

WestminsterResearch

<http://www.westminster.ac.uk/westminsterresearch>

Modern foreign languages get a voice: the role of the journals

Linn, A.

This is a pre-publication version of a book chapter published in: McLelland, N. and Smith, R.C. (eds.) The History of Language Learning and Teaching, Legenda, Oxford, pp. 145-160 in 2018.

The WestminsterResearch online digital archive at the University of Westminster aims to make the research output of the University available to a wider audience. Copyright and Moral Rights remain with the authors and/or copyright owners.

Whilst further distribution of specific materials from within this archive is forbidden, you may freely distribute the URL of WestminsterResearch: (<http://westminsterresearch.wmin.ac.uk/>).

In case of abuse or copyright appearing without permission e-mail repository@westminster.ac.uk

Modern foreign languages get a voice. The role of the journals.

ANDREW R. LINN

University of Westminster, UK

Abstract

This chapter investigates the significance of specialized journals for the development of modern language teaching. It begins by explaining the development of language journals up to the point at which language teaching reform really took off with the emergence of the so-called Reform Movement in the 1880s. The principal journal for this movement was *Phonetische studien* [Phonetic Studies] founded in 1888 and renamed *Die neueren Sprachen* [Modern languages] in 1894. The style of the early issues of this journal allows modern readers an insight into the discourse practices of that community of language scholars and teachers, the opportunity to hear its characteristic 'voice' and recreate the means by which modern foreign language teaching became an independent discipline.

Keywords

Journals, Reform Movement, phonetics, discourse community, *Phonetische studien*

1. Introduction

Any community needs what Swales (1990: 25) calls "mechanisms of intercommunication", and these are all the more important to the community when it is a dispersed one. "The participatory mechanisms will vary according to the community", writes Swales: "meetings, telecommunications, correspondence, newsletters, conversations and so forth". Such means of remaining in touch are typically on-line in the 21st century, but those of us who lived in the pre-digital age will remember the satisfaction in finding a newspaper from home when travelling overseas. It would be several days late and also exorbitantly expensive, but it provided not just information but familiar forms of discourse and a physical link with home. There are plenty of examples throughout history of the community-bonding function afforded by shared texts and documents. For 19th-century scholars the primary mechanism of intercommunication was the journal, and in this chapter I will investigate the emergence of specialized journals to support the study and teaching of modern languages, and their role in the development of the field of language teaching and of the community which worked in that field.

In section 2 I will introduce the scientific journal as a genre and consider its development up to the second half of the 19th century, when the journal which is our main focus, *Phonetische studien*¹ [Phonetic Studies], began to be published. In section 3 attention turns to the first journals to deal with the study of the modern foreign languages, albeit prior to the reforms, nay revolutions, in thinking about language teaching which characterize the 1880s. In section 4 I present the community whose work and interaction resulted in the establishment of *Phonetische studien* and take the opportunity to expose a few deep-seated myths about the linguistic work of the decades around the turn of the 20th

¹ It did not adopt upper-case letters word-initially in nouns.

century. Finally in section 5 I look closely at some features of *Phonetische studien* and its subsequent incarnations up to the end of the century in order to seek to understand more about the nature of this community of modern linguists via its discourse as revealed in its principal surviving forum. In short, the aim of this chapter is to seek to reconstruct the voice of the Reform Movement (although see section 4 for a critique of that label).

2. Journals in the history of science

Various infrastructural developments have been key to the professionalization of science. These developments have had a symbiotic relationship with the discipline itself (or disciplines) in that they have both enabled and sprung from the changing goals and ambitions of science. The foundation of the Royal Society in England in 1660 (Royal Society, 2015), for example, was both a means by which scientific work could be advanced and an outcome of the enthusiasm and commitment of its founders. Morrell (1990: 982-984) identifies six “stages’ of professionalization” which resulted in science gradually developing from an amateur to a professional pursuit during the 19th century. These were: more full-time employment opportunities; specialist qualifications; improved training especially through the universities; increased technical complexity; growing group solidarity; and new reward systems. Underlying all this was the increased and constantly increasing opportunity for that community of scholars to communicate with one another and with interested parties outside their immediate ranks in the pages of the new specialized journals.

The scientific journal is usually regarded as having been born in 1665 in the form of the French *Journal des Sçavans* (Mantel, 1980: 1) and the Royal Society’s *Philosophical Transactions*. More specialized medical journals began to appear soon after, and with the eighteenth century we find the appetite for specialized professional publications becoming increasingly insatiable. This development was fired by the emergence of privately published journals and the involvement of independent publishers to supplement the more general journals of the established learned societies (Lowood, 2003: 430). As the 18th century, with its coffee houses and shared bourgeois hunger for the consumption and generation of knowledge, turned to the 19th century, “the specialization of knowledge made it increasingly difficult to maintain the notion of a unitary public sphere” (Dawson, Noakes & Topham, 2004: 4). The 1860s was a decade “characterized by a very great expansion in the field of periodical publishing” (Ellegård 1957: 1), so the Reform Movement of the 1880s was born just as the specialized scientific periodical was achieving its pre-eminence as the primary means for professional debate. Several new journals (see section 4 below) provided natural fora for its adherents to drive forward their radical ideas about language teaching and related applied linguistic interests, not least because “periodicals thrived on controversy and intellectual disputes like no other nineteenth-century mode of cultural production” (Cantor, et al., 2004: xix).

The 1840s had witnessed the advent of journals for general linguistics, and the modern language journals of the 1870s and 1880s continued on the way they had paved. The Philological Society of London started to publish its *Proceedings* with effect from its first meeting in 1842 (Marshall, n.d.). This periodical came out monthly following each meeting and consisted of the papers read at the meeting in question. The topics addressed were as wide-ranging as the interests of the members. The very first communication to be read and published in the *Proceedings* was a letter from James Yates (1789-1871), Fellow of the Royal Society and Unitarian minister, on the subject of reform in the orthography of English.

This is interesting in part because the topic is clearly applied rather than historical or theoretical and also because orthographic reform had similarly exercised the founder members of the Royal Society in the 1660s (Scragg, 1974: 98-99). The list of original members of the Philological Society (*Proceedings* 1:1, 1-5) reveals the same mixture of professional scholars, ordained ministers and interested laypeople that would later characterize the contributors to *Phonetische studien*. A distinction between professional linguists and 'others' has not yet been fixed: language is a topic for all educated people, and there is no formal constraint on what passes as appropriate material for discussion. By 1854 *Proceedings* had been renamed *Transactions*, the title which remains in use to this day, although in the 1850s it still reads more like a series of meeting reports than a collection of scholarly articles.

The next journal in this field more resembled the later conception of a journal as a collection of discrete research outputs. In 1846 the first issue of the *Zeitschrift für die Wissenschaft der Sprache* [Journal of the Science of Language] was published by the publishing house of Georg Reimer under the editorship of orientalist Albert Höfer (1812-1883) of the University of Greifswald. Unlike the journal of the Philological Society, the new German journal was short-lived (four volumes), victim of what was undoubtedly a precarious market rendered all the more so by this new periodical being the work of an individual enthusiast rather than a society with subscribing members. Although the first article proper was by the leading light of historical-comparative language study, Jacob Grimm (1785-1863)—'Über das finnische epos' [On the *Kalevala*] (Grimm, 1846)—the first issue contained several articles either by or translated by the editor. The journal sought to be as wide-ranging in its understanding of the science of language as possible, and this openness to all forms of language study (not only the historical-comparative) and all languages, ancient and modern, is set out in the opening manifesto (Hoefer [sic], 1846). The two journals just discussed typify the general content of the first generation of periodicals in a particular field. Linguistic journals were the product of the nineteenth century and the period of "very great expansion" in periodical publishing, and, as journals became more focused in their scope, it was inevitable that these general journals would soon be joined by ones catering for the burgeoning interest across Europe in questions relating specifically to the study and teaching of modern languages.

3. The first journals for modern foreign languages

The modern languages began to enter the curricula of schools across Europe around the middle of the 18th century (Howatt & Smith, 2014: 79), bringing to an end the "so-called quiet period" (Hüllen, 2005: 63-72), in which foreign languages were not studied in the schools in any consistent way. Which languages were offered and how much teaching was available depended very much on local conditions and priorities. It was typically in response to curricular reforms at school level that university positions in modern languages were created, in order to prepare would-be school teachers for their new profession (see papers in Engler & Haas, 2000; Haas & Engler, 2008). The philology of the modern languages which began to blossom as a result was, however, rather more traditional in its object of study and in its methods than the "philology of the ear instead of the eye" (Jespersen, 1962: 839) pursued by the subsequent Reform Movement.

The pages of *Englische Studien* [English Studies], the first journal for English, launched in 1877, thus evidence a traditional interpretation of philology, embracing both

language and literature but with a strong historical emphasis. *Englische Studien* was founded by medievalist Eugen Kölbing (1846-1899), professor at the University of Breslau and editor of the new journal until his death (Utz, 2006). According to Utz (2006: n.p.) Kölbing was anxious about the sustainability of his project, given the very limited size of the community of English philologists in Germany. Despite these misgivings, *Englische Studien* prospered, and each of its first four volumes ran to over 500 pages. Each issue of the new periodical was divided into three sections, as was common practice: original articles; reviews of recently published literature; and “miscellaneous”. The emphasis was firmly on Old and Middle English literature, although there were more squarely linguistic pieces, not least two very brief notes by the leading English linguist of the day, Henry Sweet (1845-1912) (Sweet, 1879a; Sweet, 1879b) in the second volume, and a more polemical article by the language-teaching reformer and English scholar Wilhelm Viëtor (1850-1918) (Viëtor [sic], 1880) in volume 3. *Englische Studien* is a good example of the diversification of the periodical literature in the mid-to-late nineteenth century as it sought to speak to an increasingly specialist audience. The project, like the *Zeitschrift für die Wissenschaft der Sprache*, was the work of an individual pioneer rather than a collective, but this time the specialist interest was what made the project marketable. Its audience was a rapidly growing one, such that in 1880 the publisher was pleased to propose the launch of a parallel journal, *Französische Studien* [French Studies], and within a year there was room for another journal in the same field.

Anglia: Zeitschrift für englische Philologie [Journal of English Philology] was founded the following year by Richard Paul Wülcker (1845-1910) in collaboration with Moritz Trautmann (1842-1920) as reviews editor. Wülcker was an Anglo-Saxonist, and the contents of *Anglia* tended to focus more on Old English language and literature than *Englische Studien*, whose emphasis was more on the subsequent period. Despite this partial complementarity of coverage, there blew up “a flurry of heated exchanges about the priority, value, and quality of both ventures during the first few years of their existence” (Utz, 2006: n.p.). Trautmann, professor at Bonn, was an Old English specialist too but also author of a comparative practical phonology of English, French and German (Trautmann, 1886). The inclusion on the editorial board of Sweet and also the Leipzig phonetician Eduard Sievers (1850-1932) was probably thanks to Trautmann engaging his extended ‘discourse community’ (see Linn, 2008), and Sweet wrote several pieces in the earliest volumes of *Anglia*. *Anglia*, still going strong today, takes pride in being the longest standing continuous journal publication dedicated to English. Today its subtitle appears in both English and German guise, and English has become the language of publication.

The last journal I shall mention here, dedicated to the traditional philology of the modern languages (see Storost (2000: 1260) for journals dealing with German), is the *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie* [Journal of Romance Philology]. This was founded in the same year as *Englische Studien* under the editorship of Gustav Gröber (1844-1911), professor at the University of Breslau and so a colleague of Kölbing. It was published by Max Niemeyer Verlag, publisher of *Anglia*, which demonstrates both a real commitment to the field of modern language philology by the academic publishers and something of a cartel amongst editors and publishing houses. Like *Anglia* it is still in print, and also like *Anglia* it has now been taken over by the de Gruyter publishing house. As with its sister periodical, the early issues covered the full range of philological topics, although there was greater emphasis on the language than was the case in the English journals. In volume 2 of 1878, for example, six of the nine articles are on language, including ‘Die Negation im

Altfranzösischen' [negation in Old French] by Friedrich Perle and 'Ueber die vocalisirten Consonanten des Altfranzösischen' [On the vocalized consonants of Old French] by Oscar Ulbrich. This is, however, philology of the most traditional sort. There appears to have been no real interest in more practical linguistic questions or applied methods, such as those which would have faced these scholars in the classroom and would have been pressing issues for their students as they prepared to go out into the schools. In fact they signal an interest in language which, with its historical emphasis and focus on narrow phonological and morphological points, looks firmly backwards towards the first half of the century. The time was right for a revolution.

4. The Reform Movement and the journal genre

The journals discussed thus far supported the professionalization of language study in the 19th century as characterized by Morrell in section 2 above. In the canon of the history of linguistics—the version of that history propagated through the principal textbooks in the field, thus defining its boundaries for new generations of its students—the professional field during the 19th century emerges with certain standardized characteristics. First, it was dominated by German science and German scholars, a view expounded, for example, in R. H. Robins's *A Short History of Linguistics*:

...after 1800...one is brought face to face with a remarkable continuity of scholarship focused on a specialized field of theory and practice, in which generations of scholars, mostly from Germany or from other countries trained in Germany, built up their subject on the basis of what had been done by their predecessors or earlier contemporaries. (Robins, 1997: 190)

The second canonical characteristic of the 19th century is that it was one of historical-comparative studies, which continued unabated until the Saussurean revolution in the second decade of the 20th century, as set out in Seuren's *Western Linguistics: An Historical Introduction*:

In the 19th century, the most obvious and spectacular progress was made in historical linguistics. (Seuren, 1998: 51)

...19th century comparative philology, which led straight to 20th century structuralism and hence to the gamut of modern theories of grammar. (Seuren, 1998: 104)

I do not deny this version of history, but such a view of the development of linguistics fails to take into account the applied linguistic work carried out in the final three decades of the century by scholars from across Europe, with England and the Nordic countries leading the way. The proponents of this work, inspired by the advances made in the field of phonetics, turned their focus on what they called 'the living language', wherever that may be found. Henry Sweet, in his 1877 presidential address to the Philological Society, wrote of the importance of "phonetics and pronunciation" in bringing the language scholar "face to face with the ultimate facts of all linguistic investigation, viz. the living language" (Sweet, 1879c: 7). Many of these language scholars were or had been foreign language teachers, and so they had a strong interest in language teaching reform, and have thus been identified as members of the *Reform Movement* (Howatt & Smith, 2002; Howatt with Widdowson, 2004: Ch. 14). However, their commitment to investigating the living language drew them to other issues as well, such as spelling reform and dialectology. As Howatt & Smith (2014: 82) note, the term 'Reform methods' was not used in the 1870s and 1880s to describe the activities of this community of applied linguists. They referred to themselves by a variety of other

names, and labels were applied freely as linguistics moved ahead at a tempo almost too quick for those who sought to define the various new philologies (Toy, 1885). The leading Danish linguist, Otto Jespersen (1897-1899: 55) writes of “the Anglo-Scandinavian School”, a label I have found helpful for historiographical purposes (Linn, 2008), as it shines the light away from the trope of German dominance. Paul Passy preferred the label “les jeunes phonéticiens” [the young phoneticians] (e.g. Passy 1887: 4), emphasizing the unifying influence of phonetics as well as their radicalism by suggesting a link to ‘die Junggrammatiker’, the “young philologists” (Neogrammarians) of the previous generation. Later on, looking back at their achievements, Hans Raudnitzky (Raudnitzky, 1911) wrote of *Die Bell-Sweetsche Schule* [the Bell-Sweet School], emphasizing the role of key pioneers in the field. A fully adequate label may prove elusive, but ‘Reform Movement’, linked as it is specifically to reform in language teaching, doesn’t do justice to the full range of this group’s ambitions for the science of language (see next section), although I shall continue to use it here since the focus of the current book is on teaching. The fact remains in surviving correspondence, evidence of visits to each other’s homes, encounters at conferences and on dialect field trips, etc., that the pioneers of this new approach to language study and teaching communicated with each other enthusiastically and incessantly, and they constituted a textbook example of a ‘discourse community’, i.e.:

...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. (Watts, 1999: 43)

I don’t have the space to discuss the “set of individuals” in detail here nor to explore the full range of means by which they interacted and how their vision of the living language developed (see Linn, 2008). Here I will concentrate on the journal they made their own, *Phonetische studien*, the forum in which language teachers from school and university came together around a common cause and made their voice heard. Borg (2003), following Swales (1990), defines a prototypical discourse community as “a society of stamp collectors scattered around the world but united by a shared interest in the stamps of Hong Kong”:

The collectors never gather together physically; instead a newsletter, that has a particular form of text organization, making it a genre, which they use to pursue their goals, unites them. Borg (2003: 398)

The group of teachers and scholars and other interested parties we are discussing here did meet, and it is clear that their discourse was both oral and written. As their oral practices do not survive, we are limited to studying their written discourse in order to help understand the processes by which modern foreign languages became a discipline, and so we now turn to the genre in question, their “newsletter”.

Phonetische studien (1888-)

The journals explored above gave proponents of the linguistics of the modern languages a means to talk to each other in a scholarly environment as the modern languages established their bona fides as university disciplines. In the same way, *Phonetische studien*, renamed *Die neueren sprachen: Zeitschrift für den neusprachlichen unterricht* [The Modern Languages: Journal of modern language teaching] in 1894, provided the discourse forum for

the Reform Movement. It was not in fact the first journal to seek to bridge the gap between school and university, between the study of foreign languages and their teaching. In the same year as the short-lived *Zeitschrift für die Wissenschaft der Sprache* was established, Ludwig Herrig (1816-1889) and Heinrich Viehoff (1804-1886) had published the first volume of their *Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen* [Archive of Modern Language Studies]. The editors did not represent a self-styled school and nor did they have the sense of purpose and of independence of the later movement. Content remained 'old' philological. They explain that their focus is on historical-comparative grammar and onomastics, literary history, metrics, poetics and prosody, the interpretation and criticism of texts and the teaching of those topics (Herrig & Viehoff, 1846: 3). There is little interest in methodology, although the early volumes do contain reviews of new teaching materials. But in an account of the means by which the community of modern language scholars and teachers came to exchange ideas, the *Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen* is a landmark in the pre-history of the Reform Movement. A complete investigation of the role of the journals in the establishment of modern language teaching as a field would call for a more intensive study of this journal and its predecessor, the *Archiv für den Unterricht im Deutschen* [Archive of German Teaching] (1843-1844), than our current focus allows.

Phonetische studien appeared in 1888 with 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 regard for the teaching of pronunciation]. The title was a work in progress, as we shall see in due course, and its fluidity tells us much about the journal and the community it served. The style of the title was clearly calqued on that of the journals we have already surveyed above (*X studien*), and it served to position the newcomer amongst them as a serious contribution to the philological literature. By the 1880s journals had come to "represent the most important single source of information for the scientific research community" (Meadows, 1979: 1), and any self-respecting scholarly endeavour needed one to give it credibility as well as serving "to create and solidify a bonding sense of community for scholars who might otherwise have remained isolated individuals or small cadres" (Christie, 1990: 17). *Phonetische studien* appeared two years after the 1886 Scandinavian philologists' meeting in Stockholm, attended by Passy, which led to the formal statement of the four key principles of language teaching reform (see Linn, 2002). This meeting, and indeed the other philologists' conferences which were by now a regular fixture in the annual calendar, must have been an invigorating and empowering experience for the phonetically minded language teaching reformers, and the new journal was a way of keeping the community together and focused between times. Regular reports on efforts to put reform measures into practice provided a source of encouragement to those who felt themselves to be lone voices against a chorus of traditional methods. However, those lone voices were joining forces rapidly to form a new chorus of reforming zeal. Writing in 1893, and looking back over the previous years, Viëtor charts the dramatic development of this community of scholars and teachers dedicated to applying the insights of phonetics to language teaching reform. He notes that "this rather insignificant germ of reform literature has meanwhile grown to very considerable dimensions" (1893: 353) and that the community is coming together in significant numbers:

The ... *Verband der Neuphilologen Deutschlands* [German association of modern philologists] now numbers about one thousand members, and may be said to be thoroughly representative...Between five and six hundred modern language teachers of different countries have joined [the Phonetic Teachers' Association] (354)

The founding editor of *Phonetische studien* was Wilhelm Viëtor himself, “the main initiator of the late 19th century Reform Movement” (Smith, 1997), its primus motor via his famous reform pamphlet (*Quousque Tandem*, 1882), but the involvement of the wider community of scholars and teachers is clear from the title page on which the members of the editorial board are listed. Volume 1 was published ‘unter mitwirkung von’ [with the collaboration of] fifty-one leading names in the interlinked fields of phonetics and language teaching, although the fifty one were evidently only the most noteworthy, as the list concludes “u.a.” [amongst others]. The group numbers 77 “u.a.” in volume 2 and this is an ever-growing army of supporters such that the list is replaced from volume 3 by the statement “unter mitwirkung zahlreicher fachgenossen” [with the collaboration of numerous colleagues]. Amongst the list of names are: Henry Sweet; the leading Norwegian linguist of the day Johan Storm (1836-1920); Otto Jespersen; the Swedish phonetician and reformer J. A. Lundell (1851-1940); and the Norwegian teacher and grammarian, August Western (1856-1940). These are joined by *eminences grises* of the older generation of phonetics such as Alexander Melville Bell (1819-1905) and A. J. Ellis (1814-1890). The new journal was crucially showing itself to have the authority to take on its role.

It was not unusual for new journals to open with a ‘manifesto’, setting out the agenda for the new publication, siting it within the market and clarifying what readers could expect. This was the case for the two new journals of 1846 discussed above (*Zeitschrift für die Wissenschaft der Sprache* and *Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen*), indeed the editors of *Archiv* open their preface thus:

If it can reasonably be expected of the editor of every periodical that he pronounce at the beginning of the same on the object, goal and reach of the endeavour, of which he can at first only present weak beginnings and small fragments to the public, so the challenge seems doubly justified in a journal, like the one presented here, which has chosen to develop a new field and so in a sense can be considered the first of its kind. (Herrig & Viehoff, 1846: 1)²

Phonetische studien does not open with a statement by the editor but with an article from the pen of one of the first to hold a university position in phonetics and the architect of the teaching reform principles elaborated at the 1886 Stockholm meeting, J. A. Lundell. It is, however, a rhetorically daring manifesto for the new journal and the ambitions of the community it served.

Lundell’s enthusiasm and his sense of being involved in a paradigm shift are palpable. His manifesto, with the seemingly innocuous title ‘Die phonetik als universitätsfach’ [Phonetics as a university subject] opens with a clear statement of that shift. The article starts with quotations from William Dwight Whitney (1827-1894) and from Sweet, predicting a bright phonetic future and immediately marshalling two of the leading linguists on either side of the Atlantic to the cause:

[Phonetics] will also become by itself a definite science, or department of study, having its close and important relations to physiology and acoustics, as well as to philology. Whitney 1875.

² Wenn man von dem Herausgeber jeder periodischen Schrift mit Recht verlangen darf, daß er sich beim Beginn derselben über Gegenstand, Zweck und Umfang eines Unternehmens ausspreche, wovon er zunächst nur schwache Anfänge und kleine Fragmente dem Publikum zur Ansicht vorlegen kann: so erscheint diese Forderung bei einer Zeitschrift, wie die hier angekündigte, welche sich ein neues Feld zur Bearbeitung ausersehen hat und so in gewisser Hinsicht als die erste ihrer Art gelten kann, doppelt gerechtfertigt.

I have little doubt that before many years there will be professors of phonetics and elocution at many of the Continental universities. Sweet 1882. (Lundell 1888: 1)

With these giants looking forward, Lundell looks back to the previous generations, both the early 19th-century pioneers of historical-comparative linguistics and the Neogrammarians, as 'yesterday's men':

The founders of comparative linguistic research in the first half of this century, Bopp, Grimm and the other representatives of the historical-antiquarian direction, as is generally known did not give much to the actual nature of the sounds of language... Not only Bopp and Grimm, but even Schleicher and Curtius are already old-fashioned... (Lundell 1888: 3-4)³

The thirty-six-year-old 'Young Turk' Lundell does soften his dismissal of his forebears by acknowledging that "the younger generation just stands on the shoulders of the older one and therefore has a wider horizon"⁴ (p. 4). His enthusiasm for what phonetics can achieve is almost unbounded. He makes the case for the role of phonetic insights in historical-comparative language study, but he also maintains that phonetics will revolutionize orthographies, the teaching of reading, the education of the deaf and dumb [die taubstummenbildung], speech pathology, the study of metrics, rhetoric and the art of singing. As if this list of beneficiaries from the science of phonetics isn't long enough, he finally erupts: "So here too more phonetics!"⁵ (p. 6).

While Lundell's manifesto is a clarion call for the increased study of phonetics, as might well be expected at the start of a publication entitled *Phonetic Studies*, reform in language teaching is the focus of many of the articles and reports which fill the pages of the early volumes. In fact it feels as though the journal can't quite make up its mind what its role is, as witnessed by the constantly changing title in the early volumes. The constantly changing title is indicative of a community in a hurry, acting first and then thinking later, wanting to get on with what they believed to be important reforms. The first volume of 1888 was entitled *Phonetische studien. Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche und praktische phonetik mit besonderer rücksicht auf den unterricht in der aussprache* [Journal of Scientific and Practical Phonetics with particular regard for the teaching of pronunciation]. So, to begin with phonetics was in the foreground with the teaching of pronunciation listed as a particular focus. The titles of subsequent volumes are as follows. Volume 2 is *Phonetische studien. Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche und praktische phonetik mit besonderer rücksicht auf die phonetische reform des sprachunterrichts* [Journal of Scientific and Practical Phonetics with particular regard for the phonetic reform of language teaching], such that it is not only the teaching of pronunciation that is in the spotlight now but reform in language teaching more broadly. Volume 3 is *Phonetische studien. Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche und praktische phonetik mit besonderer rücksicht auf die REFORM des sprachunterrichts* [Journal of Scientific and Practical Phonetics with particular regard for the REFORM of language teaching], the phonetic element of the reform being no longer specified but with reform upgraded via the use of upper-case letters; reform has now become more overtly visible.

³ Die begründer der vergleichenden sprachforschung in der ersten hälfte dieses jahrhunderts, BOPP, GRIMM und die übrigen vertreter der historisch-antiquarischen richtung, kehrten sich bekanntlich an die eigentliche natur der sprachlaute nicht viel...Nicht nur BOPP und GRIMM, sogar SCHLEICHER und CURTIUS sind schon antiquirt...

⁴ die jüngere generation steht eben auf den schultern der älteren und hat deshalb einen weiteren horizont.

⁵ Also auch hier mehr phonetik!

Volume 7 is effectively Volume 1 of *Die neueren sprachen. Zeitschrift für den neusprachlichen unterricht mit dem beiblatt Phonetische Studien* [Modern Languages. Journal of the teaching of modern languages with the supplement Phonetische Studien], so by 1893 phonetics has drifted into the background, with the former journal described as a “beiblatt” [supplement]. Ernst von Sallwürk explains in his introduction :

Phonetische Studien has been expanded into a journal for the whole of modern languages teaching, in so far as it falls within the scope of our higher schools. Via this expansion of its field it indicates the advance that modern language education has itself made since it was founded. (von Sallwürk, 1893: 1)⁶

Volume 6 of *Die neueren sprachen* (1899) simply describes itself as a “fortsetzung [continuation] der phonetischen studien” and by the new century the rhetorical shift is complete, from a journal of phonetic studies to a journal of modern language teaching, appearing in 10 annual instalments. On the front of volume 10 for 1902/1903 phonetic studies are no longer mentioned at all.

Another manifestation of the fact that the journal is a ‘work in progress’ is that reviews and replies to those reviews could appear in the same volume. The discourse is ongoing. In volume 1 Willem Sijbrand Logeman of Newton School, Rock Ferry, Birkenhead, and subsequently professor of modern languages at the South African College (later the University of Cape Town), published a series of “remarks” on Passy’s views on the phonetics of French in June 1887, and these were immediately followed by Passy’s response of August 1887. This exchange was good-natured, although Logeman did take the opportunity to have a swipe at the “enthusiasm for dealing with ‘living realities’” (Logeman 1888: 170) and at the opinion of Western and others that teachers should teach their own dialect:

Would Mr Western like a Lancashire or Dorsetshire man to teach the dialect of his county as “English”? or that of Alsace or say dep. Puy de Dôme as French? (Logeman 1888: 170)

Logeman was a future professor and a textbook author, so it would be wrong to characterize this sort of disagreement as one between scholars and practitioners, but the roster of contributors is one which doesn’t discriminate between academic linguists and those dealing with language matters from a practical point of view. One of the strengths of the Reform Movement, I maintain (see Linn, 2011), was precisely that practice and theory were undifferentiated; there was just the ‘living language’. This was a journal of “wissenschaftliche und praktische phonetik”.

However, given the immediacy of response allowed this discourse community by the availability of a journal with regular issues, real arguments could blow up, as when R. M’Lintock of Liverpool published a review of Sweet’s *Elementarbuch des gesprochenen englisch* in volume 2 of *Phonetische studien* in which he objected in the strongest possible terms to Sweet’s version of London English, “wie er in gebildeten kreisen gesprochen wird” [as spoken in educated circles] (Sweet, 1885: iii). For M’Lintock this was a variety which “the cultured—and even the half-cultured—of three fourths of the kingdom can scarcely hear without a feeling of somewhat scornful displeasure tempered with amusement at the curious combination of (apparent) mincing affectation and (real) slovenliness displayed by it”

⁶ Die *Phonetischen Studien* erweitern sich zu einer zeitschrift für den gesamten neusprachlichen unterricht, soweit derselbe in den gesichtskreis unserer höheren schulen fällt. Sie bezeichnen durch diese vergrößerung ihres gebietes den fortschritt, den seit ihrem bestehen der neusprachliche unterricht selbst gemacht hat.

(M'Lintock 1889: 212). Sweet's 'Reply to Mr Maclintock's Review' was characteristically explosive:

Mr M'Lintock's review ... shows such utter and complacent ignorance of the elements of phonetics and philology, and involves so many gross misunderstandings of plain statements in my book that I shall not stop to discuss details, but content myself with a few general remarks. (Sweet 1890: 114)

M'Lintock's mournful response, published straight afterwards, notes that, regarding the "prejudices" of which Sweet accuses him, he has "no interest in them whatsoever" (M'Lintock 1890: 115). (R. J. Lloyd would later (Lloyd 1895: 52) recommend that the student of English should "choose a sound *via media* [middle way], and speak an English which will be recognised as pure and good everywhere"!)

Academic fights make for amusing reading, but there are some serious points here about the nature of the discourse community as it exchanges ideas in the journal: it brought all those committed to the 'living language' together, regardless of their status or views; it was one of immediacy, of 'speak now and worry about the consequences later'; it was made up of passionate people for whom language and language teaching was something important.

The activity reflected in the pages of this journal gives the lie to the assumption that nothing new was happening in the world of linguistics between historical-comparative philology and Saussure, contrary to Seuren (1998), cited above. The fact that the Association Phonétique des Professeurs de Langues Vivantes (later the International Phonetic Association) boasted 743 members by 1896 would further support this line. The *Phonetische studien* community also demonstrates that this was no uniquely German endeavour. In his report on the activities of the Association Phonétique, Viëtor (1897:60) lists the national background of that association's members. The largest number are from Germany (202), but 92 are from Sweden, 78 from Denmark, 71 from France and 54 from England. Twenty two nationalities are represented, making phonetics and its application in the language classroom a truly international commitment. Contributors to the discourse of *Phonetische studien* are similarly international. Some of the more regular contributors include: Rudolf Lenz (1863-1938), director of the Instituto Pedagógico at the University of Chile; Sylvester Primer (1842-1912) from Charleston, South Carolina, later at the University of Texas at Austin, whose contributions dealt with the dialect of Charleston; József Balassa (1864-1945) from Székesfehérvár, Hungary; Romeo Lovera (Salò, Italy, "un personnage clé, dont le profil reste à tracer" [a key personality, whose profile remains to be drawn] (Galazzi 2002: n.p.)).

Conclusion

In 1994 Konrad Schröder wrote an overview of the 20th-century history of *Die Neueren Sprachen* (Schröder, 1994), focusing on the impact of the history of ideas and of developments in German society on its contents. In the following year (1995) the journal seemed to enter its final issue (94:6 (December 1995)), although it started to appear again in 2010, this time as a yearbook rather than in monthly instalments. On page 589 of the December 1995 issue the journal was described as having been a "...reform-minded organ which tried to address the link between school and university, practice and science, at a high

level”⁷. It had certainly been that, and the connection between school and university, practice and science had characterized it from the very outset, indeed had been one of its major strengths. However, this somewhat laconic backward glance doesn’t capture the great significance of the journal, notably during its years as *Phonetische studien*, as the key forum for the development of the Reform Movement in language teaching as well as for the wider Anglo-Scandinavian School.

Over the course of two centuries the journal genre had become the academic and professional forum par excellence, a position it retains to this day, and this pre-eminent position was fully arrived at by the time of the Reform Movement. It was inevitable that the new movement would seek to establish a journal as part of its programme of expansion and development, but *Phonetische studien* was more than just a signal that modern language teaching had come of age. It had a title which placed it alongside the other serious philological journals and it had an extensive international editorial board to give its contents the necessary imprimatur. From the historiographical point of view it allows us to see the Reform Movement in operation, to hear its voice. That voice is one of urgency and enthusiasm, exemplified above all in the ever-changing title but also in the way in which debate is actively taking place in its pages. This is no dry academic publication, but rather a hot-house of impassioned views about the importance of phonetics and the need for a revolution in language teaching based on the study and application of phonetics. Given this, it is noteworthy how quickly phonetics slips into the background in terms of how the journal presents itself. Scientific journals had become specialized fora, and another journal for phonetics was established at the same time. In May 1886 the first issue of *Dhi Fonètik Tîtcer* was published by Dhi Fonètik Tîtcerz’ Asóciécon as the brainchild of Passy (MacMahon, 1986). This journal also underwent a name change, becoming *le maître phonétique* in 1889 (before later morphing in 1970 into the *Journal of the International Phonetic Association*), and further research is called for in order to understand the relationship between these journals, their contributors, their readers and the subsequent development of both phonetics and the theory and practice of modern language teaching. The 1880s were heady times, and the air of excitement, infecting those within and beyond academia, the sense that language learning is important, is one of enduring value.

References

- Borg, Erik. 2003. Discourse Community. *ELT Journal*, 57(4): 398-400.
- Cantor, Geoffrey, Dawson, Gowan, Noakes, Richard, Shuttleworth, Sally, and Topham, Jonathan R. 2004. Introduction. In: Louise Henson, Geoffrey Cantor, Gowan Dawson, Richard Noakes, Sally Shuttleworth, and Jonathan R. Topham, eds. *Culture and Science in the Nineteenth-Century Media*. Aldershot & Burlington, VT, pp. xvii-xxv.
- Christie, John R. R. 1990. The Development of the Historiography of Science. In: R. C. Olby, G. N. Cantor, J. R. R. Christie and M. J. S. Hodge, eds. *Companion to the History of Modern Science*. London and New York: Routledge, pp. 5-22.

⁷ reformfreudiges Organ, das die Verbindung von Schule und Hochschule, Praxis und Wissenschaft auf hohem Niveau zu thematisieren versuchte.

- Dawson, Gowan, Noakes, Richard, and Topham, Jonathan R. 2004. Introduction. In: Geoffrey Cantor, Gowan Dawson, Graeme Gooday, Richard Noakes, Sally Shuttleworth, and Jonathan R. Topham, eds. *Science in the Nineteenth-Century Periodical: Reading the Magazine of Nature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 1-34.
- Ellegård, Alvar. 1957. The Readership of the Periodical Press in Mid-Victorian Britain. *Acta Universitatis Gothoburgensis*, 63(3): 1-41.
- Engler, Balz and Haas, Renate, eds. 2000. *European English Studies: Contributions towards the History of a Discipline*. Leicester: The English Association.
- Galazzi, Enrica. 2002. Echos phonétiques en Sicile entre XIXe et XXe siècles. *Documents pour l'histoire du français langue étrangère ou seconde*. [online] [Accessed 5 June 2015]. Available at: <<http://dhfiles.revues.org/2626>>.
- Grimm, Jacob. 1846. Über das finnische epos. *Zeitschrift für die Wissenschaft der Sprache*, 1: 13-55.
- Haas, Renate, and Engler, Balz, eds. 2008. *European English Studies: Contributions towards the History of a Discipline*. Volume 2. Leicester: The English Association.
- Herrig, Ludwig and Viehoff, Heinrich. 1846. Vorwort. *Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen*, 1: 1-4.
- Hoefler, A. 1846. Andeutungen zur Eröffnung der Zeitschrift. *Zeitschrift für die Wissenschaft der Sprache*, 1: 1-12.
- Howatt, A. P. R. & Smith, Richard C., eds. 2002. *Modern Language Teaching: The Reform Movement*. 5 vols. London: Routledge.
- Howatt, A.P.R. and Smith, Richard. 2014. The History of Teaching English as a Foreign Language, from a British and European Perspective. *Language and History*, 57(1): 75-95.
- Howatt, A. P. R. with Widdowson, H. G. 2004. *A History of English Language Teaching*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hüllen, Werner. 2005. *Kleine Geschichte des Fremdsprachenlernens*. Berlin: Erich Schmidt Verlag.
- Jespersen, Otto. 1897-1899. *Fonetik: En systematisk fremstilling af læren om sproglyd*. København: Schubothe.
- Jespersen, Otto. 1962. Farewell Lecture at the University Given on 25th May 1925. In: *Selected Writings of Otto Jespersen*. London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd / Tokyo: Senjo Publishing & Co., Ltd, pp. 835-845.
- Linn, Andrew R. 2002. Quousque Tandem. Language-Teaching Reform in 19th-Century Scandinavia. *The Henry Sweet Society Bulletin*, 38: 34-42.
- Linn, Andrew R. 2008. The Birth of Applied Linguistics: The Anglo-Scandinavian School as 'Discourse Community'. *Historiographia Linguistica*, 35(3): 342-384.
- Linn, Andrew R. 2011. Impact: Linguistics in the Real World. *Histoire Epistémologie Langage*, 33(1): 15-27.
- Lloyd, R. J. 1895. Standard English. *Die neueren sprachen*, 2: 52-53.

- Logeman, Willem S. 1888. Remarks on Paul Passy's French Phonetics. *Phonetische studien*, 1: 170-171.
- Lowood, Henry. 2003. Journal. In: J. L. Heilbron, ed.-in-chief. *The Oxford Companion to the History of Modern Science*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 429-431.
- Lundell, J. A. 1888. Die phonetik als universitätsfach. *Phonetische studien*, 1: 1-17.
- MacMahon, M. K. C. 1986. The International Phonetic Association: The First 100 Years. *Journal of the International Phonetic Association* 16: 30-38.
- Marshall, Fiona. n.d. History of the Philological Society: The Early Years. [online] [Accessed 18 May 2015]. Available at: <http://www.philsoc.org.uk/includes/Download.asp?FileID=39>.
- M'Lintock, R. 1889. Review of Henry Sweet, *Elementarbuch des gesprochenen englisch*. *Phonetische studien*, 2: 212-216.
- M'Lintock, R. 1890. On Mr Sweet's Reply. *Phonetische studien*, 3: 115.
- Meadows, A. J. 1979. Introduction. In: A. J. Meadows, ed. *The Scientific Journal*. London: Aslib, p. 1.
- Manten, A. A. 1980. Development of European Scientific Publishing before 1850. In: A. J. Meadows, ed. *Development of Scientific Publishing in Europe*. Amsterdam – New York – Oxford: Elsevier Science Publishers, pp. 1-22.
- Morrell, J. B. 1990. Professionalisation. In: Olby, R. C., G. N. Cantor, J. R. R. Christie and M. J. S. Hodge, eds. *Companion to the History of Modern Science*. London and New York: Routledge, pp. 980-989.
- 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.
- Quousque Tandem. 1882. *Der Sprachunterricht muss umkehren! Ein Beitrag zur Überbürdungsfrage*. Heilbronn: Gebr. Henninger.
- Raudnitzky, Hans. 1911. *Die Bell-Sweetsche Schule. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der englischen Phonetik*. Marburg: N. G. Elwert.
- Robins, R. H. 1997. *A Short History of Linguistics*. 4th ed. London and New York: Longman.
- Royal Society. 2015. History. [online] [Accessed 18 May 2015]. Available at: <https://royalsociety.org/about-us/history>.
- Scragg, D. G. 1974. *A History of English Spelling*. Manchester: Manchester University Press / New York: Barnes & Noble Books.
- Sallwürk, E. von. 1893. Zur Einführung. *Die neueren sprachen*, 1: 1-4.
- Schröder, Konrad. 1994. 100 Jahre Fremdsprachendidaktik. 100 Jahre *Die Neueren Sprachen*. *Die Neueren Sprachen*, 93(1): 6-44.
- Seuren, Pieter A. M. 2004. *Western Linguistics: An Historical Introduction*. Oxford and Malden, MA: Blackwell.

- Smith, Richard C. 2007. Wilhelm Viëtor's Life and Career. [online] [Accessed 4 June 2015]. Available at:
 <www2.warwick.ac.uk/fac/soc/al/research/collect/elt_archive/halloffame/vietor/life>.
- Storost, Jürgen. 2000. Die 'neuen Philologien', ihre Institutionen und Periodica. Eine Übersicht. In: Auroux, Sylvain, E. F. K. Koerner, Hans J. Niederehe and Kees Versteegh, eds. *History of the Language Sciences / Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaften / Histoire des Sciences du Langage*. Berlin: de Gruyter Mouton, pp.1240-1272.
- Swales, John M. 1990. *Genre Analysis: English in Academic and Research Settings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sweet, Henry. 1879a. Some of the Sources of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle. *Englische Studien*, 2: 310-312.
- Sweet, Henry. 1879b. Old English Etymologies. *Englische Studien*, 2: 312-316.
- Sweet, Henry. 1879c. The Work of the Philological Society, from May, 1876, to May, 1877. *Transactions of the Philological Society*, 1877-8-9: 1-122.
- Sweet, Henry. 1885. *Elementarbuch des gesprochenen englisch (grammatik, texte und glossar)*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Sweet, Henry. 1890. Reply to Mr Maclintock's Review. *Phonetische studien*, 3: 114-115.
- Toy, C. H. 1885. The New Philology. *Science*, 6(142): 366-368.
- Trautmann, Moritz. 1886. *Die Sprachlaute im allgemeinen und die Laute des Englischen, Französischen und Deutschen im besonderen*. Leipzig: Gustav Fock.
- Utz, Richard. 2006. Medieval Scholarship in *Englische Studien*, Part 1: Eugen Kölbing and the Foundational Period (1877-1899). *Erfurt Electronic Studies in English* 12. [online] [Accessed 5 May 2015]. Available at:
 <webdoc.sub.gwdg.de/edoc/ia/eese/artic26/Richard/textfield.html>.
- Viëtor [sic], W. 1880. Die wissenschaftliche grammatik und der englische unterricht. *Englische Studien*, 3: 106-124.
- Viëtor, W. 1893. A New Method of Language Teaching. *Educational Review*, 1893: 351-365
- Watts, Richard J. 1999. The Social Construction of Standard English: Grammar Writers as a "Discourse Community". In: Tony Bex & Richard Watts, eds. *Standard English: The Widening Debate*. London: Routledge, pp. 40-68.
- Watts, Richard J. 2008. Grammar-Writers in Eighteenth-Century Britain: A Community of Practice or a Discourse Community. In: Ingrid Tieken-Boon van Ostade, ed. *Grammars, Grammarians and Grammar Writing*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 37-56.