



The
University
Of
Sheffield.

*Centre for
Nordic Studies*

*‘The Birth of Applied Linguistics:
The Anglo-Scandinavian School as
“Discourse Community”’*

Andrew R. Linn

<http://www.nordic-studies.group.shef.ac.uk>

The Birth of Applied Linguistics: The Anglo-Scandinavian school as 'discourse community'

Andrew R. Linn
University of Sheffield

1. Introduction

This article has two principal aims. The first is to argue that there was a distinctive and independent movement in linguistics in the decades around the turn of the 20th century, referred to as the Anglo-Scandinavian School, and that it was here that modern applied linguistics was established. Several members of this School have been studied quite extensively, e.g., Jespersen (Juul & Nielsen 1989), Storm (Juul 2002; Linn 2004a), and Sweet (two monographs on Sweet are in preparation by Atherton and MacMahon, respectively), but the relationships between them and the common vision of language study they shared has not been thoroughly investigated.¹ It has been argued that Henry Sweet (1845–1912), committed as he was to the study of 'living language', can be credited with establishing what would later come to be called applied linguistics (e.g., Howatt & Widdowson 2004: 198–207), but Sweet was not a lone scholar. He was rather part of an active and international circle of linguists, who corresponded with each other, visited each other, and championed a new approach to language study, rooted in phonetics, but committed to the study of the 'living language' in a range of 'real-world' contexts. It is not hard to argue that, for example, Johan Storm (1836–1920) and Henry Sweet espoused a common cause and shared a common philosophy in their linguistic work, so to test the coherence of the School, and to ask whether the historiographical case can really be made, we are choosing for the present purposes to analyse the movement from the point of view of Johan August Lundell (1851–1940), one of the group's less high-profile members.

The second and related aim is a

historiographical rather than a historical one, and it concerns the notion of a *school* in the history of linguistics. Members of the Anglo-Scandinavian School saw themselves as belonging to a 'school', and the term has been used by subsequent historiographers. However, it is a problematic one, and I have already used 'movement', 'circle' and 'group' as alternatives, without interrogating that usage and asking what the use of these terms implies, whether they are indeed interchangeable, and whether or not it is justifiable to make the claim that this or that group in the history of language study deserves the label 'school', 'circle', 'movement', or anything else. I will be suggesting that the notion of 'discourse community' (see section 2.2) would in fact be a more fruitful one to understand the nature of a group like the Anglo-Scandinavians and to explain the dynamic which underpins intellectual history.

The present study grew out of two visits to Uppsala in 2007, funded by the British Academy and the Royal Swedish Academy of Letters, History and Antiquities (Kungl. Vitterhetsakademien), to study Lundell's papers.² Some of the letters to and from Lundell have been catalogued and placed in separate, labelled folders, but the majority are stored, uncatalogued, with all his other papers in a series of large cardboard boxes (Uppsala Universitetsbibliotek NC 679–695). The boxes have been given general descriptions, such as "Biografica", "Slavica", or "Nordiska språk", but the only way to investigate their contents at the moment is to pull them out, item by item, meaning that what is there is currently invisible to the research community. The letters at least need to be made accessible to researchers through proper cataloguing. These include letters from the leading linguists of the day, from within Scandinavia, e.g., Otto Jespersen (1860–1943), Holger Pedersen (1867–1953), Vilhelm Thomsen (1842–1927), and beyond, e.g., Karl Brugmann (1849–1919), Hermann Paul (1846–1921), Paul Passy (1859–1940). My primary interest in the archive was to understand more completely the network of linguists to which Lundell belonged, as well as Lundell's role within it. This meant

that I was not equally thorough in my scrutiny of all the papers I came across, and my own language limitations meant that I could do very little with the letters and other documents written in Slavic languages, so the archive has more to yield.

Working through a relatively unexploited archive must be one of the most rewarding tasks for any historian. To do so in the surroundings of Uppsala's *Carolina Rediviva* library only enhances the pleasure, and I am not the first to admire that library. Paul Passy wrote that, after attending the 1886 Scandinavian philologists' meeting in Stockholm, he visited several Scandinavian educational institutions. His first visit ("naturellement") was to Uppsala, "où je pus admirer, après tant d'autres, la bibliothèque [...]" (Passy 1887: 29). I hope, for their sake, that other historians find their way to Lundell's papers in the future to ask some of the questions I failed to ask. Jordanova (2000: 185) warns of putting too much faith in sources as a key to unlock the door of the past, noting that "most sources are [...] mediations [...]. No sources are transparent records of a past situation, not even archaeological fragments". However, in a historiographical climate still frosty from the debates of recent decades concerning the ability of historians to 'get at' the past (for an overview, see Burke 1991; Fay, Pomper & Vann 1998), "the aesthetic grasping of surviving fragments" (Tortarolo 1996: 18) remains a physical and undeniable link with the past, regardless of problems of interpretation.

2. *The Anglo-Scandinavian School*

2.1 *On the concept of 'schools' in linguistics*

It is common practice in the historiography of linguistics, as in all forms of intellectual history, to designate groups of scholars demonstrating a shared agenda, one manifestly different from that of other groups with which they might be compared, as *schools*. The shared agenda may only become clear in retrospect, and so historians posit schools of thought where their actual members may have been unaware or suspicious of such commonality of purpose. Two directions in linguistics of the past century or so are

sometimes described as 'schools', when their members in fact took no such view of themselves.

Jankowsky (2001: 1363) quotes Hermann Paul's 1886 review of Schuchardt's 1885 *Über die Lautgesetze: Gegen die Junggrammatiker*, where Paul insists that a neogrammarian *school* does not exist, although "one may talk of a neogrammarian *direction* ("junggrammatische *Richtung*") [...] if by all means one has to have such a troublesome name" (Paul 1886: 3). In the title of his survey, Jankowsky adds 'framework' to the collection of circumlocutions for *school*.

Even more varied are the alternative labels used by Vachek (1966) in his survey of "The Linguistic School of Prague". In his opening paragraph, Vachek writes of "what is commonly termed the Prague School of Linguistics [...]" what has been referred to for almost four decades as the *École de Prague*" (Vachek 1966: 3). In the following paragraph he writes of the "Prague group", and in the next paragraph variously of the "Prague group", "the Prague school" [lower-case 's'], "the Circle". Later, on page 6, Vachek writes of "the Prague movement" and a page later of "the Prague people". There is real anxiety here about how to refer to these linguists, not least because they didn't use the term *School* themselves:

In the invitational prospectus for this congress [the First International Congress of Phonetic Sciences in Amsterdam, 1932] the organizers used, for the first time, the term "L'École de Prague" [...] no stimulus for this use had come out of Prague [...] (Vachek 1966: 10)

If the linguists themselves did not perceive themselves in this way, does the historian have the right to reinvent the views of those who knew the work best, the scholars themselves? This is a perennial historiographical problem, but happily not one facing us here.

Looking back at those pioneering phoneticians of the last two decades of the nineteenth century and the first two decades of the twentieth, historiographers have been quick to identify a common purpose. Writing from a close distance about the older of the two generations involved, Raudnitzky entitled his 1911 book *Die*

Bell-Sweetsche Schule. However, it was the linguists themselves who first identified themselves or each other as members of a School, and we shall see throughout this article how often they used that word to frame their activities. Jespersen (1897–1899: 55) spells this out:

With the year 1881 [i.e., with the publication of Storm (1881) and Sievers (1881)] we have to say that modern phonetics really broke through, and it is beginning now to make itself felt in ever more circles of language scholars and language teachers. Its significant characteristic, by contrast with the more isolated efforts of earlier times, is its international character. “The Anglo-Scandinavian School” [“den engelsk-skandinaviske skole”], as Sweet and Storm and their followers have been called, found strong support in the German Sievers and soon influenced research in other countries too. What is more, with the aforementioned men comes a previously unknown combination of theoretical knowledge and practical ability. In this connection there is a growing interest in language teaching.³

It is obvious from this quotation that the phrase “Anglo-Scandinavian School” was already in use by the end of the 19th century, as Jespersen is citing others’ practice, and that there was a clear understanding of who it involved. Although he uses a different phrase to describe these linguists, Passy is also clear that the catalyst was the publication of Johan Storm’s *Englische Philologie*, this time in its original Norwegian version:

Ce travail considérable, paru en 1879 [= Storm 1879] a exercé une très grande influence sur les esprits des linguistes; il a, pour ainsi dire, provoqué la formation de la nouvelle école des *jeunes phonéticiens*. (Passy 1887: 4; emphasis in the original)

‘Les jeunes phonéticiens’ [Neophoneticians], calqued on ‘die Junggrammatiker’, was the phrase Passy used to describe the younger generation, but it excludes the older Storm, whose survey of English philology he explicitly credits with launching the School, and it excludes Sweet, who, as we shall see, was very much at the heart of the School, both personally and as an inspiration for its members. So, given that the phrase has a pedigree and that the constant invention of new labels is just confusing, we will continue to describe the linguists in question as

the *Anglo-Scandinavian School*, while recognising that some of the satellite members lived and worked elsewhere in Europe, such as Passy in France. (Interestingly Passy had to choose a Scandinavian country with which to be affiliated when he joined *Quousque Tandem* (see section 5), and he chose Sweden, because of “les relations si exsèlantes [sic] que j’ai avec Upsala” (letter to Lundell, Feb. 1887).

2.2 Schools, discourse communities and communities of practice

Metaphors like *school* and *circle* can be unhelpful in intellectual history because they have demarcated boundaries and imply a binary relation between those inside and those outside. These metaphors also suggest a centre holding the group together, either a central place (Prague, Copenhagen, etc.) or a central figure (Saussure, Chomsky, etc.) and so fail to do justice to more international and collaborative enterprises. ‘Anglo-Scandinavian School’ is a convenient description, but as a means of explaining the mechanisms by which linguistics developed around the turn of the 20th century, it is too rigid. We need a more flexible term, one which can express different sorts of membership, central and peripheral, short-term and long-term, while expressing the key fact of intellectual history, that it is down to human agency, the interaction between individuals. Alternative terms like *movement* or *Richtung* give the impression of the ideas transcending the individuals involved, as though insights into language are like the rat-catcher of Hameln, leading their followers out along a true path, leaving the blind and the lame behind. Instead we will use the English term ‘community’ to explain how the Anglo-Scandinavian School works. This term reflects the fact that this was a collaboration of individuals, some of whom were more centrally involved than others, and that it was not limited to one historical period either; the community in question survived at the very least for two generations, and we suggest that it in fact grew and blossomed and lives on as the international community of applied linguists, but we return to this in the next section. The idea of a *community*

in the historiography of linguistics is not a new one, and in introducing the notions of ‘discourse community’ and ‘community of practice’ here, I am building on the work of Watts (1999; forthcoming) in analysing 18th-century English grammar-writing.

Watts (1999: 43), drawing on earlier work in applied linguistics by Martin Nystrand (1982) and John Swales (1990), defines a discourse community as

... a set of individuals who can be interpreted as constituting a community on the basis of the ways in which their oral or written discourse practices reveal common interests, goals and beliefs, i.e. on the degree of institutionalisation that their discourse displays. The members of the community may or may not be conscious of sharing those discourse practices.

The extent to which this is a satisfactory definition of the Anglo-Scandinavian School will be revealed as the practices of that community are set out in the rest of this article, but there is no doubt that this was a community of linguists united in a common cause, a cause which they pursued in writing, in communication with each other, in books and newspapers, and above all in the pages of the newly emergent specialist journals. They were avid writers of programmatic texts, and these texts cohere via the reproduction of certain phrases (‘the new science’, ‘the living language’, etc.). Swales (1990: 24-27) seeks to characterise a discourse community by identifying “six defining characteristics” of a discourse community, which:

- has a broadly agreed set of common public goals;
- has mechanisms of intercommunication between its members;
- uses its participatory mechanisms primarily to provide information and feedback;
- utilizes and hence possesses one or more genres in the communicative furtherance of its aims;
- has acquired some specific lexis;
- has a threshold level of members with a suitable degree of relevant content and discursal expertise.

In section 7 below we will measure these

characteristics against the facts of the operation of the Anglo-Scandinavian School to ask whether they can be explained by appealing to the notion of a discourse community or not.

Watts (forthcoming) also introduces the notion of ‘community of practice’, developed and vigorously expounded across a range of areas of human behaviour by Étienne Wenger, fully in Wenger (1998), but most helpfully on Wenger’s own website,⁴ from which the following definition is drawn. Communities of practice are defined as “groups of people who share a concern or a passion for something they do and learn how to do it better as they interact regularly”. There are three defining characteristics. Firstly, a community of practice is identified by a shared domain of interest. Secondly, it is a true community, based on a mutual desire to learn together. Thirdly, there has to be a shared practice. As Wenger puts it, “members of a community of practice are practitioners”. While the Anglo-Scandinavian School can certainly be seen to exhibit the characteristics of a community of practice, Wenger’s view of this sort of community is so entirely synchronic and practical that it does not prove particularly enlightening in explaining the mechanisms by which ideas have developed historically.

2.3 *The Anglo-Scandinavian School in applied linguistics*

The Anglo-Scandinavian School is significant in the history of linguistics because, I contend, it is here that modern applied linguistics emerged as an independent and coherent enterprise in language study. There are differing opinions today about what applied linguistics involves, how it is distinct, if at all, from ‘normal’ linguistics, whether there is a useful distinction to be made between applied linguistics and linguistics-applied, and these debates are summed up in Davies & Elder (2004). Applied linguistics, as reflected in the national and international conferences dedicated to the field, is a very broad church. The *Association Internationale de Linguistique Appliquée* (AILA) defines its discipline like this:

Applied Linguistics is an interdisciplinary field of research and practice dealing with practical problems of language and communication that can be identified, analysed or solved by applying available theories, methods and results of Linguistics or by developing new theoretical and methodological frameworks in Linguistics to work on these problems. Applied Linguistics differs from Linguistics in general mainly with respect to its explicit orientation towards practical, everyday problems related to language and communication.⁵ (AILA website)

So, applied linguistics is about using insights from the academic discipline of linguistics to address what we can paraphrase as ‘real-world’ language issues, and this is precisely what the Anglo-Scandinavian School was committed to. AILA goes on to list some of the language issues with which applied linguistics is typically concerned. Although applied linguistics has extended its reach to treat language issues which have emerged more recently, we do not have to look hard to see the work of the Anglo-Scandinavian School at the core of what applied linguistics is now, a century on. Language teaching is the dominant topic in applied linguistics today, as it was for the Anglo-Scandinavian School, but the “problems” italicised in the following quotation are all ones with which they also engaged (see, e.g., Jespersen 1909, 1916; Storm 1896, 1911b; Lundell 1934):

The problems Applied Linguistics deals with range from aspects of the linguistic and communicative competence of the individual such as *first or second language acquisition*, literacy, *language disorders*, etc. to language and communication related problems in and between societies such as e.g., *language variation* and linguistic discrimination, multilingualism, *language conflict*, language policy and *language planning*.⁶ (AILA website; my emphases: ARL)

With the exception of some specific subdisciplines of applied linguistics (e.g., Howatt & Widdowson 2004), the field has not been the subject of extensive historiographical research. Davies & Elder (2004: 6-8) have a section entitled *History* in their overview of applied linguistics, but this makes no reference to the period prior to the 1920s. Dealing with real-world language problems, like establishing a writing

system or working out how best to teach foreign languages, goes back to the very beginning of the tradition of linguistic enquiry across the world. Applied linguistics predates and provides the impulse for theoretical linguistics. It is only the historical accident of linguistic historiography coming to maturity in a century in which theoretical approaches dominate institutionalised linguistics that has prevented the canon of linguistic historiography being applied. Taking a less revisionist stance, it is our claim that applied linguistics, as recognised by its international association, has its roots in the application by the Anglo-Scandinavian School of the new science of phonetics to “practical, everyday problems related to language and communication”, as expressed in this quotation from Lundell (1887: 2):

It is seldom that linguistics is in a position, like the natural sciences, to intervene in practical life. However, it now offers its assistance in two directions: in support of a sensible revision of the orthography and improvement in language-teaching methods.⁷

3. *The Anglo-Scandinavian discourse community*

3.1 *J. A. Lundell: A biographical sketch*

As noted in the introduction, we will be assessing the status of the Anglo-Scandinavian School by placing one of its less prominent members at the centre of our investigation. It is pretty unexceptionable to suggest that, for example, Sweet and Storm collaborated. A more robust test is to assess the extent to which a range of other contemporary linguists were engaged in the same discourse community. Since Lundell is not as well known as some other members of the School, it will be useful to start with him and with an outline of his life and achievements.

Johan August Lundell was born on 25 July 1851 in Hårstorp in the parish of Kläckeberga, north of Kalmar in the Småland region of south-east Sweden. Although he spent his entire adult life in Uppsala, he remained faithful to his geographical roots. Together with his sisters, Hilda and Elise, Lundell published a 900-page collection of folklore from Kläckeberga (Lundell, Lundell & Zetterqvist 1889–1940), which was

produced piecemeal over the course of half a century. Of his childhood there is not much to report, but it is clear that he was precociously bright as well as bookish. Throughout his life he kept a careful list of all the books he bought, where he bought them and how much they cost. This list (preserved in Uppsala Universitetsbibliotek (henceforth: UU) NC 682 was started in 1862 when Lundell was ten or eleven years old. Item 1 is entitled *Andeliga sånger för barn* (“Spiritual songs for children”) and was bought at Snöberg’s bookshop in Kalmar. The final item in this catalogue of his personal library was entered in 1938, two years before his death, and was number 23,776, indicating an accession rate approaching an average of one item per day for 76 years. Lundell’s work as journal editor, notably as the founder editor of *Nyare bidrag till kännedom om de svenska landsmålen ock svenskt folklif* [*Recent Contributions to Knowledge of the Swedish Dialects and Folklore*], meant that he acquired published works in greater numbers than other contemporaries did, but this is also testimony to the extent to which authors sent copies of their publications to other interested parties. Letters to his parents from 1862, the same year as he began his library catalogue, are collected together in UU NC 686 under the title *Formula litterarum svecarum ad parentes*, suggesting that, even before his teenage years, he approached his world very much as a collector and cataloguer. His biographer in the *Svenskt biografiskt lexikon* (Witting 1982/1984: 264) describes Lundell the scientist as “primarily a teacher and a collector of data”. This is to belittle the range and impact of Lundell’s writings and contacts with other scholars, but his instinct was certainly that of a collector, as can be seen from his working notebooks and hundreds of scraps of paper containing tiny, illegible jottings, stuffed in amongst his papers.

In August 1871 Lundell entered Uppsala University, where he would remain until his retirement in August 1916. Nearly half a century after starting his university studies, Lundell wrote that “during my first years as a student, when I intended to become a zoologist, I had studied

several branches of natural science” (Lundell 1928: 1). When Passy visited Lundell in Uppsala in 1886, Lundell showed him the anatomical models he used with his students and explained that he had his students dissect the vocal organs of animals in preparation for the study of practical phonetics. This early training in the natural sciences reminds us of the experience of other influential linguists of the period. Johan Storm began his university studies in Norway by taking natural sciences, before re-enrolling as a philology student, and Ferdinand de Saussure (1857–1913) also began his academic career studying the natural sciences in Geneva. Vilhelm Thomsen made a false start as a student of theology, and his fellow-Dane Jespersen began his academic career as a law student, before, he claimed, Storm’s *Engelsk Filologi* made him realise that philology was the true path (see Jespersen 1995 [1938]: 33-34). Those interested in modern languages at university level were poorly provided for in the 19th century, which explains why the first generation of modern language specialists had to get there via circuitous routes (see Linn 2004a: 55-78, 150-159). Lundell had a copy of Thomsen’s own student lecture notes from an 1865 series on “den gotiske Folkeklases Sproghistorie”. That this found its way into Lundell’s hands is an indication of how Scandinavian linguists of the later 19th century corresponded and cooperated with each other — how the discourse was pursued.

Lundell must have developed an interest in the emerging science of phonetics during his student days, but it is not obvious how and why this interest arose. Given his earlier flirtation with zoology (which gave him a “knowledge of acoustics, anatomy, and physiology” [Lundell 1928: 1]) and his fondness for taxonomies, put together with his linguistic interests, perhaps it was only natural that his attention would be drawn to phonetics. Pioneering textbooks (Sievers 1876, Sweet 1877) appeared at the end of Lundell’s student days (he gained the degree of Fil. Kand. in December 1876). He was in contact with Sweet from 1877 and with Sievers at least from 1879 (to judge from a letter in UU) sent by

Sievers to Lundell's Uppsala colleague, Adolf Gotthard Noreen (1854–1925).⁸ Lundell was writing to Alexander John Ellis (1814–1890) in 1877, enquiring about his work *The Alphabet of Nature*. In response Ellis suggests that Sweet would be a far better person to talk to, and that Sweet was in fact in Uppsala at that moment. Meeting Sweet and corresponding with the international community of phoneticians would have given Lundell confidence and inspiration in the pursuit of phonetic research, but he was already respected, at least within Uppsala, for his phonetic skills before this.

Lundell is best remembered in linguistics for his dialect alphabet, *Det svenska Landsmålsalfabetet* (see Eriksson 1961), first set out in full in 1879 (Lundell 1879). In 1928 Lundell explained (in English) how he came to devise this system. Various of the student “Nationer” in Uppsala were carrying out work on the dialects and traditions of their home regions, but they were using different systems to record the sounds. Lundell was called upon, as the resident expert, to devise a common system (see section 6.1 below). Although self-taught in phonetics (how could he be otherwise?), Lundell was appointed to what was, as far as I know, the first university post explicitly wedded to phonetics, becoming *Docent i Fonetik* at Uppsala University in January 1882. Similarly unwilling to state it categorically, Passy bears out that, “toutefois M. Lundell est probablement le seul professeur officiellement chargé d'enseigner la phonétique (*dosent i fonetiken*)” (Passy 1887: 31, fn.). He held this post until June 1885, after which all his positions at the University were in the field of Slavic languages, from June 1908 onwards as ‘ordinary professor’. His scholarly contributions to Slavic studies were minor (e.g., Lundell 1890, 1911–1914; Lundell & Rubetz 1921), and much of the Slavic material in the archive relates to teaching rather than research activities. The provision of Russian language training for the military occupied much of his time, and he was also active administratively in the furtherance of Swedish-Slavic relations.¹⁰

In the sections which follow we will investigate Lundell's work in the various areas he

dedicated himself to, with a view to understanding the nature of the wider community of linguists to which he belonged. Briefly now, however, we will complete the sketch of Lundell the man, as far as is possible at a distance of several decades. Archive work gives the researcher a privileged view of the life of another, but it is a view entirely framed by the chance collection of materials within the archive. I cannot say that I *know* Lundell, but I have an ethical obligation to remind readers that we are using personal materials without explicit permission, and that what we treat as ‘findings’ or ‘data’ is the production and possessions of a fellow human being.¹¹

Lundell's last passport (dated 1927) survives in UU NC 684. It describes him as 1,76 m. tall (including his shoes), with an oval face, grey eyes and (unsurprisingly in a man of 76) grey hair. Photographs show a well-built man, and, although not very tall, larger and more powerful than Jespersen, with whom he was photographed. He had a high forehead and full moustache, and, again to judge from photographs, was a commanding presence on stage.

Lundell lived for most of his working life at various addresses in Skolgatan, a well-established residential area immediately to the north of Uppsala's University and Cathedral district, and although he travelled a lot, this must have provided a pleasant base for his activities. In June 1882 he married Marie-Louise Jönsson (1860–1940), who post-deceased him by just a week. To judge from notebooks (UU NC 686) containing pencil drawings of the churches of Öland, close to his home region, and provided they are Lundell's own, he was a capable artist. To judge from his writings he also had a good sense of humour, writing for example that “*beauty* and *harmony* are innate human desires, from which only some modern linguists have been able to free themselves” (1928: 6)! Papers in UU NC 684, concerning his efforts to gain a patent for a divider for use in book collections, suggest a practical side to his character too. The picture which forms is one of domestic and professional comfort and contentment, but in his work he shared with other leading linguists of the time a

passion for reform, which Witting (1982/1984: 264) attributes to a sense of social responsibility, but which was as likely inspired by a belief in what could be achieved by phonetics. This reforming zeal is particularly evident in the efforts he made towards the provision of better and fairer education, including the foundation in Uppsala of summer schools (see papers in UU NC 684), of a reformed school with fewer hours and a more practical curriculum (with Adolf Noreen) and of a home-economics college (with Ida Norrby).¹⁴

3.2 Johan Storm

Seen through Norwegian eyes, there was one dominant figure in language study in the decades around the turn of the 20th century, and that was Johan Storm, described in 1907 by Bjørnstjerne Bjørnson (1832–1910) as “the highest authority on language as such” (reported in Langslet 1999: 44). He was (from 1873) the first Professor of English and Romance Philology in Norway, but he also provided lectures on Norwegian in the absence, before 1886, of a professor of Norwegian (see Venås 2000: 35-38). Storm felt the lack of a kindred spirit in Norway very keenly, and, to judge from the letters he received, and which survive in the National Library in Oslo, he was a particularly conscientious letter-writer. As the representatives of the new linguistics were spread around northern Europe, in some cases as lone advocates of a new approach to language study in their universities or even in their countries, correspondence was a lifeline. There are 88 surviving letters from Johan Storm to Vilhelm Thomsen,¹⁵ sent sometimes at the rate of several letters per month, and Storm became upset when Thomsen failed to respond as quickly as he would have liked (see Linn 2004a: 5). This was a community held together by correspondence.

Storm corresponded most actively with members of the *first* generation of the Anglo-Scandinavian School. His letters from Henry Sweet are particularly valuable in our efforts to understand the mechanisms of linguistic debate at that time (see Foldvik 1976). Storm found the enthusiasm and reforming zeal of the younger

generation (Jespersen, Lundell and Western) frustrating and unattractive, regarding its proponents as arrogant. Although like Lundell he dedicated his working life to questions of reform, language-teaching reform (e.g., Storm 1887), reform in his mother tongue (e.g., Storm 1878) and to a new form of dialectology rooted in phonetics (e.g., Storm 1884), in short all the School’s key applied linguistic interests, he was by nature more reserved and conservative in his views and felt that reform should take place slowly. It is fair to say that the first generation was generally more cautious in its calls for reform than the second.

Storm was the leading light of the older generation in Scandinavia, and it was natural that Lundell should contact him, as he did Sweet and Sievers further afield. Storm was certainly a strong supporter of Lundell’s *Landsmålsalfabet* project, which he reviewed very positively (Storm 1880). Storm’s letters to Thomsen show that he was already working out his own transcription system as early as 1874, but Lundell’s work evidently encouraged him to advance his own project. Movement in one part of the community provided a fillip in another. The fact about Storm which gets repeated from one historiographical overview to the next (see Linn 2004a: 43-50) is that he encouraged Sweet to write his *Handbook of Phonetics*, a topos deriving from Jespersen (1897–1899: 53), and it is true that there was plenty of mutual support and encouragement between members of the group. Storm concluded his review of recent Swedish dialectological work:

[...] with the wish that this meritorious undertaking might make good and lasting progress and might be warmly participated in as well as emulated in the other Scandinavian countries. In particular it is my wish that all Norwegians interested in our beautiful dialects might follow the shining example shown by their Swedish brothers, and might unite in that noble goal, a scientific study of the Norwegian dialects.¹⁶ (Storm 1880: 350)

From 1880 until 1886 Storm received financial assistance from the University’s travel fund, and work leading towards his own dialect alphabet was firmly underway. Lundell returned the

compliment five years later, writing in a review of Storm (1884) that it contained the best introduction to phonetics to be found in any language (Lundell 1885: 459).

Given such mutual admiration, it is surprising that there is not more evidence of close cooperation between the two men than there is. There are no letters from Storm amongst Lundell's papers. They met each other at conferences and congresses, and they travelled together through Telemark in the summer of 1881, after they had both attended the meeting of Scandinavian philologists held in Kristiania (today's Oslo) that year, at which Lundell delivered his polemic on Scandinavian dialectology, published as Lundell (1881). While there are no surviving letters from Johan Storm, there is one from Storm's wife, Louise, telling Lundell of her husband's death and hinting at a closeness belied by the apparent lack of correspondence:

When the professor paid my husband a visit last year, it was probably noticeable that he was not as lively as previously. He found it difficult to express himself, but he was always lucid, and we spoke afterwards of how nice it was that you had come. He valued it greatly [...].¹⁷ (Letter of 18 July 1921, UU NC 680)

The popular picture of Storm was of a difficult and unapproachable person, and this is supported by some frank letters Lundell received from Norwegian colleagues of his own generation. In November 1888 Olaf Broch (1867–1961), later Lundell's opposite number as professor of Slavic languages in Kristiania and an influential scholar of the phonetics of Russian and Eastern Norwegian, described Storm as "impossible":

It is little use to know that we have one of Europe's leading scholars — in his field — at the University, when one gets so little use from him, when one is even afraid to approach him. Most people find it best to keep their distance. I don't know him so well personally, and perhaps exaggerated descriptions by others have created too strong an impression.¹⁸ (UU)

The relationship between Broch and Storm thawed, and Broch wrote fondly of him to Lundell, following the older man's death in

1920.¹⁹ No matter what sort of fearsome reputation Storm had (reinforced in a letter to Lundell from Yngvar Nielsen of 8 Feb. 1904),²⁰ the fact is that, by the time Lundell was reading of it in correspondence from Broch, he and the impossible Storm were already mutual supporters and travelling companions, so the absence of any correspondence from Storm in the papers of the arch-collector, Lundell, remains a mystery.

In 1882 Storm travelled briefly in Norway in the company of Noreen, just from Kristiania north to Gardermoen, the site today of Oslo's main international airport. On the face of it, Storm had less in common with Noreen than he had with Lundell, but there are surviving letters in Uppsala to Noreen, where, amongst other things, Storm writes in preparation for Noreen's visit to Norway, how he looks forward to working together undisturbed for several days and discussing in peace and quiet the things "which concern them [hvad der ligger os paa Hjerte]". Noreen was obviously another of those who Storm regarded as part of the community. He wrote to him of Sweet's planned visit to Norway in 1883 (Sweet was Storm's travelling companion in the summer of 1883) and of the desirability of "en liden fonetisk Konferents" between them (UU, letter to Noreen of 6 May 1883).

Letters are the clearest evidence, and for the historian the most satisfactory evidence, of membership of a discourse community. If the correspondence from Storm to Noreen was this warm, writing of the need to spend undisturbed time together and of "little conferences", then how much more so are the letters to Lundell likely to have been? The discourse between Storm and Lundell is destined to remain a spoken one.

3.3 *Otto Jespersen*

Internationally the best known Scandinavian linguist of the younger generation, not only from within the Anglo-Scandinavian School but of all Scandinavian linguists, was Otto Jespersen. Jespersen was the Danish equivalent of Storm, the first professor of English with a serious research profile and a serious commitment to

pursuing the study of the modern languages in line with the standards of the international research community. As Sørensen (1971: 94-95) notes, “it was only when Otto Jespersen was appointed professor in 1893 that it became possible to study English on a sound basis”.

Lundell, Storm and Jespersen had more in common than just being among the first to occupy internationally regarded chairs in modern languages. Firstly, they were all to a large extent *self-taught* or came to the modern languages having first studied something else. They corresponded with and visited others with similar interests, and this was very much a community on a shared voyage of discovery; much of their insight into language, particularly in the area of phonetics, was acquired not by attending courses as students, but through self-motivation. Consequently they were not hide-bound by disciplinary tradition, and this sense of being pioneers permeates their correspondence. The pioneering spirit, reinforced by forging new disciplines and new syllabuses in their respective universities, gave them a freedom to be different and a fearlessness of reform. Secondly, they all had experience of teaching in *schools* and were therefore personally interested in language-teaching at that level (see section 5 below). As well as working on topics not traditionally regarded as part of the university curriculum, they were not afraid to break down the traditional barrier between school and university. In fact Storm’s post in Kristiania had been made possible by new legislation of 1869, which introduced a modern syllabus into the schools, on an equal footing with the traditional ‘Latin line’. Thirdly, all three were very active in the study and reform of their own *native languages*, even though their university appointments were in other areas, and as we noted above, Lundell’s contributions to Slavic philology were negligible, compared with his work on Swedish, both the standard form and the dialects. Fourthly, they were all fired by a philosophy of the *living language*, and we will return to what this meant in practice in the following sections. For now we will simply say that this philosophy is a major reason for arguing that these linguists constituted

a community with a common cause, a common approach and a common language, rather than being merely a loose association of contemporaries.

Jespersen’s main involvement with Lundell was through the *Quousque Tandem* society. Letters from Jespersen in the Lundell archive tend to be quite brief and practical, which is to be expected between collaborators, who probably met each other reasonably frequently. The photograph of the two elderly men reproduced above shows, despite the formal constraints of a posed photograph, two people at ease in each other’s company. In his autobiography Jespersen writes of “a friendship that lasted throughout our lives” (Jespersen 1995 [1938]: 39).

The relationship between Storm and Jespersen was less placid. Jespersen sent some of his own work to Storm as early as 7 June 1885, very much as a disciple to a master but with some of the self-confidence which would later infuriate the older man:

Together with this letter I permit myself to send you the first two sheets of a little English grammar “of the written and spoken language”, which I intend to publish immediately. I am in fact very eager to hear a competent man’s judgement of this attempt to provide a slightly more contemporary grammar than those used previously.²¹

Storm was enthusiastic about Jespersen to begin with, writing to Thomsen a year earlier that he found Jespersen “promising [lovende]” (22 Nov. 1884). By 1890 Storm’s avuncular admiration has turned to paternal pride, proclaiming that Jespersen will soon become Scandinavia’s leading phonetician. It is interesting that Storm, although by no means reaching the end of his career, should show no sign of professional jealousy here. From now on, however, Storm’s comments on Jespersen in his letters to Thomsen are characterised by complaints of Jespersen’s arrogance and lack of respect, and Storm’s enthusiasm for the young Jespersen finally exploded into anger on the publication of Jespersen’s *Fonetik* (Jespersen 1897–1899). In the preface to *Fonetik* Jespersen credits Storm (along with Sweet and Thomsen) with having

encouraged and furthered his studies, and he sent Storm a signed copy of *Fonetik*. This copy, now in Bergen University Library, bears the scars of Storm's fury, however, as pages 53 and 54, which discuss Storm's contributions to phonetics, are partially torn out; Storm has marked the passages he found particularly offensive. To be fair, Jespersen is as full of admiration here as other contemporaries at Storm's practical linguistic abilities, but he does go on (p. 54) to criticise his failure to systematise, a criticism which could also have been levelled at Lundell:

His presentation is organised by associations of ideas, which to others can seem extremely random [...] when the material is inflated to the extent that it is from the first to the second German version (from 88 to 352 pages on General Phonetics), this à-propos method has an off-putting and tiring effect.²²

On 3 January 1898, in handwriting that is difficult to read, Storm wrote to Thomsen that "I have neither the wish nor the time to bother any more with J [Jeg har ikke Lyst eller Tid til at beskæftige mig mere med J]".

Like all human relationships, the interpersonal relationships within the School ebbed and flowed. The relationship between Storm and Sweet, for many years so close, to judge from the richness of Sweet's letters to Storm, appears to have ended abruptly, and for no obvious reason (see Linn 2004a: 116). It may just be that Storm kept the letters written by Sweet after 1892 elsewhere, and that they have not made it into the archive housed in the Norwegian National Library, just as I cannot believe that there were no letters from Storm to Lundell. The relationship between Jespersen and Storm had good reason (at least in Storm's eyes) to break down, but papers in private ownership, which have recently come to light,²³ indicate that the Jespersen-Storm correspondence did in fact pick up again in later years. In 1911 they were sending each other copies of their recent publications, and on 28 January Jespersen wrote to "Cher maître", thanking him for a copy of Storm (1911a). In 1915 Jespersen received the next volume of *Større fransk Syntax*, and wrote to Storm:

Heartfelt thanks for sending your French Syntax

(prepositions). A read-through of it has been very instructive for me: I am occupied with similar things and am still working on my large English syntax, so I know how to assess the impressively large amount of material you have collected and organised and sifted in your book. May you have the strength and fortune soon to be able to publish further parts of your great work, for which all who are concerned with modern languages will be grateful to you.²⁴

Despite disagreements over the years, at the end these are two members of a community on a common mission.

3.4 August Western and Knud Brekke

Links between the members of the School were kept strong not only by means of correspondence, but also via personal visits. Neither Storm nor Sweet were famous for their personal warmth, but both were generous in entertaining visitors who shared their professional interests, and indeed the image of younger members of the community going physically to sit at the feet of the older masters is a compelling one. In a letter to Lundell of November 1878, Sweet notes that: "I have had the pleasure of seeing several Swedes here this summer: Ekman from Upsala [*sic*], + Wulf + Cederschiöld from Lund".²⁵

He also welcomed at least two of Storm's students to his home: Knud Olai Brekke (1855–1938) and August Western (1856–1940). Brekke and Western represent the part of the community that was 'out there' in the real world. Brekke spent his working life as a teacher of English, putting into practice the ideas on language-teaching reform being worked out in and around *Quousque Tandem*. In 1893 he won a scholarship, allowing him to visit Bedford High School, Bedford Park, London and observe in operation François Gouin's (1831–1896) 'Series Method' of language teaching (more often referred to as the 'Direct Method'; see Howatt & Widdowson 2004: 178-185), which sought to teach a second language in the same way as a child acquires their first. His report was published as Brekke (1894), and Lundell owned a copy.

Western worked as a teacher and educational administrator all his life, but he in many ways embodies the ethos and the ambitions of the new

School better than anyone else. With a doctoral thesis on English subordinate clauses and a range of scholarly publications to his name, he represents the erosion of the dividing line between linguistics in the University and linguistics applied in the school system. He was equally active in researching modern foreign languages (English) as he was his native language: his most substantial publication was a 1921 grammar of Norwegian Riksmål, which he acknowledges as being written under the influence of Jespersen. He was committed to the application of phonetics, writing descriptions of both Norwegian sounds (e.g., Western 1889) and English sounds (e.g., Western 1885). In all he did he bore the marks of his teacher, Storm, but Storm himself identified his former student with the work of the *English* phoneticians:

W[estern] has wedded himself closely to the modern English School, even in points which are dubious to me. There is scarcely anyone outside England, who is as familiar with the results of the School as W. is.²⁶ (Quoted in Storm 1892: 466)

Western was in England from 1880 to 1881, where he visited Sweet, no doubt thanks to an introduction from Storm, and where he was, to judge from his letters to Storm, the beneficiary of much academic and personal kindness from Sweet. Sweet was impressed with Western, and the mutual respect which developed between members of the School, even between individuals not always known for their generosity of spirit, is remarkable, and further reinforces the impression that this was a real community. In a letter of December 1880 Sweet wrote to Storm, “I see Western once a week. He seems likely to have a good influence on Norwegian phonology and the teaching of English pronunciation in Norway”. After Western had returned to Norway in April the following year, Sweet summed up his experience of him:

I saw a good deal of Western, and thought him very promising. He is clear-headed, firm + modest — in fact, a true Norwegian. With him and Brekke you ought to found a good school.

Here is Sweet using the term ‘School’ to describe the Norwegian linguists of two generations, but

we remember that the founder of this ‘School’ felt that the “promising” Western was a true disciple of the ‘English School’, meaning Sweet, so the notion that at least Sweet and the Norwegians constituted a unified group is not merely a historical construction; it was a very real connection to those involved.

Western’s closest collaborations, however, were with Lundell and Jespersen. In 1887, according to Jespersen’s 1938 autobiography “to my good fortune” (Jespersen 1995 [1938]: 61), he coincided and lodged with Western in London, where they both met Sweet, Ellis and Wilhelm Viëtor (1850–1918), who was also visiting London then. Later in the autobiography Jespersen lists Western among his “phonetic friends abroad” (p. 138).

This article places Lundell at the centre of the community, and we shall return to his collaboration with Western and Jespersen on the *Quousque Tandem* project later.

3.5 Henry Sweet

Henry Sweet, “probably above all the greatest living phonetician” (Jespersen 1897–1899: 50) was the undisputed ‘father’ of the School, and his home was a magnet for phonetically-minded scholars from across Scandinavia. It was almost a rite of passage to visit Sweet. Interestingly, there is no evidence that Lundell did so. Although he was well travelled, England was not an obvious destination for him, since his interests and specialisms tended towards the Slavic world and France (he was a leading light in the *Association Franco-Scandinave* from 1904 to 1914). Furthermore, he had already met Sweet, during the latter’s visit to Uppsala in 1877. I shall here simply give a summary of Sweet’s letters to Lundell (in the letter collection of Uppsala University Library) and note what these can tell us about the dynamic of the School.

Sweet wrote to Lundell in the period from 10 November 1878 until 3 May 1881. In his first letter he apologises for not being able to get hold of a copy of Bell’s *Visible Speech* for Lundell, and, more interestingly, he comments on his perception of the phonetic work being carried out

in Sweden, particularly with regard to the recording of dialect forms:

You may be sure that the phonetic studies now being carried on in Sweden will be followed with warm interest here in England, where the importance of laying an international foundation for phonetics seems to be better recognized than in most other countries.

Here the significant phrase is “international foundation”, and which for Sweet not only involves England and Norway (see previous section), but also Sweden. Storm was in the same period writing of a Swedish “fonetisk skole” (Storm 1880: 335). Schools are being spotted all over northern Europe, but the crucial thing is that this is an international community. Its members still continued to think of national groupings, because that is traditionally how intellectual history had developed and would continue to develop. The historiography of linguistics will go on to identify a Geneva School, a Prague School, a London School, all of which labels fail to do justice to their international nature, at least in the case of the latter two. In this respect the label ‘Anglo-Scandinavian’ is similarly unrepresentative, since it appears to exclude the likes of Passy and Sievers. Although based in France, Passy was very firmly part of the community of discourse through his visits to and correspondence with Scandinavian and English colleagues. Sweet also stresses the importance of a multilingual approach to the study of phonetics. He writes that “no one can understand the sounds of his own language who has not a thorough knowledge of those of several foreign ones”. To this end:

I intend to study as many foreign pronunciations as I can. I have secured a Russian already, + hope to find natives for Sanskrit, Chinese + Japanese as well, perhaps also Arabic.

In letters of 1880 and 1881, the international agenda is pursued further. Sweet writes on 12 December 1880 that:

I am glad to know that Swedish philology is flourishing. I shall be curious to see Svahn’s Swedish Phonology (which I hear Storm is going to translate into Norse).²⁷ I hear that Sievers is preparing a new edition of his *Lautphysiologie*, in

which he will take more notice of English investigations than before.

And continues on 6 February 1881 that:

He [Sievers] does full justice to English and Scandinavian work, and his book will no doubt tend to give German phonology a more cosmopolitan + wider character than it has hitherto had.

Subsequent correspondence comprises change-of-address cards, sometimes accompanying gifts of publications. For Sweet the international strength of phonetic science was important, partly for the furtherance of the discipline based upon as wide a range of data as possible, but also for the credibility of the discipline. Sweet famously regarded phonetics as the “indispensable foundation” (1877: v and elsewhere) of all language study, and international support for the enterprise was essential. Phonetics was at the heart of the matter, and it is to phonetics, and specifically Lundell’s vision for phonetics, that we now turn.

4. *Phonetics* — ‘*The New Science*’

In 1888 the first journal dedicated to the new science of phonetics began to appear. This was *Phonetische Studien*,²⁸ and it bore the subtitle *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche und praktische phonetik mit besonderer rücksicht auf den unterricht in der aussprache* [*Journal of scientific and practical phonetics with particular respect to the teaching of pronunciation*]. Notable here is the fact that the journal is intended to bridge the gap between ‘scientific’ and ‘practical’ — its aims are *applied* — and that it is particularly concerned with what has subsequently become the principal subfield of applied linguistics, namely language teaching. Before the appearance of *Phonetische Studien*, work on phonetics was published in more or less unsatisfactory publications, which failed to reach the whole community of scholars working in what Lundell calls variously ‘the new science’ or ‘the young science’. Storm, for example, had published his first article (on tone) in the Norwegian Sunday newspaper, *Illustreret Nyhedsblad* (Storm 1860). There was no danger

that *Phonetische Studien* would fail to reach the right people, since most of them were on the 51-strong editorial board: Bell, Ellis, Jespersen, Lundell, Noreen, Passy, Storm, Sweet, Western, as well as a significant number of German scholars. The editor-in-chief was Viëtor, Professor of English Philology at the University of Marburg, and author, under the pseudonym *Quousque Tandem*, of the influential call for reform, *Der Sprachunterricht muss umkehren!*.

The first article in the first issue of this new journal was written by Lundell, and is a manifesto for the new approach to language. This manifesto, *Die phonetik als universitätsfach*, is prefaced by two quotations, one from Whitney and one from Sweet, both predicting that phonetics will become an independent university discipline in the very near future. This is of course a pressing issue for Lundell, who had been appointed to just such post a few years earlier. The second part of the article is taken up with establishing a pedigree for phonetics as a university subject, by charting the history of phonetics teaching in European universities. The first teaching which touched on phonetics, according to Lundell's survey, was a course "über die prinzipien der orthographie", delivered in Berlin in 1867–1868 by Gustav Michaelis (1813–1895), and the first teaching explicitly entitled "allgemeine phonetik" was Lundell's own in Uppsala in the spring of 1882. This is by way of preparation for a rather full account of Lundell's unsuccessful attempt to get the University to recognise phonetics as an independent discipline. Lundell's ultimate goal in this article is to rally the new journal behind the cause of lobbying for an increase in the status of phonetics in universities. However, it is the first part of the article, where Lundell sets out the claims of phonetics for greater recognition, which is the more important.

Early in his survey of the state of the art Lundell notes that schools are beginning to emerge, but the only one he actually specifies is the "englisch-skandinavische", with Bell, Sweet, Storm and Sievers "an der spitze [at the top]" (p. 3). The novelty and originality of the School is underscored by constant reiteration of words like

"neu" and "jung" in its description. Lundell contrasts the newness of the enterprise with what has gone before: "Nicht nur Bopp und Grimm, sogar Schleicher und Curtius sind schon antiquirt" (p. 4). This is not, however, to belittle the contribution made by the older generation, rather to emphasise the originality of the younger (ibid.): "[...]was die ehre dieser genialen forschers natürlich nicht im mindesten schmälern kann, die jüngere generation steht eben auf den schultern der älteren und hat deshalb einen weiteren horizont".

The major shift between the generations is that the spoken language is now foregrounded as the object of study, and not just the speech of the educated classes but also "des bauers und des strassenjungen [of peasants and urchins]" (p. 4). So how does this new direction relate to the work of the Neogrammarians, another group of young, reforming linguists, who had proclaimed their originality and independence from the older generation a few years earlier?

The Anglo-Scandinavian School has a different agenda, crucially an applied one based on the development of phonetic science, and we will go on in a moment to see what Lundell claims that this can achieve. He views the Anglo-Scandinavians' work as in step with the Neogrammarians. As he writes, "Die reformation hatte ihre vorläufer [...] *in der that* sind die jetzigen sprachforscher insgesamt 'junggrammatiker' [contemporary language scholars are *in fact* all 'Neogrammarians']" (p. 5), rather as the phrase "we're all structuralists now" is often used nowadays. So the Anglo-Scandinavian School grows out of the Neogrammarian Movement, but in terms of its emphasis, its areas of interest and its membership, the Anglo-Scandinavian School is something new. Passy points to a parallel with Neogrammarianism, but at the same time stresses the independence of his own community of linguists, when he describes it in a November 1886 letter to Lundell as "Jungfonetismus" (UU NC 680). Passy is even more specific about the calqued name the following year:

On donne parfois à ses sectateurs, pour les distinguer, le nom de jeunes phonéticiens (en allemand

jungfonetiker, sans doute par analogie avec le mot *junggrammatiker*...). Je l'adopterai ici, parce qu'il est commode et assez juste, aucun de ces messieurs, à ma connaissance, n'ayant dépassé quarante ans. (Passy 1887: 5)

Correspondence in the Lundell archive from leading members of the neogrammarian movement is somewhat limited. Letters and cards from Brugmann and Paul in 1909 (UU NC 691) relate only to a biographical entry on Lundell in *Meyer's Konversationslexikon*. Noreen studied in Leipzig in 1879, and, according to Moberg (1979: 67), "Noreen remained a Neogrammarian throughout his life"; there are 28 items of correspondence from Brugmann to Noreen in UU covering the period from 1880 to 1919. Moberg quotes Noreen as stating that Sweden became "ett andra hemland [a second home]" for the Junggrammatiker school, but, while he recognised his indebtedness to the Neogrammarians, Lundell felt that the emphasis of the Anglo-Scandinavian School took them in a different direction, a sense supported by the relative absence of Lundell's name from Moberg's article on Neogrammarianism in Sweden.

Lundell's claims for what phonetics can achieve are ambitious. It is described as an unavoidable aid to understanding the history of language, as well as indispensable for practical language study (p. 5), so "unentbehrlich" for both the 'old' and the 'new' linguistics. As phonetics takes on ever greater importance for both scientific and for practical purposes, Lundell claims, it can be used in work on orthography (as he did himself), in the teaching of reading, in the education of the deaf and dumb (p. 6), in pathology, in the study of metrics, and in the art of singing (p. 8). Lundell's war-cry is simply "Also auch hier mehr phonetik!" We need to remember the context for this article. It is the opening statement in the first issue of the first dedicated phonetics journal from the hand of a pioneer in terms of the university study of the subject, and this is the rhetoric of one enthusing to friends rather than of someone seeking to win over an audience of sceptics. All the same, it is quite clear that the discovery of phonetics

provided its advocates with a new lease of intellectual life, with a sense of excitement and urgency. Lundell writes that the study of written materials remains a concern in philology, "aber das gesprochene wort, der fluss der rede wird zum eigentlichen gegenstand des studiums" (Lundell 1888: 4), what Jespersen (1933: 5) would call "a philology of the ear instead of the eye".

In *Die phonetik als universitätsfach*, Lundell includes Sievers in the Anglo-Scandinavian School. Not all of the group were equally sure that Sievers was 'one of them'. Jespersen, as we saw above, described Sievers as having provided "strong support", and both Sweet and Storm were at times critical of Sievers, although in a letter to Storm (27 Dec. 1880) Sweet expressed the view that the three of them had between them laid "the foundations of international phonetics". Another who saw the phonetic movement as a truly international enterprise was Passy, and there is some very interesting correspondence from Passy in the Lundell archive concerning an international vision.²⁹ In a letter of 24 February 1887 (using his own reformed spelling for French, and writing on the notepaper of the *Assossiation Fonétique, Orthographe Simplifiée*) Passy proposes an international committee for spelling reform:

Il me semble, surtout si Klinghardt réussit en Juin à fonder une Société analogue en Allemagne,³⁰ qu'il y aurait avantage à les grouper ensemble; chaque société conserverait son organisation spéciale, mais nomerait, par exemple, deux membres d'un comité central et verserait entre les mains de celui-ci un tant pour cent de ses ressources. Ce serait alors ce Comité central qui serait chargé de la publication d'un journal.

Passy, as founder of what would later become known as the International Phonetic Association, was an advocate of international language-reform bodies, but this proposal does not seem to have come to anything. In November of the previous year, in a letter following his visit to the third Scandinavian Philologists' Meeting in Stockholm, at which the Scandinavian *Quousque Tandem* society was founded, Passy wrote enthusiastically to Lundell:

Auch bin ich damit beschäftigt, ein referat über den Stockholmerverein für unser departement zu bereiten. Ich mach daraus eine föllige geschichte

des “Jungfonetismus”, u. endige mit dem wunsch, 1° dass die Lautlehre auch auf der Pariser universität studirt sei; 2°, dass Ihre fier tesen im neusprächlichen unterricht befolgt seien.

We now turn to this Stockholm meeting and to the “theses” set out there. As we noted above, Passy regarded the community to which both he and Lundell belonged as pursuing a common cause, and it is likely that the term “Jungfonetismus” was coined at the Stockholm meeting, although probably partly in jest, as it does not appear to have been in general use.

5. *Phonetics and Language-Teaching Reform*

The third Scandinavian philologists’ meeting was held in Stockholm in the summer of 1886, and on Thursday 12 August Gustaf Axel Ludvig Drake (1834–1893), a teacher from Nyköping in Sweden, gave a talk entitled “Huru skall en praktiskt och psykologiskt viktig anordning af ock metodik för språkundervisningen vid våra läroverk kunna ernås? [How can a practically and psychologically significant system of and methodology for language teaching be achieved in our schools?]”. This talk generated a great deal of interest, such that it was decided to postpone the subsequent discussion until the following morning, Friday 13th, inauspiciously enough. Lundell, Passy and Western all took part in the debate. Further discussion was needed, and so an extra session was arranged for some 50 delegates, with Lundell in the chair. This time, it is reported (Jørgensen 1893: lxviii), Jespersen, Noreen and Storm, amongst others, also contributed to the debate. The chief outcome of these meetings was the foundation of the Scandinavian *Quousque Tandem* (*QT*) society under the leadership of Jespersen, Lundell and Western, and a letter was sent out, dated September 1886, signed by all three and printed in parallel Danish and Swedish versions, inviting like-minded people to join the new society. (For more on the foundation and development of *QT*, see Linn 2002.)

This was part of a wider international debate surrounding more effective language-teaching methods and the role of phonetics in those developments. Both Jespersen (1901) and Sweet (1899) devoted entire books to the issue, and new

journals emerged (like *Phonetische Studien* discussed above, but also *Englische Studien* and *Anglia*) to support the blossoming debate, and to which schoolteachers and university linguists alike contributed. The Reform Movement (see Howatt & Widdowson 2004: 187-209; Howatt & Smith 2002) was at heart a German movement, witnessed by the large number of German members of the editorial board of *Phonetische Studien*. The Scandinavian society proposed reform along four lines, the four theses referred to by Passy above, and these were set out in the letter of invitation. These theses actually started life as four proposals put forward by Lundell in discussions following Axel Drake’s paper, and which went on to form the agenda for subsequent discussions. They are also reproduced in Jespersen (1886):

It is not the written language which is taken as the foundation for teaching, but the real, living spoken language. In those languages whose orthography differs significantly from the pronunciation, we therefore begin with texts in an appropriate phonetic script.

From the very start teaching is based on connected texts, not disconnected sentences.

Grammar teaching is wedded to reading to the extent that the pupil, with the help of the teacher, is guided into gradually working out the laws of the language from the reading. Only later should a systematic textbook be used for revision purposes. Translation both from the first language into the foreign language and *vice versa* is limited, and replaced partly by written and spoken reproduction and free production in the foreign language in conjunction with what is being read, partly by more cursory reading.³¹

The ideal of the ‘living language’ is the foundation stone of the reform proposals.

The society attracted considerable interest. Its *Revy* [*Review*], which ran from 1888 to 1891, lists members. By the time of issue 3, 169 members, mostly from the Nordic countries, had joined, and members continued to join throughout the years in which the society functioned. It isn’t actually clear how long the society continued in operation, and to what extent the explicit pursuit of the principles actually outlived a formal society. The journal, which was more of a newsletter and which didn’t appear

regularly, certainly ground to a halt in 1891, but Lundell's personal papers suggest that the society was still active at a later date. There are letters to Lundell in the period 1891–1895 from Johan Bergman, whose letterhead describes him as co-director of the “Nye Språkkursen” Centre at Mästersamuelsgatan 19 in Stockholm, introducing new members. By the beginning of 1903, however, all formal activity had ceased. In a letter of 24 January, Axel Gabriel Wallensköld (1864–1933), later Professor of Romance Philology in Helsinki, writes asking what to do with the subscriptions from Finnish members, now that the society is no longer functioning, and proposes that the remaining sum of 228,20 Finnish kroner be handed over to the *Association phonétique internationale*. (In 1904 *Le maître phonétique* reported a donation from *Quousque Tandem*.) The initial years were the most productive, but Western felt that there were grounds for feeling positive about *QT*, whatever its fate:

If the Quousque Tandem society has achieved nothing else, it has at least quickened tempers and generated some discussion. It has hopefully made it clear to many that the excellence of our current teaching method is not beyond doubt. And that is something. If the young society dies, it can't be said that it was silenced to death, and hopefully it won't be spoken or written to death either.³² (Western 1888: 40)

Lundell appears to have been the least active of the three founders in terms of promoting the society, but this is not to underestimate his commitment to the cause, and Passy was impressed by his fervour in the Stockholm debate:

M. Lundell fut chargé d'ouvrir le feu. Il eût été difficile de faire un meilleur choix [...] M. Lundell apportait, dans ce débat, l'autorité d'une compétence théorique et pratique incontestable. En outre, jeune, ardent, ennemi passionné des vieilles méthodes d'enseignement et de l'orthographe traditionnelle, il n'y avait pas à craindre de sa part un manqué d'énergie. (Passy 1887: 15-16)

He was obviously keenly interested in the issues involved, given his willingness to chair the discussions which led to the society's formation, and he is explicit about presenting natural

sounding texts reflecting natural speech forms, and employing some phonetic script in his Swedish and Russian textbook much later (Lundell & Rubetz 1921: vii-ix). The most interesting documents to shed light on the *QT* enterprise in the Lundell archive are however several letters from Jespersen.

In 1893 Jespersen sent Lundell a copy of a letter he had originally sent to someone else; intriguingly enough we don't know for sure who the recipient was. This is what Jespersen wrote:

Herewith I am sending you (somewhat late) Lundell's and Western's thoughts in connection with the suggestion that *QT* be allowed to merge with Passy's association. As to my own view, I have never been unequivocally in favour of merger, but I am in agreement with LII, that we should keep *QT*'s name. On the other hand I am for discontinuing our *Revy*, which is not very satisfactory in relation to the inconvenience and the cost.

But can you find another form of activity? The most important thing for me is that by publishing teaching books and taking part in discussions we do our bit so that quousquism permeates teaching more and more.

How is the printing of the French book going?³³ (UU letter collection)

There is no evidence of the French association considering a merger, although in January 1887 *Le Maître phonétique* carried a proposal for a joint publication by the two societies.³⁴

The query about “the French book” is not an immediate clue to the original recipient of this letter, since a number of French language books were published in the Nordic countries in the mid-1890s, but the most likely addressee is Axel Wallensköld (see above), leading light in the Finnish branch of the society, who in 1893 published in Helsinki a Swedish translation of Jespersen's 1889 French primer “*efter lydskriftmetoden [on phonetic principles]*” (Jespersen 1889). The significant thing about what Jespersen discusses here is that new forms of language teaching based on phonetic principles were an international mission, and members of the School felt the international nature of the enterprise strongly.

Jespersen had written directly to Lundell in praise of his own French primer, suggesting it might be translated into Swedish (a suggestion

obviously well taken by Wallensköld), since Jespersen writes (in all humility!) that he has never witnessed such joy in school as precisely in his own classes. Jespersen notes that he is due to give a lecture about the *QT* enterprise in *Det pædagogiske Selskab*, and the letter is redolent throughout of the international fellowship of *QT* (his final words are “salus et fraternité!”). He and Christian Sarauw (1865-1925) are preparing a Danish version of Brekke’s English primer, and Sarauw is preparing a German primer for Frederiksberg Latin- og Realskole, Copenhagen, whose governors, Jespersen claimed, wanted ‘quousquism’ implemented across the board as soon as possible. The urgency and the enthusiasm are tangible. Even before its formal establishment, *QT* was characterised by urgency and enthusiasm. Passy (1887) gives a full report of the debates following Drake’s paper, where even Storm gets washed along on the wave of enthusiasm (although “je ne puis suivre partout les chefs de la jeune école phonétique” [p. 25]). No sooner had the discussion finished at 1230 on Friday 13 August when:

Quelques instants après la clôture de la séance, une affiche était posée dans l’antichambre de la Chambre des députés, invitant toutes les personnes s’intéressant à la réforme de l’enseignement des langues à s’unir pour former une Association. (Passy 1887: 29)

6. *The mother tongue*

6.1 *Phonetics and dialectology*

The phrase which above all stands as the motto of the Anglo-Scandinavian School is *the living language*, or its various Scandinavian translations. It permeates all Johan Storm’s writings, no matter what the topic under discussion. In his last major work, a study of French historical syntax, Storm wrote of the need to draw out “the playful life of the living language” (Storm 1911a: xiv), where language is not to be seen as a collection of moribund forms, but as something alive and even ‘playful’. The subtitle of his major work, the *Engelsk Filologi* of 1879, is in fact “det levende Sprog” (or in the later German editions “Die lebende Sprache”). This does not just mean the spoken language, but all forms of the language, spoken and written,

which are alive for its users. In language teaching, too, it was the ‘living language’ that was the yardstick for Storm. The living language should be the only variety taught, and language learning will be brought alive as a consequence. As he wrote in a newspaper article in 1883:

My principle for education in the modern languages, which I have always pointed out, and which has gained a significant following abroad, is that one must begin at the beginning, i.e. start from the simplest basis for language, the living language.³⁵ (Storm 1883)

This emphasis on the living language as the only appropriate linguistic object also included Storm’s work on Norwegian, both the standard variety, where he was a central figure in contemporary debates (see Linn 2003), and the dialects, where he founded scientific Norwegian dialectology. As a language reformer and as a dialectologist, Lundell was Storm’s direct counterpart in Sweden, and Holm (1996: 593) simply describes Lundell as “dialectologist of Swedish”. Jespersen devised the *Dania* transcription system (see Rischel 1989) as the Danish equivalent to Storm’s Norwegian dialect alphabet (*Norvegia*) and Lundell’s *Landsmålsalfabet*. It was not only the practice of devising transcription systems that spread across Scandinavia, but there was clearly a suggestion in the air that the three countries should work towards a common system, as suggested in a 1916 letter from Didrik Arup Seip (1884–1963) to Lundell (UU NC 680), where he wrote:

With regard to the plan for a common-Scandinavian phonetic alphabet I will say that I am still very interested in the case [...] I have mentioned it to Amund B. Larsen and others.³⁶ Dr Larsen agrees with the idea; he thinks that the Swedish Landsmålsalfabet in any case needs to be modified a bit to be suitable in Norway. He thinks that the case should be taken up at a meeting of Scandinavian philologists [...].³⁷

Here is yet another example of the commonality of purpose evident across the School.

It is not necessary to read for long in the works of the Anglo-Scandinavian School to find the group’s motto cropping up, and it seemed to carry a real power for them. In his 1881 polemic on dialectology, the barely thirty-year-old

Lundell opens by characterising “the most recent period’s linguistics”, which “concerns itself with the real language” and “puts great weight on the study of the current living language” (Lundell 1881: 3).³⁸ He goes on in his presentation at the Kristiania meeting of Scandinavian philologists to set out his vision for dialectology. Dialectology was the linguistic science of the moment in Scandinavia, witnessed by the widespread interest in Swedish dialects and, for example, Ivar Andreas Aasen’s (1813–1896) Norwegian dialect grammar and dictionary, published a few decades earlier (albeit not on phonetic principles). Lundell’s manifesto for dialectology is summarised in 13 theses, listed on pages 30 and 31 of Lundell (1881). Thesis 1 states that “practice in direct observation, preferably achieved by carrying out dialect studies, also belongs to a good general linguistic training”. The new linguistics is to be based on the observation of real language in use, because, in the words of thesis 3, “dialects have the same importance for linguistics as the literary language”. Lundell cannot go the whole way, barely thirty years old and addressing the massed ranks of Scandinavia’s philologists, and suggest that the dialects are of greater interest than the literary language, but he didn’t believe this either, since language can be alive to its users in many different varieties. We will not be presenting the *Landsmålsalfabet* here, concerned as we are with the development of a philosophy of linguistics rather than the detail of practice, but it is no surprise that thesis 12 states that “an organic alphabet complementing the usual Latin one is to be preferred to alphabets based on other principles”.³⁹ (The principles of *Landsmålsalfabetet* are set out in Lundell 1928, and discussed in Eriksson 1961.)

Phonetics and orthographic reform

In the 1880s an interest in phonetics often went hand-in-hand with a desire for orthographic reform, although not all phoneticians were in favour of orthographic reform and vice versa, as Passy (1887: 3) points out: “Bien que les phonéticiens soient, en general, partisans d’une réforme de l’orthographe usuelle, il ne faut pas

croire que les deux qualifications soient synonymes” [while phoneticians in general are in favour of reform in standard orthography, it should not be assumed that the two are synonymous].

Johan Storm was a vociferous and active contributor to debates concerning language reform (Linn 2003), but in Norway it was more than just spelling reform that was at stake. The whole standard was up for debate, and it was inevitable that the country’s leading linguist should have applied his knowledge in the national cause. For Lundell as well, debates surrounding the national language were a natural forum in which to apply his phonetic knowledge, and here it was orthographic reform that was under the spotlight. Lundell was amongst those “new spellers” who advocated cautious reform in Swedish spelling, by contrast with Noreen on the radical wing (Sellberg 1988: 102). Writing in that ‘annus mirabilis’ of 1886, in a review of Noreen’s proposals for spelling reform of the same year, Lundell set out his views on reform in general:

There is a general rule that applies in all areas of life, that reforms could — and let us add *should* — only be carried out to the extent that general opinion is adequately prepared and willing to recognise their authority.⁴⁰ (Leffler, Lundell & Schwartz 1886: 39)

This is in fact very much in line with Storm’s approach to reform, although it remains true to say that Lundell’s generation was on the whole more eager for reform of various sorts than Storm’s was.

Swedish spelling was by and large standardised by the beginning of the 19th century, and it was thanks to the influence of proponents of the new science of phonetics that questions about its fidelity to the spoken system of the language came to be raised. Noreen and Lundell were not lone voices, however, and during 1885 and 1886 numerous articles on the question of spelling reform were published. In 1886 those in favour of a spelling which more adequately reflected contemporary spoken Swedish formed the *Orthographic Association* [*Rättstavningsällskapet*], which in turn launched its own journal, *The New Speller* [*Nystavaren*].

Some years later an equivalent society was established in Norway, as discussed by Western in letters to Noreen from 1892 (UU). (For more on the debates surrounding Swedish spelling, see Teleman (2003).)

Lundell sets out his approach to spelling reform in three lectures “on the orthographic question”, published in 1886, not, he writes, as a definite suggestion for a new spelling system, just the boundaries within which one for now should be kept (1886: ii). In the preface to these lectures he aligns his own efforts on behalf of Swedish with efforts being made internationally to make spelling systems of established written languages more rational, and he insists that he is addressing the question from the rational point-of-view (Lundell 1886: ii). For Lundell an “irrational” spelling system has the social consequence of preventing the majority of Swedes from achieving a satisfactory level of education, but the appliance of phonetic science can rectify this. Consequently this course of lectures opens with an introduction to general phonetics and Swedish dialects before going on to set out the benefits to be gained from revising Swedish spelling. The fullest account of his views on Swedish spelling (Lundell 1934) reiterates the social nature of the question, and here Lundell states quite categorically that spelling is not a linguistic question, but, in his words, a practical, pedagogical and social question (Lundell 1934: 5), in short at the interface between language study and the real world, so firmly within the domain of applied linguistics. The system he proposes is based on the one sound — one symbol principle and involves the introduction of three new symbols (ƒ [UNICODE 0283], ŋ [Unicode 014B] and œ [Unicode 0277]) alongside existing alphabet letters. Lundell offers the dire warning that failure to reform Swedish spelling could result in Swedes ending up in the same mess as the English and the French (1934: 63)!

Lundell liked to summarise his philosophy concerning the various applied linguistic questions he was concerned with. We have already noted his summary theses concerning language teaching and dialectology. The seven

principles of spelling reform are set out in Lundell (1893: xxi-xxiii), and they can be summed up as stating that: orthographic reform is needed in the name of better educational opportunities; it needs to be extensive enough to reap real benefits; it should be cautious. Lundell’s proposals (like Storm’s) were not accepted. The point is, however, that here was yet another area in which the science of phonetics could be applied in the name of social improvement. It is not until the middle of the 20th century that the branch of applied linguistics known as *language planning* gets a name, but there is no doubt that Lundell (as well as Storm and Western and others of the Anglo-Scandinavian School) were firmly engaged in the enterprise of language planning from the 1880s.

7. *Conclusions*

Because of its emphasis on the development of theoretical linguistics, the history of linguistics canon has failed to give adequate recognition to the Anglo-Scandinavian School. This is where applied linguistics emerged in its modern form. Henry Sweet has been called the founder of applied linguistics, but he was part of tight-knit international community of linguists pursuing a common agenda based on the desire for reform. These linguists wanted reform in language-teaching methods and they wanted reform in the written standards of their own languages. They felt passionately about these ‘real-world’ language problems. They had the confidence to lobby for reform because they possessed a pioneering spirit. Many of them were pioneers in the teaching of modern languages in universities across northern Europe. They were pioneers in the teaching and application of the science of phonetics, which provided the foundation for all their work with language. There was a clear sense in which they were embarked on a new form of linguistics, and the rhetoric to support this permeates their writings. They knew each other personally, they supported each other both face-to-face and in their publications, and when they were prevented from meeting, the relationships were kept up by vigorous correspondence. The members of the Anglo-Scandinavian School had

a strong sense of constituting a school, and this term formed an important element in their discourse practices and their self-justification.

It was suggested in section 2.2 (above) that the Anglo-Scandinavian School can best be described as a *discourse community*, so now it is time to test it against the “six defining characteristics” of a discourse community advanced by Swales (1990: 24-27).

Firstly, a discourse community is said to exhibit “a broadly agreed set of common public goals”. There is no textbook of Anglo-Scandinavian practice as such, so there was never any reason for the members of the School to express these in any formal sense. However, Lundell (1888) as a manifesto for the ‘new science’ sets out a series of goals for phonetics, a set of goals tacitly agreed by the august editorial board at the start of whose new journal they appear. And in their practice — what they wrote about and were concerned with — members of the School show a striking similarity of purpose.

Next, a discourse community “has mechanisms of intercommunication between its members”. These linguists communicated with each other tirelessly, through letters, visits to each others’ homes, holidays together, conferences, and more formally in the rash of new journals dedicated to their interests.

Thirdly, a discourse community, according to Swales’s definition, “uses its participatory mechanisms primarily to provide information and feedback”. Swales (1990: 26) glosses this by explaining that “membership implies uptake of the informational opportunities”. From the point of view of the Anglo-Scandinavian School this refers to the fact that they sent each other copies of their publications, which they read and reviewed. They subscribed to each others’ journals and attended each others’ conferences. So they took part actively in the School’s activities in order to advance their understanding of the field.

Further, a discourse community “utilizes and hence possesses one or more genres in the communicative furtherance of its aims”: “[...] groupings need, as it were, to settle down and work out their communicative proceedings and

practices before they can be recognized as discourse communities” (Swales 1990: 26). In short, a discourse community needs to talk a common language. For the Anglo-Scandinavian School this means the language of the science of phonetics, including the use of a specialised phonetic alphabet in various contexts, like dialect studies and language-teaching books.

A discourse community is recognised by its *discourse*, how its members speak to each other, and this involves at the micro-level having “acquired some specific lexis” (Swales’s fifth characteristic). There are several discursal red threads running through the writings of the School, and a close reading of key texts would draw out more, as well as characteristic rhetorical gestures. For now it is sufficient to mention the mantra *living language*, as well as the language of *newness* and *freshness*: young science, new science, young practitioners, ‘Jungfonetismus’.

Finally, a discourse community is said to exhibit “a threshold level of members with a suitable degree of relevant content and discursual expertise”. Whether we count up members of *QT* or subscribers to *Phonetische Studien*, or the number of people carrying out dialect work according to the principles of Lundell, we have no difficulty in arguing that this was an active community. It was not an artificially constructed community either. As Swales notes, “discourse communities have changing memberships” (1990: 27). We have already witnessed some of the inter-personal ebb and flow, which characterises a dynamic community, in Storm’s changing relationships with Jespersen and Sweet. Members of *QT* came and went, whether “by death or in other less voluntary ways” (Swales 1990: 27), but the causes survived them, mutating ultimately into the applied linguistics of the 21st century.

This article has deliberately scrutinised the Anglo-Scandinavian School from a somewhat narrow perspective, from the point-of-view of the Lundell archive. Nonetheless, I hope to have presented enough evidence to argue for the existence of an independent Anglo-Scandinavian School within the history of linguistics and for the usefulness of the concept of a discourse

community in intellectual historiography. What is needed now is: better knowledge of other members of these two first generations of applied linguists; a more nuanced understanding of the inter-personal dynamics of the community; focused studies of the individual topics on which they worked; and a thorough investigation of the subsequent development of applied linguistics, both locally and internationally.

REFERENCES

- Atherton, Mark. In preparation. *Henry Sweet and the Nature of Language*.
- Brekke, K[nud Olai]. 1894. *Indberetning om en høsten 1893 foretagen stipendiereise til England for at studere Gouins metode for undervisning i sprog* [Report on a scholarship visit to England in the autumn of 1893 to study Gouin's method of language teaching]. Kristiania: A.W. Brøggers bogtrykkeri.
- Burke, Peter, ed. 1991. *New Perspectives on Historical Writing*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Collins, Beverley & Inger M[argarethe] Mees. 1999. *The Real Professor Higgins: The life and career of Daniel Jones*. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Davies, Alan & Catherine Elder. 2004. "General Introduction: Applied linguistics. Subject to discipline?". *Handbook of Applied Linguistics* ed. by Alan Davies & Catherine Elder, 1-15. Malden, Mass.; Oxford & Carlton: Blackwell.
- Ellis, A[lexander] J[ohn] 1885. *The Alphabet of Nature; or, Contributions towards a more accurate analysis and symbolization of spoken sounds; with some account of the principal phonetic alphabets hitherto proposed*. London: Bagster.
- Eriksson, Manne. 1961. *Svensk ljudskrift 1878–1960: En översikt över det svenska landsmålsalfabetets utveckling och användning huvudsakligen i tidskriften Svenska landsmål* [Swedish phonetic transcription 1878–1960: An overview of the development and use of the Swedish dialect alphabet, primarily in the journal *Svenska landsmål*]. (= *Svenska landsmål och svenskt folkliv* B, 62.) Stockholm: P. A. Norstedt & Söner.
- Fay, Brian, Philip Pomper & Richard T. Vann, eds. 1998. *History and Theory: Contemporary readings*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Foldvik, Arne Kjell. 1976. "Henry Sweet om lydskrift, Svenska landsmålsalfabetet og J. A. Lundell". *Svenska landsmål och svenskt folkliv* 99.64-68.
- Holm, Gösta. 1996. "Lundell, Johan August". *Lexicon Grammaticorum: Who's who in the history of world linguistics* ed. by Harro Stammerjohann, p. 593. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer.
- Hovdhaugen, Even, Fred Karlsson, Carol Henriksen & Bengt Sigurd. 2000. *The History of Linguistics in the Nordic Countries*. Helsinki: Societas Scientiarum Fennica.
- Howatt, A[nthony] P[hilip] R[eid] and R[ichard] C. Smith, eds. 2002. *Modern Language Teaching: The reform movement*. 5 vols. London: Routledge.
- Howatt, A. P. R., with H[enry] G[eorge] Widdowson. 2004. *A History of English Language Teaching*. 2nd ed. Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press.
- Jankowsky, Kurt R. 2001. "The Consolidation of the Neogrammarian Framework". *History of the Language Sciences – Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaften – Histoire des sciences du langage*, vol II ed. by Sylvain Auroux, E.F.K. Koerner, Hans-Josef Niederehe & Kees Versteegh, 1350-1368. Berlin & New York: Walter de Gruyter.
- Jespersen, Otto. 1886. "Den ny sprogundervisnings program". *Vor Ungdom* 1886.353-381.
- Jespersen, Otto. 1889. *Fransk Læsebog efter Lydskriftmetoden*. Kjøbenhavn: N. publ.
- Jespersen, Otto. 1897–1899. *Fonetik: En systematisk fremstilling af læren om sproglyd*. København: Schubothe.
- Jespersen, Otto. 1901. *Sprogundervisning*. København: Schubothe.
- Jespersen, Otto. 1909. "Artenes oprindelse og sprogenes verden [The origin of species and the world of languages]". *Tilskueren* 1909.8-17.
- Jespersen, Otto. 1916. *Nutidssprog hos Børn og Vøxne* [Contemporary language amongst children and adults]. København & Kristiania: Gyldendal.
- Jespersen, Otto. 1933. *Linguistica: Selected Papers in English, French and German*. Copenhagen: Levin & Munksgaard; London: George Allen & Unwin.
- Jespersen, Otto. 1995 [1938]. *A Linguist's Life*. An English translation of Otto Jespersen's autobiography with notes, photos and a bibliography. Edited by Arne Juul, Hans F[rede] Nielsen & Jørgen Erik Nielsen, Odense:

- Odense University Press. [Original title, *En sprogmands levned*. København: Gyldendal, 1938.]
- Jordanova, Ludmilla. 2000. *History in Practice*. London: Arnold; New York: Oxford University Press.
- Juul, Arne. 2002. *Den levende fonograf: Nordmændenes Professor Higgins*. (= *University of Southern Denmark Studies in Linguistics*, 14.) Odense: Syddansk Universitetsforlag.
- Juul, Arne & Hans F[rede] Nielsen, eds. 1989. *Otto Jespersen: Facets of his life and work*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Jørgensen, C[hristian Peter Julius], ed. 1893. *Forhandlinger paa det fjerde nordiske Filologmøde i København. Den 18–21 juli 1892. Tillæg: Berättelse om Förhandlingarna vid det tredje nordiska filologmötet i Stockholm 10–13 augusti 1886 af Nils Linder* [Proceedings from the Fourth Nordic Philologists Meeting, Copenhagen, 18–21 July 1892. Appendix: Presentation of Proceedings at the Third Nordic Philologists Meeting, Stockholm, 10–13 August 1886 by Nils Linder]. København: Gyldendalske Boghandels Forlag (F. Hegel & Søn).
- Klinghardt, Hermann. 1888. *Ein Jahr Erfahrungen mit der neuen Methode: Bericht über den Unterricht mit einer englischen Anfängerklasse im Schuljahre 1887/88; zugleich eine Anleitung für jüngere Fachgenossen*. Marburg: N. G. Elwert.
- Langslet, Lars Roar. 1999. *I kamp for norsk kultur: Riksmålsbevegelsens historie gjennom 100 år* [Fighting for Norwegian culture: 100 Years of the Riksmål movement's history]. Oslo: Riksmålsforbundet.
- Larsen, Amund B[redesen]. 1897. *Oversigt over de norske bygdemål* [Overview of the Norwegian rural dialects]. Kristiania: Aschehoug.
- Leffler, L[eopold] Fr[edrik], J. A. Lundell & Eugène Schwartz. 1886. *Några anmärkningar i rättstafningsfrågan med särskild hänsyn till rättstafningssällskapets reformförslag* [Some observations on the orthography question with particular regard to the reform proposals of the spelling association]. Stockholm: P. A. Norstedt & Söner.
- Linn, Andrew R[obert]. 2002. "Quousque Tandem: Language-teaching reform in 19th-century Scandinavia". *The Henry Sweet Society Bulletin* 38.34-42.
- Linn, Andrew R. 2003. "Johan Storm, 'målmennenes og fornorskingsmennenes argeste motstander' [Johan Storm, 'fiercest opponent of the Landsmål activists and the Norwegianisers alike']". *Krefter og motkrefter i språknormeringa: Om språknormer i teori og praksis* ed. by Helge Omdal & Rune Røsstad, 175-186. Kristiansand: Høyskole Forlaget.
- Linn, Andrew R. 2004a. *Johan Storm, dhi grétest praktikal liNgwist in dhi werld*. Oxford & Boston: Blackwell.
- Linn, Andrew R. 2004b. "Research Ethics in Book-Based, Historical Research". *Flores Grammaticæ: Essays in memory of Vivien Law* ed. by Nicola McLelland & Andrew R. Linn, 21-32. Münster: Nodus.
- Linn, Andrew R. 2006. "Adolf Gotthard Noreen". *Encyclopedia of Language & Linguistics*, 2nd ed. directed by Keith Brown, vol. VIII, p. 696. Oxford: Elsevier.
- Lundell, J[ohan] A[ugust]. 1879. "Det svenska landsmålsalfabetet, tillika en öfversikt af språkljudens förekomst inom svenska mål [The Swedish Landsmålsalfabet, together with an overview of the occurrence of speech sounds in the Swedish language]". *Nyare bidrag till kännedom om de svenska landsmålen ock svenskt folklif* 1.11-158.
- Lundell, J. A. 1881. "Om dialektstudier med särskild hänsyn till de nordiska språken: Föredrag vid andra nordiska filologmötet i Kristiania i allmän sammankomst den 11 augusti 1881". *Nyare bidrag till kännedom om de svenska landsmålen ock svenskt folklif* 3:1.1-31.
- Lundell, J. A. 1885. Review of *Norvegia* 1. *Nordisk Revy* 1885.458-460.
- Lundell, J. A. 1886. *Om rättstafningsfrågan: Tre föreläsningar* [On the orthography question: Three lectures]. Stockholm: P.A. Norstedt & Söner.
- Lundell, J. A. 1887. "Olika ståndpunkter". *Nordisk Tidskrift för Vetenskap, Konst och Industri* 10.1-30.
- Lundell, J. A. 1888. "Die phonetik als universitätsfach". *Phonetische Studien* 1.1-17.
- Lundell, J. A. 1890. *Études sur la prononciation russe 1^e partie: Compte rendu de la littérature. 1^e livraison*. (= *Upsala Universitets Årsskrift 1891 [sic] Filosofi, Språkvetenskap och Historiska vetenskaper*. 1.) Stockholm: P. A. Norstedt & Söner.

- Lundell, J. A. 1893. *Svensk ordlista med reformstavning och uttalsbeteckning* [Swedish Wordlist with Reformed Spelling and Pronunciation Guide]. *Under medvärkan av Hilda Lundell och Elise Zetterqvist samt flere fackmän*. Stockholm: Hugo Geber.
- Lundell, J. A. 1911–1914. *Lärobok i ryska språket*. Stockholm: P. A. Norstedt & Söner.
- Lundell, J. A. 1928. “The Swedish Dialect Alphabet”. *Studia Neophilologica* 1.1-17.
- Lundell, J. A. 1934. *Svensk rättstavning. Principutredning*. (= *Studentföreningen Verdandis småskrifter*, 368.) Stockholm: Albert Bonnier.
- Lundell, J. A., Hilda Lundell & Elise Zetterqvist (née Lundell). 1889–1940. “Folkminnen från Kläckeberga och Dörby, upptecknade av Hilda Lundell och Elise Zetterqvist, utgivna under medverkan av J.A. Lundell”. *Nyare bidrag till kännedom om de svenska landsmälen och svenskt folklif* 9.
- Lundell, J. A. & Al[exander] A. Rubetz. 1921. *Svensk-Rysk Parlör till tjänst för ryssar och svenskar vid inlärande av svensk och ryskt talspråk*. Stockholm: P. A. Norstedt & Söner.
- MacMahon, Michael K. C. In preparation. *Through the Silent Land: The life and times of Henry Sweet*.
- Moberg, Lennart. 1979. “Om den nordiska språkvetenskapen i Sverige för hundra år sedan”. *Svenska landsmål och svenskt folkliv* 102.53-71.
- Nystrand, Martin. 1982, ed. *What Writers Know: The language, process, and structure of written discourse*. New York: Academic Press.
- Passy, Paul. 1887. *Le phonétisme au Congrès philologique de Stockholm en 1886: Rapport présenté au Ministre de l'Instruction publique*. Paris: Ch. Delagrave & Hachette et Cie.
- Paul, Hermann. 1886. Review of Hugo Schuchardt, *Ueber die Lautgesetze: Gegen die Junggrammatiker* (Berlin: Robert Oppenheim, 1885). *Literaturblatt für germanische und romanische Philologie* 7.1-6.
- Raudnitzky, Hans. 1911. *Die Bell-Sweetsche Schule. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der englischen Phonetik*. (= *Marburger Studien zur englischen Philologie*, 13.) Marburg: N. G. Elwert.
- Rischel, Jørgen. 1989. “Otto Jespersen’s Contribution to Danish and General Phonetics”. Juul & Nielsen, eds. 1989.43-60.
- Sellberg, Lars. 1988. “Rationalismen”. *De nordiske skriftspråkernes udvikling på 1800-tallet*, vol. III: *Ideologier og språkstyring*, 93-112. Oslo: Nordisk Språksekretariat.
- Sievers, Eduard. 1876. *Grundzüge der Lautphysiologie zur Einführung in das Studium der Lautlehre der indogermanischen Sprachen*. Leipzig: Breitkopf & Härtel.
- Sievers, Eduard. 1881. *Grundzüge der Phonetik zur Einführung in das Studium der Lautlehre der indogermanischen Sprachen*. Zweite wesentlich umgearbeitete und vermehrte Auflage der *Grundzüge der Lautphysiologie*. Leipzig: Breitkopf & Härtel. (5th ed., 1901.)
- Storm, Johan. 1860. “Tale og Accent i Forhold til Sang”. *Illustreret Nyhedsblad* 9.169-170, 177-178.
- Storm, Johan. 1878. “Det norske Målstræv”. *Nordisk Tidsskrift for Vetenskap, Konst och Industri* 1.407-430, 526-550.
- Storm, Johan. 1879. *Engelsk Filologi: Anvisning til et videnskabeligt Studium af det engelske Sprog for Studerende, Lærere og Viderekomne. I: Det levende Sprog*. Kristiania: Alb. Cammermeyer.
- Storm, Johan. 1880. “De svenske Dialekter”. *Nordisk Tidsskrift for Vetenskap, Konst och Industri* 3.333-350.
- Storm, Johan. 1881. *Englische Philologie: Anleitung zum wissenschaftlichen Studium der englischen Sprache. Vom Verfasser für das deutsche Publikum bearbeitet. I: Die lebende Sprache*. Heilbronn: Gebr. Henninger.
- Storm, Johan. 1883. “Engelsk Stil ved Realartium 1882, med nogle Bemærkninger om Realdannelsen”. *Morgenbladet*, 23, 25, and 26 January 1883.
- Storm, Johan. 1884. *Kortere Ordliste med Forklaring af Lydskriften*. (= Bilag til *Norvegia*, 1.)
- Storm, Johan. 1887. *Franske Taleøvelser. En systematisk Fremstilling af det franske Talesprog gennem Samtaler af det daglige Liv, ordnede efter Grammatiken*. Melletrin. Kjøbenhavn: Gyldendalske Boghandels Forlag (F. Hegel & Søn)
- Storm, Johan. 1892. *Englische Philologie: Anleitung zum wissenschaftlichen Studium der englischen Sprache. Vom Verfasser für das deutsche Publikum bearbeitet. I: Die lebende Sprache. I. Abteilung: Phonetik und Aussprache*. Zweite, vollständig umgearbeitete und sehr vermehrte Auflage. Leipzig: O. R. Reisland.

- Storm, Johan. 1896. *Norsk Sprog. Kraakemaal og Landsmaal* [Norsk language: Crow language and Landsmaal]. Kjøbenhavn: Gyldendalske Boghandels Forlag (F. Hegel & Søn).
- Storm, Johan. 1911a. *Større fransk Syntax I: Artiklerne*. Kristiania & Kjøbenhavn: Gyldendalske Boghandel, Nordisk Forlag.
- Storm, Johan. 1911b. *Om Nabosprog og Grænsedialekter*. (= *Videnskapselskapets Skrifter*, II. Hist.-Filos. Klasse, 1911, 4.) Kristiania: I Kommission hos Jacob Dybwad.
- Svahn, Oscar. 1882. *Lärobok i Välläsning*. Stockholm: P. A. Norstedt & Söner.
- Swales, John M[alcolm]. 1990. *Genre Analysis: English in academic and research settings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sweet, Henry. 1877. *Handbook of Phonetics*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Sweet, Henry. 1899. *The Practical Study of Languages: A guide for teachers and learners*. London: J. M. Dent & Sons.
- Sørensen, Knud. 1971. "The Teaching of English in Denmark: An historical survey". *Pædagogica Historica* 11:1.90-101.
- Teleman, Ulf. 2003. *Tradis och funkis: Svensk språkvård och språkpolitik efter 1800*. (= *Skrifter utgivna av Svenska språknämnden*, 87.) Stockholm: Norstedts ordbok.
- Tortarolo, Edoardo. 1996. "Intellectual History and Historiography". *Intellectual News* 1.17-18.
- Vachek, Josef. 1966. *The Linguistic School of Prague: An introduction to its theory and practice*. Bloomington & London: Indiana University Press.
- Venås, Kjell. 2000. *Ivar Aasen og universitetet*. Oslo: Universitetet i Oslo.
- Viëtor, Wilhelm [= Quousque Tandem]. 1882. *Der Sprachunterricht muss umkehren! Ein Beitrag zur Überbürdungsfrage*. Heilbronn: Gebr. Henninger.
- Watts, Richard J. 1999. "The Social Construction of Standard English". *Standard English: The widening debate* ed. by Tony Bex & Richard J. Watts, 40-68. London: Routledge.
- Watts, Richard J. Forthcoming. "Grammar Writers in Eighteenth-Century Britain: A community of practice or a discourse community?" *Grammars, Grammarians and Grammar Writing* ed. by Ingrid Tieken-Boon van Ostade. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Wenger, Etienne. 1998. *Communities of Practice: Learning, meaning, and identity*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Western, August. 1885. *Englische Lautlehre für Studierende und Lehrer*. Heilbronn: Gebr. Henninger.
- Western, August. 1888. "Mere om den nye sprogundervisning [More about the new language teaching]". *Vor Ungdom* 1888.40-70.
- Western, August. 1889. "Kurze Darstellung des norwegischen Lautsystems". *Phonetische Studien* 2.259-282.
- Witting, Claes. 1982/1984. "Lundell, Johan August". *Svenskt biografiskt lexikon*, band 24: *Ljungdahl-Malmros* ed. by Birgitta Lager-Kromnow, 261-264. Stockholm: Svenskt biografiskt lexikon.

SUMMARY

The major claim of this article is that there is an independent and clearly defined chapter in the development of linguistics, beginning in the 1880s, which represents the birth of modern *applied linguistics*, and which has been overlooked in linguistic historiography because of the comparative marginalisation of applied linguistics in the literature. This is the *Anglo-Scandinavian School*, a phrase its members used to describe themselves. Pioneers within *phonetics*, these linguists applied their phonetic knowledge to a range of 'real world' language issues, notably language-teaching reform, orthographic reform, language planning, and the study of the spoken language. As well as presenting the ideas of the Anglo-Scandinavian School and how they were developed, this article interrogates the notion of a *school* in intellectual history and proposes that it may in fact be more fruitful to view intellectual history in terms of *discourse communities*.

RÉSUMÉ

Cet article a pour but principal de démontrer l'existence d'une période claire et définie dans le développement de la linguistique, qui se situe dans les années 1880 et qui représente la naissance de *la linguistique appliquée* moderne; aspect souvent négligé par l'historiographie linguistique, vu une certaine marginalisation de la linguistique appliquée dans la littérature. Il s'agit

de l'École anglo-scandinave, pour reprendre l'expression dont se servaient avec ses membres afin de se décrire. Pionniers au sein de la *phonétique*, ces linguistes appliquaient leurs connaissances phonétiques sur toute une gamme de questions concernant les actes de paroles ou l'énonciation, telles que la réforme de l'enseignement du langage, celle de l'orthographe, la politique linguistique et l'étude de la langue parlée. Au-delà de la présentation des idées de l'École anglo-scandinave, cet article s'interroge sur la notion même d' 'école' au sein de l'histoire intellectuelle et envisage qu'il serait peut-être plus fructueux de concevoir l'histoire intellectuelle en termes de 'discourse communities'.

ZUSAMMENFASSUNG

Seit den 80er Jahren des 19. Jhdts. zeichnet sich eine eigenständige Entwicklung in der Linguistik ab, die man gut und gerne als *Angewandte Sprachwissenschaft* bezeichnen kann: die sog. *Anglo-Skandinavische Schule*. Aus dieser "Schule", die bisher wegen der Marginalisierung der angewandten Sprachwissenschaft in der linguistischen Historiographie übersehen wurde, entstand die moderne Angewandte Sprachwissenschaft. Die Vertreter dieser "Anglo-Skandinavischen Schule" — denn so bezeichneten sie sich auch damals — leisteten Pionierarbeit, indem sie ihre Kenntnisse in der *Phonetik* auch auf eine Reihe von konkreten sprachlichen Problembereichen anwendeten, wie Reform des Fremdsprachunterrichts, orthographische Reform, Sprachplanung sowie das Studium der gesprochenen Sprache. Dieser Beitrag stellt die Hauptvertreter und die Ideen der "Anglo-Skandinavischen Schule" vor, aber problematisiert gleichzeitig auch die Angemessenheit des Konzepts 'Schule' in der Geistesgeschichte und plädiert stattdessen für 'discourse community' als theoretische Größe, mit der sich Ideengeschichte adäquater beschreiben lässt.

Author's address:

Andrew R. Linn
School of English Literature, Language and
Linguistics
University of Sheffield
SHEFFIELD S10 2TN
England
e-mail: a.r.linn@shef.ac.uk

* While preparing this article, I have received valuable comments from Professor Oddvar Nes (Bergen) and from audiences at: the University of Bergen; the University of Stavanger; the University of Stockholm; and at the 2007 joint meeting of the Henry Sweet Society and the Studienkreis 'Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft' in Helsinki. I also wish to acknowledge the helpful comments by two anonymous readers on an earlier draft. — I dedicate this article to the memory of Professor Werner Hüllen (1927–2008).

¹ Linn (2004a) asks whether an independent Anglo-Scandinavian School existed and suggests that this question is worth "a closer look" (p. 125).

² My thanks go to the staff of the Manuscript section of Uppsala Universitetsbibliotek, especially Håkan Hallberg, for allowing me access to these materials and for providing me with help and advice during my visits.

³ All translations are my own, except where stated otherwise.

[Med året 1881 må vi sige, at den moderne fonetik er slået igennem, og den begynder nu at gøre sig gældende i stedse videre krese af sprogforskere og sproglærere. Dens væsentlige karaktermærke i modsætning til tidligere tiders mer isolerede bestræbelser er dens internationale karakter; „den engelsk-skandinaviske skole”, som man kaldte Sweet og Storm med deres efterfølgere, havde jo en kraftig støtte i tyskeren Sievers og påvirkede snart forskningen også i andre lande. Endvidere kommer med de nævnte mænd en tidligere ukjendt forbindelse af teoretisk viden og praktisk kunnen frem. I forbindelse hermed står en stigende interesse for sprogundervisning.]

⁴ <http://www.ewenger.com/index.htm> [accessed 17.12.2007]

⁵ <http://www.aila.info/about/index.htm> [accessed 17.12.2007]

⁶ <http://www.aila.info/about/index.htm> [accessed 17.12.2007]

⁷ [Sällan kommer dock språkvetenskapen i tillfälle att, som naturvetenskaperna, omedelbart ingripa i det praktiska livet. Den erbjuder emellertid nu i tvänne riktningar sitt biträde: för en förständig omreglering af stafsättet och för förbättring af språkundervisningens metodik.]

⁸ For Noreen, see Linn (2006).

⁹ The Uppsala Nationer resemble the colleges of some of the older British universities, providing social and academic facilities for the students affiliated to them.

¹⁰ In 1925 he was appointed *Commandeur de l'Ordre Tchecoslovaque du Lion Blanc* by the President of Czechoslovakia.

¹¹ For a fuller discussion of ethical issues in book-based, historical research, see Linn (2004b).

¹² This and the two other pictures provided by Uppsala

Universitetsbibliotek for use in publications.

¹³ “According to Lundell, general linguistics should include the following fields: 1) the history of linguistics, 2) the languages of the world, 3) the study of a non-Indo-European language, 4) general phonetics, 5) language psychology, and 6) dialects and dialogue” (Hovdhaugen et al. 2000: 316).

¹⁴ Ida Norrby (1869–1934) was awarded an honorary Doctor of Medicine degree by the University in 1927. She and Lundell were obviously close, and letters to Norrby from Lundell are signed, for example, “vänkapliga hälsningar från Frökens ‘professor’” [friendly greetings from mademoiselle’s ‘professor’], and address “kära snälla lilla vän” [dear, good little friend].

¹⁵ Catalogued as NKS 4291-4° in the Royal Library in Copenhagen.

¹ [... med ønsket om at dette fortjenstfulde foretagende må få god og varig fremgang og finde varm deltagelse såvelsom efterligning i de øvrige skandinaviske lande. Navnlig ønsker jeg, at alle nordmænd, som interessere sig for vore vakre bygdemål, ville følge det glimrende eksempel, som deres svenske brødre have givet dem, og samles i enighed om det skønne mål, en videnskabelig granskning af de norske dialekter.]

¹⁷ [Da professoren i fjor avlagde min Mand en Visit, mærkedes nok at han ikke var saa livlig som för, han hadde ondt for at udtrykke sig, men klar var han altid, og vi snakkede efterpaa om hvor hyggelig det var at De kom; stor Pris satte han derpaa.]

¹⁸ [Det nyttes lidet at vide, at man har en af Europas første lærde — i sit slags — ved universitetet, når en får så liden nytte af ham, ja når man endog skal være ræd for at henvende sig til ham, de fleste virkelig finder det bedst at holde sig i frastand. Selv kjender jeg jo ikke hans person så nøie, det er måske overdrevne beskrivelser fra andre, som har gjort indtrykket altfor sterkt.]

¹⁹ Broch it was who also wrote the tribute to Storm in *Aftenposten* on the centenary of his birth.

²⁰ Probably Yngvar Nielsen (1843–1916), Professor of Geography in Kristiania.

²¹ [Samtidig med dette brev tillader jeg mig at sende Dem de to første ark af en lille engelsk grammatik „for tale- og skriftsproget”, som jeg agter at udgive med det første. Jeg er nemlig meget spændt på at høre en kyndig mands dom om dette forsøg på at tilvejebringe en lidt mere tidssvarende sproglære end de hidtil brugte.]

²² [hans fremstilling beherskes af ideassociationer, der for andre kan se i højeste grad tilfældige ud [...] når stoffet er svulmet op i den grad som fra den første til den anden tyske udgave (fra 88 til 352 sider om almindelig fonetik), så virker denne à-propos-metode snarere afskrækkende og trættende.]

²³ I am deeply grateful to Louise Storm for her generosity in allowing me access to her grandfather’s papers.

²⁴ [Hjertelig tak for tilsendelsen af Deres franske syntax (Præpositionerne). En gennemlæsning af den har vært meget lærerig for mig: jeg sysler jo med lignende ting og arbejder stadig på min store engelske syntax, så jeg forstår at vurdere det beundringsværdigt store stof De har samlet og ordnet og sigtet i Deres bog. Gid De må få kræfter og held til snart at kunne udsende videre dele af Deres store værk, som alle der gir sig af med nyere sprog, vil være Dem taknemlig for.]

²⁵ Wulf = Fredrik Wulff (1845–1930), Romance philologist.

Cederschiöld = Gustaf Cederschiöld (1849–1928), later professor of Scandinavian languages in Gothenburg. Ekman cannot be identified.

²⁶ [W. hat sich der neueren englischen Schule enge angeschlossen, auch in Punkten, die mir zweifelhaft sind. Es giebt ausser England kaum Jemand, der mit den Ergebnissen der Schule so vertraut ist wie W.]

²⁷ “Svahn’s Swedish Phonology” = Svahn (1882), which Storm did not translate into Norwegian!

²⁸ It did not employ upper-case initial letters in nouns.

²⁹ For Passy, see Collins & Mees (1999: 21-27).

³⁰ Hermann Klinghardt (1847–1926), author of various practical works on the intonation of English, French and German. His experience of using the ‘New Method’ of language teaching is recounted in Klinghardt (1888).

³¹ [1. Til grund for undervisningen lægges ikke skriftsproget, men det virkelige, levende talesprog. I de sprog, hvis ortografi afviger betydelig fra udtalen, begyndes derfor med tekster i en efter formaalet indrettet lydskrift.

2. Undervisningen gaar allerede fra Begyndelsen ud fra sammenhængende Tekster, ikke fra løsrevne Sætninger.

3. Grammatikundervisningen slutter sig til Læsningen paa den Maade, at Eleven ved Lærerens Hjælp ledes til af det læste efterhaanden at udfinde Sprogets Love. Først senere kan en systematisk Lærebog anvendes til Repetition.

4. Oversættelse saa vel fra Modersmaalet til det fremmede Sprog, som omvendt indskrænkes og erstattes dels af mundtlig og skriftlig Reproduktion og fri Produktion paa det fremmede Sprog i Tilslutning til det læste, dels af mere kursusrisik Læsning.]

³² [Har foreningen Quousque Tandem ikke gjort andet godt, så har den da ialfald sat lidt liv i gemytterne og fremkaldt nogen diskussion. Den har forhåbentlig gjort det klart for mange, at vor nuværende undervisningsmetodes fortræffelighed ikke er hævet over al tvil. Og allerede dette er noget. Blir den unge forening dødet, så kan den da ialfald ikke siges at være tiet ihjel, og forhåbentlig skal den heller ikke blive snakket eller skrevet ihjel.]

³³ [hermed sender jeg dig (lidt sent) Lundells og Westerns betænkninger i anledning af forslaget om at la QT smelte sammen med Passys forening; hvad min egen mening angår, da har jeg aldrig ubetinget været for sammensmeltningen: men efter Llls grunde er jeg enig med ham i, at vi bör opretholde Qts navn: derimod er jeg for afskaffelsen af vor Revy, der ikke er meget tilfredsstillende i forhold til ulejligheden og udgiften.

Men kan du finde en anden form for virksomhed? Det vigtigste for mig er, at vi ved at udgive skolebøger og deltage i diskussioner gör vort til, at quousquismen mer og mer gennemsyrrer undervisningen.

Hvordan går det med trykningen af den franske bog?]

³⁴ Many thanks to Professor Mike MacMahon (Glasgow) for help with this and other points.

³⁵ [Mit Princip for Undervisningen i de nyere Sprog, som jeg altid har fremholdt, og som har vundet meget Tilslutning i Udlandet er, at man skal begynde med Begyndelsen, d. e. gaa ud fra Sprogets enkleste Grundform, det levende Sprog.]

³⁶ Amund Bredesen Larsen (1849–1928), author of a range of dialect studies and a comprehensive overview of the Norwegian dialects (Larsen 1897).

³⁷ [Med hensyn til planen om fælles-skandinavisk

Lydskriftalfabet vil jeg si at jeg fremdeles er meget interessert for saken [...] Jeg har nevnt den for Amund B. Larsen o. fl. Dr Larsen er enig i tanken; han mener at det svenske landsmålsalfabetet i all fall må modificeres en del for å passe i Norge. Han mener saken burde tas op på et nordisk filologmöte [...]

³⁸ [den nyaste tidens språkvetenskap...sysselsätter sig med det värkliga språket...lägger stor vikt vid studiet af det samtida lefvande språket.]

³⁹ [1. Till en god språkvetenskaplig allmänbildning hör äfven vana vid direkt iakttagelse, hälst vunnen genom dialektstudier. 3. För språkvetenskapen äro dialekter af samma vikt som literaturspråken, men äga mindre literärt intresse. 12. Ett organisk alfabet med komplettering af det vanliga latinska är att föredraga framför alfabet efter andra grunder.]

⁴⁰ [Det gäller som en allmän regel på lifvets alla områden, att reformer kunna—och låtom oss tillägga: *böra*—genomföras, endast så vidt som allmänna meningar är tillräckligt förberedd och villig att erkänna deras befogenhet.]