive research in India. The first of these major works to be published was *Toda songs* (1971)—not an ethnomusicological study (no musical notation is presented), but rather a presentation of 260 song texts, with translations, ethnographic commentaries, a concordance, and indices (in a monumental volume of 1,004 pages!). The second work is *Ritual structure and language structure of the Todas* (1974), an intensely detailed study of the type that would later be called sociolinguistic, with concentration on the onomastics of human beings, buffaloes, and sacred sites.

The third volume on Toda is Emeneau's *Toda grammar and texts* (1984). With this work, we begin to appreciate fully his achievement in revealing the complexity of Toda phonology—eight vowel phonemes, long vs. short, and thirty-seven consonants (contrasting in dental, alveolar, and retroflex positions)—and in particular the value of his experience, under Sapir at Yale, with the formidable consonant clusters of Wishram Chinook: examples of Toda word-final clusters are /muṭsṇ̪ 'grasshopper', /koḍḍs̱-/ 'wasp', and /mo·ṇkym/ 'ruby'.[5] Although Emeneau never published dictionaries of Toda or of Kota as such, the English index to *A Dravidian etymological dictionary* provides access to the vocabularies of both languages.

5. CONTRIBUTIONS TO FOLKLORE. In the Boasian and Sapirian model of fieldwork in which Emeneau was trained, the collection of oral literature texts and their analysis as folklore were considered an inherent component of linguistic work.[6] Accordingly, as a product of his study in India, Emeneau published a major collection of Kota texts (1944–46); a sampling of Kolami folktales (1955:164–71), and for Toda, apart from songs, no less than 194 texts, with references to the folkloristic literature (1984: 191–408). Several of his articles discuss the occurrence of particular folklore motifs in Sanskrit and in the modern languages of India; an example from recent years is 'Kṛṣṇa steals the gopīs' clothes' (1989).[7]

6. CONTRIBUTIONS TO AREAL LINGUISTICS. Regarding the period of his fieldwork, Emeneau wrote:

> It was soon brought forcibly to my attention that in spite of many local divergences there was an underlying unity, in the anthropological sense, of all Hindu India. It began to become clear to me also

[4] Recent summaries of Emeneau's work in comparative Dravidian are given by Krishnamurti (2005) and by K. Nagamma Reddy (2005); see also discussion in the obituary being prepared by Bh. Krishnamurti for publication in the *Journal of the American Oriental Society*. The Burrow-Emeneau *Dravidian etymological dictionary* is specifically discussed by Gopinathan Nair (2005) and by Subramoniam (2005).

[5] A recent extension of Emeneau's work on Toda is Subrahmanyam 2005.

[6] It is worth recalling that Franz Boas was editor of the *Journal of American Folklore* from 1908 to 1924.

[7] A survey of Emeneau's work on folklore has been published by N. Bhakthavathsala Reddy (2005).

https://doi.org/10.1353/lan.2006.0080 Published online by Cambridge University Press

> that Jules Bloch's (and others') suggestion that there was some degree of linguistic unity in the whole of the subcontinent, no matter what the language family with which one was specifically dealing, was in principle correct . . . I began already in my paper on Toda echo-words published in 1938 to make detailed investigation of pan-Indic linguistic features, though it was only in 1956 that I collected all that I then knew on the Indian linguistic area and used and defined the term. The concept (that of the 'Sprachbund') had already been investigated for other areas . . . but India had been for all practical purposes neglected before my work. (1991:98)

This highlight of Emeneau's ground-breaking work in Dravidian and Indo-Aryan comparative studies is the concept of a LINGUISTIC AREA, defined by him as a geographical area wherein languages belonging to two or more families have traits in common that do not belong to the other members of at least one of the families. The term had been used before by Harry V. Velten, by Nikolai Trubetzkoy, and by Roman Jakobson; but the concept was given new life in Emeneau's classic article 'India as a linguistic area' (1956). To quote Dil (1980:xiv):

> Subsequently [Emeneau] added further theoretical and methodological dimensions to the concept in a series of papers on linguistic and sociolinguistic phenomena found across dialects, languages, and language families in South Asia. Throughout this work he [was] particularly sensitive to the historical facts and sociolinguistic issues behind questions of phonological, morphological, syntactic, and semantic development. The effect of this comprehensive approach to understanding the processes of language and culture contact has been to add a new dimension to our awareness of the historical interdependence of world society.

As Emeneau himself wrote, 'This was essentially an injection of ethnological thinking into diachronic linguistics' (1991:98).[8] His broader influence on the concept of linguistic area can be seen, for example, in the renewal of interest among Americanists in areal linguistics, as in the work of Haas (1976) and Sherzer (1976).

Emeneau's personal feelings for the South Asian peoples and culture were clear; to put it briefly, the man loved India. As he wrote:

> Certainly the [fieldwork] experience of 1935–38 made me feel that *Indiae nihil a me alienum puto*. It gave me a curiosity about all facets of Indian life, and the assumption (which was perhaps indeed presumption) that I should not hesitate to publish anything that I might discover, whether Sanskrit, Dravidian, literary, linguistic, ethnological, folk tale, or any combination of any of these. If generalism is not too fashionable, it certainly is not far from the practice of my teachers, or, perhaps more pertinently, from the practice of such pioneers in the study of India as Sir William Jones . . . Much of the new Indology since the middle of the century is pioneering, and I feel proud if I have been able to accomplish a little in this spirit. (1980:353)

To quote him further:

> I was able to travel widely and experience such delightful things as the temples of Tamilnadu and of Orissa, the temples and Jain monuments of Mysore and the Maharaja's dasahara, the Mogul and other monuments of Delhi and Agra, the caves and paintings of Ajanta and Ellora, the great cities of Banaras, Bombay, Calcutta, and Madras, the fiery curries of the South and the brahmans' fish curries of Bengal . . . My broad background . . . led me to take a holistic view of India, in which everything was of interest and was, so far as it was possible, fitted into the one large picture. (1991:96–97)

7. CONTRIBUTIONS TO AMERICAN INDIAN LINGUISTICS. Emeneau did not publish on American Indian linguistics as such, but his involvement in the field is attested by two published items (as well as in the memories of his students). He was active in organizing the Symposium on American Indian Linguistics which was held at Berkeley in 1951; and in his introduction to the papers from that meeting (published in 1954), he indicated the thinking that was going into the formation of the Survey of California Indian Languages (later renamed the Survey of California and Other Indian Languages):

[8] Recent work on areal linguistics in Central India has been published by B. Ramakrishna Reddy (2005).

https://doi.org/10.1353/lan.2006.0080 Published online by Cambridge University Press

> The Symposium as a whole can be regarded as programmatic . . . The programmatic needs most stressed are those of description before it is too late—and then comparison based on description. The great days of the collection of descriptive data were, without question, those of Boas, Sapir, Michelson, and Leonard Bloomfield. Those days are gone—for the moment at least. World War II has intervened and has to some extent shifted geographical interests. There has intervened too the great refinement of methodology initiated by Sapir and Bloomfield. The need for the collection of American Indian descriptive data, however, still remains . . . The refinement of methodology also demands that some, though not all, work be redone or at least retouched, with new field work usually a desideratum . . . More description, then, must for the time being remain the great need in American Indian linguistics . . . (1954:1–2)

Many years later, in the 1997 memorial collection for Mary Haas, Emeneau recalled the events of the 1950s:

> Alfred L. Kroeber and some anthropological colleagues had long before done much work on Californian Indian languages, but some time before the thirties and forties, Kroeber's interest had been diverted to more strictly ethnological matters. New practitioners of linguistics had come to the campus, but the subject had not yet achieved organization . . . The postwar GI Bill brought expansion to Berkeley . . . We found that by joining forces informally with others interested in linguistics, . . . we could offer instruction and degrees in linguistics. An offer from Yale (for myself) triggered the decision at Berkeley to regularize the linguistics program. In the early fifties, a department was created, and, with Kroeber's active support, the Survey of California Indian Languages was set up, with Mary [Haas] as director, and funded to allow students to do fieldwork, to write dissertations, and, aided by the University's publication policies, to publish accounts of these Indian languages. (1997:618)

The results have been abundant and have had a strong impact, on both Americanist and general linguistics. Emeneau's influence was also acknowledged by the volume on California Indian languages dedicated to him (Bright 1964).

8. CONTRIBUTIONS TO ANTHROPOLOGICAL LINGUISTICS. Emeneau had, to be sure, a background in classical philology; but more important, he was a student of Edward Sapir, who was as brilliant an anthropologist as he was a linguist; furthermore, Emeneau worked in the Nilgiris with the anthropologist David Mandelbaum, who had also studied under Sapir. Indeed, an important part of Emeneau's work with the Toda and Kota was explicitly ethnographic. Throughout his career, then, Emeneau was in the mainstream of American anthropological linguistics, continually pointing out the position of language as a part—and, indeed, a crucial part—of culture as studied by the anthropologist. His bibliography includes a valuable group of papers expanding and amending the classic ethnography of the Todas by Rivers, as well as several original contributions to the ethnography of the Kota and the Coorgs. On a more general level, his presidential address to the Linguistic Society of America, published as 'Language and non-linguistic patterns' (1950), must be mentioned as a study of equal relevance to anthropology and linguistics, and as a forerunner of the more recently flourishing field of ethnosemantics.

Finally, note should be made again of Emeneau's long-standing interest in oral literature, which resulted in a long list of publications. As he wrote in connection with the Toda:

> the culminating item of value that the linguistic student can give to ethnology is the study of a community's most highly verbalized cultural manifestations . . . It is here, in their verbal art forms, stories, songs, oratory, or the like, that the members of the culture give the most overt and self-conscious expression to the patterns which they follow or profess to follow in their life. (1941:158)

This vision of the integration of folklore, linguistics, and ethnography, maintained by Emeneau for years, was notably avant-garde, and is being pursued with increasing vigor in the present day by students of linguistic anthropology.

Related to Emeneau's work on oral tradition was his concern for varieties of linguistic play, especially the so-called 'echo-words' that are widespread in India; I note also his papers 'An echo-word motif in Dravidian folk-tales' (1938), 'Annamese, Arabic, and Panjabi riddles' (Emeneau & Taylor 1945), and 'Homonyms and puns in Annamese'

https://doi.org/10.1353/lan.2006.0080 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(1947b). Another form of language play is studied in his 'Joking relationships in India' (1992).

An interest in onomastics—surely a neglected topic within anthropological linguistics—was represented by Emeneau's detailed study of Toda names in his *Ritual structure and language structure of the Todas* (1974), but also in his 'Personal names of the Coorgs' (1976) and 'Towards an onomastics of South Asia' (1978).

In February 2004, colleagues of Emeneau's at Berkeley organized a 'Symposium on the ecology of language and a celebration of the 100th birthday of Murray Emeneau'. I quote from the program:

> Language ecology is a multidisciplinary study of how languages develop, spread, interact, and decline as part of sociocultural, political and environmental processes . . . Language-based and language-related phenomena including folklore and music are also part of this ebb and flow and mixing that has taken place throughout human history . . . This symposium on language ecology is dedicated to Murray B. Emeneau, an early and influential leader in language ecology, in honor of his 100th birthday.

9. PERSONAL VIEWS. Part of my heritage from studying with Emeneau is that, though he identified himself as a student of Sapir with regard to the relationship of language to the rest of culture, he taught introductory linguistics not from Sapir's *Language* (1921) but from Bloomfield's *Language* (1933), which, for him, represented the 'dominant paradigm' of the day.[9] A quote from Emeneau is appropriate:

> [The period 1931–1935] was the period when Sapir and Leonard Bloomfield were developing and using the methodology of the phoneme . . . It was the two teachers, Sapir and Bloomfield, from whom I learned the 'modern' linguistics of the 30s—from Sapir in person as a teacher, and from Bloomfield's writings and later informal contacts. Much has been made of these two men as if they were poles apart, and of course they were so, temperamentally and in style. But at bottom they followed the same method in handling the basic material of language, i.e., what is said, which is, in my opinion, what linguistics is about. Richard Handler has said . . . that Sapir inculcated in his pupils 'the passionate analysis of linguistic forms'. So he did, but so did Bloomfield, and to that extent I feel myself a pupil of both men . . . What Sapir gave me (to which I think Bloomfield contributed not at all), was a sense of language as man's culminating cultural experience. When I encountered the Todas, whose chief and all-absorbing esthetic experience was their extempore songs sung on all cultural occasions, I knew that it was that that Sapir was talking about, and his teaching led me towards copious recording and subsequent analysis. (1991:95)

Although Emeneau and Bloomfield were contemporaries at Yale, little has been written about their relationship. However, in his published note on 'Bloomfield and Pāṇini', Emeneau wrote:

> How did [Bloomfield] gain his knowledge of [Hindu grammar]? . . . I regret that I never asked him about it. He would surely have been quite open about it, . . . as he was in his remark to me that Pāṇini was one of his bedside books . . . (1988c:757)

Certainly Emeneau himself was fond of referring to the predilection for brevity in the works of the ancient Hindu grammarians; he often quoted the Sanskrit saying that 'The grammarian values the saving of half a short vowel over the birth of a son'. He also liked to note the succinctness of the last sūtra in Pāṇini's grammar, *a a*; this rule was to be later interpreted in terms of generative phonology as [V, +low, +back, −round, −long] → [+high] (i.e. short /a/ → [ə]) and echoed in the famous last rule of Chomsky and Halle's *The sound pattern of English* (1968:245) as [V, −stress, −tense] → [ə].

Another quotation is relevant. Regarding his years of study at Oxford, Emeneau once wrote:

[9] When I took a reading course in descriptive linguistics from him in 1949–1950, we discussed papers by Bernard Bloch, Charles Hockett, Zellig Harris, and Rulon Wells: not a bad preparation for the 'formalist' style of generative linguistics in later years.

https://doi.org/10.1353/lan.2006.0080 Published online by Cambridge University Press

> I also had to study ancient history and philosophy, the latter mostly ancient (Plato, Aristotle), but also modern down to the English idealistic school and smatterings of Kant. The philosophy did not take—I found that though I could understand superficially what I read, I could not reproduce it except very awkwardly and could not produce an original thought of my own; the experience left me with a permanently antitheoretical bias, inoculated against the developments in linguistics of the last three decades [i.e. 1960–1990]. (1991:93)

But this bias was of course no handicap to Emeneau in the 'anti-mentalist' American linguistics of the 1930s through the 1950s.

Emeneau was a teacher and researcher of amazing erudition, meticulous habit, and somewhat reserved demeanor (which lessened over the years). His students learned from him the meaning of professionalism in scholarship; but we were once astonished to hear him say in class, concerning a knotty analytical problem: 'Oh, the hell with it!—as it were'.

Yet his personal reserve was offset by the openness of his unforgettable wife Kitty.[10] If Emeneau was a bit of an introvert, Kitty was a pronounced extrovert who brought her husband constantly into the world. She once told me that she liked to give a dinner party once a week, for colleagues and students; when one considers the additional number of dinner parties to which they must have been invited, it's clear that the Emeneaus led an active social life. They also enjoyed participating with colleagues in a play-reading group; Emeneau was especially proud of his performance as Col. Pickering, 'the author of *Spoken Sanskrit*', in Shaw's *Pygmalion* (to become better known as the musical *My fair lady*).

As Emeneau's life extended productively into his eighties and nineties, people sometimes asked him if he attributed his longevity to diet, exercise, attitude—or what? He always answered: 'None of that; just genes'. In fact, researchers have recently pointed out that Nova Scotia—and within Nova Scotia, Emeneau's home town of Lunenburg—produces more centenarians than any other part of North America; the cause is presumed to be genetic (Duenwald 2003).

Emeneau not only had a long life, but he also continued his productivity until he was well into his nineties, to the point where his later writings include contributions to festschriften in honor of his own students—in 1998 (Bright), 2000 (Lamb), and 2001 (Krishnamurti). As he observed:

> Among Indologists . . . it is the pleasant custom to speak in the traditional Hindu way of the *guruśiṣya-paraṃparā*. That is, we trace out our place in the succession (*paraṃparā*) of pupils (*śiṣya*) and teachers (*guru*). (1998:vii–viii)

The respect that Emeneau unfailingly accorded to his Indian predecessors and contemporaries was especially appreciated by scholars in India.

Throughout his career, Emeneau was a 'scholar's scholar'; yet he was notable for his generosity and supportiveness toward his students. His memory will continue to

[10] Katharine Fitch Emeneau was born in China in 1903, the daughter of an educational missionary; she married Emeneau in 1940. He dedicated two books to her: 'I must thank my wife for her affectionate and sympathetic stimulation of all my undertakings' (1971:viii); 'I thank with love my dear wife, whose patience and solicitude have done so much to further my labors' (1984:4). As luck would have it, Kitty was a native speaker of the same Chinese dialect as Mrs. Buwei Yang Chao—the wife of the linguist Y. R. Chao, who was a colleague of Emeneau's at Berkeley. At dinner parties, Mrs. Emeneau and Mrs. Chao often enjoyed chatting in their 'native dialect'. After Kitty's death in 1987, Emeneau lived alone in their home for the next eighteen years—without a television or computer, but steadily writing and publishing, and regularly attending campus functions.

https://doi.org/10.1353/lan.2006.0080 Published online by Cambridge University Press

inspire his academic children, great-grandchildren, and generations of descendants to come.[11] [WILLIAM BRIGHT, *University of Colorado.*]

APPENDIX

भारोपीयद्राविडविद्या व्यलपत्तमां तमसि निबिडे ।
उदिते ऽपि रवौ भास्वति को ऽयं कीदृक्तमःप्रसरः ।।
हा हा क्व गता मूर्तिः सा स्मितसुमनोमयी धवलहृदया ।
धन्यास्ते तत्रत्या यत्र गता सा वयं निहताः ।।
पाणिनिमुनिमननधनस्तोल्कापीयमहाब्धिमथनमनाः ।
पण्डितमण्डलमानसमरालकुलनायकः कुत इदानीं ।।
यत्र कुतो ऽपि स भवताद्गुरुरस्माकं महामना ईमिनुः ।
शाश्वतिकीं स सुभजतां शान्तिं परमां मनीषिवरः ।।

इति शोकाकुलः शिष्यपरिवारः

bhāropīyadrāviḍavidyā vyalapattamāṁ tamasi nibiḍe |
udite 'pi ravau bhāsvati ko 'yaṁ kīdṛktamaḥprasaraḥ ||
hā hā kva gatā mūrtiḥ sā smitasumanomayī dhavalahṛdayā |
dhanyāste tatratyā yatra gatā sā vayaṁ nihitāḥ ||
pāṇinimunimananadhanastolkāpīyamahābdhimathanamanāḥ |
paṇḍitamaṇḍalamānasamarālakulanāyakaḥ kuta idānīṁ ||
yatra kuto 'pi sa bhavatādgururasmākaṁ mahāmanā īminuḥ |
śāśvatikīṁ sa subhajatāṁ śāntiṁ paramāṁ manīṣivaraḥ ||
iti śokākulaḥ śiṣyaparivāraḥ

Indo-European and Dravidian learning are grieving in unremitting darkness even though the sun has risen. What can this dark be that flows around us?
Where has that great one gone, he who would smile, his mind kindly, his heart pure?
They are fortunate, they who are where he is, but we are desolate.
His wealth was the study of the sage Pāṇini, his wisdom the churning of the great ocean of the Tolkāppiyam.
He was the foremost of the wild geese that live on the lake Mānasa that represents the wisdom of learned men—where is he now?
Wherever he may be, great-hearted Emeneau our guru, may he, the best of the wise, attain unending peace.
—So speaks his circle of students, overcome by grief.

REFERENCES

ANANTHANARAYANA, H. S. 2005. Prof. M. B. Emeneau's contribution to Indic studies. *International Journal of Dravidian Linguistics* 34.2.1–18.
BHAKTHAVATHSALA REDDY, N. 2005. Emeneau's contribution to folklore and tribal studies. *International Journal of Dravidian Linguistics* 34.2.107–20.

[11] Emeneau's last publication (2003) was a letter to the American Philosophical Society, thanking the Society for supporting his fieldwork in India and the publication of his results.

https://doi.org/10.1353/lan.2006.0080 Published online by Cambridge University Press

BLOOMFIELD, LEONARD. 1933. *Language*. New York: Henry Holt.
BRIGHT, WILLIAM (ed.) 1964. *Studies in Californian linguistics* [dedicated to M. B. Emeneau]. (University of California publications in linguistics 34.) Berkeley: University of California Press.
BURROW, THOMAS, and MURRAY B. EMENEAU. 1961. *A Dravidian etymological dictionary*. Oxford: Clarendon Press. [2nd edn., 1984.]
CHOMSKY, NOAM, and MORRIS HALLE. 1968. *The sound pattern of English*. New York: Harper & Row.
DIL, ANWAR S. 1980. Introduction. In Emeneau 1980, xi–xiv.
DUENWALD, MARY. 2003. Puzzle of the century. *Smithsonian* 33.10.72–80.
EMENEAU, MURRAY B. 1935. *Jambhaladatta's version of the* Vetālapañcaviṃśati. New Haven: American Oriental Society.
EMENEAU, MURRAY B. 1938. An echo-word motif in Dravidian folk-tales. *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 58.553–70.
EMENEAU, MURRAY B. 1939. The vowels of the Badaga language. *Language* 15.43–47.
EMENEAU, MURRAY B. 1941. Language and social forms: A study of Toda kinship terms and dual descent. *Language, culture, and personality: Essays in memory of Edward Sapir*, ed. by Leslie Spier, A. Irving Hallowell, and Stanley S. Newman, 158–79. Menasha, WI: Banta.
EMENEAU, MURRAY B. 1943a. Studies in the folk-tales of India, 1. *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 63.158–68.
EMENEAU, MURRAY B. 1943b. Studies in the folktales of India, 2. *Journal of American Folklore* 56.272–88.
EMENEAU, MURRAY B. 1943c. A Dravidian etymology of the Sanskrit proper name Nala. *University of California Publications in Classical Philology* 12.255–62.
EMENEAU, MURRAY B. 1944–46. *Kota texts*. (University of California publications in linguistics 2–3.) Berkeley: University of California Press.
EMENEAU, MURRAY B. 1946. The nasal phonemes of Sanskrit. *Language* 22.86–93.
EMENEAU, MURRAY B. 1947a. Studies in the folk-tales of India, 3. *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 67.1–13.
EMENEAU, MURRAY B. 1947b. Homonyms and puns in Annamese. *Language* 23.239–44.
EMENEAU, MURRAY B. 1949. The strangling figs in Sanskrit literature. *University of California Publications in Classical Philology* 13.545–70.
EMENEAU, MURRAY B. 1950. Language and non-linguistic patterns. *Language* 26.199–209.
EMENEAU, MURRAY B. 1951. *Studies in Vietnamese (Annamese) grammar*. (University of California publications in linguistics 8.) Berkeley: University of California Press.
EMENEAU, MURRAY B. 1952. *Sanskrit sandhi and exercises*. Berkeley: University of California Press. [Rev. edns. 1958, 1966, 1968.]
EMENEAU, MURRAY B. 1953. The composite bow in India. *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 97.77–87.
EMENEAU, MURRAY B. 1954. Foreword. *Papers from the Symposium on American Indian linguistics held at Berkeley, July 7, 1951* (University of California publications in linguistics 10), 1–2. Berkeley: University of California Press.
EMENEAU, MURRAY B. 1955. *Kolami: A Dravidian language*. (University of California publications in linguistics 12.) Berkeley: University of California Press.
EMENEAU, MURRAY B. 1956. India as a linguistic area. *Language* 32.3–16.
EMENEAU, MURRAY B. 1958. Some Indian etymologies [Sanskrit *daṇḍa-*, Sanskrit *dośa-*, *dhosaka-*]. *Indian Linguistics* 19.71–74.
EMENEAU, MURRAY B. 1962. *Kālidāsa's Abhijñāna-Śakuntalā translated from the Bengali rescension*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
EMENEAU, MURRAY B. 1967. *Dravidian linguistics, ethnology and folktales: Collected papers*. Annamalainagar, India: Annamalai University.
EMENEAU, MURRAY B. 1971. *Toda songs*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
EMENEAU, MURRAY B. 1974. *Ritual structure and language structure of the Todas*. (Transactions of the American Philosophical Society 64.6.) Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society.
EMENEAU, MURRAY B. 1976. Personal names of the Coorgs. *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 96.7–14.
EMENEAU, MURRAY B. 1978. Towards an onomastics of South Asia. *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 98.113–30.

https://doi.org/10.1353/lan.2006.0080 Published online by Cambridge University Press

EMENEAU, MURRAY B. 1980. *Language and linguistic area: Essays*. Ed. by Anwar S. Dil. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

EMENEAU, MURRAY B. 1984. *Toda grammar and texts*. (Memoirs of the American Philosophical Society 155.) Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society.

EMENEAU, MURRAY B. 1988a. *Sanskrit studies of M. B. Emeneau: Selected papers*. Ed. by B. A. van Nooten. (Center for South and Southeast Asia studies, Occasional papers 13.) Berkeley: University of California.

EMENEAU, MURRAY B. 1988b. Proto-Dravidian **c-* and its developments. *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 108.239–68.

EMENEAU, MURRAY B. 1988c. Bloomfield and Pāṇini. *Language* 64.755–60.

EMENEAU, MURRAY B. 1988d. Review of *New perspectives in language, culture, and personality: Proceedings of the Edward Sapir Centenary Conference, Ottawa, 1984*, ed. by William Cowan, Michael Foster, and E. F. K. Koerner. *Historiographia Linguistica* 15.405–9.

EMENEAU, MURRAY B. 1989. Kṛṣṇa steals the gopīs' clothes: A folktale motif. *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 109.521–26.

EMENEAU, MURRAY B. 1991. A Nova Scotian becomes a linguistic Indologist. *First person singular, vol. 2: Autobiographies by North American scholars in the linguistic sciences*, ed. by Konrad Koerner, 83–101. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

EMENEAU, MURRAY B. 1992. Joking relationships in India: A linguistic note. *Dimensions of sociolinguistics in South Asia: Papers in memory of Gerald B. Kelley*, ed. by Edward C. Dimock, Jr., Braj B. Kachru, and Bh. Krishnamurti, 73–83. New Delhi: Oxford & IBH Publishing.

EMENEAU, MURRAY B. 1994. *Dravidian studies: Selected papers*. Ed. by Bh. Krishnamurti. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.

EMENEAU, MURRAY B. 1997. Mary R. Haas and 'Berkeley linguistics'. *Anthropological Linguistics* 3.617–19.

EMENEAU, MURRAY B. 1998. Foreword. *The life of language: Papers in linguistics in honor of William Bright*, ed. by Jane H. Hill, P. J. Mistry, and Lyle Campbell, vii–viii. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

EMENEAU, MURRAY B. 2000. Linguistics in India: Past and future. *Functional approaches to language, culture and cognition: Papers in honor of Sydney M. Lamb*, ed. by David G. Lockwood, Peter Howard Fries, and James E. Copeland, 545–54. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

EMENEAU, MURRAY B. 2001. Foreword. *Comparative Dravidian linguistics: Current perspectives*, by Bhadriraju Krishnamurti, vii. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

EMENEAU, MURRAY B. 2003. Letter [of gratitude to the American Philosophical Society]. *News from Philosophical Hall* 7.1.5.

EMENEAU, MURRAY B., and ARCHER TAYLOR. 1945. Annamese, Arabic, and Panjabi riddles. *Journal of American Folklore* 58.12–20.

GOPINATHAN NAIR, B. 2005. A Dravidian etymological dictionary and its impact on comparative Dravidian studies. *International Journal of Dravidian Linguistics* 34.2.89–106.

HAAS, MARY R. 1976. The Northern California linguistic area. *Hokan studies: Papers from the First Conference on Hokan languages, San Diego, 1970*, ed. by Margaret Langdon and Shirley Silver, 347–59. The Hague: Mouton.

KRISHNAMURTI, BH. 1968 (ed.) *Studies in Indian linguistics: Professor M. B. Emeneau* śaṣṭipūrti *volume*. Poona: Linguistic Society of India.

KRISHNAMURTI, BH. 2005. Emeneau's contribution to comparative phonology and morphology of Dravidian. *International Journal of Dravidian Linguistics* 34.2.19–36.

LADEFOGED, PETER, and IAN MADDIESON. 1996. *The sounds of the world's languages*. Oxford: Blackwell.

NAGAMMA REDDY, K. 2005. Dravidian phonology: Contribution of Professor M. B. Emeneau. *International Journal of Dravidian Linguistics* 34.2.37–70.

RAMAKRISHNA REDDY, B. 2005. Convergence in Central India: Explorations into a microlinguistic area. *International Journal of Dravidian Linguistics* 34.2.121–48.

RAMAKRISHNA REDDY, B., and K. NAGAMMA REDDY. 2005. A bibliography of M. B. Emeneau. *International Journal of Dravidian Linguistics* 34.2.229–55.

SAPIR, EDWARD. 1921. *Language*. New York: Harcourt, Brace & Co.

https://doi.org/10.1353/lan.2006.0080 Published online by Cambridge University Press

SCHIFFMAN, HAROLD F., and CAROL M. EASTMAN (eds.) 1975. *Dravidian phonological systems* [dedicated to M. B. Emeneau]. Seattle: South Asian Studies Program, University of Washington.

SHERZER, JOEL. 1976. *An areal-typological study of American Indian languages north of Mexico*. Amsterdam: North-Holland.

SUBRAHMANYAM, P. S. 2005. Historical study of Toda morphology (Continuation of Emeneau's work). *International Journal of Dravidian Linguistics* 34.2.71–80.

SUBRAMONIAM, V. I. 2005. The etymological dictionary by T. Burrow and M. B. Emeneau. *International Journal of Dravidian Linguistics* 34.2.81–88.

https://doi.org/10.1353/lan.2006.0080 Published online by Cambridge University Press