

The History of Linguistics in the Nordic Countries

Even Hovdhaugen, Fred Karlsson, Carol Henriksen and Bengt Sigurd



Helsinki 2000

Preface

This project began in 1991 when Even Hovdhaugen submitted a proposal for a project on the history of linguistics in the Nordic countries to Nordiska samarbetsnämnden för humanistisk forskning (NOS H, the Nordic Research Council for the Humanities). A small grant was given to further develop the plans for the project. Even Hovdhaugen and Bengt Sigurd then jointly submitted an application for a three-year research project to NOS H in 1992. The proposal was accepted, and the project ran from 1993 to 1996. The core group of the project consisted in the beginning of Even Hovdhaugen (Norway), Carol Henriksen (Denmark), Bengt Sigurd (Sweden), and Kalevi Wiik (Finland). In 1994, Kalevi Wiik had to leave the project due to other commitments and was replaced by Fred Karlsson as the Finnish representative. Kjell Paulsen, Oslo, functioned as secretary of the project during the duration of the project period and also one year as research assistant.

The first thorough version of our manuscript was completed in late 1996. The magnitude of our task is aptly illustrated by the fact that we needed three more years of diligent work on top of the originally scheduled project period in order to properly finish the manuscript.

The book has been written jointly by the undersigned core group of the project, but we have been very dependent on the help and research of a number of Nordic linguists. First of all, we would like to thank Kjartan Ottósson who has written the draft of most of the contributions on Iceland and Icelandic in chapters three, four, and five. Secondly, we thank the participants at the conference we arranged in Oslo in 1994 on the history of linguistics in the Nordic countries. The papers presented at this conference (Henriksen et al., eds. 1996) have been a valuable source in writing this book. Last, but not least, we would like to thank all the linguists who have been willing to answer our many curious questions or helped us find obscure references and forgotten material.

The entire manuscript, with the exception of the brief concluding chapter seven, has been read and commented on in detail by nine prominent Nordic linguists, two each from Denmark, Finland, Norway, and Sweden, and one from Iceland. We express our deep indebtedness to Nils Erik Enkvist (Academician in the Academy of Finland, Helsingfors), Frans Gregersen (Professor of Danish Language, University of Copenhagen), Hartmut Haberland (Associate Professor of German Language, University of Roskilde), Auli Hakulinen (Professor of Finnish Language, University of Helsinki), Frøydis Hertzberg (Professor of Mother Tongue Education, University of Oslo), Ernst Håkon Jahr (Professor of Scandinavian Languages, University of Tromsø), Kjartan Ottósson (Professor of Icelandic Language, University of Oslo), Ulf Teleman (Professor of Swedish Language, University of Lund), and Lars Wollin (Docent of Scandinavian Languages, University of Uppsala). We appreciate the time and effort these esteemed colleagues spent on our behalf, and we have taken most of their suggestions for improvement into account. Of course, we alone are to blame for whatever remains to be criticized. The entire manuscript was finalized by Fred Karlsson.

We express our gratitude to NOS H for financial support during the initial project period, to Societas Scientiarum Fennica (Helsingfors) for publishing the book, and to Kungl. Vitterhets, Historie och Antikvitetsakademien (Stockholm), Letterstedtska föreningen (Stockholm), and Norges forskningsråd (Oslo) for sponsoring part of the publications costs. Gratitude is also due the Research Unit for Multilingual Language Technology, Department of General Linguistics, University of Helsinki, for financial and technical support, especially during the final stages of the project.

Oslo, Helsinki, Roskilde, and Lund, December 16, 1999

Even Hovdhaugen

Fred Karlsson

Carol Henriksen

Bengt Sigurd

Presentation of the authors

Even Hovdhaugen (1941-) studied classical philology and comparative Indo European linguistics. His research has mainly been focused on the history of linguistics and on descriptive and diachronic studies of Indo European, Turkic and Polynesian languages. Theoretically he started as a structuralist, had a brief generative interlude and is today mainly working within the frames of functional typology. Hovdhaugen has been Professor of General Linguistics at the University of Oslo since 1974 and is currently Dean of the Faculty of Arts.

Carol Henriksen (1944) has a background in Indo European and comparative Germanic linguistics and sociolinguistics at Florida State University (M.A. 1967) and Harvard University (Ph.D. 1973). She also studied Scandinavian languages and linguistics at the University of Oslo and the University of Copenhagen. Her interest in linguistic historiography dates back to the early 1970s when she wrote her dissertation on an anonymous and little known eighteenth century Danish grammarian. In her research in sociolinguistics and the history of Danish linguistics she has been inspired primarily by Einar Haugen, Hans Aarsleff, and Michel Foucault. Henriksen has been Associate Professor of Danish Linguistics at the University of Roskilde since 1985.

Fred Karlsson (1946-) studied Finnish, Swedish, phonetics, and general linguistics at Åbo Akademi University (M.A. 1969), University of Chicago (M.A. 1972), and University of Turku (Ph.D. 1974). His research has mainly dealt with morphological theory, Finnish grammar, and computational linguistics. His early theoretical inspiration came from classical structuralism and generative grammar. From the late 1970s he has been theoretically eclectic and taken an interest in the empirical foundations of linguistics. Karlsson has been Professor of General Linguistics at the University of Helsinki since 1980 and is currently Dean of the Faculty of Arts.

Bengt Sigurd (1928) studied Scandinavian languages, phonetics, and general linguistics at the University of Lund (M.A. 1953, Ph.D. 1965). He has been an editor of the Dictionary of the Swedish Academy, visiting Professor of Phonetics at Indiana University, Bloomington, and Professor of General Linguistics at the University of Stockholm and the University of Lund. His research first focused on Swedish structural phonology (phonotactics). Later he has dealt with morphology and syntax according to generative theories and tried to implement grammars to be used in machine translation and text generation. Sigurd is former Dean of the Faculty of Arts, University of Lund.

Contents (*note: the page numbers refer to the printed book, not this .pdf file*)

Preface	-i-
Presentation of the authors.....	-ii-
Chapter 1	
Introduction.....	1
1.1. The Nordic Countries and Languages.....	1
1.2. Our Rationale and Audience.....	2
1.3. A Synopsis of Nordic History.....	3
1.4. Approaches to the History of Linguistics.....	3
1.5. Selection of Material.....	5
1.6. Terminological and Technical Remarks	7
Chapter 2	
Language Studies in the Nordic Countries before 1500	8
2.1. Introduction.....	8
2.2. The Danish “School” of Modistic Grammar.....	10
2.3. Medieval Icelandic Grammarians.....	12
2.4. Conclusion.....	15
Chapter 3	
Nordic Linguistics 1500-1800	16
3.1. Introduction.....	16
3.2. Universities, Academies, and Schools.....	17
3.3. Latin, Greek, and Hebrew	21
3.3.1. Latin.....	21
3.3.2. Greek.....	23
3.4. The Languages of the Nordic Countries	26
3.4.1. The Status of the Vernaculars.....	26
3.4.1.1. Danish.....	27
3.4.1.2. Finnish.....	30
3.4.1.3. Icelandic	32
3.4.1.4. Norwegian	33
3.4.1.5. Sámi	34
3.4.1.6. Swedish	35
3.4.2. Lexicography.....	37
3.4.2.1. Danish.....	38
3.4.2.2. Finnish	39
3.4.2.3. Icelandic	40
3.4.2.4. Sámi	41
3.4.2.5. Swedish	41
3.4.3. Grammars of the Vernacular	42
3.4.3.1. Danish.....	43
3.4.3.2. Finnish	48
3.4.3.3. Icelandic	50
3.4.3.4. Sámi	51
3.4.3.5. Swedish	52
3.4.4. Orthography, Purism, and the Standardization of the Vernacular.....	54
3.4.4.1. Danish.....	54
3.4.4.2. Swedish	56
3.4.4.3. Icelandic	59
3.5. Other European Languages.....	60

3.6. Non-Indo-European Languages Spoken in the Nordic Colonies	62
3.6.1. Delaware (Lenni Lenape).....	63
3.6.2. Tamil.....	63
3.6.3. Kalaallisut (Greenlandic).....	64
3.6.4. African Languages.....	64
3.6.5. Creole Languages.....	65
3.7. The Origin of Languages and Historical-Comparative Studies	66
3.7.1. Denmark-Norway.....	67
3.7.2. Finland	69
3.7.3. Sweden	71
3.8. Universal Grammar and Other Studies in General Linguistics	77
3.9. Phonetics	78
3.10. Conclusion.....	79

Chapter 4

The Nineteenth Century.....	81
4.1. Introduction.....	81
4.2. Institutional Frameworks for Linguistic Research (Universities, Academies, Societies, and Journals)	83
4.3. Philosophy of Language, General Grammar, and Language Teaching	87
4.4. Historical-Comparative Grammar.....	96
4.4.1. Comparative Indo-European Linguistics	98
4.4.2. Comparative Finno-Ugric Linguistics.....	106
4.5. The Languages of the Nordic Countries	113
4.5.1. Introduction	113
4.5.1.1. Denmark.....	113
4.5.1.2. Finland.....	114
4.5.1.3. Iceland.....	115
4.5.1.4. Norway.....	116
4.5.1.5. Sweden.....	118
4.5.2. Descriptive Studies.....	119
4.5.2.1. Danish.....	119
4.5.2.2. Faroese	121
4.5.2.3. Finnish	122
4.5.2.4. Icelandic	125
4.5.2.5. Norwegian	126
4.5.2.6. Sámi	129
4.5.2.7. Swedish	130
4.5.3. Diachronic Studies of the National Languages	131
4.5.3.1. Denmark.....	134
4.5.3.2. Norway.....	137
4.5.3.3. Sweden.....	138
4.5.4. Language Planning	140
4.5.4.1. Danish.....	141
4.5.4.2. Finnish	142
4.5.4.3. Icelandic	144
4.5.4.4. Norwegian	145
4.5.4.5. Swedish	146
4.5.5. Dialect studies	147
4.5.5.1. Danish.....	148
4.5.5.2. Finnish	149
4.5.5.3. Norwegian	150
4.5.5.4. Swedish	150

4.5.6. Lexicography.....	151
4.5.6.1. Danish.....	151
4.5.6.2. Finnish.....	153
4.5.6.3. Icelandic.....	154
4.5.6.4. Norwegian.....	154
4.5.6.5. Sámi.....	155
4.5.6.6. Swedish.....	155
4.5.7. Runology.....	156
4.6. Other Indo-European Languages.....	157
4.6.1. Latin and Greek.....	157
4.6.2. English, German, and French.....	161
4.6.3. IndoIranian Languages.....	165
4.6.4. Slavic Languages.....	167
4.7. Non-Indo-European Languages.....	169
4.7.1. Finno-Ugric Languages and the Languages of Siberia.....	169
4.7.2. Semitic Languages.....	173
4.7.3. Missionary Linguistics.....	176
4.8. Phonetics.....	177
4.9. Conclusion.....	181

Chapter 5

The period 1900 -1965.....	185
5.1. Introduction.....	185
5.2. Institutional Frameworks for Linguistic Research.....	188
5.2.1. Universities, Academies, and Research Councils.....	188
5.2.2. Conferences.....	192
5.2.3. Journals.....	194
5.2.4. Societies and Circles.....	196
5.2.5. Entrepreneurs.....	199
General Linguistics.....	202
5.3.1. The Reception of New Trends in Linguistics in the Nordic Countries.....	202
5.3.2. Introductory Textbooks and Popular Introductions.....	206
5.3.3. The Internationally Most Visible Nordic General Linguists 1900-1965.....	210
5.3.4. Glossematics.....	217
5.3.5. Structural Phonology (Phonemics).....	218
5.3.6. Linguistic Metatheory.....	220
5.3.7. Language Teaching and Language Learning.....	221
5.4. Phonetics.....	221
5.5. Historical-Comparative Grammar.....	226
5.5.1. Comparative Indo-European Linguistics.....	226
5.5.2. Comparative Finno-Ugric Linguistics.....	230
5.6. The Languages of the Nordic Countries.....	236
5.6.1. Synchronic Studies.....	236
5.6.1.1. Danish.....	236
5.6.1.2. Faroese.....	238
5.6.1.3. Finnish.....	238
5.6.1.4. Icelandic.....	241
5.6.1.5. Norwegian.....	242
5.6.1.6. Sámi.....	243
5.6.1.7. Swedish.....	244
5.6.2. Diachronic Studies.....	246
5.6.2.1. Danish.....	247
5.6.2.2. Finnish.....	248

5.6.2.3. Icelandic	249
5.6.2.4. Norwegian	250
5.6.2.5. Swedish	251
5.6.3. Onomastics.....	253
5.6.4. Dialectology	255
5.6.4.1. Denmark.....	255
5.6.4.2. Finland.....	257
5.6.4.3. Iceland	260
5.6.4.4. Norway.....	260
5.6.4.5. Sweden.....	262
5.6.5. Runology.....	263
5.6.6. Language Planning	264
5.6.6.1. Danish.....	265
5.6.6.2. Faroese	265
5.6.6.3. Finnish	265
5.6.6.4. Icelandic	267
5.6.6.5. Norwegian	267
5.6.6.6. Sámi	268
5.6.6.7. Swedish	268
5.6.7 Lexicography.....	269
5.6.7.1. Danish.....	269
5.6.7.2. Finland.....	270
5.6.7.3. Iceland.....	271
5.6.7.4. Norway.....	271
5.6.7.5. Sámi	272
5.6.7.6. Sweden.....	272
5.7. Research on Non-Nordic Languages	273
5.7.1. English, German, and French	273
5.7.2. Latin and Greek.....	278
5.7.3. Indo-Iranian Languages.....	280
5.7.4. Slavic Languages.....	281
5.7.5. Celtic Languages	283
5.7.6. Semitic, Turkic, and Mongolian Languages.....	284
5.7.7. Languages of East and South Asia.....	286
5.7.8. Kalaallisut.....	287
5.7.9. Caucasian and American Indian Languages.....	288
5.8. Conclusion.....	290

Chapter 6

The Period after 1965	292
6.1. Introduction.....	292
6.2. The Institutional Framework of Linguistic Research.....	296
6.2.1. Universities and Research Councils.....	296
6.2.1.1. Denmark.....	297
6.2.1.2. Faroe Islands.....	298

6.2.1.3. Finland.....	298
6.2.1.4. Greenland	300
6.2.1.5. Iceland.....	301
6.2.1.6. Norway.....	301
6.2.1.7. Sámi Studies	302
6.2.1.8. Sweden.....	302
6.2.2. Linguistic Societies, Conferences, and Summer Schools.....	303
6.2.3. Journals, Working Papers, and Other Fora for Publication	307
6.2.4. Entrepreneurs	308
6.3. General Linguistics.....	310
6.3.1. Introduction	310
6.3.2. Introductory Textbooks.....	313
6.3.3. Phonology.....	313
6.3.4. Morphology	315
6.3.5. Syntax	316
6.3.6. Semantics.....	318
6.3.7. Language typology.....	320
6.3.8. Applied Linguistics.....	321
6.3.9. Psycholinguistics, Neurological and Clinical Linguistics, and Child Language Acquisition	322
6.3.10. Sign Languages	323
6.3.11. Sociolinguistics and Dialectology.....	323
6.3.12. Pragmatics, Text Linguistics, Discourse and Conversation Analysis	326
6.3.13. Language and Gender.....	327
6.3.14. Computational Linguistics	328
6.3.15. Diachronic Linguistics	330
6.3.16. Linguistic Metatheory, the Philosophy of Language, and the History of Linguistics	331
6.4. Phonetics	332
6.5. Historical-Comparative Grammar.....	334
6.5.1. Comparative Indo-European Linguistics	334
6.5.2. Comparative Finno-Ugric Linguistics.....	335
6.6. The Nordic Languages.....	336
6.6.1. Danish.....	337
6.6.2. Faroese.....	338
6.6.3. Finnish.....	338
6.6.4. Icelandic.....	339
6.6.5. Kalaallisut	339
6.6.6. Norwegian.....	339
6.6.7. Sámi.....	340
6.6.8. Swedish.....	340
6.7. Other Languages.....	341
6.7.1. European Languages	341
6.7.2. Languages outside Europe.....	342
Chapter 7	
Conclusion.....	344
Bibliography.....	348
Index	422

Chapter 1

Introduction

“... the future path is securely, even *inescapably*, forged by our past and by our view of that past.”¹

1.1. The Nordic Countries and Languages

This book is about the history and development of linguistics in the **Nordic countries**, which include **Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway, and Sweden**. The **Faroe Islands** and **Greenland** are part of Denmark. The native names of the Nordic countries in the respective languages are *Danmark, Suomi* (the Finnish name) - *Finland* (the Swedish name), *Ísland, Norge* (the bokmål name) - *Noreg* (the nynorsk name), and *Sverige*. The native rendering of Faroe Islands is *Føroyar* [føerjar] and of Greenland *Kalaallit Nunaat*.

The term **Scandinavia** is tempting to use as a cover term for all these countries. One drawback is that it leaves the status of Finland somewhat undetermined. Is Finland part of Scandinavia or not? Because of this indeterminacy, **Fenno-Scandia** is sometimes used as an unambiguous cover term, e.g. in geography. But as we already have a Nordic Council (since 1952), a Nordic Association of Linguists (since 1976), and Nordic journals for several disciplines, for example *Nordic Journal of Linguistics* since 1978, we feel that it is appropriate to strengthen this emerging tradition by consistently talking about the Nordic countries in the wide sense.²

Using the areal cover term **Nordic languages**, we refer to all the indigenous Indo-European, Finno-Ugric, and Eskimo languages of these countries.³ The five relevant Indo-European languages that constitute the **North-Germanic** subgroup are (with native names in parentheses) **Danish** (*dansk*), **Faroese** (*føroyskt* [fø_rist]), **Icelandic** (*íslenska*), **Norwegian** (*norsk*), and **Swedish** (*svenska*). We use the term **Scandinavian languages** for these five North-Germanic languages.

The reader should observe our terminological distinction between Nordic in the broad areal sense, and Scandinavian in the narrow genetic-linguistic sense of ‘North-Germanic’. We try to uphold this distinction meticulously. There is an obvious source of misunderstanding lurking in the interpretation of established expressions in Scandinavian languages such as Swed. *nordisk filologi* ‘Nordic philology’, *nordiska språk* ‘Nordic languages’, or *Institutionen för nordiska språk* ‘Department of Nordic Languages’, all normally referring to what we have here defined as Scandinavian. For example, when we refer to North-Germanic languages only, we henceforth translate such expressions into English as

¹ Julie Andresen (1990:254).

² Matti Klinge (1993) has treated the emergence of Nordic identity in his essay “The Nordic countries (Norden) and Europe”.

³ Cf. Karker, Lindgren and Løland, ed. (1997) for overviews (either in Danish, Norwegian, or Swedish) of all Nordic languages (in the sense just defined), their history, characteristics, and present situation. Up-to-date information in English on the Finno-Ugric (Uralic) languages is provided on the internet pages <http://www.helsinki.fi/hum/sugl/fglang.html> and <http://www.helsinki.fi/~tasalmin/fu.html>. This information includes the recommended English names of these languages and current speaker statistics.

Scandinavian philology, Scandinavian languages, Department of Scandinavian Languages, etc.

The two indigenous **Finno-Ugric languages** spoken in the Nordic countries are **Finnish** (*suomi*) and **Sámi** (*sápm̄e, sámēgiella*). Finnish belongs to the **Finnic** (*itämerensuomalainen*) subgroup⁴ of Finno-Ugric languages. The other main Finno-Ugric subgroups are Sámi languages, Mordvin languages, Mari, Permian languages, and Ugric languages (one of which is Hungarian). According to the traditional view established by Mathias Alexander Castrén in the middle of the nineteenth century (cf. 4.4.2.), the Finno-Ugric languages as just defined and the Samoyed languages together form the Uralic family. Recently, some researchers have argued that Samoyed languages are just one subgroup within the Finno-Ugric languages. If this view turns out to be appropriate, the traditional terminological distinction between Finno-Ugric and Uralic would be unnecessary. The matter is not yet conclusively settled.

Sámi was earlier also called Lapp or Lappish, but these terms are derogatory. Dialectal differences between the Sámi-speaking communities of Finland, Norway, Russia, and Sweden are actually so great that it would be linguistically more appropriate to distinguish approximately ten different Sámi languages.

As Greenland is part of Denmark, we also include **Kalaallisut** (Greenlandic, Inuktitut) in our areal concept of Nordic languages. Kalaallisut belongs to the family of **Eskimo-Aleut languages**.

Romani and several **Sign Languages** also belong to the indigenous languages of the Nordic countries with century-long traditions of use. The brief history of Nordic research on these languages will be treated in chapters 5 and 6.

1.2. Our Rationale and Audience

Why then write a history of linguistics in the Nordic countries in general without separating the history of linguistics in each country? By treating the Nordic countries separately one loses the comparative perspective that is essential for understanding some basic aspects of the history of linguistics in each country and in general. The Nordic countries constitute an ideal area for comparative studies. They are not only geographically connected, they also have a relatively similar population size, many similarities in their historical development, and similar social and political systems, including the structure of academic life and academic institutions.⁵

There are, furthermore, some obvious linguistic and historical differences between the Nordic countries, which have sometimes led to different, nation-specific directions in the development of linguistics. First, in terms of genetic relationships, we face the elementary fact that Danish, Faroese, Icelandic, Norwegian, and Swedish belong to the North-Germanic subgroup of the Indo-European languages, whereas Finnish and the Sámi languages belong to the Finno-Ugric languages, and Kalaallisut (Greenlandic) is an Eskimo-Aleut language. According to current scientific opinion, Indo-European, Finno-Ugric, and Eskimo-Aleut are genetically unrelated.

Not many studies exist with a profile like ours. The few surveys of linguistics within a geographically and politically defined and delimited part of the world are different from the one we present here in that they consist of articles, usually conference papers on various themes, for example Noordegraaf et al. (1992), Quilis and Niederehe (1986), and Ramat et al. (1986). This book is therefore more similar in style and content to Andresen (1990), though the present work is written by four authors and covers a wider range of topics.

This book has a clearly defined audience. It is written for all linguists in the Nordic countries and abroad, but especially for the novice linguist beginning his or her career by writing a doctoral thesis. In

⁴ This subgroup has often been called Baltic-Finnic languages in English. This English designation is misleading, however, because it erroneously suggests a genetic connection between Finnic languages and the two languages constituting the Baltic subgroup of Indo-European languages, Latvian and Lithuanian.

⁵ We are aware of only one other branch of scholarship of which a comparative Nordic history has been written, legal science. The first part of Lars Björne's book *Patrioter och institutionalister. Den nordiska rättsvetenskapens historia* appeared in 1995, covering the time to 1815.

the doctoral programs established in Sweden in the 1960s, and in Denmark, Finland, and Norway in the 1980s and 1990s, the theory of linguistics and the history of linguistics are natural and often obligatory topics. But so far no comprehensive history of linguistics in the Nordic countries exists.

We presuppose that our readers are familiar with the basic concepts and central personalities of linguistics. It would be impracticable in a book of this type to explain elementary linguistic concepts or to introduce every single linguist that we need to mention in passing because he or she has been relevant for some Nordic linguist or school of linguistics.

1.3. A Synopsis of Nordic History

For the benefit of non-Nordic readers of this book, we provide the subsequent brief sketch of the history of the Nordic countries since the Middle Ages. The course of history, political and otherwise, has of course significantly influenced the development of language study and linguistics.

Only Denmark and Sweden have been independent nations since the Middle Ages. The Kalmar Union of Denmark, Norway, and Sweden was a powerful uniting force from 1389 to 1523, shaping political, economic, and cultural development in the Nordic area during the final phase of the Middle Ages.

Finland became a part of Sweden in the twelfth century and continued to be under Swedish rule until 1809. As a consequence of the war of 1808-1809, Finland became a part of the Russian Empire and remained so until 1917. Nevertheless, Finland had a considerable degree of political and cultural autonomy in the period 1809-1917. Swedish remained the main language of education and internal administration until the 1860s, when the decisive steps were taken to establish Finnish as the main national language. By 1900, Finnish was the dominating national language. Finland gained full independence in 1917 and became a republic in which Finnish and Swedish were both granted status as national languages.

The Icelandic Commonwealth was formed by 930. The Kalmar Union mentioned above led to the transfer of the governance of Iceland to Denmark. The path to Icelandic independence began in 1874 when Iceland was granted a constitution of its own, with the last formal ties with Denmark being broken in 1944.

Norway was already a kingdom before 1000. Danish influence increased in the fourteenth century, and Norway came under Danish rule in 1442, a reign that lasted until 1814 when Norway regained its independence with its own constitution within the framework of a weak Swedish-Norwegian union. Ties between Sweden and Norway were severed in 1905, and the Norwegian monarchy was then reinstated.

The Faroe Islands were under Danish rule from 1380 but were granted home rule in 1948. Norway exerted a strong influence on Greenland from 1000 to 1300, but this influence gradually disappeared. The influence of Denmark in Greenland began in the early 1700s and soon led to hegemony. Full home rule was granted to Greenland in 1979.

1.4. Approaches to the History of Linguistics

The history of linguistics and scholarly studies in general is both an old and a new discipline. Already in antiquity we find books such as Suetonius's *De grammaticis* providing a popular and readable survey of the lives of some of the best known grammarians and philologists. In the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, there appeared a number of widely read descriptions of the history of linguistics in general (e.g. Vilhelm Thomsen 1902 and Holger Pedersen 1924) as well as of linguistic research in a specific geographical area or field of research (e.g. Otto Donner 1872 concerning Finno-Ugric studies).

But prior to 1960, practically all studies of the history of linguistics included either a

chronological and more or less exhaustive list of authors and publications (*res gestae* history), or they were written to strengthen the position of a specific theory or school, with their authors either describing a development from supposedly unscientific and methodologically poor speculations up to their own more perfect solution (e.g. Holger Pedersen 1924), or pointing out famous predecessors who had held views similar to their own (e.g. Noam Chomsky 1966).

A third approach also has emerged during the past twenty years, and this basically represents our current approach:

The history of linguistics situates the study of language as historically and culturally constructed forms of knowing. That is, doing the history of linguistics can be seen as an important contribution to cultural criticism and historicized inquiry into the construction of social and discursive knowledge.

...

The history of linguistics includes not only the history of linguistic theorizing and description in the modern sense, but also inquiry into the study of language variation, language change, language attitudes, language teaching, schooling and literacy, cultural representations and metaphors for understanding language, and the changes in social registers and speech communities.

...

In this respect, the history of linguistics can contribute to a critical cultural history, in particular by uncovering the assumptions and practices of not only linguistic theory and description but also language teaching practices, the ideological constructions of national languages, representations of language differences and identity, and attitudes toward language and standardization. As a poststructural historical discourse, the historiography of linguistics works at the intersections of knowledge and ignorance. By ignorance, I mean both naïve and programmatic ignorance, not only what is simply not known but also what a discipline or a knower refuses to know. (Amsler 1993:50-51)

These are ambitious objectives which are not easy to achieve. However, we have at least tried to keep them in mind and to implement them all through this text.

A methodological approach to the historiography of linguistics began with the studies of Hans Aarsleff in the 1960s (e.g. 1960, 1967), and it emerged as a separate field of research in the 1970s. Koerner (1994) and Schmitter (1982) have written surveys of this development as well as of the methodological foundations of the discipline.

In this book we have tried to observe some of the generally accepted methodological principles of linguistic historiography. Our aim has been not only to record events in the history of linguistics, but also to seek to understand and explain the reasons for and the connections between these events.

First, we have attempted to analyze linguists and linguistic studies of earlier periods on their own terms, within their contemporary contexts, as well as within the intellectual climate of their time. This includes viewing linguistics of earlier ages as well as of today as a part of a whole, being influenced by contemporary ideas and being integrated into the society, politics and culture of the time. Hans Aarsleff stated the problem as follows:

The task of gaining the proper depth of historical perspective within a given period can only be satisfied by seeking to recapture all relevant contemporary knowledge without reference to or misguidance by the later accumulation of scholarly opinion and assignment of influences, which are far too often and too easily accorded the status of unquestioned doctrine. (Aarsleff 1967:10)

Even though we do not operate with a definition of linguistics that is valid for all ages, we will try to grasp what was considered as being part of language studies during a certain period. For the period before 1800, we adopt a broad view of linguistics and have included almost all serious theoretical, descriptive, and practical approaches to the study of language and languages. After 1800, we gradually, though not always consistently, narrow our focus to what we now would view as linguistics proper.

Our major focus is on linguistics as just defined, and thus we have excluded reference to most philological work, i.e. studies concerned with the interpretation of old texts. Philology and philologists are therefore mentioned only when they have been important for linguistics. It is essential to keep in

mind that our focus leaves most of the work in fields such as classical philology outside our scope.⁶

Second, we also wish to profit from the historian's privilege of hindsight. We want to distinguish contributions with a value recognized today from contributions now forgotten or regarded as curiosities. In so doing, however, we are conscious of making anachronistic judgements and of running the risk of being fettered by our own time.

From a modern point of view, it is an indisputable fact that in certain fields at certain times significant progress occurred, if by progress we mean that more knowledge and a better understanding of a set of data or phenomena was acquired than in previous generations. One noteworthy example is found in the nineteenth century when scholarly phonetics was virtually non-existent but developed later into a full-fledged branch of scholarship. At the beginning of the century, for instance, no system for an accurate phonetic transcription was yet available to linguists, and few if any scholars really knew of the opposition between [p] and [b], or how voicing was produced in articulation. Linguists thus had no clear understanding of the function of the vocal cords. By the end of the century, however, a fairly accurate insight into articulatory phonetics was common, and numerous sophisticated phonetic alphabets were at a linguist's disposal. In this case we witness discoveries that also made it possible to solve or to better understand numerous additional aspects of language.

What is less obvious, or often more difficult for a modern scholar to see, are cases where insight or methods were neglected or forgotten. One such case is the lack of interest in, and the conscious disregard of philosophical and general grammar at the Nordic universities in the nineteenth century.

In the small Nordic academic circles, a single person could be very influential, even to the extent of virtually owning, i.e. having a monopoly on, his or her field or some part of it. Thus, a professor could dominate not only his or her field of research, but also the entire faculty, and thereby have significant influence on scientific research in the country as a whole. For this reason, this history is also focused on individuals, and ample space is given to biographical information and to the personal background of the most influential scholars. Since linguists are human beings, and as all people tend to mix private life and work, we have also included biographical material that is not strictly linguistic when we found it relevant. For example, the fact that prominent linguists such as Eemil Nestor Setälä (4.4.2.) in Finland, Matthias Moth (3.4.2.1.) and Johan Nicolai Madvig (4.3.) in Denmark, and Alf Sommerfelt (5.3.3.) and Hans Vogt (5.7.10.) in Norway had important political or administrative positions in their respective countries has played a role in the development of linguistics in these countries. Several Swedish linguists have been members of the Swedish Academy (*Svenska Akademien*) and exercised wide cultural influence through that institutional authority, not least by selecting the Nobel Prize winners in literature.

1.5. Selection of Material

The potential material is overwhelming, especially from the present century but also partly from the nineteenth century. Only a small part of it can be covered in a book this size. In some subfields we have used previous studies and refer to various histories of universities and academies, such as Matti Klinge et al. (1987, 1989, 1990) concerning the University of Helsinki, or we cite general overviews of the history of learning and science in the Nordic countries, such as Sten Lindroth's *Svensk lärdomshistoria* (The History of Learning in Sweden, 1975-1981). Especially valuable are the volumes in the series *The History of Learning and Science in Finland 1828-1918* where so far no less than four volumes have been published concerning the history of sub-branches of language study in Finland during the period mentioned: Oriental studies, classical studies, the study of modern languages, and Finno-Ugric studies (Pentti Aalto 1971, 1980, 1987, Mikko Korhonen 1986). Another example of a classical, country-specific historiography is Adolf Noreen's overview of Swedish linguistics until 1900, which

⁶ Readers with special interests in philology must consult overviews such as Ivar Heikel (1894) with regard to philological research done in Finland, Bo Lindberg's (1987) history of classical philology in Sweden from the early 1800s to the Second World War, etc.

appears in the first volume of *Vårt språk* (Our Language, Noreen 1903:181-286). Nevertheless, such studies are generally scarce and often diverse in their intentions, and they do not always contain information relevant to this study. Accordingly, the primary sources had to be consulted, and in doing so it became clear that this work could not be exhaustive in its scope.

The selection of material has been very problematic. Our aim is not to present a complete list of scholars and linguistic publications from the beginning until 1998. This would produce a completely unreadable work, which would be too expensive for all but large libraries. Instead, our objective is to present a readable book, not larger than people can afford to buy, and of even greater importance, a work that people will have time to read. In other words, this book is intended to stimulate and to inform, but it will also inevitably provoke and irritate. We have had to use our own judgement concerning what is interesting and important and worth including. But to avoid too many arbitrary choices, we have assumed the following three main criteria for the selection of material:

- (1) Include persons and studies that were considered to be interesting and influential in their own day.
- (2) Include persons and studies that have been influential later on.
- (3) Include persons and studies that received no contemporary recognition and had no influence, but that represent views and methods that were original at the time and/or that are interesting from a modern point of view.

Some scholars and studies which have been considered important and/or representative have been treated in depth, sometimes at the expense of others who have been given less space or have been excluded. An important subset of influential linguists are the “control persons” or “subject owners”,⁷ researchers who turned out to be exceptionally influential over long periods of time in terms of determining what problems were investigated, what projects were started, etc. (such as E. N. Setälä in Finland and Johannes Brøndum-Nielsen in Denmark). On the other hand, we have not fully covered all the research that was done during the extended periods of what Thomas Kuhn (1970 [1962]) called “normal” science. Instead, we try to focus on periods of change, innovation, and theoretical controversy. In this sense, our approach could be labeled elitist. Another way of describing our approach is to say that we try to describe the theoretical progress of linguistics and language disciplines in the Nordic countries.

Determining what counts as significant progress, or deciding who has been an exceptionally influential linguist is, of course, largely a question of values, especially when we write about older periods. However, where applicable, we have strived for objectivity in these regards by paying close attention to citation data (especially from the Arts & Humanities Citation Index), modes of publication such as monographs published by leading international publishers or articles published in leading linguistic journals such as *Language*, the receipt of major awards and honorary doctorates, participation in major international activities such as the International Congresses of Linguists, acting as leader of major projects, etc.

The selection of what to include and what to omit has been one of the central topics in our project meetings. We have had five intensive two and three-day meetings over the years, in which the selection of material has been perhaps the most central topic. Our group of four colleagues with different backgrounds arrived at considerable intersubjective agreement when discussing criteria, such as the ones just mentioned and evaluating individual linguists in the framework of such criteria which we personally have perceived as useful. For example, one obvious risk that we witnessed several times in our team is that a kind of “nationalistic ambition” overcomes each of us, prompting us to mention as many nationally important or less important linguists as possible. Likewise, there are imminent risks for disciplinary biases, and for theoretical biases. Here, the process of selection and critical discussion in our group has helped to make rational and intersubjectively defensible decisions on what to include and what to omit. This is one of the most obvious benefits of teamwork, especially given the wealth of material that we

⁷ The term “subject owner” was suggested to us by Frans Gregersen.

wanted to give comprehensible form. We also, once more, stress the important criticism and advice we got from nine colleagues from five countries who read the manuscript.

Our book is divided into chapters, each devoted to specific time periods. Chapter 2 provides a brief survey of linguistics in the Nordic countries in the Middle Ages. Chapter 3 treats the period from 1500 to 1800. Chapter 4 covers the nineteenth century, Chapter 5 the period 1900-1965, and Chapter 6 the time after 1965. The motivation for this chronological segmentation is given in the introduction to the individual chapters. The material is subdivided into specific fields or areas of interest within the chapters, and within the majority of these subsections we treat each country or geographic area separately. This approach may seem irritatingly atomistic to those readers primarily interested in the continuous development of linguistics in general in one particular country, or in the continuous development within one specific field of linguistics. We have attempted to compensate for this in the introductions and conclusions accompanying each chapter and in the introductory sections to the various subsections. In Chapter 6, which deals with the period in which we ourselves have been participants, we have employed a less detailed and more synthetic approach.

1.6. Terminological and Technical Remarks

The terms **school** and **paradigm** are used in our book. By **school**, we mean a group of contemporary scholars having the same basic theoretical and/or methodological notions, working in a more or less tightly knit network on the same data or problems. By **paradigm** we mean (much like Thomas Kuhn) a well-established and elaborated theory with methods and objectives of its own which forms the basis of a school. But a school need not be based on a clear paradigm.

The English names of languages will normally be in harmony with the terminology used by Barbara F. Grimes in the *Ethnologue Language Name Index* (13th edition: Grimes, ed. 1996). For the main variants of Norwegian we use the native terms **bokmål**, **nynorsk**, and **riksmål**.⁸ Our English terminology for naming Finno-Ugric languages follows the practices recommended³ by the Department of Finno-Ugrian Studies at the University of Helsinki, with the exception that we use the (more American) adjective *Finno-Ugric* rather than *Finno-Ugrian*.

All quotations from sources written in Nordic languages or Latin are also translated into English. Important terms and the most central languages and language families are emphasized with **boldface** upon first mention and definition, as in the previous paragraph and in section 1.1. Because many linguistic traditions, theories, societies, etc. are country-specific, clarity requires that concepts and names central to those traditions and institutions be rendered both in the source language and in English translation, for example Finn. *astevaihtelu* (consonant gradation), Icel. *Háskóli Íslands* (University of Iceland), and Norw. *Norsk Tidsskrift for Sprogvidenskap* (Norwegian Journal of Linguistics). Such native terms are emphasized with *italics*. We use single quotes ‘...’ for indicating meanings, e.g. *sprogvidenskap* ‘linguistics’.

⁸ Cf. 4.5.1.4. for definitions and historical background.

Chapter 2

Language Studies in the Nordic Countries before 1500

“... *tota grammatica accepta est a rebus ...*”⁹ —

2.1. Introduction

From 800 to 1000, Old Norse dialects had developed in different ways, thus forming the precursors of the present-day Scandinavian languages Danish, Faroese, Icelandic, Norwegian, and Swedish. As a consequence of societal development, especially the spread of Christianity to the north and the gradual emergence of centralized government, a need eventually arose for various types of clerical and political administration. One prerequisite for this development was a writing system.

Linguistics has its roots in the design of writing systems. A vernacular cannot be committed to writing without a systematic, more or less explicit, analysis of the phonic phenomena at hand. In this concrete sense, the first Nordic linguists were applied linguists who adapted the runic alphabet to varieties of Old Norse. The earliest Scandinavian runic inscriptions which have been preserved date back to about 200. The runic alphabet began to undergo numerous modifications around 600 and was, at least in Norway, in common use for several centuries after the introduction of the Latin script.

The Latin alphabet came into use in Norway and Iceland in the late 1100s, and in the early 1200s, Denmark and Sweden adopted this alphabet. Early Nordic vernacular literature flourished in Iceland as early as 1200. As for Finland, very little material has survived since the Middle Ages, and that which has survived consists of mainly short fragments of texts from religious ceremonies and *Piae Cantiones* written in Latin and Swedish. Finnish words from this period are only attested sporadically, and only one complete sentence has been preserved.

The Church was the most influential bearer of culture in the Middle Ages, but the process of Christianization in the Nordic countries took centuries. This process began when the missionary Ansgarius arrived in Sweden in the year 829. Iceland converted to Christianity after an *Alþingi*¹⁰ decision in the year 1000, and from 1200 to 1300, a stable phase had been reached, even in Finland.

The Church needed priests, and they had to be educated. Schools were founded for this purpose, normally in conjunction with the major cathedrals. The first cathedral school in the Nordic countries was apparently the one in Lund, which was then part of Denmark. This school was probably founded in the year 1085, although the only documented proof of its existence dates from 1123. In 1130, another Danish cathedral school was established in Viborg, followed by one in Ribe in 1145. Although we have little information about the history of the Icelandic cathedral schools, they may have been founded at the

⁹ “... the whole of grammar is based on things ...” (Boethius de Dacia around 1270, cited after Pinborg and Roos 1969:12).

¹⁰ The old Icelandic Parliament.

same time or even earlier than those in Denmark. The Icelandic School at Hólar was founded by the first bishop, Jón helgi Ögmundarson (1052-1121). The history of the school at Skálholt is not well documented, but the first bishop, Ísleifr, died in 1080 and his son and successor, Gizurr, in 1118. The first cathedral schools in Sweden were established in Skara and Strängnäs in the early thirteenth century, and similar schools were established in Norway in Nidaros/Trondheim at about the same time (first mentioned in documents from 1217) and Oslo (first mentioned in documents from 1225). In Finland, the Cathedral School in Turku/Åbo is first mentioned in documents from the year 1326.

As the Holy Mass was basically conducted in Latin, sufficient proficiency in reading, writing, and speaking Latin was the most important skill to be acquired by students. Knowledge of Latin was indispensable for their study of the Bible and other religious documents, and later it was a prerequisite in their career as priests. The curriculum of medieval schools was made up of the classical trivium: grammar, rhetoric, and logic.

The vernacular must have been used as a means of teaching, at least on the lower levels of medieval schools, since the vernacular was probably the only language known by the majority of the beginning students. Furthermore, important language activities were organized around the monasteries and abbeys. Moreover, Birgitta ruled that the friars of Vadstena Abbey should preach to the people every Sunday in *lingua materna*. A number of drafts for such preaching have been preserved in the Uppsala University library (Andersson and Borgehammar 1997).

The use of the vernacular slowly increased. In Finland, for example, a regulation was issued in 1441 that the Lord's Prayer and the Apostles' Creed be translated into Finnish and Swedish and that they also be recited in connection with the Mass. These texts must have been translated by the priests into the vernacular, because they were to be recited in the same form every time. This practise enabled ordinary people to learn the verse by heart. Many priests were thus faced with the formidable task of constructing a functional orthography for the vernacular.

The Church also introduced formal administration based on documents of various types. In fact, the first archives served the purpose of the Church.

Advanced academic studies thus became increasingly necessary, which often meant studies abroad. The University of Paris was most important for the Nordic countries in the earlier years. The University of Paris founded the first college for Nordic students, *Collegium Dacicum*, around 1270. Paris remained an important center for learning until the fifteenth century. The University of Prague, established in 1348, became important especially for Swedish students. During the Middle Ages, more Swedes enrolled in the University of Prague than in any other university. Several German universities attracted Nordic students in the fifteenth century, especially Leipzig, Erfurt, Rostock, and Greifswald. Hundreds of Nordic students studied abroad during the Middle Ages. From Finland alone, 165 such students are known by name (Nuorteva 1997:440). The Master's degree in medieval times consisted of broad studies in philosophy and grammar, with Latin being the basic medium of scholarly communication.

No Nordic universities existed in the Middle Ages. Basic Latin grammar drawn from the textbooks of Donat (3.3.1.) was taught in the few existing schools. An elementary type of vernacular grammar was written in Iceland and Norway, and perhaps also in some of the other Nordic countries (Ólsen 1884:156-158). These grammars were either word-to-word translations of Donat's *Ars minor* (The Minor Grammar) or were based on Aelfric's (?955-?1010) Anglo-Saxon grammar (Hovdhaugen 1982c:131-133, S. Pétursson 1996). These grammars, which were intended as a pedagogical aid to a swifter mastery of Latin, must have been the first attempts to systematize the basic morphological pattern of the vernacular. But since only short fragments of these grammars have been preserved, we are unable to determine the extent to which they were successful in their systematization.

In addition, and in view of what we find in other European language communities, we can assume that there were short vocabularies of Latin and vernacular words in the Nordic countries in the Middle Ages. We have several specimens of such vocabularies from Iceland (Benediktsson 1972:21). The only important Nordic lexicographic work from this period, however, is the Swedish version of the great medieval Latin dictionary *Catholicon* (thirteenth century) from about 1450 (Wollin 1992b), which

contains approximately 20,000 Swedish equivalents to the 12,000 Latin entries.

2.2. The Danish “School” of Modistic Grammar

Modistic grammar was the leading linguistic theory of Western Europe in the period from 1260 to 1380 (cf. Pinborg 1967 and Bursill-Hall 1971). Influential contributions in this field were written by the four Danes Martinus, Bo/Boethius, Johannes, and Simon, who studied and lectured in Paris from the year 1260 to 1290. Since students from the same country or area usually lived together, and as a rule belonged to the same student association, it is very likely that these Danes were in close contact with each other and met socially and had regular linguistic discussions, perhaps over a glass or two of wine.

Of these four scholars, Martinus de Dacia is the linguist we know most about, since it is likely that he is the Martinus de Dacia who became chancellor to King Erik Menved around 1288 and was the king’s candidate for the Episcopal seat in Roskilde in 1290, which he did not obtain. From 1296 to 1297 Martinus de Dacia was on an official mission to Rome, and he died and was buried in Paris in the year 1304. Martinus wrote a number of commentaries on various books by Aristotle, Porphyrius (?234-?305), and Boethius (?470-524), among others, but only one manuscript of these commentaries has been preserved. His book on modes of signifying, *Modi significandi*, however, was a great success. At least 29 manuscripts of it have been found. Moreover, there are ten different commentaries on his work, and it is frequently referred to by later scholars.

Martinus’s *Modi significandi* is one of the most important and fundamental contributions of the modistic school (Pinborg 1967:67-77, Bursill-Hall 1971:33). Here Martinus defines and organizes the basic grammatical terminology of the modists and gives a thorough and systematic, but also very condensed and somewhat incomplete outline of their theory.

Martinus maintains that the modes of signifying are the main objects of grammatical research. This statement is obviously connected with a general effort at the University of Paris to establish the borders between the various scientific disciplines. The modes of signifying are defined by Martinus as a relation, created by the intellect, through which the linguistic expression designates the basic properties of the object signified (Pinborg 1967:70). There are three types of modes: modes of being (*modi essendi*), modes of understanding (*modi intelligendi*) and modes of signifying (*modi significandi*). It is difficult to explain briefly this abstract and complicated theory, but the following quotation from the Danish expert on medieval grammar, Sten Ebbesen, may give the reader some idea of the basic features of the modists’s way of thinking:

In spite of significant differences of opinion, the modists of the late thirteenth c. (Boethius, Martin etc.) shared a far from trivial set of axioms. In a slightly modernized terminology, they may be phrased as follows: (a) The created world has a structure. (b) The structure of the world is intelligible to humans. (c) Whatever is intelligible is expressible.

In modistic theory the main structural elements of the created world are: (i) Realities (*res*) in the sense of common natures. A common nature is what unites Socrates and Plato qua men, but it is also what unites the universal man with the particular one, say Socrates. Common natures underlie not only substances, but also entities of other categories. A common nature unites running with a run, for instance. (ii) Modes of being (*modi essendi*). Each reality has several ways of being, of manifesting itself, as it were. The same reality has processual being as running and static being as a run.

It follows from axiom (b) that humans can conceptualize realities in as many ways as they have ways of being. We are capable of possessing a way of understanding (*modus intelligendi*) corresponding to each way of being. In fact, though individuals may be defective, a society as a whole must always be in possession of all modes of understanding.

It follows from axiom (c) that humans can make their signs carry a way of signifying (*modus significandi*) corresponding to each way of understanding. (Ebbesen 1995:xii)

An important part of Martinus’s work is his treatment of syntax, in which he bases his analysis on the dependency relationship between two words or phrases occurring together in the same construction, for example, by establishing which is dependent on which. Martinus basically assumes two types of constructions, intransitive and transitive, but his analysis is not fully and consistently developed.

Very little is known about Boethius de Dacia, who wrote a commentary on Priscian around 1270-1272. This work is as significant and on the same intellectual level as Martinus's *Modi significandi* (Pinborg 1967:86), yet they are quite different. Boethius was a philosopher who had both the ability for synthesis and overview as well as for formulating the basic theoretical problems of the science of grammar. To Boethius, the study of grammar was the study of form and structure. The *modi significandi* were not only the main, but also the only topic of interest for grammarians. The relationship between language and the world, being either the objects which the concepts refer to or the phonetic realization of words, is irrelevant for the grammarian (Pinborg 1967:77-86).

One important aspect of Boethius's work and of modistic grammar in general is the theory of universal grammar, i.e. that the grammars of all languages are basically identical. This means that it is sufficient for the grammarians to concentrate on the grammar of one language, in this case Latin, and by describing it they would actually have described the grammar of all languages. This modistic theory of universal grammar is clearly stated by Boethius in the following quotation, which is also a good example of the modistic way of thinking and writing:

All dialects are characterized by one grammar.¹¹ The reason for this is that as the whole of grammar is based on things — it cannot be a figment of the intellect, because a figment of the intellect is something to which no reality corresponds outside the mind — and because the natural properties of things are similar among all, accordingly the modes of being and the modes of understanding are similar among all those who have different dialects and accordingly also the modes of signifying are similar and accordingly also the modes of construction or speaking are similar. So the whole grammar which is in one dialect is similar to that one which is in another dialect. For which mode of being and understanding and signifying and constructing or speaking can be in one dialect and not in another? This does not seem possible. For instance, the noun or verb which the Greeks have must in species be identical with the noun and verb which we have. For the mode of signifying which places a [particular] part [of speech]¹² in some specific class, is the same. If specific differences are the same in species then also the things construed are the same in species. What has been said about nouns and verbs also applies to the other parts of speech and to the whole grammar which does not differ among different dialects. It is necessarily one in species and differs only as a result of different phonetic realisations which are the accidental aspects of grammar. (Pinborg and Roos 1969:12-13, Hovdhaugen 1990:120-121)

A more condensed and clear formulation of this universal principle is provided by Johannes, another Danish modist:

As far as all its essential principles are concerned and as far as its essential effects are concerned which follow essentially from its principles as far as they exist, grammar is one and the same among all [people]. Nevertheless, grammar differs accidentally among different people belonging to different dialects because there is a vocal difference between Greek and Latin. (Otto 1955:53, Hovdhaugen 1990:124)

Johannes Dacus, who also taught in Paris in the period beginning from 1260 to 1290, may be the person referred to as a certain master Johannes who was mentioned several times in university and ecclesiastic documents, but otherwise very little is known of this scholar (Otto 1955:ix-xii). Three studies by Dacus have been preserved: *Divisio scientie* (The Division of Science), *Summa grammatica*, (The Basic Principles of Grammar) which is an extensive discussion within the framework of modistic logic dealing with basic problems of grammatical analysis, and *De gradibus formarum* (On the Levels of Forms). *Summa grammatica* contains more than 450 printed pages. Only two copies of it exist (while we have eight manuscripts of *Divisio scientie*), and it appears from later references to have been the least read and least known of his works. Although not a very original contribution (cf. Pinborg 1967:87-90) when compared to those by Martinus and Boethius, *Summa grammatica* is different from all other modistic scholarship in that it treats phonetic matters (Otto 1955:83-160).

Our knowledge of Simon Dacus is limited to his being a Dane and that he may have been connected with the University of Paris after the year 1260 (Otto 1963:ix-xii). Two manuscripts of Simon

¹¹ Here the word *grammar* is used consistently as the translation of Latin *grammatica*. In some cases *grammatical structure* or even *system for grammatical description* would have been a more correct translation (Hovdhaugen 1990). For an explanation of classical and medieval linguistic terminology (parts of speech, species etc.) cf. Hovdhaugen (1982c).

Dacus have been preserved, both only single copies: *Domus gramatice* (The House of Grammar) and his comments on the second book of the syntactic part of Priscian's *Institutiones*, both edited in Otto (1963). Nevertheless, Simon was not unknown, as indicated by the numerous fourteenth and fifteenth century references to his work. *Domus gramatice* is an extensive, but elementary survey of Latin grammar from a modistic point of view, but it can hardly be said to be among the more important contributions of this school.

While the Danish modists had a profound impact on modistic grammar and philosophy and medieval grammatical theory in Western Europe in general, this school of thought had little known influence on language studies in the Nordic countries in medieval times. The modists belonged to a European tradition that had its roots outside of the Nordic countries, and the Danish origin of Martinus, Bo/Boethius, Johannes, and Simon is only revealed in their names and in a few place names mentioned in their studies.

The influence of modistic grammar on Renaissance and post-Renaissance linguistics needs further investigation, although there seems to be a tendency among more recent historiographers to see more continuity and less abrupt changes than did the earlier historiographers. But it was not until the 1950s and 1960s that the Danish modists were rediscovered and their importance recognized. The editions of their work by Alfred Otto, Henrik Roos, and Jan Pinborg and the subsequent studies by Pinborg and his pupils all represent an important Nordic contribution to linguistic historiography in the twentieth century, cf. also the series *Cahiers de l'Institut du Moyen-Âge grec et latin* published in Copenhagen since 1969.

2.3. Medieval Icelandic Grammarians

The Icelandic grammarians of the Middle Ages long remained forgotten and were even more obscure than were the Danish modists. First, there is no indication that the Icelandic grammarians were ever known outside Iceland or had any influence on any linguists other than their own Icelandic colleagues. To some extent the Icelandic linguists can be compared to their medieval colleagues in Ireland and Provence, but the Icelandic scholars were more isolated. Both in Ireland and Provence, the indigenous grammarians, who were mainly poets, wrote grammatical studies as handbooks for fellow poets, who were important and influential in both countries.

In modern linguistic historiography, however, the medieval Icelandic grammarians have received much more attention than their Irish and Provençal colleagues. This is because their studies and methods were similar to the methods of modern linguistics, especially to structural phonology. The historiographic interest in the Icelandic grammarians bears an element of *chasse aux prédécesseurs*, and accordingly an objective evaluation and description is more difficult than it is in many other cases (cf. Ulvestad 1976, Benediktsson 1972:33-107). Since they had no followers, no influence, and rather uncertain predecessors, we are left with an analysis *in vacuo*, where our own present is a dangerously tempting frame of comparison.

The *First Grammatical Treatise*, written around the year 1150 is, in general terms, an attempt to construct a phonemic Icelandic orthography (cf. Haugen 1950, 1972, Benediktsson 1972, Albano Leoni 1975). It is justified, although unhistorical, to call this treatise phonemic, because the author explicitly bases his analysis on the principle of phonological oppositions and use of the minimal pair test:

Now I shall place these eight letters — since no distinction has yet been made for the *i* — between the same two consonants, each in its turn, and show and give examples how each of them, with the support of the same letters (and) placed in the same position, one after another, makes a discourse of its own, and in this way give examples, throughout this booklet, of the most delicate distinctions that are made between the letters: sar, so***r, ser _ s_r, sor _ sør, sur _ syr. (Benediktsson 1972:215-217)

The anonymous author was a scholar with a good knowledge of Latin grammarians (including Priscian), and a very good ear (Holtmark 1936, Benediktsson 1972).

But however interesting and sensible this work is from the point of view of twentieth century phonology, it had no theoretical or practical impact outside Iceland. This treatise has, however, influenced Icelandic orthography, especially concerning the use of double consonants, and it was a source of inspiration for several eighteenth century Icelandic scholars (3.4.4.).

The *Second Grammatical Treatise* has received much less attention (cf. however Raschellà 1982 and Braunmüller 1984), probably because it is more difficult to interpret. Based to a lesser extent than the *First Grammatical Treatise* on the classical Latin tradition, the *Second Grammatical Treatise* “presents a classification of letters which lacks any parallel whatsoever in the grammatical literature presently known and employs a technical vocabulary that seems to derive for the most part from an old indigenous tradition” (Raschellà 1982:3).

While the *First Grammatical Treatise* was an attempt to reform Icelandic orthography, the *Second Grammatical Treatise* included and accepted the traditional orthography, but tried to provide rules for it, focusing on the combination of letters and their distribution in the word, thereby presenting a phonotactic analysis of Icelandic. This analysis is shown in figures 1 and 2 below.

Figure 1.

Figure 2.

The first figure is explained as follows:

In the first circle, there are four letters (*stafr*): they can be of no other use than to stand before other letters: *q, v, þ, h*.

In the second circle, there are twelve letters, which are called consonants (*málstafr*). Each of these can stand both before and after [other letters] in discourse (*mál*), but none constitutes [a piece of] discourse by itself: *b, d, f, g, k, l, m, n, p, r, s, t*; their names are given here according to their sound.

In the third circle, there are twelve letters, which are called vowels (*hljóðstafr*). The [internal] distinction of these letters is the following. The first are called [simple] letters and must be written thus: *a, e, i, o, u, y*. The second kind is called ligatures (*límingr*) and must be written as *ae, ao, au*. These are three; here two vowels are linked together, because each of these letters has every part of the sound of those [letters] it is made of. The third kind is called digraphs (*lausaklofi*) and must be written thus: *ei, ey*. These two letters are written unchanged in each part and made into one [letter], because this [letter] takes the sound of both [the letters it is made of]; but in writing it is impractical to bind those letters together.

Now there is still the twelfth letter, which is called variable; that is *i*. It is a real vowel if a consonant stands before and after it in the syllable (*samstafa*); but if a vowel stands immediately after it, it turns into a consonant. (Raschellà 1982:59-63)

Phonology is the only topic of the first two treatises. The *Third Grammatical Treatise* (Ólsen 1884:1-119, Krömmelbein 1997) is based primarily on Donat and classical commentaries on Donat, concentrating on phonology and especially on poetic language and normative stylistics. The phonological section draws heavily on Priscian and is quite elaborate, also taking the runic script into account. This is the only treatise of which we know the author, Ólafur Þórðarson, a famous poet and the nephew of Snorri Sturlason. Ólafur proposed Icelandic names for grammatical terms, and some of his proposals are still in use. The *Fourth Grammatical Treatise* (Ólsen 1884:120-151) is a study of poetics.

The Icelandic scholars seem to have been rather uninterested in writing a grammar of their own language. For example, it is significant that the *Third Grammatical Treatise* does not treat syntax. Morphology was reduced to a few lines of a very general nature, and no attempts were made to analyze the morphological patterns of Icelandic.

2.4. Conclusion

Both the medieval Danish modists and the Icelandic grammarians were among the best European linguists in their day. The Danish modists were also influential in medieval European language philosophy. Yet none of these groups significantly influenced the field of linguistics after 1500, neither in the Nordic countries nor elsewhere in Europe. The grammars of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries contain some basic features of modistic thought, but these features came from later versions of the theory and not from the Danish scholars themselves.

Chapter 3

Nordic Linguistics 1500 - 1800

“... *im ersten Anfange der Welt, im Paradeis ...*”¹³ —

3.1. Introduction

The time around the year 1500 represents a period of major changes in Europe, and some of these changes had a profound impact on scholarly life, including linguistics. Among the most important of these changes are:

- (1) the rise of the nation states,
- (2) the European colonization of parts of America, Asia, and Africa,
- (3) the rise of new varieties of Christianity,
- (4) the invention of printing,
- (5) the breakdown of the scholastic paradigm and the gradual rise of the natural sciences,
- (6) the standardization of the vernaculars.

These changes had both direct and indirect consequences for the study of language. Geographically, their impact was first felt in Southern and Central Europe, but as social, economical and political conditions gradually became ripe in the North, they also played a significant role in influencing the development of language studies in the Nordic countries.

First, in most countries the vernaculars were gradually becoming established as written languages and languages of instruction in the primary schools. Books were printed in the vernaculars, and in Protestant countries the Bible was translated into the vernaculars.

Second, the recognition that there were numerous and partly very different languages in the world became part of the general knowledge among intellectuals and presented new tasks for scholars seeking to explain the origin and diversity of languages. Surveys and attempts at the classification of such languages appeared, as did multilingual grammars and dictionaries.

Third, knowledge of Greek and Hebrew became widespread among scholars, and, in addition to Latin, Greek and Hebrew became obligatory languages in schools. The introduction of Greek and Hebrew in curriculums was due to the importance that the Protestants attributed to the original version of the Bible and the two primary biblical languages, as well as to the humanistic focus on the study of the culture, literature, and languages of antiquity. The teaching of Latin in schools also changed, now being based on the classical Latin language and classical authors.

In 1500, the Nordic countries were on the outskirts of European civilization, much more so than in the Middle Ages. For most Nordic countries, the sixteenth century marks a transition period that is more abrupt and clear than in most other European countries where there is a strong continuity with the

¹³ “... in the very beginning of the world, in paradise...” (Kempe 1688, Title page).

past, culturally, politically, and especially scholarly.

Politically, the sixteenth century represents a significant change in the Nordic countries. Norway lost the last vestiges of its independence, and, with the introduction of the Lutheran church, the last foothold of the Old Norwegian language was lost. Beginning in 1537, Norway and its former colonies, Iceland, Greenland, and the Faroe Islands, had Danish as their official and written language, with no national centers of learning such as universities. Sweden, on the other hand, following years of internal and external struggle and unions with Norway and Denmark, emerged as a new strong nation state, which quickly assumed an important position on the European scene, both politically and militarily. Finland had already come under Swedish rule in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries and became even more a part of Sweden in the centuries to follow, with Swedish as its official literary language. In the period from 1550 to 1800, written Finnish was mostly used alongside Swedish in religious, judicial, and administrative texts, but on the whole the use of Swedish prevailed.

The rise of the new Danish and Swedish nation states in the 1500s was accompanied by a sense of nationalism, which often revealed itself as a mixture of anti-foreign attitudes and national patriotism. In Denmark, for example, efforts to establish, cultivate, and codify a national language were based on external inspiration, but certain aspects of this same national-patriotic movement, like cleansing Danish of foreign loans, came from growing anti-German sentiments in the latter half of the century.

Both in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, the intellectual climate in the Nordic countries conformed to orthodox religious views. Scholarly research had to be carried out within the limits tolerated by the church and the framework dictated by the Bible. Since the orthodox position was that the creation of the world was not very distant, approximately 6,000 years back in time, any historical explanation of historical development, be it in zoology or linguistics, had to accept this very short time span as a given frame of reference. To overstep this assumption about creation would be heresy, with fatal consequences for the scholar in question. Furthermore, a number of important problems had already been solved in the Bible and were thus not topics for further research, for example the origin of language (*Genesis* 1.5, 2.19-20) as well as the reason for the multitude of existing languages (*Genesis* 11.1-9). What remained for the scholar to investigate in this field were minor topics such as determining which language the angels spoke, how many languages existed after the confusion of Babel, the search for Hebrew words in various languages, etc.

In the eighteenth century, the Enlightenment came late to the Nordic countries and exerted considerable influence on Swedish research, especially within the natural sciences (cf. Carl Linné, Anders Celsius and others). In Denmark-Norway, where connections to France were few and far between, this influence was less prominent, though visible, for example, in the works of Jens Pedersen Høysgaard (3.4.3.1.) around the middle of the century, after the turn of the century in N. Lang Nissen's translation of Silvestre de Sacy's popular Port Royal grammar (4.3.), and in Rasmus Rask's descriptive studies (4.4.1.). For the most part, however, the Enlightenment and the discourse of rationalism in the Nordic countries was repressed by the more dominating discourse of romanticism.

3.2. Universities, Academies, and Schools

In the Middle Ages, the universities were the main centers of learning and the place where most language-related research was conducted. This was also the situation from 1800 on. But in the period from 1500 to 1800, the situation was different. Those who wrote grammars, dictionaries, and diachronic studies of languages were often teachers, clergymen, vicars, bishops, administrators, and officers with professions outside the universities. Furthermore, other institutions like Sorø Academy (*Sorø Akademi*, a school for children of the nobility) in Denmark, the Royal Swedish Academy of Sciences (*Kungliga Svenska Vetenskapsakademien*), and the Swedish Academy (*Svenska Akademien*) in Sweden, played a significant role in the study of languages and the development of linguistics, especially from the eighteenth century onwards.

The universities were highly conservative during the period of orthodoxy, especially during the

seventeenth and much of the eighteenth century. The main task of the professors in those days was to educate obedient clerical and civil servants rather than to do original research. At the Nordic universities in this period, as at most other European universities, there were normally three professorships in languages: one in Latin, one in Greek, and one in Oriental languages (mainly Hebrew, but also Aramaic, Chaldean, Syrian, and Arabic). But at many universities in the Nordic countries (e.g. Lund, Turku/Åbo, and Tartu/Dorpat) there were only two professorships: one in Latin and one in Greek and Oriental languages. The professorship in Latin focused mainly on rhetoric and literature, since the students were already fluent in Latin and thus did not have to be taught Latin grammar. The professors of Greek and Oriental languages were above all expected to interpret the Bible and to teach Hebrew grammar. In principle, the professor was also expected to teach other Semitic languages, but not all professors were capable of doing so. Occasionally separate temporary professorships were established in Latin, Greek, or Hebrew.

The professorship in Oriental languages was usually a stepping stone on the way to a professorship in theology, which for obvious economic reasons, in turn, was another stepping stone to a position as bishop or pastor. Moreover, many scholars came to a professorship in languages from a professorship in medicine, mathematics, or law. Accordingly, a professorship in many cases did not necessarily imply a great interest for, nor scholarly competence in the field. Well into the nineteenth century, a short dissertation of only a few pages, seldom of a higher standard than a seminar paper today, was sufficient to qualify for a professorship.

An interesting feature of the seventeenth and especially the eighteenth century is the use of foreigners, so-called language masters, to teach primarily French, but also to offer instruction in Italian, Spanish, and later German and English. Many of these teachers were prolific writers of textbooks and elementary grammars. These language masters frequently had no salary, or did not get one even if they had been promised one. This forced them to be mobile. The story of the French-Italian language master Antonio Papi (1659-1740) is representative. We know nothing of his early life, but of his later years we have the following account:

[I]n 1683 he had settled down in Stockholm where he came into contact with certain noble families who used him as a teacher of languages and composer of eulogies. In 1692 he was appointed as a teacher of Italian at Uppsala University, but for obscure reasons he was compelled to leave his post two years later, and was sent to Turku. There he remained eleven years, but several times had leaves of absence and stayed in Stockholm, from 1701 teaching the Royal princesses Italian and French. Papi's salary was paid very irregularly, if at all, and in 1705 he resigned and was appointed as the teacher of French in Uppsala. (Aalto 1987:7)

During this period, Denmark, including Norway and its former provinces, had only one university, the University of Copenhagen. It was founded in 1479, but ceased functioning temporarily around the year 1530 and was reopened with a new constitution in 1537. The structure of the university from 1537 included one professorship in each of the three holy languages: Greek, Hebrew, and Latin. In Latin, there were actually three positions, since there were also two instructors in Latin grammar.

In 1669, the university established a professorship in French, Spanish, and Italian, or at least these were the languages taught by its first holder. Subsequent holders of this position had various specialties and diverse academic backgrounds, and at one point (1732) the professorship was defined as a post in geography and French with at least one of its holders probably also teaching German.

In the period from 1773 to 1866, the German town Kiel belonged to Denmark. But although formally Danish, Kiel never lost its close connections with Germany, and its Christian-Albrechts University, established in 1665, never became a truly Danish university. In all respects, this university remained German, and it eventually became a center for German local nationalism in Schleswig-Holstein.

Within the territory under Swedish political control, five universities were established in this period. In chronological order they are: Uppsala, Tartu/Dorpat, Greifswald, Turku/Åbo, and Lund.

Uppsala University was founded in 1477, but received only sporadic support from the kings, and in several cases it was closed for long periods of time. Not until Gustav II Adolf proclaimed an edict in 1621 did the University acquire a stable economic and legal basis as well as an acceptable number of

faculties (4) and professors (17). The university established a professorship in Greek and Hebrew in 1606, a separate post in Greek in 1624, a professorship in French in 1637 (the first Nordic professorship in modern languages), and one in German in 1694. It is interesting to note that the first professorships in modern languages were in foreign languages and not in the vernacular.

The University of Tartu/Dorpat in present-day Estonia was founded by Gustav II Adolf in 1632 and was given the same privileges as the University of Uppsala (cf. J. Bergman 1932, Engelhardt 1933, Rauch 1943). Gustav II Adolf's main motivation for founding the new universities in Tartu and Turku/Åbo was to strengthen the ties between center and periphery as part of the process of tightening Sweden's central administration. Thus it was more a question of power politics and a need for schooling loyal civil servants than a genuine concern for the dissemination of knowledge and education. Only one language professor in Tartu covered the instruction of Oriental languages and Greek. Emphasis was on Hebrew, which also included post-Biblical texts. At the beginning of the eighteenth century, teachers in French and Italian were hired. Initially, most of the professors were German, whereas the students were Swedish and Finnish. In 1656, the Russians invaded Tartu, and the University of Tartu was closed. When it reopened in 1690, the University of Tartu was then a Swedish university, and remained so until 1710. From 1700 to 1710 the University was relocated in Pärnu. In this last period, most of the professors were Swedish, whereas the students were primarily German.

The University in Greifswald (cf. Seth 1952) was a Swedish university from 1638 to 1711 and was well supported by the Swedish government, which also paid the salaries of the professors. In comparison with the University in Tartu/Dorpat, which had good connections with both Uppsala and Turku/Åbo and had a certain amount of influence on linguistic studies in the Nordic countries, the University of Greifswald had no such impact.

The Academy of Turku/Åbo¹⁴ was founded in 1640 as Finland's first university. As an example of the structure of a Nordic university at that time, the Academy had eleven professors: three in theology (among them, as Primarius, Æschillus Peträus, the author of the first preserved Finnish grammar, cf. 3.4.3.2.), one in mathematics, one in physics and botany, one in law, one in medicine and anatomy, one in history, one in logic and poetry, and two in language: one in eloquence (i.e. Latin) and one in Hebrew and Greek. A language master of French was appointed in 1670 and a master of German in 1706. Of the eleven professors appointed, more than half were school teachers who were given a promotion. The professor of eloquence, Johannes Elai Terserus, had no formal degree, although he had studied in several different countries, cf. Klinge et al. (1987:75-79).

Lund University was founded in 1668. Instruction in French began in 1668, German language teaching began in 1735, and English education was initiated in 1748. In addition, Turkish was included in the languages expected to be taught by the professor of Oriental languages in the early 1800s.

Just as during the Middle Ages, it was not uncommon for students to study abroad, for example at another Nordic university. Thus, there were several students from Småland in south-east Sweden studying at the Åbo Akademi in the seventeenth century. It was easier to sail from Kalmar to Turku/Åbo than to walk from Kalmar to Uppsala.

Most of the research carried out at the universities in this period was published in the form of dissertations, of which there are many hundreds dealing with linguistic and philological subjects. Most of these dissertations were quite short, averaging about 20 printed pages. To obtain a master's degree, the candidate had to defend a dissertation or, more precisely, some theses put forward in the dissertation.

Frequently these theses had very little to do with the rest of the dissertation, but were of a general philosophical or theological character. In practice, it was unusual for the candidate to write the dissertation himself. It was often written by the student's professor, who was also in charge of the public defense. At that time, it was the duty of a professor to write one or two dissertations a year, but many did not comply with this demand. For this reason, it is often difficult or even impossible to determine the

¹⁴ After Turku/Åbo had been destroyed by a fire in 1827, the Academy was moved to Helsinki and reestablished as the "Imperial Alexander's University of Finland" (cf. 4.2.). Present-day Åbo Akademi (Åbo Akademi University) was founded in 1918 as a Swedish-speaking university. The present-day University of Turku (*Turun yliopisto*) was founded in 1920 as a Finnish-speaking university. Cf. 5.2.1.

real authorship of a dissertation.

Dissertations produced during this era are for the most part unoriginal, as they sometimes consisted of no more than a summary of one or two other books, occasionally appearing without indicating the sources. As trivial as they are in themselves, these dissertations do provide an indication of the topics that were considered interesting and important in academic life at that time. The following are some examples of the titles of Danish dissertations on topics which today would be placed under the heading of general linguistics:

About the causes of the diversity of languages / *De cavsis diversitatis lingvarum* (Borrichius 1675 - 34 pages)

About the life and death of languages / *De vita et morte lingvarum* (Pihl 1748 - 8 pages)

About the use and necessity of grammar / *De grammatices utilitate et necessitate* (Lindegaard 1759 - 8 pages)

About the possibility for a universal language / *De linguae universalis possibilitate* (Örsted 1753 - 17 pages)

From the middle of the eighteenth century, scientific academies began to play a role in scholarly life in the Nordic countries, about 50-100 years after such academies had been founded in France (1635),¹⁵ England (1662), and Germany (1700).

In Denmark-Norway, the Royal Danish Academy of Sciences (*Det kongelige danske videnskabernes Selskab*) was founded in Copenhagen in 1742, and the Royal Norwegian Society of Sciences and Letters (*Det Kongelige Norske Videnskabers Selskab*) was established in Trondheim in 1760.

In Sweden, both the Royal Swedish Academy of Sciences (*Kungliga Svenska Vetenskapsakademien*), founded in 1739, and the Swedish Academy (*Svenska Akademien*), founded in 1786, played a role in the study of Swedish and the development of linguistics in Sweden. The Royal Swedish Academy of Sciences promoted the use of Swedish in scientific publications, and two of its members, Abraham Sahlstedt (3.4.4.2.) and Anders af Botin (3.4.3.5.), wrote grammars of the Swedish language. The Royal Academy of Letters, History, and Antiquities (*Kung. Vitterhets Historie och Antikvitets Akademien*), founded in 1753/1786 (3.4.1.6.), had little influence on linguistic studies during this time except by way of its interest in old manuscripts and runic inscriptions.

In Finland, the Aurora Society (*Aurorasällskapet*) was founded in 1770 by H. G. Porthan and several of his colleagues in Turku/Åbo. One of the goals of the Aurora Society was to promote the advancement of the study of Finnish and the history of Finland. In 1771, the Society established the ideologically oriented newspaper, *News Edited by a Society in Turku/Åbo* (*Tidningar Utgifne af et Sällskap i Åbo*), which published poetry and articles on history, folklore, and language. In that same year, for example, Porthan informed about János Sajnovics's (1735-1785) demonstration from the previous year of the affinity of Hungarian and Sámi. The activities of the Aurora Society came to an end, however, in 1779, marking the end of scientific societies in Finland until new societies were established around the year 1830.

With the Reformation, the responsibility of education was transferred from the Church to the State, and although the Latin schools increased in number and enjoyed great popularity in the last years prior to the Reformation, these schools soon became less popular with the nobility, since they no longer served to pave the way to higher positions in society. With the rise of the middle class during the eighteenth century, practical knowledge and a command of the vernacular became significant factors in establishing and consolidating social position, and as a result, many of the Latin schools became vernacular schools, particularly in the smaller towns, first unofficially and later in name as well. In Denmark, 38 of the existing 58 Latin schools were abolished by law in 1739 and were replaced with Danish schools, which were also called Christian schools. In the Latin schools that remained, religion as well as the three holy languages, Latin, Greek, and Hebrew, were still taught, but knowledge of arithmetic, geography, history (Biblical, Danish, and World History), logic, and philosophy was also required, being taught for the most part in the vernacular using vernacular textbooks.

When discussing popular education, it is necessary to distinguish between rural areas and the

¹⁵ The *Académie des inscriptions et belles-lettres* covering philology and history was founded in 1663 and the *Académie des sciences* in 1666.

larger towns. The majority of the population was comprised of farmers, inhabiting various regions throughout the country, where, for a long time, there was little instruction beyond a single lesson a week in the recitation of the Catechism. Gradually, reading was added to this instruction, at least during a few winter months when children were not needed to work in the fields. Since popular education had a primarily religious basis, subjects like mathematics and writing were seldom taught, and if they were, a fee was charged. Although numerous laws were passed concerning more widespread education of the general population, for economic reasons few of these had practical consequences.

The schools that existed in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries were slow in changing throughout the Nordic countries. For example, the Swedish school ordinance of 1571 stipulated only three obligatory subjects, Latin, religion, and singing. In practice, the basic educational goal was still proficiency in written and spoken Latin. Queen Kristina's school ordinance of 1649 introduced Swedish as the language of instruction in the lower grades. The ordinance from 1724 relegated spoken Latin to the higher grades. Parts of this tradition survived in Finland, for example, until the mid-nineteenth century, when Latin was abolished as a language of instruction in the schools (Pekkanen 1975:289-292).

3.3. Latin, Greek, and Hebrew

3.3.1. Latin

Latin, the sole academic language of the Middle Ages, also maintained its position after the Renaissance as the dominant language in the schools and as the international language of scholarship. Nevertheless, renewed focus on classical Latin and new pedagogical approaches to language teaching necessitated new or revised textbooks for the teaching of Latin. Even prior to 1500, some European textbooks of Latin grammar were printed and published in Copenhagen and Stockholm. These publications were then adapted to a certain degree to accommodate the local situation, for example by including a few Danish words and place names and by arguing that the treatment of metrics in the grammar was a necessary prerequisite for reading Saxo Grammaticus.

The dominating elementary textbooks in Latin all over the Nordic countries in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries were called *Donat*, named after the most popular elementary Latin grammar of Antiquity and the Middle Ages — *Ars minor* (The Minor Grammar) by Aelius Donatus (fourth century AD) — cf. Hovdhaugen (1982c:88-90) and S. Pétursson (1996). Most of these Donats were merely a collection of elementary paradigms and had little to do with the real Donat, (cf. for example Adolphus Elai Terserus 1640b). On a more advanced level, one of Philipp Melanchthon's (1497-1560) grammars, or a local adoption of one of them, was used (cf. K. Jensen 1982:107-108). Melanchthon wrote a grammar, originally published as two separate volumes: a morphology, published as *Grammatica Latina* in 1525, and a syntax, first published in 1526. Many grammars with only a vague resemblance to Melanchthon's original were published later under his name, cf. K. Jensen (1988:514). There were several reprints of his grammar or of grammars based on *Grammatica Latina* in the Nordic countries, cf. S. Pétursson (1996) for a survey of the study of Latin grammar in Iceland. Melanchthon's grammars were traditional and did not deviate markedly from the Medieval tradition of philosophical grammar.

In the eighteenth century, other well-known European grammars of Latin were reprinted in the Nordic countries, especially in Sweden where Melanchthon's grammars were not used as frequently. The number of Latin grammars published by Nordic scholars in this period is very high. Most of these were elementary and stereotypic, based entirely on earlier grammars. A few of the earlier grammars, however, warrant mention.

Billius's grammar from 1579, for instance, was the first Latin grammar written in Sweden by a Swede. This short grammar of 116 pages was well organized and clear. It was entirely in Latin, and had no obvious source. Independent of the Melanchthon tradition, Billius's grammar was more similar to classical grammars such as Donat's, though superior to the latter in its clear formulation of rules and language structure as well as in its many illustrative paradigms. This study of Latin is probably the best

elementary grammar of Latin written in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries in the Nordic countries.

In Iceland, an anonymous compilation grammar, which was clearly influenced in its methodology by the ideas put forth by the French philosopher Petrus Ramus (1515-1572), was printed in 1616 (Anon. 1616). The author, or rather compiler, may have been the well-known humanist scholar Arngrímur Jónsson (1569-1648). Besides Ramus, the author of this grammar also drew on Melanchthon, cf. S. Pétursson (1996).

The first two short Latin grammars which partly used Danish as a medium of instruction were published in 1623 and 1624 by Jens Dinesen Jersin (Janus Dionysius Jersinus, 1588-1634). In Finland and Sweden, Latin grammars were not written in the native languages until somewhat later. An Icelandic version of Jersin (1623) appeared in 1734.

Jersin was an influential person. In 1617, after completing his studies in Germany, he became a tutor for the king's son, Christian Ulrik Gyldenløve, and he was generally privileged in having good relations with the king. In 1619, Jersin became professor of metaphysics, which was a newly-established professorship, and he eventually became bishop in Ribe in 1629, cf. Gjellerup (1868-1870). Jersin's grammars were written in Latin, with most of the definitions provided in Danish and with the examples translated into Danish. In the preface to his grammar of 1624, Jersin noted that having an explanation of cases, for example, in Danish would make it easier for the pupils to learn Latin and would remove some of the pressure this difficult task placed on their tender souls.

Jersin's books were rightly considered unorthodox and innovative, mainly because they placed pedagogical considerations above the logical structuring of the grammar. For a while Jersin's works competed with other similar and more traditional grammars which followed the pattern of Melanchthon's grammar more closely, cf. K. Jensen (1982:131-142) and Povl J. Jensen (1992:134-139), but finally Jersin's books as well as compendia and revised versions based on his works came to be the dominant texts used in teaching in Denmark and Norway on both the elementary (Jersin 1623) and the more advanced levels (Jersin 1624).

As examples of Jersin's way of writing grammar, we can take his definitions of the noun and the verb (based on Melanchthon) and of the accusative:

You call a word a noun when you can put *een* [indefinite article, common gender] or *eet* [indefinite article, neuter gender] before it in Danish as e.g. *deus En Gud* ['a god']. You call a word a verb when it signifies to do or to be done as *I/thou/he/we/you* or *they do or are done*. (Jersin 1623:A1)

What one does something with is put in the accusative as e.g. *One beats him, one loves him etc. I beat the dog*. (Jersin 1623:A1)

The revised versions of Jersin's grammars had one thing in common: the use of Danish was reduced to a minimum. But with the educational reform of 1739, it was decided that textbooks, including Latin and Greek grammars, should be written in Danish. The first grammars published were of mixed quality, and not until the publication of J. Baden's (3.4.3.1.) *Grammatica Latina* (1782) did Danish children have access to a good grammar of Latin in their mother tongue. This grammar was also the first to treat Latin syntax systematically and extensively. The author admitted that his grammar was based for the most part on earlier grammars and that his contribution was primarily pedagogical.

Baden's introduction was interesting because he was clear in expressing the purpose of his grammar. Stressing the importance of Latin grammar for developing the pupils's ability for abstract thinking and logic, he also emphasized the usefulness of Latin grammar for insight into the grammar of one's native language:

... because the rules through which human beings arrange and combine their ideas are the same in all languages. (J. Baden 1782: Preface)

Baden did not, however, extend the systematic approach found in the sections on morphology and syntax to the section on phonology. Here, Baden's lack of insight into the diachronic aspects of

language led him to make misleading statements such as the following:

In the pronunciation the Romans have probably frequently made errors concerning the vowels and e.g. pronounced a as e, or e as I, o, u, etc. thereby having feci from facio; egi from ago; adimo, colligo, from emo, lego; vertex and vortex, faciendum and faciundum. Similarly we pronounce: Menneske and Menniske [human being], pønter and pynter [decorates], tong and tung [heavy] etc. (J. Baden 1782:3)

In Sweden, Adolphus Elai Terserus's Latin grammar (1640a) was an attempt to be original and innovative in the teaching of Latin. This grammar was written in Latin, but made extensive use of Swedish in translating examples. Terserus's work consisted of a set of obscurely ordered rules and attempted to distinguish between general rules and minor rules dealing with exceptions. The main difference between this grammar and others was that there are no paradigms. Instead, the paradigm approach was replaced by one that derived one form from another by means of rules, as in Priscian's grammar.

The opposite pedagogical approach to Terserus's grammar is found in Helsingius's grammar (1670), which began with an extensive collection of paradigms with Swedish translations and then provided general rules for the inflection and ordering of the data.

The linguistically most interesting of all the Latin grammars of this period was published in Finland by Bartholdus Rajalen in 1683 (cf. also 3.5.). Written in Latin, it was a condensed and formalized grammar with abstract rules and formalization of the morphology where the inflectional morphemes were always separated from the stem. The paradigms in this grammar often consisted solely of inflectional morphemes.

The most eccentric Latin grammar from this period was Nils Tiällman (1679), written by the author of one of the first Swedish grammars (3.4.3.5.). In the preface, Tiällman stressed the need for a short grammar with declensions and paradigms without the endless rules that only discourage the pupils. He then began with four pages containing lists of Swedish monosyllabic rhyming words without explaining their place in an elementary Latin grammar. The grammar, written in a mixture of Swedish and Latin, contained twenty-six dense pages with short rules, a few paradigms and lists in hexameters of nouns of various inflectional patterns and gender. Finally, Tiällman added six pages on prosody in Latin, followed by twelve pages on poetry in Swedish, with examples from both Latin and Swedish.

3.3.2. Greek

In contrast to Latin, the Greek language had no Nordic medieval grammar tradition to rely upon. Initially, foreign textbooks were used. The elementary grammars of Greek in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries focused on pronunciation and morphology. In these works, the morphology was usually described by means of paradigms containing isolated inflectional morphemes that were often arranged in an abstract way, but this practice hardly could have been founded on sound pedagogical principles. There are also indications that the number of pupils attaining any degree of fluency in Greek was low, and that the linguistic competence of the teachers and professors was questionable.

In Denmark, a number of studies exist on Greek pronunciation and metrics, some dating back to the seventeenth century, for example Johannes Alanus (1623). The first Greek grammar in Danish was written by Munthe in 1744. It was an extensive, although not very original work, as the author himself admitted. In this grammar, syntax was still treated only marginally compared with what we find in Latin grammars of the same period. Jacob Baden, a contemporary of Munthe, who published both an extensive Latin grammar and a Danish grammar, also wrote an elementary, pedagogical, and systematic Greek grammar (1764) in which he attempted to avoid the use of a complicated metalanguage on the elementary level.

The most widely used Greek grammar in Finland and Sweden was Gezelius's grammar which was published in 1647. It was to be reprinted more than twenty times during the following 150 years.

The author, Johannes Georgii [Göransson] Gezelius, known as Gezelius the Elder, was born in Västmanland in 1615. He studied in Tartu/Dorpat. In 1642, he became professor of Greek and Oriental

languages there, but returned to Sweden in 1649. Gezelius became bishop in 1664 in Turku/Åbo. In addition to his Greek and Latin grammars, Gezelius also published elementary grammars of Hebrew and German.

The Greek grammar by Gezelius was very concise, which perhaps was the main reason for its popularity, and focused only on Biblical Greek, a subject in which the priests had to be educated. This grammar consists mainly of paradigms of inflectional morphemes. Gezelius mentions that there is a dual in Greek, but does not include it in the paradigms. His explanations are often superficial:

It is better to get the meaning of middle verb forms from the use of authors than from the teachers. (Gezelius 1647:A5)

In the revised edition published in Skara (Gezelius 1744), full paradigms are introduced into the grammar. Gezelius also published a Greek-Latin dictionary in 1649. Furthermore, he took part in the debates concerning how the Swedish Bible translation should be undertaken, advocating a literal mode of translation.

3.3.3. Hebrew

Beginning in the late sixteenth century, Hebrew was as important a language as Greek at the universities. Hebrew was not introduced as a mandatory subject in the high schools, however, until the seventeenth century, and in Denmark-Norway it was not part of the high school curriculums until after 1621. At first grammars that had been written abroad were used, cf. Garstein (1953:133-144). But during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, numerous Hebrew grammars and textbooks as well as minor studies on Hebrew phonology and morphology were published by Nordic scholars. The first such publication was Aslakssøn's grammar that appeared in 1606. Cort Aslakssøn [Cunradus Aslacus Bergensis] (1564-1624), born in Bergen, studied Semitic languages with the most prominent scholars in Europe. He was influenced by Petrus Ramus, worked together with Tyge Brahe and published studies on astronomy. Aslakssøn was professor of Greek in Copenhagen from 1602 to 1607, cf. Garstein (1953). Aslakssøn's grammar (1606) is a pedagogical and independent work based on his extensive knowledge of Hebrew.

The publications in the Nordic countries at that time provide little more than reflections of what was going on in Hebrew studies elsewhere in Europe, where there was both the tradition of Hebrew grammar and also, since the Renaissance, a Latin-based tradition in which Hebrew was described according to the structure of Latin, cf. Kessler-Mesguich (1992). Both approaches are found in the Nordic countries, and sometimes these approaches are even mixed. It is significant that in 1627, two Hebrew grammars were published in Copenhagen, one (Trostitius 1627) following the Hebrew tradition, while the other (M. Petræus 1627) followed the Latin tradition.

The most important linguistic contribution to Hebrew studies in this period was Paulinus's *Grammatica hebræa* (1692). Simon Paulinus (1652-1691), professor of Hebrew and Greek in Turku/Åbo, adhered to the conservative view that Hebrew was the first and original language. His extensive Hebrew grammar (541 pages + index, texts, errata, etc.) is based on the structure of Latin grammar. But Latin categories were not forced onto Hebrew, so that the grammar represented a reasonable and independent compromise between the two traditions. Paulinus's analysis was very data-oriented, with each example drawn from the Bible, replete with details, and synchronic (with no references to other languages). The grammar focused on morphology, but also contained a short syntax.

Paulinus was also an outstanding teacher. He lectured daily on Hebrew and Greek, and his lectures were regularly attended by about sixty students. Such popularity was rarely enjoyed by Professors in Turku/Åbo until H. G. Porthan taught a century later, cf. Klinge et al. (1987:609-610).

Scattered studies also exist that deal with other Semitic languages such as Syrian, Aramaic, and Arabic. Written by professors of theology or Oriental languages, as well as by bishops, many of these studies can be classified as theological philology.

Nordic scholars who were interested in Semitic studies beyond Hebrew traveled to various universities in Europe. But their job possibilities were few, and they had problems financing their travel, since there seemed to be little practical need for studies of Syrian, Arabic, etc. In fact, the Danish-

Norwegian King Christian IV strongly opposed providing scholarships for people to “visit foreign countries and to learn various languages that are useless for the work of a preacher” (Løkkegaard 1992:487), and in 1646, the professorship in Oriental philology in Copenhagen was abolished because there was no benefit to be gained from teaching Syrian and Arabic.

Several important scholars and travelers of the late eighteenth century increased the prestige of and interest in Oriental studies in the Nordic countries. The most famous of these is probably the Dane Carsten Niebuhr (1733-1815), who led an expedition to Arabia in 1761 by order of the king.

In Sweden, Carl Aurivillius (1717-1786) became professor of Oriental languages at the University of Uppsala in 1772. He was one of the leading orientologists of his time in Europe, and in addition to carrying out extensive studies of Hebrew, Arabic, and Turkish, he also acted as an official translator in these languages. Furthermore, he had good knowledge of Georgian, which was unique at that time, and he even translated a Georgian manuscript for Queen Lovisa Ulrika.

In Iceland, conditions were very poor for the study of the more exotic languages, given the absence of a university and any real academic environment, even at the cathedral schools. Some Icelanders studied Hebrew and Greek in Copenhagen and made a career in Denmark. One scholar working in Iceland, however, was the Rev. Páll Björnsson (1621-1706) in Selárdalur. He had been a pupil of Ole Worm, was knowledgeable in Greek and Hebrew and a student of Arabic, Akkadian, and Syrian. In addition to a heavily annotated translation of the Greek New Testament, Björnsson translated four books of the Old Testament from Hebrew, accompanied by extensive commentaries on difficult words, and he also wrote a treatise on accent in Hebrew. None of this has been published, however, and thus still awaits investigation.

3.4. The Languages of the Nordic Countries

3.4.1. The Status of the Vernaculars

With the exception of Iceland (2.3.), interest in the study and cultivation of the vernaculars came relatively late to the Nordic countries. Major prerequisites for such studies were some sort of unity in the existing vernacular writing traditions as well as a sense of the worth and importance of the vernacular. Whereas the Icelanders of the twelfth century had inherited a rich literature from their Nordic ancestors and were themselves about to embark on a native literary tradition unparalleled in the rest of Europe, the remaining Nordic vernaculars did not yet occupy such a position of prestige. Nordic vernaculars thus did not prove to be ripe enough for cultivation until at a much later date.

Native writing traditions were, of course, in existence in the Nordic countries throughout the Middle Ages, but a genuine interest in investigating these traditions from a descriptive and normative point of view first arose as a part of the Renaissance, when there was a renewed interest in things native and a growing awareness of the excellency of individuality and local traditions. This early “nationalist” movement, which spread from Italy to France, Germany, and Holland and eventually to the Nordic countries, provided the motivation for a more widespread use of the vernaculars, and in turn for the first serious studies of the native tongues of the North.

The Bible translations and other prestigious printed texts such as law codifications established a number of tentative written language standards in the Nordic countries, especially for Danish, Icelandic, Finnish, and Swedish.

Bible translations:

Danish:	New Testament 1524, the entire Bible 1550
Finnish:	New Testament 1548, the entire Bible 1640
Icelandic:	New Testament 1540, the entire Bible 1584
Swedish:	New Testament 1526, Old Testament 1541

Many other vernaculars spoken in the Nordic countries did not take this leap in the sixteenth century and therefore remained as “dialects”, for example Norwegian, Scania (*Skåne*) Swedish, the Sámi languages, Savo Finnish, and Karelian (a Finnic language fairly close to Finnish), cf. Klinge (1994:63).

In the sixteenth century, the linguistic map of the Nordic countries basically assumed the shape it has today. Dialect continua were thus split up into languages clustering around the emerging written standards. This process of establishing standard literary languages was decisively implemented by spreading the printed Bible to the masses. The process was simultaneously reinforced by the large-scale introduction of oral recitation of the newly translated biblical texts. The literary culture in the national languages gradually took shape, and the languages themselves became more uniform.

These religious and cultural trends were further reinforced by simultaneous political and economic developments. In Sweden, for example, King Gustaf Vasa introduced strict central government around the year 1540 when real estate registers were introduced. Another reinforcing factor is found in the merchants along the Baltic coast, who took a commercial interest in the increasing use of the vernaculars (Klinge 1994:53).

The majority of the linguistic studies of the vernacular from this period are closely connected with the political and economic development of the emerging Nordic nation states: Denmark (including Norway, Iceland, the Faroe Islands, and Greenland), and Sweden (including Finland, and in periods Estonia and parts of Germany). The centralization of government and commerce created the need for a common linguistic norm for which a model had to be found and agreed upon. Once there was agreement on the particular variety of the vernacular to be used as the basis for standardization, this language had to be codified in normative grammars and dictionaries, and knowledge of it subsequently disseminated to the population as a whole. In many cases, such agreement was slow in coming, and it could even take centuries to establish a norm, as in Finland, where there was much discussion as to which dialects standard Finnish should be based on until the mid-nineteenth century. One reason for this may be that even if the first versions of written Finnish were established by 1550, the language had no official status apart from its religious use, until around the year 1860. Prior to 1860, Swedish was the official language of Sweden-Finland.

The linguistic activity of the period from 1500 to 1800 consists of as much discussion and deliberation as it does actual analysis and concrete regulation of the language. The most important aspect of this early period in the history of Nordic linguistics is without a doubt the ongoing conflict between foreign influence and native identity and the problems created by the fact that ideas underlying the new national vernacular movements were derived from the very tradition from which they were striving to free themselves.

One prerequisite for the study of the vernaculars was a recognition of their utility and worth. Therefore, a great deal of energy was spent in the various countries advocating the more widespread use of the native languages and praising their merits in relation to classical and contemporary competitors. One excellent example of this type of activity on behalf of the vernacular is the famous speech given in 1657 by the Danish professor of medicine, Rasmus Bartholin (1625-1698) (3.4.1.1.).

Since there were two nation states in the Nordic countries in this period, Denmark and Sweden, the focus in this chapter will be on Danish and Swedish. But within the territory of these countries, several other languages were spoken, and five of these (Faroese, Finnish, Icelandic, Norwegian, and Sámi) later emerged as national languages or as languages mainly cultivated in the Nordic countries. Accordingly, these languages have also been included here. Kalaallisut (Greenlandic) is treated in 3.6.3. Estonian will not be considered, because its history since the eighteenth century has only marginal connections with the Nordic countries.

Sweden adopted a fairly outspoken policy of linguistic assimilation that started around 1650 and this extended especially to Finland. The long-term goal of Sweden was to make Finland Swedish-speaking. It was fortunate for Finland that this political aim of the state was counterbalanced by the need of the Church to disseminate its message to everyone. The broad population could only be approached comprehensibly through Bible translations, and through the use of the vernacular in the services. This theological need brought written Finnish into existence in the sixteenth century and kept the language

alive for centuries, despite adverse measures taken by the state. For a long time the basically Swedish-speaking clergy had to cope with Finnish-speaking parishioners, which deeply affected Finnish literacy, orthography, and culture.

3.4.1.1. Danish

After the Reformation, which took place rapidly in Denmark (1526-1536), religious authority was shifted from the Church to the Bible, thus producing a need for Bible translations which would give the population direct access to the word of God.

After several translations of the New Testament, some of which were begun just prior to the Reformation, the entire Bible appeared in print in 1550 as *Christian III's Bibel*, based on Luther's Bible of 1545 and translated by Christiern Pedersen. Three thousand copies of this Bible were printed, with every church being required to purchase one. In contrast to earlier translations, this work was orthographically, morphologically, lexically, and syntactically consistent and contained very few indications of its having been translated from German.

In addition to the Bible and other types of religious literature in the mother tongue, popular books on subjects such as medicine, agriculture, and navigation, as well as historical literature such as translations of Saxo's *Gesta Danorum*, also played a role in increasing the status and more widespread use of the vernacular. To these we can also add various translations of foreign literature and even original plays which were performed in schools, but rarely published. The older, regional laws had been printed at an early date in an archaic language, such as the Law of Jutland in 1504 and the Laws of Zealand (*Sjælland*) and Scania (*Skåne*) in 1505. But by the time Absolutism¹⁶ was introduced more than a century later, these and a number of intermediary laws were outdated. A need thus existed for a more composite law for the new nation as a whole. This need was fulfilled with the appearance in 1683 of the law code of Christian V (*Christian den Femtes Danske Lov*), a work which was intentionally written in a language capable of explaining even the most difficult legal stipulations using "a clear and contemporary Danish vocabulary".

Although the vernacular was gradually gaining recognition as a language in its own right in important areas of society, it was not always adequate, and spoken as well as written usage was far from uniform. A typical way of describing the vernacular, which in the eyes of many was in need of improvement, was to compare it to a ruin, bemoan it as being grossly neglected, or to personify it as suffering from a serious illness that could be cured by the production of native grammars and dictionaries. In an early Danish grammar the author allows the injured language to speak on its own behalf, pleading in a lengthy appeal for the country's "physicians" to save it from neglect and destruction. A similar Swedish example is provided in 3.4.1.6. Such complaints, as drastic as they may seem, are also indications that interest in the vernacular had been aroused among those who were to become both advocates of linguistic reform as well as scholars providing suggestions as to how the cultivation and development of the native language should be carried out.

The use of the vernacular in scholarly-scientific literature was first advocated in Denmark by Christoffer Dybvad (1578-1622), in his mathematics textbook published in 1602. In this work Dybvad presents a new Danish mathematical terminology to replace the Greek, translating many of his terms from Dutch. In 1610, the famous bishop Hans Poulsen Resen (1561-1638) wrote a school textbook on logic in Danish. Approximately ten years later Jens Dinesen Jersin (3.3.1.) advocated that grammatical instruction in Danish be given in the schools, paving the way himself with Danish examples and definitions in his two Latin grammars published in 1623 and 1624.

The importance of the native language was first defended from a university lectern by Hans Jensen Alanus (1563-1631) in two dissertations (1608, 1609). His opinions were similar to those voiced in France by Du Belay (1520-1560) and in Germany by Opitz (1597-1639). These views were also representative of the rest of Western Europe during the early stages of recognition of the vernaculars.

¹⁶ Absolutism meant a concentration of all power to the King.

Alanus, who was a pupil of Jacob Madsen Århus (3.9.), insisted that Danish was in principle as adequate as any other language. Alanus further argued that only through cultivation can a language realize its innate possibilities and develop to perfection.

The *Dictionarium Herlovianum* (The Herlufsholm Dictionary), the oldest and quite extensive Danish-Latin dictionary, was compiled in 1626 by the headmaster of the Herlufsholm school, Poul Jensen Kolding (or Colding) (1581-1640). This dictionary was written with a view to Danish as well as to Latin and contains a number of Danish phrases and idioms as lexical entries. The author, who had also compiled a Latin-Danish dictionary in 1622, insisted that nothing could be said in Latin or any other language which could not just as easily be expressed in Danish: “Quid enim est in Lingva Latina aut alia, quod non æquè commodè exprimi potest Danicâ”.

Hans Mikkelsen Ravn (1610-1663) wrote *Lingvæ danicæ exercitatio* (An Exercise in the Danish Language) between 1634 and 1640. Ravn insisted that Danish was simple and pure in its origins but had become corrupted by foreign influences, a view held not only by many of his contemporaries but also one which flourished among the late seventeenth and early eighteenth-century grammarians.

Perhaps the most well-known praise of the mother tongue and plea for its acceptance as a means of communication in all areas of life is Rasmus Bartholin’s *De studio lingvæ danicæ* (The Study of the Danish Language, 1674:146-170).¹⁷ In this treatise, Bartholin shows a surprising awareness of the linguistic developments of which he himself is a part. He maintains that the vernacular is a necessary prerequisite for the prosperity of the new nation and that vernacular terminology must be created for various areas of society such as science, history, mythology, education, entertainment, and poetry. He also recognizes the importance of elevating the vernacular to a prestigious position in the eyes of the Danish public.

In a similar vein, an early advocate of a native poetics, Søren Poulsen Judichær Gotlænder (1599-1668), left no doubt in the minds of his readers as to how the vernacular should be treated:

Whoever does not hold his native tongue in high esteem, he should be driven out of his fatherland with rotten eggs, and should never be considered worthy of being called a Dane. (Gotlænder 1671:109).

The chaotic nature of the linguistic situation in Denmark around 1700 was apparent on the occasion of the king’s birthday in 1699 when an opera with four leading roles was performed. Cupid sang in Italian, Diana in French, Mars in High German, and Neptune in Low German (cf. Skautrup II 1947:305, cf. 3.4.1.6. for a similar characteristic of the situation in Sweden). The linguistic chaos of the day was also a favorite topic in Ludvig Holberg’s comedies, as in *Barselsstuen* (The Nursery, 1724) where one character speaks an imperfect German, another a variety of Copenhagen French, a third Latin, and a fourth an ornate academic language full of interference from French, German, and Latin. The situation in the early eighteenth century is also aptly described in the following poem by Christian Wilster (1827):

Før var der knap skreven paa dansk en Bog,
Som ret kunde Hjerterne hue,
Kun Eventyr, brugbart i Kakkellovnskrog,
Vise til Spinderskens Stue.
Hver Mand, som med Kløgt gik i Lærdom til Bund,
Latin paa Papiret kun malte,
Med Fruerne Fransk, og Tydsk med sin Hund,
Og Dansk med sin Tjener han talte.

Before now hardly a book was written in Danish
That really could warm your heart.
Only fairy tales for the fireplace,
And ballads for the spinners chamber.

¹⁷ A speech given by Bartholin in 1657 when he exchanged a professorship in mathematics with one in medicine, included in Bartholin (1674), also in Bertelsen I 1915:1-33 (Danish translation VI:34-64).

Every man who delved seriously into learning
 Painted only Latin on paper,
 Spoke French with the ladies and German with his dog,
 And with his servant Danish.

Shortly after the turn of the century, a booklet appeared stressing the equality of the Danish vernacular with Latin, Greek, and Hebrew, even when it was a question of rhetorical elegance. In a brief treatise bearing the title *Rhetorica laica et pagana, det er Læg-Mands Tale-Kunst og Bondens Veltalenhed* (Rhetoric for Lay People and Farmers, 1727), the Norwegian-born Hans Olufsen Nysted (1664-1740) demonstrated that the uneducated common man intuitively masters all the devices employed by classical rhetoric. An expanded version of this same work appeared in 1727, containing almost twice the number of examples to illustrate the argument that the mother tongue is filled with hidden elegance. Nysted shows, for example, that there are numerous Danish expressions that are comparable to those of Hebrew, Greek, and Latin, such as the following:

Hebrew uses the singular for counting something above ten.
 So does Danish: De var tyve Mand, 42 Fod lang
 (They were twenty man. 42 foot long.)

Greek uses a double negative.
 So does Danish: Der var aldrig ingen, som saa det.
 (There was never no one who saw it.)

Another important contribution of this period is Johan Henrich Schlegel's (1726-1780) *Afhandling om det Danske Sprogs Fordeele og Mangler* (Treatise on the Advantages and Shortcomings of the Danish Language) from 1763. This treatise describes what the author considered the good and bad properties of Danish as compared to German and French. The author was originally German and the uncle of the famous Schlegel brothers. His work was typological, providing a detailed comparison of the word formation patterns and inflectional morphology of these three languages. Schlegel argued that these languages were more or less equal, since languages with little inflection are just as suitable for expressing human thoughts as languages with a more complicated inflectional system. He also showed that Danish, through its rules of compounding, had as great a lexical potential as the two major languages of Europe.

As these examples indicate, the Danish vernacular had acquired numerous advocates in the course of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries and had finally developed into a well-esteemed and full-fledged language equal in status to Latin and other to foreign languages. This development is aptly summed up by the educator L. Stoud Platou:

To the glory of the Danish-Norwegian people, the time has passed when the tongue of our fathers was scorned not only by foreigners, but even by our own scholars. Our language has gained as much in recognition as it has developed in the past half of a century. ... Hail to our mother tongue, that we now, even in the public schools, educate our sons and daughters in its use and teach the future men and women of our country to speak, write, read and understand correctly the language of their fathers, of which our Baggesen has spoken so elegantly: that the graces themselves, if they were to choose one of the living languages of Europe as their morning attire, would, after mirroring themselves in all the others, most certainly keep the Danish language. (Platou 1806:III-IV)

3.4.1.2. Finnish

A short Finnish text for clerical use must have existed in the fifteenth century, but no copies have been preserved. Finnish became a literary language in the sixteenth century, largely due to the efforts of bishop Mikael Agricola (1510?-1557). In 1548, Agricola's Finnish translation of the New Testament appeared. The first book printed in Finnish was his ABC-book (*Abckiria*), which is estimated to date back to 1543. There were also some manuscripts with unclear provenience that have been traced back to the period 1530-1540 (Rapola 1963:76-77).

Agricola came from Pernaja/Pernå, a primarily Swedish-speaking area, but his command of Finnish was so good that he must have been a fluent bilingual in Swedish and Finnish from childhood.

In the preface of his Bible translation, Agricola made the modest remark “*Nihil simul inceptum et perfectum esse constat*” (Nothing can be simultaneously started and perfect). For lexical and grammatical structure, Agricola chose the South-Western (especially Turku) dialects as a basis for the emerging written norm, since the Turku region was the administrative and religious center at that time. Agricola was not wholly successful in establishing the phoneme/grapheme correspondence that modern Finnish orthography frequently has been commended for, such as the phoneme /k/, which was variably written as <k>, <c>, or <q>. Neither was he clearly aware of the phonemic status of length.

Rapola (1963:138) has calculated that Agricola used some 6,000 lexemes out of which 4,450 can still be considered part of current Finnish vocabulary. Later, Raimo Jussila has estimated the total size of Agricola’s vocabulary to be 8,500 words out of which some 5,350 would still belong to current Finnish (Jussila 1987:207,211). Basically, Agricola wrote idiomatic Finnish, but as most of what he wrote in Finnish was translated, negative transfer from the source languages could not be fully avoided. Thus, Agricola frequently used personal agentive passive constructions modeled on Indo-European, with the agent in the ablative case, such as *häneltä luettu* ‘read by him’.

The next important step towards establishing Finnish as a literary language was the translation of the entire Bible in 1642. After several attempts, the translation was completed in 1638-1642 by a committee headed by Eskil Peträus. Peträus was to later become one of the first eleven professors at Åbo Akademi. One of the goals of Peträus’s committee was to use genuine Finnish that could be understood all over the country. Several printings and editions were made of the 1642 Bible. The most significant edition was by Antti Lizelius in 1776, a version that was used well into the 1800s.

The founding of the Academy of Turku/Åbo in 1640 created a national scholarly center in Finland (cf. Klinge et al. 1987). Although written Finnish was mainly used in translated religious and administrative texts, the language was held in great esteem by the intellectuals in Turku/Åbo, and it was sometimes considered a disadvantage not to know Finnish. On the other hand, the university discouraged the students from using Finnish, because Latin, and later Swedish, was the compulsory academic lingua franca, used in teaching and written dissertations alike, until the middle of the nineteenth century.

Finnish did not receive official recognition until 1863, when it was accorded status as the language of administration and education. During the period of Swedish sovereignty until 1809, the main public use of Finnish was in sermons and other religious ceremonies. The basic administrative and legal language was Swedish, and only occasionally Finnish (sometimes in courts) or Latin (church administration).

The use of written Finnish developed positively during the Reformation and continued until the middle of the 1600s. Per Brahe, for example, the key person when the Academy of Turku/Åbo was founded, strongly favored Finnish. Per Brahe realized that the country could not be properly administered if the officials knew no Finnish. However, among the educated, the use of Finnish decreased (cf. Nikkilä 1985:74-77). Sweden’s position as an emerging “superpower” led to the centralization of government and administration and to a growing influx of Swedish officials in Finland, including most bishops and most of the early professors at the Academy of Turku/Åbo.

The central laws were also translated into Finnish, such as the Canon Law translated by Henrik Florinus in 1688, and, in particular, the new Swedish law from 1734 (*Sweriges Rikes Lag*), translated into Finnish in 1759 (*Ruotzin Waldacunnan Laki*), though the latter was not officially authorized. Administrative regulations issued by the king were occasionally translated into Finnish. A post as Finnish translator was instituted at the Chancellor’s Office in Stockholm in 1735. The first newspaper in Finnish was *Suomenkieliset Tieto-Sanommat* (Knowledge News in Finnish), published from 1775 by Antti Lizelius (1708-1795). This paper was intended for the general public and contained information on topics such as agriculture and cattle breeding. In those days, Finnish was mainly written for utilitarian purposes, for example very little fiction or poetry was written in Finnish prior to 1850.

Academic interest in Finnish was prominent in Turku/Åbo as evidenced by the numerous studies

of the relationship of Finnish to other languages, notably to the holy languages Hebrew and Greek (3.7.2.), and by the grammars of Finnish that were published (3.4.3.2.). Even so, there was no professorship in Finnish at the old Academy of Turku/Åbo, and it was not until 1768 that Carl Gustaf Weman (1740-1803) was appointed as the first lecturer in Finnish language and literature in Turku.

In the course of the 1700s, plans were made to extend the Swedish settlements in Finland by way of purposeful immigration, and there were even schemes to relocate the existing Finnish population (Klinge et al. 1987:625). Such policies, in connection with the romantic ideals of the time, gave rise to the Fennophile Movement, whose most prominent early representative was Daniel Juslenius (1676-1752). His dissertation *Aboa vetus et nova* (Old and New Åbo, 1700) sang the patriotic praises of the glorious past of Finland and Turku/Åbo, in the true spirit of Olof Rudbeck (3.7.3.), maintaining, for example, that Finland had a written culture older than that of classical Latin and Greek. But Juslenius also drew attention to the enemies of Finland by whom he meant the central bureaucracy in Stockholm, which was trying to make Swedish the dominant language in Finland (cf. also 3.4.2.2.).

The polyhistorian Henrik Gabriel Porthan (1739-1804) was the most prominent Finnish scholar in the eighteenth century. Porthan was a librarian, and in 1777 he became professor of eloquence (Latin) at the Academy of Turku, where he laid the foundations for critical research in Finnish history and folklore and gave considerable momentum to the fennophile movement. His five part dissertation series *De poësi Fennica* (On Finnish Poetry, 1776-1778) underscored the significance of Finnish folk poetry. This series also contained detailed descriptions of several aspects of poetry, such as metrics and how the poems were sung in genuine settings. Above all, Porthan made people realize that the Finnish language had a long history of its own, that it was a medium of artistic expression for the general public, and an expression of national values that bridged generations.

3.4.1.3. Icelandic¹⁸

During the Middle Ages, Icelandic was the only Nordic language with an independent grammatical tradition and a strong literary tradition (2.3.). This, as well as the translation of the Bible into Icelandic in 1584, may explain how the Icelandic literary language survived even through the period from 1500 to 1800, which was mainly an age of decline in Iceland. Due to the strong position of the language and the distance from Copenhagen, Danish exerted little influence until after the introduction of Absolutism in 1662 and apparently did not become very strong until the mid-eighteenth century.

Foreign languages were not used much in Iceland during the first centuries after the Reformation (Ottósson 1990:24-27, 29-35). Latin remained the learned language, as in the other Nordic countries. The Reformation itself was rooted in High German, and before 1600, German was better known in Iceland than Danish. Danish remained relatively little known in the seventeenth century, although its use in administration and commerce was increasing. The basic law code was *Jónsbók* (Book of Jón) from 1281, but after the adoption of Absolutism in 1662, laws in Danish were used to an increased extent alongside Icelandic law. As a result, a Danish law degree was required for all judges in Iceland from 1736, which quickly led to a great influx of Danish law terms into the Icelandic judicial system. During the sixteenth century, there were generally more Low German than Danish merchants in Iceland, but Danish trade monopoly was enforced from 1602 to 1787. Contact with Danish merchants was limited, however, until the 1760s, when the staff of some of the merchants began staying over for the winter.

Icelandic was the main medium of expression in Iceland during this period, both as a spoken and written language. It was used in many kinds of scholarly endeavors, not least those related to Icelandic culture and history. As we shall see (3.4.2.3. and 3.4.3.3.), extensive and impressive scholarly activity was taking place with regard to the vernacular in this period, cf. Jónsdóttir (1996). Soon after the Reformation the clergy was almost entirely educated in Iceland, at the cathedral schools with Icelandic headmasters. In the 1600s, only a few Icelanders studied at the University of Copenhagen, and before

¹⁸ This subchapter as well as 3.4.4.3., 4.5.1.3., 4.5.2.4., 4.5.4.3., 4.5.6.3., 5.6.2.3., 5.6.6.4., and 5.6.7.3. are to a large extent based on a draft by Kjartan Ottósson.

that Icelandic students preferred Rostock to Copenhagen if they wanted to study abroad.

Iceland had a print shop from around 1530, located most of the time at the bishopric at Hólar in the North. New and revised editions of the Bible appeared there both in 1644 and 1728-1734. This was the only print shop in Iceland until around 1770, and since it mainly published religious literature, most of the scholarly and literary works of this period were only preserved in manuscripts.

It seems to have been universally accepted in Iceland at this time that the contemporary language was the same as the old language. The name *norrænn* and *norræna* was commonly used for the contemporary language until around 1600, and even later it competed with the term *Icelandic* (Ottósson 1990:17). The Icelanders took pride in being the only people to have preserved the old common language of all the Scandinavian countries, the language, as they saw it, that was the vehicle of the great medieval literature. This pride was much reinforced when the Scandinavian humanists started intensive study of the old literature around 1600, and were dependent on help from Icelanders in interpreting it. The first one of these consultants, Arngrímur Jónsson “the learned” (1568-1648), encouraged his countrymen to seek models for good language use in their rich native tongue instead of in Danish and German.

From about 1750 onwards one can talk about an awakening concerning the intrinsic value of the Icelandic language and the need for its restoration. Its most prominent advocate was probably the lawyer Eggert Ólafsson (1726-1768), who composed a poem on the disease and death of Icelandic, the disease being the adoption of too many foreign words. The Icelandic learned society *Hið íslenska lærdómslistafélag* (founded 1779) had as a stated aim in its by-laws to preserve the beautiful Norse language (*norræntunga*), that has been spoken for a long time in the Nordic countries, and take pains to purify it from foreign words and phrases (Ottósson 1990:41-47). This period, however, also brought some reactions as from Sveinn Sölvason (3.4.4.3.), and from the headmaster Bjarni Jónsson (1725-1798), who in 1771 advocated the abolition of the Icelandic tongue, following the example of the Norwegians and Faroese, as a means to progress. The Danish government apparently did not try to interfere with the use of Icelandic. On the contrary it had laws translated into Icelandic and made four futile attempts to have an Icelandic law code written in the period 1688-1760 (Hermannsson 1919:15-16).

3.4.1.4. Norwegian

For more than 300 years after the Reformation, there was no Norwegian literary language due to the political and cultural dominance of Denmark. Norwegian dialects, however, were of interest to scholars, and particularly to clergymen. The first known study of Norwegian dialects was by the clergyman Jørgen Thomassøn. This study included a collection of proverbs and a short phonological sketch in Latin verse of a dialect from South-East Norway. Written about 1625, this work was not printed until 1911 (Hannaas 1911a). Thomassøn established the basic sound correspondences between Danish and several Norwegian dialects, comparing the situation to the relationship between the ancient Greek dialects.

During the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries a series of dialect studies were initiated, both published and unpublished (cf. Hannaas 1911a, 1911b, 1915, 1923). Most studies were made in the form of glossaries, sometimes containing samples of dialect speech (cf. Jensøn 1646, Pontoppidan 1749, Wilse 1780). Some of these also contained interesting phonological and morphological observations. Wilse (1780:A2) observed, for example, that the post-alveolar-apical flap is a characteristic shibboleth of Norwegian. Often there was a streak of patriotism behind this work. Pontoppidan (1749:13-14) even found a number of Greek words in Norwegian. In other cases, the intention was purely practical: to warn Norwegians against typical idioms that ought to be avoided or to help Danish officials (mostly pastors) to understand the local dialect, cf. Jensøn (1646). Yet there were also other, more practical aims. Pontoppidan’s vocabulary list (1749:112-120), for example, contains a list of Norwegian proper names that were used in the Bergen area, a list which was useful for pastors administering baptism, and which is of interest today to modern scholars of onomastics.

In 1784, a book appeared by Marcus Schnabel with the interesting title *Prøve paa hvorvidt det*

gamle Norske Sprog endnu er til udi det Hardangerske Bonde-Maal (An Attempt to Show the Extent to Which the Old Norwegian Language Still Exists in the Language of the Hardanger Peasants). The author was a clergyman from a Western fjord, who tried to show the connection between Old Norse and his own dialect by comparing words and expressions from the two languages. The main objective of Schnabel was to write a complete grammar of the Hardanger dialect with reference to Old Norse. Through his reading of Old Norse texts, Schnabel came to understand that his own dialect had several characteristics in common with the old language, and by comparing the various Norwegian dialects that he knew, he concluded that they were more closely related to Old Norse than the written language was.

The view underlying Schnabel's study, namely, that modern Norwegian dialects had developed directly from Old Norse, later became a central topic and source of inspiration for Norwegian linguistics in the nineteenth century (4.5.). This influence is already expressed clearly in the preface of an extensive Norwegian dialect dictionary that appeared in 1802 (Hallager 1802):

The remnants of the old Norwegian language which still exist are not to be looked for in Norway's towns or their surrounding areas, where the language as well as the culture is Danish, but in the interior of the country, in the mountain settlements, and everywhere among the peasants who have little or no connection with the towns. ... It [the Norwegian language] differs from the two other Nordic Languages [i.e. Danish and Swedish] not only by having a rich vocabulary, a distinctive pronunciation, and characteristic idioms peculiar to itself, but also by having a distinctive type of word connection or syntax, so that one can say it has merely lacked cultivation through writing to become an independent language like the others. (Hallager 1802:iii)

Laurents Hallager (1777-1825) was from Bergen. He began as a French teacher, and his publications included a short elementary French grammar (Hallager 1798). Hallager later studied medicine and became a physician in Bergen. He published a dialect dictionary in 1802 that contained his own observations as well as material from other sources. This dictionary provides a short grammatical introduction with the first sketch of Norwegian morphology, as well as a few poems in a dialect from Gudbrandsdalen.

Danish and other European linguists of the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth centuries considered Norwegian to be a separate language and even produced a short version of the Lord's Prayer in Norwegian. Additional information on the status of this phantom Norwegian language can be found in Hovdhaugen (1982 a,b).

3.4.1.5. Sámi

The ten main Sámi (Lappish) dialects/languages are spoken in four countries, Finland, Norway, Russia, and Sweden, but the development has been somewhat different in each of these countries.

The oldest known Sámi texts are an ABC-primer and a missal dating back to 1619 written by a priest Nicolaus Andreae from Piteå in Northern Sweden. In 1643, the Swedish government gave Johannes Jonae Tornaeus, the priest of Torneå, the task of translating the Swedish church manual, *Manuale sueticum*, into Sámi. Part of Tornaeus's task was to design a common Sámi written standard that could be understood by Sámi speakers in all parts of the country. Tornaeus used assistants and informants from several Sámi dialect areas in order to establish this standard. In 1648, Tornaeus's *Manuale Lapponicum* appeared, containing almost 1,000 pages, mainly based on Torneå Sámi. Nevertheless, this attempt to create a Sámi written standard common to all major dialects turned out to be unsuccessful, and such a standard has yet to be achieved. In the mid 1700s, Petrus Fiellström (3.4.3.4.) created the written standard for South Sámi in Sweden.

The first texts in (Denmark-)Norway written in Røros Sámi were published around 1750. However, in 1774 a decree was issued that the language of school instruction for Sámi pupils should be Norwegian (M. Korhonen 1981:56), and this was detrimental both for oral and written use of the language.

In this period, those occupied with Sámi were either pastors and missionaries in the Sámi speaking areas, or scholars comparing Sámi with other languages. Their views on the Sámi language

were intimately connected with their views on the Sámi culture and people. This is clearly evident in the introductory remarks to the first Sámi grammar (Fiellström 1738a), where the author, a Swede, talks about this language:

... which is spoken by a disagreeable and uneducated people, and due to their irregular visiting and traveling to and fro has not only degenerated into different dialects but has not been used for such a long time and been mixed with elements from other languages such that it has lost much of its own regularity. (Fiellström 1738a:8)

Other scholars were less negative and saw the language from another perspective. For example, Ganandrus (3.4.3.4.) who was also a Swede and the author of the next Sámi grammar (1743), assumed Sámi to be a very old language, a descendent of Hebrew. To Ganandrus, Sámi, like the related languages Finnish and Estonian, constituted one of the seventy languages arising out of the confusion of Babel.

A very favorable view of the language that reflected deep insight is found in the preface of the third Sámi grammar (1748). Leem claimed that most people of his time regarded Sámi to be:

an absurd, wild, and confused language in which there are no rules for the construction of words, for inflection, and similar things. Others imagine that it is a haphazard mixture of numerous languages. (Leem 1748: Preface)

But Leem did not agree with such views. He had several reasons for his writing a grammar of Sámi, including the following:

partly for the sake of the language itself, since it is not only a very old language, which was used long ago and is still used by a people having the same belief and religion as us and serving one God and one king together with us, and living in the same kingdom with us, and furthermore because it is an interesting, accurate and copious language,... (Leem 1748 Preface)

The only Sámi scholar from this period to undertake linguistic studies was Anders Porsanger (1735-1780) from Porsanger in Norway, cf. Martinussen (1992). Porsanger held a degree in theology and worked as a priest, but he also made a substantial contribution to Leem's Sámi dictionary (Leem 1768-81). Porsanger was also the main informant and assistant to János Sajnovics in the latter's epoch-making studies of the relationship between Sámi and Hungarian (Sajnovics 1770). Porsanger wrote a Sámi grammar which was never published, and the manuscript has since been lost. In fact, all that remains of Porsanger's works are some unpublished reflections on Sámi orthography (Martinussen 1992:43-59). These orthographic observations seem very sensible to a modern reader, since Porsanger was a native speaker and had a good ear for phonological oppositions. Furthermore, Porsanger also advocated, albeit tentatively, the thorough study of Sámi dialects in order to establish a firmer basis for a common Sámi orthography. He addressed several basic issues concerning language standardization, such as how to construct a literary norm for a community with many dialects having equal social and political status, the extent to which an orthography should reflect phonological oppositions, and how to write sounds that had no immediate orthographic correspondences in the Latin alphabet. This project was not realized for Sámi, but it was a predecessor of Ivar Aasen's program for a new Norwegian written language in the next century. As a Sámi, Porsanger had very little possibility of getting his ideas accepted, since his academic career was haunted with difficulties and discrimination that followed him from his very first days in school until his death.

Porsanger was very critical of the negative attitude of Norwegians toward learning Sámi and of their lack of competence in Sámi. Even his superior, Knud Leem, did not escape Porsanger's criticism, which did not make life easier for Porsanger:

Concerning language [specimens] which from the Holy Book are put into the lexicon as examples by Mr. professor Leem himself, I have frequently discussed with him that it would be better to use as examples expressions which concern the Sámi way of life at least until there is a translation of the Bible, which has to be a masterpiece if it is to function as an expression of the genius of the language. But in this case as in all others, I have not been heard. (Martinussen 1992:57)

3.4.1.6. Swedish

The New Testament was translated into Swedish in 1526, and the Old Testament in 1541. These translations, mainly undertaken by the brothers Olaus and Laurentius Petri, gave new status to the Swedish language, distinguishing it from Danish by making a number of specifically Swedish choices in the vocabulary, grammar, and inflectional endings.

Johannes Bureus (1568-1652) is one of the first and most important figures from the early period of Swedish linguistics. Bureus has been called the father of Swedish grammar and he made various observations about Swedish in a number of publications, also showing an interest in the origin of language typical of the time. Bureus was the first person to study Old Swedish texts in order to gain a deeper knowledge of the Swedish language. The old texts had previously been studied mainly for religious, political, or juridical reasons. Bureus not only registered written words, but also spoken and dialect words. He began collecting historical manuscripts and documents of all kinds and took a particular interest in runic inscriptions (Wollin 1992). As a result, he learned the runic alphabet and published an introduction to the writing system, as well as elementary textbooks in Swedish using the runic script. Bureus's *Sveorum Runae* (The Runes of the Swedes, ?1640) includes handwritten interpretations and translations of approximately 600 inscriptions. This interest in the runes was probably connected with his interest in Cabalistic studies and mysticism in general. Bureus's writings include various tables and paradigms which show that he tried to analyze Swedish grammar and to find declensions and conjugations. Lindroth (1911-1912) provides a survey of Bureus's linguistic work.

Runology, the investigation and interpretation of runic inscriptions, was to become an important topic in the study of Swedish. For example, J. Göransson Bautil published a book of drawings of runic inscriptions but without interpretations in 1750.

Bureus's linguistic interests and love for the Swedish language was inherited by his student Georg Stiernhielm (1598-1672), who was a talented linguist. Stiernhielm also eventually married into Bureus's family. In 1627 Stiernhielm was called from Västerås to Stockholm to teach at the Collegium Illustre. Johan Skytte (1577-1645), a nobleman and member of the Royal Council, contacted Stiernhielm for this job, and he also took Stiernhielm with him when he became Governor General of the Baltic provinces and moved to Tartu/Dorpat. Stiernhielm worked in many fields, but most of his energy was spent on the Swedish language, the status of which he wanted to raise both through his linguistic studies (3.7.3.) and his poetry, for example his didactic poem "Hercules". For a survey of Stiernhielm's life and scholarship, cf. Nordström (1924).

Stiernhielm was appointed director-general of the Central Board of National Antiquities (*riksantikvarie*) in 1648, a post that also Bureus had had, and subsequently moved to Stockholm. He traveled to various universities in Europe, including Greifswald, Wittenberg, Helmstedt, and Strasbourg, and met with other scholars such as Samuel Columbus (3.4.4.2.), who mentions him in his notes. Stiernhielm also met Cartesius when the latter was at the Swedish court in Stockholm in 1649.

Stiernhielm's most important and influential linguistic work is his *De linguarum origine* (On the Origin of the Languages, 1671), which is a preface to the first Swedish edition of Wulfila's Gothic Bible (3.7.3.).

Stiernhielm had broken ground by proving that Swedish could be used for poetry, but he also demonstrated that it had to be further developed. Stiernhielm's efforts found support in certain quarters, but there were also dissenting opinions. One typical representative of his critics is the diplomat Gustav Rosenhane (1609-1663), who wrote a versified personification of the Swedish language entitled *Thet Swenska Språkets Klagemål, at thet, som sigh borde, icke ährat blifwer* (The Complaint of the Swedish Language that It is not Honored As it Ought to Be, 1658). This book was published under the pseudonym Skogekär Bergbo, cf. Källquist (1934). The poem ends, as it continued to be the custom, with a nationalistic conclusion similar to that which was expressed later by Rudbeck Sr. and Jr. (3.7.3.).

At the end I will make known
that soon there will be a time
when you will hear

Sidst wil jagh nu kungöra,
Thet kommer snart en Tidh,
På hwilken man skal höra,

me [= the Swedish language] spoken around the whole world more than Latin now I will some day be used.	Migh kring om Wården wijdh. Mehr än Latin nu öfwas, Jagh en gång brukas skal;
...	
Once in the future nobody will mix in new words many countries will serve me as well as honor me.	En gång skal ingen blanda, The nyie Orden in, Mång Land migh gå tilhanda, Så wäl som Wårnän min.

The nineteenth century scholar Carl Ulric Broocman (4.5.2.7.) paints a vivid picture of this situation in his grammar (1820:93). To briefly summarize, the Swedish Queen Kristina and the court loved French customs, fashions, and expressions, and the armies returning to Sweden brought back a corrupt form of the Swedish language. Their speech revealed that the old inflectional endings had been lost and that all words beginning in *sk-* had changed this to German *sch-*. Moreover, everything written and spoken in these times abounded with foreign words. For example, sermons were full of Latin and Greek phrases. In addition, official letters, instructions, and laws were full of French and German expressions. All in all, this was a situation that was bound to provoke nationalistic feelings and puristic attitudes, as well as attempts among patriots to save the language.

Pehr Adrian Gadd's treatise on the consequences of linguistic neglect (1770) advocated the use of the vernacular on all levels at home and abroad and was strongly against any use of foreign languages. He considered it dangerous and detrimental to the morals, character, and national feeling of a people if they did not use their mother tongue. Gadd was especially occupied with the role of women, for he felt that women were the worst corruptors, since they found it fashionable to use foreign languages. Gadd urged the Swedes to return to the morality of former times.

One of the first members of the Swedish Academy was Anders af Botin (1724-1790), a lawyer who published a Swedish grammar in 1777 (3.4.3.5.). In his acceptance speech upon being appointed to the Academy, Botin remarked that the language:

is similar to a badly cultivated and overgrown field and needs to be cleaned and brought to the beauty which its nature demands and the language really deserves and can acquire through the Master's hand and that will bring the most delicious fruits in the future. (Rosenstein 1801:67)

In 1753, Queen Lovisa Ulrika (1720-1782) established *Kungl. svenska vitterhets-akademien* (The Royal Swedish Academy of Letters) after observing foreign institutions such as the French *Académie des inscriptions et belles lettres*. *Kungl. svenska vitterhets-akademien* was continued by *Kungl. Vitterhets Historie och Antikvitets Akademien*, which was established by King Gustaf III in the same year (1786) as the Swedish Academy, which took over the literary and linguistic tasks. King Gustaf was keenly interested in the possibilities of writing in the Swedish language and of translating French literature and drama into Swedish. The following paragraphs from the statutes of the Swedish Academy reflect this interest:

XXII. §.

The best and most suitable task of the Academy is to work for the purity, strength, and supremacy of the Swedish language in sciences, but particularly in poetry and rhetoric in all its fields and also in the one devoted to the interpretation of the Heavenly Truth.

XXIII. §.

It is also a duty of the Academy to produce a Swedish dictionary and grammar and also such treatises that can contribute to the maintenance and development of good taste.

(Rosenstein 1801:27)

The task of producing a Swedish dictionary and grammar was a challenge to the academicians for centuries. A grammar which satisfies the requirements of the Swedish Academy is now (1999) being completed by Ulf Teleman and Staffan Hellberg, but the dictionary project will seemingly not be finished until the middle of the twenty-first century (4.5.6.6. and 5.6.7.6.).

The Swedish Academy has influenced research in the Swedish language and supported various linguistic projects, but its prize competitions have dealt with literary, cultural, and historical topics rather than problems of the Swedish language or linguistics.

3.4.2. Lexicography

The first concern with the vernaculars both in Denmark and Sweden consisted of small vocabularies and dictionaries to or from Latin. These early vocabularies were usually ordered thematically and not alphabetically. A typical specimen of such a work is *Variarum rerum vocabula* (Words for Various Things) printed in Stockholm in 1538 and reprinted as late as the seventeenth century. The author of this work is anonymous, and it is actually a Latin word list with Swedish equivalents, organized to cover different areas of life, ranging from God and heaven to kitchen utensils.

3.4.2.1. Danish

The first Danish dictionaries were in the form of word lists in Latin with equivalents or explanations in Danish. Prior to his translation of the Bible (3.3.1.1.), Christiern Pedersen published an extensive Latin-Danish dictionary for the use of Danes, *Vocabularium ad usum Dacorum*, containing over 13,000 Latin entries with Danish translations (1510). His dictionary was so popular in schools that it was reprinted in 1514 and 1518. Similar vocabularies, though more specialized, were compiled and published in 1561 by the Scanian canon Jon Turson, in 1563 by Henrik Smith, who was also the author of books on several subjects including herbs and popular medicine, and in 1594 by the pastor in Ribe, Mads Pors. In addition to Latin equivalents, Henrik Smith's Latin synonym dictionary (1520) contains a number of Danish equivalents and expressions which are also presented collectively at the end of the book. Jacob Madsen Århus's unpublished Latin-Danish dictionary has not been preserved.

The oldest Danish-Latin dictionary is Kolding's *Dictionarium Herloviaenum*, which appeared in 1626 (3.4.1.1.). Among the earliest dictionaries, Bolling's short English-Danish dictionary (1678) should also be mentioned (cf. Kabell and Lauridsen 1988). The glossary that accompanied Hans Rhode's (1672) translation of Comenius's *Orbis pictus* (The World as Pictures) is systematically ordered and interesting with regard to its illustrated presentation of a very large corpus. Owing to its peculiar orthography, *Orbis pictus* also provides information on the spoken language found in Jutland during Rhode's day.

The work on a Danish-Latin lexicon begun by Lavrids Kock was continued by Peder Syv, who prepared the letters A-J in manuscript form, including much historical and etymological material in his entries. Syv published a condensed version of the letter A (1692), unfortunately omitting the historical material on the advice of Matthias Moth (1647-1719).

The preliminary work carried out by Kock and Syv became useful not only to Moth, who had already begun collecting material for his own dictionary in 1680, but also to Frederik Rostgaard (1671-1745), who was also independently at work on a dictionary. Both Moth and Rostgaard managed to complete their projects and to produce a Danish lexicon in manuscript form, but neither of these works was ever published. Of the two, Moth's dictionary is the larger and more significant.

As advisor to Christian V (1670-1699), Moth was in a position to enlist the aid of bishops and school teachers throughout the country. The final result was a monumental work of over sixty folio volumes in its various versions.

Moth's lexicon is broad in scope and provides a detailed picture of the Danish language around 1700. Unlike the academy dictionaries in France and Italy, which limited their inventory to the finer, socially acceptable expressions, Moth's lexicon contains material from the spoken language at all levels of society and in all regions of the country. Moth also included some purely Norwegian entries and even a few Faroese and Icelandic words. For this reason, no clear standard emerges from the various entries, and the dictionary is not the normative, regulatory instrument which had been sought by Moth's contemporaries. The final version of the dictionary is the most important, completed in twenty volumes except for P and R. For the missing letters, the second version can be consulted. One interesting feature of Moth's dictionary is the use of accents to indicate pronunciation.

Frederik Rostgaard made use of much of Syv's material which he purchased at an auction after Syv's death. The twenty-volume work by Rostgaard, completed in manuscript form between 1720 and 1730, amounts to little more than a Latin-Danish vocabulary. Unlike Moth, who provides an explanation in Danish of the meaning of each word, Rostgaard supplies only the Latin synonym. His idea of what type of language to include is only slightly more restricted than is Moth's.

Hans Olufson Nysted (3.4.1.1.), one of Moth's contributors, continued his lexicographic investigations in an attempt to produce a normative Danish dictionary. Only incomplete versions of Nysted's "Lexicon Danicum" have survived.¹⁹ Nysted's dictionary was not meant to provide official norms and is in many ways even broader in scope than was Moth's. Utilizing his background in Norway and Jutland, Nysted's dictionary also included dialect material and information on folklore.

All of these dictionaries were later used in preparing the dictionary commissioned by the Royal Danish Academy of Sciences, the first volume of which appeared in 1793 (A-E). This dictionary was not completed until over a century later when volume 8 (V-Z) appeared in 1905 (Videnskabernes Selskab 1793-1905).

An anonymous work dating back to the year 1727 (3.4.3.1. and 3.4.4.1.) contains a model for an official normative dictionary of the Danish standard language. The author of this work criticizes those who would include everything that they came across of dialectal and historical material in a dictionary, stating that by doing so they would only end up with a Danish hodgepodge dictionary. In the anonymous author's opinion, a dictionary is not meant to register everything in the language from dialect to standard and from lower to higher usage, nor is it meant to explain archaic vocabulary that is no longer in use. Furthermore, a dictionary is not intended as a device for learning the language, but rather as a handbook in which the standard language is presented in such a way as to provide information on correct usage for those cases about which a speaker might be in doubt. This author further explains in detail the method employed in establishing the various types of entries in his own dictionary model:

For nouns:

- (1) Designation of the article for all nouns, both to distinguish these from verbs and to indicate the proper gender in the standard language.
- (2) Indication of proper syllable division.

¹⁹ In *Gl. kgl. Saml.* 773 fol., *Ny kgl. Saml.* 483 fol. and *Ny kgl. Saml.* 484 fol

- (3) Indication of the genitive singular and plural for each noun.
- (4) Indication of the plural of each noun.
- (5) Designation of each noun both with preposed indefinite article and with postposed definite article.
- (6) Indication of the proper placement of diacritical marks.
- (7) Designation of proper placement of upper and lower case initial letters.

For verbs:

- (1) Indication of the present tense of the verb, preceded by the pronouns “jeg og vi (I and we)” to point out that the plural lies in the pronoun and not in the verb.
- (2) Indication of the past tense, the past perfect, the active infinitive, the passive infinitive, the imperative and the present participle.
- (3) Illustration of the precise meaning by adding a Latin translation.
- (4) Presentation of explanatory phrases and synonyms.
- (5) Illustration through examples of usage.

3.4.2.2. Finnish

The first Finnish word list is found in Ericus Schroderus's (1608?-1639) dictionary of Latin with translations into Swedish, German, and Finnish (Schroderus 1637). Schroderus's original *Lexicon Latino-Scondicum* was a Latin-Swedish glossary (1631), where German had first been added and finally Finnish was included. The dictionary contains approximately 2,600 entries. The Latin words are arranged in terms of broad semantic fields, with glosses given for the other three languages, e.g. *Pretium - Wårde / Kööp - der Werth - Hinda* 'value, price'. In the preface, Schroderus states some of the characteristics of Finnish, such as the absence of word-initial consonant clusters and grammatical gender, as well as the use of cases corresponding to prepositions. These characterizations were largely borrowed from Bureus (3.4.1.6.), and they mark the beginning of the linguistic description of Finnish in Finland.

Henricus Florinus (1633-1705) published a Latin-Swedish-Finnish vocabulary in 1678 that was thematically ordered and intended for use by young children. Florinus's next work (1708) was a dictionary of four languages (Latin, Swedish, German, and Finnish), which was once again thematically ordered. The Latin section of this dictionary is the most extensive. The other sections lack the grammatical information concerning declension, inflection, synonyms, etc. that were found in the Latin section. Florinus was a teacher and headmaster of the school in Hämeenlinna/Tavastehus, and his vocabulary was still in use in the schools around the year 1750.

The bishop Daniel Juslenius (3.4.1.2.) was the author of the first Finnish dictionary, *Suomalaisen Sana-Lugun Coetus* (Attempt at a Finnish Dictionary, 1745). This dictionary contains a translation of approximately 16,000 Finnish word forms into Latin and Swedish, but it also includes a number of more or less regular derivations listed under each main entry and concludes with a Swedish word index. The words for the first Finnish dictionary were collected from the meager Finnish literature of the time, as well as from oral sources, partly with the help of priests. Juslenius also studied the relationship between Finnish and Hebrew or Greek (3.7.2.).

Juslenius was clearly inspired by his pro-Fennic ideology when he wrote his pioneering dictionary. But he also had a realistic view of the labor-intensive nature of lexicographic work, for he stated: “This work devours its man, and even then it will never be fully complete. I could not but try.” It is not yet known what principles Juslenius used in compiling the words to be included. Apparently he did not use Schroderus's or Florinus's earlier lexicons systematically. In the preface, Juslenius described the sound structure of Finnish and the principles of Finnish orthography in more detail than anyone before him, being aware, for example, of the importance of the phonemic opposition of long/short in Finnish. Juslenius's dictionary has had lasting value. In terms of citation frequencies, it is clearly the most cited work on Finnish from the period 1500 to 1800 (F. Karlsson 1994a:14).

Christfrid Ganander (1741-1790) was a priest and collector of folk poetry. Ganander compiled an extensive dictionary manuscript called *Nytt finskt lexikon* (The New Finnish Dictionary) from 1786 to 1787, after laborious preparatory work. Ganander used Juslenius's dictionary as a starting point and augmented it with words that he collected himself. Most of the new material derives from Ganander's own collections of folk poetry and vernacular speech, based on informant work, but he also excerpted

eleven written Finnish sources, eight religious works, and three calendars (Hormia 1961). Ganander's lexicon is the first true lexicon in Finland in the sense that his lexical entries frequently contain phrases and sentences drawn from the sources. Many of Ganander's entries also contain etymological speculations that do not stand up to critical scrutiny.

When Ganander sent his manuscript to Henrik Gabriel Porthan in Turku/Åbo for criticism, Porthan's evaluation was that the manuscript was not ready for publication. Because no one undertook the necessary revisions, the manuscript ended up in the library of the Academy of Turku/Åbo. When the city burned to ashes in 1827, the manuscript had fortunately been borrowed and was therefore saved from the flames. Ganander's examples drawn from folk poetry have especially had lasting value as one of the few original manuscript sources surviving the 1827 fire. Now the manuscript is one of the treasures of the library of the University of Helsinki. Ganander's lexicon was published in 1937-1940 as three extensive facsimile volumes, including more than 1,400 pages.

3.4.2.3. Icelandic²⁰

Brief Icelandic-Latin vocabularies existed as far back as the Middle Ages (2.1.). The first published dictionary of Icelandic was the collection of phrases by the poet and pastor Magnús Ólafsson (1573-1636), appearing posthumously in 1650. This dictionary was compiled at the request of Ole Worm, who also added translations in Latin (the author had used Danish) and prepared the book for publication. The entries for the first dictionary were mainly taken from old Icelandic literature (poetry as well as prose), but some words from the spoken language were also included. Most words were illustrated with sentences taken from literature, accompanied by a Latin translation. One exceptional aspect of this work is that each word is first written in the Runic script and then in the Latin alphabet.

The next dictionary by Andr sson in 1683 was also published after the author's death. Gu mundur Andr sson (?1610-1654), who was exiled to Denmark in 1648 and imprisoned temporarily, did not complete his work, and the final editing was carried out by professor P. H. Resen. This book contains Latin and sometimes also Greek and Hebrew translations of the Icelandic words. Andr sson's dictionary is much more comprehensive than  lafsson's dictionary and a good source of information on spoken Icelandic of the 1600s.

The Icelandic-Swedish-Latin dictionary by Verelius (1691) is a reflection of the important role played by Old Norse and other older stages of the Germanic languages in historical-comparative studies in Sweden in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries (3.7.3.). This work was edited and published after the author's death by Olaus Rudbeck Sr., and it differs from the other dictionaries mentioned because it focused solely on the old language and was based on the old manuscripts.

Basque was an important language among the fishermen and sailors in the North Atlantic in the 1500s and 1600s. In fact, Basque loan words are even found in North American Indian languages (Bakker 1989). We find an interesting testimony to the importance of Basque in this area in three hand-written Basque-Icelandic glossaries and phrase books from the early seventeenth century, cf. Deen (1937). These vocabularies are also important in the documentation of Basque nautical pidgin, which may be of significance for the diachronic study of creole languages, cf. Bakker (1987).

In the eighteenth century, two other Icelandic dictionaries were compiled but not published. Gu mundur  lafsson wrote an unfinished manuscript of an Icelandic-Latin dictionary for Swedish scholars, and J n  lafsson (assistant to  rni Magn sson) compiled a dictionary that was more like an encyclopedia, alternating between Latin, Danish, and Icelandic explanations of the entries. Finally, there is the very extensive Latin-Icelandic dictionary (2,092 pages) by the Bishop of Sk lholt, J n  rnason (1665-1743) (J.  rnason 1738).

The old and ambitious *Dictionarium Islandico-Latinum* by Bishop Hannes Finnsson (1739-1798), preserved in autograph, never progressed beyond the letter C (Lane 1968:116f).

²⁰ This section is based on J nsdottir (1996).

3.4.2.4. Sámi

The first lexical work on Sámi is the comprehensive Swedish-Sámi dictionary by Petrus Fiellström (1738b), cf. 3.4.3.4. This dictionary covers both what Fiellström called *dialectus australior* (Ume Sámi) and *dialectus borealis* (Lule / Pite Sámi).

Knud Leem produced an impressive Danish-Sámi dictionary and phraseology of 666 pages (1756), where derivations are put under the basic stem (3.4.1.5.). Leem's later publication, a dictionary that he worked on from 1768 to 1781, is an even more impressive, strictly synchronic work, and few European languages at that time could boast of a similar dictionary. The two volumes contain 2,184 pages, with the Sámi section constituting 1,616 pages.

3.4.2.5. Swedish

The first Swedish dictionary was the trilingual *Dictionarium latino-sveco-germanicum*, printed in Linköping in 1640 and thus called Lincopensen. Work on Lincopensen was started by the lecturer Nic. Grubb, and its contents were reprinted in many later dictionaries. Lincopensen is trilingual in Latin, Swedish, and German. The number of Latin entries is approximately 30,000 (cf. M. Johansson 1997). A number of smaller vocabularies and dictionaries covering Swedish began to appear in the sixteenth century. For a more detailed survey of these works in Swedish, cf. Noreen (1903:209-216).

Ericus Schroderus (3.4.2.2.) published a dictionary of Latin in 1637, with translations into Swedish, German, and Finnish. He also left behind the manuscript to *Dictionarium quadrilingue* (Quadrilingual Dictionary), which was published by Hesselman in 1929 and covered Swedish, German, Latin, and Greek. Schroderus used a variety of sources for his collection of Swedish words and included many words from the spoken language not attested in the literary language. Schroderus's dictionary (1637) is the first attempt to describe Swedish word formation by providing long lists of words with common derivational suffixes such as *-skap*, *-else*, *-ing* etc. In the preface, Schroderus comments on the nobility and age of the Runic language and then analyzes some sound correspondences between Swedish and German, Greek and Latin. For example, Schroderus observed that Greek *D* = German *T* and German *T* = Gothic [i.e. Swedish] *D*. This is a systematic work, its main insight being that sound correspondences such as these are not haphazard.

Johannes Gezelius's *Vocum Latinarum Sylloge, in quâ primitivis subjiciuntur ex iisdem Derivata & Composita, Lingvâ Svecicâ. quâ fieri potuit, propriè reddita. In usum ætatis puerilis, ut hâc methodo facillimâ, usitatissima Lingvæ Latinæ vocabula sine tædio addiscere queat* (roughly translated as The Latin-Swedish School Dictionary, 1672) is comprised of 277 pages, followed by a Swedish index of 304 pages, thus constituting an extensive Swedish dictionary containing about 9,000 lexical entries.

The archbishop, administrator, and poet Haquin Spegel (1645-1714) compiled a lexicon of more than 600 pages which serves as an important source for the language of his time (Spegel 1712). This dictionary contains words that have Swedish explanations and synonyms, as well as Latin, and frequently also English, German, French, Italian, and Spanish equivalents. Although an admirer of Stiernhielm and Rudbeck Sr., Spegel was very critical of etymological speculations (3.7.3.) and thus excluded etymological information from his dictionary.

Spegel offers two main reasons for writing his dictionary: first, and foremost, it was to increase the status of the Swedish language and to contribute to the cultivation of the Swedish literary language; second, he also had a more practical aim, since many words in the old Bible translation had become unfamiliar to readers and since many of the words in the standard language were unknown to readers with a dialect background.

A contemporary of Spegel was Jesper Swedberg whose *Swensk Ordabok* (Swedish Dictionary) was never accepted for publication. This dictionary is an impressive and highly original work (cf. Holm 1986). Jacob Serenius compiled the *Dictionarium anglo-svethico-latinum* (The English-Swedish-Latin Dictionary), which was printed in Hamburg in 1734. This is the first dictionary where English and Swedish are treated in the same volume. The foreword tells about the early contacts between Sweden

and England.

Samuel Schultze (1698-1778) was a linguist who was greatly influenced by the German school of lexicography. In 1755 he presented a dictionary manuscript to the Royal Swedish Academy of Sciences (cf. Hast 1990). Even though this dictionary was a comprehensive work (6,000 pages), it was never printed. Three of the six volumes of the unpublished manuscript are now at the library of the Dictionary of the Swedish Academy and constitute an important source of information for the language of this period.

3.4.3. Grammars of the Vernacular

Most of the vernacular grammarians of this period followed the model of Latin grammar. Several grammars were even written in Latin. These works are generally subdivided into the sections traditionally used by the classical grammarians: orthography, prosody, etymology (i.e. morphology), and syntax. This classical descriptive model was based on the notion that there is a fixed set of categories (word classes, *partes orationes*) and that the forms of the words belonging to the different categories can be described by means of paradigmatic tables. Whereas the task of the grammarian is to discover the different paradigms, these grammarians simply took it for granted that the paradigmatic frames of Latin could also be used to describe other languages. These scholars thus began by more or less unconsciously applying the model of Latin grammar to their own native data. But in doing so they were quickly confronted with a number of problems which had not been handled in the description of Latin, as outlined below:

- (1) The articles in Danish and Swedish: the categorization of the indefinite article (*en*²¹ 'a man') as a numeral or something else, the enclitic definite article (*mann+en* 'the man') and its co-occurrence with a pronominal article (*den mann+en*) and the variant gender and number forms of the articles *en : ett, den : det : de*.
- (2) The cases in Finnish and Sámi: for example, Finnish had 15 cases compared to the six cases in Latin.
- (3) The analysis of nominal and verbal inflection into declensions and conjugations and the decision as to how many conjugations and declensions should be assumed for each language.
- (4) Consonant gradation in Finnish and Sámi: for example, Finn. *kukka* 'flower' (nom. sg.) - *kuka+t* 'flowers' (nom. pl.), *tietää* '(s)he knows' - *tiedän* 'I know', *joki* 'river' (nom. sg.) - *joe+t* 'rivers' (nom. pl.).

It was during this period that all the Nordic languages (as well as some of the languages of the colonies such as Kalaallisut), with the exception of Norwegian and Faroese, were given grammatical descriptions by Nordic scholars. In some instances these descriptions were on a very high scholarly level. Although nearly all of these grammars were normative in their intent, many provided excellent descriptions of the vernaculars they were attempting to codify.

3.4.3.1. Danish

In addition to the grammars of this period, seventeenth-century Danish studies of metrics and musicology also contain valuable linguistic material. For example, several aspects of Danish pronunciation and morphology were given a thorough treatment in the works of the scholars Peder Jensen Roskilde, Hans Mikkelsen Ravn, and Søren Poulsen Judichær Gotlænder. These authors wrote extensively on stylistic matters and loan words, and they all stressed the importance of the vernacular. Several of these linguists, Ravn in particular, were also interested in language in general, from both a diachronic and a synchronic point of view, but their various attempts at descriptive analyses were never published, cf. Arnholtz et al. (1953-1960).

The first Danish grammars were written in Latin. Erik Eriksen Pontoppidan's (1616-1678) *Grammatica Danica* was written, at least in part, as early as 1646, cf. Brøndum-Nielsen (1914:142), but it was first printed in 1668. Lavrids Olufsen Kock's (1634-1691) *Introductio ad lingvam Danicam puta*

²¹ Using modern Swedish examples.

Selandicam (Introduction to the Zealand Danish Language) was written between 1656 and 1666, but not published until 1909, cf. C. Petersen (1908-09).

These two grammars are different with respect to their purpose and scope. Pontoppidan's grammar was intended for native learners, and Kock's publication was written for a foreign readership. Kock's grammar was based on the dialect of Zealand. The work is short and basically consists of inflectional paradigms following the traditional pattern of the Latin grammars. Kock felt that it was unnecessary to provide Danes with rules of usage for the vernacular. Thus his grammar was explicitly designed as an aid for the numerous foreigners who were pouring into the country. In the section on the letters and their phonetic manifestations, Kock compares the sounds in the Danish language with the sounds of English, French, and German. He operates with eight parts of speech: articles, nouns, pronouns, verbs, adverbs, prepositions, conjunctions, and interjections. This is a quite traditional view.

Kock attended school with Peder Syv (cf. below and 3.4.4.1.), and the two remained life-long friends. After studies in theology and journeys to England, France, and Germany, Kock was appointed the principal of the school in Ringsted (1666) and later became a pastor and a provost (1684).

Pontoppidan, with whom Kock was also acquainted, studied in Copenhagen and received a scholarship from the king to study in the Netherlands and France in 1641. When he returned in 1643, he was offered a professorship in poetry, but declined and continued his studies. Instead, he became a pastor in 1649 and five years later accepted the appointment as Bishop of Trondheim, Norway. Pontoppidan remained in this post until his death in 1678 (cf. Rørdam 1891-1893).

In contrast to Kock, Pontoppidan's grammar was primarily intended for an educated native audience. Pontoppidan quotes the German humanist Johannes Manlius and questions the usefulness of providing grammatical rules for the vernacular, since every child can learn to speak correctly, and as a rule, children eventually learn to write correctly by imitation and practice. Pontoppidan maintains, however, by quoting the same source, that the Greeks and Romans made a concerted effort to teach their native languages, while many Germans who spoke publicly in an official capacity, used the language in an improper and obscure manner because they had not perfected it through grammatical studies (Bertelsen II 1917:17f.).

Pontoppidan's Danish grammar was modeled on Latin grammars, but he also relied heavily on the German vernacular grammars of Albert Oelinger (*Vnderricht der Hoch Teutschen Spraach* 1573) and Justus Georg Schottelius (*Teutsche Sprach-kunst* 1641). The latter had already undertaken the task of adapting a Latin grammar to a Germanic language. Pontoppidan's work is divided into three sections: *Observationes orthographicae*, which presented pronunciation and spelling (cf. 3.4.4.1.), *Observationes etymologicae*, which dealt with the parts of speech and inflection and was the largest section, and *Observationes syntacticae*, which discussed word order with reference to the parts of speech.

In his discussion of the parts of speech and their inflection, Pontoppidan operates with five parts of speech which are subject to inflection (*variabiles & flexibiles*: articles, nouns, pronouns, verbs, and participles) and four which are not (*invariabiles & inflexibiles*: adverbs, prepositions, conjunctions, and interjections). Thus, in contrast to Latin grammar, but following the tradition of his German predecessors, Pontoppidan introduces the article as one of the parts of speech and shows an awareness that there are only two cases for nouns since they only have two possible inflections: *Casus Rectus* and *Casus Obliquus*.

Pontoppidan's view of syntax is clearly positional and relational. His observations in the final section of *Grammatica Danica* are organized systematically with reference to the parts of speech. Pontoppidan's analysis was concerned primarily with combinatory rules, inflectional agreement, and the sequence in which the various parts of speech can occur. Verbs of expectation and desire, for example, were combined with the preposition *efter* 'after' plus nominative:

Verbs of expectation and desire will have joined to them the preposition *Efter* with the nominative like: *Bi efter Gud. ... Dend ærgjerige stunder efter forfængelig ære*. "Wait for God, ... The ambitious one longs for vain honor" (Bertelsen II 1917:325).

Nouns in the oblique case (genitive) are preceded by an uninflected adjective:

Before a noun in the oblique or increasing case one puts an invariable and not an increasing adjective like *En from* (not *froms*) *mands gjerning*. “A pious man’s deed” (Bertelsen II 1917:291).

The first Danish grammar written in the vernacular, *Den Danske Sprog-Kunst* (The Danish Art of Language), was written by Peder Syv (1631-1702) in 1685 for much the same reason as Pontoppidan’s, that is, to provide native speakers with rules for speaking and writing correctly. In 1683, Syv was appointed “philologus regius linguæ Danicæ” (Royal Philologist of the Danish Language), perhaps becoming the first state-paid linguist in the Nordic countries. Syv was a strong advocate for the promotion of the Danish language, possibly inspired by his acquaintance with Ravn (3.4.1.1.). Besides his earlier work which dealt with the origin of languages and the problems of orthography (3.7.1. and 3.4.4.1.), completed in 1663, Syv worked in numerous humanistic fields of national significance such as Old Norse manuscripts, Danish folk ballads, proverbs, and Danish lexicography, cf. Horn (1878). Like Pontoppidan, Syv insists that not everyone masters his mother tongue, and that even if this were the case, there would still be merit in demonstrating what is already known, or what one may know but may not be aware of knowing (Bertelsen III 1919:156).

The grammatical section of Syv’s *Den Danske Sprog-Kunst* is intentionally brief, containing sections on syllables, letters, and pronunciation but otherwise organized with reference to the parts of speech, including illustrative inflectional paradigms. Syv’s motivation for writing his grammar is clearly normative, and as one might expect, he also includes an extensive section on orthography. Grammarians of this time were engaged in extensive debates over the question of how much detail to include in a grammar, and Syv criticizes Pontoppidan’s grammar for being much too detailed, but in doing so he fails to recognize that it is precisely the details and finer points of grammar that cause difficulty for most native users of the language.

Peder Schulz is another grammarian from this period, but little is known about him except that he was a Copenhagenener who was primarily concerned with questions of orthography. His *Danskens Skriversigtighed* (Danish Orthography, 1724) also contains interesting grammatical information. In his discussion of how much grammatical knowledge is necessary, he states, for instance, that we need to know what the term case means, and that he operates with four cases, primarily for the sake of other languages. He contends that there is really only one declension in Danish and that Danish has only two cases, nominative and genitive. In explaining why the accusative is not included in his paradigms, he states that “the fourth case is the accusative, but since it can’t be explained to any Danish man in his own language, I will do no more than just mention it”. Furthermore, Schulz’s grammar contains an interesting section on word formation and stress patterns.

One of the most detailed grammars of this period, but one which was never published in its own day, and thus exerted little or no influence, is the work of an anonymous Danish grammarian (possibly Hans Olufsen Nysted, cf. C. C. Henriksen 1976:91-117), who delivered a voluminous manuscript on the Danish language to King Frederik IV in 1727. This manuscript was later registered in the Royal Library in Copenhagen under the title “Attempt or Draft at the Improvement of the Danish Language Written in the Time of King Frederik IV”.²² This work consists of four parts, a grammar, an appendix with a discussion of the standard language and how to write it (3.4.4.1.), a historical-comparative section with a discussion of the origin of language and of the relationship of Danish to German and Norwegian (3.7.1.), and a sample dictionary with a discussion of the proper methodology to be employed in setting up specific types of entries and a dictionary as a whole (3.4.2.1.).

This grammar, which was not published until the twentieth century (C. C. Henriksen 1976), is both descriptive and normative. The author is interested in recording the observed usage of speakers of the purest form of Danish, which in his opinion is found in the speech of the educated citizens of Copenhagen. But his description is also influenced by an attempt to recover the original uncorrupted uniformity of the language, that is, “all the order that God has given us in the language”. The author has no concept of linguistic change, but wants to correct the language to the extent that “posterity need not

²² Geh. Arch. Lit. C. No 33, forma maxima.

have any further problem”. His measuring device for correctness is derived from a rationalistic approach to language in which reason (*den sunde fornuft*) is the decisive factor in determining the acceptability of a given form. Only through reason, he notes, can one actually arrive at the unique character and natural makeup of the Danish language.

The morphology of this grammar is explained primarily on the basis of function rather than form. This allows the author to set up full paradigms of six cases for nouns, as in Latin, including an elaborate vocative. Yet this grammarian also expresses very clearly that, with respect to form, there are only two “shapes” and “endings” for nouns and three for pronouns. He operates with six parts of speech, divided into two groups: those which are inflected (nouns, adjectives, pronouns, verbs, participles) and those which are not (particles, which include adverbs, prepositions, conjunctions, and interjections). This grammarian used terminology that is Danish and slightly influenced by Pontoppidan and Syv.

The most fascinating and productive Nordic grammarian of this period is Jens Pedersen Høysgaard (1698-1773). After finishing his baccalaureate, Høysgaard may have worked for a while as a teacher before becoming a janitor at the university. He later became a bell-ringer at Trinity church, a much more important function than the title indicates, cf. Bertelsen (1926). Although Høysgaard never held an academic position, he produced the theoretically most significant works of his day. His work indicates that he was acutely aware of the difference between Latin and Danish and that he insisted upon rejecting inflection as the basis of Danish syntax. His main goal was to provide an exhaustive description of the Danish language on its own terms, and although he was clearly acquainted with the philosophical approach to universal grammar, his own aim was more nationalistic and pedagogical. Høysgaard argued that the Danish language should be studied for the sake of the Danish people and for the benefit of their children, who ought to master their native language before learning foreign languages.

The notion that languages such as German and Danish were too crude and disorderly to be dealt with in terms of grammar was a frequently argued position of scholars of the eighteenth century. This assumption was perhaps a byproduct of the humanist conviction that a language could only acquire regularity and clarity through grammatical and literary cultivation. For instance, Høysgaard stated:

It is enough for me to have shown that our language can be captured by rules just as others. That this was possible was something which many have questioned, and that is one of the reasons that they place more value on foreign languages. (Bertelsen V 1923:11)

Høysgaard maintains that the study of grammar is more of an art than a science and that the purpose of his own work is practical and normative. Nevertheless, if we take a closer look at his contributions to the study of the vernacular, it is clear that his writings are more theoretical than practical. Høysgaard is very explicit about the appropriate length and degree of detail of a grammar of the vernacular, maintaining that the solution is first to write a complete grammar and then to extract various compendiums from it for specific pedagogical purposes.

Høysgaard’s first linguistic study (1743a) was a contribution to the ongoing orthographic debate in Denmark (3.4.4.1.). This work was published anonymously by “a Danish patriot from whom more of the same can be expected if this first attempt is found acceptable and stands up to scrutiny” (Bertelsen IV 1920:187). It is the good fortune of linguistics that there was much more of the same excellent caliber scholarship to come from Høysgaard’s pen. A second study appeared almost immediately (1743b) in which Høysgaard introduced a descriptively-based system of diacritics to deal with vowel length and the “stød”, i.e. glottal stop (3.4.4.1.).

In 1747 Høysgaard produced a highly original grammar of Danish, which he called an “accented and rational” grammar describing the language in “its natural shape”. This extensive grammar is based on a slightly-revised version of the system of “tones” or diacritics introduced in his previous work. Høysgaard’s objective here was very similar to that found in Abbé Girard’s grammar of French, published in the same year. Like Girard, to whom he refers in his syntax (1752), Høysgaard attempts to provide an ideal description of his native tongue by choosing from actual usage that which agrees most closely with the true nature of the language, thus reflecting the innate “genius” of the language. The most fundamental principle in this reasoning is that of “clarity”. As far as possible, each and every word and

construction should have one and only one meaning. Høysgaard's grammar consists of sections on pronunciation, the parts of speech, inflection, and orthography, as well as a brief treatment of syntax, punctuation, and prosody.

Although Høysgaard did not succeed in freeing himself of tradition, operating, for example, with two declensions for nouns, one ending in a consonant and one ending in a vowel, his approach is for the most part analytically independent and at times even refined. The following remarks on case in Danish as opposed to Latin reveals the subtlety of Høysgaard's approach to grammatical analysis:

Latin and several other languages have six cases, both with respect to meaning and inflection ... but in Danish there are at the most two endings with which to inflect nouns, and three to inflect certain pronouns, which we can call the 1st, 2nd, and 3rd case. But even though nouns (*Nomina eller Nævn-ordene*), with respect to changes in their endings, only have two, for the sake of clarity we still have to say that they, with respect to their meaning (*bemærkelsen eller meningen*), have at least three endings, of which the 1st and 3rd are identical, and the 2nd is the one which is called the genitive in other languages, and ends in s in Danish. (Høysgaard 1747:42f.; Bertelsen IV 1920:303f.)

The section on syntax in Høysgaard's 1747 grammar is brief, but of particular interest are his conclusions regarding the difference between Latin word order and the positional syntax of Danish. Being mathematically inclined, he observes that the order of the elements in a Latin sentence of eight words can be changed 40,320 times, whereas in Danish there are numerous sentences in which the word order cannot be changed at all. Høysgaard is precise in his description of sentence positions and in the order of elements, and he also notes that certain adverbs can occupy various positions while others usually only occur in one specific position. Høysgaard describes a sentence topology consisting of 12 positions, where all positions need not be filled in every sentence. His approach to topological syntax strongly resembles more recent theories of positional syntax and the sentence frame orientations to language theory proposed by Aage Hansen and Paul Diderichsen (5.6.1.1.).

In his introductory remarks to the section on syntax, Høysgaard contrasts the logic of grammar with logical reasoning, noting that a sentence can be grammatically correct yet questionable as to its truth value. For example, the sentence *Vore Forfædre, endogsaa de Gudfrygtigste af dem, troede Skjersild; dêrfor kan ogsaa vi troe det samme* 'Our forefathers, even the most God-fearing of them, believed in purgatory; therefore we can also believe the same thing.', where the first clause forms the basis for the second, and where these sentences are correctly connected with the conclusive particle expressing 'therefore', is correct according to the logic of grammar but questionable with regard to the logic of reason. This argument is based on the state of contemporary religious beliefs.

Høysgaard's most extensive contribution to linguistics was his 500 page "methodological" syntax published in 1752. This book is actually a continuation of the previous grammar with primary focus on syntax. The paragraphs are numbered consecutively as if the two works comprised one and the same work, with cross-references between the two. Høysgaard distinguishes between universal and specific grammar, but he leaves the deductive method of general grammar to the logicians and, as in his previous studies, limits his own analysis to those features specific to Danish. When discussing the difference between philosophy and grammar, he states that it makes no difference to the philosopher whether or not one says the following:

Paulus har skrevet denne Epistel.	'Paul has written this epistle.'
Denne Epistel er skreven af Paulo.	'This epistle is written by Paul.'
Denne er Pauli Epistel.	'This is Paul's epistle.'

These above statements, however, are quite different in the eyes of the grammarians. Since Høysgaard's primary aim was to describe the true nature of the language, he devotes most of his efforts to syntactic regularities and is less interested in exceptions and ornamental stylistic variation.

Høysgaard's approach to syntax is relational, and his basic presupposition is that the verb is the central element in the sentence. In his attempt to discover the semantic relations underlying the syntactic constructions found in the language, Høysgaard introduces and discusses a wealth of examples to support his rules for correct usage.

Høysgaard's views were so original and his presentation was so detailed and complicated that his ideas were never introduced in schools. But he did succeed in influencing several later grammarians such as Nicolai Nannestad (3.8.) and Jacob Baden.

Jacob Baden (1735-1804) was an educator and a professor of rhetoric at the University of Copenhagen. Baden produced a Danish grammar in German in 1767, and already in this work, he acknowledged his debt to Høysgaard. Baden was the first person to lecture on Danish grammar at the university between 1782 and 1783, and it is reported that his lectures were both well-attended and highly esteemed. These lectures were later published in 1785 under the title *Forelæsninger over det danske Sprog, eller resoneret dansk Grammatik* (Lectures on Danish Language or Rational Danish Grammar). They contained treatments of phonology and morphology, syntax and prosody. The basic aim was to set up rules for correctness based on reason. The influence of Høysgaard is apparent in this publication, yet Baden had diverging opinions about diacritics. Baden thus chose to create his own system of diacritics rather than adopt those of Høysgaard.

The Norwegian-born Carl Frederik Dichman (1763-1806) wrote a Danish grammar for naval cadets which appeared in 1800. This grammar is particularly valuable because of the emphasis it places on the contexts in which grammatical phenomena occur. For more detailed information on Dichman's grammar, cf. Hertzberg (1990:121-175).

3.4.3.2. Finnish

The first known Finnish grammar was written around 1640 by Henricus Crugerus from Naantali/Nådendal, a city close to Turku/Åbo (Mark 1949). Crugerus attempted to publish his manuscript in Sweden or Finland, as there was a printing house in Turku/Åbo from 1642,²³ but he did not succeed. Unfortunately, no copy of the manuscript has been preserved. Crugerus did, however, send the manuscript to the Danish grammarian and bishop Erik Pontoppidan in Copenhagen, who referred to the manuscript in his Danish grammar (1668). The manuscript was also known to both Peder Syv (3.4.3.1) and G. W. Leibniz.

Judging from remarks by these scholars, Crugerus's grammar was both scientific and original in its linguistic insight (Stipa 1990:120-121). Mark (1949) has inferred that its main parts treated orthography, morphology, and syntax, yet contrary to most other grammars of this time, Crugerus's analysis was not based on traditional Latin grammar. Instead he arrived at a fairly accurate description of Finnish in which he postulated twelve cases, mentioned the lack of gender, the dominance of postpositions over prepositions, and characterized certain types of word formation such as *-toin*, *-töin* 'lack of something', modern Finn. *-ton*, *-tön* (also cf. Vihonen 1978:28-29).

The founding of the Academy of Turku/Åbo in 1640 provided a setting for research in Finland. Eskil (Æschillus) Peträus (1593-1657) was a Swede, who came to Turku in 1628, and became the first professor of theology at the new Academy in 1640. Peträus wrote the first grammar of Finnish (indeed, of a Nordic language) and published it in 1649, cf. Vihonen (1978, 1983, 1998). In 1662 Peträus became bishop in Turku.

Peträus (1649) writes that Swedes, Germans, Scots, and other foreigners who did not know whether they spoke Finnish correctly or not, were particularly in need of a grammar and of linguistic guidance. Moreover, Governor General Per Brahe had decreed that a grammar be written especially for those Swedish officials who were later to be appointed by the government to crucial administrative offices.

Peträus goes on to provide a tabular survey of the prominent morphophonological alternations such as consonant gradation. This grammar has a brief section on morphology that appears to be strongly influenced by the structure of Latin, for Peträus proposes only six cases for Finnish and analyzes most of the remaining Finnish cases as variants of the ablative. Similar analyses are found in Stahl's grammar of Estonian (1637). Vihonen (1978:48-58) has shown, however, that Peträus did not

²³ This company still exists and is the oldest one in Finland. (Frenckellska Tryckeri Ab).

draw on Stahl's work, but rather from current Latin grammars, especially A. J. Tiderus, Donatus, and Philipp Melanchthon. According to Vihonen, approximately 60 % of Peträus's grammatical statements are borrowed from Latin morphology.

Peträus's grammar also contains a very brief phonology listing the letters, seven of the diphthongs, and some morphophonological alternations. The section on syntax contains forty-eight rules and twenty-two of these (46 %) are taken directly from Tiderus (1640), with all but one of the remaining rules being very similar to the rules proposed by Tiderus (Vihonen 1978:58-65). However, when compared to contemporary grammars of Greek and Hebrew, Peträus's syntax is surprisingly extensive. For example, the end of the book has texts with a thorough word-by-word analysis and with all forms explained grammatically.

The next grammar of Finnish was written by a Finn (Martinius 1689), but published in Stockholm. Its author was Matthias Martinius (1655-1728), a pastor and teacher. On the title page of his grammar, Martinius refers to himself as a Tavast-Finn, that is, from the area 150 kilometers north of Helsinki. Martinius is accurate in delineating the basic traits of Finnish phonology. For instance, he develops a kind of minimal pair technique to explain the differences between *waras* (*varas*) 'thief' - *varras* 'iron-bar', or *oja+t* 'ditches' - *ohja+t* 'reins'.

Martinius drew on Peträus's grammar, but also attempted to develop Peträus's morphology. Most of Martinius's new descriptive statements were taken from Latin grammars. In essence, more than one-third of Martinius's statements are not modeled on Peträus (Vihonen 1978:57), and some of these are improvements, such as the rules for forming comparative and superlative adjective forms.

Martinius's grammar also retains the six Latin cases, with numerous supplemental ablative forms and their corresponding uses. A table at the end of the grammar lists consonant gradation in nouns, giving nominative and genitive forms, and offers these encouraging words:

Cætera Te Lector, docet usus quotidianus Improbis atque labor, qui felix omnia vincit.
'Else, daily use will teach you, reader, and excessive toil, which luckily overcomes everything.'

While Peträus only used Latin, Martinius translated the forms and examples into Swedish and Latin, but provided the explanatory text in Latin only. Neither Peträus nor Martinius mentioned vowel harmony in the inflection, and vowels are not classified into the categories of front, back, and neutral.

The next Finnish grammar was written in 1733 by Bartholdus G. Vhael (1667-1723). Vhael was a pastor of German descent who had worked as a military pastor in Riga. Vhael's grammar was published ten years after his death by his widow. The manuscript itself had been edited by his friends on the basis of his outline and notes.

Vhael tried to describe the Finnish that was actually used at the time. This usage differed considerably from Biblical prose and the language variants described in previous grammars. As a critical reader of the manuscript prior to publication, Daniel Juslenius wanted to discard some of the vernacular innovations in favor of Hebrew-inspired constructions, but Vhael's widow refused to accept these changes (Suhonen 1973, Koivusalo 1975). To her merit, the grammar appeared basically as it was conceived by Vhael himself.

This grammar, which became the standard grammar of Finnish until around 1820, succeeded much better than its predecessors in describing the structure of Finnish. Vhael's grammar operated with fourteen cases, including a semantically but not grammatically justified vocative, which in Finnish is always identical with the nominative. Vhael called the partitive accusative (*accusativus partialis* and *accusativus totalis*) but overlooked the (fairly rare) comitative case. It is easily understandable that a grammarian would ignore the comitative, since, in contrast to all the other case forms, it never occurs in isolation, but only in combination with suffixed possessive endings. The cases are given Latin names, and three of these – the nominative, genitive, and instructive – are still in use. Morphophonological alternations are ably dealt with, and vowels are classified into front vowels [ä,ö,y] (*vocales minores*), back vowels [a,o,u] (*vocales majores*), and neutral vowels [i,e] (*vocales mediæ*).

Another contribution by Vhael was his improved description of the verbal inflectional categories, especially personal endings, and of verbal inflectional types. His treatment of pronouns was more

detailed than that of his two predecessors, and he devotes ten out of 109 pages to word-formation, especially to derivation, a phenomenon highly characteristic of Finnish.

As in Martinius's grammar, the examples given by Vhael were translated into Latin and Swedish, and the text was in Latin. Vhael did not analyze syntax, but did offer observations on differences between West-Finnish and the Savo dialects, e.g. Vhael (1733:92-94).

Although no other Finnish grammars were written before 1800, Esaias Hildeen made a valuable contribution to the field of Finnish grammar with an analysis of the Finnish case system in 1797. Hildeen began with a general typological survey of cases and then analyzed Finnish cases, operating with thirteen cases but excluding the vocative. The analysis is backed by good examples and observations and by solid semantic-syntactic descriptions.

3.4.3.3. Icelandic

The importance attributed to the Icelandic language increased after 1550. This increase in status may have arisen because historical studies of that time connected the Viking period and the pre-Christian religion and culture with the old Norse language, and most people in turn thought that old Norse was identical with contemporary Icelandic. In historical and etymological studies, no distinction was usually drawn between Old Norse and Icelandic. It is therefore not surprising that Icelandic is one of the first Nordic languages for which we have a complete grammatical sketch.

The author of this grammar, Runolfur Jónsson [Runolphus Jonas] (?1620-1654), was educated in Holar [Iceland] and Copenhagen, where he obtained his master's degree in 1651. Jónsson died during his tenure as the principal of a school in Scania (*Skåne*), Sweden. Jónsson published two linguistic studies, one of which (R. Jónsson 1651a) treated the relationship between the Nordic languages and the runic script. Jónsson pointed out that since Odin spoke Icelandic (= Old Norse) in the poem *Hávamál*, this must have been his language when he entered the Nordic countries from Asia, the land of his former residence.

Jónsson's most important contribution to linguistics is his grammar of Icelandic (R. Jónsson 1651b), which is traditional in all respects. This work contains a brief phonology and a survey of morphology with extensive lists of paradigms, but no syntax. He assumes, for instance, that Icelandic has only five vowels [a, e, i, o, u], which leads him to conclude that there are three degrees of quantity (R. Jónsson 1651b:3). Moreover, he operates with all six Latin cases instead of the four Icelandic cases. In addition, nouns are classified according to gender, but then in a curious way, in inflectional subgroups (sub-declensions) according to the final letter of the nominative singular of the noun.

Jónsson's motivation for writing this grammar was clearly a strong admiration for the richness and elegance of the Icelandic language and a desire to impart these aspects of Icelandic to others. Many of Jónsson's contemporaries thought that Icelandic was the most original and the least corrupted of the Nordic and even of the Germanic languages. This view was not only held by Nordic scholars, but linguists residing elsewhere in Europe also considered Icelandic to be special. In fact, this may explain the popularity of Jónsson's grammar, which was reprinted in England in 1688 (R. Jónsson 1688) and again in 1703. A short Icelandic vocabulary, mainly drawn from the grammar, was added to the 1688 edition. Furthermore, most of Jónsson's paradigms were included in Hicke's grammar of Anglo-Saxon and Gothic from 1689, with proper reference to the original source.

The next unfinished and unpublished grammar by the lexicographer Jón Ólafsson (1705-1779), cf. 3.4.2.3., was also based on Latin grammar (cf. Jónsdóttir 1996). Ólafsson is also the author of an unpublished textbook on Icelandic written in Danish. This short grammar, which must have been written about 1735, was designed as a textbook for one particular person. It consists of simple sentences from the everyday language and has instructions for the pronunciation of the letters, cf. Jónsdóttir (1996).

Jón Magnússon (died 1738), whose grammar was not published until 1933 (F. Jónsson 1933), is the first scholar to provide a more independent analysis of Icelandic. Magnússon stated that there were only four cases in Icelandic and only two tenses, past and present. Magnússon's grammar is entirely synchronic and contains a wealth of examples. Like his predecessors, he had difficulties in delineating the

rules for Icelandic morphology and in arriving at a functional subclassification of nouns into declensions and verbs into conjugations. Although the distinction between strong and weak verbs had already been observed by R. Jónsson (1651b), Magnússon did not take these into account in his analysis.

3.4.3.4. Sámi

The first Sámi grammar was written by Petrus Fiellström (1697-1764) in 1738 and was obviously based in part on Bartholdus Vhael's Finnish grammar (1733), cf. Sammallahti (1996:303). Fiellström was a pastor who was born in the Sámi-speaking area, and therefore knew the language from childhood. He worked as a pastor in Lycksele in the Sámi-speaking area of Sweden and made numerous translations into Sámi. Fiellström also compiled a comprehensive Swedish-Sámi dictionary (3.4.2.4.). In the introduction to his grammar, Fiellström states that he has written this grammar for pastors working among the Sámis. Moreover, he argues that because the language has not been cultivated, it is almost dead and needs to be regulated. Fiellström (1738a:79) also states that only those born in the area would be able to learn the language, because no handbooks or grammars have been available before his grammar.

Fiellström's grammar is well-organized. It begins with a section on phonology that has notes on dialects and dialect differences, and it continues with a morphology that depicts the structure of the language with nine cases (including a vocative). Fiellström's syntax is more extensive and interesting than most contemporary grammars of this era. For instance, a section of this work is devoted to the use of the cases and their construction with prepositions and verbs (Fiellström 1738a:87-101).

The next grammar of the Sámi language was written in 1743 and was also written by a Swedish pastor, Henricus Ganandrus (died 1752). This grammar is concerned particularly with dialect diversity and the problems of establishing a norm. Ganandrus stated that it is easy to learn Sámi for those who know Finnish grammar. His grammar has extensive paradigms and operates with thirteen cases for nouns (the six Latin cases used by Vhael (1733) in his Finnish grammar plus *locativus*, *meditativus*, *negativus*, *factitivus*, *nuncupativus*, *penetrativus*, and *descriptivus*), eleven cases for pronouns, and has a quite comprehensive syntax with a focus on rection. The case system established by Ganandrus is clearly influenced by his knowledge of Finnish, but it is not applicable to Sámi, as many of his case forms are not distinguished formally and are based on semantics and/or on a corresponding case form which existed in Finnish.

Knud Leem (1696/7-1774) was the founder of Sámi studies in Norway. Leem was educated as a pastor and worked as a missionary among the Sámis in Porsanger, Finnmark from 1725 to 1728. After various positions as a pastor, he became the headmaster of the Seminarium Lapponicum, the missionary training school in Trondheim, where he was given the title of professor. Leem published three studies on the Sámi language (3.4.1.5. and 3.4.2.4.) and also produced a manuscript containing a valuable collection of Norwegian dialect words (Hannaas 1916, 1923).

Leem's 1748 grammar is extensive, and it is based primarily on the author's knowledge of the language, an expertise he developed after spending four years in Finnmark, where he was sent as a missionary with the explicit task of becoming acquainted with the language. While Leem is very positive in his evaluation of the Sámi (= North Sámi) language (3.4.1.5.), he mentions in the introduction to the grammar that he encountered problems in writing a grammar of a language where hardly any written material was available. In this introduction, Leem also analyzes the relationship between Sámi and other languages, noting a number of structural similarities between Hebrew and Sámi, especially concerning possessive pronouns and verbal derivations. Leem did not, however, conclude that Sámi originated from Hebrew. Leem mentions a number of words which are similar in Sámi and Hebrew, Greek, and Latin, but he concludes that these words may not be loan words but original Sámi words.

Leem's grammar deviates from most of the other Sámi grammars in that it consists mainly of paradigms which are clearly based on elicitation. Thus, there are few rules, and syntax is not analyzed, and there is only a vague section on orthography at the end. Leem is very data-oriented and atheoretical. He does not go beyond the categories of elementary Latin grammar in his analysis. For example, he

incorporates only the six Latin cases in his grammar, combining some of the remaining cases as ablative forms.

Whereas the main variants of Sámi spoken in Sweden and Norway had thus been described by the end of the 1700s, the eastern Sámi languages spoken in Finland and Russia were not to be analyzed until the latter part of the 1800s.

3.4.3.5. Swedish

The first Swedish grammar is probably *Grammatica suetica*, ordered by the Papal emissary A. Possevino for Jesuit missionaries from abroad. This grammar was reported to be completed in 1580, but was lost, and today it is only known from references. Earlier studies of Swedish, such as the works by Bureus, cf. Lindroth (1911-1912), and early grammars of Latin published in Sweden (cf. Hovdhaugen 1987:77) were important steps towards achieving an analysis of Swedish morphology.

At the end of the seventeenth century, two rather independent motivations existed for providing grammatical descriptions of Swedish. In the bilingual town of Turku/Åbo in Finland, problems arose involving language contact and the mastery of Swedish as a second language. The speakers of Finnish found the Swedish gender system to be especially difficult to master.

The first grammar of Swedish to be printed appeared in this “applied linguistic” tradition in 1682. The author of this work was the Uppsala University librarian, Gabriel Wallenius (1648-1690). His grammar includes long word-lists specifying gender. This grammar is partly written for speakers of Swedish as a second language. For example, Wallenius (1682:6) mentions that one main problem in the grammar is the confusion of the third person singular pronouns *han* ‘he’, *hon* ‘she’, and *den* ‘it’. He then gives the example: *Fader hon badh tigh, at du skulle låna henne tit book* ‘Father she asked you to lend her your [neut.] book [masc.]’ instead of *Fader han badh tigh at tu skulle låna honom tin Book*. ‘Father he asked you to lend him your [masc.] book [masc.]’. This type of error would be very unlikely in the speech of a native Swedish speaker. The alternation *du > tu* ‘you (sg.)’ is also significant. Wallenius observed that no Swedish words began with a *muta tenuis* “unvoiced stop”, but that the stop is always aspirated (with an *h*-like release) in the initial position.

This grammar is very short, with the exception of the extensive lists of nouns in the three genders. But the main morphological features of both nouns, pronouns, and verbs are described, and basic syntactic rules are given. The author did not analyze the functions of the definite article, and in his description of verbs, main focus is placed on the formation of past forms “which are most difficult in our language”, again showing that the purpose of the grammar is to teach Swedish to foreigners.

In dealing with orthography, Wallenius is not willing to slavishly follow the spoken language, noting that “it is not correct to write or let the pen obey the tongue, which sometimes does not care how it throws out the words”. Wallenius offers numerous interesting examples of spoken language, which he compares to the correct written forms. As one illustrative example, Wallenius contends that we should write *jagh war hoos tigh i morgons, och fann tigh intet hemma* ‘I went to see you this morning and did not find you at home’, although one would actually pronounce the same sentence *ja wa hoos däij i måros, å fann däij intä hemma*.

The other tradition in Swedish grammar was nationalistic, reflecting the position of Sweden as an important European power. This prestige was accorded to Swedish by King Karl XI (1655-1697) and his successor King Karl XII (1697-1718), both of whom required the use of Swedish in official documents.

The manuscript of the first of these nationalistic grammars was completed in 1684, but was not published until 1884 (Aurivillius 1884). The author, Ericus O. Aurivillius (1643-1702), was a law professor and came from a family that would influence Swedish academia for generations to come. In his preface, Aurivillius observed that Swedish, unlike all other languages, had not yet been provided with a grammatical description, and thus his main purpose is to provide a description which would not only be useful to foreigners wanting to learn Swedish, but also to the indigenous population.

Aurivillius’s grammar provides a very orderly description of Swedish phonology and morphology. Few diachronic speculations or digressions appear in the text, and the usual laudatory

remarks on the excellence of the Swedish language are absent. Aurivillius includes the article as an additional category in Swedish. He assumes six declensions, of which the last five are the ones still considered as the basic declensions of Swedish. His declensions are based on the plural endings and are: 1. plural *-r*, 2. plural *-or*, 3. plural *-ar*, 4. plural *-er*, 5. plural *-n*, 6. plural \emptyset . Credit must be given to Aurivillius for his analysis of the Swedish nominal system, which compares favorably with the descriptions by Salberg and Tiällman (cf. below) and has been repeated in grammars since his time.

The next grammar from this period was written in 1696, but was never published (cf. A. Andersson 1884). The author was Johan Salberg (ca. 1640-1699), a public servant. For financial reasons, Salberg took up teaching Swedish to foreigners. This activity, combined with a national-patriotic sentiment, led him to write *Grammatica Svetica*, an incomplete grammar covering only orthography, prosody, and nouns. Salberg's grammar does not include a section on verbs, nor is there a chapter on syntax (cf. Teleman 1984) for the treatment of articles in grammars from the end of the seventeenth century).

The only Swedish grammar printed in this period is Tiällman (1696), cf. Wollin (1984). Like Tiällman's Latin grammar (3.3.1.) it is heterogeneous and, as Noreen (1903:198) states, full of all kinds of unnecessary learning.

Nils Tiällman(n) (1652-1718) was eager to quote all the linguistic predecessors known in his day, following a style which was customary among his contemporaries. He wrote a mixture of Swedish and Latin, producing a text in which associations seemed to float freely, with one irregularity leading to another irregularity in a different part of the grammar of the language.

Tiällman considers the Swedish article to be an admirable characteristic of the Swedish language, even though he cannot explain its use. His classification of verbs to three classes (conjugations) is, however, insightful and has served as a model to be followed even in modern grammars. Tiällman makes an important identification of the verb ending *-er* in, for example, *Han äter* 'He eats' with the copula *är* 'is' as in *Han är stark* 'He is strong'. Later, many nineteenth-century grammarians also made this identification, e.g. Boivie, Moberg, and Strömberg (4.3. and 4.5.1.5.). An example of Tiällman's somewhat fuzzy analysis is a quote from his section on cases, where he operates with five of the Latin cases (the vocative is omitted):

We probably have these six cases in common with Danish concerning marking, meaning, and sense, but not as many for endings. How the French and several other nations do not complicate their languages with many cases is shown by their grammarians. Thus also the Hebrew language, which has only one case in each number. Accordingly, we could probably also manage with few cases, since we also have the articles, which in our language cause the cases to double, or indefinite and definite forms. (Tiällmann 1696:161)

The first extensive grammar of Swedish and the first to analyze Swedish syntax was a grammar written for Germans (Heldmann 1738), which was apparently also the first grammar of Swedish written by a foreigner.

The poet Anders Nicander (1707-1781) was the first scholar to take notice of the difference between tone accent 1 and accent 2 in Swedish, as noted by Axel Kock (1884-1885). Nicander observed that while many words in Swedish seem to rhyme in their written form, they actually do not rhyme due to this accent (Nicander 1737:34). This is evident in the italicized words in the following examples (1737:34):

Han ei sumera kan ihop de minsta *talen*
 Ty han är yhr och *galen*.
 Hwi grymten I och *grinen*,
 Som *Swinen*.

The rough English translation is:

He cannot add the smallest numbers,
 because he is dizzy and mad.

Why do you grunt and whine,
like the swines.

Nevertheless, Nicander's insight remained unnoticed by many authors, as can be seen in many of the Swedish grammars from the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. The lawyer Anders af Botin (3.4.1.) published one of the finest early grammars of Swedish in 1777 (a new edition appeared in 1792). Influenced by continental linguists, he divided the book into a general introductory section on speech and writing (Botin 1792:5-25) and a Swedish section (Botin 1792:25-213). In the Swedish section, Botin restricts his analysis to four declensions of nouns. For example, he does not think the addition of an *-n* to make the plural of *äpple* 'apple' motivates a special declension. Instead, words like these are included in declension four with the comment that some words increase their form with an *-n* in the plural. Botin divides verbs according to their supine ending, which is an innovative approach that results in three conjugations, illustrated by *älskat* (*-at*) 'loved', *lärt* (*-t*) 'learned', *tagit* (*-it*) 'taken'.

Sven-Göran Malmgren (1991) has shown that Gustaf Sjöborg's *Schwedische Sprachlehre für Deutsche* (1796) is one of the best Swedish grammars of its time. Sjöborg was inspired by Adelung's *Deutsche Sprachlehre für Schulen* (1794), and he adopts a syntactic analysis using subject and predicate in a systematic way. According to Malmgren, Sjöborg was the first Swedish grammarian who formulated the rule for reflexivization which is now commonplace.

3.4.4. Orthography, Purism, and the Standardization of the Vernacular

Much of the linguistic debate in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries in Denmark and Sweden was concerned with orthography and the standardization of the written languages. Many of the orthographic studies of this period contain a wealth of information concerning the spoken language at that time.

The main question in both Denmark and Sweden was the extent to which orthography should reflect the spoken language. This problem was often linked to both theology, so as to preserve the orthography of the Bible, and to practical pedagogy, so as to learn how to make it easier for people to master reading and writing. The question of purism was another important aspect in the often heated discussions of orthography, stemming from a nationalistic attitude towards the use and spelling of loan words.

The standardization of the other Nordic languages did not take place until the nineteenth century, but there was a lively discussion in the eighteenth century, especially in Iceland.

3.4.4.1. Danish

The first to show any scholarly interest in orthography in this period in Denmark is Jacob Madsen Århus (1538-1586), best known for his contributions to phonetics (3.9.). Based on his analysis of the sounds of Danish, in this case an incorrect analysis, he maintained that there were no diphthongs in the language and insisted on writing *av*, *ev*, *aj*, and *ej* (and not *au*, *ai* etc.). The major concern of most of the Danish grammarians of this period was with problems of orthography, and Peder Syv's initial work on language (1663) was no exception. His *Nogle betenkninger om det Cimbriske Sprog* (Some Remarks on the Cimbric Language) dealt not only with the history of the Danish language and its relation to other languages (3.7.1.), but also with orthography in a normative vein. Syv was acquainted with Pontoppidan's grammar (1668) prior to its publication (Bertelsen II 1917:156), and like Pontoppidan, Syv advocates a moderate application of Scaliger's rule that one should write as one speaks.

In his concern for the relationship between speech and writing, Pontoppidan (1668) followed Scaliger (1540), who maintained that writing should not deviate from that which is spoken. This potentially radical view was, however, not carried to the extreme by Pontoppidan, whose major interest was in a simplification and Danicization of the orthography. An excerpt of Pontoppidan's orthographic observations was published in Danish under the title "Some Thoughts and Rules about the Correct

Orthography of Danish” (Bertelsen III 1919:1-10) and appended to Erik Olsen Marsløv’s Danish edition of Comenius’s *Vestibulum* (Entrance, 1678). Credit for this section is usually given to Marsløv, Pontoppidan’s nephew, but it could just as easily have been a reworking by Pontoppidan himself (Bertelsen VI 1929:65). With the appearance of this work, Pontoppidan’s orthographic considerations were made available to a public who previously had no access to his Latin work.

Just over a decade after Syv’s work appeared, the first public orthographic debate in Denmark was set in motion by Henrik Gerner (1629-1700) with the publication of his *Orthographia Danica* (Danish Orthography, 1678). On the surface, Gerner’s criticism is aimed at the radical orthography in which Hans Rhode’s (ca. 1587-1679) Danish edition (1672) of Comenius’s pioneering *Orbis sensualium pictus* (The Visible World in Pictures, 1658), the first illustrated schoolbook, was written. But Gerner is really attacking indirectly the spelling reforms proposed by his personal friend and scholarly opponent Peder Syv. Gerner is consistently the conservative of the two and only advocated reform in those instances where Syv remained conservative. Gerner wanted to have nothing to do with Scaliger and the spoken language, insisting instead that orthographic norms should be based on previously established written usage, even at the expense of uniformity.

The death of Rhode in 1679 prevented his participation in the debate, but Syv did not let Gerner’s attack go unanswered. Syv’s defense came in 1685 in the final and largest section of *Den Danske Sprog-Kunst* (Bertelsen III 1919:147-250). This was met by a new battery of remarks from Gerner in his *Epitome Philologiae Danicae* (Basics of Danish Philology, 1690). Syv never replied in print, but many of his comments are retained, some of them written in the margins or on loose sheets inserted in his own private copies of Gerner’s publications.

After a period of silence in Denmark, orthographic questions were addressed again, this time initially by Peder Schulz (ca. 1691-1773). Schulz’s discussion of the orthography of the vernacular (Schulz 1724) was written so that it could be understood by the common people because the author was interested in bringing the written language closer to the spoken language. His ideas concerning the correct orthography for Danish differ only slightly from those of Pontoppidan and Syv. It is possible that Ludvig Holberg (1684-1754) was inspired by Schulz to write his “Remarks on Orthography”. This essay appeared at the end of Holberg’s *Metamorphosis* (1726), in which Holberg attempted to explain his own orthography, bemoaning the lack of normative guidelines and expressing the desire that someone more knowledgeable in linguistic matters than himself should attempt to resolve the problem. Holberg himself argued for a spelling that was close to pronunciation, but where the same morpheme is spelled, whenever possible, in the same way in all its derivations and inflected variants.

Not long after Holberg had made this plea, an anonymous Danish grammarian delivered an extensive manuscript to King Frederik IV (1727), cf. 3.4.3.1. The author advocated the extreme position of Scaliger’s view that orthography should follow pronunciation, demonstrating this point by writing the manuscript in what comes very close to a phonetic orthography, including a system of diacritics for indicating vowel length and stress. The anonymous Danish grammarian built partly on ideas found in Syv and Pontoppidan, but his view was more radical than either of these. Many of the anonymous author’s views were original, and he gave an excellent picture of what the spoken language in Copenhagen was like in his day. The most significant aspects of this Danish author’s work were his proposals for orthographic reform, together with his own practices. Although his suggestions went unheeded during his lifetime, they provide the modern reader with valuable information on the sound system of the spoken language in Copenhagen in and around the beginning of the eighteenth century, cf. C. C. Henriksen (1976).

A renewed orthographic debate began when Niels von Hauen (1709-1777) published a brief treatise on orthography together with a spelling dictionary (Hauen 1741a). This publication contained provocative views on questions such as not using initial capital letters for nouns, the use of *e* and *æ*, the spelling of foreign loans, and the banning of plural verbal forms. Among others, the journalist Thomas Clitau criticized von Hauen’s views. Von Hauen replied to his critics with a short publication (Hauen 1741b), but was further criticized in a larger work by Clitau (1742). The most significant aspect of these exchanges, which Clitau himself referred to as an “orthographic war”, was that they served to set Jens

Pedersen Høysgaard's pen in motion (3.4.3.1.).

Although Høysgaard is clearly participating in the “war” between von Hauen and Clitau, he pretended to be taking sides in the older debate between Syv and Gerner. Like Syv and von Hauen, Høysgaard proposed to write the letter *j* in words like *Bjerg* and *Høj*, whereas Gerner (and Clitau) preferred the letter *i*. Concerning the plural of verbs, Høysgaard agreed with Gerner's (and von Hauen's) rule to use only the singular forms in accordance with spoken usage, but disagreed with Syv's (and Clitau's) practice to retain the plural forms. On writing double vowels or double consonants to distinguish between short and long vowels (Syv: *Brøød* ‘bread’, *Smør* ‘butter’, Gerner: *Brød*, *Smørr*), Høysgaard stated that both are correct in one sense, but still incorrect since only one vowel is heard in *Brød* and only one consonant in *Smør*, noting that we should find a better way to indicate the distinction without having to write too much or too little. Just what this “better way” was, namely the use of diacritics to indicate vowel length and the glottal stop (the *stød*), became clear in his next contribution to the discussion of orthography (Høysgaard 1743b).

This work contains a section on “tones” in which Høysgaard introduces four different types of accents to deal orthographically with differences in vowel length and the occurrence of the glottal stop. Høysgaard suggests the following system: 1) an acute accent to indicate a short vowel without the glottal stop; 2) a grave accent to mark a short vowel followed by a consonant containing a glottal stop; 3) a circumflex to indicate a long vowel containing a glottal stop and 4) an apostrophe to mark a long vowel without the glottal stop. Høysgaard also includes a section on vowels where, like his anonymous predecessor from 1727, he advocates using the same vowels in writing as are heard in speech. To fully accomplish this, Høysgaard adds a tenth vowel to the existing nine.

Høysgaard's last contribution to the orthographic debate was his 1769 appendix to his 1747 grammar, in which he introduced guidelines for a basic orthographic word list, insisting once more on the merits of his system of diacritics.

In addition to orthographic reforms, Syv was interested in purifying the vernacular by ridding it of foreign loans, particularly items originating from French and Latin. According to Skautrup (II 1947:305), objections to French influence prior to the period of Absolutism were more likely adopted from German sources than produced by the contemporary linguistic situation. Nevertheless, it is interesting to note the enthusiasm with which patriots like Ravn exclaimed: “Gallica lingua, Gallica vestis, Erit, Dania, tua pestis” ‘The French language, French cloth will be your plague, Denmark’ (Skautrup II 1947:305).

Grammatical terminology was one area of linguistic purification with which both Syv and Pontoppidan were occupied. They had similar suggestions for a native terminology, so that it is difficult to determine which terminology can be attributed to whom. Most of them were translations from Latin, some had clearly been mediated by way of German.

3.4.4.2. Swedish

Swedish spelling was the topic of a heated discussion during the last decades of the seventeenth century, and this debate continued until the early 1900s. Hugo Hernlund (1883) submitted spelling proposals from 1691 to 1739, and he also wrote a survey of the status of Swedish in the past.

Lillemor Santesson's study (1986) of the printer Salvius illustrates the great importance of the printers in the standardization of the orthography. Linguistic writings were often polemic contributions to this discussion. One radical and one conservative party participated in the discussion. The conservative party wanted to retain spellings which more or less had been established, such as the abundant use of *ch* (still existing in *och* ‘and’) and the use of *f* and *fv* for *v* in final (*haf*) and medial (*hafva*) position, respectively. One plausible argument for keeping *ch* seems to have been that the printers had a type in their cast on which *c* and *h* were combined. The spelling discussion also raised issues such as the representation of the special vowel sounds which varied in different dialects, as well as the general problem of marking length.

The morphological relations between words made matters even more complicated. A rule

stipulating that the short *å*-sound should be spelled *o* would run contrary to the principle that morphologically related words should have the same spelling. The morphological principle would thus be violated if the color adjective *blå* ‘blue’ was spelled *blå*, while the neuter form of this adjective was spelled *blott*. One complication was that a word spelled *blott* meaning ‘only’ already existed. The morphological argument is also linked to the long-standing problem of the spelling of neuter participles, for example the participle of *måla* ‘paint’, which may be spelled phonetically as *målat* or morphologically adding the default *-t* to the non-neuter form *målad* as *måladt*. The radical line that argued for the supremacy of phonetics (“the eye should not see more than the ear could hear”), preferred the spelling *målat* and suggested that both the neuter adjective to *blå* and the word meaning ‘only’ were to be spelled *blott*.

In 1674, the poet and teacher Samuel Columbus (1642-1679) wrote *En svensk orde-skötsel* (A Swedish Word Cultivator, cf. Stjernström and Noreen 1881 and Hesselman 1908) which included ideas of language planning and some strange notes about Swedish words and their spelling. This book remained unfinished and unpublished, but is mainly of interest as evidence of nationalistic thinking and as a source of knowledge of the language at that time. Columbus noted that Swedish had to use more letters than did Latin and French and observed that loan words were concentrated in certain domains such as in business (*bankrutt* ‘bankrupt’) and travel (*bagage* ‘luggage’). He argued that grammar was nothing but a set of rules and conditions that governed correct speech and writing. Columbus believed that the orthography should correspond closely to the spoken language and that the spoken language should be the norm for the written language. These views are similar to the views of the leading language theoretician of French classicism, Claude Favre Vaugelas (1585-1650), cf. Vaugelas (1647).

Several dissertations on spelling problems were defended under Aurivillius and Lagerlöf, scholars who tried to prove their point with linguistic arguments, thereby contributing indirectly to the linguistic analysis of Swedish. Lagerlöf’s dissertation (1694) contains a number of keen observations on the pronunciation of Swedish, and the author makes a very clear distinction between sounds (*sonus*) and letters (*litterae*). Lagerlöf stresses the principle that spelling should be based not only on pronunciation, but also on tradition and authority. Lagerlöf also notes the great variety in the spoken language and the need for a uniform orthography based primarily on etymology. In other words, Lagerlöf felt that words derived from the same root should have the same spelling, or at least consideration of related words should be decisive in determining correct spelling. On the whole, he ends up supporting the existing spelling. Aurivillius (1693) provided a more extensive description than did Lagerlöf. He defended the existing Swedish orthography and tried to correlate it with pronunciation, for example, by pointing out how the two conform and where exceptions and irregularities occur.

The most vehement defender of the older spelling was Jesper Swedberg (1653-1735), the presiding bishop in Skara. Swedberg wanted to reintroduce the language of the Petri brothers and of the first Bible translation. In his book *Schibboleth* (1716), Swedberg argues emphatically for a conservative and purist approach. He also proposed a new volume of psalms (1695) which, however, was officially rejected. The following examples of his arguments for not changing the orthography are also typical of the conservative view in general:

Against changing *ck* to *kk* (as in *lycka* ‘luck’ > *lykka*):

Because we Swedes have used this letter “c” in these and other words for a long time. We also ought to retain it and not throw it away at the whim of somebody else. It does not do us any harm. All changes that are unnecessary ought not to be praised. What our parents have left us that is useful, we should receive with thankfulness and respect and take good care of it and use it well, and we should leave it to our children and descendants in just as good shape as we received it. If everybody should change, take away and add as he pleases, everything will become unstable and wishy washy. And the language will become totally ruined and incomprehensible as we have already experienced. (Swedberg 1716:5)

Swedberg’s opposition to spelling long vowels as double vowels are apparent in the comment below:

The Hebrews and Greeks, whose languages the Holy Spirit used to compose the Holy Bible for our sublimity, know nothing of double vowels. (Swedberg 1716:59)

Swedberg's grammar (1722) dealt with the language of the old Bible translation. He displayed little interest in the emerging language of his time, and his grammatical system does not indicate that he had distinguished relevant declensions and conjugations in any detail.

Urban Hjärne (1641-1724) was a famous physician and scientist who was born in Estonia and grew up in a multicultural environment. As an old man, Hjärne also engaged in orthographic fights with Swedberg. After studies in Uppsala with Olov Rudbeck, Hjärne spent a year in London and three years in Paris (see also 3.9.) before he established himself as the head of an impressive chemical laboratory in Stockholm (cf. Ohlsson 1991, 1992 for details on Hjärne's background, studies, contacts, and insights). Hjärne challenged Swedberg's attempts to standardize the orthography by a new book of hymns and a new version of the Bible.

Hjärne's satirical work *Orthographia Suecana* (Swedish Orthography), published anonymously between 1716 and 1717, was written as a dialogue between the old Eustathius and the young man Neophilus, where the opinions of Eusebius (easily identified as Swedberg) were criticized. Only part of this work was printed, but copies were distributed. For instance, it is known that Swedberg borrowed a copy from King Karl XII when he visited Lund in the winter of 1717-1718. This heated polemic is of interest to the modern reader because it demonstrates ways of analyzing data and modes of argumentation that were prevalent at the beginning of the eighteenth century.

An eccentric work from this period that covered several aspects of language was produced by Johannes Jacobus Pfeif (1713). This author generally had strong if not always well-argued views. Pfeif begins by criticizing the growing influx of loan words in Swedish in a chapter entitled "On remedies for the foreign evil". He then turns to orthography, where his extensive treatment is characterized by a strong personal bias and a lack of confidence in authorities. Pfeif has a negative view of Finnish, which is characterized as barbaric because it has many vowels in the same syllable (Pfeif 1713:299) and contains both geminated vowels and consonants. According to Pfeif, these features create terrible speech ("horridum sermonem", Pfeif 1713:305). Pfeif strongly opposed conservatism in orthography, showing the arbitrariness and inconsistency of older spellings. He analyzed various stylistic aspects, including poetic language and archaic words, and he also stated that Swedish word order and syntax is as natural as it is in French.

In spite of its inconsistencies and idiosyncrasies, Pfeif's work contained a number of interesting and original views on language. This publication stimulated, at least in one instance, a thorough and detailed commentary (Iserhielm n.d.) that provides an excellent example of the advanced level of linguistic argumentation in the Swedish orthographic debate at the beginning of the eighteenth century.

Another Swede, Abraham Sahlstedt (1716-1776), worked as a secretary in the Swedish State Archives. But after 1756 Sahlstedt was not expected to do archival work but merely to publish useful books. Sahlstedt adopted French ideas on language standardization, using the language spoken by educated people as the norm. He also played an important role in the standardization of Swedish, both through his dictionary (Sahlstedt 1773) and his grammar (Sahlstedt 1769a),²⁴ the latter covering both orthography and morphology. Both these publications were officially accepted by the Royal Academy of Sciences. Sahlstedt's influence on Swedish orthography has been studied in detail by Lindblad (1919), who also provides a survey of Sahlstedt's extensive linguistic work.

Sahlstedt's judgment is usually praised, and he managed to recommend many forms which stood a chance of being generally accepted. But, like many language planners, he recommended several forms for systematic reasons which were not accepted, e.g. definite plural *binen* from sing. *bi* 'bee' (4th declension), pl. *bin* (The form accepted today is *bina*. The definite article for plurals ending in *n* of the 4th declension is *-a*.) Sahlstedt wanted to give up the *-o* in oblique words of the first declension, which was not rare, for example, *nytto* 'usefulness' in favor of *-a* as in *nytta*. This recommendation was successful. Sahlstedt only recognized four declensions, and the plural ending *-n* in e.g. *strån* 'straws', *bon* 'nests' was not considered to be common enough to establish as a declension of its own. These

²⁴ An earlier shorter version of the grammar was published in 1747. The expanded version (1769a) also appeared simultaneously in a French translation (Sahlstedt 1769b).

nouns were included in the fourth declension (the *-n* was disregarded; some dialects still form the plural of these words with no ending). He suggested the adoption of the plural *-n* instead of *-r* for a number of words ending in *-e*, as in the word *testamente* ‘testament’. The dictionaries of Sahlstedt’s day followed his suggestions very closely.

Sahlstedt suggested the retention of the difference between the supine (*-it*; *Pojken har sprungit* ‘The boy has run’) and the neuter participle (*-et*; *Barnet är bitet* ‘The child is bitten’). The difference, for example, between the supine *målat* and the neuter participle *måladt* disappeared as a result of the 1906 spelling reform that abolished the *-dt*.

Sven Hof (1703-1786), an educator at a high school in Skara, was strongly in favor of a phonological orthography in his famous book *Swänska Språkets Rätta Skriftsätt* (The Proper Way of Spelling Swedish). Two of Hof’s slogans were: “Let the spelling as closely as possible follow a correct Swedish pronunciation” and “Write the words according to correct pronunciation” (Hof 1753:253, 254). Hof also wanted the grammar to be free from disturbing Latin influences. He had no interest in, or respect for, etymological and diachronic factors, since he was only concerned with the modern language.

Hof participated vigorously in the linguistic debate of his day (cf. Beckman 1930) and wrote the first scholarly monograph of a Swedish dialect (1772). This was mainly a dictionary, albeit with a thorough grammatical introduction, where the words were written as they were pronounced and then compared with their pronunciations in other dialects. This introduction also contained a number of sound correspondences between Swedish dialects, as well as systematic morphological comparisons. Hof appears to have pondered language problems in great depth as evidenced by his treatment of the conventionality and arbitrariness of words and by his ideas on the difference between alphabetic and ideographic writing. He also made pioneering observations concerning phonetic variation. His contribution to linguistics was considered to be valuable enough to warrant another edition. Mats Thelander therefore reissued Hof’s *Swänska språkets rätta skriftsätt* (1985).

The Swedish Academy was founded in 1786 and it took part in the discussion of spelling through various contributions by its members.

3.4.4.3. Icelandic

The first clear effort to establish a firmer basis for Icelandic orthography was made by the great manuscript collector Árni Magnússon (1663-1730). Based on intensive study of the old manuscripts, he established new orthographic rules, more consistent and closer to the old language, which he taught to his scribes, and which spread to others because of his authority (Ottósson 1990:23-24). The earliest known treatise on Icelandic orthography was written by one of Magnússon’s scribes, Jón Ólafsson frá Grunnavík (1705-1779), the core part in 1733. This treatise was never published and seems not to have had much influence (Helgason 1926:71-87). Ólafsson distinguishes between various kinds of orthographic arguments, the most important being contemporary usage and pronunciation, and after these the orthography of old manuscripts and the origin of the words. He stresses the necessity of distinguishing old short and long vowels, sometimes neglected in contemporary writings, and proposes to mark the old long vowels by doubling, probably inspired by Hiärne (1716/1717).

In the second half of the eighteenth century, several young and enthusiastic patriots who had studied the language and orthography of the old manuscripts wanted to go much further in an archaizing direction than Árni Magnússon had. Jón Ólafsson later moderated his views, as seen in his orthographic treatise, *Réttritabók*, from 1762 (Gíslason 1926:147-169). The treatise was never published, but it was influential in the following decades by wide distribution in manuscripts. Ólafsson does not adhere consistently to any orthographic principles, and his discussion of alternatives is often indecisive. He warns against following the orthography of the old manuscripts, but this still is one of his main types of argument, together with morphophonemic considerations, for example minimizing variation within a paradigm. He often refers to the Old Icelandic grammatical treatises, and in his discussion of the spelling of the old manuscripts, he shows much knowledge, although he is often misled by imperfect knowledge of language history. He is apparently the first to advocate the use of accent for the old long vowels,

following the First Grammarian (cf. 2.3.).

The earliest post-reformation translations into Icelandic, in poetry and prose, tended to contain many loan words and to follow the original language too closely (Hermannsson 1919:6-7). Guðbrandur Þorláksson, Bishop of Hólar 1571-1627, turned the tide when he both advocated and practiced lexical purism in his extensive publications. This policy was accepted by most later writers, at least to some extent. One exception is Sveinn Sölvason (1722-1782), who in his introduction to law from 1754 saw it as natural to use Danish loan words because the laws themselves came from Denmark.

3.5. Other European Languages

The Nordic universities did not make the major modern European languages, German, English, French, Italian, Spanish, and Russian, objects of serious research until the 1800s. Nevertheless, a demand arose for the practical teaching of some of these languages among university students, the nobility, and the court, and also later among merchants and craftsmen. For example, French was taught at the Academy of Turku/Åbo beginning in 1670.

This language teaching was done by so-called “language masters”, predominately foreigners who either taught privately or were employed at universities or academies. Many of these teachers produced elementary grammars and textbooks. As an illustration of the purpose and intended audience of these grammars, the full title of the first grammar of Italian published in the Nordic countries (Bang 1733) is quoted below:

Grammatica Italiana e Danese or a small short Italian and Danish grammar containing the most important things with which one in a quite short period of time and with the help of a dictionary can by oneself learn to understand the Italian language (which is the foundation of French) as well as poets and other authors, excerpted with diligence from Veneroni Italian and German grammar; of the last edition as well as of others: To the honor of the fatherland, to the propagation of sciences and for the use of young students.

The author of a Latin grammar published in Turku/Åbo in 1683 (Rajalen 1683) stresses the importance of language learning and of acquiring language proficiency early in life to assure correct pronunciation. This author then lists what he considers to be important languages besides Latin, which everyone mastered, to be learned in the following order: 1) Finnish, 2) Swedish, 3) German, 4) Polish, Ruthenian (i.e. Russian), Estonian, and Latvian, 5) French, 6) The Biblical languages Hebrew and Greek. Estonian and Latvian were claimed to be “not very useful for anybody except soldiers, officials, and governors”, whereas French was particularly suited for “young noblemen and those who are found worthy to sit at the table of kings”.

The most important foreign language was French. Daniel Matras (1598-1689) was the founder of French grammar in Denmark and of the teaching of several other modern languages. Matras was born in Vendôme, France. In 1623, he served as the professor of French and Italian at Sorø Academy, and in 1625 he published a short grammar of French and Italian that was written in Latin. This grammar had examples translated into German, and his French grammar was published in German in 1637. Matras also published a French-Danish-Italian-German book of proverbs and a French-Latin dictionary, both of these quite extensive. The Danish version of his grammar was published in 1663.

The first French grammar published in Sweden was probably Pourel’s grammar for travelers (1650). In the preface, Pourel states that the grammar is written for those traveling to France and Europe, travelers who would have more pleasant and facile journeys if they mastered the language. But the author also adds that there is an increasing desire to learn foreign languages among all classes of Swedes, the educated as well as the common people. Pourel was himself a native Frenchman and a language teacher in Stockholm. His grammar is written partly in Swedish, and he strongly emphasizes pronunciation, which, as the author says, is much more important in French than in German and Swedish because one speaks rapidly in French.

Carolo Rodriguez Matritense (born 1618 in Madrid) was a professor at Sorø Academy and

taught Spanish, French, and Italian. When Sorø Academy closed in 1669, Rodriguez became the professor of French, Spanish, and Italian at the University of Copenhagen. Rodriguez's Spanish grammar (1662) is a short, elementary, and traditional (e.g. with six cases) grammar written in Latin.

One pedagogically interesting type of grammar is represented by Peter Canel's French-German grammar (1701), a good example of the so-called royal grammars. Canel was the language teacher for Prince Wilhelm of Denmark, and his grammar was entitled *Der Königliche Französisch-Teutsche Grammaticus zur Übung Ihrer Prinzlichen Hochheit Prinz Wilhelms von Dennemark Meines Gnädigsten Herrn* (The Royal French-German Grammar for the Practice of his Highness, Prince Wilhelm of Denmark, my Dear Sir). In the preface to this grammar, Canel contends that children are taught too many rules and that he consequently would limit the rules to the basic paradigms and then use texts in which these rules are illustrated. Accordingly, each page has bilingual paradigms and below these are bilingual texts composed so that the same words are constantly repeated. The result is an awkward text that is not easy to read. The text deals with all kinds of family matters and daily life and is written in a very idyllic and moralistic manner.

The fact that these royal grammars were printed and probably available to the nobility is an indication that they may have had some influence. Pedagogically they represent a complete break with the classical tradition.

Of the major Western European languages, English received least attention from Nordic grammarians. The first extensive grammar of English written in the Nordic countries is Bertram's grammar for "students, sailors and those having commercial contact with Great Britain" (1750). The author, Charles Julius Bertram (1723-1765), was born in London, but the family moved to Copenhagen when Bertram was a child. Bertram later worked as an English teacher in Copenhagen. Prior to the publication of his grammar, only a few very short studies of English had been published in Copenhagen, among them Bolling's "A perfect English grammar" (1678), which, in spite of the title, is mainly an introduction on how to pronounce the literary language. Bertram points out that pronunciation is the main difficulty in English, and he devotes ample space to explaining elementary terms like vowel and consonant to his readers. His explanations are not always successful, however, since he lacks a phonetic metalanguage. For instance, the sequence *th* is explained as follows:

We cannot describe this sound otherwise than to state that it is a sharper puff of breath in the pronunciation of the single *t*. (Bertram 1750:100)

The grammar concludes with a list of subscribers, mostly naval officers, merchants, craftsmen, and a few pastors, with four or five young women (*Jomfru*) counted among them. An extended and revised version of the grammar appeared in 1753 entitled *Royal English-Danish Grammar*.

In 1800, Henrik Gabriel Porthan in Turku/Åbo made a valuable contribution to Old English studies by publishing and critically analysing a text translated by King Alfred. This study was held in esteem by Rasmus Rask (Aalto 1987:9-10).

The most important scholar of modern language studies in the Nordic countries before 1800 was undoubtedly Hans von Aphelen (1719-1779), the son of a teacher from Namdalen in Norway. Aphelen studied in the Netherlands and France and came to Copenhagen in 1749, where he taught French and became a professor without a salary in 1759. He published a number of translations from French as well as elementary textbooks in the language, but he also produced a comprehensive and pedagogical, although not very original, French grammar consisting of 417 pages (Aphelen 1775). This work was dedicated to his pupil, the seven-year-old Crown Prince Frederik (later King Frederik VI). Like most grammars of French published in Denmark before 1800, Aphelen's grammar is based on the grammatical structure of Latin, assuming, for example, six cases for French.

Aphelen's most important contributions to linguistics are his impressive dictionaries of French (Aphelen 1759, 1772-1775) and German (Aphelen 1764), which were of very high quality. The last edition of his French-Danish and Danish-French dictionary of 1772-1775 consists of 2,130 pages in quarto and remained the most extensive work of its kind in Denmark for more than 100 years. Aphelen was a proponent of including French in the high school curriculum and of strengthening the teaching of

French in general (Aphelen 1772-75:Preface), but the extent of his influence is difficult to determine.

Scholarly interest in the grammar of Russian and other Slavic languages came late in the Nordic countries, with one important exception, Michael Groening. He was born in Vaasa, Finland, in 1714 and moved with his mother to St. Petersburg in 1729, where he lived until 1748. Groening traveled in Russia as an Imperial interpreter in German, French, Finnish, and Swedish. In 1748, he moved to Sweden. His grammar of Russian (1750) contains seventy pages on orthography, a very clear and extensive morphology, but very little information on pronunciation. This was probably the best grammar of Russian available at that time, and it continues to be held in high esteem today (Aalto 1987:14-15).

3.6. Non-Indo-European Languages Spoken in the Nordic Colonies

The study of non-Indo-European languages in the Nordic countries before 1800 focused mainly on the Semitic languages. Research was primarily connected with the teaching of Hebrew in the schools and with theological studies (3.3.3.), with Sámi (3.4.1.5. and 3.4.3.4.) as well as descriptive studies of the indigenous languages of the inhabitants of some of the Danish and Swedish colonies in Greenland, America, Asia, and Africa. Not all of these colonies received the same attention. Few if any linguistic studies emerged from the Swedish colonies in Africa and the West Indies, and linguistic research from the Danish mission and occupation on the Nicobar Islands (1756-1856) did not appear until the nineteenth century.

Most studies of languages spoken in the colonies were undertaken by missionaries and thus belong to the tradition of missionary grammar which dominated European studies of non-Indo-European languages in the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth centuries and to a significant degree also in the nineteenth century (4.7.3.).

Furthermore, much linguistic material was collected in the eighteenth century by Nordic explorers like Henrik Brenner (3.7.2.) and Strahlenberg (3.7.3.), material which became very useful for comparative research throughout Europe. Two of Linné's colleagues and pupils, David Solander (1733-1782) and Anders Sparrman (1748-1820), took part in Captain Cook's expeditions to the South Seas.

These travelers were children of the Enlightenment, and they gathered linguistic material within the framework of the natural sciences. For this reason, they classified languages according to a Linnaean scheme of hierarchical categories, just as they classified plants, fish, and birds. In the same spirit, they collected word lists, which were extensive enough to establish the genetic relationships of the languages they encountered.

3.6.1. Delaware (Lenni Lenape)

The first Swedish colonists in America, many of them Finnish immigrants from Värmland, came to Delaware as early as 1538. John [Johannes Jonæ Holmensis] Campanius (1601-1683) stayed and served as a pastor in Delaware from 1643 to 1648. After returning to Sweden, Campanius finished the manuscript of a Delaware catechism in 1656, but by this time a Swedish colony no longer existed in Delaware. Long after his death, Campanius's grandson, Thomas Campanius Holm, as well as others who planned missionary work among the Delawares, had the Delaware catechism published in 1696, and 600 copies were printed and brought to the Delaware Indians. The article on Campanius in the Swedish Biographical Lexicon (*Svenskt Biografiskt lexicon* VII:1927 p.262), contains the following informative passage:

The Swedes there, who now knew the language of the Indians as well as their own, read from the catechism to the Indians, and "a number of them observed carefully what was written". They even asked a Swede, Karl Springer, to teach their children.

This is especially interesting in the light of Holmer's analysis of Campanius's Catechism (1946b), in which he convincingly shows that Campanius only had a very rudimentary knowledge of Delaware and

furthermore that he had no understanding of the very complicated morphology of this Algonquian language. For instance, he never used plural forms, and he adopted very unidiomatic independent pronouns instead of pronominal suffixes, which he had not observed. Accordingly, he used *nux*²⁵ ‘my-father’ (cf. *n-* ‘my’, *ux* ‘father’) as the word for ‘father’ and when he wanted to express the sentence ‘honor thy father’, he wrote the equivalent of ‘honor thy my-father’ which may have been unintelligible for the natives. Similarly he used *mpa* ‘I come’ (cf. *m-* ‘I’, *pa* ‘come’) also for ‘thou come(st)’, which is *kpa* (cf. *k-* ‘thou’) in Delaware. The syntax was worse. Sometimes Campanius even resorted to desperate devices like introducing the Swedish genitive *-s* into Delaware.

Holmer is right when he stated that this translation was unintelligible to a native speaker of Delaware. But actually it was not Delaware at all, but a kind of Delaware-based pidgin that had already developed through contact with Europeans (mainly Dutch colonists) before the Swedes arrived. In this respect, Campanius’s catechism may be a very valuable document for linguistics, since it would be the only record of this language.

Campanius’s grandson published an account of the Swedish colony in Delaware (T. Campanius Holm 1702), which was influential and widely read in Sweden. The book contained extensive material, word lists and short phrases as well as a dialogue, mainly based on his grandfather’s work. He also tried to prove the hypothesis going back to Governor William Penn that the Delaware Indians are one of the ten lost tribes of Israel and accordingly that their language is related to Hebrew. To prove this Holm provided about twenty etymologies of very questionable quality (T. Campanius Holm 1702:115-120).

3.6.2. Tamil

Tamil is the Dravidian language that has an indigenous grammatical tradition going back more than 2,000 years. The first western grammars of Dravidian appeared in India, in the Danish colony in Tranquebar, written by Germans who had joined the Danish colony. The Danes established their settlement in Tranquebar in 1620, but the first grammar, which was written by a German missionary, appeared in 1716 (Ziegenbalg 1716) with the following somewhat verbose title (in translation)–

A Tamil grammar which through various paradigms, rules, and the necessary apparatus of words shows the shortest way through which one can easily learn the Tamil or Malabaric language which is used among the oriental Indians and until now is unknown in Europe, for the use of those who now try to lead these heathens from idolatry to the cult of the true God and to Christ’s eternal salvation through the Gospel.

The author of this grammar obviously had a profound knowledge of the language. He was also aware of the relationships between the Dravidian languages. All Tamil words and forms in the grammar are given in the native alphabet, but the author does not explain the pronunciation very clearly. The cases are as in Latin, but the ablative is divided into numerous subtypes. The verb is analyzed much more on the basis of Tamil and not forced to the same extent into the structural framework of Latin. The grammar mainly consists of morphology, with syntax being limited to agreement.

²⁵ Campanius’s orthography is replaced by a modern phonological one.

3.6.3. Kalaallisut (Greenlandic)

The first Nordic contribution to the study of Kalaallisut was the extensive list of words and phrases found in vol. VII of Resenius's *Atlas danicus* (Map of Denmark, 1677). This material came from an Inuit informant who had been brought to Denmark. The list also contains a few European concepts such as *serningersong* 'cross' and *Tugang, Tuaca, Tonach* 'unicorn', as well as etymologies, but the compiler noted that there were very few words in Kalaallisut that corresponded to similar words in Norwegian, German, Greek, or Latin. Moreover, both the etymology (i.e. morphology) and the syntax are quite different in Kalaallisut when compared to those in other languages. Some phrases may be attributed to an attempt at a direct word for word translation of a Danish/German phrase into Kalaallisut. For example, the expression for 'my wife' in Kalaallisut is *nuliaga*, but in Resenius's work 1677 *uvanga nulia* appears with that meaning, which actually means 'I wife' (Elke Nowak p.c.).

The first published grammar of Kalaallisut (Egede 1760) was written by the son of the first Norwegian missionary to Greenland, Paul Egede (1708-1789). Having grown up among the Inuit, Egede demonstrated near native competence in Kalaallisut. As a result, his grammar is good by contemporary standards. In the introductory section, Egede recounts various theories of the origin of Kalaallisut, its age, and its relationship to other languages. However, Egede finds all these theories to be vague and speculative. His grammar is a typical word and paradigm grammar, and the paradigms as well as the analysis in general are dependent on the model of Latin grammar, for example by assuming six morphological tenses that do not exist in Kalaallisut. Most non-Latin phenomena in Kalaallisut are not recognized, such as the ergative construction. Egede's syntax is brief and mainly treats case usage. For a detailed study of the beginning of Greenlandic linguistics, cf. Bergsland and Rischel (1986:7-30).

At the end of the eighteenth century, another Nordic contribution to Kalaallisut grammar appeared (Fabricius 1791). This grammar was basically a data-extension of Egede (1760), and thus it did not solve theoretical problems that Egede did not solve, although it contained a lot of material and paradigms. Another source of Kalaallisut material was obtained from the Moravian Brethren, who gathered large amounts of linguistic data around this same time. Since the Danish and Moravian missions were located only a short distance apart, a regular exchange of material took place (Elke Nowak p.c.).

3.6.4. African Languages

The linguistic outcome of the Danish colonization on the Guinea coast of Africa was a short study (Protten 1764, reprinted with an English translation in a rare edition in the early 1970s) of the two languages Ga (Accra) and Fante entitled *En nyttig Grammaticalsk Indledning til Tvende hidtil gandske ubekjendte Sprog, Fanteisk og Acraisk, (paa Guld=Kysten udi Guinea,) efter den Danske Pronunciation og Udtale* (A Useful Grammatical Introduction to Two Hitherto Completely Unknown Languages, Fante and Accra on the Gold Coast in Guinea, Following the Danish Pronunciation and Articulation). The author was born on the Gold Coast and probably had near-native competence in these languages. He taught the native children in the Danish colony of Christiansborg and states in the introduction that the purpose of his grammar is to teach the native children Danish. The author especially emphasized the written language and that writing is easier when teaching can be done in one's native tongue.

The introduction to this grammar also provides extensive information on the two languages, such as where they are spoken, the number of speakers, their status, etc. This is followed by alphabets and lists of syllables, as well as a translation of the Catechism into both languages. This grammar is very sketchy and contains approximately ten pages on each language. At the end, short lists of words are arranged according to Danish grammatical categories. This grammar does not, however, establish categories on the basis of the Latin grammatical tradition, and the author is eager to point out when something found in Latin or in other European languages is lacking in the grammar of these languages. The description of the pronunciation is, as elsewhere in this period, characterized by a lack of a suitable phonetic terminology and alphabet, but it is clear, for example, that the author was very well aware of

the distinction between implosive and non-implosive stops. Rasmus Rask's revised and expanded version of this grammar (Rask 1828) relied on work with a native speaker living in Copenhagen.

3.6.5. Creole Languages

The Danish colonies in the West Indies were the jewels of the Danish colonial empire and influenced Danish culture and perhaps also indirectly Danish (and international) linguistics through the impression their language made on Rasmus Rask (Diderichsen 1960:156-166).

The Moravian missionaries, who contributed considerably to the research on Eskimo languages in both Greenland and Labrador, also completed the basic linguistic work on the Dutch-based creole language of the Danish colonies in the West Indies (Elke Nowak p.c.). The Danish contribution to the study of creoles was meager and came later. Joachim Melchior Magens's (1715-1783) description of the creole was published in 1770. Magens was born on St. Thomas and was both a merchant and head of the citizens's militia (*Stadshaubtmand*). In his grammar, he sets up paradigms following the Latin system. Of particular interest are the numerous dialogues with Danish translations, which take up most of the book. These are very colloquial and full of information on daily life in the colonies, for example the following dialogue between a woman and her (female) slave:

Imellom en Frue og hendes Slavinde

Na wa Ju blief?	Hvor bliver du af?
Mie le krieg skoon Kleer voor Vrou. Jeg tager reent Tøy ud for Mesterinde.	
Wa Ju klein Vrou bin?	Hvor er din unge Mesterinde?
Hem bin hieso.	Her er hun.
Krieg een Paer skoon Kous.	Hent et par rene Strømper.
Ja ka krieg skoon Kleen?	Har du hentet reent Tøy?
Ja Vrou.	Ja mesterinde.
Wa mie blau Sie Skuen mit die Silver Galoon?	Hvor er mine blaae Silke-Skoe med Sølv-Galoner?
Gief mie een van die Onder Saja mie ha maek left.	Giv mig et af de Underskiørter, som jeg syede sidst.
...	...
Hael mie hemete beetje na molee.	Træk min Særk lidet ned.
Da alteveel, mie gloof Ju bin Sot.	Det er for meget, jeg troer du er gal. (Magens 1770:77-78)

The English translation is:

Between a mistress and her slave

Now where did you go?
I'm getting some clean clothes for Madame.
Where is your young mistress?
Here she is.
Get a pair of clean socks.
Have you gotten clean clothes?
Yes Ma'm.
Where are my blue silk shoes with the silver laces?
Give me one of the other slippers
that I have just sewed
Pull my skirt down a little bit.
That's way too much, I think you're crazy.

Cefas van Rossem and Hein van der Voort (1996) have written a comprehensive overview of the Virgin Island Dutch Creole.

3.7. The Origin of Languages and Historical-Comparative Studies

In most fields there are few if any traces of contact between the Danish-Norwegian tradition on the one hand and the Swedish-Finnish tradition on the other. But as a rule, certain parallels are evident, as in the study of the classical and modern languages and in the study of the mother tongues. An exception is the lack of interest in Norwegian compared to the extensive occupation with Finnish and Sámi. However, the differences between Denmark and Sweden are striking where the origin of language and historical-comparative studies are concerned.

The study of the origin of language and of the multitudes of languages was a popular subject in Europe after the Renaissance. The origin of language was primarily a theological question in this period, for it was generally accepted that Hebrew was the first language from which all languages had developed. Since the late sixteenth century, however, attempts have been made to link certain living languages of Europe such as Dutch and Swedish (or older stages of the Germanic languages) directly to Hebrew. This link gives these languages the same status as Hebrew, if not going even further and considering them the first language of mankind and the language of Eden.²⁶

Whereas a modern reader may find the etymological research of this period to be haphazard and completely lacking in method, this is not quite the case. There was a method, going back to Plato's *Cratylus*, where we find the following four principles for establishing the formal etymological connections of words with similar meaning from different languages or from different periods of one and the same language:

- (1) Add a letter
- (2) Delete a letter
- (3) Change the order of letters
- (4) Replace a letter with another letter (cf. Hovdhaugen 1982c:28)

The problem with this method is that its theoretical implications are too strong: everything is possible, and etymology arrived at by this procedure can rarely be falsified.

One should also remember that the term "etymology" throughout this period meant something quite different from the modern meaning of this word, a meaning it had acquired in the nineteenth century. Today, etymology is the historical-comparative study of a word, relating it to earlier forms of the word or cognates in genetically related languages; before 1800, etymology meant a morphological analysis of a word and/or a comparison between a word (or its morphemes) and other words or morphemes in the same or other languages, an analysis made to obtain a better knowledge and understanding of the meaning of the word in question.

One important aspect of historical philological studies was the study of runic scripts. Both in Denmark and Sweden the runic script was considered to be very old, sometimes older than the Greek or Latin alphabet, and it was something one took great national pride in. Both historians and grammarians were occupied with the origin and interpretation of the runic script. The script and monuments written in it were used as data for their hypotheses. In addition, it became fashionable to write Old Norse words in the runic script. The first entry in an Icelandic dictionary (Ólafsson 1650) was given in both the runic and the Latin alphabet. A number of scholarly studies of runic writing emerged in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries (e.g. Verelius 1675), and these laid the foundations of runology as an important linguistic discipline in the Nordic countries.

²⁶ Cf. J. Agrell (1955) for an excellent survey of this field of research.

3.7.1. Denmark-Norway

In his national-patriotic work of 1663 (3.4.4.1.), Peder Syv made a number of interesting observations on the origin and genetic relationship of languages. Like his contemporaries, he was influenced and bound by the intellectual climate of his time, and thus he united what he knew about language and its history with the accounts given in the Bible. Syv was convinced that Hebrew was the language of Adam and that everyone spoke Hebrew, in one form or another. The first major alteration came, as one might expect, from God's mixing of languages at the Tower of Babel, with subsequent changes being due to the speed of the tongue, the natural development of all things, as well as contact through commerce and war.

In his classification of languages, Syv sets up four main language groups of Europe: Greek, Latin (yielding Italian (*Vælsk*), Spanish, and French), Slavic (including Russian, which, according to Syv, was originally a Germanic language, Croatian, Czech, and Polish), and Germanic, which he calls Cimbric (including Danish, Swedish, Norwegian, German etc.). Syv stated that he would not analyze the Hungarian language, since it did not belong to any of these groups but came instead from Asia.

An anonymous Danish grammarian from 1727 (3.4.2.1.) insisted that there was one original language for all people, the one given by God to Adam and Eve at creation. This grammarian did not wish to attach the name of any known language to this now long-lost tongue, and consequently he took issue with those who regard Hebrew as the original language. In his view, which is much more conservative than that of his contemporaries Henrik Gerner and Peder Syv, no language came from another, since this would be just as strange as saying that fruits, fish, birds, and animals of the same species came from each other. Unlike his Swedish contemporary, Stiernhielm (3.7.3.), the anonymous Danish grammarian did not dwell at any length on the languages of Noah and his sons. Instead, he agreed somewhat reluctantly with the tradition apparently initiated by Isidore (Hovdhaugen 1982c:110-111), who related the European peoples to the sons of Japheth and argued that the Danes were the descendants of Japheth.

According to his theory of the origin of languages, God scrambled the original language to form each individual language in existence. To support his argument, the Danish grammarian drew an analogy from the field of music. Thus, just as an infinite number of melodies can be created from a finite set of musical tones, numerous languages could likewise be formed on the basis of the limited set of "letters", that is, sounds, available to human speech. He also introduces certain forms of metathesis like "*die presse, en perse... die furcht, en frøgt ... das kraut, en urt*" as examples of the way in which God rearranged the sounds of the original language. This mixing process explained how languages could be similar and still not be derived directly from one another. To this Danish grammarian, Latin, French, and Italian were parallel and mutually independent. His remarks were directed to those who considered Latin to be the original language and are illustrative of the heated nature of contemporary debate on this subject:

as if the Latin language or any other should either be a mother or, so to speak, an unquestionable original, which many learned men just like a lot of confused and ignorant fools have maintained. (C. C. Henriksen 1976:159)

In spite of his insistence that languages were not derived from each other, he had a very clear notion of how the various contemporary languages and dialects were related to each other. He did not make a terminological distinction between language and dialect, using the term "co-language" for both, but he was aware that some co-languages were more closely related than were others. His numerous charts comparing cognates (co-words) in Danish, German, Norwegian, and Jutlandic indicated that he was aware of certain systematic correspondences between these "languages". He also noted that it was comparisons of this type that led others to their mistaken views of common roots and origins.

The anonymous Danish grammarian made comparisons that included not only sound correspondences and lexical correspondences, but also a comparison of syntactic structure, primarily between Danish, Norwegian, and Jutlandic. This led him to set up two degrees of kinship: Two languages were related to each other in the "first degree" if:

- (1) They were lexically identical with respect to almost every word.
- (2) They had nearly identical syntax.

Two languages were related to each other in the “second degree” if:

- (1) They displayed great similarity in certain features but recognizable differences in others.
- (2) Each had its own respective syntax.

The study of the origin and diversity of languages was a favorite topic of linguistic dissertations at the University of Copenhagen in the period 1600-1800.²⁷ Yet all of these dissertations were of a superficial and unoriginal nature. Plato’s *Cratylus*, which was the leading and most frequently consulted book for linguistic information in Denmark in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, served as the basic text and the starting-point for most such studies on the origin of language as well as their diversity. In this area, in contrast to universal and general linguistics (3.8.), Danish intellectuals were familiar with relevant European scholars like Gesner, Bibliander, Becanus, and Rudbeck (3.7.3.).

Studies on the diversity of languages mention several possible reasons for the above-mentioned state of affairs. The following five reasons, given in order of importance according to Borrichius (1675), cover the most popular explanations, although many authors only mention the first two:

- (1) Differences in climate. (This was used as a standard explanation for almost everything, for example, to explain the lack of final *-m* in Greek compared with Latin. According to Borrichius, this was due to the differences in climate between Greece and Italy. One of the few who argued against climate as a main cause of language change was Holst (1747). Holst stated that the two most important factors determining language change were a lack of communication and language learning.)
- (2) Differences in the phonetic representation of onomatopoeia. (Cf. Greek βορβορυμόν, Latin *murmur*, German *kurren*, *murmeln*, Danish *romlen* which are all derived from the same sound and meant to represent it (Borrichius 1675:A8).)
- (3) The failure of mothers and teachers to teach the younger generation a proper language.
- (4) The instability of the objects in the world (*inconstantia rerum* ‘the inconsistency of things’).
- (5) The carelessness of people.

Borrichius mentioned other factors such as war, commerce, immigration, frequent contact, and intermarriage, all causes of language change. Borrichius pointed specifically to a number of cases of language change in the colonies where the natives adopted the language of their European masters. As an example of language mixing, Borrichius mentioned Flensburg, where the inhabitants vacillated between the use of Danish and German, speaking neither of them properly.

Concerning the origin of language, unlike Sweden, the dominant theory in Denmark was that Hebrew was the first language and the main source of all other languages. As early as 1651, Wandal established Hebrew etymologies for 300 Danish words. The status of Hebrew was also the main topic of one of the few more extensive studies of language origin from this period (Muhle 1692). Henricus Muhle had read most of the relevant sources from Antiquity as well as from the post-Renaissance period. He mentioned a number of grammars of Oriental languages and also of Chinese and American, but without utilizing them.

Muhle’s main thesis was that everything could be explained as originating from Hebrew, and he established a set of cognates in which one or two letters were identical in words with similar meanings in two or more languages. He had no clear sense of chronology and sometimes assumed, for example, that a word was borrowed into Greek from Anglo-Saxon. He also compared Umlaut/Ablaut in German with vowel alternations in Hebrew verbs (Muhle 1692:110-112). Furthermore, he observed that Greek, Latin, and German had the same syntax, since texts could be translated almost word for word from one of these languages into another.

A few other authors (Aquilonius 1640, 1641, J. Baden 1799) compared Danish with Latin and

²⁷ Cf. Alanus (1609), Vorstius (1657), Borrichius (1675), Brasen (1679), and Holst (1747).

Greek (Baden sticks mainly to Latin). These comparisons, which are extensive, comprised both words and phrases. The authors assume a relationship between these languages, but the precise nature of this relationship remains unclear. Are the Danish words derived from Greek and Latin or vice versa, or did the languages have a common ancestor? Aquilonius assumed derivations both ways, while Baden is less clear and speaks about similarities (“congruentia”) between Danish and Latin, or he assumed that Danish words and especially idioms were derived from Latin.

Danish linguists produced very few comparative studies during this period. One example is Andreas Brunchmann’s comparative study (1756), which was partly a comparative-contrastive grammar of German, Danish, and Swedish and partly a comparative-etymological vocabulary list. Brunchmann mainly attributed word origins as coming from Hebrew, but in a few cases he stated that the origin was from Latin and Greek. In addition, he maintained that borrowing between languages was a major reason for similarities in the vocabulary.

Ivar Abel (1720-1788) was a lawyer and amateur linguist who published three comparative studies of varied quality (Abel 1782, 1783a,b). Abel assumed that the language of the American Indians had a connection to all European language groups, but that American Indians were primarily descendants of the Turks. Genetic relationship was also demonstrated through phonotactic similarities. The same phonotactic restrictions in Finnish and Brazilian, for example, pointed strongly to a genetic relationship (Abel 1783b:25). The linguistic complexity of the Americas was overlooked by this author. He claimed that most languages in this area were mutually intelligible and were just dialects of one and the same language. His most interesting work was a collection of fifty-three etymologies for the languages of India, with sensible comments about the similarities between Sanskrit and Latin words (Abel 1782), cf. Løkkegaard (1992:516) concerning his sources.

Several additional Danish contributions to the study of the origin of languages and the comparative study of languages, mainly by non-linguists, are mentioned in Lollesgaard (1925).

3.7.2. Finland

The genetic relationship between Finnish and Sámi has attracted the attention of scholars since the sixteenth century. As early as 1544, Sebastian Münster (1489-1552) observed that Finnish and Sámi were related and that neither of these was related to Swedish or Russian. Furthermore, Olaus Magnus (1555) noted that Finnish and Sámi were very different from the Scandinavian languages.

The close relationship between Finnish and Estonian was stated clearly for the first time in Michaël Olsson Wexionius Gyldenstolpe’s (1609-1670) comparative study (1650) in the chapter entitled *De convenientia ling: Fennicæ et Æstnicæ in specie* (On the Basic Correspondences between Finnish and Estonian). Gyldenstolpe, who became professor of history and politics at the Åbo Academy (Turku) in 1640, analyzed the correspondences between these two languages using a methodology similar to that of a much later stage of comparative philology. Gyldenstolpe noted the following correspondences between the two languages:

- (1) accent on the first syllable,
- (2) no gender in nouns,
- (3) the same case forms,
- (4) the same comparative suffix (Finn. *-mba*, Est. *-mi*),
- (5) pronouns (and their inflection) are similar,
- (6) verbal inflection in tense and mood corresponds in the two languages,
- (7) denominal verbal suffixes like *-sta-* are identical in the two languages,
- (8) numerals, adverbs, conjunctions, and postpositions correspond in the two languages.

These seemingly simple and down-to-earth comparisons by Gyldenstolpe created little interest at the time, but the story of comparative linguistics would undoubtedly have been different if his methods had been accepted, cf. O. Donner (1872:89-90). The next Finnish study of the relationship between Estonian and Finnish (Palander 1819) was much less systematic and comparative.

The most popular historical-comparative hypothesis in Finland was that Finnish was related to

Hebrew or perhaps more correctly, that there were a number of Hebrew words in Finnish. This theory was first put forward by the professor and poet Enevald Svenonius (1617-1688). Svenonius (1662:65-88) proposed a number of Latin, Greek, and Hebrew etymologies for Swedish words and approximately thirty Hebrew etymologies for Finnish words, such as Hebrew *em* ‘mother’ = Finn. *ämi* ‘old woman’ (cf. archaic Mod. Finn. *emä*²⁸ ‘mother’, *ämmä* ‘old woman’), Hebrew *hulel* ‘mad’ = Finn. *hullu* id. etc., a list which was replicated and cited for more than a hundred years.

An interesting contribution to this field is Erik Cajanus’s (1658-1723) comparative study of Hebrew and Finnish (1697) in which he repeated Svenonius’s etymologies and had added a few of his own. In addition, Cajanus pointed out a number of common grammatical features in the two languages, like:

- (1) similarities in the verbal system of the two languages (both having verbal derivational categories like causative and frequentative),
- (2) the formal similarity between independent pronouns and possessive suffixes in the two languages,
- (3) possessive pronouns in both languages are suffixes,
- (4) both languages have a preference for metrical patterns of eight syllables,
- (5) both languages avoid word initial consonant clusters.

The numerous Finnish studies on the relationship between Finnish (sometimes also including Swedish) and Hebrew/Greek, cf. below and O. Donner (1872:74-82), contain a number of fascinating observations on the principles of comparative linguistics. In his lecture *Oratio de convenientia linguae Finnicæ cum Hebræa et Græca* (A Speech about the Correspondence between Finnish and Hebrew and Greek), delivered in 1712 in Turku/Åbo (published in Nettelbladh 1728:157-168), Bishop Daniel Juslenius (3.4.1.2.) tried to establish general principles for language relationship based on a combination of phonological and semantic resemblance between words in the languages involved (Nettelbladh 1728:158). Juslenius also tried to describe very generally the principles of sound change and morphological change (Nettelbladh 1728:158). But in his study of etymologies Juslenius applied a Platonic analysis, thereby freely adding, changing, or dropping letters to fit his Finnish-Hebrew or Finnish-Greek comparisons.

Juslenius was the author of the first Finnish dictionary (1745), cf. 3.4.2.2., and in the preface he refers to studies by himself and others on the relationship between Finnish and Hebrew or Greek. But he concludes by stressing the relationship of Finnish to other Finno-Ugric languages (Sámi, Estonian etc.), and he mentions, partly with reference to Strahlenberg (1730), the possibility of the Hungarian, Slavic, and Turk languages all coming from the same family.

Another interesting work from a methodological point of view was Fredericus Collin’s historical study (1764-1766), which distinguished between material (i.e. lexical) and formal (i.e. grammatical) correspondences. But otherwise Collin adhered to the theory that Finnish is related to Hebrew and Greek and that the Finns descended from the Israeli and Greek tribes which had moved northwards to avoid the Babylonians, a theory originally attributed to Rudbeck Jr., cf. J. Agrell (1955:76).

Both Svenonius (1662) and later Juslenius (1745) mentioned the similarities between Finnish and Greek. These authors made lists of words in the two languages that were alike in form and meaning. The best known work on this topic, however, is Nils Idman’s (1716-1790) comparative study of Finnish and Greek (1774). Idman was a pastor, and his book was translated into French (1778) and mentioned in German journals. His work contained approximately 600 Finnish-Greek etymologies and a number of morphological parallels, which was an impressive amount at that time. By contemporary standards of comparative linguistics and etymological research, this must have been a convincing study. The author claimed that the Hebrew-Finnish hypothesis was not very interesting since the list of similar words in the two languages was not greater than what could be established between Hebrew and any other European language.

Idman (1774:85-88) thus concluded that the Finns were Scythians (i.e., Indo-Europeans in a

²⁸ The current word for ‘human mother’ is *äiti*.

vague sense) and that the similarities between Finnish and Greek could be attributed to language contact in the period when the Finns lived just north of the Greeks, a time when the two peoples had close cultural contact. To support this premise, Idman pointed to the many similarities in the names of pre-Christian gods in the two languages. On the other hand, he stated that no other language outside the Finno-Ugric language family had been found to be related to Finnish.

With János Sajnovics's comparisons (1770), a more scientific approach to the historical-comparative study of Finno-Ugric languages was established. In Finland this was reflected for the first time in Porthan's work in 1795. Porthan strongly rejected any chance relationship and referred to attempts at connecting American Indian languages with Hebrew. He stressed the importance of determining correspondences between basic words to establish a genetic relationship between languages, especially for those words referring to body parts, common natural phenomena, daily human activities, etc. (Porthan 1795:8). Furthermore, common sound correspondences such as the following were to be studied:

Gr. πῶς, pes, fuss, fot; nasus, nase, näsa; Auris, öra; wasser, water, watten; zimmer, zunge, & timmer, tunga, have come from the same source. (Porthan 1795:7)

Since languages like Greek, Latin, and German have been in contact, similar words may be loan words.

Porthan (3.4.1.2.) was interested in both comparative Finno-Ugric and Finnish linguistics, but he did not publish a major work on the subject. However, in many of his dissertations (e.g. Porthan 1795, 1801), he served as a source of inspiration for Finnish linguistic research in the nineteenth century, cf. Stipa (1990:223-228).

Finally, there is the important pre-scientific tradition of Finnish travelers, which provided a background for the later scientific tradition of the historical-comparative Finnish linguistics of the nineteenth century cf. Aalto (1971:13-30). One example is the diplomat Henrik Brenner (1669-1732), who, like many other Swedes and Finns, was held prisoner in Russia during the Great Northern War (1700-1721). Brenner collected important linguistic material on numerous Finno-Ugric and Caucasian languages for Rudbeck Sr. and Leibniz. He also became a leading expert on Armenian and Georgian philology, cf. Stipa (1990:149-151).

3.7.3. Sweden

Georg Stiernhielm (3.4.1.6.) was the founder of Swedish historical-comparative linguistics. His most important linguistic work is his preface to the first modern edition of Wulfila's *Gothic Bible* (Stiernhielm 1671). Both the *Gothic Bible* and Stiernhielm's preface concerning the origin of languages became very influential in linguistic research in Sweden in the years following their publication.

Stiernhielm began by questioning the current opinions on the topic, regardless of whether they were based on the Bible or on authorities like Goropius Becanus. He then proposed as his basic thesis that all languages existing in the Old World came from one language and could be reduced to one language. These languages came from Adam and Noah and the diversification of languages. Accordingly, his language family classifications began with the three sons of Noah (3.7.1.). Stiernhielm explicitly excluded the languages of America and the islands in the Caribbean, because the race there may have originated in this area and thus might not be descendants from Adam and Eve.

The next point he argued was that languages are not static by nature, but under constant development and change, even where there are no external forces. According to Stiernhielm, all languages develop dialects, which over time develop into new languages.

Stiernhielm then turned to the three sons of Noah. Sem was the father of the Semitic languages of Hebrew, Arabic, and Syrian, while another son, Cham, was the father of Egyptian, Ethiopian, Phoenician, etc. Stiernhielm clearly saw the relationship between the two groups, however, and presented a good and substantially correct survey of this language family. He stressed that Hebrew was not the original language, but just like Syrian, Arabic, etc., Hebrew itself developed from a dialect of the original common language.

The third son, Japheth, was the father of Latin and the Romance languages, Greek, Persian, Germanic, and Slavic. This group was the Indo-European family, which Stiernhielm called Scythian. Moreover, lesser known languages such as Phrygian and Thracian were included here. Stiernhielm then stressed the internal relationship between the Romance languages, which had developed from dialects of Latin. These dialects in turn had developed from a dialect of Scythian. And similarly, Germanic developed into the dialects which became the modern Germanic languages. Stiernhielm provided one of the first, primitive tabular representations of the relationship between the Germanic languages:



Stiernhielm had difficulty determining the origins of Finnish and Hungarian, which could not be related to the Slavic languages or to any other languages. He observed the numerous correspondences between Hungarian and Finnish and also mentioned the great number of Greek words in Finnish. His hypothesis was that long ago the Finns were mixed with people from a Greek colony. Furthermore, he considered Sámi and Estonian to be dialects of Finnish. Stiernhielm concluded his preface with the Lord's Prayer in Latin and in the various Romance languages as an illustration of how languages could develop from a common source.

But Stiernhielm was still convinced of the importance of Hebrew, and he lists etymologies in some of his other works where Hebrew words are compared with words having a similar meaning and a more or less phonological resemblance. He only provides these etymology lists for a haphazard collection of languages, ranging from Semitic, Indo-European, and Turk, to Finno-Ugric.

Stiernhielm assumed, just as Plato did in *Cratylus*, that certain sounds or sound combinations had certain specific meanings where *r*, for example, is said to indicate movement, and *l* lightness. This search for the true meaning of sounds is paralleled with a quest to attain the fundamental dimensions of the world. Stiernhielm accepts Plato's opinion that *l* denotes life and light and finds confirmation in the Swedish words *lätt* 'easy', *le* 'to smile', and *leka* 'to play'.

A number of speculative studies attempting to prove that Swedish was the oldest language on earth, the language of Eden, or the language most closely related to Hebrew, appeared in this period, cf. J. Agrell (1955) for a thorough survey. A much referred to, and probably misunderstood, Swedish work concerning the origin of language (Kempe 1688) argued in a very general way that Swedish was the language of Paradise. But here again, no really linguistic arguments are offered, no historical speculations are given, and only very few etymologies are listed. This is a clearly satirical work, and a very good and amusing one, making fun of Swedish speculations about Swedish being the language of Paradise. The satirical aspect of this work is evidenced in the following quotations, given in the original German wording, since the satirical character of the book is also clearly reflected in the form of language used by the author:

Als nur die Mahlzeit vorüber, und das gute Bier zu würcken begunte, vorfielen unterschiedene Reden nach eines jeden Verstands Begreiffung, bis dass die mancherley Sprachen in Betrachtung kahmen. Darüber eine langweilige Rede und Antwort veranlasset ward, und der Abend mit fast die ganze Nacht verlief. (Kempe 1688:2)

Will also näher zu unserm Gesprächs Ziel und Schluss kommen, welches vor mein Persohn das Absehen zu den Natur-Sprachen von Anfang der Werelt hat, in welchem alle Thier von Adam gekant wahren, und er ihnen nennen könte. Sage derentwegen, dass die drey, die Schlange, Adam und Gott, ein jedweder seine Sprache geredet, Nemlich, Frantzösch, Schwedisch und Dänisch. (Kempe 1688:25-6)

[About the origin of the name Adam]:

Nemlich er ward vom Staub der Erden (Limbo Terræ) geschaffen, und darum Af damb, dernach aber Adam genant, wie Bartolomeus Bartel, Nicolaus Niclas verkürtzet ist, denn unter der Sonnen ist nicht beständiges. (Kempe 1688:33)

Kempe also included an eulogy to Swedish wives and their cooking (1688:36-41), followed by a listing of twenty-six different kinds of sausages.

Olaus Rudbeck (1630-1702), a world-famous physician, who contributed much to the development of medicine both in Sweden and abroad, was also an authority on linguistics. His great intelligence, humor, and vitality, however, was paired with a stubbornness and unwillingness to accept the opinions of others. Rudbeck also could not tolerate criticism. But he was met with great respect in his lifetime, and his prestige, together with the impressiveness of his work (and that of his son as well), made him an authority whom everybody could refer to, especially when they knew little about languages and linguistics.

Rudbeck tried to contribute towards improving the status of Sweden and the Swedish language through his famous work *Atland or Manheim*, published 1679-1702 in four volumes. This work was originally written in Swedish but later translated into Latin. Rudbeck's intention was to show that Plato's island, Atlantis, was in fact Sweden and that Swedish was the language of Paradise mentioned in the Bible. The four volumes consist of approximately 3,000 pages, including a collection of all kinds of myths. These myths were considered to be historical facts and thus an empirical basis for historical studies, where all possible kinds of connections are drawn, not least concerning etymology.

Rudbeck began with a conclusion, and his entire work is a manipulation of the facts to support this conclusion. In volume one, Rudbeck introduces a series of systematic comparisons between languages (1679:19) with a list of correspondences like Swedish F = Latin P, K = C, and K = G, the last illustrated by both Swedish *åker* = Latin *ager* as well as Swedish *leka* = Danish *lege*. Rudbeck also argued that the letters of the alphabet had originated in the Nordic countries.

Rudbeck's son, Olavus Rudbeck Jr. (1660-1740), followed in his father's footsteps, both as professor of medicine and in continuing to promote his father's exaggerated patriotic ideas. Rudbeck Jr's contribution to linguistics is a mixture of everything. His book of 1717 contains extensive lists trying to prove connections between Sámi and Hebrew, Gothic and Chinese, and Finnish and Hungarian, interspersed with all kinds of etymologies of Hebrew words, which are compared with other Semitic languages, Greek, Italian, Gothic, Annamese, Bantu languages etc. By the end of this work it is totally unclear which languages are related to which. Sámi is related to both Finnish and Hungarian, as well as to Hebrew. Such a wealth of examples from so many languages in various alphabets must have dumbfounded readers into becoming more and more impressed. The less the reader understood, the more likely he/she was to be convinced.

For instance, here are some examples of Rudbeck's Chinese-Swedish etymologies (Rudbeck 1717:64-67):

<i>Chinese/Annamite</i>	<i>Gothic</i>	<i>Latin</i>
čan f. San	San, sanod Lap. ²⁹	Respondeo 'I answer'
Chen chu	San gu	Verus Deus 'True God'
Cym	Thim, tima	Tempus 'time'
Dau	Dau, du, dug	Pluvia 'rain'
Deeo	Dei, deig	Mollis's oft'

As we see, Sámi is considered a Gothic language. Furthermore, the Swedish forms are frequently colloquial or dialectal variants, no doubt chosen because they were most suitable for the comparison with Chinese.

Connections between Sámi and Hebrew were more extensively documented in a letter to the English mathematician John Wallis, who was also the author of a famous grammar of English. This letter was published as an appendix to Rudbeck's book. Here more than 200 Hebrew-Sámi etymologies are presented, with no indication of how to interpret or explain them. Rudbeck Jr. also published many more studies, all brimming with word lists or etymologies. Languages were included in these writings whenever a sound or two were identical and the meanings not too different.

²⁹ Lappish, i.e. Sámi.

Rudbeck's earlier work (1705) uses 148 pages to demonstrate that the animal *selav* in the Bible (Num.XI:31) is not a bird, but a flying fish. To the modern reader, the work appears as a stream of unstructured associations, where a Hebrew word evokes associations with similar-sounding words in any other language, which in turn evoke an association with another Hebrew word of more or less — usually less — similar form, etc.

In spite of their popularity, a few scholars in Sweden and some from abroad (e.g. Leibniz) recognized the methodological weaknesses of the etymological speculations of Stiernhielm and the Rudbecks. In the introduction to his Swedish dictionary (*Spegel* 1712), cf. 3.4.2.5., Haquin *Spegel* was very critical of the etymological speculations of his day. Attempts to link living languages like Swedish or Dutch to Hebrew, the garden of Eden, or to the sons of Noah were ideas which he found both arbitrary and heretic:

Because in addition to experience, which shows something different [from the ideas of these scholars], one has the testimonies of many learned men that nothing is so changeable as language and that accordingly each and every language due to time and contact with distant people and commerce and many fugitives from one [land] to another etc. is so changed that if you could hear those who lived 1,000 years ago now, you would not understand them at all. (*Spegel* 1712: Preface)

Johan Ihre (1707-1780), who was one of the most important and influential historical-comparative linguists in Europe in his day, marks the return to more sober research methods. Ihre studied in Jena, Utrecht, and Leiden. Among his first publications is his collection of dissertations (1742-1743) presenting a short, laudatory history of the Swedish language. He provides a survey of the opinions of others, relying heavily on Stiernhielm. Ihre analyzes the different layers of loan words from Latin and German, at the same time condemning the extensive modern use of loan words, but his work is not particularly original. In his short treatise (1751) on Swedish orthography, he advocates a cautious approach to phonological spelling (3.4.4.2.).

With the exception of Rudbeck's elaborate treatises (1679-1702), Ihre's study (1769) is the most extensive (1,260 pages) linguistic work published in the Nordic countries in this period. Compared with Rudbeck, it is much more systematic and methodologically sound. It is the major contribution to Swedish etymological research in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries and was later influential in the development of historical-comparative linguistics in the early nineteenth century. In many respects Ihre's study is, however, an uneven and contradictory work. In the extensive introduction (pages i-xlviii), he first provides a survey of the various languages he refers to. The history and relationship of these languages were analyzed mainly on the basis of mythical sources ranging from the Bible to Snorri's *Ynglingasaga* (Tale of the Youngster). The most prominent position was accorded to Hebrew, and to Scythian (i.e. Indo-European). Of the Scythian languages, Swedish was the oldest, purest, and most important member. For each language, a word list was compared to Swedish. But Ihre also maintained that Finnish and Sámi were related to each other and to Hungarian. In addition, he argued that Finnish and Sámi were Hun languages spoken in the Nordic countries before the arrival of Odin. Borrowing was cited as the reason for the numerous resemblances of Finnish and Sámi words to those in various Germanic languages, although he found it hard to state the direction in which the borrowing had taken place. But the concept of borrowing was very vague to Ihre, and he usually failed to distinguish between loan words and inherited words.

The second part of Ihre's introduction contains systematic lists of sound changes and sound correspondences (*mutationes litterarum*). Initially, Ihre states that one of his main purposes is to describe these sound changes and that etymological research should not be undertaken without this description (Ihre 1769:ii). He has ninety-six lists of sound correspondences (Ihre 1769:xli-xliiii), ordered alphabetically. The examples for each change are presented with an uncritical taxonomy of data, unsystematic and without internal classification. For example, Ihre mixed together regular and sporadic changes, diachronic changes within one language, and comparative correspondences between languages, as well as optional synchronic variants. In numerous instances, words were compared that were not etymologically related at all. Rask criticized Ihre's work harshly:

The great amount of letter changes [which Ihre postulated e.g. in Ihre (1769)] are so completely insufficient and unscientific that they cannot be used as anything but raw and mixed material. (Rask 1818:12)

But Rask's remarks are unjust. Without Ihre's extensive collection of data, Rask's own work would have been much more laborious. For anyone studying Germanic languages or wanting to have a good etymological basis for comparing them with other languages, Ihre's work was and is an excellent and useful tool, and without the support of Ihre (1769), both Rask and Grimm would surely have had problems in achieving what they did.

In spite of, or perhaps precisely due to his overwhelming collection of data, Ihre seems to have understood very little of the principles of language change, language relationship, and genetic classification. He could not discern which correspondences were interesting and which were not. On the other hand, J. Agrell (1955) is undoubtedly correct when he emphasized the importance and uniqueness of the Swedish interest in sound correspondences. The Swedish scholars were occupied with a trial and error procedure which finally led to the emergence of the comparative grammar of the nineteenth century, and in this respect the Swedish contribution was unique.

Ihre's survey of earlier research on the relationship between Hungarian and Sámi (1772) is for the most part a very positive summary of Sajnovics's earlier work (1770). Ihre stressed the importance of the near identity of basic words like numerals and words for family members, and above all the identity of inflectional morphemes in the two languages. He also tried to trace the movement of the Sámi people into the Nordic countries and analyzed some of the Scandinavian loans in Sámi.

Ihre's comparative study of 1772 was probably not only influenced by Sajnovics, but perhaps even more so by Strahlenberg's 1730 study, which changed the horizon of Finno-Ugric comparative linguistics and to some extent comparative linguistics in general. Actually, this work by the former Swedish officer and prisoner of war in Russia, Philip Johan Strahlenberg³⁰ (1676-1747) is probably the most important contribution by a Nordic scholar to humanistic research in the eighteenth century (a more negative evaluation of Strahlenberg's work is found in Hämäläinen 1938). Strahlenberg's publication was translated into English in 1736, with several reprints, into French in 1757, into Spanish in 1780, and into Russian in 1797. Strahlenberg was one of the more than 20,000 Swedish soldiers and officers taken prisoner by the Russians after the defeat at Poltava in 1709, many of whom brought back information about the Russian empire, which was largely unknown at that time, cf. Hämäläinen (1938). Strahlenberg returned to Sweden in 1723, cf. Krueger (1975:10-30) for more detailed information.

Strahlenberg's significance lay primarily in that he made available extensive material to European scholars on the ethnography, geography, and language of the peoples of the Russian empire. His work published in 1730 contained copies of Old Turkic runic inscriptions and extensive word lists from the Uralic, Turkic, Mongolian, and Paleo-Siberian languages. Strahlenberg was intentionally independent of previous authors in his presentation of data, as he tried to analyze the data he had collected in his own way.

There is, however, one serious problem in evaluating Strahlenberg's work. Much of his material is found in the diaries of the German doctor and scholar D. G. Messerschmidt (1662-1737), for whom Strahlenberg was assistant and secretary for some time, cf. E. Winter and B. A. Figurovskij (1962). Stipa (1990:178-79) assumes that Strahlenberg either acquired or stole most of his ethnographic material from Messerschmidt, but this does not seem to be the case with Strahlenberg's linguistic material, since much of it is not found in Messerschmidt (1662-1737).

Most of Strahlenberg's success is undoubtedly due to his field work methods, where he may have learned a lot from Messerschmidt. He collected his material during extensive travels in Russia, and where languages were concerned, he chose the numerals from one to ten as his basis. Thus he rejected the practice of others who collected words for abstract religious terms or for translations of The Lord's Prayer as a basis of comparison, because such translations would be difficult to obtain, and unnatural and

³⁰ This is the German spelling of his name used in all of his publications. The Swedish spelling was Stralenberg. Before being admitted to the nobility in 1707, the family name was Tabbert, cf. Krueger (1975:11-13).

abstract concepts might be lacking in the language. On the basis of his collection of numerals and a few other lexical items, he set up his *Harmonia Linguarum* of thirty-two languages, among them five Caucasian languages, with material he had from other sources. In addition, he classified the languages into groups or nations, and with the exception of the subclassification of Caucasian languages and the grouping together of the Tungusic and Paleo-Siberian languages, he arrived at a classification quite identical to the results of modern comparative research.

Strahlenberg was successful because he based his analysis on numerals, which is the reason he could classify Yakut and especially Chuvash as Turkic languages. Due to the numerous Finno-Ugric loan words, Chuvash was considered to be a Finno-Ugric language by many scholars for more than a century after Strahlenberg until August Ahlqvist (4.4.2.) conclusively falsified this hypothesis. Strahlenberg also correctly identified the Mongolian and Samoyed groups of languages, although he did not realize that the Samoyed groups were ultimately related to the Finno-Ugric languages. Strahlenberg's work from 1730 had an important effect on the development of Finno-Ugric studies. Here he demonstrated that Finnish was related also to Hungarian and to a whole range of languages in Russia, both to the east and west of the Urals. With this new perspective on the genetic position of Finnish, Finno-Ugric research was extended to a new world almost as vast and challenging as that of the Indo-European languages, cf. also M. Korhonen (1986:30-31).

Strahlenberg mentioned that he would have liked to have included the two Indian languages of New Sweden in America, languages described by J. Campanius Holm (1696), cf. 3.6.1. He was interested in possible connections between the languages of the far east of Siberia and the languages of America, and he also mentioned the possibility of a relationship to languages of Peru.

Another contribution to early comparative studies was provided by Thorberg (1785), who categorically rejected the relationship between Semitic and Indo-European languages. After eliminating loan words and onomatopoeic words, Thorberg noted:

Furthermore, it will necessarily be so that if you have a large number of words collected from various languages, at least a few will have some apparent similarity although they, by their nature, cannot be connected or considered as parallel forms. In this connection one has to admit that those philologists who believe that there is harmony between the Oriental and Occidental languages are wrong, because the apparent similarity disappears when the languages are more thoroughly investigated. (Thorberg 1785:2)

Thorberg also stated that Turkish was not Semitic, but was related to Tatar. In addition, he argued that Persian was not related to any of these, but was rather a continuation of Old Persian, though full of Arabic and Turkish loans. But he also believed that the differences in languages were due to differences in climate and that the speech organs were strongly influenced by climatic conditions (Thorberg 1785:3).

At the turn of the century, Jacob Frederik Neikter (1744-1803) summed up some of the Swedish insights concerning language relationships and language change (Neikter 1800-1803). Neikter was a university librarian and a professor of literature, and he later became professor of rhetoric and political science. Although a student of Ihre, very little of Neikter's publications concern linguistics. Instead, he was occupied for the most part with literary aesthetics and culture, but he was also deeply interested in general scientific methods and in the theoretical foundations of humanistic studies.

Neikter was well-oriented with regard to European linguistics and well-read in the major linguistic scholarship of the eighteenth century, cf. Neikter (1791). His works published from 1800 to 1803 were unorganized from a modern point of view, but at that time he produced one of the best surveys of diachronic linguistics published anywhere in Europe.

Neikter (1800-1803:3) was well aware that phonological changes and correspondences between languages were not random. He recognized that these were usually restricted to sounds that have a certain phonetic similarity and that they are often restricted to a single language or a small group of languages.

Neikter gave several correct correspondences such as Latin *f* > Spanish *h*. Using numerals as a source of comparison (probably inspired by Strahlenberg's success), he divided languages into groups of

related languages, where he used the terms “mother languages” and “daughter languages”. He admitted, however, that it was sometimes difficult to ascertain which was the mother. In the case of German and Swedish, he said that they were daughter languages of an unknown mother language. He was also surprised at the results of his investigation when they revealed that the languages of India were more similar to Swedish than to the Finnish and Sámi spoken by Swedish citizens (Neikter 1800-1803:19).

From 1800 to 1803 Neikter provided one of the earliest descriptions of the Indo-European family (which remains unnamed), including Indian languages, Iranian, Celtic, Slavic, Latin, Germanic, and Greek. Furthermore, he stated that the Finno-Ugric family comprised Finnish, Sámi, Hungarian, Mari, etc. He then mentioned other languages such as Tahitian, Basque, Samoyed, Mongolian, and Tibetan none of which he considered to be mutually related nor related to any of the other languages.

Neikter was also aware that the same words in related languages could have different meanings, and his etymologies were essentially correct because, in contrast to previous etymologists, he put more stress on formal similarities than on meaning. For example, to illustrate his point, Neikter compared Swedish *högtid* ‘feast, party’ and German *Hochzeit* ‘wedding’, as well as Swedish *gård* ‘farm’, Russian *gorod* ‘town’, and German *Garten* ‘garden’.

3.8. Universal Grammar and Other Studies in General Linguistics

Contrary to the situation in France and Great Britain and to a certain degree in Germany, the study of universal grammar played a very marginal role in the Nordic countries during this period. A few dissertations of a superficial nature analyzed the problem, cf. Örsted (1753). But these works indicated only a rudimentary acquaintance with contemporary European contributions to universal grammar. In addition, the introduction to Baden’s Latin grammar (J. Baden 1782), cf. 3.3.1., and in particular Nicolai Nannestad’s Danish grammar (1761), contained reminiscences of the ideology of universal grammar.

Nicolai Engelhardt Nannestad (1730-80) was Norwegian by birth and worked as a teacher of Hebrew and theology in the high school in Odense. Nannestad was interested in educational reforms and wrote the first Danish grammar for use in schools, called a “Donat” because it was written in dialogical form with questions and answers. The purpose of this grammar was to provide a survey of Danish grammar within a general educational framework that would make it easier to learn foreign languages. Its detailed introduction is probably the best program for language teaching that existed prior to Johan Nicolai Madvig, cf. Diderichsen (1968:61). Nannestad had observed that Greek grammar was easier for the pupils to learn than Latin, even though Greek grammar was actually more difficult. This was because the pupils had already learned the basic principles of grammar from their instruction in Latin. Thus, his idea was to teach the principles of grammar once and for all by means of the language with which the pupils were truly familiar, namely their mother tongue (cf. also 4.3.).

Nannestad was influenced by Høysgaard (1747, 1752) in his approach to grammar. He begins by providing a general “logical” definition of a grammatical category, then indicates the way in which this category is manifested in Danish, and finally concludes with information on the significant differences between Danish and other languages. Instead of providing rules for correct usage himself, however, he refers to Høysgaard’s more detailed studies.

Nannestad’s pedagogical program apparently was not influential, and it is doubtful whether the method described in his book was ever used in the schools. As we shall see in chapter four, it was not until after 1800 that general grammar had any impact on school curricula in the Nordic countries.

It is also relevant to note that one of the major outcomes of the theory of universal grammar, namely the search for a universal language, a pursuit of linguists in most of the other European countries, was unknown in the Nordic countries.

3.9. Phonetics

Phonetics was not one of the favorite pursuits of linguists before 1800 in the Western linguistic tradition. Thus, it was not until the end of the nineteenth century that anything approaching the phonetic insight of Indian and Arabic grammarians was achieved in the West. No phonetic description of a Nordic language of this period reached the level of completeness and accuracy of the medieval Icelandic *First Grammatical Treatise* (2.3.).

Until 1800, phonetics was not a separate subfield of linguistics, much less a separate field of research. Nevertheless, Nordic scholars did make several important contributions to phonetics in this period. Furthermore, the numerous studies treating orthography and language standardization (3.4.4.-3.4.4.2.) and the grammars of modern European languages, notably French (3.5.), contained interesting, although scattered, phonetic observations.

Jacob Madsen Århus (3.4.4.1.) is considered one of the fathers of phonetics. Born in Århus, he studied in Copenhagen and Germany and became a professor of Latin (later of Greek and finally of theology) in Copenhagen in 1574. His study entitled *De literis libri duo* (Two Books about the Letters) was published in 1586 (cf. Madsen 1586 and 1930-31). Jacob Madsen relied heavily on the French Renaissance grammarian Petrus Ramus, but he also made a number of important original observations concerning the classification of consonants and the pronunciation of Danish.

In the preface, Madsen notes that the current description of letters was not based on nature but on human invention. He further argued for the usefulness of establishing a general theory of letters based on nature, a theory common to all human beings. Madsen provided an overview of the speech organs and their function in articulation and then offered a survey of various letters and their pronunciation in Hebrew, Greek, Latin, and Danish. As for Danish, he used the dialect of Jutland, and his examples reveal keen phonetic observation. The following examples, where the present Danish orthography is given in parenthesis, exemplify Madsen's power of observation: *njes* (*næse*) 'nose', *mjel* (*mel*) 'flour', *smej* (*smed*) 'blacksmith'. He also described the postvocalic aspiration (*h*-like release) in Danish words like *da*, *de*, and *du*, but apparently was not aware of the *stød*, the glottal stop typical of Danish.

In spite of all its shortcomings, few European phonetic studies prior to 1800 surpassed Madsen in depth as well as in accuracy of observation. His work was isolated, however, both in his own day and in the centuries to follow.

By the end of the seventeenth century, the Swedish physician and scientist Urban Hjärne was among the leading phoneticians of Europe (cf. 3.4.4.2. and Ohlsson 1992, 1996). The members of the Académie Royale des Sciences de Paris and the Royal Society in London were very active in scientific studies, with language and phonetics also being in focus. For example, Gerould Cordemoy published a book entitled *Discours physique de la parole* (Physical Treatise on Speech) in 1668. During his stay in London, Hjärne became a member of the Royal Academy and must have taken part in the discussions there. While in Paris, he studied anatomy and physiology and experimented with synthetic speech as shown by the following text:

I started to make such a speaking head in Paris as Roger Bacon and Albertus Magnus had tried to fabricate in Regensburg. I learnt that the task was feasible. The greatest problems are the vowels, where you have to have many threads and strings in order to widen or constrain the mouth and the lips. (after Ohlsson 1996:228)

This macabre experiment was carried out by means of a real human head. Hjärne had extensive knowledge of spoken languages (Swedish, Finnish, Polish, Russian, and the major languages of Western Europe) and made a number of keen phonological observations in his work on Swedish orthography (1716/1717). He also seems to be among the first linguists with correct ideas about the articulation of nasal consonants.

Høysgaard (3.4.3.1.) made a number of important phonetic observations about the Danish *stød* and its phonetic realization, as well as its phonemic and phonotactic function (1747: § 24-5 and 1769: § 1953).

The Danish-German physician C. G. Kratzenstein (1723-1795) studied in Halle, became a

professor in St. Petersburg in 1748, and professor of experimental physics and medicine in Copenhagen in 1753. Kratzenstein was revolutionary in his day with his instrumental research on the physical aspects of vowel production. He was, for instance, among the first linguists to notice the elevation of the back of the tongue in the articulation of [u] and [o]. He also managed to construct an elementary talking machine, cf. Fischer-Jørgensen (1979:403-405).

3.10. Conclusion

Before 1800, being a linguist was not a profession as such. Few scholars could earn their living on linguistics, with Hans van Aphelen being a noteworthy exception. The universities were very conservative during the period of orthodoxy, especially from around 1600 to 1750. The main task of the professors in those days was to educate obedient clerical and civil servants rather than to do original research. Many early Nordic linguists were generalists with broad interests, like Stiernhielm, Hjärne, and Porthan, or priests like Swedberg, Porsanger, and Ganander. The number of Nordic linguists who were travellers or served as librarians was also substantial.

Nordic linguistics in this period was only partially integrated into the mainstream of European linguistic research. Although most early Nordic linguistic researchers had either been students at or had visited continental universities, integration only occurred in certain fields and even then to a limited extent.

The academic environment in the Nordic countries did not foster the study of universal grammar or language philosophy to any significant extent. The main efforts of language students in this period were concentrated on the study of the vernaculars and on historical-comparative grammar. Significant results in descriptive and normative linguistics (orthographic studies, grammars, and dictionaries) were achieved not only for national languages such as Danish and Swedish, but also for Finnish and Sámi. The Faroese and Norwegian languages, however, were almost totally neglected. In the study of the vernaculars and also of colonial languages, linguistic research had very practical ends. The problems of a standard language and a standard orthography were in the foreground, and these motivated most linguistic research.

The Finnish-Swedish achievements in historical-comparative linguistics were significant and anticipated the successful emergence of comparative Indo-European and Finno-Ugric linguistics in the nineteenth century. The discussion of the origin of language was part of the intellectual climate of the time, but was taken to extremes in Sweden, possibly owing to Sweden's position as one of the great new powers of Europe. Another reason may be that the Enlightenment and rationalism came late to the Nordic countries and had only a marginal influence on linguistic research, though there were notable exceptions such as Strahlenberg, Høysgaard, and Porthan. The doctrines of religious orthodoxy dominated linguistic research until romanticism and the Enlightenment took over in the Nordic countries.

The development of linguistics was quite parallel between Denmark-Norway on the one hand and Sweden-Finland on the other. Exceptions were the descriptive studies of the vernacular, which came later in Sweden than in Denmark and Finland, and the strength and nationalism of Swedish historical-comparative linguistics, but there are few if any signs of contact or mutual influence between scholars and institutions in these two countries. However, it must be admitted that Denmark and Sweden were in a state of war with each other most of the time, or at least had a very tense relationship. For this reason, Swedish-Finnish scholars moved freely and frequently between Uppsala, Turku/Åbo, and Tartu/Dorpat, or spent several years in Germany or the Netherlands, but they rarely went to Denmark or met a Danish colleague.

Conversely, Danish scholars were rarely found in Uppsala, Turku/Åbo, or Tartu/Dorpat. When the University of Lund was founded in 1668, some of the professors were Danes, but several of them quickly got into trouble and were forced to flee or were exiled to Denmark, cf. Ståhl (1834). After this, contact between Copenhagen and Lund was almost non-existent until well into the nineteenth century. The only scholars who seem to have traveled freely between the Nordic countries were the French and German language masters.

Chapter 4

The Nineteenth Century

“... *man maa først bringe Bestemmelserne og Reglerne i det rene ...*”³¹

4.1. Introduction

Technological development made the beginning of the nineteenth century a turning-point in human history. The industrial revolution, which began around 1770 and reached its peak in the 1800s, was accompanied by unprecedented technological advances that radically changed the Western world. This resulted in an expansion of cities, attracting most of their new labor force from rural areas.

These developments profoundly affected societal organization and even communication patterns. Rural dialects began mixing at a growing rate, and new city dialects (sociolects) emerged. Alexander Graham Bell invented the telephone in 1876, and Guglielmo Marconi created the radio in 1896.

The various sciences developed in astounding leaps, often in close interaction with technological advances. The spectacular breakthroughs of the natural sciences, especially in the fields of physics, chemistry, biology, and medicine, created a paradigm for the successful pursuit of scientific inquiry. These same ideals strongly influenced linguistics as well, particularly in the latter part of the 1800s.

From the point of view of human self-perception, the most influential new ideas of the time were those on biological evolution by Charles Darwin. His book *On the Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection* appeared in 1859 and soon caused an upheaval in intellectual and religious life. The theologically-based view of the world fell apart, paving the way for alternative, more or less materialistic world-views. Empirical methods came to the fore in all branches of science.

Industrial and technological developments created professions that required more knowledge than had previously been necessary. This, in connection with the emerging, more egalitarian perspectives in social life and structures, created the need for the education of the masses. To answer this need, the primary school system evolved in many Western countries. The subjects and skills taught in these schools were oriented more towards practical needs than ever before in history.

This, in turn, led to a revolution in language teaching, both in universities and somewhat later in schools. In the period from 1840 to 1880, Latin was officially demoted from its position as the central (foreign) language in universities. New ways of life and new patterns of communication required an increasing command of native and modern foreign languages. Professorships were created in the primary

³¹ “... first one has to clarify the regulations and rules ...” (Heiberg 1807:15-16).

native languages (Danish, Finnish, Norwegian, and Swedish) and in foreign languages such as English, French, German, and Russian.

The beginning of the nineteenth century is also a turning point in the history of the Nordic countries. In 1809, Finland was separated from Sweden and became a Grand Duchy of Russia, a position that afforded Finland a high degree of autonomy. This included the use of Swedish and, after a few decades, Finnish as languages of education and local administration. The relentless work through the 1700s and 1800s of the many generations of mostly Swedish-speaking Fennophile intellectuals and politicians gradually brought about a radical change in the overall position of the Finnish language.

The first Norwegian university was established in 1811 in Christiania (now Oslo), and Norway gained its independence from Denmark in 1814, though complete independence remained brief. As early as the end of 1814, Norway was forced into a union with Sweden. In this union, however, Norway retained a high level of independence and self-government. Around 1900, the two present-day national written standards of Norway had come into existence.

The political changes in the Nordic countries were more or less directly linked to the wars and the fall of Napoleon I, but also to the ideas of the French revolution. The concepts of French rationalism surfaced somewhat later in the Nordic countries, and the late arrival of rationalism took place alongside the first waves of romanticism, which was the most significant source of inspiration for the revolution in linguistic studies in Europe around 1800.

The national awakening in Finland and Norway, a result of greater independence in the early 1800s, influenced the position of research in general in these countries. Since linguistics was a science of high international prestige in the nineteenth century, it benefitted from more public support for scholarships and university posts than did many other fields of research, even under very tight financial conditions.

Linguistics and linguistic research were actually seen as important prerequisites for national development and as means of attaining international prestige. The two Finnish linguists Georg August Wallin (1811-1852) and Mathias Alexander Castrén (1813-1852), both of whom died young, became national heroes and made the name of Finland well known abroad. In a memorial address to the Royal Geographical Society in London, the Earl of Ellsmere said that “such men as Wallin and Castrén can elevate any country above the rank of a mere appendage of an empire” (Aalto 1971:41). When Ivar Aasen published his grammar of the Norwegian dialects in 1848, the enthusiastic review by the leading Norwegian historian Peter Andreas Munch clearly reveals the national and nationalistic importance of linguistics for the new Nordic nations:

This book, which is under review here, is not only an adornment for our literature, but it is a national work, which the entire nation can be proud of. Because it shows more than any other similar work the genuine and pure Nordic nationality of the Norwegian people; it demonstrates that the very ancient Old Norse language, more than 1,000 years old, is still very much alive among the people, with a genuine original ring that you can't even find on Iceland... (Munch 1848d:282)

In Denmark, the national-romantic movement was furthered by a number of scholars in linguistics, including Rasmus Rask. One of the foremost advocates of Danish patriotism was Rask's schoolmate and friend, N. M. Petersen (4.5.1.1.). All Petersen's work, which includes extensive volumes on the history of the Scandinavian languages (1829-1830) and of Danish literature, the history of Denmark, and Scandinavian mythology, were written within the national-romantic framework.

During the 1840s and 1850s, the national-romantic movement in Denmark, Norway, and Sweden was characterized not only by national, but also by strong pan-Scandinavian sentiments. N. M. Petersen even went as far as to advocate the formation of a common Scandinavian language based on the ancient Old Norse language, but there were few who followed his lead. In connection with the Danish educational reform of 1871, however, the circle of Scandinavianists, which consisted of several of his pupils, succeeded in making instruction in Old Norse and Swedish mandatory in the high schools. Petersen's arguments in

favor of this decision are interesting, particularly in the light of the pedagogical discussions of prior decades. It had already been established that language instruction should begin with the mother tongue and not with Latin, but according to Petersen and his followers, this was no longer sufficient. Now it was necessary that higher education in language begin with Old Norse, since this language contained the solution to all the riddles of the mother tongue.

In Sweden, romantic and patriotic attitudes created a strong interest in Swedish folklore and Swedish dialects, resulting, as in Denmark, in the establishment of new archives, museums, and societies. This has been described in fascinating detail in Sellberg's book (1993) on the enthusiastic amateur linguist and ethnographer Nils Gabriel Djurklou (1829-1904).

Another important aspect of Nordic linguistics in the nineteenth century is the end of the previous scholarly isolation within the Nordic countries (3.10.). After 1815, this isolation was broken, and since then there have been no wars between the Nordic countries. Gradually, a pro-Nordic attitude emerged, reinforced by Nordic scholarly meetings, Nordic journals, and a strong personal network among Nordic scholars, especially scholars from Denmark, Norway, and Sweden.

Developments in Finland assumed a somewhat different course. The establishment of Finnish as the primary national language was a century-long laborious historical process beginning in the early 1800s. The formation of a genuinely Finnish self-image required emphasis to be focused on eastern Finno-Ugric connections and history in order to uncover the requisite historical depth.

Furthermore, after the war of 1808-1809, Finland was a part of the huge Russian empire. Finnish scholars could now obtain funding, especially from the Imperial Academy in St. Petersburg (founded in 1725), and were thus able to undertake extensive field trips to the northern and eastern Uralic peoples in the empire. It was the task of the Imperial Academy to describe Russia, its peoples, geography, meteorological conditions, natural resources, etc., and because there was a common belief around 1800 that the Finno-Ugric languages spoken in northern Russia were dialects of Finnish (Branch 1994:28), it was considered natural for the Imperial Academy to assign this fieldwork to the Finns themselves.

Another relevant factor for developments in Finland was the political interest of the new Russian rulers in establishing a Finnish (as opposed to Swedish) national consciousness. By allowing and enabling the Finns to define their own Finnish (Finno-Ugric) self-image, the historical ties to Sweden could be expected to weaken and, correspondingly, loyalty towards the Russian empire to grow.

Towards the end of the 1800s, Finno-Ugric scholarly connections to Hungarian colleagues also became increasingly important.

4.2. Institutional Frameworks for Linguistic Research (Universities, Academies, Societies, and Journals)

Three Nordic universities were founded in the nineteenth century. The University of Christiania (later Oslo) was founded in 1811 and began functioning in 1813. The University College of Stockholm (*Stockholms Högskola*, later the University of Stockholm) was established in 1878 and funded by private donations and the municipal authorities of Stockholm. During the first years, instruction was only given in mathematics, physics, chemistry, geology, botany, and zoology. Other faculties (law, history-philosophy, political sciences, languages) were added in the beginning of the twentieth century. The University College of Gothenburg (*Göteborgs Högskola*) was founded in 1891 and became the University of Gothenburg in 1954 (cf. 4.9.).

In 1827, after a great fire had destroyed much of the Finnish city of Turku/Åbo, Åbo Akademi was moved to Helsinki, which had been the capital of Finland since 1812. This transfer was also dictated by the Russian authorities, who wanted to have better control over the university, since students were notorious troublemakers. In connection with the transfer to Helsinki, the university got new statutes in 1828, and the

official name of the university became trilingual in Finnish, Swedish, and Russian: *Suomen Aleksanterin Yliopisto*; *Alexanders Universitetet i Finland*; *Imperatorskij Aleksandrovskij Universitet v Finljandii* (Emperor Alexander's University of Finland). This change in names was a reflection of the new political conditions.

The existing universities in the Nordic countries, as elsewhere in Northern Europe, underwent significant changes in the first part of the nineteenth century, influenced to a great extent by the ideas of Wilhelm von Humboldt (1767-1835). Humboldt advocated the following principles when he founded the Friedrich Wilhelm University (today Humboldt University) in Berlin in 1810:

- (1) Universities should be based on a combination of research and teaching. Equal time should be devoted to both, and teaching should be linked to research. Before 1800, research was not the explicit duty of a professor.
- (2) Each university subject calls for specialization and should define its specific area of interest and its methods. The old system, where a professor could advance from a professorship in metaphysics to one in Greek, and having become a professor of Hebrew could end up as a professor of theology, was abandoned and replaced by a university system requiring specialization in one academic discipline and lifetime professorships in this discipline.

One effect of this restructuring was to provide the academic disciplines with a much higher degree of institutional clarity. This led to a methodological consciousness, but also to isolation, thus rendering interdisciplinary cooperation more difficult. Gradually, each discipline developed its own culture and tradition, which in some cases ended in stagnation, a feature which became even more problematic in the twentieth century.

In contrast to the previous centuries, the increased power and prestige of the universities led to a concentration of almost all aspects of linguistic research of any significance in the universities. The professionalization of research and its more clearly defined institutional framework is a significant aspect of the history of science in the nineteenth century. The role played by amateur linguists and other institutions such as academies became more marginal, although a significant number of the publications on the national languages were still written by high school teachers.

The change in the political status of Norway had little effect on the international network of scholarly studies. Strong ties with the university in Copenhagen were maintained and were never replaced by similar connections to Swedish universities. Strong cultural influences came from Denmark to Sweden as well. The new political situation in Finland had profound effects on Finnish linguistics. Finnish scholars at the University of Helsinki were in close contact with the leading linguistic centers of Russia, in particular with the universities in St. Petersburg and Kasan and the Academy in St. Petersburg. The Academy in St. Petersburg generously supported much of the Finnish linguistic research among the Finno-Ugric and Altaic peoples in Russia until 1917. In the emerging Nordic scholarly network, Finnish linguists tended to be left in the margins.

One example of Nordic cooperation is the journal *Arkiv for nordisk filologi* (Archive for Nordic Philology), founded in 1883 by the Norwegian historian Gustav Storm (1845-1903). The editorial board consisted of Sophus Bugge (Christiania), Nicolaus Linder (Stockholm), Adolf Noreen (Uppsala), Ludvig Wimmer (Copenhagen), and Theodor Wisén (Lund). In 1889, Axel Kock (4.5.3.3.) became editor. This journal was an important forum for the new trends in philology and historical linguistics as applied to the Scandinavian languages. With very few exceptions, the contributors were Nordic scholars.

Several philological societies were also founded in this century, for example in Copenhagen (1854), Uppsala (1882), and Lund (1887). By way of comparison it is important to note that the Philological Society in London was founded in 1830 (1842) and the Société de linguistique in Paris in 1868.

The philological society established in Uppsala (*Språkvetenskapliga Sällskapet i Uppsala*) provides a

good example of how these societies started their activities. In September 1882, the lecturers Adolf Noreen (4.5.2.7.) and Axel Erdmann (4.6.2.) invited the younger teachers in the language section of the University of Uppsala to meet to constitute a forum for the exchange of information on current language research. Those who participated were professors M. Sundén and H. Almkvist, the adjunct P. A. Geijer, and the lecturers A. Erdmann, C. Wahlund, A. Noreen, O. A. Danielsson (4.4.1.), O. V. Knös, and J. A. Lundell (4.6.4.). The name of the society was to be The Linguistic Society (*Språkvetenskapliga Sällskapet*) and it was to meet each month (the society in Lund met every three weeks). According to the report of 1885, a few foreign scholars were temporary participants.

The program for 1882 included talks by Noreen on the latest discoveries concerning the German sound shift and Ablaut, and views on correct usage. Lundell presented a plan for the investigation of Swedish dialects, Almqvist discussed the ethnography of South Africa from a linguistic point of view, and Erdmann reviewed the first part of James Murray's *A New English Dictionary on Historical Principles*, which appeared in 1884.

The Swedish Academy, which had been established in 1786, played an important role during the nineteenth century through its prize competitions which were, however, mainly oriented towards literary topics. The Academy supported two lexicological projects at the end of the nineteenth century, both of which had nationalistic and puristic motives when they were initiated, namely the normative word-list of the Swedish Academy (*Svenska Akademiens Ordlista*, SAOL) and the large-scale historical dictionary of the Swedish Academy (*Svenska Akademiens Ordbok*, SAOB), which has been predicted to be completed around the year 2040 (4.5.6.6.).

The Copenhagen section of *Det kgl. Selskab for Norges Vel* (The Royal Society for the Good of Norway) was established in 1809 and founded its own Society for the Publication of Texts from Scandinavian Antiquity (*Selskabet for de nordiske Oldskrifters Udgivelse*). This society published N. F. S. Grundtvig's controversial translations of Saxo and Snorri Sturlason in the language of the common people, which Grundtvig believed to be the language that had best preserved the ancient Danish tongue, a line of thinking very similar to that of Ivar Aasen in Norway.

The Royal Danish Academy of Sciences continued to play a significant role in promoting publications and scholarly discussions in the area of linguistics. This Danish institution also continued to support the dictionary project initiated in the previous century, *Videnskabernes Selskabs Ordbog* (Dictionary of the Academy of Sciences), and perhaps most importantly, it proposed the prize competition to which Rasmus Rask responded with his *Undersøgelse om det gamle Nordiske eller Islandske Sprogs Oprindelse* (Investigation of the Origin of the Old Norse or Icelandic Language, completed in 1814, published in 1818).

In Finland, the Finnish Literature Society (*Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura*, SKS) was founded in 1831 with Karl Niklas Keckman (4.5.1.2.) as its driving force. This society was instrumental in promoting research in Finnish culture, including literature, folklore, and language. It published the epic *Kalevala* in 1833, 1835, and 1849, and the collection of lyric poetry *Kanteletar* in 1840-1841. SKS founded the periodical *Suomi* (Finland) in 1841, which remained an important linguistic forum for decades. Over the years, the Finnish Literature Society has also (re)published many of the classics of Finnish literature and linguistics. A Finland-Swedish counterpart is The Swedish Literature Society (*Svenska litteratursällskapet*), founded in 1885.

The Mother Tongue Society (*Kotikielen Seura*) was founded in 1876 at the suggestion of August Ahlqvist (4.4.2.). This society was instrumental in promoting the use of Finnish, developing its lexical and grammatical potential, collecting dialect material, and in initiating linguistic projects (Paunonen 1976a). It also published *Virittäjä* (Instigator), the central journal for Finnish studies, which first appeared in 1883 and 1886 and then continuously from 1897. By 1976, the issues of *Virittäjä* totaled no less than 26,500 pages (Paunonen 1976a:406).

The Finno-Ugrian³² Society, SUS (*Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura*) was founded in 1883 with Otto

Donner (4.4.2.) taking the initiative. The main purpose of this society was to collect and publish linguistic, historical, archeological, and ethnological materials relating especially to the more distantly related Finno-Ugric languages. It also publishes periodicals and series, particularly *Finnisch-Ugrische Forschungen* (FUF, 1901-) and *Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne* (MSFOu, 1890-).

The Classical Association of Finland (*Klassillis-filologinen yhdistys - Klassiskfilologiska föreningen*) was founded in 1882. In 1930-1931, this association published two volumes under the title *Arctos*. Since 1954 *Arctos* (*Acta Philologica Fennica*), *Nova Series*, has appeared as an annual publication. In the field of modern (foreign) language study in Finland, *La Société Néophilologique* (*Uusfilologinen yhdistys - Nyfilologiska föreningen*) was founded in 1887. This society was to serve as a forum for representatives of the modern languages in schools and at the university. At its meetings, both philological and pedagogical papers were presented from the beginning (Aalto 1987:225). The Society has published the periodical *Neophilologische Mitteilungen* (NM) since 1899. NM has acquired a notable international position, as witnessed, for example, by the fact that it — alongside *Moderna språk* (Modern Languages) — is the only Nordic periodical from the language disciplines that is presently being indexed by the Arts and Humanities Citation Index.

The first scientific academy in Finland was *Societas Scientiarum Fennica* (*Finska Vetenskaps-Societeten - Suomen Tiedeseura*), founded in 1838, followed by The Finnish Academy of Science and Letters (*Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia*) in 1908. The former was and is mainly populated by Swedish-speaking members, the latter by Finnish-speaking members, thus reflecting the major cultural conflict in Finland in the period from 1850 to 1940.

Prior to 1850, Latin was the main academic language of Nordic scholars, at least in principle. At the University of Helsinki, for example, Latin was required in all written and oral dissertations, and in public university examinations until 1852, when the strict requirement was abolished after lengthy discussions. However, the gradual tendency towards using Swedish as the language of instruction had begun already in the 1700s (Pekkanen 1975:292). Thus, with the prestige and urgency attached to the cultivation of the national languages, Latin was gradually being pushed aside, even in scholarly publications. This was due partly to growing national sentiments, and partly to the fact that Latin, as a dead language, was not considered to be particularly well-suited for dealing with the new sciences. The first linguistic doctoral dissertation to be presented in Swedish was by August Ahlqvist in 1854 (*Bidrag till Finska språkforskningens historia före Porthan*, Contributions to the History of Finnish Linguistics before Porthan), and the first in Finnish was defended by Oskar Blomstedt in 1869 (*Suomen verbien vi eli pi päätteestä tutkimus*, An Investigation of the Verbal Ending vi/pi in Finnish). Cf. F. Karlsson (1998).

In Denmark, The Royal Danish Academy of Sciences required presentations to be given in Danish, and already at the end of the previous century, a number of university lectures were given in Danish. Almost all university lectures were in Danish by the 1830s, and beginning in 1833, the university catalogue was printed in Danish. The first university program in Danish appeared in 1835, and permission was given the following year for the first dissertation to be printed in Danish. The university's president also gave his first official speech in the native language in 1835. The use of Latin was abolished at final examinations, first in medicine (1838), then in law (1847), and finally in theology and most areas of philology (1849). The statistics for dissertations are also revealing. From 1836 to 1842, 79 dissertations were written in Latin and three in Danish; from 1842 to 1854, 27 dissertations were in Latin and 11 in Danish; from 1855 to 1870, five were in Latin and 71 in Danish; and from then on, only two were in Latin, one in 1874 and one in 1900. Dissertations were, however, still defended in Latin until 1866.

Latin also dominated scholarly activities in Sweden far into the nineteenth century. The Lund

³² The Society uses the adjective *Finno-Ugrian* in the English version of its name, and we respect this usage. In all other connections we translate the Finnish adjective *suomalais-ugrilainen* into English as *Finno-Ugric*.

University catalogue of lectures was published solely in Latin until 1866, when it was printed both in Latin and Swedish. Dissertations were generally written in Latin. The ordinance of 1870 stated, however, that the dissertation should be written in Swedish or a major European language. As a result, Swedish began to be used as a scientific language in the latter part of the 1800s, but it was soon superseded by German, French, and more recently by English in many academic subjects, cf. Sigurd (1994b).

This movement away from Latin in scholarly life presented a problem internationally, and many Nordic contributions to linguistics passed unnoticed simply because they were written in a Nordic language. In Artturi Kannisto's (1938-1939) edition of the letters exchanged between the Hungarian scholar József Budenz and the leading Finnish Finno-Ugrist August Ahlqvist, numerous complaints were made about how much Finnish and Hungarian scholars published in their exotic languages (Finnish and Hungarian) and how damaging this was to the future and international status of Finno-Ugric studies.

A final point, not without significance for understanding the development of linguistics in this century, is that the academic circles in all the Nordic countries were small, and the scholars were sometimes also interrelated through marriage or family. An example from Finland given by Aalto (1971:31) is that Gabriel Geitlin (1804-1871), professor of Oriental languages appointed in 1835 in Helsinki (4.6.3.), and Wilhelm Lagus (1821-1909), professor of Oriental languages beginning in 1857 and later (1866) of Greek literature (4.7.2.), were relatives. Lagus married a cousin of the wife of his rival, Herman Kellgren (4.7.2.), whose wife, in turn, was the sister of the wife of Mathias Alexander Castrén (4.5.1.2.).

4.3. Philosophy of Language, General Grammar, and Language Teaching

A work to profoundly influence linguistics thought and the teaching of the mother tongue in Denmark, Norway, and Sweden was Antoine-Isaac Silvestre de Sacy's (1758-1838) popular pedagogical presentation of the Port Royal grammar, which was published in 1799 (Silvestre de Sacy 1799) and which soon appeared in a Danish (N. L. Nissen 1801) and a Swedish translation (Silvestre de Sacy 1806). The book was clear and well-written and was immediately appealing to teachers. The subtitle of the book explicitly states that it is adapted to the level of children and is useful as a preparation for learning foreign languages.

In the Nordic countries, general grammar was introduced at the same time as the dawn of historical-comparative Indo-European studies. This meant that two almost opposite European ideological trends, rationalism and romanticism, came to the Nordic countries simultaneously, although they had begun at quite different times elsewhere in Europe. These trends met in a few places, but for the most part they existed side by side, without recognizing each other. General grammar was mainly restricted to studies of the vernacular, and primarily to school grammar.

General grammar was actually based on the grammatical structure of Latin and in particular French, but was justified by a philosophy that considered this grammatical structure a proper reflection of the logic of human intelligence. There is variation in the realization of the logical-grammatical categories in languages, but it was assumed, as in medieval linguistics (2.2.), that we all think alike and have the same logic, although some languages (notably French) reflect this logic better than others.

Silvestre de Sacy's work is structured into three sections:

- (1) Word classes defined on a semantic basis.
- (2) Morphology, i.e. the meaning of inflectional categories.
- (3) Syntax, which is mainly concerned with the "logical" order of words and phrases, agreement, and dependency.

The components subject and predicate are fundamental and are illustrated by copulative sentences

(*Victor is young*), as well as by sentences with transitive or intransitive (called neutral) verbs, for example *Victor plays*. *Young* is seen as the predicate in the first sentence, and *plays* is the predicate in the second. There is no indication of the term to be used for the copula. The natural order of thoughts is considered to be identical with French word order. This natural order could be changed into an artificial order for poetical or rhetorical effect.

In Sweden, but not in the other Nordic countries, we also find reminiscences in a number of publications (cf. below) of the theories on the origin and development of language developed by the French philosopher and psychologist Etienne Bonnot de Condillac (1714-1780). The French influence in Sweden in the first part of the nineteenth century may be related to the fact that the French field marshal Jean-Baptiste-Jules Bernadotte (1763-1844) became the King of Sweden as Carl XIV Johan in 1818.

In Finland, influences from general grammar are discernible in Finnish grammars like those of Fabian Collan (1847) and Yrjö Koskinen (1860). Wilhelm Heikel published a textbook on Swedish and general grammar intended specifically for cadets (Heikel 1856). After 1809, Finland's westward connections were not as tight as they had been under Swedish reign. Furthermore, the Finnish school system now had two new problems to cope with, namely planning and implementing primary and more advanced curricula for teaching especially Finnish, but also Russian. For understandable reasons, planning and implementation of the latter was much slower.

In Denmark, Norway, and Sweden, until about 1850, general grammar had a strong position in elementary analyses of the vernacular. Publications in Denmark and Sweden included a number of more advanced grammars of the vernacular that also used general categories prior to 1850. The following examples illustrate the type of books, mostly grammars, that were written within the framework of general grammar and the broad audience for which they were intended.

The first real school grammar of Danish was written by Matth. Bøgh (1800) and was originally intended for use in the military academy where Bøgh was a teacher. This grammar was also used by N. Lang Nissen in the first educational experiment implementing the educational reforms of 1775 and 1795 in which the teaching of grammar with reference to the native language was recommended. Bøgh's grammar was based for the most part on J. Baden's grammar published in 1785 (3.4.3.1.), but it introduces a number of new Danish grammatical terms. Much of Bøgh's grammatical terminology was later adopted by Bloch and Rask, but the grammar itself was soon replaced in the school system, first by Nissen's translation of de Sacy's popularized Port Royal grammar (1801) and later by Nissen's own grammars.

Nissen, who became a highly esteemed principal of the Metropolitan School in Copenhagen, is the Danish grammarian and educator who insisted most rigidly on the importance of teaching language according to the principles of general grammar. His own textbooks were published in numerous editions, and his suggestions for a Danish grammatical terminology, together with his elaborate system of case and tense paradigms, were adopted by a number of his followers (e.g. Werfel 1811, Høegh-Guldberg 1814, Bentzien 1825, and C. Kalkar 1825).

In the introduction to his 1801 translation of de Sacy's *Principes*, Nissen maintains that we speak in order to communicate to others what we are thinking, comparing language with a painting.

The words we make use of are thus just like the painting of our thoughts and serve to give other people knowledge of the objects that are close to our soul and about the judgement we pass on them. (N. L. Nissen 1801:2)

Furthermore, he stresses, as does de Sacy, the fundamental components of subject and predicate:

When we are thinking, we can distinguish between the thing we are thinking about and the characteristic we notice in connection with this thing. The thing we are thinking about is called the *subject*: the characteristic we notice in connection with this thing is called the *predicate*. (N. L. Nissen 1801:2)

Noting that each language has its own rules for word order, Nissen maintains, also in accordance

with the notions of general grammar, that there is a natural word order underlying all languages, corresponding to the progression of our thoughts. In this universal word order, to which the word order of specific languages can be reduced, the subject is always first, followed by the verb and then the predicate.

Nissen quickly came to realize that de Sacy's method was too abstract for his pupils, but he was convinced that some kind of general grammar should always precede the first instruction in language and the learning of the grammar of a specific language. Thus, in the second and significantly revised edition of the Danish grammar that had accompanied his earlier translation of de Sacy (1808), he introduces the most important notions of general grammar, still using very abstract logical or semantic definitions, but without dwelling in too much detail on the nature of language and thought. He defines the noun, for example, as:

... that part of speech that designates an *object* in a specific way, and thus expresses the name of a person or thing which either really exists, or can be thought of as something that could exist as a thing in its own right. (N. L. Nissen 1808:5)

The way in which logical grammar derives its concepts from the nature of thought is illustrated by the following passage:

Since speech thus should be a precise painting of the ideas of our soul, languages have to possess means of characterizing each sentence so that we can determine whether it expresses a *query*, a *judgment*, or an *intention*. (N. L. Nissen 1808:47)

In the third edition of his grammar (1816), Nissen intentionally includes the notion of six cases for Danish, not in unconscious imitation of Latin models, but by establishing these cases as functionally significant for meaning in paradigms like the following:

Nom.	<i>M a n d e n.</i>	Ex. <i>M a n d e n er hjemme.</i> ‘The man is at home.’
Gen.	<i>M a n d e n s.</i>	Ex. <i>M a n d e n s Kjøle er grøn.</i> ‘The man’s suit is green.’
Dat.	<i>M a n d e n.</i>	Ex. <i>Konen forærede M a n d e n to Æbler.</i> ‘The woman gave the man two apples.’
Acc.	<i>M a n d e n.</i>	Ex. <i>Konen elsker M a n d e n.</i> ‘The woman loves the man.’
Voc.	<i>M a n d!</i>	Ex. <i>Hør, M a n d! et Ord.</i> ‘Listen, man! A word.’
Abl.	<i>M a n d e n.</i>	Ex. <i>Konen bør følge med M a n d e n.</i> ‘The woman should go with the man.’

(N. L. Nissen 1816:69)

While arguing for the six-case system, Nissen contends that Latin grammar also does the same, for instance when six cases are set up for words like *cornu* ‘horn’ which have the same form in all cases in the singular, adding that in Danish, one also says that *mus* ‘mice’ is the plural of *en mus* ‘a mouse’.

Nissen's colleague, Søren Bloch (1772-1862), chose to follow the more positive approach to general grammar laid out in Høysgaard and Baden (3.4.3.1.). Bloch's school in Odense was the second Danish school to carry out reform experiments, and for this purpose Bloch compiled an encyclopedia containing everything that he felt was necessary for the theoretical instruction of young people in their native language. Only the first part on morphology was printed (S. Bloch 1808). Like Nissen, Bloch advocated that beginning instruction be given in the native language and general grammar, not in a foreign language. In his view, grammar was a philosophy of language, and as such it should be deduced from language itself. And to Bloch, the best way to uncover the principles of general grammar was by studying one's own language and deducing rules from one's own linguistic observations. Moreover, Bloch believed that expression and thinking were closely interrelated, and that all thinking manifested itself in words like pictures of ideas.

Unlike Nissen, however, Bloch simplified the inflectional paradigms and provided rules like “-s is

added to the postposed article in the genitive” (S. Bloch 1817:XIIIf), instead of presenting entire paradigms. In addition to limiting the nominal declensions to three, organized according to their endings in the plural (-*e*, -(*e*)*r*, and Ø), Bloch radically simplified the verbal conjugations “according to the nature of the language” (S. Bloch 1817:XIV).

Both Bloch and Nissen produced grammars that contained 3000 pages in their final editions. Owing to these grammars, the teaching of Danish in what were formerly the “Latin” schools was carried out on a very advanced level.

There were also numerous attempts at introducing the ideas of general grammar in the more elementary grammars of Danish (and Norwegian). Fuglsang’s grammar (1815) is a small elementary grammar which the pastor N. S. Fuglsang (1759-1832) of Slagelse wrote for his 10-year-old son. This book describes the standard categories of Latin grammar, which are assumed to be universal, and provides a comparison between some basic aspects of Latin, Greek, and English grammar, such as the realization of the universal six Latin cases in Greek and English. According to the author, this grammar was based on the successful teaching of his son and others. Fuglsang was a Danish pastor in Trankebar from 1792 to 1798 and published a number of popular articles on Indian literature and mythology. He was also honorary member of the Asiatic Society in Calcutta.

Oftedahl’s general grammar was published in Kristiansand in Norway in 1820, and it began with two illuminating definitions:

A language is the name of the collection of tones and signs which the inhabitants of a certain part of the earth have agreed upon to use as a means of expressing their thoughts and feelings to each other, either orally or literally, for example the Danish, French, German, Arabic etc. languages. (Oftedahl 1820:3)

Since a sensible human being in all cases should proceed according to certain rules, accordingly, language also has general rules by which it is formed. Thus, language becomes a science, and this science has been given the name of grammar. Grammar is either general and contains the fundamental rules which are common to all languages or special, which covers the specific regulations according to which the various languages may differ from each other in keeping with established usage. (Oftedahl 1820:4)

The rest of the book, which was designed for high schools, provides an explanation of the classical Latin categories with Norwegian (or rather, Danish) examples. There is no phonology, merely a list of letters. The only comparisons are in the description of cases, between Norwegian and English with two cases, French with three (but only in the article), and Latin with six (Oftedahl 1820:30). Curiously enough, no mention is made of German with four cases and Greek with five. Oftedahl also wrote a pedagogical but traditional Latin grammar (Oftedahl 1823) in which there are no clear traces of general grammar.

H. B. Dahlerup’s grammar (1824) offered a short introduction to general grammar for recruits to the Royal Navy. It differs from Oftedahl’s work in having a long and systematic phonetic introduction, which also includes prosody. All the examples used by Dahlerup are taken from Danish, however, and no other languages are mentioned. Dahlerup completely forced Danish into the Latin model so that it is described, for example, as having six cases, which it seems that all languages are obliged to have, neither more nor less.

A higher level school reform introduced in 1850 by the classical philologist Johan Nicolai Madvig (cf. below), the Danish Secretary of Culture at that time, postponed the teaching of Latin until the third level and upheld the principle that the concepts of general grammar should be explicated by means of an analysis of the mother tongue. In order to learn the grammatical phenomena that were not found in the Danish inflectional system, the pupils also received instruction in German from the beginning. From a grammatical point of view, this was particularly important, since it provided more detailed knowledge of the concepts of case and mood. Like many of his predecessors, Madvig viewed language as a means of communication which could reach the same goal by different linguistic means.

Madvig recommended E. Bojesen’s short grammar of 1845 as the basis for teaching the general

concepts of grammar. Bojesen's grammar was largely based on Madvig's own school grammar of Latin (Madvig 1841a) and was written with a view to the new educational reform, which had been introduced experimentally in Sorø already in the early 1840s. In spite of drawing heavily on Madvig's grammar, Bojesen was less dependent on Latin than the earlier school grammars. He presented two cases for nouns and an extra "dependency form" corresponding to the Latin accusative for pronouns. In his section on verbs, he only included the three absolute tenses and the three perfect tenses. Numerals and pronouns were assigned to nouns and adjectives according to syntactic function. Following Madvig, Bojesen did not define verbs on the basis of word class as "action words" or on the basis of inflection, but on the basis of their syntactic function as "the word with which something (an activity or state) is said about the subject" (Bojesen 1845:§4). Bojesen's grammar deviates in its structure from all previous grammars, including Madvig's, by presenting the entire grammar as syntax. As he maintains (Bojesen 1845; §1), "We speak in sentences". The main sections of his work are: (1) The Sentence and its Parts, including the parts of speech and inflection, (2) Different Types of Sentences, and (3) Word Order. Bojesen's grammar continued to be used in the schools as the main grammar until close to the end of the century, its twenty-first edition appearing in 1890.

Another grammar based on Madvig's grammar and similar to Bojesen's is Ludvig H. F. Oppermann's grammar of 1844. Oppermann is also functional in his approach and takes his point of departure in syntax.

As early as 1800, in Carl Frederik Dichman's (1763-1806) Danish grammar for students at the Naval Academy (Dichman 1800), we find the notion of the sentence as a type of psychological speech act.

In Sweden, the idea of focusing on syntax and function was introduced by P. E. Svedbom (1843), who used the well-received German grammatical system launched by K. F. Becker. A more popular version of Becker's grammar was developed by R. J. Wurst (1836) and became known as the Becker-Wurst method.

The German scholar Karl Ferdinand Becker (1775-1849) had a significant impact on Nordic school grammars and on the grammars of the vernaculars as well as on syntactic studies in general in this period. Becker's grammar of 1827 was influenced by Humboldt's romantic view of language as an organism. But like general grammarians, Becker was interested in the logic behind language and in semantics. In the introduction to his grammar of German from 1829, he mentions the contribution of historical grammar to phonology and morphology, and of logic to syntax, insisting in both cases, however, that the grammarian should be critical in using the results of these fields of research. In his influential work (especially K. F. Becker 1829 and 1836-1839), Becker makes numerous references to the classical languages and to older stages of German, and his syntax is greatly influenced by Latin syntax. Becker also knew Finnish and sometimes referred to aspects of Finnish grammar.

The Swedish edition of Silvestre de Sacy's book was translated by J. Borelius, a lecturer in moral philosophy at the University of Uppsala. This book was sent to the Swedish Academy for examination. The secretary of the Academy, Rosenstein, wrote a preface in which he mentioned that the opinions expressed in the book seemed sensible and that such a presentation was lacking in Sweden. The impact of the book was thus strong in Sweden, and a number of both elementary and advanced grammatical studies of Swedish were based on the theory of general grammar (cf. also 4.5.2.7.). Some of these books had pedagogical objectives and promoted the idea that languages were best learned by first learning general grammar.

The Swedish poet and government official Axel Gabriel Silfverstolpe (1762-1816) wrote a study of general grammar (1814) which became one of the most independent Nordic contributions to the field. Silfverstolpe had read the work of many contemporary linguists, mainly French grammarians from the Port Royal tradition (Silvestre de Sacy is not mentioned, however). Silfverstolpe's view of language development is based on Condillac, to whom he frequently refers, and this is also reflected in his theory of word class classification:

I Necessary words:

1. Nouns.
2. Articles, participles, adjectives, adverbs.
3. Prepositions, relative pronouns, conjunctions, the word (*to*) *be*.

II *Unnecessary words*:

Personal pronouns, demonstrative pronouns, elliptic words (*one, yes, no*, and all verbs).

Moberg's elementary grammar of Swedish (1815), with its 300 pages, is one of the few extensive books of its kind. Following de Sacy, it treats general and Swedish grammar separately. The broad linguistic outlook of the author is likewise unique. He begins by treating language in general and the arbitrary combination of sound and thought in natural languages. According to Moberg, one cannot conclude anything from the sounds of the words concerning their denotation, which is always determined by word usage. In addition, he discusses various ways of writing language, like the Chinese system and hieroglyphs. Moberg concludes that alphabetic writing is the highest level of advancement for presenting thoughts visually, because only a small number of figures (letters) are needed. He then discusses the many languages of the world, loan words, ambiguous words, untranslatable idiomatic expressions, the problem of pronunciation, and much more.

Another Swedish grammarian influenced by general grammar was Pehr Gustaf Boivie (1780-1860), an educator who greatly influenced the Swedish educational system. Boivie was opposed to specialization in the schools and stressed instead the importance of general education. He wrote a Swedish grammar (1820) with a long introduction on general grammar, clearly influenced by de Sacy.³³

Boivie (1820) begins with an introductory section on the origin of language, which is said to be the result of imitation extended metaphorically. Like Silfverstolpe, it is evident that he is influenced by the views of Condillac and French rationalism, but his writings show no traces of romanticism. Boivie makes a distinction between linguistic objects such as sentences (*satser*) and conceptual or logic objects such as propositions (*omdömen*). He defines a proposition as a combination of ideas; its expression in words is called a sentence. All that humans say can be analyzed into sentences (clauses). And each of these sentences consists of three parts: a subject, a predicate and a copula, which represents the junction of the subject and the predicate. In finite verbs the predicate and the copula are combined.

Especially interesting is Boivie's treatment of prepositions, which are related to cases in a quite modern way. The following passage provides a typical example of his reasoning:

A substance can be *over, under, beside, on the same level of* another substance: it can come closer *to*, get away *from*, be produced *out of* etc. These various relations, which originally are related to *space*, are signified through prepositions. The nouns are names of substances and the concept of space has gradually been extended to purely intellectual relationships: accordingly a preposition can be defined as a word which designates all kinds of relationships, both direct and indirect, which a noun can have to another noun in the sentence.

Prepositions have a certain resemblance in meaning to adverbia loci.

...

The relationship of nouns could also be signified by case endings or simply case. Accordingly, there is in principle no difference between preposition and case except in the way of signifying. The relationships are almost innumerable, and it would be impossible to signify them all through suffixes. Accordingly, there are only a few special and general relationships that in some languages have their own case suffixes or case. (Boivie 1820:68-69)

After an extensive general introduction of almost 100 pages, an equally extensive concise grammar of Swedish with a morphology and syntax follows, where rules for word order, reflexive pronouns, and other syntactic details are presented so clearly that they could easily fit into a modern grammar of Swedish.

The grammar that Joh. L. Dufva (d. 1848) published in 1833 is unique. Although it is called a general

³³ Boivie says in the preface that his main sources of inspiration were German and British scholars like James Harris and his book *Hermes*.

grammar, it has nothing to do either with the rationalist tradition or other general introductions to the topic. Dufva wanted to base grammar on mathematical principles. He developed a complicated notational system using capital indexed letters to denote various combinations, for example combinations including a verb, combinations with prepositions, and combinations with conjunctions and coordinators. There is no indication that Dufva used his system in a grammatical description of any language or that his ideas were influential at the time.

An interesting and little known Danish linguist from the early nineteenth century is Frederik Olaus Lange (1798-1862). Lange was an influential Danish educator, who advocated greater unity in the teaching of languages and argued in favor of a school curriculum intended to develop the culture and character of the pupils rather than aiming at giving the students knowledge of every possible topic. Lange published a grammar in 1840 in an attempt to provide a general introduction to the study of language. In the first part, which is devoted to phonology, there is a traditional description of sounds which also contains several original observations. The description draws mainly on classical languages and Sanskrit. Then assimilation and other types of sound alternations are dealt with. In his treatment of syllables, as well as words and sentences, Lange is occupied in a very general way with how languages express various ideas by using derivations, compounds, and phrases. The description is psychologically oriented, and a number of cases of sound symbolism are pointed out. There is hardly any mention of grammatical categories and grammatical terms, and not even the traditional word classes are discussed. Mention is made only of nouns and verbs. Lange has a lot to say about how wonderful language is and how it manages to express all our ideas, but he fails to cite examples from languages other than Danish, nor does he discuss topics that were fashionable at that time, such as the general logical structure of languages, primitive languages, the origin of language, etc. Instead, his main concern is with concepts and the way in which they are expressed in the language, illustrated with Danish examples.

Although Lange's grammar is general, with no references to other languages, except in the phonological section, it fails to do justice to the author's knowledge of languages and linguistics. Not only did he write a school grammar of Greek (Lange 1826), but his dissertation (Lange 1836) shows that he had read most of the contemporary work in comparative and general grammar. He lucidly discusses the local cases of Finnish, the opposition between the two nominatives (absolutive and ergative) in Basque and Kalaallisut, the difference between attested and unattested past forms in several languages, etc. His dissertation contains a few examples, and the approach is similar to his grammar of 1840. He begins by asking how many cases are needed in order to express our thoughts and concludes that only two are absolutely essential: nominative and vocative (Lange 1836:24). He considers the local cases of Finnish to be an unnatural luxury, because such relations are more wisely expressed by prepositions, as in Greek (Lange 1836:72-75). Furthermore, he considers the distinction between the two nominatives in Basque and Kalaallisut easy to understand but superfluous.

The Dane Johan Nicolai Madvig (1804-1886) was an internationally recognized classical scholar and one of the founders of the critical method in philology. In addition to his scholarly activities as a linguist and philologist (4.6.1.), he was also a prominent politician, educator and research administrator, cf. Madvig (1955-1963) for a thorough biographical survey. As a linguist, he has remained controversial. His numerous studies on general linguistics were mainly published in Danish, and for the most part in publications that were not internationally renowned and relatively inaccessible (cf. Hauger 1994:15-16). Late in life, he published some studies in German translation (Madvig 1875), and a complete edition is now found (Madvig 1971).

In her illuminating analysis of Madvig and his linguistic theory, Hauger (1994) gives the following succinct characterization:

Madvig was also the author of a remarkable language theory, which is still widely unknown, especially in the English-speaking world. It is structural and synchronic rather than analytical and diachronic, and consequently arrives at conclusions

which gained general acceptance much later, through the work of others. Madvig considered language to be arbitrary, conventional, and systemic. He defined meaning as use, emphasized language function over form, and demanded a synchronic investigation of language during a time when the diachronic/historical method was considered to be the only valid scientific approach to language. (Hauger 1994:9).

Madvig never really had a chance. In the century in which phonology, comparative studies (mainly in phonology and morphology), and etymology were in vogue, he was explicitly uninterested in phonology. He was also indifferent to comparative studies, at least as far as they were diachronically oriented and aimed at the reconstruction of a proto-language. Furthermore, he was manifestly sceptical of the scientific standard and usefulness of etymology. Instead, he stressed the importance of syntax and synchronic descriptions. No wonder Brugmann, in his review of Madvig's *Kleine philologische Schriften* (1875), accused him of not being sufficiently familiar "mit dem gegenwärtigen Stande der vergleichenden Sprachwissenschaft" (Brugmann 1876:115).

As a scholar, Madvig was an empiricist and refused to accept any kind of sound symbolism or connection between language and thought or culture. This position alienated him from Humboldt and other possible non-neogrammarian scholars, even though the neogrammarians were not that clear on sound symbolism either.

But Brugmann was wrong. Madvig was not behind his time, he was ahead of it. In fact, Madvig's ideas about language and linguistics bear close similarities to those that gave William Dwight Whitney and Ferdinand de Saussure their fame in history. To Madvig, it was a shock to find his thoughts and ideas in Whitney's book on the principles of linguistics (1867) and to observe the success this author had. Although his suspicions of plagiarism were probably unfounded, Whitney's success, as well as his reluctance to enter into a discussion with Madvig, gave his last years as a linguist a bitter taste.

There was little contact, and in fact a significant amount of animosity, between the adherents of general grammar and descriptive linguistics on the one hand and those working with historical-comparative linguistics on the other. Mention has been made of Madvig's critical attitude towards the neogrammarians, and according to the following revealing quotation from Thomsen's history of linguistics (1902), a quotation that concerns an evaluation of Humboldt's linguistic publications, the neogrammarians also had no special regard for general grammar:

These investigations are undoubtedly significant within the history of human thinking, but I dare say that they have little to do with linguistics and have neither directly nor indirectly contributed towards bringing it a single step forward. They are subjective speculations which were doomed to fail, simply because they contain no notion of empirical linguistic research, of diachronic linguistics, and of the life of language in general. (Thomsen 1902:38)

In practice, the differences between the two camps were not that clear-cut. The first professor of the Danish language at the University of Copenhagen was Niels Matthias Petersen (4.5.1.1.). His main work was an impressive and influential two-volume history of the Scandinavian languages (Petersen 1829-1830), in which the theoretical differences between the two approaches are described as follows:

One can approach language in two ways. Either one can concentrate on the study and description of the present form of the language and the connections that can be found in this description. Or the description can include the original form of the language and explain the connections of the present forms by considering their development. The first way is like its intention mechanical; it will only tell what the object of investigation is like and assume that it will remain as it is. The other approach, however, includes the study of how something has become what it is and assumes that it can be changed through better insight. (Petersen 1854:1)

But in supporting the preservation of the distinct plural forms of verbs, which at that point were disappearing from the spoken language both in Denmark and Sweden, Petersen used arguments that were as philosophical and metaphysical as any general grammarian could have used:

Each insightful (theoretical) view should conclude that the divine in the language is its harmony; it follows an instinct which is independent of any single will or any agreement; and to discover this ought to be the purpose of mankind.

...

Usage is constant change, but harmony is eternal beauty. In the smallest as in the largest [object] the same divine laws rule, and the purpose of life is to search for, to feel, and to realize the will of God in your soul, and then to fulfill it. (Petersen 1854:20)

By the end of the nineteenth century, several new topics had been introduced by language scholars, representing a broader view of language. These included its different manifestations in speech and writing, in male and female speech, its stylistic variation in different situations, and its relation to thinking and society. Studies or essays on linguistic topics such as these were also clearly more interesting to a broader public.

The best example in Sweden is Esaias Tegnér the Younger (1843-1928), the linguist whose grandfather was a well known poet. Tegnér became professor of Oriental languages in Lund in 1879 and was head of the Dictionary of the Swedish Academy from 1913 to 1919. In his youth, he worked on a typical Indo-European topic, the palatals of the Indo-Iranian languages. But Tegnér's results were not published, since several other scholars, including, for example, Vilhelm Thomsen, had reached the same conclusions. Tegnér the Younger published a number of widely-read essays which were written in a popular style and treated topics of current interest: language and nationality (1874), the power of language over thought (1880), and gender in Swedish (1892), which is a classical paper, often quoted because of its insightful analysis and good examples. His most important studies were published in three volumes entitled *Ur språkens värld* (From the World of Languages, 1922-1930). Tegnér's publications in general linguistics represent a combination of pre-neogrammarian, neogrammarian, and classical philological views, interspersed with ideas from Whitney and especially from Madvig.

Gustaf Cederschiöld (1849-1928), professor of Scandinavian languages in Gothenburg from 1894 to 1914, also had broad linguistic interests. In 1897, he published a study on Swedish as a written language, which treats the basic differences between speech and writing, and his study on women's use of language (1899) is one of the earliest investigations of this topic. The latter is often quoted because of observations like the following: that women's speech contains fewer pauses than men's, that women's speech is more concrete and direct, that women do not use the stuttering or humming pause sounds *uh, eh, ah* as men do, and that women feel free to express their opinions in a discussion, even if someone else is talking.

In Denmark, Kristoffer Nyrop (1858-1931, cf. 4.6.2.) and Otto Jespersen (cf. 5.3.3.) were similarly prominent representatives of this broader view of language.

Towards the end of the nineteenth century, a number of European linguists, many educated in the neogrammarian paradigm, became interested in how to teach and learn languages and how to correlate these activities with linguistics. Perhaps the most important change in language teaching in Europe was initiated with Wilhelm Viëtor's booklet (1882) *Der sprachunterricht muss umkehren!* published under the pseudonym Quousque tandem.³⁴ Otto Jespersen agreed so strongly with the views expressed by Viëtor that he and several other Nordic linguists founded the Quousque Tandem Society at the Third Meeting of Scandinavian Philologists in Stockholm in 1886. The purpose of this society was to promote foreign language teaching based on the spoken language. Its basic methodological principles were:

- (1) Begin with a phonetic transcription in languages where the orthography is different from the spoken language.
- (2) Begin immediately with texts.
- (3) Do not use translation, but instead free composition and oral practice.
- (4) Do not use grammar in the beginning, and the pupils should deduce the grammar from the texts.

³⁴ *Quo usque tandem* are the three first words of Cicero's first speech against Catilina, meaning "How much longer [will you abuse our patience, Catilina?]"

In the years to follow, Jespersen published numerous articles in the new society's periodical and elsewhere. These publications were often of a polemic nature, criticizing older teaching methods involving translation and theoretical grammar and insisting instead that the direct method, supported by phonetics and phonetic transcriptions, was the correct way to teach a foreign language. His textbooks in French and English using this new approach became models for textbooks throughout the Danish school system, with some also being adapted for use in other countries. A theoretical account of this method is found in Jespersen's book on language teaching (1901), translated into English (1904b) and later into Spanish and Japanese.

Jespersen's English grammar of 1885 was the first Danish grammar of a foreign language based on spoken language and containing phonetic transcriptions. His Danish edition of Franke's work on teaching foreign languages (1884), in which the Norwegian linguist Johan Storm (4.6.2. and 4.8.) is also mentioned as one of the pioneers in reforming language teaching, is a milestone using this approach. Here the use of the historical-comparative method in linguistics is considered marginal to language teaching, and there are numerous references to Wilhelm von Humboldt and Heymann Steinthal. Language is *energeia* and not *ergon*.

Storm's most important contribution in the field of language pedagogy was his introduction to the study of modern English and other Germanic languages (1879), which appeared in several editions in German translation. Here he provides an overview of the existing literature, focusing on what he calls the living language. Storm presents a thorough and critical survey of general introductions to phonetics and of studies of English phonetics and English dictionaries. Furthermore, he analyzes varieties of English (vulgar, American, etc.) in English history and especially literature. Storm criticizes the kind of linguistics that focuses only on the diachronic aspects of language, and he stresses the importance of the contemporary spoken and written language. He says that practice is more important than theory, both in learning to write and especially in speaking a foreign language, and that it is important to develop good pronunciation of the language.

Another pedagogical success and a model for the development of modern textbooks for second language learning was Storm's textbook of modern French (1887). This textbook was used in Norway, Denmark, and Sweden and was reprinted several times. Its success could be attributed to its lively dialogues in a colloquial and idiomatic language.

Figure *. A page from Storm 1887:159)**

In the introduction, he is explicit as to how second languages should not be taught:

The need to reform the teaching of living languages has been felt for a long time. None of the methods used so far have turned out to be practical. There has been too much theory and too little practice. The pupil is forced to learn elaborate grammar with numerous difficult rules and exceptions for which he rarely or never has any use and which he immediately forgets; the little he retains cannot be used. (Storm 1887:i)

An important factor which contributed toward promoting an interest in "applied linguistics" was the reform of the school system in which the classical languages Latin and Greek were gradually replaced by English, French, and German during the last decades of the nineteenth century. This created a need for new pedagogical methods in language teaching and above all for more insight into practical phonetics, a field that had been largely ignored (4.8.). An illustrative example of the old attitude is the story told about Professor Alf Torp in Kristiania (4.4.1.), who never dared to pronounce an English word in his lectures, but always spelled them out.

4.4. Historical-Comparative Grammar

The etymological comparative studies of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, based on a method where everything was possible (3.7.), had led to frustration. It was not only the “discovery” of Sanskrit, or the famous speech of William Jones that created a shift in paradigm. The intellectual climate in the Nordic countries, as elsewhere in Europe, was also changing. One of the founders of the new historical-comparative method, Rasmus Rask, did not know Sanskrit when he wrote his first important publications, but he grew up in an intellectual climate where scholars were becoming sceptical of the established methods of diachronic linguistics.

The nineteenth-century comparative linguists gradually came to share the assumptions underlying scientific discourse of their time. In this discourse, language was seen as a natural object that should therefore be described with the methods of the natural sciences. Language was viewed as an organism and interpreted in the framework of an overriding biological metaphor.³⁵ This view maintained that languages and linguistic elements could be classified in the same taxonomic way as plants and their parts. And just as a natural phenomenon could only be understood with reference to the whole world of nature, an individual language could only be studied in relation to all other languages.

The notion that language was an organism placed linguistics in a position similar to that of comparative anatomy. In linguistics, just as in comparative anatomy, two methods of classification emerged: 1) on the basis of the reproductive system, i.e. a genetic classification and 2) on the basis of characteristic features, i.e. a typological classification. Thus, it is easy to see how linguistics of this period became both historical (genetic) and comparative. The goal of this new trend was to describe as many languages as possible, to compare them, and to set up diagrams showing their typological and genetic relationships. And again parallel to the natural sciences, an additional goal was to formulate laws for the natural development of languages.

Ludvig Heiberg (1760-1818), the headmaster of the cathedral school in Odense where Rask received his education, published a well argued attack on contemporary etymological research in 1807. His views were representative of the opinions of many European intellectuals at that time. Heiberg tells the sad story of etymology from the Greeks to Ihre, where words in the Scandinavian languages are compared with Hebrew, Scythian, Celtic, Persian, Greek, and Latin. He then states:

I can easily understand that among all the words in a language there have to be some that resemble words in other languages, but I do not see any evidence in this alone for a common origin, and I believe even less that such a search after similarities is worthy of the study of etymology or that aspect of it that deserves to be recommended as beneficial to language. ...

After what has been mentioned above, I would hardly doubt that anybody would find it peculiar that etymology is not generally recognized, that it was even considered ridiculous, since it is completely open to anyone who could discover similarities, and those who were best at it had the least knowledge of the language. If we want to give etymology any importance in language, then we have to develop the study of etymology more than has been done in the past, and we have to clarify the regulations and rules, otherwise only vague and individual feelings remain. They may sometimes be right, but as frequently or even more frequently wrong, and practically always unstable, because the foundation is weak. (Heiberg 1807:15-16).

As pointed out by Diderichsen (1960:12-13), Heiberg is not an original author. Most of his ideas were borrowed or even directly translated from contemporary German linguists like Johann Christoph Adelung, but this, of course, does not render them any less representative.

³⁵ The importance of the biological metaphor in the latter part of the 1800s can be compared to the importance of the computer metaphor a century later.

In the same year (1807), a modest, but interesting attempt at a new etymological method appeared in Denmark, also written by one of Rask's teachers, Carl Ferdinand Degen (1766-1825). Degen was a prominent mathematician, who at that time was the headmaster of the Cathedral School in Viborg. In his work on etymology, Degen tried to set up systematic principles for etymological research. According to his view, one should first look for cognates within the same language so as to begin with in its present stage, then proceed to examine older stages. Next one should look for cognates in other languages for regular correspondences that can often be found (a term not used by Degen, but implied in cases like German *ei* > Danish *i*, e.g. *Wein* > *Vin*, *Fleis* > *Flid*, *mein* > *min*, etc., cf. Degen 1807:12). Other principles or concepts, like metathesis, should be avoided as far as possible (Degen 1807:34). Degen's work contains much old-fashioned etymology, but like Heiberg, he recognized the need for guiding principles and a systematic methodology.

Degen exerted a profound influence on Rask, both as a teacher and through his books. Especially his book on the principles of etymology (1807) had an impact on Rask with respect to scientific methodology.

The prerequisites for the historical-comparative linguistics that came to flourish during the nineteenth century were at least threefold:

- (1) the detailed synchronic knowledge of many different languages,
- (2) the concept of historical thinking as development in time, and
- (3) the knowledge of older stages of specific languages.

The first was achieved largely through widespread travel and increased contact between scholars of various countries. The second was brought about by the new historical orientation involving chronologically-based historical thinking which produced parallel developments in such diverse areas as natural history, economic history, and historical linguistics. And the third was the product of the ideas of national romanticism, inspired by Herder and adopted throughout the Nordic area. The one Nordic linguist in whose life and publications the combination of these three factors can be seen most clearly is the Danish linguist Rasmus Rask (4.4.1.).

Interestingly enough, Rask was a pupil of both Heiberg and Degen, and of Søren Bloch (4.3.). The independent systematic approach of his teachers seems to have rubbed off. Degen, in his contribution to the ongoing pedagogical debate (1799), stresses the importance of independent reasoning:

- (1) Theory is extremely important for anyone who would practice art or science, and without it every deed, even if it is successful, is so only by a stroke of luck.
- (2) It is indispensable for he who would expand and improve his field of study.

(Degen 1799:72f.)

In his comments on Rask in the school records, Degen characterizes Rask as having a practical and heuristic mind, a talent for making independent judgments and for drawing his own conclusions. These characteristics enabled Rask to become the most significant figure in the 1800s in many areas of Nordic linguistics, cf. also 4.5.3.1.

4.4.1. Comparative Indo-European Linguistics

In the field of comparative Indo-European linguistics in the Nordic countries, one name stands out above all others, that of the Dane Rasmus Rask (1787-1832). Rask was educated in Odense. He studied at the University of Copenhagen but never obtained a degree. He became professor of literature in Copenhagen in 1825, university librarian in 1829, and professor of Oriental languages in 1831, just one year before his death. He was one of the founders of the historical-comparative study of the Indo-European languages in the nineteenth century and became a legend after his death. Various aspects of Rask's life and person have been described in detail by Petersen (1834), Rönning (1887), O. Jespersen (1918), Hjelmslev (1951), M. Bjerrum (1959), Diderichsen (1960), Gregersen (1980), and Rischel (1987).

The methods of comparative linguistics were not well-developed in Rask's day, and his own methods were hardly sophisticated in all their details. Yet Rask had a type of intuitive feeling that was often right. Today it is surprising how well his genetic classification of languages, which extends far beyond Indo-European, agrees with the linguistic insights of our own day.

Whereas Høysgaard and Baden in the previous century (3.4.3.1.) had based their analyses and descriptions on one individual language, in their case Danish, in the belief that each language has its own unique nature, Rask reasoned on the basis of comparison. Each individual language was to be analyzed by using a common framework and was to be described with reference to its origin and on the basis of a comparison with other related languages. In the view of the historical-comparativists, a grammar could not be written merely from knowledge of one language alone; it was necessary to look back in time, and to look outward geographically.

The possibility of historical thinking in a chronological rather than cyclical fashion was accompanied by a view of linguistic development different from that of the previous centuries. Linguistic change was no longer understood as a form of natural deterioration, like the life-cycle or the seasons, but as an organic development, often referred to as "the course of nature". For Rask, nature's course meant a kind of simplification: In relation to the Old Icelandic language, Danish was greatly simplified, and English even more so. Rask did not completely discard earlier notions of linguistic decay, however, and has his own special view of the natural development of language, which involved an original language, a period of "fermentation" in which the worst confusion is overcome, resulting in the modern stage of the language. He spoke in terms of a parent language (*stamsprog*) and derived languages (*afledte sprog*), for example Icelandic and Danish respectively. Thus, according to Rask, the parent language comes first, followed by a period of fermentation, and then by a clarification (*afklaring*), which then leads to the formation of several new derived languages. In concrete terms, Rask maintained that Icelandic was spoken everywhere in Scandinavia, followed by a period of mixing, and then by a clarification in the form of Danish, Swedish, Norwegian, and Icelandic, which form a common language class, not, interestingly enough, because of their origin, but because of their grammatical similarity.

One can get a relatively good idea of the historical-comparative method as Rask understood and developed it from the following passage. This excerpt is taken from his early work on the origin of the old Norse language (1818). Here Rask distinguishes between two different aspects: the individual word (*leksikalier*) and linguistic structure (*grammatikalier*):

Now if we want to compare several languages, and their comparison is to be complete, and to allow us to draw conclusions as to their relationship, age, and other factors, then it is necessary to take both of these aspects of the language into consideration, and to pay particular attention to the grammar. Experience shows us that lexical agreement is highly unreliable. Through the interaction among nations, a great many words can find their way from one language to another, no matter how very unlike these languages might be with regard to origin and type; ... Grammatical agreement is a much more certain sign of kinship or basic unity, because we find that a language that is mixed with another language will rarely, if ever, adopt changes in form or inflections from the other language. (Rask 1818:34)

Certain lexical comparisons are acceptable to Rask, however, as long as they are taken from the core

vocabulary of the language:

A language, however mixed, belongs to the same language class as another, when the most essential, most concrete, most indispensable and very first words, the foundations of the language, are common to them both. (Rask 1818:35)

Nevertheless, the following should not be compared:

... terminology, polite words, words from commerce, fashion, and science, and other words that it has been necessary to add to the original vocabulary. (Rask 1818:35)

The underlying line of thought in Rask's comparative method also parallels the thinking of the natural sciences with respect to the notion of a kind of transitional continuity between the various natural types. Dialects form such a continuum, and the relationship between languages of the same family can also be established by means of rules for what Rask calls the transition of letters (*Bogstavernes Overgange*). These transitions are not to be interpreted, as has sometimes been the case, as representing a historical development, but as systematic differences along a scale. Rask defines the comparative method in these terms:

When correspondences are found between two languages in such words, in fact so many of them that rules can be deduced for the transition of letters from one to the other, a basic kinship is found between these languages; especially when these similarities are matched by similarities in the structure and system of the two languages. (Rask 1818:36)

For instance, an example of such similarities are the transitional rules between Greek and Latin like Gr. $\eta >$ Lat. a and Gr. $o >$ Lat. u .

Even if one can question the extent of Rask's influence on linguistics outside the Nordic countries, his influence within the Nordic countries was clearly enormous. This was largely due to the relevance of his publications, notably those on Icelandic (Rask 1811, 1818, 1832a) and Sámi (Rask 1832b). These works were not only relevant in connection with national history and national identity, but they also presented a suitable framework for grammatical descriptions of both Icelandic and Old Norse, as well as of the Finno-Ugric languages. Few if any later grammars of these languages were not influenced by Rask. Furthermore, it was Rask who developed an appropriate terminology for the local cases of the Finno-Ugric languages.

Rask began studying Old Norse on his own and published his first research on the language in 1811, based on information from written sources as well as from Icelanders in Copenhagen. The preface of this work contains a very positive evaluation of Old Norse, which is said to be more perfect than German and also better sounding, lacking the hard consonants and diphthongs and the unpleasant hissing sounds of German, though not being as soft as Danish (Rask 1811:vi).

Rask's concept of how to write a grammar originated here. He was conscious of finding a morphological classification that fits the patterns of the language and was very critical of previous attempts which followed the Latin tradition, uncritically establishing paradigms on the basis of Latin. Furthermore, he stressed the importance of a thorough treatment of word formation:

The study of word formation represents a very important insight into the structure of a language, and it is here, in particular, that the inner perfection of a language is to be sought. (Rask 1811:146)

One of Rask's primary aims in his Old Norse grammar, as in all his later grammars, is to establish a Danish linguistic terminology to replace Latin terms. In this respect Rask was also very influential. Both school grammars and more advanced linguistic studies accepted his terminology, for example Madvig's Latin grammar (4.6.1.). Rask's syntax is, however, based predominantly on Latin syntax.

At the end of his grammar of Old Norse, Rask presented a survey of languages that are related to

Icelandic and of the differences between Old Norse and Modern Icelandic, and finally, a sketch of Faroese phonology and morphology, which was the first of its kind.

Rask stayed in Iceland from 1813 to 1815, but in 1816, he left Denmark on a journey which brought him to Sweden, Finland, Russia (including the Caucasus), India, and Sri Lanka. His short stay in Finland left its mark on Finnish linguistics, inspiring the study of the Finnish language as well as of comparative Finno-Ugric linguistics.

When Rask returned to Copenhagen in 1823, he brought with him a number of Pali, Pahlavi, and Avestan manuscripts, and he was received with great expectations after the publication of his work on the origin of Old Norse (1818). This work had been written when he was in Iceland and was submitted to the Royal Danish Academy of Sciences in 1814. Rask's work on Old Norse was a fundamental contribution to historical-comparative linguistics. After emphasizing that language is the most important source for the understanding of preliterate history, and that the historical study of languages can help us to enlarge significantly our knowledge of the past, Rask stresses that the historian of languages, like all other historians, must be free from prejudices and must not consider his or her own language superior to others, as Rudbeck and others like him had done. Rask himself was not completely blameless in this respect, however.

Although Rask is known primarily for his work in historical-comparative linguistics, this represented but a small part of his linguistic production. Above all he was a descriptive grammarian, who considered this area of linguistics to be an absolute prerequisite for comparative studies. By comparative studies Rask was probably thinking as much of typological as of genetic comparisons. Significantly enough, his first publication after returning from his great journey to the east was his grammar of Spanish (Rask 1824), and this was followed by grammars of Old Frisian (Rask 1825), Italian (Rask 1827), the West African language Acra (Rask 1828), Danish for Englishmen (Rask 1830), and Sámi (Rask 1832b). In addition, he had already published a grammar and reader of Anglo-Saxon in Stockholm during his stay there in 1817 (Rask 1817). All these grammars followed the methodological and organizational pattern he had already laid down in his grammar of Old Norse (Rask 1811): a short phonology, extensive descriptions of inflection, derivation, and syntax (and frequently a survey of metrics). In the case of Sámi he relied decisively on Leem's (1748) grammar. The reason for Rask's extensive grammar writing is clearly spelled out in the preface to his Italian grammar (1827):

But it is absolutely necessary for the comparative study of languages to have grammars of each of the cognate languages, structured in the same way, since otherwise a comparison cannot be undertaken without also producing completely revised grammatical descriptions, which is an endless task. Accordingly, it has been my plan for a long time, when I found time and the opportunity, to prepare grammatical descriptions of the various languages of our group of Japhethic peoples according to one and the same system. (Rask 1827:6-8)

Rask elaborates his views on grammar writing and the grammatical structure of language even more clearly in the introduction to his Danish grammar for Englishmen (1830):

Though if the language itself follows a system, as in fact every language may be supposed to do, or it could not be spoken by a whole nation, that system should appear in the Grammar, or the Grammar must be acknowledged to be deficient in the most material point, its chief object being to exhibit a view of the system of speech adopted by the nation. This system, however, is seldom so evident in any language, that there may not be formed many different ideas of it, and consequently many different plans may be laid down for a Grammar of one and the same language. (Rask 1830:iv)

Rask's grammars were influential particularly in the Nordic countries, and their structure influenced many other descriptions of both the Scandinavian and the Finno-Ugric languages. His grammars were not without bias, however. He was, for example, very much occupied with an aesthetic evaluation of the languages. Portuguese is considered much more beautiful than Spanish because it lacks the "hard, oriental sound of Spanish *j x*" (Rask 1824:10).

Sometimes practical considerations interfered with his original intentions. In the introduction to his Italian grammar (1827), Rask claims that he wrote it because the university gave him the right to print a certain number of pages at the university printer free of charge. He explains that originally he had intended to write a description of several lesser-known languages of Southern India but could not do so since the printer lacked the necessary types. As a result, he decided instead to write a grammar of Italian. But he was not allowed enough free printed pages for a whole grammar, so he had to leave out the syntax.

After completing his journeys, Rask worked at the university library until 1831, the year before his death, when he was appointed professor of Oriental languages. During the last years of his life, he was particularly concerned with trying to reform Danish orthography (4.5.4.1.).

Another Danish linguistic legend is Jacob Hornemann Bredsdorff (1790-1841). Bredsdorff was an internationally recognized natural scientist, who also published several works on Danish orthography and phonetics (e.g. 1817), on diachronic linguistics (1821), and on runology (1822). His study on the causes of sound change (1821) is considered by many to be his central work. This study was republished in 1886 by Vilhelm Thomsen (Bredsdorff 1886), where Bredsdorff is accorded the status of a genius. In 1982, Bredsdorff's study was translated into English with a commentary by Henning Andersen. Compared with scholars of the eighteenth century as well as later scholars, Bredsdorff is concrete and realistic concerning linguistic changes, dropping, for example, all references to euphony and climate as conditioning factors. His explanations of language change include mishearing, faulty memory, imperfection of speech organs, indolence, and propensity for analogy.

It is still an open question (in spite of Henning Andersen 1982) to what extent Bredsdorff (1821) was influenced by Rask and in particular by Rask's grammar of Old Norse (1818). Bredsdorff had little influence on the development of linguistics because he was not widely read when his work was published.

In spite of Rask, and in spite of the success of comparative Indo-European studies in the rest of Europe, little of any significance transpired in the field of Indo-European studies in the Nordic countries in the first half of the nineteenth century. Professorships in comparative Indo-European philology, usually combined with Sanskrit, did not appear until the last quarter of the century. The table below shows the dates these chairs were established and their first occupants:

Helsinki	1875	Otto Donner
Copenhagen	1887	Vilhelm Thomsen
Uppsala	1889	Karl Ferdinand Johansson
Christiania	1894	Alf Torp
Lund	1898	Nils Otto Flensburg
Gothenburg	1899	Per Evald Lidén

Thus the comparative school was not institutionalized in the Nordic countries until around the year 1890.

Interest in the new developments in linguistics was, however, much greater than these university posts indicate, for lectures on comparative Indo-European linguistics at most universities date back to the 1840s. The lectures given by Aubert in Christiania (4.6.1.) are examples of this. Furthermore, we find well-oriented, informative, and enthusiastic descriptions of the new trends in linguistics written for a general audience by, for example, Palmblad (1819) in Sweden and O. H. Nissen (1843) in Norway.

In Christiania, it was the professor of Latin, Ludvig Cæsar Martin Aubert (1807-1887), who began lecturing on Latin phonology and morphology on a comparative basis (4.6.1.). But Aubert remained outside public life and did not take part in the bitter academic controversy in Norway over the methodology of comparative grammar which took place around the middle of the century.

The cause of this controversy was a series of publications comparing Sanskrit and Old Norse, written by the professor of Oriental languages in Oslo, Christopher Andreas Holmboe (1796-1882), cf. 4.6.3. While Holmboe's first publications (1846, 1848) were more or less unnoticed, his treatment of the relative pronoun

(1850) was severely attacked by the historian Peter Andreas Munch (1810-1863). In the following review, Munch (1850) said that he had to protest strongly against:

... a method or rather lack of method, which if it should become widespread and not be brought to a halt in time, would be very damaging to Germanic linguistics and would mean a regression back to an outdated and already abandoned point of view, instead of being something beneficial to its promotion. (Munch 1850:378)

Munch had complete faith in sound laws, and he rejected Holmboe's etymologies that did not follow Grimm's law down to the last detail. Holmboe was also severely criticized by several other foreign linguists, including the famous August Friedrich Pott. In most respects, Munch was right, and even by contemporary standards Holmboe's publications were superficial and weak methodologically. Sometimes merely the identity of one single sound in two words was enough for Holmboe to establish an etymological connection, even though the semantic resemblance between the words being compared was frequently loose. Holmboe often equated words from Old Norse and the modern Indo-Iranian languages without paying any attention to related forms in the other Germanic languages or in the ancient Indo-Iranian languages.

There may have been several reasons for Munch's attack on Holmboe. The strong criticism waged on Holmboe by foreign scholars was seen as damaging to the reputation of scholarship in the newly independent country, which was trying to gain recognition and prestige abroad.

But Holmboe was probably much more interesting in many respects than his contemporaries realized (cf. Hertzberg and Hovdhaugen 1979:186-188 for a more thorough evaluation). In a later study (1852), Holmboe provides the following description of his own methods and views on comparative linguistics:

Even the all-important Grimm's law is not exclusive, it admits exceptions like everything based on induction. When we, in addition to the sets of examples on which this law relies, establish other, although less frequent, sets of examples which show correspondences which do not fit Grimm's law, we are justified in assuming that either the hitherto unknown reasons for the first set of examples are absent in the later, or that new reasons have been added which have modified or eliminated the first. It is the task of scientific research to search for these reasons. But to do so requires a large array of examples to ensure reliable results. From such a collection of examples, nothing which can be physiologically justified ought to be excluded, even if it seems to violate generally recognized laws. (Holmboe 1852:viii)

This is a good example of the high level of scholarly debate which took place in the Nordic countries around 1850. Holmboe's argument was illustrated empirically 24 years later through Karl Verner's famous discovery of regularities in the exceptions to Grimm's law.

The methods of Grimm and Rask were also used as basic arguments in the Norwegian historical school headed by Munch and another historian, J. Rudolf Keyser (1803-1864). The basic tenet of the Norwegian historical school was that the Scandinavians had immigrated from the north, and to support this thesis, arguments from comparative linguistics were frequently used. Munch, who was not a linguist, but familiar with the publications of Grimm and Rask, had also published some good presentations of the comparative method, which were widely read at that time.

Munch's elementary phonology and morphology of Gothic (1848a), with a short reader and glossary, was unique at the time. There were more extensive grammars, but nothing short and elementary. This work is well organized with a thorough critical analysis of Gothic phonology and a presentation of the morphology that reflects contemporary insight, for example in the arrangement of the Ablaut classes of verbs.

Munch also wrote a short comparative phonology and morphology (although the title only refers to morphology) of Danish, Swedish, and German for schoolchildren (1848b). Its aim is to introduce the new historical linguistics to the schools and to make learning easier for the pupils, but of course also to make the grammatical description more correct, for example by showing them that Ablaut-verbs are not irregular, but in fact regular. Munch also suggests that elementary grammars should all be based on the same model, and

that in the future the mother tongue should, as advocated by Aasen (4.5.4.4.), draw on the dialects, because in many cases they are more archaic. Influence from Rask is discernible on almost every page of Munch's grammars, both in their structure and in his general views on grammar writing.

Rask's national and international recognition notwithstanding, the first professorship in comparative linguistics in Denmark was not established until 1887. The first to occupy this position, Vilhelm Thomsen (1842-1927), had served as a part-time lecturer in comparative philology since 1871. Thomsen was a pupil of Madvig (4.3.), Westergaard (4.6.3.), and Smith (4.6.4.), and eventually became one of the best known and most widely respected Nordic linguists of his day. His appointment was based on his scholarly achievements, especially his famous deciphering of the Old Turkish runic inscriptions (4.7.1.), and his studies of the relationship between the Indo-European and Finnic languages in which he established an international standard for the study of loan words (4.4.2.). Thomsen published important contributions to comparative Indo-European phonology, Romance studies, Lycian, and the Munda languages, and wrote a history of linguistics (Thomsen 1902).

In addition to the classical Indo-European languages and the modern languages of Western Europe, Thomsen mastered Czech, Finnish, Hungarian, Turkish, and Tamil. He also had an unusually wide network of linguistic contacts. With this depth of knowledge, Thomsen was an influential teacher, who educated a whole generation of Danish linguists, who in turn became leading scholars in their fields, among them his successor, Holger Pedersen (5.5.1.), as well as Otto Jespersen (4.6.2. and 5.3.3.), Kristoffer Nyrop (4.6.2. and 5.7.1.), Kristian Sandfeld (5.7.1.), William Thalbitzer (5.7.8.), and Karl Verner.

Karl Verner became professor of Slavic languages (4.6.4.), but he published very little. Still, his main linguistic publication of a mere 33 pages (Verner 1876) was sufficient to give him a leading place in the history of linguistics.

The core of the comparative method since Grimm was comprised of the regular sound correspondences between genetically related languages. This approach was taken a step further when the neogrammarians claimed that these sound correspondences actually reflected sound laws, i.e. sound changes that were without exceptions. But there were problematic cases, like the instances in which unvoiced stops in Sanskrit and most other Indo-European languages corresponded both to unvoiced fricatives and to voiced stops/fricatives in Germanic languages, cf. Sanskrit *pitar-* 'father' = Gothic *fadar* and Sanskrit *bhr_tar-* 'brother' = Gothic *broþar*.

One afternoon, when Verner was about to take a nap, his eyes fell on a page in Bopp's comparative grammar of the Indo-European languages (Bopp 1833-1849), where the Sanskrit forms are prominently printed. Here he noticed that in the word for 'father', the oldest form of Sanskrit (Vedic) had an accent after the *t*, but in the word for 'brother' the accent was before the *t*. Accordingly, the variable representation in the Germanic languages, the so-called exceptions to Grimm's Law, could be explained as being conditioned regularly by the Indo-European accent. Verner's discovery, which has since been referred to as Verner's Law, provided crucial confirmation that sound laws were without exception. Verner demonstrated that a language could reflect features from the protolanguage (like accent) that had disappeared without leaving a trace in many other languages, even in languages like Latin that were attested much earlier than the Germanic languages. Verner called attention to the importance of suprasegmental features in comparative research and to the methodological importance of relative chronology.

While the Danish contributions to comparative Indo-European linguistics in the nineteenth century are found in every textbook on the history of linguistics, references to the Swedish school of comparative linguistics in Uppsala are rare. Nevertheless, three scholars, namely Olof Danielsson, Karl Johansson, and Per Persson,³⁶ were held in high regard by the leading neogrammarians, and several of their publications are

³⁶ Noreen also belonged to this group, but the main focus of his research was directed towards Swedish and general linguistics, cf. 5.6.1.7.

still frequently referred to and considered as classics in comparative Indo-European linguistics. All three were educated as classical scholars. The main source of inspiration for their later scholarly orientation came from the professor of Scandinavian languages in Uppsala, Mårten Richert (1837-1886, cf. 4.5.1.5.), whose few but inspiring lectures introduced comparative Indo-European linguistics in Sweden. In 1866, Richert also produced a pedagogical, but not very original survey of correspondences to the Sanskrit consonants (Sanskrit implicitly being considered the proto-language) in Greek, Latin, and Germanic, as well as of the correspondences to the Latin consonants in Italian and French.

Olof Danielsson (1852-1933) was the professor of Greek language and literature in Uppsala from 1891 to 1917. Danielsson received his education mostly from Uppsala, but he also studied in Germany 1877-1878 and 1881-1882. He was greatly influenced by the neogrammarians, who also held him in high regard and considered him a leading expert on the Italic languages. Danielsson's articles on comparative Indo-European morphology and etymology were published for the most part in leading international journals of classical and comparative philology. After 1900, and especially after his retirement, he worked on the little documented languages of Venetic, Lydian, and especially Etruscan. Danielsson's fascination with these languages was shared by many Nordic linguists at the end of the nineteenth and early twentieth century, for example by Bugge, Thomsen, and Torp. Danielsson's Etruscan studies were fundamental for all later research on this language.

Karl Johansson (1860-1926) was professor in Uppsala from 1889 to 1926, first in comparative philology and from 1892 in Sanskrit and comparative philology. Johansson published several articles that had a significant impact on international comparative research. The studies he produced in 1888 on the Indo-European *Schwebeablaut* were especially important. Johansson had plans to write an etymological dictionary, but they were never realized. Instead, he devoted his efforts to a number of popular presentations of Sanskrit literature and of Indo-European culture and history. He also published a number of translations from Sanskrit and Pali, and in his later years he worked with the well-known bishop and archbishop Nathan Söderblom on the history of religion, thereby initiating a tradition of close cooperation between these two fields in Sweden.

Per Persson (1857-1929) was the professor of Latin language and literature in Uppsala from 1895 to 1922. His main production was within comparative Indo-European philology, especially etymology and word formation, cf. Persson (1912).

In Helsinki, Otto Donner (1835-1909) became the Lecturer (1870) and Professor (1875) of Sanskrit and comparative Indo-European linguistics, but since practically all of his scientific production is related to Finno-Ugric comparative linguistics or to comparisons between Indo-European and Finno-Ugric, he will be discussed in 4.4.2. In fact, very little comparative Indo-European linguistics was done in Finland during the 1800s. For obvious reasons, comparative interest was focused on Finno-Ugric.

The first Norwegian to acquire a university position in comparative linguistics was Sophus Bugge (1833-1907), who became professor of comparative philology and Old Norse in Christiania in 1866. Bugge had studied in Copenhagen and Berlin from 1858 to 1859 and had acquired a first-hand knowledge of contemporary historical-comparative linguistics. His publications in comparative linguistics were, however, insignificant and weak methodologically. His comparative studies of Armenian and Etruscan (Bugge 1890, 1909) were almost scandalous. The internationally best known Nordic scholar on Etruscan, the Dane S. P. Cortsen (1908), mentions that a German scholar had commented that Bugge's Etruscan studies were characterized "mit jener bodenlosen Willkür, die die Lektüre seiner etruskologischen Beiträge zu einer Qual für jeden halbwegs kritischen Leser macht...".

Bugge's important scholarly contributions were in the field of Old Norse philology, runology, onomastics, and folklore. He published several editions of Old Norse texts, applying text critical methods. He was held in high esteem by his contemporaries, and he frequently corresponded with leading Danish and Swedish linguists such as Madvig, Thomsen, Danielsson, Johansson, and especially with Noreen. As a result, Bugge is known today as the great national hero of Norwegian linguistics in the nineteenth century and has

been singled out as “the greatest among Norwegian philologists and the most noble one” (Amundsen 1961:429), cf. also M. Olsen (1911:348-372). Moreover, he is one of the few Norwegian linguists of the nineteenth century still mentioned in international encyclopedias. But he is hardly, if ever, mentioned in the histories of linguistics, and there are few, if any, indications that he influenced later research. His studies in Indo-European comparative philology and of the ancient Mediterranean languages were either overlooked or strongly criticized by his contemporaries and were thus forgotten after his death. In addition, later scholars questioned most of his theories concerning the origin of the runes and challenged some of his interpretations of runic and Old Norse texts.

Bugge was probably given the status as one of the greatest Norwegian scholars because his theories appealed to the new Norwegian state in its search for national identity and in its cultivation of Norwegian nationalism. For instance, Bugge claimed that the old Edda texts were Norwegian, not Icelandic. He demonstrated that the language of the oldest runic inscriptions was not Danish or Icelandic or Gothic, but a specific common and archaic Scandinavian language (*urnordisk*), and he showed that both the runic alphabet as well as the old mythology had connections to the best of European culture. What more could nation builders expect from a linguist or philologist?

In 1894, Alf Torp (1853-1916) became the first professor of Sanskrit and comparative philology in Oslo. Torp obtained his doctoral degree in Leipzig. During the 1890s, he concentrated on the study of undeciphered and/or fragmentarily recorded languages such as Etruscan, Messapic, and Lycian. After 1900, he worked mainly on the etymology, history, and syntax of Norwegian and Old Norse (4.5.3.2. and 5.6.7.4.). His doctoral thesis (1881), a comparison of Sanskrit and Pali, is a solid classical neogrammarian study. Torp first employed the normal sound correspondences and then tried to explain the deviations through analogy in order to test the neogrammarian theory. His testing of the theory on central data, material which had not yet been fully analyzed, shows his ability to spot theoretically interesting data.

In his attempt to reconstruct the original case forms of the single *o*-declension of Proto-Indo-European, originating from clitic pronouns and adverbs, as well as the subsequent emergence of the consonant declension, Torp (1889) seldom refers to other scholars or to the existing literature. Instead, he frequently refers to language as a mystical entity having its own life: the awareness in the language itself of the relationship between different forms (Torp 1889:92,96) and the need of the language for leveling. However, a number of irregularities must be accepted for his reconstructions to work.

Torp was not successful in comparative Indo-European studies, but his work on several undeciphered Mediterranean languages (Etruscan, Messapic, and Lycian) was recognized to a certain extent by his contemporaries (e.g. Vilhelm Thomsen). Above all, Torp has been praised for his synchronic and almost structuralist approach (cf. Torp 1905a:4)

Later scholars working with Etruscan (e.g. Cortsen 1908) were nevertheless critical of Torp’s readings of the inscriptions. His publications after 1900 on Norwegian etymology and syntax, in cooperation with Hjalmar Falk, are those which have been remembered by posterity.

4.4.2. Comparative Finno-Ugric Linguistics

Anders Johan Sjögren (1794-1855), who worked as an academician in St. Petersburg from 1844, introduced the historical-comparative method of Rask, Grimm, and Bopp to Finnish linguistics, combining it with the multicultural approach of Porthan (3.7.2. and 4.7.1.). Sjögren saw and heard Rask, but did not personally meet Rask, when he visited Finland, and according to Sjögren’s own biography, it was Rask who inspired him in his career.

More than anyone else, and both as an organizer and researcher, Sjögren created the profile of Finnish linguistics in the nineteenth century. His most important publications are within descriptive linguistics, both of Finno-Ugric (4.7.1.) and Indo-Iranian languages (4.6.3.). One of his central observations was that Finno-Ugric peoples had occupied a much larger territory in ancient times, prior to the expansion of

Novgorod.

In his main comparative work (1832), Sjögren uses grammatical comparison to demonstrate the relatedness of Finnish and Komi. There are, however, methodological weaknesses in some of his historical-comparative research. Thus there are outdated etymologies in his comparative study of Ossete (1848) and in his early paper on Finnish (1821). In the introduction to this paper (1821:vii), Sjögren mentions that until he had finished the manuscript he had not read Gyarmathi (1799), a work by which he was impressed.

The materials Sjögren gathered have had lasting value, especially his Livonian collection from trips made in 1846 and 1852 (M. Korhonen 1986:49). Above all, he made several significant contemporaries, such as Elias Lönnrot, aware of the Finno-Ugric connections and of the history of the Finns.

When Sjögren was appointed academician in linguistics and ethnography of Finnic and Caucasian peoples in St. Petersburg in 1844, he became the first to occupy a full-time research position in Finno-Ugric studies (Branch 1994:29).

The real founder of Finno-Ugric and especially Uralic (i.e. Finno-Ugric and Samoyed) linguistics was Mathias Alexander Castrén (4.1.). Castrén, the son of a pastor in Oulu (Uleåborg) in Northern Ostrobothnia, became one of the legends of nineteenth century linguistics. He studied classical and Semitic languages and obtained his degree in 1836.

***PICTURE OF Mathias Alexander Castrén (1813-1852)

However, Castrén's career took a different turn. Like many of his contemporaries, he became deeply influenced by the publication of the *Kalevala* in 1835. Under the influence of scholars like Lönnrot, Snellman, and Runeberg, he became engaged in the national awakening in Finland. As a student, he actually lived for two years in the home of Runeberg. Furthermore, like Sjögren, Castrén had also been impressed by the comparative ideas and methods of Rask, which he wanted to apply to languages related to Finnish.

Castrén's first comparative study (1839) dealt with nominal inflection in Finnish, Estonian, and Sámi. In many respects it is a fundamental work and the one that explicitly formulates a program for further studies in the field. Castrén begins his preface with a quotation from Franz Bopp:

Eine Grammatik in höherem, wissenschaftlichem Sinne soll eine Geschichte und Naturbeschreibung sein; sie soll, so weit es möglich ist, geschichtlich den Weg ausmitteln, wodurch sie zu ihrer Höhe emporgestiegen oder zu ihre Dürftigkeit herabgesunken ist. (Castrén 1839:1)

After criticizing his predecessors who had compared Finnish with the languages of the most distant people and had only been occupied with accumulating a "forest of words with similar sounds and meaning" (*silvam aequae sonantium valentiumque vocabulorum*), Castrén states his own view and research program:

The most fertile and certain knowledge of language relationship is no doubt achieved through grammar. The grammar contains the laws, the *genius* or to put it differently, the soul of each language, while on the contrary, words only constitute the form of the language. Although form is necessary for everything and always is adapted to the genius, it has no value by itself. Accordingly words are of no value in investigating the relationship between different languages, except when their inflection and derivation follows the same laws. (Castrén 1839:1)

Castrén begins by conducting a systematic and critical survey of the classification of nouns into declensions in grammars of Finnish, Estonian, and Sámi. He then takes up morphophonemic alternations like vowel harmony and consonant gradation and finally treats number and case inflection on a comparative basis. Castrén's analysis of consonant gradation (weakening) has had lasting value. He was the first linguist to demonstrate that the stop alternations in Estonian, Finnish, and Sámi are (partly) dependent upon the structure of the following syllable (open vs. closed).

Another major comparative achievement is Castrén's (1850) study of pronominal suffixes in the

Altaic languages. This was the thesis he defended in Helsinki on October 16, 1850, in order to prove his formal competence for the newly established professorship of Finnish language and literature. His thesis attempts to show that the Finno-Ugric, Samoyed, Turkic, Mongolian, and Tungusic languages are related and belong to what Castrén called an Altaic family. The proof consists solely of the pronominal suffixes, which Castrén exhaustively documents and analyzes for each language. But the results are meager: *-m* in the first person and *-t* in the second person singular is actually all he finds, although for him this is sufficient to prove the genetic relationship. Although generally considered as one of his more important studies (M. Korhonen 1986:65), it had several weaknesses, even by contemporary standards. For example, there are no clear statements as to which phonetic changes can be considered regular, and there is no sense of system, since all kinds of variation and deviation are considered possible in isolation. It was not by being a comparativist but by being a field linguist who covered much of the vast territory of Russia that Castrén gained his fame as one of the great linguists of the nineteenth century (4.7.1.).

Castrén's most important comparative contribution is his grammar of the Samoyed languages (1854) based on his own extensive fieldwork. Castrén struggled to complete this book, even writing on his deathbed shortly before he prematurely passed away in 1852. He died at the age of 39, his health broken down by the extreme conditions under which he had conducted fieldwork among the Samoyeds and other indigenous peoples. The book was completed and published by the academician Anton Schiefner. This 600-page work contains descriptions of all the five Samoyed languages investigated by Castrén, especially of their sounds and morphological properties, and provides outlines of the development of the languages and their common source. Comparisons to other Finno-Ugric languages are included as well, thereby constituting an attempt at a comparative Uralic grammar.

The Norwegian politician and historian Ludvig Kristensen Daa (1809-1877) worked on a comparative study of the languages of Northern Asia and America that was of questionable quality, but it was published in 1867 in an international journal. Daa was inspired by Castrén who, according to Daa, had shown that all the languages of Northern Asia and Europe (i.e. Finno-Ugric, Samoyed, Altaic, Yukagir, Ket, etc.) were related. Daa assumed that the languages of America and the Pacific must have been related to the Siberian languages, since the American Indians originally traveled across the Bering Strait. He operates with extensive root etymologies, where the identity of one syllable or sound in words with somewhat similar meanings is sufficient to establish an etymological relationship. The etymologies are made even easier by disregarding the order of sounds (free metathesis). Daa's article is also full of scattered observations on primitive languages, commenting, for example, on their poverty in "letters", that is, sounds. Only a few of these languages have a full-fledged set of letters, whatever that may be, and if they have letters (i.e. sounds) not found in the Indo-European languages, then Daa contends that these letters are harsh, rude, or impossible to hear. And in addition, he states that all these primitive languages are poor and unstable.

David Emanuel Daniel Europaeus (1820-1884) was an ambitious Finnish amateur researcher. Even though he had no university degree or position and therefore was not very strong in scientific methodology, Europaeus's publications are a mixture of intelligent and pertinent observations and free fantasy. He was most interested in folklore, language, history, and archeology, and he was one of the main collectors of folk poetry for the *Kalevala*. In 1853, Europaeus published a good Swedish-Finnish dictionary with 35,000 entries. Europaeus was also interested in phonetics, the teaching of the deaf, comparative linguistics, and the ancient history of Finland. He is considered by many to be a forerunner of onomastic studies.

August Ahlqvist (1826-1889) is a controversial person whose scholarly work and influence on Finnish linguistics and on Finnish cultural life in general has been subject to conflicting evaluations. He was professor of Finnish language and literature for a 25-year period from 1863 to 1888, which was after Lönnrot had been an incumbent of the chair 1853-1862, following Castrén's early death in 1852.

Ahlqvist was more of a Finno-Ugrist than a Fennist. He continued the fieldwork tradition begun by Sjögren and Castrén by making several long trips to Russia and Siberia (4.7.1.). Ahlqvist studied several of the more distant Finno-Ugric languages in detail, especially the Moksha dialect of Mordvin, Mari

(Cheremis), Mansi (Vogul), and Hanti (Ostyak). He can reasonably be regarded as the founder of Finno-Ugric studies in Finland (M. Korhonen 1986:87), just as Castrén was the pioneer of Uralic studies.

Ahlqvist produced the first modern scientific comparative study of Finnish and Hungarian (1863). Here he established the primary regular sound correspondences between the two languages and presented a thorough morphological analysis. This work was of a high standard, at least equal to, if not better than other contemporary Indo-European studies. Today Ahlqvist's description of verb inflection in Moksha Mordvin (1861) is still considered to be relevant. He also investigated Mansi and Hanti extensively, as well as the Finnic languages Vepsian and Votian. During his field trips in 1857, Ahlqvist came to the conclusion that Chuvash was a Turkic, not a Finno-Ugric language, thereby settling a question that had until then been open to dispute.

Ahlqvist's very well written description of the origin of cultural words in Finnish (1871) is a typical study in the words and things (*Wörter und Sachen*) tradition. With this book, Ahlqvist initiated the study of language contact and loan words that later came to flourish in Finland. Ahlqvist worked at the same time as Vilhelm Thomsen, but Ahlqvist had his own manuscript ready before Thomsen's (1869) was published. Ahlqvist was sceptical of the neogrammarians, and Thomsen considered him to be old-fashioned. Thomsen was very critical of Ahlqvist's lack of method (i.e. the neogrammarian method) and rejected many of Ahlqvist's conclusions, which according to Thomsen were unfounded and based on fantasy.

Ahlqvist's major contribution to Finnish linguistics is his extensive study of derivational suffixes in Finnish nouns (1877), a work that contained a tabular taxonomic survey of the material with a wealth of examples, that also included older sources.

Ahlqvist had a notorious temper and held strong, if not always consistent, views on scholarly matters and other topics. He was conservative in his insistence on language norms and reacted fiercely against the national poet Aleksis Kivi's break with the traditional models of written Finnish (4.5.4.2.). On the other hand, Ahlqvist made important contributions to the emerging standard of written Finnish. He wrote poetry under the name of A. Oksanen, and he did much to elevate the level of university teaching in Finnish. Ahlqvist also promoted Finnish and Finno-Ugric studies in general, for example by founding the first linguistic journal in Finland, *Kieletär* (Language Lady, 1871-1875), and The Mother Tongue Society (*Kotikielen Seura*, 1876). He was Rector of the University of Helsinki from 1884 to 1887.

Ahlqvist was criticized by later neogrammarians, especially by Setälä, for being ahistoric and for lacking a clear method. From today's perspective, however, Ahlqvist's Mansi and Hanti studies and his broad lexico-grammatical-cultural perspective on language continue to be well respected (M. Korhonen 1993b).

The first professor of Sanskrit and comparative Indo-European linguistics in Helsinki was Otto Donner (4.4.1.), who became a lecturer in 1870 and a professor in 1875. Most of Donner's important publications are devoted to Finno-Ugric studies.

In his study of the immigration into Finland (1875), which Donner wrote in the *Wörter und Sachen* tradition, he maintained that the Finns had arrived from further south than was generally assumed and that the Mordvins were closely related to the Finns, a view which had already been proposed by Europaeus and Ahlqvist. Donner's work is mainly a collection of material that is without any theoretical framework or evaluation of the data.

Donner also compiled one of the first comparative dictionaries (1874-1888), which was actually a collection of small etymological studies of Finno-Ugric. Most of Donner's etymologies still hold, and he also proposed a number of noteworthy comparisons with Indo-European. But this dictionary also contained a number of questionable etymologies, and Ahlqvist (1879) strongly criticized it for its omissions. The most controversial and unacceptable aspect of his work was the application of Indo-European root theory and Ablaut to Finno-Ugric. This Donner had already advocated in 1873, where, on the basis of scanty material, he attempted to establish a basic monosyllabic root theory for Finno-Ugric. In his 1879 work on the classification of the Finno-Ugric languages, he illustrated their mutual relation by a *Stammbaum*

(genealogical tree) presentation that has been widely used up to the present.

Donner was not only influenced by the neogrammarians, but also by their leading antagonists Wilhelm von Humboldt and Heymann Steinthal. Donner wrote a survey of contemporary language typology (1885) and a detailed history of Finno-Ugric linguistics (1872). But his greatest service to Finnish linguistics was undoubtedly his administrative work (he was also an influential politician and from 1905 senator), where he strongly promoted linguistic fieldwork and linguistic expeditions to Russia. Donner was also instrumental in the founding of the Finno-Ugrian Society, *Suomalais-ugrilainen Seura - Société Finno-Ougrienne*, which came to play a prominent role in Finno-Ugric studies (4.2.).

The scientific foundation for the study of loan words in Finnish and for linguistic contact between Finnish and other language groups was laid by the Danish linguist Vilhelm Thomsen (4.4.1.). By using strict methods and a vast material, Thomsen demonstrated how the study of loan words could provide information about earlier history and contact between peoples.

Thomsen's doctoral thesis (1869) is a short systematic study, beginning with a survey of Finnish historical-comparative phonology, followed by a systematic treatment of regular sound correspondences in the loan words, thereby establishing the system and the underlying rules and excluding partial, unsystematic, and haphazard similarities. In his comparative study of 1890, Thomsen shows the same systematic approach, basing this entire analysis on sound laws and regular formal correspondences. He is very critical of earlier research, pointing out the inconsistencies and one-sidedness in the publications of Donner and Ahlqvist, who viewed the whole field only from a Finnish perspective.

At the end of the nineteenth century, around 1890, the methodology and theoretical foundation of Finno-Ugric linguistics became the topic of a bitter academic dispute in Finland. This soon led to the complete dominance of the neogrammarian research paradigm, a situation which was to affect Finno-Ugric linguistics as a whole until 1930 and the study of Finnish until around 1960.

On one side of this dispute we find the descriptivist (4.5.2.3.) and phonetician (4.8.) Arvid Genetz (Arvi Jännes, 1848-1915). Born in Karelia, Genetz also became known as a poet and a politician. From 1901 to 1905, he was the Head of the Ecclesiastical Department in the Finnish Senate, an office equal to that of a Minister of Education. Genetz traveled extensively and conducted fieldwork in Karelia and in the Sámi area, and he introduced phonetics in Finland. His dissertation on the sounds of Finnish and Karelian (1877a) is a short, but clear and very advanced survey of articulatory phonetics. Nevertheless, his diachronic analysis and his use of phonetics for analyzing Karelian (1877b) was not as successful. Genetz tried to explain all sound changes in a strict, but sometimes also speculative phonetic way. He did not always keep diachrony and synchrony apart, but probably did not intend to, either.

Genetz worked for a long time as a high-school teacher and could devote himself to scholarly work only during periods of fieldwork. When Ahlqvist's professorship became vacant and was advertised in 1889, the two applicants were Genetz and Setälä.

No single scholar has affected linguistics in Finland more profoundly than Eemil Nestor Setälä (1864-1935). He established the neogrammarian research paradigm that became dominant for decades in Finno-Ugric and, especially in Finnish studies, with long-lasting consequences that lack counterparts in the other Nordic countries. Setälä was not only an eminent linguist and organizer of linguistic research infrastructure, he was also strongly involved in politics for almost 30 years. His political life included posts as Minister of Education 1925, Minister of Foreign Affairs 1926, as the Ambassador to Copenhagen and Budapest from 1927 to 1930, as an author of the Finnish Declaration of Independence and one of its twelve signers in 1917, as a member of the Senate Cabinet that declared Finland independent in 1917 and almost simultaneously had to deal with the Finnish war from 1917 to 1918.³⁷

Setälä began studying linguistics at school, with Genetz as one of his teachers. In 1880, at the age of

³⁷ Called the War of Independence by some, and the Civil War by others.

16, he published his legendary Finnish syntax (Setälä 1880). This book was written under the supervision of Genetz and was to a very large extent based on material and analyses taken from Adolf Waldemar Jahnsson (cf. 4.5.2.3.). Setälä learned neogrammarian theory in the course of his studies in Latin, Sanskrit, and especially Greek. The decisive impetus came when he read Gustav Meyer's book *Griechische Grammatik* in 1885. From 1888 to 1890 Setälä traveled extensively and became acquainted with the Uppsala Circle as well as with the leading German neogrammarians. In Leipzig, he made personal acquaintance with Karl Brugmann, August Leskien, and Friedrich Techmer. But he introduced neogrammarian methods in Finland in his dissertation (1886), before this trip to Germany. Setälä finished his dissertation when he was a fifth-year student at the age of twenty two. His dissertation analyzes the history of the formation of tense and mood stems, especially in Finnic and Sámi languages. Setälä demonstrated how the tense and mood markers were related in these languages, how the sound structure of the markers had developed, and how analogy eventually had interfered with the general course of sound development. Setälä's doctoral thesis is thus a masterpiece of neogrammarian diachronic linguistics, and as such it became very influential. His claims are clear and well-argued and show the restrictions that the sound laws impose on the material.

For the competition for the professorship, Genetz produced a thesis on Finnish particles (Genetz 1890), which began by proclaiming his total conversion to the neogrammarian faith (Genetz 1890:v). But the topic of this thesis was not very suitable for illustrating this method. This study is mainly a contribution to Finnish descriptive morphology, and diachrony plays only a marginal role in it. Setälä's thesis (1890) for the professorship was on the history of the stops in Finnic languages, and once again he produced a masterpiece of neogrammarian research. It was clear and systematic and convincingly corrected previous theories while drawing attention to new material. For a long time this work formed the basis for Finnish and Finno-Ugric linguistic research in Finland, and it had an enormous influence on Finnish linguistics. In the twentieth century, this book came to serve as a model for many other similar studies in its focus on the study of consonants, in disposition and problem formulation, and in the selection and presentation of data. This thesis also contains numerous critical comments on Genetz's work.

Another item written by Setälä in connection with the professorial competition was a kind of early textbook, *Nykyaikuisen kielentutkimuksen periaatteista* (On the Principles of Modern Linguistics, 1891). It is a brief, dedicated, strongly polemical exposition of the neogrammarian manifesto, directed against the "old type" of historical-comparative linguistics and intended for language teachers and students. This textbook is based primarily on the work of Hermann Paul and Berthold Delbrück. Here linguistics is viewed as a three-layered hierarchy of descriptive, comparative, and historical study, the latter being the highest form to be served by the other two.

Setälä argues against the use of stems and roots in morphological description and instead postulates sentences and words as the main objects to be investigated. The importance of a rigorous methodology is emphasized, and the nature of sound change, especially its purported exceptionless nature, is singled out as the most important theoretical problem. The textbook ends with a plea that Finno-Ugric linguistics should not estrange itself from the methodological development of Indo-European studies. The book was later reprinted as part of Setälä's 1921 publication, an indication that he had not had the time to update the original publication or to follow the activities that had taken place in international linguistics during those three decades.

Genetz was awarded the professorship, but when he was appointed to the new professorship in Finno-Ugric languages in 1893, Setälä got Genetz's former position. By then the two rivals had become enemies.

Genetz did not remain a professor for long, because he turned to politics and administration around the year 1900. Among his later more important publications is his dictionary of Kola Sámi languages printed in 1891. This dictionary contains approximately 4,000 lexical entries. In this work, Genetz often gathers and records forms from several dialects under the same entry. Each lexical entry contains a basic form that attempts to unite the varying phonetic features encountered in different dialects. These basic forms were

considered by his colleagues to be historical reconstructions, and since they obviously failed in this respect, Genetz was severely criticized, primarily by Setälä, and blamed for being old-fashioned and unaware of what was going on in contemporary linguistics. Wiklund's review (1892a) is particularly revealing regarding these criticisms. As Genetz did not explain what his basic forms meant, from a neogrammarian point of view Wiklund's devastating critique is well-founded and logical.

The next important step in Setälä's development was the gradation theory for the Finno-Ugric languages (cf. M. Korhonen 1986:129-133), which he developed together with Heikki Paasonen, Yrjö Wichmann, and especially with the Swedish scholar K. B. Wiklund (Setälä 1896, Wiklund 1891, 1906; cf. 5.5.2.). In this theory, the consonant gradation of the stops found in Sámi and Finnish was not only reconstructed for the Finno-Ugric proto-language (and later for the Samoyed languages), but was also transferred to all consonants and vowels, even though no existing language has such a gradation. This theory formed the canonized foundation and framework for diachronic Finno-Ugric research in Finland as long as Setälä lived, even though there was little empirical foundation for the theory. Around 1930, the theory came under criticism, and today it is largely rejected. Yet Setälä's success in his own day was not only due to his personal charisma. He was also able to convince his readers that his approach was the right one because it was modern, that it was based on the neogrammarian view that development was positive and that older theories were wrong simply because science progressed rapidly.

In 1896 Genetz published an important study of Finno-Ugric vowels, which appeared just after Wiklund had published his study of the vowel system of Proto-Sámi (1896) and Setälä had presented his theory of quantity alternations in Finno-Ugric, which was the beginning of the gradation theory (1896). The latter two publications were severely criticized by Genetz with convincing arguments. Genetz's critique is worth quoting, as found in Korhonen's translation:

Wiklund most often obtains only negative or, in my opinion, incorrect results primarily because he either does not check or decide matters from a Finno-Ugric point of view, but confuses the older and newer words and neither does he group them according to the vowels of the second syllable. Setälä, on the other hand, only "presumes" a splendid vowel system - discounting the long vowels he includes twelve original vowels whereas I have only six - and is unconcerned that Mordvin immediately provides counterexamples. (Genetz 1896:4 - M. Korhonen 1986:121)

But Setälä's views were accepted because his theory was considered the new and correct one, and he and his peculiar theories of consonant gradation dominated Finnish linguistic research for a long time:

The reception that Genetz's vowel theory had is a copybook example of the irrationality by which a scientific community makes its choice during a crisis period in a given discipline.

...

It was quite usual to consider Genetz as the representative of the old inaccurate and imprecise methods and although he too had adopted some of the neogrammarian principles he did not have Setälä's charisma. Setälä's vowel theory was adopted because one believed in Setälä. Subsequently, until the 1930s the history of the vowels in the Uralic languages was investigated by applying Setälä's gradation theory. Genetz's model for the history of the vowels was silenced to death. (M. Korhonen 1986:122)

Since 1950, there has been a complete reappraisal of Genetz in Finland, and today his methods and results are considered much more fruitful and relevant to modern linguistics than those of Setälä, cf. M. Korhonen (1986:123-125). Erkki Itkonen (i.a. 1939, 1949, 1961) launched this rehabilitation by showing the lasting value of Genetz's paper on the development of the first-syllable vowels in Finnish, Sámi, and Mordvin (1896). Genetz used both phonetic and statistical arguments when constructing his theory. M. Korhonen (1986:120) interprets the base-forms in Genetz's Kola Sámi dictionary (1891) as early precursors of twentieth century synchronic morphophonological representations.

A methodological investigation of Genetz's complete production has not yet been completed. There seems to be a continuity from Genetz's early Karelian studies to his last diachronic speculations, where

history to him was not a static reconstruction, but a constant reshaping and reconstruction of the basic forms from generation to generation, and where he also attempts to solve the *langue - parole* conflict.

The scientific community that accepted Setälä and rejected Genetz may not have been wholly irrational, however. Setälä had a well developed and internationally-recognized method, and he mastered this method and brought the understanding of Finno-Ugric linguistics a significant step forward in a way that could immediately be understood by his colleagues. Whereas Genetz had an intuitive feeling for the basic aspects of language and for the problems of diachrony and synchrony, of norm and variation, he did not formulate a theoretical and methodological framework for others.

As noted above, Setälä was also an active politician during one of Finland's critical periods, a scientific organizer of unusual stature (cf. 4.5.6.2. and 5.6.7.2. for his "dictionary program" formulated in 1896), and a very influential teacher especially in the 1890s before politics lured him away:

Setälä's influence as a producer of scholars and teachers of Finnish and the related languages was far-reaching in the extreme, and total. ... His pupils, and to some extent even the pupils of his pupils, kept Setälä's school in power in university teaching in Finland until the 1960s. (M. Korhonen 1986:138-139)

One important aspect of Setälä's activity is his founding (in collaboration with the folklore professor Kaarle Krohn) of the periodical *Finnisch-Ugrische Forschungen - Zeitschrift für Finnisch-Ugrische Sprach- und Volkskunde*, the first volume of which appeared in 1901. This volume contained a very important article by Setälä (1901) on the phonetic transcription of Finno-Ugric languages. He begins by stressing that a common transcription system is necessary for scientific progress. Following a survey of earlier transcription systems and alphabets, beginning with Rask, whom Setälä gives the honor of having initiated them, he then proposed a system that later became dominant in Finno-Ugric research. This is a detailed and complicated phonetic alphabet with an extensive use of diacritics, indicating minute phonetic nuances. There were, for example, no less than forty three different vowel qualities.

4.5. The Languages of the Nordic Countries

4.5.1. Introduction

After 1750, reading became more popular and there was a significant increase in the number of books published. Literacy became widespread in the Nordic countries in the 1800s. It is, however, conceivable that ordinary people were reasonably able to read even at far earlier periods than commonly assumed. One reason for the growing interest in the cultivation and description of the mother tongues in this period is this increase in reading and writing, which in turn was linked to the strengthening of the primary school system. Another reason, particularly in Finland and Norway, was that national languages served as symbols of nationalism and independence. As far as Finnish and Norwegian were concerned, a very tangible need arose to standardize and develop the lexicon, (normative) grammar, spelling conventions, etc. in order to satisfy the needs of a full-fledged national language.

Accordingly, one of the significant changes in the universities in the 1800s was the introduction of directorships or chairs in the national languages, coupled with a strong increase in academic research on these languages, their dialects, and their history.

This century also witnessed the growth of a national philological tradition in the Nordic countries, a tradition which had already begun to flourish in the previous century. This branch of linguistics, which will only be treated sporadically here, was concerned with the details of the individual text. This area was patterned on the classical model, its goal being to provide "correct" editions of historical texts and manuscripts of national interest such as the sagas and the ancient law codes and to likewise produce correct

interpretations of the runic inscriptions.

4.5.1.1. Denmark

As a product of Danish romanticism, the first professorship in the Scandinavian languages in the Nordic countries was established in Copenhagen in 1844. Niels Matthias Petersen (1791-1862), a schoolmate and lifelong friend and colleague of Rasmus Rask, was appointed to this position in 1845, thanks mostly to the success of his prize-winning and influential two-volume history of the Scandinavian languages (Petersen 1829-1830), cf. 4.5.3.1. Petersen's task as the first professor of the national language was a difficult one, partly because the field was relatively new and partly because it had to compete with traditional classical philology and dynamic scholars like Madvig (4.3.). Petersen published two small books on language as a result of his lectures at the University of Copenhagen (1852 and 1861), but since his main interest was history, he paid little regard to the new developments in linguistics that were taking place at home and abroad. Instead, his major contribution during this period was a five-volume history of Danish literature (1853-1864).

Petersen was followed by the Icelandic scholar Konrað Gíslason (1808-1891), who was the professor of Scandinavian languages from 1862 to 1886. Gíslason had been a lecturer in Scandinavian philology at the university since 1848, and his major achievements were in the area of Old Icelandic (4.5.3.).

Gíslason's successor was the runologist Ludvig Wimmer (1839-1920), who had also previously been a lecturer, first in comparative linguistics (from 1872), subsequently in Scandinavian philology (from 1886). Following in Rask's footsteps, Wimmer published an Old Norse grammar (1870a), accompanied by a reader containing a commentary and dictionary (1870b). His grammar, particularly in its expanded Swedish version, formed the basis for later publications of a similar nature, among others Noreen's Old Icelandic and Old Norwegian grammar of 1884, in which Noreen comments in the preface that it was impossible to produce a work on Old Icelandic morphology that was not actually a reworking of Wimmer's book. The reader, which included a substantial scholarly introduction, was characterized by Henry Sweet as "the best reading-book that exists in any language". Like his predecessors, Wimmer was also occupied with editing older texts, and together with Finnur Jónsson he produced an edition of the *Codex regius* of the Elder Edda in 1891. Wimmer's main contribution to linguistics was in the area of runology (4.5.7.), a field prominent in the national-romantic movement as well.

This may be the place to mention the *enfant terrible* of Danish linguistics in the nineteenth century, Edwin Jessen (1833-1921). Jessen never held a university position, nor any other permanent job it seems, but for about 50 years he provoked Danish linguists with a number of intelligent, independent, but also very polemic publications on phonology, grammar, orthography, etymology, and on the origin of language. But Jessen was often more critical than constructive, for example in his sharp and ironic attack (1867) on Madvig's (1842) work on the origin and development of language. Many of Jessen's points of criticism were nevertheless correct, but he himself often had little to offer in the way of alternative ideas and hypotheses.

4.5.1.2. Finland

In Finland, Swedish was the dominant language in public administration and culture for most of the nineteenth century, one reason being the fear that Russian would be established as an alternative. The low status of Finnish, particularly in the first half of the century, is exemplified by the fact that not a word of Finnish was uttered at the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Finnish Literature Society in 1856 and that the minutes of the Society were kept in Swedish until 1858.

One of the first to advocate a more wide-spread use of Finnish was Johan Gabriel Linsén (1785-1848). In his periodical *Mnemosyne* (1819), Linsén explained that there were two reasons for the neglected state of the vernacular: first, it had not been cultivated as a literary language and had thus been excluded

from the learned societies, and second, it had been pushed aside by Swedish as the language of administration. In 1821, an article appeared in the Turku newspaper *Åbo Morgonblad* (Åbo [Turku] Morning Newspaper) in which Erik Gustav Ehrström (cf. 4.6.3.) advocated the use of Finnish in culture and administration and the teaching of Finnish in the schools. Finnish eventually became a subject of instruction in the schools in 1841. A decade later, the first high schools were established in which Finnish was the language of instruction.

Finnish gradually gained ground in the cultural sphere as well, for instance the first Finnish theater was founded in 1872. Finnish also gradually became the language used at home in a growing number of originally Swedish-speaking families with Fennophile convictions. In 1863, the professor and politician Johan Vilhelm Snellman (1806-1881) was successful in having Finnish declared constitutionally as an official language for the Finnish-speaking population, but it took approximately twenty years before this law resulted in the production of official documents in Finnish, and the Department of Justice did not produce a resolution in Finnish until 1898. Finnish was used for the first time in Consistorium Academicum in Helsinki in 1894, by E. N. Setälä on the day his first daughter was born.

Although Finnish gained a certain degree of official recognition in the latter half of the nineteenth century and its use in practical situations gradually increased, there were still areas in which Swedish retained its stronghold. One of these was at the University of Helsinki, which resisted the use of Finnish. Prior to 1894, no requirement was established that teachers should be able to lecture in Finnish.

In 1821, 222 students at the Academy of Turku/Åbo petitioned for the creation of a university post in Finnish. The post was granted in 1828 (after the University moved to Helsinki), and there were two applicants: Gabriel Rein (1800-1867) and Karl Niklas Keckman (1793-1838). Keckman was appointed to the position, and Rein later became a professor of history. Rein's short grammar of Finnish (1829) is, however, an interesting linguistic work from a methodological point of view. It provides a penetrating discussion of the views of other grammarians on certain grammatical phenomena in Finnish, especially cases, and is an attempt to view the structure of Finnish as independent of other languages.

Mathias Alexander Castrén, cf. 4.4.2., became the first professor of Finnish language and literature in 1851. His successor, appointed in 1853, was the equally famous Elias Lönnrot (1802-1884), the compiler of the *Kalevala*, who actually only applied for the position to prevent Karl Axel Gottlund (4.5.4.2.) from getting it. Lönnrot obtained his degree in medicine in 1832 and worked as a district physician in Kajaani for almost twenty years before he was appointed professor.

One of Lönnrot's influential publications (1841-1842) is a research program for Finnish linguistics, pointing out topics in Finnish phonology, morphology, and syntax that had not yet been treated satisfactorily or at all in existing grammars. In several cases he proposed new analyses himself. Thus he suggested that there is only one nominal declension and one verbal conjugation in Finnish. Lönnrot was not, however, the first to have this idea. It is also found as early as 1832 in a short elementary school grammar for the schools in Vaasa (Wikström 1832).

Lönnrot's greatest linguistic achievements are his dictionary (4.5.6.) and his edition of the *Kalevala* (1835, 1849). He was seminal in basing the emerging written language standard on both western and eastern dialects. Lönnrot was the first to lecture in Finnish at the university (from 1856 to 1857, on Finnish mythology), and the first linguist to publish an article (1844) in a scholarly journal in Finnish. The first grammar of Finnish written in Finnish was a school grammar (Corander 1845).

In 1892, a new professorship in Finno-Ugric linguistics was established to which Arvid Genetz was appointed (4.4.2.).

The journal *Suomi. Tidskrift i fosterländska ämnen. Kirjoituksia isänmaallisista aiheista* (Suomi. Journal for Patriotic Writings), which started to appear in 1841 in Helsinki, immediately became an important early forum for publications in Finnish linguistics. Soon afterwards, in the 1850s, the Finnish language was accepted as an academic language along with Swedish. Today the most important linguistic forum in Finland is the publication *Virittäjä*, which began appearing on a regular basis in 1897.

4.5.1.3. Iceland

The increased use of Danish in the administration and the increased presence of Danish merchants in the course of the seventeenth century and early eighteenth century led to an increased influx of Danish lexical and other elements into the Icelandic language itself, especially in Reykjavík. Thus, when Rasmus Rask went there in 1813, he predicted that, unless decisive measures would be taken, the Icelandic language would become extinct there within a century, and in the whole country within two hundred years (Ottósson 1990:52). In the following decades, especially in the wake of the reestablishment of the Icelandic parliament *Alþingi* in 1845, this development was turned around in a rather swift and decisive manner.

Except for the Latin school at Bessastaðir and later in Reykjavík, no other centers of learning in Iceland existed in the nineteenth century. Nevertheless, this century is of great importance for the study and description of the Icelandic language. Through the works of Rasmus Rask (1811, 1818, 1832a) the foundation was laid for a better understanding of the basic structure of the language. Icelandic also became an important language in the emerging paradigm of historical-comparative Indo-European studies (4.4.1. and 4.5.3.).

The school at Bessastaðir (1805-1846) was the first institution of learning in Iceland at which teaching positions were permanent jobs (Ottósson 1990:61-65) This school provided the first academic environment and was the first institution where teachers were expected to do research and could have scholarly papers published in the yearly publications of the school. The great majority of Icelandic theologians, the bulk of the educated class of that time, received their education at the Latin School.

The Latin school in Reykjavík (established in 1846) also had some great scholars on its staff, and some of their scholarly papers were published by the school. Two teachers in classical languages who also were rectors, Jón Þorkelsson (1822-1904) and Björn M. Ólsen (1850-1919, cf. 5.6.4.3.), were members of learned societies in other countries. The research interests of Jón Þorkelsson (a teacher from 1859, rector from 1872 to 1895) were mostly linguistic, although he also pursued philology, especially the interpretation of Skaldic verse. Ólsen's (a teacher from 1879, rector from 1895 to 1904) interests were more evenly distributed between literature, history, and language. Another center for the study of the Icelandic language, the old language in particular, was at the University of Copenhagen, especially while the Icelander Konráð Gíslason taught there (1848-1886), but the study of old Icelandic also flourished under his successor, Ludvig Wimmer (4.5.1.1.).

4.5.1.4. Norway

The study of Norwegian³⁸ in the nineteenth century was dominated by two scholars, who both worked outside the university: Ivar Aasen (1813-1896) and Knud Knudsen (1812-1895).

Ivar Aasen (cf. Linn 1997, Venås 1996, Walton 1991, 1996) occupies a unique position in Norwegian history, and the impact of his work has continued to be felt in many areas of Norwegian culture. He was first and foremost a language planner, the creator of New Norwegian (*landsmål*, later *nynorsk*), one of the two official written standards of modern Norwegian. But Aasen was also a poet, authoring several songs and poems, which are still popular today.

Aasen had very little formal education, and as a linguist he was completely self-taught. He was

³⁸ The term *Norwegian* was by no means clear and uncontroversial in the early nineteenth century, neither in Norway nor abroad. After independence was established and the new constitution adopted in 1814, the literary language in Norway was Danish. In the early days, people started speaking of the *Danish and Norwegian language* (M. C. Hansen 1828). Later on, some people like Aa. Hansen (1833) started to call the language *Norwegian*, even though little or no linguistic justification could be found for this term.

offered an academic position in 1880, but declined. His research was initially supported by the Royal Norwegian Society of Sciences and Letters (*Det Kgl. Norske Videnskabers Selskab*) in Trondheim, but in 1851 the Norwegian Parliament gave him a life-long scholarship to study Norwegian dialects.

Early in his career, Aasen wanted to create a Norwegian literary language based on the more “genuine” dialects. He accomplished this by means of grammars (Aasen 1848, 1864) and an extensive dictionary (4.5.2.5. and 4.5.6.4.). Aasen’s work in language planning was motivated mainly by patriotic and practical reasons (C. Henriksen 1995:92-94). In contrast with Denmark, Sweden, and most other European nations, Norway had no national language of its own. Furthermore, another strong argument in line with the new Norwegian state’s romanticism and nationalism was the fact that many Norwegian dialects had words and morphemes which were much more similar to the high-status language Old Norse than to Danish. In addition — and here Aasen’s background in a rural area in Western Norway may have been of significance — Aasen wanted to create a language for the Enlightenment and education of the common people in those rural areas where the mother tongue was so different from the Danish written language that this difference, in his opinion, caused them severe problems in reading and writing Danish.

Aasen seems to have read very little on linguistics except grammars. He was familiar with the grammars of Grimm and especially Rask. He had read various school grammars of Latin and other Indo-European and non-Indo-European languages. It is, however, an open question to what extent his reading, especially after 1850, had any influence on his own linguistic studies. It seems that he not only formed his ideas of how to do linguistic fieldwork and how to create a new language at an early stage, but that he also constructed a scheme for writing a grammar that he followed the rest of his life. The more Aasen turned from language description to language planning, the more he concealed his sources, cf. Linn (1996a). In the end, Aasen’s influence as a descriptive linguist was not significant. He was little known outside the Nordic countries, and his influence on the emerging discipline of dialectology was hardly profound, even in Norway. This is probably because his purpose was more practical than scholarly. As Aasen’s goal was to reconstruct a Norwegian language from the dialects, he was in this sense a descriptive dialectologist, but phonetic transcriptions, theoretical discussions of dialect variation, and fieldwork methods were of little interest or relevance to him. For a more thorough evaluation of Aasen as a linguist, cf. E. Haugen (1965), Linn (1997), and C. Henriksen (1995).

Like Aasen, Knud Knudsen was born into poverty. He grew up close to the small town of Tvedestrand on the coast about 300 km south-west of Oslo. He was a high-school teacher who aimed at modifying various aspects of the curriculum of the high schools. One of Knudsen’s main aims was to strengthen the position of Norwegian at the expense of Latin and Greek (K. Knudsen 1884). This campaign for reducing the position of Latin and Greek had widespread support in Norway in commercial and religious circles and among natural scientists and leftist politicians. This movement was also strongly supported by the influential novel *Gift* (Poison, 1883), written by one of the leading Norwegian authors at that time, Alexander Kielland (1849-1906). As a result of this successful movement, by the turn of the century, little remained of Latin and Greek in the Norwegian high schools.

Like Aasen, Knudsen was first and foremost a language planner. Thus Knudsen advocated the development of a written variant of Norwegian (*riksmål*, later *bokmål*)³⁹ based on the cultivated spoken language of the towns, that is, a language based on the variety of Norwegian that was most heavily influenced by Danish, but which was also the variety that had the strongest literary and administrative support. Like Aasen, Knudsen’s goal was to create a Norwegian national language, and he too successfully

³⁹ The change of name in 1929 from *landsmål* to *nynorsk* was a change in a continuous development of the standard, while the relationship between *riksmål* and *bokmål* is more complicated. In 1929, *bokmål* became the official name of the standard, but those opposing the changes in the orthographic and morphological system in 1938, began using *riksmål* as the name of a more conservative and unofficial standard that was and still is widely used by several leading newspapers and by many authors.

achieved it. Both the orthography and to some extent the vocabulary of the other variant of modern Norwegian, the “book language” (*bokmål*), is based on the work of Knudsen, a scholar who also made several important contributions to Norwegian grammar (4.5.2.5.).

From 1828 to 1843, the teaching of Old Norse at the University was taken care of by the leading Norwegian historian, J. Rudolf Keyser (4.4.1.). He had a good practical command of Icelandic, but his interest in teaching the linguistic aspects of the language was minimal. In one of his courses, Aasmund Olavsson Vinje (1818-1870), who later became a famous Norwegian author, reported that he once asked Keyser if there were no rules for the use of the subjunctive in Old Norse. “No”, Keyser characteristically replied, “there aren’t any, and who cares anyway!”

Another equally famous historian, Peter Andreas Munch (4.4.1.) taught language history, mainly focusing on the relationship of Norwegian to Old Norse, Gothic, and the other Germanic languages. Munch was a much better linguist than Keyser, and Munch’s lectures on language history, which were held regularly from 1846 to 1853, made up the basic introduction to linguistics for the first generation of Norwegian scholars in the fields of Norwegian, Old Norse, and Germanic linguistics.

In 1881, the Norwegian Parliament created a personal professorship for Hans Matthias Elisæus Ross (1833-1914), who had done extensive fieldwork on dialects since 1866, resulting in the publication of a monumental dialect dictionary in 1895 (4.5.6.4.). But the university did not find Ross qualified for the professorship (cf. Venås 1992:154-155), and since the government followed the advice of the university, Ross was not appointed.

When the Liberal Party took over the Norwegian government in 1884 under the leadership of Johan Sverdrup, the situation changed. This party had its main support in the rural areas and in the districts where the rural dialects were spoken, and one of its first acts was to establish a professorship in the “People’s Language” (Aasen’s proposed standard) in 1885. The first to occupy this professorship was Ingebret Moltke Moe (1859-1913), who was not a linguist, but a specialist in folklore. In 1899 this professorship was divided into two chairs: one in folklore, held by Moe, and one in the Norwegian written standard as proposed by Ivar Aasen and this standard’s dialects. There were two applicants for this position: Marius Hægstad (1850-1927) and Amund B. Larsen (1849-1928).

Larsen was the leading Norwegian dialectologist of the time (4.5.5.3.), and his production was far above Hægstad’s both in quantity and quality. But Larsen did not share the view that Aasen’s Norwegian standard was the written expression of the rural dialects, a viewpoint that was the very rationale of the professorship. Accordingly, Hægstad was appointed to the position, as his academic production (even if small) was of high quality and clearly within the defined framework of the professorship.

Hægstad, who was also an important educator and politician, had studied phonetics under Henry Sweet in England and was well acquainted with contemporary linguistics. Most of his publications and activities as professor belong to the twentieth century (5.6.4.4.). Here it can merely be noted that he was to have a profound and far-reaching effect, for better or worse, on Norwegian linguistics, and in particular on the profile of the department of Scandinavian languages at the University of Oslo.

It was not until 1912 that the University of Oslo established a professorship in *riksmål*. The main focus at the University of Oslo in the nineteenth century was on Old Norse.

In the 1840s the pastor Nils Vibe Stockfleth (4.5.2.6.) began offering courses in Sámi at the university in Christiania. Jens Andreas Friis (4.5.2.6.) became lecturer in 1851, and in 1866 he was appointed professor *extraordinarius* in the Sámi language. In 1874 his position was converted into an ordinary professorship. As to the position of Sámi studies in the other Nordic countries, cf. 4.4.2.

4.5.1.5. Sweden

Chairs in Scandinavian languages were set up at the University of Uppsala and at the University of Lund around 1860, somewhat surprisingly fifteen years later than the first Danish chair had been founded in Copenhagen, and almost ten years later than Castrén was appointed professor of Finnish language and literature in Helsinki.

The first professor of Scandinavian languages in Uppsala was Carl Säve (1812-1876), who served as professor from 1859 to 1876. Säve had originally planned to become a physician. But when he fell ill, he began to study Swedish dialects, especially the dialects on Gotland and in Dalecarlia, an interest that developed into a professional ambition. Most of his publications were in the field of Scandinavian and Old Norse philology, and he was able to stimulate an interest among the students in the Scandinavian languages and especially in dialect studies (4.5.5.4.). Carl Säve was N. M. Petersen's favorite pupil, and their relation is reflected in their correspondence, published and edited by Carl S. Petersen (1908).

Mårten Richert (4.4.1.) was Säve's successor as professor of Scandinavian languages in Uppsala from 1877 to 1886. Richert began his studies in the natural sciences, but turned to philology after a quarrel with his chemistry professor. Unfortunately Richert was ill and unable to work most of the time he served as a professor, but when he did lecture, he was an inspiration to his students. The few lectures he gave and his work from 1866 were instrumental in introducing comparative philology into Sweden, and they were significant for the Uppsala circle in comparative philology, especially for Danielsson, Johansson, Noreen, and Persson (4.4.1.).

The next professor of Scandinavian languages in Uppsala was Adolf Noreen (1854-1925), who occupied the chair from 1887 to 1919. Noreen, who had studied in Leipzig under the leading neogrammarians such as August Leskien, began his academic career as a dialectologist (4.5.5.4.). Later he became the leading Swedish expert on historical-comparative and general linguistics in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries (5.6.1.7.).

The first professor of Scandinavian languages at Lund University was C. A. Hagberg (1810-1864), who moved to this position in 1858 from his post as the chair in modern European languages, which he had held since 1840 (4.6.2.). He became a member of the Swedish Academy in 1851 and took part in the preparation of the Dictionary of the Swedish Academy.

Hagberg began his academic career as lecturer in Greek in 1833 and thus had the same background as his successor, Theodor Wisén (1835-1892), who became lecturer in Greek at Lund in 1862 and was professor of Scandinavian languages 1865-1892. He prepared the publication of the Dictionary of the Swedish Academy, which started in 1892, with his successor Knut Söderwall as main editor. The dictionary was considered part of the responsibility of professors in Scandinavian languages at Lund. Wisén's own work was mainly concerned with West-Scandinavian philology. His views on linguistics as a science, which are clear from a draft of the syllabus in 1873, are representative of Scandinavian linguists of this period:

Scientific knowledge of the mother tongue and the other modern Scandinavian languages is not possible without an understanding of their historical development, the subject must be predominantly, although not exclusively, devoted to the study of the old languages of Scandinavia.

Knut Söderwall (1842-1924) was professor of Scandinavian languages 1886-1907 in Lund. His survey of the main periods in the history of the development of Swedish (Söderwall 1870) presented the first historical overview of the history of Swedish and pointed out the most important changes and characteristics of the different periods, cf. also 4.5.6.6.

4.5.2. Descriptive Studies

During the first decades of the nineteenth century, a broader approach to grammar writing was adopted in many countries. New languages had added to the empirical basis of linguistics, and the field was increasingly open to new methods of description and even to speculation.

Most of the grammars of this period were school textbooks, and most of the pre-1850 textbooks belonged to the tradition of general grammar (4.3.). From the perspective of the late twentieth century, the high quality of these books is surprising. It was not until the end of the century, when the teaching of the national languages was established at the universities, that descriptions began to appear of national languages aimed at university students. Grammars at the university level were also the only type of grammars in which the historical-comparative method had any significant influence on how grammatical phenomena were conceived and described. Grammars of Old Norse and the older stages of the languages began to be published around the year 1850.

4.5.2.1. Danish

Compared to Høysgaard's descriptions of the Danish language from the previous century (3.4.3.1.), the Danish grammars produced in the nineteenth century were not particularly original. Most of them were written with a view to instruction in the schools, primarily in the tradition of general grammar (4.3.). There was actually little interest in descriptive studies of the vernacular at the university, where the focus was primarily on sound laws and the historical development of language.

One consequence of this interest in the historical development of the vernacular was the necessity for documentation of the forms and constructions found in the earlier stages of the language. Although the usefulness of this practice was not as evident when it came to describing the modern language, several Danish grammarians saw the value of such an approach and based their descriptive publications on what was sometimes quite an extensive collection of historical excerpts, e.g. Levin (1844), Lefolii (1871), B. T. Dahl (1884), and Mikkelsen (1894).

An early descriptive study that deserves mention is N. M. Petersen's (4.5.1.1.) detailed treatment of Danish word formation (1826). Petersen acknowledges his debt to Høysgaard, Bloch, and Rask, and in the preface he comments on his own approach and results in relation to those of Jacob Grimm, whose *Deutsche Grammatik* appeared just before Petersen's work went to press. Petersen's survey of almost 100 pages is well-organized and provides a wealth of detailed information and examples for the rules of both derivation and compounding. He observes that there is no sharp distinction between inflectional and derivational morphemes.

Israel Levin (1810-1883), or "Language-Levin", as he was nicknamed by his contemporaries, was engaged in a number of activities including translation, the editing of older texts, and various forms of journalism. While he may be remembered in other connections for his articles on prostitution in the metropolis of Hamburg, his contribution to linguistics lies in his 1844 work on Danish phonology and nominal inflection, the only part of his planned reference work on the grammar of the Danish language that was ever published. In the preface, Levin opposes the notion that the modern language should be studied with reference to its history, insisting instead that the language should be studied in its own right, not as a degenerated form of Old Norse, but as the product of natural social and cultural development. Although he is primarily concerned with an analysis of the written language, he distinguishes between a higher variety of "book language" and the spoken language used by educated speakers in private conversation and includes the latter in his description. Levin is also aware of the difference between the standard language and the dialects, as well as of the affinity of the lower-class Copenhagen dialects with the educated standard. His greatest merits lie in his observation of the finer details of the language, which are not, however, always presented in the most systematic fashion.

Levin applied for the position as lecturer in Scandinavian philology at the University of Copenhagen in 1862. When he was required to write a scholarly treatise, because he lacked the final examination, and when he failed to convince the university that the position should only be in Danish and not also include Icelandic and Old Norse (which Konrãð Gíslason already covered), he withdrew his application. From then on he viewed the university as a nepotistic refuge for privileged mediocrity.

Edwin Jessen (4.5.1.1.) published a short sketch of Danish grammar in 1868, which he revised and expanded in 1891. This grammar resembles Levin's in its opposition to what Jessen calls "the destructive «Scandinavian philological» approach" (1891:preface). In his opinion, a grammar of Danish should be written on a contemporary descriptive basis by someone with Danish as his main field of study. Furthermore, he states in the preface to the revised version that he left out the comparison with Icelandic as irrelevant and, according to experience, disorienting (1891:preface).

Jessen's grammar probably deserved more recognition than it received, which is true of most of his work. The Danish terminology is his own, but underlying it there is a new and interesting, albeit highly controversial, classification of word classes, sentence structure, and embedded clauses (nominal embedded clauses, adjectival embedded clauses, and adverbial embedded clauses, cf. Jessen 1868:16). In this grammar as in his other works, his systematic approach is evident. Yet there were also areas in which his description was completely mistaken, for example when he states that, with the exception of questions and emphasis, the subject always precedes the verb (Jessen 1868:58).

In 1871, the liberal educator and principal in Viborg, H. H. Lefolii (1819-1908), published a Danish grammar containing a new conception of the purpose, method, and contents of grammatical instruction. In line with Rask's historical and evolutionist conception of language as a natural organism, Lefolii insisted on an objective analysis based not only on the written language, but also on the spoken language and on its historical development. Lefolii stated:

Instruction must not be content with treating the present written literary language. It must include the spoken language, both the learned language and the language of the common people in its various forms, and finally it must show the history of the forms, – actually present the language exactly as it is today, but at the same time illustrate its present form as the result of a previous development. (Lefolii 1871:VII)

Lefolii's basis in the tradition of general grammar is thus supplemented with a broader descriptive and historical element. But whereas Rask and his followers stressed the importance of words and inflectional systems, in particular their origin and development, Lefolii emphasizes the necessity of taking a closer look at syntax. In order to document his views on word order, he makes reference to a large corpus of excerpts from literature and the spoken language. His definitions and explanations are not always immediately clear, but he must still be credited with giving the grammar of the native language the status of an independent discipline, to be studied in its own right and not just for the purpose of essay writing or for exercising logical thinking.

In 1884, B. T. Dahl (1836-1918) published an extensive Danish syntax based on excerpts from historical and contemporary texts. However, since his work was not intended for use in schools, the need also arose for a new and more complete school grammar based on these same principles. As a consequence, the Danish Ministry of Education announced a prize competition in 1886 for a grammar designed for the most advanced levels in the schools and for the teacher training colleges. The prize was awarded to Kr. Mikkelsen (1845-1924) in 1890. It was agreed that Mikkelsen's book should be published in four different versions: a reference book for teachers, a grammar for the higher level schools and teacher's colleges, a grammar for the middle schools, and a small book of exercises for the lower levels. Mikkelsen's system and terminology is similar to Bojesen's (4.3.), and his formulation of the logical basis for the parts of speech and sentence members is in almost complete agreement with that of Port-Royal and traditional general grammar. Mikkelsen's analysis is illustrated, for example, in the following derivation of sentence members and the

parts of speech from the basic categories of thought:

Since it is necessary, in order for a meaning to become evident, to have both a concept of an object, or something we have a mental picture of regarding an object, and a concept of an activity, which the object undertakes, is the result of or is produced by, or of a condition or a transition or a situation in which it occurs, there are, in the phrase that expresses the meaning, normally two main parts, of which the one is a noun, or a word that is used as a noun, and the other a verb in one of the so-called primary tenses. (Mikkelsen 1911:I)

But Mikkelsen also continues the positivistic trend set in Lefolii's grammar through his focus on presenting a wealth of detailed rules for the language, based on excerpts and concrete observations, as well as by including a diachronic perspective with regard to phonology and morphology. Mikkelsen's strength lies in the precision and exhaustiveness of his definitions and rules. His advanced grammar (1894) and greatly expanded syntax (1911) are still valuable sources for knowledge of the Danish language.

4.5.2.2. Faroese

The first sketch of Faroese phonology and morphology can be traced to Rask's work of 1811, which consists primarily of folk songs and word lists collected by Jens Christian Svabo (1746-1824). Nevertheless, it was not until Hammershaimb (1854) that a grammar of Faroese was produced covering both the phonology and morphology, and even including a short syntax. Hammershaimb's grammar was important for the standardization of Faroese in that it introduced a relatively uniform Faroese orthography, based in part on Old Norse.

Venceslaus Ulricus Hammershaimb (1819-1909) studied theology and worked his entire life as a pastor in the Faroe Islands. He began collecting folk songs and tales and is considered to be the founder of the Faroese literary language. Svabo, who was the first to record Faroese oral literature, used a spelling which was rather orthophonic. Hammershaimb was also originally in favor of such a solution, but the leading authority on the diachronic study of the Scandinavian languages at that time, the Danish professor N. M. Petersen (4.5.1.1.), persuaded Hammershaimb to alter the orthography in the direction of Old Norse. Petersen's main line of reasoning, besides being based on an aesthetic argument, was to preserve the basic unity of the Scandinavian languages by letting the literary languages reflect the older language as much as possible.

Although the resulting orthography made Faroese easy to read for other Scandinavians, it created a number of orthographic problems for the Faroese children. However, owing to the great dialectal diversity of the Faroe Islands, particularly in the phonology, there was probably no better alternative.

4.5.2.3. Finnish

The first attempt at a Finnish grammar in the nineteenth century was Strahlmann's grammar of 1816 (*Finnische Sprachlehre für Finnen und Nicht-Finnen*), which was published in St. Petersburg. Johan Strahlmann (Johan Stråhlman, 1749-1840) was a pastor who wrote a grammar because he was dissatisfied with Bartholdus Vhael's (1733) grammar of Finnish, cf. 3.4.3.2. Strahlmann's grammar served to raise the status of Finnish at a time when there was little literature in Finnish and the country was dominated by other languages. The author's explicit aim was to produce a pedagogical grammar, and to some extent he succeeded. The book also contains a section comparing Hungarian and Finnish, consisting mainly of parallel paradigms. About 130 subscribers to the book are listed, the majority from Finland with Swedish names, and most clearly belonging to the economic and/or academic upper class. As Strahlmann's grammar was written in German, it was the main Finnish grammar used abroad for a long time. It was also severely criticized by the author's contemporaries, for example by A. J. Sjögren, who noted that Strahlmann's grammar was incomplete and insufficiently precise.

The next Finnish grammar was published in 1818 by Jacob Judén (Jaakko Juteini, 1781-1855), who was also known as a poet. Judén was offered a job as translator for the government in 1810, but he declined when he was told that he had to use *z* and *x* instead of *ts* and *ks* in his writing. His introduction is nationalistic and stresses the importance of the cultivation of a national language. He argues in favor of a strict norm, noting that one should not write as one speaks, since that would mean a separate written language for each dialect. Judén contends that forms should be selected from among all the dialects that are “in closest agreement with the nature of the language”, and then one should speak as one writes (Judén 1818:6).

Judén operates with seventeen cases in his description, including a vocative and several subclasses of the adessive *-lla/-llä*. For Judén, cases are clearly semantic concepts. To him, the grammar is unstructured and the morphology is a mixture of unsystematic observations on morphophonology, semantics, and word formation based on isolated words. His section on syntax consists of scattered remarks on subject-verb agreement and the relationship between prepositions and cases.

Reinhold von Becker’s *Finsk grammatik* (Finnish Grammar) of 1824 was much more successful and influential, and it was this grammar that finally replaced Vhael (1733) as the standard grammar of Finnish. Reinhold von Becker (1788-1858) played a major role as a government translator and writer in promoting the development of the Finnish literary language. He began collecting poems about the legendary hero Väinämöinen, an endeavor continued by Lönnrot and culminating in the composition of the Finnish national epic, the *Kalevala*. Becker’s grammar gives due credit to his predecessors, but he expresses dissatisfaction with their work. He claims that his grammar is written to fill the needs of future public servants in Finland. In his introduction, he underscores the clarity, simplicity, and logical structure of Finnish and mentions (R. von Becker 1824:ii-vi) that there are two main dialect areas, Häme/Tavastland and Savo/Savolaks. Becker maintains that the written language is based on the Häme dialect, but that the Savo dialect is older and more genuine. He advocates a literary standard language with elements from both dialects. Becker was thus one of the first to initiate what has later become known as the Dialect Battle (*murteiden taistelu*) in the history of written Finnish. At the end of the grammar he also includes some notes on the dialectal peculiarities of the Savo dialect (R. von Becker 1824:269-272).

Reinhold von Becker’s grammar (1824) is thorough and well-structured in its treatment of Finnish morphology. It contains many pioneering morphological observations, for instance concerning the nature and distribution of the gradation of stops, and of vowel alternations before suffixes beginning with *-i*. He also realized that insights derived from language history could be used to determine why certain sound alternations existed in the language, and this occasionally led him to obliterate the distinction between synchrony and diachrony. Becker was the first to base the description of nominal inflection on stems rather than on the nominative alone. Furthermore, his grammar is also the first to contain an extensive syntax. Although this grammar follows the Latin model in overall structure, it nevertheless laid a useful foundation for later syntactic studies.

In the nineteenth century, linguists gradually realized that the syntactic structure of Finnish could not easily and satisfactorily be analyzed within the framework of Indo-European syntax. To describe Finnish syntax without comparing it to the structure of Latin was an important task for Finnish linguistic research. The main problem was the case system, especially the local cases, so the analysis of cases became a central theme in Finnish syntactic research. Reinhold von Becker was the first grammarian to eliminate the vocative from the repertoire of Finnish cases and to grasp how the whole case system could be partitioned into subclasses such as grammatical cases, directional cases, and non-directional locative cases (cf. Wiik 1990:13-14).

The first important contribution to an understanding of the Finnish case system was made by Gustav Renvall (1781-1841), a university teacher and priest (cf. 4.5.4.2. and 4.5.6.2.). Renvall was appointed docent of Finnish at the Academy of Turku/Åbo in 1811. He was interested in language comparison and looked at the Finnish cases from a typological perspective, comparing Finnish case forms with cases in other

languages and with prepositions in Swedish (Renvall 1815-1817). He frequently refers to the German linguist J. S. Vater as his source. Renvall's analysis is systematic, and he also did a lot to develop a system for naming the cases.

Renvall later published a grammar (1840) based on Western Finnish dialects to replace Becker's grammar, because, in Renvall's opinion, the latter contained too many elements from the Savo dialect. Renvall's manuscript existed in a draft version already before 1820, but it was not ready to be printed until twenty years later. Renvall's 1840 grammar contains an elaborate, but somewhat cumbersome description of inflectional types. Theoretically this work is not as interesting as von Becker's grammar (1824).

Several other scholars contributed to a better understanding of the grammatical structure of Finnish. Among these was the amateur linguist Gustaf Adolf Avellan (1785-1859), who published one of the first Nordic theses on a modern language (English, cf. Avellan 1828 and 4.6.2.). Avellan was originally a lawyer, but gave up his legal profession to earn his living as a translator and farmer. His publications (1851, 1854) are syntactic studies of how temporal relations and negation are expressed in various ways in Finnish. Avellan starts from broad semantic concepts. He treats expressions indicating the lack of something, losing something, etc. His analysis covers both negative verbs, caritative adjectives and nouns, and prepositions like *ilman* 'without'. Avellan cites numerous examples and is intentionally very normative. In fact, his normative perspective even leads him to correct the language of the Bible. He also notes that whereas the morphology of Finnish has been thoroughly investigated, the syntax still needs a lot of research. He originally planned to write a Finnish syntax, but considered himself too old to be able to complete the task, publishing these minor studies instead.

Pastor J. A. Lindström (1819-1874) provided a systematic description of the semantic structure of the Finnish local cases in 1857. His approach is "structuralistic" in the sense that he attempts to explain the Finnish case system and more or less artificially tries to fill in "gaps" in the system. He wrote extensively on both linguistic and historical matters, and his writing incorporates a strange combination of orderly analysis and free fantasy. In 1847 he produced a good comparative analysis of Finnish morphology by contemporary standards, but he also tried to find etymological correspondences in Greek to the Finnish case endings.

In 1841, Finnish became a mandatory subject in the high schools and this led to the publication of numerous Finnish grammars in the period from 1845 to 1880, most of which were explicitly written for school use.

The teacher Gustaf Erik Eurén (1818-1872) wrote several Finnish grammars that were widely used. His first grammar, printed in 1846, is short and orderly. Eurén stated in the introduction that Becker's excellent grammar was becoming outdated, and that it was no longer acceptable to force the categories of all languages into the framework of Latin grammar. He further argued that comparative linguistics had shown that each language has its own specific character, upon which a description should be based.

These ideas were further developed in Eurén's grammar of 1849, which is the first extensive grammar of Finnish after Becker's 1824 contribution. Eurén's phonological analysis is somewhat unsystematic, as is generally the case in Eurén's publications, but the morphology is orderly, and, more importantly, the syntax provides a framework for the syntactic description of Finnish. Especially illuminating is his treatment of the notion of subject and of the non-finite verbal forms (*modus substantivus*). Eurén was particularly concerned with developing Finnish grammatical terminology, and many of the terms coined by him are still in use.

Eurén's grammars were followed by numerous other descriptions of Finnish syntax of variable quality and originality. One noteworthy, pioneering grammar was Adolf Waldemar Jahnsson's *Finska Språkets Satslära* (Finnish Syntax, 1871), which contained several new insights concerning the description of subjects, objects, and non-finite verb forms.

Setälä's *Suomen kielen lauseoppi* (Finnish Syntax, 1880), which was written when he was a 16-year-old high school pupil of Genetz (4.4.2.), finally became the standard school syntax of Finnish in Finland, especially in its third edition from 1891. Setälä (1880) was very concise and well-organized, but he was not

innovative. His syntax was actually an abridged version of Jahnsson (1871), and Jahnsson accused Setälä of plagiarism in the second edition of *Finska Språkets Satslära* that appeared in 1886 (F. Karlsson 1999).

Setälä's syntax is word-based and it provides a synopsis of the central sentence types and treats the syntactic use of inflected word forms. The grammatical functions subject, object, etc. occupy a central position. Finnish is analyzed on its own terms, and the influence from Latin grammar is no longer visible. In all these regards, Jahnsson (1871) had presented the basic insights, which Setälä then adopted and developed further. Over the years, Setälä's syntax became more or less canonized as "the proper" scientific description of Finnish syntax. Setälä still lived when the eleventh, amended edition appeared in 1926. The thirteenth edition was updated by Matti Sadeniemi and appeared in 1951. The current sixteenth edition was printed in 1973. In the departments of Finnish, Setälä's syntax was compulsory reading for first-year university students, for example at the University of Helsinki from 1888 well into the 1970s.

Setälä also wrote a description of Finnish phonetic and morphological structure (Setälä 1898) that soon acquired a status that approached that of his syntax. The eighteenth edition, updated by Matti Sadeniemi, appeared in 1970 (Setälä and Sadeniemi 1970). The preface to this work reflects the theoretical positions of the neogrammarians. In it Setälä advocates a strict division between synchrony and diachrony in school grammars and criticizes earlier school grammars for mixing the two and thereby giving an erroneous picture of the historical development. Specifically, what Setälä had in mind was the description of (synchronic) morphophonological alternations and their relation to sound changes.

Arvid Genetz (4.4.2.) wrote a short grammar entitled *Suomen kielen äänne- ja muoto-oppi ynnä runous-oppi* (Finnish Phonology and Morphology, with Metrics, 1881). Due to his knowledge of phonetics and morphology, Genetz was able to correct and simplify the description of Finnish phonology and morphology in several respects and also to bring the school grammars up to the standards of contemporary linguistics. Compared to Eurén's grammars, the strength of Genetz's grammar is the reduction of the number of nominal and verbal inflectional classes. In several respects, this grammar also served as a model for Setälä (1898), even if Setälä criticized Genetz's views on the functions and nature of stems and on sound alternations in morphological description.

Wiik (1988, 1989, 1990, 1991) analyzed the history of early Finnish grammar writing in the period from 1649 to 1850, especially the way in which nominal inflection and morphophonological alternations were described. According to Wiik, a typical feature of all Finnish grammars up to 1820 was that they treated the nominative singular as the starting point or "base form" for the description of nominal inflection, especially for the (formation of the) genitive singular.

Reinhold von Becker started a new tradition in 1824 when he described nominal inflection on the basis of stems, i.e. parts of words that normally do not qualify as independent words. This tradition was continued by Eurén and Genetz. Eurén's grammar of 1849 contains a wealth of generative morphophonological rules for the construction of stems from other stems, or word-forms from combinations of stems and endings. Genetz's grammar (1881) is also generative or constructivist in a similar way.

The appearance of Setälä's grammar (1898) led to a break with this stem-and-rule-tradition, for Setälä had adopted neogrammarian positivistic attitudes. Because he argued that stems did not occur as such in isolation in speech and writing, but only as parts of word forms, Setälä condemned the stem-based approach to inflectional morphology:

My central criticism against it [the earlier descriptive practice in school grammars] is that its views of sound change, inflection, derivation, stems, and endings are too mechanistic and constructive and not in harmony with present-day linguistics; that it frequently applies categories and formulae borrowed from the grammars of other languages to the description of Finnish, without daring to treat our native language according to the requirements of its own nature; and, finally, that the whole system of our school grammar is in many respects incoherent. (Setälä 1898:V-VI)

Setälä published a general introduction to linguistics in 1891, which served as a kind of manifesto for neogrammarian linguistics. In this work, Setälä argued even more strongly against the morphological

relevance of stems:

About “roots” and “stems” we nowadays try to speak as little as possible. -- [Stems are] just plain haphazard abstractions, which do not have any scientific value and whose practicality is very doubtful. In reality, only sentences exist and their parts, the words. (Setälä 1891:9-10)

His own descriptive framework (1898) was consequently concrete, the emphasis being on the word forms as such. An interesting and somewhat ironic fact in this connection is that recent psycholinguistic research by Niemi et al. (1994) has shown morphophonologically complex Finnish lexemes to be stored mentally according to their stems.

4.5.2.4. Icelandic

Rask’s Icelandic grammar (1811) was the first description of Icelandic based entirely on the structure of the language and not on the pattern of Latin grammar. This grammar and Rask’s subsequent descriptive studies of other older Germanic languages created a pattern that was followed by later descriptions of Icelandic and Old Norse in the nineteenth century. Especially important was Rask’s restructuring of the presentation of the verbal system compared to older descriptions, where he drew a basic distinction between verbs with Ablaut and verbs without. Rask’s analysis of the patterns of word formation was thus a stimulus and a help in connection with the emerging lexical purism in Iceland.

One important aspect of Icelandic not perceived by Rask was that Modern Icelandic and Old Norse were not identical languages, but differed in phonology and morphology, as well as in other features. To some extent, though, Rask came to realize this by the time he wrote his last Icelandic grammar (1832a).

The Rev. Guttormur Pálsson (1775-1860) wrote what was probably the first grammar of Icelandic in the mother tongue between 1811 and 1822 (Lane 1968:119-124). Only one brief manuscript of this grammar has been preserved, and it has remained relatively unknown. Apart from a short introduction on letters and spelling, it is restricted to morphology in a broad sense. The manuscript is clearly incomplete, however, as the strong verbs are lacking, and the syntax and prosody included in the table of contents may be lost as well. The inflectional classes of nouns and verbs, as well as most of the paradigms, are borrowed from Rask (1811), with a little rearrangement in disposition.

Konráð Gíslason (4.5.1.1., 4.5.3.) introduced a critical philological approach to the linguistic study of Old Norse manuscripts, and thereby provided the basis for clarifying the differences between Old Norse and Modern Icelandic, as well as the internal variation within Old Norse. However, Gíslason continued to use Modern Icelandic pronunciation as the point of departure for Old Icelandic phonology. Gíslason’s studies mainly dealt with historical linguistics and were limited to phonology and morphology, cf. Kvaran (1996).

Thanks to Rask and the position of Icelandic and especially Old Norse in historical-comparative research, a number of more or less elementary introductions to Old Norse / Icelandic appeared in many European countries in the nineteenth century. However, none of these were especially suitable for teaching Icelandic in Iceland. It was not until the end of the nineteenth century that good synchronic and pedagogical descriptions of Icelandic appeared, written by Icelanders for the Icelandic schools.

The first real grammar used in the Latin school in Reykjavík (established in 1846) was the Icelandic morphology (*Íslenzk málmýndalysing*) of 1861 by Halldór Kr. Friðriksson. This grammar drew on studies by Rask, Munch and Unger, and Konráð Gíslason, and often projected Old Norse rules onto the modern language. Later, in 1885, a translation of Ludvig Wimmer (1870a) was published with supplementary notes on the modern language, and this was used as a textbook for several years.

The first detailed grammar of modern Icelandic which kept the modern language strictly separated from the older language was that of the German scholar William Carpenter (1881). Most of the information

about the modern language was provided by Björn M. Ólsen (4.5.1.3.), who pointed out to the author the differences from the old language as described by Ludvig Wimmer.

The teacher Halldór Briem (1852-1929) published a grammar that was well received (1891). Its popularity can be attributed to its simple, clear presentation, beginning with basic syntactic patterns and the syntactic function of morphological categories, followed by a morphology and finally a phonology, which Briem considered the most difficult and probably also the least important part of the grammar.

The weakest part of Rask's studies on Icelandic was his treatment of syntax, something he was quite aware of himself. The first comprehensive Icelandic syntax appeared in 1893. The author, Bjarni Jónsson (1862-1951), was a teacher. He stated in his preface that too much emphasis had been placed on orthography in the schools. In his opinion, syntax was more important than orthography when it came to constructing a good text.

4.5.2.5. Norwegian

In their study of Norwegian school grammars, Bjørkvold and Hertzberg (1976) show that, with only one exception — a grammar from 1855 written by Jacob Løkke (1829-1881) — the historical-comparative method was not reflected at all in Norwegian school grammars in the nineteenth century. The traditional pattern of Latin grammar, with a strong element of general grammar mediated through Silvestre de Sacy and Lang Nissen (1801), dominated the field. The school grammar tradition was occupied with the question of terminology which had its own history separate from other linguistic traditions. In fact, the school grammars of the nineteenth and early twentieth century in Norway were little influenced by what went on in the other fields of linguistics.

It is significant that Løkke wrote two more elementary grammars (Løkke 1865a,b), which did not refer to the comparative method and which remained (especially Løkke 1865b) the most popular school grammars until the 1960s. A comparison of Løkke's two grammars (1855 and 1865a) illustrates the variation in the approaches available at that time in school grammars of Norwegian. Løkke's 1855 grammar is a true historical grammar with an extensive phonology, also covering morphophonology, and a morphology divided into word formation and inflection. Throughout the book, Løkke makes comparisons with Old Norse as well as German and Swedish. He states that the language he describes is Danish, and he refers to Munch and Grimm as his basis, but he also quotes Petersen extensively in the introduction. His more elementary grammar (1865a) is not devoid of historical observations and notes, but it is much less historically-oriented, with no phonology and no treatment of word formation. But on the other hand, this elementary grammar had a syntactic component and is semantically-oriented in its definitions of word classes and syntactic categories.

In many cases, the school grammars, even the more elementary grammars, were more in line with modern linguistics as well as with earlier general grammars than with linguistic work produced at the universities. One example is N. S. Schultz's grammar from 1826, which clearly stressed the double articulation of language.

Most of these grammars were written by high school teachers, for example Johannes Musæus (1843). Musæus purports to be rational and compatible with the insights of modern scholarship. Syntax, based on German sources according to the author, and semantics play a significant role in the book. As an example of the author's semantic approach and of his dependency on general grammar, we can take a look at three of his definitions of word classes:

- (1) A noun is a word which signifies a concept by indicating its specific traits.
- (5) A pronoun is a word which signifies a concept by indicating the relationship to the speaker of the object corresponding to the concept.
- (6) A verb is a word by which the copula of a sentence can be expressed. (Musæus 1843:164)

Musæus adds that his classification and definitions are not perfect, but are only based on the current state of our knowledge.

The lawyer Bjarne S. Kofod (1813-1868) wrote a grammar (1849) for non-students (*Ikke-Studerende*). Kofod wanted to cleanse Norwegian grammars of the unpedagogical dominance of Latin grammar and terminology and therefore wrote his grammar in opposition to “the unnatural dominance of a foreign language and the ensuing disregard of the characteristic traits and rights of our own written language” (Preface). Thus, Kofod intended to produce a completely new terminology. His theoretical background is unclear, and his analysis and classifications are problematic. For example, verbs with vowel alternations are all considered to be irregular (Kofod 1849:53-55), and he is apparently unfamiliar with concepts such as Umlaut and Ablaut.

The greatest Norwegian grammarian of this century was undoubtedly Ivar Aasen (4.5.1.4.), whose two monumental studies (Aasen 1848, 1864) of the Norwegian vernacular dialects are among the most outstanding vernacular grammars of their time. Aasen did not write a condensed description of a dialect or a more or less uniform language; he chose instead to describe an entire dialect area, selecting the common basic features in order to arrive at a norm for this area. When the dialects were at variance, Aasen sometimes took recourse to diachronic considerations, and he frequently stressed the continuity of the dialects in relation to Old Norse. In most respects, however, his normalization was based on a synchronic comparison of dialect forms.

To some extent Aasen constructed an artificial language. The main difference between Aasen’s grammars of 1848 and 1864 is that the former is focused more on the description of variation, whereas the latter has the description of the new norm as its central feature, stressing uniformity more than variation, cf. Linn (1996a). Many national languages represent various dialect sources (standard Finnish is one such example (4.5.4.2.)). But Aasen used a highly systematic approach and based his normalization on very extensive data, having done fieldwork on a large number of Norwegian dialects.

Aasen’s knowledge of linguistics and grammar writing was based on his reading of grammars of Latin and several modern Germanic languages. He developed his own scheme for writing a grammar very early in his career, and he stuck to this approach with very few modifications for the rest of his life. The main source of this scheme was apparently the first grammar he read, a handwritten copy of David Birch’s grammar of 1812,⁴⁰ an elementary, but well-structured grammar written for elementary schools.

The structure of all of Aasen’s grammars, but particularly of his 1864 grammar, resembles that of Rask (4.4.1.). Thus Aasen covers phonology, inflection, word derivations and compounding, and syntax. In contrast to Rask, however, Aasen treats word formation before inflection, an order of presentation that was most probably inspired by Birch (1812). These grammars also contain a systematic survey of Norwegian dialects. Yet they are unique in that they provide a comparative description of each phenomenon based on the dialects and then arguments for selecting a standard form. Aasen is actually writing two grammars simultaneously: a comparative grammar of Norwegian dialects and a grammar of the New Norwegian standard language *landsmål*. This comparative approach may not be derived from Rask or Grimm, who according to Aasen provided him with most of the inspiration, but may have come from more personal and local sources, since ideas concerning the comparative study of the genetic relationship of the Norwegian dialects had been a topic that concerned Norwegian intellectuals for some time (Brunstad 1995:201-202).

Like Rask, Aasen is careful not to set up categories which are not formally expressed in the language. This resulted in Aasen developing a system for describing Norwegian inflection that remains unsurpassed even today. The most impressive parts of Aasen’s grammar, however, are the sections on word formation and syntax. For instance, the section on word formation was the most extensive for any Nordic language at that time. At first Aasen approached word formation from a formal point of view, distinguishing

⁴⁰ Jarle Bondevik, personal communication.

three subcategories: derivation through conversion or root internal morphophonological processes; derivations by means of derivational suffixes; and compounding. Then he analyzed word formation from a semantic point of view, distinguishing derived nouns, adjectives, and verbs. This methodology was consistent with the strong tendency in nineteenth-century linguistics to grant a somewhat sacred status to the number three, cf. Linn (1996a). Rask's treatment of word formation in his grammars is, however, brief when compared with Aasen's detailed treatment. Aasen may have used Niels Matthias Petersen's 1826 study as a model (4.5.2.1.).

Aasen's syntactic analysis is not as comprehensive as Petersen's and is in some respects fragmentary. Nevertheless, Aasen's treatment of syntax contains numerous original observations and reveals his ability to point out the characteristic features of Norwegian syntax. For example, when analyzing rules for word order, he points out the characteristic feature of Norwegian dialects that allows almost all of these rules to be overridden for rhythmical reasons, such as the weight of the phrase (1864:§ 331).

The other Norwegian language planner, Knud Knudsen, also made significant contributions to the description of the Norwegian language. Yet whereas Aasen concentrated on the rural dialects and their common underlying structure as he saw it, Knudsen's description focuses on the upper-middle class urban variety spoken mainly among civil servants throughout the country. His position as both high school teacher and language planner is evident in his grammatical publications, which must be viewed in this double context, cf. also Bleken (1956).

Knudsen's short study of 1847 is interesting from a methodological point of view. He argues (K. Knudsen 1847:1-2) that the existing grammars are too general, and that they do not give rules that enable the readers to know exactly which plural form a noun takes, especially if the noun is rare, nor do the grammars indicate where there is vacillation. In general, Knudsen's view is that rules, which frequently are of a logical nature, have to be stated, and then usage should follow these rules. This is illustrated with the topic that is the main issue of his booklet (K. Knudsen 1847:30-65), namely the use of the reflexive pronoun. Knudsen presents his rules and then shows the errors, that is, deviations from his own rules, that exist and how they can be corrected. Even in the face of overwhelming data from leading newspapers and authors, Knudsen stubbornly stuck to his rules and claimed that everyone else was wrong. He is also critical of other grammars and grammarians.

Knudsen's thorough and explicit grammar of 486 pages (1856) begins with syntax, then continues with inflectional morphology, word formation and ends with phonology. Although Knudsen's main point is the relationship between pronunciation and writing, the last part is detailed for its time in its treatment of phonetics and dialectal variation. In his definitions of terms, for example word classes, Knudsen is semantically oriented. He had a positive attitude towards general grammar, which influenced his definitions and way of thinking.

4.5.2.6. Sámi

The foundation of a more theoretical approach to Sámi studies was laid by Rasmus Rask. His Sámi grammar (1832b) was basically a rewritten version of Leem (1748). But Rask also took other sources into account and worked for several months in Copenhagen with Stockfleth (cf. below) and with a Sámi informant. Rask's grammar is unique, since it was written by someone who did not have a command of the language. It was successful, however, primarily owing to Rask's systematic approach and to his knowledge of grammar writing. Rask's description of Sámi morphophonology is much more accurate than previous attempts at describing this phenomenon. The grammar does not treat syntax.

Nils Vibe Stockfleth (1787-1866), a pastor, was one of the founders of the Sámi literary language through his numerous translations, mainly of religious texts. Stockfleth wrote a Sámi grammar in 1840,⁴¹

⁴¹ In most bibliographies and textbooks, the publishing date of this book is given as 1838. But the edition of 1838 was only a

which was limited to phonology and morphology. Compared to Rask's grammar, this work did not contribute anything new to the field, and, in fact, it represents more of a regression. Stockfleth's extensive treatment of phonetics is confusing. He provides no descriptions, but refers vaguely to the pronunciation of Hebrew and Arabic. His description of sound alternations and his paradigms are extensive and complicated, and he seems not to have understood the main principles of the structure of Sámi. Stockfleth's grammar was severely criticized by his contemporaries, for example by Holmboe (1843), and especially by Fritzner (1846). These criticisms centered on the lack of reliability of Stockfleth's data, his terminology, his categorical classification, etc.

After receiving his degree in theology, Jens Andreas Friis (1821-1896) began to study Sámi and Finnish under Stockfleth in Norway and Elias Lönnrot in Finland. As Friis notes in the preface to his 1856 publication, he makes a modest attempt to fill a practical need by writing a grammar of Sámi. He refers to earlier work, but points to the lack of an analysis of word formation and syntax in all previous studies. Friis maintains that his syntax is based on Eurén (1849) and Madvig (1841a), but adds that his section on word formation is based primarily on the study of texts. Friis may not have thought of himself as a linguist, but his treatment of Sámi word formation and syntax is good and succeeds in drawing the first map of a largely unexplored area, and a map that became very influential in later research.

In addition to his linguistic work, Friis was a prolific writer on Sámi culture, and his works include a widely read novel (*Lajla*) about a Norwegian girl who grew up among the Sámis as well as a very popular book on outdoor life.

Within the framework of Finnish Finno-Ugric studies, important contributions were published on Sámi dialectology and lexicography, as well as scholarly studies of various components of the language, including, for example, Lönnrot's (1854) study of Inari Sámi and Genetz's (1891) dictionary of the Kola Sámi languages.

4.5.2.7. Swedishx

One significant aspect of Swedish grammar writing in the first part of the nineteenth century is the inspiration it received from general grammar, especially from Silvestre de Sacy (1799, Swedish translation 1806) as well as from Condillac (cf. 4.3.). Most grammars of Swedish from the period 1800-1850 were in fact written within the framework of general grammar and are discussed in 4.3.

Carl Ulric Broocman (1783-1812) wrote a grammar of Swedish that was published posthumously by an anonymous friend in 1813 and subsequently reprinted in 1814 and 1820. The grammar is comprised of lessons that progress from a very elementary to a more advanced level, and it is accompanied by a reader that was written in an extremely patriotic tone. After an elementary introduction to the basics of phonology, orthography, and morphology, the second section provides a paradigm-oriented presentation of Swedish, abounding in elaborate paradigms and tables. Broocman's diachronic explanations are clearly reminiscent of Condillac's theories. This is evident, for instance, in his comments on verbs with monosyllabic past forms ("enstafvigt Imperfectum"):

Here we find the oldest verbs of the languages that signify the most simple, necessary, and sensual concepts: *eat, drink, sleep*..... they belonged to the language before it had any laws and have followed it ever since through all its changes and deviate from each other accordingly in inflection.... The basic vowel, in particular, is altered in several ways in the various tenses, whereas the consonants, which belong to the word itself, mainly remain the same (Broocman 1814:44).

This part concludes with a survey of various types of documents: letters, bills, receipts, contracts,

instructions, reports, applications, recommendations etc. Part 3 (pp. 66-111) treats the origin of language and the history of the Swedish language. Broocman rejects all Biblical explanations, which in his opinion are merely poetical, and assumes a Condillacian approach, where the first language was originally a very poor language, containing only a few words for practical concrete objects. For Broocman, the great invention for enriching and developing the language is word formation. He concludes his work with an extensive, but very puristically oriented, survey of the history of the Swedish language.

Carl Johan Love Almqvist (1793-1866) was a key figure in nineteenth century Swedish culture (cf. 4.5.6.6.). He was the author of novels, short stories, poetry, and songs and composed music. Almqvist, who was also a headmaster, produced a Swedish grammar in 1832. This publication was later revised and expanded and then printed several times. The later editions included examples of Swedish from different historical periods and sections on Swedish dialects, metrics, and letter writing. Almqvist stated in the preface that his grammar presupposed that the reader had knowledge of general grammar, and accordingly no definitions of grammatical categories were provided.

Like Almqvist, Magnus Enberg was also a headmaster interested in Swedish grammar. He became a member of the Swedish Academy in 1824 and went on to write the famous, rather notorious, Grammar of the Swedish Academy, *Svenska Akademiens grammatik*. Enberg's name is not found on the title page, since the academy wanted, for various reasons, to take responsibility for this work collectively. The reviewers criticized the description for its lack of consistency and originality. Enberg copied most of the contents from other grammars, primarily Moberg and Boivie, although unlike these linguists, Enberg's grammar does not include a separate section on general linguistics, cf. Loman (1986). The section on the history of the Swedish language seems to be based on N. M. Petersen's two-volume history of Danish, Norwegian, and Swedish (1829-1830). As this was the Academy's first attempt at a Swedish grammar, one of the two tasks given by the King to the Academy in 1786 (3.4.1.6.), the grammar was intensely scrutinized by the reviewers.

Enberg takes a conservative view of the number of verb and noun forms to be set up for Swedish. He lists as many Swedish verb forms as there are Latin forms, in contrast to others who treated periphrastic constructions in the syntax. Similarly, Enberg assumes separate dative and vocative cases for nouns, resulting in the same paradigms as in Latin grammar. Furthermore, Enberg's grammar does not treat the emerging *den*-gender, and he seems to believe that the gender of nouns can be derived from the meaning of the words.

There were plans to revise Enberg's grammar, but they were never carried out, partly because of the extreme criticism the work had received, and partly owing to the new ideas of historical linguistics, which required a completely new approach. The latter view was repeatedly expressed by Rydqvist (4.5.3.3.), who was a strong advocate of the new paradigm.

A unique grammar of Swedish is N. Strömberg's school textbook published in 1852, which was written from a diachronic point of view and based on the comparative method. The first edition contained extensive paragraphs on Gothic, Old Norse, and Old Swedish, but these were dropped in the second edition (1857), which otherwise retained the diachronic aspect. Strömberg divided the verbs into Ablaut classes with reference to the system in Gothic.

Johan August Aurén (1843-1911) was a teacher and a self-trained linguist with a keen ability for phonetic observation. He is well-known for his publications on phonetics, phonotactics, and spelling (Aurén 1869, 1874, 1880b,c), cf. 4.8. His grammar (Aurén 1877, 1880a) has attracted less attention, even though it introduces some new ideas. Aurén states in the preface that he retains the traditional terminology, which, however, is not completely true. For example, he uses the term *modalverb* (modal verb) for finite verbs.

Aurén's grammar is divided into two main sections: word classes and syntax. The first section consists of two subparts. The first subpart includes most of the word classes (nouns, adjectives etc.) and is entitled "changeable words". The second subpart has the title "unchangeable words" and covers particles, prepositions, conjunctions, interjections, and infinitive markers. Aurén states that a sentence or clause is a

thought expressed in words, and he does not distinguish between propositions and sentences. According to Aurén, the main parts of the sentence are the following: predicate, subject, object, agent, attribute, adverbial and predicative, accusative with infinitive, and nominative with infinitive.

4.5.3. Diachronic Studies of the National Languages

When the national languages were given a place at the universities during the first part of the nineteenth century, the diachronic approach remained dominant for several reasons:

- (1) The general intellectual climate of the early 1800s was strongly influenced by Romanticism and its quest for examining the past. As such, Romanticism was closely linked to the emergence of new national states and their quest for a national identity. This process gained momentum in Finland and Norway throughout the 1800s. For the established national states Denmark and Sweden, the traumatic political losses of Norway and Finland, respectively, proved fertile ground for influences from Romanticism.
- (2) The diachronic approach was dominant in most other fields of study. In the natural sciences, the diachronic approach of geology (Charles Lyell) and biology (Charles Darwin) provided an important model.
- (3) Prior tradition in the study of the vernaculars, brief as it was, was linked to the philological studies of older texts, mainly of Old Norse, to etymological speculations, and to studies of the runic inscriptions.
- (4) There was no tradition for descriptive and synchronic linguistics at the university level. These academic orientations had been the province of school grammars, language planners, and missionaries.

The scholars of the Nordic countries found it intellectually interesting to study the history of their own languages in the light of new discoveries. The work begun by Rask, Grimm, Bopp, Pott, Curtius, Schleicher, etc. was to be continued. In Finland, the combination of the historical-comparative method, and the specific Finno-Ugric tradition established by János Sajnovics and Sámuel Gyarmathi formed the methodological basis of comparative Finno-Ugric studies (4.4.2.). In the other Nordic countries, the study of the national languages was likewise linked to the ongoing comparative research on the Indo-European languages, especially the Germanic languages.

In the nineteenth century, the study of Old Icelandic was central in language studies in the Nordic countries outside Finland. Rask's pioneering work on Old Icelandic is discussed in 4.5.3.1. Later Peter Andreas Munch and Carl Richard Unger (1847) made major contributions to Old Norse grammar. Their 1847 grammar was the first grammatical study of Old Norse to be widely used in the Nordic countries. It was largely based on the grammars of Grimm and Rask in arrangement and terminology, a debt explicitly acknowledged by the authors. Both authors were historians, neither was primarily a linguist (cf. 4.4.1.), yet they produced a pedagogical grammar with a pattern that was well-suited for future use in grammars of Old Norse as well as of Icelandic and Faroese. It is both a strength and a weakness that Munch and Unger's grammar is not philological, assuming the Old Norse language to be homogenous and the manuscript tradition to be unproblematic.

The first Icelandic scholar to affect the study of Old Icelandic in this period was Konráð Gíslason (cf. 4.5.1.1.). In 1846, Gíslason published a study of Old Icelandic phonetics based on painstaking scrutiny of a number of old manuscripts, with specimens from most of them in transcription. In these specimens, as well as in the documentation in the text itself, Gíslason set new standards for precision. This work provides an extensive catalogue of spelling variants for individual sounds and other primary source material, which still retains its value today. Gíslason's reluctance to recognize words or forms as old without precise reference to

a manuscript, a practise which is also evident in his Danish-Icelandic dictionary of 1851, facilitated the separation of Old and Modern Icelandic elements. The 1846 study formed the basis of the phonetic part of a later work of 1858. The morphological part of this work was never completed.

One feature common to the studies mentioned above by Rask, Munch and Unger, and Gíslason was that Modern Icelandic pronunciation was taken as a point of departure in assigning sound values to individual letters, and deviations were assumed only when strictly necessary. This was especially important when analyzing vowels. In his grammar of 1811, Rask did not discuss the old language separately and saw *y* as an “etymological symbol”. Rask’s studies of 1818 and 1832 take into account modern Faroese and continental pronunciation and assign a separate sound value to *y*. Rask also posited a sound value closer to Norwegian for *au* and a separate sound value for long *ø*, which has merged with long *æ* in Icelandic. Munch and Unger (1847) tended to accept and follow Rask’s later views. Gíslason (1846) also followed Rask, albeit with some apparent reluctance.

Against this tradition stood Jacob Grimm, who had claimed that the only difference between unaccented (short) and accented (long) vowels was quantity itself. Kristian Lyngby (1861, cf. 4.5.5.1.) gave a systematic and thorough evaluation of many different sources of evidence, including the *First Grammatical Treatise* (cf. 2.3.), the modern pronunciation of Norwegian, Faroese, even Swedish and Danish, and the orthography of the manuscripts. His results, which have required very little modification to date, came out in favor of Grimm’s general position and showed conclusively the distinction between the two kinds of *ö*. Lyngby (1861) also made an important contribution to morphology. The Danish scholar J. Hoffory (1883) also analyzed some important aspects of the phonetics of Old Icelandic consonants. On the basis of a thorough comparison of evidence from manuscripts and comparison with Gothic and other old Indo-European languages, Lyngby achieved results that have remained essentially unchallenged until today.

Konráð Gíslason (1858) began a detailed treatment of inflectional morphology, but only completed half of the strong noun inflection. Gíslason does not distinguish *i*-stems or root stems as a separate class in the noun inflection in this study. Another important contribution came from Ludvig Wimmer (cf. 4.5.1.1.), who wrote the most detailed inflectional morphology of old Icelandic to date (1874b). Wimmer’s study is based on independent work with the sources, which he unfortunately does not identify in individual cases.

Jón Þorkelsson (cf. 4.5.1.3.) published extensively on Icelandic language history, both on Old Icelandic and later developments, especially on morphology. His work is characterized by painstaking documentation rather than by grand theories. Some of his work appears in the form of valuable additions and corrections to work by others. In addition to a monograph on the svarabhakti vowel, his studies treat various aspects of the verbal inflection, the subjunctive, strong verbs, and the preterito-presents.

Adolf Noreen (cf. 4.5.1.5, 4.5.3.3, 5.6.1.7.) published the standard handbook of Old Norse / Icelandic in 1884, with three new and revised editions appearing up to 1923. Noreen may be criticized for his tendency to take all spelling variants too much at face value. Nonetheless, his work is extremely valuable for its exhaustive reference to previous research.

With regard to syntax, the works of Lund (cf. 4.5.3.1.) and Nygaard (cf. 5.6.1.5.) were published in the last decades of the nineteenth century and just after the turn of the century.

As the Scandinavian languages had undergone their own specific development, they were very interesting to study from a comparative point of view. These languages were characterized, for example, by the loss of initial *j* and *w* before back vowels (Germ. *jung*, Eng. *young*, Swed. *ung*; Germ. *wolf*, Eng. *wolf*, Swed. *ulv*). They also displayed certain types of Umlaut and had undergone a special process called “breaking”, illustrated for instance by the difference between German *helfen* and Swedish *hjälpa*, German *Erde* and Danish, Norwegian, and Swedish *jord*. Other interesting features included the suffixed definite article, the tonal accent in Norwegian and Swedish, and the related glottal stop (*stød*) in Danish. The syntax of the Scandinavian languages developed special word order (with the verb second) and the *s*-passive construction.

Interest in the historical aspects of language led to the systematic publication of old texts, which gave

philological study a new basis. As a result, societies such as the Swedish Society for Ancient Texts (*Svenska fornskriftsällskapet*, established 1843, Stockholm) were founded with the goal of publishing texts from the period before 1600 and historical, philological, and bibliographical studies based on them. Series such as the Collections published by the Swedish Society for Ancient Texts (*Samlingar utgivna av Svenska fornskriftsällskapet*) have been in existence since 1844. The Swedish medieval laws, comprising a rich material, were published by Carl Johan Schlyter (1795-1888) in *Corpus juris sveo-gotorum. Samling af Sveriges gamla lagar* (Collection of Sweden's Old Laws, 1827-1877, 13 volumes). Schlyter, who was educated in law, is famous for his exactitude and patience. He worked 50 years on this project of unsurpassed quality (cf. Holm 1972).

In Finland, historical studies were promoted by the aim of the Imperial Academy of St. Petersburg to find out about the present and past of the peoples living in Northern Russia.

In the subjugated parts of Fenno-Scandia, i.e. in Finland, and somewhat later in Norway, rising sentiments of nationalism also made it important to establish a distinct, national, self-image based on as much historical evidence as possible.

At the end of the century, onomastics, a field intimately linked to diachronic linguistics, emerged as a specific field of research. Although onomastics is based on linguistic data, it was first cultivated primarily by historians and scholars from adjacent areas. Oluf Rygh (1833-1899), for example, who was the scholar who started publishing the large survey of Norwegian place-names (Rygh 1897-1936), was professor of history and archeology.

4.5.3.1. Denmark

The Danish Academy of Sciences announced a prize competition in 1811. The announcement for this competition was still formulated in Latin, as translated below:

To investigate, by means of historical criticism, and to illustrate with appropriate examples, from what source the ancient Scandinavian language can most correctly be derived; to explain the nature of the language and its relationships, from ancient times and up through the Middle Ages, to Scandinavian and Germanic dialects; and to determine exactly the rules on which all derivations and comparisons in these languages should be based.

Rasmus Rask participated in this contest with his prize-winning essay entitled “An Investigation of the Origin of the Old Norse or Icelandic language” (*Undersögelse om det gamle Nordiske eller Islandske Sprogs Oprindelse*, 1818, cf. 4.4.1.).

This essay compares Icelandic to various European languages and concludes that Icelandic is related to the Germanic, Romance, and Slavic languages, but not to languages like Finnish, Hungarian, and Greenlandic (4.4.1.). The background for this essay had already been established in his earlier grammar of the Icelandic or Old Norse Language (1811), which he revised and translated into Swedish in 1818, incorporating the insight he had gained from his work on the prize essay. This early grammar, pedagogical in its intent and based on the grammar Rask sketched out for his own use while he was still a student, is the first historical grammar of an Indo-European language. In its organization it served as a model for numerous subsequent historical grammars. It was also translated into English twice shortly after it was published, first in 1838 by George P. Marsh, and in 1843 by Sir George Webbe Dasent, who used Rask's revised Swedish translation “to further my own studies in the Old Norse”, as he notes in the translator's preface.

Rask's purpose in this instance was not comparative. Instead, he set out to produce a grammar that would facilitate efficient learning of the language, with sections that dealt with phonology and orthography, morphology, word formation, syntax, metrics and prosody, and dialectal variation. The section on phonology is brief, providing correspondences between the sounds in Modern Icelandic and Danish. It was important for Rask to acquire a modern rather than a reconstructed pronunciation, so that a speaker could

be understood by other contemporary speakers.

The sections on morphology and word formation, which comprise the bulk of the book, are more historically oriented and based on the notion that inflection and lexical formation are the result of regular and predictable processes. The following paradigm, which describes a part of the nominal declension in Old Norse, illustrates the detail of Rask's analyses as well as his attempt to follow the tradition of Høysgaard and describe the language in its own right, rather than forcing it into the pattern of classical grammar:

Rask prefers this degree of detail himself, but realizing that it might seem strange to others, he explains:

The endings marked + are those which require besides a change in the vowel of the chief syll.; should any one regard the four last decl. as too like one another to be separated, the 5th and 6th, and 7th and 8th, need only be joined so as to make together two classes under one decl.; in which case the agreement between the two head classes; as well as that with the other Gothic tongues becomes more plain, without at the same time any disturbance in the system. (Rask 1843:53)

Rask's syntactic analysis is less detailed, since he recognized that:

the many and clearly distinguished cases, genders, and other forms, render it easy to find out what words are to be taken together. The chief word can therefore be placed at will in the place where it will have most effect. (Rask 1843:180)

The section on metrics and prosody is not patterned on classical metrics, but takes into account features specific to Scandinavian languages, for example syllable length, alliteration, and assonance.

The short section on dialect variation reveals Rask's early views on the origin, relationship, and historical development of the Scandinavian languages. In the introduction to the section on the dialects, he states:

All the northern tribes of Gothic offspring, formed in ancient times one great people, which spoke one tongue, that namely which I have now striven to describe. Even then it is natural to suppose that variations in speech were to be met with, but the orthography was arranged on the same principles, and these peculiarities in speech were so unimportant as not to deserve the name of Dialects. Even now, when the Old Norse has been entirely destroyed and shattered to pieces in Scandinavia, the difference between the new tongues is scarcely greater than that between the Old Greek Dialects, when allowance is made for the fact, that the alphabetical system, which was always the same among the Greeks, is differently arranged in Swed. and Danish ... On the older Runic stones altogether the same tongue is found in all three kingdoms, and in the oldest laws of each people very nearly the same. (Rask 1843:227f.)

In addition to his historical studies of Old Norse, Rask produced a sixty-page work on the historical morphology of Danish. Rask began this work in 1815 and published it in 1820, which was three years prior to the publication of the first volume of Jacob Grimm's German Grammar (*Deutsche Grammatik*). Rask described this study as a "Danish grammatical etymology" or an "etymological grammar" and notes in the preface that this is not only the first work of its kind for Danish, but as far as he knows the first such undertaking for any language. Up to this point scholars had been content to study the etymologies of individual words, but not the origin of the changes in their form. Although Rask here as elsewhere mistakenly assumes that Danish is a direct descendent of Old Icelandic, his precise methodology, for example in recognizing the necessity of describing intermediate forms, provides the reader with numerous original and valuable observations.

In an unpublished manuscript in the Royal Library in Copenhagen (Ny kgl. Saml. 8° No. 203d II), Rask exclaims:

O that we would thoroughly study our own language industriously, seek out its roots, sources and branches – i.e. a) the

Icelandic, b) the Swedish, c) that which is found in the old Danish books, d) the language of the people.

Rask never wrote a history of the Danish language himself, but he was most probably involved in the prize competition that resulted in N. M. Petersen's history of Danish, Norwegian, and Swedish (1829-1830), since it is documented that he was on the jury.

In 1828 the Society for the Promotion of Danish Literature announced a prize competition on the topic:

How has the written language developed out of the common mother language, Icelandic, in the three Scandinavian kingdoms, and especially in Denmark?

In response to this contest, N. M. Petersen (cf. 4.5.1.1.) produced a prize-winning two volume treatise on the history of the Danish, Norwegian, and Swedish languages up until 1700, also tracing their developmental origin from a common proto-language (1829-1830). The section on Swedish was translated into Swedish in 1837.

If one were to characterize the two schoolmates and colleagues, Rask and Petersen, one might say that although Rask was inspired to a great degree by the ideas of national romanticism, he was a true linguist, whereas Petersen was first and foremost a national romantic with a natural interest in history, language, and literature. Their differences were apparent already in their school days, when Rask offered informal instruction to fellow students in Old Icelandic. Rask was deeply interested in the forms of the language, whereas N. M. Petersen was mainly fascinated by the contents of the sagas.

Petersen's prize-winning history of the three Scandinavian languages contains investigations not only of the grammar, but also of foreign influence, the development of the lexicon and of the literary language. This meticulous work became the main reference book on the history of Danish, Norwegian, and Swedish for several generations, thus paving the way for Peter Skautrup's subsequent history of the Danish language (cf. 5.6.4.1.). Petersen's history offers much valuable information, particularly since, unlike Rask, Petersen placed language in its social and historical context. His work provides a supplement to Rask's prize essay, since Petersen is also concerned with the intermediate stages in the development from the mother language to the modern tongues.

Portions of Petersen's university lectures were published in 1861. Here his enthusiasm for the past and for the study of language is evident, as is his poetic means of expression. The following excerpts reflect his attitudes about the nature and development of human language and his notion of diachronic phonology:

The child forms his first words by means of an automatic movement of the organs, the ancient primitive man by imitating the sounds of nature; the man of knowledge by transferring the sounds of nature to the higher senses, and the man of reason by elevating the sensual expressions to the suprasensual; he lifts his thoughts from the earth to the heavens, he speaks with the angels, listens to them, and understands them, and is enthralled; he speaks with God and trembles. (Petersen 1861:9)

... in the exchange of sounds, where attraction and repulsion, love and hate, kinship and sociality, affinity and association, apparently accidentally and yet everywhere searching for perfection, in short all the spirits of nature reveal themselves in the word. The sounds run together, and one of them is lost in the shuffle (*danskt* becomes *danst* or *dansk*). It is so sad to part, and the one left alone takes one of his old friends along with him (*uppå, oppå* becomes *på*. ...) Some (like *rs, fr*) want to be together, so one of them has to trade places with his neighbor (*crux, kors; ...*). (Petersen 1861:10)

A brief overview of the historical development of Danish is provided by Christian Molbech (cf. 4.5.6.1.) in the introduction to his Danish dictionary (1833). Several of Molbech's editions of older texts include a brief description of the language. In his description of the early Bible translations (1840), besides providing a description of the manuscript, Molbech offers a brief account of the language of the manuscripts, including a survey of the orthography and word classes, the latter often full of mistaken assumptions.

Towards the end of the century (1896), a short history of the Danish language was produced by Verner Dahlerup (1859-1938). Dahlerup was Ludvig Wimmer's successor as professor of Scandinavian

philology at the University of Copenhagen. Dahlerup's motive was to address the need for a comprehensive study of the development of Danish after the year 1700. The structure of Dahlerup's work laid the foundation for Peter Skautrup's five-volume history of the Danish language (1944-1970).

In addition to his more famous study on the causes of sound change (1821, cf. 4.4.1.), Jacob Hornemann Bredsdorff, who was also a friend of Rask since youth, published two interesting historical studies. One study analyzed the Danish language of the twelfth century (1831), and the other focused on the relationship between the various branches of the Germanic language family (1833).

Two additional works on morphology in the older stages of Danish deserve mention, namely Lyngby's treatise on the morphology of the verbs in the Jutlandic law texts (1853) and Wimmer's treatise on the nominal inflection in Old Danish (1868).

The first attempt to write a syntax of Old Norse was made by the high-school teacher and classical philologist, Georg Fredrik Vilhelm Lund (1829-1891), cf. Kristoffersen (1997). Lund's Old Norse syntax, printed in 1862, is a pioneering work, though not without faults. To his credit, Lund had few preliminary studies to rely upon, and many of these were of questionable quality. His main achievement is therefore the systematic way in which he organized the data. Furthermore, the introduction is interesting as a characteristic expression of the descriptive historical work of this period:

Concerning the plan of the book, it is clear that the description of the syntax of a language cannot be based on an already existing scheme, developed and used for another language, into which all the details are inserted or forced more or less easily and naturally, nor can a framework be set up in advance, no matter how logical and consistent it might be, with the idea that the specific characteristics of a language should be classified and explained in terms of it. This is the error of the so called "rational grammar", especially in the recent German school. The description can only be natural and simple and clear, and in addition scientifically true and correct, when the specific traits of each language are described according to the development the individual language has undergone, employing the means which the language has used to combine the individual concepts into coherent speech. (G. F. V. Lund 1862:iv)

For a long time, the first and the only etymological dictionary of Danish was published by Jessen (4.5.1.2.), first appearing in 1893. It is an impressive book, and even though some of the etymologies are questionable, it has played a major role in correcting the notion that Danish was derived from Old Icelandic. This dictionary is also valuable in its critique of the neogrammarians for their exaggerated use of starred forms and in its polemics against what Jessen referred to as "language-making", that is, the excessive introduction of neologisms and new pronunciations.

Konrað Gíslason (4.5.1.1.) was the author of a number of masterly philological editions of various Old Norse texts. In 1846, he published an important philological study of Old Icelandic phonology and morphology, which formed the basis for his unfinished investigation appearing in 1858. This study only covered phonology and nominal morphology, but it provides an exhaustive treatment of the problematic variation in the manuscripts and deals in part with Old Norse dialectology. Gíslason later published a number of articles on the grammar of Old Icelandic, cf. Kvaran (1996).

4.5.3.2. Norway

All the historical studies of the vernacular in Norway after 1850 were more or less influenced by the conflict between the two emerging new Norwegian literary languages *landsmål* and *riksmål*. Ivar Aasen and his followers argued that *landsmål* and the dialects it was based on were a direct continuation of Old Norse, while the adherents of *riksmål* would argue that their language was as genuine Norwegian as *landsmål*. The main purpose of many diachronic studies of Norwegian in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries was to investigate and prove or disprove these claims of (un)interrupted historical development from pure Norwegian roots.

A good example is the diachronic study of Norwegian and Danish phonology by Alf Torp and

Hjalmar Falk (1898). It is probably no accident that Falk was a leading figure in the *riksmål*-movement. Torp and Falk clearly disregard Aasen's *landsmål* and speak only in terms of dialects, which are treated extensively. But they stress that there is only one Norwegian language, *(ny)norsk* '(new) Norwegian', coined on the word *(ny)dansk* '(New) Danish', which is an independent language, but that there are numerous Norwegian dialects.

Torp and Falk's book reveals their command of neogrammarian methods. The final chapters on methodology (Torp and Falk 1898:250-262) provide a succinct survey of two basic neogrammarian concepts: sound law and analogy. In view of this, it is surprising to find the following statement, which is clearly an unconscious inheritance from centuries long gone:

Most sound changes are caused by a change in the organs of speech. Accordingly, we see how changes of place of living or way of living have the same strong effect on language as on people's physical condition. Among people living in the same climate we can observe similar sound changes: thus West Norwegian and Icelandic, East Norwegian and Swedish (especially Northern Norwegian and Northern Swedish), and Southern Norwegian and Danish have many common features, ... Just as such a change of speech organs or their nerves is a gradual and very slowly developing process, the sound changes caused by these changes are without leaps. (Torp and Falk 1898:251)

Falk and Torp's diachronic syntax (1900) also does not completely accept *landsmål*, but to them, the distinction between the two varieties of Norwegian is not very important. This book is written in the neogrammarian tradition and analyzes syntactic phenomenon from Old Norse through various stages up to modern Norwegian. The treatment of syntax is oriented towards morphology and to a certain extent also provides a historical morphology. But above all, it is an innovative work. It is particularly interesting with regard to its wealth of examples from all the historical periods, making the book a source of inspiration even today for scholars working with empirical syntax and modern syntactic theory.

4.5.3.3. Sweden

The influence of historical linguistics is not evident in Sweden prior to 1850. At this time, Johan Rydqvist (1800-1877) started applying Rask and Grimm's diachronic methods to Swedish (1850-1883, the last volume edited after his death), cf. also Rydqvist (1870). Rydqvist was a lawyer, librarian, and poet, but when he fell ill in 1844, he devoted the rest of his life to linguistics. Rydqvist visited Jacob Grimm, and the two corresponded with each other. It was Grimm who encouraged Rydqvist to publish his work. He was also the first scholar to introduce Grimm's theories of Ablaut, Umlaut, and breaking into Sweden.

Rydqvist's six volumes only treat morphology and vocabulary and are comprised for the most part of material which was carefully collected from older sources, with due reference to them. Rydqvist applies the historical method carefully and keeps close to the data, and although his approach is diachronic, it is not comparative, but more along the lines of a historical-etymological dictionary systematically arranged according to grammatical categories. Rydqvist likewise wanted to apply his diachronic results to Swedish orthography, thereby advocating a conservative normative view in which the historical origin of a word was the decisive factor in determining its spelling, cf. for example Rydqvist (1863).

Rydqvist was the leading Swedish authority on linguistic matters in the third quarter of the nineteenth century. He played a significant role in producing the first word list of Swedish (*Svenska Akademiens ordlista över svenska språket*, SAOL) which was published in 1874 by the Swedish Academy (of which Rydqvist was a member). Rydqvist defended the conservative mode of spelling in SAOL in spite of the criticism it received.

The discovery of the Germanic consonant shift in the beginning of the nineteenth century was the basis for the formulation of sound laws. By the 1870s, the concept of sound laws was strengthened. When a scholar proposed a sound law, he had to prove that it was valid in all words and that exceptions could be explained or said to follow another law such as Verner's law. These demands implied a new methodology

and opened up new fields to (young) scholars. The investigations were focused on Indo-European vowels, where the correspondences were not straightforward. On the basis of Sanskrit it had been assumed that Indo-European had the basic vowel triangle *i, a, u*. This was now questioned, and instead the vowels found in Greek were assumed: *a, e, o, i, u*.

Fredrik Löffler/Leffler (1847-1921) visited Leipzig 1874-1875. As one of the first Nordic scholars to apply the new methods to Scandinavian data, he showed that the *i*-Umlaut known to apply to back vowels also was at work in changing *e > i*. (cf. L. Moberg 1979). Löffler also took an interest in phonetics and communicated his ideas as docent at Uppsala from 1872 and as professor extraordinarius from 1881 to 1904.

Mårten Richert, professor at Uppsala University from 1877 to 1886 and Noreen's teacher (cf. 4.5.1.5.), visited Leipzig and was especially inspired by Curtius. Noreen spent some time in Leipzig himself in 1879 and participated in the circles where Leskien, de Saussure, Brugmann, and Osthoff established and discussed the principles of sound laws and exceptions. According to Loman (1993b), Swedish linguists had closer contacts with their German colleagues in those days than contemporary Danish and Norwegian linguists had.

Noreen was quick to investigate the Scandinavian languages according to the new methods and he soon became a leading authority. He was asked by Hermann Paul to write the section on the history of the Scandinavian languages in *Grundriss der germanischen Philologie* (1889). He also contributed to *Sammlung kurzer Grammatiken germanischer Dialekte* published by Braune. Noreen's well-known handbooks from this period are *Altislandische und Altnorwegische Grammatik* (1884) and *Altschwedische Grammatik* (1897-1904).

One of the most influential scholars of his day to treat the history of the North-Germanic languages was Axel Kock (1851-1935), lecturer in Lund 1879, and professor of Scandinavian languages in Gothenburg from 1890 to 1893 and in Lund from 1907 to 1916, where he was also Vice-Rector from 1911 to 1916. Inspired by the German linguists, Kock embarked on a project which was to provide us with much of our knowledge of the sound history of Swedish and the etymology of Swedish words. It also led to a comprehensive theory of sound change, Kock's "period theory" of Umlaut. His production is important, as shown by the many references to his work in Hellquist's etymological dictionary (1922) and in Elias Wessén's standard handbooks (1941a,b, 1943, 1956). Kock was the first editor of *Arkiv för nordisk filologi*, where he published many of his investigations.

Kock's first extensive study was *Språkhistoriska undersökningar om svensk akcent* (Historical Investigations on Swedish Accent, 1878, 1884-1885), of which an extended German version (*Die Alt- und Neuschwedische Accentuierung unter Berücksichtigung der anderen nordischen Sprachen*) appeared in 1901. Continuing the work of Nicander, who was the first to note the important distinction between accent 1 (acute) words such as *talen* 'the numbers' and accent 2 (gravis) words such as *talen* 'speak!', Kock takes on the task of describing all the stress and tone patterns of modern Swedish and explain their development from Germanic sources. Some of his explanations are now standard textbook material, for example the interpretation of why some modern disyllabic words ending in *-er* (*hummer* 'lobster'), *-el* (*nagel* 'nail'), and *-en* (*botten* 'bottom') have accent 1. They were monosyllabic in Old Norse and kept that accent when the epenthetic vowel *e* was later inserted before *r, l, n*. Similarly, accent 1 words (monosyllables) kept their accent after the definite article *-(e)n* was added, which resulted in minimal pairs such as the famous *ande+n* 'the spirit' and *and+en* 'the duck'.

Kock established a three-level stress system: fortis (expiratory main stress), semifortis (expiratory semistress), and infortis as in the last syllable of *tala* 'to speak' (levis), *pojkar* 'the boys' (levior), and *talet* 'the speech' (levissimus). In addition, he made a distinction between the two tone accents, including an acute accent marked by "1" after the stressed vowel and a gravis accent marked by "2". Kock's book lists examples of the different stresses and accents and relates them to a series of sound changes. Kock did not, however, describe the tone patterns of these accents. This phonetic investigation was later undertaken by

Ernst A. Meyer (1937, 1954).

Later Kock started his investigations of the development of different sounds in different positions, resulting in *Studier öfver fornsvensk ljudlära* (Studies on Old Swedish Phonology, I-II, 1882-1886). His magnum opus is *Svensk ljudhistoria* (Swedish Sound History, five volumes, 1906-1929), which is included here even though it was published in the twentieth century. The third volume of this work includes Kock's theories of Umlaut and breaking, which were also published in German.

Kock's presentation of his periodical theory in *Svensk ljudhistoria* 3:1 (1916) is interesting. He maintains that it is important to give an integrated account of Umlaut and breaking phenomena because they had a radical effect on the Scandinavian languages and because the *u*-Umlaut could be implemented during very different periods, during the common Old Norse period and during the period after the separation of the different Scandinavian languages. The problem concerning *i*-Umlaut is to explain why some words like Icel. *gestir* 'guest' have Umlaut before an *i*-sound (dropped or remaining), but others do not (Icel. *talde* 'said', where *i* was dropped). Kock assumes a period when *i* occurs after a short syllable but has no effect. His rules for *i*-Umlaut can be summarized as follows: 1) an older Umlaut period where *i* disappeared after a long root syllable and caused Umlaut, for example Icel. *do:mian* > *døma* 'to sentence', 2) a middle period where *i* was dropped after a short root syllable without causing Umlaut as in *taliðo* > *talde*, and 3) a younger Umlaut period when a remaining *i* (and *j*) caused Umlaut as in *gastiR* > *gestir*.

Three features characterize Kock's theory: that Umlaut is associated with loss of the causing factor; the loss of vowels is related to the length of the preceding syllable; and that vowels were lost earlier after long syllables. Sievers stated that there was a stronger expiratory accent on the syllable after a short root syllable in the West-Germanic languages and that vowels were lost earlier after a long syllable than after a short vowel in Anglo-Saxon.

The assumption of a period with no Umlaut is unnatural. Pipping and Noreen criticized this discontinuity and maintained that the Umlaut tendency was continuous while *i* after short syllable was too weak to cause Umlaut. Kock rejected their criticism. He gave an enormous number of examples to support his theory and devoted much energy to explaining exceptions.

Kock also presented theories of vowel balance and vowel harmony. He coined the term "vowel balance" to denote instances where the quality of a vowel was dependent on the quantity of the preceding syllable. Thus in certain dialects, *o* alternated with *u* and *e* with *i*. The sounds (actually letters in manuscripts) *o* and *e* occurred after a long syllable, *u* and *i* after a short syllable.

A rough calculation based on the register in the fifth volume of *Svensk ljudhistoria* shows that some 20,000 words are treated as examples of sound patterns, regular sound laws, exceptions, etc. This register indicates the magnitude of Kock's work.

Kock published a book on language change for the general public entitled *Om Språkets förändring* (On Language Change, 1896). He discussed the relation between regular sound change (sound laws) and analogy. He said that the term "sound law" is not quite appropriate and that analogy has only recently been accepted as an important factor in sound change. He explained analogy as a psychological factor and provided a number of examples, beginning with child language. Kock maintained that older grammarians could agree that analogical forces were at work in the modern degenerated languages, but not that they had also affected the classical languages Greek and Latin, and certainly not that most venerable of languages, Sanskrit. According to Kock, prior linguists did not realize that the human spirit had always been the same and that even the oldest languages have a long history, where many of the forms now considered correct were once incorrect innovations.

The characteristic difference between sound change and analogy is that analogy takes place at once with no intermediate stages. Thus, while analogy satisfies the demands of logic, sound change satisfies the requirements of the speech organs. Analogical changes affect individual words, and sound laws affect a great number of words. Kock admits that the neogrammarian premise that sound laws have no exceptions encouraged modern linguists to demand explanations for all problematic cases. But he still claims that the

thesis is not true in its strictest interpretation. His own idea is that the semantic and stylistic context of the words is also crucial, not only the phonetic context. He takes his examples from child language, religious language, and language use in situations with various degrees of formality.

Fredrik Tamm (1847-1905) was a lecturer at Uppsala who applied the historical-comparative method to his study of the phonetic characteristics of loan words in Modern Standard Swedish (Tamm 1887). Tamm identified loan words by their lack of certain features otherwise found in the genuine vocabulary, which had been affected by the sound laws. For instance, an initial *j* (as in *jungfru* ‘virgin’) or a *v* before a back vowel would thus be indications of loan words. Moreover, Tamm was a pioneer in the investigation of Swedish word formation, a field which emerged from comparative and historical linguistics (Tamm 1899, 1900).

4.5.4. Language Planning

Language planning was an important theme in most of the Nordic countries during the nineteenth century. Matters being discussed (especially in Finland and Norway) were the selection of a national standard language, the establishment of a national orthography, the creation of new words, and the minimization of foreign influences (i.e. Danish influence upon Norwegian and Swedish influence upon Finnish).

The interest in orthography and the need to regulate it were very different between the new literary languages of Finland and Norway on the one hand, and the well-established literary languages of Denmark and Sweden on the other.

4.5.4.1. Danish

Although many Danish grammarians, educators, and editors of this period were very interested in questions of orthography, most of what they produced had no real influence on the written standard.

One extreme contribution to the ongoing Danish debate between radicals and conservatives was J. J. Dampé’s proposal of 1811. Dampé based his suggestions for reform on the spoken language, while advocating, for example, the removal of all silent letters from the writing system. Bredsdorff’s (cf. 4.4.1.) somewhat less radical attempt to formulate a phonetic orthography for the Danish language (1817) is one of the most valuable publications of this period, primarily because it also provides an extensive and coherent phonetic description of the language.

A new phase in the debate in Denmark was introduced with Rask’s attempt to formulate what he termed a scientifically-based orthography (1826). The basis for Rask’s orthography was the pronunciation of educated speakers, which meant, in principle, that there should be only one single letter for each individual sound. For vowels, he established a system of ten vowels, each with its own corresponding letter, including *å* for *aa*. Agreeing with Høysgaard, for whom Rask had great respect, he distinguished between an open *ö* and a closed *ø* (*en Dör* ‘a door’, *jeg dør* ‘I die’). Rask insisted that there were no diphthongs in Danish and wrote *v* for *u* in words like *tavs* ‘silent’ and *Evropa*, and *j* for *i* (or *y*) in words like *vej* ‘way’ and *øje* ‘eye’. Furthermore, he saw no need to write long vowels with a double vowel as long as this did not result in ambiguity. Otherwise, he recommended the use of diacritics to distinguish vowel length (*vîs* ‘wise’ : *vis* ‘sure’, *Dûg* ‘ability’ : *Dug* ‘dew’). Like many of his predecessors, he found the letters *c*, *q*, *x* and *z* to be superfluous.

Rask’s conception of language as an organism runs contrary to what we find in his orthographic and puristic publications, where he assumes that language can be improved. On the one hand, Rask maintains that one should not go against “nature’s course in language”, for example by trying to preserve forms that have died out in the spoken language (e.g. the plural forms of verbs). On the other hand, he insists that we should be able to improve language, for instance by adding elements from the original language and from related languages. He avoids this problem by separating the written language (the depiction of language, a

work of art) from the genuine living language (the work of nature).

Rask's attitude towards linguistic regulation and to the nature of the written language closely reflects the early eighteenth century position, namely the view of the spoken language as the original and the written language as a copy. But whereas the linguists of the previous century assumed a cyclical concept of history and viewed language as a decayed and neglected ruin to be reconstructed and improved in order to bring it back to its original perfect shape, the linguistic reformers of the nineteenth century valued progress and thus wanted to make changes in the language in order to improve it.

Scholars in more official positions completely rejected Rask's system. When Rask refused to change the orthography in his own publications, The Academy of Science (*Videnskabernes Selskab*), The Danish Society (*Det danske Selskab*), and The Scandinavian Literature Society (*Det skandinaviske Litteraturselskab*) all refused to publish his writings. A few years after Rask's death, Petersen and a small group of supporters founded the Society for the Dissemination of an Improved Orthography (*Selskabet for en forbedret Retskrivnings Udbredelse*), which tried to attract public attention with its periodical of general literary interest, The Scandinavian Weekly (*Nordisk Ugeskrift*). The same year, Petersen published an excerpt of Rask's work (Petersen 1837), but the efforts of this group were largely unsuccessful.

After a few years, Petersen adapted his own orthography in the direction of the pan-Scandinavian movement. His orthography was often referred to as the Rask - N. M. Petersen orthography and it deviated from Rask's original proposal only on two significant points (no capital letters in nouns and no *j* after *k* and *g* before *e*, *måske* 'maybe', *gennem* 'through'). This orthography won fairly widespread acceptance and was adopted in pro-Scandinavian circles and by educators and scholars such as Lyngby, Jessen, and Wimmer. Some scholars opposed its use, however, for example I. Levin (1846). When Madvig served as Minister of Education, he was required to take a stance on the use of the new orthography in the schools. Madvig was conservative on some points and accepted reform with respect to others. As a result, there was confusion in the schools as to whether or not certain reforms were acceptable.

The pro-Scandinavian activist Sven Hedin made a constructive suggestion at the Second Nordic Meeting of National Economists in Stockholm in 1866, and it was later repeated by the Norwegian professor Ludvig Kr. Daa (4.4.2.) on a visit to Copenhagen in 1868. Hedin suggested that a number of representatives from Norway, Sweden, and Denmark be chosen to work towards greater uniformity in the orthography of the two Scandinavian languages (Danish and Danish-Norwegian were then considered to be one language). A meeting was held for this purpose in Stockholm in 1869, and the result for Danish was very similar to the Rask - N. M. Petersen orthography. The Stockholm meeting was widely publicized, and authors like Bjørnson and Ibsen quickly announced that they would follow its recommendations.

Others, like the Danish newspaper *Berlingske Tidende* (Berling's News), were more hesitant and demanded a dictionary. Svend Grundtvig, assisted by Lyngby and Jørgen Bloch, quickly compiled a spelling dictionary (1870), adhering precisely to the rules set down at the meeting. This dictionary made the reforms visible, which was a provocation to some and an aid to others. Under pressure from those who advocated reform, a government commission was appointed to dictate official rules for spelling, which it issued in 1888.

The government also commissioned an official spelling dictionary, which appeared in 1891, produced by Viggo Saaby and revised after his death in 1898 by P. K. Thorsen (through its eighth edition in 1919).

4.5.4.2. Finnish

At the beginning of the nineteenth century, written Finnish basically had the form given to it by Mikael Agricola in the first half of the sixteenth century. Finnish was based on the Western dialects, the spelling principles were unsystematic, and the syntax and vocabulary were heavily influenced by Swedish. After 1809, the new historical situation gave rise to growing national sentiments. In intellectual circles in Turku/Åbo, there was first a romantic and abstract desire to promote the status and use of Finnish. This spirit had originated as early as the 1700s (Juslenius, Porthan, and others). In the course of the 1800s, this attitude was transformed into political reflection, and the Fennophile Movement was born. The radical faction of this movement introduced the slogan “one people, one language” (*yksi kansa, yksi kieli*).

The language question, i.e. giving Finnish the position it required and deserved as the primary national language, came to dominate much of Finnish politics after 1850, with repercussions extending into the 1930s. The first decisive step was taken in 1863, when Czar Alexander II issued an imperial manifesto declaring that Finnish be an official language in administrative and legal practice and teaching, to be implemented during a transition phase of 20 years. But such a goal could not be reached without systematic development of the expressive potential of the language. The nineteenth century thus became the formative phase of Finnish language planning.

The Finnish grammarian and theologian Gustav Renvall (4.5.1.2.) was influential in his work as a teacher and in other official positions. Renvall established several fundamental principles for Finnish orthography in his insightful study, which he wrote in Latin:

All letters that do not represent a specific sound in the language they are transferred to should immediately be excluded from it. On the other hand, no sound which is distinct from the others should lack its own letter. (Renvall 1810-1811,I:4)

Renvall argues that the main purpose of orthography should be to establish phonological distinctions that keep words apart. He also treats the problems which dialectal variation creates for the orthography. Renvall purposefully tried to develop norms for a national standard variety of Finnish (cf. Klinge 1986).

Reinhold von Becker's weekly *Turun Wiikkosanomat* (Turku/Åbo Daily News, 1820-) was an important step in the increasing public use of written Finnish. Becker advocated a more extensive use of the eastern (Savo) dialect in writing and omitted medial *-d-* as in *kahen pro kahden* ‘two’ (genitive). In his popular grammar (1824), Becker introduced East-Finnish dialect elements and excluded a number of influences from Swedish (4.5.1.2.). This set off a discussion concerning the morphological and orthographic normalization of written Finnish. The debate came to be known in Finnish linguistics as the Dialect Battle (*murteiden taistelu*), and it lasted until the 1850s (Koivusalo 1975).

One of the main instigators of the Dialect Battle was Karl Axel Gottlund (1796-1875), lecturer of Finnish since 1839 at the University of Helsinki, but also the *enfant terrible* of nineteenth-century Finnish linguistics. Gottlund had learned, more or less perfectly, the Savo dialect and used it in his writings according to the principle “write as you speak” or “leave your language alone”. He was a versatile and complex person and accomplished a lot through his enthusiasm, for example for the study and position of the Finnish immigrants in Sweden and Norway. But he was not a very disciplined scholar. Neither the linguistic information nor the pornographic notes (Gottlund 1986:496-518) in the journal he kept during his research in Värmland and Solør can be trusted. He corrected the local Finnish names to standard Finnish and even invented new Finnish place names and family names by translating Norwegian names into Finnish, morpheme by morpheme. His linguistic publications, like his attitude towards Finnish orthography, were not highly valued by his contemporaries.

As a linguist, Gottlund went his own way without much knowledge of or interest in what was going on in contemporary linguistics. He maintained (1863:x) that he had found firm evidence that Finnish was related to several hundred languages all over the world, but his work had not been accepted for publication

by any academy, although, in his own words, it is a “magnificent, clever, and even brilliant attempt to explain the origin of Finnish root words” (Gottlund 1863:1).

Renvall was in favor of a standard based on Western Finnish. In 1837, he published a volume of papers on grammatical topics. In one of the papers entitled *Om Finlands National- eller Bokspråk* (On Finland’s National or Written Language), Renvall, as one of the first, ventured the idea that Finnish should be the primary national language. This was a far-reaching idea that was soon to catch on. In 1840 Renvall published a Finnish grammar based on the Western dialects, again with the outspoken aim to establish norms for a national standard. But by then, the Dialect Battle had already been settled. The final solution for a unified literary language was given in Lönnrot’s publication of the *Kalevala* in 1835 in which the orthography is based on the western dialects, but which is also full of words and grammatical features from the eastern dialects. From that time on, only minor controversies arose regarding Finnish orthography. Hundreds if not thousands of eastern dialectal words were assimilated into written Finnish, and several grammatical morphemes stabilized in a partly new shape, such as the double -ss- in the inessive case -ssa/-ssä ‘in’ and the ending -vat/-vät in the third person, also in the past tense.

In many ways, the Finnish Dialect Battle was similar to the language conflict going on at the same time in Norway. Both were concerned with the major problem of language planning, viz. establishing a national standard for the written language. However, a major difference between Finland and Norway is that the Finnish debate ended in a de facto compromise in the 1850s, whereas in Norway the outcome was two national standards (*bokmål, nynorsk*).

Volmari Kilpinen [Wolmar Styrbjörn Schildt] (1810-1893) proposed a number of orthographic changes in Finnish in 1857, such as writing a long vowel not as a sequence of two vowels, but as a single vowel with a circumflex, for example $\hat{a} = aa$, $\hat{e} = ee$, etc., and writing \hat{a} and \hat{e} instead of \ddot{a} and \ddot{e} . These were not completely different from the ideas of Rask and even Lönnrot, but the old orthography was too well established to be changed. By 1860 or so, Finnish orthography basically had the shape it has today. One of the few remaining fluctuations was the alternate use of *v* and *w* (modern Finnish *v*).

A central task for society was to develop the lexical resources of Finnish. Many lexical inventors, professional linguists and laymen alike, participated in this laborious endeavor. Elias Lönnrot was the most influential creator of neologisms in Finnish. He invented several thousand words that are in common use today, and also developed several subterminologies, such as legal and botanical terms. Another major wordsmith was Volmari Kilpinen (who i.a. coined the Finnish compound word for linguistics, *kieli+tiede* ‘language science’; the word *tiede* ‘science’ was also coined by Kilpinen by denominal derivation from the verb *tietää* ‘to know’). The favorite method of the wordsmiths was to use the rich derivative and compounding capabilities of Finnish for coining new words. Like Lönnrot, Kilpinen was a physician by profession.

As for normative grammar, Becker’s grammar (1824) was too eastern and lacked a normative attitude, while Renvall’s grammar (1840) was too western to qualify as the basis for a national norm. In 1846, the Finnish Literature Society offered an award to the prospective writer of a comprehensive Finnish scientific grammar, but no submissions were obtained, even though Lönnrot wrote a sketch. Genetz’s grammar (phonology and morphology, 1881) was widely used. However, by 1900, Setälä’s syntax (1880) and morphology (1898) were already widely regarded as valid codifications of the norms of Finnish grammar.

In the course of the stabilization of standard Finnish, a strict normative tradition developed towards the end of the 1800s, which was to dominate the use and teaching of Finnish for decades. August Ahlqvist (cf. 4.4.2.) was the first example of this tendency. His normative judgements were derived from a grammatically-based view that professional linguists well-versed in language structure are the best experts, also in matters relating to language usage. An extreme early outburst of normative attitude was Ahlqvist’s devastating criticism of Aleksis Kivi’s (1834-1872) novel *Seitsemän veljestä* (Seven Brothers, 1870). This book was the first full-blown piece of fictional writing in Finnish. Ahlqvist, himself a poet with a very

conflict-seeking personality, condemned all aspects of the novel — its structure, contents, ideology, way of describing the Finnish people, and language use, for example words and expressions that he considered repulsive or brutal. Kivi died in misery shortly afterwards, without knowing that his work was to become part of the national heritage.

4.5.4.3. Icelandic

In matters of Icelandic orthography, the linguist Rasmus Rask was the most influential from the 1820s to the mid-century. His orthography was archaic in some respects, for example in disregarding the svarabhakti vowel, writing *z* for *s* in certain cases, writing *g/k* and not *gj/kj* before front vowels, and distinguishing *y* and *i*. Serious controversy was sparked in 1836 by Konráð Gíslason's (4.5.1.1.) proposal for a phonetically-oriented orthography, which he published in the journal *Fjölnir*.⁴² Gíslason later retracted his proposal and advocated spelling that resembled the way the older stages of the languages were written. Halldór Kr. Friðriksson (1819-1902) who was an Icelandic teacher at the Latin school in Reykjavík for almost fifty years, based his own rules, which he used in his teaching, on Gíslason's "school orthography". This spelling was not supported by any law, but it was widely used in the second half of the nineteenth century. There were, however, various other proposals along the same principles, differing in details on where pronunciation should be the decisive factor and where origin should be the governing criterion. Many proposed moving closer to pronunciation in the last decades of the nineteenth century, but this position gained little support (Jónsson 1959).

One interesting feature of Icelandic language norms is their strong lexical purism, coupled with extended coinage of neologisms (Ottósson 1990). This policy had already been firmly established in the 1780s, in the yearly publications of *Hið íslenska Lærdómslistafélag* (cf. 3.4.1.3.). Purism remained strong in subsequent decades, for example in publications of the Icelandic Literature Society (*Hið íslenska bókmenntafélag*), founded at the initiative of Rasmus Rask in 1816. In the political debate following the resurrection of the Icelandic Parliament *Alþingi* in 1845, this principle was strictly adhered to, since a pure language was seen as a weapon in its own right in the struggle for political self-determination. In the second half of the nineteenth century, much more was published in Icelandic than had been the case earlier, and on more varied subjects than ever before. And it was considered a national and patriotic duty to try to follow the norms established by the editors of *Fjölnir* and others like them. During this period, the need for neologisms was to a large extent connected to the social debate, calling for political and legal terms, terms from political economy and for technical innovations. Many neologisms were also coined for various branches of the natural sciences, sometimes for use in textbooks for the Latin school.

There was considerable vacillation in usage in the second half of the nineteenth century, some wanting to follow the old language more closely than the mainstream. A lasting feature of Icelandic purism remained the cultivation of uncommon morphological archaisms, resulting in the reintroduction of older and outdated inflectional forms and even complete paradigms into the modern language (cf. Kvaran 1996, Ottósson 1987). One example is the genitive of *faðir* 'father', which in Old Icelandic was *föður*, but which had become *föðurs* from the fifteenth century on, both in written and in spoken Icelandic. But in the nineteenth century, purists managed to reintroduce *föður* and similar forms in the standard language. The main instigator of the reintroduction of such morphological archaisms was Konráð Gíslason.

⁴² In Old Norse mythology *Fjölnir* was the name of Odin's horse.

4.5.4.4. Norwegian

Language planning in Norway in the nineteenth century was mainly focused on establishing a norm for the two emerging new literary languages, *landsmål* and *riksmål*, both of which were official literary languages after 1885. When Ivar Aasen established his norm for *landsmål*, he was criticized for not making it closer to Old Norse and not selecting the most archaic dialect forms. But he undoubtedly made a wise choice in keeping the language much closer to a general consensus of the living dialects, cf. E. Haugen (1965) and 4.5.2.5. The development of *riksmål* as a literary language distinct from Danish was strengthened by the position of Norwegian literature in *riksmål* in the last part of the century (Henrik Ibsen, Bjørnstjerne Bjørnson, Jonas Lie, Alexander Kielland etc.). The orthographic characteristics of *riksmål*, distinct from Danish, were mainly developed through the work of Knud Knudsen (4.5.1.4.).

K. Knudsen (1865) focuses on the need for a spoken standard that could form the basis of the written form. Knudsen stresses the priority of the spoken language and insists that the written standard should be based on the speech of educated people for the following reasons:

The reason why there is a more standardized pronunciation among this [educated] class than in any geographic area or social class is probably partly the cultivated intellect which demands order and unity and does not tolerate a confused and barbaric situation, and partly the fact that cultured people are gathered in great numbers in many places, particularly in towns, and do not live as separate as people in the rural areas. In addition, they are continuously remixed, since they move from town to town, from one part of the country to another, because of their positions and jobs. (K. Knudsen 1865:11, cf. also K. Knudsen 1876:16-17).

Knudsen had to fight on two fronts: first against those who wanted to retain an orthography which was as close as possible to Danish and second, against the adherents of *landsmål*. Knudsen had to show that his putative standard was as genuinely Norwegian as Aasen's, and that his orthography and morphology were as consistent.

Knudsen's first extensive and detailed attempt to establish the new norm of Norwegian was published in 1876. To rid the vocabulary of Danish and German loan words was seen by Knudsen as a major part of his language reform, and he published an extensive dictionary (K. Knudsen 1881) with thousands of proposals for new Norwegian words to replace the Danish-German ones. Some of his new words were a success and have become part of the modern Norwegian vocabulary, but most were not.

Although Knudsen's aims and motivation were different from those of Aasen, he also recognized the potential for cooperation and furthermore, that a final solution could be one single Norwegian literary language, a goal which has not yet been reached. Knudsen also worked toward establishing a common Scandinavian orthography (K. Knudsen 1866), and he was a key figure at the meeting concerning such an orthography held in Stockholm in 1869. One of the results of this meeting was the proposal to replace *aa* with *å*.

The phonetician and applied linguist Johan Storm (4.3., 4.6.2. and 4.8.) played a curious and often overlooked role in the discussion of language planning in Norway in the last decades of the nineteenth century. Storm published several short books (Storm 1888, 1896, 1903, 1904-1906) and articles in newspapers attacking both Aasen's and Knudsen's work. All of these publications are characterized by sharp and demagogic polemics and a negative attitude towards all aspects of the two new emerging standards and their creators. Storm's wording is abrasive, and he was certainly his own worst enemy in this debate. Storm's arguments against *landsmål* (e.g. Storm 1888) were that it contained too much variation and too many stylistic inconsistencies. For example, "It makes a strange impression to hear both God and other Biblical persons speak «pure» *trøndersk*-dialect" (Storm 1888:35). He also argued that the written norm of *landsmål* was so different from the dialects that it represented no real pedagogical advance. As for Knudsen, Storm found that he had no sense of style and no aesthetic view of language (Storm 1896:3).

But behind Storm's harsh polemics there was some solid linguistic footwork. His claims concerning

variation, stylistic inconsistencies, and differences between the spoken and written language were documented by extensive and thoroughly analyzed material from Norwegian literature as well as dialects. From a modern point of view, these studies represent some of the most important contributions to the phonetics of Norwegian dialects as well as to the stylistics of the written languages of the nineteenth century. But few read them, and even fewer used them. Storm had become persona non grata both in the *landsmål* and *riksmål* camp.

It is a part of Norwegian linguistic mythology that both the language situation in Norway and Ivar Aasen's creation of *landsmål* are unique from an international perspective. These claims are doubtful both from a sociolinguistic and historiographic point of view. What Aasen did was actually similar to what had been undertaken by many of the creators of the national languages of Europe in the nineteenth century. Lönnrot and Finland is the closest example. What is really unique about Aasen is the method he used to produce his grammar of the new standard language, i.e. the comparative method based on his own grammars of Norwegian dialects.

But Knudsen's work is even more remarkable, even unprecedented. A parallel (suggested by Jan Terje Faarlund) might be that after the breakdown of the Soviet Union, the Ukraine had chosen not to use either Russian or Ukrainian as its national language, but had chosen Russian as spoken by Ukrainians, adapted the orthography to this pronunciation and included numerous Ukrainian words, phrases, and morpho-syntactic features which were widespread in this Ukrainian-Russian interlanguage.

4.5.4.5. Swedish

The publication of *Afhandling om svenska stafsättet* (A Treatise on the Spelling of Swedish, Leopold 1801) marks the beginning of a renewed interest in the Swedish language. This book was written by Carl Gustaf af Leopold (1756-1829), who had undertaken the task in 1798 (cf. Loman 1986). The book contains a long preface written by Nils von Rosenstein (1752-1824), who offers a comprehensive survey of previous work and discussions of the basic problems and formulates a number of general principles to be followed by the Academy. Rosenstein's preface makes it clear that the Swedish Academy sides with the French Academy in considering the usage of good authors as the model for a norm, rather than the language of the people. He states that grammarians and lexicographers cannot institute laws and rules, merely being able to collect examples and formulate rules on that basis.

It is clear from the minutes of the Swedish Academy that the members had discussed most of the suggestions and principles mentioned in the book and that Leopold had made an attempt to compromise. As a result of this collective approach, there are several inconsistencies and unclear statements in the book, but it is still considered a fine accomplishment of the Swedish Academy.

The Academy realized that its orthographic rules could not run contrary to general opinion if they were to be followed, but as expected, the book met with a certain amount of criticism. Leopold was given the task of answering these critical comments. Although his manuscript was ready in 1805, it was not published until 1837, when it was no longer of any interest. Even one of the members of the Academy, A. G. Silfverstolpe (4.3.), had doubts as to the Academy's recommendations and suggested a complete change by introducing new letters for the *ng*- sound [ŋ] and the *tj*-sound [ç] (he wanted to spell the *tj*-sound with *k*, which was available, since he had suggested that *q* be used for spelling the *k*-sound). Silfverstolpe found that Swedish had 37 sounds and devised a complete alphabet for them, including several diacritics. He based his proposal on the following principles:

- (1) A separate specific letter for each single sound.
- (2) No more than one letter for a simple sound.
- (3) No letter indicating more than one sound.
- (4) No combination of letters to express one sound.

He presented his proposal in 1811, but his ideas were too unconventional for the Academy, which was afraid that all existing Swedish books would have to be reprinted in the new orthography and also that the new letters he proposed would make the Swedish language look ridiculous abroad (Silfverstolpe 1811:123).

Spelling was much discussed in the nineteenth century. The Swedish Academy made an attempt to normalize spelling in the first version of its wordlist, *Svenska Akademien ordlista* (SAOL, 1874). In 1885 a society for radical change, *Rättstavningssällskapet* (Orthographic Society), was established in Uppsala. Adolf Noreen (4.5.5.4., 5.6.1.7.) was the chairman. The society also started the journal *Nystavaren* (New Speller). Its second volume (1887) has a title demonstrating the use of *j* instead of *g*: *Rättskrivningslära och ordlista, utgivna av Rättstavningssällskapet genom Adolf Noreen och Rolf Arpi* (Orthography and Word List, published by the New Speller Society via Adolf Noreen and Rolf Arpi). But conservative Swedes fought back by ridiculing the proposals, supported by Esaias Tegnér (4.3.) who published *Natur och onatur ifråga om svensk rättstavning* (Natural and Unnatural in Swedish Orthography, 1886).

4.5.5. Dialect studies

Interest in dialects is a significant characteristic of linguistics in the nineteenth century. In the spirit of the romantic movement, dialects were considered a part of the national heritage that should be documented and preserved, but they were also interesting from the point of view of historical linguistics, since they seemed to preserve old words and grammatical features. They were also closely related to the new nationalistic interest in folklore, evidenced by the founding of new societies in this period to support the collection and scholarly description of various types of national folklore. Furthermore, industrialization, urbanization and other pervasive societal processes created a feeling that there was an imminent need to save the remnants of old, nationally valuable dialects from final loss.

Unfortunately, the development of dialectology in the Nordic countries was soon marked by a strong tendency towards national isolation. The clearest evidence of this is the fact that at the end of the nineteenth century Denmark, Finland, Norway, and Sweden each had their own separate systems for the phonetic transcription of dialects.

4.5.5.1. Danish

In the 1800s dialectology took shape as a scholarly discipline in Denmark, largely through the efforts of Kristen Jensen Lyngby (1829-1871). At the beginning of the century, Rasmus Rask described his childhood dialect, the language of the farmers on the Island of Funen, employing, like others before him, a kind of home-made phonetic notation to describe various distinctive features of the dialect, including prosody (P. Andersen 1938). Several other studies were published early in this period, for example J. C. S. Espersen's (1812-1859) dictionary of the Bornholm dialect (1908), cf. 4.5.6.1., and J. Victor Bloch's description of West Jutlandic (1837), with observations on the use of the article.

Around the middle of the century we find several dialect investigations dealing with Southern Jutlandic, an area of particular national interest. E. Hagerup's (1854) description of the Danish language in Anglia, which contains a dictionary, sections on phonology, morphology, and word-formation, together with several dialect texts, was re-edited by Lyngby in 1867. An extensive work in two volumes describing the Danish language of Southern Jutland was published by Johannes Kok (1863-1867). The most significant study of Southern Jutlandic, however, is Lyngby's 1858 grammar, the result of a new approach to fieldwork. Lyngby's fieldwork in Southern Jutland from 1854 to 1861 is marked by extreme caution and a precision which was new to the field of dialectology. He was meticulous in recording the sources of his data,

mentioning the place where the informants lived and providing both a sketch of their life history and an assessment of their command of the dialect.

Lyngby, who can be considered the founder of Danish dialectology, got off to a difficult start in life, which marked him for the rest of his days. His father, in an attempt to keep his three sons morally pure, never allowed them to play with other children or attend public school. A pastor who taught the children finally managed to persuade the father to send Kristen to a public high-school. Lyngby later studied classical philology, comparative Indo-European, and Scandinavian languages. He became lecturer in Scandinavian philology in 1863 and professor in 1869, teaching linguists like Vilhelm Thomsen, who became his successor. Although he published little in his short lifetime and did not receive a professorship until two years before he died, his influence on Danish and Scandinavian dialectology was significant and enduring.

Lyngby began collecting material for a Jutlandic grammar and dictionary in 1854 and, seeing the need for a more precise way of recording the pronunciation, developed a fine-grained system of phonetic transcription. Its purpose was not to represent every phonetic detail, but to record only those phonetic distinctions that he considered important or interesting from a diachronic point of view. Compared with previous studies and with the standard found in the dialectological works of Ivar Aasen, Lyngby's approach represents a significant breakthrough with respect to phonetic accuracy and general methodology. His transcription is used in Feilberg's four-volume dictionary of the Jutlandic dialects (1886-1914), cf. 4.5.6.1.

His fieldwork methods are particularly significant, since they contributed towards establishing the basic methodology for future dialect research both in Denmark (e.g. Thorsen 1886) and in Scandinavian dialectology in general. Lyngby notes that there are three ways of gathering material on a dialect (Lyngby 1858:v-vii): a) by introspection; the linguist himself being a speaker of the dialect, b) by observation; a scientifically solid method, but one by which the observer does not always get the data he wants, c) by elicitation; frequently a necessary method, but one which involves many sources of error, both with respect to the influence of the standard language and the language of the elicitor, as well as the possibility that the informant may provide a form that he or she does not normally use.

Lyngby is clearly aware of the inherent bias of the field worker and frequently states that he is uncertain as to what he had heard, using expressions like "as far as I could hear it" (Lyngby 1858:41). He did not consider the dialects to be degenerated variants of the standard language or as variants caused by the mixing of languages, cultural changes, or cultural differences. To him a dialect was simply one of many diachronically developed and equally valid variants of an older language. He describes the relationship between the various dialects and the standard language by means of regular sound correspondences between the dialects in question and between these dialects and Old Norse, thus using an approach similar to that of the historical-comparative linguistics of his day. Lyngby was one of the founders of the Danish Philological Historical Society (*Filologisk-historisk Selskab*) in 1854 and in 1858 of the periodical for philology and pedagogy (*Tidskrift for Philologi og Pædagogik*) for which he was editor of comparative linguistics and Nordic philology. One of Lyngby's contemporaries, Pastor Varming, produced a large compilation of Jutlandic dialect material (1862), which, although generally chaotic and uncritical, is one of the few early studies to contain a section on syntax.

Later in this period P. K. Thorsen, another Danish dialectologist, published several papers, including a monograph on the island dialect of Sejerø (1889) and an interesting contribution to the theory of language change (1894) in which he discusses spontaneous and gradual change in language.

Finally, the end of the century marked the beginning of an extensive project in Danish dialect geography, the Atlas of the Danish Dialects (Bennike and Kristensen 1912), cf. 5.6.4.1. The idea for this atlas, which was not patterned on the existing contemporary continental atlases, came from the folk high school teacher, Valdemar Bennike, who was inspired by Prince Louis-Lucien Bonaparte's survey map of the dialects of Southern England and wanted to produce a similar survey for Denmark. The resulting maps show the distribution of sound complexes (isophones) or of grammatical forms (isomorphs), and in some instances the forms of individual words. As pointed out by Inger Ejkskjær (1926-) in her survey of Danish dialect

research (1993:27), here, as so often elsewhere in Danish dialectology, it was an amateur who took the initiative.

4.5.5.2. Finnish

In his dissertation of 1801, Porthan established the basic division between the eastern (Savo) and western (*Dialectus communior*) Finnish dialects and demonstrated that Karelian belongs to the eastern group. The dialects are only treated by means of scattered examples, not systematically, but several phonological differences between the dialect areas are pointed out.

In 1846, Antero Warelius (1821-1904) was asked by the Imperial Academy in St. Petersburg to investigate the Finnish dialects and their boundaries. This information was needed for an ethnographic map of Russia. Warelius presented the results of his fieldwork in 1847 [1848], finding no perfectly clear dialect boundaries and ascertaining that Finnish dialectology was an extremely complicated matter. Warelius's study is particularly interesting because it is based primarily on morphological features.

After 1863, when Ahlqvist (4.4.2.) began promoting the study of Finnish dialects as a professor, the interest in dialect studies increased markedly. The Finnish Literature Society began awarding grants for conducting fieldwork on dialects, and the results were impressive. The first published account was by the soldier and teacher Torsten Aminoff (1838-1881), who published a study of a dialect from Ostrobothnia in 1871. His description, which covers both phonology and morphology, compares the dialect with standard Finnish. He also includes a few texts written in the dialect. The phonetic section remains primitive from a modern perspective. Aminoff also studied the language of Finnish immigrants in Värmland and produced a description of its morphology in 1876, including several texts.

Arvid Genetz's outstanding dialect monograph of 1870 (4.4.2.) should be mentioned among the many additional studies conducted during this period, published for the most part in the journal *Suomi* (Finland). This monograph contains a detailed section on phonology with a precise phonetic description achieved by the use of numerous diacritics. The transcription is broadly phonetic. The numerous texts are rendered in the same transcription, followed by a comprehensive morphology. There is no syntax, and since the dialect is treated as a system in its own right, no comparison with the standard language was offered.

Finnish dialect studies began, after the year 1880, to occasionally reflect the neogrammarian emphasis on a diachronic perspective. Yet most published dialect studies still reflected a synchronic orientation. In the early 1880s, an exceptionally lively synchronic interest in the syntax of Finnish dialects arose, and this interest lasted for approximately 20 years. These studies were normally based on fieldwork. Setälä's (1883) syntactic observations concerning the northeastern Satakunta dialects set the model. This study has become a classic. Salu Latvala's (1895) paper on the syntax of the northwestern Satakunta vernacular belongs to this same tradition.

4.5.5.3. Norwegian

The founder of Norwegian dialectology was Ivar Aasen (4.5.1.1.). Through his monumental grammars (Aasen 1848, 1864), he presented a thorough and systematic description of the major Norwegian dialect areas. The most significant aspect of Aasen's approach to dialectology is its originality. He looked for the basic structure of an entire dialect area, searching systematically in all the components of the grammar for dialectal variation. Furthermore, he provided a systematic classification of the Norwegian dialects into main groups and subgroups, and he also published a short and traditional account of his home dialect in 1851.⁴³

⁴³ Various handwritten drafts of this grammar exist from 1839 onwards, cf. Bondevik et al. (1992).

Aasen differs from other contemporary Scandinavian dialectologists, and probably most significantly from his Danish contemporary Lyngby, who had received his inspiration from Aasen. Aasen was more interested in establishing a norm than in dialect variation itself, and more in synchrony than in diachrony. Accordingly, he did not occupy himself with recording all kinds of minor variation, especially on the phonetic level as he was more interested in studying one good representative informant than in analyzing variation among several informants or in a particular social or personal context, cf. Djupedal (1957:48).

Aasen was more modern than many of his contemporaries. His phonological approach to the description of the sound system, disregarding minor phonetic variation, and his ability to see each form and construction as part of a system and not in isolation, are similar to the theoretical orientation of the twentieth century. Although he was inspired by Grimm and Rask, Aasen showed little interest in diachrony and in the search for proto-sources of single sounds.

At the end of the century, another talented dialectologist, Amund B. Larsen (4.5.1.4.), published several important monographs and articles on Norwegian dialects. Larsen never occupied a university position, but after the year 1900, he received an annual scholarship from the Parliament to study Norwegian dialects. More than any other linguist, Larsen continued in the tradition of Aasen. Larsen adopted the same synchronic and systematic approach, having received solid training in phonetics and phonetic transcription from Johan Storm (4.8.). In addition to his insight and training in phonetics and historical linguistics, Larsen used a more sociological approach to language phenomena, on both the diachronic and synchronic levels (5.6.4.4.). A collection of Larsen's minor publications and later appraisals of him as a scholar are found in Myhren (1976).

Another major contribution to Norwegian dialectology is found in the dictionaries of Norwegian dialects compiled by Aasen and Ross (4.5.6.4.) and in Johan Storm's phonetic alphabet, *Norvegia*. The latter was created specifically for the transcription of Norwegian dialects and has been in use until the present (4.8.), although the International Phonetic Alphabet has gradually gained acceptance since 1975.

4.5.5.4. Swedish

The father of modern Swedish dialectology was Carl Säve (4.5.1.5.). Säve was born on Gotland, worked as a physician in Visby, and became doctor honoris causa. His interest in linguistics was evoked by his observations of the similarities between Old Icelandic and Gotlandic (Guthnic). Säve began collecting words from different Swedish dialects, encouraged by his contacts with Danish dialectologists, in particular by Christian Molbech (4.5.6.1.). His brother, Per Säve (1811-1887), was an ethnographic enthusiast. For instance, he collected all sorts of folkloristic data and delivered 300 color drawings of churches, ruins, tombstones, etc., to the Academy of Letters (*Vitterhetsakademien*). The dialect words collected by Carl and Per Säve constitute an important source for Gotlandic (Gustavson 1918-1945). Moreover, Säve took an interest in the dialect of Dalecarlia and also supervised a great number of dissertations on dialect studies.

Adolf Noreen (4.5.1.5.) introduced a historical-comparative perspective to Swedish dialectology. Noreen created a new and influential model through his dialect monographs, a model which became characteristic of the dialect research conducted in Uppsala. In his thesis printed in 1877, Noreen compared the individual sounds of the dialect to Standard Swedish and to earlier stages of the language. The same diachronic approach was used by Noreen in his publications (1879a,b). However, the morphological section in Noreen (1879a) is synchronic, consisting of paradigms with no attempt at a historical explanation.

The scholar who exerted the most profound influence on Swedish dialect studies was the phonetician and professor of Slavic languages J. A. Lundell (4.6.4.), who designed a phonetic alphabet for Swedish dialects (Lundell 1879) based on a systematic survey of their sounds. While Noreen was attached to the Department of Scandinavian languages, Lundell worked within the framework of the regional dialect associations and their organizations. Lundell did not do much fieldwork himself, but he took a special interest in the relationship between the different Scandinavian dialects. He also wrote surveys of dialectology

abroad (e.g. Lundell 1884) and participated in local and international conferences as a representative of modern dialectology.

Lundell also attempted to develop a theory of dialectology. He considered the dialects as genuine products of the people, where the forces of change could work uninhibitedly, and he viewed the standard language as an artifact. A dialect such as the one of Dalecarlia included both old and new features, the latter being the result of a natural development which had taken place free of orthographic constraints. While the vocabulary was old in the dialects, the phonology could be very modern, even more modern than the pronunciation of the standard language.

Another scholar who influenced the development and institutional organization of Swedish dialectology was the enthusiastic amateur linguist and ethnographer Nils Gabriel Djurklou, cf. Djurklou (1860) and Sellberg (1993).

4.5.6. Lexicography

A number of important international lexicographic projects were initiated in the nineteenth century. In the United States, Noah Webster published his impressive English dictionary in 1828. The Philological Society in London, which had long fostered plans for a large dictionary, published the first sample volume in 1884, and the entire dictionary was completed in 1928. The French equivalent to this work, published by Larousse, appeared in 1860-1870. Activities of a similar nature focusing on important national dictionary projects were also underway in the Nordic countries.

Lexicography had a unique status among linguistic activities, because extensive dictionaries of the national languages were considered a matter of national importance. Accordingly, dictionaries were usually of interest to the government and could thus become matters of politics, even to the extent of being discussed in the national assemblies.

4.5.6.1. Danish

Throughout this century, work was continued on the dictionary of the Royal Danish Academy of Science. By the time the last volume finally appeared in 1905, the dictionary was unfortunately outdated. From a modern point of view, however, it provides valuable information on Danish phraseology.

One of the contributors and supporters of this dictionary, Christian Molbech (1783-1857), was also a famous historian and man of letters who published his own two-volume dictionary in 1833. This work was no less than 1,430 pages and took twenty years to produce. Molbech's dictionary contains random and not always correct etymological information, but its definitions are good. Usage is not only illustrated by constructed examples, but also by means of excerpts from literature. The dictionary was a success, and Molbech produced a second, greatly augmented and improved edition in installments during his last years, a work that eventually was completed by his son in 1859.

Molbech also published a Danish dialect dictionary in 1841, based on existing collections and material sent to him from around the country. This dictionary covers all of Denmark except Bornholm. Produced at a time when dialects were considered more of a curiosity than an object for scientific study, it limits itself to words and definitions not found in the standard language. In the preface, Molbech mentions three reasons for compiling this dictionary:

- (1) A scientific linguistic interest for historical-comparative studies of Scandinavian and Germanic languages.
- (2) The need to document the lexical treasure of the dialects as a source to draw upon for authors and the standard language in general.
- (3) A national interest and obligation to care for the language of the people (*folkesproget*), which he also assumes must be saved since it is in the process of dying out.

(Molbech 1841:xviii)

The material for Molbech's dialect dictionary comes from written, mostly unpublished, sources and was not collected by Molbech himself. Each word is given in the standard orthography, with information on its place of origin followed by a definition or semantic explanation. An example sentence containing the word is usually given under each entry.

Another dialect dictionary from this period is J. C. S. Espersen's (4.5.5.1.) dictionary of the Bornholm dialect, completed by Viggo Holm (1846-1927) in 1881, but held back until 1908 in order to include a 200-page introduction to the grammar of the dialect by Vilhelm Thomsen and Ludvig Wimmer. Even though most of Espersen's etymological explanations are incorrect, the dictionary is valuable because it is based on an older stage of the language and contains information on linguistic and cultural history that would be impossible to obtain today.

Henning Frederik Feilberg (1831-1921) was inspired when he assisted E. H. Hagerup in collecting material for a revised edition of the latter's book on the Danish language in Anglia. Feilberg carried on the work on the dialects of Jutland where K. J. Lyngby left off. Continuing in accordance with Lyngby's approach, Feilberg included not just strange words and expressions, but also everyday language. He also attempted to introduce and explain the cultural relics that could be uncovered by way of the language, an approach which came to dominate his efficient process of collecting and editing. Feilberg had completed the first draft of the entire dictionary in 1887, but since the university society publishing it (*Universitets-Jubilæets danske Samfund*, i.e. the Danish Society for the University Jubilee) could only afford to print a small portion each year, the complete dictionary in four volumes was not published until 1914.

The nineteenth century also marked the beginning of work on the 28-volume Dictionary of the Danish Language (*Ordbog over det danske Sprog*), a project initiated by Verner Dahlerup, who began collecting words he found missing in the second edition of Molbech's dictionary (5.6.7.1.).

The national romantic movement was accompanied by an interest in older words and expressions. The foundation for lexicographic studies of a historical nature was laid by the edition of older publications like the Rhymed Chronicle (*Rimkrøniken*) and the work on folk medicine by Henrik Harpestreng. These editions were all equipped with glossaries, many due to Molbech. Work on these glossaries led Molbech to continue his historical lexicographic efforts and to produce a two-volume historical dictionary of antiquated words found in the various manuscripts and books from the thirteenth to the sixteenth centuries, published after his death (Molbech 1857-1866). Molbech's definitions are detailed, and his principle of including illustrative excerpts is a major asset of his dictionary.

Molbech's historical dictionary did not include material from the regional law texts. This lack was remedied, though not very satisfactorily, by G. F. V. Lund (4.5.3.1.) in his dictionary of the ancient regional laws, the statutes of Southern Jutland, and a number of other texts from around 1200 to 1300 (1877).

A more extensive but amateurish historical dictionary was compiled by the theologian Otto Kalkar (1837-1926). Kalkar spent more than thirty years collecting material for his four-volume dictionary of the older Danish language (1881-1918), covering the period from 1300 to 1700. His original plan was to provide a supplement to Molbech's dictionary, but when he applied for support for his project, the Danish Academy of Science suggested expanding the project to a full-fledged dictionary. Unfortunately, the academy accepted Kalkar's idea of arranging the material according to an etymological principle, not alphabetically, thus making the dictionary very difficult to use. The 1976 reprint of Kalkar's dictionary contains a comprehensive introduction by Marie Bjerrum. Kalkar is an amateur when it comes to methodology, especially when his lexicographic principles are compared to those of his professional Swedish contemporary, Söderwall (4.5.6.6.). Whereas Söderwall's dictionary of medieval Swedish systematically delineates the period with which it is concerned so as to allow it to operate with a consistent normalization of entries, Kalkar's dictionary encompasses two very different periods, which makes normalization difficult. Söderwall's work is also more professional in the format of the articles, the logical system of the definitional framework, and its consistent references to sources.

4.5.6.2. Finnish

The first important Finnish contribution to nineteenth century lexicography is Renvall's dictionary (1826) based on the Turku dialect. This is an extensive work of almost 700 pages, but it did not replace Juslenius's dictionary of 1745, since it was only unidirectional and with translations into Latin and German, not Swedish. Juslenius's dictionary was not replaced until 1838 when Helenius published his bidirectional Finnish-Swedish dictionary.

Elias Lönnrot's (4.5.1.2.) Finnish-Swedish dictionary is without doubt his most important linguistic work (Lönnrot 1874 [1866]-1880). He compiled two volumes of more than 1,000 pages each. It is a very useful work and became the standard dictionary of Finnish for over eighty years. The number of lexical entries in this publication is around 200,000. Several thousand of his new coinages are now part of the central Finnish vocabulary, e.g. *alkuperä* 'origin', *itsenäinen* 'independent', *johtaa* 'lead, derive', *käsite* 'concept', *muste* 'ink', *osoite* 'address', *sisältää* 'contain', *viesti* 'message'. However, many of the entries were unsuccessful neologisms invented by Lönnrot, who had a tendency to stretch the derivational capabilities of Finnish to extremes.

Geitlin's Russian-Swedish dictionary (1833-1834) is approximately 1,700 pages (4.6.4.) and reflects indirectly the new importance of Russian in Finland at that time.

In 1896, E. N. Setälä presented the proposal for his famous lexicographic project to the Finnish Literature Society, a plan which was to determine to a very great extent the nature of research on Finnish in the twentieth century (5.6.7.2.). The design of lexicographic tools for Finnish had begun informally in the late 1870s, but it was not until 1896 that a concrete plan was presented. Setälä proposed the compilation of three dictionaries: (i) a dictionary of Finnish dialects, (ii) a dictionary of old literary Finnish, and (iii) a dictionary of modern literary Finnish (cf. Häkkinen 1993:34 and 5.2.5. for details).

4.5.6.3. Icelandic⁴⁴

At the beginning of the century, in 1814, Rasmus Rask edited the manuscript of the most extensive and thorough dictionary of Icelandic at that time, Björn Halldórsson's (1724-1794) dictionary, compiled between the years 1770 and 1785, which contains translations into Latin and Danish. The vocabulary in this publication is mostly contemporary colloquial language, but the author also included words from the old language.

Konráð Gíslason (4.5.1.1.) published a Danish-Icelandic dictionary in 1851. His publication was based on Christian Molbech's Danish dictionary (1833) and is especially important due to its purism, helping to establish those neologisms which Gíslason deemed acceptable. Another Danish-Icelandic dictionary, by Jónas Jónasson, appeared in 1896, contained many more recent neologisms and contributed significantly to their spreading. These dictionaries were especially influential because Danish was the predominant foreign language at the time.

The first dictionary of the old language specifically was Sveinbjörn Egilsson's *Lexicon poëticum* 1854-1860. This dictionary revolutionized the study of the old poetry, especially the skaldic poems. For a substantial part of the poetry, excerpts had to be extracted from manuscripts and many existing explanations proved to be unsatisfactory. The first dictionaries of Old Norse-Icelandic to include the prose were those of E. Jónsson (1863), which had almost no citations, and the first edition of Fritzner's dictionary (1862-1867), which was a rather small and imperfect work (4.5.6.4.).

In 1840, a wealthy Englishman, R. Cleasby, took the initiative in Copenhagen for a dictionary of Old

⁴⁴ For an overview, see J. Benediktsson (1969).

Icelandic and subsequently financed the project. Cleasby participated in this project until his death in 1847, but as he lacked the scholarly qualifications, the editorial work was entrusted to Konráð Gíslason, who continued the work after Cleasby's death, until 1854. At that time a draft of the manuscript for the entire alphabet was ready for publication. Work on this draft was continued in England in 1864 by Guðbrandur Vigfússon (1827-1889), who saw the dictionary to completion in 1874. Vigfússon revised and updated the earlier manuscript, adding a number of more recent words as well as etymological information. Although the individual contribution of the editors remains to be determined, it is clear that Cleasby's scholarly role was insignificant, and that Gíslason's part in the work was greater than that of Vigfússon (cf. Kristjánsson 1996). Although the translations in "Cleasby-Vigfússon" are considered to be more reliable than those of the second edition of Johan Fritzner (1886-1896), Fritzner's translations have superseded the former as the standard dictionary.

Jón Þorkelsson (4.5.1.3., 4.5.3.) published two volumes of additions to the existing Old Norse dictionaries by Fritzner and "Cleasby-Vigfússon", *Supplement til islandske ordbøger* 1-2 (Supplement to Icelandic Dictionaries, 1876, 1879-1885), but with the exception of some late citations, his additions were generally utilized in the second edition of Fritzner (1886-1896). The fourth collection (1899) concentrated on the morphology, word formation, as well as the inflection in the old language and to some extent inflection until around 1700. For the third collection, on the other hand, Þorkelsson mostly took excerpts from contemporary publications and from numerous works of the late eighteenth century. The citations of this work remain valuable even after the publication of Sigfús Blöndal (1920-1924), cf. 5.6.7.3.

4.5.6.4. Norwegian

The foundation of modern Norwegian lexicography is Ivar Aasen's monumental dictionary of Norwegian dialect words (1850, 1873). This high-quality dictionary was a prerequisite for establishing the new literary standard *landsmål* and is famous for its precise definitions. This, as well as other aspects of the dictionary, is partly due to influence from Molbech's lexicographic groundwork (4.5.6.1.). Aasen's compilation contains information on where the words are used and is consequently valuable for diachronic studies as well as for language planning. Ross's dictionary of 1895 is labeled as an appendix to Aasen's dictionary, but in reality it is a new work containing about 40,000 entries that are not included in Aasen's dictionary. The author, Hans Mathias Elisæus Ross (cf. 4.5.1.4), received his degree in theology, but the help of a scholarship from the Norwegian Parliament enabled him to work his entire life gathering dialect material.

Another pastor, Johan Fritzner (1812-1893), worked on a dictionary of Old Norse from 1862 to 1867, which appeared in a second and significantly enlarged edition that was printed from 1886-1896. This second edition had a lasting influence as the standard dictionary of Old Norse. Fritzner was a pastor in a Sámi area of Finnmark and also published studies on Sámi religion and language (Fritzner 1846).

4.5.6.5. Sámi

Two extensive dictionaries of Sámi appeared in Norway in the nineteenth century. Nils Vibe Stockfleth produced a Norwegian-Sámi dictionary in 1852, and Jens Andreas Friis compiled a Sámi-Latin-Norwegian dictionary in 1887. Friis's work contained a short introduction and a sketch of the phonology and morphology in Norwegian and German.

4.5.6.6. Swedish —

The Dictionary of the Swedish Academy, which had been discussed since the Academy was founded in 1786, began to print sections of the first volume in 1892. Various members of the Academy had made several attempts at writing dictionary entries themselves, but with little success, and at the end of the century, the work was placed in the hands of a professional editorial staff. The first volumes are detailed and interesting, but in 1916, after six thick volumes had been published, not even the letter *d* was complete.

Work on the dictionary was temporarily interrupted after a few decades, since it was impossible to see an end to the project, but after Ebbe Tuneld (1877-1945) reorganized the project, the editorial process became more effective, the work picked up speed and has now (1998) reached the letter *t*. This dictionary project has played a significant role in the development of Swedish philology and linguistics, and many Swedish scholars have spent several years on the editorial staff of the dictionary, thus causing Swedish linguists take a special interest in the methods and problems of lexicography, cf. Sigurd (1986).

Many other important lexicons were written in Sweden in the nineteenth century. An unfinished attempt at a Swedish dictionary was made by Carl Johan Love Almqvist (4.5.2.7.) in 1842. Only the first volume of Almqvist's dictionary ever appeared in print. It covers the subsection *A - Brand* in 624 pages, which indicates the planned size of the work. Almqvist includes dialect words, colloquial forms as well as many loan words from other languages. Almqvist listed the dialectal origin or source of borrowing for each word, as well as its stylistic level and pronunciation. For the latter, a standard orthography is used, with the addition of diacritics and other indications of stress, tone, and quantity. In Almqvist's dictionary, word meaning is explicated mainly by semantically-related words in Swedish (partly synonyms) but sometimes also by longer, but not necessarily precise circumlocutions.

The first scholar to compile a complete dictionary of Swedish that actually reached publication was Anders Fredrik Dalin (1806-1873). Dalin worked most of his life as a lexicographer, partly for the dictionary project of the Swedish Academy. But seeing the need for a dictionary and recognizing the long-term prospects of the dictionary of the Academy, he decided to publish his own dictionary. Dalin's dictionary (1850-1853) consists of two volumes encompassing 1,668 pages. It contains no etymologies and a very limited number of dialect words, concentrating on the standard language. Dalin's dictionary is characterized by good, extensive semantic definitions and is an invaluable source of knowledge concerning the Swedish language around the year 1850.

Two other important dictionaries were Rietz's dialect dictionary (1867) and Söderwall's (1884-1918) dictionary of medieval Swedish. Knut Söderwall (4.5.1.5) was head of the dictionary of the Swedish Academy from 1892 to 1912. He established the editorial principles and got the project off the ground.

The publication of the wordlist of the Swedish Academy (*Svenska Akademiens Ordlista över svenska språket*, SAOL) in 1874 was important, because it established orthographic and morphological norms based on usage. The different wordlist editions reflect the latest development of the vocabulary, inflection, and to some extent the pronunciation of Swedish. The editions also reflect the views of the respective editors and are thus a mirror of the linguistics of the time. The first edition was strongly influenced by Rydqvist (4.5.3.3.), whereas Tegnér's (4.3.) ideas had more impact in subsequent editions. The production of a new edition of SAOL is an important undertaking in Sweden, and it is always reviewed with great interest and critical acclaim.

4.5.7. Runology

The runic alphabets had been studied by the Swedish comparativists of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries (3.7.), and the discussion which they began was continued enthusiastically by the linguistic scholars of the nineteenth century.

The study of the runes and their origin, as well as the interpretation and dating of the various runic

inscriptions, was of interest from three points of view. In the light of national romanticism, the runic inscriptions were monuments of national pride, to be studied as important sources of national history. Second, in academic circles, where historical-comparative linguistics was in the foreground, there was increased interest in the old writing systems as sources of knowledge for Indo-European and other languages. Finally, and most importantly, runic texts provided older and hence more valuable historical data than texts written in the Latin alphabet.

The first serious contribution to the study of runology in the nineteenth century was Jakob Hornemann Bredsdorff's (4.4.1.) work on the origin of the runic alphabet (1822). Bredsdorff assumed that the runic alphabet was derived from Wulfila's Gothic alphabet which, in turn, he assumed to be a mixture of the Greek and the Latin alphabets. Bredsdorff was the first scholar to arrive at a relatively correct reading of the inscription on the famous drinking horns called "the golden horns", and he was also the first to point out that the shorter runic alphabet, which was comprised of only sixteen runes, had to be younger than the longer alphabet of twenty four runes (1828).

An introduction to the study of the runes, which covered their origin, interpretation, and the grammar of the language of the runic inscriptions, was published by P. A. Munch (1848c).

Theories of the origin of the runes were much debated, particularly during the latter part of the nineteenth and the beginning of the twentieth century, and the topic was one of general interest in Denmark, Norway, and Sweden, and peripherally in Finland as well. Three main questions occupied scholars in this area: 1) From which alphabet was the runic alphabet derived? 2) Where and by which Germanic tribe were the runes created? 3) When did the runes originate?

Two different theories were proposed initially as an answer to the first question, to which a third was added in the next century (Marstrander 1928), cf. 5.6.5. According to the Latin theory, proposed by the Danish runologist Ludvig Wimmer (4.5.1.1.), the runes were derived from an adaptation of the Latin alphabet. In support of his theory, Wimmer argued (1874a, 1887) that the oldest area in which the runic monuments are found corresponds to the area of Roman cultural influence. Furthermore, Wimmer maintained that there is an obvious resemblance between the letters of the Latin alphabet and the runes, particularly the runes for *f*, *r*, *b*, and *m*. As to the order of those letters and the names of the runes that deviate from both the Latin and the Greek names for the letters of the alphabet, Wimmer suggested that the names of the runes were based on the names of letters which the Goths had heard from the Christian Armenian and Galatian prisoners they had taken during their campaign to Lesser Asia in the year 267. According to Wimmer, similar names were found in Armenian and Georgian.

The Norwegian runologist Sophus Bugge (4.4.1.) attended the Fifth Meeting of Scandinavian Philologists in Christiania (1898), where he argued that the runes were developed by the Goths in South-Eastern Europe on the basis of both Greek and Latin alphabets. He repeated this line of argument in the introduction to his edition of the Norwegian runic inscriptions (1891-1924). Otto von Friesen (1907) agreed with Bugge and found further support in archeological evidence. A Germanic, mainly Gothic, culture had developed from 100 AD on the Northern and Western banks of the Black Sea. From this area, impulses streamed northwards and westwards towards the Baltic and the regions where the first runic inscriptions were found. Thus it seemed reasonable to assume that the runic alphabet belonged to Gothic culture. In supporting their theories, the comparative philologists were willing to take into account evidence from the emerging science of archeology.

National projects for the publication of runic inscriptions in several of the Nordic countries began at the end of the nineteenth century. Sophus Bugge began the publication of the Norwegian inscriptions in the older futhark in 1891, but after his eyesight began to fail he was assisted by Magnus Olsen. Bugge's original plan was to publish all the Norwegian runic inscriptions in two separate series, one for the older futhark and one for the inscriptions written in the later runic alphabets. He did not complete the project before his death, but it was continued in the following century by Olsen.

After ten years of collecting notes and making molds of the Danish inscriptions, Wimmer published

the Danish inscriptions in four volumes 1893-1908, including drawings made by Magnus Petersen. This work was not only significant because of its precise reproductions, descriptions, and transcriptions, but also because it provided interpretations based on Wimmer's historical knowledge and the comparative method. Although more advanced techniques have later made it possible to reinterpret some of Wimmer's results, most of his interpretations are still accepted today. His chronology, however, has sometimes been questioned.

With more than 2,000 inscriptions, most of them in Uppland, Swedish scholars also took an early interest in the runes. Swedish runology built on the early work of Johannes Bureus (cf. 3.4.1.6.). R. Dybeck published a selection of pictures with texts in *Sverikes Runurkunder* (Swedish Runic Inscriptions, 1860-1876). These rune inscriptions were to play a new role, due to the influence of historical linguistics by the end of the nineteenth century, as the runes could shed light on the phonological system of Old Norse and be called on as evidence of phonological processes such as syncope, Umlaut, breaking, and their respective chronology. Erik Brate (1857-1924) was interested in the literary aspect of the runic inscriptions. He was a productive runologist and published several volumes in the series Swedish Runic Inscriptions, for example an extensive volume on runic inscriptions from Öland in collaboration with Sven Söderberg (Söderberg and Brate 1900-1906).

4.6. Other Indo-European Languages

4.6.1. Latin and Greek

At the beginning of the nineteenth century, Latin and Greek were the two main school languages, and Latin was still the language used in university lectures, dissertations, and scholarly publications aimed at an international audience, even if the oral educational use of the vernaculars had started in the late 1700s. This had basically been the position of Latin and Greek since the latter part of the sixteenth century. But at the end of the nineteenth century, the picture had completely changed. Neither Latin nor Greek were mandatory in the high schools, Latin was no longer the language of science and university lectures, and both languages had to compete in both the high schools and the universities not only with the national languages, but also with modern European languages like German, French, and English. Nevertheless, the changed status of Greek and Latin had no discernible effect on linguistic research in these two languages, which was dictated by different factors.

The amount and quality of Latin scholarship at many Nordic universities was not overwhelming prior to the changes described above. This lack of scholarship could be attributed to one simple reason: most early professors of Latin were in reality professors of rhetoric (eloquence) and Roman literature, others were language masters, whose main responsibility was to check and develop the oral and written skills of the students (3.2. and 3.3.1.).

After 1800, school grammars of Greek and Latin changed in scope and quality. Their approach became more pedagogical and theoretical, and the syntax in particular was more structured. A good example of this new type of grammar of the classical languages is C. Dahl's Greek grammar of 1814 (390 pages), which was based, although not uncritically, on the publications of the German scholar Johann Georg Trendelenburg. One major aspect of Trendelenburg's ideas is his complete reanalysis of the Greek verbal system. A number of different verbal forms -- medium and passive forms of the same verb -- are analyzed as optional variants of each other and thus excluded from the paradigms, i.e. Trendelenburg maintains that there is no medium in Greek. Furthermore, he argues that the aorist and (in part) the future are eliminated and considered as variants of the past or present respectively. His purpose is to establish a system where students of Greek who know only three forms of a verb can nevertheless derive all the other forms by means of rules.

Dahl argues that his grammar is much simpler when compared to the traditional Greek grammars, which operate with three genders and six or even eight tenses. His paradigms consist for the most part only of suffixes, and they are accompanied by rules for deriving one verb form from another. Because Dahl operated only with inflectional suffixes, it was possible for him to reduce the number of declensions and conjugations, but at the cost of complicated morphophonological rules which had to be learned. The grammar can be compared to a modern generative description of Greek morphology, which would probably not be used today as a textbook for beginners.

Another example of these pedagogical and comprehensive grammars of classical languages is the German scholar Bröder's grammar of Latin, which was translated into Danish in 1801 by Georg Sverdrup (Brøder 1801). Sverdrup later became a professor of Greek and Latin in Christiania. His grammar attempts to be pedagogical, with "interesting" examples that are organized in progression from the fairly easy to the more difficult. According to the author, this work is also complete (648 pages), at least in its syntax. In reality, however, Sverdrup did little more than translate Bröder's grammar.

The contribution of another Norwegian, Søren Bruun Bugge (1798-1886), to Latin grammar was more original and influential, although he too based his grammars on German sources. Bugge was a theologian by education and became a pastor in the parish of Gran in 1847. Yet Bugge also studied philology and was the first to take a university degree in philology at the new University of Christiania in 1820. From 1833 to 1847, Bugge served as the Rector of the Cathedral School in Christiania, and this is when he published his two grammars of Latin (Søren B. Bugge 1835a,b). His grammars are completely synchronic, with no reference to other Indo-European languages or to other types of Latin than classical Ciceronian Latin. The more extensive grammar is 562 pages with the morphology constituting 106 pages, the syntax 424 pages, and the metrics 32 pages. This increased emphasis on syntax is also found in the school grammars of the other main languages taught at this time, Greek and Hebrew. But the sections on syntax were never as extensive in the Greek and Hebrew textbooks as they were in Latin. Nevertheless, syntax replaced morphology as the main topic in nineteenth century textbooks. One can have doubts as to whether this was also the case in the classroom.

Bugge's grammars were influential in Norway and probably a main resource of grammatical knowledge for many Norwegians at that time. But these grammars were short-lived, because in 1841 the Danish scholar Johan Nicolai Madvig (4.3) published the most successful Latin grammar since Antiquity. Madvig's *Latinsk Sproglære til Skolebrug* (Latin Grammar for Use in Schools, 1841a) became the main Latin grammar of Europe in the nineteenth century. Evidence for this is found in the translations and reprints found in the Royal Library in Copenhagen, a list which is hardly complete:

Danish	1841, 1844, 1852, 1862, 1867, 1878, 1882, 1889, 1897
German	1844, 1847, 1857, 1867, 1868, 1877
English	1849, 1859
Modern Greek	1849
Dutch	1858, 1876
Russian	1867
Italian	1869, 1870, 1880
French	1870
Portuguese	1872

This 488-page grammar molded a whole generation of students, influencing their view of grammar as well as all subsequent Latin grammars. Thanks to his knowledge of all the minute details of Latin manuscripts, Madvig was able to correct and supplement early grammars, especially their morphological analyses. His syntax was more traditional. He analyzed Latin synchronically and also described it on its own terms. He rejected, for example, a general syntactic framework based on logic for describing Latin syntax. As a result, Madvig was obliged to publish an explanation (1841b) for both teachers and colleagues of why

the grammar was arranged as it was and of how to use it.

Madvig's main goal was to make his grammar descriptively adequate, meaning that all details should be included and that his generalization about a certain form or structure should cover all uses. An example of how everything is included meticulously to cover every detail and his attempt at precision can be seen in the following:

Just as in the example *magno comitatu* [”with a great suite”] the ablative of means is often used concerning the force with which something is undertaken in war. (Madvig 1841a:257)

Madvig's (1846) Greek syntax was a similar success. Based on the same model as his Latin syntax, he stressed the pedagogical advantage of having the same structure and terminology in the description of both languages, while at the same time stressing that each language should be described on its own terms (Madvig 1846:iii).

Madvig's Latin grammar (1841a) was not an easy book for the pupils to comprehend, and it also created problems for the teachers. But Madvig's prestige as a scholar and politician lent it support. A number of competing Latin grammars were published, however, trying to offer an easier approach by being more pedagogical or being based on a different theoretical foundation. Two examples are the Latin grammars published in Norway in 1871. E. Schreiner's elementary grammar of Latin (1871) was the one most frequently used in the Norwegian schools for almost a century, and it was also widely used elsewhere in the Nordic countries, especially in Denmark and Iceland. Pedagogically, Schreiner's book is a very successful grammar, with a clear arrangement of paradigms, while omitting less important points. The author stresses this feature in the preface, where he also questions the pedagogical nature of Madvig's grammar. As mentioned earlier, even the best pupils had problems with Madvig. But Schreiner is not merely an abridgment and pedagogical revision of Madvig (1841a). The author further points out that his views, based for the most part on the publications and lectures of professor Aubert, cf. below, also deviate from Madvig's.

While Schreiner's aim is purely pedagogical, Johan Peter Weisse's (1832-1886) Latin school grammar of 1871 is theoretically oriented. In fact, Weisse produced one of the most innovative grammars written in the Nordic countries in this period. He later became professor of Latin in Christiania in 1875. In the preface to his grammar, Weisse states that the goal of this grammar is to integrate the recent results of comparative linguistics into the description of Latin morphology at the high school level, and to base the syntactic description on form and not on the logically based approach of K. F. Becker (cf. 4.3.). Weisse continues:

One should, I believe, be in agreement that the formal approach is the only justified one and that the logical approach, which assumes an identity of logic and grammar, is false, but it seems to me that this view is far from generally accepted among us. (Weisse 1871:iii)

The reference to Becker is puzzling, since no Latin syntax or grammar used in the Nordic countries was based on his research. Becker's influence was mainly limited to the national languages.

Concerning Latin grammar, Weisse says he draws heavily on Madvig and on Aubert's books and lectures. His treatment is comparative to the extent that he treats Ablaut systematically and bases the entire morphology on the concept of the root, deriving all word forms from roots. In his syntactic analysis he distinguishes systematically between syndetic and asyndetic constructions and attempts to treat syntax from both a formal external analytical and a semantically internal synthetic point of view. This is close to the system for grammatical description later advocated by Georg von der Gabelentz (1891). Although Weisse is not always successful in realizing his plan, his grammar is one of the most theoretically conscious grammars written in the Nordic countries in this period. But this landmark work never reached a second printing. The anti-comparative and anti-diachronic front established by school teachers and the old generation of classical

scholars, strengthened by Madvig's scholarly and political prestige (and sometimes effectual sarcasm), was impossible for any school grammar to penetrate with success.

In spite of Madvig's position and very anti-comparative attitudes (cf. 4.3.), comparative linguistics gained a stronghold in the departments of classical philology in the Nordic countries. The first classicist to seriously take up comparative linguistics was the Norwegian Ludvig Cæsar Martin Aubert. Aubert became professor of Latin in Christiania in 1840 and held this position for thirty five years, thus educating a whole generation of Norwegian philologists. In addition to his traditional philological studies, Aubert's linguistic work falls into two categories (cf. Hertzberg and Hovdhaugen 1979). In his grammatical study (1843a), he presents a strictly formal analysis of sentence connections and sentence types with special regard to Latin. One of his main assumptions is that embedded sentences must be analyzed as expansions of non-sentential phrases, and not as originally conjoined sentences. This article, which is probably the most important and original contribution by a Norwegian linguist to syntax in the nineteenth century, was overlooked in his day, as were most of his publications.

In 1843, Aubert began lecturing on Latin phonology and morphology on a comparative basis. In the same year he published his first comparative work (Aubert 1843b, cf. also Aubert 1844) where he argued that the results of comparative grammar were so important that no scholar could ignore them. Aubert further emphasized that scholars could not go on with their studies of individual Indo-European languages without taking these new approaches into account. This work by Aubert is also interesting in its criticism of Madvig and Bopp for their seeing the origin of inflectional case suffixes in independent words. In doing so, Aubert contends that they run into problems when analyzing case endings as forms of demonstratives, not taking regular sound correspondences into account. Aubert published no major works on comparative linguistics until his analysis of the Latin verbal inflection in 1875. This book, written in Norwegian, was an excellent introduction to the topic by contemporary standards, and it was favorably reviewed in Norwegian newspapers and journals. These reviews show respect for the author and express national pride in a book on comparative philology being published in Norway. But the book received no serious scholarly evaluation, and it was completely overlooked abroad.

Madvig also did not manage to keep comparative linguistics out of classical studies in Copenhagen. After 1883, students of Greek and Latin were required to complete a basic course in comparative Indo-European philology.

In Finland, a major administrative reform at the University of Helsinki was called for in 1852 by Czar Nicholas I, who wanted to modernize the university. An important aspect of this reform was to terminate the dominance of Latin as a scientific *lingua franca*. In this same connection, the title of the chair in Eloquence was changed to Roman Literature.

Edvard Brunér (1816-1871), who was professor of Latin, and later of Roman Literature beginning in 1851, is mainly known for his literary studies. He also published several unsuccessful studies of Latin grammar, cf. Heikel (1894:301-304) and produced some unenlightened comparative studies, assuming as a basic hypothesis that Latin was closely related to Aeolic Greek. In spite of this, he published a good Latin grammar, and has the honor of having initiated the Finnish research tradition on gerunds in Latin, a topic which numerous Finnish classical scholars cultivated for more than a century afterwards.

Fridolf Gustafsson (1853-1924), professor in Helsinki from 1882, studied Sanskrit, Scandinavian languages and Finnish in addition to classical languages, partly in Leipzig under Georg Curtius. In spite of these studies, he was weak in comparative linguistics (Aalto 1980:61) and mainly published insignificant philological studies. But Gustafsson did produce some interesting studies on Latin cases in a localist framework, inspired by the case system of Finnish. This localist approach to the analysis of case systems of various languages later became a typical feature of Finnish linguistics, although it was not very popular outside the Finno-Ugric languages. Gustafsson was also active in the debate on the methods and principles of language teaching that took place in Finland for several decades, starting in the 1880s.

In Sweden, the study of both Greek and Latin was philologically-oriented, with little focus placed on

linguistics during most of the nineteenth century. The change came with Einar Löfstedt (1831-1889), professor of Greek in Uppsala from 1874 to 1889, who influenced and transformed study and research with his positive attitude towards comparative linguistics. His successor was the Indo-Europeanist Olof August Danielsson (professor from 1891 to 1917, cf. 4.4.1.). A few years later, another prominent comparative linguist, Per Persson (4.4.1.), became professor of Latin in Uppsala (1895-1922). This sudden, and by European standards unique, dominance of comparative Indo-European linguistics in a classics department did not, however, lead to a specific development of classical studies in Sweden. Danielsson, and especially Persson, were also good traditional philologists, and they did not try to change the philological character of classical studies in Sweden.

After 1800, the classical curricula in the Nordic countries became more philologically oriented, with an emphasis on cultural studies. The inspiration now came from Germany, from philosophy as well as from Humboldt and the new universities and high schools, where Latin and Greek were central subjects. Madvig's greatest contributions to philological studies were his new methods for text editions. Thus most of the dissertations and most research in classical studies after 1840, as well as research on the older stages of the modern languages, was focused on text editions.

4.6.2. English, German, and French

A characteristic feature of the nineteenth century is the founding of new professorships in the major Western European languages, English, German, and French. The new professors were expected to teach both language and literature, according to the broad sense of the term *philology*, and, in the beginning, they were expected to cover either Germanic or Romance languages in general. Sometimes professors were required to teach both Germanic and Romance languages when their professorship was defined as one in modern languages.⁴⁵ Without a tradition to rely on (3.5.), and with an impossibly large field to cover, it is not surprising that many of these professors did not manage to produce much linguistic research.

Christiania

Romance and English philology 1873

Copenhagen

English 1893

German 1883

Helsinki

Germanic and Romance philology 1894 > split into two 1907

English philology 1907

Lund

modern languages 1816 > modern European languages and literatures 1878 >

divided into Romance languages and Germanic languages 1888

English 1906

Uppsala

modern European languages and literature 1855 >

Romance languages 1887 and Germanic languages 1887 (> English 1904 and German 1904)

The teaching of modern languages at the university was clearly linked to the position of these languages in the schools and the need for educating teachers, especially at the high-school level. As an illustration, the position of English in Denmark is worth mentioning. In Denmark, English became an optional subject in the elementary schools in 1814 "if the commercial contacts of the towns should indicate a

⁴⁵ The term *modern languages* has, somewhat misleadingly, evolved to refer to German, French, and English only, to the exclusion of the native languages of the Nordic countries, Russian, etc.

need for it” (Anordning for Almue-Skolevæsenet i Kiøbstederne i Danmark af 29. juli 1814). In the learned schools in Denmark and Norway, positions in English opened up as early as in 1805, but it was hard to find teachers. The status of English in Denmark increased around the year 1800, but it was not until 1903 that English became mandatory at all levels beyond the elementary school.

At the University of Copenhagen, Thomas Bruun (1750-1834) was appointed to a professorship (extraordinarius) in English in 1802. He was a respected teacher, but not a research scholar. He was mainly known for having translated some of Boccaccio’s and Fontaine’s less moral stories into Danish. This book was confiscated, he had to pay a fine, and was then required to brush up his basic knowledge of Christianity under the supervision of Bishop Balle. When Bruun died, no new professor was appointed to replace him until 1851.

The next position in English was held by George Stephens (1815-1895), who was appointed lecturer with primary focus on the older stages of the language, its literature, and runic inscriptions. His publications, particularly those concerned with the runes, were written in the discourse of romantic philology that had already become outdated by the end of the nineteenth century. They were thus severely attacked by other scholars, notably Wimmer (4.5.7.). After Stephens retired, his position was upgraded to a professorship, which was filled by Otto Jespersen.

The first professorship in modern languages in Lund was founded through a gift from Matthias Norberg (4.7.2.). As a condition for donating the money, Norberg stipulated that his sister’s son, Jonas Steckzén (1773-1835) be given the first position. This was by no means a simple matter, since Steckzén had been to sea as a ship’s captain most of his adult life. During his travels he had gained a good practical knowledge of various languages, notably English, but he had no theoretical background and was not a good teacher. Nevertheless, Steckzén was given the position in 1816, but was never properly accepted by his colleagues and was not allowed to sit in the university senate. He died a bitter man and refused to donate his considerable fortune to Lund, so in revenge, he bequeathed his wealth to the University of Uppsala.

Steckzén’s successor in 1840 was Carl August Hagberg (4.5.1.5.), who is mainly known as a translator of Shakespeare. In 1858, Hagberg moved into the new position in Scandinavian languages (4.5.1.5.). His successor in the professorship of modern languages, E. M. Olde (1802-1885) had as his main qualification a number of elementary textbooks in French and English and the merit of having been a private tutor for members of the royal family.

This chair in Lund was designated as a chair in Modern European languages and literatures in 1878, and in 1888, it was divided into Romance languages and Germanic languages. A chair in English was added in 1906.

Edvard Lidforss (1833-1910) was appointed to the chair in Modern European languages in 1878. He was a specialist in Romance languages, especially Old French, and published impressive translations and commentaries to Cervantes’s *Don Quijote* and Dante’s *Divina Commedia*. In a letter, Lidforss states that he was the first to teach phonetics in Lund, and he maintained that modern languages should be taught by native speakers and could not be handled by just one single language master. The new chair in Romance languages was given to Fredrik Wulff (1845-1930), who is best known for his collaboration with I. A. Lyttkens on the pronunciation, phonology, phonotactics, and vocabulary of Swedish (4.8.). Most of Wulff’s work was, however, in Romance philology and linguistics, making Lund a center for Romance linguistics during these years.

The University of Helsinki was slower than the other major Nordic universities in establishing the modern languages on the professorial level. However, the chair in Aesthetics and Modern Literature founded in 1852 was formally regarded as covering modern languages. An early attempt was made by August Ahlqvist in 1866 to establish chairs in Romance and Germanic philology (Aalto 1987:21-22). Helsinki emphasized Russian studies at an early date, with the first professorship being founded as early as 1828. This is easy to understand given the political situation at the time. Furthermore, the second half of the nineteenth century was the decisive phase in the struggle for promoting Finnish to its position as the

dominant national language. In 1892, the existing professorship in Finnish language and literature was split in two (Finnish language and literature, and Finno-Ugric linguistics), thus reflecting what the university considered important at this time.

During the nineteenth century few significant linguistic contributions were made in the field of modern European languages in the Nordic countries. The initiator of serious linguistic studies of Western European languages was Rasmus Rask (4.4.1.), who published a good grammar of Spanish in 1824, a short grammar of Italian in 1827, and, most importantly, a grammar and reader of Anglo-Saxon, which appeared in Stockholm in 1817 during his travels eastwards.

An impressive work for its time is Gustaf Adolf Avellan's study of the etymology of the English vocabulary and the relation of English to other languages (*Reflexioner öfver Engelska språkets upphof och bildning samt förhållande till andra Europeiska tungomål*, 1828, cf. also 4.5.2.3.). As for its subject, Avellan's dissertation was unique in Finnish nineteenth-century scholarship. His starting point was that English is a mixed language with numerous words that have been borrowed through historical contacts with other languages like Latin, French, and the Scandinavian languages. But Avellan also states that English is a Germanic language, in spite of all the Latin and Romance borrowings, because it has the Germanic articles, prepositions, conjunctions, comparative particles, etc. This Finnish author was also well aware of the relationship of English to Sanskrit and of the whole Indo-European hypothesis, referring to William Jones, Franz Bopp, and Fr. Schlegel. Avellan had read Rask's publications, and in his own dissertation he criticized some of Rask's views on language development.

In 1883, the first professorship in Germanic philology was advertised in Copenhagen. Of the five applicants, the faculty preferred Julius Hoffory (1855-1897), who had written his dissertation (1883) on the consonants in Old Norse and who had been a lecturer in phonetics and Scandinavian languages. But Hoffory was judged to be unacceptable politically, since he had mocked church prayer at a student meeting ten years earlier. As a consequence, the professorship was given to Herman Møller (1850-1923). Hoffory later became a professor in Berlin. Although Hoffory's interests were mainly in literature, he kept in touch with Scandinavian linguists. Both through his lectures and his private conversations he had a stimulating effect on other linguists. (O. Jespersen 1938:61-62). Jespersen had a very high opinion of Hoffory as a scholar and even called him a genius. Hoffory was also in close contact with Henrik Ibsen and promoted Ibsen's position in Germany. In fact, Hoffory also proudly claimed that he was the model for the character Eilert Løvborg in Ibsen's play *Hedda Gabler*.

Herman Møller was uninterested in modern languages and literature and only lectured on texts prior to 1600. His interest in linguistics began in his youth with Frisian, and his life-long project was to write a Frisian grammar (which never appeared). Instead, Møller published a number of important studies on comparative Germanic phonology and morphology, beginning with his dissertation in Leipzig published in 1875. But Møller's main contribution to linguistics is his much discussed and controversial work on the relationship between Semitic and Indo-European (Møller 1906, 1909, 1911) where he assumed that these two language families were genetically related.

The first professor in the chair in English and German in Uppsala was Axel Erdmann (1845-1926). Although he was an Indo-Europeanist who had mainly investigated older stages of English, he is primarily known for concentrating his teaching and the curriculum on the modern languages and on topics of immediate relevance to the future teachers of English. Erdmann was explicit in his views. In his curriculum for English and German in Uppsala (Erdmann 1891), he actually eliminated the diachronic aspect.

The course of study should, as a university syllabus, have a scientific character. Since until now there has been a tendency to regard only diachronic linguistics as scientific, we must provide an explanation when we put the main stress on the study of the modern language. (Erdmann 1891:19)

It is not so, as we have been prone to think, that only the occupation with older stages of a language — the older the better — makes a study scientific. Contemporary language, in all its facets, from the highest to the lowest, can just as well be the

subject of scientific research as the language of past ages. (Erdmann 1891:20)

In Norway, a professorship in French was established as early as 1816 for Mathurin René Orry (?1760-?1825). Orry had no academic background whatsoever. His qualifications were based on his status as a native speaker of French, but by profession he was a cloth and lace salesman. It was to Orry's credit, however, that he had gone to the same school as King Carl XIV Johan (Jean-Baptiste Jules Bernadotte) in Pau in France, and his professorship was in all probability due to the personal intervention of the king, since the university senate opposed it. Orry's successor was John Andreas Messell (1789-1850), who had been a lecturer at the university since 1822 in English and Italian, and later also in French. In 1834, he became a professor of the same three languages. Messell had traveled extensively in Europe and published a few elementary textbooks later in life. The next professor in Germanic and Romance languages was Carl Richard Unger (1817-1897), a philologist and specialist in Old Norse. But Unger was not highly competent in all the topics covered by his position. Johan Storm (1836-1920), who became a professor in 1873, was the first to introduce study and research in modern languages, mainly English, to the university curricula. Storm was also the first to lecture on phonetics in Norway, and he was instrumental in modernizing the curriculum by placing emphasis on the modern spoken language (4.3., 4.8.).

A linguist who is difficult to classify is the Swedish scholar Hjalmar Edgren (1840-1903). Edgren led a wandering and, in many respects, unacademic life. He began as an officer, took part as a volunteer in the American Civil War, functioned as a teacher of English and French at various American colleges and universities and studied Sanskrit extensively (4.6.3.). Edgren held several professorships in both the United States and Sweden. When the University College (Swed. *högskola*) of Gothenburg was founded, Edgren became professor of modern European languages in 1890. From 1891 to 1893 he was the Rector of the university, a position that suited him well, since he was a good administrator. His scholarly work consists primarily of pedagogical contributions and several grammars of English, French, Spanish, and Sanskrit.

At the end of the nineteenth century, the modern languages had become more mature as fields of research. At this time several linguists who were to put their mark on Nordic and international linguistics in the twentieth century published their first writings or were appointed to their first positions. A prominent example is Otto Jespersen (1860-1943), who was appointed professor of English in Copenhagen in 1893 (cf. 5.3.3.).

Chronologically, the Danish Romance linguist Kristoffer Nyrop belongs to both the nineteenth and the twentieth centuries, but his approach remains more characteristic of the nineteenth century. Nyrop, who had studied under Vilhelm Thomsen, received his degree in Romance philology in 1879 and his doctorate in 1886 with a comparative-historical study of the gender inflection of Romance adjectives (1886). He later became a lecturer in French in 1888 and a professor of Romance philology in 1894. In addition to his interest in diachronic lexical semantics (e.g. 1882, 1901) he published articles on numerous literary and linguistic subjects. His major work is a monumental historical French grammar (1899-1930) in six volumes in which he codified the results of nineteenth century linguistics (5.7.1.).

Although Uno Lindelöf (1868-1944), the professor of English Philology in Helsinki from 1907 to 1936, lived well into the middle of the twentieth century, his work also belongs primarily to the nineteenth century. All his influential publications were published before 1900, among them his dissertation of 1890. His history of English was published in 1895 and republished in 1911, as well as several editions in English and German. This work was outstanding at the time for its pedagogically useful survey based on the wave theory of J. Schmidt. Lindelöf's historical study was up-to-date with linguistic research in all respects, which proved to be a reason for criticism by some reviewers who thought it would be too difficult for the students. Lindelöf published extensively on Old English philology and dialectology, especially on Northumbrian. In his paper of 1892, he analyzed OE strong verbs, noting that they form a psychologically strong and homogeneous group kept together by systemic pressure. He also wrote a number of articles on various aspects of English orthography and grammar and on language typology and the original homeland of the

Indo-Europeans. Together with Joh. Öhquist, Lindelöf wrote an elementary German grammar (Lindelöf and Öhquist 1899a,b) that was reprinted several times in both Finnish and Swedish and was the standard grammar of German in Finland for almost fifty years.

Werner Söderhjelm (1859-1931) was one of Finland's first philologists in modern languages. He received his doctorate in 1884, and in 1898 he became professor of Germanic and Romance philology. Söderhjelm had taken the initiative when the Club (from 1891 La Société) Néophilologique (Finn. *Uusfilologinen yhdistys*) was founded in Helsinki in 1887. He was mainly interested in older French literature and published several text editions. Söderhjelm also published a few linguistically significant papers, for example a study on stress shift in the Old French third person plural (1895), where he showed that the triggering factor was analogy from the first person plural.

4.6.3. Indo-Iranian Languages

The growth of Sanskrit studies in the nineteenth century was as significant as the success of historical-comparative linguistics. Before 1800, no European university had a chair in Sanskrit, and by the end of the century, most European universities of any standard and ambition had a chair or at least offered courses in Sanskrit. At the university level, research in Sanskrit philology attained the same level of methodology and prestige as classical philology.

The founder of a scientific approach to Sanskrit philology in Europe was a Norwegian, Christian Lassen (1800-1876), who was born in Bergen and became professor of Sanskrit in Bonn from 1830 to 1868. Lassen was not only the founder of Sanskrit philology in Germany, he also published a number of significant linguistic studies, including the first introduction to the study of Pali in Europe and studies on the decipherment of the Old Persian inscriptions. The Norwegian linguist lived in Germany from the age of nineteen and had little, if any, contact with Norway after that time.

Christopher Andreas Holmboe (4.4.1.) studied Arabic and Persian under Silvestre de Sacy. Holmboe was the first to occupy the professorship in Oriental languages in Christiania from 1825 until his retirement in 1876. The faculty eagerly awaited the establishment of this professorship for some time, and the position was felt to be necessary for both scholarly and prestigious reasons. But it took time to persuade the parliament to give funding as it was a time when the new Norwegian state had severe economic problems.

Holmboe was a prolific writer whose range and scope of scholarship was unusually broad for this time. Holmboe covered not only Oriental languages, literature, and religion, but he also published a number of comparative studies of Sanskrit and Old Norse, Celtic and Norwegian (1846, 1848, 1854), as well as many studies of a more general nature concerning phonetic alphabets. In addition, he wrote a review of a Sámi grammar (Holmboe 1843) and the preface to a grammar of the Zulu language (Schreuder 1850). But Holmboe's contributions to Oriental studies were insignificant, cf. Hertzberg and Hovdhaugen (1979:186-188).

In Denmark, Rasmus Rask (4.4.1.) was professor of Oriental languages for one year (1831-1832), but he did not teach Sanskrit. Carl Theodor Johannsen (1804-1840) became professor after Rask and was the first teacher of Sanskrit in Copenhagen. Johannsen was not an important scholar, however. He published little and died young.

Niels Ludvig Westergaard (1815-1878) was a pupil of Lassen and professor of Indian and Oriental languages in Copenhagen from 1845. His classification of verbal roots in Sanskrit (1840-1841) was a giant step forward in the analysis of the Sanskrit verb and provided the cornerstone for Böthlingk and Roth's great Sanskrit dictionary (1853-1875). On a research trip to India and Iran in 1841-1844, Westergaard collected a number of valuable Pahlavi manuscripts and studied Old Persian cuneiform inscriptions. He made internationally recognized contributions to the decipherment of the cuneiform inscriptions and the various languages they were written in, as well as to the study of Pali texts. Since Westergaard published several of his important studies in Danish and/or in Denmark, some of his ideas did not receive the attention they

deserved.

A special Danish tradition is the focus on the edition of Pali texts, owing partly to the Pali manuscripts which were brought back by Rask and Westergaard from India and Sri Lanka, and the compilation of a comprehensive dictionary of this important middle Indian language.

The Swede Hjalmar Edgren (4.6.2.) studied Sanskrit with the famous American Sanskrit scholar, William Dwight Whitney. When Whitney needed a part-time substitute to fill his professorship, Edgren stepped in and later collaborated with Whitney. Edgren (1883) then published an extensive and very pedagogical synchronic grammar of Sanskrit, the only Sanskrit grammar published in Swedish. This grammar was later translated into English, but, as the author admits, it is not very original and is largely based on the content and structure of Whitney's great *Sanskrit Grammar* (1879).

An internationally acclaimed contribution to Indo-Iranian studies is the work on Ossete by the Finnish scholar Anders Johan Sjögren, who is known primarily as a Finno-Ugric scholar (cf. 4.4.2.). His Ossete grammar and dictionary of 1844 brought him well-deserved international recognition and is based on fieldwork which Sjögren carried out when he came to the Caucasus in 1835 for medical treatment. Once there, he soon got very involved in the language and the people, and subsequently wrote the grammar when he returned to Finland, not only for the use of adults, Russian teachers, officials, and officers who wanted to learn the language, but also in the hope that Ossete children themselves would benefit from it, since it laid the foundation of Ossete as a school language and a written language (Sjögren 1844:ix-xi.). For this reason Sjögren felt that it was important to create a good orthography. He adhered to the principle that there should be one separate letter for each sound, always having the same referent, in clear opposition to most European languages (Sjögren 1844:xix-xx). By basing his alphabet on the Russian Cyrillic alphabet and by adding some letters from the Greek and Latin alphabets, Sjögren managed to solve the orthography problem very well.

Sjögren's grammar contains a thorough phonological section with very accurate phonetic descriptions of the articulation of Ossete sounds, based on a surprisingly good insight into articulatory phonetics. The phonology section is followed by an orderly word and paradigm morphology and a syntax of 146 pages, which gives a good treatment of most aspects of the syntax. The entire grammar is based on the pattern of Latin grammar, but this is not very disturbing, since Ossete is an Indo-European language. The author is apparently not completely bound by this pattern either, and can transgress it when the structure of Ossete makes it necessary or advisable. With his Finnish background, Sjögren was well equipped to handle the rich set of local cases in Ossete.

Sjögren's analysis of the Ossete vowels (1848) is a systematic comparative study which reveals the author's extensive knowledge. Yet Sjögren's fundamental hypothesis is incorrect, namely the assumption that Ossete is an independent Indo-European language, and not an Iranian language.

In the nineteenth century, it was common for professors of Oriental languages to know Arabic, Turkish, and Persian, and a knowledge of Modern Persian was to some extent considered fashionable. Gabriel Geitlin's Persian grammar 1845, which is thorough but hardly very original, is an example of this interest. The author apparently has a good knowledge of most of the existing grammars of the language. He based his grammar on the Latin model with six cases, etc. Geitlin was lecturer in Russian 1824-1835, and professor of Oriental languages in Helsinki from 1835, cf. also 4.6.4. He began publishing his grammar in 1839 in the form of small dissertations by his pupils. This work received favorable mention from German contemporaries (Aalto 1971:36).

Finland has a strong, and in the Nordic countries unique, tradition in Gypsy (Romani) studies, including the study of the Gypsy language, cf. Aalto (1971:81-82). This tradition can be traced to the eighteenth century, when most scholars were amateurs, with no connection to the universities. This also applies to the excellent natural scientist Arthur Thesleff (1871-1920), who published an important Gypsy dictionary (Thesleff 1901), but who never held a university position, nor for that matter, a university degree. Thesleff's book also contains references to other Gypsy languages, etymologies, and at the end, paradigms

of nouns and verbs. Thesleff published extensively on the gypsies in both Sweden and England.

4.6.4. Slavic Languages

Before 1800, there were no chairs, and not even a language master, in any of the Slavic languages in the Nordic countries.

From 1808 to 1809, after Russia had taken over control of Finland, the Academy of Turku/Åbo immediately rose in status to a more important position than it had enjoyed under Swedish reign. From the Russian point of view, the Academy was of prime importance for educating officials who could strengthen the ties between Finland and the central government in St. Petersburg. For this reason, Czar Alexander I wanted to develop good relations with the Academy. On June 8, 1808, barely three months after Turku/Åbo had been seized by Russian troops, the Czar issued a manifesto declaring his wish to develop the Academy. This eventually led to a doubling of the Academy budget in 1811 (Klinge et al. 1989:9-14,28). For example, the Professorship of Holy Languages (Hebrew and Greek) was divided into two posts, Oriental literature and Greek in 1811, and instruction in Russian was also added the same year. For obvious reasons, the central government was interested in promoting Russian studies, especially for the purpose of obtaining competent and loyal officials.

The first Finnish teacher of Russian was Erik Gustaf Ehrström (1791-1835). In 1812, he and Carl Gustaf Ottelin were the first Finns to obtain scholarships to study Russian in Moscow. When Napoleon approached Moscow, the university was evacuated to Nišnij Novgorod, and from here the Finns were permitted to return home in 1813 (Aalto 1987:129). Ehrström and Ottelin wrote an elementary Russian grammar in Swedish (1814) that was used for decades. Ehrström was appointed lecturer of Russian language and literature in 1816 after having defended an unsuccessful thesis on the text of the peace treaty between Russia and Sweden in 1661. He was also one of the activists behind the pioneering petition of 1821, where 222 students argued for making Finnish an academic subject.

Ehrström left the university in 1824, became a vicar, and was succeeded as a lecturer of Russian by Gabriel Geitlin (4.6.3.). Geitlin had produced two superficial theses on Russian, treating the relations between tense and aspect (Aalto 1987:132). He also compiled a good Russian-Swedish dictionary (1833-1834) of over 800 pages (the introduction is full of unstructured etymological ideas, assuming that a number of Russian words originated from Finnish).

In 1828, in connection with the university's move to Helsinki, a position as professor extraordinarius of Russian was founded, the first such post in modern languages in Finland and the first professorship of Russian in the Nordic countries. Geitlin would have been the obvious candidate for the position, but the Russian authorities wanted a native Russian and appointed Sergej Solov'ev in 1830, who remained in this position until 1843. Solov'ev had no scientific production whatsoever (Kolari 1985:7). Geitlin decided to concentrate on Oriental studies and held the Oriental chair between 1835 and 1849.

In 1841, a full professorship of Russian history, statistics, language and literature was established in Helsinki. Thus, there were now two professors of Russian alongside those of Eloquence (Latin), Oriental literature, and Greek. The first to occupy the new chair was Jacob Grot (1812-1893), who was born in St. Petersburg of German origin. Grot published textbooks both on Russian language and Russian history, as well as a few papers on philological problems and the history of Russian literature.

In 1828, the University of Helsinki and just two other institutions in all of Russia were awarded the privilege of obtaining a free copy of every publication in the vast empire. This privilege, in force until 1917, laid the foundation of a copious Slavic collection with which Grot established a Russian library. This library, now called the Slavic Library of the University of Helsinki, is unique in the West.

In 1853, Grot was appointed professor in St. Petersburg and the tutor for the imperial Princess. In the Academy of Sciences Grot took the initiative to publish a large dictionary of Russian (1873), which became the standard dictionary until 1917. Accordingly, Grot's orthographic principles were dominant in

Russia for more than forty years, and the Russians used to say that they were writing “according to Grot”. Most other scholars who were engaged in Russian studies in Helsinki were working on literature.

The first great Finnish scholar of Slavic was Jooseppi Julius Mikkola (1866-1946), who was a personal friend of Thomsen and Setälä. Mikkola was educated in Helsinki in Sanskrit and comparative linguistics, Finnish language and literature, Swedish language and literature and he studied Indo-European comparative linguistics in Uppsala under Noreen, Danielsson, and Lundell. After receiving his degree in Sanskrit and comparative philology, Mikkola began his Slavic studies, his main interest being the contact between Russian and Finnish, cf. Mikkola (1894), which is a revised version of his thesis. This work, which relies on Thomsen (1869, 1890), treats Slavic loans in Finnic languages, with results that have retained their relevance to the present day.

In 1896, Mikkola went to Pomerania to do fieldwork on a minor Kashubian dialect, referred to as Slovinzian by its speakers. Mikkola collected texts and published a dialectological study (1897), paying particular attention to accentuation and the history of the vowels. This study was particularly timely and remains valuable because the last speakers of Slovinzian died during World War I. Mikkola continued and expanded these studies, and in 1899 he published a monograph on accentuation and quantity in West Slavic languages (Aalto 1987:162). In 1900 he was appointed professor extraordinarius of Slavic philology in Helsinki. His publications mainly belong to the twentieth century (5.5.2.).

The founder of Slavic studies in Denmark was Casper Wilhelm Smith (1811-1881), who studied Polish and other Slavic and Baltic languages abroad. In 1845 Smith published the first grammar of a Slavic language written by a Dane (second edition 1864), which was a synchronic grammar of Polish that contained careful observations of the structural features of the language. Smith worked for a while teaching Danish, but he was encouraged to write a dissertation because the university wanted Slavic and Baltic languages represented. He took leave from his school work to finish his thesis (C. W. Smith 1857-1859), which is a comparative study of aspects of Baltic-Slavic phonology and morphology (case inflection and pronouns). The dissertation could not be evaluated in Denmark, so it was necessary to get written testimonies from foreign scholars to get the work accepted. Smith later became lecturer in Slavic languages and literature in 1859 and was awarded a professorship in 1865.

Among Smith’s pupils were Vilhelm Thomsen (cf. 4.4.1.) and Karl Verner. Karl Verner (1846-1896) began studying classical philology and Sanskrit, but Smith got him interested in Slavic studies. From 1871 to 1875 Verner stayed in St. Petersburg and Moscow where he studied several Slavic and Baltic languages. In 1883, he became Smith’s successor, but published very little in Slavic studies (and in general) and made his fame in comparative Indo-European linguistics (cf. 4.4.1.). His 1903 publication contains all his writings in print, as well as an extensive selection of his letters to leading contemporary linguists. In fact, these letters contain the bulk of Verner’s linguistic production.

The professorship of Slavic languages in Uppsala was established in 1890. The first to hold this position was the well-known phonetician, dialectologist, and self-taught Slavic scholar, Johan August Lundell (1851-1940; 4.5.5.4., 4.8.). Lundell published a Russian textbook, but little else on Slavic (Lundell 1890). He educated the first group of Slavic scholars in Sweden, among them Sigurd Agrell (1881-1937) and Richard Ekblom (1874-1959), who later put Sweden on the international map of Slavic studies (cf. 5.7.4.).

Although Sweden became the center of Slavic studies in the Nordic countries in the twentieth century, the internationally best known Nordic scholar in the field was the Norwegian Olaf Broch (1867-1961). Most of Broch’s scholarly work belongs to the twentieth century, but as early as 1895, he submitted his work *Zum kleinrussischen im Ungarn* for the doctoral degree. Both the faculty and the government found his topic too exotic, however, and they turned down a request to call in an expert from abroad (Vilhelm Thomsen) to evaluate the dissertation. However, Broch became lecturer in Slavic languages in Christiania 1896, and in 1900 he was appointed to the new professorship in Slavic languages.

4.7. Non-Indo-European Languages

The nineteenth century was characterized by an increase in language chairs and the number of languages taught at the universities. This expansion focused on the national languages and modern European languages. In light of the limited resources available, any increase in research on non-Indo-European languages could not be expected. The only exceptions were, of course, Finnish and Sámi, the two non-Indo-European languages spoken in the Nordic countries. It is nevertheless significant that there were no university chairs and no university teaching or research on the languages spoken in the colonies, such as West Indian Creole and Kalaallisut, or important Oriental languages like Chinese or Japanese.⁴⁶ The position of Hebrew also declined (4.7.2.). But the Nordic countries paid a price for introducing most aspects of national vernacular culture, including language, into university research and teaching in the nineteenth century, and this price was a national egocentricity which marginalized everything situated outside Western Europe in many areas of humanistic studies. An obvious exception to this claim is the Asian perspective on Finno-Ugric studies.

4.7.1. Finno-Ugric Languages and the Languages of Siberia

The only Nordic field where academic linguistic research on non-Indo-European languages took a new and important turn was in Finland, where an ambitious program for the description of the non-Indo-European languages of the Russian empire was carried out. These projects were initially undertaken in collaboration with Russian academic institutions. The result of this fieldwork was a set of systematic linguistic descriptions, including grammars, dictionaries, and text collections of a number of Finno-Ugric, Samoyed, Turkic, Mongolian, Tungusic, and Paleo-Siberian languages, all unparalleled at the time. In addition, these descriptions were accompanied by detailed ethnographic studies, as well as comparative linguistic and ethnographic studies on a wider scale.

For centuries, the great linguistic variation in Russia attracted the interest of scholars, and in the eighteenth century numerous foreign travelers (German, Dutch, but also Swedish and Finnish) collected shorter or longer word lists from some of these languages. Strahlenberg (1730; cf. 3.7.3.) is a noteworthy example. Other more systematic and organized collections of linguistic data were produced, such as those organized by the philosopher Leibniz, and in particular those by Czarina Catherina II. All these linguistic studies were carried out in the spirit of the Enlightenment, where words were collected much like plants and classified from a comparative perspective, but without interest in the grammar and the synchronic description of the languages studied or rather, collected.

As mentioned in 3.7.3., Strahlenberg (1730) had a profound effect in broadening the horizon of Finno-Ugric studies. As early as the Middle Ages, Finnish scholars had an inclination for traveling that became even more prominent in the nineteenth century, when long trips and extensive fieldwork became one of the dominant characteristics of Finno-Ugric studies.

The idea of sending expeditions in search of roots into Russia to study the Finno-Ugric languages there was first put forward by the influential Finnish polyhistorian Henrik Gabriel Porthan, cf. 3.7.2. Porthan introduced this idea around 1780, specifically to determine the lexical resources of Finnish by comparing it with related languages. Little was known about eastern Finno-Ugric languages when Porthan articulated this view. Porthan was well aware of the dimensions of the task which, in his own words, presupposed

⁴⁶ In contrast, there were chairs in Assyrian and cuneiform studies established in most Nordic countries at the end of the nineteenth century. But cuneiform studies were uncontroversial, of public interest, and relevant to the study of the Old Testament.

knowledge not only of Russian but also of Tatar, Turkic, and Mongolian languages. In the 1820s the Russians, or more precisely the Academy in St. Petersburg, became interested in his idea and wanted the Finnish scholar Sjögren to conduct these investigations.

Anders Johan Sjögren (4.4.2., 4.6.3.) was the first of the classic Finno-Ugric field linguists, introducing his main expedition in 1824-1829 with the broad aim of collecting and investigating materials related to Finno-Ugric languages, history, archeology, geography, agriculture, etc. (cf. Branch 1973). This trip covered more than 20,000 kilometers and brought him to areas where i.a. Karelian, Sámi, Mari, Komi, and Udmurt were spoken. During this trip Sjögren identified and even partially described the Finnic Vepsian language. He also noted the separate Ludian dialects and was one of the last scholars to have the opportunity to investigate Kemi Sámi. Most of his material remained unpublished, but his grammatical and comparative sketch of Komi (Sjögren 1832) became a model for similar studies.

Sjögren spent the years from 1835 to 1838 in the Caucasus, curing his eye that had been badly injured in an accident during his youth when he had been playing war games in the winter of 1808. Here he relentlessly studied Georgian, Persian, Turkish, Cabardian, and, especially, Ossete (4.6.3.). His pioneering contribution to empirical Finno-Ugric studies has often been underestimated, partly because he spent his whole career in St. Petersburg and was therefore frequently encountered with suspicion by scholars residing in Finland.

When the Imperial Academy of Sciences in St. Petersburg wanted to send new expeditions to carry on the successful linguistic fieldwork initiated by him, Sjögren considered himself too old and suggested that Castrén go instead (4.4.2.). Castrén, who was appointed to the task in 1844, had previously completed fieldwork in Lapland and Karelia in 1838 and 1839 and, during his long journey to Lapland and Western Siberia in 1841-1844, had already begun fieldwork in Russia in 1843. Although he was an experienced traveller in the Far North, the conditions of this first long journey were so tough that he contracted tuberculosis in 1844 and was forced to return home. One of the main results of this journey was his Komi grammar of 1844.

When Sjögren once again managed to get financial support from the Imperial Academy, it was for Castrén to make a decisively long journey to last from 1845 to 1849. This expedition covered an area that extended over Siberia beyond the Jenissei, from the coastal tundra of the Arctic Sea all the way to the Chinese border. What Castrén managed to accomplish during this trip is amazing. Beside extensive archeological and ethnographic material, he collected data on the Samoyed languages, which was sufficient to write a thorough grammar of them all (Castrén 1854, 1855, both posthumously published by Anton Schiefner). Castrén also collected materials on Khanty (Ostyak), on the isolated and very difficult Ket (Yenisei-Ostyak) language and the related Kott language, on two dialects of the Turkic language Khakas, on Buryat Mongolian, and on Evenki (Tungus). All his work was carried out under rugged climatic conditions that fostered almost constant illnesses.

An idea of how his fieldwork took place can be gleaned from Castrén's own description of how he wrote his grammar of Komi.

In that town [Kolwa] I settled down for the rest of the summer and got as a place to stay one of the worst poky holes there, where I was constantly pestered by heat and humidity, by mosquitoes, vermin, and a noisy crowd of children. Although I was accustomed to working under many different circumstances, I had great difficulties in keeping my thoughts together and often had to take refuge in a cellar under my dwelling. In this subterranean abode I wrote my Komi grammar, although I was disturbed even here by both rats and mice. The study of Samoyed, which was the main purpose of my visit to Kolwa, had to be done on the upper floor, since my teachers were a bit nervous about the lower region and did not like to enter it. Besides this, I strolled every day around in the woods and the fields, shot some ducks, collected cloudberryes, and tried, to put it bluntly, to get myself some better food than the Samoyeds usually served me. (Castrén 1852:263-264)

Castrén managed to publish only a few grammatical descriptions before his death. In his grammar of Komi (Castrén 1844), he is critical of the numerous errors, simplifications, and gaps in the older studies.

Castrén is careful in explaining Komi pronunciation, continuously making comparisons with Finnish. He maintains the same structure in his Mari grammar (Castrén 1845), where the long preface and the entire grammar are comparative, and the etymologies are given for many forms, accompanied by a systematic analysis. On his deathbed, Castrén managed to finish his grammar of Samoyed (Castrén 1854). But the rest of his material consisting of grammars of Ket and Kott, Khakas, Buryat Mongolian, and Evenki was edited and published by the famous Orientalist Anton Schiefner (1817-1879). Together with Böhlingk's (1851) Yakut grammar, Schiefner's editions of Castrén's Mongolian, Turkic, and Tungusic material introduced a new era in Altaic studies.

Castrén's main scientific contributions are his vast collections of linguistic, ethnographic, and archeological materials. In addition, he demonstrated that the Finno-Ugric languages, in a narrow sense, and the Samoyed languages are related and form a super-family, the Uralic languages. Today, Castrén is rightly regarded as the father of comparative Uralic studies. He was also a proponent of an even larger Altaic genetic phylum, purportedly comprising i.a. Uralic, Turkic, Mongolian, and Tungusic languages. This has been a popular hypothesis ever since his proposing it, although it is currently considered to be untenable by most experts.

Castrén is not easy to evaluate. To a large extent he drew a picture of himself through his well-written and widely read diaries and reports from his travels (Castrén 1852-1870). He was glorified in Finland. But it is clear that he had a complex personality. On the one hand he was a romantic, looking for the relatives of his people, something he expressed with strong feelings the first time he crossed the Ural. On the other hand, he had a superior and a somewhat racist view of the people whose language and culture he investigated, an attitude which was not uncommon in his day. His linguistic work was also uneven. Even though he was interested in phonetics, Castrén lacked knowledge of a phonetic alphabet and an understanding of articulatory phonetics. As a result, his phonetic descriptions of the languages he investigated are often unclear and inaccurate. He was basically a comparativist and, like Rask, collected his language material and wrote his grammar as a basis for comparative studies. Castrén was uninterested in syntax, and none of his grammars, not even his extensive grammar of Samoyed (1854), contain a syntactic analysis. But he laid the cornerstone of comparative Uralic studies in Finland, and he provided linguistics with important material from languages that otherwise might have been neglected.

Just a few years after Castrén published his grammars of Komi and Mari, the Estonian scholar Ferdinand Johann Wiedemann (1805-1887) also published grammars of these two languages (Wiedemann 1847a,b). Wiedemann was aware of Castrén's grammars, but made few references to them. Wiedemann based his grammars on translations of the New Testament, deviating from Castrén by making little mention of phonology, while including short descriptions of the syntax.

A grammar that served as a model for many Finnish descriptions of the Finno-Ugric languages and dialects and also of the Finnish dialects is August Ahlqvist's grammar of Moksha Mordvin (1861). This grammar was based on the author's fieldwork, and whereas the data accordingly still have a certain value, it does not contain any syntax, but covers phonology and morphology with due regard to the structure of the language. This Moksha Mordvin grammar also includes texts and word lists.

It is important to note that Sjögren and Castrén were instrumental in starting an Age of Explorers in Finland, a tradition of making long and cumbersome scientific expeditions to the East, especially to Siberia. An important methodological consequence of this tradition was that Finnish linguists began analyzing authentic vernacular speech much earlier than linguists in many other countries.

Elias Lönnrot gained his fame in the 1830s, having made his first journey to Karelia to collect folk poetry in 1828, leading to the publication of the epic *Kalevala* in 1835. Part of Castrén's first long journey from 1841 to 1844 was, in fact, undertaken with Lönnrot.

August Ahlqvist went to Karelia 1846-1847, the Vepsians 1855, Northern Russia and North-West Siberia 1856-1859, and North-East Siberia 1877 and 1880, investigating i.a. Finnic Votian (Finn. *vatja*), Chuvash (establishing that it is a Turkic language), Moksha Mordvin, Mari, Khanty, and Mansi (Vogul).

The ultimate consolidation of these fieldwork efforts was performed by Otto Donner (4.4.2.), an excellent organizer, on whose initiative the Finno-Ugrian Society was founded in 1883. Donner outlined a systematic program for the Society to promote Finno-Ugric research and fieldwork, and he raised most of the money needed for implementing his plan. Starting in 1884, the Society sent numerous field workers and researchers throughout the Uralic area (cf. M. Korhonen 1989:247-248). Moreover, much work was completed on neighboring non-Uralic languages. The overall perspective for these projects was broad and frequently included folklore, ethnography, history, and archeology. Some of the central explorers were: Volmari Porkka (1854-1889), working on Mari from 1885 to 1886; Arvid Genetz (4.4.2.), who investigated most Finno-Ugric languages in their natural settings, for example Mari, Khanty, and Mansi in 1887, Mordvin, Komi, and Udmurt in 1889; K. B. Wiklund (1868-1934), analyzing South Sámi from 1891 to 1892; Heikki Paasonen (1865-1919), studying Mordvin 1888-1889 and Mordvin, Mari, Khanty, Tatar, and Chuvash 1898-1902; Yrjö Wichmann (1868-1932), gathering data on Udmurt 1891-1892, 1894, Komi 1901-1902, and Mari 1905-1906; K. F. Karjalainen (1871-1919), investigating Khanty from 1898 to 1902; and Artturi Kannisto (1874-1943), working on Mansi 1901-1906.

These activities went on for the thirty years from 1884 to 1914. No less than forty one scholars participated in the systematically organized journeys, which can be characterized as constituting the largest research project so far undertaken in the humanistic disciplines in Finland. The Russian Revolution and Finland's independence in 1917 changed the situation. The borders were closed, and after the early 1920s, almost no explorers were allowed into the young Soviet Union.

One fascinating result of the Finnish linguistic and ethnographic research in Russia and Siberia was the discovery and later decipherment of the Old Turkish runic inscriptions, one of the internationally-renowned achievements of Nordic scholars in the nineteenth century. The first knowledge of these inscriptions had come to European scholars from Strahlenberg's historical-geographical account from 1730. Castrén was the first linguist to copy and study some of these inscriptions (1846), concluding that they were not of Finno-Ugric origin (Halén 1989:177).

From 1884 onward, Finnish scholars began systematically collecting and studying runic inscriptions in the Minusinsk area. This resulted in thirty two inscriptions published in 1889 as *Inscriptions de l'Iénisséi*. Most of the research on Siberian archaeology and the runic inscriptions had been carried out by the young archaeologist Johan Reinhold Aspelin (1842-1915). When Aspelin and Otto Donner heard at the Eighth Congress of Archaeologists in Moscow in 1890 that a Russian explorer had found some new Runic inscriptions at the river Orkhon in Mongolia, a Finnish expedition headed by the ethnographer A. O. Heikel (1851-1924) was immediately sent to investigate these inscriptions. The result of this expedition was published in 1892 by the Finno-Ugrian Society as *Inscriptions de l'Orkhon recueillies par l'expédition finnoise 1890*. One of the inscriptions also had an accompanying Chinese text, and it was suspected and later confirmed that the inscriptions were written in a Turkic language, or at least written by people of Turkic origin.

On the basis of the Finnish publication of the inscriptions, Vilhelm Thomsen (4.4.2.) was able to decipher them (Thomsen 1894, 1896):

At the anniversary meeting of the FUS [Finno-Ugrian Society] on December 2, 1893, the Chairman read a letter from Thomsen, in which he reported that he had succeeded in deciphering the Orkhon inscriptions. A complete account of the decipherment was included, but it was to be kept sealed until Thomsen had presented his discovery to the Royal Danish Academy of Sciences: this was done at the session of December 15. The printing of Thomsen's definitive interpretation was begun in 1894, and at the Congress of Orientalists convened in the same year in Geneva, Donner presented an account of the inscriptions and the decipherment. Thomsen's work appeared in print in 1896: "Inscriptions de l'Orkhon déchiffrées" (MSFOu V). (Aalto 1971:98)

Even though Thomsen was otherwise known as a uniquely mild-mannered person, a bitter fight concerning the Old Turkish runic inscriptions soon arose between Thomsen and the Russian Turkic scholar

Wilhelm Radloff in St. Petersburg. After Thomsen's decipherment, Radloff quickly rushed to publish a translation of the inscriptions. Radloff's translation was a superficial work full of errors. Shortly after Radloff's book went to press, Thomsen (1896) published an excellent edition that surpassed Radloff's work. Thomsen later published a number of studies on Old Turkish (e.g. 1913-1918, 1916), which became classics in the study of Turkic historical linguistics, written in several instances to correct Radloff's ideas. One major effect of this decipherment was that Turkic and Altaic studies acquired a firm foothold in Finland (5.7.6.).

Heikki Paasonen, who became professor of Finno-Ugric linguistics in 1904, was another great Finnish fieldworker. He worked mainly in the Volga area and focused on the oral literature and the linguistic relationship, particularly in loan words, between the Finno-Ugric and Turkic peoples in that area. Yrjö Wichmann and Paasonen joined efforts and began a research tradition on language contact, using Paasonen (1897) as a model, and on the editing of oral texts, with Paasonen (1891) and Wichmann (1893) as models. In the decades to follow, extensive and well-analyzed materials on language contact in a multilingual setting were the result of their work. These publications deserve much more attention from both sociolinguistics and language contact research than they have hitherto been afforded.

4.7.2. Semitic Languages

The nineteenth century marked the decline of the position of Hebrew studies. At the beginning of the century, Hebrew was mandatory in the high schools in the Nordic countries, as elsewhere in Europe, and after 1732, new students in Copenhagen had to attend a two-month course in Hebrew when entering the university. But in 1845, Hebrew was made an optional subject in the Norwegian schools, the alternative being Old Norse. When Madvig served as the President of the State Council (Dan. *rigsraadet*), he abolished Hebrew from the Danish schools in 1873. In Finland, the teaching of Hebrew in schools ceased after 1850, partially due to the ideas that materialized in the 1852 reform of the statutes of the University of Helsinki in which the use of Latin was renounced.

One consequence of the decline of Hebrew in the educational system was that Semitic linguistics during this period concentrated more on Arabic than on Hebrew, and at the end of the century on cuneiform studies (5.7.6.). Furthermore, the methods of classical philology (4.6.1.) were transferred to Semitic studies, implying a focus on text editions and literature. Comparative linguistics was also influential, however, leading to comparative studies of the Semitic languages.

In the first part of the nineteenth century, Hebrew studies in Northern Europe were strongly influenced by the work of the German scholar Wilhelm Gesenius (1786-1842). Gesenius wrote a Hebrew grammar (published 1813) that was translated into many languages (a Swedish version appeared in 1836) and also formed the basis of shorter grammars like those of J. C. Lindberg (1822) and Whitte (1842) in Denmark.

One of Gesenius's main aims was to use the pattern of the Latin school grammar, thereby making it easier for the pupils, since Gesenius assumed that students would more easily recognize the same pattern in their Hebrew grammar that they were familiar with from Latin grammar. This does not mean that Gesenius forced Hebrew into the grammatical patterns of Latin. He just adopted the main structure of Latin grammar, i.e. the order in which topics are introduced and the way grammatical phenomena are explained. Secondly, Gesenius used a comparative approach, drawing every possible comparison to other languages, mainly modern school languages. To take just two examples:

(On pronunciation)

_ is the hardest throat sound, a guttural *ch*, like the Swiss and Poles have it and like Spanish *x* (Gesenius 1836:24).

(On suffixed pronouns)

These suffixes originated without doubt from a rapid pronunciation of pronouns after verb, noun or particle, and in this conjunction, the first letter of the pronoun is swallowed up, like in German *du hast*'s, Greek *πατήρ μου* instead of *πατ_ρ*

μo, Latin *eccum* instead of *ecce eum*. (Gesenius 1836:87)

Most grammars that were based on Gesenius reduced this comparative aspect to a minimum. But when Gesenius was used during the time when Hebrew was still an important topic in school, the pupils became acquainted with a comparative approach to language studies.

Mathias Norberg (1747-1826) was a central, but controversial figure in Oriental linguistics in Sweden. He came from a wealthy farming family, and in 1744 he became lecturer in Greek in Uppsala. In 1777 Norberg set out on a journey financed by the king of Sweden. Norberg's assignment was to meet and assist the famous Orientalist Jonas Björnståhl (3.3.3.), who traveled to various scholarly centers collecting Arabic, Persian, and Turkic manuscripts. Björnståhl was appointed professor in Lund but died before he could occupy the chair, and Norberg succeeded him in 1780, even if he did not return from his journey until 1782. Norberg is the author of about 150 dissertations on topics in Oriental philology and linguistics, history, and aesthetics, most of these full of unstructured ideas and fuzzy methodology, cf. Norberg (1818).

Norberg is also known for his editions and translations of Syrian texts, and many of his dissertations were concerned with the pronunciation of Oriental languages and Greek. He worked to promote the study of the spoken register of these languages in university teaching. In addition, Norberg was active in university politics and donated funds to establish a chair in Modern European languages and literature in Lund (4.6.2.), stipulating that his sister's son should be given the position.

Norberg's main interest, however, was comparative linguistics. He published a number of minor studies (e.g. 1804, 1808) and left behind an enormous lexical-comparative study of languages throughout the world. Whereas his intention was to compare a great number of languages in order to find their common origin, he did not apply the new methods of historical and comparative linguistics (J. Agrell 1955:173-200) or those of his immediate predecessors. There are no traces in his publications of either the Swedish tradition (e.g. Ihre, cf. 3.7.3.) or of contemporary scholars in comparative linguistics such as Rask and Schlegel, whose books Norberg owned. Norberg did not even have Ihre's systematic approach to sound correspondences, clinging instead to outdated ideas such as deriving the Greek inflectional morphemes from Hebrew. The value of much of Norberg's earlier work has been questioned, and his text editions have proven to be careless works. It is interesting to see how his prestige and influence could conceal all these shortcomings to the extent that there is still a tendency, even today, to honor him as a great man in Swedish linguistics, cf. for example Gierow (1971:321-322) and Westerdahl (1990).

One prominent Oriental scholar was Georg August Wallin (1811-1852), who became an unsalaried professor of Oriental languages in Helsinki in 1851. He has become most famous, and almost a national legend in Finland, for his daring travels on the Arabic peninsula disguised as an Arab (1843-1850). His mastery of spoken Arabic dialects was considered to be nearly perfect. He wrote numerous short travel accounts of his experiences that were subsequently published in Finland. These made him well known to the general public. The Royal Geographical Society in London awarded him a special prize for his merits as a geographical explorer. But he was also an excellent linguist, as evidenced by his short but informative dissertation (1839) on the differences between classical and modern Arabic and the posthumously edited studies (1855) of Bedouin dialects and Arabic phonology. He had, however, no real taste for arm-chair academic life and did not like lecturing, publishing, or even reading for that matter; he preferred living among the Bedouins and studying their life (Aalto 1971:40).

Wallin's successor was Herman Kellgren (1822-1856), who had studied Sanskrit and comparative philology. Kellgren published several studies on Sanskrit literature and on Finnish and its relationship to the Finno-Ugric languages (4.4.2.). When the professorship in Oriental languages became vacant in 1852, Kellgren went to St. Petersburg and Leipzig and learned the main Oriental languages Arabic, Turkish, and Persian very rapidly and wrote his dissertation (1854), which immediately gave him the professorship. His dissertation consists of two parts: the first is a morphosyntactic study of suffixed pronouns in Arabic, Turkish, and Persian; the second is a translation of a commentary on an Arabic grammarian, actually a

continuation of a work by Wallin. The first part provides good descriptive analyses, more or less unconnected, that are theoretically interesting. Kellgren relies heavily on Silvestre de Sacy in both details and theoretical superstructure.

Wilhelm Lagus, who was professor of Oriental languages in Helsinki from 1857 to 1866, but then moved to a professorship in Greek, contributed primarily to the field of Finnish history. He published an extensive Arabic grammar in Swedish (1869), with an introduction on the history of the Semitic language, and an Arabic reader with a vocabulary (1874). His introduction to the history of the Semitic languages is unclear as to which languages are Semitic and to the difference between borrowing and genetic relationship. In the long introduction, Lagus elaborates on the importance of Arabic and the purpose of the grammar. He says that he is not following the Arabic tradition but rather has adopted the historical-comparative approach. In reality, however, Lagus is following the Arabic grammatical tradition closely. The book provoked Herman Almqvist to write a penetrating scholarly review in a general journal for non-specialists (1879). This, in turn, led to a long and linguistically very advanced discussion in the same journal between the two scholars, although, as the editor noted, "few readers would be able to follow this learned discussion".

The University of Christiania established a professorship in Semitic languages in 1866. The first to be appointed to this post was Jens Peter Broch (1819-1886), who worked on grammatical studies in the Arabic tradition. In Denmark, Semitic studies were dominated by A. F. von Mehren (1822-1907), who served as a professor for almost fifty years. He was a specialist in Arabic and covered all aspects of Arabic philology. But the most influential Arabic scholar in the Nordic countries in this century was the German theologian Carl Paul Caspari (1814-1892). In 1848 Caspari published a widely used Arabic grammar, written in Latin and translated into English, French, and German. He was appointed as professor of theology in Christiania in 1857. But in Norway, Caspari is probably better known for his strong Lutheran conservatism than for his contribution to Arabic grammar.

The study of Semitic languages took a new direction at the end of the nineteenth century thanks to the decipherment of the cuneiform script. Within a few decades, the study of cuneiform languages, especially Assyrian, rapidly became established as an academic field in Europe. The first professorships in Assyriology were created in Paris (1874) and Leipzig (1877), and other positions soon followed in the Nordic countries.

The study of Assyrian was undoubtedly of great interest to historians, comparative Semitic linguists, and to Biblical scholars. Nevertheless, when compared to the long period it took before professorships were established in comparative Indo-European linguistics, or before teaching positions were created for world languages of both cultural and practical importance, such as Spanish, Chinese, and Japanese, it is both surprising and strange that Assyriology swept into the universities so rapidly. By the end of the nineteenth and the beginning of the twentieth century, Assyrian studies dominated the field of Semitic studies in Denmark, Finland, and Norway, while in Sweden traditional Arabic philology still retained a dominant position. Scholars who made internationally recognized contributions to Assyrian philology and to the study of the linguistic aspects of the cuneiform texts included the Dane Valdemar Schmidt (1826-1925), who accepted the position of lecturer in Assyrian and Egyptology in Copenhagen in 1883, the Finn Knut Tallqvist (1865-1949), who became lecturer in Assyriology and Semitic languages in Helsinki in 1891, and the Norwegian Arthur Gotfred Lie (1887-1932).⁴⁷

⁴⁷ The history of Assyriology has been studied by the Danish scholar Mogens Trolle Larsen (1994).

4.7.3. Missionary Linguistics

In Denmark, Finland, and Sweden, little missionary work was accomplished in the nineteenth century.

The Finnish Missionary Society (Finn. *Suomen Lähetysseura*) sent its first missionaries to Amboland, in 1868, to what is now the northern part of present-day Namibia. The missionary Martti Rautanen (1845-1926) spent approximately fifty years in Amboland and was instrumental in committing the Bantu language Ndonga to writing. The strength of Rautanen's work lies in his careful lexical analysis of the local dialects. In 1924, his translation of the whole Bible into Ndonga appeared. Rautanen's life-long concern with Ndonga was of a clearly linguistic nature, but it also had tangible cultural and even political consequences (Murtorinne 1989:409).

The Swede Ola Hanson (1864-1929) emigrated to the United States in 1880 where he studied theology. Hanson subsequently was sent to Burma by *Första Svenska Baptiskyrkan* (The First Swedish Baptist Church, now the Bethlehem Baptist Church) and worked for more than thirty years as a missionary among the Kachin people in northern Burma. Hanson created a writing system for Kachin that was based on the Latin alphabet. In 1896 he published a grammar, and in 1906, his dictionary of Kachin was completed. He also translated the entire bible from Hebrew and Greek into Kachin.

Missionaries at the Danish mission on the Nicobar Island produced a few linguistic studies, and at least one of these was published in Copenhagen (Röepstorff 1874), but none were written by Danes.

The most important linguistic works by Nordic missionaries in the nineteenth century were published by Norwegians.

Hans Paludan Smith Schreuder (1817-1882) journeyed to South Africa in 1843. His grammar of the Zulu language (Schreuder 1850) was one of the early grammars of African languages. At that time there were few studies to rely on, something which is emphasized by Holmboe (4.6.3.) in his introduction to the grammar.

In his pioneering Zulu grammar (1850), Schreuder views the noun class system as the fundamental feature of Zulu, and he therefore begins by explaining it thoroughly, referring to both gender and agreement. He offers a lengthy analysis of the phenomenon of agreement with reference to Norwegian, Latin, and Greek and of the typological characteristic features of Bantu, such as class prefixes, which also differ between singular and plural. Schreuder's grammar is completely independent of the categories of Latin grammar. It begins by establishing a phonological orthography, where both articulated and "unarticulated (*uartikulerte*) sounds", i.e. the three clicks which Schreuder (1850:5) characterizes as "smacking, clicking, and clucking sounds" (*smekkende, klikkende og klukkende Lyd*), are all represented by separate letters. Phonemes are never represented by combinations of letters. Since Schreuder had little knowledge of phonetics, his phonetic explanations are generally incorrect.

One striking feature of this work is that Schreuder made no negative or pejorative comments about the language or its speakers, which was unusual at that time. In Holmboe's preface, however, a number of such negative remarks are made on the stature and complexion of the Negro peoples and on his impressions of their languages, for example, that the Hottentot (now more properly: Khoikhoi) language had been compared to "the clucking of male turkeys" (*kalkunshaners Klukken*), "the call of magpies" (*Skaders Skrig*), or "the howling of night owls" (*Natuglers Hylen*). Schreuder's grammar, although brief, figures among the great grammars of the nineteenth century and is still held in high regard by Africanists, cf. also O. Dahl (1987:52). It is also well known that this grammar was widely read among Norwegian intellectuals, and it provided an excellent introduction to linguistic typology and language structure for Norwegian linguists, among them Ivar Aasen.

The most famous Norwegian missionary of the nineteenth century was the former criminal Lars Skrefsrud (1840-1910). Skrefsrud came from a poor family and had a sad fate until he underwent a religious conversion in prison. Later he achieved great success as a missionary, which transformed him into a national

legend. Skrefsrud the linguist is part of this legend, both as the person speaking an incredibly large number of languages and as the first to write a grammar of Santali, a language belonging to the Munda language family in India. But Skrefsrud's (1873) grammar of Santali and his other publications on Munda languages are not impressive, when compared, for example to Schreuder (1850). As one might expect, Skrefsrud's grammar is based entirely on the model of Latin grammar and is mainly an extensive list of paradigms. Skrefsrud had not fully understood the basic structure and regularities of Santali, so it was his colleague and successor Paul Olaf Bodding (1865-1938) who actually broke the code and was able to write a good grammar of the language.

Although the Nordic interest in Kalaallisut was insignificant in the nineteenth century, this language was spoken in an area governed by a Nordic state and received one of the most interesting grammars of the nineteenth century. This grammar, together with Böhlingk's grammar of Yakut (1851), belongs to the classics of modern grammar writing. Its author, Samuel Kleinschmidt (1814-1886), was born to German parents on a Herrenhuter missionary station in Greenland. He mastered Kalaallisut as a child, together with Danish and German. As an adult, he learned Latin, Greek, and Hebrew as well as French, English, and Dutch. Kleinschmidt was familiar with both the classical grammar tradition and the earlier grammars of Kalaallisut, but in his description he is independent of both. Two things characterize his description: its completeness and the author's ability to see the basic structure of Kalaallisut. Thus, he did not treat the differences from the Latin model as deviations, but as the basis for a description based on Kalaallisut language structure. The history of Kleinschmidt's grammar and its structure is thoroughly discussed in Nowak (1987, 1990, 1992).

4.8. Phonetics

The nineteenth century is not only the century in which modern historical-comparative linguistics originated. It is also the century which witnessed the birth of modern phonetics and the beginning of a scholarly interest in experimental phonetics. The role of the Nordic linguists Rask, Verner, and Thomsen was prominent in the development of comparative Indo-European linguistics. Even more prominent was the role that the Nordic phoneticians Storm, Lundell, and Pipping played in the development of phonetics.

Early nineteenth century phonetics was basically "Ohrenphonetik", ear phonetics, based on subjective impression and recording. A major step forward was taken when Eduard Sievers (1850-1932) created a firm basis for articulatory phonetics in 1876 with his work entitled *Grundzüge der Lautphysiologie*.⁴⁸

At the beginning of the nineteenth century, a common concern among linguists in the Nordic countries, as elsewhere in Europe, was the lack of a phonetic alphabet. At first, the interest in a phonetic alphabet was not so tightly linked to the needs of modern languages or dialectology as to the transcription of Oriental languages such as Sanskrit and Armenian and of Slavic languages, i.e. languages that were important for the comparative study of the Indo-European languages.

Another reason for this interest in phonetic alphabets was the attempt by various linguists to reform the orthography of their mother tongues (4.5.4.). Examples of such early studies are Bredsdorff's publication in 1817 and Rask's phonological study of sibilants (1832c). Rask observed that there were many more sibilants in some languages (Italian, Slavic languages, Sámi etc.) than there are letters for them in the Latin alphabet and that this was also a serious problem in the transliteration of Armenian and Georgian. Rask's study is not phonetic in the scientific sense, but it is practically oriented towards transliteration and towards establishing a complete phonetic alphabet. A strong interest in the development of phonetic alphabets is also found in Edwin Jessen's article (1861b) comparing the sounds of various modern languages

⁴⁸ From its second edition (1881), this book was published under the title *Grundzüge der Phonetik*.

with their representation in phonetic transcription.

The real breakthrough for phonetics and especially for the development of phonetic alphabets was found, however, in the increasing occupation with dialectology and the teaching of modern languages. The practical need for phonetics was crucial in these fields, and consequently, many linguists and authors of school textbooks utilized and developed phonetics. It was common for a leading phonetician of the twentieth century to begin as a dialectologist or as an author of school books for teaching the pronunciation of English, French, and German, the major school languages.

Finland was undoubtedly the Nordic country where phonetic studies were most cultivated in the nineteenth century. The first work of significance was written by Frans Peter von Knorring (1792-1875), who was a teacher and pastor. He published a study of the Swedish spoken in Finland in 1844 in Stockholm, a work which seems not to have attracted attention. The book begins with a good introduction to general articulatory phonetics, illustrated by drawings of the position of the tongue and lips in the articulation of various consonants. This is followed by an illuminating survey of Finnish phonotactics. In the last section, Knorring (1844:41-63) attempts to provide meanings for the sounds, operating with consonant roots resembling those in Semitic (the author explicitly refers to Hebrew), for example:

K,n: a binding together: *knapp* 'button', *knekt* 'jack', *knippe* 'bunch' ...
 S, t, r: a movement with twisting: *strand* 'beach', *streta* 'to struggle against', *strida* 'to fight', *strumpa* 'stocking', ...
(Knorring 1844:43)

Matthias Akiander (1802-1871), professor of Russian in Helsinki from 1862 to 1867, produced a study of Finnish phonology which also contained information on general articulatory phonetics and a survey of Finnish morphophonemics (Akiander 1846). Daniel Europaeus (cf. 4.4.2.) published an early work on Finnish articulatory phonetics in 1857 entitled *Suomalaisten puustavein äännös-kuvat* (Pictures of the Pronunciation of Finnish Letters).

One of the most outstanding, but little known Finnish contributions to phonetics is Wallin's (1855) study of Arabic (4.7.2.). This publication is full of astute phonetic observations and is still quoted by contemporary scholars of Arabic as one of the best early phonetic studies of Arabic. Another pioneering contribution to phonetics is found in Arvid Genetz's work on Karelian (1877a,b; cf. 4.4.2.). Genetz was familiar with Eduard Sievers's work on articulatory phonetics (sound physiology) and rightly considered himself to be the person who had introduced modern articulatory phonetics in Finland.

In 1887, the first course in phonetics was offered to Finnish university students, but it was actually a textbook in French (Söderhjelm and Tötterman 1892) that first presented articulatory phonetics to a larger audience in Finland. This textbook is a remarkably thorough and pedagogical description, with a modest attempt at phonetic transcription. As a result, it was reprinted several times.

Experimental phonetics began in Finland with the pioneering research carried out by an amateur scientist, Emil von Qvanten (1827-1903). An officer in political exile, von Qvanten lived most of his adult life in South Africa, Sweden, and Italy. He studied the physical characteristics of vowels and made some constructive critical remarks on ongoing research. He also carried out research on the size of the vocal tract.

The first academic researcher to seriously concentrate on acoustic phonetics at the university level was Hugo Pipping (1864-1944). After defending his dissertation on the timbre of sung vowels (1890a), Pipping became the Lecturer in Phonetics in 1891, which gave him the distinction of being the first teacher of phonetics in the Nordic countries, cf. Enkvist (1954:6). Pipping's dissertation was based on experimental studies carried out in Kiel, where he had access to Hensen's phonograph (*Sprachzeichner*), which took sound as input and generated curves written down by a diamond stylus on a glass plate, thereby making it possible to analyze the acoustic structure of sounds and prosodic phenomena.

Pipping also worked actively to develop the mechanics of the phonograph. He was especially interested in the harmonic structure of vowels and conducted one of the first systematic studies in this

domain. One of Pipping's notable accomplishments was that he subjected his measurements to detailed mathematical treatment. As a consequence, his results were more precise than previous findings and were used to verify some of Helmholtz's theories on vowel structure, especially the claim that vowels only contain harmonic elements. Pipping's 1894 publication is a summary of his ideas on vowel structure, including his views on the necessary features of vowels. In his work on Hensen's phonograph (1890a, b), Pipping tries to demonstrate the linguistic relevance of new methods, and he points out the limitations of perception, while insisting all the while on the importance of acoustic analysis.

Pipping became professor of Scandinavian languages in Helsinki in 1907. Although he was one of the leading acoustic phoneticians of his time, he was notoriously narrow-minded and contentious, easily becoming embroiled in quarrels with others, including Jespersen. He was also involved in several disputes with phoneticians favoring an articulatory (genetic) approach. In short, he trusted his own research and was very critical of others.

In 1894, Pipping was asked by the Finno-Ugrian Society to undertake an experimental phonetic investigation of Finnish, which, due to his interests, mainly focused on vowels (H. Pipping 1899). Using primitive equipment, Pipping managed to obtain results that continue to evoke admiration from modern phoneticians (cf. Enkvist 1954:11-12). The resulting monograph is a precursor to modern formant theory. In it Pipping discusses pharyngeal and oral resonances and tries to relate the results of his acoustic measurements to the articulatory configuration of the vocal tract. Pipping not only occupies an honorable place in the history of experimental phonetics, he should also be credited for establishing a tradition of modern phonetics at the University of Helsinki.

The Swedish scholar Aurén (4.5.2.7.) made several important contributions to Swedish phonetics. The first was his articulatory description of Swedish sounds (1869), where he demonstrated his awareness of the primacy of the spoken language and of the confusion caused by mistaking letters for sounds. Aurén warns against the common error of considering spelling to be the same as pronunciation. Nevertheless, his proposal for a phonetic alphabet, although precise, did not gain acceptance. In addition, Aurén presented a phonotactic analysis of Swedish with a survey of the structure of consonant groups.

Aurén also studied quantity in Swedish, not only at the word level, but also at the sentence level and in poetry (1874). This work contains a number of keen observations on spoken Swedish and is still considered by many to be one of the most thorough and extensive pre-instrumental studies on this topic. Aurén's analysis on the word level systematically covers all possible phonotactic combinations. His study of 1880, although similar and less systematic and thorough, deals with Swedish accent. Here he includes too many and partly unrelated phenomena such as tone, stress, and aspects of quantity under the heading of accent.

An indication of the lively interest in phonetics is found in C. F. E. Björling's Swedish textbook *Klangfärger och språkljud* (Timbre and Language Sounds, 1880). This work focuses on oscillations and resonances and discusses Helmholtz's vowel theory and the production of the central classes of sounds. Björling also makes contrastive observations. He notes, for example, the lack of *r* in Chinese and of labials in some Iroquois languages. Since phonemes and oppositions were not yet part of the descriptive apparatus, it is not unusual to find explanations of phonetic phenomena that appear unscientific from a late twentieth century point of view. For instance, Björling interprets the lack of the opposition *k/t* in Hawaiian as being due to:

... a habit developed in the course of generations that has made the tongue muscles feeble and therefore the tongue strikes the palate haphazardly here and there between the k- and t-points, insecurely and without clear control. (Björling 1880:103-104)

The rapid development of phonetics emerges clearly in Lyttkens and Wulff's book on phonetics (1885). Opening with an advanced description of the articulatory organs, Lyttkens and Wulff discuss the glottis and its function. The description of the sounds in Swedish is accurate and detailed, and the authors

present an impressive survey of the sound system and the distribution of sounds. Their description lacks functional aspects, however, and the reader has to wade through abundant detail.

Lyttkens and Wulff published an updated version of their book in 1889. This edition contains some interesting sociolinguistic observations on varieties of Swedish, operating with six levels of phonetic style. This is illustrated with the pronunciation of the word *tisdag* 'Tuesday' (observe that in the transcription the colon marks a long vowel and the simple quote, ', a half long vowel):

- | | |
|------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1. High language | a. solemn speech (church etc.) [ti:sd_'gs] |
| | b. careful speech (plays, public lectures) [ti:sdags] |
| 2. Middle language | a. conversational speech (= the language of polite, educated conversation) [ti:sdaks] |
| | b. relaxed speech (more familiar and intimate speech) [tis:das] or [ti:stas] |
| 3. Low language (ugly) | a. colloquial language (generally used, but not considered as really good language) [tis:tas] |
| | b. vulgar speech (marks the speech as belonging to an uneducated person) [ti:sdes] |
- (Lyttkens and Wulff 1889:6)

Phonetic research was much less prominent in Denmark and Norway. In Denmark, Karl Verner (4.6.5.) summarized his own views on the relationship between the Danish *stød* and the Swedish and Norwegian tonal accents in his review of Kock's historical investigations of accent in Swedish (Verner 1881). His letters reveal that he undertook a series of experimental phonetic investigations between 1886 and 1890.

Several smaller investigations of quantity and tonal accent were produced in the course of the nineteenth century, for example Sv. Grundtvig in a lecture on the Danish tonal accents at the Meeting of Scandinavian Philologists in 1876. In 1879, Julius Hoffory (4.6.2.) published a book on phonetics. Hoffory lectured on phonetics in Copenhagen in 1883, two years after the first lecture on phonetics had been given by Vilhelm Thomsen.

One scholar who strongly influenced Danish, Norwegian, and Swedish phonetics at the end of the century was the British phonetician Henry Sweet (1845-1912), whose famous handbook on phonetics appeared in 1877. Sweet collaborated with several Nordic scholars, including Otto Jespersen from Denmark, J. A. Lundell from Sweden, and Johan Storm from Norway. From these contributors, Storm (4.3. and 4.5.2.) shall be singled out here for special consideration.

In 1884, Storm designed a phonetic alphabet for the study of Norwegian dialects called *Norvegia*, which has been both widely used and severely criticized (Foldvik 1994). Storm served as an inspiration for leading international scholars like Sweet and Sievers and influenced their writings. Storm also caught Otto Jespersen's attention and turned Jespersen's interest to phonetics to the extent that he later became one of the leading phoneticians of the early 1900s. Storm can therefore be recognized as one of the founders of modern articulatory phonetics. Sweet summarized Storm's influence in his work dated Christiania, Aug. 27, 1877:

Professor Storm, of Christiania, whose practical command of sounds will not easily be rivalled, and who has carefully studied the works of our English phoneticians, represented these defects [i.e. some wrong identifications of natural sounds and phonetic symbols] very forcibly to me, and urged me to write an exposition of the main results of Bell's investigations, with such additions and alterations as would be required to bring the book up to the present state of knowledge. (Sweet 1877:ix)

4. 9. Conclusion

The nineteenth century saw theoretical, descriptive, and applied linguistic research become full-blown professions where one could earn a living, for example, as a researcher without teaching duties (like A. J. Sjögren), as a university teacher, or lexicographer. Humboldt's new conception of universities as sites for both research and teaching at the highest level was the ideological background for the flourishing of academic research.

The late 1800s was the first period in which a paradigm and school developed that influenced most linguists — the Neogrammarian School in Leipzig, which was a (radical) continuation of the comparative-historical approach introduced by Rask, Bopp, Grimm, Schleicher, and other pioneers who were active during the early 1800s. The younger generation of Swedish scholars were the first to be influenced by the neogrammarians. Noreen (1903:267) has even stated that Sweden became the second home of the Neogrammarian School. In retrospect, it is obvious that the neogrammarians overstated their originality and underrated the significance of their immediate predecessors. For example, Setälä emphatically propagated the doctrine of the “new” (neogrammarian) linguistics and relentlessly criticized the “old” (comparative) school and their representatives such as Ahlqvist and especially Genetz. In the twentieth century, the significance of the neogrammarians has been toned down, and many of the early comparativists (such as Genetz) have been reappraised.

The writing of the history of linguistics began in the nineteenth century by the neogrammarians. At the end of the nineteenth (Benfey 1869, H. Pedersen 1899) and the beginning of the twentieth century (Thomsen 1902, H. Pedersen 1916a, 1924), these neogrammarians painted a picture in which the comparative and historical aspects of linguistic research were reviewed as the dominant approaches in the nineteenth century. To them everything else was qualitatively and quantitatively of minor importance. As this chapter has shown, this is not a representative picture of linguistics in the Nordic countries during this period, nor is it indicative of linguistics elsewhere in Europe, not even in Germany. The following characteristics of linguistics in the Nordic linguistics in this century are also significant:

- (1) General grammar was introduced in the Nordic countries and had a strong impact on the study and especially the teaching of the mother tongues. Johan Nicolai Madvig revived Nordic interest in language theory, which had not been practiced much since the medieval modists.
- (2) This was the century where descriptive synchronic syntax made a giant leap forward, first in grammars of Latin and later in grammars of various other languages, especially in the national languages.
- (3) Several important descriptive grammars of languages deviating from the pattern of Latin and from that of the major languages of Western Europe were published in the nineteenth century, and these gradually exerted a profound influence on linguistic typology and on our general understanding of human languages. Among the most important of these are Böhlingk's grammar of Yakut (1851), Kleinschmidt's grammar of Kalaallisut (1851), Schreuder's grammar of Zulu (1850), and Sjögren's grammar of Ossete (1844), a list with a clear Nordic bias. In this connection one should also mention the extensive fieldwork carried out by Finnish scholars among the non-Indo-European peoples of the northern parts of the Russian empire. These researchers produced numerous grammars and text collections which in turn provided a basis for future Finno-Ugric and Altaic linguistics.
- (4) The nineteenth century is also the century of phonetics. At the beginning of the century no phonetic alphabets existed, and few linguists could describe the articulation of even the most common sounds. Students of language were, for example, ignorant of both the physical form and the function of the vocal cords. By the end of the century, however, phonetics had been

introduced as an academic subject into most Nordic universities. As a result, elaborate phonetic alphabets had been developed, much was known about articulatory phonetics, and surprising progress had been made in instrumental phonetics. In the development of all the basic aspects of phonetics, Nordic scholars such as Johan Storm, Hugo Pipping, and J. A. Lundell played a central role. The development of phonetics also influenced language teaching, drawing the attention of many linguists, among them a number of Nordic scholars, to problems of applied linguistics.

Clearly, Nordic linguists were no longer isolated from Europe or the world, nor were they marginalized. On the contrary, the nineteenth century is the century in which Nordic linguists are among the leaders in central fields of linguistics. Some, like Mathias Alexander Castrén, Johan August Lundell, Johan Nicolai Madvig, Adolf Noreen, Rasmus Rask, Johan Storm, Vilhelm Thomsen, and Karl Verner, have been given a prominent place in the general history of linguistics.

The term “progress” is notoriously difficult and controversial in linguistic historiography. However, some significant changes in linguistic methodological consciousness clearly took place in the nineteenth century. An illuminating example from Denmark is the poet Frederik Sneedorff Birch’s (1805-1869) rejected dissertation of 1838. Birch submitted his dissertation for a masters degree, but it was rejected by the faculty due to its “lack of clear concepts, internal consistency, and scientific treatment” (Birch 1838:iii), a decision which is easy to understand for the modern reader. But Birch’s dissertation ranks far above most dissertations from the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries where data, knowledge of contemporary international research, and scientific argumentation are concerned. Scientific methodology had clearly become a criterion by the beginning of the nineteenth century. The most common reason for rejecting a dissertation before 1800 was the author’s blasphemous comments in the contents, questionable morals, or even disrespectful behavior.

The emerging critical scholarly discourse in the nineteenth century may have several sources. In part, the requirement concerning methodological rigor and a general critical attitude was derived from contemporary standards and practices in the hard sciences and philosophy, where positivism was growing. Standards were also affected by the development of comparative and historical linguistics, which came to require careful consideration of previous research. The debate surrounding the emergence of the neogrammarian paradigm enhanced methodological self-awareness of linguists. This awareness was presumably also strengthened through the appearance of a number of scholarly periodicals and by the activities of the linguistic societies, providing an institutionalized forum for debate.

The structure of the new University College of Gothenburg, founded in 1891 by a private initiative, is illustrative of the status of linguistics and its subfields at the end of the century. From its inception the following professorships in language sciences were available:

- modern European (especially Germanic) languages (and Sanskrit),
- modern European linguistics (focused on Romance languages),
- Scandinavian languages,
- classical languages.

In addition, there was a lecturer in Semitic languages. Before 1900, two lectureships of English and of French were instituted. In 1899 a professorship in comparative linguistics and Sanskrit was established. In addition to reflecting the status of linguistics and its subfields at the end of the century, the structure of this new university also reflects the development of linguistics in general during this period. A century earlier one would most probably have encountered only three professorships: one in Latin, one in Greek, and one in Semitic languages.

Nordic linguists were occupied with several topics in the 1800s. All of this work has not been of

consequence for the twentieth century. The intensive occupation with general grammar and the numerous grammars written within the framework of general grammar in the first part of the century had very little impact and therefore has been largely forgotten today.

On the other hand, the historical-comparative studies of the Scandinavian and the Finno-Ugric languages resulted in a clarification of the historical development of these languages, and many insights gained in this area are still valid today. Furthermore, the articulatory phonetics of most dialects of the Scandinavian languages were also described before the turn of the century. Many problems in the synchronic description of the Finno-Ugric languages were also clarified, mainly through the work of Finnish linguists, who likewise made significant contributions to the descriptions of the numerous languages of Siberia.

In the nineteenth century, linguistics played an important role in the development of national identity and in the consolidation and modernization of the Nordic countries. This is evidenced in particular by the large dictionary projects and the intensive occupation with historical linguistics and fields such as runology.

Linguistic historiography is no more objective than most other scholarly activities. Nevertheless, it is interesting to analyze the selection of Nordic linguists mentioned in the ten-volume *Encyclopedia of language and linguistics* (Asher 1994, ed.). If one excludes Otto Jespersen, Herman Møller, and Holger Pedersen, all three Danes who are mainly known from their publications from the twentieth century, five Danish scholars (Bredsdorff, Madvig, Rask, Thomsen, and Verner), one Norwegian (Storm) and one Swede (Noreen) remain. The only Nordic linguist from the period 1500-1800 mentioned in Asher (1994, ed.) is another Dane, Jacob Madsen. It is reasonable to ask why the Danes are so strongly represented. Have the authors and the Editorial Board of Asher (1994, ed.) simply been partial and/or negligent of linguistics in the European northern periphery? Would not, for instance, Axel Kock and E. N. Setälä have deserved articles of their own? Is this visibility of the Danes due to the fact that some of the most influential histories of linguistics have been written by Danes (Thomsen 1902, H. Pedersen 1899, 1916a, 1924)?

Or have the qualities of Danish linguists been higher than of those from the other countries? Did Danish linguists have a better network of contacts and better connections to international linguistics? Did they publish more than their Nordic colleagues in international languages?

The answer to the last question is clearly no. The two preceding ones, however, are more complicated. While there is little doubt that the Swedish comparativists Danielsson, Johansson, and Persson were recognized by their contemporaries as numbering among the best practicing Indo-European scholars, these Swedish researchers were not theoretical innovators. As a consequence, even though they produced thousands of published pages, they never wrote anything like Karl Verner's short article, which influenced the entire theoretical foundation of diachronic linguistics.

Why is Castrén not on the list? Indeed, he was an excellent field linguist, but his grammars are traditional when compared with those of Rask. His comparative Finno-Ugric studies were important and up-to-date when published, but they quickly became outdated. And it is hard to find a single linguistic theory or method that can be traced to Castrén's influence. On the other hand, Johan Storm was not a national linguistic hero in his day, as were Sophus Bugge and Ivar Aasen, and Storm is hardly viewed as such even today in the Nordic countries. But Bugge's comparative linguistic work (his philological and partly runological work is another matter) was outdated already before being published and exerted little influence inside or outside Norway. The whole development of phonetics would, however, have been different without Johan Storm.

An obvious difference between Finland and the other Nordic countries is the language barrier. Around the year 1850, Finnish began to be used as the language of publication in grammars and other linguistic writings. This use increased rapidly towards the end of the century, especially in the study of Finnish. Publications written in Finnish are, of course, largely inaccessible to the international research community. In the 1800s, most of the linguistic work in Finland was done in Finno-Ugric studies. The research interests of these scholars were for a long time more directed towards the Great Journeys eastwards than towards establishing contacts with leading linguists elsewhere in Europe (apart from Hungary).

However, from the 1870s onwards it became common for scholars of the more distant Finno-Ugric languages to publish their results in German.

Over the years, Finno-Ugric scholars actually built up a research network of their own, with journals, meetings, scientific problems, etc. Setälä had direct personal contacts with Noreen, Danielsson, and Lundell in Uppsala, and, of course, with Thomsen, who later (from 1913) was to become Setälä's father-in-law. By contrast, many later Finno-Ugrists and Fennicists rarely had Nordic or continental European contacts.

The network explanation seems to have some credibility. The Norwegian linguists Aasen and Aubert rarely left their country and had little contact with non-Norwegian linguists. Castrén never visited universities and academic institutions outside Finland and Russia. In contrast, Vilhelm Thomsen had visited most of the universities in Europe, and there were few if any European linguists of importance that he did not know personally. The same type of international networking is characteristic of Johan Storm and of E. N. Setälä.

The geographic proximity of Denmark to the continent is a fact of nature that has influenced linguistic research. Being closer to the center increases a scholar's visibility and facilitates travel, communication, and all types of contacts.

Chapter 5

The period 1900 - 1965

*“Le point de vue structural, la conception de la langue dans sa totalité, dans son unité et dans son identité ...”*⁴⁹

5.1. Introduction

In 1907, just after Norway gained its independence, the first Norwegian encyclopedia began to appear (Nyhuus 1907-1913). Under the entry *grammatik* (grammar, vol. III:1118), only a few lines are devoted to the distinctions between descriptive, historical, and philosophical grammar. In this section of the encyclopedia, it is also stated that grammar can be further subdivided into semantics, morphology, and phonology, or into inflection and syntax. In contrast, almost four columns (Nyhuus 1913:1077-1080) are devoted to linguistics, *sprogvidenskap*, but to historical-comparative linguistics exclusively. The only Nordic linguists mentioned are Rasmus Rask and Vilhelm Thomsen. The field of linguistics is defined as the study of spoken human language, as a cultural science, and mainly as a child of the nineteenth century. Linguistics prior to the nineteenth century is characterized as being arbitrary and unproductive. According to this entry, the only scientific way to study language is to evaluate each linguistic form in relation to corresponding forms from earlier periods.

In the span of a century, the concept of what constitutes linguistics had changed completely (4.1.). The neogrammarians and their forefathers in comparative Indo-European linguistics had apparently taken over the field, or so they claimed in their own historiographic studies, including the classical and influential overviews of the history of linguistics by Theodor Benfey (1869), Vilhelm Thomsen (1902), and Holger Pedersen (1924), and various short articles in encyclopedias like the one referred to above, the author of which was probably Hjalmar Falk (5.3.2.).

But the twentieth century also marked the beginning of modern general linguistics, and both synchronic descriptive grammars and philosophical grammars were soon to return to the scene. More than any previous period in linguistics, the first part of the twentieth century is the age of theoretical experiments and many-faceted approaches to the study of language. It is also the period in which general linguistics emerged as a distinct academic discipline in the Nordic countries.⁵⁰ In the overall development of linguistics in this period, the Nordic countries took part on the international stage, though in different ways and to varying degrees.

⁴⁹ The structural point of view, the conception of a language in its totality, in its unity and in its identity... (The opening editorial statement of *Acta Linguistica Hafniensia*, Brøndal and Hjelmslev 1939:1)

⁵⁰ In Germany the first professorship of general linguistics (*allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft*) was founded as early as 1833 at the University of Halle. The first professor was August Friedrich Pott (1802-1887).

The beginning of the twentieth century, like the beginning of the nineteenth century, was marked by profound political changes in the Nordic countries. First, the union between Norway and Sweden was severed in 1905, and Norway became a fully-independent state for the first time in 400 years. Then, in 1917, Finland gained its independence for the first time in recorded history. Finally, in 1944, Iceland became independent from Denmark.

Finno-Ugric studies were strongly affected by the collapse of Czarist Russia after the October Revolution. The young Soviet Union closed its borders for more than 50 years, and around 1920 the “Great Research Journeys” virtually came to an end. Around the same time, Finland also estranged itself from the international linguistic scene and was thus only marginally influenced by the rapid development of theoretical linguistics from 1920 to 1965 (5.3.1.).

World War II left its mark on the Nordic countries in different ways. Finland fought two wars with the Soviet Union (1939-1944) in which 88,000 Finnish soldiers were killed and 200,000 men were wounded. These casualties affected all levels of Finnish society, and recovery took close to two decades. Almost a whole generation of Finnish male linguists was lost as a result of these wars. Thus, the theoretical and methodological development of linguistics in the twentieth century took place slowly in some countries, as in Finland, and more rapidly in others, as in Denmark.

Various Nordic linguists played a significant role in the theoretical as well as organizational expansion and consolidation of linguistics as a separate science in this period. Nordic linguistic journals represented a high percentage of all such journals around 1950. Moreover, several Nordic linguists of this period were internationally well-known, in particular the Danes Otto Jespersen and Louis Hjelmslev, but other noteworthy scholars were the Finn Gustaf John Ramstedt, the Norwegian Alf Sommerfelt, and the Swede Bertil Malmberg.

Some of the most significant factors influencing the international development of linguistics from 1900 to 1965 are:

- (1) The rise of European structuralism focusing on synchronic descriptions of language. This particular variety of structuralism was based on the posthumously edited lectures of Ferdinand de Saussure and was further developed within the linguistic milieus of Prague and Copenhagen.
- (2) The rise of linguistics in the early 1900s in the United States, gradually leading to a versatile and theoretically challenging international linguistic milieu. Franz Boas and Edward Sapir started North-American anthropological linguistics, a tradition of fieldwork among indigenous peoples speaking languages without a documented written history. This called for a fully synchronic perspective on linguistic analysis. Leonard Bloomfield’s and Zellig S. Harris’s approach stressed the importance of theory building and formal discovery procedures. The anthropological and formal approaches in conjunction led to a new pool of empirical data, new descriptive problems, and a theoretical awareness all of which were at variance with the old European descriptive linguistic tradition as well as with neogrammarian diachronic linguistics.
- (3) The development of phonetics starting in the 1940s, especially of acoustic phonetics (with the advent of the sonagraph as one of the most important innovations).
- (4) An increasing professionalism in linguistics, something which is clearly documented in the increasing number of international linguistic journals and conferences.
- (5) The sophistication of linguistic theorizing and the advent of formal approaches to linguistics.

This line of development started after World War II under the influence of mathematical communication theory (Shannon, Weaver), cybernetics (Wiener), and formal language theory (the early Chomsky).

- (6) By and large, Germany had dominated the development of linguistic theory since the early 1800s with scholars like Humboldt, Bopp, Grimm, Schleicher, Paul, Leskien, Brugmann, and Wundt. With Saussure, American structuralism, and the outcome of World War I and especially World War II, Germany lost its lead. International linguistic theory thereafter became strongly dominated by the Anglo-Saxon world, and the English language became the lingua franca of the discipline. Becoming aware of the new centers took a generation after World War II in those countries that had been strongly oriented towards Germany, Finland being a case in point.
- (7) Empirical language typology began to show its face toward the end of this period, set in motion by Greenberg's classical paper on word order (Greenberg 1963).

The separation of human intellectual development into consecutive periods is never straightforward. However, if there is a major identifiable turning point in twentieth century linguistics in the Nordic countries, the year 1965 is a good candidate. It took about two decades for Europe to recover from the physical and intellectual devastation of World War II. Around 1965, the exceptionally large post-war generations born between 1945 and 1948 began entering the universities, thus forcing governments to rapidly expand higher education by founding new universities. And, of course, 1965 was the year Noam Chomsky's *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax* appeared. This work had an enormous impact on both new students and mature linguists in the late 1960s, and it came to dominate theoretical discussions in several of the Nordic countries for years to come.⁵¹

Finally, until 1965, most Nordic linguists worked within the framework of Neogrammarian historical-comparative linguistics. The Nordic scholars, their way of thinking, and their approaches to linguistic research were, for the most part, little influenced by the advent of the new structuralist approach or other theories briefly mentioned above (1-7). Most of these innovations did not affect mainstream Nordic linguistics with full force until after 1965.

Thus, we have a number of reasons for considering the years around 1965 as being pivotal and especially important in the history of linguistics in the Nordic countries. On the international scene, the decisive turning point in the periodization of the 1900s occurred somewhat earlier, in the years after World War II, when the theoretical focus of linguistics was reoriented from the German to the Anglo-Saxon world.

The academic discipline of general linguistics in the Nordic countries illustrates the periodization we advocate. Professorships were founded at the Nordic universities as follows:

Oslo	1931
Trondheim	1964
Helsinki	1966
Stockholm	1967
Lund	1969
Odense	1969
Umeå	1969
Copenhagen	1976
Turku	1978
Göteborg	1983

⁵¹ It is also by far the most cited linguistic work ever written (cf. Garfield 1987:11, whose data concern the period 1976-1983).

Bergen	1983
Tromsø	1984
Joensuu	1991

Oslo was exceptionally early, and Norway got its second professorship in Trondheim before any other Nordic country had even one. Five professorships were founded in the 1960s, clearly indicating that this was the major breakthrough of general linguistics in the Nordic countries. The late appearance of Copenhagen on the list is surprising, given the theoretical traditions of Danish linguistics dating back to the 1930s.

5.2. Institutional Frameworks for Linguistic Research

5.2.1. Universities, Academies, and Research Councils

From 1900 to 1965, a number of new universities were established in the Nordic countries. In Sweden, the University College of Stockholm (*Stockholms Högskola*) was founded in the nineteenth century (4.2.), but the Faculty of Humanities was not established until the beginning of the twentieth century. This institution later became known as the University of Stockholm. The first chair in Scandinavian languages was occupied by Elias Wessén (5.6.2.5.) 1928-1956, and in addition to chairs in the modern languages (established in the 1930s) and classical languages, the University of Stockholm also established chairs in Semitic languages, Indic languages (not only Sanskrit), Sinology, and Japanese. A chair in Modern Swedish was established in 1955. The chair in Sinology, actually a chair in East Asian Archeology, was first occupied by Bernhard Karlgren (5.7.7.) beginning in 1939.

The creation of positions in phonetics abroad and the need for better training in pronunciation caused the Swedish government to pass a bill in 1947 suggesting that similar chairs be founded in Lund and Uppsala. Bertil Malmberg (5.3.3.) was appointed to the new chair in phonetics in Lund, and the reopened chair in comparative linguistics was given to Nils Holmer (5.7.9.).

Research councils were established in Sweden in the 1940s following models in Great Britain and the United States. These councils played an important role by supporting research projects, particularly after 1965.

The University of Iceland (*Háskóli Íslands*) in Reykjavik was founded in 1911 as a merger of a theological seminar, a medical college, and a school of law. A Faculty of Arts was established at the university at the same time. From early on, courses in Danish, Swedish, English, German, French, Greek, and Latin were offered, to which courses in Norwegian, Spanish, Italian, and Arabic were added in 1940. These courses were given by part-time teachers, however, who were often financed by their home countries. Until the 1960s, the only professorships in linguistics were in Icelandic. The first professorship (1911) was in Icelandic language and literature, occupied by Björn M. Ólsen 1911-1918 (4.5.1.3.), but subsequently redefined as a post for literary history. In 1925, a lectureship in the history of the Icelandic language was established, occupied by Alexander Jóhannesson (5.6.2.3.). An increase in academic posts led to the establishment of the Icelandic National Research Council (*Rannsóknaráði ríkisins*), which was founded in 1940.

In Denmark, the University of Aarhus was established in 1928. From its inception, there were lecturers in French (Andreas Blinkenberg), English, German (Christen Møller), and Scandinavian philology (Peter Skautrup). In 1930, Franz Blatt became lecturer in classical philology, and in 1931 Adolf Stender-Pedersen (1893-1963) accepted the post of lecturer in Slavic philology. Louis Hjelmslev was then appointed lecturer in comparative linguistics in 1934, but left in 1937 to become Holger Pedersen's successor in Copenhagen. Hjelmslev's successor in Aarhus was Jens Holt (1904-1973), who had studied Indo-European linguistics with Antoine Meillet in Paris. The library of the Linguistics Department in Aarhus was founded

when Holger Pedersen arranged for the private library of his friend, the Swiss linguist Edmund Kleinhaus (1870-1934), to be donated to the University of Aarhus.

The University of Copenhagen functioned as the center of linguistic research in Denmark throughout this period, not least internationally, with scholars like Otto Jespersen in phonetics, English, and general linguistics, Holger Pedersen in historical-comparative linguistics, Louis Hjelmslev in theoretical linguistics, Viggo Brøndal and Knud Tøgeby in French and general linguistics, and Eli Fischer-Jørgensen in phonetics. Vilhelm Thomsen's successor as professor in comparative linguistics, Holger Pedersen (5.5.1.), contributed significantly to Indo-European comparative linguistics, particularly through his studies of Celtic languages, Hittite, and Tocharian. With the theoretical contributions of Pedersen's successor, Louis Hjelmslev (5.3.3.), the Linguistics Department at the University of Copenhagen was instrumental in promoting the transition from historical-comparative linguistics to structural linguistics, largely within the framework of the Linguistic Circle of Copenhagen, which was founded by Hjelmslev in 1931 (5.2.4.).

Linguistics and Phonetics were established as separate departments at the University of Copenhagen in 1956, primarily as the result of Hjelmslev's international reputation, since at the time only two students had received degrees in the field of linguistics. In 1966, Eli Fischer-Jørgensen (1911-) was appointed professor of phonetics (6.4.) and the department was split into two departments, one for linguistics and one for phonetics.

The School of Business and Economics was founded in Copenhagen in 1917, and part of its task was to train secretaries in foreign languages. Basic instruction in English, French, German, and Spanish was therefore offered systematically beginning in 1924, together with other practical courses like typing and stenography. Later, in the 1950s, Portuguese was offered sporadically, and Italian and Russian were added on a more regular basis. Higher level language studies were established in 1966 (6.2.1.1.).

In Norway, the University of Bergen was founded in 1945, but the staff of the Bergen Museum had included professors in various humanistic fields since 1914. Professors of languages (from 1918) were all connected with the study of Norwegian, and some, like Gustav Indrebø (1889-1942), had a strong impact on the nynorsk-tradition of Norwegian linguistics (cf. Venås 1984, Eidissen 1993). After the founding of the University, professorships in Norwegian, Old Norse, English, German, and French were established in the 1950s. The study of modern European languages was weak in Norway at that time, and it was thus necessary to import scholars to fill the new positions. The first two professors in English, for example, were Swedes. In 1965, Martin Kloster-Jensen (5.4.) became lecturer in phonetics. Up to 1970, linguistics only played a marginal role in Bergen, and there was no professor of general linguistics. In Bergen, a philological tradition combined with a conservative attitude regarding scholarly method and ideology was even more prominent than in Oslo.

The University of Trondheim was officially founded in 1968, but this was merely an organizational merger of three institutions: The Technical College, The National Teachers' College, and The Museum and Library of the Royal Academy of Science. The National Teachers' College was founded in 1922. From 1953, Olav Næs (1901-1984) was professor of Scandinavian linguistics, and in 1964, he became professor of general linguistics.

Norway's College of Business Administration and Economics in Bergen (*Norges Handelshøyskole*), which was founded in 1936, offered courses in English, German, and French, and in 1952 it also introduced Spanish to its curriculum. In the 1950s, professorships in German (1951) and French (1955) were created. The first professor in French was Leiv Flydal (5.7.1.), but it was not until 1965 that advanced courses were offered.

The development of language studies at the University of Oslo can be illustrated by listing the new professorships that were established in this area during this period (with the name of first professor to occupy the position in parenthesis):

Slavic languages 1900 (Olaf Broch)
 Semitic languages 1907 (Jørgen Alexander Knudtzon)
 Finno-Ugric languages 1910 (Konrad Nielsen)
 Celtic languages 1913 (Carl Marstrand)

1916-1940

Professorship in riksmål 1916 (Didrik Arup Seip)
 Icelandic 1923 (Sigurður Nordal)
 General linguistics 1931 (Alf Sommerfelt)
 Germanic philology and general phonetics 1937 (Ernst Westerlund Selmer)

1945-1965

Comparative Indo-European linguistics 1947 (Carl Hjalmar Borgstrøm)

A unique but instrumental organization for the promotion of linguistic research was the Institute for Comparative Research in Human Culture (*Instituttet for sammenlignende kulturforskning*) in Oslo, established in 1922. This independent research institute had considerable financial means prior to 1940 to finance guest lectures, research scholarships, large research projects, and the publication of expensive scholarly studies. The list of guest lecturers included the famous linguists Antoine Meillet, Otto Jespersen, Franz Boas, Bernhard Karlgren, and Carl Meinhof. In addition, the institute at least partially financed the following linguistic research:

- (1) Several projects on the Sámi language by Qvigstad, Nielsen, Nesheim, and Bergsland (5.6.1.6. and 5.6.7.5.),
- (2) Morgenstjerne's fieldwork and publications on Indo-Iranian frontier languages (5.7.3.), and
- (3) Sommerfelt's and Vogt's fieldwork and publications on Caucasian languages (5.7.9.).

The institute also financed the editing and publication of a monumental work on Burushaski, an isolated language in northern Kashmir. Its editor, David L. R. Lorimer, was a British officer, who had collected valuable material on this hitherto undescribed language during his stay in that region.

An important event for Norwegian research, including linguistics, was the founding of the Norwegian Research Council (*Norges almenvitenskapelige forskningsråd*) in 1949, a loose superstructure for four largely independent research councils: one for medicine, one for the natural sciences, one for the social sciences, and one for the humanities. This represented an entirely new situation for the humanities in terms of research financing. Up to this point university research scholarships had been few and far between. Furthermore, public or institutional financial support for dictionary projects or for the collection of dialect material had been almost nonexistent. With the founding of the Norwegian Research Council, a stable source of scholarships was thus established for the humanities, including resources for travel to conferences and for fieldwork. Large-scale linguistic research projects supported by the research council were not initiated until after 1965, but the council did begin to provide individual research opportunities for young Norwegian linguists as early as 1950.

In comparison with the other Nordic countries, Finland has practiced a much more pronounced policy of regional decentralization, resulting in a greater fragmentation of the university disciplines.

Two new universities with Faculties of Arts, both private, were founded in Turku/Åbo at approximately the same time. *Åbo Akademi* (Åbo Akademi University) was founded in 1918 and used Swedish as the language of instruction and administration. The other, *Turun yliopisto* (University of Turku), established in 1920, correspondingly used Finnish. The national language issue had not yet been settled at Finnish universities, and it remained a central topic in political discussions until the 1930s, especially at the

University of Helsinki.

The State University of Oulu/Uleåborg (*Oulun yliopisto*) was founded in 1958, and language studies were introduced in 1966. The Helsinki Business School (*Helsingin kauppakorkeakoulu*), established in 1911, and the Swedish Business School (*Svenska handelshögskolan*), founded 1927 in Helsinki, have also had teaching positions in languages for decades. The Teachers' College in Jyväskylä (*Jyväskylän kasvatustieteiden korkeakoulu*), founded in 1936, likewise established positions in languages: professorships in Finnish in 1936, and in English, German, and Swedish in 1958.

At the University of Helsinki, new professorships in language-related disciplines were established between 1900 and 1965: in Slavic philology in 1900, English philology in 1907, Germanic philology in 1908, Romance philology in 1908 (by splitting the combined chair founded in 1894), phonetics in 1921, and Finnic languages in 1929. Partly owing to the hardships of World War II, the language disciplines experienced little growth from 1930 to 1950. A direct reflection of the effect of external historical events and political developments is found in the example of the chair in Russian. This position was abolished in 1919, after Finland gained its independence from Russia, but was re-instituted in 1945, after the war with the Soviet Union had been (in some sense) lost. From 1950 to 1965, additional professorships were established: in Finnish in 1951, in English in 1959, in Scandinavian philology in 1962, and in Germanic philology in 1963.

At the Åbo Akademi University, teaching in Swedish on the professorial level began in 1923, Germanic philology instruction started in 1929, Greek and Roman literature in 1935, English language and literature in 1937, and Finnish language and literature in 1957. The University of Turku established professorships in Finnish and Finnic languages in 1921, in Germanic linguistics in 1925, in Romance languages in 1945, in English in 1946, in Scandinavian philology in 1962, in classical philology in 1964, and in Finno-Ugric linguistics in 1964.

Three main trends are discernible if one takes a closer look at these chairs. First, the investigation of Finnish and the other Finno-Ugric languages, clearly an important task from a national point of view, was the focus of research from 1900 to 1965. The ideological motivation was to make Finnish the primary national language. In practice, this meant that language planning was called for. Standard Finnish had to be developed and turned into a full-fledged and socially well-functioning language. This, in turn, could only be accomplished with the help of knowledge obtained through research. The importance attributed to promoting the Finnish language is also evident in Parliament debates on linguistic matters, for example in 1927, when a decision was made to subsidize the compilation of a comprehensive dictionary of Modern Finnish (*Nykysuomen sanakirja*, 5.6.7.2.).⁵²

The second trend is the increasing interest in modern languages, particularly in English, German, and French, the study of which was predominantly philological during this period.

The third trend is the partial cloning of the new universities on the model of the University of Helsinki. New chairs were established primarily in subjects already being taught at the University of Helsinki: Finnish, Swedish, English, etc. This tendency became even more pronounced during the rapid university expansion that took place in the late 1960s. Diversification and attempts at individual profiling were long discouraged and did not begin, with some exceptions in the private universities, until the 1980s.

After the war, the Academy of Finland (*Suomen Akatemia*) was founded in 1948. This institution provided the funds for twelve Academicians representing the arts and the sciences. The Academy and its composition was a source of continued debates of a political nature, and these discussions lasted well into the 1960s. In 1964, President Urho Kekkonen intervened and called for a reassessment of and change in the formulation of the Academy's tasks. The Academy of Finland was therefore re-designed to be an instrument

⁵² By 1927, no authoritative monolingual Finnish dictionary had yet been written. The lack of such a dictionary was tangible. Almost fifty years had passed even since the publication of Elias Lönnrot's voluminous *Suomalais-Ruotsalainen Sanakirja - Finskt-Svenskt Lexikon. I-II* (Finnish-Swedish dictionary) in 1874-1880.

for science policy that would be more sensitive to societal and political needs (Immonen 1995). This transformation took place in 1970, and whereas the Academy retained its original name, it nevertheless became a government research council.

In 1961, a new system of full-time research positions was established by the academy, thus providing three-year appointments for junior research scholars and senior research positions with no teaching obligations. The recruiting of young scholars became more widespread, effective, and diverse than it had been, and the number of professional scholars, including linguists, increased markedly under this system. As a consequence, most linguists in Finland today have been at one time or another on the payroll of the Academy of Finland.

Three languages were spoken in the Nordic countries that did not belong to independent political entities in this period: Faroese, Kalaallisut, and Sámi. Separate institutions for the study of Kalaallisut and Sámi did not appear until after 1965, and the Faroese Academy, which later became the Faroese University, was founded in 1965.

One event in the last few decades which has had a significant impact on Nordic linguistics was the creation of the Nordic Council in 1952. The Nordic Council is a political organization designed to promote cooperation between the Nordic countries. From the beginning, cooperation within the area of culture and research was an important goal of this organization, and this objective became even more prominent after 1960. Financial support has been allocated to research projects as well as to seminars and summer schools, on a Nordic basis that requires the participation of at least two Nordic countries. Since the late 1960s, the projects supported by the Nordic Council, and perhaps to an even greater extent the summer schools in various fields of linguistics, have provided an important source of contact for linguists in the Nordic countries, often leading to joint research projects. These activities have provided a common sense of identity to many young linguists in the Nordic countries.

5.2.2. Conferences

One important feature of scholarly life in twentieth century linguistics is the increasing number of Nordic and international conferences. While linguists did attend the meetings of philologists that began in the late nineteenth century, meetings devoted exclusively to linguistics were first initiated in the twentieth century.

The importance of these conferences can hardly be overrated. They institutionalized contact between scholars, thus making it possible for an increasing number of linguists to meet each other. While earlier networks were few and often dictated by the personal interests, position, and personality of individual scholars, it now became possible for most linguists in university positions to participate in such networks. Furthermore, these international conferences provided unique occasions for presenting new ideas to other scholars in a face-to-face situation and for collectively addressing fundamental topics and problems in linguistics.

The International Congresses of Linguists were no doubt the most important academic gatherings. The first congress was arranged in The Hague in 1928 where the participants included five Danes (Brøndal, Hjelmslev, Jespersen, Pedersen, and Thalbitzer), three from Finland (Äimä, Karsten, Setälä), five from Norway (Konow, Morgenstjerne, Nielsen, Sommerfelt, Sverdrup), and eight Swedish linguists (Karlgrén, Kock, Lidén, Lindroth, Meyer, Person, Vising, Wiklund). Of the twelve chairpersons at the conference, three were Nordic (Karlgrén, Jespersen, Pedersen). The only Nordic scholar to read a paper was Torsten Evert Karsten (5.5.1.) from Finland, who actually had two presentations: “Niederländische Sprachdenkmäler in Finnland” and “Die Sprachverhältnisse im Finnland”.

The Fourth⁵³ International Congress of Linguists was held in Copenhagen in 1936. This marked a

⁵³ The second conference was held in Geneva (1931) and the third in Rome (1933).

breakthrough internationally for Nordic linguistics. Of course, most Danish linguists were present, with Otto Jespersen presiding. Seven Finnish participants attended, sixteen Norwegians,⁵⁴ one Icelander, and eighteen Swedes. Two of the eight plenary papers were given by Nordic scholars, Alf Sommerfelt on “Conditions de la formation d’une langue commune” and Kr. Sandfeld on “Problèmes d’interférences linguistiques”. Section papers were given by Hjelmslev and Thalbitzer from Denmark, Kiparsky and Penttilä from Finland, Christiansen and Nielsen from Norway, and Collinder, Lindroth, Lindqvist, and Zachariasson from Sweden.

The fifth conference was to take place in Bruxelles, from August 28 to September 2, 1939, but it was canceled due to the war. In the two volumes of abstracts from those who indicated that they would have attended the conference, there were responses from Björn Collinder (Sweden), Ingerid Dal (Norway), Arthur Arnholtz (Denmark), and Viggo Brøndal (Denmark). In addition, Hjelmslev was among those who submitted a report to the conference on the topic of morphological structure.

At the sixth conference in Paris, held in July of 1948, the low number of participants reflects both the effect of the war and the activity of the Danish linguistic milieu. There were twenty-four participants from Denmark, thirteen from Sweden, ten from Norway, and only one scholar from Finland.

At the seventh conference held in London, in September of 1952, Danish linguists were the dominant force in discussions. L. L. Hammerich, Jens Holt, and Knud Tøgeby took part in numerous debates, the obvious result of the intensive and lengthy discussions which were taking place in the Linguistic Circle of Copenhagen (5.2.4.). By contrast, Alf Sommerfelt and Björn Collinder were the only participants from Norway and Sweden who presented papers.

The eighth conference in Oslo, held from August 5th to 9th, 1957, provided another opportunity for presenting Nordic linguistics to the world. This conference, which was organized by Sommerfelt, included papers by prominent Norwegian (Trygve Knudsen, Alf Sommerfelt) and Danish (Paul Diderichsen, Henning Spang-Hanssen, Eli Fischer-Jørgensen, Louis Hjelmslev, H. J. Uldall) linguists. It was here that Paul Diderichsen, who later discarded Hjelmslev’s theory of glossematics as unproductive, but at this point was an enthusiastic advocate of the theory, strongly attacked American linguistics in his paper on “The Importance of Distribution versus Other Criteria in Linguistic Analysis” (Diderichsen 1958). Sweden was represented with a paper by Gunnar Fant.

—

⁵⁴ Among them was Sigurd Kolsrud, which is surprising considering his negative attitude towards structural linguistics, cf. 5.3.1.

The Meetings of Scandinavian Philologists were initiated in 1876 by scholars from all fields of the language sciences. But these meetings were held only sporadically in this period: 1902 in Uppsala, 1932 in Lund, 1935 in Copenhagen, and 1950⁵⁵ in Helsinki and Turku. One of the most memorable of these meetings took place in Copenhagen in 1935. Here representatives of the older generation such as Otto Jespersen were confronted by young linguists like Paul Diderichsen, who presented his field theory of syntactic analysis for the first time (*Forhandlingar* 1936), cf. 5.6.1.1.

The Seventh Meeting of Scandinavian Philologists (*Sjunde nordiska filologmötet*) was held in Lund in 1932. This gathering attracted 200 participants, including a number of scholars from outside Scandinavia. From the point of view of the emerging university subject of general linguistics, the most interesting lecture was given by J. A. Lundell (4.6.4.), a linguist from Uppsala. Lundell maintained that Sanskrit should not dominate the linguistic scene and suggested that there be one professor in Sanskrit, another in comparative linguistics, and a third in general linguistics. 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.

Copenhagen was also host to the First Meeting of Scandinavianists (*Det første Nordistmøde*) in 1946. The chief linguistic topic discussed at this meeting was Umlaut and breaking. Once again Diderichsen was active as a representative of the new trends in linguistics. But this time he encouraged a discussion between the old-timers and the new structuralists, including suggestions on the goals and methods in contemporary Scandinavian linguistics (Diderichsen 1947). Here Diderichsen advocated a reorientation of linguistics away from a purely diachronic to a synchronic-diachronic focus.

The Finno-Ugrian Society organized an international meeting in Helsinki in 1931, with participants from Hungary, Estonia, and Norway (Konrad Nielsen, J. K. Qvigstad). Another conference was held in Helsinki in connection with the seventy-fifth anniversary of the society in 1958 (M. Korhonen et al. 1983:50). A persistent theme through the 1900s at Finno-Ugric conferences has been the development and simplification of the narrow Finno-Ugric phonetic transcription system.

Following a suggestion by Hugo Pipping, the Swedish Literature Society in Helsinki arranged a three-day conference in August 1922, on Swedish philology and history. More than one hundred participants attended. The topic of one of the four sections was general and comparative linguistics. Two of the presentations in this section were related to general linguistics, Kristoffer Nyrop's "General remarks on onomatopoeic words" and Viggo Brøndal's "Directional historical development of language".

The International Finno-Ugric Congress (*Congressus Internationalis Fenno-Ugristarum*) was first held in Budapest in 1960, followed by Helsinki in 1965, and from then on these international gatherings have been held every five years (6.2.2.).

In November of 1960, the Swedish linguist Hans Karlsgren (5.2.5.) invited younger linguists, statisticians, and data processing experts from all the Nordic countries to a symposium at Sundbyholm Manor near Stockholm. Approximately fifty persons participated and twenty papers were given. These presentations reflect the current interest in the ideas of statistical and structural linguistics. The potential use of computers in linguistics was also discussed. More importantly, this meeting was perhaps the first in the Nordic countries where Chomsky's theories were presented. A selection of these papers was printed in the first issue of *Statistical Methods in Linguistics* (SMIL, 1961).

The Nordic Summer Academy was founded in 1949, sponsored by the Nordic Council (cf. above). This organization was particularly important in establishing inter-Nordic contacts after World War II. The academy worked on an interdisciplinary basis and frequently took up avantgarde themes, such as "Language history and structuralism", which was launched in the late 1950s and "Measurement of language proficiency" presented in the mid-1960s. These meetings were a successful precursor to the Scandinavian

⁵⁵ This meeting was originally scheduled for 1939 but was postponed due to wartime activity.

linguistics conferences that were established in the 1970s.

5.2.3. Journals

One characteristic feature of the nineteenth century is the emergence of scholarly journals as forums for publication and debate. In the Nordic countries, important journals of Scandinavian and Finno-Ugric studies also appeared, e.g. *Arkiv för nordisk filologi* (Archive for Scandinavian Philology, 1883) and *Finnisch-ugrische Forschungen. Zeitschrift für Finnisch-ugrische Sprach- und Volkskunde* (1901). However, what is novel in the twentieth century is not only the steadily increasing numbers of journals, but also the emergence of journals dealing with general linguistics. In this respect, the Nordic countries held a leading position. For instance in the middle of the century, three journals of general linguistics published in the Nordic countries constituted a significant part of the international market, as there were fewer than ten journals of this kind in the world at that time. In addition, some of the old journals adopted the new ideas, e.g. *Arkiv för nordisk filologi*, where several important articles on Swedish phonology and structural morphology and syntax were published.

The first volume of *Norsk Tidsskrift for Sprogvidenskap* (Norwegian Journal of Linguistics) appeared in 1928, only three years after the journal *Language* was introduced. But here it is important to note that Oslo was one of the first universities in the world that had a professorship in general linguistics, established in 1931. The Norwegian journal was created by Carl Marstrand, professor of Celtic languages (5.7.5.), and he remained its editor until his death in 1965. The editorial board reflects the journal's strong national character, as its members were all Norwegians. This was because the journal was only open to contributions from Norwegian linguists, and it was their main place of publication. Many monographs were also published here, for example Vogt's grammar of Georgian (1938) and Konow's primer of Khotanese Saka (1949) as well as the most important articles written by Borgstrøm, Sommerfelt, and Vogt. In most volumes, Sommerfelt wrote reviews of new publications in linguistics. These reviews had an important informative function and gave readers an international perspective on linguistic topics. Another characteristic feature of this journal was the preponderance of articles devoted to various aspects of runology, a product of Marstrand's interests. In vol. 3 (1929), for example, over half of the journal's 396 pages were devoted to runology.

The Danish journal *Acta Linguistica. Revue internationale de linguistique structurale* was established in 1939 by two Danish linguists who were not otherwise personally close and cooperative, Viggo Brøndal and Louis Hjelmslev (5.3.3.). The international editorial board of this Danish journal is impressive and includes the famous linguists Émile Benveniste, Giacomo Devoto, Henri Frei, Alan H. Gardiner, Roman Jakobson, Jerzy Kuryłowicz, Vilém Mathesius, A. Rosetti, A. Sechehaye, Alf Sommerfelt, Arvo Sotavalta, W. Freeman Twaddell, J. Vendryes, and N. van Wijk. The first volume clearly reflects the ambitions of the editors, and the list of contributors featured a parade of leading international names: Émile Benveniste, Roman Jakobson, Jerzy Kuryłowicz, W. Freeman Twaddell, André Martinet, and N. S. Trubetzkoy.

The *Acta Linguistica* editorial statement of the first volume was written jointly by Brøndal and Hjelmslev and simply stated that the centers of structural linguistics were Prague and Copenhagen and that there was a need for a more permanent, regular international forum for debating the topics discussed in the journal and at the international conferences. The editorial statement also contained some programmatic and fundamental statements on structuralism, such as the following:

Le point de vue structural, la conception de la langue dans sa totalité, dans son unité et dans son identité, se manifeste de plus en plus dans la linguistique d'aujourd'hui. (Brøndal and Hjelmslev 1939:1)

This journal continued to maintain its high standard until vol. VII in 1952, although by this time the publication schedule had become increasingly irregular. After 1952, publication ceased until 1960, when vol.

VIII appeared, and the journal did not print another issue until 1965, when vol. IX was published. These irregularities in publication between 1952 and 1965 were the result of Hjelmslev's theoretical frustration and subsequent illness. After 1965, the journal began to appear on a regular basis, but it had a somewhat different profile. It contained fewer international contributions and included more articles by Danish linguists.

The Swedish journal *Studia Linguistica. Revue de linguistique générale et comparée* was founded in 1947 by Bertil Malmberg and Stig Wikander. Other members of the editorial board were Nils Holmer, Hjalmar Lindroth, K. G. Ljunggren, Alf Lombard, and H. S. Nyberg. The editorial language was French (English had not yet become the lingua franca of linguistics), but articles written in German, English, and Spanish were also accepted. This journal became an important forum for Scandinavian linguists, interspersed with contributions by authors from other countries. The articles covered most fields in general linguistics as well as phonetics and comparative Indo-European linguistics.

Several additional journals appeared, devoted either to Scandinavian philology or to Germanic and Romance philology. Some of these journals also contained numerous linguistic contributions. An example is the Norwegian *Maal og Minne* (Speech and Tradition) founded by Magnus Olsen (5.6.5.), Professor of Old Norse and Icelandic Language and Literature in Oslo from 1908 to 1948 and a specialist in runology and Old Norse philology. The first volume appeared in 1909, and the language of publication was Norwegian. Most of the authors were Norwegian, but there were also a few contributions from outsiders. The journal was, and still is, mainly oriented towards philology, but a few linguists such as Olaf Broch and Alf Sommerfelt contributed regularly to the journal. Broch published some of his most important contributions to general linguistics here, namely his studies of spoken East Norwegian (O. Broch 1923) and of the pidgin language *russenorsk* (O. Broch 1927). Sommerfelt also published many of his informative reviews in this journal, e.g. of Otto Jespersen's 1922 edition of *Language* (Sommerfelt 1924). After World War II, the number of linguistic contributions increased, including several articles by Einar Haugen.

In Denmark, Lis Jacobsen (5.2.5.) and Johs. Brøndum-Nielsen (5.6.2.1.) played a similar role and were instrumental in producing *Acta Philologica Scandinavica*. From the outset these two journals were markedly different. *Acta Philologica Scandinavica* aimed at being an international journal with an editorial board on which there were representatives from all the Nordic countries. Its goal was to present Scandinavian philology to the outside world. Accordingly, in the first volume, all the contributions were written in English, German, or French. But gradually articles written in the Scandinavian languages appeared, and even more gradually it became a Danish journal. Eventually, the journal more or less became Brøndum-Nielsen's own personal forum for publication. This journal was never attractive to linguists, except Paul Diderichsen, and when Brøndum-Nielsen died in 1952, it gradually faded away.

Two additional Danish journals have published articles with primary focus on the native language, including not only linguistics but also literature and culture, namely *Danske studier* (Danish Studies, 1904-) and *Sprog og Kultur* (Language and Culture, 1932-).

Other Nordic journals focusing on specific fields were more successful in establishing contacts and in stimulating discussion. One example is the onomastic journal *Namn och bygd. Tidskrift för nordisk ortnamnsforskning* (Name and Settlement. Journal for Nordic Onomastic Research), which started in 1913 as a Swedish journal, but which soon became Nordic, with a Nordic editorial board. The introduction to the first volume maintains that the increase in scholarly activity and the general accumulation of knowledge necessitated cooperation on an international level.

In Uppsala, linguistic interest was combined with an interest in stylistics, evidenced by the title of the new journal *Språk och Stil* (Language and Style). Established in 1901 by Bengt Hesselman (1875-1952), Ruben G:son Berg (1876-1948), and Olof Östergren (1874-1963), this journal, however, focused mainly on the descriptive studies of modern Swedish. As a consequence, by 1921 the name was changed to *Nysvenska Studier* (Studies in Modern Swedish), but in 1992 the name was again changed to *Språk och Stil*.

The journal *Statistical Methods in Linguistics* (SMIL), established in 1962 by the Swedish linguist

Hans Karlgren (5.2.5.) and published until 1980, contributed to the development of structural and quantitative linguistics in the Nordic countries. Karlgren was inspired by the success of the 1960 Sundbyholm Manor Symposium (5.2.2.). A nephew of the famous sinologist Bernhard Karlgren (5.7.7.), Hans Karlgren saw the need for a modern journal that was devoted to the emerging field of computational and quantitative linguistics. SMIL was edited with an international audience in mind. For instance, the table of contents was also given in Russian, and the publisher used modern techniques, including a microfiche edition. “Statistical” was the key word in linguistics at that time, but related linguistic subjects were also accepted. The name of the journal was later changed to *SMIL — Journal of Linguistic Calculus*, reflecting its mathematical orientation. The journal provided a source of information for current activities in the Nordic countries, for example, that a Scandinavian machine translation group had met in Oslo in August 1961.

In Turku/Åbo, the interdisciplinary yearbook *Sananjalka* (literally: Foundation of the Word) went to press in 1959, supported by the Finnish Language Society (5.2.4.). From the onset, the contributors have been affiliated predominately with the University of Turku. *Sananjalka* has published several articles on theoretical linguistics over the years.

Hreinn Benediktsson (5.3.5.) was the first editor of the new Icelandic linguistic journal *Lingua Islandica - Íslenzk tunga* 1959-1965. This journal mainly contained articles on Icelandic written in Icelandic by Icelanders. But a few articles in other languages by both Icelanders and foreigners were also accepted.

In the Faroe Islands, the journal *Fróðskaparrit* (Journal of Science and Scholarship, 1952-) occasionally contained articles on Faroese linguistics.

5.2.4. Societies and Circles

The most important linguistic organization in the Nordic countries in this period was the Linguistic Circle of Copenhagen. This forum for linguistic discussions was founded in 1931 by Louis Hjelmslev, based on the model of the Linguistic Circle of Prague. Hjelmslev’s aim was to promote discussions on structuralism, a new kind of linguistic theory that was an important prerequisite for his own subsequent proposals for a theory of glossematics (5.3.4.). The Copenhagen Circle brought together a group of linguists that could participate collectively in international conferences just as the Prague school linguists had done at the Haag conference in 1928. In the course of a few years, Hjelmslev, together with colleagues such as Viggo Brøndal, succeeded in organizing nearly all Danish linguists in this society. They also managed to establish a periodical, *Acta Linguistica*, and to found a linguistics library.

The central idea behind the Copenhagen circle was to include only active members. By “active” the circle meant those who could participate in plenary meetings and discussion groups within three sub-committees, one on grammar, one on phonology, and one on Caucasian languages. Of these committees, only the grammar committee turned out to be productive. From the beginning, Hjelmslev was the dominant figure and the one who set the agenda for the topics to be discussed. Yet Viggo Brøndal also came to play an important, albeit controversial role from Hjelmslev’s point of view. Brøndal served the valuable function of organizing the activities of the circle. At first Hjelmslev and Brøndal joined forces to attract new members. Promising young scholars, including Eli Fischer-Jørgensen and Paul Diderichsen, who were initially fascinated by the new trends in linguistics, were sought out to be members of the circle. The initial years were stormy for the group. Disagreements arose over the circle’s publications and over its leadership. These conflicts were particularly heated from 1934 to 1937 when Hjelmslev was in Aarhus (cf. Gregersen 1991:86ff). Later problems were due to conflicts between Hjelmslev and Brøndal.

The plenary meetings were all centered upon a structuralist theme. Hjelmslev gave two lectures in 1933, on the general structure of grammatical systems (April 17th) and on case (May 18th). Brøndal and his pupils delivered numerous lectures during the three year period from 1934 to 1937. Paul Diderichsen used this forum to test applications of Hjelmslev’s theory of glossematics in a lecture on number in Danish in 1945, and later to develop his own theory of syntax. For example, as early as 1941, Diderichsen gave a

critical presentation of the French linguist Jean Fourquet's book on positional syntax.

The most important function of the Linguistic Circle was to stimulate the theoretical discussion of issues in linguistics and to inform the Danish linguistic population of new developments in the field. The inspiring nature of this organization has been characterized by the Danish linguist Eli Fischer-Jørgensen as follows:

Thus it was as if pent-up forces were being liberated, like awakening to a new life when I participated in the Linguistic Circle of Copenhagen and thus came in contact with the new directions in linguistics which attempted to view the infinite details of language from a more elevated and simplified point of view and to shed light on the specific methods and problems of linguistics using general cognitive principles. (Fischer-Jørgensen 1992:4)

An important factor in Norwegian linguistics in the twentieth century was the Norwegian Linguistic Society, *Norsk forening for sprogvidenskap*, cf. Bergsland (1984). This organization was founded in 1924, primarily on the initiative of Olaf Broch, the first chairperson, and Alf Sommerfelt, the first secretary. In the invitation to the founding meeting of the society Alf Sommerfelt wrote:

Linguistics is developing rapidly these days. In every country the number of publications is increasing, most of them especially concerned with the specific principles of general linguistics, and this discussion will surely be of decisive significance for our own research in historical linguistics. (cited after Bergsland 1984:37)

An important aspect of the first years of the society was the presentation of modern trends in linguistics and to conduct a heated debate with neogrammarians such as Falk, cf. Bergsland (1984:38) and 5.3.1. However, to some extent, Sommerfelt used the society to promote his own views. As early as 1924, Meillet was invited to give a lecture at one of the meetings. After 1928, for reasons that are not clear, the society stopped functioning, but its activity was continued through the editorial board of *Norsk Tidsskrift for Sprogvidenskap* (Norwegian Journal of Linguistics, 5.2.3.), which included all the core members of the society, and through the monthly social gatherings of linguists that Sommerfelt arranged in his home.

In 1948, Hans Vogt again revived the Linguistic Society, and its monthly meetings have since functioned as a central and inspiring forum for linguists in the Oslo area. The speakers participating in the society have been an even mixture of old and young Norwegian linguists and guest lecturers from abroad, often famous names in linguistics.

In the 1950s, the Linguistic Society (*Språkvitenskapelig forening*) was established in Bergen. The main function of this circle was to serve as a meeting place for linguists from the University of Bergen and from the College of Economics and Business Administration.

Various fora for philological or linguistic presentations and discussions were established in Sweden by the end of the nineteenth century. They were important since the cooperation between language departments was scarce and departments in general linguistics were not established until the 1960s. It is interesting to see the type of presentations and discussions that took place in the Philological Society at Lund (established in 1881). The following are some of the lecture titles (translated into English) from the period 1920-1965.

Nov. 1920	Axel Kock	The interpretation of the Björketorp stone
Nov. 1925	Sigurd Agrell	The numeral magic of runes and its antique origin
March 1937	Gunnar Jarring	The spread of the Latin alphabet
Sept. 1938	André Martinet, Paris	The purpose and methods of phonology
Dec. 1941	Bertil Malmberg	On the French vowel system
April 1949	Nils Holmer	Structure types in the American Indian languages
Nov. 1956	Henry Henne, Oslo	Word classification in Japanese
March 1958	Bengt Sigurd	Mechanical translation
March 1960	Louis Hjelmslev, Copenhagen	A lexical and grammatical description of numerals
May 1962	Pierre Naert	Lexical contacts between Ainu and Gilyak

March 1964	Bengt Loman	Problems of synonym research
Nov. 1965	Jan Svartvik, Gothenburg	New studies of English syntax

The membership and participants increased from about ten to around fifty during this period, but the number of meetings decreased from several to one per semester.

The Philological Society (*Filologiska samfundet*) in Gothenburg was established in 1900. The meetings were to be held every month, which indicates the philological enthusiasm brewing at the University of Gothenburg at the beginning of the century. In contrast, the number of meetings per semester was reduced to three beginning in the 1950s, and no meetings have been held since 1986. The society had fifty members in the first decades and as many as 200 during the 1950s. The decline of the philological societies can probably be explained by the expansion of the various language departments in the 1960s, most of which had their own seminars, and by the establishment of departments of linguistics that focused on modern general linguistics.

A linguistic circle in Stockholm met informally at the phonetics laboratory during the 1950s and 1960s. It was initiated by Bengt Loman, and among the early participants were Lars Gunnar Hallander, Lars Hermodsson, Sten Malmström, Els Oksaar, Nils Stridsberg, and Claes Christian Elert. Participants in this circle felt that the traditional postgraduate courses placed too much emphasis on historical linguistics and too little focus on contemporary ideas, especially those of American structural linguistics as represented by Zellig Harris's *Methods in Structural Linguistics* (1947), a work which was studied in detail at some of the first meetings. The meetings were open to anyone who was interested and provided an opportunity for students and professors to meet together and to listen to outside lecturers.

It is a characteristic feature of Swedish linguistics that phonetics and linguistics developed side by side. In Stockholm, for example, there was close cooperation between linguists, phoneticians, and speech technologists at the Royal Institute of Technology (*Kungliga Tekniska Högskolan*). It is also characteristic that this development took place in an informal democratic way and was not headed by one authoritative person.

Finland probably has the greatest number and variety of active linguistic and philological societies (4.2.). The Finnish Oriental Society (*Suomen Itämainen Seura - Finska Orientsällskapet*) was founded in 1917 and has published the series *Studia Orientalia* since 1925. A new society for Finnish and ethnology, *Suomen Kielen Seura* (Finnish Language Society), was established in connection with the University of Turku in 1929. Later, this society broadened its scope to cover Finno-Ugric linguistics, literature, and folklore as well, i.e. all the central national sciences that were so important in Finland, especially during the first half of the century (Ikola 1980:78).

In the late 1950s, a group of linguists met in Turku on the initiative of Paavo Siro (5.3.1.), then an associate professor of Finnish at the University of Turku. Their purpose was to discuss linguistic problems, particularly the application of structural and (later) generative theories to Finnish. Other participants were Mauno Koski (1930-), Alho Alhoniemi (1933-), and Kalevi Wiik (1932-). This informal network that began in the 1960s, called *Kielitieteen kerho* (Linguistics Club), was influential in creating a theoretical linguistic milieu in Turku. Cf. also 5.3.1.

5.2.5. Entrepreneurs

The notion “entrepreneur” refers to those individuals who in one way or another played a particularly active role in stimulating the field of linguistics. This could be done by creating linguistic infrastructures, such as founding societies, journals, or research groups, by facilitating international contacts, heading important organizations or committees, or by establishing contacts with politicians, etc. In addition, entrepreneurs are often theoretically innovative, either as a result of their own original work or owing to their successful mediation of new ideas from abroad. In some cases both innovation and mediation are involved. Organizational ability is also one basic characteristic of an entrepreneur. This is why entrepreneurs are often elected to the positions of dean, rector, chancellor, and occasionally even as a member of parliament or a minister in the government.

Entrepreneurs are not a new phenomenon in the history of science, but they became much more prominent and influential in the twentieth century. As universities increasingly institutionalized linguistic research and research funding began to be organized on an institutional and government level, it became more important to be a good administrator, to know the rules of the game and to take the initiative in acquiring new posts, new scholarships, good students, and economic support.

To a great degree, individuals and not institutions changed the course of development in Nordic linguistics during this period, or at least they initiated the development that subsequently led to change. In some cases, the promotion of one linguistic area occurred at the expense of others, and of course, there were also individuals who were in a position to block changes, thereby contributing to fossilization.

Where Denmark is concerned, the designation “entrepreneur” is particularly appropriate for two linguists, namely Lis Jacobsen (1882-1961) and Paul Diderichsen (1905-1964).

Although Lis Jacobsen contributed to the study of the Danish language as a historical linguist, philologist, and runologist (5.6.2.1., 5.6.5. and 5.6.7.1.), some of her greatest merits are to be found in her remarkable ability to gain financial and political support for large-scale projects of national interest, most within the area of linguistics and philology. In 1911 she founded a society for editing contributions to the study of language and literature, *Det danske sprog- og litteraturselskab* (Danish Society for Language and Literature), which has since published numerous philological studies of high quality. Moreover, she was instrumental in overseeing the completion of the 28-volume dictionary of the Danish language. She also took the initiative to publish an encyclopedia of medieval Scandinavian cultural history, *Kulturhistorisk Leksikon for nordisk Middelalder*, and paved the way for the publication of a concise dictionary of modern Danish, *Nudansk Ordbog*.

Paul Diderichsen’s most significant effort on the organizational level was to found the Nordic Summer Academy (*Nordiska Sommarakademin*) for which he is largely responsible (5.2.2.). It was in this context that he succeeded not only in creating an interest in theoretical linguistics among students and teachers throughout the Nordic countries, but also in bringing together scholars from various fields outside linguistics in an attempt to further the kind of academic cross-fertilization that was so important to him.

In the area of university administration, Diderichsen was untiring in his efforts to revise and update the curriculum. Students were his primary concern, and his idealism often led him to introduce reforms that were in conflict with existing patterns and which placed a significantly greater work load on his colleagues. Through his reform efforts, Diderichsen unwittingly paved the way for the 1968 student revolution. In this movement the students of Scandinavian philology in Copenhagen were among the most active, partly by demonstrating that the modernization of a conservative curriculum was indeed possible, and partly by proving, if only on a small scale, that student interests could be accommodated by even such a rigid and traditional academic institution as the University of Copenhagen. Diderichsen was also acutely concerned with promoting closer contact between the university and the schools. His efforts toward this end included his historiographic work on various conceptions of language and the linguistic education provided in the Danish school system, which was published posthumously in 1968.

In Finland, academic entrepreneurs, including linguists, have played a more vital official and political role than in the other Nordic countries. This may be because the combination of academic status and

political influence is more common in Finland than in other countries and because a Finnish professor's power and influence is generally somewhat greater than in other countries.

The first linguistic entrepreneur in Finland was Otto Donner (4.4.2.), who founded the Finno-Ugrian Society and was instrumental in organizing the great research trips to Russia. After Donner, beginning in the late 1880s, E. N. Setälä became a central, though often controversial, figure in the field of Finno-Ugric and Finnic studies (4.4.2.).

Setälä proposed three dictionary projects in 1896, (i) a dictionary of Finnish dialects, (ii) a dictionary of old literary Finnish, and (iii) a dictionary of modern literary Finnish. Afterwards he used his influence to place himself at the head of the dialect dictionary project as chairman of the board of the dictionary foundation. The colorful and chaotic events leading to the establishing of the dictionary foundation, as well as Setälä's role in this process, are described in detail by Häkkinen (1993:34-41). Having been appointed Minister of Education in 1925, Setälä used this position to acquire government support for his dictionary enterprise. As a result of his efforts, the dialect dictionary gradually grew into one of the largest projects ever undertaken in Finland (5.6.7.2.). Nevertheless, this was not without negative effects, as stated in the words of M. Korhonen (1986:139):

Setälä himself could hardly have envisaged the immense and far-reaching nature of the project which to this day has bound, for over ninety years, a considerable part of the resources — both material and in personnel — that a small country could set aside for linguistic research.

Setälä became Minister of Foreign Affairs in 1926, and that same year he was also elected Chancellor of the University of Turku. In 1930 he organized the founding of the private research institute *Suomen suku* (The Family of Finnish) in connection with the University of Turku, its major task being to compile an etymological dictionary of Finnish. In practice, the institute was not located in Turku, but in Setälä's home in Tuusula (Tusby), forty kilometers northeast of Helsinki (cf. Erkki Itkonen 1976). This geographical separation, coupled with disagreements over fiscal affairs, explains in part why the relationship between the institute and the university was problematic. From 1930 until Setälä's death in 1935, serious disagreements arose between Setälä and the University of Turku as to how the university should be developed. This led to the resignation of Rector V. A. Koskenniemi in 1932, a large public debate, and to a situation in which the very existence of the University of Turku was at stake (Perälä 1970:149-178). In 1937, *Suomen suku* was detached from the University of Turku and associated with the dictionary foundation.

The cornerstone of modern Finnish research policy was laid by a government committee headed by Edwin Linkomies (1894-1963), professor of Roman literature at the University of Helsinki from 1923, Rector from 1956 to 1962, and Chancellor from 1962 to 1963. Linkomies was also a member of the Finnish Parliament from 1933 to 1945 and Prime Minister during the difficult and decisive war years from 1943 to 1944. He and President Risto Ryti managed to lead Finland out of the war still as an independent nation. In 1958, Linkomies was appointed chairman of a new government committee which was to make proposals concerning the way scholarly research should be organized in Finland. The Linkomies Committee, as it was referred to, submitted a number of far-reaching proposals regarding public sponsoring of research, the organization of the Academy of Finland (especially its commissions for various disciplines), the need for new types of research positions (e.g. assistantships), and the government administration of science.

Along similar lines, Paavo Rivila (1902-1974), professor of Finnish and Finnic languages at the University of Turku 1934-1949 and of Finno-Ugrian linguistics at the University of Helsinki 1949-1956, was influential in dictating Finnish university and research policy during the 1950s and 1960s. Rivila was also Rector of the University of Helsinki from 1953 to 1956, Chancellor (1963-1968), member of the former Academy of Finland (5.2.1.) from 1956, and its chairman from 1963. He is also to be credited for proposing a chair in general linguistics at the University of Helsinki, a suggestion he made for the first time in 1958 in a speech addressing the Finno-Ugrian Society. This professorship was eventually founded in 1966.

In Norway, the situation was different. Here initiatives on a more personal level played a greater role than power and political influence. Although the Norwegian linguist Alf Sommerfelt (5.3.1.) cannot be considered to be an entrepreneur in the sense that he was a leading theoretical figure or the organizer of research projects, he deserves mention here because of his far-reaching influence as a teacher. Through his theoretically diverse and undogmatic seminars, Sommerfelt educated a whole generation of Norwegian linguists. He would invite colleagues and students to his home on a monthly basis, thus promoting an atmosphere of close and constructive research cooperation.

In Sweden, the first person that comes to mind as an entrepreneur is Hans Karlgren. As a young linguist, Karlgren (1933-1996) worked with the mathematician Benny Brodda (who later became professor of Computational linguistics in Stockholm) to establish a forum for research in quantitative linguistics, the KVAL-group. The Hungarian linguist Ferenc Kiefer also belonged to this research group. Karlgren did not hold a university position, but he did manage to organize numerous symposia, conferences and seminars in the area of computational linguistics. He also conducted research, particularly on statistical approaches to morphology and syntax. Kiefer was instrumental in establishing the International Conference on Computational Linguistics (COLING) and was a long-time member of the International Committee on Computational Linguistics. The first conference organized by this committee was held in New York in 1965. Karlgren also played an important role in establishing a forum for the publication of research in computational linguistics by founding the journal *Statistical Methods in Linguistics* (5.2.3.).

In addition to Bertil Malmberg, who was influential in establishing new chairs in phonetics and general linguistics in the 1960s (5.3.3.), and Max Gorosch, who took the initiative in founding the International Association for Applied Linguistics (5.3.7.), one other Swedish linguist deserves the title “entrepreneur”, namely Jöran Sahlgren (1884-1971).

Sahlgren attracted scholarly attention even as a young man when he published a critique of professors Noreen and Hellquist. He played a particularly active role in founding various academic societies in Sweden. While Sahlgren was a member of the editorial board of the Dictionary of the Swedish Academy in Lund, he took the initiative to establish *Sydsvenska ortnamnssällskapet* (Place-name Society of Southern Sweden) in 1925, hereby initiating the systematic collection of place-names in this part of the country. He was appointed to a personal chair in Scandinavian place-name research in Uppsala in 1930, where he founded *Ortnamnssällskapet i Uppsala* (Place-name Society of Uppsala). He was the founder of a new Swedish academy, *Gustaf Adolfs Akademien* (Gustaf Adolf Academy), and his talents in fund-raising brought several major contributions to the University of Uppsala.

5. 3. General Linguistics

5.3.1. The Reception of New Trends in Linguistics in the Nordic Countries

The neogrammarian paradigm dominated Nordic linguistics at the beginning of the twentieth century. Two Danish linguists, Holger Pedersen and Vilhelm Thomsen, were prominent neogrammarians. In Finland, E. N. Setälä dominated the scene, and Sweden was a neogrammarian stronghold headed by Adolf Noreen and Axel Kock. However, the most influential Nordic linguist in the beginning of the twentieth century was the Dane Otto Jespersen (5.3.3.) whose textbooks and numerous other books gave readers balanced, although not uncritical, information on what was going on in the field of linguistics. Jespersen had a broad theoretical orientation, was interested in all subsystems of language, and invoked examples from many different languages in a way that made him a precursor of language typology.

Louis Hjelmslev, who was educated within the neogrammarian paradigm, introduced structuralism in Denmark. Hjelmslev developed his own particular version of structuralism (5.3.4.) and soon became one of the world’s leading structuralists. Up to 1960, Denmark was thus in the forefront of modern theoretical

linguistics. This situation changed after Hjelmslev's death, in the wake of glossematics, when Danish linguists apparently experienced a certain weariness of abstract theorizing with few if any concrete applications, cf. Herslund (1996).

During this period structural linguistics was introduced in Norway by Alf Sommerfelt (1892-1965), lecturer at the University of Oslo from 1926 and professor of general linguistics (1931-1962), cf. Hovdhaugen (1978). Sommerfelt was educated abroad, mainly in Paris. In his seminars, he introduced Saussure and structuralism, including glossematics, the Prague school, and American structuralism. Sommerfelt was thoroughly familiar with the neogrammarian method in historical-comparative linguistics and used it in the French version of Meillet. Even so, in many of his studies, he was met with opposition from both neogrammarians and from the departments of Scandinavian languages. For instance, Hjalmar Falk (5.3.2.) was Sommerfelt's main opponent. Sommerfelt's response to Falk's criticism (1925) provides a good survey of the discussion which took place between these two linguists. The main point of controversy was the emphasis Sommerfelt and the French school placed on the social aspects of language and language change. This was hard to accept for the neogrammarians, who stuck to a psychological explanation of the assumed mechanical character of sound changes.

This opposition was, however, short-lived. Soon both old and new comparativists, as well as professors of Oriental and non-Indo-European languages, joined Sommerfelt's seminars. The opposition to his work from the professors of Norwegian was more serious. This divisiveness was long-lasting, and until the 1960s, little contact, several conflicts, and a fair amount of mutual distrust continued to exist between the Scandinavian departments and general linguistics.

One reason for this conflict can probably be found in the significance of the mother tongue in Norwegian linguistic research. Nobody could be a professor of nynorsk and hardly of bokmål without subscribing to a large extent to the ideologies of the two linguistic movements. The task of professors of both bokmål and nynorsk was in part to subscribe to the official normative policy concerning the two variants. An important person in this regard was professor Marius Hægstad who, already in his inaugural lecture in 1899, formulated a program for his work and that of his followers, cf. Venås (1992:163-166). Hægstad's view of language is emotional and idealistic, stressing the excellent inherent qualities of nynorsk and its natural and organic growth. To some extent one can understand why a more objective, non-evaluative approach like structuralism had to be rejected by this tradition, and one can also understand why those working in the well-established neogrammarian paradigm opposed an alternative approach. The total rejection of structuralist terminology, above all of the term *phoneme* and structuralist phonology in general, however, can hardly be interpreted as anything but the fossilization of a vulnerable tradition that regarded even the smallest change as a threat to its own position.

In the 1930s and 1940s Sommerfelt and some of the leading riksmål/bokmål professors such as Didrik Arup Seip (5.6.2.4.) and Trygve Knudsen frequently worked cooperatively (5.6.1.5.). Seip joined the editorial board of *Norsk Tidsskrift for Sprogvidenskap* (Norwegian Journal of Linguistics), and Knudsen worked together with Sommerfelt on a large dictionary project (5.5.7.4.). But there were few if any traces of structural linguistics in the work of Seip and Knudsen, and they did not affect the development of linguistics in the Scandinavian Department in Oslo.

In 1921 Sigurd Kolsrud (1888-1957) was appointed professor of Scandinavian languages in Oslo. In this capacity he strongly influenced the scholarly attitude of his department. Kolsrud was not only untheoretical, he also disliked theories of any kind, and even strongly disdained methodological innovations. To him, the term *phonology* was useless, and the use of the word *phoneme* was almost heresy. He was not alone in his views, however, as similar views were prevalent at that time in both Sweden and Finland.

The first serious conflict arose in 1931 when Hallfried Christiansen (1886-1964) submitted a doctoral thesis on the phonological analysis of a Norwegian dialect. By contemporary standards this was not a revolutionary work, but Christiansen used modern terms such as *phoneme* and employed the methodology of minimal pairs in her analysis. With Sommerfelt on the evaluating committee, the thesis was accepted, but

Kolsrud's opposition at the public defense contained mainly negative criticism.

A more decisive confrontation occurred in 1947 when Magne Oftedal (1921-1985) submitted a structuralist study of the phonology of his own dialect of Jæren for a degree in the Scandinavian department. The thesis was rejected by Kolsrud. Sommerfelt and Hans Vogt subsequently helped Oftedal to get his degree in linguistics with the same thesis. Oftedal later became professor of Celtic languages in Oslo (5.7.5.), no doubt a loss for the Scandinavian department.

Many of the young scholars who had taken part in Sommerfelt's seminars were given positions as professors just after 1945: Carl Hj. Borgstrøm (1909-1986) was appointed to the first professorship exclusively devoted to comparative Indo-European philology in 1947, Hans Vogt (1903-1986) became professor in Romance languages in 1946 and succeeded Alf Sommerfelt as professor of general linguistics in 1962, and Knut Bergsland (1914-1998) became professor of Finno-Ugric linguistics in 1947. When Harris Birkeland (1904-1964) is added to this list, as he became professor of Semitic languages in 1948, it can be said with some justification that the period from 1945 to 1950 was evidence of the institutional success of the "Sommerfelt School".

From the late 1950s onwards, the Norwegian-born American linguist Einar Haugen (1906-1994) played an important role in bridging the gap between linguists and scholars of Scandinavian languages. Haugen was a leading American linguist, particularly on the organizational level, and one of the founders of sociolinguistics. He maintained close contact with scholars both in the linguistics and in the Scandinavian departments, and even though he favored the riksmål side of the Norwegian language, he was respected in both camps. He was the general linguist that scholars in the Scandinavian departments would listen to and from whom they could tolerate criticism, which sometimes was strong and straightforward.

Swedish university departments did not establish chairs in linguistics until 1965. The historical-philological tradition was strong, with dialectology and place-name research attracting many practitioners. However, an interest in general linguistics emerged occasionally. A growing interest in general linguistics manifested itself, for example, in a series of lectures arranged by *Språkvetenskapliga Sällskapet i Uppsala* (Linguistic Society of Uppsala) in 1942. These lectures (Nyberg 1943) were intended to give an overview of linguistics, but they show little evidence of the international structuralist trends.

In Sweden, modern general linguistics was introduced via phonetics. In Uppsala, regular courses in phonetics were given in the early 1950s. These courses were taken over in 1955 by Göran Hammarström (1922-), lecturer in Romance languages. Hammarström became a keen structuralist (cf. Hammarström 1966, English version 1976), and his seminars in Uppsala were a forum for theoretical discussions. However, shortly after becoming professor of phonetics in 1965, he moved to Monash University in Melbourne.

The first ideas from contemporary European linguistics were introduced in Stockholm by the Hungarian-born linguist John Lotz, who published a structural grammar of Hungarian in Stockholm in 1939. Lotz accepted a post at Columbia University in 1945, but was called back to Stockholm in 1962 to build a new program in general linguistics. In addition, the informal linguistic circle in Stockholm (5.2.4.) played a significant role in the reception of structural linguistics. The cooperation between Gunnar Fant at the Royal Institute of Technology and Roman Jakobson and Morris Halle at MIT resulted in a classical work in phonology: *Preliminaries to Speech Analysis* (1951). The acknowledgment in the preface to the second edition, where C. H. Borgstrøm, Eli Fischer-Jørgensen, and Knud Tøgeby are mentioned, illustrates the international networking of Nordic linguists in this period.

In Gothenburg, the problems of general linguistics were discussed in the seminars of the language departments headed by Natanael Beckman (1868-1946, professor of Scandinavian languages 1918-1937) and Hjalmar Lindroth (1878-1947, professor of Scandinavian languages 1919-1945). Lindroth, one of the first Swedish scholars to try to clarify the complex syntax and semantics of reflexive pronouns (Lindroth 1941), was head of the Dialect, Place-name, and Folklore Archives (*Dialekt-, ortnamns- och folkminnesarkivet*) at the University of Gothenburg and published a popular book on place-names (Lindroth 1923).

Linguists in Lund were introduced to general linguistics mainly by way of Copenhagen. Moreover, World War II had an effect on scholarly activities. The Frenchman Pierre Naert (1916-1971), who worked in Lund from 1939 to 1962, became a lecturer in Scandinavian languages and included Saussure in his teaching. From Lund, Naert moved to the University of Turku in 1962 to become professor of Scandinavian philology. He is also known for his interest in the Ainu language.

Bertil Malmberg's obligatory courses in phonetics for all language students and the establishment of the journal *Studia Linguistica* in 1947 (5.2.3.) were both significant in providing a more wide-spread introduction to general linguistics. Malmberg's early engagement in the new trends in linguistics is apparent in his article "What is phonology?" (Malmberg 1939). Here he introduced phonology (phonemics) in Sweden and started a debate on the nature of the phoneme, experimental phonetics, and the role of phonology in linguistic description, views which were fiercely opposed by his neogrammarian colleagues.

Roman Jakobson (1896-1982) was a main source of inspiration for Norwegian linguistics in this period, and his influence was also felt to a certain extent in Denmark and Sweden. Jakobson and Trubetzkoy had developed the Prague-school theories of structuralist phonology already in the 1930s. But Jakobson fled the Nazis in 1939. With the help of Brøndal and Hjelmslev, he escaped to Denmark and later to Norway, where Sommerfelt helped him to obtain Norwegian citizenship and a part-time job at the University of Oslo. In 1940, Jakobson had to flee again, and this time he went to Sweden. While in Sweden, he wrote his famous book *Kindersprache, Aphasie und allgemeine Lautgesetze*, printed in Uppsala (1941), where he spent some time before going to the United States in 1941. While in Norway, Jakobson started an ambitious research project in 1939 to produce a phonetic atlas of the world, which, like many of his projects, was never realized. Jakobson maintained a close personal relationship with Norwegian linguists for the rest of his life, and many present-day Norwegian linguists have had the inspiring experience of conversing with Jakobson at one of his favorite Norwegian restaurants, traveling by car with him through the countryside, or joining him at a late party with friends. A concrete indication of Jakobson's attachment to Norway was his Norwegian passport, which he still used when he attended the Eighth International Congress of Linguists in Oslo in 1957, a conference at which he was a central figure.

Before World War II, the general orientation towards Germany was particularly obvious in Finland. The thinking of scholars like Walter Porzig, Hans Sperber, Leo Weisgerber, and Wilhelm Wundt was influential, not to mention the classical neogrammarians, especially Hermann Paul. When Lauri Hakulinen presented his doctoral dissertation (1933) on historical semantics in the framework of Hans Sperber's theory of meaning, and in partial opposition to then established etymological doctrines, he was strongly criticized by neogrammarians like Martti Rapola. Thus a fierce dispute arose as to whether or not the dissertation should be accepted. Finally, however, it was accepted (cf. 5.6.4.2.).

Influences from and references to Saussure can be seen in Aarni Penttilä's dissertation (1926) on the accentuation of Finnic languages (cf. 5.3.6. and 5.4.). The first full-blown writing in the framework of structuralism was Valentin Kiparsky's presentation of Prague-school phonology (1932), but the editor of *Virittäjä* only reluctantly published this paper (cf. 5.3.5.).

In the midst of World War II, the first major public debate in theoretical linguistics took place in Finland. Its instigator was Paavo Siro (1909-1996, professor of Finnish at the University of Tampere 1965-1975), who published a paper entitled "Lauseoppi uuden logiikan valossa" (Syntax in the Light of Modern Logic, 1941). Siro had studied philosophy under the legendary Finnish philosopher Eino Kaila (1890-1958) and became inspired by symbolic logic, in particular by Carnap, Ajdukiewicz, and Tarski. In the course of his studies in Finnic languages, he became dissatisfied with the prevailing diachronic paradigm. He was particularly critical of the syntactic descriptive system embodied in Setälä's codification (Setälä 1880), and considered his main challenge to be a theoretically satisfactory description of the Finnish case system, especially of object marking (cf. Leino 1996).

Siro raised the question of how the syntax of Finnish could be described if it were a formal language. His aim was to present a synchronic description on a general level, made by means of exact formal rules. To

Siro, this description needed to fully cover the data, taking the sentence level (rather than morphological categories) as the starting point of syntax, and to do so without invoking psychological considerations. He tried to define the basic minimal sentence types of Finnish (Siro 1941:200) and to distinguish between central and peripheral constituents of the sentence. He also demonstrated how syntactic structures could be described by using logical formulae.

Siro's paper clashed with the prevalent neogrammarian paradigm. In a paper on the origin of Uralic sentence structure ("Uralilaisen lauseen alkuperäisestä rakenteesta"), Paavo Ravila (5.2.5.) claimed (1943:249) that it was totally useless to refer to formal logic in the description of natural language syntax and that one must remain in the realm of pure linguistic phenomena, which are the only possible sources of explanation. Ravila continued his opposition in a paper on fundamental problems of syntax ("Lauseopin periaatekysymyksiä", 1944) in which he claimed that formalization of natural language is impossible not only in practice but also in principle, that syntactic investigation is an empirical science where one must confine oneself to authentic sentences, and that the historical point of view is the only correct, purely scholarly method (1944:108, 120, 131).

Ravila was one of the few Finnish linguists between 1940 and 1965 to take an active interest in the international development of linguistic theory and to attempt to transmit the new ideas to Finland. He wrote a number of knowledgeable general presentations of current linguistic concepts and issues, for example on the relation between linguistics and positivism, truth and method in linguistics, the parts of speech from a general (especially Uralic) point of view, the notion *protolanguage* as a basic concept of historical linguistics, the phoneme, the notion *structure*, the morpheme, and transformational syntax. Ravila had a critical attitude to many of the new approaches, especially to transformational generative grammar. A collection of his papers on theoretical topics was published in 1967 under the title *Totuus ja metodi* (Truth and Method). In the preface, Ravila states (1967:6) that he would be happy if the essays could inspire an interest in young students for general theoretical questions. The following statements are indicative of Ravila's views:

I think it is clear that the theory that Brøndal [1939; also cf. 5.3.3.] is developing can never serve as the basis of fruitful linguistics. (Ravila 1967 [1941]:20)

... linguistics is basically a historical science. Every single linguistic concept that ignores the notion 'time' is unscientific. (Ravila 1967 [1941]:25)

The best grammar is one where copious, reliable, and well-structured materials (Finn. *aines*) speak for themselves without being overshadowed by a spider's web of mixed new terms and questionable concepts. (Ravila 1967 [1951]:35)

Surely no traditional linguist has been able to avoid the impression that in structuralism and modern descriptive linguistics such basic concepts as the phoneme resemble artificial constructs. (Ravila (1967 [1962]:147)

Such judgments, reiterated in 1967, articulate a fundamental skepticism towards structural linguistics that was typical of much of Finland's mainstream linguistics prior to 1965. Another influential Finnish linguist sharing this skeptical attitude towards linguistic theorizing was Martti Rapola (cf. 5.6.2.2. and 5.6.4.2.).

In the period from 1900 to 1965, Finnish linguistics had less contacts with the international development of linguistic theory than Danish, Norwegian, and Swedish linguistics had. The disastrous effects of World War II are obvious, and they had not been overcome by 1960. However, as pointed out by Urho Määttä (1994, 1998), an innovative research tradition began to emerge in Finno-Ugric studies through the work of Eliel Lagercrantz in the 1920s and of Erkki Itkonen in the late 1930s (5.5.2.), a kind of holistic Gestalt approach to phonology and especially to morphology. This tradition grew stronger after 1965 (6.3.4.). After the war, a few Finnish linguists went abroad (especially to the United States) to study, e.g. Nils Erik Enkvist in the late 1940s, Eeva Kangasmaa-Minn in the early 1950s, and Kalevi Wiik in the late

1950s. Through these scholars, ideas from contemporary American linguistics came to Turku/Åbo.

Icelandic linguistics was not really influenced by structural linguistics before 1965, but from then on it participated in international linguistic discussions on a scale beyond what we find in many other European countries. In the late 1950s, however (cf. Benediktsson 1958, Thráinsson 1996), structural phonology began to gain a foothold through the publications and initiatives of Hreinn Benediktsson (5.3.5.).

5.3.2. Introductory Textbooks and Popular Introductions

When linguistics developed into a discipline of its own, and as the field made its way into university curricula, a need arose for elementary textbooks. The success of historical-comparative linguistics and breakthroughs such as Thomsen's decipherment of the Orkhon inscriptions (4.7.1.) created a market for popular introductions to the field. Public discussions on language planning and standardization also increased the demand for popular presentations designed for lay readers.

Textbooks and popular introductions are not only valuable from a socio-scientific perspective, but these publications also have an inherent theoretical value. In Kuhn's (1970 [1962]) terminology, these texts are important exponents of a scholarly paradigm or "disciplinary matrix". In a branch of scholarship or science, a paradigm defines the practitioners' shared values, goals, methods, world view, etc. Textbooks are important in introducing novices to the paradigm, making them believe in it, causing them to pose the right type of questions, and to solve problems according to the methods recommended.

E. N. Setälä wrote a kind of neogrammarian textbook as early as in 1891 (cf. 4.4.2.). This book was used for several decades in Finland as an introduction to the principles of language study. Another early introductory book was written by the Dane Kristian Sandfeld Jensen (1913), who states in the introduction, that he is greatly indebted to Jespersen. This book was intended as an elementary introduction to linguistic studies and views linguistics entirely in a historical-comparative perspective. In the framework of this book, phonology, for example, is sound change, morphology is analogy, and semantics is semasiology.

Otto Jespersen wrote an influential advanced textbook in linguistics entitled *The Philosophy of Grammar* (1924), as well as several popular books on various aspects of language and linguistics, e.g. on child language, on the origin and growth of language, and on the nature of language. Jespersen addressed his works to both a Danish (O. Jespersen 1916, 1926b) and an international (O. Jespersen 1922) audience. All his publications were successful (cf. 5.3.3. for the content and theoretical orientation of these studies).

Since 1920 the University of Oslo had offered elementary courses in linguistics and phonetics which were obligatory for all language students. Because most students had at least one language as part of their degree program, this meant that most students in the humanities attended these courses. The courses in phonetics were given by Olaf Broch and Ernst W. Selmer and the courses in linguistics by Falk, Sommerfelt, Vogt, Borgstrøm, etc. Many of these scholars later published their lectures as introductory textbooks (O. Broch and E. Selmer 1921, Falk 1920, 1923, Vogt 1945, Sommerfelt 1947, Borgstrøm 1958).

The Norwegian neogrammarian Hjalmar Falk (1859-1928, professor of Germanic philology 1897, cf. 4.5.3.2.) published two books designed primarily for the introductory courses in linguistics in Oslo. His first book (1920) is an introduction to semantics, focusing exclusively on historical semantics. Falk cited numerous examples from Germanic and other Indo-European languages, but offered no theoretical treatment. Furthermore, the basic concepts of semantics are not discussed or defined, but simply taken for granted. His second introduction (1923) is a historical survey of the basic concepts of grammar. This work is based on the categories of traditional Latin and Greek grammar, and the examples are almost all drawn from Indo-European languages. In his treatment of nominal gender, however, Falk draws examples from such "primitive" languages as Iroquois and Hottentot (Falk 1923:22). In the last chapter, "The origin and disintegration of the grammatical system", a comparison is made between the language of children and the Bushmen who "put their words together without any connection". According to Falk, the oldest and original language was based on this system and not on the complex and irregular system of the classical language

(Falk 1923:94-96). But he is unable to ascertain how the grammatical system of the older Indo-European languages could have developed from this primitive stage.

Kolsrud's popular introduction to language and linguistics (1922), written when he was one of the most influential Norwegian linguists of the twentieth century (5.3.1.), is a strange work in several respects. Firstly, it is written in a general style, reminiscent of the Romantic tradition which was prevalent around the year 1800. Secondly, Kolsrud's book does not contain a single reference to any other linguistic study, and it has few examples, only a dozen, all of which are from Norwegian. It is also replete with undefined and idiosyncratic concepts. From his use of notions such as the "inner form" of a language it is possible to spot influences from contemporary German linguistics, e.g. Leo Weisgerber. This publication had a certain influence in the nynorsk camp and played a role in reinforcing linguistic prejudices of its time. One of the author's favorite terms is *organic*, and he espouses an almost mystical view of language, its origin, its use, and its biological status, intertwined with a clearly expressed racial theory woven with mysterious elements of folk psychology.

Vogt's lectures on general linguistics (1945), which were only published in a mimeographed version, represented the first introduction to twentieth-century linguistics in Norway. This short survey of about 100 pages deals with the basic aspects of linguistics. Vogt was both a classical scholar and a structuralist and had a broad knowledge of various non-Indo-European languages (5.7.9.). He managed to combine all this knowledge in a textbook that deserved a much greater audience than it received. His presentation of linguistics was superior to Sommerfelt's introduction (1947) and provided the structure for Borgstrøm's textbook (1958).

Alf Sommerfelt (5.3.1.) wrote a number of popular introductions to linguistics (Sommerfelt 1934, 1935, 1948) in which he focused on describing language history, the social aspects of language, and language typology (including a survey of the languages of the world). His book on race (1939) provides a well-argued and critical survey of race and racist theories, a work which later made him unpopular with the Nazis. Sommerfelt insisted on the importance of this theme, and in several of his postwar publications, he rejected the Nazi race theories and maintained that the term *race* was absolutely useless in linguistics.

Sommerfelt's mimeographed introduction to linguistics (1947) is based on his basic courses. His views are derived from Saussure and the French school of linguistics as represented by Antoine Meillet and Maurice Grammont as well as by the Prague-school phonology. Sommerfelt combined structuralism with a sociocultural approach.

In Finland, Paavo Ravila (5.2.5.) published a brief introduction to diachronic linguistics (*Johdatusta kielihistoriaan*, 1946, second edition 1961). The first chapter treats the differences between philology and linguistics and presents the basic Saussurean distinctions *langue/parole* and *synchrony/diachrony*. He stresses that synchrony and diachrony cannot be rigidly separated. To Ravila, the most interesting linguistic problems are frequently found in the intersection of (synchronic) description and history. For example, he states that:

... if we also want to explain our findings in a scientifically adequate way, we must unconditionally rely on the help of historical research. (Ravila 1946:7)

The chapter on sound history is the longest and concentrates on explaining the concepts of sound law and analogy. In the second edition (1961), mention is also made of the distinctiveness principle, phonemes, and allophones. Ravila uses these concepts in his presentation of the types of sound changes and in his interpretation of the nature of sound change. His work was the basic introduction to general linguistics used in the Finnish and Finno-Ugric departments well into the 1980s. The basic problems of linguistics were still taken to be sound change and morphological change, which occupy half of the book:

The overriding principles by which phonic facts of language are analyzed and explained are 'sound law' and 'analogy'. (Ravila 1961:21)

Martti Airila (1878-1953) wrote a three-volume series of books entitled *Johdatusta kielen teoriaan* (Introduction to the Theory of Language, I 1940, II 1946, III 1952). Airila (1940) starts in an unorthodox way because his dominating topic is semantics. He distinguishes sense (meaning) and reference. He discusses several psychological dimensions of meaning, for example the relation of meaning to imagery, but the main topic is semantic change. He raises the question whether there might be some kind of regular meaning development similar to the notion of regular sound change. With this book, Airila made an original contribution to semantic theory that has not received the attention it deserved, perhaps partly due to its publication during the early phase of World War II.

The subtitle of Airila's 1946 publication is "Phonic shape and change in language". In the preface he states expressly that the book is written for those interested in the problems of general linguistics, but the most extensively discussed problem in the book is still the purported unexceptional nature of sound change. In spite of this, Airila was more influenced by European structuralism (e.g. Saussure and Jakobson) than most of his Finnish contemporaries. His work published in 1952 is only concerned with the parts of speech. He tries to base the categorization of the parts of speech on semantic and syntactic criteria, and explicitly not on morphological criteria.

In 1947, Emil Öhmann (5.7.1.) published a textbook called *Kieli ja kulttuuri. Kielitieteen peruskysymyksiä* (Language and Culture. Fundamental Questions of Linguistics, third edition 1964), a synopsis of his lectures at the University of Helsinki. This book was compulsory reading in introductory German studies at several Finnish universities for several decades (Kärnä 1995:245). In the chapter on the methods and history of linguistics, Öhmann makes some critical observations on the clashes between the older and younger generations of linguists:

In linguistics, as in other fields of research, there have always been one-sided researchers who consider their method the only appropriate one and who tend to think that the methods of others are old-fashioned. Especially the proponents of new methods (that can be useful as such) often behave narrow-mindedly and in a loud voice. Such agitators do not deserve to be taken too seriously; continuous scholarly development usually silences their exaggerated eagerness. (Öhmann 1947:30)

Öhmann then goes on to argue for methodological pluralism. Thus to Öhman, the methods used are less important than the results obtained. Öhmann had been deeply influenced by Hermann Paul, and therefore it is natural that he sees language history as the core of linguistics. Semantics is primarily concerned with change in meaning, dialectology with geographically conditioned language change, etc.

In Sweden, the clear and well written linguistic surveys by Esaias Tegnér (4.3.) continued to be popular well into the twentieth century. There was a Swedish tradition for linguists to write informative books on language for the general public, and linguists like Gustaf Cederschiöld (1905) and Axel Lindqvist (1945) continued this tradition. Adolf Noreen (5.6.1.7.) also followed in this tradition by publishing several volumes of essays on language and linguistics.

In 1941, Björn Collinder (5.5.2.) published *Introduktion i språkvetenskapen*, a popular introduction to linguistics concentrated almost entirely on historical-comparative linguistics, but including topics like standardization, loan-words, and language contact. This book reappeared under a new title in 1959 and in a fourth, revised and expanded version in 1966 to be used as a university textbook, this time including a little phonology, morphology, and syntax. Considering the date of its publication, its references to other linguists and to linguistic theories are anachronistic, reflecting more of the nineteenth century, for example, by including references to von Gabelentz, Madvig, Schuchardt, and Tegnér. In fact, the book is written as if structuralism never existed, and the most modern linguists referred to are Noreen and Saussure.

The most important Norwegian introduction to linguistics was Borgstrøm's textbook of 1958, *Innføring i sprogvidenskap*, which provided the linguistic foundation for a whole generation of Nordic linguists. This was the leading textbook in all the Scandinavian countries in the late 1950s as well as through most of the 1960s. Its approach is rigidly structuralist, with a mixture of Saussure, Harris, and Hjelmslev,

but it has a depth and theoretical perspective that would have deserved a wider international audience. Borgstrøm's book is based on a strict division of synchrony and diachrony and on a division of grammar into components presented in the following order: phonology, > morphology, > semantics, > morphophonology, > typology. Here syntax is included in morphology, mainly based on Jespersen. Borgstrøm's methods of analysis are substitution and permutation, and more emphasis is placed on identification than is found in other structuralist studies.

In 1959, Bertil Malmberg (5.3.3.) published *Nya vägar inom språkforskningen* (New Avenues in Linguistics), a survey of twentieth-century linguistics. This work served not only as a popular introductory text for undergraduates and interested laymen, but also as a survey of new schools, fields, and methods. Malmberg's introductions to the various linguistic schools were written with a scholarly enthusiasm that stimulated young readers and helped to recruit many future linguists. The following table of contents shows that Malmberg's perception of the field of linguistics in the middle of the century was broad and differed radically from previous surveys:

- Historical and comparative linguistics
- Ferdinand de Saussure, the Geneva school and structuralism
- Dialectology and language geography
- The Vossler school and the Spanish school
- The phonological (Prague) school and different phoneme theories
- Modern (experimental) phonetics
- Semantics
- Hjelmslev and Glossematics
- Modern American linguistics
- Statistical and mathematical methods in linguistics
- Psychological and philosophical contributions to the study of language
- Applied linguistics

Several of Otto Jespersen's (5.3.3.) surveys have been widely used as textbooks. One of his most inspired presentations of linguistics is *Language, its nature, development and origin* (1922). This book, dedicated to Vilhelm Thomsen, was also published in German and Japanese. It is a broad introduction to linguistics as Jespersen viewed the field, divided into four parts:

- (1) *The history of linguistic science*, a traditionally oriented historical account focusing on the main linguists belonging to the comparative-historical school in the nineteenth century.
- (2) *The child* concerns the language development of children viewed as a major source of language change. This section represents something new in the history of linguistics.
- (3) *The individual and the world* treats topics like language mixture, language contact, pidgins and creoles, sex and language, all of which are assumed to be factors influencing the development of language.
- (4) *Development of language* presents Jespersen's teleological theory of language change.

Louis Hjelmslev (5.3.3.) wrote a short introductory book on language in 1941, but it was not published until 1963 (*Sproget. En introduktion*, English translation 1970). Although the book was not intended as an introduction to his own theory of glossematics, it is evident throughout that the results of the past are presented as they are seen by a new generation of linguists.

The introduction is interesting from the point of view of linguistic historiography. Here Hjelmslev makes some remarks concerning his own era:

The science of language, *linguistics* (from Latin *lingua* 'language, tongue'), has, like all science, had its classical and critical periods: classical periods, where there was a fixed theoretical framework, which everyone agreed on and adhered to, and where scholarly endeavors were centered around details that could be fit into this framework; and critical periods, in which the theoretical framework itself was the object of investigation, and where attempts were made to establish this framework from new and better vantage points based on a deeper and more penetrating knowledge of the nature of language.

Linguistics has possibly never before experienced a critical period of such depth and scope as in our day. The very nature of language and its structural peculiarities are being discussed by linguists today; the very foundation of linguistics is in the making. ... Out of the present crisis a new classical state will surely arise sooner or later; we might even dare say today that we have reached the stage where at least the contours of such a new classical state are becoming visible; but we have not reached our goal yet, nor is there agreement as to the means and ways for getting there.

Such a fundamental crisis is not to be lamented — on the contrary. The critical periods are precisely the most enlivening and inspiring, and they provide evidence that science is not stagnant, but under continuous renewal. The critical periods are the ones that broaden our horizons and equip us with a deeper understanding of the most important things. In fact, this is true of the present crisis in linguistics to such a degree that we can justifiably maintain that it is precisely in the course of this crisis that linguistics has been able to organize itself as an independent science. (Hjelmslev 1963:7f.)

Hjelmslev's basic stance is that linguistics can deliver permanent results, but not permanent points of view. Thus, in his introduction to linguistics, he presents the results of historical-comparative linguistics from his own structuralist point of view.

There were fewer introductory textbooks in linguistics (but not in phonetics) written by Danish linguists than by linguists from the other Nordic countries in this period, and after 1965, when there was an explosion of such books elsewhere, hardly any were written in Denmark.

5.3.3. The Internationally Most Visible Nordic General Linguists 1900-1965

The most influential, and by far the most productive, general linguist in the Nordic countries in this period was Otto Jespersen (4.6.2.), cf. also 4.3. Jespersen was one of the most widely read and most frequently quoted general linguists of the first half of the twentieth century. As a student of Vilhelm Thomsen, he was educated as a neogrammarian. But being dissatisfied with the linguistic school that viewed language as an independent organism, he became inspired by nineteenth-century theories of evolution and further developed the neogrammarian theory within an evolutionist framework. To Jespersen, language changes were a sign of “progress in language” and to be interpreted as positive developments in the direction of increased clarity, simplicity, and economy in the language.

Jespersen's first significant work in linguistics dealt with the question of sound laws (1886) and was also published in German (1887). In this article Jespersen attacked the neogrammarian assumption that sound laws apply without exceptions.

Jespersen's dissertation on case in English (1891) contains an introduction presenting his notion of linguistic progress. To Jespersen, language is not an organism, but a tool that allows people to communicate with each other. Since the adjusting of linguistic forms facilitates ease of communication, such changes in the language are to be considered as progress. This notion of progress is taken up again in 1894 and most penetratingly in his book *Language* (1922, cf. 5.3.2.).

Jespersen developed his goal-oriented conception of language change more fully in his study of efficiency in linguistic change (1941a). Here he deviates from the neogrammarians in assuming that sound change is not mechanical, blind, and purposeless, but functional, a kind of “survival of the fittest” (1941a:6-7), where those traits that are best adapted to serving the purpose of the language tend to be preserved, at the expense of others that are less functional. For Jespersen, the purpose of language is clear, unambiguous, and efficient communication involving as little effort as possible on the part of the language user. This means, for example, that shorter forms will win over longer forms, that regular constructions will replace irregular constructions, that an analytical structure will be more flexible and allow for the expression of more varied and precise meanings than a more synthetic structure, and that a polysynthetic structure, and repetitions like concord, will have a tendency to be dropped (O. Jespersen 1941a:8).

Jespersen thus introduces a principle of “language economy” which is related to the famous laws of G. K. Zipf. This is illustrated with examples to support the assumption that most sound changes can be explained in this way. At the end of the book, Jespersen compares the views of Prague-school phonologists like Jakobson, Trubetzkoy, and Sommerfelt with his own assumptions (1941a:83-85) and finds their

teleological views on sound changes not only to be identical to his own, but also to be based on the same dissatisfaction with the neogrammarians. There is a difference, however, for Jespersen observes:

Still it must be confessed that my point of view is different from that of the phonologists. They are interested exclusively in the phonematic systems and their changes; they speak of teleology in bringing about a harmonic vowel or consonant system arranged in their triangles and squares and correlations, but do not really discuss the question whether such changes constitute an advantage to the speaking communities, whereas this question is my chief concern: my interests in this treatise therefore center round other linguistic departments than theirs, morphology and syntax, rather than the sound system. (O. Jespersen 1941a:84)

There was hardly any field of linguistics that Jespersen did not touch upon or develop. He was a diachronic linguist, an excellent phonetician, an equally good descriptive syntactician, both in theory and practice, and one of the founders of sociolinguistics, although he never referred to it as such. Contrary to the neogrammarians, he was not opposed to the philosophical tradition in linguistics (O. Jespersen 1913). He was a pioneer in the field of child language and in the study of the relationship between idiolects, the language of a family, a nation, and the universal aspects of language (1916, 1925, 1941b). His influence in the area of foreign language teaching (4.3.) likewise extends far beyond the borders of Denmark.

Jespersen's book *The Philosophy of Grammar* (1924) provides a systematic introduction to descriptive grammar, which he utilized in his comprehensive grammar of English (1909-1949). This grammar, both in its theoretical and applied version, exerted an enormous influence on grammar writing and syntax in the Nordic countries as well as abroad.

Jespersen was also a pioneer in the study of women's language (cf. 1907, 1941b) and is often quoted for his views on what he believed to be the biologically determined nature of women's usage. A product of his own day and age, it is not surprising that he characterizes women's language and linguistic usage in the following way:

Women are linguistically more conservative than men.
 Women invent innocent and pleasant words (euphemisms) for otherwise unmentionable notions.
 Women instinctively avoid swearing and slang expressions.
 A woman's vocabulary is much smaller than a man's, and it is significantly more concrete than the abstract vocabulary of a man.⁵⁶
 Women have no sense of rhyme or word play.
 Women use a relatively greater number of adverbs, adjectives, and interjections.
 Women have a tendency not to complete their sentences.
 Women use coordinate grammatical constructions rather than subordinate constructions.
 Women speak faster than men.⁵⁷

For better or worse in the history of linguistics, he has become famous for these remarks.

Jespersen was also active when it came to developing artificial international languages. Besides being a member of the committee which developed Ido, he designed his own international language, Novial, in 1928.

Interestingly, Jespersen's *Analytic Syntax* (1937), which puzzled contemporary readers, played a role in the development of syntactic theory in the second half of the twentieth century. In this work, Jespersen attempts to construct a precise terminology and formal notation for analyzing and describing syntactic

⁵⁶ In fact, Jespersen recommends that beginning readers start out with female authors, since the vocabulary in these works would be expected to be more central and limited.

⁵⁷ This statement is related to that of the woman's limited vocabulary. Jespersen maintains, namely, that the limited vocabulary of a woman makes it easier and quicker for her to choose a word. In contrast, the man's store of words is so great that it necessarily takes him longer to choose precisely the most appropriate word.

relations and constructions, illustrating his views with data from some of the major languages of Western Europe (Danish, English, German, French, Spanish, Finnish). To a certain extent, his theory resembles Brøndal's (cf. below) objective to construct a universal and logically-based notation for morphological and syntactic analysis. Jespersen is aware of this similarity, but argues (O. Jespersen 1937:98-101) that his system is simpler and more down-to-earth than Brøndal's.

Jespersen's books were among the few on general linguistics that were widely read in all the Nordic countries prior to 1950. Jespersen's influence on linguistic concept formation and terminology should also be mentioned, above all his concepts of *nexus*, *junction*, and *rank*.

Another important general linguist in Denmark during this period was Viggo Brøndal (1887-1942), professor of Romance philology at the University of Copenhagen 1928-1942. Except for an early work on the problem of language substratum, inspired by his studies with Antoine Meillet in Paris, Brøndal's work focuses on developing a linguistic theory based on logical principles.

Brøndal's treatment of word classes (1928) is his first main work in theoretical linguistics. It was written in Danish, but contained a long and illuminating synopsis in French. Later, the whole work was translated into French (Brøndal 1948). In this early work, Brøndal presented the basic terminology and theoretical approach that was further developed in his subsequent analyses of morphology and syntax (1932) and in his attempt to formulate a theory of prepositions (1940, translated into French in 1950). This book also contains a thorough historiographic survey of the treatment of word classes in Western linguistics up to that time (Brøndal 1928:2-73).

Continuing along the same lines as Jespersen, who based his syntactic analysis on the traditional distinction between formal case and the semantic relations between sentence members, Brøndal is even more precise in showing that every word and every word form can, in principle, perform many different syntactic functions. Moreover, he maintains that each functional syntactic category can be filled by different words or groups of words. Thus, no word class and no word form can be defined by means of a specific syntactic definition, and no sentence member can be defined by the form of the word or word groups that can occur in a specific function. His basic ideas on the relationship between morphology and syntax are illustrated by the following quotation:

On a number of decisive points there is a sharp distinction between morphology (...) and syntax (...), and thus between the items belonging to these two grammatical disciplines: on the one hand words and forms, on the other hand sentences and sentence members. Whereas the morphological formations or forms are constant, the syntactic formations or connections are variable. Whereas the units of form are collective or social, the formation of sentences are of an individual and personal nature. Whereas the classes of words, forms, and derivations are abstract potential ideals, sentences and their members are concrete existing realities. Whereas a list of forms (e.g. of word classes or case forms) can be viewed in random order without making any difference, the members in a sentence (and analogously the sentences in a period) always form a chronological sequence in which every alteration in position, even the smallest, will alter the nature of the members. (Brøndal 1932:100)

Brøndal's aim was to construct a logical system of description applicable to all languages in which the parts of speech are defined not by their syntactic function, but by their logical content. His theory employs the four fundamental logical categories, based on the Aristotelian categories quantity, quality, substance, and relation:

- (1) r (relator, relation)
- (2) R (relatum, substance)
- (3) d (descriptor, quality)
- (4) D (descriptum, quantity)

As examples of classifications according to his system, we can take prepositions (r), proper names (R), adverbs (d), numerals (D), nouns (Rd), verbs (rd), and verbal nouns (rdR). The main purpose of

Brøndal's research, and of theoretical linguistic research in general, in his view, is to determine:

- (1) Which combinations of these linguistic categories are possible *at all*, and
- (3) Which combinations are possible *simultaneously*.

(Brøndal 1928:74)

The bibliography of Brøndal's work on morphology and syntax (1932), which is dedicated to Jespersen, covers the whole spectrum of relevant linguistics, including Saussure and Sapir. His analysis is centered on the fundamental problems and oppositions of Western linguistics, ranging from the Greek opposition between *thésis* and *phúsis* to Saussure's distinction between *langue* and *parole*.

Brøndal's attempt to construct a formal and semantically-based theory of prepositions (1940, French translation 1950) is much like Hjelmslev's (1935-1937) attempt at constructing a similar theory for cases. Both theories are equally formal, and neither was practical nor influential. Brøndal supports his theory primarily with data from the Indo-European languages of Europe. A few Semitic languages are also included, whereas Finnish is not considered as having genuine prepositions. In this work Brøndal places himself in a structuralist tradition, referring in the introduction both to Saussure and the Prague circle, but he makes no mention of Hjelmslev. He describes his overall objective and its foundation in the relational concepts of modern logic:

The present work attempts to define the necessary basic concepts and to establish principles for their use in every possible system of prepositions (and of words in general). Methods are provided for the confirmations of experience, but this confirmation can, of course, only be hinted at. ...

The theory of prepositions, as it is presented here, is not considered solely as a guideline for a new linguistic technique. It also presents problems and suggests solutions of theoretical and thereby of logical and epistemological interest. The specific notions of relation in this new logical system (primarily symmetry, transitivity, and connectivity) turn out to be applicable to linguistic analysis — though with certain corrections and additions. (Brøndal 1940:vi)

After Brøndal's death, a collection of his papers on general linguistics was published (1943), including a valuable bibliography. Most of these papers contain further elaboration and exemplification of his logical formal analysis, applied to linguistic phenomena in various languages.

Brøndal played an important role in Danish linguistics as the collaborator and opponent of Hjelmslev, cf. Gregersen (1991:II,83-124) and Fischer-Jørgensen (1992:5-6). Few linguists implemented his formal descriptive approach, however, but there are traces of his ideas in the work of Diderichsen (cf. below) and Tøgeby (5.7.1.). Although his formalistic approach was not foreign to the adherents of the glossematic school, it was impossible for others to follow his lead because of Hjelmslev's strong antagonism. Nevertheless, his ideas were more influential abroad, especially in French semiotics. According to Hans Aarsleff (1975:444), Brøndal may have been the one who drew Chomsky's attention to Port Royal grammar.

The greatest theoretically-oriented Nordic linguist of this century is unquestionably Louis Hjelmslev (1899-1965). Internationally, Hjelmslev was more well-known than understood. In 1931, he and several other young Danish linguists founded the Linguistic Circle of Copenhagen, and during the next thirty years, the activities of this circle, under Hjelmslev's leadership, were often collectively referred to as the Copenhagen School of Linguistics. As Eli Fischer-Jørgensen has pointed out (1995:114), such a school did not really exist. Yet it is true that many Danish linguists were influenced in one way or another by Hjelmslev's teaching and by the theory of glossematics which he developed together with his colleague, Hans Jørgen Uldall, cf. 5.3.4.

Although Hjelmslev's theory of glossematics has rarely been applied to concrete languages, its theoretical notions have not only influenced a whole generation of Danish linguists, for better or worse (cf. Gregersen 1991), they have also functioned as the direct inspiration for the theories of Sydney Lamb and S. K. Šaumjan. Hjelmslev owes his international visibility to the fact that he published much of his work in

French and was translated into English by Francis J. Whitfield (Hjelmslev 1953, 1961), who also attempted to explicate Hjelmslev's theories.

From the beginning, Hjelmslev was an intellectual, his interest in language was evident at an early age. Eli Fischer-Jørgensen reports that Hjelmslev had once told her how, when he was ten years old, he had paid the housemaid a penny an hour for permitting him to give her Italian lessons (1965:iv).

Hjelmslev received his initial university training in linguistics in the historical-comparative tradition as a pupil of Holger Pedersen. He studied abroad in Prague and Paris periodically between 1923 and 1927, and his contact with the French and Franco-Swiss schools of linguistics during these years was decisive for his future development. While in Paris, Hjelmslev wrote his first book on the principles of grammar (1928), inspired by linguists such as Saussure, Vendryes, Sechehaye, and Grammont. He published his doctoral dissertation in 1932, in which he tested a hypothesis on Lithuanian proposed by his teacher Holger Pedersen, and after a brief appointment as a lecturer in comparative linguistics at the University of Aarhus, he succeeded Pedersen in 1937 as professor of comparative linguistics at the University of Copenhagen. Hjelmslev is characterized as having a clear and constructive mind, an exceptional gift for concise formulation, and a good deal of personal authority (Fischer-Jørgensen 1995:115).

One of the most influential linguists in Denmark in this period was Paul Diderichsen (5.2.5.), whose influence also extended to Norway and Sweden. Eli Fischer-Jørgensen notes (Diderichsen 1966:11) that Diderichsen's significance lies not in the development and promotion of a single theoretical idea, as was the case with Hjelmslev and glossematics, but in his multiple talents and in the open-mindedness with which he received and discussed new impulses from abroad.

For more than thirty years, Diderichsen was an active and thought-provoking participant in the discussions of the Linguistic Circle of Copenhagen, and some of the most inspiring meetings of this circle came about as a result of his initiatives. He was also an enthusiastic and inspiring sounding board in informal discussions with colleagues and students. The numerous cross-disciplinary seminars he arranged at the university had both far-reaching and long-lasting effects, if not only because it was in this connection that he incorporated new ideas and approaches into the traditional curriculum.

There are conflicting reports concerning Diderichsen's abilities as a teacher. It appears that for the intelligent and dedicated student, he was a source of unlimited inspiration, whereas for the average or less enthusiastic student, his lectures were so demanding that they were nearly incomprehensible. Although he all too frequently allowed himself to get carried away, fascinated by the intricacies of his subject matter, he always had the time and patience to answer questions and to discuss specific problems with those whose linguistic interests and curiosity were as genuine as his own.

Although Diderichsen's influence within a broad international context is limited, his theory of syntax (5.6.1.1.) has been and remains a subject of interest and debate among linguists in the Nordic countries. As Erik Vive Larsen has observed (Larsen 1986:131), there are few handbooks dealing with modern Scandinavian syntax that do not give Diderichsen's topological model a central place in their presentation, though most supplement his sentence frame with various other approaches. His theory has also prompted discussions between Danish grammarians of the Diderichsen school and Finnish and Swedish generativists, particularly regarding the question of the verb-second position in the Scandinavian languages (cf. Telemann 1972, E. Andersson 1977, Platzack 1983, 1985, 1986 and Heltoft 1986a, 1986b). This debate is also interesting from another point of view, in that it is one of the few instances where generative transformationalists have extended their scope of interest to consider the merits of a theory other than their own.

The Norwegian linguist Alf Sommerfelt (5.3.1.) covered numerous fields in his academic research: historical-comparative grammar, Celtic and Germanic languages, structural phonology, sociolinguistics, etc., cf. Sommerfelt (1962). To modern readers, his sociolinguistic studies are often the most interesting. According to Sommerfelt, "la langue est un fait social" (1925:25). Of particular interest today is the article he published in 1930 on the spreading of sound changes, where he treats a wide variety of both linguistic and

non-linguistic features that could influence the general acceptance of a sound change. This article seems neither to have been appreciated nor understood by his contemporaries.

One book in particular attracted international attention in the field of general linguistics, though not always positive attention. It dealt with language and society with reference to a “primitive” society (Sommerfelt 1938). This strange and unique work belongs more to the tradition of late eighteenth-century linguistics than to the present century. Sommerfelt, like the late eighteenth-century linguists, was looking for a primitive language that would correlate with a primitive culture. And the more primitive the better. Unfortunately, the Tasmanians had died out without leaving many cultural artifacts. Otherwise, they would have been the best test case, since their civilization was, as Sommerfelt notes, “la plus basse que l’on connaisse” (Sommerfelt 1938:15).

Sommerfelt argued that in this primitive stage there were only concrete words and no grammatical abstractions. He discovered, for example, that the Australian language Aranta, which provided the basic data for his study, had no pronouns, since the pronouns could be analyzed as combinations of lexical roots with a lexical, non-pronominal base (Sommerfelt 1938:109-124). Furthermore, there were no inflectional or derivational morphemes, because these could all be analyzed as lexical roots (Sommerfelt 1938:124-125). Accordingly, Aranta could not be classified, for example, within the current types of language typology as polysynthetic since it had virtually only root combinations (Sommerfelt 1938:188). Indeed, it represented the most primitive type of morphology.

Sommerfelt further assumed that there was a strong connection between language and culture. For example, since there was no need in its culture for a system of numerals, Aranta had no numerals other than “one” and “two”. On the other hand, the simple three-vowel system /i a u/ of Aranta was not seen as an indication of primitiveness, since it is also found “dans les langues de haute civilisation telles que l’arabe” (Sommerfelt 1938:52).

The problem was that Sommerfelt never studied Aranta in the field. Instead, he relied heavily on second-hand information and used only a restricted amount of linguistic data, mostly gathered unsystematically by non-linguists. Moreover, the book was written at a time when the linguistic study of Australian languages was in its infancy. As a result of his lack of systematic investigation, later studies have shown that most of Sommerfelt’s conclusions were wrong. Today scholars acknowledge that Aranta is as normal and as complicated as any Australian or other human language in its categorization of morphology and lexicon.

After World War II, Sommerfelt’s influence diminished. This was mainly voluntarily, since he devoted most of his postwar time to university administration and to international work, for example, as the Secretary General of the *Comité international permanent de linguistes* (CIPL).

In Sweden, Bertil Malmberg (1913-1994) was the key figure in spreading structuralist ideas. Malmberg studied Romance philology and during his two visits to France in 1933 and 1937, he became fascinated by the potential of phonetics as well as by the structural approach to language.

In 1950, Malmberg was appointed to the new chair of phonetics at Lund University. He was subsequently offered the new chair in general linguistics at the same university in 1969. Malmberg built a phonetics laboratory with the equipment that was available or could be constructed at the time: oscilloscope, oscillograph, kymograph, recording equipment, and Meyer’s intonation meter. The laboratory was first located in a kitchen on Sölvegatan. Malmberg was one of the first to use the equipment called Visible Speech (originally developed by the Bell Laboratories) at the Haskins Laboratory in New York. He was also quick to utilize the new possibilities offered by the sound spectrograph (or sonagraph, an application of the Visible Speech technology), and he managed to define the characteristic features of Swedish word accents.

By education, Malmberg was a specialist in Romance languages. His internationally acknowledged production includes studies on French, Italian, and Spanish, also the Spanish of the New World. He visited South America several times and also wrote about the linguistic and cultural situation of the South American Indians. In collaboration with Stig Wikander, he founded the journal *Studia Linguistica* in 1947 (5.2.3.).

Malmberg's influential survey of linguistics (1959) has already been mentioned (5.3.2.).

Malmberg's interests included child language, bilingualism, language learning and teaching. He was also active in initiating courses for speech therapists. The French version of his textbook on general phonetics in the series *Que sais-je?* (Malmberg 1954) has been printed in 200,000 copies and is a bestseller in the series.

Other Nordic linguists from this period also acquired an international reputation. Examples include the Swedish Sinologist Bernhard Karlgren (5.7.7.) and the Finnish Mongolist and Altaist Gustaf John Ramstedt (5.7.6.). The Swedish engineer Gunnar Fant (5.4.) was internationally acclaimed for his acoustic theory of speech production and furthermore for work that he undertook in cooperation with Roman Jakobson and Morris Halle.

5.3.4. Glossematics

Glossematics is a linguistic theory developed by two Danish linguists, Louis Hjelmslev (5.3.3.) and Hans Jørgen Uldall (1907-1957). The theory was an indirect outgrowth of the committee set up by the Linguistic Circle of Copenhagen, of which both Hjelmslev and Uldall were members. The Danish committee was modeled on the Prague School phonological research committees that were established in several other European countries, and its particular task was to describe the phonology of the Danish language.

Uldall, who was the less dominant partner in the glossematic twosome, was a somewhat roving researcher. He studied English with Otto Jespersen and phonetics with Daniel Jones in London. He also did fieldwork on Southern Maidu (Nisenan) in California, though publishing little, and received a Master's degree from Columbia University in New York. In addition, he was appointed as a temporary university professor in Cape Town. He even studied anthropology with Franz Boas. Later he worked intensively with Hjelmslev from 1933 to 1939, before moving on to work for the British Council in the Near East and Brazil, followed by a teaching position at the University of Ibadan, Nigeria, where he organized a linguistic survey of West Africa. It was his fieldwork on Maidu and his attempt to write its grammar that sent him looking for a new theoretical approach to linguistic description.

Driven by this quest for a new theory, Uldall and Hjelmslev quickly moved from the Prague-inspired phonological goals of the Linguistic Circle committee to the construction of a completely new theory. They called it phonematics and introduced it in 1935 at the Second International Congress of Phonetics in London (Uldall 1935 [1936], Hjelmslev 1937). The essence of this theory is that the individual phonemes be defined on the basis of combinatory possibilities, i.e. alternations determined phonemically, and in a restricted sense also grammatically. The presentations by Hjelmslev and Uldall were clearly inspired by Sapir, and probably also by Bloomfield, whose book *Language* had been discussed in the Linguistic Circle in 1934.

Hjelmslev wrote a general introduction to the theory in 1943, *Omkring sprogteoriens grundlæggelse*, which, together with its annotated and authorized English translation *Prolegomena to a Theory of Language* (1953), became the standard presentation of the theory for most linguists. His lapidary style, the lack of examples, and terminology that was complicated did little to convince readers of the merits of the new theory.

During 1951 Uldall completed the first part of their projected common work, published in 1957, shortly before his death at the age of 50. His approach had developed in a different direction than Hjelmslev's, particularly his conception of the glossematic procedure as a discovery procedure, and their cooperation came to an end. Although Hjelmslev continued to work on the second part, he gave up publishing it, first because he disagreed with Uldall's algebraic system, and secondly because his own health had begun to deteriorate.

The purpose of the glossematic theory was to establish linguistics as an exact science, a science that would be independent of extra-linguistic phenomena such as physiology, psychology, logic, and sociology. In order to do this, it was necessary to establish a procedural method in which each operation was dependent

on the preceding operation, and where everything was precisely defined. Following Saussure, Hjelmslev set up a number of dichotomies: system and process, content and expression, form and substance.

The existence of a system (often referred to as “language”) is considered to be a prerequisite for the existence of a process (a “text”), and it is the system that is the object of linguistics. In order to arrive at the system underlying the process, a procedure for the analysis of texts must be followed. Saussure’s theory of the sign as comprising a *signifié* and a *signifiant*, a concept and an acoustic image, formed the basis for Hjelmslev’s notions of content and expression, and Saussure’s distinction between substance and form was his point of departure in establishing his own notions of expression-form and content-form. Thus, in Hjelmslev’s theory, language is a sign system with two planes, content and expression. Furthermore, within each plane, a distinction can be made between form and substance, referred to in his introductory book on language (1963), cf. 5.3.2., as linguistic structure and linguistic usage. In addition, by combining these planes, four strata of language can be postulated, namely expression-form, expression-substance, content-form and content-substance. At certain points, Hjelmslev expanded his dichotomy to include the concept of norm, which is a central concept in his books on case (1935-1937) and reoccurs in his 1957 conference paper (Hjelmslev 1959:96-112).

The analytical procedure of glossematics involves the continuous partitioning of a text. At each stage of analysis, a limited number of elements, referred to as invariants by Hjelmslev, are revealed by means of the commutation test (also employed by the Prague School and Bloomfield), a procedure which also determines the syntagmatic function of these elements. Following the syntagmatic analysis, there is a paradigmatic analysis in which the elements are assigned to various categories, but this functions more as a final control than as a discovery procedure.

Glossematics is basically an abstract theory about the linguistic sign. It has little to offer in such central domains of language as morphology and syntax. While most Danish linguists, directly or indirectly, were influenced by the glossematic theory and used glossematic terminology, the success and influence of the theory outside Denmark was limited. Some of the leading Norwegian linguists such as Hans Vogt (5.7.9.) and Knut Bergsland (5.6.1.6. and 5.7.8.) were attracted to glossematics for a time and used it as a theoretical basis for some of their own work, but they soon abandoned it and turned to American structuralism. Only Leiv Flydal (5.7.1.) remained a true adherent of glossematics until his death. Outside the Nordic countries, the influence of glossematics is most clearly seen in stratificational grammar as developed by Sidney M. Lamb in the late 1950s, and in the theory of glossology developed by Jean Gagnepain within the French school of mediation theory from the early 1960s (cf. Therkelsen 1996). In addition, Hjelmslev influenced Roland Barthes, A. J. Greimas, and the French structuralist school of semiotics, literary criticism, and film analysis.

5.3.5. Structural Phonology (Phonemics)

The most conspicuous achievements of structural linguistics during the period from 1930 to 1960 was undoubtedly in phonology, particularly the phonology of the Prague School, developed primarily by Trubetzkoy and Jakobson. In Denmark, the glossematic school concentrated on the expression side of language. It developed a theory that was more abstract than any other structuralist phonological theory since it refrained, as far as possible, from taking phonetic substance into account. Glossematic phonology focused on the analysis of invariants and variants, insisting on the commutation test as the means of establishing the basic phonological units of language (Fischer-Jørgensen 1952, 1956). Glossematic phonology also exerted a certain influence in Norway and Sweden, together with American structuralism as represented by Pike, Nida, and Harris.

The need for a phonemic interpretation of the Danish phonetic data was stressed by both Hjelmslev and Uldall in their brief presentations at the Second International Congress of Phonetics held in London in 1935. For Hjelmslev, phonemics was not a goal in itself, but a part of the overall theory of glossematics

(5.3.4.). The first to make a full-fledged attempt at a phonological study of Danish was André Martinet (1937). Following Trubetzkoy and the Prague School, Martinet based his phonemes on the distinctive phonetic features, and not on the morphological alternations utilized by Hjelmslev. In 1948, Hjelmslev illustrated the application of glossematics in phonology by analyzing the phonemes of Danish solely in terms of their distribution, expressed logically as selecting (marginal) or selected (nuclear) elements. Contrary to Martinet, he reduced the Danish stops to a single series by interpreting the aspirated stops as clusters [p^h t^h k^h] = /bh dh gh/. He did not include the *stød* (glottal stop) in his phonemic inventory, interpreting it instead as a signal for certain types of syllable structures. In order to do this, he sometimes had to interpret the syllable as containing a latent consonant, e.g. [fal'] = /fald/ 'fall'.

The two most important Norwegian contributions to phonology were C. Hj. Borgstrøm's description of the phonological system of Eastern Norwegian in the framework of the Prague School (1938) and Hans Vogt's description of the phonotactic structure of the Norwegian monosyllables (1942). But no trace of structural phonology could be found in the departments of Scandinavian languages, with the exception of Hallfrid Christiansen's description of the Gimsøy dialect (1933) (5.3.1.).

Structuralist phonology was introduced into Iceland by Hreinn Benediktsson (1928-, professor of linguistics at the University of Reykjavík since 1958). Benediktsson had studied comparative Indo-European phonology in Oslo, where Borgstrøm was his teacher. Structuralist phonology, especially Prague School phonology, was one of Borgstrøm's main fields of research, and Benediktsson was well prepared when he subsequently went to Harvard and wrote his dissertation on the vowel system of Icelandic (Benediktsson 1958). His advisors at Harvard were Roman Jakobson and Einar Haugen.

In a number of later publications, Benediktsson applied the structuralist approach to a diachronic analysis of Icelandic phonology. His solid background in both comparative Indo-European philology and modern structural linguistics provided him with the tools for analysis. Through the quality of his research as well as his teaching, Benediktsson not only introduced modern phonology to the younger generation of Icelandic students, but he may also have been instrumental in arousing interest in Icelandic phonology among leading international phonologists later on (6.3.3.).

Structural phonology, often called phonemics, was introduced in Sweden by Bertil Malmberg (1939). Malmberg was innovative in applying the concept of the phoneme and the distinction between variants and invariants in his publications and teaching. Claes-Christian Elert (1923-) was the first to publish and discuss the Swedish phoneme inventory and present minimal pairs to support his analysis (Elert 1955, 1957). His analysis of the differences and relations between the different phonemes in terms of distinctive features was inspired by Trubetzkoy (1939) and Jakobson, Fant and Halle (1951). Sigurd (1955) dealt with the initial and final consonant clusters of Swedish monosyllables and showed that they reflect an almost completely transitive order relation. He also treated the phonotactic structure of whole Swedish words in 1965.

Sture Allén (1965) applied the phonemic principle to written texts, defining graphemes and allographs and using the analysis as a basis for text editing. The emic principle, i.e. the distinction between invariants and variants (phonemes and allophones, etc.), was extended to all linguistic units in Göran Hammarström's survey *Linguistische Einheiten im Rahmen der modernen Sprachwissenschaft* (1966).

As early as 1932, the Finnish scholar Valentin Kiparsky (5.7.4.) wrote an article entitled "Johdatusta fonologiaan" (Introduction to Phonology) that appeared in *Virittäjä*. Kiparsky succeeded in getting his article printed, even though the editor was critical of the article and even suggested not publishing it, cf. Määttä (1994:198). Kiparsky studied in Prague from 1930 to 1931 and had participated in the meetings of the Linguistic Circle of Prague, noting in June 1932 that "now one can, in my opinion, already speak of a new linguistic school" (V. Kiparsky 1932:230). Kiparsky analyzes basic phonological concepts, often citing Finnish examples, such as the distinction between phonetics and phonology, and the notions phoneme, archiphoneme, phonological correlation, and phonological transcription. Almost half the paper is devoted to showing how phonological principles may be applied to the study of sound change.

Arvo Sotavalta (1889-1950), who was influenced by Trubetzkoy, published a study on the relationship between phonetics and its neighboring disciplines in 1936. In particular, he attempted to show that phonetics was a distinct science, parallel to phonology.

One of the first clear influences from North American structuralism in Finnish linguistics is Kalevi Wiik's (1959) paper on the morphophonology of the Finnish derivational ending *-uus ~ -yys*.

5.3.6. Linguistic Metatheory

A number of the leading Nordic general linguists from this period (especially Brøndal, Diderichsen, Hjelmslev, Jespersen, and Ravila) published important contributions to linguistic metatheory. Their work has been discussed in chapter 5 (5.2.5. and 5.3.3.). But there are also some interesting, although lesser known, Nordic contributions to this area.

Aarni Penttilä (1899-1971) was appointed professor of Finnish at the Pedagogical College of Jyväskylä in 1936. He remained in this position until 1966, but he also served as Rector from 1948 to 1962. His dissertation (1926) was in the intersection of phonetics, general linguistics, and Finnic studies (5.4.). His article on explanation in linguistics (1928) is perhaps the first contribution by a Finnish linguist to linguistic metatheory. Elaborating themes already touched upon in the dissertation, Penttilä begins with Saussure's *langue/parole* distinction. In particular, he criticizes the neogrammarian view that descriptive linguistics was inferior to historical linguistics, and only provided a service function in relation to the latter. Penttilä contends that no historical interpretation is possible without descriptive groundwork. He also discusses the relation between linguistics and (language) psychology, and the nature of explanations of social phenomena.

Erik Ahlman (1892-1952), who was professor of philosophy in Jyväskylä and Helsinki, also took an interest in theoretical linguistics. Ahlman (1933) analyzes the possibility of defining the category of adverbs. Here he discusses formal (especially syntactic) criteria for distinguishing adverbs from other parts of speech, presents a subclassification of adverbs that has been widely used in Fennistics (material, intensifying, modal), and compares his own views to those of Hjelmslev and Jespersen. In a similar spirit, he treats the distinction between nouns and adjectives (1936) and the relation between syntax and semantics (1943). In the latter work, he distinguishes between various types of meaning and notes that substitution is a good method for establishing what he calls "syntactic meaningfulness", not to be confused with the sense of the expression. To illustrate syntactic meaningfulness, Ahlman uses sentences such as *This is an exceptionally round triangle* and *Here is an absolutely non-existing concept*. Obviously, Ahlman was discussing what Chomsky later (1957) called grammaticality, and Ahlman's examples are similar in kind to Chomsky's *Colorless green ideas sleep furiously*. Ahlman notes that a sentence like *big here that tomorrow* is a "syntactically meaningless aggregate of words", i.e. an ungrammatical sentence. This, in turn, must be distinguished from notions such as logical contradiction (Ahlman 1943:267).

One of the internationally most influential contributions by Nordic linguists in the first decades after the war was Knut Bergsland and Hans Vogt's critical examination of the glottochronology hypothesis (Bergsland and Vogt 1962). If not killed, the theory was at least mortally wounded by this article. Bergsland and Vogt provided convincing documentation that the rate of lexical substitution is a culturally-determined process and not a universal law of nature. Some language communities are, due to a number of factors, simply more lexically conservative than others.

5.3.7. Language Teaching and Language Learning

Applied linguistics is a term first adopted in the late 1950s, but it did not receive recognition as a specific field of linguistics until 1965, when it rapidly gained momentum throughout the world in research, teaching, and organization. But the seeds for this development were planted in the first half of the twentieth century, owing in part to the interest a number of prominent linguists such as Jespersen and Malmberg (5.3.3.) showed for language teaching and research in it. Jespersen's interest in the creation of an artificial international language is another sign of this interest in applied linguistics.

The Swedish Romanist Max Gorosch (1912-1983), lecturer in Romance languages in Stockholm before becoming professor of Romance languages at the Copenhagen Business School, was instrumental in the development of applied linguistics. He served as head of the language training laboratory in Stockholm during the 1950s and 1960s and is known for his pedagogical experiments with "language learning without a book". He made an important contribution to linguistics by starting the International Association for Applied Linguistics (AILA) which has organized conferences in different parts of the world, including the Nordic countries. There are national associations of applied linguistics in most Nordic countries: *Association Danoise de Linguistique Appliquée* (ADLA) in Denmark, and correspondingly AFinLA in Finland, ANLA in Norway, and ASLA in Sweden. All these are active as publishers and conference organizers and collaborate with AILA in disseminating the results of applied linguistic research to language teachers.

This is also the place to mention the Danish businessman and publisher Arthur M. Jensen (1891-1968), who through his *Nature Method*⁵⁸ represents the most successful Nordic enterprise in language teaching. Jensen had studied linguistics under Jespersen and was a close friend of both Hjelmslev and Malmberg. His nature method is largely based on Jespersen's ideas: language should be learned independently of the mother tongue, and the texts should be self-explanatory, that is, the meaning should be clear from the context, which was often illustrated with pictures. The course in English (1943) became an international triumph, whereas the subsequent courses in Latin, French, and Italian were less successful. Behind Jensen's method lay some basic ideas of structuralism, clearly mediated through Hjelmslev. For instance, each and every language is a closed system where the functions of categories are determined by internal relations. According to this method, the system of one language is different from the systems of all other languages, and translation is in principle impossible.

Through his Nordic publishing house for language and culture (*Nordisk Sprog- og Kulturforlag*), Jensen published a number of linguistic studies by the Danish structuralists and especially works on glossematics such as *Acta Linguistica Hafniensia* IX-XI (5.2.3.) and *Travaux du Cercle linguistique de Copenhague* V-XIII. This was made possible as a result of the economical success of his Nature Method. Jensen also supported a number of international linguistic conferences and gave travel grants and research financing to linguists, particularly during the period from 1945 to 1960 when means for such activities were hard to obtain.

5.4. Phonetics

At the turn of the twentieth century, many linguists believed that new insights from acoustics and the physiology of speech sounds could shed new light on the problems of sound change. Thus the scientific study of speech sounds by means of instruments began, and Nordic linguists also became active in this area, cf. Fischer-Jørgensen (1975).

⁵⁸ Jensen's Nature Method should not to be confused with the natural or direct method, which has part of its roots in the *Quousque* movement of the late 1800s, cf. 4.3.

Phonetics in the Nordic countries in this period occupied a position that can be characterized by two opposite features. On the one hand, several Nordic linguists were internationally recognized for their research in the field. On the other hand, however, few academic positions in phonetics were available. As a result, several of the leading Nordic phoneticians of this period were often associated with universities outside the Nordic countries.

The leading Scandinavian phonetician in the beginning of the twentieth century was Otto Jespersen, whose main work in this field was his systematic presentation of the sounds of language (1897-1899, abridged and updated German version 1904). In this work of over 600 pages, Jespersen summarized what was known at the time about the articulatory characteristics of the consonants and vowels and about the acoustics of vowels. Each vowel was said to have its *Eigenton*, a theory which gradually resulted in the theory of characteristic formants. Jespersen was eager to find a system to represent the characteristic features of the sounds and suggested his “antalphabetic system”, where letters were used to denote the most important articulator and numbers were used to indicate the manner of articulation, e.g. occlusion (0), rounding (1), etc.

Like Eduard Sievers, Jespersen was skeptical of the new ideas of experimental phonetics, and his own work in this area is limited to his amateur investigations like the one where he tried to rank speech sounds according to their power, measuring how far they could be heard by a person along a road. His theory of the syllable is an original contribution for which he has not always been given sufficient recognition. Here he maintains that speech sounds have an inherent force called sonority, that sounds can be ranked according to sonority, and that syllables correlate with peaks of sonority. In focusing on language as a means of communication, he emphasized the ability of sounds to distinguish meanings. In this respect Jespersen can be considered a forerunner of phonemic theory.

Beginning in 1895, Jespersen gave lectures on general phonetics, and his concise textbook on Danish phonetics (1906), with examples from his earlier work (1897-1899), became the standard work for university students in Denmark for several decades.

In 1943, a new position at the University of Copenhagen as lecturer in phonetics was given to Eli Fischer-Jørgensen (5.2., 6.3.3., 6.4.). The position was converted to a professorship in 1966. After 1944, instruction was given in general phonetics, including a course in advanced phonetics. At first there were only three students, but gradually nearly all students studying a foreign language attended these courses. In the late 1950s, the number of students was 60-70, topping in the early 1970s with no less than 700 students (Fischer-Jørgensen 1979:412). In the mid 1940s, phonetics shared laboratory facilities with speech therapy, a situation that was far from satisfactory. The laboratory was only available for phonetic experiments from seven to eleven o'clock in the evening. Since the experiments usually lasted until midnight, the teachers and students actually had to crawl out of a basement window into a patch of roses until they were finally given a key (Fischer-Jørgensen 1979:412). The laboratory situation gradually improved, and by the early 1970s the laboratory was well-supplied with experimental equipment, including a speech synthesizer constructed by Jørgen Rischel.

One of the major problems with which Danish phonetics was concerned was glottalization. Aage Hansen (5.6.1.1.) devoted a monograph (1943) to analyzing the functions of the *stød* in the standard language, concluding that it was not a consonant nor a prosodic phenomenon with phonemic status, but a marker distinguishing a class of word types having stress on a final, sonorant syllable. His book on pronunciation in Modern Danish (1956) is written in the Jespersen tradition.

A significant contribution to the description of the *stød* based on the methods of experimental phonetics is found in Svend Smith's dissertation (published in 1944) in which he suggests that there is a connection between aspirational stress and the *stød*. Another problem relating to the *stød*, namely the occurrence of a short vowel *stød* in West Jutlandic, was discussed in a number of studies, in greatest detail from the point of view of experimental phonetics in Kristian Ringgaard's dissertation (1960). Marie Bjerrum's investigation of the tonal accents of the Felsted dialect (1948) is also interesting in its

experimental approach to the question of word tones vs. syllable tones.

Although experimental phonetics had its roots in the middle of the nineteenth century, this type of research was late in coming to Denmark, possibly due to Jespersen's skepticism. However, an early Danish instance of phonetic experimentation was Karl Verner's work with the Edison phonograph in the 1880s.

Hugo Pipping had made significant contributions to experimental phonetics in the 1890s (4.8.). After 1900, he started investigating Scandinavian languages and became professor of Scandinavian philology in Helsinki in 1907. Pipping's introduction to the study of the phonology of the Scandinavian languages (1922) is a synthesis of more than a decade of work and of several earlier papers on the subject. It begins with a summary of the methodology of experimental phonetics and discusses the hypothesis that various classes of sounds excite different loci in the auditory nerve. The bulk of the study is concerned with the historical phonology of Proto-Scandinavian, starting from the Indo-European period. In the words of Aalto, "the work may be regarded as one of the most successful applications of phonetics in linguistic history ever written" (1987:217). This study therefore belonged to the central course requirements in many Scandinavian universities (Huldén 1990:46).

Jean Poirot (1873-1924), who became lecturer in phonetics at the University of Helsinki in 1908, wrote his doctoral dissertation (1912) on the timbres of French vowels, registered with a disc-phonograph and analyzed with a Harmonic Analyser. This study contains the first phonetic investigation of nasalized vowels ever undertaken for any language (Aalto 1987:220). The kymograph was a basic research tool in the phonetics laboratory, and Poirot aided several Finno-Ugric scholars in undertaking phonetic analyses, normally using kymographic measurements. These problems, which were often assigned by E. N. Setälä, usually dealt with the historical phonology of Finno-Ugric languages (cf. Aalto 1987:218-223).

Frans Äimä (1875-1936) was the first professor of phonetics at the University of Helsinki, appointed in 1924. Äimä, who had studied phonetics under Jean Poirot made a year-long field trip to collect material on Inari Sámi in 1900. His earliest research papers dealt with the history of consonant gradation, a topic intensely debated around 1900 after the publication of Setälä's work from 1890. Äimä's dissertation (1914) was on the phonetics of Inari Sámi. Part I is classical *Ohrenphonetik*, i.e. observational studies, where Äimä distinguishes between no less than seventy consonants and fifty vowels (on the level of "concrete sounds"). Part II presents the results of kymographic and palatographic measurements. Inari Sámi is known for its phonetic complexity, and Äimä treats the details of its pronunciation with meticulous care. According to Erkki Itkonen (1976), Äimä's dissertation is the most diverse and meticulous phonetic study of a Finno-Ugric language ever written.

Äimä's lectures on linguistic phonetics were published posthumously (Äimä 1938). In these, he criticizes the view that phonetics is merely a kind of natural science of language, dealing only with speech production and acoustics. He argues that phonetics must also be concerned with psychological factors, such as speech perception (Äimä 1938:5-6). This is especially important for the investigation of prosody. In Äimä's view, meaning in its entirety belongs to "language psychology", as does analogy. His ontology does not comprise any language system. However, in the chapter on sound combinations, he makes a clear distinction between "sound individuals" and "sound types".

Aarni Penttilä (5.3.6.) wrote his doctoral thesis (1926) on the accentuation system of Finnish and its closest relatives. This study was an innovation, not only in terms of its topic, but also in theoretical orientation. The subtitle states that it is a psychological research experiment. Penttilä was familiar with Max Wertheimer's Gestalt psychology and wanted to apply its basic concepts to the interpretation of some well-known Finnic sound changes, such as the diphthongization of long vowels, the loss of medial and final vowels, and the shortening of unstressed vowels. His suggestion was that these phenomena were a partial consequence of a centralizing accentuation (stress) type. Penttilä was appointed professor of Finnish in Jyväskylä in 1936. In 1941, he founded a phonetics laboratory where he carried out several oscillographic studies of Finnish intonation.

Antti Sovijärvi (1912-1995) received his doctorate in 1938 with an experimental phonetic thesis on

Finnish vowels. He was appointed professor of phonetics in Helsinki in 1940, after Äimä, and held the position for no less than thirty-seven years. In his thesis, Sovijärvi used both physiological and acoustic methods in an attempt to describe and even explain the production and acoustic structure of vowels and nasals. His methods were the best available in the 1930s: Röntgen photography, palatography, laryngoscopy, Fourier analysis of oscillographic curves, use of the Tonfrequenzspektrometer, and so on. Acquaintance with Eberhard Zwirner's phonometrics had made Sovijärvi aware of the need to combine phonological and phonetic analysis. Sovijärvi's aim was to demonstrate the correlation between articulatory cavities and specific formants (acoustic resonances) such as the pharyngeal formant, the oral formant, and the nasal formants. Later research has, however, demonstrated that such one-to-one relations between cavities and formants are hard to prove.

Sovijärvi also took an interest in developing pedagogical aids for the teaching of phonetics, e.g. ADAM (= Apparatus Demonstrating Articulatory Movements) by which one could demonstrate articulatory movements using lights and special magnetic pintapes. In 1961, Sovijärvi served as President of the IV International Congress of Phonetic Sciences in Helsinki (cf. Aalto and Sovijärvi 1962, eds.).

Kalevi Wiik's dissertation (1965) on the phonetics and phonology of Finnish and English vowels was a pioneering work. His was the first monograph written in Finland within the framework of international twentieth century linguistics. Here Wiik presented a phonological analysis of the vowel systems of Finnish and English, demonstrating why Finnish phonemic long quantity ([e:], [u:] etc.) is best analyzed as a phoneme sequence of two corresponding short vowels (/ee/, /uu/ etc.). He also performed a detailed spectrographic analysis of the acoustic structure of Finnish and English vowels, and he developed a new method for contrasting the allophones of two languages. Using these experimental data and his phonological interpretation of the vowel systems, he also predicted which main learning difficulties Finns would encounter when trying to learn the pronunciation of English vowels.

The study of Icelandic phonetics began with Jón Ófeigsson's (1920-1924) survey of the phonetics of modern Icelandic, found in Sigfús Blöndal's Icelandic-Danish dictionary. Ófeigsson (1881-1938) studied in Germany and made his observations without instruments. Nevertheless, his observations are accurate and formed the basis for subsequent work on Icelandic phonetics. Ófeigsson also included a number of observations on dialects, thereby creating a link between phonetics and dialectology that became typical of Icelandic linguistics in the 1900s.

The two most influential and internationally best known Icelandic phoneticians in this period were Stefán Einarsson and Svein Bergsveinsson, both of whom spent most of their professional life outside Iceland, Einarsson as a professor at Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore, and Bergsveinsson as professor in (former East) Berlin. Both scholars worked with experimental studies of Icelandic phonetics.

Although Johan Storm (4.8.) was one of the founding fathers of phonetics, the first academic position in phonetics in Norway was not established until 1924. At this time, Ernst Selmer (1890-1971) became lecturer in German philology and general phonetics in Oslo. Selmer, who was professor from 1937 to 1960, founded the Institute of Phonetics in 1918 and introduced experimental phonetics in Norway. Among his numerous studies are those on accent and tonemes in Norwegian dialects. Working with Olaf Broch, Storm published an elementary introduction to phonetics (1921) that was the standard textbook in phonetics at Norwegian universities for forty years.

Olaf Broch (4.6.4., 5.7.4.), professor of Slavic languages from 1900 to 1937, was an international expert on the phonetics of Slavic languages. He also made numerous contributions to the phonetic description of colloquial East Norwegian, especially to the study of intonation, e.g. O. Broch (1923).

The first Norwegian university position devoted solely to phonetics was founded in Bergen in 1953 when Martin Kloster Jensen (1917-) was appointed as lecturer. From 1966 to 1974 he held the post of professor of phonetics. Jensen was professor in Bonn 1963-1966 and moved to Hamburg in 1975.

In 1916, the Lund scholars Ivar Lyttkens (1873-1953) and Fredrik Wulff (4.6.2.) published an important early database for the study of the distribution of Swedish sounds. Lyttkens was then a zoologist

and Wulff was professor of modern European languages (*nyeuropiska språk*). The database contains copious examples of words with certain sounds in certain positions. Lyttkens and Wulff's book *Svenska språkets ljudlära och beteckningslära jemte en afhandling om aksent* (Phonology and Transcription of Swedish, with a Treatise on Accent, 1885) is an impressive analysis of the sounds and their spelling in words with different structures.

Ernst A. Meyer (1873-1953), lecturer in phonetics at the University of Uppsala 1909-1910, made an important contribution to phonetics by inventing a device for measuring intonation. This instrument could represent the distance between the peaks of a kymograph oscillogram as intonation curves. Meyer used this instrument to study the word accents in different parts of Sweden. Meyer's intonation studies were continued by Eva Gårding (1977) using modern techniques. Meyer also developed a palatographic method called plastography to study the placement of the tongue in the mouth for different speech sounds. He also introduced the use of X-rays in phonetic research. The phonetic X-ray film used in these studies was first presented at the IV International Congress of Linguists in Copenhagen in 1936.

New equipment such as the sonagraph made it possible to study formant patterns and intonation curves with increased accuracy. Malmberg participated in the ongoing discussion of the distinctive features of Swedish vowels (1956) and suggested that there were two degrees of rounding in Swedish, thereby accounting for the difference between *u* and *y*. As a result of Malmberg's finding as well as Gunnar Fant's work, the rich Swedish vowel system became a topic of discussion in the field of phonetics. Moreover, new equipment made it possible to analyze in greater detail the phonetic problems of Swedish and Norwegian word tones and the related Danish glottalization, *stød*. In 1959, Malmberg noted that the difference between the two word tones consisted of a difference in the placement of the intonation peak in the first syllable of the words, with accent two words having a late peak.

Gunnar Fant (1919-) was trained as an engineer in electroacoustics and worked for the Ericsson telephone company in his early career. Fant was professor of speech transmission (*talöverföring*) at the Royal Institute of Technology (*Kungliga Tekniska Högskolan*), Stockholm, from 1966 to 1987. His acoustic analyses of the Swedish vowels and consonants form the embryo of his theory of speech production, which he elaborated and presented in various publications and in his thesis *Acoustic Theory of Speech Production* (1960). Fant's model of speech production as source plus filter, as well as his calculations of the relations between the positions of the speech organs (articulation) and the acoustics of speech, have since gained world-wide recognition. His model forms the basis for several speech synthesis applications (Ove I, Ove II, Infovox) developed at the Royal Institute of Technology in Stockholm, and he also was the founding father of the successful department of speech (and later also music) research at this institute. Fant was influenced by the structural ideas of the 1950s and participated in the discussion concerning the distinctive features best suited for classifying Swedish vowels. In the famous work *Preliminaries to Speech Analysis. The Distinctive Features and Their Correlates* of 1951 (seventh printing 1967), Gunnar Fant joined forces with Roman Jakobson and Morris Halle to use instrumental data in setting up categories of distinctive features. This book presents a phonological theory based on minimal universal phonetic features and attempts to show how these could be defined on the basis of their acoustic properties, as investigated by use of the new sound spectrograph. The acoustic properties detected by theoretical and empirical analysis are then related to physiological and perceptual data.

Claes-Christian Elert (1923-) played an important role in the development of the Department of Phonetics and General Linguistics at the University of Stockholm. Elert was professor of phonetics in Umeå (1969-1988). His dissertation on quantity in Swedish based on Stockholm speech (1964) analyzed the duration of phonologically long and short segments in different environments and the phonological functions of different prosodic phenomena. Elert exerted great influence on the emerging field of Swedish phonology and structuralism in his papers from 1955 and 1957. His phonetics textbook (1966) was frequently used in university courses.

5.5. Historical-Comparative Grammar

5.5.1. Comparative Indo-European Linguistics

The development of historical-comparative Indo-European studies as a main field of linguistic research was one of the great achievements of the nineteenth century. To many people — especially to comparativists themselves — linguistics on a scholarly level was identical to historical-comparative Indo-European linguistics. Although it took some time before the field was properly endowed with academic chairs, it was unthinkable at the beginning of the twentieth century that any university in the Nordic countries lacked a position or at least regular courses in comparative Indo-European linguistics. Most linguists of any caliber, no matter what their field of specialization was or became, published at least a few articles with comparative or diachronic content.

Holger Pedersen (1867-1953), professor of comparative linguistics at the University of Copenhagen 1903-1937, was the leading Nordic scholar in Indo-European studies in the twentieth century. Between 1892 and 1896, Pedersen studied under some of the best Indo-European scholars in Germany and Russia. He also did fieldwork on Albanian in Greece and on Irish on the *Áran* islands west of Galway. His letters from these years, edited and published by Bentzen (1994), provide unique glimpses of the intellectual growth and development of a leading Nordic linguist of the twentieth century, as well as of the academic gossip among his contemporaries.

Pedersen was extremely self-confident. There were few linguists that he really admired or accepted as his equals. He either considered their teaching to be too elementary, unoriginal, or dull, their research of low quality, or he felt that they had personal weaknesses such as a fear of doing fieldwork under uncomfortable conditions. Many, among them the famous contemporary linguists Karl Brugmann and Per Persson, were subjected to the severe evaluation of their younger Danish colleague. His negative view of the well-known orientalist and general linguist Georg von der Gabelentz (1840-1893) is typical: “professor in Chinese, Malay, and other similar strange things” (Bentzen 1994:115-116). Pedersen, who only attended Gabelentz’s lectures for a few weeks before the latter became mortally ill, found the lectures to be of little value, just as the book upon which they were based (Gabelentz 1891), which is “a huge book without any substance that strangely enough has received widespread praise” (Bentzen 1994:118). Like most neogrammarians, Pedersen had a low opinion of general linguistics.

Pedersen’s description of his own field-work methods is by no means flattering to his self-image. Here are some illustrative excerpts from his letters concerning his work on *Áran*:

When I arrived in *Áran* and looked for a man who could be useful to me in my Irish studies, I was directed to the old seaman Marc O Flaherty. I went to him; he said he “could not attend” the first week without neglecting his work (he is a sail-maker). I considered this arrogance as I of course only wanted to occupy him an hour or two a day. Since I of course could not go unoccupied for a whole week, I got hold of a young man Michael Flaherty and started my language studies by questioning him. He had the great advantage of not being able to read Irish... Next week Marc O Flaherty turned up. It appeared that he planned to “attend” half a day to get a whole day’s payment out of it. It still turned out that he was a very clever man, but he spoke the dialect as a school master; of course he was able to read. I soon realized that there was nothing I could do about this conceited, but ignorant man whose good intellect could not compensate his lack of understanding of my purpose. (Bentzen 1994:195)

Still there is a lot to criticize in Martin’s dictation. When the hero of a story is first told what to do and then does it, Martin switches regularly from the order in the future to telling the story in the past. In the beginning I forced him to correct this, but it was difficult. Now I do not raise any objections to this “stylistic” peculiarity. (Bentzen 1994:197)

Martin spoke, however, in the only natural discourse style of his dialect, and his only crime was that Pedersen did not get the interesting morphological forms he was looking for. It is no wonder that the linguist

and the informants did not get on well, and that Pedersen's conclusion upon leaving was that "with regard to the general conditions on Aran, I cannot just say that I am delighted with the inhabitants" (Bentzen 1994:214).

As a linguist, Holger Pedersen was a pure neogrammarian, and he probably mastered the method better than anyone. His methodological skills were accompanied by a broad and profound knowledge of practically all major Indo-European languages, combined with thorough philological training. This enabled him to produce a masterpiece like his still unsurpassed comparative Celtic grammar (*Vergleichende Grammatik der keltischen Sprachen*, H. Pedersen 1909-1913). After his retirement, he published two well-written and influential comparative studies of the newly discovered Indo-European languages Tocharian (H. Pedersen 1938) and Hittite (H. Pedersen 1941), placing the study of both on a firm foundation. Through his sober scholarly attitude, he effectively denounced the more fantastic speculations provoked by these new data.

Pedersen was not only a comparativist. He also published a pedagogical grammar of Russian (H. Pedersen 1916b) and a Russian reader. But perhaps his most lasting influence is to be found in his historiographic studies.

Pedersen's first historical account of linguistics in the nineteenth century is his little-known work from 1899, written when he was thirtytwo years old and a lecturer in Slavic languages at the University of Copenhagen. In this 64-page popular presentation of linguistics, he describes the founding of historical-comparative grammar by Bopp and Rask, with no mention of Grimm, noting that their work marked the beginning of linguistics as a science. He begins with the discovery of Sanskrit and the other Aryan languages in the latter half of the eighteenth century and provides a description of the various members of the Indo-Iranian branch of Indo-European. He then analyzes Armenian and Albanian, followed by a survey of the Slavic languages in which he treats the Baltic group as a separate, but closely related branch. After discussing the role of Greek in comparative-historical linguistics, he deals with the Italic, Celtic, and Germanic branches of Indo-European and mentions, though only briefly, various non-Indo-European languages such as Basque, Etruscan, Finno-Ugric, Turkish, and several Caucasian languages. He concludes the survey with brief remarks on methodology in historical-comparative linguistics.

Concerning his next historiographic work (1916a), which he distinguishes from Vilhelm Thomsen's broader survey (1902), Pedersen notes:

I have centered my attention solely upon one specific aspect of the history of linguistics: the development of notions concerning linguistic kinship and the history of phonology, and I have placed special emphasis on underlining the causality of this development. (H. Pedersen 1916a:note 1)

As the title indicates, this work is written with particular regard to the historical study of phonology.

Pedersen's most influential historiographic work was his survey of linguistic science in the nineteenth century (1924), which was translated almost immediately into Swedish and appeared in an English translation in 1931 (reprinted in 1983). For more than fifty years, this book became the most widely read survey of the history of linguistics in the world. It was not only well-written in a popular and appealing style, but it also contained a wealth of interesting illustrations. But the story Pedersen told was not an unbiased one. His was the neogrammarian version of the history of linguistics, with primary emphasis on the achievements of the neogrammarians. As a result, few other approaches or schools are mentioned at all, and where they are, they are given much less credit. More than anyone else, Pedersen created the myths of nineteenth century linguistics, myths that are still part of the historiographic knowledge of many linguists. One such myth is the notion that the main-stream linguistics of the nineteenth century was historical-comparative Indo-European linguistics, cultivated primarily in Germany (and Denmark).

Several other Danish linguists such as Hans Hendriksen (1913-1989), professor of Indo-Iranian languages, L. L. Hammerich (1892-1975), professor of German (1922-1962), and Gunnar Bech (1920-

1975), another professor of German,⁵⁹ published important studies in the field of Indo-European linguistics. Studies by Hammerich (1948), and especially by Hendriksen (1941), were basic contributions to the emerging laryngeal theory which, from the mid 1930s, was a much debated and influential theory concerning the Proto-Indo-European phonological system. Other influential scholarly publications were Bech's investigations of the history of the verbal morphology of the Germanic languages (1963, 1969), works which were both original and penetrating.

The greatest theoretical Danish linguist of this century, Louis Hjelmslev, was also educated in comparative Indo-European linguistics, but he did not publish much in this field. All the same he had a profound knowledge of and respect for comparative Indo-European linguistics, something which is especially apparent in his introduction to linguistics (1963). In this work, Hjelmslev gives a thorough and theoretically advanced introduction to the methods of comparative linguistics. In the beginning of the book he states:

...the study of the genetic relationship between languages is the most cultivated part of linguistics until now, and in addition, the only part where classical linguistics has developed a method which, at least in a reasonable reinterpretation, may be called exact. (Hjelmslev 1963:11)

In reality, however, the generation shift that occurred when Hjelmslev was appointed professor after Holger Pedersen's retirement in 1937 also marked a paradigm shift from comparative linguistics to general linguistics. In 1940, new requirements were added for the master's degree. In addition to the earlier requirement of a thorough knowledge of the ancient Indo-European languages, knowledge of three unrelated non-Indo-European language was now required. In practice, this meant that only three students completed the demanding program in comparative linguistics between 1940 and 1970. The discrepancy between the traditional requirements and Hjelmslev's own scholarly interests also played a role in the lack of student interest in the field. Had it not been for the inspiring teaching of Kaj Barr, cf. 5.7.3., the field might have died out altogether in Denmark.

In Norway, the twentieth century began with a significant achievement, the identification of Hittite as an Indo-European language by Jørgen Alexander Knudtzon (1854-1917), professor of Semitic languages in Oslo from 1907 to 1917 and a specialist on Assyriology. Knudtzon's analysis (1902) combined a sound knowledge of the cuneiform script with knowledge of cuneiform languages. Sophus Bugge's comments on Knudtzon's analysis in the same work (1902) contain typically wild etymological speculations on the basis of the uncertain and preliminary translation and Knudtzon's analysis. Alf Torp's contribution (1902), on the other hand, is a careful analysis of the inflectional endings assumed by Knudtzon to be Indo-European. Torp mentions possible connections with Lycian, but has no word etymologies, keeping more or less to an internal analysis of the material.

Most Norwegian linguists of this period, such as Knut Bergsland, Sten Konow, Carl Marstrand, Georg Morgenstierne, Alf Sommerfelt, and Hans Vogt, all published minor studies in comparative Indo-European linguistics, some of them quite important, even though their fields of research and teaching were non-Indo-European or modern European languages. Only Christian Stang (1900-1977), professor of Slavic languages 1938-1970, made Indo-European his major field of research. His publications on the Balto-Slavic languages in a comparative perspective (e.g. Stang 1957, 1966) became standard international handbooks in the field. Stang specialized in the comparative study of Balto-Slavic prosody, an exotic field of research which had previously been cultivated by Saussure and Hjelmslev (1932). Methodologically, Stang and most of his colleagues were orthodox neogrammarians.

The first professorship (ordinarius) in Norway devoted solely to comparative Indo-European

⁵⁹ Bech became professor of German in 1956, professor of comparative linguistics (as Hjelmslev's successor) in 1966, and from 1968 until his retirement in 1972, he was professor of Germanic philology.

linguistics was established in Oslo in 1947. The first to occupy this chair was Carl Hj. Borgstrøm (5.3.1.) who, however, was not a typical Indo-European scholar. Instead, Borgstrøm was primarily a structural linguist, strongly influenced by Prague school phonology and later by glossematics and American structuralism, and he was a specialist in Gaelic dialects of which he had published two thorough descriptions (5.7.5.). His publications on comparative Indo-European linguistics are few (e.g. 1949, 1954), but interesting from a methodological point of view, since more than any other contemporary Nordic scholar he tried to apply structuralist methods to comparative Indo-European linguistics. His work gained little recognition, however, was probably not understood, and had marginal influence on the development of Indo-European studies (W. Winter 1965:29). Borgstrøm's main influence was as a teacher. He educated a whole generation of Norwegian and Icelandic linguists. Due to his theoretically challenging courses, these young scholars acquired a solid basis for their future research, regardless of their subsequent field of specialization.

In Sweden, comparative-historical linguistics acquired a strong position within the study of the Scandinavian languages because of Adolf Noreen and Axel Kock, and this branch of linguistics was also cultivated in a number of other language departments. In 1911, Herbert Petersson (1881-1927) was appointed lecturer in comparative Indo-European linguistics in Lund, and he later became a professor in 1923. Petersson published theoretical studies on comparative Indo-European phonology and morphology as well as etymologies of words in the Baltic, Slavic, and Armenian languages. In 1927, Jarl Charpentier (1884-1935) was appointed professor of Sanskrit and Indo-European linguistics at the University of Uppsala. His publications were mainly on Indo-Iranian philology and the history of religion, but he also wrote a popular book on comparative Indo-European linguistics (1926).

Hannes Sköld (1886-1930), lecturer in Slavic languages, was a comparativist working in Lund. He was known as a political journalist and spent time in Russia, which resulted in interesting fieldwork notes (e.g. 1936, edited by Gunnar Jarring). Due to his communist sympathies, however, Sköld met with strong opposition both academically and privately and never acquired a professorship.

Probably the most significant Swedish contribution in the field of comparative-historical linguistics, besides Per Persson's monumental work of 1912, is the large etymological dictionary of Greek (Frisk 1960-1972) published by Hjalmar Frisk (1900-1984), professor of comparative Indo-European linguistics and Sanskrit (1938-1967) in Gothenburg and Rector from 1951 to 1968. Frisk also published on comparative Indo-European linguistics. To this we can add the important Swedish contributions in the field of comparative Finno-Ugric (Björn Collinder, cf. 5.5.2.) and Chinese (Bernhard Karlgren, cf. 5.7.7.).

In Finland, comparative studies were mainly carried out in the field of Finno-Ugric studies and in the neogrammarian tradition. Nevertheless, Finland had two leading scholars in historical-comparative Indo-European linguistics in this period, Jooseppi Julius Mikkola and Torsten Evert Karsten.

Torsten Evert Karsten (1870-1942), professor of Scandinavian languages in Helsinki, was a prolific writer. Most of his production concerns the early linguistic contacts between the Finns and the Germanic peoples exemplified through Germanic loan-words in Finnish and Germanic place-names in Finland. Karsten drew on the work of Thomsen, although he frequently disagreed with him. According to Aalto (1987:98-110), who provides a survey and analysis of Karsten's production, he often contradicted himself. His main conclusion was that the Germanic loan-words in Finnish were very old and came from various layers of Germanic, mostly Proto-Germanic, but also from Old Norse. He also maintained that many Finnish place-names were Germanic. In spite of inconsistencies and weaknesses in his work, Karsten stimulated debate and further research among various leading contemporary Indo-Europeanists, and many of the etymologies he proposed are accepted today. He is one of those scholars whose assertions have not always stood the test of time, but who nevertheless laid the foundation for subsequent research in a central field of Finnish and Swedish linguistics in the twentieth century. He lectured frequently to wide audiences, and his popular presentation of the language and culture of the Germanic peoples (1925), which was also published in German and French, is a well-balanced, informative, and readable introduction.

Jooseppi Julius Mikkola (4.6.4. and 5.7.4.) was appointed to the post of Extraordinary Professor of Slavic Philology in Helsinki in 1900. He published much on Slavic etymology and was regarded as the leading international expert in this field. A thorough evaluation of Mikkola's scholarship is provided by Aalto (1987:157-173). The etymological tradition begun by Mikkola and his work on Finnish-Russian contact were continued in the neogrammarian tradition by his pupil Jalo Kalima (5.5.2.), cf. Aalto (1987:173-183).

5.5.2. Comparative Finno-Ugric Linguistics

Three subsections overlap here: the current section, section 5.6.2.2. on historical studies, and section 5.6.4.2. on dialectology. Most of Finnish dialectology has been historical, and much of it has also been comparative, especially with regard to the Finnic languages. Here Finnic comparative studies are treated as part of Finno-Ugric comparative linguistics. To complicate matters further, most comparative studies are historical (rather than synchronic-typological). Several descriptive studies of individual languages, however, were carried out under the presumption emanating from neogrammarian theory that the phonology of the daughter languages should be described first, and that historical comparison would be possible only when a sufficient number of such descriptions existed.

In section 5.5.2., the main focus of comparison lies outside Finnish dialects, i.e. on Finnic or general Finno-Ugric, including descriptive studies intended to serve as a basis for comparison, as well as etymology and loan-word research. In 5.6.4.2., the focus shifts to Finnish dialects. Section 5.6.2.2. then treats other historically-oriented work on the development of individual (mainly written) languages. The interest in sound history was frequently combined with etymology and word history, especially the investigation of loan-words, in ways that make these topics difficult to separate.

Heikki Paasonen's (4.7.1.) dissertation (1893) provides a detailed historical account of sound development from Proto-Mordvin to present-day dialects. Paasonen, a contemporary of Setälä, was a typical neogrammarian. He did important work on Turkish loan-words, e.g. in Khanty (1902), and wrote numerous articles on Uralic etymology, often with an outlook towards Indo-European. In his comparative work from 1907, he discusses whether the Uralic and Indo-European languages are related. His most important contribution is perhaps a series of articles (1917) published in Hungary on Uralic sound history (especially consonants), based on extensive etymological data. The connections between Finno-Ugric and Samoyed languages are more precisely elaborated upon in these articles.

Yrjö Wichmann was also one of the prototypical linguistic explorers who conducted fieldwork (4.7.1.). His dissertation was written in the neogrammarian spirit on the development of Udmurt first-syllable vowels as compared to Komi (1897), but it turned out to be a detour, based as it was on Setälä's untenable theory of Ablaut alternations in Proto-Finno-Ugric. Wichmann's best work is his investigation of Chuvash loan-words in Udmurt and Komi (1903). He also wrote a long series of articles on Udmurt/Komi etymologies.

After M. A. Castrén's Samoyed fieldwork in the 1840s, very little research had been undertaken on this most remote branch of Uralic since the Finno-Ugric Society had decided to concentrate on Finno-Ugric languages during the first decades of its activities. But in 1910, Kai Donner and Toivo Lehtisalo informed the society that they were prepared to do Samoyed fieldwork, backed by a patron of linguistics. Lord Abercromby had donated 200 pounds for this purpose (M. Korhonen 1986:163-164).

Kai Donner (1888-1935, son of Otto Donner, cf. 4.4.2.) did fieldwork on Selkup Samoyed, Nganasan (Tavgi) Samoyed, Kamas Samoyed, and even Ket (Yenisei Ostyak) between 1911 and 1914. His material on Kamas, a language extinct since 1989, has proven particularly valuable. Donner's dissertation (1920) was a comparative study of Uralic initial labial spirants and stops.

Toivo Lehtisalo (1887-1962) did fieldwork among the Nenets (Yurak) Samoyeds from 1911 to 1923. He, too, wrote a dissertation (1927) on first-syllable vowels in Nenets, and completed another

monograph (1933) on the same topic from a general Finno-Ugric point of view. Like others, Lehtisalo relied on Setälä's vowel gradation theory, but he is still considered to be a pioneer in the area of Uralic vowel history. Lehtisalo's study of primary Proto-Uralic derivational endings (1936) is a central source regarding Uralic derivation, grouping derivational endings together if they share consonants (a principle that is not universally accepted).

Publication of the materials from these field trips has been a laborious and costly enterprise that has taken decades of dedicated work under the direction of the Finno-Ugrian Society. This material has not only been linguistically interesting. Many of the texts are also valuable from a folkloristic, literary, ethnological, religious, and anthropological point of view. Several field linguists managed to publish much of their material during their lifetime, e.g. Lehtisalo on Nenets Samoyed and Wichmann on Udmurt and Mari. Other linguists passed away before having the time to publish the results of their field trips. Thus, many later Finno-Ugrists have published the field results of their deceased predecessors. Heikki Paasonen, for example, published only a fraction of his vast Mordvin, Mari, and Khanty material. Kai Donner later published much of the Khanty material, and Paavo Siro then prepared the Mari Texts. In 1938-1947, Paavo Ravila and Kaino Heikkilä published four large volumes of Mordvin folk poetry collected by Paasonen. Even today, however, much material still remains unpublished.

This formative phase in comparative Uralic studies up to the 1930s laid the empirical foundation for the discipline and thereby provided an initial view of the historical relationship between the Uralic languages. As noted above (4.7.1.), only occasional field trips could be undertaken after 1920. Among the basic results of this work, which was carried out by several generations of linguists, is a series of dictionaries, often including grammatical sketches. These dictionaries are published by the Finno-Ugrian Society in the series *Lexica Societatis Fenno-Ugricae*. To date, twenty-four items have appeared in this series (cf. SUS-Publications 1995:42-45).

Around 1930, a new generation of Finno-Ugrists entered the scene, notably Paavo Ravila (5.2.5.) and Erkki Itkonen (1913-1992), linguists who eventually became influential. Both Ravila and Itkonen wrote their dissertations on Sámi sound history. Ravila studied the dialect of Maattivuono (1932), whereas Itkonen wrote on Eastern (especially Inari and Skolt) Sámi vowel history (1939). Erkki Itkonen can perhaps be considered the most significant Finno-Ugric scholar of this century.

Few linguists have started their careers with a publication as successful as Ravila's first work on vowel alternations in Mordvin (1929). This work dealt a blow to Setälä's gradation theory (4.4.2.) and led Uralic vowel studies in a new direction. Until that time, Mordvin data had been particularly important as evidence for the presumed Proto-Uralic nature of vocalic gradation (Ablaut), but Ravila showed that the Mordvin vowel alternations could not derive from Proto-Uralic. He came to the conclusion that Genetz had been correct in 1896, when Setälä had forced him out of the arena (4.4.2.). Genetz's claim that Mordvin alternations were due to late changes, a shift of accentuation patterns in Proto-Mordvin, was elaborated upon by Ravila (1932). Ravila's study of Sámi consonant gradation (1960b) is based on the phonetics/phonology distinction and demonstrates that the gradation phenomena in Sámi and Finnic have a common early Proto-Finnic source.

Erkki Itkonen's dissertation (1939) provides a descriptive analysis of the East Sámi vowel system with a thorough analysis of its development from Proto-(East-)Sámi. Particularly innovative is Itkonen's attempt to consider sound phenomena as parts of systems, in relation to sounds in other syllables, other word types, etc. Itkonen was influenced by contemporary phonology, even though he did not use its terminology. His holistic approach made it possible to elucidate the complex Umlaut-type alternations typical of the vowel structure of East Sámi words. One of his main theses was that the development of first-syllable vowels had been dependent on the nature of second-syllable vowels, as a kind of regressive vowel harmony (1939:57). In a later work (1946a), Itkonen extends the same methodology to the complex quantity alternations of East Sámi. This work on Sámi also sheds light on the history of Finnish vowels and on Finnish-Sámi relations.

In the 1940s, Itkonen wrote several papers on the history of Finnish vowels that have since become classics. In 1945, he refuted the assumption made by Setälä (1896) and others that there were central front unrounded vowels in Proto-Finnic. In his own reconstruction, in which he used phonotactic considerations and Mordvin and Mari data, Itkonen proposed Proto-Finnic vowel harmony. Here he made the important observation that after stems with /i/ or /e/ or combinations of these in the first syllable, back vowels have tended to generalize in derivational endings, e.g. *ime-* 'suck' — *im+aise-* 'suck (momentary)'. Itkonen's paper on vowel combinations and stem types (1948) is another classical study on a related theme. In this paper, he applied phonotactic ideas involving stem (inflectional) types to basic problems of Uralic vowel harmony. He observed that there were no Proto-Finno-Ugric nominal stems with the vowel combination first-syllable *e* + second-syllable back vowel, and that the *-e*-stems have been unproductive for a long time. One of his main conclusions (1948:142) is that there was a tendency in Proto-Finno-Ugric for the vowels to group themselves into pairs, the terms of which were in phonological opposition, i.e. *a/ä*, *o/ö*, and *u/y*, based on the phonetic distinction back/front. The front vowels *i* and *e* lacked corresponding back vowels and became neutral. This, together with specific phonotactic restrictions on first and second syllable neutral vowels, gave rise to the whole phenomenon of Finno-Ugric vowel harmony.

In his work on Finno-Ugric vowel history (1946b), Itkonen pays special attention to Mordvin, later (1954) broadening the comparative investigation of vowels to Mari, Komi, and Udmurt. These papers are frequently cited and have decisively shaped the interpretation of Finno-Ugric vowel history.

Lauri Posti (1908-1988), professor of Finnic languages at the University of Helsinki (1953-1971) and Minister of Education in 1975, conducted fieldwork on Votian, Vepsian, Estonian, and Livonian in the 1930s. He was also familiar with Karelian and Latvian. Posti's dissertation on the sound history of Livonian (1942) was a pioneering work, especially regarding the clarification of the Latvian influence on Livonian. Posti had familiarized himself with phonology and used it successfully in several of his most important publications. His phonologically-based interpretation of quantity in Estonian (1948) triggered a lively international discussion. His central thesis was that Estonian quantity degrees can only be properly interpreted within the framework of disyllabic sequences where the quantity of the first syllable depends upon that of the second.

Posti's central contribution to linguistics is his 91-page paper "From Pre-Finnic to Late Proto-Finnic" (1953), probably the most important paper ever written on Finnic historical phonology. Posti showed that the profound sound changes that had occurred within a short period of time three or four millennia ago were basically due to Baltic and Germanic influences. Above all, the most typical feature of present-day Finnish morphophonology, the gradation of stops (*astevaihtelu*), was found originally to be due to language contact, ultimately caused by Verner's law⁶⁰ (4.4.1.), which also was at work in Pre-Finnic (= Early Proto-Finnic). Germanic speakers of Finnish are likely to have identified the medial lenis stop in a word such as **pata* 'pot' as a stop because the first syllable was clearly stressed. But in the gen. sg. form **pata+n*, the longer second syllable caused the first syllable to have less pronounced primary stress (primary stress was fixed on the first syllable in Proto-Finnic) and thus, the medial stop was prone to weakening (voicing or the like). This interpretation of the origin of consonant gradation was revolutionary.

Etymology and the study of loan-words in Uralic languages have continuously been central topics in comparative Uralic and Finnic studies. One of the leading etymologists of the time was Y. H. Toivonen (1890-1956), who presented more than 800 etymologies, often in the traditional spirit of the *Wörter und Sachen* approach focusing upon extralinguistic facts relating to ethnology, folklore, religion, etc. Toivonen knew Khanty particularly well, having spent more than twenty-five years compiling a dictionary of Karjalainen's texts (Toivonen 1948, ed.), and he also wrote an investigation (1956) of Komi loan-words in Khanty.

⁶⁰ According to Verner's law, unvoiced spirants became voiced when occurring between voiced sounds, except when immediately preceded by a syllable with primary stress.

Jalo Kalima (1884-1952), professor of Finno-Ugric languages at Kasan university 1917-1924, and of Slavic philology in Helsinki from 1935, was also an expert on loan-words. His books on Baltic (1936) and Slavic (1952) loans in Finnic are classics.

There was little focus on comparative syntax and morphology between 1900 and 1940, even though Setälä's history of the Proto-Finnic sounds (1890) touched upon several morphological problems and could therefore have inspired further work in this field. One notable early exception is E. A. Tunkelo's (1870-1953) thesis on the syntactic functions and semantics of the genitive case in Finnic languages (1908). The subtitle of this thesis emphasizes semantics, but case syntax would be a more appropriate characterization. Tunkelo was strongly influenced by Adolf Noreen's conceptual framework (5.6.1.7.), and his application of Noreen's complex apparatus resulted in a highly theoretical, meticulous, and extremely detailed description of the various functions of the genitive. Here Tunkelo demonstrates an interest in theoretical and methodological matters concerning morphology, syntax, and semantics that was ahead of its time. The work is more descriptive than historical, with parallel treatments of syntax and semantics and comparisons with several other languages, especially Finnic and classical languages. Tunkelo also discusses the views of, for example, Otto Behaghel and Wilhelm Wundt. Unfortunately, Tunkelo's analysis was so burdened with minute terminological distinctions and excessive classification that it received little recognition from readers. The work is actually only "Part I:1" of a larger proposed work on the same topic. From 1919 to 1920, Tunkelo published "Part I:2", but thereafter no continuation appeared.

Paavo Ravila and especially Erkki Itkonen were also important contributors in the area of morphology. Several of Ravila's papers mentioned below under syntax are also relevant morphologically. Of particular interest here is his basic exposition of the inflection system of Proto-Finno-Ugric (1945). Itkonen wrote a series of papers on topics such as Kola Sámi vocatives (1947), the Sámi perfect participle (1950), traces of the dual in Finnic (1955), and the development of the Mari conjugational system (1962b). He also wrote several important surveys. Among the most significant are his two articles on the phonological and morphological structure of Proto-Finno-Ugric (1957 and 1962a). Itkonen's textbook (1961) was widely used as the basic reader for the history of comparative Finno-Ugric studies.

As a result of work by Setälä, Ravila, Björn Collinder, and others, Proto-Finno-Ugric is assumed to have had six cases (nominative, genitive, accusative, locative, ablative, lative) and to have contained a distinction between the absolute and the possessive inflection of nouns. The question of the Proto-Uralic nature of objective verb inflection (found in Mordvin, Khanty, Mansi, Hungarian, and Samoyed) is still unresolved. However, in the words of Pekka Sammallahti: "After Castrén's and later Setälä's times, the historical study of morphology was degraded to serve the purposes of research into the sound-history of Finno-Ugric languages. A new era began in the sixties ..." (Sammallahti 1996:315).

Paavo Ravila laid the foundation for comparative-historical Finno-Ugric syntax. He became interested in the category of number in the late 1930s, an interest which led to several important papers, notably his famous study "Über die Verwendung der Numeruszeichen in den uralischen Sprachen" (1941). This is one of the most interesting, and also one of the most controversial, contributions to Uralic syntax ever written. This 136-page paper begins, in keeping with the title, with a treatment of number categories and endings and their syntactic use. But at the same time, Ravila also develops a more general theory of the evolution of Uralic sentence structure, discussing the claims of scholars like Paul, Delbrück, Jespersen, Schuchardt, and Meillet. He also includes comparative data from many other languages, including Japanese and Somali, thus making the paper a contribution to general linguistic theory as well as to historical Finno-Ugric syntax.

The dual number category is found in Sámi, Khanty, Mansi, and Samoyed, and Castrén had assumed that the dual also existed in Proto-Uralic. Ravila argues, however, that Proto-Finno-Ugric did not have a (natural) dual category, motivating his claim by contending that words denoting referents occurring in pairs (hands, feet, etc.) are frequently used in the singular form ("put the gloves on your hand") in Finno-Ugric languages. Ravila suggests that this singular usage was a primitive feature of Proto-Finno-Ugric.

As for the origin of Uralic clause structure, Ravila extends his argumentation to early linguistic prehistory. On the basis of Uralic data, he makes several strong claims, the main claim being that subordination as a relation between parts of a clause is older than coordination and nexus. Ravila maintains that the subject-predicate distinction is secondary to an early basic attributive construction type. In other words, an expression such as *the bird sings* would have been predated by a construction that can be glossed as *bird-singing*. This implies that the nominal (as opposed to verbal) sentence type was original. A related claim is that subjectless sentences such as *Sataa* '(It) rains', now often considered deviant, were originally basic. Ravila also argues that clauses preceded words at some Pre-Uralic stage, and that conjunction (*Sue ate and drank*) historically comprises addition to simpler structures (*Sue ate + drank*) rather than elliptic reduction (*Sue ate + Sue drank*). As for number concord, Ravila shows that the common Uralic ending *-t* (pl.) was originally appended to the verb alone, from where it later attached to the subject, for example in Finnish. In his later production, Ravila frequently returns to these same themes (1943, 1946, 1960a).

A new approach to semantics and syntax was introduced by Paavo Siro in his dissertation on verbs denoting speaking in Finnic languages (1949). The subtitle states that the work involved research in semantics. The method of this research, however, is syntactic. Siro began to engage in a public debate with Ravila in 1941 on the nature of syntactic description (5.3.1.). In his thesis, however, he returns to a more traditional topic, but his methodological approach is still new. In the preface, he says that semantics is normally historical, and he himself originally collected the data in the 1930s for the purpose of writing a diachronic thesis. Later, he became more interested in descriptive aspects. "One would believe it to be important to know *what* changes before one asks *why* something changes that one usually calls meaning" (Siro 1949:5). He postulates four basic meanings belonging to this semantic area: SPEAK, TALK, TELL, and DISCUSS, and develops a distributional method for investigating the typical collocations of the verb usages. Siro thus tries to operationalize meaning descriptions. He was inspired by American structuralism as well as by formal logic. His method contains many essential properties typical of later dependency grammar and other types of structural grammars, for example obligatory arguments and substitution tests. Siro was perhaps the first linguist in Finland to explicitly define and use the concept *morpheme* (he used the Finnish term *vaihe*) in a full-scale investigation (1949:40-41). He applied these methods to the verbs of speaking in all the Finnic languages and managed to establish several basic syntactic-semantic differences.

A central historical problem of comparative linguistics is the question of whether or not languages sharing specific characteristics are genetically related, or whether these similarities in linguistic structure and lexicon should be attributed to borrowing or to other types of language contact, convergent developments, chance, general markedness principles, etc. As for Uralic, the classical problem has been its relationship to the Indo-European and Altaic languages (we use the term *Altaic* in the traditional way as a cover term, even if the commonly accepted view these days is that an Altaic phylum should not be postulated). Erkki Itkonen (1961:5-47) produced a survey of the history of research on Uralic genetic relationships, internally and externally. M. A. Castrén demonstrated the affinity between Finno-Ugric and Samoyed, thus establishing the Uralic phylum.

There is a vast literature, reviewed by Erkki Itkonen (1961), pertaining to Uralic and Finno-Ugric peoples. For example, questions such as the location of the presumed Uralic and Finno-Ugric *Urheimat* and the relations of various Uralic languages to the culture, race, and anthropological characteristics of their speakers are discussed by Itkonen.

The bulk of comparative Finno-Ugric linguistics in the Nordic countries in this period was carried out by Finnish linguists. But there were also some important contributions from Swedish and Norwegian linguists.

Karl Bernhard Wiklund (4.7.1.), the first professor of Finno-Ugric linguistics at the University of Uppsala (1905-1933), was the founder of Finno-Ugric studies in Sweden. Wiklund worked on Sámi, in particular, which he had already learned as a schoolboy. His viewpoint was mainly diachronic. In his 1891 work, he provides a traditional neogrammarian description of a Sámi dialect, based on reconstructed forms

and disregarding older written sources, thereby creating a model for later Finno-Ugric studies in Sweden. Wiklund (1896) argues that the Sámis had undergone a prehistoric language switch, acquiring a Finno-Ugric tongue from pre-Finns. This type of theory has recently gained additional support from the observation that the Sámis are genetically of different stock than are the neighboring Finno-Ugrians. In addition to his historical works, Wiklund also wrote an elementary grammar of Sámi (1901).

Wiklund supported Setälä's efforts to develop a phonetic notational system for the Finno-Ugric languages (4.4.2., and Setälä 1901). This system was largely based on Wiklund's own work (Wiklund 1890, 1896 and especially 1893), where most of the transcription system is already found. But behind this phonetic notation lay Genetz's phonetic studies and dialect investigations (4.5.2.3. and 4.8.). Wiklund also actively participated in the lengthy discussion on Finno-Ugric gradation (4.4.2.) and developed his own theories of its nature and chronology. However, Setälä and others could not accept Wiklund's theories, and Setälä and Wiklund therefore started a debate that lasted for years (cf. Häkkinen 1996b).

Björn Collinder (1894-1983), professor of Finno-Ugric linguistics at Uppsala University (1933-1961), was a productive scholar and one of the last great neogrammarians. In his work on comparative Finno-Ugric linguistics, he was one of the most outspoken proponents of the view that Indo-European, Altaic, and Uralic languages may be genetically related, and that Yukagir is also a Uralic language (1940), a view that has since been abandoned. For example, Collinder claimed that there were approximately thirty or forty Indo-European/Uralic word roots deriving from a common genetic source (Collinder 1934:59-75), and similarly some seventy common Altaic/Uralic word roots (Collinder 1955:143-149). This view has since met with criticism. Erkki Itkonen (1961:16), for example, is more conservative and considers that there are at the most ten candidate words in these two groups that are, at best, "almost probable". When constructing these theories, Collinder arrived at his estimates by using the mathematical theory of probability (e.g. 1964).

Collinder's handbooks on Uralic languages (1960, 1962a) have been widely used. His *Fenno-Ugric Vocabulary. An Etymological Dictionary of the Uralic Languages* (1955) was an attempt at a provisional etymological dictionary of the Finno-Ugric languages. Collinder was occupied with the Sámi variants spoken in Sweden (Gällivare, Härjedalen, Jukkasjärvi, Luleå) and also participated in the loan-word discussion of the 1930s (Collinder 1932-1941). Throughout his career, he also took an active interest in general linguistics. His linguistic textbooks are discussed in 5.3.2. However, Collinder is best known for his congenial translations, of the Finnish epic *Kalevala* in 1948, Snorre's *Edda*, many of Shakespeare's dramas, *Beowulf*, dramas by Sophocles and Euripides, etc.

The Norwegian Finno-Ugric scholars in this period concentrated their research activities more or less on Sámi (5.6.1.6.), but there were also a few valuable contributions to comparative Finno-Ugric studies. For instance, Asbjørn Nesheim's (5.6.7.5.) doctoral thesis (1942) provides a comparative analysis of the dual in Sámi, and Knut Bergsland published a number of minor studies on various aspects of comparative and diachronic Sámi and Finnish phonology and etymology. Bergsland's most significant studies deal with the connections between Uralic and Eskimo (Inuit) languages (e.g. Bergsland 1959a). Here he used his unique insight into both language families to undertake a thorough critical analysis of a question that has usually been answered only by superficial speculation on the part of people with only limited knowledge of the data.

An important factor influencing the development of Nordic linguistics and especially Finno-Ugric studies in the Nordic countries was Indiana University in Bloomington and its Uralic and Altaic programs. In the 1950s and 1960s, many Nordic linguists were there as either teachers or visiting scholars for a shorter or longer period. Bloomington thus opened the door to American linguistics for Nordic scholars and became an important source of inspiration and influence by encouraging Nordic linguists to apply new methods to the study of Finno-Ugric languages. To some extent, it was Bloomington that brought an end to the hegemony of the traditional neogrammarian school in Finno-Ugric linguistics that was predominant in the Nordic countries, and above all in Finland, until 1965 (with Knut Bergsland and Erkki Itkonen as the most notable exceptions). An example of this new approach is Hasselbrink's structural phonological analysis of South Sámi (1965).

5.6. The Languages of the Nordic Countries

In the twentieth century, the study of the national languages rose in prominence, and in some cases even acquired a dominant position at the universities in the Nordic countries. As far as the humanities are concerned, this probably represents the most profound restructuring of disciplines and allocation of research funds in this period. The emphasis placed on the study of the national languages (national minority languages like Faroese, Sámi, and Kalaallisut did not fare nearly as well) was due both to official government policies (motives like developing national identity and improving education were prominent ones) and pressure from private organizations involved in the language struggle in Finland and Norway. The study of the national languages was not focused on the descriptive-synchronic study of the standard languages, however. The main emphasis was on diachronic studies, with dialectology (also mainly on a diachronic scale), onomastics (a flourishing field in practically all the Nordic countries, which also extended to minority languages like Faroese and Sámi) and, of course, language planning (standardization as well as purification), and lexicography.

5.6.1. Synchronic Studies

5.6.1.1. Danish

According to Paul Diderichsen (1965:143), the turn of the century marked the beginning of a new era in the history of Danish grammar. In 1901 H. G. Wiwel (1851-1910) published his *Synspunkter for dansk sproglære* (Views on Danish Grammar), characterized by Otto Jespersen in a review as the first attempt at a consistent treatment of Danish grammar from a thoroughly realistic point of view. This grammar was later praised by Erik Rehling (1924:Vf.) and Louis Hjelmslev (1929:109f.) for its innovative approach. Wiwel's adversary, Kristian Mikkelsen (4.5.2.1.), characterized Wiwel's grammar as being closer to revolution than to reform (1902:3).

Wiwel viewed language not as something logical and full of regularity like a mathematical formula, but as something closer to zoology and botany, something flexible, wave-like, and flossy on the edges: "the most correct picture is the concrete organism" (1901:345f.). Influenced by the collective psychology of Wilhelm von Humboldt and Heymann Steinthal, Wiwel also considered language to be "an *average product*, produced by a greater or smaller society of people expanding in time and space and designed to be the common property of the members of this society" (1901:346).

The most innovative aspects of Wiwel's grammar are the consideration of word order, stress, accent, and pauses as "positive phenomena" on a par with inflection, and the requirement that linguistic description be based solely on those elements of form to which a specific content can be attached.

In opposition to general grammar, and following in the footsteps of Jens Høysgaard, Wiwel notes that, although there are certain general forms of thought that are common to all people, languages are as varied grammatically as they are with respect to their sounds and vocabulary. For example, Wiwel states that "there is no generally valid grammar, but only grammars of the individual languages" (1901:7). The elements to be described by these grammars are the sounds and the ways in which they are combined, the words, including their meanings, the ways in which they are formed and inflected, and the order in which they occur, as well as prosodic features such as stress and accent, and finally, pauses. Wiwel deals at length with pauses and advocates placing commas according to the natural breaks in speech rather than mechanically according to grammatical structure, as in German.

Otto Jespersen, whose influence on Wiwel is readily apparent, also made several contributions to the study of Danish grammar (e.g. 1921), all of which emphasize the relationship between categories in the real

world and grammatical categories.

Wiwel's views were met with skepticism, but many of them were incorporated into Erik Rehling's Danish grammar of 1924, which became popular in the schools and was continuously revised to incorporate more current points of view (1932, 1949). Although Rehling's grammar was intended for intermediate instruction in the schools, it was also used by Johannes Brøndum-Nielsen in his university courses in Danish grammar. This was probably the first Danish grammar read by Paul Diderichsen. Diderichsen attended Brøndum-Nielsen's course and describes how he was struck by the difference between Rehling's grammatical description and the traditional Latin-based approach to grammar in which he had previously been educated (Diderichsen 1965:166). In addition to his descriptive grammar, Rehling also wrote a normative grammar dealing with stylistics (1948), based on a large collection of less fortunate expressions and ordered within a stylistic-grammatical system.

The first linguist to attempt a general reorientation in Danish grammar was Aage Hansen (1894-1983, cf. also 5.4.). Like Rehling, he was also influenced by the discussion between Wiwel and Kristian Mathias Mikkelsen, and in particular by Otto Jespersen's linguistic work. Hansen had studied English under Jespersen and belonged to the circle of grammarians with whom the master conferred when he was working on his *Analytic Syntax* (1937). In a significant early work on modern Danish syntax (1933), which he dedicated to Jespersen, Hansen described the syntactic structure of Danish with particular reference to the spoken language. This discussion of Danish syntax paved the way for the ideas which were later developed by Diderichsen, particularly the description of normal Danish sentence structure consisting of two main units, an introductory, presentational unit (the A-member about which something is communicated) and a concluding or predicative unit (the B-member, that which is communicated). Hansen's ideas, though less theoretically consistent, closely resemble Hjelmslev's notions of solidarity and selection. In an interview by Christian Becker Christensen and Jan Katlev, Hansen relates that since he and Viggo Brøndal lived close to each other, they often discussed linguistics after the linguistic circle meetings, and if they hadn't finished their discussion before they reached his home, he would offer to walk Brøndal home. Once they reached Brøndal's home, if they still weren't finished, Brøndal would walk him home and so on, until they were through. In addition to the inspiration from Hjelmslev's theories, there is also a certain affinity in Hansen's analytical procedures to immediate constituent analysis, which emerged around the same time in American linguistics.

The foremost Danish grammarian in this period is without doubt Paul Diderichsen (5.2.5. and 5.3.3.). His development as a descriptive grammarian also involved synchronic studies of the syntax of historical texts, for example his investigation of *tha* in the East Scandinavian legal language (1934) as well as his dissertation on Old Danish syntax and the sentence structure of the Scanian (Skåne) Law (1942), cf. 5.6.2.1.

Diderichsen's main contribution to linguistics is the elaborated sentence model, which he first introduced at the Eighth Conference of Scandinavian Philology in Copenhagen in 1935 (Diderichsen 1936) and presented not long afterwards at a meeting of the Society for Scandinavian Philology (*Selskab for nordisk filologi*). The model Diderichsen developed took the finite verb as the central point of reference, placing other sentence members in relation to the verb. His model is based on the interplay between topologically defined fields and syntactically-defined sentence members. He sets up three fields (fundamental, nexus, and content) in which nominal, verbal, and adverbial sentence members are placed in a definite order (with the exception of certain unstressed members). For example, for main clauses in Modern Danish, Diderichsen proposes:

Fundamental	Nexus	Content
	v n a	V N A
<i>Derfor</i>	<i>ville Peter ikke</i>	<i>sende bogen tilbage.</i>

'Therefore would Peter not send the book back.'⁶¹

The nexus field contains the finite verb, the subject, and sentence adverbials, the content field the remaining nominal, verbal, and adverbial members, whereas any member except the finite verb can be placed in the fundamental field. Free adverbials can be placed either in a or A. This model, which is designed for maximally filled positions, is not unlike that of Kenneth Pike in being based on a sentence skeleton consisting of positions or slots which can be filled by various members or be left open. Shorter sentences are assumed to have empty slots. In Diderichsen's model for subordinate clauses, there is no fundamental field, and the order in their nexus field is n a v. Diderichsen's theory of syntax was further developed and presented in detail in his definitive work on Danish grammar (1946, revised 1957).

5.6.1.2. Faroese

The first grammar of Faroese in Faroese was written by Jákup Dahl (1908). It is traditional in all respects and, according to the author, based on V. U. Hammershaimb's work (4.5.2.2.), as well as that of Munch/Unger (1847). This grammar contains a thorough section on phonology, including morpho-phonology, a comprehensive section on morphology, including word formation, and a short section on syntax. The main significance of this grammar lies in the establishing of a Faroese grammatical terminology. After 1900, Faroese was gradually introduced as a school language, and in 1907, Faroese was introduced as a subject in teachers' colleges. But it was not until 1948 that Faroese was declared as the main official language, *Høvuðsmál*, of the islands.

The central figure in Faroese linguistics in this period was Christian Matras (1900-1988). Matras, who was born in Tórshavn, studied in Copenhagen and Oslo and became a lecturer at the University of Copenhagen in 1947. In 1952, he was appointed professor of Faroese in Copenhagen, thereby becoming the world's first professor of Faroese. Matras was a diligent researcher, touching on most aspects of Faroese language and culture. His studies of Faroese place-names and his Faroese-Danish dictionary (Jacobsen/Matras 1927-1928) represent valuable contributions of the field.

The British linguist W. B. Lockwood of the University of Birmingham wrote a grammar of Faroese in English (1955), thus making knowledge of Faroese available to non-Nordic scholars. In his grammar, Lockwood not only describes the standard literary language, but also the modern spoken language, providing material that soon attracted the attention of several leading international phonologists. Interest in Faroese phonology was also stimulated by M. Bjerrum's study of the Faroese vowel system (1949). Lockwood introduced Faroese as a subject at the University of Birmingham.

⁶¹ This example stems from Eli Fischer-Jørgensen's article on Diderichsen in the large bibliographical lexicon of linguists, *Lexicon Grammaticorum*.

5.6.1.3. Finnish

As noted in 4.5.2.3., Setälä's textbooks on Finnish syntax (1880) as well as on phonetics and morphology (1898) both became more or less canonized in Fennistics. A wealth of Finnish grammars had been published in the 1800s, but interest in grammatical research declined after 1900.

A feature typical of Finland is that several ad hoc government committees have been charged with the task of developing the grammatical description of Finnish and, even more importantly, to propose a general grammatical terminology that could be used in the description and teaching of all the modern school languages. The tasks of these committees involved a mixture of grammatical description, language planning, and pedagogical development.

The first grammar committee, with Arvid Genetz as secretary, delivered its report in 1888, but its impact was negligible. A new grammar committee was appointed in 1906, and soon afterwards Setälä became its chairman. The report of Setälä's committee was delivered to His Imperial Majesty nine years later (Committee 1915). This report is interesting from a linguistic point of view. It consisted primarily of a grammatical sketch containing suggestions for a unified terminology and precise definitions of terms. The report proposed, in accordance with the ideas of Adolf Noreen, who was frequently referred to, that grammar be divided into phonology, morphology, and semantics. Syntax entered the scene as part of the domain of "word-form combinations".

The 1915 report contains several suggestions that were precursors of later twentieth-century linguistic insights: the idea to parse sentences not word by word, but by hierarchical constituents (cf. constituent and phrase structure analysis); the idea that there are both transitive and intransitive direct objects in syntax (cf. modern dependency grammar); the splitting-up of a word-form into minimal meaningful parts (morpheme analysis); the view, borrowed from Jespersen, that the subject/predicate relation is a nexus (cf. exocentric constructions).

Strangely enough, the Committee 1915 report was almost completely ignored in the study of Finnish for nearly fifty years (until Penttilä's grammar 1957), even though Setälä himself was the chairman. This may be because the main activities of the Fennicists were focused on diachronic phonology and dialectology. However, the ideas of Committee 1915 were implemented in a number of Swedish school grammars written by the secretary of the committee, Ralf Saxén (1868-1932), who also was the main author of the memorandum of the Committee.

A few fairly traditional Finnish school grammars appeared between 1900-1950. Martti Airila wrote on the orthography, sound and form structure, and syntax of Finnish (1920, 1926). In the preface to his book from 1926, he complains that he would have liked to have revised the system of grammatical description along the lines suggested by Committee 1915, but refrained from doing so, since Setälä's syntactic framework had not been revised after 1891. Airila stated that he was afraid of the disintegration that would follow if different conceptual systems were introduced for teaching purposes. Setälä, on the other hand, was not willing, nor did he have the time, to reformulate the syntactic system that he as a schoolboy in 1880 basically had taken from Adolf Waldemar Jahnsson (1871) and partly refined in the second and third editions of the book (1884, 1891).

Knut Cannelin's grammar (1932), written in Swedish, is mainly concerned with inflection and derivation, and there is no syntax. Cannelin describes the inflection of nouns and verbs in terms of five declensions and four conjugations, and morphophonological sound alternations are treated in connection with inflectional phenomena. The book primarily deals with derivation.

Lauri Kettunen's grammar (1934) and its modified version (Kettunen and Vaula 1938) are complete grammars. Kettunen introduced substantial historical and dialectological information to illustrate the background of the phenomena he treated. In conformity with tradition, Kettunen defined the parts of speech notionally, the bound enclitic morphemes like *-kin*, *-ko* ~ *-kö* are treated as if they were independent words, the subject and the predicate are the main parts of the sentence, etc. Kettunen also introduces a few

innovations in the syntax. He recognizes, for example, the importance of subjectless sentences in Finnish, operates with a distinction between (minimal) basic sentences and extended sentences containing adjuncts, and uses dependency trees for illustrating the depth of syntactic embedding. As for normativity and language planning, Kettunen was a rebel and in outspoken opposition to the strict and somewhat dogmatic views of some of his contemporaries, especially those of E. A. Saarimaa (cf. 5.6.6.3.). Furthermore, as an experienced dialectologist, Kettunen had a liberal attitude towards colloquial features.

In his study of Finnish local cases as verbal complements (1956), Paavo Siro further develops the distributional method for determining substitution classes that he had used in his dissertation, published in 1949 (5.5.2.). In 1964, Siro formulates and introduces the rule which later became known as the “relation rule”: local cases, just like prepositions and postpositions, express the relation of their head to some other word in the sentence, and if this head is a bound (i.e. obligatory) complement of a verb, it modifies the subject if the verb is intransitive, and the object if the verb is transitive. This pioneering observation was different in kind from what the syntactic description of Finnish normally was thought to be about. Siro showed that major syntactic insights could be achieved using distributional criteria alone, without invoking morphology or semantics. He also demonstrated (1964b), by using distributional analysis alone, how the description of Finnish infinitives could be simplified. Siro postulated two synchronic infinitives instead of the traditional four.

One of the two major grammars from this period is Paavo Siro’s Finnish Syntax (*Suomen kielen lauseoppi*, 1964a). Siro wanted to provide a synchronic syntactic description based on distributional principles but, as he admitted in the preface, at this stage of research meaning-based definitions and methods could not be altogether dispensed with. He uses several notions taken from structural or functional linguistics, such as morpheme, nexus, category, valency, and obligatory complement. New solutions are introduced especially in the description of adverbials, infinitives, and the subclassification of the case system.

The basic handbook on Finnish, and the most cited item in Finnish linguistics, was for a long time Lauri Hakulinen’s (1899-1985) *Suomen kielen rakenne ja kehitys* (Structure and Development of the Finnish Language), widely known in Finland also under its acronym SKRK. The first edition appeared in two parts in 1941 and 1946, and it was translated into German, Russian, and English as early as the 1940s. These translations allowed some of the results of Finnish historical linguistics to be communicated to an international audience. The fourth edition of SKRK appeared in 1979. Lauri Hakulinen’s original intention was to write a handbook similar to Otto Jespersen’s (1905) on English and to Otto Behaghel’s on German.

The SKRK is partly a synchronic-diachronic grammar and partly an encyclopedia. There are chapters devoted to the historical background underlying present-day morphophonological alternations, inflectional categories, morphological derivation, basic syntactic phenomena (word order, definiteness, the use of local cases, case marking of the object, the principles of agreement, non-finite verb constructions), and loan-word layers, in particular the etymological loan-word layers of present-day Finnish vocabulary. Several chapters contain contrastive comparisons, for example those on sound structure and word order. Hakulinen had followed the development of linguistics in Germany, in particular the thinking of Sperber, Weisgerber, and Wartburg. Some theoretical issues are also considered in SKRK, such as the problem of how the category “word” is defined. Some of Hakulinen’s views are no longer current, for example his speculative characterizations of primitive languages (L. Hakulinen 1979:63, 337).

The first major grammar of Finnish written in the twentieth century was Aarni Penttilä’s approximately 700-page *Suomen kielioppi* (Finnish Grammar, 1957), to date the largest existing grammar of Finnish, written more than half a century after the publication of Setälä’s grammars. Penttilä covered all aspects of grammar (phonology, morphology, syntax) in this one volume. He was influenced by the Committee 1915 report, thus treating various phenomena normally considered syntactic under the heading of word-form combinations, for example the syntactic use of cases. For several decades Penttilä had been interested in phonetics and the psychology of language, and such influences are readily apparent in his grammar.

Penttilä's overall conception of grammar was, however, somewhat idiosyncratic. He made an explicit tripartite distinction between word-form tokens, word-form types, and lexemes that was correct enough in itself, but he carried the distinction to extremes. In particular, the distinction between word-form tokens and types has little syntactic relevance, but Penttilä took this distinction to be a very important one, and it profoundly affected i.a. the basic disposition of the chapters on morphology and syntax. This led to some awkward solutions, such as having a long chapter on "Word, word-form type, and word-form token groups" under which parts of speech and the uses of the cases were described. A distinct chapter called "Word-form type groups among the verbs" treated active and passive forms, personal endings, tense and mood, and several petrified verbal phrases. The motivation for these distinctions is not easy to see, and the book met with strong criticism (T. Itkonen 1958). However, to this day, the work is still an inspiring and unavoidable source of information for anyone working with the grammatical description of Finnish.

Interest in syntax and morphology grew in the 1950s. Göran Karlsson (1917-), professor of Finnish at Åbo Akademi University from 1964 to 1980, wrote his dissertation (1957) on specific subclasses of adverbs and analyzed the semantic causes underlying their unexpected plural forms. Terho Itkonen (1933-1998), professor of Finnish at the University of Helsinki from 1965 to 1989, studied the free variation and its background in the endings of the illative case using frequency data (Itkonen 1959). This study shows clear influences from structural morphology.

Syntactic research in Finland was initiated in the 1940s by Paavo Siro (1941, 1943, 1944, 1949, cf. 5.3.1.) and Osmo Ikola. Ikola was professor of Finnish and Finnic languages at the University of Turku 1951-1981 and Rector 1975-1981. His dissertation (1949) treated the use of tenses and moods in the Finnish Bible translation of 1642. Ikola developed a basic framework for classifying the functions of tense and mood. This framework incorporated the points of view of time axis categorization and speaker perspective, also encompassing verbal aspect and paying attention to the views expressed by Jespersen, Noreen, Gardiner, and Marouzeau. Ikola gave special consideration to the opposition past tense versus present perfect.

In the 1950s, a lively and constructive discussion on problems relating to Finnish existential sentences was initiated by Osmo Ikola (1954). Much of the discussion concerned the restrictions on the use of the partitive case for marking grammatical subjects, such as the transitivity and semantic properties of the predicate verb, or the polarity of the sentence. The nature of definiteness (of noun phrases) and the conditions for subject - verb agreement were also central in this discussion, which continued into the 1980s. Among the early participants in this discussion were Aarni Penttilä, Paavo Siro, and Göran Karlsson.

5.6.1.4. Icelandic

Generally speaking, there was more interest in Icelandic language history than in the study of the modern language during this period. A number of textbooks in Icelandic for foreigners were written, of which the 1943 Danish text by Blöndal and Stemann is noteworthy. Among textbooks for Icelandic schools, the grammar and syntax texts (1943, 1946, 1947) by Björn Guðfinnsson (5.6.4.3.) deserve special mention, because for decades from the 1940s on, they dominated the view of Icelandic in the school system with their normative tendency.

The foundation for the study of modern Icelandic inflectional morphology was established by Valtyr Guðmundsson's (1860-1928) detailed grammar (1922). The most remarkable aspect of this grammar is its complete synchronic orientation, something which was unusual at the time. The standard work of reference in many respects is still Stefán Einarsson's *Icelandic* (1945, second edition 1949), originally written for American soldiers in Iceland. This work includes a fairly full treatment of syntax.

Syntax was not a central topic in Icelandic linguistics during this period, in contrast to what was to follow after 1965 (6.3.5.). Most efforts were in the area of traditional normative and/or historical studies, and the theoretical level of the work done was not very high. The most important contribution in this field is

probably Jakob Smári's grammar (1920), which became quite influential due to its numerous examples, particularly from folk tales and modern literature. It is not a completely synchronic work, however, since it also contains examples from Old Norse and is heavily influenced by Nygaard (1905).

5.6.1.5. Norwegian

Most research on Norwegian and other Scandinavian languages in Norway between 1900 and 1965 was carried out in the areas of diachronic linguistics and dialectology. Most investigations in Norwegian phonetics and morphology also focused on Norwegian dialects. Thus, this period is generally weak when it comes to more comprehensive descriptions like grammars and descriptive studies concentrating on a wide range of data or on the standard languages.

An inspection of the selected collections of studies in Norwegian linguistics edited by Ernst Håkon Jahr and Ove Lorentz (1981-1989) indicates that the articles selected from the period 1900-1965 are mainly within phonology and especially prosody, whereas there are few and only minor contributions to morphology and syntax. Of the eleven articles on phonology mentioned, eight were written by scholars outside the departments of Scandinavian languages.

The twentieth century began with a major contribution to the study of Norwegian syntax by Falk and Torp (1900), cf. 4.5.3.2. Syntax is also the focus of study in Western's description of Norwegian from this period (1921). The author, August Western, D. Phil. (1850-1940), was a high school headmaster and never held a university position. He was, however, a prolific scholar. Even if Western's book of 1921 has the title *Grammar of Norwegian riksmål (Norsk riksmåls-grammatikk)*, it is not a traditional grammar. For instance, it contains no phonology, and the section on morphology is dominated by syntax, focusing more on word classes and syntactic function than on inflection.

Western was, as he states himself, strongly influenced by Otto Jespersen's theories of language and grammar writing (5.3.3.), but he also refers to Adolf Noreen's *Vårt språk* (5.6.1.7.) and to H. G. Wiwel (1901). Western's grammar is divided into a logical and a formal part. The logical part treats the semantic aspects of syntactic constructions, while the formal part treats the form of various sentence constructions, phrases, and formal characteristics of word classes, including inflection. The grammar is based on literary riksmål and contains a wealth of examples, mainly from literary texts, but also from newspapers.

Only four additional grammars of Norwegian above the elementary school level were published in this period. Leiv Heggstad wrote a traditional grammar of nynorsk (1914, 1931), and Gorgus Coward wrote a short, but well-written normative grammar of riksmål (1959). Olav Næs's (5.2.1.) first attempt at a description of Norwegian covered only phonology and morphology (1952), but was followed by his full-scale grammar in 1965 (6.6.6.).

Trygve Knudsen (1897-1968), professor of Scandinavian languages in Oslo from 1954 (cf. also 5.6.7.4.), published several important contributions on Norwegian morphology and syntax, for example his studies of pronouns (1949) and cases (1967). Knudsen combined a diachronic analysis with keen observations on modern Norwegian. His books, which were written in Norwegian and for a long time only existed in a duplicated version, were widely read by students, but these works were little known outside a small circle of Norwegian scholars.

In 1905, Marius Nygaard (1838-1912) published a syntax of Old Norse (cf. Kristoffersen 1996), which was not only the standard work in its field for a long time, but which also represented a strong break with tradition. Since the first decades of the nineteenth century, the study of Old Norse had been largely dominated by the historical-comparative tradition. Nygaard's syntax is a descriptive synchronic syntax based on thorough data documentation from one specific stylistic register, prose texts in colloquial language. The grammar is based on the traditional descriptive school grammar, and neither comparative grammar nor universal grammar plays any part in the book.

In 1923, Ragnvald Iversen (5.7.3.) published his grammar of Old Norse, which was the standard

grammar of Old Norse in Norway for a long time, enjoying numerous reprints and revised editions. This grammar is a typical theoretical compromise, since the phonology is largely diachronic, whereas the morphology is synchronic, but with diachronic notes. The syntax is entirely synchronic, and to a large extent based on Nygaard's book.

5.6.1.6. Sámi

In addition to his monumental dictionary (5.6.7.5.), Konrad Nielsen (1875-1953), professor of Finnish and Sámi in Oslo from 1910 to 1947, published a number of valuable studies of Sámi. His most influential work in this field is his introductory Sámi textbook (1926-1929) in three volumes: grammar, reader, and vocabulary.

Nielsen's grammar contains numerous observations on dialectal variation in the central Northern Sámi region. He treats all the components of the grammar on an equal level and gives ample space to both word formation and syntax. Nielsen had a thorough knowledge of the best of both the Finno-Ugric and the Indo-European grammar traditions of his day and managed to write what we today would call a good reference grammar.

Nielsen's reader is no less impressive, as it covers daily conversations, texts on Sámi material culture, folklore, letters, and literary texts, including extracts from newspapers. This broad coverage of Sámi culture is combined with the high linguistic quality of the oral texts. It is hard to believe that these lively dialogues could have been captured on paper at a time when there was no tape recorder.

A new period and a milestone, not only in the study of Sámi and in Norwegian Finno-Ugric studies, but in Finno-Ugric studies in general, is represented by Knut Bergsland's (5.3.1.) dissertation (1946), which was a grammar of the South Sámi dialect of Røros in Norway. This was the first time that a Nordic linguist with thorough training in general linguistics, as well as in comparative Indo-European linguistics, approached the description of Sámi without being educated in or formed by the tradition of grammatical description of the Finno-Ugric languages. Bergsland used a structuralist approach, heavily influenced by Hjelmslev's glossematics, and accordingly he concentrated mainly on phonology and morphology. The book is a beautiful intellectual exercise and a superb illustration of a theory, showing both its strengths and its weaknesses (e.g. by making a language look more structured than it is), but its impact on both grammatical theory and on Finno-Ugric studies appears to have been marginal.

Bergsland has since produced numerous grammars of various languages (5.7.8., 6.6.7., and 6.7.2.), all of a high standard. He based his grammatical analysis on a combination of traditional grammar and an eclectic attitude towards twentieth-century linguistic theories, but with a solid structuralist basis. The pedagogical aspect, which was absent in 1946, was becoming more prominent in these grammars.

Bergsland wrote a short, but systematic Sámi grammar for teachers of Sámi (1961). Sponsored by the Ministry of Church and Education, this grammar was to some extent thought of as an official grammar of Sámi, introducing the new Sámi orthography of 1947 common to Sámis in Norway and Sweden.

A person whose scholarship proved to have lasting value for Sámi studies was Just Knud Qvigstad (1853-1957), Rector of *Tromsø Lærerskole* (Tromsø Teachers' Training College) from 1874 to 1923 and Minister of Ecclesiastical Affairs from 1910 to 1912. In 1878, Qvigstad went to Kautokeino to learn Sámi and then published numerous collections of Sámi folklore and dialect texts as well as many studies on Sámi culture and etymology. He became the founder of Sámi onomastics in Norway with his collection of Sámi place-names. After his retirement, his research was largely financed by the Institute for Comparative Research in Human Culture. He was an active scholar even after his 100th birthday, and he is said to have remarked on that occasion that he regretfully assumed that his best years of work were now behind him.

5.6.1.7. Swedish

The central scholar in the study of Swedish, both from a diachronic and a synchronic point of view, was Adolf Noreen (4.5.1.5.), professor of Scandinavian languages in Uppsala from 1887 to 1919 and member of the Swedish Academy (4.5.5.4.). Noreen's research covered the standard language as well as dialects. He played an important role as a teacher, inspiring the next generation of scholars and professors. To some extent, because of Noreen's leadership, one can speak of an "Uppsala School of Scandinavian Linguistics" in Sweden. Noreen was open to modern methods and eager to apply them to Swedish data and to share them with others. He started his scholarly career with a number of important studies of Swedish dialects (4.5.5.4.) and later wrote on many subjects and collaborated in several surveys, for example on Swedish place-names. His articles and handbooks on the history of the Scandinavian languages were influential (4.5.3.3.).

Noreen's most well-known work today, a major contribution to the linguistic description of Swedish, is his monumental *Vårt språk* (Our Language, 1903-1923), published in seven volumes, although it still remains unfinished. A German version of parts of this work appeared in 1923. According to John Lotz (1954:82), Noreen's work of more than 3,000 pages is "one of the greatest undertakings in the history of grammar".

The text which was intended to attract subscribers is revealing:

A complete comprehensive grammar of modern Swedish written according to modern linguistic principles is lacking. Yet few books seem to be more needed than such a book. It will be the most important aid in linguistic studies in our country, since the mother tongue is the incomparably best basis for any attempt to clarify the general laws and phenomena of language life... [The writing of such a book] is simply a national duty...

Noreen's description of Swedish is unconventional. He divided his description into three main parts — phonology, semantics, and morphology — but the text was much too comprehensive to be covered in only three volumes. He supports his tripartite division by comparing language to artifacts such as clothes. Language can be regarded from the same three points of view: the material, the use, and the form. The first volume presents a general introduction to linguistics and a survey of the genetic relations of Swedish, its different variants, the different periods in its history, the sources of Swedish, as well as previous descriptions of it. The first volume also includes an introduction to phonology and a survey of the vocalic (sonorant) sounds of modern Swedish. Phonological observations and analyses are found in volumes II-IV. Volume II contains a detailed survey of the consonants and their combinations. This volume also analyzes prosody (syllables, stress, and tone) in another 400 pages. The phonological description also contains diachronic sections. Diachronic phonology is included in Volumes III and IV. Each sound is treated in isolation, and no sign of a structuralist viewpoint occurs in the text. Volume V contains semantics (semology) and what would today be classified as syntax and lexicon.

In his analysis of phonology, Noreen states that there are 116 different sounds in Swedish, which may be reduced to sixty-nine, as shown in the table of the sound frequencies. But it is difficult to determine what criteria Noreen used when he reduced the number of sounds, and his result does not agree with numbers later established by phonologists. He uses the term *fonem* (phoneme) in a novel way, using the term to refer to any sound or sequence of sounds, such as *s* as well as *st*, *str*, *stri*, and *strid*. In other words, Noreen is not looking for the minimal phonological units to which the others can be related as variants.

The third volume is a continuation of his phonological commentary, but the approach is now diachronic. He bases the text on his comprehensive studies of the phonological development in the Scandinavian languages. This section also includes a critical review of the discussion of sound change and sound laws, a debate first initiated at the end of the nineteenth century. Noreen lists all the factors related to sound change, even mentioning the changes sounds undergo when sung, such as the prolongation of the sounds in stressed syllables in the Swedish national anthem. Furthermore, he traces the history of the

changes in Swedish vowels from the fourteenth century, providing ample exemplification in the course of approximately 500 pages. Volume IV treats the changes of the vowels (sonants) caused by prosody (stress and tones).

The fifth volume of *Vårt språk* includes Noreen's semology. Many who have written about semantics at a later date would have profited from reading his semiology had he written it in English. Most of the concepts and distinctions discussed later are treated in these 700 pages. Noreen suggests the concept and term *sememe* as the basic unit in semantics. He establishes a taxonomy of sentence types and argument roles which is a precursor of twentieth-century theories of speech acts and deep semantic cases. He has little to say about the semantics of sememe combinations, presumably as a consequence of his lack of interest in syntax. Volume VII includes morphology, where he uses the term *morpheme* in the modern sense, referring to Baudouin de Courtenay. The survey is systematic, and the morphemes are classified in a number of ways: bound versus free, heterophonic versus homophonic, and prefixes versus suffixes. The prefixes are divided into those which are stressed and unstressed, monosyllabic and disyllabic. Suffixes are divided into those with strong stress, those with half-strong stress, and those with weak stress, each divided in turn into monosyllabic, disyllabic, trisyllabic suffixes, etc. Volume VII also includes derivation and compounding, including numerous examples within its 550 pages.

Noreen takes the time and space to report on previous discussions pertaining to terminology. His analyses are mainly debates with other scholars concerning the proper use of terms such as meaning, sentence, word, subject, etc., and the usefulness of new terminology such as phoneme, sememe, nexus, etc. His discussion frequently ends with specific examples and suggestions for new terminology, often with persuasive new insights when interpreted in light of twentieth-century linguistic theory.

In spite of the impressive title of the German version (*Einführung in die wissenschaftliche Betrachtung der Sprache*), Noreen exerted little influence on the international scene, apart from Finland and Norway, where his ideas had an impact on the thinking of several scholars of Finnish and Norwegian. In Sweden, the reviews were more polite than enthusiastic. Some scholars maintained that *Vårt språk* was a misguided side-step. It was not until the 1950s that Swedish linguists were to raise similar questions, and only then because they were influenced by American structuralism. At this point, Noreen's terminology was outdated. Thus, he was rarely referred to, except in an occasional footnote. *Vårt språk* was read and referred to by several Norwegian (e.g. Western) and Finnish scholars (e.g. Ikola, Penttilä, Setälä, Tunkelo). Along with Jespersen, Noreen was asked to submit an evaluation of the memorandum delivered by the Grammar Committee that worked in Finland from 1906 to 1915 during E. N. Setälä's chairmanship (Committee 1915, also cf. 5.6.1.3.).

The overwhelmingly rich materials in Noreen's work may, in fact, be one of the reasons why the book had so little impact. Everything is discussed and illustrated at painstaking length, and the many details often overshadow the basic structures of the language. In a discussion of the definition of the sentence and of the characteristics of the finite verb, Noreen does not hesitate to use as arguments such marginal utterances as exclamations, alongside core declarative sentences. This presentation is also burdened by polemic comments on the terminology used by other linguists.

Noreen was a typical taxonomist, as evidenced by his categorization of affixes according to stress and number of syllables and his meticulous classification of semantic case roles (in modern terminology) where he distinguishes, for instance, *Essiva*, *Lativa*, *Spatii*, *Koexistencia*, *Partitionis*, *Klassifikationis*, *Kvalifikationis*, *Dependentia*, *Koncordia*, and *Diskordia*.

Among the many linguists educated by Noreen, the following contributed in various and significant ways to the description of Swedish in the first part of the twentieth century: Elof Hellquist (5.6.2.5.), Bengt Hesselman (5.2.3., 5.6.2.5.), and Natanael Beckman (5.3.1.).

Beckman studied in Uppsala, where he received his doctor's degree and became a lecturer in 1895. In 1918, he was appointed professor of Scandinavian languages in Gothenburg, a post he retained until 1935. But Beckman was also headmaster at a high school, and several of his contributions were thus

pedagogical in nature. He created popular textbooks that were reprinted many times, for example his study of Swedish metrics (1898) and especially his *Svensk språklära för den högre elementarundervisningen* (A Swedish Grammar for Higher Elementary Schools, 1904). He also studied the ongoing disappearance of plural verb forms in Swedish, the peculiar relations between social rank and personal pronouns in Sweden, and the syntactic phenomena that had spread across linguistic borders in Western European, such as the definite article and the perfect tense.

Some Swedish linguists did not follow the mainstream of Nordic linguistics, however, concentrating instead on syntax. One such scholar was Ture Johannisson (1903-1990), professor of Gothenburg University from 1945 to 1970, who wrote a dissertation on the use of *hava* 'to have' and *vara* 'to be' as markers of tense in the Scandinavian languages (1945). Johannisson was consulted as an expert on author attribution in the famous trial of Bishop Dick Helander, who was suspected of having written incriminating anonymous letters. Johannisson's statistical analyses played an important role as evidence in the case, and he summarized this experience in his book *Ett språkligt signalement* (Distinguishing Linguistic Traits, 1973).

A productive Swedish grammarian and general linguist in the middle of the century was Rudolf Körner, who was a headmaster of a high school. Körner investigated a variety of topics such as word classes (1933), subordinate clauses (1934), the object (1935), and formal and logical categories in grammar (1936).

Bengt Kinnander's work on coherence analysis (1959) stands out as an isolated work in Swedish linguistics. Kinnander's purpose was to characterize the special rhythm of poems. He was familiar with works on metrics, poetry, phonetics, grammar, and linguistics, including those of Paul, Bally, Sievers, Saussure, and Bühler, and dedicates the first part of his book to a discussion of the relevance or lack of relevance of previous approaches. He maintains that a suitable theory must take into account the dynamics of speech and suggests that the basic units are speech acts, which associatively form different types of sequences. He defines a number of coherence types, which can be illustrated by: *A horse! It is approaching. Run!* and a related complex sentence: *A horse is approaching, which is why we had better run.* Kinnander provides a number of diagrams illustrating the different types of connections. Thus, his book is a forerunner in the area of text linguistics.

An important structural approach to Swedish syntax is found in two studies by Bengt Loman (1956, 1958) on aspects of Swedish word order. Loman (6.2.4.) was inspired by Diderichsen's positional syntax (5.6.1.1.), and he found that the prenominal attributives could be placed in seven different positions which included only words with a specific meaning (e.g. holistic, deictic, possessive, comparative, numeral). The different classes were thus defined solely by means of distributional criteria. Semantic criteria were not always considered valid as evidence during the structuralist period.

5.6.2. Diachronic Studies

In the study of the Scandinavian languages, diachronic aspects were central in the first part of the twentieth century. The neogrammarian heritage was strong in the national language departments, and the diachronic approach was undoubtedly the most prestigious. These departments were also the guardians of a national heritage, and a diachronic approach to language studies was an obvious way to cultivate and develop this heritage. This also accounts for the lack of interest in the synchronic approaches to language studies in these departments at a time when synchrony was becoming more accepted in general linguistics. To a certain extent, Denmark was an exception to this general neogrammarian dominance. But even in Denmark, as elsewhere, the comparative-historical method dominated the teaching of the national languages until 1960.

Significant research in historical linguistics in the Nordic countries throughout this period was carried out in the areas of dialectology (5.6.4-5.6.4.5.), runology (5.6.5.), and onomastics (5.6.3.).

5.6.2.1. Danish

In Denmark, this is the period in which the genetic-historical paradigm was confronted with the new structuralist ideas from Geneva and Prague. While a number of historically-oriented scholars continued working in the tradition of the previous century, others were eager to incorporate the new ideas from abroad into their historical studies. It is typical in Denmark during this period that many of the historical contributions were descriptive. This reflected the view that diachronic linguistics and language history could best be studied by tracing the development between two specific historical stages of the language, both of which had to be described synchronically. Most of these studies were concerned with historical phonology and morphology, but a few descriptions of syntactic development were also undertaken. There was not only an interest in describing changes, but also in determining how such changes took place, when, and why.

One of the monumental studies of this period is Johannes Brøndum-Nielsen's (1881-1977) eight-volume historical grammar of Old Danish (*Gammeldansk Grammatik i sproghistorisk Fremstilling*, 1928-1973). It derived inspiration from Nils Hänninger's monograph on the phonological development in Old Scanian (1917) and was influenced by Axel Kock and Adolf Noreen, particularly by Kock's five-volume work on the phonological history of Swedish (1906-1929), cf. 4.5.3.3. Its merits lie in the wealth of details it provides, but right from the start it was criticized for its conservative approach and for the absence of a more modern structural orientation. A critical review of the first volume by Alf Sommerfelt (1929) is as much a critique of the school represented by Brøndum-Nielsen as of the work itself. Sommerfelt's main objection is that the overwhelming profusion of details makes it difficult to gain an overview of general tendencies and of changes that are of a systematic nature, not least because its underlying organizational principle separates things that belong together from a systematic and structuralist point of view.

Marius Kristensen's much less systematic attempt at explaining historical problems by way of comparison with the modern dialects (1933) is also pre-structuralist, but as pointed out by E. Haugen and T. L. Markey (1972), Kristensen's interpretations often have a structuralist flavor. An example is his explanation of the dialectal reflexes of *u*-Umlaut.

The origin and development of the standard language, primarily in its written form, was a topic of interest to a number of Danish linguists. In her dissertation on the phonological history of standard Danish from Erik's Law of Zealand to Christian III's Bible, Lis Jacobsen (1910) argued that the Danish written language was based on the same language as that found in Erik's Law of Zealand, which had been passed on up through the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries by way of the chancery. Jacobsen's overall objective was to include a historical account of morphology and syntax, but the project was abandoned due to the lack of well-edited texts, handbooks, dictionaries, and monographs. Instead, in order to remedy this lack, the author founded a society for editing studies on language and literature.

Historical studies of the orthography of the various stages of the language were also in vogue during this period. One of the earliest orthographic descriptions based on the new theories of Prague School phonology was Paul Diderichsen's pioneering treatment of Old Danish orthography (1938) in which he sets up the phonemic system underlying the orthography of the oldest manuscripts and compares this system with one established for the early Middle Danish period. Paul Diderichsen's (5.2.5.) theory of syntax, as proposed in the sentence model he introduced in his studies of the Old Scanian law texts (1941-1942), has had a lasting influence and is still a source of inspiration for the study of Danish today.

The most important historical contribution of this period is Peter Skautrup's (5.6.4.1.) four-volume history of the Danish language (1944-1968, index 1970). This work was conceived by Lis Jacobsen as an alternative to Johannes Brøndum-Nielsen's approach in his historical grammar of Old Danish. Skautrup's work was innovative in its design, employing a sociocultural approach to language history with focus on the development of the standard language. In his treatment of both the internal and the external history of the Danish language, Skautrup includes spoken as well as written language, dialects as well as the standard language, and even stylistics. This history was written so it could also be read by those

who were not educated as linguists. Skautrup, who viewed the Danish language as an expression of the life of its speakers, also gave popular lectures on language on the radio, some of which were published.

Continuing in the tradition of Lis Jacobsen, Aage Hansen (5.2.4.) followed the chronological pattern laid out by Brøndum-Nielsen, though with a view to the new structuralist paradigm. Hansen produced a two-volume work on historical phonetics (1962, 1971) in which he compared the phonetic development of Danish vowels and consonants from 1300 to the present, with the pronunciation in the modern standard language.

5.6.2.2. Finnish

Many Finnish comparative and dialectological studies analyzed in sections 5.5.2. and 5.6.4.2. adopt a historical perspective and most frequently treat phonological history.

Martti Rapola's second major area of research, in addition to dialectology (5.6.4.2.), was the history of literary Finnish, especially from the viewpoints of lexicology and orthography and based on his solid knowledge of Finnish dialectology. He published more than 100 such studies. Rapola investigated Abraham Kollanius's († 1667) translations from Swedish into Finnish of the medieval Swedish country and town laws (1925). He produced the largest study to date on the semantic history of a single Finnish word family (1928), demonstrating that the word *toimi* with the original concrete meaning 'weave model of fabric' has undergone successive abstraction and metaphorization leading to later meanings such as 'rationality, understanding, wisdom'. Rapola's method was based on analyzing word occurrences in their immediate linguistic contexts. In several studies, he researched the language of Mikael Agricola (3.4.1.2.), the earliest Finnish Bible translator. His survey of the history of old literary Finnish (1933) was used as the basic textbook on this topic for decades, especially regarding orthography and its relation to phonological history. In Rapola's synthesis of several decades of his lexicological research (1960), he presents the earliest attested occurrences of the core elements of Finnish vocabulary.

In 1956, Rapola began work on the Dictionary of Old Literary Finnish (*Vanhan kirjasuomen sanakirja*) of which two volumes have appeared to date, the letters A through I in 1985 and J through K in 1994.

Loan-word research has been a recurring topic in Finnish linguistics since the days of Vilhelm Thomsen (4.4.1.). This was because loan-words are important for the investigation of prehistoric relations between languages in contact, and also due to the conservative nature of the sound structure of Finnish. The Proto-Indo-European, Baltic, and Germanic loan-word strata have attracted the most attention. Over the decades, there have been several interesting debates over loan connections, especially between Indo-European and Uralic on a general level, and on Baltic/Germanic loans in Finnish on a more specific level. These discussions have been significant in shaping a linguistically-motivated view of the prehistory of the Uralic peoples.

The most vivid discussion has concerned the Germanic loan-words in Finnic, especially Finnish. This is understandable for two reasons: firstly, these loans are numerous, and secondly, they are highly relevant for the interpretation of Finland's prehistory. Thomsen's studies (1869, 1890) became influential. His main theses were that the (Proto-)Finns had been living south of the Gulf of Finland and had been exposed to (early) Gothic influence, discernible in the oldest Germanic loan-words borrowed in the first centuries AD. Thomsen also claimed that the early Finns did not move to Finland until after that time, perhaps around 700 AD. Archeological evidence from the Stone Age indicated that there had been Indo-Europeans living (roughly speaking) in Western Finland at that time, and Finno-Ugric tribes (at least Sámis) living east and north of that area. Thus, several questions remained unanswered: How long had Finno-Ugric and Indo-European people been living in Finland? Where did the first contacts between Finns and Indo-Europeans take place? From where had the Indo-European (Early Germanic or Proto-Finland-Swedish) population in Finland come? Had this population been assimilated with entering Finnish tribes, which would mean that the

present-day Finland Swedes were descendants of later (= early medieval) layers of Scandinavian immigrants? These questions have been the source of lively discussions in the twentieth century, with scholars representing both Finno-Ugric and Germanic languages participating in the debate. The most relevant linguistic areas involved in this discussion are loan-word research and onomastics. Loman (forthcoming) notes that research on the Scandinavian languages in Finland in the first decades of the 1900s had precisely these problems as research focus.

Setälä's paper (1906) deals with the sources and chronology of Old Germanic loans in Finnish. Setälä criticized the view held by the Swedish archeologist Oscar Montelius that Germanic peoples inhabited Finland continuously from 2000 BC. Setälä's argument was that there are ancient Germanic loans all over the Finnish dialect area, but no corresponding (Proto-)Finnic loans in the Finland-Swedish dialects. According to Setälä, this distribution of loans could only be understandable if the ancient Germanic inhabitants had been assimilated by the Proto-Finns. Accordingly, the (Finland-)Swedes would not have arrived until the 1100s. In general these views of Setälä corroborated Thomsen's conclusions.

Unlike Setälä, Tor Evert Karsten (5.5.1.) considered the Germanic loans in Finnish to be much older, dating back (Karsten 1915) to the time before the Germanic sound shift, thereby proposing that they are pre-Germanic. Karsten also claimed that the Finns had had no particular connections with the Goths. Karsten's approach was innovative methodologically in that he did not analyze isolated words, but groups of loan-words. But Karsten was not alone in these views. The Swedish Finno-Ugric scholar K. B. Wiklund (5.5.2.) agreed with him. A lively debate eventually ensued in which Karsten was criticized by Thomsen, Setälä, and Björn Collinder and was forced to partly withdraw his claims. However, in his posthumous opus magnum (1943-1944), Karsten still insisted that the Germanic loans were at least 1,000 years older than Thomsen's theory presumed.

Historical syntax was first analyzed on the theoretical level by Paavo Ravila, who produced several papers in the early 1940s (cf. 5.5.2.). Osmo Ikola (1949) also contributed to this field (cf. 5.6.1.3.), as did Paavo Siro (1949, cf. 5.5.2.).

In several studies, Lauri Hakulinen (5.6.1.3.) treated the etymology and especially the semantic history of Finnish words. He demonstrated the importance of calques in the present-day Finnish vocabulary (e.g. 1958, 1969). Over the centuries, and especially with the advent of the written language and its standardization, the semantic structure, and to a lesser extent the morphological composition of the Finnish vocabulary, have thus been decisively Europeanized.

5.6.2.3. Icelandic

When the University of Iceland was founded in 1911, the dominant method in linguistics was that of the historical-comparative neogrammarian school. This orientation is clearly seen in the work of the first professor of Icelandic language in Reykjavík, Alexander Jóhannesson (1888-1965, cf. Halldórsson 1969). Jóhannesson began his teaching career at the University of Iceland in 1915 and remained the only teacher in Icelandic language until 1941. He became a professor in 1958. Jóhannesson's first major work was his grammar of Proto-Nordic (1920). This publication was the first of its kind and was promptly translated into German. Jóhannesson's grammar of Old Icelandic (1923-1924) systematically included comparison with other Old Germanic languages and discussed the Proto-Indo-European background. This work was not very carefully written and not always up-to-date, but in contrast to the standard handbooks (e.g. by Adolf Noreen), Jóhannesson's grammar was based on considerable research using primary sources. Jóhannesson also published several studies on Icelandic historical morphology, and he was the author of an Icelandic etymological dictionary (5.6.7.3.).

Jóhannesson also studied the origin of language (Halldórsson 1969). Some of his contributions were in English, and his theories received considerable attention abroad, although linguists tended to be highly critical of his methods. He argued for the gestural origin of language, comparing reconstructed Indo-

European roots with words from Inuit, Polynesian, Turkish, Ancient Chinese, and Hebrew — some of them modern languages.

Another contributor to Icelandic linguistics was Professor Halldór Halldórsson (1911-), who taught at the University of Iceland in Reykjavik from 1951 to 1981. Halldórsson specialized in various aspects of the history of the lexicon, including idioms, loan-words, and historical derivational morphology.

Another center for the study of Icelandic language history was in Copenhagen, home of the Arnamagnæan manuscript collection. A research fellow of the Arnamagnæan commission, Björn K. Þórólfsson (1892-1972), wrote the standard overview of Icelandic historical morphology (1925) and made valuable contributions to historical phonology. Jón Helgason (1899-1986), professor of Icelandic in Copenhagen, also contributed to Icelandic language history, especially in his description (1929) of the language of Oddur Gottskálksson's New Testament translation of 1540. Moreover, the Swiss scholar Oskar Bandle wrote a massive description of the language of the *Guðbrandsbiblíá* (Bible from Guðbrand) of 1584, which was published in 1956 by Jón Helgason in his Arnamagnæan series. In commenting on the forms of this Bible translation, Bandle summarizes all previous research on their historical background and context. Outside both academic environments stands the historical phonology written by the clergyman Jóhannes L. L. Jóhannsson (1859-1929, cf. Jóhannsson 1924), covering the period from 1300 to 1600. Although his main source of data, *Diplomatarium islandicum*, is not entirely reliable, and his explanations are sometimes quirky, Jóhannsson's work contains valuable insights.

5.6.2.4. Norwegian

Three of the most thorough linguistic studies published by Norwegian linguists in this period concern the history of Norwegian: Iversen (1921-1932), Seip (1931), and Indrebø (1951), cf. also Hægstad (5.6.4.3.). These studies were written within the framework of the current situation of the Norwegian language and are, in many respects, influenced by the particular author's position on the Norwegian linguistic map and by his ideas about language planning in Norway. For instance this influence is reflected in the choice of topics and periods as well as in the selection of data. Three topics were of central interest: (a) the Old Norse dialects and the decline of Old Norse, (b) Norwegian during the period of Danish dominance from 1537 to 1814, and (c) the Norwegian ancestry of riksmål/bokmål.

A major goal for both parties in the Norwegian language struggle was to show that both bokmål and nynorsk were genuine Norwegian languages. Accordingly, the investigation of Norwegian features in documents during the period of Danish dominance from 1537 to 1814 was intensified. While the nynorsk party was mainly interested in information on and material from the dialects from this period, the bokmål side concentrated on vestiges of spoken Norwegian in the towns.

Didrik Arup Seip (1884-1963) became the first professor of riksmål in Oslo in 1916 (later the title of the chair was changed to Professor of Scandinavian Languages). In a number of studies of both late Old Norse documents, as well as of literary documents from the Danish-Norwegian union written by Norwegians, Seip tried to prove that many features of riksmål/bokmål considered to be a result of Danish or Swedish influence were genuinely Norwegian. Seip even tried to trace features of riksmål/bokmål generally considered to be of Danish origin back to late Old Norse, sometimes through a biased interpretation of the documents (Hødnebo 1972). His history of the Norwegian language up to 1370 (Seip 1931, cf. also Seip 1959) was particularly influential. He also tried to show that Old Norse texts generally assumed to be Icelandic were in fact based on an underlying Old Norwegian text.

Seip's theories became popular, even outside academic circles, because they lent support to the nationalism of the new independent nation and to the nationalistic currents of the 1930s. In 1937, Seip was elected Rector of the University of Oslo, but in 1941, he and many other teachers and students were arrested and placed in concentration camps. This unfortunate situation added to Seip's prestige and further strengthened his scholarly position. As a result, he met with only minor opposition (mostly from members of

the nynorsk camp) during his lifetime. Today, scholars are more critical of Seip's linguistic results and particularly of his selection and interpretation of data. In the history of Nordic linguistics, few examples of political, nationalistic research exist that are as clear as in the case of Seip.

Nonetheless, the nynorsk version of history was hardly less biased or less nationalistic. Gustav Indrebø's (5.2.1.) history of the Norwegian language, published posthumously in 1951, stresses the continuity of Old Norse in the dialects leading up to nynorsk, and on the other hand the strong influence of Danish and Swedish on the spoken language of the urban upper-middle classes.

There are other significant differences between Seip (1931) and Indrebø (1951). Seip's book was written within the neogrammarian tradition, influenced above all by Adolf Noreen's historical studies. The major emphasis was on phonology. In Indrebø's book on the other hand, the linguistic development made up only part of the story, since it is examined within a cultural setting where political and social factors are as prominent as sound changes. These non-linguistic factors are considered to be decisive in promoting language change.

Indrebø's book was never as influential as Seip's for several reasons. First, Indrebø did not have the same academic and social prestige, as the text was written in an archaic variant of nynorsk which did not attract bokmål readers, and it failed to present new interpretations of the data. Instead, Indrebø's work simply confirmed the views of Aasen and other nynorsk pioneers. In many respects, however, this book is easier to read, more comprehensive, and more trustworthy than Seip's. Of these three contributions, Iversen's (1921-1932, cf. 5.7.3.) was the least biased and the least influential. It was a sober traditional study based on a thorough analysis of the texts.

In Norway, as elsewhere, onomastics constituted an important part of the diachronic research on Norwegian (cf. 5.6.3.).

5.6.2.5. Swedish

At the beginning of the twentieth century, Sweden's leading scholars in the historical study of the Scandinavian languages were Adolf Noreen and Axel Kock (4.5.3.3.). These scholars supplemented and extended in many ways the neogrammarian methods, and their efforts may be referred to as the "Uppsala School". The first step in the development of historical comparative linguistics had been the formulation of sound changes ("sound laws") such as $p > f$. The next crucial step was then taken by Karl Verner, who added a condition based on stress in Indo-European, and this opened new perspectives. Linguists now began to search for possible sound laws with the relevant segmental and prosodic conditions in their languages. Exceptions were seen as challenges for further investigations. Axel Kock was active in this field and identified many segmental and prosodic contexts as well as changes conditioned by these contexts (4.5.3.3.). Kock postulated sound changes that could be complex with many conditions. Here is his formulation of one case of the change called *i*-Umlaut: $a > \text{æ}$ in a fortis long root syllable before a non-fortis vowel *i* which was lost.

The beginning of the twentieth century was a time when linguists had heated debates about sound changes. Bengt Hesselman (1875-1952), a member of the emerging Uppsala school, played an important role in these discussions. In 1902, Hesselman became docent in Uppsala, professor in Gothenburg in 1914, and was subsequently appointed professor of Swedish in Uppsala in 1919. Hesselman maintained that loss (syncope) of the conditioning vowel was irrelevant and should not be included as a condition for Umlaut. In a study on Umlaut and breaking in the Nordic languages (1945), he presented his views of these important processes. In another study on the short vowels *i* and *y* in Swedish (1909-1910), he described the development in dialects which make up Swedish.

Hesselman also pointed out differences which implied that sound changes were dialect-specific. Such data could be mapped according to the principles of linguistic geography, a field that was gaining in popularity. Hesselman focused his interest on the general differences between West-Nordic and East-Nordic

languages, and in his study on the Svea dialects and the classification of Swedish dialects (1905), he concentrated on the differences between the southern Swedish dialects (*Götamålen*) and the dialects around Stockholm (*Sveamålen*). He analyzed the processes of syllable lengthening and vowel quality in 1902, *Stafvelseförlängning och vokalkvalitet i östsvenska dialekter* (Syllable Lengthening and Vowel Quality in East Swedish Dialects). In this analysis, the vowel *a* is always lengthened as in *gata* > *ga:ta* 'street'. The other vowels are also lengthened in the southern dialects, while the consonant is lengthened in the Svea-dialects, e.g. Göta [ve_ka], Svea [vek_a] 'week'. Standard (written) Swedish has generally followed the Svea-dialects. Hesselman also used place-name data, and these place-names often appear as exceptions to otherwise regular sound changes. Hesselman's contemporary, Axel Kock, did not accept all place-names as evidence of sound laws or exceptions. Hesselman sketched the overall development of Scandinavian sound history in his most well-known book *Huvudlinjer i nordisk språkhistoria* (Outline of Scandinavian Language History, three volumes 1948-1953).

Elof Hellquist (1864-1933) studied under Adolf Noreen and later went to Jena, where he was inspired by Friedrich Kluge and the students around him. He was professor of Scandinavian languages in Lund from 1914 to 1929. Hellquist's own research concerned word formation and etymology (Hellquist 1929-1932). His main work, however, is his etymological dictionary of Swedish (Hellquist 1922), cf. 5.6.7.6.

Elias Wessén (1889-1981) was professor of Scandinavian languages at the University of Stockholm from 1928 to 1956. As a member of the Swedish Academy, Wessén established the Committee for Swedish Language Cultivation (*Nämnden för svensk språkvård*, 1944, since 1974 *Svenska språknämnden*), which has played an important role in Swedish language planning. Furthermore, he exerted a great influence on students of the Scandinavian languages through his series of university textbooks on the history of the Swedish language (Wessén 1941a,b, 1943, 1956). Wessén also published numerous studies on Germanic phonology, morphology and syntax, place-names, and runology. Wessén was traditional and little influenced by the contemporary trends in linguistics.

Valter Jansson (1907-1996), professor of Swedish at Uppsala University from 1947 to 1973, is a typical representative of the conservative and strong Uppsala tradition. Jansson was influential in recruiting scholars to positions in Scandinavian languages in Sweden. His own publications include etymological studies, philological editions of medieval texts, and a book dealing with place-names in *-vin* (1951). His conservative attitude is apparent in the foreword to his book *Eufemiavisorna. En filologisk undersökning* (The Euphemia Songs. A Philological Investigation, 1945), where he criticizes Hjalmar Lindroth for his interest in the phoneme.

The study of Swedish in Finland was strongly oriented towards philology, dialectology, and loan-word studies way up into the 1960s. The exceptions here are Hugo and Rolf Pipping, father and son, the former also deeply interested in phonetics (5.4.), the latter in grammar, yet the bulk of their production remained in the area of historical linguistics and philology.

Throughout his career, Hugo Pipping wrote several papers on metrics, i.a. on J. L. Runeberg's hexameter and the Icelandic Edda. His early work dealt with text editions and phonological history relating to the Gotland dialect. Old Swedish law texts were a persisting interest of his, especially *Äldre Västgötalagen*, the central Old Swedish text. H. Pipping participated (1902) in the lively discussion on the nature of Scandinavian Umlaut and breaking and returned to the question of Umlaut several times during the next two decades. His theoretical paper on the nature of analogy (1906) inspired discussion. Pipping's introduction to the phonological structure and history of the Scandinavian languages (1922) was an innovative work with a solid phonetic basis. He also published much on onomastics.

Rolf Pipping (1889-1963) was the author of one of the most penetrating text editions ever produced in the study of Scandinavian languages, Erik's Chronicle (*Erikskrönikan*) from the early 1300s. His dissertation (1919a) was an analysis of the phonological history of the chronicle, and later that same year, he published a study on its vocabulary (1919b). But R. Pipping's magnum opus is his commentary to the

chronicle (1926), a massive 859-page account of the text, its variants, and their historical and cultural background, with everything meticulously documented. Rolf Pipping also took an active interest in theoretical linguistics, for example in his collection of papers (1940) scrutinizing several basic theoretical topics, such as the notion “sentence” on the basis of claims made by Alan Gardiner. In a long paper on language and style, he introduced the basic stylistic concept *sakprosa* (= neutral informative prose), which has become widely used. During his later years, his main research interests were in medieval Finland-Swedish proverbs. In a sense, R. Pipping could be said to be the founder of a philological school at Åbo Akademi University. He was a demanding teacher, and several of his students wrote their dissertations or other major studies on medieval Swedish philological topics, cf. Loman (1993b:246-248).

Eskil Hummelstedt (1906-1986, professor of Swedish and Scandinavian philology at Åbo Akademi University 1959-1973), was a pupil of Karsten from whom he had learned a contextual, *Wörter und Sachen*-based approach to dialectology, which he applied in his own work, e.g. in the doctoral dissertation (1939) treating occasional verb neologisms in the Närpes dialect.

Olav Ahlbäck (1911-1989, professor of Scandinavian philology at the University of Helsinki from 1950 to 1960), wrote his dissertation (1946) on the development of nominal inflection in Finland-Swedish dialects. This was the first study on morphological dialectology, and the first to analyze all dialects. From 1960, Ahlbäck began work as principal editor of the new dialect dictionary *Ordbok över Finlands svenska folkmål* (Dictionary of Finland-Swedish Dialects) for which material had been compiled beginning in 1927. The first volume of this dictionary appeared in 1982.

Carl-Eric Thors (1920-1986) was professor of Scandinavian philology (later Scandinavian languages) at the University of Helsinki from 1963 to 1985. His dissertation (1949) treated nominalizations of adjectives in Old Swedish, and his massive 664-page study (1957) dealt with the influence of missionary languages like Greek, Latin, and Germanic on the formation of Old Swedish Christian terminology.

The doctoral dissertation (1957) written by Lars Huldén (1926-, professor of Scandinavian philology at the University of Helsinki 1964-1989) dealt with verb inflection in Ostrobothnian dialects. Huldén was interested in the question of why strong verbs tended to change their inflection, and showed frequency and homonymy to be relevant affecting factors.

The language used by Jöns Budde (?1461-1491), a monk in the Naantali/Nådendal monastery near Turku/Åbo, in his Swedish Bible translations (the oldest preserved translations) has been a recurring topic in Finland-Swedish diachronic studies and philology. This discussion began the moment the texts were published by O. F. Hultman in 1895, and have continued through a recent study by Christer Laurén (1972) of Budde’s translation practice.

5.6.3. Onomastics

The first major Nordic enterprise in the field of onomastics was *Norske Gaardnavne* (Norwegian Farm Names), which was initiated by the Norwegian Oluf Rygh (4.5.3.) in 1878 and which later became a model for place-name research in the other Nordic countries. When it was published, it was in the forefront of international onomastic research.

Another prolific and influential scholar in this field was Gustav Indrebø (5.2.1.), who published several monographs. Norwegian research in onomastics after 1945 is based, for the most part, on Indrebø’s approach and methods. An interesting aspect of Indrebø’s research is that he was able to recruit many school teachers in Western Norway to help him collect local place names.

Place-name research developed into a Nordic specialty, a linguistic subdiscipline of its own, as evidenced by the establishment of the periodical *Namn och bygd* in 1913 (5.2.3.), copious place-name archives, a number of dissertations, and recurring conferences.

Sweden has become the Nordic center of onomastics. The expansion of this field has been supported by public interest in place-names, further reinforced by popular books such as those by Hjalmar Lindroth

(1923) and Jöran Sahlgren (1932). Onomastic research developed in parallel with dialect studies. The financially independent dialect archives were established in connection with several universities, and these archives also collect onomastic data as reflected in their names, e.g. the Institute for Onomastic and Dialect Research in Lund (*Dialekt- och ortnamnsarkivet i Lund*) and the Institute for Dialect, Onomastic, and Folklore Research in Gothenburg (*Dialekt-, ortnamns- och folkminnesarkivet i Göteborg*). Such archives are also found in Uppsala and Umeå. Of all Swedish centers on onomastics, Uppsala University has been the central institution. A chair in Scandinavian Place-Name Research was established in Uppsala in 1930, with Jöran Sahlgren (5.2.5.) as the first professor. Noreen and Hellquist also played an important role in promoting this area of research.

Problems concerning the interpretation and etymology of place-names have made it necessary to include methods and results from fields like history, archeology, demography, ethnology, and religion.

Numerous place-name studies appeared between 1930 and 1950, primarily in Uppsala, thanks to Sahlgren's influence. These studies often stimulated work on phonological, morphological, and diachronic problems as well. Personal-name research was an accompanying field, initiated in Uppsala by Ivar Modeer (1904-1960), who collected personal names from different periods and began publishing the series *Anthroponymica Suecana* in the 1950s. The onomastic tradition has been continued by Per Lundahl, Lars Hellberg, and Thorsten Andersson in Uppsala, and by Sven Benson and Bengt Pamp in Lund.

Internationally, the most well-known research by a Swede on place-names is Eilert Ekwall's work on English place-names (5.7.1.).

Place-name research in Denmark began in the last decade of the nineteenth century with the publications of Steenstrup (1894, 1896) and Nygård (1897), who provided the basis for a relative chronology for the most common types of names and set up rules for their formation.

Inspired by the government-sponsored activities in Norway and Sweden, Marius Kristensen pointed out the need for a similar project in Denmark in his overview of Scandinavian place-name research (1905). His plea went unheeded until Axel Olrik, who had already established several national research institutes in folklore and dialectology, succeeded in 1910 in convincing the Ministry of Culture to fund an institute for place-name research. Since then, virtually all research in the area of onomastics in Denmark has taken place in this institute, which is now affiliated with the University of Copenhagen. The first volume in the series of Danish place-names appeared in 1922 as a result of the cooperative efforts of Gunnar Knudsen, Viggo Brøndal, and Svend Aakjær. Since then, nineteen additional volumes have appeared, the goal being eventually to cover the entire country. The structure of the articles has generally followed the pattern set down at the start, with an entry, information on the localization and type of locality, the basis for an interpretation, and the interpretation of the name and the elements of which it consists.

An interesting detail in Danish onomastic research is the soliciting of field names from school teachers around the country. An official topographical map of each parish in Denmark was cut out and pasted on cardboard and distributed to the schools throughout the country. In the course of only a few years, over half of the country's field names were recorded by enthusiastic amateurs, many of whom followed the accompanying instructions for recording the names in a rough phonetic alphabet.

Two more specialized studies were also initiated in Denmark, one, still incomplete, dealing with the place-names of Southern Schleswig (A. Bjerrum et al. 1948-), covering not only Danish, but also German and Frisian, and another containing Danish names for lakes and rivers (J. Sørensen 1968-1996). The latter deviates from traditional onomastics in being arranged alphabetically and in having a linguistic rather than a geographic basis, thus including names from Scania, Southern Schleswig, the Danelaw, and Normandy.

Denmark has also produced one major work on personal names (Hornby et al. 1936-1964), a historical work extending from the younger runic inscriptions up to about 1500.

Onomastics has been much cultivated in Finland as well. Onomastic data and arguments have frequently been appealed to in the lengthy discussion concerning how Finland was settled in prehistoric times. Early participants in this discussion were Ralf Saxén, T. E. Karsten, and Heikki Ojansuu (1873-1923).

Viljo Nissilä can be considered the founder of modern Finnish onomastics. His dissertation of 1939 dealt with the place-names around Vuoksen in SE Finland. Nissilä wrote a textbook on onomastics (1962) which has been widely used. The relations between Finnish and Swedish place-names through the ages has remained a focus of onomastic research, such problems having been investigated by scholars such as Åke Granlund and Carl-Eric Thors.

Onomastics in Iceland has never gained the relative prominence it has had in Norway, Sweden, and Denmark. Icelandic place-names tend to be more conspicuous to the general public than in Nordic-speaking mainland Scandinavia because of the conservatism of the Icelandic language. Interest in Icelandic place-names has traditionally been archeological and historical rather than linguistic, and until the present century mostly associated with saga research. Systematic collection of place-names from oral tradition did not start until after 1920, under the auspices of the Archeological Society (*Hið íslenska fornleifafélag*), and increased after the war. The resulting archive was located at the National Museum (*Þjóðminjasafn*), and the Icelandic place-name institute (*Örnefnastofnun þjóðminjasafns*) became part of that museum when it was founded in 1969. Large-scale studies comparable to Rygh (1897-1936) still do not exist.

Research on Icelandic personal names has been concentrated on the medieval literature, being most intensive in the early twentieth century. The most important contributions from this period are the three volumes by the Swede H. Lind (1905-1915, 1920-1921, 1931) on Old Norse - Icelandic personal names and nicknames.

A typical example of successful scholarly cooperation in the Nordic countries is the establishment of NORNA, *Nordiska samarbetskommitten för namnforskning* (Nordic Joint Committee for Onomastic Research), which has organized more than twenty conferences and publishes a journal entitled NORNA.

5.6.4. Dialectology

Nordic dialectology in this period was an intensively cultivated field, and most linguists working on Nordic languages devoted at least part of their research to dialects, mainly from a diachronic point of view. There was also a synchronic descriptive tradition focused on gathering material. There are important differences between the Nordic countries regarding the methods used.

5.6.4.1. Denmark

Dialectology became institutionalized in Denmark with the founding of the Committee for the Folk Dialects in 1909, no doubt a product of the existing political situation in which the rural parties were in the majority from 1922, with a Minister of Education from Southern Jutland. The purpose of this organization was to collect material for a dictionary of the island dialects to complement Feilberg's dictionary of the dialects of Jutland (4.5.6.1.). Things did not really get under way until around 1927 when the committee acquired an office, employed a small salaried staff, and began to publish its periodical, *Danske Folkemål* (Danish Folk Dialects).

In 1927, Johannes Brøndum-Nielsen (5.6.2.1.), who was quick to recognize the significance of dialectology for the historical study of the language, published a comprehensive monograph on dialects and dialect research, including numerous maps with isoglosses showing not only the major dialect divisions within Denmark, but also the most important isoglosses within the Scandinavian languages. This work, which introduced the problems dealt with in European dialectology to Denmark, formed the basis of university studies in dialectology for many years in Denmark, Norway, and Sweden.

The general trend in Danish dialectology in this period was towards refining phonetic description and away from a historical perspective, often to the extent that recording phonetic details was carried to the extreme, e.g. J. M. Jensen (1897-1902), H. M. Jensen (1919-1926), and Sandvad (1931). There are a few historically oriented dialect studies from the first part of the period, however, such as J. Lund (1932-1938)

and Christensen and Widding (1936).

In contrast to the rest of the Nordic countries, dialectology rapidly became structuralist in its approach in Denmark, at least in Copenhagen. This was in part a reaction to the tendency towards increasingly elaborate phonetic transcriptions. The other reason was the influence of the Prague school, and then of Hjelmslev's theory of glossematics, which became the predominant linguistic paradigm in Denmark in the 1940s and 1950s.

The first major structuralist description of a Danish dialect was Anders Bjerrum's (1903-1984) dissertation on the phonology of the now extinct Fjorde dialect (1944), once spoken south of the present Danish-German border. Bjerrum began his work as a Prague school phonologist, cf. I. Pedersen (1996:250), and was initially skeptical of Hjelmslev's insistence on the absolute objectivity of a phonemic analysis, but he was soon converted to Hjelmslev's way of looking at language:

Every renewed consideration of a specific detail and every revision of a paragraph pushed me step by step towards the realization that the phonological method is hampered by subjectivity; at the same time I became increasingly convinced that Hjelmslev's views, which I initially attempted to oppose, actually can lead to objective insight into the external structure of language. (A. Bjerrum 1944:4)

In the same year, 1944, Ella Jensen published a structural description of the Houlbjerg dialect of eastern Jutland, which came to serve as a model for numerous subsequent dialect descriptions, e.g. K. Olsen (1949), Ejskjær (1954), and E. Jensen (1959). These studies, all of which are descriptions of the sound system of a single dialect, are based on Hjelmslev's notion of a constant linguistic structure which can be uncovered by means of an analysis of variable linguistic usage.

The dialect analysis adhering most rigidly to Hjelmslevian structuralist principles is Børge Andersen's description of the Rønne dialect of Bornholm (1959). His description is technically competent, but as noted by Poul Andersen, "in its argumentation, it is difficult to understand for scholars outside the inner circle of the Linguistic Circle of Copenhagen due to its terminology, which presupposes a long period of intimate contact with this circle" (1965:92). Swedish dialectologists have been generally critical of the entire Danish tradition of structural dialect descriptions, their main objection being that it is not practical to spend a whole volume on phonemic analysis when the good traditionalist could establish the phonological system of a dialect in a few pages.

The direction taken by dialectology was somewhat different in Aarhus, where Hjelmslev's influence was less prominent. The Institute for Research in Jutlandic Language and Culture, founded in 1929 by Peter Skautrup (1896-1982), professor of Scandinavian languages at the newly established University of Aarhus 1934-1966, was the center of dialect research in Jutland. The institute was affiliated with the university from the start, and in 1932 it began to collect material for a new Jutlandic dictionary and to publish the journal *Sprog og Kultur* (Language and Culture). Skautrup was historically oriented, and his approach to language was consistently more socio-cultural than theoretical (5.6.1.).

Skautrup's successor, Kristian Ringgaard, was not a structuralist either, even though he used some structuralist terminology in his dissertation on the West Jutlandic *stød* (1960). Similarly, Niels Åge Nielsen, who collected an abundance of material for the Jutlandic Dictionary, never became a structuralist, in spite of the fact that he was a student of Hjelmslev during the latter's stay in Aarhus 1934-1937 as lecturer in comparative linguistics and the only Aarhus dialectologist who was a member of the Glossematic Committee around 1950.

A topic of particular interest to Danish dialectologists was the question of the tonal accents and their relationship to the Danish *stød*, a discussion that was introduced shortly before the turn of the century with Nikolaj Andersen's article on the musical accent in the dialect of East Schleswig (1897). Andersen's work on linguistically significant accent distinctions of a tonal nature was continued by Marie Bjerrum in her study of suprasegmental features in the Felsted dialect (1948), which she approached from phonetic, phonological, and historical points of view. Bjerrum's findings were supplemented by Gunhild Nielsen in her description of

the tonal distribution in the dialect of Rømø (1959), which differed only slightly in its tonal patterning, but which was interesting in relation to the findings of Svend Smith's dissertation on *stød* (1944), cf. 5.4., because it tended toward the so-called "West Jutlandic *stød*".

Another work on tonal accent in Danish, Erik Kroman's dissertation from 1947, demonstrated that there were two distinctive tones in the dialect of Ærø, but that they were distributed across the vocabulary differently from those in Southern Jutlandic. His theory that the tonal accents were the result of an invasion from the Swedish area has been rejected by most scholars, the general assumption today being that the tones in the Danish dialects are relic phenomena.

The morphology of the various dialects has been dealt with in a number of studies, cf. P. Andersen (1965). The most interesting discussion in the area of morphology involves the use of the article, where the most important contributions are Aage Hansen's dissertation (1927), Kristen Møller's monograph on the articles in the various Scandinavian languages (1945), and Gudmund Schütte's discussion of the use of the article in Jutlandic and Eastern Danish (1922). The main problems were whether the preposed West and Southern Jutlandic article was *thæn* or *inn*, the age and origin of the article, and the genitive of the postposed article.

Focus was also placed on the relationship between words and things in this period, particularly among those who were influenced by Peter Skautrup's down-to-earth approach to dialectology and to linguistics in general. Inspired by Vilhelm Grundtvig's book on concepts in language (1925), Skautrup employed an innovative approach in his description of the vocabulary of the Hardsyssel dialect (1927-1930). Instead of organizing the vocabulary alphabetically, as Feilberg had done, he grouped it according to concepts, describing the way in which the various objects, actions, and abstract notions were expressed in the dialect, also including pictures in his description. This approach was adopted as a part of the dictionary project for the island dialects and formed the basis of numerous descriptions of both individual dialects and of specific semantic areas in different dialects, e.g. Sv. Jespersen (1931), Widding (1931), Skautrup (1949), P. Andersen (1949), and N. Å. Nielsen (1956).

The work in dialect geography begun by Bennike and Kristensen in the previous century was completed in 1912, resulting in 104 maps and a description of the development of the phonology and morphology of the individual dialects (Bennike and Kristensen 1898-1912). This atlas, which is not paralleled in any of the other Nordic countries, is one of the fruits of the Danish folk high school tradition, which assembled a great many pupils from all parts of the country. Being teachers at two of these schools, Bennike and Kristensen could solicit information from their pupils on the details of their respective local dialects. In spite of its methodological weaknesses, this work has been useful to later generations of Danish dialectologists.

A detailed survey of dialect research in Denmark up to 1964 is given in P. Andersen (1965), and a discussion of the relationship of Danish dialectology to structuralism and sociolinguistics is found in I. Pedersen (1996). Inger Ejskjær (1993) has also surveyed dialect research in Denmark.

5.6.4.2. Finland

In twentieth century Fennistics, dialectology has been the most popular area of research, and it is still going strong under the influence of modern sociolinguistics. One reason for the flourishing of dialectology was the absence of old written records of Finnish. When interest in national history arose, a need was felt to start collecting oral tradition (= dialects). Another reason was the absence of a received norm for standard Finnish. Knowledge of genuine spoken Finnish was needed. A third reason was the breakthrough of neogrammarian phonological history after 1890.

A research program was drawn up by the Finnish Literature Society in the 1860s. Numerous studies based on fieldwork were undertaken, ranging from phonetics and morphology to lexicology and syntax. Many of these studies were synchronic. When neogrammarian views became prevalent around 1900, it

became important to obtain material from informants who were as old and linguistically conservative as possible.

Another feature typical of early dialect studies in Finland was the treatment of entire dialects in terms of at least one linguistic level (e.g. phonetics), and often several levels (e.g. phonetics and morphology). After 1900, this holistic perspective changed, and the scrutiny of details (specific sounds in specific contexts) became popular. Thus, Heikki Ojansuu (1873-1923), professor of Finnish at the University of Turku from 1921 to 1923, who had already written two large monographs on the phonological history of South-Western dialects (1901-1903), treated word-final *-k* and *-h* in detail (1908).

Martti Rapola (1891-1972), Setälä's successor as professor of Finnish in Helsinki from 1930 to 1957, wrote a detailed analysis of unstressed diphthongs ending in *-i* in all Finnish dialects (1919-1920). Another innovation was Rapola's unorthodox view of the relation between phonological structure and morphology. Rapola implicitly applied a functional approach. He noted that in certain dialects the *-i* of unstressed diphthongs was retained when it carried the morphological/semantic function of the plural (in nouns) or the past tense (in verbs).

Lauri Kettunen (1885-1963) was one of the few outspoken critics of Setälä's influential paradigm. He did not accept the excesses of Setälä's extended Uralic gradation theory that applied to all consonants and vowels. Setälä could not face this criticism (which was later largely accepted by the research community) and tried to obstruct Kettunen's academic career on several occasions. Kettunen was professor of Estonian at Tartu University 1919-1925 and the first professor of Finnic languages at the University of Helsinki from 1929. One of his major publications is his phonological history of the vernacular of the "forest Finns"⁶² in Värmland in Sweden (1910). Kettunen was a legendary collector of dialectal speech. From 1926 to 1939 he personally visited almost all the Finnish parishes, traveling by motorcycle or car, checking dialect-specific answers to some 300 moot questions. The results of this large project, his book *Suomen murteet* (Finnish Dialects, Kettunen 1930) and his atlases⁶³ (Kettunen 1940) have become enduring classics and remain the only attempt at a detailed comprehensive survey of all Finnish dialects. No item of dialectological research is cited even half as frequently as these two publications (1930, 1940), which are among the three most cited items of Fennistic studies. Kettunen and Rapola were the ones who introduced language geography in Finnish dialectology as a complement to the neogrammarian approach.

Over the decades, a stream of dissertations and other studies on the phonological history of the dialects appeared. The outline and structure of these monographs tended to become stereotypical. The section on consonants started with the initial consonants, the voiceless stops being treated first, then came the medial consonants, and so on. Consonants in medial position were treated in minute detail. If ever there was a concrete linguistic model, a paradigm in Kuhn's sense (1970 [1962]), for how a science should be practiced, it was Setälä's model (1890) for the study of the sound history of Finnish dialects.

Influences from the international development of structuralism came to Finnish dialectology in the late 1950s. One of the first to invoke phonological factors in passing was Pertti Virtaranta (1958) in his description of *ɔ* in Finnish dialects. Virtaranta notes, for example, that contacts between two dialects can give rise to a new phoneme (1958:79) and that *ɔ* was retained longer in those dialects where it was in phonological opposition to its voiceless counterpart (1958:204). The breakthrough of structural linguistics (especially phonology and morphophonology) in dialectology came with Terho Itkonen's dissertation (1964). An outward mark of the change is the fact that Itkonen's thesis was written in English, for the first time in Fennistics. Phonemes and morphophonology are treated as familiar concepts right from the start. Itkonen discusses the notion "juncture" at length and analyzes its phonetic correlates.

⁶² The ancestors of the forest Finns emigrated from Finland to Värmland during the second half of the sixteenth and especially during the seventeenth century.

⁶³ For the atlases, Kettunen included prisoners among the informants in order to be able to reduce his extensive traveling.

Martti Rapola remained the Grand Old Man of Finnish dialectology into the late 1960s. In 1966, he published a 500-page synthesis of his life-long research titled *Suomen kielen äännehistorian luennot* (Lectures on the Phonological History of Finnish). In the preface he describes how the book originated. During the war, he had met Pertti Virtaranta, his former student, at the Maaselkä front in January 1944. Virtaranta had attended Rapola's lectures in 1936-1938 (a course lasting two years), taken down detailed notes, and typed them. When the two linguists met at the front, Virtaranta took the typescript out of his pack. Rapola was astonished, since he himself did not possess such detailed notes. In the end, Rapola adopted the typed version as the basis of his final manuscript. Even at the age of seventy-five, Rapola corrected his text and tried to update it. In a sense, this book thus represents a synthesis of almost a century of work on the details of Finnish dialects. Rapola was outspoken in his views on what he thought to be central in linguistics:

Whatever one might think these days about the position of phonological history in linguistics, it was then [in the 1920s], and still is, in my personal opinion, the backbone of linguistics. Without the history of sounds, no etymology, without etymology, no semantics, without semantics, no door to an overall conception (Finn. *kokonaisahmottus*) of language life. (Rapola 1966:5)

After Rapola, sociolinguistics started to influence dialectology, and the field entered a somewhat different phase (6.3.11.).

Recordings of Finnish dialects using parlographs (precursors of tape recorders) had already been made in the early 1900s by Setälä and Kettunen. By the 1950s, tape recording technology had advanced considerably, and in 1959, Pertti Virtaranta proposed founding a tape archive for Finnish. In collaboration with the University of Helsinki Finnish department, the tape archive has recorded some 16,000 hours of Finnish speech, mainly dialects. Another 6,000 hours have been recorded covering languages related to Finnish and over sixty other languages. The Finnish tape archive (*Suomen kielen nauhoitearkisto*) is the largest of its kind in the world. Since 1976, it has functioned as part of the Research Center for the Languages of Finland (6.2.1.3.).

The other central topic in Fennistic dialectology has been lexicology. The Mother Tongue Society (*Kotikielen Seura*), founded in 1876 under the chairmanship of August Ahlqvist and later chaired by E. N. Setälä, did much to promote interest in dialects and in the collection of dialect material. Setälä's famous dictionary plan of 1896 and the subsequent measures that were taken to implement it are described in 5.2.5., (also cf. Vilppula 1976).

The dictionary foundation *Sanakirjasäätiö*, established in 1924 for lexicology by several scholarly associations, universities, and the Ministry of Education, became responsible for collecting the lexical data needed for the compilation of the large dialect dictionary. Lauri Hakulinen (5.6.1.3.) was instrumental in directing the activities of *Sanakirjasäätiö*. The foundation was successful in establishing contacts with the general public, and in 1927, the journal *Sanastaja* (Word Collector) was started to disseminate inquiries about dialectal words. In the 1930s, more than 1,000 people from the Finnish language area answered these inquiries. *Sanastaja* was terminated in 1990 after 139 issues. In no other country did the general public — farmer's wives, policemen, bricklayers, painters, lumberjacks, physicians, even President Urho Kekkonen — prove so interested and qualified in providing high-quality lexical material. More than eight million excerpts were gathered, forming the largest collection of its kind in the world.

Several linguists affiliated with *Sanakirjasäätiö* have investigated subareas of the dialectal vocabulary, often in the *Wörter und Sachen* tradition. Lauri Hakulinen wrote his dissertation (1933) on the development of the meanings of certain meteorological and affective words in the Finnic languages, using a lexical semantic approach inspired by Hans Sperber, Karl Vossler, Otto Jespersen, and Hugo Schuchardt. Hakulinen claimed that several Finnish words (e.g. the verb *uhata* 'to threaten') had developed from words with originally meteorological meanings (heat, radiation of light, wind, etc.) which also had stronger affective components of meaning than today, due to the greater significance of such phenomena in a culture

closely tied to nature. Hakulinen's dissertation provoked a heated debate concerning the methodology of phonological history, lexicology, and etymology (analyzed in detail by Onikki 1996).

Hakulinen's dissertation (1933) and the ensuing discussion developed the second major paradigmatic clash in twentieth century Finnish linguistics, the first being the clash between Setälä and Kettunen. The critics, especially Martti Rapola, thought that Hakulinen's method did not meet ordinary neogrammarian requirements, and that historical lexical semantics was not possible without previously ascertaining by way of etymology which words (especially homonyms) could be regarded as having developed from the same source.

Veikko Ruoppila (1907-1993) defended his dissertation in 1943 on words denoting domestic animals in the Finnish dialects. This initiated a tradition of word geography that was to acquire several followers.

Little was done on the morphology and syntax of the dialects. This is surprising for two reasons. First, the morphological characteristics of Finnish invite serious investigation. Secondly, a tradition of syntactic dialect description had developed in the late 1800s, but declined as sound history took over.

5.6.4.3. Iceland

The study of Icelandic dialects began at the end of the nineteenth century, although there were already numerous observations on regional phonological differences in the studies of Konráð Gíslason (4.5.1.1.) and other scholars from the 1850s onwards. At the turn of the century, Björn M. Ólsen (4.5.1.3.) began a more systematic study of Icelandic dialects, but because of other academic and administrative duties associated with the establishment of the University of Iceland in Reykjavík in 1911, Ólsen never managed to complete his project or to get his results published.

The Norwegian scholar Marius Hægstad (4.5.1.4.) did fieldwork on Iceland in 1907 and published a paper (in 1910) on the question of the extent to which one could speak of regional dialects in Iceland. But this article was published in an obscure Norwegian journal, and in spite of its scholarly merits, it seems to have had no impact in Iceland. Hægstad's major work on West Scandinavian dialects, which was mainly a diachronic-comparative work, was not published until 1942 (Hægstad 1942a,b).

Icelandic dialectology was at the outset intimately linked to phonetics, and most such studies in Iceland in the first part of the twentieth century were actually studies of phonetic differences between the dialects. In the 1940s, Björn Guðfinnsson (1905-1951) and his assistants traveled all over the country and visited almost all the Icelandic school districts. They made twelve-year-old children read specially prepared texts, and phonetic details were taken down while the children were reading. His procedure, including the choice of informants, which was highly unusual for his time, was to some extent dictated by pedagogical and normative considerations. He was interested in establishing a standard norm for spoken Icelandic on an empirical basis, and he needed to understand where the children deviated from the intended norm and where phonetic training was necessary. Guðfinnsson must have planned and carried out his project without much knowledge of contemporary dialectological research methods and scholarly goals. He never prepared any dialect maps, for example. The unique material from Guðfinnsson's project (1946) is still useful and has been an inspiration for Icelandic linguists, cf. Thráinsson (1996:330-333).

5.6.4.4. Norway

The leading Norwegian dialectologist at the end of the nineteenth century, Amund B. Larsen (4.5.5.3.), continued to publish significant studies in the first decades of the twentieth century. Of particular interest were his monographs on the dialects of towns like Kristiania/Oslo (Larsen 1907), Bergen (Larsen and Stoltz 1912), and Stavanger (Berntsen and Larsen 1924). Larsen was unique for his time in his awareness of sociolinguistic variation and stratification as well as in his careful concern for the problems of informant representativeness.

Two prominent non-Nordic linguists have written surveys of Norwegian dialectology in this period or in parts of this period, and their evaluation is generally negative. Einar Haugen (1948) is particularly negative, but on the whole Bandle (1962) supports Haugen's conclusions.

This quick survey of recent contributions shows many valuable studies but no major discoveries; it shows progress made, but less rapid than might have been hoped. There is still great uncertainty concerning the geographical distribution of major features of phonology, morphology, and vocabulary. The typical dialect monograph is still the popular survey written on the basis of school grammars, or at best the graduate thesis. The latter is basically neo-grammarians in approach and rarely gets very far beyond the phonology, i.e., an inventory of present-day reflexes of the ON sounds. In lieu of texts we get a few proverbs and a brace of folk tales. The phonological structure is barely touched; there is neither syntax nor word formation, stylistics nor semantics. Very seldom do we find a mature grappling with the problems of dialect geography, implying a realization that a dialect is not just a "growth" out of Old Norwegian, but the resultant of conflicting influences washing back and forth along the lines of communication. (E. Haugen 1948:75-76)

To what extent is this negative evaluation justified? For most of the work done on Norwegian dialects, the answer is that it is. The approach is basically neogrammarians, and most studies on the synchronic-descriptive side are unsystematic collections of data presented without any insight into or knowledge of descriptive linguistics, present or past. Haugen's evaluation of Olai Skulerud's work on a Telemark dialect is a characteristic example of the best of this tradition:

Since Olai Skulerud completed his study of the phonology of the dialect of Tinn, this region in Eastern Telemark has become the most massively investigated in all Norway (1938: Skulerud). This volume of 786 tightly packed pages is as difficult to penetrate as a primeval forest because of its lack of tables, maps, and indices. Its basic scheme is traditional, the words being arranged under each present-day sound according to their ON origin. A multitude of digressions constitute almost a general survey of all Norwegian dialects, but for all its vast materials, recorded with infinite patience and accuracy, the effective phonological system of the present-day dialect remains undescribed. (E. Haugen 1948:71)

There are a few additional dialectologists and publications that deserve mention. First of all, Hallfrid Christiansen's (5.3.1.) monograph (1933) on the Gimsøy dialect broke some of the established rules by introducing a structuralist approach to the analysis of the phonological system, and she also included a comprehensive treatment of word formation in the dialect. Later on, she published an unfinished survey of Norwegian dialects (Christiansen 1946-1948), which not only introduced various aspects of descriptive linguistics into Norwegian dialectology, but also provided the first good dialectological maps of Norway.

However, Christiansen's introduction was subjected to competition from Sigurd Kolsrud (1951). Kolsrud (5.3.1.) was the leader of the existing dialectological tradition and was conservative in scholarly matters, opposing all aspects of twentieth-century linguistics, which he rejected as useless (Jahr 1996:88-89). His introduction to Norwegian dialectology (1951), which vexed Norwegian students for decades, is so unsystematic and untheoretical that it is hard to see what the author is trying to say. It is a monument of a method (or lack of method) that failed.

In 1936, the Norwegian Dialect Archive (*Norsk Målførearkiv*) was founded in Oslo, thus establishing the first permanent institution for research on Norwegian dialects. But this institution, as well as a similar section of the Department of Scandinavian Philology in Bergen, set up in 1954, was dominated by the neogrammarians tradition and by Kolsrud. In 1952, the Norwegian Dialect Archive began publishing a series of dialect monographs, and the first volume was reviewed by Einar Haugen in *Language* (Jahr 1996:93-94) in the following outspoken terms:

Since the present study was made without any phonemic theory whatever, it can only be judged on the basis of its phonetics, which is poor. (E. Haugen 1953:45)

One obstacle to cooperation between the dialectologists and the linguists was the dialectologists' use of Storm's phonetic alphabet (*Norvegia*, cf. 4.8.) and their rejection of the IPA.

The most important traditional dialect monograph is probably Hoff's work of 1946, which in addition to the usual diachronic orientation also contains numerous valuable dialect maps. Ingeborg Hoff (1911-1993) became head of the Norwegian Dialect Archive after Kolsrud's death, and she was also the main representative of the Kolsrud tradition, which dominated Norwegian dialectology until the late 1970s. Just as the opposition to structuralism had been fierce, the same was true of the opposition to the new discipline of sociolinguistics.

Variation, both interindividual and intraindividual, was considered as uninteresting as terms such as "phoneme" (Jahr 1996:96). Nevertheless, Ingeborg Hoff did not close the doors to linguistics, as Kolsrud had done. She did not object when her students studied linguistics, and she participated with an open mind in linguistic seminars and in discussions with linguists.

5.6.4.5. Sweden

Modern Swedish dialectology begins with Adolf Noreen's *Fryksdalsmålets ljudlära* (Phonology of the Fryksdalen Dialect, 1877, cf. 4.5.5.4.), which focused on individual sounds and their development from Old Swedish. This study established a paradigm which was followed in many later studies. Lars Levander (1883-1950) wrote a monograph on the Dalecarlia dialects (1925-1928), and Hjalmar Lindroth (5.3.1.) published two books on the Öland Islands dialect (1926, 1945).

A salient characteristic of the Uppsala School of historical linguistics is the use of old texts and dialect and place-name material. One example of this is Lennart Moberg's dissertation on the nasal assimilations *mp > pp*, *nt > tt*, *nk > kk* (1944). This change is known throughout Iceland and Norway, but the application varies in other parts of Scandinavia, as Moberg shows with his maps.

Gösta Holm's dissertation on the Swedish *s*-passive (1952) is typical in its focus on dialects and old texts. Holm's originality lies in his choice of a syntactic construction as the object of study. The objective of his thesis is to discover whether this passive construction has its roots in the native language (dialects and the older language), or whether it comes from other sources; above all translated Latin texts have been assumed as a source.

The Umlauts continued to interest the Uppsala School as shown by Gun Widmark in her dissertation *Det nordiska u-omljudet. En dialektgeografisk undersökning* (Scandinavian *u*-Umlaut. A Study Based On Dialect Geography, 1959). Widmark provides detailed documentation of the application or lack of application of the *u*-Umlaut within words in Scandinavian dialects. Later (1991) she returned to the problems of Umlaut with a phonemic approach describing allophonic and phonemic steps in the development.

Other approaches in dialectology focus on a specific phonological, morphological (inflectional, derivational), lexical, or syntactic feature in the dialects, such as the dialectal distribution of the Umlaut. Dialect studies were often concerned with the use of different words indicating the same referent in various dialects. One such example is Sigurd Fries's (1957) study of words denoting trees in Scandinavian languages. Structural linguistics and the concept of the phoneme were applied to dialect studies by Hjalmar Lindroth and later by Åke Hansson (1969) in his studies of a Scanian dialect. Ulrik Eriksson (1971) attempted to apply glossematic methods to the Åsele dialect, but in general, structuralism has not been successful in dialectology in Sweden.

The analysis of dialects is also closely related to language geography. In a classic study by Gösta Sjöstedt (1936), the borderline between the southern uvular and the northern palatal *r* is pinpointed. Further examples are Natanael Lindqvist's *Sydväst-Sverige i språkgeografisk belysning* (South-west Sweden in the Light of Language Geography, 1947), Sven Benson's studies on the adjective suffix *-ot* in Swedish (1951) and Hugo Areskoug's research on the dialects of Southeastern Skåne (1957). Sven Benson (1919-), who was head of the dialect and place-name archives in Lund (from 1957 to 1974), also began a two-volume dialect atlas for the dialects of Southern Sweden (1965-1970).

Several dialect archives were established. The first one was *Uppsala landsmålsarkiv* (Uppsala Dialect Archive, ULMA), later called *Dialekt- och folkminnesarkivet i Uppsala* (Uppsala Archive of Dialects and Folklore), founded in 1914 on the basis of fieldwork initiated as early as the 1870s by societies for the dialects. The huge project *Ordbok över Sveriges dialekter* (Dictionary of Swedish Dialects) was begun in the 1950s. The first two volumes appeared in 1991 and 1993.

5.6.5. Runology

During the twentieth century, runology developed into a well-established sub-branch of philology, with close ties to the fields of history and archeology. Studies were initially focused primarily on the production of reliable editions of the runic inscriptions. The interpretation of the texts was either based on an internal analysis of the text — a typical representative of this approach is the Danish linguist Lis Jacobsen — or on an external philological analysis of the texts, taking into account not only linguistic but also cultural data. A typical representative of the external approach is the Norwegian Magnus Olsen (1878-1963), professor of Old Norse and Icelandic language and literature in Oslo from 1908 to 1948. Olsen devoted most of his life to the editing of all the Norwegian runic inscriptions, in addition to his publications on onomastics, literature, and the history of Old Norse religion.

The runic material made available by the philologists enabled linguists working on the Germanic languages to describe the older stages of the language more precisely. They explained historical developments, particularly in the areas of phonology and morphology.

Some linguists, like Lis Jacobsen (5.2.5.), became more actively engaged in runic studies and made substantial contributions to the field. Jacobsen was a student of Ludwig Wimmer, whose large work on the Danish runes she edited in the form of a handbook in 1914. She also published numerous independent articles and monographs on various runic inscriptions. It was her intention to arrive at a new edition of all the runic sources. Working with Erik Moltke she was able to finish this project with a three-volume edition of the Danish runic inscriptions (1941-1942), supplemented with a pocket edition in 1942.

Another Danish linguist, Harry Andersen, whose primary field of research was the language of the Danish runic inscriptions, combined the information on word forms found in Jacobsen and Moltke's edition of the Danish inscriptions with details in Brøndum-Nielsen's grammar of Old Danish in order to produce transcriptions that were more precise than Wimmer's. Andersen was particularly concerned with the sounds symbolized by the letters of the runic alphabet, and in a number of articles on specific details (e.g. 1942, 1946, 1949) he paved the way for Karl Martin Nielsen's treatment of runic orthography (1960). Nielsen demonstrated systematically that the orthography of the Danish runic inscriptions clearly reflected etymological and historical phonetic developments, particularly the results of Umlaut and breaking. He also compiled an exhaustive dictionary of the vocabulary of the runic inscriptions, which was included in Jacobsen and Moltke's work on the Danish runes (1941-1942).

Since the publication of Jacobsen and Moltke's edition of the Danish inscriptions in 1942, some 250 new inscriptions have been found. Plans are now being carried out for the publication of this material, partly in catalog form according to the type of runic alphabet used in the inscription, and partly as a large corpus edition of the Viking Age material.

The origin of the runic alphabet was still a topic of great interest in this century. One of the most important contributions to this discussion was made by the Norwegian linguist Carl Marstrand, professor of Celtic languages (5.7.5.). Marstrand (1928) argued against Wimmer's theory (4.5.7.), proposing that the runic alphabet was older than had previously been assumed and that it originated from a version of the Latin alphabet that had been influenced by Celtic. Marstrand was also critical of the view that the runic alphabet was derived from Greek letters, a theory proposed in 1906 by Otto von Friesen (1870-1942), professor of Swedish at the University of Uppsala from 1906 to 1935 and a member of the Swedish Academy from 1929. The origin of the runes, as well as whether or not the runes had magical qualities (cf.

Anders Bæksted's original work on this topic from 1952), are all questions that are still being debated today.

The publication of the Swedish runic inscriptions began in 1900. A major contributor to this work was Elias Wessén, who is known for several penetrating runological studies, for example of the famous Rök stone. Sven B. F. Jansson (1906-1987) became the leading Swedish expert on runology and was consulted whenever new runic inscriptions were found. He wrote many popular presentations of runology and published the survey *Runinskrifter i Sverige* (Runic Inscriptions in Sweden, 1963). Jansson was professor of runology at the University of Stockholm from 1955 to 1966 and director-general of the Central Board of National Antiquities (*riksantikvarie*) 1966-1972.

In 1955, part of the old town of Bergen burned down, and after the fire, archeological excavations unearthed very rich and varied materials. Approximately 600 runic inscriptions were found, most of them on bones or pieces of wood. This material was quite different from the stone inscriptions, which were mainly burial inscriptions, and which, up to that point, had been the main source of runic material. The inscriptions found in Bergen were letters, business contracts, poems, pornography, and graffiti, all written by ordinary citizens. These findings thus demonstrated that the knowledge and use of runic script was prevalent in Bergen during the Middle Ages long after the Latin script had been introduced. From this legacy young Norwegian linguists were given a unique and valuable corpus of primary data, which attracted a new generation of scholars to the field of runology. Furthermore, the nature of the runic material in Bergen has also forced scholars to revise their views on literacy in the Nordic countries during the Middle Ages.

Particularly during the past decade, runological research in the Nordic countries has undergone considerable theoretical and methodological renewal, in part due to the availability of computer-based text corpora containing the bulk of the Nordic runic inscriptions. One important forum for discussion has been the series *Runrön* (Rune Findings) inaugurated by Lennart Elmestik and Lena Peterson in Uppsala in 1989.

Finland has never proved to be a good hunting ground for runic inscriptions. One minor exception is the fragment recovered under water in the South-West archipelago in 1997. Several laymen in Ostrobothnia claim to have made runic findings, but these have not been confirmed by experts.

Runology attracts widespread interest among lay people. Books on runes and interpretations of runic inscriptions are frequently given broad coverage in newspapers and other media.

5.6.6. Language Planning

Until the end of the nineteenth century, language planning in the Nordic countries had been left to individuals. In the twentieth century, governmental committees and institutions gradually took over the task of regulating the national languages. For the most part, the standard literary languages of the Nordic countries were subject to only minor orthographic and morphological changes during this period. Finnish orthography was definitively consolidated during the first half of the 1900s. In Norway, a more radical regulation of the language took place.

Initiatives in the area of normalization are often interwoven with linguistic studies. In order to defend a certain position with convincing arguments, detailed linguistic investigations are often undertaken. It is therefore not surprising that the publications of the national language planning institutions such as *Nyt fra Sprognævnet* (News from the Language Council) in Denmark, *Kielikello* (Language Clock) and *Språkbruk* (Language Use) in Finland, *Språknytt* (Language News) in Norway, and *Språkvård* (Language Cultivation) in Sweden often contain insightful analyses of specific linguistic phenomena, usually presented in a popular and informal way.

Language cultivation is a topic of great interest in all Nordic countries. The media (TV, radio and newspapers) give readers an opportunity to ask questions to which a linguist or an editor with linguistic interests will reply. Changes or proposals for changes in the language generally create intense and often heated public debate.

5.6.6.1. Danish

Even though the basis for a standard Danish orthography had been established in 1891 (4.5.4.1.), orthographic and purist debates continued into the twentieth century, many of them due to the purist sentiments that accompanied the German occupation during World War II. Societies like *Samfundet "Modersmaalet"* (Society for the Mother Tongue), founded in 1920 to promote the purity and beauty of the Danish language, and *Dansk Forening til nordisk Sprogrøgt* (Danish Society for Scandinavian Language Cultivation), established in 1941 to develop the specifically Scandinavian character of the Danish language gained popularity and increasing support for their views. The latter gained so much acclaim that reforms that were not approved by the existing orthographic committee, were carried out by political intervention. The major orthographic changes legislated in 1948 were: 1) initial capital letters in nouns were abolished, 2) *aa* was replaced by *å*, and 3) the past tense of the modal verbs *kunde* 'could', *skulde* 'should', and *ville* 'would' were to be written without the silent *d* as *kunne*, *skulle*, and *ville*. A committee was appointed in 1948 to implement these changes and to produce a spelling dictionary, but since its members could not agree, a new committee was appointed in 1953.

As early as 1948, Jørgen Glahder, Peter Skautrup and Lis Jacobsen sent a private proposal to the Danish government advocating the founding of a language commission similar to those which had already been established in the other Nordic countries (except Iceland). For various reasons, ranging from apathetic government officials to a heated academic and public debate concerning the position of the letter *Å* in the alphabet, the matter remained unsettled for several years, in spite of repeated appeals from both Skautrup and Jacobsen. In 1954, however, the suggestion of appointing a Danish language commission was taken up again at the meetings of the spelling dictionary committee. Soon afterwards, in 1955, *Dansk Sprognævn* (Danish Language Council) was established by the Ministry of Education and given the task of publishing the new dictionary — with the letter *Å* to be alphabetized last by legislative decree.

5.6.6.2. Faroese

The Faroese standard, established mainly by V. U. Hammershaimb (4.5.2.2.), was markedly archaic and different from the spoken dialects. Hammershaimb's orthography was strongly defended by Christian Matras, the leading Faroese linguist of this century (5.6.1.2.). He compared the Faroese orthography with the nynorsk orthography established by Ivar Aasen and argued that the less phonological Faroese solution was better. Faroese language studies in the first half of the twentieth century were diachronically and normatively oriented, and the modern spoken language was first taken into account by the British linguist W. B. Lockwood (1955, 1956; cf. 5.6.1.2.). He described the phonological differences between the literary language and the modern spoken language and also dealt with changes in morphology and syntax, as well as the significant influence of Danish on the Faroese language.

5.6.6.3. Finnish

When Eemil Nestor Setälä took office as the professor of Finnish and Finnish literature at the University of Helsinki in November 1893, his inaugural lecture was entitled “Oikeakielisyydestä suomen kielen käytäntöön katsoen” (Language Planning from the Viewpoint of Finnish Usage; Setälä 1894, republished in Setälä 1921). In compliance with neogrammarian views, Setälä was not in favor of conscious interference with language usage, i.e. deliberate language planning. In his view, established usage determines what is felt to be correct, and “The recommendation for optimal use of language is ... that of the best writers” (Setälä 1921:121-124, 145). As pointed out by L. Hakulinen (1938), Setälä’s position had a sobering effect on Finnish language planning discussions. Extreme views on the importance of language history and grammar as decisive criteria for normative judgments had often been voiced in the spirit of August Ahlqvist (4.4.2.).

Setälä’s own grammars, i.e. his *Syntax* (1880) and *Sound and Form Structure* (1898) had, ironically, come to be *de facto* definitions of the norms of standard Finnish. Setälä’s liberal attitude toward language planning was theoretically motivated, but impossible to implement. Much work had already been done on standardizing Finnish grammar and lexis, and it was felt that language planning without systematic deliberation was impossible.

The journal *Virittäjä* (Instigator) has devoted ample space to language planning ever since its first issues in the present series (1897-). Knut Cannelin (1868-1938), a schoolteacher and lexicographer, noted many instances of fluctuation in the spelling and morphology of Finnish words in the course of his lexicographic studies. In the book *Kieliopas* (Language Tutor, 1916), he offered recommendations for proper usage, focusing on instances where there was more or less free variation. He also treated problems such as the spelling of compounds (one or two graphic words) and abbreviations.

J. J. Mikkola (5.5.1. and 5.7.4.), a Slavonic scholar with wide-ranging international interests, wrote a paper (1928) voicing his dissatisfaction with the current tendencies in Finnish language planning. In particular, Mikkola criticized the prevailing emphasis on pure genuine Finnish, which in his understanding led to an exaggerated nativization of loan-words, even ones which were already well-established. Mikkola claimed that this practice jeopardized the stability of the language, one of the most important characteristics of an established national standard. Above all, he wanted to stress functionality and practicality as the most important goals of language planning. Mikkola also proposed the founding of a supervising authority that would publish model word lists, similar to those of the Swedish Academy for Swedish.

In 1928, the Finnish Literature Society (SKS) established its *Kielivaliokunta* (Language Subcommittee) with nine linguist members to deal with language planning issues. It was particularly difficult to agree on principles for loan-word adaptation. In fact, it was not until the 1970s that relative stability had been achieved in this respect (Räikkälä 1995:5). In 1945, SKS founded *Kielitoimisto* (Language Bureau) that answered usage-related questions posed by the general public. The Academy of Finland was founded in 1948, and it took over the Language Bureau services after 1949. The Bureau had a board of experts with five linguist members to settle normative problems and to make recommendations. The Swedish Language Commission in Finland, *Svenska språkvårdsnämnden*, was founded by private initiative in 1942 for the cultivation of Finland-Swedish.

E. A. Saarimaa (1888-1966) was the incarnation of the conservative language planner. He published two books in the spirit of Antibarbarus, *Huonoa ja hyvää suomea. Oikeakielisyysohjeita* (Bad and Good Finnish. Advice for Good Usage, 1930), and *Kielenopas* (Language Tutor, 1947), both of which were in widespread use for a long time. These works contained categorical views on good and bad language with particular emphasis on eradicating Swedish loan-words and other foreign influences. This in turn triggered a reaction from Lauri Kettunen (5.6.4.2.), who published a book entitled *Hyvää vapaata suomea* (Good Unconstrained Finnish) in 1949. Kettunen outspokenly criticized Saarimaa for insisting on constraints which suffocated language use with reference to personal taste rather than to established fact. For instance,

Kettunen showed that Saarimaa's word-order stipulations forbidding inverted order were factually incorrect, because such word order patterns occurred in many dialects.

One of the greatest problems of Finnish language planning in the beginning of the twentieth century was the lack of a normative dictionary of standard Finnish (5.6.7.2.).

5.6.6.4. Icelandic

Icelandic has a tradition of linguistic purism and archaism, primarily applied to the lexical level. This tradition goes back to the eighteenth century and remained strong throughout the nineteenth century (Kvaran 1996). This tendency continued in the twentieth century, and in 1918, the Icelandic Association of Engineers (*Verkfræðingafélag Íslands*) established a committee for lexical planning. One of the members of this committee was Sigurður Nordal (1886-1974, professor of Icelandic literary history at the University of Iceland from 1918). Another member, Guðmundur Finnbogason (1873-1944), professor of psychology, was the most prolific creator of neologisms of his time. This was the first unofficial committee for language planning in Iceland. After 1965 these committees increased in number, eventually running into the dozens. In addition, individual authors created many neologisms, each in his/her own field of specialization.

Compulsory education from 1907 onward provided a channel for standardization of the spoken language, especially with regard to the lexicon, morphology, and pronunciation. One of the most radical effects was the eradication of the so-called *flámæli*, i.e. the merger of *i* and *e*, sometimes also *u* and *ö*. This pronunciation feature apparently emerged not later than the nineteenth century and had several foci of spreading in the first half of the twentieth century. In large measure, the investigations of pronunciation by Björn Guðfinnsson in the 1940s (5.6.4.3.) were conceived of as the first step in the strike against this phenomenon. Guðfinnsson devised a method for teaching school children to eliminate this feature from their speech, and intensive efforts in the post-war decades resulted in its gradual elimination (Ottósson 1990:136f-).

Around 1950, the founding of an Icelandic Academy was discussed in the Parliament, but the idea was not accepted. However, in 1951, the dictionary committee of the university (*Orðabókarnefnd Háskóla Íslands*) received separate funding for collecting new words in Icelandic. Gradually, this committee acquired the function of an advisory board on questions of language normalization and correctness. In 1964, Iceland founded an official language council (*Íslensk málnefnd*).

5.6.6.5. Norwegian

In twentieth-century Norway, both of the official standards have undergone numerous and sometimes profound orthographic and morphological changes. The changes in the official rules of orthography, all of which were instigated and supervised by the government, took place in 1901 (landsmål/nynorsk), 1907 (riksmål/bokmål), 1910 (landsmål/nynorsk), 1917 (both languages), 1938 (both languages), and 1959 (both languages). The basic motive underlying these reforms has been to reduce the differences between the two literary languages in orthography, vocabulary, and morphology. Many politicians even expressed the desire to achieve one common language (common Norwegian, *sammorsk*) as a possible solution in the more or less distant future.

Although the differences between the two norms have been significantly reduced, this has not occurred without strong resistance and bitter struggles on the part of the interest organizations of the various groups. The organization for landsmål/nynorsk (*Noregs Mållag*) was founded in 1906, that of riksmål (*Riksmålsforbundet*) in 1907, and in 1959 an organization for the promotion of common Norwegian was founded (*Landslaget for språklig samling*). The organizations for riksmål and nynorsk were actually so strong that they managed to render the efforts of the first official language council founded by the government, *Norsk språknemnd* (1951-1972), largely null and void in fulfilling its mandatory task of moving

towards one common Norwegian language, cf. Bleken (1966) and E. Haugen (1966). In 1964, a governmental committee headed by Hans Vogt (5.3.1.), who at that time was Rector of the University of Oslo, was appointed to establish peace on the language front, and in 1972, the Norwegian Language Council (*Norsk språkråd*) was established with the broad representation of all parties.

There have been linguists on all the committees for spelling reforms and in all private and public organizations for language normalization and language cultivation. The Norwegian language situation has engaged linguists, in some cases providing them with part-time jobs and in other cases causing them to produce interesting research. But basically, these linguists have not been and are not any more objective in this conflict than any other Norwegian. It is all too easy to find internationally recognized Norwegian linguists who forget their basic linguistic knowledge, be it Saussure, Sapir, or Labov, as soon as they enter the local language battlefield. A detailed and interesting survey of language conflict and language planning in Norway is found in Einar Haugen's book on this subject (1966, translated into Norwegian 1969).

5.6.6.6. Sámi

Most of the Sámi language planning with special regard to orthography and to the dialectal basis of the written language was carried out independently by individual non-Sámi scholars until World War II, and separately in the various countries where Sámi was spoken. Sámi was originally written in an orthography based on written Norwegian or Swedish. The first scholar to provide an orthography that mirrored the phonological system of Sámi was Rask (1832b), and his work exerted a significant influence on the subsequent orthographies of Sámi, cf. Bergsland (1951-1952) and 4.5.2.6. Originally, the written language was based on the coastal dialects, although the Sámi scholar Anders Porsanger (3.4.1.5.) had already in the eighteenth century advocated the study of Sámi dialects in order to establish a firmer basis for a common Sámi orthography. Jens Andreas Friis (4.5.2.6.), who was the first Norwegian professor of Sámi and who was mainly familiar with the Kautokeino dialect, introduced a number of features from this and neighboring dialects into the written language. From then on, the North Sámi literary language was based on the Kautokeino dialect.

Konrad Nielsen's dictionary and introductory textbook in Sámi (5.6.1.6. and 5.6.7.5.) presented a phonologically accurate orthography, which was widely used in Norway until the end of World War II. Nielsen's orthography was, however, not very practical since it included several phonetic minutiae of marginal phonological importance and a number of diacritics. After the war, and partly in connection with the publication of Sámi textbooks for schools, the question of a revised Sámi orthography was raised, along with the possibility of having a common Sámi orthography for Sámis in Norway and Sweden. In 1947, the Norwegian Ministry of Church and Education took the initiative to ask Professor Knut Bergsland in Oslo and the Swedish Sámi scholar Dr. Isak Ruong to propose a new orthography. These two scholars worked in cooperation with Professor Emeritus Konrad Nielsen, Oslo, and Professor Björn Collinder, Uppsala, and their proposed new orthography was officially accepted in 1950.

To a great extent, this orthography was a compromise between various traditions rather than between national and personal prestige, cf. Bergsland (1951-1952) for a thorough and fascinating account. The result was based for the most part on Nielsen's system. Both in its use of diacritics and in its marking of vowel distinctions, the orthography was still complicated. It was replaced in 1979 by a common Sámi orthography for Sámis in Finland, Norway, and Sweden, worked out mainly by Sámi scholars and teachers. This new spelling norm is generally accepted today and is used in practically all Sámi publications.

5.6.6.7. Swedish

Language cultivation in Sweden is supported by the prestigious Swedish Academy. The Academy's most influential activity is the publication of its word lists (SAOL, cf. 5.6.7.6.), which define the norms for Swedish spelling and inflection. The members of the Swedish Academy do not take part directly in language standardization, but they take initiatives and provide economic support for various linguistic and literary activities.

Erik Wellander (1884-1977), professor of German at the University of Stockholm from 1931 to 1951, is known for his popular book *Riktig svenska* (Correct Swedish, 1938). It provides advice, comments — often ironical or humorous — and many awkward examples taken from established Swedish authors as well as from newspapers and student essays. In Finland, Hugo Bergroth's (1866-1937) book *Finlandssvenska* (Finland Swedish, 1917) has been influential in trying to eradicate provincial features and bring Finland Swedish somewhat closer to common Swedish norms.

A milestone in Swedish language cultivation was the founding in 1944 of *Nämnden för svensk språkvård* (Committee for Swedish Language Cultivation, since 1974 *Svenska språknämnden*) in response to a suggestion by Elias Wessén. *Tekniska nomenklaturcentralen* (Center of Technical Nomenclature) had already been established in 1941. *Nämnden för svensk språkvård/Svenska språknämnden* plays a central role in deciding questions dealing with language norms.

The spelling reform 1906 established the still valid norm avoiding etymological spellings such as *-dt* (e.g. *rödt* > *rött*, as neuter form of the adjective *röd* 'red'). One important issue in language planning involved the distinct plural forms of verbs, which had gradually disappeared from the spoken language, for example *de komma* (pl.) 'they come' as opposed to *hon kommer* (sg.) 'she comes'. Norway and Denmark had given up this distinction before the turn of the century. The influential Swedish newspaper *Dagens Nyheter* (Daily News) used no plural forms after 1943, and the Swedish news bureau *Tidningarnas Telegrambyrå* (TT) abandoned the plural verb forms in 1945, following the advice of *Nämnden för svensk språkvård*. The Swedish Academy, however, was on the conservative side and tried to persuade the Swedish School Board to intervene in this question as late as 1957.

5.6.7 Lexicography

Dictionaries remained a significant part of the linguistic activities of this period. Besides lexicographic work on the standard national languages, several comprehensive dictionaries of dialects and bilingual dictionaries of national languages and English, French, and German were published. In many cases, leading linguists were engaged in such lexicographic projects. Only a few of the most important lexicographic projects will be mentioned here.

5.6.7.1. Danish

Recognizing the need for a successor to Molbech's dictionary (1833), the Gyldendal publishing house encouraged B. T. Dahl (4.5.2.1.) and H. Hammer to compile a handy dictionary of the modern language. Aided by B. T. Dahl's brother, pastor Hans Dahl (1830-1921), who had been collecting lexicographic material for many years, they produced a concise two-volume dictionary (1907-1914) which, partly thanks to its non-academic style, was well-received by the general public. In contrast to Molbech's dictionary, it also included dialect material and a number of nonstandard words and phrases. It was decidedly purist, including only the most common foreign words, replacing others with native substitutes. There is no information on pronunciation, little on inflection, and only random information on etymology. Instead, it contains much phraseological material and an abundance of synonyms.

While this dictionary was being completed, the ground was also being laid for a more scholarly

dictionary of the Danish language. In 1901 Verner Dahlerup (4.5.3.1.) had signed a contract with a publishing house to publish a larger, but still concise, successor to Molbech's dictionary, covering the period from Ludvig Holberg to modern times. By the time the preliminary version of *A-Aarefistel* appeared in 1909, it was already clear that producing an adequate modern vernacular dictionary of high standard was a much more demanding task than had first been assumed. In 1915 the administration of the dictionary was taken over by the recently founded Society for Danish Language and Literature, which provided funding for a permanent staff of lexicographers. The first half of volume one appeared in 1918, and the twenty-eighth and final volume was published in 1956. The project was supervised by various editors, among them Lis Jacobsen (5.2.5.), Johannes Brøndum-Nielsen (5.6.2.1.), and Aage Hansen (5.6.1.1.). This Dictionary of the Danish Language (*Ordbog over det danske sprog*, 1918-1956) covers the period from 1700 to the date each volume was edited. It is descriptive, not normative, primarily a dictionary of the standard language, with information on pronunciation and inflection, history and etymology, usage and style, together with systematically ordered definitions, including phraseology and examples of usage taken from literature. Although the work is uneven due to its long period of production under various editors, it is an invaluable lexicographic work and one which has been popular, in spite of its size and scholarly approach.

A more concise dictionary of Modern Danish intended for the general public is the Dictionary of Contemporary Danish (*Nudansk Ordbog*), published for the first time in 1953 under the supervision of Lis Jacobsen. Since then, the dictionary has been under constant revision, expanded and updated and supplemented with brief sections on the history of the language, correctness, and grammar. In some cases the entries contain definitions, in others there are illustrative examples of usage and phraseology. The dictionary also contains numerous proper names and place-names and can be used as a spelling dictionary, since it follows the orthography authorized by the Danish Language Commission. Although the Dictionary of Contemporary Danish has no official status, it has been a best-seller and is consulted as an authoritative dictionary by the general public, schools — even by the Danish Language Commission.

5.6.7.2. Finland

In the early 1900s, the central entrepreneur in the field of Finno-Ugric and Finnish studies was Eemil Nestor Setälä (4.4.2. and 5.2.5.). His famous dictionary plan of 1896 has already been presented in section 4.5.6.2.

From the viewpoint of societal needs, a comprehensive normative dictionary of Standard Finnish was the most urgent task. On the initiative of Antti Kukkonen and seven other members of the Finnish Parliament, the Parliament decided in 1927 to urge the Government to work for the publication of a basic dictionary of written cultivated Finnish. Work on *Nykysuomen sanakirja* (Dictionary of Contemporary Finnish, abbreviated NS in Finnish) began under the auspices of the Finnish Literature Society, with Matti Sadeniemi (1910-1989) acting as editor in chief. Many Finnish linguists like Paavo Siro and Jorma Vuoriniemi have worked as lexicographers on NS.

NS finally appeared in six volumes from 1951 to 1961. Immediately it became the standard authority on issues of spelling, morphology, word meanings, and word selection. NS contains 207,256 lexical entries, some two thirds of which are compounds. The morphological properties of the words are described by a word-and-paradigm model, in which each inflectable entry has an inflectional index that can be spelt out using model paradigms. When needed, the entries also have indications of register and stylistic value. The normative invention of NS was clear from the outset. The dictionary contains numerous recommendations concerning preferred and non-recommended usage. It also contains excellent semantic analyses that have been a lasting source of inspiration for new generations of linguists. The basic corpus material of NS was excerpted from Finnish literature (especially from the classical “good writers”), but systematic excerpting was not carried out after 1938. NS was therefore not up to date when the last volume appeared in 1961.

Materials for an etymological dictionary of Finnish had been collected in the 1910s from many Finno-

Ugric languages. Systematic work on this project was initiated by Setälä in 1930 in collaboration with Toivonen (5.5.2.). After Setälä's death in 1935, Toivonen headed the project. Part I (*a - kn*) of *Suomen kielen etymologinen sanakirja* (Etymological Dictionary of Finnish, SKES) appeared in 1955, compiled by Toivonen. The preface gives an idea of the enormous groundwork that had to be done in the process of manual compilation. For example, it took a total of 329,000 excerpts just to describe the use of the most important words in the 33-volume collection *Suomen kansan vanhat runot* (Old Poems of the Finnish People). Similar laborious excerpts had to be made, by hand, for all the Finno-Ugric languages, because few dictionaries based on fieldwork had yet appeared. A typical etymological article in SKES lists the derivatives of the entry along with its cognates in related languages, sometimes all the way to Samoyed. Due attention is also paid to Indo-European, Turkic, and other connections.

Much work on the later parts of SKES had been done all along. Erkki Itkonen (5.5.2.) was involved in the work as early as 1934. Part II of SKES, which appeared in 1958, was written by Toivonen, Itkonen, and Aulis J. Joki, parts III (1962) and IV (1969) by Itkonen and Joki, and the last parts V (1974) and VI (1978) by Itkonen, Joki, and Reino Peltola.

Work on *Suomen murteiden sanakirja* (Dictionary of Finnish Dialects) began in the 1910s. The first volume (*a - eläi*) appeared in 1985, the fifth volume, reaching the letter *k*, was published in 1997.

5.6.7.3. Iceland

According to E. Haugen and T. L. Markey (1972), Iceland is blessed with one of the best dictionaries in Scandinavia, the result of more than twenty years of labor on the part of Sigfús Blöndal and his wife Björg Blöndal (1920-1924). The dictionary incorporated collections from the spoken language by Björn M. Ólsen (4.5.1.3.). A supplement to this comprehensive Icelandic dictionary appeared in 1963, edited by H. Halldórsson and J. Benediktsson, including new technical terms and other neologisms. The first monolingual Icelandic dictionary did not appear until 1963, edited by Árni Böðvarsson on the basis of Blöndal's dictionary.

In 1939, the Arnarnagæan Commission in Copenhagen initiated the preparation of a new dictionary of Old Norse prose (*Ordbog over det norrøne prosasprog*) intended to replace the standard dictionary by Fritznér (1886-1896). Originally conceived as a joint Icelandic-Danish venture, although financed exclusively by the Danish state from the start, its scope was Icelandic prose writings up to 1540 and Norwegian up to 1370. The project was led by Ole Widding from 1946 to 1977. The first regular dictionary volume appeared in 1995, but a volume containing indices of texts and manuscripts, also valuable for language historians, had already appeared in 1989.

A historical lexicographic project was undertaken at the University of Iceland in 1948, until 1977 under the direction of Jakob Benediktsson (see the various contributions in *Orð og tunga* [Word and Language] 1, 1988). The scope of this project was from 1540, the date of the first printed books in Iceland, to the present. Spoken language was collected systematically from 1917 to 1924. The project is now in the editing stage, but no part of it has been published as yet. A rather unique feature of this project has been the collection of words from the spoken language from radio programs covering about forty years (Ingólfsson 1988).

An Icelandic etymological dictionary was compiled by Alexander Jóhannesson (1956, cf. 5.6.2.3.). Modeled on Walde and Pokorny's Indo-European dictionary, it is arranged by roots but also includes an Icelandic index. To this we can add Christian Westergaard-Nielsen's investigation of loan-words in the literature of sixteenth-century Iceland (1946), a study which gives an idea of what Icelandic might have been like today, had the purist tendencies begun in the eighteenth century not prevailed.

5.6.7.4. Norway

At the beginning of the twentieth century, Hjalmar Falk and Alf Torp (4.5.3.2.) published, first in Norwegian (1903-1906) and then in German (1910), what was later to become the standard etymological dictionary of riksmål/bokmål. Several years later, Torp wrote a shorter etymological dictionary of nynorsk (1919). The high quality of these studies produced by two neogrammarians is illustrated by the fact that it was not until the late 1980s that plans for a complete new etymological dictionary of Norwegian were put forward.

The most important lexicographic achievement in Norway during this period was *Norsk riksmålsordbok* (Dictionary of Norwegian Riksmål, T. Knudsen and A. Sommerfelt 1937-1957), a comprehensive dictionary of the riksmål literary language. The book represented something unique in Norway for this period, namely close co-operation between Scandinavianists (Trygve Knudsen, cf. 5.6.1.5.) and linguists (Alf Sommerfelt, cf. 5.3.1.).

The work on the great dictionary of nynorsk and Norwegian dialects, *Norsk ordbok* (Dictionary of Norwegian), got underway in 1930, but the first volume did not appear until 1966, and thirty years later only three of the planned nine or ten volumes have appeared. These long periods of preparation and production are due to the large amount of material to be included as well as to the lack of funds, especially during the first 25-30 years. Actually, the collection and organization of the material in the early years was carried out on a volunteer basis.

5.6.7.5. Sámi

Comprehensive dictionaries of Sámi dialects had been produced in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, many of them of high quality. But the work that became the standard dictionary of North Sámi was the dictionary compiled by K. Nielsen and A. Nesheim (1932-1962). Konrad Nielsen (5.6.1.5.) began collecting material for the dictionary in Finnmark early in 1906, and this work continued until 1911. The original plan was to publish a dictionary based on the dialects of Polmak, Kautokeino, and Karasjok in Hungary, accompanied by a Hungarian and German translation. But before this plan could be actualized, the Finno-Ugrian Society in Helsinki took over its publication on the recommendation of E. N. Setälä, and in 1913 the first volume of the dictionary appeared. The publication was interrupted by the war, however, and it was not until 1929 that the Institute for Comparative Research in Human Culture, together with the Rockefeller Foundation, took the initiative to publish the dictionary, albeit in a different form. There was now not only a Norwegian and an English translation, but each entry was augmented with numerous examples illustrating the syntactical frames of the entries, as well as phraseology and semantics. The entries were written in a simplified and largely phonemic orthography, but the complicated phonetic transcription of the Finno-Ugrian Society was still used for the example sentences.

The first three volumes containing the complete dictionary from A to Æ appeared in print from 1932 to 1938. A fourth volume treating various semantic fields with special regard to Sámi culture was published in 1956. This volume provides a unique linguistic representation of a culture, and its scholarly and practical value is enhanced by the wealth of illustrations documenting Sámi traditions. Although this volume was based on Nielsen's notes, most of it was compiled and edited by Asbjørn Nesheim with the help of the Sámi scholar Hans Henriksen. Both Nesheim and Henriksen had been Nielsen's assistants since 1929. A fifth and final volume (1962) was also edited by Nesheim in collaboration with Hans Henriksen. This volume contains a selection of items from Knud Leem's old dictionary (3.4.2.4.) as well as addenda and corrigenda. With respect to the documentation of Sámi culture and the Sámi language, this is truly a masterpiece, and it is hard to believe that such a wealth of material could be handled and presented so clearly in pre-computer times.

5.6.7.6. Sweden

Swedish lexicography from 1900-1965 is characterized by ambitious work on the large-scale Dictionary of the Swedish Academy (4.5.6.6.) and by the publication of several dictionaries focusing on present-day Swedish, etymologies, or specific domains of the language. Practical needs also led to the publication of synonym lexicons.

The Dictionary of the Swedish Academy is not a simple lexicon, rather a series of articles on the history and use of Swedish words since 1526, with ample semantic information and examples. It now includes some thirty volumes and is predicted to be completed until 2040. The dictionary is rich in detail, and much of the information in it can only be appreciated by specially trained philologists, historical scholars, or linguists. Copies of the dictionary are found mainly in public libraries.

The first edition of *Svenska Akademiens ordlista över svenska språket* (The Swedish Academy's Word List of the Swedish Language, SAOL) was published in 1874. The seventh SAOL appeared in 1900 with only minor reforms in spelling. The eighth SAOL was published in 1923, but the conservative attitude of the academy made even this edition too conservative and outdated for popular use. In the 1950 edition, the legendary head of the Dictionary of the Swedish Academy, Pelle Holm, finally transformed SAOL into a useful word list reflecting contemporary Swedish. Holm took a modern pragmatic view concerning questions of usage, cf. Allén, Loman and Sigurd (1986). The eleventh edition of SAOL appeared in 1986, the twelfth in 1998.

Olof Östergren (5.2.3.) wrote a remarkable dictionary of modern Swedish, *Nusvensk ordbok*, in ten volumes (1919-1972). Intended to give brief definitions rather than semantic analyses, it provides good examples, often excerpted from Swedish literature.

Elof Hellquist's dictionary *Svensk etymologisk ordbok* (Swedish Etymological Dictionary, 1922) is the most respected etymological dictionary of Swedish and still one of the best etymological dictionaries of a Scandinavian language. A new version (or supplement) is under way.

5.7. Research on Non-Nordic Languages

5.7.1. English, German, and French

After 1900, English, French, and German were the dominant foreign languages in high schools in all the Nordic countries, and they had largely replaced Latin and, of course, Greek. There were differences in the position of Latin in the various countries, and the number of students taking Latin as a subject in high schools also varied over time. After World War II, English gradually became the dominant foreign language taught in the schools, (in Finland both Finnish and Swedish, the official national languages, are obligatory for all pupils). In the second half of the twentieth century, the position of English on all levels was as strong as that of Latin before 1900. Actually, the period between 1850 and 1950 can be labeled the multilingual period in the Scandinavian school system. It was also the period in which there was no single common international language for communication or science. This new situation created a need for university positions in English, French, and German to conduct research and to educate new high school teachers. In Denmark, a tradition of comprehensive grammar writing emerged, usually with a diachronic perspective. Several of these grammars became international reference works and are probably among the most important international contributions of Nordic linguists in this period. In connection with these grammars, either as a background or a by-product, a number of descriptive studies of a high international standard were produced by Danish linguists.

This tradition began with Nyrop's historical grammar of French in six volumes (1899-1930). Kristoffer Nyrop (4.3., 4.6.2.) was a student of Thomsen and educated as a neogrammarian, cf. his doctoral

dissertation (Nyrop 1886). His main interest, however, was in diachronic semantics, and he published several short and readable popular presentations based on extended research in this field, for example his tracing of the history of the motif *Nej* (i.e. the negation “no”, 1891). Several of his works were unconventional, and his study of the kiss and its history (1897) caused the Royal Danish Academy of Sciences to find him unworthy of membership in 1899. Nyrop became a professor in 1894, and his scholarly achievements are admirable, particularly considering the fact that he was almost blind from the age of fifty.

Methodologically, Nyrop’s French grammar is a combination of the Latin grammar tradition and the neogrammarian paradigm, but traditional grammar forms the basic framework for his analysis. Although the grammar contains no theoretical innovations, it shows the strength and usefulness of the classical nineteenth century grammar model for organizing information and data.

Volume four on semantics is the most original part of the grammar and comprises Nyrop’s most significant contribution to general linguistics. Its approach is that of traditional semasiology, treating changes in meaning, stylistic differences, metaphors and metonymy, and euphemism, but it also contains topics like proper names (place-names and personal names) and several fundamental aspects of semantics. It is in itself interesting and unusual to have an independent book on semantics within a grammar. Volumes five and six on syntax are less original, and it is evident that syntax was not the author’s main interest.

Continuing in this tradition, Denmark had two additional Romance linguists, Andreas Blinkenberg (1893-1982) and Kristian Sandfeld (Jensen) (1873-1942).

Blinkenberg, who was professor of Romance philology in Aarhus 1934-1963, is mainly known for his Danish-French and French-Danish dictionaries, but he also published some significant contributions in the area of French syntax (Blinkenberg 1928, 1933, 1960). Thanks to their wealth of data, these studies formed the basis for many later descriptive studies of French. Blinkenberg was theoretically old-fashioned, mainly a neogrammarian, although influenced to some extent by Jespersen’s approach to syntax.

Kristian Sandfeld, professor of Romance philology in Copenhagen from 1914, was educated in the neogrammarian paradigm under Thomsen and Nyrop, but in his dissertation (1900), Sandfeld already showed his independence from both of these teachers and revealed his future profile as a specialist in syntax and language contact in the Balkans. This work, which has no clear predecessors, is a forerunner of modern studies in language contact and typology. It is characterized by a well-ordered set of data and argues convincingly against the assumption that everything common in the Balkan languages is due to a genetic relationship. Sandfeld’s survey of Balkan philology (1926) focuses on comparative syntax and typology. Through its French edition (Sandfeld 1930) in a prestigious linguistic series, it became well-known and influential and gave Sandfeld international recognition.

Sandfeld’s main descriptive contributions are his French syntax, three penetrating studies on French syntax (1928-1943), and his Rumanian syntax in three volumes (1930, 1960-1962), written together with Hedvig Olsen. The last two volumes of this work were published after Sandfeld’s death. In these studies, written in the school grammar tradition, Sandfeld refers to Blinkenberg and provides an excellent descriptive syntactic analysis, based primarily on literary texts, in which every phenomenon and every detail is documented and analyzed, but with no reference to any specific theory. Sandfeld also wrote a popular introduction to linguistics in Danish (Sandfeld 1913, 1923), cf. 5.3.2, which is neogrammarian in outlook, not containing a single chapter on synchronic linguistics. But this is not surprising, since the study of French at the University of Copenhagen was historically oriented in his day. Even as late as the 1940s, Old French was obligatory in the first year of study.

The other professor of Romance philology in Copenhagen before the war, Viggo Brøndal (5.3.3.), was mainly occupied with general linguistics, but he drew heavily on the French grammatical tradition and used data from French in his theoretical work (5.3.3.).

Knud Togeby (1918-1974), another internationally recognized Danish Romanist, produced a comprehensive traditional grammar of French for university students (1965). Above all, however, he is known for his daring structural grammar of Modern French (1951), which, together with Bergsland’s

grammar (1946), is one of the few existing grammatical descriptions based on the theory of glossematics. By applying this theory to a well-described language, Togeby managed to illustrate the strengths and weaknesses of the theory. The book was reviewed in the leading international linguistic journals, e.g. Cohen (1951), Fowler (1953), and Martinet (1953), and these reviews were actually as much reviews of the glossematic theory as of Togeby's book, both of which came under attack. The critics, especially Martinet (1953), found that the glossematic theory was unclear and dogmatic and that Togeby had not contributed much to the understanding of the structure of French. As Cohen put it (1951:125), it was a curious book. In retrospect, the evaluation should probably have been much more positive. First of all, the grammar is not purely glossematic, but a broader structuralist work. Togeby was not only well acquainted with American and European structuralism, but, in addition to Hans Vogt, was one of the first European linguists to utilize the methods of American structuralism in a descriptive work, although in an eclectic and critical way.

To complete the picture, we should add that Danish Romance linguists like Nyrop and Sandfeld, and not least Togeby, were also outstanding scholars in philology and literary studies, see Togeby (1978) for the wide range of his research activities.

Holger Sten (1907-1971), who was Sandfeld's student and successor as professor of Romance philology at the University of Copenhagen, made a number of valuable contributions to French linguistics. He produced a classic treatise on the French tenses (1952a) and wrote a textbook on French phonetics (1956). His early dissertation on negation in French (1938) is still a much consulted work in Romance linguistics. He was also a pioneer in Portuguese linguistics (cf. 1952b, 1973).

The most outstanding, and without doubt the most influential of the Danish contributions to descriptive grammar, was Otto Jespersen's *A Modern English Grammar on Historical Principles* (1909-1949).⁶⁴ The title says that it is based on historical principles, and although it is certainly not untouched by the neogrammarian education of its author, it is mainly a descriptive study illustrating Jespersen's general ideas of descriptive linguistics, cf. 5.3.3. and O. Jespersen (1897-1899, 1924, 1937). Syntax occupies five of the seven volumes, morphology and phonology one volume each. Jespersen's influence on the study of English grammar and on descriptive linguistics was not limited to this voluminous grammar. He also published numerous shorter versions, both in Danish (1909-1914) and English (e.g. 1933). This last grammar was reprinted twenty times between 1933 and 1974.

In Finland, the philological approach to the study of English, French, and German was introduced by four scholars under the heading "new philology" (Finn. *uusfilologia*), as distinguished from classical philology. The pioneer was Werner Söderhjelm (4.6.2.), a humanist in the strongest sense of the word, who initiated the age of modern philological study in Finland. Söderhjelm had Romance and Germanic languages and later literary studies as his main fields, and he influenced many younger scholars through his teaching, in particular Uno Lindelöf (English, German, cf. 4.6.2), Axel Wallensköld (Romance languages), and Hugo Suolahti (German). All of these scholars traveled to France, Germany, and England, and studied under the leading scholars of their time. In the 1890s, French and German were considered the most important modern languages. Söderhjelm and Wallensköld had been strongly influenced by Gaston Paris (1839-1903), the most famous French philologist of his time. Another major source of influence, especially among scholars of German, was neogrammarian theory.

Most of Axel Wallensköld's (1864-1933) publications were editions of medieval French texts. His dissertation (1891) on a twelfth century French text was the first work of its kind at the University of Helsinki to comply with modern editorial standards (Aalto 1987:55). Wallensköld, who was professor of Romance philology 1905-1929, also produced a detailed syntactic study of comparative constructions in the Romance languages (1909). He was also interested in the artificial languages of his time, especially Ido, on which he wrote a textbook (1922).

⁶⁴ Vol. VII is written mainly by Niels Haislund.

Arthur Långfors (1881-1959) specialized in Romance philology. He was influenced by Söderhjelm and had studied for several years in Paris and Florence. His dissertation (1907) was a critical medieval text edition which was widely commended for its methodological rigor. Over the decades, Långfors became a productive philological scholar and rose to international fame as an erudite Mediaevalist in the Romance philological research community. He was president of the *Société des anciens textes français* for several years and was made a laureate at the *Institut de France* no less than three times. Långfors was not a theoretical scholar, and according to Aalto (1987:78): “His only principle in textual criticism was the possession of an incredibly wide expert knowledge.” In the early 1920s, Långfors was a diplomat in Madrid and Paris. He was professor of Romance philology from 1925-1951 and Rector of the University of Helsinki 1945-1950. He influenced many younger scholars such as Tauno Nurmela and Veikko Väänänen, giving rise to a Finnish school of Romance philology.

Oiva Tuulio (1878-1941, until 1933 Tallgren), professor of Southern Romance languages 1928-1941, was Finland’s first Hispanic scholar, but he also worked on Italian and Arabic. He was invited to become professor in both Tartu and Riga (without going to either) before receiving an offer from the University of Helsinki. Tuulio’s opinions were always based on solid text criticism. He also undertook basic work on the status of Sicilian within the Romance family.

Hugo Suolahti (1874-1944, until 1906 called Palander) was the founder of German studies in Finland. As a young student, he had been inspired by Söderhjelm. While abroad he became familiar with neogrammarian theory and methodology, which he applied throughout his career. Suolahti’s main field of research was German historical lexicology, based on the neogrammarian and *Wörter und Sachen* approaches. In 1909, he published a large historical study of German bird names which is a model example of careful methodology. A prerequisite for this work was familiarity with the relevant ornithological details. Suolahti’s second major research domain was the influence of French on German, lexically and otherwise, in the early Middle Ages (Suolahti 1929, 1933). This laid the foundation of another Finnish school, that of German loan-word study. Suolahti was professor of Germanic philology from 1911 to 1941. He also displayed unusual organizational talent and was Rector of the University of Helsinki 1923-1926 and Chancellor 1926-1944, the longest term served by anyone in the twentieth century. Like Setälä, he was active in politics, serving as a member of Parliament from 1919 to 1921 and running for the presidency of Finland in 1925 as the official candidate of the conservative party.

Emil Öhmann (1894-1984) became the Grand Old Man of German studies in Finland in the twentieth century; see J. Korhonen (1995) for a summary of his career. He was a student of Suolahti, who not only provided the topic for his dissertation (1918), namely French loans in German 1100-1200, but also much of the empirical material, meticulously collected by Suolahti himself over more than a decade. Öhmann was appointed professor of German linguistics at the University of Turku in 1925 and professor of Germanic philology at the University of Helsinki in 1944. His influence on the shaping of German studies in Finland was immense.

Öhmann’s main field of research remained the influence of Romance on medieval German, especially in the form of loan-words. He also extended his loan-word studies to Romance influence on Dutch, the Scandinavian languages, and Russian. As a result of his work, the German department in Helsinki became the international center of German loan-word research from the 1940s up to the 1960s, known as “Die finnische Schule”, “Die Schule von Helsinki”, or simply “Die Öhmann-Schule”. When Kaj B. Lindgren studied in Zürich in 1951 and told his fellow students that the name of his professor was Öhmann, he got the reply “Doch nicht *Emil* Öhmann, der ganz große Mann?”, followed by the question why, in that case, did he want to come to Zürich to study (Lindgren 1985:133).

Öhmann did some philological work on text editions, but basically his approach was linguistic. He demonstrated (1924) that the German s-plural was not just a loan, as was widely believed, but existed in north-western German dialects. Unlike most Finnish philologists, Öhmann also took an interest in general linguistics. His inaugural lecture in Turku (1925) dealt with new directions in the study of modern

languages, cf. also his textbook in linguistics (1947, third edition 1964) which became a classic (5.3.2).

Before World War II, research on modern languages mainly meant research on German and French in Finland. As for English, Uno Lindelöf completed a number of text editions and inaugurated the study of Northumbrian dialects of Old English, but otherwise he did not publish much during the last decades of his career (4.6.2.). H. W. Donner (1904-1980), professor of English language and literature at Åbo Akademi University from 1937 to 1952, did research in English literature. World War II drastically altered the political and cultural situation in many countries, and English soon became a central foreign language in the Finnish school curriculum, German correspondingly losing ground, and English teaching and research at the university had to be expanded accordingly.

The University of Turku established a new professorship in English philology in 1946 to which Yrjö M. Biese (1903-1983) was appointed. Biese had a broad background in classical and modern languages as well as comparative Indo-European linguistics. His dissertation (1928) was on the absolute accusative construction in late Latin from a comparative point of view. In 1941 he published one of the first thorough studies of conversion as a means of English word-formation. Biese had an early interest in applied linguistics and language teaching. His English textbooks and grammars (e.g. 1930, 1931) were used for decades in several printings, and he also wrote teaching materials for Swedish.

Tauno F. Mustanoja (1912-1996), professor of English philology at the University of Helsinki from 1961 to 1975, continued Lindelöf's philological tradition, bringing further international recognition to his university. Mustanoja is known world-wide for his *Middle English Syntax* (1960), which, alongside Väänänen's (1962) introduction to Vulgar Latin, is the internationally best-known work written by a Finnish scholar in language studies. In the preface, Mustanoja states that the book "grew out of my desire to help the student of English literature to understand the language of writings in Middle English". This modest aim resulted in a 700-page volume, which has risen to the status of an authority on Middle English descriptive grammar, based on the author's solid knowledge of the written sources.

Nils Erik Enkvist (1925-, cf. 6.2.4. and 6.3.12.) became acting professor of English Language and Literature at Åbo Academy in 1952 and ordinarius in 1957. His early work, such as his doctoral thesis in 1952, was philological and literary in nature. Soon a gradual shift occurred via applied linguistics in the late 1950s and 1960s towards more general linguistics, especially stylistics and text linguistics in the 1970s. Enkvist introduced theoretical and applied linguistics in survey articles (1952, 1962b, 1964b), did applied linguistic work on comparing the English and Finnish vowel systems (1962a, 1963), and started his work on linguistic stylistics (1964a).

Generalizing over the fields of English, French, and German studies in Finland 1900-1965, we see that in all three there arose strong and internationally esteemed philological traditions, "Finnish schools". The negative consequence was that in the first half of the 1900s, there was a philological monopoly (Rissanen 1980:110). Influence from twentieth-century linguistics is not detectable to any significant extent prior to the late 1950s, despite occasional exceptions such as Tuulio. Söderhjelm and Wallensköld had been critical of neogrammarian doctrines and were interested, for example, in problems relating to language teaching, but such interests and attitudes "were overrun in the 1900s by research that was historical and increasingly dogmatic", as Heikki J. Hakkarainen (1980:19) puts it.

In Norway, Ingerid Dal wrote a diachronically oriented German syntax (1952), which was also widely used as a textbook outside the Nordic countries. Dal (1895-1985) was professor of Germanic philology in Oslo from 1939 to 1965. She first studied philosophy in Germany and then turned to Germanic philology, where her scholarly work dealt primarily with diachronic phonology and morphology.

The Norwegian linguist Leiv Flydal (1904-1983) was professor of French at *Norges Handelshøyskole* (Norway's College of Business Administration and Economics) in Bergen from 1955 to 1963 and of Romance languages in Oslo 1963-1971. Flydal wrote a number of studies in Romance philology which were clearly influenced by Hjelmslev's theory of glossematics (5.3.4.), e.g. his monograph on French temporal periphrases (1943) and his paper on liaison (1979). Most of his work is concerned with the linguistic sign

and with what makes linguistic signs different from other kinds of symbols. This is perhaps best illustrated in his study on human communication with animals (1957).

The best-known Swedish scholar in the field of English in this period was Eilert Ekwall (1877-1964). He studied in Uppsala and was professor in Lund for thirty-five years, 1907-1942. His rich production includes works on Shakespeare's vocabulary, the older pronunciation of English, and historical morphology and syntax. His *Historische neuenglische Laut- und Formenlehre* (1914, second edition 1922) was published in the well-known series *Sammlung Götschen*. He treated historical contact-linguistic phenomena in "Scandinavians and Celts in the North-West of England" (1918). He is probably best known for his studies in onomastics, for example *English River-names* (1928) and above all *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of English Place-names* (1936, third edition 1947), which gave him a leading role within this field. Ekwall was awarded an honorary doctorate by Oxford University in 1939.

The philological orientation of most Swedish language departments can be illustrated by Emanuel Walberg (1873-1951), who was professor of Romance languages in Lund 1910-1938. He grew up with language interests, as his father had been professor of Greek and his grandfather, E. M. Olde (4.6.2.), professor of Modern European Languages, both in Lund. Like some Finnish scholars mentioned above, Walberg also belonged to the enthusiastic group around Gaston Paris in Paris at the turn of the century. Walberg was respected for his careful editions and comments on medieval French texts, such as *La vie de Saint Thomas le martyr* (1922).

The first chair in Romance languages in Uppsala was established in 1890 and held by Per Adolf Geijer. The Uppsala scholars were also inspired by Gaston Paris. A number of professors of Romance languages, e.g. Erik Staaf, Johan Melander, and Paul Falk, stem from the Uppsala seminars, as do Johan Vising, Hilding Kjellman, and Karl Michaelson, who held the chair in Romance languages in Gothenburg, and Alf Lombard. Their language studies typically resulted in philological articles or editions, but also in diachronic studies of specific morphemes, words, or syntactic constructions in one or several of the Romance languages. This orientation was followed by Bengt Hasselrot (1910-), who after a short period as professor in Copenhagen, became professor in Uppsala in 1959.

Alf Lombard (1902-1996) was professor of Romance languages in Lund 1938-1996. He was born in Paris and had the advantage of knowing Russian in addition to the Romance languages. He worked in comparative Romance linguistics, but is best known for his work on Rumanian grammar, above all *Le verbe roumain. Étude morphologique* (1954-1955), which even brought him a prize from the Rumanian state.

Bertil Malmberg (5.3.3.) was also a well-known expert on Romance languages, particularly Spanish in Latin America.

5.7.2. Latin and Greek

The position and research profiles of other Indo-European languages at the universities underwent significant changes in this period. The classical languages Latin and Greek had to a great extent lost their position in the high schools, which also resulted in the gradual loss of students at the universities, perhaps less so in Finland than in the other Nordic countries. The research profile in the departments of classical languages was oriented towards philology, and linguistics played only a marginal role. One exception was the research on late Latin and vulgar Latin in Finland and Sweden and to some extent in Norway. A leading figure here was the Swede Einar Löfstedt (1880-1955), whose father had also been a classical scholar (4.6.1.). Löfstedt received his doctorate in 1907 in Uppsala (Löfstedt 1907) for a syntactic study of late Latin and was appointed professor in Lund in 1913. His dissertation and his numerous editions of late Latin texts contributed significantly to a new and better understanding of late Latin. His work actually marked the introduction of a new area of research, namely a philologically based, but strictly linguistically oriented study of late Latin with special emphasis on syntax in which sociolinguistic features were also taken into account, cf. Löfstedt (1959). Löfstedt created a Swedish school of international renown in the field of vulgar Latin:

Almost every page of the new edition of Leumann-Hofmann's grammar, published by Anton Szantyr in 1965, shows that Sweden has been leading in the field of Latin syntax and stylistics internationally and that an enormous amount of knowledge has been made available to scholars everywhere through the works of these three leaders [E. Löfstedt, Svennung, Norberg] and their pupils. (Lundström 1976:61)

Today the leading scholar of this school is Löfstedt's son, Bengt Löfstedt (1931-), professor at the University of California at Los Angeles and known for his many editions and studies of late Latin grammarians. Dag Norberg (1909-1996) was influential both as a professor of Latin in Stockholm 1948-1975 and as Rector of the University of Stockholm from 1966 to 1974. He focused on medieval Latin and tried to persuade his students that Latin was a living language.

In Finland, the study of Latin and Greek has been a fairly central concern throughout the twentieth century. Edwin Linkomies (5.2.5.) was professor of Latin from 1923 to 1963, but his scholarly career was more or less over before the age of thirty because of his administrative and political commitments. His main work (1929, written in Latin) concerns the absolute ablative construction.

A. H. Salenius (1884-1930) studied in the 1910s with Karl Brugmann in Leipzig, with Jacob Wackernagel in Göttingen, and with Einar Löfstedt in Lund. He was professor of Greek literature in Helsinki in the brief period 1929-1930. His syntactic and lexicological work (1920) on the Late Latin text family *Vitae Patrum* is one of the most cited Finnish contributions to classical studies.

Johannes Sundwall (1877-1966), professor of Ancient History, Greek, and Latin at Åbo Akademi University 1921-1945, studied in Berlin from 1912 to 1915, but became trapped there during World War I. He participated in the activist movement in Germany, working for Finland's independence. For decades following 1914, he worked on Cretan (Minoan) scripts, both Linear A and Linear B, e.g. Sundwall (1915, 1931, 1957). He used a contextual method, trying to understand the contents of the inscriptions by analyzing the structure of the tablets they were inscribed on. When Michael Ventris deciphered Linear B in 1952 and showed that the language had to be a form of early Greek, most of Sundwall's work on Linear B turned out to have been on the wrong track.

Veikko Väänänen (1905-1997) worked as assistant professor of classical philology in Helsinki from 1938 and as professor of Romance philology 1951-1972. He has become widely known as an expert on Vulgar Latin and has written two of the internationally best-known studies ever produced by Finnish linguists. Väänänen studied under and was strongly influenced by Linkomies, Långfors, and Tuulio. In the 1930s, he also studied in Paris, Montpellier, and Naples. His dissertation (1937) was on the inscriptions uncovered during the lengthy excavations of Pompeii and Herculaneum. Väänänen wanted to shed light on the nature of everyday Latin based on the available data. A wealth of inscriptions had been found that were not literary, official book-keeping records or the like, but which were more casual writings about actual situations from everyday life, such as messages about what slaves got to eat, the date of birth of a donkey, love letters, etc. The impact of Väänänen's dissertation is also witnessed by the fact that two further printings have appeared, published by the Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin (3rd edition, Väänänen 1966).

However, Väänänen's most used and cited work is his *Introduction au latin vulgaire* (1962, 3rd edition 1981), an elaboration of his doctoral dissertation, also translated into Italian and Spanish. Väänänen views the evolution of Latin into the current Romance languages as an uninterrupted historical continuum through late Antiquity and the Middle Ages, in which the study of vernacular features is especially significant. Latin in its later phases is not the same as the homogeneous usage of the great classical authors, but subject to local, social, and other types of variation and innovation, ultimately leading to present-day Romance differentiation. Väänänen (1962) presents a detailed survey of the sources of Vulgar Latin (mostly medieval grammars, glossaries, inscriptions, studies on history, chronicles, etc.) and detailed surveys of the development of phonology, word formation, inflection, and syntax.

Perhaps the most innovative Latin grammar of this period was published by the Danish professor of Iranian languages Kaj Barr (5.7.3.). Barr's grammar (1957) is based on an eclectic but modern linguistic

approach, combined with philological precision and the author's deep knowledge of comparative Indo-European linguistics. The grammar is not less original and unique when we consider that it was designed as an elementary grammar for pharmacists learning to read medical prescriptions. As a pedagogical endeavor it must have failed its original purpose, and the linguists who would have been capable of benefitting from it hardly ever became aware of its existence.

5.7.3. Indo-Iranian Languages

Another classical field was Indo-Iranian, where there were endeavors, especially in Denmark and Norway, to study the modern languages. In Denmark, studies of Indic languages had been and still are focused on Pali (4.6.3.). With the work of Hans Hendriksen (5.5.1.) a more purely linguistic approach reappeared. Hendriksen was educated in comparative Indo-European linguistics under Holger Pedersen. His first contribution was on historical Hittite and Indo-European phonology (Hendriksen 1941, cf. 5.5.1.), an important and innovative work at the time. Hendriksen also worked on Pali and a number of modern Indic languages.

Arthur Christensen (1875-1945) was appointed the first professor of Iranian at the University of Copenhagen in 1919, and although he mainly worked on Middle Iranian, he also made significant contributions to the study of modern Persian and Ossete. His successor was Kaj Barr (1896-1970), who was educated in classical philology, but well-read in comparative Indo-European linguistics. Barr published little on Iranian languages and little in general. His most important linguistic publication was his grammar of Latin (5.7.2.). Although few, if any, of his publications had any influence, Barr was an important person in Danish linguistics, known for his almost encyclopedic knowledge, which he frequently shared with colleagues in the company of good food and drink late into the night. He was one of the founding members of the Linguistic Circle in Copenhagen, but he left the Circle when he was not appointed Hjelmslev's successor in Aarhus.

In Norway, Sten Konow (1867-1948) was the first professor of Indic philology, from 1910 to 1937, during which time he was also professor in Hamburg for five years and carried out various scientific projects for the British government in England and India. Most of Konow's publications are on literature, history, and religion. His most important contributions to linguistics were the *Linguistic Survey of India* and his posthumously published grammar of the newly discovered Middle Iranian language Khotanese (Konow 1949). After his retirement, Konow played an important role in the decipherment of the Khotanese manuscripts found in the early part of this century in Central Asia. His grammar is a masterly first presentation of the language, forming a basis for later studies.

Konow's successor and son-in-law, Georg Valentin von Munthe af Morgenstierne (1892-1978) became professor in Gothenburg in 1930 and in Oslo after Konow in 1937. Morgenstierne's special field of research was Pashto, Farsi, and the Indo-Iranian frontier languages in Northern Pakistan and Afghanistan. Most of these latter languages, which constitute an intermediate group between Iranian and Indo-Aryan languages, were more or less undescribed until Morgenstierne set out on some daring, soon to become legendary field trips in the 1920s (Morgenstierne 1926). The mass of material he collected on these field trips, which he continued to undertake until late in life, is found mainly in his publications from 1929 to 1967 and in 1973 as well as in scattered articles and monographs.

Morgenstierne studied in Germany and was well versed in comparative Indo-European linguistics. He made important contributions to the diachronic investigation of Iranian languages (e.g. 1927). He was also well-read in contemporary theoretical linguistics and knew both structuralism and glossematics intimately. But in practice, his descriptive contributions and his fieldwork methods are somewhat superficial. He often gathered his materials quickly, and informant sessions could simply consist of a short ride on a local bus where notes taken down from fellow passengers formed the basis of a sketch of their dialect.

In Sweden, Hans Samuel Nyberg (1889-1974), professor in Uppsala 1931-1956, published some internationally significant books on the Middle Iranian language Pahlavi (Nyberg 1928-1931, 1964-1974),

although his main field of interest was the study of religion. Nyberg's interesting life as a famous scholar has been described in the biography written by his daughter Sigrid Kahle (1991).

Nils Simonsson (1920-), professor of Indic philology in Oslo 1963-1975 and of Sanskrit and comparative linguistics in Uppsala 1975-1985, published several important studies on translation techniques in India and Tibet.

Sten Wikander (1908-1983), professor of Sanskrit and comparative linguistics in Uppsala from 1953, was mainly occupied with religious and cultural history. Towards the end of his career, he started work on a speculative and not very convincing comparative analysis of Indo-European and several Meso-American languages. He was also one of the founders of the journal *Studia linguistica* (5.2.3.).

This is also the place to mention the versatile Norwegian linguist Ragnvald Iversen (1882-1960), professor of Norwegian at *Norges Lærerhøgskole* (Teachers' College of Norway) in Trondheim from 1922 to 1952. Iversen published the most widely used Norwegian grammar of Old Norse in the twentieth century (5.6.1.5.) and also an innovative study of the history of the Norwegian language in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries (5.6.2.4.). He was actively involved in several lexicographic projects. Furthermore, he published three volumes on the Gypsy languages in Norway (1944, 1945, 1950). Iversen managed to save from oblivion an astonishing quantity of lexical and cultural material, which has been invaluable for the few Norwegian linguists (with Knut Kristiansen (1928-) as the main instigator) who began studying the Gypsy languages and collecting texts in the 1980s. Furthermore, Iversen also conducted research in another neglected field, namely the relicts of the language of the Finnish immigrants in Southern Norway (Iversen 1959) although the last study is weak, not least because of Iversen's insufficient command of Finnish.

Both the study of Gypsy languages and the study of Finnish in Southern Norway are representative of the all-too-frequent phenomenon in linguistics that linguists neglect research in important and interesting areas lying right on their own doorsteps.

5.7.4. Slavic Languages

Slavic studies were strongly represented at all the major Nordic universities after 1900. This probably represents one of the most significant changes in the structure of the humanities in this period.

In Sweden, J. A. Lundell (4.6.4.) had educated a group of prominent Slavic scholars, among them Sigurd Agrell (4.6.4.), professor in Lund, and Lundell's successor, Richard Ekblom (4.6.4.). The descriptive morphosyntactic studies of these two scholars put Slavic linguistic studies in Sweden on the international map. Agrell's work on aspect (1908) is an example of the aspectual studies that became a major theme in Swedish Slavic linguistics, with special focus on the study of Polish and Russian. Ekblom published a brief but widely used grammar of Russian (1911) and a number of pioneering phonetic studies of the Slavic and Baltic languages.

In Norway, Slavic studies were dominated by Olaf Broch (4.6.4. and 5.4.), professor of Slavic languages from 1900 to 1937. Internationally, he was the best known Slavic scholar along with the Finnish comparativist J. J. Mikkola. Broch's international reputation was mainly based on his *Slavische Phonetik* (1911), which was the leading international textbook in the field for a long time. Broch also published a number of descriptive studies of the Slavic languages. His early studies of contact and mutual influence among the Slavic languages are of particular significance. Broch was as much a phonetician as a Slavic scholar, and he also made important contributions to general and Norwegian phonetics (O. Broch 1923).

Broch's successor was Christian Schweigaard Stang (5.5.1.), professor of Slavic languages 1938-1970. Stang did fieldwork in Lithuania and published studies of Lithuanian dialects and Old Baltic texts. But his main field of research was historical and comparative studies of the Baltic and Slavic languages (5.5.1.).

In Finland, the chair in Russian language and literature at the University of Helsinki was abolished in 1919 (5.2.1.). This was partly compensated for by the transformation of J. J. Mikkola's personal chair of Slavic philology (extraordinarius since 1900) into a full professorship in 1921. Mikkola (1866-1946; cf.

4.6.4. and 5.5.1.) held this chair until 1934. He consolidated his position as a leading international Slavic scholar after the publication of the first part of *Urslavische Grammatik* (1913), which treated vowels and accentuation. Part II on consonants was published in 1942, and part III on morphology posthumously in 1950. These volumes became a standard reference work on Old Slavic. Mikkola was one of the early editors of the journal *Wörter und Sachen*. Another indication of the international appreciation of his work is the fact that the University of Leipzig made him an offer to become the successor of August Leskien (1840-1916), the leading neogrammarian theorist and Slavic scholar. Mikkola declined the offer, because he wanted to stay in Finland, one reason being that his wife was Maila Talvio, an influential novelist and cultural activist.

Another outstanding Finnish Slavic and Baltic scholar, who originally came from St. Petersburg, was Valentin Kiparsky (1904-1983). Kiparsky is said to have had a fluent command of no less than fourteen languages, including all the Slavic languages. He was a productive scholar, publishing some 400 scholarly writings (in sixteen different languages), among these nine major monographs. The chair of Russian language and literature at the University of Helsinki was reestablished after World War II, and Kiparsky was appointed in 1947. In 1958, the Freie Universität Berlin offered Kiparsky the chair of Slavic philology after Max Vasmer (1886-1962). Kiparsky accepted the offer and taught in Berlin until 1963, when he returned to Helsinki and was appointed to Mikkola's Slavic chair, which had been held by Eino Nieminen (1891-1962) in the period 1952-1961.

Kiparsky's dissertation (1934) dealt with Germanic loan-words in Slavic, using a strict methodology and discarding as potential loans all those words whose phonological history could be interpreted internally in Slavic. Both Mikkola and Karsten found Kiparsky's method too conservative. Kiparsky's magnum opus is his *Russische historische Grammatik* in three parts, totaling more than 800 pages. Part I on the development of the sound system appeared in 1963, part II on the development of morphology in 1967, and part III on the development of the vocabulary in 1975. Part I (1963) is linguistically the most significant. Kiparsky describes the development of the sound system using phonological principles that he had already familiarized himself with in the early 1930s when studying in Prague, and which he had written an article on in 1932 (5.3.5.). This volume (1963) is the first systematic phonological study written by a Finnish linguist.

Interest in Russian and Slavic studies among Finnish students was at a low ebb between 1940 and 1970. An acute need of young Slavic scholars arose in the 1950s, illustrated by the fact that the Russian chair in Helsinki was vacant from 1958 to 1967.

After Karl Verner died, Holger Pedersen took care of the teaching of Slavic languages in Copenhagen for a while. He had spent some time in Moscow and had learned Russian there, publishing a number of comparative studies on Slavic languages, but also a descriptive grammar of Russian (H. Pedersen 1916b).

An important theme in Danish Slavic studies in the twentieth century has been the study of the Norse influence on the language, culture, and politics of the early Russian state.

From the point of view of general linguistics, one of the most important studies in Slavic studies in the Nordic countries in this period is Gunnar Bech's brief study of the Czech subjunctive with an appendix on the subjunctive in Russian (1951). This is basically a structuralist work without being directly linked to any specific version of structuralism (glossematics included). What makes it unique is that it applies structuralist principles to the analysis of syntactic phenomena.

5.7.5. Celtic Languages

The study of the Celtic languages was a new field of research which was actively cultivated in Norway and actually became the central field in Norwegian linguistics, undoubtedly as a consequence of the rise of Norwegian nationalism. In the Viking Age, much of the Celtic-speaking world had been under Norwegian rule for a shorter or longer time. Serious scholarly interest in Norway in the Celtic-speaking area was initiated, significantly enough, by the historian Alexander Bugge (1870-1929), the son of Sophus Bugge (4.4.1.). Later on, the folklorist Reidar Christiansen (1886-1971), who was well-versed in Irish, conducted extensive fieldwork in Ireland, an example of the breadth of the Norwegian scholarly engagement in this area.

The linguistic study of Irish was initiated in Norway by Carl Marstrand (1887-1965), who was appointed to a professorship in Dublin in 1909 and held a personal professorship in Celtic languages in Oslo 1913-1954. Marstrand, who was educated in the neogrammarian tradition, was a versatile scholar. He published on comparative Indo-European linguistics and was one of the first to study the newly discovered Indo-European language Hittite from a comparative point of view. Furthermore, he was the leading Norwegian specialist on the Runic script and its origin (4.5.7. and 5.6.5.).

The central topic in Marstrand's Celtic studies was the influence of Old Norse on Celtic languages as shown in loan-words and place-names (Marstrand 1915). One of his main achievements was the influence he exerted in educating a whole group of Norwegian Celtic scholars, among them Sommerfelt and Borgstrøm, who later became experts in this field. Most of these scholars also continued his research on Norse place-names in the British Isles and on additional traces of Norwegian influence on Celtic. In addition, they brought the new structuralist methods of descriptive linguistics to the study of Celtic dialectology. Marstrand was theoretically traditional in his own work, but he had an open mind towards new approaches and theories among his former students and as the editor of *Norsk Tidsskrift for Sprogvidenskap* (Norwegian Journal of Linguistics, 5.2.3.).

Alf Sommerfelt (5.3.1.) was also a leading Celtic scholar and published several historical-comparative as well as descriptive studies of various Celtic languages (e.g. 1922, 1962:311-369). Even more important are Borgstrøm's (5.3.1. and 5.5.1.) two dialect monographs on the Gaelic dialects of the Hebrides (1940, 1941). These descriptions contain both a diachronic and a structural synchronic phonology and a morphology that is mainly synchronic, but there is no syntax. Emphasis is placed on phonetic accuracy. The best Norwegian descriptive study of a Gaelic dialect is Magne Oftedal's (5.3.1.) description of the dialect of Leurbost Isle of Lewis (1956). It contains a well-organized, thorough, and detailed phonology and morphology, arrived at by means of a basically structural approach. Oftedal was appointed professor of Celtic languages after Marstrand in 1957.

Outside Norway, interest in Celtic studies was more sporadic. In Denmark, Celtic was one of Holger Pedersen's (5.5.1.) specialties, and he wrote a comparative Celtic grammar that is still a basic reference work in the field (H. Pedersen 1909-1913).

Sweden had one Celtic scholar of high international status, Nils Holmer (5.7.9.), who worked together with Marstrand. On the basis of intensive fieldwork, Holmer published some useful sketches of Irish and especially of Gaelic dialects, beginning in 1938. Holmer's Celtic studies consist both of articles on historical-comparative problems as well as of five larger dialect monographs. His studies are innovative in their careful phonetic representation, thus documenting his competence in fieldwork, and they provided a useful foundation for the dialect monographs of Borgstrøm and Oftedal, cf. above.

5.7.6. Semitic, Turkic, and Mongolian Languages

At the beginning of the twentieth century, Assyrian studies dominated the field of Semitic studies in Denmark, Finland, and Norway, while in Sweden traditional Arabic philology still retained a dominant position (4.7.2.). The Dane Otto E. Ravn (1881-1952), professor in Copenhagen from 1937, made internationally recognized contributions to Assyrian philology and to the study of linguistic aspects of the cuneiform texts. Ravn's pupil, Thorkild Jacobsen (1904-), became one of the world's leading experts on Babylonian-Assyrian and has also produced a number of studies on Mesopotamian linguistic texts and linguistic methods. Jacobsen has been in the United States since 1927, serving as professor both at the University of Chicago (from 1942) and Harvard University (from 1962).

The field of Assyriology was introduced into Finland by Knut Tallqvist (4.7.2.), professor of Oriental literature 1899-1933. Tallqvist had studied under the leading assyriologist Friedrich Delitzsch in Leipzig in 1888-1889. Helsinki was the first of the Nordic universities to establish a teaching position in Assyriology, a position as lecturer in 1891, to which Tallqvist was appointed. Tallqvist wrote extensively on Assyrian and Babylonian onomastics and lexicology.

Harri Holma (1886-1954) was a diplomat, Finland's ambassador to Germany from 1921, France, Belgium, and Luxembourg from 1927, and Italy from 1947. Throughout his life, he was also a devoted assyriologist. His dissertation (1913) was on words for parts of the human body in Assyrian and Babylonian, where he broke new ground in the analysis of word formation. His profession allowed him to travel frequently and to follow the results of the excavations in various parts of the Middle East, and he brought his knowledge back to scholarly colleagues in Finland.

Jussi Aro (1928-1983) began his career as an assyriologist, but later turned to Semitic studies, especially Arabic. He was professor of Oriental literature at the University of Helsinki from 1965. Tallqvist, Holma, and Aro all worked actively in introducing the Oriental world, Islam, and Arabic as well as other Semitic languages to the general public in Finland. Holma's work of 1943, for example, was a widely read introduction to the prophet Muhammed that was translated into Swedish and French, and Aro's textbook *Arabiaa ilman kyneleitä* (Arabic without Tears, 1980) was a useful introduction to Modern Arabic.

Harris Birkeland (5.3.1.), professor of Semitic languages in Oslo from 1948 to 1961, was a pioneer in introducing structural linguistics to Semitic studies, particularly by way of his studies of Arabic and Hebrew phonology (1940a,b). He also published some valuable contributions to Arabic dialectology.

The leading Swedish scholar in Semitic studies in this period is Fritjof Rundgren (1921-), professor of Semitic languages at the University of Uppsala. He is mainly known for his studies of aspect and the verbal system of various Semitic languages.

The study of Turkic languages was another field cultivated in all four continental Nordic countries, but to varying degrees and in different ways. It was also a field with no regular professorships, although in all countries except Norway, professors (extraordinarius) or lecturers in Turkic, and sometimes Mongolian, were appointed in this period.

Turkic studies in Denmark have a strange history. They began with Thomsen's decipherment of the Orkhon inscriptions (4.7.1.). Later, Vilhelm Grønbech (1873-1948), professor of the history of religion, wrote his dissertation on comparative Turkic phonology (1902), his only contribution to Turkic studies and linguistics. Being written in Danish, this work had no international impact, but it was a strange and remarkable book covering a wealth of topics. In spite of its superficiality and inconsistency from a methodological point of view, it is a fascinating work, full of ideas and suggestions that touch upon fundamental aspects of historical Turkic phonology. Many of the topics Grønbech discussed were not taken up by Turkic scholars until the latter part of the twentieth century.

Grønbech did not argue against the neogrammarian doctrine, but in practice he violated many of the basic tenets of the theory, so much so that Holger Pedersen (5.5.1.) wrote a devastating critique of his work (H. Pedersen 1903). But Pedersen is also constructive in his critique and used his own methodological

sophistication to reveal some basic features of the subclassification of the Turkic languages, for example the position of Chuvash as an independent, but not necessarily archaic, branch of Turkic. Like most neogrammarians, however, he shared the belief that phonetics could explain everything. In the case of vowel harmony, his solution is not accepted today, based as it was on questionable phonetic hypotheses.

If it was a surprise to see Vilhelm Grønbech as a Turkic scholar, it was at least equally surprising to see his son, Kaare Grønbech (1901-1957), submit a dissertation on the structure of the Turkic languages (1936). Kaare Grønbech had studied English and German and was a high school teacher. His dissertation, written in German, had a fate very different from that of his father. As soon as it was published, he was immediately recognized as a leading international Turkic scholar, and his subsequent editions of older linguistic monuments and texts (e.g. of Cuman, a Turkic language known only from medieval documents), his textbook of classical Mongolian, and his expeditions and international organizational work served to increase this initial respect and admiration.

His doctoral dissertation is his main linguistic work, however. Although not well known among linguists, it represents an important contribution to linguistic typology and language description. Grønbech undoubtedly knew contemporary linguistics well and was, of course, familiar with the theories of prominent linguists like Jespersen and Hjelmslev, but his book is an attempt, not founded on any linguistic theory, to explain the structure of the Turkic languages, trying to avoid interference from a priori linguistic classification and especially from the traditional categories of Latin grammar. His conclusion is that the morphological categories and the syntactic structure of Turkic are fundamentally different from those of Indo-European.

The publication of the decipherment of the Orkhon inscriptions (4.7.1.) caused Turkic and Altaic studies to gain a firm foothold in Finland. With names like Gustaf John Ramstedt (1873-1950), Heikki Paasonen (4.7.1.), and Martti Räsänen (1893-1976), this field became the most renowned area of Finnish linguistics internationally in the first half of the twentieth century.

Ramstedt was inspired by Otto Donner (4.4.2.) to carry out the latter's plans (in the spirit of M. A. Castrén) for linguistic and archeological fieldwork in Mongolia and adjacent areas. Ramstedt made his first field trip in 1898-1901 and found a number of important Turkic runic inscriptions, among them the famous Toñuquq inscription. He also became the world's leading expert on Mongolian languages, especially Mongolian dialectology, a field that had not really been investigated since Castrén's work on Buryat. Ramstedt published numerous collections of oral texts and a Kalmuk dictionary (Ramstedt 1935), which became an invaluable tool for later comparative Mongolian linguistics.

Ramstedt's dissertation (1902) had already revolutionized Mongolian studies in being based on an accurate phonetic transcription. This achievement was even more impressive since almost all of his notes had been stolen at the railway station in Kansk on his way back from Mongolia in 1901. Thus he had to write his dissertation largely from memory. Furthermore, he managed to provide a much more adequate analysis of the Mongolian verbal system than had previously existed. His second study (1903) laid the foundation for the diachronic study of Mongolian.

During the following years, Ramstedt made numerous field trips to Siberia, especially to areas where Mongolian was spoken. When in Finland, he worked as a teacher in the city of Lahti, and from 1906 he also lectured at the University of Helsinki. In 1917, he was finally appointed to a chair (extraordinarius) in Altaic Linguistics, which he held until 1941. In 1919, he became Finnish chargé d'affaires in Tokyo, with accreditation in China and Siam (Thailand) as well. He remained in this office until 1930, and at this point began learning first Japanese, and then Korean (from some Koreans visiting the Finnish Legation). This changed the direction of his research. His Korean and Japanese studies not only resulted in the first modern grammatical description of Korean (1939, a bestseller, bought in great numbers by the U.S. Army during the Korean war in the early 1950s), but they also stimulated his comparative Altaic studies. When he began learning Korean, he found a number of lexical similarities with Turkic, Mongolian, and Tungusic languages. This resulted not only in his assumption that there was an Altaic language phylum consisting of Turkic,

Mongolian, and Tungusic languages, but that Korean was also part of this phylum. His theory was published posthumously (1952-1966), but parts of it had already appeared, for example in his highly debated work on Korean etymologies (1949). Ramstedt himself said that he would be content if just half of the proposed etymologies turned out to be correct (Räsänen 1952:87).

Few present-day scholars accept Ramstedt's comparative theory (cf. 5.5.2., Janhunen 1984), but his descriptive studies are still ranked as classics. His opponent at the doctoral disputation, E. N. Setälä, appropriately said that "the author had the instinct of a real scholar. If methodologically schooled he could have made remarkable achievements. His critical sense was, however, often less marked than the richness of his ideas." (Aalto 1971:104). For the most part, Ramstedt stayed outside university life and was thus never properly cast in the academic mold.

Martti Räsänen (1893-1976), professor of Turkic philology in Helsinki from 1944, became an international expert on the historical-comparative study of the Turkic languages. Besides important studies on the lexical contact between the Finno-Ugric and Turkic languages and equally important collections of dialect texts from Anatolia (1934-1942), his main contributions are his comparative phonology (1949) and morphology (1957) of the Turkic languages. These studies are unsurpassed even today with regard to their systematic nature and wealth of data.

Loan-word research has also been a central topic within the broad framework of Uralic studies. Aulis J. Joki (1913-1989), professor of Finno-Ugric linguistics at the University of Helsinki from 1965 to 1977, published Kai Donner's Kamas Samoyed material (1944) and in the process became an expert on Samoyed languages. Joki's dissertation (1952) treated the loan-words, especially in Kamas. Joki had familiarized himself with several Turkic, Mongolian, and Tungusic languages. He demonstrated the strong lexical influence of Turkic on Kamas, showing that it occasionally reached the level of language mixing. These results were also used to shed light on the cultural contacts and prehistory of the peoples involved. Joki's approach in this and other studies could appropriately be labeled ethnolinguistic.

An account of the Finnish fieldwork tradition would not be complete without mention of the trip made on horseback in 1906-1908 by the future Field Marshal and President of Finland, Carl Gustaf Mannerheim (1867-1951), from Andijin, the terminal of the Turkestan railway, to Kalgan close to Peking. The ride took two years and covered 14,000 kilometers. Mannerheim was not a linguist, but he had a good practical command of several languages, including Kirgiz and Chinese, and he took some accurate and useful linguistic notes on this trip, for example of the language of the so-called Yellow Uigurs (Aalto 1971:116). Mannerheim also collected ancient texts and brought back manuscripts written in Saka, an extinct Northern Aryan language until then unknown in the West.

In Sweden and Norway, the study of Turkic languages was more sporadic and in each case limited to one person. In Sweden, Gunnar Jarring (1907-), who became lecturer in Turkic in Lund in 1933, published numerous texts and vocabularies of the little known Turkic languages of Sinkiang and Central Asia, based on fieldwork in the area. But in 1940, Jarring joined the Swedish diplomatic service and soon became a famous international diplomat, to the great loss of Swedish Turkic studies. In Norway, Konrad Nielsen (5.6.1.6.) published a contribution to the little researched field of Turkic phonology and prosody (1945).

5.7.7. Languages of East and South Asia

The best-known international Swedish linguist of this period is probably Bernhard Karlgren (1880-1978), who became famous for his reconstruction of Archaic Chinese on the basis of modern Chinese dialects, thereby successfully applying the neogrammarian methodology to data of a different character than was found in the Indo-European languages. Equally remarkable was his discovery that Archaic Chinese was not an isolating, but an inflectional language. Karlgren's life and scholarly achievements have been described in detail by Malmkvist (1995).

Karlgren studied Scandinavian and Slavic languages in Uppsala and in 1909-1911 stayed in China,

where he investigated a number of dialects and wrote the studies that made up his thesis (Karlgren 1915). He was appointed professor of East Asian languages at the University of Gothenburg in 1918, but he also taught in Stockholm, serving as director of the Museum of Far Eastern Antiquities. It is significant that the professorship in Chinese in Gothenburg was based on private funding, mainly from shipowners.

Karlgren's reconstruction of Archaic Chinese made it possible to emend the editions of various ancient texts and to show that Chinese had previously undergone morphological processes such as Ablaut, Umlaut, and affixation. The most important work presenting the results of his research is his study of 1940, but he also published a number of more popular books (e.g. 1926, 1946) that attracted many readers, not only linguists. Karlgren's reconstructions were to a large extent based on his own fieldwork, resulting in accurate phonetic transcriptions of lexical material from twenty-four different dialects. Karlgren had been trained by Swedish dialectologists, especially Lundell (4.6.4.), and he used Lundell's phonetic alphabet in his fieldwork in China, a notational system which proved to be fairly well-suited for accurately representing the sounds of the Chinese dialects.

Karlgren's reconstructions of Archaic Chinese were not accepted by all scholars in the field. When structuralist phonemics entered the arena, Karlgren was criticized by several American linguists for making the reconstructions too complicated by including phonetic distinctions of no phonemic significance. Karlgren reacted strongly against this criticism, and like his former colleagues, the Swedish dialectologists, he was negative in principle towards structuralism, cf. Egerod (1980). Karlgren also made significant contributions to Chinese lexicography and cultural history.

In Denmark, Kurt Wulff (1881-1939) was a strange, even unique linguist (cf. Egerod 1992:715-730 for a more detailed description). He began his studies in classical philology, then turned to Austronesian languages, and then to the relationship between the Austronesian and Sino-Tibetan languages, especially the relationship between Thai and Austronesian (Wulff 1934, 1942). His theories are speculative, however, and his comparisons are methodologically sloppy, operating with a flexible pre-neogrammarian system of sound correspondences, when he bothered to give such correspondences at all. He laid the foundation for the teaching of both Chinese and Malay in Copenhagen, where he was the first to lecture on the languages of East Asia. Wulff also worked with Thomsen on the Old Turkic inscriptions, but he never got his research published. He worked mainly as a university librarian and part-time university teacher.

Søren Egerod (1923-1995) was appointed to a new professorship in East Asiatic languages in Copenhagen in 1958. His research was focused on Chinese dialect phonology (1956). Later he worked on Atayal, a Formosan language and member of the Austronesian language family.

One of the largest language families on earth, the Austronesian family has never been subjected to much research in the Nordic countries, and even today (1998) there is no university post for this language family. A lot of research has been devoted to Austronesian languages since 1965 (6.7.2.), but before this, there was (with the exception of Kurt Wulff, cf. above) only one linguist of any significance working in this field, namely the Norwegian Otto Chr. Dahl (1903-1995).

Dahl lived in Madagascar for thirty years as a missionary and spoke several dialects of Malagassy fluently. He studied linguistics under Alf Sommerfelt and under the famous Austronesian scholar Otto Dempwolff in Hamburg. In 1951 Dahl published his dissertation, which convincingly showed that Malagassy is closely related to the Ma'anjan language of Northern Borneo, thereby clarifying an important point in the history of immigration to Madagascar. The work of this grand old man of Austronesian studies belongs, however, to the period after 1965 (6.7.2.).

5.7.8. Kalaallisut

The study of Kalaallisut had been severely neglected in Denmark in the nineteenth century (4.7.3.). In 1929, the first chair in Eskimo languages was established in Copenhagen. The first professor, William Thalbitzer (1873-1958), published a number of valuable studies (e.g. 1904, 1911), but he also had some strange ideas, for example concerning the nominal character of the Eskimo languages. But since his views were published in a widely read international handbook of high reputation, they had a disproportionate influence, although hardly any specialist on the language today would subscribe to his vague and speculative observations:

...we get the impression that to the Eskimo mind the nominal concept of the phenomena of life is predominant. The verbal idea has not emancipated itself from the idea of things that may be owned, or which are substantial. Anything that can be named and described in words, all real things, actions, ideas, resting or moving, personal or impersonal, are subject to one and the same kind of observation and expression. We are accustomed to conceive activities or qualities as essentially different from the things in themselves, and we have a special class of words (viz., the verbs) to express them. They seem to impress the Eskimo mind, or to be reflected by it, as definite phenomena of the same kind as the things, and accordingly are named and interpreted by means of the same class of terms as are used for naming things. The Eskimo verb merely forms a sub-class of nouns (Thalbitzer 1911:1059)

The Indo-Europeanist and professor of German L. L. Hammerich (5.5.1.) worked with Thalbitzer and contributed, in particular, to Eskimo etymological studies (1936).

The descriptive study of Kalaallisut reached a milestone in Kleinschmidt's work (1851, cf. 4.7.3.), and a hundred years later, a new foundation was laid by Knut Bergsland (1955). Although Bergsland's book was never really published (only some mimeographed copies and a later Swiss pirate copy exist), it forms the basis of practically all later studies on the grammar of Kalaallisut as well as of other Eskimo languages.

When he wrote the grammar, Bergsland (5.3.1. and 5.6.1.6.) was familiar with all the major new theories of linguistics as well as with a number of typologically different languages. He managed to apply all this knowledge in an eclectic way to produce a short but insightful description of Kalaallisut, a work that is referred to in all linguistic studies of Eskimo languages after 1955. It is deplorable that this book, which touches on many typological and theoretical questions, is inaccessible to most linguists today simply because of the lack of copies.

In 1949-1950, Bergsland spent a year as visiting professor at Indiana University in Bloomington, during which time he visited the Aleutian Islands. Their language became his main field of research after 1965, resulting in a large collection of Aleut texts (Bergsland and Dirks 1990), a comprehensive dictionary (1994) and a reference grammar (1997). As early as the 1950s and 1960s he had produced several small articles mainly focusing on the genetic relationship between Eskimo and Aleut. The hypothesis claiming such a genetic relationship had already been put forward by Rasmus Rask, but Bergsland proved it beyond any doubt. In 1959, his collection of Aleut texts appeared (Bergsland 1959b), thus facilitating an analysis of several aspects of Aleut language structure, a structure that in some respects, for example anaphoric reference and sentence construction, deviates from most other human languages and accordingly is of general interest to linguists.

5.7.9. Caucasian and American Indian Languages

Data from the morphologically complex Caucasian languages interested many of the leading linguists of this century, among them Louis Hjelmslev and Nikolaj Sergejevič Trubetzkoy. One of the founders of the modern study of the Caucasian languages was Hans Vogt (5.3.1.). Using material gathered during his stay in Tbilisi for over a year, Vogt published his grammar of Georgian (1938, 1971), which became the standard international grammar of Georgian for a long time. This work was also one of the few theoretically up-to-date descriptions of a non-Indo-European language available to linguists at that time. Later on, Vogt published numerous studies on Modern and Old Georgian linguistics as well as contributions to the investigation of Armenian, an Indo-European language also spoken in the Caucasus area. Besides clarifying some fundamental aspects of Old Armenian syntax and comparative phonology, he published several studies on language contact in the Caucasus, cf. Vogt (1988).

Another of Vogt's important achievements is his dictionary of the North Caucasian language Ubykh (1963). This language was considered dead, but with the help of the French expert on Caucasian languages, Georges Dumézil, Vogt managed to locate a few old speakers in a village in Turkey. Ubykh has one of the largest inventories of phonemes known in natural languages, according to Vogt eighty-three or eighty-four. It was excellently described by Vogt under difficult circumstances. Here is his own description, which also says a lot about his attitude towards his descriptive work:

In the village, during the day, I sat out in the garden with my sixty-year-old informant Halil Ural. In the evening we sat on low benches along the walls of an earthen hut, in the light of a lone gas lantern, the old Ubykhs drifting in one by one in the semidarkness to seat themselves, always in places according to age and dignity. Unfortunately, because of this, I always got the most dignified, oldest, and deafest next to me. Many discussions were held among the members of this little senate on the finer points of the language, which they only now for the first time had begun to think about, and which now was to be saved, if not from extinction, at least from being forgotten by history. That scholars should come from afar to preserve treasures which they alone, of the entire world, had known, clearly reinforced their feelings of self worth. (Vogt 1988:456)

Vogt even brought one of the informants to Norway and worked with him in an isolated hotel in Flisa in the Eastern part of Norway. Since the book appeared at the same time as the emergence of generative phonology, it also had a certain impact on international phonological theory at the time.

Vogt's grammar of the North American indigenous language Kalispel (1940) is the result of intensive fieldwork. In the summer of 1937, he worked for eleven weeks in the small community of Kalispel speakers (about 600) in the state of Washington. The language belongs to the Salish family of languages on the coast of British Columbia and the Northwestern United States. These languages still baffle linguists with their complexity and peculiarities in almost all components of the grammar: a large inventory of phonemes, an almost complete lack of distinctions between basic lexical categories such as verb and noun, a great number of derivational suffixes of a lexical nature, in many cases a unique semantic categorization, etc.

Vogt had a broad knowledge of linguistic methods, and he mastered both the neogrammarian historical-comparative method as well as the various forms of structuralism. In his descriptive studies, he applied an eclectic and undogmatic version of structuralism containing elements from Saussure, the Prague Circle, and glossematics. Vogt attended high school in France and also studied linguistics for a long time in Paris. This underlying French influence was obvious, but it was modified through Vogt's contacts with American structuralism in the 1930s and later on by Hjelmslev and his theory. Like Bergsland, Vogt was impressed by Hjelmslev and was attracted to his theory for a while. His study of the case system of Ossete (1944), an Iranian language spoken in Caucasus, is one of the first, if not the first, work of a non-Danish linguist which relies to a great extent on Hjelmslev's methods and terminology.

Although Vogt was professor of both Romance philology, a field in which he published almost nothing, and general linguistics, he had little direct influence on either of these fields. He was no great theoretician, and his most significant theoretical work is his analysis of the Norwegian monosyllable (1942),

which is a structural analysis showing how the method can provide new insight. Vogt was a good teacher, but he neither attempted nor wanted to influence the theoretical orientation of his students or to form a school. He would certainly have joined Saussure wholeheartedly in his famous statement in a letter to Antoine Meillet in 1894:

C'est, en dernière analyse, seulement le côté pittoresque d'une langue, celui qui fait qu'elle diffère de toutes autres comme appartenant à certain peuple ayant certaines origines, c'est de côté presque ethnographique, qui conserve pour moi un intérêt...

Some of the linguists mentioned above, and especially Hans Vogt, worked on a great variety of languages in different parts of the world. But none of them could compete with Nils M. Holmer (1904-1994), professor of comparative linguistics, especially Indo-European, in Lund from 1949 to 1974. Holmer may be an unknown name to most Nordic linguists, yet he was probably one of the best known Nordic linguists around the world and one whose scholarly studies are considered fundamental in a number of different fields. He is one of the few Nordic linguists who has had three articles accepted in the prestigious linguistic journal *Language* (Holmer 1947a, 1947b, 1948).

Holmer first devoted himself to Celtic studies (5.7.5.). Later on, he became a specialist on various South American languages, in particular the Cuna language of Panama (1946a and numerous later publications), on North American Indian languages, especially Iroquois and Algonquian (e.g. 1949), on Basque and on Australian aboriginal languages (e.g. 1988). In all these fields, his contributions were published in leading international journals and were frequently referred to in subsequent research. In addition, he also published articles on various Indo-European languages, and on Polynesian, Melanesian, and Paleo-Siberian languages.

Holmer published several extensive studies of the languages and dialects he worked with, but he also produced structural sketches, smaller typological comparisons, and studies on etymology and genetic relationship. He devoted his life fully to fieldwork and documentation of languages, but also came up with some daring hypotheses on language and linguistic relationships. The main significance of his studies today is the vast amount of data from dying languages and dialects that he saved for future generations, recording it so reliably that the data can still be used and trusted. Furthermore, he brought a solid philological method to fields of research where it was not usually employed, thus exerting influence on research methods and setting a standard for others to follow. He is less known as a typologist. He posited, for example, a fundamental typological difference between prefixing and suffixing languages. His work probably deserves more attention than it has received. Few linguists in this century, with the exception of Edward Sapir and Kenneth Pike, knew so many genetically and geographically different languages as did Holmer. His proficiency as a practical linguist provided him with an unsurpassed database for his hypotheses.

5.8. Conclusion

The linguists born at the end of the nineteenth century were born into a world of Herderism and romanticism. Neogrammarian views became dominant around 1900 and retained this position in many countries for half a century. Furthermore, the curricula in language studies were heavily influenced by a historical-comparative point of view, even in places where individual research had become strongly influenced by structuralism.

From a theoretical point of view, the most characteristic aspect of linguistics in the first half of the twentieth century was the emergence of various forms of structural linguistics. The extent to which structuralism was adopted differed from country to country and from one research field to another. In this respect the development in the Nordic countries and the variation within them is not unique, but follows an

international pattern.

Significant, but likewise not unique, was the dominance of the neogrammarian tradition in the study of the national languages and in national dialectology in Finland, Norway, and Sweden. Hardly any structuralist technical term or point of view was allowed to enter the curricula in the national language departments in these countries prior to 1960. Even in the late 1960s, the number of students attending advanced courses in comparative Indo-European phonology and morphology in Oslo was greater than the number attending courses in general linguistics.

In Norway, and to a lesser extent in Denmark and Sweden, there was, as early as the late 1930s, and especially after World War II, a strong reorientation away from German and European linguistics towards American linguistics, notably American structuralism. An important center which influenced the development of Nordic linguistics was Indiana University in Bloomington. In the 1950s and 1960s, many Nordic linguists visited this university for various periods of time, teaching and conducting research. Bloomington opened the door to American linguistics for Nordic scholars and became an important source of inspiration and influence. Having Uralic studies as one of its specialties, it also represented a breakthrough for the application of new linguistic methods to the study of the Finno-Ugric languages.

Finnish linguistics was more tightly bound to German linguistics and the neogrammarian paradigm than linguistics in the other Nordic countries, and Finland developed its own special tradition, concentrating on the study of the Uralic and Altaic languages from a descriptive and especially a historical-comparative point of view. The research activity on Finnish in Finland is impressive. A sizeable number of leading Finnish linguists were also prominent administrators, politicians, and diplomats to a degree that is unique internationally.

Swedish linguistics during this period is mainly characterized by philological publications and historical studies of words, morphemes, or constructions. The new fields of onomastics and dialectology attracted scholars and resulted in new archives, new methods of analysis, and a variety of publications. Swedish onomastics gained an international reputation. From 1950 on structural methods were discussed and applied, above all in phonology, which developed together with phonetics as a Swedish specialty.

In general linguistics and its various subfields like phonetics, historical-comparative Indo-European linguistics, and the synchronic or diachronic study of various languages or language groups, names like Hjelmslev, Jespersen, Karlgren, and Ramstedt place Nordic linguists among the best in the world.

This chapter covers the advent of structuralism, but structuralism never dominated the field of linguistics and the university curricula to the extent that neogrammarian linguistics did at the beginning of the twentieth century. In this connection, it is interesting to read what Louis Hjelmslev wrote in 1941 about how he saw the situation in linguistics approaching the middle of the century:

Linguistics has possibly never before experienced a critical period of such depth and scope as in our day. The very nature of language and its structural peculiarities are being discussed by linguists today; the very foundation of linguistics is in the making. ... Out of the present crisis a new classical state will surely arise sooner or later; we might even dare say today that we have reached the stage where at least the contours of such a new classical state are becoming visible; but we have not reached our goal yet, nor is there agreement as to the means and ways of getting there. (Hjelmslev 1963:7f.)

Only a few years later, at the Conference of Scandinavian Philologists in Copenhagen in 1946, Paul Diderichsen took up this same theme in his introductory remarks to a discussion of ends and means in contemporary Scandinavian linguistics. According to Diderichsen, the goals of nineteenth-century linguistics had already been achieved, and the importance of genetic linguistics was now reduced to the joy of recognition it gives to those who still wish to devote their time to such studies. He feels that linguistics at this point is in a period of stagnation and that more than ever, the linguist should be able to demonstrate the social utility of his efforts. His central question in this introduction is whether or not there is a need for a change in direction in both teaching and research in linguistics.

Chapter 6

The Period after 1965

“MIT oli lingvistiikan ehdoton ykköspaikka, koska siellä oli Noam Chomsky.”⁶⁵

6.1. Introduction

The main reasons for choosing 1965 as the turning point in twentieth-century linguistics have already been given in 5.1. But one more reason may be added — the growth and transformation of information and communication systems after 1965. For future historiographers, this may turn out to be more significant than anything else.

The marked increase in the number of linguists occupying teaching and research positions coincides with a similar increase in the number and frequency of linguistic conferences, as well as of books and journals published in the field. Before 1960, it was not an impossible task for a scholar to read all that was published internationally on linguistics, but by 1970, this had become completely impossible. Linguists were forced to specialize in one or two areas, and even then covering the relevant literature was impossible. The need for specialization was to some extent counterbalanced by a much tighter network among researchers and larger research groups. Traditionally, linguistics had been carried out on an individual basis, with the exception of large lexicographic projects and endeavors requiring extensive collection of data, like dialectology. But in the 1960s, teamwork became more common, and by the 1970s, several linguistic research groups had already been formed in the Nordic countries (6.3.11.).

After 1965, linguistic communication and publication patterns changed considerably. International travel, especially by air, was more or less a luxury in post-war Europe, but became much easier in the 1960s. This was the decade in which regular international conferences were introduced in many fields. Later, a multitude of regular or ad hoc meetings, seminars, workshops, courses, summer schools, etc. arose and now constitute an important part of the infrastructure of linguistics, emphasizing the international character of the scholarly undertakings both in general linguistics and within the individual language disciplines.

Hundreds of new linguistic journals devoted to a wealth of different specializations have been established during the past few decades. An innovation of the late 1960s, partly due to the development of mimeographing techniques, was the habit of publishing informal departmental working papers or modest reports on work in progress, where peer review was not always exercised, thus making it easier to publish than had previously been the case. The general idea behind these working papers was to allow colleagues to

⁶⁵ MIT was without doubt the number one place in linguistics because Noam Chomsky was there. (Olli Nuutinen 1995: 62).

comment on work in progress before it was submitted for formal publication. In most cases, however, the working paper was the only version ever published.

The world-wide computer networks have dramatically affected scholarly communication habits. Many linguists started using electronic mail in the 1980s, and today e-mail is more important than the telephone for a linguist. E-mail is not used just for messages and (scholarly) chatting, but also for exchanging publications, corpora, and other scholarly commodities. The writing of this very book, with authors from four countries, was greatly simplified, since we could send electronic manuscript sections to our co-authors quickly and have comments returned in minutes or hours.

The advent of the Internet in the 1980s and the World Wide Web in the 1990s have even made on-line electronic publishing possible, i.e. fetching text files from people's ftp-sites (ftp = file transfer protocol) or Web pages. A debatable consequence of this new possibility is that the very notion of "publication" tends to become blurred. Electronic text files are more transient than traditional printed articles and books, and they can be changed easily, which usually results in the deletion of the previous version. Copies of files are not normally kept in libraries. In addition, the important critical phase of peer review is skipped as these practices become more common.

The rapid development of information technology also created a need for automatic natural language processing, which made computational linguistics a rapidly expanding field. In the 1960s, computing was more or less equal either to number crunching or to the manipulation of raw data. But as the computational approach was gradually extended to include modeling of human activities, programming became more symbolic than numeric in nature, the expressive power of programming languages grew, and artificial intelligence soon became a popular subfield of computer science. One of the starting points of computational linguistics was the realization of the importance of language in the understanding of human behavior. Another driving force was the prospect of important applications like machine translation and automatic information storage and retrieval.

The growing number of linguists realizing the potential of more rapid communication caused the field of linguistics to become diversified. This quickly led to some of the new basic characteristics of twentieth-century science: specialization, fragmentation, and — as a partial and fortunate counterbalance — interdisciplinarity. Today there are thus dozens if not hundreds of linguistic subdisciplines and theoretical frameworks, each potentially relevant and applicable to the study of any individual language. From the viewpoint of the sociology of knowledge, linguistics is now characterized by the coexistence of diverse traditions, theories, and methods to a much greater degree than a century ago, and this coexistence is not always peaceful.

The sheer quantitative increase in linguistic research, in combination with the tendency towards specialization, thus gave rise to a multitude of branches of linguistics, each striving for its own identity, and with its own meetings, journals, and professorships: sociolinguistics, psycholinguistics, neurolinguistics, quantitative linguistics, ethnolinguistics, areal linguistics, applied linguistics, computational linguistics, even computational semantics and computational morphology, and so on. Many of these new approaches are interdisciplinary and combine linguistics with fields like psychology, sociology, history, neurology, mathematics, anthropology, geography, education, and computer science. This trend shows how multifaceted a phenomenon natural language is. The basic object of autonomous linguistic research may be "language as such", but language structure and use also have mental, social, neurological, biological, areal, educational, cognitive, acoustic, and other dimensions that have become increasingly important as fields of study. Autonomous linguistics does not dominate the research scene as it did in the early 1960s.

In the twentieth century, knowledge, information, and communication became commodities of immense productive value for Western societies. As current slogans claim, we are moving from an industrial society towards an information society. Universities are no longer just institutions for exercising intellectual curiosity. When the politicians and, sometimes, farsighted private entrepreneurs had realized (as in Åbo) the importance of knowledge and high-level education (which they actually started doing around 1900), one

consequence was the founding of numerous new universities, especially after 1960. In the Nordic countries, as in many others, there was an outspoken policy of regional university dispersal.

In addition to regional spread, the need to recruit university students from socially more diverse backgrounds arose, particularly after 1968. This tendency was accompanied by the need for changes in teaching methods and by a reevaluation of the very purpose of higher education. In one instance, protests on the part of students and younger teachers about political and educational matters contributed to the founding and shaping of a new university, the University of Roskilde in Denmark in 1970. In Sweden, the University of Linköping (1975) was also largely a product of radical educational reform.

The number of university teaching and research positions grew correspondingly. For example, in Finland, which is a somewhat extreme example in this regard, there was only one Faculty of Arts (and one university) in 1900, just as there had been since 1640. But by 1980, there were no less than eight Faculties of Arts or the like with scholarly language studies as part of the curriculum: Helsinki, Turku/Åbo (both Finnish and Swedish), Oulu, Joensuu, Tampere, Jyväskylä, and Vaasa.

In 1900, the number of full professorships in language-related disciplines in Finland was ten, here listed chronologically:

Roman literature	1640
Oriental literature ⁶⁶	1640 / 1811
Greek literature	1640 / 1811
Russian language and literature	1841
Finnish language and literature	1850
Sanskrit and comparative linguistics	1875
Swedish language and literature	1876
Finno-Ugric linguistics	1892
Germanic and Romance philology	1894
Slavic philology	1898

By the end of 1986, the corresponding number (including associate professors, Finn. *apulaisprofessori*) was 121 (Perusvoimavaraselvitys 1988), and in 1998 the number was over 140. The growth rate factor in the number of language-related professorships in Finland in the twentieth century is thus at least ten, and most of the growth was rapid, starting in the 1960s. These figures give an idea of the enormous quantitative expansion of university education in the twentieth century. Such a growth rate is in rough harmony with Solla Price's (1963) and Rescher's (1978) statements (based on empirical research mainly concerning natural science) that, since the 1700s, science has grown exponentially. The numbers of scientists, subdisciplines, publications, journals, etc. have doubled every ten or fifteen years. However, at least in the humanities, there have also been shorter or longer periods of slow quantitative growth, for example in the ten-year period following World War II.

The decisive breakthrough of general linguistics at Nordic universities occurred after 1965. New professorships were founded, for example in Helsinki 1966, Stockholm 1967, and Odense, Lund, and Umeå 1969. There is another aspect of the recent strong "linguistification" of language study that has become particularly obvious in the Nordic countries after 1980, viz. the fact that many professors in individual languages have a solid knowledge of and frequently a background in general linguistics as well, for example Hans Basbøll (Odense), Frans Gregersen (Copenhagen), and Ole Togeby (Aarhus) in Danish, Ulf Teleman (Lund), Christer Platzack (Lund), Lars-Gunnar Andersson (Gothenburg), Erik Andersson (Åbo), and Marketta Sundman (Åbo) in Swedish, Lars Vikør (Oslo) and Gjert Kristoffersen (Bergen) in Norwegian, Jan Terje Faarlund (Oslo) in Scandinavian linguistics, Auli Hakulinen (Helsinki), Matti Leiwo (Jyväskylä), and Urpo Nikanne (Oslo) in Finnish, Michael Herslund (Copenhagen Business School) and Juhani Härmä

⁶⁶ Originally Oriental languages and Greek 1640, split 1811.

(Helsinki) in French, Jouko Lindstedt (Helsinki) and Marja Leinonen (Tampere) in Slavic philology, Inger Rosengren (Lund) in German, Jan Svartvik (Lund) and Jan-Ola Östman (Helsinki) in English, Pekka Sammallahti (Oulu) in Sámi, etc.

In this connection it should also be mentioned that this was the period in which the Nordic countries exported linguists to the rest of the world, as a kind of brain-drain. Many Nordic linguists held positions abroad for shorter or longer periods, in some cases permanent positions at leading universities, for example: Hans Aarsleff, Thorkild Jacobsen, Henning Andersen, and Sten Vikner from Denmark, Raimo Anttila, Paul Kiparsky, Lauri Karttunen, and Anders Ahlqvist from Finland, Höskuldur Thráinsson from Iceland, Per-Kristian Halvorsen from Norway, and Elisabeth Engdahl, Björn Jernudd, Lars Johansson, Björn Lindblom, Göran Hammarström, and Nils Simonsson from Sweden. Knut Tarald Taraldsen from Norway has even taught as a replacement for Noam Chomsky at MIT. This export record shows the high quality of Nordic linguistics, and it has significantly strengthened both its international prestige and connections.

One of the consequences of World War II was that Germany was no longer the leading scholarly nation. The United States rapidly took over this position, which soon led to the Americanization of many branches of science. Linguistics, especially general linguistics, is no exception. English became the lingua franca of the field. After 1965, even Nordic linguists, especially general linguists, began to use English as their preferred language of publication.

More than in most other periods, scholarly life and research were influenced after 1960 by political and social change. The explosion of academic posts and institutions in the 1960s was in itself the result of the economic expansion that took place after the effects of the World War II had finally been overcome. The 1960s and 1970s were also decades characterized by a naive belief in unlimited technical and economic progress, a belief that rational government-directed planning, especially in scholarship and science, could help us to solve the few remaining problems of the world. This expansion in academic positions in the 1960s later caused a backlash, however, since government cutbacks in education in the 1970s and 1980s closed the door on younger scholars, leaving many university departments with an overpopulation of already tenured middle-aged teachers. Only recently has this door been partially opened again.

The student revolution in Europe around 1968 affected both the structure and content of the universities, including studies in linguistics — the keywords here being sociolinguistics and pragmatics. Changes in the curriculum away from traditional disciplines in the direction of newer fields of study took place more rapidly in some of the Nordic countries than in others, and the new disciplines which were introduced were not necessarily the same in the respective countries.

Changes in the demographic make-up of the population in the Nordic countries also played a role in the development of new fields of linguistic research and in reshaping existing disciplines. Increased immigration of workers as well as the position of minorities posed social and educational problems that had to be solved and created new fields that had to be developed. There was a large-scale need to teach the national language as a second language, it was necessary to study the languages of minorities and immigrants in order to produce grammars and school books, and translators and interpreters had to be trained. Applied linguistics became a central part of linguistic activities. Furthermore, language typology, which gradually became an important part of international linguistics after 1960, was introduced in the Nordic countries partly in connection with the study of immigrant languages.

Turkish was no longer a distant Oriental language of purely scholarly interest, but was spoken in the streets of Copenhagen, Oslo, and Stockholm, and in many a small Nordic town as well. A Turkish specialist no longer sat in his office studying an old Ottoman manuscript or pondering the use of the genitive in the manuscripts of some Turkish author. He was now writing an elementary introduction to the structure of Turkish for educators teaching a Scandinavian language to Turkish immigrants, since they needed to know more about interference errors from Turkish, or he was translating official documents into Turkish or acting as an interpreter in court cases.

And he was no longer always a he. Before 1960, there were few female linguists. After 1960, and

especially after 1970, women linguists became prominent all over the world, although they are still underrepresented, especially at the professorial level in many language and linguistics departments. For example, of all doctoral dissertations in these departments in Finland in the period 1988-1997 (N = 160), 62 % (N = 100) were defended by women, whereas the corresponding percentage was 16 % in the period 1948-1957, 20 % 1958-1967, 27 % 1968-1977, and 43 % 1978-1987 (F. Karlsson 1998a:24-27). Language and gender also became an important topic in sociolinguistics, attracting mostly women, though by no means exclusively.

Governments became aware of the economic value of knowledge and a university education, which in turn gave birth to goal-oriented policies in science and education. This awareness took shape in the 1950s, and from the 1960s on, political interest in science and higher education became institutionalized in various national and international boards, agencies, and commissions. Linguists, like other scientists, had to write applications for research and travel grants, which might or might not be awarded depending on the policies of the board in question. Reporting and accountability post hoc grew accordingly, reaching new heights in the 1990s. The setting for science and scholarly research had become more bureaucratic. Evaluations of research fields, institutions, and research programs, frequently initiated by the government, have posed new and time-consuming tasks for many scholars, especially since the late 1980s. And the results of such evaluations have often been meager.

Government control of research continues to be hotly debated. There is a pronounced tendency to define foci of research to be given special funding. The large research programs of the European Union, for example have strongly supported topics in language technology and applied linguistics. The common denominator of such trends is the optimistic belief among politicians that they are capable of spotting “useful” fields of science worthy of support. In many cases, particularly regarding large-scale research projects, this has resulted in the strengthening of specific areas of linguistics that otherwise might not have been developed, and as a by-product, in the systematic recruiting and training of young linguists. The need for training young scholars in linguistics, and in language studies in general, has been particularly acute in Denmark in recent years, since a whole generation of students after 1968 either showed little or no interest in studying linguistics proper, or, if they chose to study Danish or a modern foreign language, preferred courses in literature.

The overwhelming amount of material in general linguistics and its many modern subfields makes it impossible to try to describe in detail the development of Nordic linguistics after 1965 within the scope of a concise overview.⁶⁷ Therefore, we must restrict ourselves to sketching the primary lines of development as we see them, focusing particularly on general linguistics. In doing so we are aware that we lack the requisite historical distance from the events of the last few decades, and that we ourselves have been participants in this phase in the development of Nordic linguistics, which makes us far from impartial judges of what has been significant, and what has not.

⁶⁷ Nation-wide overviews of recent developments in some subfields of linguistics already exist, for example text linguistics in Finland until 1985 (A. Hakulinen 1986) and generative linguistics in Denmark until 1995 (Herslund 1996). Much relevant information on Swedish linguistics until 1990 is provided in the evaluation report *Linguistic Research in Sweden* (Enkvist, Ferguson, Haji_ová & Ladefoged 1992).

6.2. The Institutional Framework of Linguistic Research

6.2.1. Universities and Research Councils

The universities, both old and new, continued to provide the main institutional framework for linguistic research during this period. Research initiated and financed by research councils was also often affiliated with the universities.

New to this period was the introduction of doctoral courses in Denmark and the (re)organization of doctoral programs in Norway, Sweden, and Finland. This process of professionalization of the education and training of researchers started in Sweden in the late 1960s.

In addition to the universities, linguistics and language studies have been cultivated at various other academic institutions. Many business schools, translation schools, and regional colleges now offer university level language studies and have both lecturers and professors in specific languages as well as in fields like translation and computational linguistics. The so-called “academic drift” of intermediate colleges has been strong in most countries of Western Europe since 1970. In what follows we will concentrate on the universities, which have remained the focal institutions in academic life in all the Nordic countries, and thus only touch occasionally on the activities of other institutions.

6.2.1.1. Denmark

Three new universities were founded in Denmark during this period: Odense in 1966, Roskilde in 1970, and Aalborg in 1974. While regional decentralization was a major motivating factor in establishing universities on Funen (*Fyn*) and in Northern Jutland (*Jylland*), the University of Roskilde, situated less than thirty kilometers from Copenhagen, was established both to relieve the pressure on the University of Copenhagen and as a social and educational experiment in the wake of the 1968 student revolution.

Common to all three new universities, in contrast to Copenhagen and Aarhus, was the concept of incorporating a variety of institutions of higher learning within one large organizational structure. The University of Odense took up educational programs that had not previously been connected with a university, and in Aalborg various already existing institutions were united in a “university center”. The original plans for the University of Roskilde, were similar to those which were implemented in Aalborg, but few of these plans were realized. Separate departments of linguistics were not established in any of these universities, leaving language studies to the modern language departments and in particular to the departments of Danish and Scandinavian languages. In Roskilde, linguistic activities have often been carried out as teamwork, in keeping with the university’s original spirit of interdisciplinary teaching. At the University of Aalborg, research in linguistics has largely been conducted on an individual basis.

The older universities in Copenhagen and Aarhus were also influenced by the student revolution. In the Danish department in Copenhagen, nearly all instruction in the historical disciplines was either thrown out intentionally in the process of curriculum renewal or indirectly reduced to a minimum for lack of student interest. Pragmatics became very popular in Denmark in a special Danish version that could be described as content-based text analysis. Historical-comparative linguistics was only represented briefly during this period in the linguistics department, first by Hjelmlev’s successor, the Germanic linguist Gunnar Bech (5.5.1.), and then by the Norwegian linguist Fredrik Otto Lindeman (6.5.1.). When Lindeman returned to Oslo in 1976, the vacant position was advertised in Indo-European linguistics or general linguistics and filled by Jørgen Rischel (1934-), a specialist in phonetics and general linguistics. Rischel later got the chair in phonetics (after Fischer-Jørgensen), but when he moved, the chair in general linguistics was discontinued. The degree program in general linguistics had been established in 1969 with the main purpose of providing a broad orientation within the various schools of modern linguistics. It attracted few students, but recently there has been renewed interest in this field, particularly as a supplement to the students’ major field of study.

Originally, from 1943, phonetics was a small subdiscipline within the linguistics department, but in 1966 a separate department of phonetics was established at the University of Copenhagen with Eli Fischer-Jørgensen (5.2.1.) as the first professor. Four years later, in 1970, another independent department was established in applied and mathematical linguistics as an outgrowth of the language laboratory. This new department was headed by Henning Spang-Hanssen (1920-) who had been appointed professor in applied and mathematical linguistics in 1969. The location of these small departments, scattered around here and there in central Copenhagen, made close contact difficult until 1976 when they were geographically reunited in a new university complex on Amager. In 1988, these three departments and the Center for Audiologopedics were amalgamated into the Department of General and Applied Linguistics.

In addition to university programs in linguistics, teaching and research in linguistics also play a role in the language departments of the Danish business schools (Copenhagen, Aarhus, and Kolding), primarily research in applied linguistics in areas like translation and so-called “languages for special purposes” (LSP). In 1985, a separate department of computational linguistics was established at the Copenhagen Business School. The first graduates from this program (1992) were marketed as “linguistic engineers”, stressing the applied nature of their studies. On a more individual basis, various business school language professors also conduct linguistic research of a theoretical nature in cooperation with colleagues at the universities.

It should be noted here, in contrast to the situation in Sweden, Norway and Finland, the extent and quality of linguistic research in Denmark cannot be measured by the number of full professors in linguistics or related disciplines in the same way as in the other Nordic countries, since there are relatively fewer full professors in general in Denmark, and since Danish professors have precisely the same teaching, research, and administrative responsibilities as lecturers.

In addition to university research allocations, which comprise 30-40% of the work-load of university professors and lecturers, external funding for research in linguistics has been available from various sources in Denmark, among these the Carlsberg Foundation and the Danish Research Council for the Humanities (established in 1968). The research council has funded numerous individual projects in linguistics, ranging from runology to the language of psychotic patients in an insane asylum, and in recent years in particular, it has supported larger research projects for which it has taken the initiative in areas such as spoken language and linguistic variation, cultural and linguistic interaction, and, as its most recent initiative, the linguistic and stylistic history of the Danish language.

6.2.1.2. Faroe Islands

Fróðskaparsetur Føroya / Academia Færoensis was founded in 1965. In 1989 it changed its name to *Universitas Færoensis*. There are three main sections: natural science, theology, and Scandinavian languages. Christian Matras (5.6.1.2.) became the first professor of Faroese at the Academy. Thus, language interest in the Faroe Islands is focused on Faroese and the language planning associated with it. Language planning organizations and the university work in close cooperation. The seventh conference in the series “Nordic Languages and General Linguistics” was held in Thorshavn in 1989, organized by Johan Hendrik Poulsen.

6.2.1.3. Finland

The Universities of Tampere (*Tampereen yliopisto*) and Jyväskylä (*Jyväskylän yliopisto*) were founded in 1966. Both were successors to older university colleges (in social sciences, founded in Helsinki, and in education, respectively), and both had new faculties for the humanities. The University of Joensuu (*Joensuun yliopisto*) was founded in 1966, and teaching started in 1969, in several languages. The Vaasa Business School (*Vaasan kauppakorkeakoulu*) was founded in 1968 and was transformed into a university college (Finn. *korkeakoulu*) in 1980, from 1992 recast as the University of Vaasa (*Vaasan yliopisto*), offering teaching in modern languages and translation.⁶⁸

As noted in 6.1., the policy of regional decentralization of higher education has led to a situation where Finland has eight universities and two business schools with more or less full-blown academic language studies in their curriculum. When the new faculties of the humanities were formed in the 1960s, they were often cloned on the model of the University of Helsinki, having the same basic subjects and departments, the most important being Finnish, Swedish, English, German, and Romance languages. For any given language, Finland thus tends to have more, but consequently also smaller, departments than the other Nordic countries.

A major administrative step was taken in 1976 when the Research Center for the Languages of Finland (*Kotimaisten kielen tutkimuskeskus*, abbreviated KKTK) was founded⁶⁹ under the Ministry of Education, independent of the universities. KKTK was initially the sponsor of a number of traditional lexicographic and dialectological projects, most of which emanated from Setälä's proposals (4.4.2. and 5.2.5.), particularly the Finnish dialect dictionary, the dictionary of old written Finnish, and the Finno-Ugric etymological dictionary. Several other long-standing projects and institutions were also placed under the supervision of KKTK: the Karelian dictionary, the dictionary of Finland-Swedish dialects, dictionaries of various more distant Finno-Ugric languages, the Tape Archive of Finnish (5.6.4.2.), the Finnish Onomastic Foundation, the Institute of Modern Finnish (a language planning agency belonging to the Academy of Finland), the Finnish part of the *Atlas Linguarum Europae*, and several others.

Today, KKTK is the major organization for lexicography and language planning in Finland, with a staff numbering close to 100 in 1995, more than double the size of even the largest language departments. KKTK's research profile is becoming more linguistic, its present projects including work on a new and extensive descriptive Finnish grammar, an electronic dictionary of Finnish Sign Language compiled in collaboration with the Finnish Union of the Deaf (*Kuurojen Liitto*), and Romany, the Gypsy language. The other Nordic countries have not founded such linguistic research centers outside the universities, although lexicography and language planning are for the most part pursued extramurally, for example in the various language councils or committees.

As for the allocation of human resources to various linguistic subdisciplines in Finland, the following statistics for December 1986 concerning professorships (full and associate) are informative (*Perusvoimavaraselvitys* 1988):

⁶⁸ Cf. Numminen (1987: 16-31) for a survey of how Finnish universities were founded.

⁶⁹ The ultimate driving force was Lauri Posti, Minister of Education in 1975 (cf. 5.5.2.).

PROFESSORSHIPS IN	N
Finnish	21
English (philology) ⁷⁰	19
Swedish (philology)	17
German (philology)	14
Latin, Greek	9
translation (English, German, French, Russian)	9
Slavic (philology + Russian)	7
Finno-Ugric + Finnic	6
Asian + African languages	4
Romance (philology + French)	4
general linguistics	3
phonetics	3
Italian + Spanish	2
speech therapy	2
applied linguistics	1
Σ	121

Number (N) of professorships in linguistic disciplines in Finland in December 1986.

⁷⁰ Expressions like “English (philology)” here mean that the names of the discipline vary from one university to another, for example “English” or “English philology”. The term “philology” has been largely retained in Finland for historical reasons and does not necessarily imply that research is focused on the study of old texts.

Seen from a Nordic perspective, there is an emphasis on Finnish and Swedish, classical languages, and translation. In 1996, there were three professorships in general linguistics (Helsinki, Turku, Joensuu), one in computational linguistics (Helsinki), two in language theory and translation (Helsinki/Kouvola, Joensuu/Savonlinna), two in applied linguistics (Vaasa, Jyväskylä), and two in speech sciences (Jyväskylä). Classical languages and phonetics have lost or are about to lose some of their chairs. An important positive trend is the recent focus on non-European languages. Chairs have thus been founded at the University of Helsinki in Arabic 1980, Indology 1982, East-Asian languages and cultures 1987, African languages and cultures 1989, and Japanese 1993, all reflecting the internationalization and globalization of scholarship and science.

6.2.1.4. Greenland

The University of Nuuk, *Ilisimatusarfik* ('the place where one strives to get wise') was officially opened in 1984. From the beginning, there was a lectureship in linguistics focused on Kalaallisut. In 1992, a separate lectureship in linguistics was founded. Furthermore, there are now two lectureships in Eskimology in Nuuk.

6.2.1.5. Iceland

The University of Akureyri (*Háskólinn á Akureyri*) was founded in 1988, although teaching had already started in 1987. In Reykjavík, there were four professors in Icelandic linguistics and one professorship in general linguistics in 1996.

6.2.1.6. Norway

Only one new university has been founded in Norway since 1965, namely the University of Tromsø (*Universitettet i Tromsø*) founded in 1968. The University of Trondheim was also officially founded in 1968, but this merely represented an organizational merger of three institutions: The Technical University College, The National Teacher University College, and The Museum and Library of the Royal Norwegian Society of Sciences and Letters. The National Teacher University College was founded in 1922.

In the 1960s and early 1970s, like most other universities in the Western world, Norwegian universities underwent an explosive development in positions, subjects taught, and enrollment. Even after the tighter economic situation in the 1970s, Norwegian universities were able to expand and have continued to do so. University downsizing never hit Norwegian academic life to the same extent as it did in most European countries in the 1980s and 1990s, including the other Nordic countries, primarily thanks to Norway's strong economy based on oil from the North Sea.

Three main features characterize the linguistic aspects of this expansion:

- (1) A considerable increase in staff (mainly lecturers, but also professors) in the departments of Norwegian, English, German, and to a lesser extent French, particularly in the 1960s and early 1970s.
- (2) A slow increase in positions in other languages, dictated by practical needs in connection with immigrant groups (Turkish, Urdu) or with politically and commercially important languages (Russian, Chinese, Japanese).
- (3) A strong, and from the Nordic point of view unique, development of the departments of linguistics at all four universities. In 1996, there were at least three positions in general

linguistics in each of these departments, two of them professorships.⁷¹

If we look at the development in general linguistics, comparative Indo-European linguistics, and phonetics with regard to university positions (professorships in parenthesis), we get the following picture:

	general linguistics	Indo-European linguistics	phonetics
1950	1 (1)	1 (1)	1/2 (1/2)
1970	6 (2)	1 (1)	6 (2)
1995	13 (9)	1 (1)	3 (1)

In 1995, there were also two professors and several lecturers in applied linguistics, whereas there was just one lecturer in this area in 1970.

The profiles of the linguistic departments in Norway are different. Tromsø and Trondheim have specialized in formal theoretical linguistics, Bergen in computational linguistics, Oslo in cognitive grammar, descriptive linguistics, and the historiography of linguistics. Formal linguistics is also taught at the Department of Mathematics in Oslo.

An important factor affecting the development of Norwegian linguistics in this period is the Norwegian research council NAVF and its independent humanities sub-council RHF. The research council was able to sponsor large research projects that would have been impossible for the universities to finance. In doing so it often promoted teamwork, which was instrumental in recruiting young scholars. A sociolinguistic study of variation in the spoken language in Oslo (TAUS), which laid the foundation of Norwegian sociolinguistics, was initiated in 1971 (6.3.11.) and conducted primarily by a group of young scholars (Eskil Hanssen, Ernst Håkon Jahr, Olaug Rekdal, and Geirr Wiggen). The most recent linguistic project sponsored by the research council is the Norwegian Reference Grammar (6.6.6.).

A central function of the research council was to survey the current position in various research fields and to take initiatives to promote research in areas and disciplines that had been neglected. Typically, such initiatives were initiated by inviting scholars to a conference on a specific topic. The publication of the papers from these conferences often turned out to be a basic reference work for future research projects and research planning in these fields. In other cases, a group of scholars was asked to write a report on the current situation and the future of a specific research field. The topics of such conferences and reports include the relationship between linguistics and the social sciences (1976, published as *Språkvitenskapens forhold til samfunnsvitenskapene*, 1977); the position of Norwegian in Norwegian society (*Norsk språk i dagens samfunn*, 1979), pointing to the need for research on spoken language; the relationship between gender and language; language problems of immigrants; child language (*Barnespråkforskning*, 1981).

⁷¹ Observe, however, that there are more professorships in Norway than in the other Nordic countries due to a system of personal advancement to professor for persons having been declared qualified for a professorship. A similar system is now being introduced in Sweden.

6.2.1.7. Sámi Studies

Prior to 1965, Oslo, Uppsala, and Helsinki were the centers for the study of Sámi languages and culture, the linguistic approach being mostly that of traditional comparative Finno-Ugric. When new universities were founded in the 1960s and 1970s in the northern parts of Finland, Norway, and Sweden, however, departments with Sámi studies were established there, and these departments soon became national centers for Sámi research: Oulu (Finland), Tromsø (Norway), and Umeå (Sweden). Several of the Sámi scholars at these new universities were themselves Sámis, for example Nils Jernsletten (Tromsø), Tuomas Magga (Oulu), and Mikael Svonni (Umeå).

Equally important was the founding the research institutions and colleges in the Sámi-speaking areas. The Nordic Sámi Institute (*Sámi Instituhitta*) was established in 1973 in Kautokeino. Here Sámi scholars from Finland, Norway, Sweden, and Russia could meet and conduct their research on the spot and in close contact with each other. In 1989, the Sámi Teachers' college (*Sámi Allaskuvlla*) was established in Kautokeino. Ole Henrik Magga (1947-), who was professor of Finno-Ugric linguistics (after Knut Bergsland) at the University of Oslo from 1986 to 1989, left this post to take up teaching at Sámi Allaskuvlla.

6.2.1.8. Sweden

Swedish policies concerning the regional dispersal of higher education have created several new university colleges such as those in Karlskrona, Karlstad, Skövde, Sundsvall/Mitthögskolan, Södertörn (in south Stockholm), Växjö, and Örebro. Their curricula are normally focused on economic and/or technical subjects, but some offer studies in the humanities, including languages and linguistics. For example, *Högskolan i Växjö* has subdepartments in English, German, French, and Scandinavian languages, *Södertörns högskola* in German. Karlstad, Sundsvall/Mitthögskolan, Växjö, and Örebro were accredited as universities in 1998.

The chair in general linguistics in Stockholm was established in 1967 and was occupied initially by Karl-Hampus Dahlstedt (1917-1996), who had a broad background in Scandinavian languages (especially dialectology and onomastics) and is known as a pioneer in sociolinguistics in Sweden.

A chair in speech physiology and speech perception, held by Björn Lindblom, was established in Stockholm in 1973 by the Council for Research in Humanities and the Social Sciences (*Humanistisk-samhällsvetenskapliga forskningsrådet*, HSFR). This chair was later taken over by the university. The study of second language acquisition and bilingualism in Stockholm led to the founding of a center for research on bilingualism and later to a chair (held by Kenneth Hyltenstam). In addition, chairs were created in sign language research (Brita Bergman) and in computational linguistics.

At the University of Uppsala, dialectology and the sociology of language had a strong position. A special research center called the Research Group for Modern Swedish (*Forskningsgruppen för modern svenska*, FUMS) was established there in 1967. FUMS is an internationally recognized center, as evidenced in part by the many visiting scholars. Chairs in sociolinguistics (Bengt Nordberg) and computational linguistics (Anna Sägval Hein) were also established in Uppsala.

A chair in linguistic computing (*språkvetenskaplig databehandling*) was established at the University of Gothenburg, to which Sture Allén (1928-) was appointed in 1972. It has since been supplemented by a new chair in computational linguistics (Robin Cooper) at the Department of Linguistics. The first chair in general linguistics at the University of Gothenburg was established in 1986 (Jens Allwood). This new chair did not replace the chair in Indo-European and comparative linguistics as was the case in Lund.

The University of Umeå was founded as the fifth university in Sweden in 1965, with chairs in general linguistics and phonetics as important elements of its original profile. This shows the prestige and perceived promise of general linguistics and phonetics at the time. No positions in classical languages were established

in Umeå, but there were chairs in Finnish and Sámi. Umeå has gradually developed into a center for research in the regional languages, dialects, and cultures of northern Sweden.

The University of Linköping was established in 1975 and organized in thematic research programs (Swed. *tema*) instead of faculties. Linguistic research is pursued in the Department of Communication Studies, where conversation analysis and pragmatics are areas of specialization, and, since the 1980s, in the Department of Computer Science. A chair in communication is held by Per Linell and a chair in computational linguistics by Lars Ahrenberg.

Research councils were established in Sweden in the 1940s following models in Great Britain and the United States. These have played an important role in supporting research projects, along with private foundations such as the Bank of Sweden Tercentenary Foundation (*Riksbankens Jubileumsfond*), which was established in 1968.⁷² This foundation was established to support research on topics that were considered important to society and its development and has thus primarily been geared to the social sciences, including the humanities. *Riksbankens Jubileumsfond* favors long-term research conducted by teams rather than individuals. Among the linguistic projects funded are computational investigation of newspaper prose (Gothenburg), the syntax of spoken language (Lund), and the structure of Swedish Sign Language of the deaf (Stockholm).

In 1991-1992, HSFR organized an international evaluation of the state of linguistics in Sweden (Enkvist, Ferguson, Haji_ová & Ladefoged 1992).

6.2.2. Linguistic Societies, Conferences, and Summer Schools

The first International Conference of Nordic and General Linguistics, organized by Hreinn Benediktsson, took place in Reykjavík in 1969 (the proceedings appeared as Benediktsson 1970). “Nordic” here meant the Scandinavian languages to the exclusion of Finnish and Sámi. It is interesting to note how general linguistics and Scandinavian languages were combined at this conference, giving it a different profile from that of the international Finno-Ugric conferences to be mentioned below. The need for orientation towards modern linguistics was apparently more strongly felt among young scholars of the Scandinavian languages than among Finno-Ugric scholars. This conference served as a much needed meeting place for traditional Nordic linguists and structural linguists, as well as for emerging generativists.

The Conferences on Nordic and General Linguistics became a tradition, normally being held every 3 years. The subsequent meetings were in Umeå 1973, Austin, Texas 1976, Oslo 1980, Aarhus 1983, Helsinki 1986, Thorshavn 1989, Gothenburg 1993, and Oslo 1995. The proceedings from these conferences have been published under the title *The Nordic Languages and Modern Linguistics*. The development of generative grammar is reflected in the later meetings and proceedings of these conferences, although generativists have sometimes either boycotted the conference or held separate parallel sections and produced a separate publication.

In 1974, Östen Dahl (1945-) took the initiative in establishing the Scandinavian Conferences on Linguistics, the first of which was held in Kungälv close to Gothenburg. Twenty-one papers were published in the proceedings (Ö. Dahl 1974, ed.), almost all of them generative (mostly Chomskyan) in nature. Subsequent meetings were held in Oslo 1975, Helsinki 1976, etc., usually every one or two years. The sixteenth conference in this series was held in Turku/Åbo in 1996, and the seventeenth in Nyborg, Denmark, in 1998.

Since it has been difficult at times to mobilize sufficient interest in both of these conferences, they

⁷² External research funding is more important in Sweden than in Denmark and Norway because Swedish university lecturers have a heavier teaching load from which they can be relieved for research purposes only by external funding.

have sometimes been combined, as in 1993, when the Fourteenth Scandinavian Conference of Linguistics and the Eighth Conference on Nordic and General Linguistics were collapsed into one conference, held in Gothenburg. The proceedings of this twin conference (Allwood et al. 1994), fill no less than seven impressive volumes (some 1,350 pages), including special session volumes on pragmatics in dialogue management, language development, activity theory, and Scandinavian syntax. The subsequent conference in Oslo in 1995 was also combined.

In 1976, the *Nordic Association of Linguists* (NAL) was founded, largely on the initiative of Stig Eliasson (1937-, since 1995 professor of North European and Baltic languages in Mainz), and since then this has been the main organizational forum for Nordic linguists. The organization soon took over the responsibility for deciding when and where the Scandinavian Conferences on Linguistics should be held. Another important function of the new organization was to promote better dissemination of information among Nordic linguists, and to achieve this goal, the *Nordic Linguistic Bulletin* (1977-) was established. Another main goal of the new organization was to establish a new linguistic journal for Nordic linguists (6.2.3.).

A two-week Nordic Research Course in Linguistics (originally called a Summer School) sponsored by the Nordic Cultural Foundation (*Nordiska Kulturfonden*) was arranged in August 1969 near Stockholm, with Sven Öhman (1936-, professor of phonetics at the University of Uppsala from 1969) as primus motor. There were some forty participants and three main lecturers: Paul Kiparsky, James D. McCawley, and John Robert Ross, all generativists from the United States. The purpose was to promote inter-Nordic contacts and provide up-to-date postgraduate education for young Nordic linguists. The second Linguistic Summer School held in 1970 was also arranged near Stockholm, this time with David Perlmutter, Paul Postal, and John Robert Ross as invited lecturers. These summer schools were influential for two reasons. First, they offered top-level international teaching and ample opportunity to talk to the teachers. Secondly, they brought together young Nordic linguists, many of whom are now professors in the various Nordic countries. In a real sense, an influential “invisible college” (cf. Solla Price 1963) was born in those days, i.e. a network of people knowing each other well and in positions to affect future development.

Summer schools became popular in many countries. For example, there was also a summer school in linguistics in Kiel, Germany in 1968 which was attended by a number of young Nordic linguists, particularly from Denmark. Einar Haugen taught a course in the Scandinavian languages (a forerunner of E. Haugen 1976) and Harry Hoenigswald taught a course in historical linguistics. There was also an inspiring course in sociolinguistics (I. Pedersen 1996:259).

The Nordic research courses (*Nordiska forskarkurser*) in linguistics have been an important forum for keeping up with international developments and for postgraduate education. The first courses were strongly dominated by the generative paradigm, while the topics have since been more representative of the whole diverse field of linguistics, for example psycholinguistics in 1979, language teaching 1980, artificial intelligence 1982, speech and language 1984, evaluation of speech therapy methods 1985, conversation analysis 1987, and semantics 1989.

A special series of conferences on Nordic prosody has been held in Lund since 1978. These meetings have played an important role in the successful development of prosodic research in the Nordic countries. There have been numerous additional conferences at a Nordic and a national level, among these the Nordic Conference on Computational Linguistics (NODALIDA), which was first held in Gothenburg in 1977 (Gellerstam 1977, ed.). The tenth conference in this series was held in Helsinki in 1995. In 1988, The First Nordic Conference on Text Comprehension in Man and Machine was held in Sigtuna, Sweden. There have also been more or less regular Nordic meetings in areas such as onomastics, sociolinguistics, text linguistics, conversation analysis, and lexicography.

In 1963, several Swedish linguists (Claes Christian Elert, Bengt Loman, Eva Gårding, Carl Ivar Ståhle) met in Stockholm and established a forum which was to play an important role in the development of the linguistic study of Modern Swedish. The name of this workshop was deliberately chosen to be

descriptively elaborate: *Sammankomst för att dryfta frågor rörande svenskans beskrivning* (Gathering for discussing questions concerning the description of Swedish). This was a reflection of the interest in the emerging new descriptive methods of structuralism. The twenty-second conference in this series was held in Lund in 1996.

Ulf Teleman initiated the conference series *Svensk språkhistoria* (History of Swedish) the first meeting of which was held in Lund in 1987. Subsequent meetings were held in Gothenburg, Uppsala, Stockholm, and Umeå, each time with 100-150 participants. This testifies to the vivid interest in diachronic linguistics which has experienced a kind of second wave since the synchronic heyday in the 1960s.

Among the large international conferences arranged in and by the Nordic countries since 1965, at least the following deserve mention. The Ninth International Congress of Phonetic Sciences was held in Copenhagen in 1979 and the Thirteenth in Stockholm in 1995. The Third International Conference of Applied Linguistics sponsored by AILA (*Association Internationale de Linguistique Appliquée*) was held in Copenhagen in 1972, the sixth in Lund in 1981, and the eleventh in Jyväskylä in 1996. The Thirteenth International Conference on Computational Linguistics was held in Helsinki in 1990 and the Sixteenth in Copenhagen in 1996. The Seventeenth International Congress of Onomastic Sciences was held in Helsinki in 1990.

Since 1960,⁷³ the international Finno-Ugric conferences (*Congressus Internationalis Fenno-Ugristarum*) have been held in Budapest 1960, Helsinki 1965, Tallinn 1970, Budapest 1975, Turku 1980, Syktyvkar (Komi Republic) 1985, Debrecen 1990, and Jyväskylä 1995. These conferences have retained their broad scope and encompass almost all central aspects of Finno-Ugric culture, with emphasis on language, literature, folklore, ethnography, archeology, and anthropology, and with language comprising the largest part of the program. The influence of general linguistics on these congresses has been fairly marginal so far, especially in comparison to the profile of the corresponding conferences arranged in the domain of the Scandinavian languages.

AFinLA (*Association Finlandaise de Linguistique Appliquée*) was founded in Turku in 1970 on the suggestion of Nils Erik Enkvist, Kay Wikberg, and Kalevi Wiik. This was the first association in Finland with a clear orientation towards modern linguistics, its main purpose being to combine linguistic knowledge and teaching practices.

Paavo Siro arranged the first Syntax and Semantics Conference (*Lauseopin ja semantiikan päivät*) at the University of Tampere in September 1972. These meetings were continued, and in Jyväskylä (1976) the name of the conference was changed to *Kielitieteen päivät* (Linguistics conference). Under this name, the tradition of an annual meeting for all Finnish linguists has continued, with the responsibility for organizing the conference rotating from one university to another. The Twenty-fifth Linguistics Conference was held in Tampere in May 1998. The average attendance at these conferences has been 200-300 participants, occasionally reaching even 400 (as in Helsinki 1996). *Kielitieteen päivät* has thus become the most important public forum in Finland for discussing linguistic problems in a multilingual, theoretical setting.

In 1976, Paavo Siro suggested that an association be founded for promoting modern linguistics in Finland. *Suomen kielitieteellinen yhdistys* (SKY, The Linguistic Association of Finland) was founded in 1977 to promote the study of general linguistics in Finland. Kalevi Wiik, the first chairman of this association, organized the first (Finnish) phonetics conference (*Fonetiikan päivät*) in Turku in May 1971. The conception of phonetics was a broad one, including all of phonology. The next meeting was in Oulu in 1973. This tradition has continued, with the Nineteenth Phonetics Conference taking place in Joensuu in August 1995.

⁷³ A preliminary meeting, a precursor of the Finno-Ugric Congresses with some forty participants convened in 1931 in Helsinki, summoned by E. N. Setälä. The main purpose of this meeting was to discuss the Finno-Ugric transcription system.

A striking feature of the organizational development of modern linguistics in Finland is that all of the important initiatives were taken in Turku and Tampere in the early and mid 1970s. The University of Helsinki, which was the stronghold of neogrammarian theory and practice, was conservative throughout these formative years, as it had been for decades. However, a professorship in general linguistics was established at the University of Helsinki in 1966, and the corresponding department in 1967.

In Norway, *Møte om norsk språk* (MONS, Meeting on the Norwegian Language), held for the first time in Bergen in 1985, became a regular forum for Norwegian linguists and a common meeting place for people in the Scandinavian departments and the linguistic departments. The initiators were Ernst Håkon Jahr, Tromsø, and Kjell Ivar Vannebo, Oslo, both belonging to the departments of Scandinavian languages, but with a background in general linguistics. MONS has done a lot to promote contact and cooperation between general linguists and Scandinavianists, especially since a large number of the participants have been young scholars and students, who often give their first paper at a MONS meeting. The papers from these conferences are published in *Norsk Lingvistisk Tidsskrift* (6.2.3.).

The year after the MONS meetings were started in Norway, a similar initiative was taken in Denmark to establish a forum for reporting ongoing research in the Danish language. The Danish counterpart of MONS was christened MUDS, *Møde om Udforskning af Dansk Sprog* (Meeting on Research on the Danish Language), and the first meeting was held in 1986 in Aarhus. Meetings have been held every other year in Aarhus, most recently in 1996, where a number of younger scholars presented papers, primarily in the area of pragmatics and conversation analysis.

In Iceland, a linguistic society (*Íslenska málfæðifélagið*) for the general public as well as professional linguists was founded in 1979 with Kristján Árnason as its first president. This society has organized an annual conference in the name of Rasmus Rask since 1986.

Generalizing over these data, it is obvious that the infrastructure of Nordic linguistics and the collaboration patterns of individual Nordic linguists have changed fundamentally since the 1950s. On the one hand, we see fragmentation and the emergence of many relatively independent linguistic subfields such as sociolinguistics, computational linguistics, text linguistics, etc. On the other hand, the subfields are much more tightly networked across Nordic and other international borders than they were in the 1950s. One aspect of such networking is joint multinational projects and teamwork, such as the writing of the present book, which has been sponsored by the *Nordiska samarbetsnämnden för humanistisk forskning* (NOS-H, The Nordic Council for Research in the Humanities).

The same is true of the core of general linguistics, and of many individual language disciplines. We surmise that much of this development is due to the theoretical, methodological, and even social change that occurred in linguistics and many other fields of scholarship in the 1960s. Linguistics was no longer an affair reserved exclusively for older, well-dressed gentlemen. Rather, it became more down-to-earth, and its practitioners were frequently much younger than they had previously been. These changes, especially the emergence of subfield networks, were also facilitated and supported by rapid technological development.

6.2.3. Journals, Working Papers, and Other Fora for Publication

This survey focuses on avenues of publication that are strongly linguistic, either in the theoretical or applied sense. Journals devoted exclusively to the study of specific languages will not be included.

Norsk tidsskrift for sprogvidenskap, which had established an international reputation, changed its name in 1972 to *Norwegian Journal of Linguistics*. One of the main goals of the Nordic Association of Linguists (6.2.2.) was to establish a new linguistic journal for Nordic linguists. The Nordic research councils were, however, not willing to support this new journal financially as long as the three existing journals (*Norwegian Journal of Linguistics* in Norway, *Acta Linguistica Hafniensia* in Denmark, and *Studia Linguistica* in Sweden) continued. The *Norsk Tidsskrift for Sprogvidenskap/Norwegian Journal of Linguistics* was discontinued, and *Nordic Journal of Linguistics* (NJL) was founded instead. The first volume of NJL appeared in 1978 with Even Hovdhaugen (1941-) as editor.

The need for a national journal was still felt in Norway, however, and in 1983 Ernst Håkon Jahr founded *Norsk lingvistisk tidsskrift* (Norwegian Journal of Linguistics), which has since become the natural publication channel for many young Norwegian linguists.

Acta Linguistica Hafniensia and *Studia Linguistica* (5.2.3) continued in this period. *Virittäjä* and *Finnisch-ugrische Forschungen* in Finland and *Maal og Minne* in Norway also continued to be important fora for the study of Finnish, Finno-Ugric, and Norwegian.

The journal *Lingua Islandica - Íslenzk tunga* was established by Hreinn Benediktsson in 1959. Around 1980, a second linguistic journal was established, *Íslenskt mál og almenn málfræði* (Icelandic and General Linguistics). Its editors have been Höskuldur Thráinsson, Eiríkur Rögnvaldsson, and Halldór Ámann Sigurdsson. Both journals have published papers mainly in Icelandic by Icelanders, although most issues also contain a paper or two in English or another “major” language, written by Icelanders as well as linguists from abroad.

FINLANCE - A Finnish Journal of Applied Linguistics has appeared since 1981, presently with two issues a year. Its publisher is now the Center for Applied Language Studies, University of Jyväskylä (previously the Language Center for Finnish Universities).

The central international journal for pragmatics, *Journal of Pragmatics*, was established in 1977 by Jacob Mey (1926-) and Hartmut Haberland (1948-) in Odense and Roskilde (cf. Haberland 1996). The journal has continued with these same editors, along with several new co-editors, and is well established and prestigious today. One of the results of this journal has been to make Nordic linguistics visible internationally.

In 1991, Ernst Håkon Jahr and Geirr Wiggen initiated *The International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, which had a firm Nordic basis in the editorial board, but which also in all respects (language of publication, contributions, and editorial board) aimed at being an international journal with high scholarly standards.

In addition to these journals, which require that all contributions be submitted to peer review and that a high international quality be maintained, there are now hundreds of linguistic series, journals, yearbooks, working papers, technical reports, etc., published mainly by university institutes or societies. The quality of these publications is as variable as their readership and distribution. We shall not attempt to give a comprehensive list of all such journals, but just mention a few that have been especially important for the development of general linguistics in the Nordic countries. The publications are listed in order of year of appearance of the first volume. As is evident, this mode of publishing developed en masse in early 1970s.

Working papers. Department of Linguistics and Phonetics. Lund 1969-. (Initially dominated by phonetic articles; 45 issues by 1996.)

OSCU LD = *Outfit for Scandinavian underground linguistic dissemination*, Gothenburg 1970-1973. (A classic pioneer in its genre, initiated by Östen Dahl. OSCULD was a rapid means of mediating unpublished papers on early generative grammar to the Nordic countries.)

GPTL = *Gothenburg Papers in Theoretical Linguistics*. Gothenburg 1970-. (Syntax, phonology, semantics, pragmatics.)

NyS = *Nydanske Studier & Almen kommunikationsteori*. København 1970-. (Pragmatics, syntax, semantics, sociolinguistics, conversation analysis, communication theory)

PILUS = *Papers from the Institute of Linguistics*, Stockholm University. Stockholm 1970-. (Occasional papers on syntax, semantics, discourse theory, computational linguistics.)

Kopenhagene Beiträge zur germanistischen Linguistik. Herausgegeben von Karl Hyldgaard-Jensen. Copenhagen 1972-.

RUUL = *Reports from Uppsala University, Linguistics*. Uppsala 1972-. (Phonology, phonetics, syntax, psycholinguistics, computational linguistics.)

ROLIG papir. Roskilde Universitets Center, Lingvistgruppen. Roskilde 1974-. (Semantics, pragmatics, text linguistics, applied linguistics, language planning, and language policy; 59 publications by 1997.)

Publications of the Department of General Linguistics, University of Helsinki. Helsinki 1974-. (Syntax, computational linguistics, sign language, proceedings, dissertations; 29 publications so far.)

NORDLYD. *Tromsø University Working Papers on Language & Linguistics*. Tromsø 1979-.

SKY. *The Yearbook of the Linguistic Association of Finland*. Helsinki 1988-.

Hermes. Tidsskrift for sprogforskning. Det Erhvervsprogglige Fakultet. Handelshøjskolen i Aarhus 1988-. (Language for Special Purposes.)

6.2.4. Entrepreneurs

The function of entrepreneurs (cf. 5.2.5.) became prominent after 1965, especially in initiating projects, increased funding, and influencing contemporary research policy. The universities expanded rapidly, and more funds became available from research councils, international organizations, and government sources. For a vital institution or research field, it was important to engage people who were able to formulate research projects that could compete for these new resources. A need arose for good organizational talent coupled with linguistic and even political insight concerning what was interesting and worthwhile in research pursuits. This started the “project phase” of linguistics, a tendency which has grown stronger ever since. No longer was it considered optimal for an isolated scholar to apply for money solely for his own research. Now the tendency was to work in groups. Many of the linguists mentioned throughout this chapter are to some extent entrepreneurs, and it could actually be argued that a successful scholar today has to be something of a scholarly politician as well.

Here, we have chosen Bengt Loman, Ernst Håkon Jahr, Alvar Ellegård, Nils Erik Enkvist, Frans Gregersen, and Peter Harder as examples of such modern and influential scholars, who have often conducted societally relevant linguistic research and attempted to bridge the gap between general linguistics and the theoretical or practical study of individual languages.

Bengt Loman (1923-1993) played an important role in Nordic linguistics from 1950 to 1990. While he was studying Scandinavian languages at the University of Stockholm, Loman became interested in American structuralism as represented by Leonard Bloomfield, Zellig S. Harris, Eugene Nida, and Kenneth Pike. He was one of the founders of the Linguistic Circle in Stockholm and the annual conferences on describing Swedish (6.2.2.). In 1955, he moved to Lund and worked as an editor of the Dictionary of the Swedish Academy, where he wrote over 300 articles and became interested in deeper questions of lexicography like semantic fields, competition between words, and how to distinguish senses of words. Bengt Loman was a docent in Lund, and for a time Swedish lecturer at the University of Copenhagen. He was a visiting researcher at the Center for Applied Linguistics in Washington D.C. 1966-1967. He was offered a special research chair in sociolinguistics, but moved to Finland as professor of Swedish at Åbo Akademi University in 1973.

Bengt Loman's many publications in different fields reflect his energy and enthusiasm for new ideas and projects. In Lund he wrote his classic papers on the order of attributive modifiers based on Paul Diderichsen's ideas of grammatical positions, and it was in Lund that he started the projects *Talsyntax* (Speech syntax) and *Skrivsyntax* (Written language syntax). These pioneering projects in the sociolinguistic and text linguistic study of spoken and written language in the Nordic countries led to several dissertations and papers, including important contributions by Loman & Nils Jørgensen (1971) and Ulf Teleman (1974), cf. 6.3.12. These projects, which were among the first in the humanities to involve a research team, required new types of field methods and transcriptions and paved the way for the new field of sociolinguistics in the Nordic countries.

During his stay in Washington D.C. 1966-1967, Loman, along with the Danish scholar Mogens Baumann Larsen, studied Black English and became familiar with current developments in American sociolinguistics (Loman 1993a), later introducing William Labov's and Basil Bernstein's theories of sociolinguistics to the Nordic countries (Mæhlum 1996:188, 209-210). Bernstein's idea of differences in the complexity of noun phrases in different social classes could be verified in the *Talsyntax* project. But the project went much further and revealed differences between the two sexes as well as differences between spoken and written language. Bengt Loman carried out an interesting experiment which showed that Swedes were able to identify the social classes (as defined by professions) by hearing tapes. He also found interesting differences in the attitudes to different dialects in Sweden. As a professor in Finland, Loman started a project to study the Finland-Swedish dialects.

Alvar Ellegård (1919-), professor of English in Göteborg 1962-1984, wrote his thesis on the auxiliary verb *do* and another book about Darwin, but among linguists he is perhaps best known for his work in statistical linguistics, above all author attribution (the Junius letters). He devised a method of studying words which were more or less frequent than expected (plus words, minus words). Ellegård also influenced the Swedish school system by introducing a new subject called *allmän språkkunskap* (general language knowledge) which could be chosen as an alternative to the classical languages Latin and Greek. Ellegård was himself an enthusiastic generative grammarian for a while and published a book (Ellegård 1971), which helped introduce generative grammar into the language curricula. He was also engaged in discussions concerning language teaching methods and published books and numerous articles in newspapers on this subject and on language psychology.

Ellegård supported the new chair in general linguistics in Göteborg and invited American visiting professors in linguistics to Göteborg, e.g. James D. McCawley. Following a suggestion from Ellegård, chairs in general linguistics and phonetics were established before chairs in English, German, and French at the new University of Umeå (6.2.1.).

Nils Erik Enkvist's (5.7.1.) scholarly work will be discussed in 6.3.12. He has been the leading linguistic entrepreneur in Finland, i.a. Rector 1966-1968 and Chancellor 1991 of Åbo Akademi University, Founding Member of Societas Linguistica Europaea and Academia Europaea, President of Societas Linguistica Europaea 1977-1978, President of Fédération des langues et littératures modernes (FILLM) 1987-1990, President of the Modern Humanities Research Association 1991, and President of Societas Scientiarum Fennica 1992-1995. Enkvist formed a one-man committee in 1970, appointed by the Finnish Ministry of Education to submit suggestions as to how practical language teaching should be organized at Finnish universities. He was one of the early proponents of linguistic teamwork by forming the Working Group for Applied Linguistics (AFTIL) at Åbo Akademi University in the mid 1960s and the Text Linguistics Research Group ten years later.

Ernst Håkon Jahr (1948-), professor of Scandinavian languages in Tromsø from 1986 (from 1999 professor in Kristiansand), started his career as a member of the sociolinguistic research project on spoken language in Oslo (TAUS, cf. 6.2.1.6.). His research has mainly focused on the history of the Norwegian language and on the Norwegian language conflict. He has edited numerous books ranging from *Festschrifts* to popular surveys of Norwegian dialects. Together with Ove Lorentz, he has edited selected articles from

the last 100 years in five volumes (1981-1993) covering Norwegian phonology, prosody, morphology, and syntax. He was the founder and first editor of *Norsk lingvistisk tidsskrift* (6.2.3.) and has arranged several thematic symposia in Tromsø, where leading linguists from all over the world have participated together with Norwegian linguists. The proceedings of several of these symposia have been published by internationally recognized publishers (e.g. Breivik & Jahr 1989, Jahr 1992, Jahr & Broch 1996). Jahr has done a lot to create close and constructive cooperation between general linguists and people from the language departments. Such cooperation is something new in Norway and is certainly one reason why the small Arctic university in Tromsø occupies a prominent position in Nordic linguistics and was awarded the prize for excellent research by the Norwegian Research Council in 1990.

As a central figure in the promotion of various aspects of linguistics in Denmark, Frans Gregersen (1949-, professor of Danish at the University of Copenhagen from 1996), has not only been a productive scholar in a number of areas, but has also been active in promoting educational reforms and research policy-making, in editing books and journals, and in planning and supervising two major research projects in sociolinguistics (6.3.11.). Both projects have furthered research in the spoken language and have served to recruit and train young scholars in linguistics. Gregersen has also been instrumental in organizing a doctoral program in linguistics at the University of Copenhagen and in planning courses for doctoral students throughout Denmark. Recognizing the acute need in Denmark to educate a new generation of linguists, he has recently organized a forum for discussing ways to improve the recruiting of candidates to language studies.

Another noteworthy Danish entrepreneur is Peter Harder (1950-), professor of English at the University of Copenhagen since 1998. The functional grammar circle in Copenhagen was established in 1989 largely as a result of his initiatives, and it has since developed into an inspiring and productive forum for discussion of modern linguistic theory. A wide variety of linguists from various institutions and university language departments now participate in the discussions of this circle on a regular weekly basis, and the extended seminars arranged by the circle have also attracted prominent linguists from abroad, particularly from Germany and the United States. Harder's scholarship in functional semantics has also brought him and the circle international recognition.

6. 3. General Linguistics

6.3.1. Introduction

General linguistics as an academic discipline was institutionalized in Germany around 1830, when the first professorships were established. In the Nordic countries, general linguistics is a child of the twentieth century, closely tied to structuralism, and in Norway, Sweden, and Iceland to a large extent to generative grammar.

Structuralism was originally resisted, though to varying degrees, in the Nordic countries by the predominantly neogrammarian linguistic establishment. One outspoken early critic was Björn Collinder (5.5.2.), who (1962b) accuses structuralism of constructing a system where there is no system, of neglecting individual variation, historical and stylistic layers, of focusing on one informant and only synchronically, of operating with artificial and complicated rules and notational systems, and of neglecting semantics. Instead, Collinder emphasizes what we would call today the speaker's encyclopedic knowledge and variation, and he is against a strict separation between diachrony and synchrony. In his early critical account of transformational grammar (1970), Collinder maintains that traditional grammar, the precise nature of which is not clearly stated, can do everything just as well if not better. Collinder's critical comments on Chomsky and his new ideas had little impact on the younger generations of linguists, however, to whom this new field

was attractive.⁷⁴

Chomsky's impact was apparent in several places in Sweden. Sven Öhman and Björn Lindblom, both closely connected with the Royal Institute of Technology in Stockholm, had good contacts at MIT, and they were able to spread information on the new trends in generative phonology. Another Swedish linguist, Alvar Ellegård, was instrumental in introducing transformational grammar in the language departments through his lectures and publications (6.2.4.). Ulf Teleman was one of the first to teach generative grammar in Sweden, and his dissertation (1969b) included both a transformational analysis of Swedish noun phrases and an account of Swedish inflectional morphemes in the framework of generative phonology. In Gothenburg, Östen Dahl taught an inspiring seminar in transformational grammar, and in Stockholm, transformational grammar was included in the linguistics curriculum from 1970.

In Norway, the new trends in linguistics from MIT were received with great interest by most linguists. In the early 1960s, both Knut Bergsland and Carl Hj. Borgstrøm gave courses and seminars in transformational grammar, and Jacob Mey (6.3.12.), who was lecturer of general linguistics in Oslo 1961-1968, did much to introduce the new perspectives in linguistics to both students and established linguists. Generative grammar was also greeted with interest in most of the other linguistics departments, but interest was limited in the departments of Scandinavian languages in Norway.

In Iceland, generative grammar became the main paradigm for a whole new generation of linguists after 1970, many of whom achieved international recognition (6.3.3-5.). Iceland apparently had no strong opposing linguistic tradition, since the dominant research tradition in language studies in Iceland had been traditional philology. Icelandic linguists have been successful in integrating philological material and methods with their theoretical linguistic research.

In Denmark the situation was different. Diderichsen had advocated structuralism at an early stage, and with Hjelmslev's glossematics, Danish linguists already had a formal linguistic theory. As pointed out by Herslund (1996), the Danes probably did not feel the need for another theory, and especially not a theory of syntax, since they also had Diderichsen's theory of syntactic fields. There were also those who were simply tired of the intense theoretical discussions of glossematic theory, and as a consequence were generally skeptical towards all-encompassing linguistic theories, especially those with a formalistic flavor. Transformational grammar was taught sporadically in Denmark after the appearance of *Aspects*, and although a few scholars, particularly in the departments of French and English, familiarized themselves with generative grammar and have since kept up with developments in the field, this theory never really caught on in Denmark. The few linguists who pursued it did so as a supplement to other approaches, and not as the only way of doing linguistics. This skeptical attitude towards transformational grammar may in part also be due to the fact that Danish linguistic theory has been firmly oriented towards both content and form, with Hjelmslev and Diderichsen as the primary examples.

This tradition has been continued in the functional grammar circle of Copenhagen (6.2.4.). This circle, originally inspired by Simon Dik's approach to functional grammar (e.g. 1978 and 1989), has as its goal a functional, structural theory of language in which both cognitive and pragmatic considerations also play a significant role. These last two factors reflect the fact that most of the founding members of the functional grammar circle were also associated with the pragmatic circle in Copenhagen (6.3.12.).

The Department of Phonetics at the University of Turku, headed by Kalevi Wiik (5.2.4.), professor of phonetics 1968-1997, became the main channel for theoretical (especially generative) linguistic influx in Finland. Auli Hakulinen (1941-), professor of Finnish at the University of Helsinki from 1991, was the first post-war generation linguist to publish theoretically minded papers and reviews of linguistic monographs written abroad, in *Virittäjä*, starting in 1964. Another main channel of theoretical linguistic influx in Finland

⁷⁴ In Finland, i.a. Paavo Rivila (1962) and Aarni Penttilä (1971) wrote similar negative evaluations of Chomsky.

was the Text Linguistics Research Group at Åbo Akademi University (1974-1977).

Several young linguists started working in the generative framework in the late 1960s. Terho Itkonen (5.6.1.3.), professor of Finnish at the University of Helsinki 1965-1989, was an outspoken critic of the generative paradigm as such and of the early Finnish generativists in particular. Several heated debates took place, most frequently in the pages of *Virittäjä*.

In the 1950s, it became possible to go abroad for extended periods of study. The ASLA/Fulbright scholarships for study in the United States were especially important, and many Finnish linguists received such grants, some of them also remaining in the United States after receiving their Ph.D. Raimo Anttila (1936-) received his doctorate at Yale and became professor of linguistics at UCLA (and Helsinki 1972-1976). Paul Kiparsky (1941-) received his Ph.D. at MIT in 1965 and became professor first at MIT and later at Stanford University. Lauri Karttunen (1942-) received his Ph.D. at the University of Texas (Austin) and then became professor there and later at Stanford. All of these linguists became internationally recognized: Anttila in historical linguistics and morphology, Kiparsky in phonology, morphology, and metrics, and Karttunen in semantics and computational linguistics.

Koerner (1982:411) has made the apt remark that "German-speaking lands -- did not wholeheartedly accept synchronic linguistics before the mid-1960s". This is also true of Finland, which had a strong German orientation until World War II. What was least acceptable to Paavo Ravila and Terho Itkonen (and the philologists in the modern language departments) in the doctrine of modern linguistics was the idea that synchrony could be studied in isolation from diachrony. Most of the Finnish linguistic debates concern this issue.

One characteristic feature of linguistics after 1965 is, however, its diversity or fragmentation, the seeds of which were sown in the late 1960s (6.1.). Structuralism and generativism soon evolved into several mutually more or less opposing approaches. But first and foremost, semantics, pragmatics, text linguistics, psycholinguistics, and sociolinguistics all acquired significant status. Of course, there were local and national preferences determining which approaches became dominant.

To illustrate the rapid diversification of linguistics in the area of thesis production, let us consider Sweden. A survey of the Ph.D. theses at the language and linguistics departments in Sweden shows the fields and topics that attracted Swedish Ph.D. candidates during the 1980s (Sigurd 1995). During the period 1984-1993, a total of 285 doctoral dissertations were produced, generally printed as books, which is the usual procedure at Swedish universities. The greatest number (69) were produced in the departments of Scandinavian languages (mainly in Uppsala), in particular on Swedish. The modern language departments contributed a great number of dissertations: English 40, German 26, French 19. The general linguistics departments produced 23, and the total number of doctoral dissertations in general linguistics, phonetics, and computational linguistics was 41.

A glance at the titles of these dissertations at language and linguistics departments shows that there are new types of topics. There is a strong interest in language acquisition and bilingualism, for example the acquisition of gender in Swedish, teacher talk, the acquisition of vocabulary, learning to read and write, and the acquisition of Finnish cases by Swedish schoolchildren.

There are also Swedish dissertations dealing with mainstream problems of the linguistics of the 1980s, for example comparative studies in current syntactic theories, studies in discourse and conversation analysis, the semantics and syntax of verbs, studies of subordinate clauses in the language of young children, and investigations of problems in translation. There are also a few theses on dialects and dialect words, and several on place-names and runes. A few studies also deal with historical phonology.

Departments of classical languages continued the philological tradition, and departments of distant languages, from the Nordic point of view, often produce theses dealing with cultural and literary as well as linguistic matters.

An increasing number of dissertations deal with computational linguistics, for example parsing, tagging, and machine translation. The phonetics departments have become technical, and their theses often

concern applications in speech technology, speech synthesis, and speech comprehension.

6.3.2. Introductory Textbooks

In Finland, Erkki Itkonen (5.5.2.) published an influential 424-page textbook in 1966, *Kieli ja sen tutkimus* (Language and its Study), which is still used in several linguistics courses in Finland. Itkonen's main focus is on historical phonology and morphology, but there are also substantial chapters on syntax, meaning (especially meaning change), and vocabulary. Most of the examples are drawn from the Uralic languages. Itkonen provides a synthesis of the empirical Finno-Ugric research tradition and structural linguistics.

The dominating introductory book in the expanding undergraduate courses in Sweden during the 1970s was Bengt Sigurd's book *Språkstruktur* (Language Structure, first edition 1967). It takes a structural approach, but also includes a chapter on generative grammar.

Even Hovdhaugen's introductory textbook in generative grammar (1969, updated 1971) was the first of its kind in a Nordic language. When it was published, it was actually one of the few introductions to generative grammar in the world.

Peter af Trampe and Åke Viberg published a thorough introduction to transformational grammar (1972), in which readers are also given a brief introduction to the basic elements of structural linguistics. This book was widely used in Sweden and Finland and to some extent also in Norway.

Per Linell's broad introduction to linguistics (1978) covered most aspects of language studies. It treated topics like language development, language learning, culture and language, thought and language, text structure, pragmatics, as well as language change, phonology, morphology, syntax, and semantics. It was also more suitable to students in the new field of applied linguistics. Linell's book has been and is still widely used in the Nordic countries.

In Finland, several textbooks were written concerning various subfields of linguistics or linguistic theories. Examples include Kalevi Wiik's book on classical structural phonology (1971), Paavo Siro's introduction to case grammar (1975), Kalevi Tarvainen's introduction to dependency grammar (1977), Matti Leiwo's book on child language acquisition (1986 [1980]), Kari Sajavaara's introduction to applied linguistics (1980), Matti K. Suojanen & Päivikki Suojanen's book on sociolinguistics (1982), and Fred Karlsson's introductions to linguistics (1977, 1994b).

Two Nordic textbooks have become international bestsellers. Jens Allwood, Lars-Gunnar Andersson & Östen Dahl's lucid introduction to logic in linguistics, or more precisely, to logic for linguists (1977), which was originally published in Swedish in 1971, has been translated into seven languages, including Chinese and Japanese. Raimo Anttila's *Historical and Comparative Linguistics* (1989 [1972]) is a widely used handbook in diachronic linguistics (6.3.15.).

Danish linguists have generally shown little interest in producing textbooks in linguistics, primarily due to the lack of institutionalized introductory courses.

6.3.3. Phonology

With the advent of generative phonology in the late 1960s, phonological research took a new direction. In the next 10-15 years, phonology, and in particular generative phonology, became a prominent field of research. New directions emerged, however, some of them outgrowths of generative phonology, and soon areas like natural phonology, autosegmental phonology, and metrical phonology gained in strength and scope.

Icelandic linguists were visible in international phonological research after 1965, probably thanks to Hreinn Benediktsson's (5.3.5) international phonological network. Icelandic phonology, just like the study of Icelandic syntax (6.3.5.), became an international research field in which numerous internationally

recognized linguists participated, for example Stephen Anderson (1969) and Gregory Iverson as well as the Slovenian Janez Óresnik (cf. Thráinsson 1996:334-335).

The most important contributions to the study of Icelandic phonology, however, were made by the Icelanders themselves. A work of international standard and consequence is Kristján Árnason's (1980) book on quantity in historical linguistics, which continues the tradition of Hreinn Benediktsson by applying the methods of modern phonological theory to diachronic phonology. Árnason has later published important studies on Icelandic word stress using the model of metrical phonology (1985). Even more important is Höskuldur Thráinsson's (1946-) work on preaspiration in Icelandic (1978), which was written within the autosegmental framework and played a significant role in the development of this theory.

Another important Nordic contribution to phonology which had an impact on the development of phonological theory was Per Linell's critical analysis of generative phonology (1974, 1979), which was published in a recognized series by a leading international publishing house. Linell criticized the abstractness of the underlying forms of orthodox generative phonology and suggested more concrete representations and less complex rule systems. In Sweden, Stig Eliasson was a productive phonologist who made numerous contributions to the study of phonology in various languages, including Swedish. An early contribution to the field is Bengt Sigurd's work from 1966 which examines the relations between historical changes in Old Norse and ordered phonological rules. Claes-Christian Elert has also applied generative phonology in his descriptions of Swedish.

Eli Fischer-Jørgensen, who was one of the leading structural phonologists in Europe in the 1950s and 1960s (5.4), continued to inspire colleagues and students with her research and teaching. Her lectures at the University of Copenhagen on the history of phonological theory formed the basis of her internationally recognized historical survey of trends in phonological theory up to 1975 (Fischer-Jørgensen 1975, second edition 1995). This work contains informative chapters on the forerunners of phonological theory, Prague school phonology, Daniel Jones, Firth school prosody, the Bloomfield school, glossematics, Roman Jakobson's theory of distinctive features, generative phonology, stratificational theory, and phonological theory in the Soviet Union. Eli Fischer-Jørgensen was the main source of inspiration for a group of younger Danish phonologists, primarily Jørgen Rischel, Hans Basbøll, and Michael Herslund.

Jørgen Rischel (6.2.1.), has been productive in the area of phonology. Particularly inspired by generative phonology, he has dealt with phonological theory and undertaken phonological analyses of Danish, West Scandinavian, and Greenlandic. His dissertation on West Greenlandic phonology (1974) not only provides a description of Greenlandic, but also represents an important contribution to phonological theory by combining generative phonology with the principles of structuralism. Rischel has been particularly interested in problems of accentuation, having discussed the limitations of a purely generative approach (cf. Rischel 1972, 1975, 1982). He also has been instrumental in the development of metrical phonology.

Hans Basbøll (1943-) has discussed phonological problems involving syllabification in Danish, French, and Italian and investigated the phonological status of the Danish *stød* (i.a. 1985, 1986). As Michael Herslund has pointed out (1996:69), studies on Danish phonology are rare, but Basbøll's work on Danish phonology and phonological theory has earned him an international reputation.

Michael Herslund (1945-) has also published a number of internationally recognized contributions to the phonology of the Romance languages, particularly of Old French (1975, 1976). A detailed survey of Danish phonology during the 25-year period 1962-1987 is given by Hans Basbøll in the research profiles published by the Society for Scandinavian Philology on the occasion of the society's seventy-fifth anniversary (Basbøll 1989).

According to the Arts and Humanities Citation Index, the most cited Finnish (and, in fact, Nordic) linguist is Paul Kiparsky, Valentin Kiparsky's son (5.7.4.). Paul Kiparsky made his professional career in the United States after receiving a B.A. at the University of Helsinki. Ever since his dissertation at MIT on phonological change (1965), Kiparsky has been one of the most prominent developers of generative phonology and its successors such as cyclic phonology and lexical phonology. Kiparsky's famous

Alternation Condition, proposed in a paper in 1982, struck a conclusive blow to the abstract representations (involving absolute neutralizations) that Chomsky & Halle had postulated in *The Sound Pattern of English* (1968). Kiparsky has also written several seminal papers on metrical theory, e.g. Hanson & Kiparsky (1996).

In Finland, Kalevi Wiik introduced generative phonology in his study on the morphophonemics of Finnish inflection (1967). His ideas were close to Chomsky & Halle's abstract version of phonology. Wiik was the first to teach structural and generative linguistics systematically in Finland, and he quickly attracted an interested audience of young linguists in both Turku and Helsinki. Wiik also wrote extensively on the history of the morphophonological description of Finnish (1989, 1990, 1991).

One of Pekka Sammallahti's (1947-) main contributions is his Ph.D. thesis on the phonology of Enontekiö Sámi (1977), a phonetically highly complex language. Sammallahti's basic concern was to establish the phonemes and characterize them precisely by way of articulatory phonetic features and classificatory phonological features, within the framework of both structural and generative phonology. The description was largely formalized as generative rules, i.a. redundancy rules for describing the precise phonological content of the phonemes.

Another crucial Uralic contribution to phonological theory is Juha Janhunen's (1952-) dissertation on the glottal stop in the Samoyed language Nenets (1986). Janhunen combines extensive field work and knowledge of the long Uralic tradition in historical phonology with the approaches of several brands of contemporary phonology. He describes the segmental phonology and morphophonology of Nenets with precise generative rules in which markedness theory plays an important role.

Pentti Leino (6.3.6.) has written two substantial monographs on metrical theory and the metrics of Finnish (Leino 1982, 1986). He treats in depth the relation between poetic meter and language in the light of early twentieth-century Finnish poetry.

Except for Kiparsky's studies, the Finnish contributions to phonology mentioned above are mainly known within the research community of Finno-Ugric linguistics. In contrast, practically all standard works on phonology today refer to the work of Basbøll, Linell, Rischel, and Thráinsson.

6.3.4. Morphology

Morphology has been a much more popular research topic in Finland than in the other Nordic countries, which is not surprising given the elaborate morphological surface structure of Finnish and other Uralic languages, especially the wealth of morphological categories and the complex morphophonology.

One of the leading international scholars in this field is Raimo Anttila (6.3.1.), originally an Indo-Europeanist with broad linguistic and philological interests. As for morphology, Anttila has strongly criticized the generative paradigm and pleaded for a concrete functional conception of morphology in which allomorphs, word-forms, paradigmatic relations, and the force of analogy are central notions (Anttila 1974, 1975, 1976, 1977a,b). Anttila has repeatedly stressed the deeply semiotic nature of linguistic structure and shown how the notion "linguistic function" can be conceived in a semiotic framework. Thus, allomorphs are not just superfluous surface complexities of ideal morphological structure, but can be seen as semiotically motivated, since they point to subclasses of preceding or following stems/endings. This indexical function allows allomorphs to convey specific morphotactic information. Much of Anttila's work concerns diachronic linguistics (6.3.15.) and linguistic metatheory (6.3.16.).

Urho Määttä (1994, 1998) has shown that there are good reasons to speak of a Finnish school of field morphology, the main modern representatives of which are Terho Itkonen (5.6.1.3.) and Heikki Paunonen (1946-), professor of Finnish at the University of Tampere (1976-). The predecessors of this research tradition are the Gestalt conception of morphological structure developed by Eliel Lagercrantz in the 1920s and Erkki Itkonen's conception of language as a system in the 1940s (5.5.2.). The central concerns of field morphology are an emphasis on language variation and change as well as an evolutionary and functional conception of language structure. Synchrony and diachrony are not separated, careful analysis

of dialectal and sociolectal variation being at the heart of the analysis. Field morphology does not view language as being composed of strictly separated components, nor does it pay much attention to formalizing its descriptive claims.

Terho Itkonen's early papers (1957, 1959), which treat various instances of superficially free variation between plural case endings, contain ideas typical of the field approach, for example the notion that there is a tendency to prefer word-form Gestalts that can be segmented into maximally invariant stems and endings. Itkonen stresses the importance of analogy, one manifestation of which is the phenomenon called "surface effect connection" (Finn. *pintavaikutussyhteys*), elaborated in his paper on surface syntax (1976).

Heikki Paunonen, a pupil of Terho Itkonen, has elaborated the theory of field morphology in several papers. Paunonen analyzes instances of free variation in Finnish morphology (1973) and argues that free variation cannot be described satisfactorily within a strictly synchronic model that pays no attention to the processes and tendencies of morphological change. Paunonen also argues in favor of basing morphological theory and description on the notions of paradigm and word-form (1976). Allomorphs and associative relations between them are viewed as morphologically more important than invariant morphemes. Paunonen also extends T. Itkonen's notion of the "surface effect connection" to morphology and shows how this helps to interpret several tendencies toward productivity and change in the morphology of contemporary Finnish.

Fred Karlsson wrote a comprehensive description of Finnish morphological structure (1983) in the framework of a non-abstract conception of morphological theory. The description of morphological productivity and inflectional types was among the central topics.

There has also been a certain amount of activity in the area of morphology in the study of the other Nordic languages. Some studies, like those of Telemann on gender in Swedish (1965, 1969a), used new linguistic theories. Morphological considerations also influenced Linell's important study of the abstractness of phonological representations (1974, 1979). In the first decade of generative grammar, morphology was a neglected field, but around 1975 it became a central part of generative linguistics. Ferenc Kiefer's *Swedish Morphology* (1970) was an early suggestion for a separate morphological component in generative grammar. Although Elert was primarily concerned with phonology (1970), he also treated the morphology of nouns, numerals, and certain subgroups of pronouns.

A major work in this field is Ottósson's study of the Icelandic middle voice (1992). Kjartan G. Ottósson (1956-), professor of Icelandic in Oslo since 1992, demonstrates a successful combination of philology and linguistic theory, especially natural morphology. In this way he is able to describe diachronic processes in which phonology, morphology, and syntax interact in a complicated and far from obvious manner.

6.3.5. Syntax

The main impact of Chomsky's generative grammar was a world-wide explosion of syntactic studies within the generative paradigm. This explosion also took place in several of the Nordic countries, where syntax became the focal area of general linguistics as well as of studies of separate languages, including the Nordic (especially the Scandinavian) languages. Chomsky's generative grammar with its phrase structure, trees, and transformations made it possible to analyze syntax precisely, and grammatical constructions and their differences could be described and explained with new accuracy. Arguing for one descriptive solution rather than another was one of the methodological cornerstones of the generative paradigm.

Ulf Telemann and Östen Dahl in Sweden were among the first linguists in the Nordic countries to submit generatively inspired dissertations on syntactic topics. Telemann's dissertation (1969b) was a generative description of definite and indefinite modifiers in Swedish, whereas Dahl's (1969) argued that the so-called syntactic Standard Theory had to be enriched with a layer of Topic-Comment structure. Dahl united Prague School inspiration with generative syntax, largely using examples drawn from Russian.

Nordic linguists, especially Icelanders, Norwegians, and Swedes, have also played a prominent role

in the development of transformational syntactic theory, particularly in more recent years. Many of their publications with data from Nordic languages were published in English in international journals and by leading publishers (Engdahl 1986, Hellan & Christensen 1986, Holmberg & Platzack 1995). These and other Nordic linguists called attention to the fact that the Nordic languages have interesting features which have to be taken into account in the construction of a general theory of syntactic structure.

The Nordic research project *Centrala drag i skandinavisk syntax* (Central features in Nordic syntax), in which scholars from all the Nordic countries took part, published the first issue of *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax* in 1983, a publication which has continued to keep Nordic scholars informed of work in progress in the field.

There are several themes in modern transformational studies that caught the attention of Nordic scholars at an early stage, since they concerned phenomena where data from the Scandinavian languages were interesting or even crucial. One is the so-called extraction phenomenon, where a constituent is seemingly moved out of a sentence or clause and occurs displaced from its normal location. A classic study of this phenomenon is T. Lindstedt's article "Om satssammanflätning i svenskan" (On woven clauses in Swedish, 1926). The Scandinavian languages showed movement possibilities that were prohibited in English, thus forcing linguists to reformulate the general rules that have previously been established, cf. Engdahl & Ejerhed (1982), Engdahl (1985).

A second characteristic feature of the Scandinavian languages that has occupied modern Nordic scholars interested in syntax is the Verb second or V2 phenomenon, the fact that the verb is the second constituent in main clauses. This phenomenon is analyzed within the theory of government and binding by Platzack (1986), Holmberg (1986), and especially Vikner (1995), and it has been discussed within the framework of Diderichsen's positional syntax in a number of articles by Heltoft (e.g. 1986a, 1992b).

Another favorite area of generative grammarians is the existential sentence with or without formal subject, a theme with a long tradition in Nordic linguistics. The same applies to the passive, which is interesting in the Scandinavian languages because of its marker *-s* on the verbs and an alternative periphrastic construction equivalent to the English *be*-construction.

Icelandic is perhaps the most thoroughly investigated and most quoted Nordic language in international syntactic research since 1965, clearly so in relation to the number of speakers and the size of the country. Iceland has also produced an impressive number of internationally recognized scholars in the area of syntax.

Generative syntax was introduced in Iceland by Jón Gunnarsson in a textbook originally intended for high schools (1973). The book failed at this level, since the teachers who were expected to use it lacked the background to understand it. In several respects, however, it was a remarkable book, the first attempt to apply generative syntax to Icelandic. The generative study of syntax began on a more serious basis at the University of Iceland when Höskuldur Thráinsson (educated at Harvard) returned to Iceland and began teaching syntax. His Ph.D. thesis on complementation in Icelandic (1979) was an important contribution both to syntactic theory and to understanding Icelandic syntax.

Several foreign linguists have treated Icelandic data at length. Avery Andrews, who read a paper based on Icelandic data at the conference of the Chicago Linguistic Society in 1973, was instrumental in promoting an interest in the study of Icelandic syntax (Thráinsson 1996:341). But Andrews was not alone. Later, Annie Zanen, Joan Maling, Stephen Anderson, Christer Platzack, Anders Holmberg, and Sten Vikner made significant contributions to the study of Icelandic syntax and also to linguistic theory, basing their studies on data from Icelandic.

Knut Tarald Taraldsen (1948-), professor of general linguistics in Tromsø since 1984, belongs to the new generation of generative linguists. Several of his publications (e.g. Taraldsen 1978, 1979), especially his study of basic parameters, have had a decisive impact on the development of Government and Binding theory (Chomsky 1981:viii). Taraldsen's background is broader than that of most American generative linguists, including thorough philological training and extensive knowledge of various languages, especially

Romance.

Another Norwegian linguist, Lars Hellan (1945-), professor of general linguistics in Trondheim since 1987, has also published internationally recognized syntactic studies, especially on the syntax of anaphora (Hellan 1988). Hellan has mainly worked within an unorthodox version of Chomskyan government and binding theory. He has since moved towards a semantically and cognitively oriented syntactic model (Dimitrova-Vulchanova & Hellan 1991).

The Swedish linguist Christer Platzack (1945-), professor of Scandinavian languages at the University of Stockholm 1981-1985 and at the University of Lund from 1986, was the first scholar in generative syntax appointed to a professorship in Scandinavian languages. He has assumed a leading role in theoretical syntactic research in Sweden. Platzack has stressed the synchronic and diachronic significance for parameter-based theory of the syntactic differences between the Scandinavian languages.

Theories of valency have played a prominent role in modern studies of syntax in the Nordic countries, for example in Denmark, with numerous studies by Herslund (e.g. 1988, 1994) and Herslund & Sørensen (e.g. 1985, 1987, 1994) on valency in French. In connection with the Odense Valency Dictionary project, the University of Odense has hosted a series of international valency seminars dealing with the valency of nouns, verbs, adjectives, adverbs, and participles, primarily with focus on Danish, but also on French, Russian, and Chinese. Papers from these seminars have been published in the series *Odense Working Papers in Language and Communication*.

In Finland, dependency and valency grammar has also been a central concern of several scholars in the departments of German, some having made original contributions to syntactic theory within this theoretical framework. Jarmo Korhonen (1945-), professor of Germanic philology at the University of Helsinki since 1993, has thoroughly discussed the general foundations of syntactic theory and of several basic theoretical concepts (sentence, constituent, etc.), cf. J. Korhonen (1977, 1978). The relation between dependency and constituency is treated in detail. Korhonen attempts an integrated conception of valency in which logical, semantic, and syntactic aspects are handled within one model. Bottlenecks of valency theory such as change of valency and ellipsis are also accounted for.

Terho Itkonen has made theoretical syntactic contributions on the borderline between syntactic theory, language typology, and diachronic linguistics. His papers on "Ergativity in Finnish" (1974, 1975) shed light on the typology of ergative case marking systems and show that there are features in the syntactic use of the Finnish nominative/partitive case distinction that resemble ergative systems.

Grammatically (but not textually) free word order is one of the characteristics of Finnish syntax. Maria Vilkuna's dissertation (1989) on free word order in Finnish concerns the interface between syntax and discourse. It advocates non-transformational syntax and rejects the view that grammatical functions (subjects, objects, etc.) should be described in terms of phrase structure. Instead, Vilkuna proposes a theory of discourse functions to account for word order restrictions. These functions cut across grammatical constructions. Vilkuna's dissertation is typical of the trend which became more common in the late 1980s for dissertations in individual language disciplines to be theoretically sophisticated. Often there are no clear differences between a "dissertation in language L" and a "dissertation in general linguistics".

In Denmark, studies in syntax have been closely tied to pragmatics, and in particular to information structure. Some of the most recent work in this area is found in an international publication of the functional grammar circle in Copenhagen (edited by Engberg-Pedersen et al. 1994). Of particular interest are the suggestions for a revision of Diderichsen's positional theory of syntax by Lars Heltoft (e.g. 1986b) and Ole Togeby (e.g. 1993).

6.3.6. Semantics

Lauri Karttunen (6.3.1.), well-known internationally in the area of semantics, has been professor at the University of Texas, Austin, and at Stanford University. He has since worked as researcher and Principal Scientist at the Xerox Palo Alto Research Center and at the Rank Xerox European Research Center, Grenoble. His main contributions are in both linguistic and formal semantics, later also in computational linguistics. He has written a number of widely cited papers on factivity (1971a), implicative verbs (1971b), presuppositions (1973), the syntax and semantics of questions (1977), and conventional implicature (1979, together with Stanley Peters). Karttunen also did important early work on discourse referents.

The Swedes Östen Dahl, Jens Allwood, and Lars-Gunnar Andersson have made a number of contributions to semantics and pragmatics (6.3.12.). Östen Dahl has discussed an impressive range of semantic topics, for example indefinites, in an article published in *Language* (1970), generics (1975), and the semantics of tense and aspect (1985). Recently, he has discussed semantics in a multilingual and typological framework, also invoking discourse considerations. Jens Allwood has investigated semantics and pragmatics from the point of view of action theory and rational communicative behavior (e.g. Allwood 1976), working on the interpretation of genuine spoken discourse. His semantic approach often includes psycholinguistic, sociolinguistic, and anthropological considerations. Allwood and Andersson's textbook on semantics (1970 and later) has been widely used. Allwood and Dahl have introduced Montague's semantic theory to Nordic linguists in several publications. Elisabeth Engdahl's dissertation (1980) which deals with central semantic topics like questions, pronominal reference, etc., has been frequently referred to internationally. She is also internationally recognized for her teaching and supervising talents, demonstrated at many international summer schools.

Generative semantics was not widely cultivated in the Nordic countries, but Jan Terje Faarlund (1945-), professor of Scandinavian linguistics (*nordisk språkvitenskap*) in Oslo since 1997, based several of his studies of Norwegian grammar, especially his study of Norwegian verbs (1978), on this theory. Traces of this theory are also discernible in Östen Dahl's work from 1971.

Jorma Vuoriniemi (1924-) spent twenty-one years writing his dissertation (1973) on the language of the Finnish humorist Olli (1889-1967), especially the (comprehended) meanings of Olli's usage when he stretches the structural and meaning potential of Finnish words and constructions to their limits, for example in irony, metaphor, ellipsis, ambiguity, blends, intentional ungrammaticalities, and the use of presuppositions. Vuoriniemi developed a meticulous method of his own, drawing inspiration from current semantic, text linguistic, and logical theories, particularly speech act theory and the theory of operators and scope. His findings concerning the competence/performance distinction and the nature of deviant language use were theoretically interesting and ahead of their time.

Lauri Carlson (1952-), professor of linguistic theory and translation at the University of Helsinki since 1993, wrote several of his early papers together with Jaakko Hintikka using the latter's formal approach of game-theory semantics, for example Carlson & Hintikka (1977, 1979) on lazy pronouns, conditionals, and generic quantifiers. In a subsequent paper (1981), Carlson shows the relatedness of verbal aspect and nominal quantification.

Cognitive science has become a new multi-disciplinary field, and at several Nordic universities, there are now separate Cognitive Science departments or the like, e.g. in Lund, headed by Peter Gärdenfors.

Cognitive semantics has been pursued in Finland by Pentti Leino (1942-), professor of Finnish at the University of Helsinki since 1983. Leino examines the way in which the Finnish local cases can be described within a cognitive semantic framework when they co-occur (in adverbials) with certain referential properties of Finnish subjects and objects (1989). Within the same framework, Leino has undertaken a penetrating analysis of polysemy (1993). Several papers exemplifying this approach are found in the collection of papers on polysemy edited by Leino & Onikki (1994).

As mentioned in 6.3.5., Lars Hellan has recently developed a semantically and cognitively oriented

theory of language. He has also made significant contributions to various central issues in semantics, notably the semantics of comparatives (Hellan 1981).

Just as syntax and semantics have become related entities in linguistic research, cognitive semantics and computational linguistics (including artificial intelligence) have also become more tightly connected because of the reorientation of semantics which began in the 1970s. This is particularly evident in work originating in the department of computational linguistics at the Copenhagen Business School, e.g. Finn Sørensen and Carl Vikner's introduction to modal logic and semantics (1989), in the cognitive science research program supported by the Danish Research Council for the Humanities, such as Michael May's Ph.D. thesis on cognitive semantics and mental representation (1992), and to a certain extent, though differently, in the lexicographic work of Hanne Ruus at the University of Copenhagen, represented, for example, in her dissertation on core words in Danish (1995) in which she combines cognitive semantics in the spirit of Lakoff and Johnson with computational quantification.

Studies in syntax and semantics are, for obvious reasons, often interrelated. A recent elaboration of this topic is Peter Harder's (6.2.4.) dissertation (1997) on functional semantics in which the role of meaning is viewed in relation to language structure. In his view, linguistic structure is constituted by functionally interactive meanings, thus rendering it meaningless to discuss semantics apart from syntax. This is the view generally held by Danish linguists, which conversely means that it is also meaningless to discuss syntax apart from semantics — a stance which may also partially explain the lack of Danish interest in transformational syntax (6.3.1.).

6.3.7. Language typology

Language typology became an increasingly important linguistic subdiscipline after 1960, and in the Nordic countries interest in this area was aroused in the 1970s in connection with the study of the national languages in comparison both with the new immigrant languages and the language contact accompanying immigration. Typical examples of this approach to typology are Björn Hammarberg & Åke Viberg's study of the place-holder constraint and the teaching of Swedish to immigrants (1977) and Kenneth Hyltenstam's book on Swedish from an immigrant point of view (1979).

The center for theoretical and empirical research on language typology in the Nordic countries is Stockholm, where Östen Dahl and his colleagues have published studies frequently referred to in international typological research, for example Östen Dahl's study of tense and aspect systems (1985) based on data from sixty-four languages and his article, written together with the American linguist Joan Bybee, on the origin of tense and aspect systems in the languages of the world (Bybee & Dahl 1989). Dahl has also written typological papers on negation and discourse phenomena. In terms of citation analysis, Östen Dahl is probably the most cited Nordic linguist born after World War II (F. Karlsson 1994a:11). One of Dahl's pupils and colleagues, Maria Koptjevskaja-Tamm, has published a study of the typology of nominalization (1993). In Lund, Åke Viberg (1945-), professor of general linguistics since 1994, has done extensive typological-semantic work on verbs of perception (e.g. 1984). Karina Vamling has established a center for the study of Caucasian languages, mainly Georgian.

An important stimulus for typological research in the Nordic countries was the European project *Eurotyp*, sponsored by the European Science Foundation. This project, which lasted from 1990 to 1994, created a network between many European language typologists and stimulated much significant typological research in Europe. Among the Nordic participants were Hartmut Haberland from Denmark, Mikko Korhonen, Jouko Lindstedt, Hannu T. Tommola, and Maria Vilkuna from Finland, Jan Terje Faarlund, Lars Hellan, and Anders Holmberg from Norway, and Östen Dahl (head of the group on tense and aspect), Maria Koptjevskaja-Tamm, Gösta Bruce, Tomas Riad, and Karina Vamling from Sweden.

Typology within the framework of chomskyan government and binding theory has been cultivated by several Scandinavian linguists. Knut Tarald Taraldsen (6.3.5.) has investigated the general typological

parameters of the theory. Christer Platzack, Anders Holmberg and Sten Vikner have studied the typology of Scandinavian and Germanic syntax within this framework, and the typology of the Germanic languages has also been studied in a less theoretically restrictive manner by Jon Ole Askedal (1942-), professor of German in Oslo since 1986.

In Finland, Mikko Korhonen (6.3.16. and 6.5.2.) extended the traditional comparative Finno-Ugric approach in the direction of Western language typology, considering, for example, the phenomenon of typological drift in the Finno-Ugric languages, particularly from the viewpoint of case systems. Areal and ethnolinguistics, which was an old tradition in Finno-Ugric studies dating back to Mathias Alexander Castrén, have been continued in a broad Northern Eurasian perspective, particularly by Juha Janhunen.

6.3.8. Applied Linguistics

After 1965, applied linguistics became a central field of linguistics. Because its usefulness was much more obvious to politicians and non-linguists than the more theoretical approaches were, with the exception of computational linguistics, funds for research were frequently easier to obtain for applied purposes. Traditional neogrammarian historical linguistics had little to offer in the face of new societal needs, whereas the new linguistic theories like structuralism, acoustic phonetics, systemic grammar, and transformational grammar offered interesting new possibilities for tackling real-world problems related to areas like language teaching and language planning.

One early applied linguist was Nils Erik Enkvist (6.2.4.), who introduced this discipline in his early work on contrastive Finnish-English phonetics and on stylistics (1962a,b, 1963, 1964a). Enkvist established an informal applied linguistics group at the English department of Åbo Akademi University in the mid 1960s and published working papers, perhaps the first of such “underground” publications in Finland. Håkan Ringbom (1936-) has continued this Åbo tradition in his comparative work on the differences between the acquisition of English by Finns and Finland-Swedes (e.g. Ringbom 1987).

Later, the University of Jyväskylä, and particularly its English department, headed by Kari Sajavaara (1938-), became the main center of applied linguistics in Finland. Research in Jyväskylä has concentrated on foreign language acquisition, with emphasis on Finns learning English. Early work in the 1970s was concerned with contrastive analysis. Areas like error analysis, contrastive discourse analysis, and cross-cultural pragmatics were then taken up.

A typical feature of Finland, as distinct from the other Nordic countries, is the strong concentration on translation studies. There are five departments or schools of translation studies in Finland, and more than ten professors hold positions in “translation of language x” or the like. Translation research in Finland has drawn much of its inspiration from text linguistics as well as from discourse and genre analysis.

Interest in the language problems of immigrants in Denmark, Norway, and Sweden gave rise in the 1970s to studies in contrastive linguistics and the teaching of the Scandinavian languages as second languages. This was also a field to which authorities were willing to give extensive financial support, both in the form of research grants and through the creation of new positions. Sweden was a forerunner in this field, with Björn Hammarberg and Åke Viberg being early pioneers. Hammarberg initiated a project in Stockholm called *Svenska som målspråk* (Swedish as target language), and Viberg devised appropriate experimental situations, for example a situation in which the various uses of verbs of location in different languages were clarified, thereby also contributing indirectly to the study of lexical semantics. Kenneth Hyltenstam became the first professor of bilingualism in the Nordic countries, at the University of Stockholm. Some of his studies, for example on learning scales and learning hierarchies, have resulted in interesting theories of language acquisition in general.

Observations of the weak linguistic competence of certain children in bilingual situations led Nils Erik Hansegård (1924-), professor of Sámi 1974-1979 at the University of Umeå, to coin a new Swedish term in 1968, *halvspråkighet* (semi-lingualism), a concept that was widely debated among linguists, social

workers, politicians, and teachers, since it implied that the linguistic competence of some bilingual children was only partial in each language. This was one of the factors leading to the view that immigrant children should be taught their mother tongue before being exposed to Swedish. Extensive programs of mother tongue teaching for minorities (*hemspråksundervisning*) were established all over Sweden, but since the children in these programs often had problems keeping up with the other students, and the programs were expensive, they were gradually abandoned. Hansegård's notion of semi-lingualism has generally not been recognized by linguists, meeting with strong criticism from the outset.

Important research in applied linguistics was undertaken in Denmark by Claus Færch (1948-1987), lecturer in English at the University of Copenhagen. As head of the PIF-project in foreign and second language teaching in the late 1970s and early 1980s, Færch advocated a combination of theory development and empirical research in an attempt to shed light on the relatively new field of language acquisition. Most of his research was published together with colleagues, and as a tribute to his memory, a commemorative volume with articles on this topic was edited by several of these colleagues (Phillipson et al. 1991). A continuation of Færch's pioneering work can be seen in recent work on the consequences for foreign and second language teaching of the interplay between language and culture. Research projects of an anthropological-ethnographic nature have been carried out in this field in Denmark with support from the Danish Research Council for the Humanities, and the field was recognized as an independent section at the AILA conference in Amsterdam in 1993.

The application of linguistic methods to problems encountered in language teaching in school, especially in teaching the mother tongue, interested several linguists, for example Ulf Teleman, Jan Anward, Kent Larsson, Tor Hultman, Jan Einarsson in Sweden, Carsten Elbro in Denmark, Frøydis Hertzberg and Geirr Wiggen in Norway, and Auli Hakulinen and Matti Leiwo in Finland. The nature of classroom interaction was a particularly popular topic. A good example of this type of work is found in the Danish project on school language (*Projekt Skolesprog*), 6.3.11.

The University of Copenhagen used to have a separate Department of Applied Linguistics, now merged with the Department of Linguistics and the Department of Phonetics. A variety of linguists have been affiliated with this department, including Bente Maegaard, specializing in computational linguistics, Jesper Hermann in psycholinguistics, and Henning Spang-Hanssen in mathematical linguistics, terminology, and language for special purposes.

The language of radio and television has also been the object of both linguistic investigation and linguistic advice in this period. One example of this aspect of applied linguistics is Ib Poulsen's investigation of the language of the media, in particular his investigation of the comprehensibility of newscasts (1994), the results of which have been used to improve the production of news broadcasts on the Danish national television network. Jan Svensson in Lund has studied on language use in Swedish radio and television.

6.3.9. Psycholinguistics, Neurological and Clinical Linguistics, and Child Language Acquisition

An internationally recognized specialist and pioneer on first language acquisition is the Swedish scholar Ragnhild Söderbergh (1933-), professor of child language research in Stockholm 1976-1983 and professor in Lund 1983-1997. She has adopted a broad approach to the study of reading and language development in children, also taking into account deaf children and problems relating to the acquisition of the symbolic function.

In 1970-1976, Jorma Toivainen (1938-) headed an extensive project on Finnish child language acquisition at the University of Oulu. In his dissertation on the acquisition of inflectional affixes (1980), Toivainen shows that the starting point of inflectional acquisition is an undifferentiated singular third person present tense verb form and either the nominative or partitive basic form of a noun. As differentiation begins, the child first acquires the first person singular verb suffix to refer to his own actions, a primitive past tense form, and the genitive of his/her own name as a possessive form.

Child language has become a flourishing field of research during the last twenty years. In 1994, an extensive inter-Nordic research project on language acquisition was initiated, with participants from all the Nordic countries. The project coordinator is Sven Strömquist (Gothenburg, since 1998 professor of language acquisition in Lund), with national research groups coordinated by Kim Plunkett (Aarhus), Matti Leiwo (Jyväskylä), Jorma Toivainen (Turku), Hrafnhildur Ragnarsdóttir (Reykjavik), and Hanne Gram Simonsen (Oslo). The project is based on a combination of longitudinal case studies, narrative tasks, and morphological and phonetic experiments (Strömquist et al. 1995).

Jussi Niemi (1950-) and his colleagues at the University of Joensuu have conducted psycholinguistic studies of Finnish speech production and understanding in normal subject and aphasics (Niemi, Laine & Tuominen 1994, Laine et al. 1995). Some of their empirical findings suggest that mental morphological representations of Finnish words are in terms of the storage of all stems, not as underlying forms to which morphological processes are applied, nor as a full list of all potential word forms.

Studies of aphasia have become a prominent part of linguistics in this period in all the Nordic countries. Aphasia has been analyzed from the viewpoints of speech production and perception as well as from the point of view of the language system itself, and not only as a linguistic, but also as a cognitive and social phenomenon.

In Sweden, psycholinguistic research is carried out in several places, e.g. by Erland Hjelmquist, Sven Strömquist, and Elisabeth Ahlsén in Gothenburg (on aphasia), and by Robert Jarvella (on reading and perception) at the University of Umeå. Such studies are often conducted in departments of speech therapy (logopedics).

6.3.10. Sign Languages

Nordic scholars have made significant contributions to the study of sign languages. Interest in this area began in the United States around 1960 with the work of William Stokoe and was first taken up in the Nordic countries by the Swedish linguist Brita Bergman (1946-), who devised a typology of signs in Signed Swedish and an analysis of their internal structure in terms of basic units, cheremes (Bergman 1977). Bergman defended her Ph.D. dissertation on sign language structure in 1983. Recognizing the importance of this field, the Department of Linguistics at the University of Stockholm established a separate division for sign language research and teaching in 1980. Bergman has been professor of Sign Language in this department since 1986. She is unique in this capacity in Europe, as is the sign language division in Stockholm.

Sign language research has since also been carried out in the other Nordic countries. Elisabeth Engberg-Pedersen, for example, wrote her dissertation on localization, i.e. the use of space, in Danish Sign Language (1993), comparing the semantics and morphosyntax of localization to the corresponding means of expression in spoken and written languages. In Finland, Terhi Rissanen wrote the first comprehensive description of the structure of Finnish Sign Language (1985). An electronic dictionary of Finnish Sign Language was published as a collaborative project between the Finnish Union of the Deaf and the Research Center for the Languages of Finland (Malm et al. 1998).

Careful empirical linguistic analysis of sign language structure, its use and acquisition, has made it clear that sign languages are natural languages in the strict sense of the word, disregarding the obvious difference in mode (visual vs. acoustic). Research in this area has been instrumental in convincing politicians and educational authorities that the various sign languages should be given official status as national (minority) languages, and that this should also have consequences for the organization of education for the deaf such that sign language should be officially recognized both as a means of teaching and as a subject in its own right. Attitudes among the hearing are gradually changing in the Nordic countries, thus making the field of sign language research a good example of the societal relevance of linguistics.

6.3.11. Sociolinguistics and Dialectology

The 1960s was the decade of transformational grammar, but also the decade when modern sociolinguistics emerged as an important linguistic discipline (Labov 1966). This led to a field of research that was attractive to young scholars, politicians, and educators alike, challenging and gradually transforming traditional dialectology. Sociolinguistics in the Nordic countries was mainly carried out on the basis of Labov's variational method, but the influence of the British scholar Basil Bernstein was also significant, cf. Mæhlum (1996) for a general survey of Nordic sociolinguistics and its relationship to traditional dialectology. The scholar who introduced modern sociolinguistics to the Nordic countries was Bengt Loman (6.2.4), who through his project in Lund, *Talsyntax*, created a model for future sociolinguistic research in Finland, Norway, and Sweden.

An interesting precursor to modern sociolinguistics in the Nordic countries is Anders Steinsholt's research on dialect change and dialect mixing in an area south-west of Oslo (1964, 1972). Steinsholt, who was headmaster of a high school in Southern Norway, conducted his research in 1939-1940, but his work was not published until 1964. In 1972, he published a new study from the same parish, Hedrum, close to the town of Larvik in the south-eastern part of Norway in which he described the changes that had occurred in the local dialect over the thirty years that had elapsed since his first investigation. Such a study of changes in real time conducted by the same researcher is unique in the history of sociolinguistics and dialectology.

Methodologically, Steinsholt's work resembles Labovian and post-Labovian sociolinguistics more than traditional dialectology, with a wide range of informants classified according to criteria like age, sex, mobility (network), and prestige and with the linguistic data correlated with these features. In his radical view, a dialect was a collection of idiolects with a great degree of variability, and in contrast to the traditional romantic tradition of dialectology, he did not look for the genuine dialect in the mouth of the oldest, most traditional, longest residing, and probably most toothless, informant. Instead he saw a dialect area as a meeting place of various linguistic tendencies and systems, the individual's choice being determined by various social features.

In Sweden, dialectology and language sociology merged in many modern projects, for example in the Eskiltuna studies carried out by Bengt Nordberg and his students at the University of Uppsala. Of particular interest here are the theoretical studies of Mats Thelander, who takes a statistical approach. Sociolinguistics was established as a separate field of research much earlier in Sweden than in the other Nordic countries (Mæhlum 1996:188). Several sociolinguistic studies of Swedish town dialects had already been initiated prior to 1970.

The well-known sociolinguist John J. Gumperz published a study of variation in the dialect of Hemnesberget in Northern Norway (1971) in collaboration with the anthropologist Jan-Petter Blom (1927-). This article was reprinted in several widely read anthologies and thus became the best known Nordic sociolinguistic study outside the Nordic countries (Gumperz 1971, Gumperz & Hymes 1972). A Norwegian translation of the article appeared in 1972. Blom and Gumperz were more anthropological and interactional than Labovian in their approach, and the reaction in Norway was on the whole negative. As Brit Mæhlum has pointed out (1990b, 1996), Gumperz and Blom's linguistic conclusions are highly questionable, not least because of their insufficient knowledge of Norwegian and Norwegian dialectology.

In Norway, the TAUS project investigating the spoken language in Oslo (6.2.1.6.) represented the beginning of numerous Labovian sociolinguistic projects on town dialects, both on a larger scale (Bergen and Trondheim) and on a smaller scale involving individual dialects or population groups.

The foremost theoretical sociolinguist in Norway is Brit Mæhlum (1957-), professor of Scandinavian languages in Trondheim since 1995. Mæhlum's dissertation (1990a, 1992) is an innovative study of dialectal socialization on Svalbard in which she first provides a penetrating critical analysis of the main directions in modern sociolinguistics and then develops her own network model.

Mogens Baumann Larsen (1930-), professor of Scandinavian languages in Aalborg from 1975 to

1993, brought sociolinguistics to Denmark after his return from the United States in 1967, where, together with Bengt Loman, he had become acquainted with American sociolinguistics at the Center for Applied Linguistics in Washington D.C. while working on a sociolinguistic research project under the leadership of Charles Ferguson (I. Pedersen 1996:259). The two main sociolinguistic projects of the 1970s in Denmark, however, were not Labovian in method. The project on school language (*Projekt Skolesprog*) was inspired by Bernstein's work and carried out within a pedagogical frame of reference, and the diachronic investigation of the spoken language of Copenhagen by Lars Brink and Jørn Lund (Brink & Lund 1975) was inspired by Otto Jespersen's views on the relationship between language and society. In the 1980s, Danish dialectological research began to integrate sociolinguistic views and methods, inspired in particular by Baumann Larsen, and, as time went on, sociolinguistics was developed further, largely through the efforts of Inge Lise Pedersen (1939-) and Frans Gregersen (6.2.4. and I. Pedersen 1996:262-264). Several varieties of sociolinguistics became current in Denmark in this period, but the most productive approach has been the merger of sociolinguistics and dialectology evident in the large-scale research project in urban sociolinguistics headed by Gregersen and Pedersen (cf. Gregersen and Pedersen 1991). The extensive corpus underlying this project will soon be available on the world-wide web.

Sociolinguistics never became popular or influential in Iceland. The two most obvious explanations for this are the smallness and egalitarian character of the Icelandic society coupled with the successful and intense concentration by young Icelandic linguists on theoretical phonology, morphology, and syntax.

Finnish sociolinguistics began around 1970, inspired by Labov's classic work, as in the other Nordic countries. The immediate influences came from Sweden, especially from Bengt Loman, but also from Bengt Nordberg and Mats Thelander. As in Denmark, the tradition of Finnish and Finland-Swedish dialectology has been partly amalgamated with or at least strongly influenced by modern sociolinguistics. Mirja Saari (1943-, professor of Scandinavian languages at the University of Helsinki since 1988) joined the *Talsyntax* project in Lund (cf. 6.2.4.) in 1969 and applied this conceptual framework (analysis in terms of macrosyntagms, etc.) to syntax in interview material (1975), investigating in particular how sentence structure is affected by social background.

In 1972, a group headed by Terho Itkonen started investigating the sociolinguistic aspects of colloquial Helsinki Finnish by examining a corpus comprising interviews with 149 informants representing different parts of the city as well as different social and age groups. In 1977, Heikki Paunonen, Matti K. Suojanen, and Aila Mielikäinen initiated a large sociolinguistic project on the change in modern spoken Finnish (*Suomen puhekielen murros*), focusing on the city dialects of Helsinki, Turku, Tampere, and Jyväskylä, and especially on how these dialects had been affected by urbanization and industrialization. Paunonen described the composition and social stratification of colloquial Helsinki Finnish, especially the variation patterns of certain diphthongs and vowel combinations, personal pronouns, possessive suffixes, and verbal concord (1995 [1982]). Suojanen published the results from Turku (1985), and Mielikäinen reported on the results from Jyväskylä (1980, 1981a, b, 1986). This investigation of the changes in areal dialects has shown that sociolinguistic stratification is not pervasive in Finland. Rather, the composition of present-day spoken Finnish is the consequence of a complex interplay between traditional rural dialects, a young spoken norm that was artificially established a century ago, and recent societal changes like urbanization.

Classical scholars in Finland were among the first to apply the methods of sociolinguistics, especially Jaakko Frösén (1944-), research professor at the Academy of Finland 1993-1997, and Jorma Kaimio (1946-), Vice Executive Officer of the largest Finnish publishing house, WSOY. In his extensive theoretical introduction to the study of Greek in the first centuries AD (1972), Frösén treated the relation between classical philology and general linguistics and discussed in detail the theoretical and empirical bases of phenomena such as norm, code, variation, creolization, style, and the written/spoken distinction. He applied sociolinguistic theory in characterizing the ancient Greek language community and the position of multilingual individuals in it. Kaimio studied the sociolinguistic position of the Greek language in the Roman empire, especially its status in relation to other languages, and its Latinization process (1979). He also

described language attitudes and the principles governing language choice in ancient Rome.

In Denmark, Robert Phillipson (1942-) and Tove Skutnabb-Kangas (1940-) of the University of Roskilde have gained international recognition for their work on linguistic human rights, linguistic imperialism, and minority education (Skutnabb-Kangas & Phillipson 1995). In connection with their current research project on linguistic human rights, supported by the Danish Research Council for the Humanities, they have attracted and supervised doctoral students from various parts of the world, in particular the newly independent Baltic countries. Skutnabb-Kangas is an internationally recognized Nordic sociolinguist with extensive publications on bilingualism, language sociology (especially language problems of immigrants), and language politics. Her textbook on bilingualism (1981) is widely used, particularly in Sweden.

6.3.12. Pragmatics, Text Linguistics, Discourse and Conversation Analysis

In the early 1970s, the first enthusiasm over the advent of structure-based generative grammar started to dissipate in many quarters. Interest in semantics and pragmatics grew accordingly, soon leading to a variety of different but interrelated contextual and/or functional approaches to language, especially its semantic and communicative functions. The best-known of these approaches are pragmatics, text linguistics, discourse analysis, and conversation analysis, among which there is considerable overlap in theoretical aims and methodology. These have been the most popular branches of general linguistics practiced in Denmark and Finland since 1965, especially in departments of English, Danish, Finnish, German, and Swedish.

Denmark is undoubtedly the Nordic country in which pragmatics and text linguistics have been most extensively cultivated. To some extent, pragmatics had the same function in Denmark as generative grammar had in the other Nordic countries in being the symbol of a new generation of linguists. A special variety of pragmatics, different in many ways from what is known as pragmatics elsewhere, was cultivated in Copenhagen and at the new university in Roskilde. It was inspired by Paul Diderichsen's teaching and research in the history of non-literary Danish prose and nourished by the critical questions posed by the student population after 1968.

In Copenhagen, pragmatics became an essential part of research into the Danish language, and several informal circles were established for discussing and cultivating pragmatic research from both a political and a philosophical point of view. Young linguists like Lars Heltoft, Peter Harder (6.2.4.), and Ole Tøgeby formed *Pragmatikkredsen* (The Pragmatic Circle) in Copenhagen, a circle which is still active today. These same linguists have also shaped Danish linguistics in the 1990s in various ways, but all with a firm footing in pragmatics. Ole Tøgeby (1947-), professor of Danish in Aarhus since 1993, published a voluminous dissertation on pragmatic text theory (PRAXT, 1993). Lars Heltoft (1948-), professor of Danish at the University of Roskilde since 1997, is one of the authors of the Danish reference grammar soon to appear (written together with Erik Hansen). Central to the Copenhagen variety of pragmatics is its foundation in the speech act theory of J. L. Austin and John Searle and the theory of communicative action and universal pragmatics of Jürgen Habermas.

One of the early pioneers in the more traditional variety of pragmatics was Jacob Mey (6.2.3.), professor of general linguistics in Odense from 1971 to 1997. In 1977, together with Hartmut Haberland, he founded the *Journal of Pragmatics*, which has become a leading international journal in the field. He also published a textbook on pragmatics (1993).

Nils Erik Enkvist (5.7.1. and 6.2.4.), Åbo Akademi University, an expert on stylistics and text linguistics, introduced text linguistics in Finland and other Nordic countries. When Enkvist was appointed research professor at the Academy of Finland 1974-1977, he formed the Text Linguistics Research Group at Åbo Akademi University. His introduction to text linguistics (1974) was widely used.

The text linguistics approach in A. Hakulinen, F. Karlsson & M. Vilkuna's study of certain basic syntactic and semantic phenomena in Finnish, especially the interplay between givenness and word order (1980), was further developed by Vilkuna in her studies on word order properties and referentiality in

Finnish texts (1989, 1992).

In connection with the Swedish project in spoken syntax (6.2.4.), Bengt Loman and Nils Jörgensen wrote a manual for analyzing maximal syntactic units (macrosyntagms), which has been used extensively in studies of texts (1971). Ulf Teleman designed a detailed system for coding the structure of surface sentences, *Manual för grammatisk beskrivning av talad och skriven svenska* (Coding manual for grammatical description of spoken and written Swedish, 1974), which has been widely used as a model for other similar projects. In the late 1970s, Gunnel Källgren (1949-) became the leading text linguist in Sweden with her dissertation (1979) in which she analyzed devices for text cohesion.

An important Nordic contribution to discourse analysis was Lauri Carlson's book (6.3.6.) on dialogue games (1983), inspired by his earlier work in game-theoretical semantics. This work is an elaboration of his dissertation at MIT (1982). In his game-theoretical discourse analysis of the interjection *well* (1984), he argues that there is just one game-theoretical rule governing the use of this word and that complexities arise when this rule interacts with different environments.

Auli Hakulinen (6.3.1.) has headed a large project on conversation analysis in Finland since 1985. The theoretical and methodological statement of the foundation and aims of the project (1989) stresses the importance and specific nature of everyday speech, especially with regard to its syntactic properties. Important topics investigated in this project are the use of modals, particles, fixed phrases, connectors, and interruptions. Much attention has been paid to designing an appropriate methodology, especially an adequate transcription system that is also suited to computerized representation. The approach is more sociological than that of rigid linguistic discourse analysis. Anu Klippi and Minna Laakso have applied conversation analysis to the study of aphasics.

Jan-Ola Östman (1951-), Helsinki, has worked on semantics and pragmatics (e.g. Östman 1981), dialectology, the relation between pragmatics and ideology, and contact linguistics (Raukko & Östman 1994).

Swedish interest in the pragmatics of language, communication, and dialogue is particularly apparent in the Department of Linguistics in Gothenburg, where Jens Allwood has headed several projects in this area, and in Linköping, where Per Linell is in charge of a linguistically oriented Department of Communication specializing in conversation analysis and the structure of dialogue. Jens Allwood's dissertation (1976) is a theoretical contribution to the study of human interaction and communication. Interest in discourse analysis and text linguistics is also strong in Stockholm, Lund, and Uppsala (cf. 6.2.1.8.).

In Norway, Thorstein Fretheim (1942-), professor of general linguistics in Trondheim since 1978, has added new fields and new topics of research to both general linguistics and the study of the Scandinavian languages. He has revitalized the study of Norwegian intonation by applying modern intonation research techniques to the study of Norwegian intonation and by adding a pragmatic component to the analysis. Fretheim has also applied a pragmatically oriented approach in a number of smaller studies of Norwegian particles and various aspects of Norwegian morphology, syntax, and semantics.

6.3.13. Language and Gender

One area in which there has been much cooperation among linguists in the Nordic countries in recent years is that of language and gender. Although there were a few early studies dealing with differences between men's and women's language (e.g. Cederschöld 1900, Jacobsen 1912, O. Jespersen 1907, 1922, 1941b), it was not until the 1970s and 1980s, mostly as a by-product of the feminist movement, that a more widespread interest in women's language emerged. At first, and up through the 1980s, research in language and gender in most of the Nordic countries was devoted primarily to confirming or refuting the results of Anglo-American research, with varying and often conflicting results. A review of this literature is found in Preisler (1986). An important contribution from this period is the collection of articles by Norwegian linguists edited by Else Ryen (1976).

In the late 1980s, a loose network was formed in connection with the Nordic linguistic conferences (6.2.2.), which quickly led to more formal cooperation between linguists in the Nordic countries. As a result, the first conference on language, language use, and gender was held in Uppsala in 1991, organized by Tove Bull, Britt-Louise Gunnarsson, Auli Hakulinen, and Carol Henriksen. In addition to papers on topics ranging from theoretical issues and methodology to the linguistic interaction of kindergarten children, historiographic surveys of research on language and gender in Denmark (C. Henriksen 1992), Finland (Rautala 1992), Norway (Swan 1992), and Sweden (B. Gunnarsson 1992) were presented and discussed. These reports were summarized and updated at the second conference on language and gender held in Tromsø in 1994 (cf. I. Broch et al. 1995), where there were papers on theory and methodology, political language, pragmatics and conversation analysis, and male and female journalism. The third Nordic conference on language and gender was held in Copenhagen in 1997.

In 1996, a 10-day research course for doctoral students, sponsored by the Nordic Council of Ministers, was held in Denmark. This course not only attracted doctoral students from Denmark, Norway, and Sweden, but also several German Scandinavianists.

In Denmark, Norway, and Sweden, research in language and gender has frequently been sociolinguistically oriented, with gender being analyzed as a variable along with many others. This is particularly true of research in Norway, where the Labovian paradigm has inspired a number of quantitative correlation studies of both rural and urban dialects. One exception to this Labovian approach, however, is Ellen Andenæs' work on gender and second language learning, e.g. Andenæs (1993). In Denmark and Sweden, there has been a greater tendency to apply the methods of pragmatics and conversation analysis to gender research. Most research in these countries has also been centered on the spoken language.

In Finland, language and gender research has been approached primarily from the point of view of feminist theory, and many of the Finnish linguists engaged in these studies have also been politically active in the feminist movement. Auli Hakulinen, the leading Finnish linguist in this field (cf. Rautala 1992:33f.), wrote an article on the significance of language for women (A. Hakulinen 1981). Since then she has inspired a productive group of young linguists to focus in particular on gender research in pragmatics, discourse analysis, and semiotics. This group has published a collection of articles on language and gender and linguistics and gender, including a history of women in Finnish linguistics (Laitinen 1987), and it has also been active in popularizing research in this area. Compared to the other Nordic countries, there is little sociolinguistically oriented research in language and gender in Finland, where the focus is more on philosophical French feminism than on American approaches to linguistics.

6.3.14. Computational Linguistics

Early Nordic work on computational linguistics in the 1960s and 1970s was usually related either to machine translation or to corpus analysis intended for lexicographic, other linguistic, or applied purposes. In the late 1970s, more theoretically oriented approaches to computational linguistics entered the scene. The Nordic countries have made significant contributions both to computerized corpus linguistics and to theoretical computational linguistics.

Sture Allén (1928-), professor of linguistic computing in Gothenburg 1972-1994 and Permanent Secretary of the Swedish Academy since 1986, was a forerunner in computational lexicography. He headed the team that was among the first to use computers for handling basic-level text corpora. This project published a large frequency dictionary of modern Swedish in three volumes (vol. 1: Allén 1970). The corpus became known under the name *Press-65*, since it consisted of one million words of newspaper text. Another offspring of the project was Staffan Hellberg's computationally oriented explicit description of contemporary Swedish morphology (1978). The Gothenburg group in computational lexicography became known as *Språkdata* (Language data), and it has published a number of Swedish dictionaries in collaboration with commercial publishers.

The tagged data of the *Talsyntax* and *Skrivsyntax* projects (6.2.4.) were computerized in the early 1970s.

Another large computerized text corpus project was the London-Lund Corpus (LLC) of Spoken English, initiated in 1975 and headed by Jan Svartvik (Svartvik 1990, cf. also 6.7.1.). The original corpus consisted of eighty-seven texts (435,000 words) and had originally been compiled by Sir Randolph Quirk, now Lord Quirk, and his colleagues at University College London, starting in 1959 (The Survey of English Usage project). Svartvik's team carried out a basic prosodic analysis of the corpus. The London-Lund Corpus was the first large computerized spoken language corpus in the world and has stimulated research on spoken English, not least because of its marking of prosody.

Stig Johansson (1939-), professor of Modern English at the University of Oslo since 1981, collaborated with Geoffrey Leech from Lancaster and Knut Hofland from Bergen in compiling the computerized Lancaster/Oslo-Bergen Corpus of British English (one million words). The LOB Corpus has become one of the classics of corpus linguistics. Its selection of genres and texts was modeled on the well-known Brown Corpus of American English, compiled by W. Nelson Francis and Henry Ku_era at Brown University (Providence, Rhode Island) in the 1960s. The LOB Corpus and many other central computerized English text corpora are distributed by the International Computer Archive of Modern English (ICAME), an international organization of linguists and information scientists working with English machine-readable texts. The distribution of corpora via ICAME is run by the Norwegian Computing Center for the Humanities in Bergen, which also publishes the newsletter *ICAME Journal - Computers in English Linguistics*, an important forum for corpus linguistics, especially as applied to English. Both Oslo and Bergen have become international centers of excellence for computer-based English language research.

In Helsinki, Matti Rissanen has collaborated with Merja Kytö in compiling the *Helsinki Corpus of English Texts: Diachronic and Dialectal* (Kytö & Rissanen 1988). The corpus contains a diachronic section covering the period from c. 750 to c. 1700 and a dialect section based on transcripts of interviews with speakers of British rural dialects from the 1970s (this section was conceived by Ossi Ihalainen). The diachronic *Helsinki Corpus* has become a concept and is in widespread international use. In 1991, the Old English section contained 413,000 words and the Middle English section 608,000 words (Kytö 1991).

In Sweden, Gunnel Källgren and Eva Ejerhed have compiled the SUC (Stockholm - Umeå) corpus in the 1990s, a one-million word corpus of written Swedish. The corpus is also available on CD-ROM.

There have also been a number of large Danish corpus compilation endeavors, mostly funded by the Danish Research Council for the Humanities and directed to projects in the area of language for special purposes (*fagsprog*) at the Danish business schools.

Problems of machine translation were discussed in Sweden at an early date (Fröberg & Sigurd 1962). Sigurd has subsequently dealt with this problem in connection with his work on the Swetra Referent Grammar and its implementation (Sigurd 1994a).

In the 1980s, the European Union launched the EUROTRA project, the aim of which was to design a system for automatic translation between all seventy-two language pairs among the then nine languages of the Union. Denmark participated in EUROTRA under the leadership of Bente Maegaard of the Department of Applied and Mathematical Linguistics at the University of Copenhagen. EUROTRA did not achieve all its original aims, but it was important in creating a European infrastructure for computational linguistics.

In 1993, a Danish research program supported by the Danish Research Council for the Humanities was established to explore some of the basic linguistic features of Danish by utilizing the potential of computational linguistics. This large-scale project, which involved senior scholars and Ph.D. students from five Danish institutions, was also headed by Bente Maegaard of the new Center for Language Technology at the University of Copenhagen. The program, called *Udforskning af Dansk Ordforråd og Grammatik* (UDOG, Exploration of Danish vocabulary and grammar), involves the study of linguistic phenomena both at word and clause level, the exploration of semantic and syntactic selections between words, and the application of and comparison between different linguistic methods. This project has six sections, one of the most productive being the Odense Valency Dictionary project (6.3.5.).

Hans Karlgren (5.2.5.) and Benny Brodda were engaged in early attempts to use the computer in the analysis of texts and words. Brodda has developed a special programming language, Beta (Brodda 1977), which is a powerful tool for character-string based automatic analysis of large masses of text. Beta has been successfully used by Brodda, Gunnel Källgren and others for modeling such linguistic phenomena as morphological inflection, morphological word segmentation, and automatic hyphenation. Beta is also a good tool for retrieving (excerpting) example sentences conforming to a specified structure from large corpora.

In the 1980s, theoretical approaches to computational linguistics became topical. Kimmo Koskenniemi (1945-), professor of computational linguistics at the University of Helsinki since 1992, submitted his dissertation on two-level morphology (TWOL) in 1983. This is one of the most cited publications in computational linguistics. Building upon the ideas of Martin Kay and Ron Kaplan, Koskenniemi developed, formalized, and computationally implemented a language-independent theory of computational morphology. The two levels referred to are lexicon and surface. The theory incorporates a rule formalism for morphophonological alternations expressed as correspondences between lexical and surface segments. These rules can be compiled into run-time finite-state automata used in the processes of recognizing actual word forms, i.e. associating them with lexical lemmata, and generating word forms from lemmata. The theory has been applied to numerous languages, for example Finnish, Swedish, English, Russian, Japanese, Swahili, and Arabic. The theory demonstrated that morphology can be described in a language-independent way simply by finite-state means, formally the simplest ones available.

Fred Karlsson developed a language-independent formalism called Constraint Grammar (1990) for the morphological disambiguation and surface syntactic analysis of running text. Atro Voutilainen, Juha Heikkilä, and Arto Anttila were the first to apply Karlsson's theory. They implemented and tested a full-scale Constraint Grammar description of English called ENGCG (F. Karlsson, A. Voutilainen, J. Heikkilä & A. Anttila 1995, eds.). Constraint Grammar has been applied to several languages, including Danish, Finnish, German, Swedish, Swahili, and Basque. In the period 1994-1999, part of the work on computational linguistics at the University of Helsinki was carried out at the Research Unit for Multilingual Language Technology, which belonged to the Department of General Linguistics.

No other branch of general linguistics has grown so rapidly and to such magnitude since 1965 as computational linguistics. There are one or two professors of psycholinguistics, sociolinguistics, or child language acquisition in the Nordic countries, but at least ten professors of computational linguistics or language technology at the Faculties of Arts alone, and more technically oriented positions at the Nordic Institutes of Technology. The obvious pragmatic reason is that computational linguistics has been perceived

as a central discipline in the formation of what is now loosely called the information society. An interesting question is whether computational linguistics will eventually face the same fate as phonetics (6.4.) and become so technological that it will end up solely in Institutes of Technology or Departments of Computer Science.

6.3.15. Diachronic Linguistics

Raimo Anttila's (6.3.1., 6.3.4) textbook on historical and comparative linguistics (1972, second, revised edition 1989) is one of the most widely used handbooks of its kind. Anttila describes the historical, philosophical, and even ideological background of historical and comparative linguistics. He stresses the significance of semiotics for linguistics, of analogy as an important mechanism in grammatical change (Anttila 1977a), of abductive and teleological explanations of linguistic development, and of variation for understanding change. The cornerstone of Anttila's conception of language comprises the subtypes and classes of signs. Allophones, for example, are classified as iconic indexes. The comparative and historical methods are dealt with in detail, exemplified by both Indo-European and Finno-Ugric languages, thus giving typological and universalistic arguments a force not always found in this type of analysis.

Another internationally recognized scholar in theoretical diachronic linguistics is Henning Andersen (1934-), since 1989 professor of Slavic Languages and Literatures at the University of California, Los Angeles. Andersen's work, mainly based on data from the Slavic languages, has contributed to a typology of language change, especially sound change, and has had a decisive influence on international linguistic research, not least his distinction between abductive and deductive sound change (He. Andersen 1973). Andersen's particular strength is his ability to combine diachrony and synchrony, phonology and morphology, philology and dialect geography in his analyses, thereby giving his conclusions multiple support.

Martti Nyman (1944-) was one of the first to unite classical philology and modern linguistics. Like Andersen, he too had an article published in the prestigious journal *Language* (1977), on the development of Latin *sum*. Nyman has been particularly interested in the metatheoretical aspects of diachronic linguistics (1982).

Jan Terje Faarlund (6.3.6.) has become an internationally recognized expert on diachronic syntax, (cf. Faarlund 1990 and numerous articles in internationals). He has also produced several studies of Norwegian morphology and syntax, mainly within the framework of generative semantics. He is one of the co-authors of the Norwegian reference grammar (Faarlund, Lie & Vannebo 1997).

Mikko Korhonen (6.5.2.) wrote an extraordinary book on the origin of language (1993a), published posthumously by his wife Ulla-Maija Kulonen. This work provides an extensive and up-to-date exposition of the phylogenetic emergence of natural language over the course of millions of years, examined from the point of view of many different sciences: linguistics, zoosemiotics, archeology, neurology, biology, paleontology, genetics, etc. Korhonen also relates this background to current problems of historical linguistics and linguistic typology and tries to answer questions such as "Do language universals change?" and "Can protolanguages be reconstructed using presently hypothesized universals?"

Swedish diachronic linguistics since 1970 has been innovative in several areas. One is the statistical approach to etymology, showing trends in the origins of words, for example Martin Gellerstam's investigation of etymological frequencies in the core vocabulary (1973). Another is the study of the development of various styles and genres (Gösta Holm 1967 and Carl Ivar Ståhle 1975). Jan Svensson has investigated the way changes in linguistic behavior are related to societal change (1993). Cecilia Falk (1992) applied principles-and-parameters based syntactic theory to investigating the development of the equivalents of the *it/there* constructions in Swedish. Tomas Riad (1992) analyzed the old problems of Germanic stress, length, and syllabification in the framework of prosodic mora theory. Gertrud Pettersson (1992) wrote an interesting study which demonstrates how legal ideals have shaped the structure and use of Swedish legal

language since 1734.

6.3.16. Linguistic Metatheory, the Philosophy of Language, and the History of Linguistics

The philosophy of language and linguistically relevant formal concepts have been written about by several prominent Nordic philosophers and logicians, for example by Arne Naess, Stig Kanger, Krister Segerberg, Jaakko Hintikka, and Georg Henrik von Wright, but their work falls outside the scope of this book. As for linguists proper, it would seem that linguistic metatheory and the philosophy of language have attracted the greatest attention in Finland.

Esa Itkonen (1944-), professor of general linguistics at the University of Turku (1982-), has written three substantial monographs on the metatheory of linguistics and related issues (1978, 1983, and 1991). In these books, as well as in many papers, Itkonen has formulated several general ontological, epistemological, and methodological claims about certain phenomena of language and the nature of linguistic research. Some of Itkonen's claims are that (atheoretical) rules of language are known with certainty by native speakers, that autonomous descriptions of the language system must be strictly separated from descriptions of mental language processing, that the practice of grammatical description essentially relies on the notion of correctness which cannot be reduced to mere observation and empirical study, that philosophy (in the sense of conceptual analysis) is a discipline closely analogous to grammatical theory, that the most natural philosophical framework of linguistics is hermeneutics, that the metatheoretical self-conception of generative grammarians is fundamentally misguided, that not much progress has been made in grammatical theory since ancient times, and that the goals of grammatical description have not changed essentially since the first classical grammarians, especially P_nini. Many of Itkonen's claims have provoked an unusually lively international discussion.

Several other Nordic linguists have also made substantial contributions to the metatheory of linguistic subdisciplines, particularly Raimo Anttila and Henning Andersen to diachronic linguistics (6.3.15.), Per Linell to phonological theory (1974, 1979), and Östen Dahl to typology and formal grammar. Helge J. Dyvik (1947-), professor of general linguistics in Bergen since 1983, offered a critical theoretical analysis of generative grammar and basic metatheoretical linguistic terminology in his thesis (1980).

Per Linell wrote a frequently cited study (1982) on the written language bias in linguistics as manifest in notions such as grammar, grammaticality, structure, and meaning.

The study of the history of linguistics has become an important field of research since the 1970s, with numerous conferences and international journals. Pentti Aalto wrote three comprehensive historical studies of research in Finland on Oriental languages (1971), classical languages (1980), and modern languages (1987) in the period 1828-1917. Even Hovdhaugen (6.2.3.) has become an internationally recognized specialist on ancient Greek and Roman grammar (1982c), but has also worked on the history of medieval grammar (1990), linguistics in the Nordic countries (1978, 1982 a,b) and missionary grammar (1992, 1996). An impressive study both in depth and breadth is Frans Gregersen's (6.2.4.) dissertation on the development of Danish structuralism and its Saussurean background (1991). Bertil Malmberg (5.3.3.) published a history of linguistics in French (1991), which has become controversial, evaluated harshly by some reviewers for representing an outdated view of linguistic historiography.

6.4. Phonetics

As noted in 6.2.1.6., one of the characteristic features of linguistics from the 1980s on is the decrease in positions in phonetics in all the Nordic countries except Sweden. There are probably many reasons for this decline, but three seem to be significant. First of all, descriptive phonetics, involving the analysis of the sounds and sound systems of natural languages, had become theoretically mature. Secondly, phonetics was becoming more and more of a natural science, closely related to physics and medicine, thus leading it in the direction of the technological disciplines and away from the humanities. Finally, the development of formal general linguistics with its strong concentration on syntax has tended to marginalize phonetics, often making it less interesting and attractive to linguists.

Nevertheless, the quantity of phonetic research undertaken by Nordic phoneticians in this period is impressive, and several Nordic contributions have had considerable international impact.

A new approach to phonetics began when mathematical models were used, as in physics. This type of work was initiated by Gunnar Fant (5.4.) and continued by Sven Öhman (1936-) and Björn Lindblom (1934-). Öhman (1966) did important work on coarticulation and transitions between segments in the 1960s and attempted to generate Swedish tone accents using a simple mathematical model (Öhman 1967). Lindblom has tried to explain phonological structure by biological and communicative factors, as in his article (1986) on phonetic universals in vowel systems, or in the article (1984), coauthored with Peter McNeilage and Michael Studdert-Kennedy, on how phonological universals may be understood in terms of self-organizing processes.

Prosody became a major field in Swedish phonetics, in particular in Lund, where the Lund model of prosody was developed by Eva Gårding (1920-), professor of phonetics 1980-1985, and Gösta Bruce (1947-), professor of phonetics since 1986. Eva Gårding's dissertation (1967) dealt with internal juncture. Later, she included all prosodic phenomena in the model and supplemented Meyer's studies of tone accents with a complete Scandinavian perspective (1977). The phonological components of the model are the word accents and accents at the phrase and sentence levels and boundaries. Sentence intonation is represented by a tonal grid on which accents and boundaries are inserted. The model has been applied to several languages and found to be useful in assigning prosody in speech synthesis systems.

In Sweden, phonetics and speech technology have been successfully integrated. Phonetic models are used in systems for speech synthesis and speech recognition, as evidenced, for example, by conferences organized by the European Union under the heading "Speech Technology" or "Language Engineering". The Swedish speech synthesizers Ove I and Ove II were formant synthesizers based on Gunnar Fant's seminal acoustic theory (Fant 1960), as is the commercial product Infovox, which can be heard in various applications such as the automated responses of banks, telephone operators, etc. The Swedish speech-to-text systems behind Infovox were based for the most part on research conducted by Rolf Carlson and Björn Granström at the Royal Institute of Technology in Stockholm (1986). Swedish researchers and companies such as Telia are currently active both in the development of new speech synthesis and speech recognition systems and applications. Computers make it possible to construct huge databases with examples of the pronunciation of words or sounds in different positions.

Cineradiographic registrations of speech have made it possible to find out how the articulatory organs move and to what extent it is reasonable to talk about individual phonemes, steady states, and coarticulation. Sidney Wood in Lund is known for his radiographic studies, which have led him to criticize the traditional vowel triangle (1979).

The leading Danish phoneticians have been Eli Fischer-Jørgensen and Jørgen Rischel. In 1966, phonetics was established as a separate department at the University of Copenhagen, and Eli Fischer-Jørgensen was appointed professor. In 1968-1970, Jørgen Rischel constructed a speech synthesizer, which was first operated manually and later computerized. In describing the explosive development of the phonetics department and its facilities in the late 1960s and early 1970s, Fischer-Jørgensen notes:

Prior to 1966, you had to stick your head and the microphone into a sheepskin when you wanted to record anything. In 1966 the staff constructed a studio out of old bicycle racks, rock wool mats and curtain material, which functioned amazingly well. Finally, in 1975, we got a super modern soundproof room with a suspended wire floor and sound-absorbing wedges, which satisfied the most demanding acoustic measurement. (Fischer-Jørgensen 1979:41-44)

Fischer-Jørgensen investigated the production and perception of stops in various languages. Electromyographic research has been carried out in cooperation with Yale University. The results have been published regularly in *ARIPUC* (Annual Report of the Institute of Phonetics at the University of Copenhagen).

The traditional areas of phonetic research were extended in this period. A work which belongs as much to phonetics as to sociolinguistics is Lars Brink and Jørn Lund's study of the phonetic development of the standard language and the less prestigious Copenhagen sociolect (1975), beginning with the first Danish audio recordings of speakers born in 1840 and continuing with a phonetic analysis of data up through 1955. This methodologically unique work of over 800 pages is of general interest, since it demonstrates how phonetic change occurs systematically from generation to generation, including repeated phases of free variation. Brink and Lund's results also show that phonetic change often occurs with greater speed in specific combinations of sounds and more rapidly in some words than in others, thus disproving one of the basic neogrammarian tenets.

Phonetic research in Finland has diminished since the 1970s, partly because experimental phonetics had become so technological that phonetics was difficult to pursue at Faculties of Arts. Cognitive psychology, neuroscience, communication technology, and other disciplines have partly taken over the previous concerns of classical linguistic phonetics. At the University of Turku, Kalevi Wiik turned towards linguistic topics after his early phonetic work in the 1960s. His professorship was abolished when he resigned in 1997. Olli Aaltonen, Turku, has worked on acoustic and perceptual phonetics, with both normal and impaired subjects (e.g. 1984), recently in collaboration with cognitive neuroscientists.

Antti Iivonen (1940-), professor of phonetics at the University of Helsinki since 1980, has dealt with the phonetics of German vowels and developed a psychoacoustic explanation of the twenty-one major IPA vowels (1994). At the University of Jyväskylä, Jaakko Lehtonen's (1942-) dissertation was an experimental analysis of the use and manifestation of quantity in Finnish (1970). Later, Lehtonen took up contrastive and communication studies. In 1984, his associate professorship in phonetics was turned into a professorship in applied linguistics and speech research, indicative of one direction in the development of phonetics.

The leading Icelandic phonetician of this period is Magnús Pétursson (1940-), whose dissertation (1974) made an important contribution to the experimental study of Icelandic phonetics. Through x-ray films, Pétursson managed to obtain new and more detailed information about the movement and position of the various articulators in the production of different sounds (Thráinsson 1996:327-328). Pétursson has spent most of his professional life abroad and has been professor of phonetics in Hamburg since 1983.

While phonetics has been reduced in many countries, Sweden has managed to keep advanced research and phonetics laboratories in Lund, Stockholm (in fact two), and Umeå.

6.5. Historical-Comparative Grammar

6.5.1. Comparative Indo-European Linguistics

From an international perspective, it would be wrong to say that there has been a general decrease in research and positions in comparative Indo-European linguistics. However, its overall share of linguistic research activities has decreased, and it is nowhere the dominant field of linguistics it was in many countries in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century. All the same, the number of journals devoted to comparative Indo-European linguistics has increased, and the network of conferences and symposia has been strengthened. There have also been several theoretical and methodological developments and innovations in the field. New and fruitful cooperation with archeologists, historians, and geneticists has shed new light on old research problems, especially concerning prehistoric Indo-European and its internal and external connections. There have been several attempts inspired by modern language typology to reanalyze the reconstructed protolanguage. Similarly, in many countries the theoretical trends in general linguistics have significantly influenced the development of research in comparative Indo-European linguistics.

But not so in Denmark, Norway, and Sweden. It is indeed remarkable that the Nordic countries, which were among the leading countries in the world in this field prior to 1965, should drop out of this area to such a great extent. University positions were lost, or their occupants turned to other fields. The number of students fell drastically, in some cases dropping to zero. Following the student revolution in 1968 and the many university reforms in the late 1960s and 1970s, the obligatory courses in Latin for students in the humanities were either abolished or greatly reduced in all the Nordic countries. With this, students lost a necessary prerequisite for diachronic studies. Another partial explanation is the theoretical take-over of general linguistics in the late 1960s. General linguistics was chosen, especially as a minor subject, by many students who previously might have chosen Indo-European linguistics or classical philology. Tuomo Pekkanen, professor of Latin at the University of Jyväskylä, notes explicitly (1997:28) that the new subjects general linguistics, Italian, and Spanish caused the decline of students in classical philology in Helsinki in the early 1970s.

The Icelander Jörundur Hilmarsson (1946-1992), whose untimely death was a great loss to Nordic and international linguistics, was one of the world's leading experts on the extinct Indo-European language Tocharian (Hilmarsson 1986). He founded the international journal *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies*, which was the only international journal devoted to its study. Fredrik Otto Lindeman (1936-), who succeeded Borgstrøm as professor of Indo-European comparative linguistics in Oslo in 1976, is actually the only professor in the Nordic countries from this period who concentrated entirely on comparative Indo-European linguistics. Lindeman has a thorough knowledge of all the major ancient Indo-European languages, and he has published a number of studies in leading international journals (a good selection is found in Lindeman 1996). In addition, he has published the standard international introduction to laryngeal theory (Lindeman 1970, 1987).

Raimo Anttila (6.3.1, 6.3.15) has published several important contributions to comparative Indo-European linguistics, starting with his Yale dissertation on Indo-European Schwa-Ablaut (1969). His contributions are in many cases combined with profound methodological analysis. Martti Nyman (6.3.15.) is another Finn who has united general linguistics and Indo-European studies. He is currently docent of general and Indo-European linguistics in Helsinki.

6.5.2. Comparative Finno-Ugric Linguistics

Mikko Korhonen (1936-1991) was professor of Finno-Ugric languages at the University of Helsinki 1973- and was appointed research professor at the Academy of Finland in 1990. Most of his production dealt with the morphology of the Finno-Ugric languages from a typological, historical, and general linguistic point of view.

Korhonen described the development of morphological techniques in Sámi in his doctoral dissertation (1967) and in a comprehensive later study (1969). He demonstrated that Sámi is no longer an agglutinating language. Several previously automatic sound alternations have become morphologically distinctive as a result of other sound changes, whereupon Sámi has developed internal inflection as a morphological means in addition to suffixation, especially in numerous instances of metaphony (Ablaut). Present-day Sámi is thus typologically a fusing-symbolic language. Korhonen was influenced by scholars such as Sapir and Greenberg and by mathematical information theory. He made statistical calculations of agglutination indexes. Based on estimation of redundancy rates, he advanced the hypothesis that morphological change is regulated by a need to achieve a balance between redundant and information-bearing language elements. When redundancy grew at the end of words in Sámi, the consequence was sound loss, whereupon the balance was restored. Korhonen's contributions to morphological typology and diachronic morphology were ground-breaking in Finland as the first thorough explicit applications of phonological, morphological, and information theory to Finno-Ugric languages. In the words of Sammallahti (1996:315), these studies marked "a methodological turning point which united phonology and morphology into a functional and developmental whole".

Mikko Korhonen also wrote extensively on long-term structural tendencies in the Uralic languages, especially their case systems (e.g. 1979, 1992). His history of Sámi (1981) is a recognized classic. Salminen (1996, ed.) contains a posthumously published selection of Mikko Korhonen's most important papers.

Aulis J. Joki (5.7.6.) published a penetrating study of ancient lexical and cultural contacts between the Uralic and Indo-Germanic languages and peoples (1973). He treated this topic particularly from the Uralic point of view, which has often been overlooked in the Indo-Germanic literature. As for the probability of Indo-European/Uralic *Urverwandtschaft*, Joki (1973:353) basically accepts the weakly affirmative opinion of Björn Collinder, although he shows that the number of presumed common Indo-Uralic words must be fewer than the fifty Collinder mentions. Joki considers the Nostratic hypothesis "without doubt interesting" (1973:354).

Jorma Koivulehto (1934-), professor of Germanic philology at the University of Helsinki 1983-1997, is the leading scholar in present-day Indo-Uralic loan word research. Koivulehto has written a long series of papers (e.g. 1976, 1979, 1983, 1994, 1995) that have profoundly affected the chronology and number of words regarded as old Indo-Germanic loans in the Finno-Ugric languages, especially Finnish. More generally, these papers have shed new light on both Indo-European and Uralic prehistory and linguistic development. In the recent survey by Kaisa Häkkinen of "The Prehistory of Finns in the Light of Linguistics" (1996), Koivulehto is the scholar most frequently referred to. He considers that the oldest (Pre-)Germanic loans in Proto-Finnic belong to the Bronze Age, and are thus clearly older than previously assumed. Early Finns must have already been in the Baltic area at that time. The oldest Germanic loans may be as old as the Baltic loans, contrary to Thomsen's theory (4.4.2.) a century earlier. Koivulehto (1983) shows the need to assume a new Finnic loan word stratum of old Indo-European loans, borrowed before the split of the Baltic and Germanic languages and dated prior to 1000 BC. These views have had radical effects on the interpretation of Finland's prehistory.

Juha Janhunen's research (e.g. 1977, 1981, 1982) has given new momentum to the study of the Samoyed and Uralic vocabulary, showing that the number of Proto-Uralic etymologies is around 150. Janhunen has also reconstructed the phonological changes leading from Proto-Uralic to Proto-Finno-Ugric and Proto-Samoyedic. Pekka Sammallahti (1988) has traced the historical development of Uralic vowels and

consonants through the various proto-languages up to the present-day Uralic languages.

Kaisa Häkkinen (1950-), professor of Finnish language and literature at Åbo Akademi University since 1994, evaluated the basic assumptions and methods of Finno-Ugric comparative linguistics, especially etymology, in her thesis (1983). Her focus is on the oldest Finnish vocabulary. Häkkinen shows the hypothetical nature of many of the widely accepted premises of the traditional Uralic *Stammbaum* theory (in its essentials already proposed by Otto Donner, cf. 4.4.2.) and of the genetic relationships of the Uralic languages. Häkkinen proposes (1983:384) that Uralic genetic relations be regarded not as a tree with many layers of branches that have developed via weakly motivated intermediate proto-languages, but rather as a flat “bush”, where no weakly motivated assumptions about intermediate proto-stages are made.

When the sixth part of the Finnish etymological dictionary appeared in 1978 (5.6.7.2.), work on an updated version of the whole dictionary commenced almost immediately. The first volume of *Suomen sanojen alkuperä* (Origin of Finnish Words) appeared in 1992 (SSA 1992).

Summing up, it is clear that the classical Uralic comparative-historical research tradition dating back to the late 1800s and the days of the Great Research Journeys is still going strong and has continuously kept abreast of developments in general linguistics. Few signs of paradigmatic senility are visible. This research tradition is perhaps the most significant of Finland’s contributions to international linguistics in the twentieth century. Jorma Koivulehto was nominated research professor in the Academy of Finland 1988-1993, which is the most prestigious position that can be achieved in the Finnish academic hierarchy. Mikko Korhonen was research professor from 1990 until his death in 1991, and Terho Itkonen was research professor from 1971-1974. These are all clear indications of the significance of this tradition in Finnish linguistics.

6.6. The Nordic Languages

The research interests and practices of general linguistics, on the one hand, and those of individual languages, on the other, have frequently been intertwined in this period. After 1965 there is an explosion in the number of publications dealing with the national languages. In many instances, these contributions were written by scholars in the linguistics departments, who used data from the Nordic languages to illustrate or investigate a particular point in a specific grammatical theory. In other cases, the primary aim was to provide a description of the language in question, which often included a discussion of the appropriate theoretical approach.

In this section, we focus on the main grammars and handbooks, and on a few large and relevant monographs and seminal articles on the Nordic languages. We do not attempt to cover the extensive activities that have taken place in Nordic language-specific diachronic linguistics, dialectology, lexicography, onomastics, and the like. Contributions of general linguistic import have been presented in the previous sections.

6.6.1. Danish

Shortly before his death in 1964, Paul Diderichsen remarked that there were numerous tasks awaiting Danish grammarians in the last half of the twentieth century, and he looked forward to welcoming the young scholars who would render the work of his own generation outdated (1965:208). A glance at the work on the Danish language produced in this period shows, however, that Diderichsen’s own achievements were far from rendered outdated. On the contrary, his ideas and descriptions were refined and developed by his successors.

Before this development got underway, however, one of Diderichsen’s contemporaries, Aage Hansen, published the most extensive grammar of Modern Danish to date (1967). This is a unique three-volume work based on excerpts of both the written and spoken language. The merits of Hansen’s

description of the modern language, which spans a hundred years, are not found in the area of theory or methodology, but in the grammar's descriptive detail and broad coverage. As Erik Hansen has pointed out, Hansen's grammar neither marks the conclusion of the previous period nor an introduction to a new era (1989:136). In its attempt to integrate elements of grammar rather than separate them, systematic categorization is often sacrificed in order to present a more holistic picture of connections and transitions. This approach means that the grammar often takes up problems which were not dealt with until a later date in modern text linguistics. Hansen's focus on examples from the spoken language is also a new feature in Danish grammatical description.

Although Hansen dedicated his grammar to his friend and teacher Louis Hjelmslev, he indirectly rejects the descriptive rigidity of structuralism, a view soon to be shared by later Danish linguists, for example Hermann & Gregersen (1978) and Gregersen (1991). Erik Hansen sums up the Danish stance, particularly with regard to Chomsky's brand of structuralism, as follows:

The ideal language user lives in a homogeneous language community in which everyone speaks *one* language and in which everyone knows this language to perfection and is never disturbed in their use of the language by things like bad memory, distraction, confusion, noise or physiological disorders like coughing, hiccuping, and sneezing. But this criterion is actually hardly ever fulfilled! In addition, linguistic description to date is almost always monological, i.e. it describes sentences as if the typical way of using language was for *one* person to have control of the floor all the time. No one in this camp is concerned with linguistic interaction – dialogue or conversation – which, however, is the most common type of language use. (E. Hansen 1989:137)

Grammar for the sake of grammar is thus not a part of the Danish tradition. In fact, the preface to Erik Hansen's brief introduction to Danish grammar, with the telling title "The Portal of Demons" (1977), refers to the study of grammar as a necessary evil, something to be gotten over with so students can get on with the more exciting aspects of linguistics like semantics, pragmatics, sociolinguistics, and dialectology. This basic introduction to modern Danish morphology and syntax, whatever its purpose, has been the standard textbook for students of Danish for the last two decades. Its treatment of syntax comprises a textbook account of Diderichsen's field theory, including an analysis of the particularly Danish *der*-construction.

Diderichsen's fundamental distinction between topology and syntax forms the basis of a number of studies in Danish grammar which have appeared during the 1980s and 1990s, all dealing with a revision or elaboration of Diderichsen's field theory of syntax (e.g. E. Hansen 1983, Heltoft 1992a, 1992b, and 1993). These studies have provided the groundwork for the large-scale Danish reference grammar presently in the making (Hansen & Heltoft, forthcoming).

6.6.2. Faroese

One of the main areas of research on the Faroese language has been Faroese vocalism, which is both varied and in many ways unusual, and which therefore has also attracted the attention of scholars outside the Nordic countries. Among the more important of these studies are Stephen Anderson's generative dissertation on the West Scandinavian vowel systems (1969), Björn Hagström's phonetic-phonological analysis of the final vowels in Faroese (1967), and Jørgen Rischel's investigation of diphthongization in Faroese (1967-1968).

6.6.3. Finnish

Pentti Leino (1992) calculated that, depending upon how Fennistics is defined, some 60-70 Fennistic Ph.D. dissertations were submitted in Finland between 1960 and 1992, more than half of them at the University of Helsinki. As for subject matter, syntactic and semantic topics became more popular towards the end of this period, whereas phonology, morphology, and lexicology became less attractive. The study of contemporary Finnish gained ground at the expense of old written Finnish. Dialectology remained an important topic. Kangasniemi (1988) investigated publication patterns in *Virittäjä*, comparing the periods 1950-1959 and 1975-1984. Etymology and loan word research were the most popular topics in the 1950s but have declined quantitatively in the 1980s. Phonology and especially semantics gained ground in *Virittäjä* in the 1980s, as did research on standard Finnish and on synchronic topics, as compared to dialectology and diachrony. The international evaluation of Fennistic research, especially the period 1989-1993 (Anttila, Lehiste & Wande 1996) notes that phonology, phonetics, and psycholinguistics are areas in which only limited research is being carried out in the 1990s.

The departments of Finnish have acquired relatively distinct research profiles of their own. The Helsinki department was the stronghold of dialectology and diachronic linguistics well into the 1980s (Pertti Virtaranta, Terho Itkonen). In the 1990s, conversation analysis and cognitive linguistics became new foci of research. Onomastics (Viljo Nissilä, Eero Kiviniemi) has been strong in Helsinki for several decades. Turku became the center of syntactic research in the 1950s thanks to the work of Osmo Ikola, Paavo Siro, and Göran Karlsson. In the 1960s and 1970s, this tradition was continued by scholars like Alho Alhoniemi, Kalevi Wiik, Eeva Kangasmaa-Minn, and Aimo Hakanen. Tampere has been the center of Finnish sociolinguistics for some twenty years, primarily due to the work of Heikki Paunonen and later Matti K. Suojanen. At Oulu, Pauli Saukkonen initiated an early tradition of quantitative linguistics and stylistics in the 1960s, one major result of which was the frequency dictionary of Standard Finnish (Saukkonen et al. 1979).

The basic general handbook of Finnish is still Lauri Hakulinen's grammar (1979 [1941, 1946]). Two newer classics dealing with Finnish grammar are Aarni Penttilä's grammar (1963 [1957]), the largest full-scale grammar of Finnish published thus far, and Paavo Siro's syntax (1964), cf. 5.6.1.3. Inspiration from modern syntactic theory is found in A. Hakulinen & F. Karlsson's syntax (1995 [1979]). Ikola, Palomäki & Koitto have produced a large descriptive syntax and an empirical text grammar of Finnish dialects (1989), based on the analysis of a corpus of almost 900,000 taped and transcribed running words (some 166,000 simplex clauses or the like) that constitute the core of the computerized Syntax Archives of the University of Turku and the Research Center for the Languages of Finland (cf. 6.2.1.3.). Under the direction of Auli Hakulinen, an extensive new grammar of modern Finnish is in the making, as a collaborative project between the Research Center for the Languages of Finland and the Department of Finnish at the University of Helsinki.

The overriding topics in Finnish syntactic research have been the syntax and semantics of existential sentences, case marking, clause typology, and word order.

In the domain of morphology, word-formation, especially derivational morphology, has attracted much attention. Leena Kytömäki's dissertation (1993) provides a survey of this field, particularly of deverbal derivation. Terho Itkonen founded the Morphology Archives for Finnish dialects at the University of Helsinki in 1967. Systematic long-range field work has made these archives a basic source of dialect data on morphology (cf. Juusela 1987).

The interest in diachronic and comparative linguistics has been stronger in Finland than in the other Nordic countries in recent years. The prehistory of the Finns, including the history and descent of the Uralic languages continues to fascinate researchers and laymen. In 1980, a cross-disciplinary meeting was arranged at Tvärminne in the South-West Hanko archipelago, where linguists, historians, archeologists, geneticists and others met to survey the state of the art. The proceedings from this meeting (SVEJ 1984) became a classic, with papers written by scholars like Terho Itkonen, Jorma Koivulehto, Mikko Korhonen, and Pekka

Sammallahti. Terho Itkonen's new theories of the history of the Finnish dialects and the other Finnic languages have attracted much attention, especially the idea that Proto-Finnic was divided into a northern dialect area in Finland and a southern area south of the Gulf of the Finland (e.g. T. Itkonen 1983, which is a much cited paper). A survey is provided by Häkkinen (1996). A new multidisciplinary meeting on the same topic was held at Lammi in November 1997.

6.6.4. Icelandic

The study of Icelandic since 1965 has mainly been pursued within the framework of modern linguistic theories and has been dealt with in 6.3.3., 6.3.4., and 6.3.5.

6.6.5. Kalaallisut

Kalaallisut attracted attention among several non-Nordic linguists (e.g. Marianne Mithun, Jerrold Sadock) during this period because of its special typology (ergativity, noun incorporation etc.). Copenhagen, however, has remained the center of Eskimo language studies through the descriptive and theoretical works by Jørgen Rischel, Michael Fortescue, and colleagues. Rischel's penetrating study of West Greenlandic phonology (1974) and Fortescue's grammar of West Greenlandic (1984) are of particular importance. The University of Greenland was established in 1984 (6.2.1.4.).

6.6.6. Norwegian

The much-awaited first extensive grammatical description of Norwegian in this century (Næs 1965, cf. 5.6.1.1.5.) was a disappointment in many ways, and it met with criticism from the beginning (Gussgard 1967). The author was largely an outsider to current general linguistics and Nordic linguistics, except for strong influence from Diderichsen (1946), and the idiosyncratic nature of the book restricted its influence both at home and abroad. The book was widely read by university students of Norwegian, and despite its inconsistencies and theoretical weaknesses, it contained numerous valuable observations.

The next Norwegian grammar published was a grammar of nynorsk (Beito 1970). Olav Toreson Beito (1901-1989) was professor of Nynorsk at the University of Oslo from 1959 to 1971. His grammar comprised only phonology and morphology and was written in an almost pre-neogrammarian tradition. Beito himself links his grammar explicitly to the Aasen tradition (4.5.2.5.), but with its strong diachronic orientation and general lack of any systematic approach, it is far inferior to Aasen's grammars.

The next grammar of nynorsk (Kjell Venås 1990) is smaller than Beito's (1970), but more pedagogical and broader in scope, and it includes syntax. To a certain extent it represents a break with the post-Aasen tradition in nynorsk linguistics, and it is the first grammar of nynorsk since Aasen that is reasonably up-to-date from a linguistic and grammatological point of view.

A milestone in Norway concerning the relationship between linguistics and the study of the Scandinavian languages is Svein Lie's influential work on Norwegian grammar (1976). It is not actually a grammar, but rather a lucid textbook survey of Norwegian syntax, with a clear and explicit theoretical foundation and a well-defined terminology. From a theoretical point of view, it is a consciously eclectic mixture of Diderichsen's syntax, structuralism, and generative grammar. Lie's book has been a basic handbook for a generation of students in Scandinavian languages in Norway through several reprints and editions, and it is not by chance that its author is also one of the authors of the Norwegian reference grammar (Faarlund, Lie & Vannebo 1997).

6.6.7. Sámi

Several scholarly grammars of both North Sámi and South Sámi were written during the previous centuries, and for North Sámi there are also pedagogical grammars of varying quality. However, the first pedagogical grammar written for the small and threatened language community of South Sámi, did not appear until 1982. The author, Knut Bergsland (5.6.1.6. and 5.7.8.), had written one of the first scientific grammars of South Sámi (Bergsland 1946). Bergsland's more traditional grammar of North Sámi (Bergsland 1961, cf. 5.6.1.6.) was written partly to introduce the new Sámi orthography of 1947. The next extensive grammar (Nickel 1990) was written in response to the new common Sámi orthography of 1979. The German author, Klaus Peter Nickel, learned Sámi by staying in a Sámi-speaking area, spending part of his time as a teacher. He is not a linguist by profession, but his intent, stated in the preface, to base the grammar on a combination of three principles (the tradition in Sámi grammar writing, the West European grammar tradition, and modern linguistics) has resulted in a comprehensive, well organized work that is likely to be a model for many future Sámi grammars.

Of particular significance for the future of Sámi studies is the fact that since the late 1960s, several young Sámi students have studied Sámi with Bergsland and general linguistics as well (perhaps not only due to Bergsland's encouragement and his close ties with the department of general linguistics, but also because the Department of Finno-Ugric languages and the Department of Linguistics were adjacent). As a result, there is now a whole group of young Sámi linguists, among them the former president of the Sámi Parliament, Ole Henrik Magga (6.2.1.7.), who are working on their own language and also using it in their linguistic publications. In Finland, Pekka Sammallahti played had a similar role in encouraging Sámi students to take up the linguistic study of their own language.

Marjut Aikio (1988) published a thorough sociolinguistic study of the language shift process in five Sámi villages. The subjects moved from Norway to Finnish Lapland in the late 1800s. Aikio measured the language shift process from the viewpoints of individuals, villages, social networks, and generations, in the framework of the theory of diffusion of innovations over time. She found that language shift was more pronounced from one generation to the next than within generations, that language shift took place mainly in the family, and that the most critical time was 1930-1950. The Sámi language was retained longest among men. Dense networks and the remoteness of the speaker community protected Sámi from being replaced by Finnish.

6.6.8. Swedish

Elias Wessén's grammar (1968) was the last traditional grammar of Swedish, but hardly better than Beckman's grammar of 1904.

A number of new grammars appeared in the 1970s and 1980s. Some of these responded to a need for up-to-date examples and new formulations and comments on modern Swedish. Others were stimulated by new grammatical theories, first Diderichsen and then Chomsky. In addition, the teaching of Swedish to immigrants required new ways of presenting Swedish to speakers for whom it was an exotic language.

Olof Thorell's ambitious Swedish grammar (*Svensk grammatik*, 1973) was intended for the university level and has been widely used in courses in Scandinavian languages and Swedish. Thorell's grammar offers little more than good modern examples and explanations of the traditional grammatical categories and their labels. One innovation, however, is the use of Diderichsen's positional framework in describing word order in noun phrases and clauses.

Ebba Lindberg's descriptive Swedish grammar (*Beskrivande svensk grammatik*, 1976) was also written for the university level, and it is the first traditional grammar written for prospective teachers of Swedish that incorporates not only Diderichsen's but also Chomsky's approach. It presents deep and surface structure and illustrates a number of transformations in a special section, though without generative rules. It

also includes an insightful section on text analysis and is clearly based on the author's long teaching experience. The examples are generally chosen from authentic texts.

Chomsky's ideas were first introduced into the Swedish school system through Ulf Teleman's article (1969c) on grammar for high school students. Generative rules, phrase structure trees, and transformations with simple Swedish examples were provided. Later, Tor Hultman introduced generative grammar into the curriculum for teachers of Swedish. In the preface of his Swedish grammar (*Liten svensk grammatik*, 1975) he states that the purpose of the book is to give the candidates tools with which they can analyze and comment on the pupils' texts, and he maintains that Diderichsen's field analysis and Chomsky's analysis using deep structure and transformations are the most useful. A number of transformations are presented, and the book also includes illustrative text samples written by pupils and shows how to analyze texts using chains of reference and theme-rheme structures.

Östen Dahl's grammar (*Grammatik*, 1982) is an elaborated version of his earlier grammar (*Generativ grammatik på svenska*, 1971), this time inspired by generative semantics and reflecting the grammatical thinking of the late 1970s. The book deals with both traditional and modern grammatical concepts (including speech acts) in insightful ways. There is a special section on mood, aspect, and tense, some of Dahl's favorite topics.

The most ambitious Swedish grammar project of the late 1900s is the grammar of the Swedish Academy, *Svenska Akademiens grammatik*, initiated by Sture Allén in 1985. The project is headed by Ulf Teleman in cooperation with Staffan Hellberg and is scheduled to be completed in 1999.

6.7. Other Languages

6.7.1. European Languages

The main trends after 1970 place a stronger emphasis on synchronic topics and show the growing influence of general syntactic and semantic theory, sociolinguistics, and applied linguistics at the expense of dialectology and philology. Syntax, semantics, and text linguistics have been the central topics.

Since 1965, an impressive amount of research has been carried out in the field of English in all the Nordic countries. The increasing importance of English, both in the educational system and in society was reflected in an increase in university posts, which, in turn, was accompanied by increased research activity. The main focus has been on synchronic studies, but research has also been undertaken from a diachronic point of view. Among the synchronic studies, we find descriptive grammars, specialized studies of various aspects of English grammar within the framework of specific theoretical approaches, applied linguistics, and studies of the influence of English on the Nordic languages.

Thanks to Otto Jespersen (5.3.3. and 5.7.1.), Nordic linguistics occupied a strong position in English studies, and many Nordic scholars have published articles in leading international journals or in books that are extensively quoted in the international research community. One of the authors of the standard and extensive modern grammar of English (Quirk et. al. 1972, 1985) is the Swedish linguist Jan Svartvik (1931-), professor of English in Lund 1970-1995.

The position of both German and French in the school system has declined in this period, although to varying extents in the various countries. Nevertheless, the position of both of these languages is still strong at most universities, and high-quality research has continued in these languages. The spread of the European Union to the north in the 1990s has strengthened the position of French and German, especially in Finland.

The university level German grammar by Brandt, Persson, Rosengren & Åhländer (1973) is an impressive study of more than 450 pages, typical of the new interest in grammar during the 1970s. The book is detailed and maintains a high theoretical level, so much so that it has encountered resistance from many language students and teachers, primarily because of its use of generative theory. Among Nordic scholars of

German, dependency grammar has been an object of extensive study, especially in Finland.

The other Germanic and Romance languages, as well as the Slavic languages, have also witnessed a certain increase in university posts, but in general, the research activities here have been more philologically oriented and less in contact with modern linguistic research. There are several professors of Romance and Slavic languages, however, who have a solid background in general linguistics. One pertinent example is Knud Togeby (5.7.1.) whose monumental five-volume *Grammaire française* was published posthumously (1982-1985).

In the case of Spanish and Russian, small staffs have often had heavy teaching loads because of the large number of students. In many cases, the research at such departments has been directed towards practical needs in applied linguistics. This also applies to the other Slavic languages, and especially to the Celtic languages, which have been seriously neglected. The only Nordic chair in Celtic languages (in Oslo) was abolished in 1985. However, the Finland-Swede Anders Ahlqvist (1945-) is professor of Old and Middle Irish and Celtic Philology at University College Galway.

Research on Latin and Greek, which had been marginalized in the school system, focused mainly on philology. A significant philological contribution to the historiography of linguistics was the edition of the Danish contributions to medieval scholastic philosophy (2.2.) in the series *Corpus Philosophorum Danicorum Medii Aevi*, begun in 1955. The most important investigation of these texts was conducted by Jan Pinborg (1937-1982), professor at the University of Copenhagen from 1972 to 1982. Our understanding of medieval and classical linguistics has been greatly increased through his dissertation (1967) and his authoritative survey of Classical Greek linguistics in Antiquity (1975), and many of his other studies have also become classics that have molded and changed our general understanding of both classical and medieval linguistics.

The Swede Jerker Blomqvist's (1938-, from 1980 to 1987 professor in Copenhagen) dissertation (*Greek particles in Hellenistic Prose*, 1969) was a meticulous study, which changed our concept of Hellenistic Greek and its relations to Classical Attic by revealing a lot more synchronic stylistic variation than hitherto assumed. It is also an in-depth diachronic semantic analysis of the Greek particles. Jerker Blomqvist and Poul Ole Jastrup (1991) have published a comprehensive grammar of Greek.

A general feature everywhere is that the previous focus on language history and older stages of the languages has been transformed into a focus on the modern spoken languages. This change has been so radical that research on the older stages of the languages has become nearly extinct in many places.

6.7.2. Languages outside Europe

After 1965, there was a slow but steady increase in university positions in the non-Indo-European languages of major political or economic importance like Arabic, Chinese, and Japanese. At most universities, there had been no positions in Chinese and Japanese prior to this time. The forces behind the creation of such posts are not always clear. Many of them were motivated by a combination of scientific and political needs, supported by academic traditions and the influence of strong individuals. Sometimes the needs of export industries and business ventures seem to have influenced the priorities. In many cases there was also planning at a national and even Nordic level, for example at the initiative of the national research councils or the Nordic Institute for Asian Research (*Centralinstituttet for Nordisk Asienforskning*) in Copenhagen.

It is significant that some languages and language areas were completely neglected, for example Indonesia and the Philippines and virtually all of South East Asia. This is even more curious since one of the world's leading experts on Austronesian languages was the Norwegian Otto Chr. Dahl (5.7.7.), who published two fundamental comparative studies on these languages (O. Dahl 1973, 1981). Although he never held a university position, living most of the time since 1965 in Stavanger, Dahl still influenced Norwegian linguistics, and he was a source of inspiration to the Norwegian linguists and anthropologists

who started to work on Austronesian languages in the 1980s and 1990s.

The Nordic universities maintained a high international level of research into non-Indo-European languages. In addition to research on major languages, especially Chinese, there were internationally recognized research groups on Polynesian languages (Torben Monberg and his research group in Copenhagen, Even Hovdhaugen and his research group in Oslo). Today the Oslo group is a centre for the study of Polynesian languages in Europe. The reference grammar of Samoan (Mosel & Hovdhaugen 1992) written by Hovdhaugen and professor Ulrike Mosel (Kiel) is one of the most thorough existing documentations of a Polynesian language.

The Finnish professor of Indology, Asko Parpola (1941-), attempted to decipher the Indus inscriptions (Parpola et al. 1969, Parpola 1994) and to show that they were written in a Dravidian language. His brother, Simo Parpola (1943-), professor of Assyriology, directs the large international project "State Archives of Assyria", the purpose of which is to publish all the inscriptions recovered from the ancient Niniveh archives, in an estimated twenty volumes. There are some 10,000 clay tablets, the cuneiform texts of which have been rendered in computerized form by Simo Parpola and his colleagues. Another Finn, Juha Janhunen, has conducted extensive ethnolinguistic field work on numerous languages of Siberia and East Asia and written a comprehensive ethnic history of Manchuria (1996).

Jan-Olof Svantesson in Lund has investigated the morphophonology and tones of Mon-Khmer languages, and Jørgen Rischel (6.2.1., 6.3.3.) has made important contributions to the study of languages of Northern Thailand (especially Minor Mlabri, e.g. Rischel 1995). Several Nordic linguists have contributed to the study of African languages, including Torben Andersen (Aalborg), Rolf Theil Endresen (Oslo), Arvi Hurskainen (Helsinki), and Tore Janson (Gothenburg).

A new field of applied linguistics arose in the Nordic countries as well as in most other European countries in connection with the large groups of immigrant workers from the Mediterranean area and Asia entering Europe after 1960. This concerned the teaching of the Nordic languages as second languages (6.1. and 6.3.8.), but it was also a question of providing brief and accessible introductions to the immigrant languages for teachers, nurses, and other interested persons. Gradually, when the second generation immigrants grew up, the study of the development and partial Nordicization of the main immigrant languages became a new and interesting field of research. A leading person in this field has been the Swedish Turcologist Lars Johanson (1936-), professor of Turcology in Mainz since 1981.

In Chapters three and four we treated missionary linguistics as a special field having little contact with or impact on linguistics in general. After 1965, and partly due to the stimulus from international Christian missionary organizations like the Summer Institute of Linguistics and its charismatic linguist leader Kenneth Pike, a number of future missionaries and Bible translators studied linguistics as part of their preparation for theological work. Many of them came back to the departments of linguistics to take a Master's degree or to write a dissertation on the language they had learned and studied in the missionary field.

Chapter 7

Conclusion

“In thought and learning, in the history of science, ideas and scholarship, nothing succeeds like success.”⁷⁵

In writing this book, we have attempted to suppress the tendency so often found in the historiography of our field to view events in the history of linguistics as a series of success stories, judged from the perspective of our own age. We have made an effort to describe the history of linguistics in the Nordic countries on its own terms and within its own context. We have tried not merely to record events in this history, but also to understand and explain them as part of the scientific and general discourse of their time. And we have tried to avoid the positivist conception of the forward march of history, in which everyone is considered to be running the same race.

In this brief concluding chapter, however, we will allow ourselves to formulate some broad generalizations from a more contemporary perspective and to single out some of the milestones, again from our late twentieth century point of view, in the study of languages and linguistics in the Nordic countries.

As we mentioned in the introductory chapter, with the development of phonetics as an example, our understanding of a great number of linguistic phenomena is clearly greater today than it was in previous generations. And as we also mentioned, a single person can exert significant and lasting influence in his field. We will thus conclude by assessing the merits, by our modern standards, of individual linguists in the Nordic countries and by evaluating the accomplishments made in various fields of linguistics in these countries. Our evaluation will not extend much beyond the middle of the present century, however, since we lack the necessary historical and personal distance to be able to assess more recent developments.

In this context we can ask questions such as what major innovative contributions have Nordic linguists made to the global enterprise of describing the languages of the world and gaining a better understanding of what language is? And to what extent have Nordic linguists made an international impact?

In judging international impact, criteria such as the following can be invoked. A linguist exerts international impact especially by:

- establishing original and lasting research traditions or theories,
- publishing major original works like monographs, grammars, or theoretically and/or descriptively significant textbooks that shape the field (cf. Kuhn’s (1970 [1962]) exemplars and paradigmatic matrices),
- publishing significant articles in leading international journals,

⁷⁵ Aarsleff (1967: 3).

- being widely cited by colleagues and peers, judged to a certain extent by consulting the *Arts & Humanities Citation Index* (AHCI), where applicable (here we must keep in mind, however, that the anglocentric, particularly American, bias of AHCI is strong and that journals like *Arkiv för nordisk filologi* or *Virittäjä* basically covering “small” national languages like the Nordic languages are not properly represented in the database).

Progressing chronologically, before 1800 Nordic linguists were not visible on the international research scene, which, of course, was just beginning to take shape.

When we come to the 1800s, we find two internationally significant Nordic contributions to linguistics in the areas of historical-comparative linguistics (Denmark) and anthropological and ethnolinguistics (Finland).

The Dane Rasmus Rask was one of the founders of the emerging paradigm of the 1800s, historical-comparative Indo-European linguistics, and several of his successors made major contributions to this tradition, in particular Karl Verner, Vilhelm Thomsen, and Holger Pedersen. In Finland, Anders Johan Sjögren and Mathias Alexander Castrén laid the foundation for ethnolinguistics and anthropological linguistics through their extensive fieldwork activities in the vast Russian empire. The Finno-Ugrian Society turned this into a productive research tradition. This tradition, which was established prior to the anthropological linguistic endeavors of Franz Boas, detached itself from Western linguistic mainstreams in the first half of the 1900s. Erkki Itkonen and Mikko Korhonen have since bridged this gap.

Around 1900, several major linguists emerged on the national scenes and exerted considerable influence in laying the groundwork for the study of the national languages. The most prominent of these were Adolf Noreen in Sweden and Eemil Nestor Setälä in Finland. Both had extensive international contacts, and Noreen was widely read in the Nordic countries. In addition to Noreen, Axel Kock was one of the leading neogrammarians working in the Scandinavian languages.

Later in the twentieth century, Louis Hjelmslev’s glossematics distinguished itself as the only well-defined linguistic theory in the Nordic countries that has received considerable international recognition. The impact of glossematics on international theoretical and descriptive practice has remained limited, however, probably due to the fact that the theory of glossematics is more of an experimental theoretical construct than a realistic framework for describing natural languages. Several of Hjelmslev’s colleagues were also quite well-known, in particular Viggo Brøndal.

As for additional Nordic contributions to general linguistics, the name of Otto Jespersen stands out above all others. His many books on theoretical topics and his extensive English grammar have been read by linguists and their students all over the world. Jespersen is by far the most cited Scandinavian (= Danish, Icelandic, Norwegian, or Swedish) linguist, cited three times more than Hjelmslev.⁷⁶

Another influential general linguist and phonetician is Bertil Malmberg, whose books on linguistics and Romance languages (often in the form of popularizations) have been very widely read in various parts of the world, especially in Romance-speaking countries. Two other significant phoneticians have come from Sweden, Gunnar Fant, who did pioneering work in collaboration with Roman Jakobson and Morris Halle, and Björn Lindblom, who has added a biological and cognitive dimension to phonetics. One has come from Denmark, Eli Fischer-Jørgensen, who is particularly well-known internationally for her work in experimental phonetics.

Another Danish linguist, Paul Diderichsen, laid the foundation for the study of Danish syntax, and his theory of syntactic fields has inspired syntacticians in a number of other countries.

In addition to Jespersen, the Nordic countries have produced several internationally recognized

⁷⁶ F. Karlsson (1994a: 10). The Finnish linguist Paul Kiparsky (1941-, cf. 6.3.3.) has a slightly higher citation rate than Jespersen.

scholars in the field of English. Eilert Ekwall's work on place-names is a classic, as is Tauno Mustanoja's *Middle English Grammar*. Jan Svartvik's collaboration with scholars like Sir Randolph Quirk on contemporary English grammar should also be mentioned.

One Nordic scholar of German seems to rank especially high in international esteem, namely Emil Öhmann, the founder of the "Öhmansche Schule" in loan word research.

Romance studies have been greatly enriched by Nordic contributions like Knud Togeby's grammars of French, Veikko Väänänen's work on Vulgar Latin, and Kristoffer Nyrop's work on the history of French.

Olaf Broch was a leading expert on Slavic phonetics, and Jooseppi Julius Mikkola's grammar of proto-Slavic and Valentin Kiparsky's three volumes on the history of Russian are also classics.

The Nordic countries have also had major successes in the study of several non-Indo-European and non-Finno-Ugric languages. Gustaf John Ramstedt is still considered the founder of Mongolian studies, and he was also very influential in Korean studies and the Grand Old Man of Altaic linguistics. Hans Vogt did pioneering work on Ubykh, Georgian, and Kalispel, Otto Chr. Dahl on Austronesian languages, and Knut Bergsland on Eskimo and Aleut. Finally, Bernhard Karlgren was a renowned authority on Chinese.

We emphasize that the scholars singled out above represent a selection, although a principled one, from a much larger Nordic pool of prominent and dedicated linguists. Because we have focused initially on the international impact of Nordic linguistics, it is natural that only a few experts on the study of the national languages have been mentioned.

Beyond this, what generalizations can be made within the Nordic framework? Is it possible to spot specific national strengths? And how has the development of language studies and linguistics in the various Nordic countries been affected by their respective geographic locations and their different historical fates?

In trying to answer these questions, we can begin with Denmark, which has been particularly strong, on the whole much stronger than the other Nordic countries, in the domain of linguistic theory and historical and general linguistics. This is witnessed by a long chain of scholars, starting with the medieval modists and continuing, after an interlude of several centuries, with scholars like Rask, Verner, Thomsen, Jespersen, Hjelmslev, and Brøndal. Denmark's geographical proximity to Germany and her influential universities can perhaps contribute to an explanation of the theoretical flowering that relates to the comparative-historical paradigm.

Finland's distinctive traits are ethnolinguistic fieldwork in remote areas, particularly in large parts of the Russian territory, and diachronic philology. Although the geographical proximity to Russia and Finland's status as an autonomous part of Russia from 1809-1917 were important factors in the development of Finnish ethnolinguistics, the main impetus was the need, still unfulfilled around 1850, to establish a comprehensive Finno-Ugric framework for Finnish nationality. Diachronic philology, often neogrammatical in spirit, has been the other main avenue of Finnish research (Öhmann, Mustanoja, Väänänen).

Norway's international strengths lie in the descriptive and typological domains, as exemplified by the work of Carl Marstrand, Hans Vogt, Knut Bergsland, and O. Chr. Dahl, as well as by the work of Alf Sommerfelt, Carl Borgstrøm, and Magne Oftedal on Celtic languages and by George Morgenstierne on Indo-Iranian languages. Norwegian linguists have been on the move a lot.

Compared to Finland and Norway, Swedish linguists have remained more on native soil. There are, of course, notable exceptions, like the famous sinologist Bernhard Karlgren. Sweden has also excelled in phonetics (Malmberg, Fant, Lindblom). Sweden's historical position as an early European superpower may have created a predilection for inward linguistic reflection, resulting in a pronounced interest in research on the mother tongue in areas like dialectology, onomastics, lexicography, and runology.

A common trait, at least for Finland, Norway, and Sweden, has been the relatively conservative position and attitudes of the historically dominating universities in Helsinki, Oslo, and Uppsala. Modern linguistics did not strike Finland and Sweden with full force until the 1960s, and even then the points of theoretical entry were the younger, less traditional universities. As for the reception of modern linguistics in the 1900s, Denmark was very open from the outset, and Norway also experienced an early influx of

structuralism compared to Finland and Sweden.

The 1800s, and much of the early 1900s, was the time of national patriotism and historical-comparative linguistics, with *Stammbaum* theories of the historical descent of the national languages and their relatives, and extensive research on the national languages, exemplified in particular by the numerous studies in dialectology, etymology, and lexicography. Scientific work on the major foreign languages, especially German, French, English, and Slavic began en masse around 1900. Here, the dominant paradigm through the first half of the century was that of text philology.

An interest in theoretical linguistics appeared in the early 1900s, first in Denmark and Norway, later in Sweden and Finland. Now, at the end of the twentieth century, the study of almost any language has been “linguistified”. Most scholars working on individual languages are now highly versatile in terms of linguistic theory and methodology. The early demarcation between general linguistic theorizing on the one hand and language-particular description on the other has largely disappeared.

A typical trait of the latter half of the present century has been the instrumentalization of linguistics and language description, as exemplified in particular by the advent of applied and computational linguistics, apparently almost the only growing linguistic subdisciplines today. Other important contemporary trends are the rise of language typology and cognitive-functional linguistics. Plain autonomous theorizing, so typical of early structuralist and generative theories, has largely been replaced by a concern for real language use. One indication of this development is the current popularity of conversation analysis, pragmatics, and various types of corpus linguistics, computational or otherwise.

A considerable extension of the set of languages investigated by Nordic linguists can be seen in recent decades in the direction of East and Southern Asia, the Middle East, Polynesia, and Africa. Growing attention is thus being paid to Chinese, Japanese, Korean, Arabic, Turkish, and some languages of India, Africa, and the South Seas. Nordic linguists have done the least work on languages spoken in South America — however, cf. the work by Bertil Malmberg (5.3.3.) and Nils Holmer (5.7.9.). Governmental interest in funding research on the linguistic aspects of most of these areas of the world is, of course, largely dictated by economic interests and national trade policies. While less than a century ago there was a much stronger concern for basic science, “the study of language and linguistics for its own sake”, we note that Nordic linguistics today, as in many other branches of science, has become increasingly instrumental in fulfilling societal needs.

Except for a brief medieval prelude, our survey in the present book starts with the sixteenth century. At that time there was the well-established canon of Graeco-Roman Christian culture consisting of the Bible and the main classical authors. Donatus and Priscian were the leading models when Europeans started to describe new languages around 1500, both the vernacular languages of Europe and languages of the new worlds outside Europe. In the same way as Genesis, Pliny, Strabo, and Ptolemy provided the main guidelines for interpreting the new lands and cultures encountered overseas.

New data gradually became integrated into our cultural heritage, and the canon changed over time. In this book, we have focused on changes and developments in theoretical and applied linguistics. However, the changes have often required a long time — a generation or two — to be accepted. What we have perhaps not sufficiently stressed is the conservative and traditional character of mainstream linguistics. As shown by Thomas Kuhn, it seems to be normal that scientific progress and particularly the acceptance of scientific innovation is slow, and linguistics surely is no exception.

The differences between the multitude of theories in linguistics may at first glance seem striking, but it may be even more interesting to look at the numerous and fundamental common canonical assumptions of these theories. This basic traditionalism in linguistics is one *raison d’être* for this book. In linguistics it is clear that the past is very much part of the present. The quote by Julie Andresen (1990:254) at the beginning of chapter one puts this nicely:

“... the future path is securely, even inescapably, forged by our past and by our view of that past.”

Many of the basic questions of linguistics were thus formulated early, especially by Aristotle and Plato. What is the origin of language? What is the relation between language and thinking? What is the nature of meaning? Is Man a unique creature in nature because of his/her language faculty? How can we explain why certain means of expression in a language are grammatical while others are not? How do we learn languages? What is the relation between language and the world?

Such partly metaphysical questions are as old as scientific inquiry itself and, as of today, can hardly be said to have been answered conclusively. But as the basic discourses of the different periods have changed, the ways of answering such questions have changed accordingly, sometimes quite radically during the period covered in this book. These questions have given rise to many new theories and methods, some questions have been taken off the agenda (e.g. the native language of the angels), and a multitude of new questions have been posed.

However, the most important development in linguistic theory and description over the past few centuries doubtless derives from the vastly increased descriptive and typological knowledge of the languages of the world. This has been a slow and largely accumulative process which has fed, and been fed by, theoretical analysis. A greater number of detailed partial interpretations and explanations are now available, even for the broad metaphysical questions just mentioned, than was the case, for example, in Aristotle's day. One fundamental prerequisite for this development has been the enormous advance in the variety and sophistication of linguistic research methods. The only methods available to Aristotle and the medieval modists were philosophical reflection and occasional naturalistic observation. In contrast, today's linguists can, for example, inspect the structured contents of computerized databases containing carefully compiled representative corpora from dozens of languages in a matter of seconds.

This book shows how Nordic scholars have contributed toward answering some of these basic questions, and how they have contributed to the development of linguistic methods, theories, and the gathering of data. Where collecting data is concerned, this has been primarily, but not only, for the indigenous Nordic languages. Nordic linguists have gathered data from many other languages as well, ranging from Samoyed to Mongolian, Ubykh, Malagassy, Minor Mlabri, and Chinese. Occasionally, Nordic linguists have even managed to take the most difficult step of all, that of posing wholly new questions.

In this book we have also tried to show how major ideas which were developed elsewhere have been received and further developed in the Nordic countries and how Nordic scholars and their work have been received by the world-wide community of linguists.

Considering the limited space available in a handbook like this, however, it is clear that in many cases we have only managed to give glimpses and samples of the numerous endeavors and discoveries of Nordic scholars in linguistics over the past 500 years. Thus, just as there is still more to be done in the field of linguistics, also by Nordic scholars, there is also still much more to be written on the history of linguistics in the Nordic countries.

Bibliography

Note: the alphabetical sequence followed is that with Æ/Ǽ (æ/ä), Ø/Ö (ø/ö), and Å (å) in that order at the end of the alphabet. Icelandic and Faroese accented vowels (Á, á, É, é, etc.) are placed with the unaccented ones, Ð (ð) follows D (d), and Þ (þ) follows Th (th).

- Aalto, Pentti. 1971. *Oriental Studies in Finland 1828-1918*. The History of Learning and Science in Finland 1828-1918. 10b. Helsinki. SSF.
- Aalto, Pentti. 1980. *Classical Studies*. The History of Learning and Science in Finland 1828-1918. 10a. Helsinki. SSF.
- Aalto, Pentti. 1987. *Modern Language Studies in Finland 1828-1918*. The History of Learning and Science in Finland 1828-1918. 10c. Helsinki. SSF.
- Aalto, Pentti & Antti Sovijärvi, eds. 1962. *Proceedings of Fourth International Congress of Phonetic Sciences*. Helsinki, 4-9 September 1961. The Hague. Mouton.
- Aaltonen, Olli. 1984. The effect of relative amplitude levels of F2 and F3 on the categorization of synthetic vowels. *Journal of Phonetics* 13:1-9.
- Aarsleff, Hans. 1960. The Study of Language in England 1780-1860. Unpublished dissertation, University of Minnesota.
- Aarsleff, Hans. 1967. *The Study of Language in England, 1780-1860*. Princeton, New Jersey. Princeton University Press.
- Aarsleff, Hans. 1975. The eighteenth century, including Leibniz. In: Th. A. Sebeok, ed. *Current Trends in Linguistics*. Vol. 13. *Historiography of Linguistics*, 383-479. The Hague. Mouton.
- Aasen, Ivar. 1848. *Det norske Folkesprogs Grammatik*. Udgivet paa det kongelige norske Videnskabs-selskabs Bekostning. Kristiania. [Feilberg & Landmark].
- Aasen, Ivar. 1850. *Ordbog over det norske Folkesprog*. Udgivet efter det kongelige norske Videnskabs-Selskabs Foranstaltning og paa dets Bekostning. Kristiania. [Feilberg & Landmark].
- Aasen, Ivar. 1851. *Søndmørsk Grammatik eller kortfattet Underretning om Bygdemålet paa Søndmør*. Eegsæt. Aarflot.
- Aasen, Ivar. 1864. *Norsk Grammatik*. Omarbeidet Udgave af "Det norske Folkesprogs Grammatik". Christiania. Malling.
- Aasen, Ivar. 1873. *Norsk Ordbog med dansk Forklaring*. Omarbeidet og forøget Udgave af en ældre "Ordbog over det norske Folkesprog". Christiania. Malling.
- AASF = *Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fennicae*. Helsinki.
- Abel, Ivar. 1782. *Symphona symphona sive undecim lingvarum orientalium discors exhibita concordia Tamulicæ videlicet Granthamicæ, Telugicæ, Samscrutamicæ, Marathicæ, Balabandicæ, Canaricæ, Hindostanicæ, Cuncanicæ, Gutzaratizæ & Peguanicæ non characteristicæ, qvibus, ut explicativo-Harmonica adjecta est Latina*. Havniæ. Typis Hallageri.
- [Abel, Ivar]. 1783a. *Gentium Boreo-Orientalium vulgo tatarorum Harmonia Linguarum. Specimen einiger Zahlen und Wörter derer in dem Nord-Ostlichen Theil von Europa und Asia wohnenden Tatar- und Hunno-Scythischen Abstämmings-Völker; Aus welchen nebst andern historischen Umständen zu ersehen seyn wird, wie solche vor Zeiten entweder unter sich oder mit andern Westlichen Völkern combinirt gewesen; ihre Wohnstellen aber können in der neuen edirten Charte gefunden werden*. [Copenhagen. No printer.]
- Abel, Ivar. 1783b. *Schediasma hocce etymologico-philologicum prodromum Americano Grönländicum in fronte gerens Mæcanatibus, patronis, & fautoribus appropriatum insinuat*. Havniæ. Typis Hallageri.
- Adelung, Johann Christoph. 1781. *Deutsche Sprachlehre. Zum Gebrauch der Schulen in den Königl. Preuss. Landen*. Berlin. bey Christian Friedrich Boss und Sohn.
- Agrell, Jan. 1955. *Studier i den äldre språkjämförelsens allmänna och svenska historia fram till 1827*. Uppsala Universitets Årsskrift 1955:13. Uppsala. Lundequist.
- Agrell, Sigurd. 1908. *Aspektänderung und Aktionsartbildung beim polnischen Zeitworte. Ein Beitrag zum Studium der indogermanischen Präverbia und ihrer Bedeutungsfunktionen*. Lunds universitets årsskrift. N. F. Afd. 1 Bd. 4. Nr. 2. Lund. Håkan Ohlsson.
- Ahlman, Erik. 1933. Adverbeista. *Vir*. 37:137-159.
- Ahlman, Erik. 1936. Substantiivin ja adjektiivin määritelmistä. *Vir*. 40:93-98.
- Ahlman, Erik. 1943. Kielellisten ilmausten sisäisestä syntaktisesta rakenteesta. *Vir*. 47:264-276.
- Ahlqvist, Aug[ust Engelbrekt]. 1857. Toinen matkakertomus. *Suomi* 16:238-252.
- Ahlqvist, August Engelbrekt. 1861. *Versuch einer Mokscha-Mordwinischen Grammatik nebst Texten und Wörterverzeichnis*. Forschungen auf dem Gebiete der Ural-altaischen Sprachen. St. Petersburg. Eggers et Comp.
- Ahlqvist, Aug[ust Engelbrekt]. 1863. Om Ungerska språkets förwandskap med Finskan. *Suomi* II,1:1-60.
- Ahlqvist, Aug[ust Engelbrekt]. 1871. *De vestfinska språkens kulturord. Ett lingvistiskt bidrag till finnarnas äldre kulturhistoria*. Helsingfors. Finska Litteratur-sällskapets tryckeri.
- Ahlqvist, August Engelbrekt. 1877. *Suomen kielen rakennus. Vertaavia kieliopillisia tutkimuksia. 1. Nominien synty ja taivutus. Suomalainen Runo-oppi*. SKS.
- Ahlqvist, Aug[ust Engelbrekt]. 1879. Om möjligheten af ett finskt-ugriskt etymologiskt lexikon och om Donners komparativa

- ordbok. *Öfversigt af Finska Vetenskaps-Societetens förhandlingar XXI:83-135*. Helsingfors. J. Simelii arfvingars tryckeri.
- Aikio, Marjut. 1988. *Saamelaiset kielenvaihdon kierteessä. Kielisosiologinen tutkimus viiden saamelaiskylän kielenvaihdosta 1910-1980*. SKST 479.
- Airila, Martti. 1920. *Suomenkielen oikeinkirjoitusoppi oppikoulujen ja seminaarien tarpeeksi*. Jyväskylä. Gummerus.
- Airila, Martti. 1926. *Suomenkielen lauseoppi oppikoulujen ja seminaarien tarpeeksi*. Porvoo. WSOY.
- Airila, Martti. 1940. *Johdatusta kielen teoriaan. I. Sanain merkityksen muuttuminen*. Porvoo / Helsinki. WSOY.
- Airila, Martti. 1946. *Johdatusta kielen teoriaan. II. Kielen äänneasu ja sen muuttuminen*. Porvoo / Helsinki. WSOY.
- Airila, Martti. 1952. *Johdatusta kielen teoriaan. III. Sanaluokat*. Porvoo / Helsinki. WSOY.
- Akiander, Matth. 1846. *Försök till utredning af finska språkets ljudbildning*. *Suomi* 5:293-438.
- Alanus, Johannes Janus. 1608. *Theses de sermone ornamento hominis singulari. Et proinde de Nominum ratione, & Lingvarum diversitate*. Hafniæ. Typis Henrici Waldkirchii.
- Alanus, Johannes Janus. 1609. *Disputatio secunda de sermone qua agitur de Lingvarum utilitate, & Dialectorum apud Græcos varietate, cum ejus gentis origine. Et proinde de Nominum ratione, & Lingvarum diversitate*. Hafniæ. Ex officina Typographica Henrici Waldkirchii.
- Alanus, Johannes Janus. 1623. *Disquisitio II. de pronunciatione graeca, cum seculis certis, quibus est variata, ut doctrina, et mores: illis est adjecta anomalia Vocalium & Diphthongorum*. Hafniæ. Typis Henrici Waldkirchii.
- Albano Leoni, Federico. 1975. *Il primo trattato grammaticale islandese. Introduzione, testo, traduzione e commento a cura di Federico Albano Leoni*. Bologna. Società editrice il mulino.
- ALH = *Acta Linguistica Hafniensia*. Copenhagen.
- Allén, Sture. 1965. *Grafematisk analys som grundval för textedering med särskild hänsyn till Johan Ekeblads brev till brodern Claes Ekeblad 1639-1655*. Nordistica Gothoburgensia. Göteborg.
- Allén, Sture. 1970. *Frequency Dictionary of Present-Day Swedish based on newspaper material*. *Data linguistica* 1. Stockholm. Almqvist & Wiksell.
- Allén, Sture. 1986. *Inför tredje seklet*. In: Allén et al. 1986:233-275.
- Allén, Sture, Bengt Loman & Bengt Sigurd. 1986. *Svenska Akademien och svenska språket. Tre studier. Svenska Akademien 200 år. Svenska Akademiens handlingar från år 1986*. Fjärde delen. Stockholm. Norstedt.
- Allwood, Jens. 1976. *Linguistic communication as action and cooperation*. Gothenburg Monographs in Linguistics 2. Gothenburg. Department of Linguistics, University of Gothenburg.
- Allwood, Jens & Lars-Gunnar Andersson. 1970. *Semantik*. Guling 1. Göteborg. Institutionen för lingvistik.
- Allwood, Jens, Lars-Gunnar Andersson & Östen Dahl. 1971. *Logik för lingvister*. Lund. Studentlitteratur.
- Allwood, Jens, Lars-Gunnar Andersson & Östen Dahl. 1977. *Logic in Linguistics*. Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics. Cambridge. Cambridge University Press.
- Allwood, Jens, Bo Ralph, Paula Andersson, Dora Kós-Dienes & Åsa Wengelin, eds. 1994. *Proceedings of The XIVth Scandinavian Conference of Linguistics and The VIIIth Conference Of Nordic and General Linguistics, August 16-21 1993, General session*. Vol. 1-2. Gothenburg. Gothenburg Papers in Theoretical Linguistics 65.
- Almqvist, Herman. 1879. *Lärokurs i arabiska språket*. [Review of Lagus 1869-1874.] *Finsk Tidskrift* VII:226-236.
- Almqvist, Carl Johan Love. 1829. *Svensk Rättstafnings-lära, innefattande Reglor för alla i Språket förekommande fall, upplysta genom Exempel, Undantags-förteckningar och Skriföfningar. För offentlig och enskild Undervisning, äfvensom för äldre personer, hvilka behöfva anvisning att rätt stafva modersmålet*. Stockholm. Johan Hörberg.
- Almqvist, Carl Johan Love. 1832. *Svensk språklära. Till Ungdomens Tjänst Vid lägre och högre Läroverk såväl som för enskild undervisning och för äldre Personer, som önska en närmare bekantskap med Modersmålet; jemte prof på Språkets tillstånd i äldre tider, samt exempel af Språkstil i olika skrifter*. Stockholm. Johan Högborg.
- Almqvist, Carl Johan Love. 1842. *Ordbok öfver Svenska Språket i dess närvarande skick*. Första delen. Örebro. Lindh.
- Aminoff, T[orsten]. G. 1871. *Tutkimus Etelä-Pohjanmaan kielimurteesta*. *Suomi* II,9:235-302.
- Aminoff, Torsten G. 1876. *Tietoja Wermlannin Suomalaisista*. *Suomi* II,11:161-244.
- Amsler, Mark. 1993. *History of Linguistics, 'Standard Latin', and Pedagogy*. *HL* XX:49-66.
- Amundsen, Leiv. 1961. *Det historisk-filosofiske fakultet. Lærere og forskere. Universitet i Oslo 1911-1961*. I:251-474. Oslo. Universitetsforlaget.
- Andenæs, Ellen. 1993. *Anvendt språkvitenskap – helt kjønnsløs? Om bruk og betydning av kjønn i et tverrvitenskapelig fag*. Trondheim. Universitetet i Trondheim, Institutt for anvendt språkvitenskap.
- Andersen, Børge. 1959. *Rønnemålet. En strukturallingvistisk analyse af udtryksplanet i en bornholmsk dialekt*. Udv. f. Folkemaals Publ. A 18. Universitets-Jubilæets danske Samfund. København. Schultz
- Andersen, Harry. 1942. *Runedansk rita og rata*. Nogle runografiske og lydhistoriske Bemærkninger. *ANF* 56:251-265.
- Andersen, Harry. 1946. *Runedansk ailti*. *ANF* 61:171-181.
- Andersen, Harry. 1948 [1949]. *Problemet siax/siæx: seks*. *ANF* 63:192-199.
- Andersen, Henning. 1973. *Abductive and deductive change*. *Language* 49:765-793.
- Andersen, Henning. 1982. *'On the causes of linguistic change' (1821) by Jacob Hornemann Bredsdorff*. English translation with commentary and an essay on J. H. Bredsdorff. *HL* 9:1-41.
- Andersen, Henning. 1994. *Bredsdorff, Jacob Hornemann (1790-1841)*. In: Asher 1994,1:401-402.
- Andersen, Nikolaj. 1897. *Den musikalske accent i østslesvigsk*. *Dania* 4:65-81, 165-180.

- Andersen, Poul, ed. 1938. *Rasmus Rask: De fynske Bønders Sprog*. København. Schultz.
- Andersen, Poul. 1949. Væv og Vævild. In: Peter Skautrup and Axel Steensberg, eds. *Festskrift til museumsforstander H. P. Hansen, Herning, på 70-årsdagen den 2. oktober 1949*, 309-327. Århus og København. Aarhus Stiftsbogtrykkeri.
- Andersen, Poul. 1965. Dialektforskningen. In: Jørgen Larsen, Christian Lisse & Karl Martin Nielsen, eds. *Det danske sprogs udforskning i det 20. århundrede*, 85-126. København. Gyldendal.
- Andersen, Poul. 1977. Dansk Dialektologi i Tiåret 1965-1974. *Danske Studier* 72:100-138.
- Anderson, Stephen R. 1969. *West-Scandinavian Vowel Systems and the Ordering of Phonological Rules*. Ph.D. Dissertation. Cambridge, Mass. MIT.
- Andersson, Aksel. 1884. *Om Johan Salbergs Grammatica svetica. Ett bidrag till kännedom om 1600-talets svenska I*. Uppsala. Edv. Berling.
- Andersson, Erik. 1977. *Verbfrasens struktur i svenskan. En studie i aspekt, tempus, tidsadverbial och semantisk räckvidd*. Åbo. Meddelanden från Stiftelsens för Åbo akademi forskningsinstitut 18.
- Andersson, Roger & Stephan Borgehammar. 1997. The teaching of the Birgittine friars at Vadstena Abbey. *Revue Mabillon*, Nouvelle série, 8 (t. 69), 209-236.
- Andresen, Julie Tetel. 1990. *Linguistics in America 1769-1924. A Critical History*. London / New York. Routledge.
- [Andrésson, Guðmundur]. Gudmundus Andreae Islandus. 1683. *Lexicon Islandicum Sive Gothicae Runae vel Lingvæ Septentrionalis Dictionarium*. Havniæ. Typis Christier. Weringii Typog & sumptibus Christier. Gerhardi.
- Andrews, Avery D. 1973. Agreement and Deletion. *CLS* 9:22-33.
- ANF = *Arkiv for nordisk filologi*. Lund.
- Anhava, Jaakko. 1993. *Suomen kieli, suomen mieli. August Ahlqvist vaikuttajana*. SKS.
- [Anon.]. 1616. *Grammatica Latina. Qvæ tam superiori quam inferiori classi Scholæ Holensis satisfacere poterit: Comparatis plurium autorum verbis & sententijs, quorum omnium maximam partem, Melanchthon & Ramus jure sibi vendicant, brevi hoc syntagmate comprehensa, simplicissimè. Methodo facilis, Præceptis brevis: Arte & usu prolixa*. [Hólar]. [No printer.]
- [Anon.]. 1989. *Ordbog over det norrøne prosasprog. Registre — A Dictionary of Old Norse Prose. Indices*. København. Den arnamagnæanske kommission.
- Anttila, Raimo. 1969. *Proto-Indo-European Schwebelaut*. University of California Publications 58. Berkeley/Los Angeles. University of California Press.
- Anttila, Raimo. 1972. *An Introduction to Historical and Comparative Linguistics*. New York. The Macmillan Company.
- Anttila, Raimo. 1974. Allomorfen semiotikkaa. *Vir.* 78:331-338.
- Anttila, Raimo. 1975. *The Indexical Element in Morphology*. Innsbruck. Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft, Reihe Vorträge 12. Sprachwissenschaftliches Institut.
- Anttila, Raimo. 1976. The Metamorphosis of Allomorphs. The Second LACUS Forum 1975, 238-248. Columbia, S. C. The Hornbeam Press.
- Anttila, Raimo. 1977a. *Analogy*. The Hague. Mouton.
- Anttila, Raimo. 1977b. Dynamic Fields and Linguistic Structure. A Proposal for Gestalt Linguistics. *Die Sprache* 23:1-10.
- Anttila, Raimo. 1989. *Historical and Comparative Linguistics*. Second revised edition. Amsterdam / Philadelphia. John Benjamins.
- Anttila, Raimo, Ilse Lehiste & Erling Wandø. 1996. *Fennistic Research in Finland at the Beginning of the Nineties. A Report Submitted to the Academy of Finland*. Helsinki. Publications of the Academy of Finland 3/96. Edita.
- Aphelen, Hans von. 1759. *Grand Dictionnaire Royal. Danois et François I-II*. Kiøbenhavn. J. P. Anchersen.
- Aphelen, Hans von. 1764. *Kongelig Dansk Ord-Bog. oplyst med Exempler og Talemaader. Første Tome Dansk og Tydsk. Anden Tome Tydsk og Dansk*. Kiøbenhavn. Bogtrykker Svare.
- Aphelen, Hans von. 1772-1775. *Dictionnaire Royal. I-III*. Andet Oplag, anseligen forbedret og forøget. Kiøbenhavn. Nicolaus Møller.
- Aphelen, Hans von. 1775. *Fransk Sproglære*. Kiøbenhavn. Johan Rudolph Thiele.
- APhS = *Acta philologica Scandinavica*. København.
- [Aquilonius, Bertel Knudsen]. Aq., C. 1640. *De Danicæ Lingvæ Cum Græca Mistione Diatribe*. Portvæ. Typis Melchioris Martzaniæ.
- [Aquilonius, Bertel Knudsen]. Aq., C. 1641. *De Danicæ Lingvæ Cum Latina Mixtione Diatribe*. Portvæ. Typis Melchioris Martzaniæ.
- Areskoug, Hugo. 1957. *Studier over sydøstskånska folkmål*. Skrifter utgivna genom Landsmålsarkivet i Lund 11. Lund. Gleerup.
- [Árnason, Jón]. 1738. *Nucleus Latinitatis. Qvò pleræque Romani sermonis Voces, ex classicis Auctoribus aureæ argenteæque ætatis, ordine Etymologico adductæ, & Interpretatione vernacula expositæ comprehenduntur, In usum Scholæ Skalholtinæ*. Hafniæ. Ex Reg-Majest. & Universit. Typographiø.
- ARIPUC = *Annual Report of the Institute of Phonetics of the University of Copenhagen*. Copenhagen.
- Árnason, Kristján. 1980. *Quantity in Historical Phonology: Icelandic and Related Cases*. Cambridge. Cambridge University Press.
- Árnason, Kristján. 1985. Icelandic Word Stress and Metrical Phonology. *Studia Linguistica* 39:93-129.
- Arnholtz, Arthur, Erik Dal & Aage Kabell, eds. 1953-1960. *Danske Metrikere I-II, IIA-IIB*. København. Schultz.

- Aro, Jussi. 1980. *Arabiaa ilman kyyneleitä: nykyarabian oppikirja*. Helsinki. Gaudeamus.
- ASF = Academia Scientiarum Fennica. Helsinki.
- Asher, R. E., ed. 1994. *The Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*. 1-10. Oxford. Pergamon Press.
- ASLA = Association Suedoise de Linguistique Appliquée.
- [Aslaksson, Cort]. Cunradus Aslacus Bergensis. 1606. *Grammaticae Hebraeae libri duo breviter et methodice in usum tyronum linguae sanctae concinnati: Accessit ad ejusdem usum ostendendum analysis grammatica Psalmi 25*. Hafniae. Typis Henrici Waldkirchij.
- ASSF = Acta Societatis Scientiarum Fennicae. Helsinki.
- Aubert, Ludvig Cæsar Martin. 1843a. Om Læren om Sætningsforbindelsen og Inddeling af de forskjellige Sætningsarter fornemmelig med Hensyn til det latinske Sprog. *NOR* 2:99-139.
- Aubert, Ludvig Cæsar Martin. 1843b. *Commentatio de quibusdam casualium formis in lingua latina*. I. Christiania. Gröndahl.
- Aubert, Ludvig Cæsar Martin. 1844. *Commentatio de quibusdam casualium formis in lingua latina*. II. Christiania. Gröndahl.
- Aubert, Ludvig Cæsar Martin. 1875. *Den latinske Verbalflexion*. Christiania. Mallings.
- [Aurén, Johan August]. J. A. A. 1869. *Bidrag till Svenska Språkets Ljudlära*. Linköping. Fridolf Wallins boktryckeri.
- [Aurén, Johan August]. J. A. A. 1874. *Bidrag till Svenska Språkets Qvantitetlära*. Stockholm. Norstedt.
- Aurén, Joh[an]. Aug[ust]. 1877. *Svensk språklära*. Karlskrona. Bjurman.
- Aurén, Joh[an]. Aug[ust]. 1880a. *Svensk språklära*. 2:a uppl. Stockholm. Norstedt.
- Aurén, Joh[an]. Aug[ust]. 1880b. *Bidrag till svenska språkets akcentlära*. Stockholm. Norstedt.
- Aurivillius, Ericus O. 1693. *Exercitatio Academica, Continens Cogitationes De Lingvæ Svionicæ. qvalis hodie maxime in usu est, recta scriptura, & pronuntiacione*. Upsaliæ. Henricus Keyser.
- Aurivillius, Ericus O. 1884. *Grammaticæ Svecanæ specimen*. Utgifvet af Gustaf Stjernström. Upsala Universitets Årsskrift 1884 III. Uppsala. Edv. Berling.
- Auroux, Sylvain. 1992. *Histoire des idées linguistiques. Tome 2. Le développement de la grammaire occidentale*. Liège. Mardaga.
- Avellan, Gustaf Adolf. 1828. *Reflexioner öfver Engelska språkets upphof och bildning samt förhållande till andra Europeiska tungomål*. Frenckell.
- Avellan, G[ustaf]. A[dolf]. 1851. Kritik öfver sättet att i Finskan uttrycka begreppet om tid. *Suomi* 10:1-64.
- Avellan, G[ustaf]. A[dolf]. 1854. Om sättet att i Finska periodbyggnaden uttrycka Negativa Begrepp. *Suomi* 13:1-48.
- Baden, Jacob. 1764. *Grædske Grammatik*. Kiøbenhavn. Aarhus Stiftsbogtrykkeri.
- Baden, Jacob. 1767. *Anweisung zur dänischen Sprache nebst einer poetischen und prosaischen Chrestomatie mit einem vollständigen Wörterbuche für dieselbe*. Kopenhagen und Odensee. Aarhus Stiftsbogtrykkeri.
- Baden, Jacob. 1782. *Grammatica Latina det er Anviisning til det Latinske Sprog, udgivet til Skolernes Brug i Danmark og Norge*. Kiøbenhavn. M. Hallager.
- Baden, Jacob. 1785. *Forelæsninger over det Danske Sprog eller Resonneret Dansk Grammatik*. Kiøbenhavn. Trykt hos P. Horrebow.
- Baden, Jacob. 1799. *Dansk ortografisk Ordbog tiligemed et kort ortografisk Register*. Kiøbenhavn. Trykt paa Udgiverens Forlag hos B. R. Horrebow.
- Badenius, Torchillus [Baden, Torkild]. 1699. *Roma Danica, Harmoniam atqve Affinitatem Lingvæ Danicæ Cum Lingva Romana exhibens*. Hafniæ. Literis Viduæ J. P. Bockenhoffer.
- Bakker, Peter. 1987. A Basque nautical pidgin: a missing link in the history of fu. *Journal of Pidgin and Creole Languages* 2:1-30.
- Bakker, Peter. 1989. Two Basque Loanwords in Micmac. *IJAL* 55:258-260.
- Bandle, Oskar. 1956. *Die Sprache der Guðbrandsbiblíá. Orthographie und Laute. Formen*. Bibliotheca Arnamagnæana 17. Copenhagen. Munksgaard.
- Bandle, Oskar. 1962. Die norwegische Dialektforschung. *Zeitschrift für Mundartforschung* 29:283-312.
- Bang, N. F. 1733. *Grammatica Italiana e Danese eller en liden kort Italiensk og Dansk Grammatica Indeholdende de fornemmeste Ting, hvorved mand i en ganske kort Tiid, formedels et Lexicons Hielp, kand af sig self lære at forstaae det Italienske Sprog, (som Grunden til det Franske,) saa vel Poëter, som andre Autores Uddraget med Fliid af Veneroni Italiensk og Tydske Grammatica; af den sidste Edition; saavel som og af andre: Til Fædernelandets Ære, Videnskabernes udbredelse; og den Studerende Ungdoms Gavn og Nytte*. Kjøbenhavn. Joh. Nic. Losius.
- Barnespråksforskning*. 1981. Konferanserapport. NAVF.
- Barr, Kaj. 1957. *Latinsk grammatik og receptlæsning*. København. Ejnar Munksgaards forlag.
- Bartholin, Rasmus. 1657. *De studio linguæ Danicæ*. In: Bertelsen I 1915:1-33.
- [Bartholin, Rasmus]. Erasmus Bartholinus. 1674. *De naturæ mirabilibus. Quæstiones Academicæ*. Hafniæ. Sumptibus Petri Hauboldi, Acad. Bibliop. Literis Georgii Gødani, Reg. Maj. Typogr.
- Basbøll, Hans. 1985. Stød in Modern Danish. *Folia Linguistica* XIX,1-2:1-50.
- Basbøll, Hans 1986. Stød-Sandhi. In: Henning Andersen, ed. *Sandhi Phenomena in the Languages of Europe*, 75-83. Berlin. Mouton de Gruyter.
- Basbøll, Hans. 1989. Dansk talesprog, systembeskrivelser. Dansk fonologi i de sidste femogtyve år. In: Bente Holmberg, Britta Olrik Frederiksen & Hanne Ruus, eds. *Forskningsprofiler*. Selskab for nordisk filologi. København. Gyldendal. 91-134.

- Bech, Gunnar. 1951. *Zur Syntax des tschechischen Konjunktivs mit einem Anhang über den russischen Konjunktiv*. TCLC VII. Copenhagen. Nordisk sprog- og kulturforlag.
- Bech, Gunnar. 1963. *Die Entstehung des schwachen Präteritums*. Hist. Filos. Medd. Dan. Vid. Selsk. 40:4. København. Munksgaard.
- Bech, Gunnar. 1969. *Das germanische reduplizierte Präteritum*. Hist. Filos. Medd. Dan. Vid. Selsk. 44:1. København. Munksgaard.
- Becker, Karl Ferdinand. 1827. *Organizm der Sprache als Einleitung zur deutschen Grammatik. Deutsche Sprachlehre*. Erster Band. Frankfurt am Main. Ludwig Reinherz.
- Becker, Karl Ferdinand. 1829. *Deutsche Grammatik*. Frankfurt a. M. Joh. Christ. Hermann'sche Buchhandlung. [Kettebeil].
- Becker, Karl Ferdinand. 1836-1839. *Ausführliche deutsche Grammatik als Kommentar der Schulgrammatik*. Frankfurt am Main. Hermann [Kettebeil].
- Becker, Reinhold von. 1824. *Finsk grammatik*. Åbo. Bibel-sällskapetets tryckeri.
- Becker-Christensen, Christian. 1988. *Bogstav og Lyd. Dansk retskrivning og rigsmålsudtale 1*. København. Gyldendal.
- Beckman, Natanael. 1898. *Grunddragen af den svenska verslärans: till universitetsstudiernas tjänst*. Lund. Gleerup.
- Beckman, Natanael. 1904. *Svensk språklära för den högre elementarundervisningen*. Stockholm. Bonnier.
- Beckman, Nat[anael]. 1930. *Sven Hof's efterlämnade skrifter*. Göteborgs högskolas årsskrift XXXV. 1929:2. Göteborg. Wettergren & Kerbers förlag.
- Beito, Olav T. 1970. *Nynorsk grammatikk. Lyd- og ordläre*. Oslo. Det norske samlaget.
- Benediktsson, Hreinn. 1958. *The Vowel System of Icelandic. Its Structure and Development*. Ph.D. Dissertation, Harvard University. Cambridge, Mass.
- Benediktsson, Hreinn. 1972. *The First Grammatical Treatise. Introduction Text Notes Translation Vocabulary Facsimiles*. University of Iceland. Publications in Linguistics 1. Reykjavík. Institute of Nordic linguistics.
- Benediktsson, Hreinn, ed. 1970. *The Nordic Languages and Modern Linguistics*. Proceedings of the International Conference of Nordic and General Linguistics, Reykjavík July 6-11, 1969. Reykjavík. Vísindafélag Íslendinga.
- Benediktsson, Jacob. 1969. Íslensk orðabókarstörf á 19. öld. *Andvari* 11:96-108.
- Benfey, Theodor. 1869. *Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft und orientalischen Philologie in Deutschland seit dem Anfange des 19. Jahrhunderts mit einem Rückblick auf die früheren Zeiten*. Geschichte der Wissenschaften in Deutschland. Neuere Zeit. Achter Band. München. Cotta.
- Bennike, Valdemar & Marius Kristensen. 1898-1912. *Kort over de danske folkemål med forklaringer*. København. Gyldendal.
- Benson, Sven. 1951. *Studier över adjektivsuffixet -ot i svenskan*. Skrifter utgivna genom Landsmålsarkivet i Lund 8. Lund. Gleerup.
- Benson, Sven. 1965-1970. *Sydschwedischer Sprachatlas*. Skrifter utgivna genom Landsmålsarkivet i Lund 15. Lund. Gleerup.
- Bentzen, Ruth, ed. 1994. *Ung sprogforsker på rejse. Breve fra og til Holger Pedersen 1892-1896*. Utgivet med indledning og noter. Danish Humanist Texts and Studies Vol. 7. København. Det kongelige bibliotek / Tusculanum.
- Bentzien, Wilh. Barthol. 1825. *Dansk Grammatik til Brug for Skoler*. Kjøbenhavn. H. F. Popp's Bogtrykkeri
- Berg, Ludvig Jörgen. 1811. *Tanker om fædresprogets retskrivning. Et forsøg*. Kiöbenhavn. Fr. Brummers forlag.
- Bergman, Brita. 1977. *Tecknad svenska*. Stockholm. Liber.
- Bergman, Gösta. 1931. *Rotvälska. Rommani, månsing, förbrytarspråk och slang*. Stockholm. Wahlström & Widstrand.
- Bergman, Gösta. 1964. *Slang och hemliga språk*. Stockholm. Prisma.
- Bergman, J. 1932. *Universitetet i Dorpat under svenska tiden. Gustav II Adolfs sista kulturskapelse*. Uppsala och Stockholm. Almqvist & Wiksell.
- Bergroth, Hugo. 1917. *Finlandssvenska. Handledning till undvikande av provinsialismer i tal och skrift*. Helsingfors. Holger Schildts förlag.
- Bergsland, Knut. 1946. *Røros-samisk grammatikk. Et forsøk på strukturell språkbeskrivelse*. IFSK. Serie B:43. Oslo. Aschehoug.
- Bergsland, Knut. 1951-1952. Hvordan den nye samiske retskrivningen ble til. *Sameliv* 1951-1952:28-50.
- Bergsland, Knut. 1955. A Grammatical Outline of the Eskimo Language of West Greenland. Mimeo. Oslo.
- Bergsland, Knut. 1959a. The Eskimo-Uralic Hypothesis. *JSFOu* 61,2.
- Bergsland, Knut. 1959b. *Aleut dialects of Atka and Attu*. Transactions of the American Philosophical Society. New ser. vol. 49,3. Philadelphia. American Philosophical Society.
- Bergsland, K[nut]. 1961. *Samisk grammatikk med øvelsessytkker*. [The title on the cover: *Lærebok i samisk*.] Sarpsborg. Utgitt av Kirke- og undervisningsdepartementet.
- Bergsland, Knut. 1982. *Sydsamisk Grammatikk*. Oslo. Universitetsforlaget.
- Bergsland, Knut. 1984. Norsk Forening for Språkvitenskap 60 år. Tale på jubileumsmøte 25.10.1983. *Norsk Lingvistisk Tidsskrift* 2:37-44.
- Bergsland, Knut. 1994. *Aleut dictionary: an abridged lexicon of the Aleutian, Pribilof, and Commander Islands Aleut language*. Fairbanks. Alaska Native Language Center, University of Alaska.
- Bergsland, Knut. 1997. *Aleut Grammar. Unagam Tunuganaan Achicaasix*. Alaska Native Language Center Research Paper Number 10. Fairbanks. University of Alaska.
- Bergsland, Knut & Moses L. Dirks, eds. 1990. *Unagam Ungiikangin kayux tunusangin - Unaangam uniikangis ama*

- tunuzangis. Aleut tales and narratives*. Collected 1909-1910 by Waldemar Jochelson. Fairbanks, Alaska. Alaska Native Language Center, University of Alaska, Fairbanks.
- Bergsland, Knut & Jørgen Rischel, eds. 1986. *Pioneers of Eskimo grammar*. TCLC XXI.
- Bergsland, Knut & Hans Vogt. 1962. On the Validity of Glottochronology. *Current Anthropology* April 1962:115-153.
- Berntsen, M. & Amund B. Larsen. 1925. *Stavanger bymål*. Oslo. Aschehoug.
- Bertelsen, Henrik, ed. 1915-1929. *Danske Grammatikere fra Midten af det syttende til Midten af det attende Aarhundrede. I-IV*. København. Gyldendal. [Reprinted 1979 with the addition of a Danish translation of Bartholin 1657 and Henriksen 1980.]
- Bertelsen, Henrik. 1926. *Jens Pedersen Høysgaard og hans forfatterskab*. København. Gyldendal.
- Bertram, Carl. 1750. *Rudimenta Grammaticæ Anglicanæ: Eller Begyndelses Grunde til den Engelske Sprog-Kunst, til Danske Læseres Nytte*. Kiøbenhavn. Trykt paa forfatterens Bekostning af Andreas Hartvig Godiche.
- Bertram, Carl. 1753. *The Royal English-Danish Grammar eller grundig Anvisning til det Engelske Sprogs Kundskab: hvorledes samme paa en læt og vis Maade skal læses, tales, skrives og kiendes i III Tomer, bestaaende af 1. En fullstændig Engelsk Grammatica, 2. En Grundig Anvisning at læse og tale det Engelske Sprog, 3. Et Begrep om det Engelske Sprog og dets Literature. Til Danske og Norske Læseres Nytte fremsat af Carl Bertram φιλολογο*. De Engelske Ord ere overeralt [sic] accentuerede; hvilket ikke findes i nogen anden Grammatica. Kjøbenhavn. Trykt paa Actoris Bekostning af A. H. G[odiche] og L. H. L[jillie].
- BF = *Boletim de Filologia*. Lisboa.
- Biese, Yrjö M. 1928. *Der spätlateinische Akkusativus absolutus und verwandtes. Eine Untersuchung auf dem Gebiete der vergleichenden Syntax*. AASF B 22:2.
- Biese, Yrjö M. 1930. *Englanninkielen alkeiskirja ja lukemisto*. I-II. Porvoo - Helsinki. WSOY.
- Biese, Yrjö M. 1931. *Lyhyt englannin kielioppi*. Porvoo - Helsinki. WSOY.
- Biese, Yrjö M. 1941. *Origin and Development of Conversions in English*. AASF B 45,2.
- Billius Suecus, Johannes. 1579. *Prima grammatices rudimenta in gratiam puerorum scholæ Regiæ Stocholmiensis concinnata*. Stocholmiæ. Anders Torstanus.
- Birch, D[avid]. S[eidelin]. 1812. *Udtog af den danske Sproglære, til brug ved den første Underviisning i Modersmaalet*. Anden og forøgede Udgave. København. Trykt paa Andreas Seidelins Forlag hos Christopher Græbe.
- Birch, Fr. Sneedorff. 1838. *De verbi generibus commentatio exemplis linguae sinicae, sanscriticae, pracriticae, zendicae, persicae, bengalicae, hebraicae, arabicae, copticae, armenicae cet. illustrata*. Hafniae. J. G. Salomon.
- Birkeland, Harris. 1940a. *Akzent und Vokalismus im Althebräischen. Mit Beiträgen zur vergleichenden semitischen Sprachwissenschaft*. DNVA 1940:3. Oslo. Dybwad.
- Birkeland, Harris. 1940b. *Altarabische Pausalformen*. DNVA 1940:4. Oslo. Dybwad.
- Bjerrum, Anders. 1937. K. J. Lyngby. In: Selskab for nordisk filologi, ed. *Fra Rask til Wimmer. Otte Foredrag om Modersmaalsforskere i det 19. Aarhundrede*, 83-112. København. Gyldendal.
- Bjerrum, Anders. 1944. *Fjoldemålets lydsystem*. København. Munksgaard.
- Bjerrum, Anders, Kristian Hald & Peter Jørgensen, eds. 1948-. *Sydsløvigs Stednavne*. København. Akademisk forlag.
- Bjerrum, Marie. 1948. *Felstedmålets tonale Accenter*. Aarhus. (Humanistiske Studier 3.)
- Bjerrum, Marie. 1949. An Outline of the Faroe vowel system. *Recherches Structurales*. TCLC V:235-243.
- Bjerrum, Marie. 1959. *Rasmus Rasks afhandlinger om det danske sprog*. København. Dansk Videnskabs forlag.
- Bjørkvold, Eva & Frøydís Hertzberg. 1976. *Norsk skolegrammatikk. Tradisjon og nytenkning*. Hovedoppgave. Institute for Scandinavian language and literature. University of Oslo.
- Björling, C. F. E. 1880. *Klangfärger och språkljud*. Stockholm. Samson & Wallin.
- Björne, Lars. 1995. *Patrioter och traditionalister. Den nordiska rättsvetenskapens historia. Del I. Tiden före 1815*. Skrifter utgivna av Institutet för rätthistorisk forskning grundat av Gustav och Carin Olin. Serien I. Rätthistoriskt bibliotek. Femtioandra bandet. Stockholm. Nerenius & Santérus Förlag AB.
- Bleken, Brynjulv. 1956. *Studier i Knud Knudsens grammatiske arbeider*. Bidrag til nordisk filologi av studerende ved Universitetet i Oslo 14. Oslo. Aschehoug.
- Bleken, Brynjulv. 1966. *Om norsk språkstrid*. Oslo. Universitetsforlaget.
- Blinkenberg, Andreas. 1928. *L'ordre des mots en français moderne*. Première partie. Hist. Filos. Medd. Dan. Vid. Selsk. 17:1. København. Andr. Fred. Høst & Søn.
- Blinkenberg, Andreas. 1933. *L'ordre des mots en français moderne*. Deuxième partie. Hist. Filos. Medd. Dan. Vid. Selsk. 20:1. København. Levin & Munksgaard.
- Blinkenberg, Andreas. 1960. *Le problème de la transitivité en français moderne. Essai syntacto-sémantique*. Hist. Filos. Medd. Dan. Vid. Selsk. 38:1. København. Munksgaard.
- Bloch, J. Victor. 1837. *Nogle grammaticalske Bemærkninger om den vesterjydske Dialect, oplyste ved ethnographiske og geographiske Billeder, af en jydsk Philolog*. Horsens. Trykt hos A. C. Fogh.
- Bloch, Søren Nic. Joh. 1808. *Encyclopædi af den hele for den studerende Ungdom nødvendige Underviisning i Modersmaalet. 1. Deels 1. Hefte. Sprogets formlære*. Odense. G. Hempel [also published as: 1808. *Haandbog i det danske Sprogs Grammatik, til Veiledning for den studerende Ungdom. 1. Afdeling. Etymologie eller formlære*. Odense. G. Hempel]
- Bloch, S[øren]. N[ic]. J[oh]. 1817. *Fuldstændig Dansk Sproglære til Brug i lærde Skoler og ved Selvunderviisning. Første*

- Deel, om Ordenes Dannelse og Retskrivning*. Andet, aldeles omarbejdede Oplag. Odense. Trykt hos Forlæggeren S. Hempel.
- Blom, Jan-Petter & John J. Gumperz. 1971. Social meaning in linguistic structure: codeswitching in Norway. In: Gumperz 1971:274-310 and Gumperz & Hymes 1972:407-434.
- Blom, Jan-Petter & John J. Gumperz. 1972. Språkstrukturers sosiale betydning: om kodeskifte i et norsk lokalsamfunn. In: Engh et al. 1972:97-127.
- Blomqvist, Jerker. 1969. *Greek Particles in Hellenistic Prose*. Lund. Gleerup.
- Blomqvist, Jerker & Poul Ole Jastrup. 1991. *Grekisk grammatik. Græsk grammatik*. København. Akademisk Forlag.
- Blöndal, Sigfús. 1920-1924. *Íslensk-dönsk orðabók / Islandsk-dansk Ordbok*. Reykjavík / København / Kristiania. Verslun Þórarins B. Þorlákssonar / H. Aschehoug.
- Blöndal, Sigfús and Ingeborg Stemmann. 1943. *Praktisk Lærebog i islandsk Nutidssprog*. København. Dansk-islandsk Samfund.
- Boivie, P. G. 1820. *Försök till en svensk språklära jemte Inledning*. Stockholm. Henrik A. Nordström.
- Bojesen, E. 1845. *Kortfattet dansk Sproglære*. Kjøbenhavn. Reitzel.
- Bolling, Frederik Andersen. 1678. *Fullkommen Engelske Grammatica som indholder En kort og nyttig Underviisning baade paa Ræt at læse/ saa og ræt at forstaae Det engelske Sprog. Tillige med et Engelsk Dictionarium ofver de Ord Som icke hafver nogen kiendelig affinitêt enten med Latinen eller Dansken*. Kjøbenhafn. Hos Daniel Paulli Kongl. Bogh. Boendis ved vor Frue Skole.
- Bondevik, Jarle, Odvar Nes & T. Aarset, eds. 1992. *Sunnmørsgrammatikkane av Ivar Aasen*. Skrifter frå Ivar Aasen-selskapet Serie A. Tekster Nr. 1. Bergen. Norsk Bokreidingslag L/L.
- Bopp, Franz. 1833-1849. *Vergleichende Grammatik des Sanskrit, Zend, Griechischen, Lateinischen, Litthauischen, Altslawischen, Gothischen und Deutschen*. 1-6. Berlin. Ferdinand Dümmler.
- Borgström, Carl Hj[almar]. 1938. Zur Phonologie der norwegischen Schriftsprache (nach der ostnorwegischen Aussprache). *NTS IX*:250-273.
- Borgström, Carl Hj[almar]. 1940. *The Dialects of the Outer Hebrides. A Linguistic Survey of the Gaelic Dialects of Scotland*. Vol. I. *NTS*. Suppl. bind I. Oslo. Aschehoug.
- Borgström, Carl Hj[almar]. 1941. *The Dialects of Skye and Ross-shire. A Linguistic Survey of the Gaelic Dialects of Scotland*. Vol. II. *NTS*. Suppl. bind II. Oslo. Aschehoug.
- Borgström, Carl Hj[almar]. 1949. Thoughts about Indo-European Vowel-Gradation. *NTS XV*:137-187.
- Borgström, Carl Hj[almar]. 1954. Internal Reconstruction of Pre-Indo-European Word-Forms. In: André Martinet & Uriel Weinreich, eds. *Linguistics Today. Published on the Occasion of the Columbia University Bicentennial*. Publications of the Linguistic Circle of New York 2:155-167. New York.
- Borgström, Carl Hj[almar]. 1958. *Innføring i sprogvidenskap*. Oslo. Universitetsforlaget.
- Borrichius, Olaus. 1675. *Dissertatio de cavsis diversitatis lingvarum*. Hafniæ. Typis Henrici Gödiani.
- Botin, Anders af. 1792. *Svenska språket i tal och skrift*. Andra upplagan. Af den framlidne Författaren öfversedd och med Tilläggningar förbättrad. Stockholm. Tryckt i Kongl. Ordens-Tryckeriet. [First edition 1777.]
- Branch, Michael. 1973. A. J. Sjögren, *Studies of the North*. MSFOu 152.
- Branch, Michael. 1994. Suomen ja tsaarin palvelija. *Hiidenkivi* 1994,3:27-30.
- Brandt, Margareta, Ingmar Persson, Inger Rosengren & Lars Åhlander 1973. *Tysk grammatik för universitetsbruk*. Lund. Gleerup.
- Brasen, Janus Olai. 1679. *Dissertatio Philologica de etymologia*. Hafniæ. Typis Christiani Weringi. Typogr.
- Braunmüller, Kurt. 1984. Fandtes der en fonotaktisk analyse i middelalderen? In: K. Ringgaard & Viggo Sørensen, eds. *The Nordic Languages and Modern Linguistics* 5:221-229. Århus. Nordisk institut, Aarhus universitet.
- Bredsdorff, Jakob Hornemann. 1817. *Prøve af en efter Udtalen indrettet dansk Retskrivning*. Kjøbenhavn. Gyldendal.
- Bredsdorff, Jakob Hornemann. 1821. *Om Aarsagene til Sprogenes Forandringer*. Indbydelsesskrift til den offentlige Examen i Roeskilde Kathedralskole i September 1821. Kjøbenhavn. Andreas Seidelin.
- Bredsdorff, Jakob Hornemann. 1822. *Om Runeskriftens Oprindelse*. Kjøbenhavn. Andreas Seidelin.
- Bredsdorff, Jakob Hornemann. 1828. Om de saakaldte tydske Runer; eller Bemærkninger ved Hr. W. C. Grimms Skrift: «Ueber deutsche Runen» (Goettingen 1831). *Nordisk Tidsskrift for Historie, Litteratur og Kunst*. 2:394-403.
- Bredsdorff, Jakob Hornemann. 1831. Om Sproget paa de danske Øer i Begyndelsen af det tolvte Aarhundrede. *Blandinger fra Sorøe. Et Tidsskrift*. 1;77-85. Slagelse. Trykt hos Peter Magnus.
- Bredsdorff, J[akob]. H[ornemann]. 1833. Om Forholdet mellem de forskjellige Grene af den germaniske Sprogstamme. *Blandinger fra Sorøe. Et Tidsskrift* 5:24-55. Slagelse. Trykt hos Peter Magnus.
- Bredsdorff, Jakob Hornemann. 1886. *Om Aarsagene til Sprogenes Forandringer*. Paa ny udgivet af Vilh. Thomsen. Kjøbenhavn. Gyldendal.
- Breivik, Leiv Egil & Ernst Håkon Jahr, eds. 1989. *Language change. Contributions to the study of its causes*. Trends in Linguistics. Studies and monographs 43. Berlin. Mouton de Gruyter.
- Briem, Halldór. 1891. *Stutt ágríp ad íslenzkri mállýsingu handa alþýðuskólum* Reykjavík.
- Brink, Lars & Jørn Lund. 1974. *Udtaleforskelle i Danmark, aldersbestemte - geografiske - sociale*. København. Gjellerup.
- Brink, Lars & Jørn Lund. 1975. *Dansk Rigsmål I-II. Lydudviklingen siden 1840 med særligt henblik på sociolekterne i København*. København. Gyldendal.
- Broch, Ingvild, Tove Bull & Toril Swan. 1995. Language and Gender Research in the Nordic Countries – the State of the Art.

- In: Ingvild Broch, Tove Bull & Toril Swan, eds. *Proceedings of the 2nd Nordic conference on language and gender. Tromsø 3.-5. November 1994. Nordlyd* 23:51-61.
- Broch, Olaf. 1895. Zum Kleinrussischen in Ungarn. *Archiv für slavische Philologie* XVII:321-416. [Also off-print: Berlin. Weidmannsche Buchhandlung.]
- Broch, Olaf. 1911. *Slavische Phonetik*. Sammlung slavischer Lehr- und Handbücher. 1. Reihe 2. Heidelberg. Carl Winter.
- Broch, Olaf. 1923. Fra Østlandets dagligtale. Verbale chablondannelser - vekslende lydlove - relativt bevisst og ubevisst talestof - de rytmiske taktavsnit og deres længde. *Maal og Minne*, 124-155.
- Broch, Olaf. 1927. Russenorsk. *Maal og Minne* 1927:81-130.
- Broch, Olaf & Ernst W. Selmer. 1921. *Håndbok i elementær fonetik*. Kristiania. Aschehoug.
- Brodda, Benny 1977. BETA-systemet: En sammanfattning. *Nordiska datalingvistikdagar 1977. Rapporter från Språkdata* 3:20-26. Göteborg. Göteborgs universitet, Institutionen för språklig databehandling.
- Broocman, Carl Ulric. 1814. *Lärobok i svenska språket, med tillhörande Öfningar*. Andra Upplagan. Stockholm. Olof Grahn.
- Broocman, Carl Ulric. 1820. *Lärobok i svenska språket, med tillhörande Öfningar*. Stockholm. Olof Grahn. [New edition of Broocman 1814.]
- Brugmann, Karl. 1876. [Review of Madvig 1875.] *Literarisches Centralblatt*, no 4 (22 January):114-116.
- Brunchmann, Andreas. 1756. *Harmonia lingvarum Teutonicæ, Danicæ, Svecicæ. Das ist: Allgemeine Zusammenstimmung Worinn Die Grammaticalischen Vesten, Besten und ersten Gründe derer Hoch-Teutschen, Dänischen und Schwetischen Sprachen*. Copenhagen. Gedruckt bey C. G. Glasinga nachgelassenen Wittwe, durch Nicolaus Möller.
- Brunstad, Endre. 1995. *Nasjonalisme som språkpolitisk ideologi. Om nynorsk, frisisk og færøysk målreising*. KULTs skriftserie nr. 36. Oslo. Noregs forskningsråd.
- Brøder, Christian Gottlob. 1801. *Praktisk latinsk Grammatik eller Anviisning til at lære sig selv det latinske Sprog*. Oversat efter det tredje Oplag af Georg Sverdrup, Overlærer i Historie og Geographie ved Cathedralskolen i Christiania. Kiøbenhavn. A. Soldin's Forlag.
- Brøndal, Viggo. 1928. *Ordklasserne. Partes orationis. Studier over de sproglige kategorier*. Kjøbenhavn. Gad.
- Brøndal, Viggo. 1932. *Morfologi og syntax. Nye bidrag til sprogets teori*. Kjøbenhavn. Gad.
- Brøndal, Viggo. 1939. Linguistique structurale. *Acta Linguistica* I:2-10.
- Brøndal, Viggo. 1940. *Præpositionernes teori. Indledning til en rationel betydningsslære*. Kjøbenhavn. Munksgaard.
- Brøndal, Viggo. 1943. *Essais de linguistique générale*. Publiés avec une bibliographie des oeuvres de l'auteur. Copenhagen. Munksgaard.
- Brøndal, Viggo. 1948. *Les parties du discours. Études sur les catégories linguistiques*. Traduction Française par Pierre Naert. Copenhagen. Munksgaard.
- Brøndal, Viggo. 1950. *Théorie des prepositions. Introduction à une sémantique rationnelle*. Traduction Française par Pierre Naert. Copenhagen. Munksgaard.
- Brøndal, Viggo & Louis Hjelmslev. 1939. Éditorial. *ALH* I:1-2.
- Brøndum-Nielsen, J[ohannes]. 1914. *Sproglig Forfatterbestemmelse. Studier over Dansk Sprog i det 16. Århundredes Begyndelse*. Kjøbenhavn / Kristiania. Gyldendal / Nordisk Forlag.
- Brøndum-Nielsen, Joh[anne]s. 1927. *Dialekter og Dialektforskning*. Kjøbenhavn. Schultz.
- Brøndum-Nielsen, Joh[anne]s. 1928-1973. *Gammeldansk Grammatik i sproghistorisk Fremstilling*. I-VIII. Kjøbenhavn. Schultz.
- Bugge, Sophus. 1890. *Etruskisch und armenisch. Sprachvergleichende Forschungen*. Christiania. Aschehoug.
- Bugge, Sophus. 1902. Bemerkungen zu den Arzawa-Briefen. In: Knudtzon 1902:57-107.
- Bugge, Sophus. 1909. *Das Verhältnis der Etrusker zu den Indogermanen und der vorgriechischen Bevölkerung Kleinasiens und Griechenlands, Sprachliche Untersuchungen*. Herausgeben von Alf Torp. Strassburg. Trübner.
- Bugge, Sophus & Magnus Olsen, eds. 1891-1924. *Norges Indskrifter med de ældre Runer*. I-IV. Norges Indskrifter Indtil Reformationen; Afd. 1. Udgivne for Det Norske Historiske Kildeskritfond. Christiania. A. W. Brøggers Bogtrykkeri.
- Bugge, S[øren]. B[ruun]. 1835a. *Latinsk Grammatik til Brug ved Undervisningen i de lærde Skoler fornemmeligen udarbejdet efter Brøders, Ramshorns og Zumpys latinske Grammatiker*. Christiania. R. Hviid.
- Bugge, S[øren]. B[ruun]. 1835b. *Udtag af det latinske Sprogs Grammatik til Brug for Begyndere*. Christiania. R. Hviid.
- Bureus, Andreas. 1631. Regni Sveciæ geographica & politica descriptio. In: Soterus 1631:1-72.
- Bursill-Hall, G. L. 1971. *Speculative grammars of the Middle Ages. The doctrine of partes orationes of the modistae*. The Hague. Mouton.
- Bybee, Joan & Östen Dahl. 1989. The creation of tense and aspect systems in the languages of the world. *Studies in language* 13:51-104.
- Bæksted, Anders. 1952. *Målruner og troldruner*. Kjøbenhavn. Gyldendal.
- Böðvarsson, Árni. 1963. *Íslenzk orðabók*. Reykjavík. Menningarsjóður.
- [Bøgh, Matth. Frid. Georg]. [1795] 1800. *Udtag af den danske Sproglære til Brug ved Underviisning*. Kjøbenhavn. Gyldendal.
- Böthlingk, Otto von. 1851. *Über die Sprache der Jakuten. Grammatik, Text und Wörterbuch*. St. Petersburg. Buchdruckerei der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Böthlingk, Otto von & R. Roth, eds. 1853-1875. *Sanskrit-Wörterbuch*. 1-7. St. Petersburg. Buchdruckerei der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Cajanus, Ericus. 1697. *Linguarum Ebraeæ et Finicæ convenientia*. [Turku]. Apud Jo. Wallium.

- [Campanius, Johannes Jonæ Holmiensis]. 1696. *Lutheri Catechismus Öfwersatt på American-Virginiske Språket*. Stockholm. Burchardi Tryckeri.
- Campanius Holm, Thomas. 1702. *Kort Beskrifning om Provincien Nye Sverige uti America, Som nu förtiden af the Engelske kallas Pennsylvania. Af lärde och trowärdige Mäns skrifter och berättelser ihopaletad och sammanskrefwen, samt med åtthskillige Figurer utsirad*. Stockholm. Tryckt uti Kongl. Boktr. hos Sal. Wankijfs Änkia med egen bekostnad af J. H. Werner.
- Canel, Peter P. P. 1701. *Der Königliche Französisch-Teutsche Grammaticus zur Übung Ihrer Prinzlichen Hochheit Prinz Wilhelms von Dennemark Meines Gnädigsten Herrn*. Hamburg. J. J. Erytropilus [Also with French title.]
- Cannelin, Knut. 1916. *Kieliopas*. Porvoo. WSOY.
- Cannelin, Knut. 1932. *Finska språket. Grammatik och ordbildningslära*. Helsingfors. Schildts
- Carlson, Lauri. 1981. Aspect and quantification. In: P. Tedeschi & A. Zaenen, eds. *Syntax and Semantics* 14:31-64. New York. Academic Press.
- Carlson, Lauri. 1983. *Dialogue Games: An Approach to Discourse Analysis*. Synthese Language Library 17. Dordrecht. D. Reidel Co.
- Carlson, Lauri. 1984. 'Well' in *Dialogue Games: A Discourse Analysis of the Interjection 'well' in Idealized Conversation*. Pragmatics and Beyond V:5. Amsterdam / Philadelphia. John Benjamins.
- Carlson, Lauri & Jaakko Hintikka. 1977. Pronouns of laziness in Game-Theoretical Semantics. *Theoretical Linguistics* 4:1-29.
- Carlsson, Rolf & Björn Granström. 1986. Linguistic processing in the KTH multilingual text-to-speech system. In: *Proc. IEEE 1986 International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing*, Vol. 4:2403-2406. Tokyo
- Carpenter, William. 1881. *Grundriss der neuisländischen Grammatik*. Leipzig. Bernhard Schlicke.
- Caspari, Carl Paul. [1844-]1848. *Grammatica Arabica in usum scholarum academicarum*. I-II. Leipzig. C. L. Fritzsche.
- Castrén, Mathias Alexander. 1839. *De affinitate declinationum in lingua Fennica, Esthonica et Lapponica*. Frenckell.
- Castrén, Mathias Alexander. 1844. *Elementa Grammatices Syrjaenae*. Helsingforsiae. Ex officina typographica heredum Simelii.
- Castrén, Mathias Alexander. 1845. *Elementa Grammatices Tscheremissæ*. Kuopio. J. Karsten.
- Castrén, M[athias]. A[lexander]. 1850. *De affixis personalibus linguarum Altaicarum*. Dissertatio Helsingforsiae. Frenckell.
- Castrén, Mathias Alexander. 1852-1870. *Nordiska resor och forskningar*. I-VI. Helsingfors. Finska Litteratur-Sällskapets Tryckeri.
- Castrén, Mathias Alexander. 1854. *Grammatik der samojedischen Sprachen*. Herausgegeben von Anton Schiefer. St. Petersburg. Eggers et Comp.
- Castrén, Mathias Alexander. 1855. *Wörterverzeichnisse aus den samojedischen Sprachen*. Bearbeitet von Anton Schiefer. St. Petersburg. Eggers et Comp.
- Cederschiöld, Gustaf. 1897. *Om svenskan som skriftspråk* Populärt vetenskapliga föreläsningar vid Göteborgs Högskole. IV. Göteborg. Wettergren & Kerber.
- Cederschiöld, Gustaf. [1899]1900. *Om kvinnospråk och andra ämnen: anteckningar och reflexioner*. Lund. Gleerup.
- Cederschiöld, Gustaf. 1905. *Rytmens trollmakt. Några bidrag til människans historia*. Stockholm. Bonnier.
- Charpentier, Jarl. 1926. *Jämförande indoeuropeisk språkvetenskap*. Bonniers små handböcker i vetenskapliga ämnen. Stockholm. Bonnier.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1957. *Syntactic Structures*. Janua Linguarum IV. The Hague. Mouton.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1965. *Aspects of the theory of syntax*. Cambridge, Mass. MIT Press.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1966. *Cartesian Linguistics: A Chapter in the History of Rationalistic Thought*. New York. Harper & Row.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1981. *Lectures on Government and Binding*. Studies in Generative Grammar 9. Dordrecht. Foris Publications.
- Chomsky, Noam & Morris Halle. 1968. *The Sound Pattern of English*. New York. Harper & Row.
- Christensen, Balthasar & Ole Widding. 1936. *Lollandsk Grammatik – Radstedmaalet*. Udv. f. Folkemaal's Publ. A 1. Universitets-Jubilæets danske Samfund. København.
- Christensen, Vibeke & John Kousgård Sørensen. 1972. *Stednavneforskning 1. Afgrænsning. Terminologi. Metode. Datering*. København. Gyldendal.
- Christiansen, Hallfrid. 1933. *Gimsøy-måley. Fonologi og orddannelse*. DNVA 1932:3. Oslo. Jacob Dybwad.
- Christiansen, Hallfrid. 1946-1948. *Norske dialekter 1-3*. Oslo. Tanum-Norli.
- Clitau, Thomas. 1742. *Journal Over Den farlige og vidtudseende Grammatikalske og Orthographisk Krig, Som er opkommen imellem ham og en Orthographisk Ordbogskrivere angaaende nogle danske Ords Retskrivelse, Udtale og Betydning; hvor udi ogsaa Fiendens præterende Rets Deduction, som hand kalder Svar, tydeligen illustreres med Roter ad modum Minellii. Sammenskreven alle Elskere af Historier og Krigs-bedrifter til Tidsfordriv*. Kjøbenhavn. Hans Kongl. majests. priv. Bogtrykkerie.
- CLS = Chicago Linguistic Society.
- Cohen, Marcel. 1951. [Review of Togeby 1951.] *BSL* 47,2:125-127.
- Collan, Fab. 1847. *Finsk språklära. Förra delen. Formläran*. Helsingfors. Frenckell.
- Collin, Fredericus. 1764-1766. *Dissertatio historica de origine Fennorum*. I-II. Aboæ. Joh. Christoph. Frenckell.
- Collinder, Björn. 1932-1941. *Die urgermanischen Lehnwörter im Finnischen*. Skrifter utgivna av K. Humanistiska Vetenskaps-Samfundet i Uppsala 28/1; 34/3. Uppsala - Leipzig.

- Collinder, Björn. 1934. *Indo-uralisches Sprachgut*. Uppsala Universitets Årsskrift. Filosofi, språkvetenskap och historiska vetenskaper I. Uppsala.
- Collinder, Björn. 1940. *Jukagirisch und Uralisch*. Uppsala Universitets Årsskrift 1940/8. Uppsala -Leipzig.
- Collinder, Björn. 1941. *Introduktion i språkvetenskapen*. Stockholm. Hugo Gebers Förlag.
- Collinder, Björn. 1955. *Fenno-Ugric Vocabulary. An Etymological Dictionary of the Uralic Languages*. Stockholm. Almqvist & Wiksell.
- Collinder, Björn. 1959. *Språket. Inledning till det vetenskapliga språkstudiet*. Stockholm. Natur och Kultur.
- Collinder, Björn. 1960. *Comparative Grammar of the Uralic Languages*. Stockholm. Almqvist & Wiksell.
- Collinder, Björn. 1962a. *Introduktion till de uraliska språken*. Stockholm. Natur och Kultur.
- Collinder, Björn. 1962b. *Les origines du structuralisme*. Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis. Acta Societatis Linguisticae Upsaliensis. Nova Series 1:1. Stockholm/Göteborg/Uppsala. Almqvist & Wiksell.
- Collinder, Björn. 1964. *Sprachverwandtschaft und Wahrscheinlichkeit*. Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis. Studia Uralica et Altaica 1. Uppsala. Almqvist & Wiksell.
- Collinder, Björn. 1966. *Språket. Inledning till det vetenskapliga språkstudiet*. Fjärde, reviderade och utökade upplagan. Stockholm. Natur och Kultur.
- Collinder, Björn. 1970. *Noam Chomsky und die generative Grammatik. Eine kritische Betrachtung*. Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis. Acta Societatis Linguisticae Upsaliensis. Nova Series 2:1. Uppsala. Almqvist & Wiksell.
- Comenius, Johann Amos. 1672. *Orbis sensualium pictus, hoc est omnium fundamentalium in mundo rerum et vita actionum pictura ac no.* Hafniæ.
- Committee 1915 = *Komiteanmietintö N:o 6, 1915*. Helsinki. Keisarillisen Senaatin kirjapaino.
- Corander, Axel Gabr[iel]. 1865. *Finsk satslära*. Andra tillökta upplagan. Wiborg. Finska litteratursällskapets i Wiborg förlag.
- [Corander, Henrik Constantin]. H. K. Koranteri. 1845. *Suomalajnen Kieli-Oppi kowlujen tarpe'eksi. Ensimmäinen Osa Ruotsalajsen Esi-puheen kanssa Opettajalle*. Wiipurissa. Johanna Cederwallerin ja pojan tykönä.
- Cordemoy, Gerould de. 1668. *Discours physique de la parole*. Paris. Wetts.
- Cortsen, S. P. 1908. *Lyd og Skrift i Etruskisk. I. Konsonantene*. København. Nielsen & Lydiche (Axel Simmelkiær).
- Coward, Gorgus. 1959. *Kortfattet riksmåls-grammatikk*. Skrifter utgitt av Det norske akademi for sprog og litteratur. II. Oslo. Universitetsforlaget.
- Daa, [Ludvig] Lewis Kr. 1867. On the affinities between the languages of the northern tribes of the old and new continents. *Transactions of the Philological society*, 251-295. London.
- Dahl, B. T. 1884. *Bidrag til Dansk sætningslære*. Kjøbenhavn. Schubothe.
- Dahl, B. T., H. Hammer & Hans Dahl. 1907-1914. *Dansk Ordbog for Folket*. 1-2. København. Gyldendal.
- Dahl, Christopher. 1814. *Grammatica Græca, Grekiska Språkläran*. Andra Upplagen. Örebro. Tryckt hos Nils Magnus Lindh, på eget Förlag.
- Dahl, J. 1908. *Føroyisk málæra til skúlabrúks*. Givi_ út hevur hitt Færoyska bókmentafelagi_ Keypmannahavn / Kristiania. Gyldendal / Nordisk forlag.
- Dahl, Otto Chr. 1951. *Malgache et Maanjan. Une comparaison linguistique*. Avhandling utgitt av Egede-Instituttet 3. Oslo. Arne Gimnes Forlag.
- Dahl, Otto Chr. 1973. *Proto-Austronesian*. Scandinavian Institute of Asian Studies Monograph Series 15. Lund. Studentlitteratur.
- Dahl, Otto Chr. 1981. *Early Phonetic and Phonemic Changes in Austronesian*. IFSK Serie B:LXIII. Oslo / Bergen / Tromsø. Universitetsforlaget.
- Dahl, Otto Chr. 1987. *En dør mellom tanker. Misjon og språk*. Oslo. Luther forlag.
- Dahl, Torsten, ed. 1942-1955. *Svenska män och kvinnor*. Biografisk uppslagsbok. 1-8. Stockholm, Bonnier.
- Dahl, Östen. 1969. *Topic and Comment: A Study in Russian and General Transformational Grammar*. Slavica Gothoburgensia 4. Stockholm. Almqvist & Wiksell.
- Dahl, Östen. 1970. Some Notes on Indefinites. *Language* 46:33-41.
- Dahl, Östen. 1971. *Generativ grammatik på svenska*. Lund. Studentlitteratur.
- Dahl, Östen, ed. 1974. *Papers from the First Scandinavian Conference of Linguistics. Kungälv, March 30-31, 1974*. Gothenburg. Dept. of Linguistics, Univ. of Göteborg.
- Dahl, Östen. 1975. On Generics. In: E. L. Keenan, ed. *Formal Semantics of Natural Language*, 99-111. Cambridge. Cambridge University Press.
- Dahl, Östen. 1982. *Grammatik*. Lund. Studentlitteratur.
- Dahl, Östen. 1985. *Tense and aspect systems*. Oxford. Basil Blackwell.
- Dahlerup, H. B. 1824. *Almindelig Grammatik til Brug for de Kongelige Søecadetter*. Kjøbenhavn. Bernhard Schlesinger.
- Dahlerup, Verner. 1896. *Det danske Sprogs Historie: i almenfattelig Fremstilling*. København. Salmonsens.
- Dal, Ingerid. 1952. *Kurze deutsche Syntax auf historischer Grundlage*. Sammlung kurzer Grammatiken germanischer Dialekte. B. Nr. 7. Tübingen. Max Niemeyer.
- Dalberg, Vibeke & John Kousgård Sørensen. 1979. *Stednavneforskning 2. Udnyttelsesmuligheder*. København. Akademisk.
- Dalin, A. F. 1850-1853. *Ordbok öfver svenska språket*. I-II. Stockholm. Tryckt hos Joh. Beckman. Författarens förlag.
- Deen, Nicolaas G. H. 1937. *Glossaria duo Vasco-Islandica*. Amsterdam. H. J. Paris.
- Degen, Carl Ferdinand. 1799. *Pædagogiske aphorismer i systematisk Sammenhæng. Et Bidrag til Opdragelses-Læren*. 1-2.

- Kiøbenhavn. N. Møller og Søn.
- Degen, C[arl]. F[erdinand]. 1807. *Bidrag til de etymologiske Undersøgelers Theorie*. Et Forsøg udgivet som indbydelsesskrift til den forestaaende offentlige Prøve, som anstilles med Viborg Kathedralskoles Disciple, og tager sin Begyndelse a.c.d. 14de Septbr. Viborg. P. S. Fønss.
- Degnbol, Helle, Bent Chr. Jacobsen, Eva Rode, Christopher Sanders & Þorbjörg Helgadóttir. 1995. *Ordbog over det norrøne prosasprog — A Dictionary of Old Norse Prose 1: a-bam*. København. Den arnamagnæanske kommission.
- Dichman, [Carl Frederik]. [Lærer i Filosofien og de skjønne Videnskaber ved Søekadet-Akademiet.] 1800. *Forsøg til en dansk Sproglære*. Kiøbenhavn. Schultz.
- Diderichsen, Paul. 1936. Prolegomena til en metodisk dansk syntax. In: E. Spang-Hanssen, Viggo Brøndal & Johs. Brøndum-Nielsen, eds. *Forhandlinger paa det ottende nordiske Filologmøde i København 1935*, 41-46. København. Schultz.
- Diderichsen, Paul. 1938. Probleme der altdänischen Orthographie. *APhS* 12:116-169.
- Diderichsen, Paul. 1941-1942. Sætningsbygningen i Skaanske Lov fremstillet som Grundlag for en rationel dansk Syntaks. *APhS* 15:1-252.
- Diderichsen, Paul. 1946. *Elementer dansk grammatik*. København. Gyldendal.
- Diderichsen, Paul. 1947. Maal og midler i nutidens nordiske filologi. In: Paul Diderichsen, Poul Andersen & Johs. Brøndum-Nielsen, eds. *Det første nordistmøde i København, den 24.-26. januar 1946*, 62-69. København. Munksgaard. [Reprinted, with several omissions, in Diderichsen 1966:80-90.]
- Diderichsen, Paul. 1958. The Importance of Distribution versus Other Criteria in Linguistic Analysis. In: Eva Sivertsen, ed. *Proceedings of the Eighth International Congress of Linguists*, 156-182. Oslo. Oslo University Press.
- Diderichsen, Paul. 1960. *Rasmus Rask og den grammatiske tradition. Studier over vendepunktet i sprogvidenskabens historie*. Hist. Filos. Medd. Dan. Vid. Selsk. 38:2. København. Munksgaard.
- Diderichsen, Paul. 1965. Synspunkter for dansk sproglære i det 20. århundrede. In: Jørgen Larsen, Christian Lisse & Karl Martin Nielsen, eds. *Det danske sprogs udforskning i det 20. århundrede*, 142-211. København. Gyldendal.
- Diderichsen, Paul. 1966. *Helhed og struktur. Udvalgte sprogvidenskabelige Afhandlinger*. København. Gad.
- Diderichsen, Paul. 1968. *Sprogsyn og sproglig opdragelse. Historisk baggrund og aktuelle problemer*. København. Nyt Nordisk Forlag Arnold Busck.
- Dik, Simon. 1978. *Functional Grammar*. Amsterdam. North Holland.
- Dik, Simon. 1989. *The Theory of Functional Grammar. Part I: The Structure of the Clause*. Dordrecht. Foris.
- Dimitrova-Vulchanova, Mila & Lars Hellan. 1991. Clitics and the Completedness Parameter. *Nordic Journal of Linguistics* 14:1-39.
- Djupedal, Reidar. 1957-60. *Ivar Aasen. Brev og dagbøger*. I-III. Oslo. Det Norske Samlaget. [I: 1957; II: 1958; III: 1960.]
- Djurklou, G[abriel]. 1860. *Ur Nerikes folkspråk och folkklif. Anteckningar utgifne till fornvännars ledning*. Örebro. Lindh.
- DNVA = *Skrifter utgitt av Det Norske Videnskaps-Akademi i Oslo*. II. Hist.-Filos. Klasse. Oslo.
- Donner, Kai. 1920. *Über die anlautenden labialen spiranten und verschlusslaute im samojedischen und uralischen*. MSFOu 99.
- Donner, Otto. 1872. *Öfversikt af den Finska Ugriska språkforskningens historia*. Akademisk afhandling. Helsingfors. Frenckell.
- Donner, Otto. 1873. Ueber die Wurzelbildung in den Finnisch-Ugrischen Sprachen. *ZDMG* 9:690-695.
- Donner, Otto. 1874-1888. *Vertaileva Sanakirja Suomalais-Ugrilaisten kielten alalla. / Vergleichendes Wörterbuch der Finnisch-Ugrischen Sprachen*. I-III. Helsinki, Helsingfors / Leipzig. Frenckell & Sons bokhandel, G. V. Edlund / F. A. Brockhaus.
- Donner, Otto. 1875. Om Finnarnes forna boningsplatser i Ryssland. *Bidrag till kännedom af Finlands natur och folk, utgifna af Finska Vetenskaps-Societeten* 24:109-149. Helsingfors.
- Donner, Otto. 1879. *Die gegenseitige Verwandtschaft der finnisch-ugrischen Sprache*. ASSF 11. Helsingfors
- Donner, Otto. 1885. Om de olika typerna af språkbildning såsom uttryck för det menckliga tänckandet. *Öfversigt af Finska Vetenskaps-Societetens förhandlingar XXVII*:142-160. Helsingfors. J. Simelii arfvingsars tryckeri.
- Dufva, Joh. L. 1833. *Utkast till Allmän Grammatik och Dess Vetenskapliga Förhållande*. Vexsö. Sven Rasks Enka.
- [Dybvad] Dibvad, Christoffer. 1602. *Decarithmia, ded er Thinde-Regnskab. Lerer formedelst en wbehor lettighed ath fuldende al regnskab som vnder mendisken kand forfalle, foruden ath bruge bróden tal*. Leyden. Christopher Gvyoy.
- Dyvik, Helge Julius Jakhelln. 1980. *Grammatikk og empiri: en syntaktisk modell og dens forutsetninger*. Bergen. Universitetet i Bergen.
- Ebbesen, Sten. 1995. Introduction. In: Sten Ebbesen, ed. *Sprachtheorien in Spätantike und Mittelalter*. Gesckhichte der Sprachtheorie 3:xi-xx. Tübingen. Gunter Narr.
- Edgren, Hjalmar. 1883. *Sanskritspråkets Formlära jämte kort översikt af Pr_kritdialekten samt inledande läsöfningar*. Lund. Gleerup.
- Egede, Paul. 1760. *Grammatica Grönlandica Danico-Latina*. Hafniæ. Frid. Kisel.
- Egerod, Søren. 1956. *The Lungtu Dialect. A descriptive and historical study of a south Chinese idiom*. Copenhagen. Munksgaard.
- Egerod, Søren. 1980. Bernhard Karlgren. *Vet. soc. Årsbok* 1980:113-128.
- Egerod, Søren. 1992. Østasiatiske sprog. In: Jensen & Grane 1992:715-742.
- Egilsson, Sveinbjörn. 1854-1860. *Lexicon poeticum antiquæ linguæ Septentrionalis*. Hafniæ. Societas regia

antiquariorum Septentrionalium.

- Ehrström, E. Gust. & Carl G. Ottelin. 1814 [1815]. *Rysk språklära för begynnare*. St. Petersburg. M. C. Iversen.
- Eidissen, Inger Indrebø. 1993. *Gustav Indrebø. Ei livsskildring*. Bergen. Norsk Bokreidingslag.
- Einarsson, Stefán. 1945. *Icelandic. Grammar. Texts. Glossary*. Baltimore. Johns Hopkins Press.
- Ejskjær, Inger. 1954 *Brøndum-Målet. Lydsystemet i en Sallingdialekt*. Udv. f. Folkemaals Publ. A 10. Universitets-Jubilæets danske Samfund. København. Schultz.
- Ejskjær, Inger. 1993. *Danish Dialect Research*. København. C. A. Reitzel.
- Ekblom, Richard. 1911. *Rysk grammatik*. Stockholm. Bonnier.
- Ekwall, Eilert. 1918. Scandinavians and Celts in the North-West of England. *Festschrift utgiven av Lunds Universitet vid dess tvåhundrafetioårsjubileum 1918*, Lunds universitets årsskrift. N.F: Avd. 1. Bd 14. Nr 27. Lund. C.W.K.Gleerup.
- Ekwall, Eilert. 1928. *English River-names*. Oxford. Clarendon Press.
- Ekwall, Eilert. 1936. *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of English Place-names*. Oxford. Clarendon Press.
- Elert, Claes-Christian. 1955. Svenska fonem och dereas strukturella relationer. *Nordisk sommeruniversitet 1954. Moderne Videnskab. Orientering og debat* 4:140-144. København.
- Elert, Claes-Christian. 1957. Bidrag til en fonematisk beskrivning av svenska. *ANF* 72:35-60.
- Elert, Claes-Christian. 1964. *Phonological studies of quantity in Swedish. Based on material from Stockholm speakers*. Monografier utg. av Stockholms kommunalförvaltning 27. Uppsala. Skriptor.
- Elert, Claes-Christian. 1966. *Allmän och svensk fonetik*. Stockholm. Almqvist & Wiksell.
- Elert, Claes-Christian. 1970. *Ljud och ord i svenskan*. Stockholm. Almqvist & Wiksell.
- Ellegård, Alvar. 1971. *Transformationell svensk-engelsk satzlära*. Lund. Gleerup. [Preliminary version 1969].
- [Enberg, Lars Magnus]. 1836. *Svensk Språklära utgifven af Svenska Akademien*. Stockholm. Tryckt hos A. G. Hellsten.
- Engelhardt, Roderich von. 1933. *Die Deutsche Universität Dorpat in ihrer geistesgeschichtlichen Bedeutung*. München. Ernst Reinhardt.
- Engdahl, Elisabet. 1980. *The Syntax and Semantics of Questions in Swedish*. Ph. D. diss. Amherst. University of Massachusetts.
- Engdahl, Elisabet. 1985. Parasitic Gaps, Resumptive Pronouns, and Subject Extractions. *Linguistics* 23:3-44.
- Engdahl, Elisabet. 1986. *Constituent Questions. The Syntax and Semantics of Questions with Special Reference to Swedish*. Reidel. Dordrecht.
- Engdahl, Elisabet & Eva Ejerhed, eds. 1982. *Readings on Unbounded Dependencies in Scandinavian Languages*. Umeå Studies in the Humanities 43. Stockholm. Almqvist&Wiksell.
- Engberg-Pedersen, Elisabeth. 1993. *Space in Danish sign language : the semantics and morphosyntax of the use of space in a visual language*. International studies on sign language and communication of the deaf 19. Hamburg. Signum.
- Engberg-Pedersen, Elisabeth, Lisbeth Falster Jakobsen & Lone Schack Rasmussen, eds. 1994. *Function and Expression in Functional Grammar*, Berlin / New York. Mouton de Gruyter.
- Eng, Jan, Eskild Hanssen, Kjell Ivar Vannebo & Geirr Wiggen, eds. 1972. *Språksosiologi*. Oslo. Universitetsforlaget.
- Enkvist, Nils Erik. 1952 [1953]. Språkvetenskapen av i dag. *Finsk Tidskrift* CLII:161-171.
- Enkvist, Nils Erik 1954 [1955]. Hugo Pipping som fonetiker. *Finsk Tidskrift* CLVI:6-17
- Enkvist, Nils Erik. 1957. *The Seasons of the Year. Chapters on a Motif from Beowulf to the Shepherd's Calendar*. SSFCHL 22:4.
- Enkvist, Nils Erik. 1958. Summary of discussion. In: Eva Sivertsen, ed. *Proceedings of the Eighth International Congress of Linguists*, 488-489. Oslo. Oslo University Press.
- Enkvist, Nils Erik. 1962a. The Choice of Transcription in Foreign-Language Teaching. In: Aalto & Sovijärvi 1962:586-589.
- Enkvist, Nils Erik. 1962b. Tillämpad lingvistik. *Hufvudstadsbladet* 14.1.1962.
- Enkvist, Nils Erik. 1963. The English and Finnish Vowel Systems: a Comparison with Special Reference to the Teaching of English to Finns. *Via* 3:44-49.
- Enkvist, Nils Erik. 1964a. On Defining Style: an Essay in Applied Linguistics. In: John Spencer, ed. *Linguistics and Style*, 1-56. London. Oxford University Press.
- Enkvist, Nils Erik. 1964b. Den amerikanska lingvistik. In: L. Åhnebrink, ed. *Amerika och Norden*, 195-212. Publications of the Nordic Association for American Studies I. Stockholm.
- Enkvist, Nils Erik. 1964c. Summaries of discussion In: Horace G. Lunt, ed. *Proceedings of the Ninth International Congress of Linguists, Cambridge, Mass., August 27-31, 1962*, 737, 899. The Hague. Mouton.
- Enkvist, Nils Erik. 1974. *Stilforskning och stilteori*. Lund. Gleerup.
- Enkvist, Nils Erik, Charles A. Ferguson, Eva Haji_ová & Peter Ladefoged. 1992. *Linguistic Research in Sweden*. The Swedish Council for Research in the Humanities and Social Sciences. Uppsala.
- Erdmann, Axel. 1891. Om studiet av germanska språk vid Uppsala universitet. *Quousque tandem* 6:17-48. Uppsala. Almqvist & Wiksell.
- Eriksson, Ulrik. 1971. *Åselesvenska 1. Introduktion*. Lundastudier i nordisk språkvetenskap. A:20. Lund. Lund University Press.
- Espersen, Johan Christian Subcleff. 1908. *Bornholmsk ordbog*. København. Bianco Luno.
- Études linguistiques. 1945. *Études linguistiques 1944*. TCLC I. Copenhagen. Munksgaard.
- Eurén, Gustaf Erik. 1846. *Grunddragen till finsk formlära*. Åbo. Frenckell.

- Eurén, Gustaf Erik. 1849. *Finsk språklära*. Åbo. Frenckell.
- Eurén, G[ustaf]. E[rik]. 1860. *Suomalais-Ruotsalainen Sanakirja / Finsk-Svensk Ordbok*. Hämeenlinnassa/Tavastehus. G. E. Eurén.
- Faarlund, Jan Terje. 1978. *Verb og predikat. Ein studie i norsk verbalsemantikk*. Oslo / Bergen / Tromsø. Universitetsforlaget.
- Faarlund, Jan Terje. 1990. *Syntactic change. Toward a theory of historical syntax*. Trends in linguistics. Studies and monographs 50. Berlin. Mouton de Gruyter.
- Faarlund, Jan Terje, Svein Lie & Kjell Ivar Vannebo. 1997. *Norsk referansegrammatikk*. Oslo. Universitetsforlaget.
- Fabricius, Otho. 1791. *Forsøg til en forbedret Grøndlandsk Grammatica*. Kiøbenhavn. Carl Friedrich Schubart.
- Falk, Cecilia. 1993. *Non-referential subjects in the history of Swedish*. Department of Scandinavian Languages. Lund.
- Falk, Hjalmar. 1920. *Betydningslære (Semasiologi)*. Kristiania. Aschehoug.
- Falk, Hjalmar. 1923. *Grammatikkens historiske grunnlinjer*. Kristiania. Aschehoug.
- Falk, Hjalmar & Alf Torp. 1900. *Dansk-norskens syntax i historisk fremstilling*. Kristiania. Aschehoug.
- Falk, Hjalmar & Alf Torp. 1903-1906. *Etymologisk ordbog over det norske og det danske sprog*. I-II. Kristiania. Aschehoug.
- Falk, Hjalmar & Alf Torp. 1910. *Norwegisch-dänisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. I-II. Heidelberg. Carl Winter.
- Fant, Gunnar. 1960. *Acoustic Theory of Speech Production*. The Hague. Mouton.
- Feilberg, H[enning]. F[rederik]. 1886-1914. *Bidrag til en ordbog over jyske almuesmål*. Udgivet af Universitets-Jubilæets danske Samfund. Kjøbenhavn. Thiele.
- Fiellström, Petrus. 1738a. *Grammatica Lapponica exhibens linguæ hujus peculiarem licet, et ab aliis linguis differentem. regulis tamen grammaticalibus adstrictam indolem in linguarum studiosorum gratiam, potissimum vero illorum, quibus munera inter Lappones obeunda demandata sunt. Brevissima qua fieri potuit methodo conscripta*. Holmiæ. Joh. Laurentius Horrn.
- Fiellström, Petrus. 1738b. *Dictionarium Sueco-Lapponicum, eller en Orda-Bok. I hvilken The förnämste Swänska Ord efter Alphabetet upsökas kunna, och på Lapska gifne finnas*. Stockholm. Joh. L. Horrn.
- Fischer-Jørgensen 1952: Fischer-Jørgensen, Eli. 1952. On the definition of phoneme categories on a distributional basis. *Acta Linguistica* 7:8-39.
- Fischer-Jørgensen, Eli. 1956: The Commutation Test and its Application to Phonemic Analysis. In: Morris Halle, Horace G. Lunt, Hugh McLean & Cornelis H. van Schooneveld, eds. *For Roman Jakobson. Essays on the occasion of his 60th birthday*, 140-151. The Hague. Mouton.
- Fischer-Jørgensen, Eli. 1965. Obituary: Louis Hjelmslev. *ALH* 9:ii-xxii.
- Fischer-Jørgensen, Eli. 1975. *Trends in Phonological Theory. A Historical Introduction*. Copenhagen. Akademisk forlag.
- Fischer-Jørgensen, Eli. 1979. *Fonetikk*. In: Jensen 1979:401-420.
- Fischer-Jørgensen, Eli. 1992. Tale ved Lingvistikretsens 50-års jubilæumsfest den 12. december 1981. In: Gregersen 1992:1-12.
- Fischer-Jørgensen, Eli. 1995. *Trends in Phonological Theory Until 1975. A Historical Introduction*. TCLC XXVII. Copenhagen. Reitzel.
- Flinck-Linkomies, Edwin. 1929. *De ablativo absoluto questiones*. AASF B XX:1.
- Florinus, Henricus M. 1678. *Nomenclatura Rerum brevissima, latino-Sveco-Finonica. In usum Iuventutis patriæ, ordine naturæ in certos Titulos digesta, & publici juris facta*. Aboæ. Johannes Winter.
- Florinus, H[enricus]. M. 1708. *Vocabularium Latino-Sveco-Germanico-Finonicum, In Usum Juventutis, Ordine Naturæ, in certos Titulos digestum, & publice juris factum*. [Also with similar title in Swedish, German and Finnish]. Stockholm. Hoos Henrich Keyzers then yngres Enkia.
- Flydal, Leiv. 1943. "Aller" et "Venir de" suivis de l'infinitif comme expressions de rapports temporels. DNVA 1943,3. Oslo. Jacob Dybwad.
- Flydal, Leiv. 1957. Språkteikn og symbol i manns tale til øyk. *NTS* 18:370-378.
- Flydal, Leiv. 1979. Latences et liaisons en français - systèmes coexistants ou un seul? In: *Estudios ofrecidos a Emilio Alarcos Llorach* IV:43-68. Oviedo. Universidad de Oviedo.
- Foldvik, Arne Kjell. 1994. Storm, Johan (1836-1920). In: Asher 1994,8:4350-4351.
- Fortescue, Michael. 1984. *West Greenlandic*. Croom Helm Descriptive Grammars. London/Sydney/Dover. Croom Helm.
- Fowler, Murray. 1953. [Review of Togeby 1951.] *Language* 29:165-175.
- Franke, Felix. 1884. *Praktisk Tilegnelse affremmede Sprog*. Dansk Bearbejdelse ved O. Jespersen. København. Carl Larsens Forlag
- Friðriksson, Halldór Kr. 1859. *Íslenzkar rjettritunarreglur*. Reykjavík.
- Friðriksson, Halldór Kr. 1861. *Íslenzk málmyndalýsing*. Kaupmannahöfn. Gefnar út af Hinu íslenzka bókmentafjelagi.
- Fries, Sigurd. 1957. *Studier över nordiska trädnamn*. Uppsala. Almqvist & Wiksell.
- Friesen, Otto von. 1906. *Om runskriftens härkomst*. Uppsala universitets årsskrift 1906. Uppsala. Edv. Berling.
- Friis, J[ens]. A[ndreas]. 1856. *Lappisk Grammatik. Udarbeidet efter den finmarkiske Hoveddialekt eller Sproget, saaledes som det almindeligt tales i norsk Finmarken*. Christiania. Cappelen.
- Friis, J[ens]. A[ndreas]. 1887. *Lexicon lapponicum cum interpretatione latina et norvegica adjuncta brevi grammaticae lapponicae adumbratione. Ordbog over det lappiske Sprog med latinsk og norsk Forklaring samt en Oversigt over Sprogets Grammatik*. Kristiania. Jacob Dybwad.
- Frisk, Hjalmar. 1960-1972. *Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. I-III. Heidelberg. Carl Winter.

- Fritzner, Johan. 1846. Bemærkninger ved Pastor Stockfleths Grammatik i det lappiske Sprog, 1ste Deel. *NOR* 3:66-132.
- Fritzner, Johan. [1862-]1867. *Ordbog over det gamle norske Sprog*. Kristiania. Feilberg & Landmark.
- Fritzner, Johan. 1886-1896. *Ordbog over det gamle norske sprog*. I-III. Omarbejdet, forøget og forbedret Udgave. Kristiania. Den norske Forlagsforening.
- Fröberg, Karl-Erik & Bengt Sigurd. 1962. *Datamaskiner och deras användning*. Lund. Bibliotekstjänst.
- Frösén, Jaakko. 1974. *Prolegomena to a Study of the Greek Language in the First Centuries A. D. The Problem of Koiné and Atticism*. Diss. Helsinki.
- FUF = *Finnisch-ugrische Forschungen. Zeitschrift für finnisch-ugrische Sprach- und Volkskunde*. Helsinki.
- Fuglsang, N. S. 1815. *Almindelig Grammatik. Et Manuskript for en tiiaarig Søn*. Slagelse. Peter Magnus.
- Gabelentz, Georg von der. 1891. *Die Sprachwissenschaft. Ihre Aufgaben, Methoden und bisherigen Ergebnisse*. Leipzig. T. O. Weigel Nachfolger (Chr. Herm. Tauchnitz).
- Gadd, Pehr Adrian. 1770. *Undersökning om de följder hvarmed inhemskt språks förakt verkar på folkets seder: med tillämpning på svenska folket i synnerhet*. Stockholm. Lars Salvius.
- Ganander, Christfrid. 1937-1940. *Nytt finskt lexicon*. I-III. Helsinki. Werner Söderström.
- Ganandrus, Henricus. 1743. *Grammatica Lapponica, Linguae Europaeum prope antiquissimæ solidam planamque viam genium Linguae Lapponicæ addiscere desideranti monstrans*. Holmiæ. Laurent. Salvius.
- Garfield, Eugene. 1987. A Different Sort of Great-Books List: The 50 Twentieth-Century Works Most Frequently Cited in the Arts & Humanities Citation Index, 1976-1983. *Current Contents* 16:10-14.
- Garstein, Oskar. 1953. *Cort Aslaksøn. Studier over dansk-norsk universitets- og lærdomshistorie omkring år 1600*. Oslo. Lutherstiftelsens forlag.
- Geitlin, Gabriel. 1833-1834. *Ryskt och Swenskt Hand-Lexicon*. I-II. Helsingfors. Frenckell.
- Geitlin, Gabriel. 1845. *Principia grammatices neo-persicae cum metrorum doctrina et dialogis persicis*. Helsingforsiae. Frenckell.
- Geitlin, Joh. Gabr. 1883. *Suomalais-Latinalainen Sanakirja. Lexicon Fennico-Latinum*. SKS.
- Gellerstam, Martin. 1973. Etymologiska frekvenser i det centrala ordförrådet. Förhandlingar vid Sjunde sammankomsten för svenskans beskrivning, Åbo Akademi. *Folkmålsstudier* 23:70-79.
- Gellerstam, Martin, ed. 1977. *Nordiska datalingvistikdagar 1977*. Föredrag från en konferens i Göteborg 10-11 oktober 1977. Göteborg. Rapporter från Språkdata, Göteborgs universitet. 3.
- Genetz, Arvid. 1870. Kertomus Suojärven pitäjäästä ja matkustuksistani siellä v. 1867. *Suomi* II,8:201-275.
- Genetz, Arvid. 1877a. *Lautphysiologische Einführung in das Studium der vestfinnischen Sprachen mit besonderer Berücksichtigung des Karelischen*. Akademische Abhandlung. Helsingfors. Frenckell.
- Genetz, Arvid. 1877b. *Versuch einer Karelischen Lautlehre*. Akademische Abhandlung. Helsingfors. Frenckell.
- Genetz, Arvid. 1881. *Suomen kielen äänne- ja muoto-oppi ynnä runous-oppi*. Helsinki. K. E. Holm.
- Genetz Arvid. 1890. *Suomen partikkelimuodot*. Yliopistollinen väitöskirja. SKS.
- Genetz, Arvid. 1891. *Kuollan lapin murteiden sanakirja ynnä kielennäytteitä/ Wörterbuch der Kola-lappischen Dialekte nebst Sprachproben*. Bidrag til kändedom af Finlands natur och folk utgifna af Finska Vetenskaps-societeten. 50. Helsingfors. Finska litteratursällskapetets tryckeri.
- Genetz, Arvid. 1896. *Ensi tavuun vokaalit suomen, lapin ja mordvan kaksi- ja useampitavuisissa sanoissa*. Helsinki. [Also in *Suomi* 3:13, 1897.]
- Gerner, Henrich Thomaesøn. 1678. *Orthographia Danica eller Det Danske Sprogs Skrifverickthged*. Kiøbenhaffn. Tryckt hos Sl. Jørgen Gøedes, Kong. Mayest. oc Universit. Bogtr. Efterleffverske. Paa Christian Geertsøns Boghandlers Bekostning oc findis hos hannem til kiøbs ved Høyebro. [In: Bertelsen III 1919:11-146.]
- Gerner, Henrik. 1690. *Epitome Philologiæ Danicæ Eller: Et kort Begrib paa det beste oc zjrligste Danske Sprocks Lyst oc Artighed rensed Det meste mueligt var Fra de ældgamlis Grofhed, Fra de flerste Mundarters Haardhed, Fra fremmede Sprocks Gloser, oc Fra andre store Vildfarelser. Forbedred med adskillige nyttige oc fornødne Regler baade udi løsz oc bunden Tale. Tienlig for Skolemesterne som først skal lære Ungdommen at læse eller skrive, saa oc for alle som det danske zjrlige Sprock vil enten udi Skrift eller paa Tryck befordre. Fædernelandet oc det zjrlige Sprock til Gaffn oc Ære forfærdiged*. Kiøbenh. Trykt hos S. L. Eichorns Efterl. [In: Bertelsen III 1919:251-317.]
- Gesenius, Wilhelm. 1813. *Hebräische Grammatik*. Hebräisches Elementarbuch 1. Halle. Rengersche Verlagsb.
- Gesenius, Wilhelm. 1836. *Hebreisk Grammatik*. Öfversatt efter 11:te Upplagen af C. J. Estlander. Åbo. Christ. Ludv. Hjelt.
- Gezelius, Johannes Georgius. 1647. *Grammatica græca, Citra Poësin & Dialectos Absoluta, ac potissimum N. T. accomodata. In usum Privatorum Collegiorum Academiae GVSTAVIANÆ, Ex prolixioribus præcipuorum Grammaticorum Præceptis in Epitomen redacta*. Dorpati Livonorum. Johannes Voelius.
- Gezelius, Johannes Georgius. 1649. *Lexicon Græco-Latinum Continens Voces omnes Cùm Novi Testamenti, Tùm Januæ Ling. græcæ, Anno superiori hic Dorpati editæ*. Dorpati Livonorum. Johannes Voelius.
- Gezelius, Johannes Georgius. 1672. *Vocum Latinarum Sylloge, in qvâ primitivis subjiciuntur ex iisdem Derivata & Composita, Lingvâ Svecicâ. quad fieri potuit, propriè reddita. In usum ætatis puerilis, ut hâc methodo facillimâ, usitatissima Lingvæ Latinæ vocabula sine tædio addiscere queat*. Aboæ. Johannes Winter.
- Gezelius, Johannes [Georgius]. 1744. *Grammatica græca, ex prolixioribus præcipuorum grammaticorum præceptis in epitomen redacta. Nunc vero, qvam antea, emendatior, auctior & usui tironum accomodatior edita, opera & studio Petri Tegnæi, s. theologiæ, antehac autem Græcæ lingvæ Lectoris, in gymnas. Scarensi. Scaræ. Herm. A. Moeller.*

- Gierow, Krister. 1971. *Lunds Universitets historia. III. 1790-1867*. Utgiven av universitetet till dess 300-årsjubileum. Lund. Gleerup.
- Girard, M-L'Abbé. 1747. *Les vrais Principes de la Langue Française, ou La Parole réduite en Méthode conformement aux Loix de l'Usage en 16 Discours*. I-II. Paris. Chez Le Breton petit-fils d'Houry, Imprimeur ordinaire Du Roi.
- Gíslason, Konráð. 1846. *Um frum-parta íslenzkrar túngu í fornöld*. Kaupmannahöfn. Á kostnað Hins íslenska bókmenntafjelags.
- Gíslason, Konráð. 1851. *Dönsk orðabók med íslenzkum þýðingum*. Kaupmannahöfn. Prentað hjá Bianco Luno, hirðprentara.
- Gíslason, Konrad [sic] 1858. *Oldnordisk Formlære*. Udgivet af det nordiske Literatur-Samfund. Kjøbenhavn. Stenderup.
- Gjellerup, S. M. 1868-1870. *Biskop Jens Dinesen Jersin. Bidrag til Danmarks Skole- og Kirkehistorie i det 17de Aarhundrede*. Kjøbenhavn. Udgivet af Selskabet for Danmarks Kirkehistorie i Kommission hos G. E. C. Gad.
- Glahder, Jørgen, ed. 1933. *J. H. Bredsdorffs Udvalgte Afhandlinger inden for Sprogvidenskab og Runologi*. Kjøbenhavn. Levin & Munksgaard.
- [Gotlænder, Søren Poulsen Judichær]. Severin Povelsøn G. 1671. *Prosodia Danica, eller danske Riimkunst, i sig befattendis, en grundig Underviisning, om alt det, som er fornøden at viide, om dend rette Maade oc Maneering gode oc skickelige Danske Vers, eller Riim at gjøre. Med Reguler, Forklaringer, Exempler, Eftertænkninger oc Paamindelser*. Kjøbenhaffn. Christen Jensøn Wering,
- Gottlund, Carl Axel. 1863. *Forskingar uti sjelfva grund-elementerna af det finska språkets grammatik, efter föregående anmärkningar om språket i allmänhet*. Akademisk Afhandling. Helsingfors. Frenckell.
- Gottlund, Carl Axel. 1986. *Dagbok över mina vandringar på Wermlands och Solörs finnskogar 1821*. Kirkenær. Gruetunet museum.
- Greenberg, Joseph. 1963. Some universals of grammar with particular reference to the order of meaningful elements. In: Joseph Greenberg, ed. *Universals of language*, 58-90. Cambridge, Mass. MIT Press.
- Gregersen, Frans. 1980. Videnskabshistorisk empiri – analyse af enkeltværker. (Om Rasmus Rasks danske retskrivningslære). *SAML* 6:201-220.
- Gregersen, Frans. 1991. *Sociolingvistikens (u)mulighed. Videnskabshistoriske studier i Ferdinand de Saussures og Louis Hjelmslevs sprogteorier*. I-II. København. Tiderne Skifter.
- Gregersen, Frans, ed. 1992. *Lingvistisk Festival. Lingvistikredsens 60 års fødselsdag 24. september 1991*. Sprogvidenskabelige arbejdsrapporter fra Københavns universitet. Årgang 2, 1992. København. Institut for Almen og Anvendt Sprogvidenskab.
- Gregersen, Frans & Inge Lise Pedersen, eds. 1991. *The Copenhagen Study in Urban Sociolinguistics*. 1-2. Institut for dansk Dialektforsknings publikationer. Serie A, nr. 30. København. C. A. Reitzels Forlag.
- Grimes, Barbara F., ed. 1996. *Ethnologue Language Name Index*. Dallas, Texas. Summer Institute of Linguistics, Inc.
- Groening, Michael. 1750. _____, *Thet är Grammatica Russica, eller Grundelig Handledning til Ryska Språket; Jemte Et tilräckeligit Vocabularium, Ryska och Swenska Samtal, samt efter Ryska Språkets egenskap inrättade små Historier til öfning i Läsannde*. Stockholm. Pet. Momma.
- Grot, Ja. K. 1873. *Filologi_ eskija razyskanija*. Sanktpeterburg. Akad. Nauk.
- Grundtvig, Svend. 1870. *Dansk Retskrivnings-Ordbog. stemmende med de på det Nordiske Retskrivningsmøde i Stockholm 1869 vedtagne Regler*. København. Reitzel.
- Grundtvig, Vilhelm. 1925. *Begreberne i Sproget. Orientering i systematisk Ordforskning*. København. Gad.
- Grönbech, K[aare]. 1936. *Der türkische Sprachbau. I*. Kopenhagen. Levin & Munksgaard.
- Grønbech, Vilh[elml]. 1902. *Forstudier til tyrkisk lydhistorie*. København. Lehmann og Stages Boghandel.
- Guðfinnsson, Björn. 1943. *Setningafræði* Reykjavík. Ísafoldarprentsmiðja.
- Guðfinnsson, Björn. 1946. *Mállýzkur I*. Reykjavík. Ísafoldarprentsmiðja.
- Guðfinnsson, Björn. 1947. *Breytingar á framburði og stafsetningu*. Reykjavík. Ísafoldarprentsmiðja.
- Guðmundsson, Valtýr. 1922. *Íslandsk Grammatik*. Íslandsk Nutidssprog. Copenhagen. H. Hagerups Forlag.
- Gumperz, John. J. 1971. *Language in Social Groups*. Stanford. Stanford University Press.
- Gumperz, John. J. & Dell H. Hymes, eds. 1972. *Directions in Sociolinguistics: The ethnography of communication*. New York. Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Gunnarsson, Britt-Louise. 1992. Forskning om språk och kön i Sverige. In: Britt-Louise Gunnarsson & Caroline Liberg, eds. *Språk, språkbruk och kön. Rapport från ASLA's nordiska symposium Uppsala 7-9 november 1991*, 45-51. ASLA.
- Gunnarsson, Jón. 1973. *Málmyndunarfræði*. Reykjavík. Íðunn.
- Gussgard, Jostein. 1967. Noen tanker omkring en norsk grammatikk [= Næs 1965]. *Maal og Minne*, 104-145.
- Gyarmathi, Samuel. 1799. *Affinitas lingvae Hvungaricae cvm lingvis Fennicae originis grammaticae demonstrata*. Göttingen. Johann Christian Dieterich.
- Gyldenstolpe, Michaël Olsson Wexionius. 1650. *Epitome descriptionis Sueciae. Gothiae, Fenningiae. et subjectarum provinciarum. Accuratiùs quàm unquam antehac editae*. Aboæ. Petrus Wald.
- Gårding, Eva. 1967. *Internal Juncture in Swedish*. Travaux de l'institute de linguistique de Lund 6. . Lund. Gleerups.
- Gårding, Eva. 1977. *The Scandinavian word accents*. Lund. Gleerup.
- Haberland, Hartmut. 1996. "Vi er selv historie". Pragmatikkens historie i Danmark, dens rødder og dens forhold til andre sprogvidenskabelige discipliner. In: Henriksen et al. 1996:31-59.
- Hagerup, E. H. 1854. *Om det danske Sprog i Angel*. København. H. Hagerups Bog- og Papirhandel.

- Hagerup, E. H. 1867. *Om det danske Sprog i Angel*. anden forøgede udgave. ordbog. sproglære. sprogprøver. København. H. Hagerups Bog- og Papirhandel.
- Hagström, Björn. 1967. *Ändelsvokalerne i färöiskan. En fonetisk-fonologisk studie*. Acta Universitatis Stockholmiensis, SSSPh, New Series nr. 6. Stockholm. Almqvist & Wiksell.
- Hakkarainen, Heikki J. 1980 Valmisteltu puheenvuoro Paavo Siron esitelmästä Kielitieteen kehitys Suomessa 1900-luvulla. In: Häkkinen & Karlsson 1980:17-21.
- Hakulinen, Auli. 1981. Ajatuksia kielen merkityksestä naiselle. In: Leena Alanen, Liisa Rantalaiho & Aino Saarinen, eds. *Naisen historiallisuus: yhteiskunta - yksilö - sukupuoli*, 163-176. Tampere. Yhteiskuntatieteiden tutkimuslaitoksen julkaisuja B 33.
- Hakulinen, Auli. 1986. Text Linguistics in Finland. In: M. Charolles, J. S. Petöfi & E. Sözer, eds. *Research in Text Connexity and Text Coherence. Papiere zur Textlinguistik* 53,1:325-345.
- Hakulinen, Auli. 1989. Keskustelun tutkimisen tavoitteista ja menetelmistä. In: Auli Hakulinen, ed. *Suomalaisen keskustelun keinoja* I:9-40. Kieli 4. Helsinki. Helsingin yliopiston suomen kielen laitos.
- Hakulinen, Auli & Fred Karlsson. 1979. *Nykysuomen lauseoppia*. SKST 350.
- Hakulinen, Auli & Fred Karlsson. 1995 [1979]. *Nykysuomen lauseoppia*. Kolmas painos. SKST 350.
- Hakulinen, Auli, Fred Karlsson & Maria Vilkkuna. 1980. *Suomen tekstilauseiden piirteitä: kvantitatiivinen tutkimus*. Helsinki. Department of General Linguistics, University of Helsinki. Publications No. 6. [Second edition 1996.]
- Hakulinen, Lauri. 1933. *Über die semasiologische Entwicklung einiger meteorologisch-affektiven Wortfamilien in den ostseefinnischen Sprachen*. Studia Fennica 1:2. SKS.
- Hakulinen, Lauri. 1938. Kielivirheen suhteellisuudesta. *Suomalainen Suomi*, 16-21.
- Hakulinen, Lauri. 1958. *Sanojen sanottavaa. Kirjoitelmia suomen kielestä ja suomalaisesta sanomise taidosta*. Tietolipas 16. SKS.
- Hakulinen, Lauri. 1969. *Suomen sanaston käänntslainoja*. SKST 293.
- Hakulinen, Lauri. 1979 [1941,1946]. *Suomen kielen rakenne ja kehitys*. Neljäs, korjattu ja lisätty painos. Helsinki. Otava.
- Halldórson, Biörn. 1814. *Lexicon Islandico-Latino-Danicum. Biörn Haldorsens islandske Lexikon*. I-II. Ex manuscriptis legati Arna-Magnæani cura R. K. Raskii editum. Præfatus est P. E. Müller. København. Schubothe.
- Halén, Harry 1989. Altain huiput siintele. In: Löytönen 1989:148-197.
- Hallager, Laurents. 1798. *Fransk Sproglære tilligemed Læse- og Skriveøvelser*. Kjøbenhavn. Schubothe.
- Hallager, Laurents 1802. *Norsk Ordsamling eller Prøve af Norske Ord og Talemaader. Tilligemed Et Anhang indeholdende endeel Viser, som ere skrevne i det norske Bondesprog*. Kjøbenhavn. Sebastian Popp.
- Hallander, Lars-Gunnar. 1954. *Morfefonematiska förhållanden vid svensk verböjning*. Nordisk sommeruniversitet 1954. København.
- Halldórsson, Halldór. 1969. Alexander Jóhannesson. *Andvari* 94:3-38.
- Halldórsson, Halldór & Jakob Benediktsson. 1963. *Sigfús Blöndal: Íslenzk-dönsk orðabók. Viðbætur-Íslandsk-dansk ordbog*. Supplement. Reykjavík. Íslenzk-danskur orðabókarsjóður.
- Hammarberg, Björn & Åke Viberg. 1977. The Place-holder Constraint, Language Typology, and the Teaching of Swedish to immigrants. *Studia Linguistica* 31:106-163.
- Hammarström, Göran. 1966. *Lingustische Einheiten im Rahmen der modernen Sprachwissenschaft*. Kommunikation und Kybernetik in Einzeldarstellungen 5. Berlin. Springer-Verlag.
- Hammarström, Göran. 1976. *Linguistic units and items*. Communication and cybernetics 9. Berlin. Springer-Verlag.
- Hammerich, L. L. 1936. *Personalendungen und Verbalsystem im Eskimoischen*. Hist. Filos. Medd. Dan. Vid. Selsk. 23:2. København. Levin & Munksgaard.
- Hammerich, L. L. 1948. *Laryngeal before sonant*. Hist. Filos. Medd. Dan. Vid. Selsk. 31:3. København. Munksgaard.
- Hammershaimb, V. U. 1854. Færøisk Sproglære. *Annaler for nordisk Oldkyndighed og Historie. Udgivne af Det kongelige nordiske Oldskrifts-selskab*, 233-316. Kjøbenhavn. J. D. Qvist.
- Hannaas, Torleiv, ed. 1911a. *Maallære og ordtøke fraa Vest-Agder* Ældre norske sprogminster I. Kristiania. Grøndahl & Søn.
- Hannaas, Torleiv, ed. 1911b. *Ordsamling fraa Robyggjelaget fraa slutten av 1600-talet*. Ældre norske sprogminster II. Kristiania. Grøndahl & Søn.
- Hannaas, Torleiv, ed. 1915. *Christen Jensøns Den Norske Dictionarium eller Glosebog*. Ældre norske sprogminster III. Kristiania. Grøndahl & Søn.
- Hannaas, Torleiv. 1916. *Presten og maalgranskaren Knud Leem i Avaldsnes*. Serprent av "Haugesund Avis". Haugesund. "Haugesunds Avis" prenteverk.
- Hannaas, Torleiv, ed. 1923. *Professor Knud Leems norske Maalsamlingar fraa 1740-aari*. Kristiania. Jacob Dybwad.
- Hansgård, Nils E. 1968. *Tvåspråkighet eller halvspråkighet?* Stockholm. Aldus / Bonnier.
- Hansen, Aage. 1927. *Bestemt og ubestemt substantiv. Bidrag til dansk substantivsyntaks*. København. Arnold Busck.
- Hansen, Aage. 1933. *Sætningen og dens led i moderne dansk*. København. Nyt nordisk Forlag. Arnold Busck.
- Hansen, Aage. 1943. *Stødet i dansk*. Hist. Filos. Medd. Dan. Vid. Selsk. 29:5. København. Munksgaard.
- Hansen, Aage. 1956. *Udtalen i moderne dansk*. København. Gyldendal.
- Hansen, Aage. 1962. *Den lydlige udvikling i dansk, fra ca. 1300 til nutiden. I. Vokalismen*. København. Gad.
- Hansen, Aage. 1967. *Moderne dansk*. I-III. København. Grafisk Forlag.
- Hansen, Aage. 1971. *Den lydlige udvikling i dansk fra ca. 1300 til nutiden II. Konsontantismen*. København. Gad.

- Hansen, Erik. 1977. *Dæmonernes Port. Støttemateriale til undervisningen i nydansk grammatik*. København. Reitzel.
- Hansen, Erik. 1983. Det pleonastiske *at*. En grammatisk-kritisk undersøgelse. *Danske Studier* 78:61-80.
- Hansen, Erik. 1989. Dansk Grammatik. In: Bente Holmberg, Britta Olrik Frederiksen & Hanne Ruus, eds. *Forskningsprofiler*, 135-157. Selskab for nordisk filologi. København. Gyldendal.
- Hansen, Erik & Lars Heltoft. forthcoming. *Grammatik over det Danske Sprog*. København. Munksgaard.
- Hansen, M[aurits]. C[hristopher]. 1828. *Grammatik i det norske og danske Sprog*. Tredie Oplag. Christiania. R. Hviid.
- Hansen, M[aurits]. C[hristopher]. 1833. *Norsk Grammatik*. Christiania. R. Hviids Enkes Bogtrykkerie.
- Hanson, Kristin & Paul Kiparsky 1996. A Parametric Theory of Poetic Meter. *Language* 72:287-33.
- Hansson, Åke. 1969. *Fonematiska studier i skånska dialekter*. Lundastudier i nordisk språkvetenskap. A:19. Lund. Lund University Press.
- Harder, Peter. 1997. *Functional Semantics. A Theory of Meaning, Structure and Tense in English*. Berlin/New York. Mouton de Gruyter.
- Hasselbrink, Gustav. 1965. *Alternative Analyses of the Phonemic System in Central South-Lappish*. Indiana University Publications. Uralic and Altaic Series, Vol. 47. Bloomington / The Hague. Indiana University / Mouton & Co.
- Hast, Sture. 1990. *Samuel Schultze och hans Svenskt lexicon*. Skrifter utgivna av Vetenskaps societeten i Lund 83. Lund. Lund University Press.
- Hauen, Niels von. 1741a. *Et lidet orthographisk Lexicon eller Ord-Bog Hvorudi korteligen handles I) Om Skrive-rigtigheden og de feyl, som derimod begaaes II) Om Eens-lydende ords skrive-maade og bemærkelse: item hvordan de gemeenligen ud-siges med de ord, som kommer deraf: samt de mænds, qvindes, øers, byers, floders og andre mærkværdige tings navne, som haver lige lyd med disse Danske ord. Alle elskere af det Danske sprog til fornøjelse, og den studerende ungdom til nytte*. Kjøbenhavn. Johan Christoph Groth.
- Hauen, Niels von 1741b. *Svar paa Avis-skriverens Anmærkninger over Hans Orthographiske Lexicon*. Kjøbenhavn. Johan Christoph Groth.
- Haugen, Einar. 1948. Norwegian dialect studies since 1930. *Journal of English and German Philology*, 68-79.
- Haugen, Einar. 1950. *First grammatical treatise. The earliest Germanic phonology*. An edition, translation and commentary. Language monographs 25. Baltimore.
- Haugen, Einar. 1953 [Review of Myhre 1952.] *Language* 29:544-47.
- Haugen, Einar. 1965. Construction and Reconstruction in Language Planning: Ivar Aasen's Grammar. *Word* 21:188-207.
- Haugen, Einar. 1966. *Language Conflict and Language Planning. The Case of Modern Norwegian*. Cambridge, Mass. Harvard University Press.
- Haugen, Einar. 1969. *Riksspråk og folkemål. Norsk språkpolitikk i det 20. århundre*. Oslo. Universitetsforlaget.
- Haugen, Einar. 1972. *First grammatical treatise. The earliest Germanic phonology*. An edition, translation and commentary. Second revised edition. London. Longman.
- Haugen, Einar. 1976. *The Scandinavian Languages. An Introduction to their History*. The Great Languages. London. Faber and Faber.
- Haugen, Einar & Thomas L. Markey. 1972. The Scandinavian Languages. Fifty Years of Linguistic Research (1918-1968). In: Thomas Sebeok, ed. *Current Trends in Linguistics. Vol. 9, 2. Linguistics in Western Europe, 1461-1625*. The Hague and Paris. Mouton.
- Haugen, Eva Lund. 1984. *A bibliography of Scandinavian dictionaries*. White Plains, N. Y. Kraus.
- Hauger, Brigitte. 1994. *Johan Nicolai Madvig. The Language Theory of a Classical Philologist*. Studium Sprachwissenschaft. Beiheft 22. Münster. Nodus Publikationen.
- Heger, Steffen. 1974-1975. *Elementær dansk fonetik*. 1-2. København. Gjellerup. [2nd ed. 1981 *Sprog og lyd. Elementær dansk fonetik*.]
- Heggstad, Leiv. 1914. *Norsk grammatik for skule-ungdom*. Kristiania. Olaf Norlis Forlag.
- Heggstad, Leiv. 1931. *Norsk grammatikk*. Større utgåve. Andre utgåve av *Norsk grammatikk for skuleungdom*. Oslo. Olav Norlis Forlag.
- Heiberg, Ludvig. 1807. *Undersøgelse om Sprogets højeste Grundlov især med Hensyn paa det danske Sprog*. Et indbydelses-Skrift til Odense Katedral-Skoles Højtidelighed paa Kongens Fødselsfest den 29 Jan. 1807. Odense. S. Hempel.
- Heikel, I. A. 1894. *Filologins studium vid Åbo universitet*. Åbo universitets lärdomshistoria. 5. Filologin. SLS 26. Helsingfors. Tidnings- & tryckeri-aktiebolagets tryckeri.
- Heikel, Wilh[elm]. 1856. *Kort Lärobok i Svensk och Allmän Grammatik för Finska Cadet-Corpsens behof*. Helsingfors. [No printer.]
- Heldmann, And. 1738. *Versuch Einer Schwedischen Grammatica Fürnehmlich zum Gebrauch Eines Teutschen*. Upsal. Joh. Höjers Wittve.
- Helgason, Jón. 1929. *Málið á Nýja testamenti Odds Gottskálkssonar*. Safn Fræðafjelagsins 7. Kaupmannahöfn. Hið íslenska fræðafjelag.
- Hellan, Lars. 1981. *Towards an integrated analysis of comparatives*. Tübingen. Narr.
- Hellan, Lars. 1988. *Anaphora in Norwegian and the Theory of Grammar*. Studies in Generative Grammar 32. Dordrecht. Foris Publications.
- Hellan, Lars & Kirsti Koch Christensen. 1986. *Topics in Scandinavian Syntax*. Studies in Natural Language and Linguistic Theory. Dordrecht. Reidel.

- Hellberg, Staffan 1978. *The Morphology of Present-Day Swedish, Word-Inflection, Word-Formation, Basic Dictionary*. Data linguistica 1. Stockholm. Almqvist & Wiksell.
- Hellquist, [Gustaf]. Elof. 1922. *Svensk etymologisk ordbok*. Lund. Gleerup.
- Hellquist, [Gustaf]. Elof. 1929-1932. *Det svenska ordförrådets ålder och ursprung. En översikt*. I-III. Lund. Gleerup. [I: 1929; II: 1930; III: 1932.]
- [Helsingius, M. Daniel]. 1670. *Grammatica Latina Contracta Denuo Plurimis in Locis Castigatior & longè melior edita in usum eorum Qvi Rudimenta Lingvæ Latinæ breviter addiscere desiderant*. Upsaliæ. Henricus Curio.
- Heltoft, Lars. 1986a. The V/2-analysis - A Reply from the Diderichsen-Tradition. In: Östen Dahl & Anders Holmberg, eds. *Scandinavian Syntax*, 50-66. Stockholm. Institute of Linguistics. University of Stockholm.
- Heltoft, Lars. 1986b. Topologi og syntaks. En revision af Paul Diderichsens sætningsskema. *NyS* 16-17:105-130.
- Heltoft, Lars. 1992a. Topologiens Plads i en Sprogteori. In: Gregersen, ed. *Lingvistisk Festival*, 67-98. København. Institut for Almen og Anvendt Sprogvidenskab.
- Heltoft, Lars. 1992b. The Topology of Verb Second and SVO Languages. A Study in the Sign Functions of Word Order. *Copenhagen Studies in Language* 15:13-64.
- Heltoft, Lars. 1993. Revision af indholdsfeltet. In: Mette Kunøe & Erik Vive Larsen, eds. *4. Møde om Udforskningen af Dansk Sprog*, 119-133. Århus. Aarhus Universitet. Institut for Nordisk Sprog og Litteratur.
- Hendriksen, Hans. 1941. *Untersuchungen über die Bedeutung des Hethitischen für die Laryngaltheorie*. Hist. Filos. Medd. Dan. Vid. Selsk. 28:2. København. Munksgaard.
- Henriksen, Caroline C. 1976. *Dansk Rigssprog. – en beskrivelse fra 1700-tallet. Gl. kgl. Saml. 789 fol*. København. Akademisk Forlag.
- Henriksen, Caroline C. 1980. *Danske Grammatikere I-VI (1915-29). En indføring og en ajourføring*. København. Reitzel.
- Henriksen, Carol. 1992. Forskning om sprog og køn i Danmark. In: Britt-Louise Gunnarsson & Caroline Liberg, eds. *Språk, språkbruk och kön. Rapport från ASLA's nordiska symposium Uppsala 7-9 november 1991*, 21-31. ASLA.
- Henriksen, Carol. 1995. [Review of Bondevik et al. 1992]. *Nordic Journal of Linguistics* 18:91-97.
- Henriksen, Carol, Even Hovdhaugen, Fred Karlsson & Bengt Sigurd, eds. 1996. *Studies in the Development of Linguistics in Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway and Sweden*. Oslo. Novus.
- Hermann, Jesper & Frans Gregersen. 1978. *Gennem Sproget. Om undersøgelse af sprogbrug i samfundet*. Gyldendals sprogbibliotek. København. Gyldendal.
- Hermannsson, Halldór. 1919. *Modern Icelandic*. Islandica 12. Ithaca. Cornell University Library.
- Hernlund, Hugo. 1883. *Förslag och åtgärder till svenska skriftspråkets reglerande 1691-1739 jämte en inledande öfversikt af svenska språkets ställning under den föregående tiden*. Stockholm. Norstedt.
- Herslund, Michael. 1975. A Note on Old French Phonology. The Source of [ü]. *Linguistic Inquiry* 6:475-481.
- Herslund, Michael. 1976. *Structure phonologique de l'ancien français*. Études Romanes de l'Université de Copenhague. Revue Romane numéro spécial 8. Copenhague.
- Herslund, Michael. 1988. On Valence and Grammatical Relations. *Cebal* 11:3-34.
- Herslund, Michael. 1994. Valence et relations grammaticales. *Linguistica* 34:109-117.
- Herslund, Michael. 1996. Generative linguistics in Denmark. In: Henriksen et al. 1996:60-83.
- Herslund, Michael & Finn Sørensen. 1985. *De franske verber. En valensgrammatisk fremstilling. I. Verbernes syntaks*. København. Samfundslitteratur.
- Herslund, Michael & Finn Sørensen. 1987. *De franske verber 2. En valensgrammatisk fremstilling. II. Klassifikation af Verberne*. København. Samfundslitteratur.
- Herslund, Michael & Finn Sørensen. 1994. *A Valence Based Theory of Grammatical Relations*. In: Engberg-Pedersen 1994:81-95.
- Hertzberg, Frøydis. 1990. '... og denne Videnskab har man kaldet Grammatiken.' Tre studier i skolegrammatikkens historie, Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Oslo. University of Oslo.
- Hertzberg, Frøydis & Even Hovdhaugen. 1979. Some trends in Norwegian linguistics 1800-1850. *HL* 6:181-197.
- Hertzberg, Frøydis & Even Hovdhaugen. 1980. Noen retninger i norsk språkvitenskap 1800-1850. *Maal og Minne*, 13-35.
- Hesselman, Bengt. 1902. *Stafvelseförlängning och vokalkvalitet i östsvenska dialekter*. Uppsala. Uppsala Nya Tidnings aktiebolag.
- Hesselman, Bengt. 1905. *Sveamålen och de svenska dialekternas indelning*. Uppsala. K. W. Appelbergs boktryckeri.
- Hesselman, Bengt. ed. 1908. *En svensk orde-skötsel af Samuel Columbus. Med anmärkingar och ordlista*. Uppsala. Akademiska bokförlaget.
- Hesselman, Bengt. 1909-1910. *De korta vokalerna i och y i svenskan. Undersökningar i nordisk ljudlära*. Uppsala. Uppsala universitets årsskrift. 1909. Filosofi, språkvitenskap och historiska vetenskaper 5.
- Hesselman, Bengt. 1945. *Omljud och brytning i de nordiska språken. Förstudier till en nordisk språkhistoria*. Nordiska Texter och Undersökningar utg. av Bengt Hesselman. 15. Uppsala.
- Hesselman, Bengt. 1948-1953. *Huvudlinjer i nordisk språkhistoria*. 1-3. Stockholm. Bonnier.
- Hickes, George. 1689. *Institutiones grammaticæ Anglo-Saxonice et Moseo-Gothicæ*. Oxoniæ. E Theatro Sheldoniano.
- Hildeen, Esaias. 1797. *Dissertatio Academica, Animadversiones Nonnullas De Declinatione Nominum, Inprimis Fennicorum, Continens*. Aboæ. Frenckell.
- Hilmarsson, Jörundur [Jorundur]. 1986. *Studies in Tocharian Phonology, Morphology and Etymology with Special Emphasis*

- on the *o*-Vocalism. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Leiden. Reykjavík.
- Hjärne, Urban. 1716/1717. *Orthographia Svecana, Eller den Retta Swenska Bookstafweringen Stelt i ett Samtal emellan Neophilum och Eustathium*. Stockholm. [No printer.]
- Hjelmslev, Louis. 1928. *Principes de grammaire générale*. København. Høst.
- Hjelmslev, Louis. 1929. *Principes de Grammaire Générale*. KDVS. Historisk-filologiske Meddelelser XVI,1 1928.
- Hjelmslev, Louis. 1932. *Études baltiques*. Copenhagen. Levin & Munksgaard.
- Hjelmslev, Louis. 1937. On the principles of phonematics. In: Daniel Jones and D. B. Fry, eds. *Proceedings of the Second International Congress of Phonetic Sciences*, 49-54. Cambridge. Cambridge University Press.
- Hjelmslev, Louis. 1935-1937. *La catégorie des cas*. I-II. Acta Jutlandica VII,1 and Acta Jutlandica IX,2. Aarhus and København.
- Hjelmslev, Louis. 1943. *Omkring sprogteoriens grundlæggelse*. København. Munksgaard. [English translation 1953, revised 1961: *Prolegomena to a Theory of Language*.]
- Hjelmslev, Louis. 1947. Structural analysis of language. *Studia linguistica* 1:69-78.
- Hjelmslev, Louis. 1948. Grundtræk af det danske udtrykssystem med særligt henblik på stødet. Selskab for nordisk filologi, årsberetning 1948/49/50. København. Selskab for nordisk filologi
- Hjelmslev, Louis. 1951. Commentaires sur la vie et l'oeuvre de Rasmus Rask. In: M. Michel Lejeune, ed. *Conférences de l'Institut de Linguistique de l'Université de Paris*, vol. X, 143-157. Paris. C. Klincksieck.
- Hjelmslev, Louis. 1953. *Prolegomena to a theory of language*. Indiana University Publications in Anthropology and Linguistics, 7. Baltimore. Revised English edition 1961. Translated by Francis J. Whitfield. Madison. The University of Wisconsin Press.
- Hjelmslev, Louis. 1959 (1957). Pour une sémantique structurale. *TCLC* 12:96-112. København. Nordisk Sprog- og Kulturforlag.
- Hjelmslev, Louis. 1963. *Sproget. En introduktion*. Berlingske leksikon bibliotek. København. Berlingske forlag.
- Hjelmslev, Louis. 1970. *Language. An introduction*. Madison. University of Wisconsin Press.
- HL = *Historiographia Linguistica. International Journal for the History of Linguistics*. Amsterdam.
- Hof, Sven. 1753. *Swänska Språkets Rätta Skriftsätt Med Sina Bevis Förestält Och till Kongl. Swänska WetenskapsAcademien Framgifwit*. Stockholm. Jacob. Merckell.
- Hof, Sven. 1772. *Dialectus Vestrogothica, ad illustrationem aliquam linguae Suecanae, veteris et hodiernae, dissertatione philologica et vocabulorum Vestrogothorum indice explanata*. Stockholm. John. Arv. Carlbohm.
- Hoff, Ingeborg. 1946. *Skjetvemålet. Utsyn over lydvoeksteren i målet i Skiptvet i Østfold i jamføring med andre østfoldske mål*. DNVA 1946,1. Oslo. Jacob Dybwad.
- Hoffory, Julius. 1879. *Lydforbindelsen fst i det Arnamagnæanske håndskrift 674, A, 4to. Særtryk af Det philologisk-historiske Samfunds Mindeskrift i Anl. af dets 25aarige Virksomhed 1854-1879*. Kjøbenhavn. I. Cohens Bogtrykkeri.
- Hoffory, J. 1883. *Oldnordiske consonantstudier*, København. Disputats. [No publisher or printer.]
- [Holberg, Ludvig]. Hans Mikkelsen. 1726. *Metamorphosis Eller Forvandlinger. Med Nogle Orthographiske Anmerkninger*. Kjøbenhavn. [No printer or publisher.]
- Holm, Gösta. 1952. *Om s-passivum i svenskan, företrädesvis i folkmålen och den äldre fornsvenskan*. Lundastudier i nordisk språkvetenskap 9. Lund. C.W.K.Gleerup
- Holm, Gösta. 1967. *Epoker och prosastilar*. Lund. Studentlitteratur.
- Holm, Lars. 1986. *Jesper Swedbergs Svensk Ordabok. Bakgrund och tillkomsthistoria*. Uppsala. Institutionen för nordiska språk vid Uppsala universitet.
- Holma, Harri. 1913. *Die Namen der Körperteile im Assyrisch-Babylonischen: eine lexikalisch-etymologische Studie*. AASFB 7.
- Holma, Harri. 1943. *Arabian suuri profeetta: pürteitä Muhammedin elämästä ja islamin alkutaipaleelta*. Helsinki. Suomen-Kirja.
- Holmberg, Anders. 1986. *Word order and syntactic features in the Scandinavian languages and English*. Stockholm. Department of General Linguistics. University of Stockholm.
- Holmberg, Anders & Christer Platzack. 1995. *The Role of Inflection in the syntax of the Scandinavian languages*. New York. Oxford University Press.
- Holmboe, C[hristopher]. A[ndreas]. 1843. *Lappisk Grammatik af Stockfleth*. *NOR* 2,2:247-276.
- Holmboe, C[hristopher]. A[ndreas]. 1846. *Sanskrit og Oldnorsk: en sprogsammenlignende Afhandling*. Christiania. Fabritius.
- Holmboe, C[hristopher]. A[ndreas]. 1848. *Det oldnorske Verbum, oplyst ved Sammenligning med Sanskrit og andre Sprog af samme Æt*. Christiania. Malling.
- Holmboe, C[hristopher]. A[ndreas]. 1850. *Om pronomen relativum og nogle relative Conjunctioner i vort Oldsprog*. Universitetsprogram for 2det Halvaar 1850. Christiania. Malling.
- Holmboe, C[hristopher]. A[ndreas]. 1852. *Det norske Sprogs væsentligste Ordforraad, sammenlignet med Sanskrit og andre Sprog af samme Æt. Bidrag til en norsk etymologisk ordbog*. Wien. Keiserlig-kongelig Hof- og Stats-Trykkerie.
- Holmboe, C[hristopher]. A[ndreas]. 1854. *Norsk og Keltisk. Om de norske og de keltiske Sprogs indbyrdes Laan*. Christiania. Malling.
- Holmer, Nils M. 1938. *Studies on Argyllshire Gaelic*. Skrifter utgivna av K. Humanistiska Vetenskaps-Samfundet i Uppsala. 31:1, Uppsala. Almqvist & Wiksell.

- Holmer, Nils M. 1946a. Outline of Cuna grammar. *IJAL* 12:185-197.
- Holmer, Nils M. 1946b. *John Campanius's Lutheran Catechism in the Delaware Language*. Essays and Studies on American Language and Literature III. The American Institute in the University of Upsala. Upsala. Lundequist.
- Holmer, Nils M. 1947a. Postvocalic *s* in Insular Celtic. *Language* 23:125-136.
- Holmer, Nils M. 1947b. On the Origin of the Celtic Preterit in -ss-. *Language* 23:419-420.
- Holmer, Nils M. 1948. Old Irish -icc-, -ucci. *Language* 24:262-266.
- Holmer, Nils M. 1949. *Lexical and morphological contacts between Siouan and Algonquian*. Lunds universitets årsskrift. N. F. Avd. I. Bd. 45. Nr. 4. Lund. Gleerup.
- Holmer, Nils M. 1988. *Notes on some Queensland languages*. Pacific Linguistics Series F, no 79. Canberra. Australian National University.
- Holst, Albertus Christophorus. 1747. *De lingvarum diversitate necessaria, sed mvltis modis prospicva*. Ienæ. Litteris Io. Christ. Croekeri.
- Holtmark, Anne. 1936. *En islandsk scholasticus fra det 12. århundre*. DNVA 1936,3. Oslo. Jacob Dybwad.
- Hormia, Osmo. 1961. *Gananderin sanakirjan lähteet*. SKST 231.
- Horn, Fr. Winkel. 1878. *Peder Syv. En literærhistorisk Studie*. København. Samfundet til den danske Literaturs Fremme.
- Hornby, Rikard, Gunnar Knudsen & Marius Kristensen. 1936-64. *Danmarks gamle Personnavne I-II*. København. Gad.
- Houken, Aage. 1956. *Håndbog i danske stednavne*. København. Rosenkilde og Bagger.
- Hovdhaugen, Even. 1969. *Transformasjonell generativ grammatikk. En innføring*. Oslo / Bergen / Tromsø. Universitetsforlaget.
- Hovdhaugen, Even. 1971. *Transformasjonell generativ grammatikk. Annen utgave med øvelser*. Oslo / Bergen / Tromsø. Universitetsforlaget.
- Hovdhaugen, Even. 1978. Linguistic theory in Scandinavia: current perspectives. The contribution of Alf Sommerfelt. In: Weinstock 1978:81-85.
- Hovdhaugen, Even. 1982a. Norsk språk i europeisk lingvistikk i det 16. og 17. århundre. *Maal og Minne*, 49-69.
- Hovdhaugen, Even. 1982b. The Norwegian Language — a Phantom in 16th Century Linguistics? *Reforme Humanisme Renaissance*, Bulletin de l'association d'étude sur l'humanisme, la réforme et la renaissance No. 15 Juin 1982:20-29.
- Hovdhaugen, Even. 1982c. *Foundations of Western linguistics. From the beginning to the end of the first millennium A. D.* Oslo. Universitetsforlaget.
- Hovdhaugen, Even. 1987. The first vernacular grammars in Europe: the Scandinavian area. *Histoire Épistémologie Langage* 9:73-89.
- Hovdhaugen, Even. 1990. Una et eadem. Some observations on Roger Bacon's Greek Grammar. In: Sten Ebbesen, G. L. Bursill-Hall & Konrad Koerner, eds. *De ortu grammaticae: Studies in medieval grammar and linguistic theory in memory of Jan Pinborg*, 117-131. Amsterdam / Philadelphia. John Benjamins.
- Hovdhaugen, Even. 1992. A grammar without a tradition? Fernando de la Carrera: Arte de la lengua yunga (1644). In: Anders Ahlqvist, ed. *Diversions of Galway. Papers on the History of Linguistics*. (= Studies in the History of Language Sciences 68), 113-122. Amsterdam / Philadelphia. John Benjamins.
- Hovdhaugen, Even, ed. 1996. ... and the Word was God. *Missionary Linguistics and Missionary Grammar*. Studium Sprachwissenschaft. Beiheft 25. Münster. Nodus Publikationen.
- Huldén, Lars. 1990. Något om nordistikens historia vid Helsingfors universitet. In: Saari et al. 1990:73-92.
- Hultman, O. F. 1895 *Jöns Buddes bok*. En handskrift från Nådendals kloster, utg. genom O. F. Hultman. Helsingfors. SLS 31.
- Hultman, Tor. 1975. *Liten svensk grammatik*. Lund. Liber.
- Hyltenstam, Kenneth. 1979. *Svenska i invandrarperspektiv. Kontrastiv analys och språktypologi*. Lund. Liber Läromedel.
- Hægstad, Marius. 1910. Er der bygdemaal paa Island? *Kringsjaa* 35:41-43.
- Hægstad, Marius. 1942a. *Vestnorske maalføre fyre 1350. II. Sudvestlandsk. 2. Indre sudvestlandsk. Færømaal. Islandsk. Tridje bolken*. DNVA 1941,1. Oslo. I kommisjon hos Jacob Dybwad.
- Hægstad, Marius. 1942b. *Nokre ord om nyislandsken*. DNVA 1942. Oslo. I kommisjon hos Jacob Dybwad.
- Häkkinen, Kaisa 1983. *Suomen kielen vanhimmasta sanastosta ja sen tutkimisesta*. Publications of the Department of Finnish and General Linguistics. University of Turku. 17. Turku.
- Häkkinen, Kaisa. 1993. Suomen kielen tutkimus kansallisen diktatuurin kourissa. In: Heikki Ylikangas, ed. *Vaikea totuus. Vuosi 1918 ja kansallinen tiede*, 18-45. SKS.
- Häkkinen, Kaisa. 1994. *Agricolasta nykykieleen. Suomen kirjakielen historia*. Helsinki. WSOY.
- Häkkinen, Kaisa. 1996a. *Suomalaisten esihistoria kielitieteen valossa*. Tietolipas 147. SKS
- Häkkinen, Kaisa. 1996b. K. B. Wiklund und E. N. Setälä — Freunde, Kollegen, Streitgenossen. In: Lars-Gunnar Larsson, ed. *Laponica et Uralica. 100 Jahre finnisch-ugrischer Unterricht an der Universität Uppsala. Jubiläumssymposium im Uppsala, 20.-23. April 1994*, 337-343. Studia Uralica Upsaliensia 26. Uppsala.
- Hämäläinen, Albert. 1938. Nachrichten der nach Sibirien verschickten Offiziere Karls XII über die finnisch-ugrischen Völker. *JSFOu* 49.
- Hänninger, Nils. 1917. *Fornskånsk ljudutveckling. En undersökning av Cod. AM.28,8. och Cod. HOLM. B76*. Lunds universitets årsskrift. N-F. Avd. I. 13:1. Lund. Gleerup.
- Hødnebo, Finn. 1972. Om diplomer som kilde for norsk språkhistorie. *Magerøy & Venås* 1972:145-153.
- Høegh-Guldberg, Fred. 1814. *Grundlæg over grammatiske Forelæsninger for Ungdommen*. København. Schultz.

- [Høysgaard, Jens Pedersen]. 1743a. *Tres faciunt collegium eller Kjendelse i Sagen imellem Tvende fordum vel-meriterede og endnu efter Døden Berømmelige Mænd, Om Nogle Stykker i den Danske Orthographie, Udstedet Af en Dansk Patriot, fra hvilken kand ventes meere saadant, om denne Første Prøve finder Behag, og staar sin Prøve.* Kiøbenhavn. Trykt af Ernst Henrich Berling, og findes tilkjøbs hos Johan Bræem i David Skolemæsters Gaard paa Kjøbmager-Gaden. [In: Bertelsen IV 1920:187-215.]
- [Høysgaard, Jens Pedersen]. 1743b. *Concordia res parvæ crescunt, eller Anden Prøve af Dansk Orthographie, Som viser skrevne Accenters Nytte, og Vocalernes rætte Brug, Utgivet som en Project, paa hvis antagelse og forskydelse haab og mishaab om den bædste forbedring i den Danske skrive-riktighed, og om enighed i det meste deraf fornemmelig beroer efter Authors mening.* Kiøbenhavn. Trykt af Johan Christoph Groth, og findes tilkjøbs hos Johan Bram i David Skolemæsters Gaard paa Kjøbmager-Gaden. [Bertelsen IV 1920:219-247.]
- [Høysgaard, Jens Pedersen]. 1747. *Accentuered og Raisonnere Grammatica, Som viser Det Danske Sprog i sin naturlige Skikkelse, saa velsom dets Rime-konst og Vers-regler; Samled med Patriotens Tvende Orthographiske Prøver og udgiven De Fremmede til Villie, som allerede veed noget af Sproget, og i sær for de Unges skyld, som opdrages enten til Bogen eller Pennen.* Kjøbenhavn. Trøkt hos Johann Christopher Groth. [In: Bertelsen IV 1920:251-487.]
- [Høysgaard, Jens Pedersen]. 1752. *Methodisk Forsøg til en Fuldstændig Dansk Syntax. Hvoraf kun tages Anledning, ey al-ene til en ræt og tydelig Construction i vort Sprog, men og til des nøyere Indsigt i alle andre.* Kiøbenhavn. Dette og den A. Danske Grammatica er tilkjøbs paa Studiegaarden ved Frue Kirke i Kiøbenhavn. [In: Bertelsen V 1923:3-506.]
- [Høysgaard, Jens Pedersen]. 1769. *Første Anhang til den Accentuerede Grammatika, angaaende Indretningen i et orthographisk Ord-Register, hvoraf en Prøve følger bag efter.* Kjøbenhavn. Trykt udi det Kongelige Wäysenhusets Bogtrykkerie, af Gerhard Giese Salikath. [In: Bertelsen V 1923:507-550.]
- Idman, Nils. 1774. *Försök at wisa gemenskap emellan Finska och Grekiska Språken, såsom Tjenande til Uplysning i Finska Folkets Historie.* Abo. Frenckell.
- Idman, Nils. 1778. *Recherches sur l'ancien peuple Finois d'après les rapports de la langue Finoise avec la langue Greque.* Ouvrage traduit du Suédois Par Mr. Genet, le fils, secretaire Interpréte de MONSIEUR, membre des Sociétés littéraires *Utile Dulci* de Stockholm & *Appolini Sacra* d'Upsal. Strasbourg. Bauer & Treutel.
- IFSK = Instituttet for sammenlignende kulturforskning/Institute for comparative research in human culture. Oslo.
- Ihre, Johannes. 1742-1743. *Dissertatio Academica De Mutationibus linguæ Sueo-Gothicæ.* I-II. Upsaliæ / Holmiæ. Typis Nyströmianis.
- Ihre, Johan. 1751. *Utkast till Föreläsningar öfwer Swenska språket. och thes närmare kännedom.* Stockholm och Upsala. Ut Kiesewetters Boklåda.
- Ihre, Johannes. 1769. *Glossarium Suiogothicum in quo tam hodierno usu frequentata vocabula, quam in legum patriarum tabulis aliisque ævi medi scriptis obvia explicantur, et ex dialectis cognatis, Moesogothica, Anglo-saxonica, Alemannica, Islandica ceterisque Gothicæ et Celtæ originis illustrantur.* I-II. Upsaliæ. Typis Edmannianis.
- Ihre, Johannes. 1772. *Dissertatio Academica de convenientia linguæ Hungaricæ cum Laponica.* Publico submittit examini Emanuel Joh. Öhrling, Lapponia-Vestrobotniensis. Upsaliæ. Joh. Edman.
- Iivonen, Antti. 1994. A psychoacoustical explanation for the number of major IPA vowels. *Journal of the International Phonetic Association* 24:73-90.
- IJAL = *International Journal of American Linguistics.* Chicago. The University of Chicago Press.
- Ikola, Osmo. 1949. *Tempusten ja modusten käyttö ensimmäisessä suomalaisessa Raamatussa verrattuna vanhempaan ja nykyiseen kieleen. I.* Annales Universitatis Turkuensis B XXXII (= Turun Yliopiston Julkaisuja). Turku.
- Ikola, Osmo. 1954. Suomen lauseopin ongelmia I-III. *Vir.* 58:209-245.
- Ikola, Osmo, ed. 1980. *Fennicum. Kielen ja kulttuurin tutkimuksen ja opetuksen tyysija.* Suomi 123:2. SKS.
- Ikola, Osmo & Ulla Palomäki & Anna-Kaisa Koitto. 1989. *Suomen murteiden lauseoppia ja tekstikielioppia.* SKST 511.
- Immonen, Kari. 1995. *Suomen Akatemia suomalaisessa tiedepolitiikassa 1970-luvulla.* Helsinki. Otava.
- Indrebø, Gustav. 1951. *Norsk Målsoga.* Utgjevi av Per Hovda og Per Thorson. Bergen. John Griegs boktrykkeri.
- Inscriptions de l'Énésié. 1889. *Inscriptions de l'Énésié, recueillies et publiées par la Société Finlandaise d'Archéologie.* Helsinki. Imprimerie de la Société de littérature finnoise.
- Inscriptions de l'Orkhon. 1892. *Inscriptions de l'Orkhon, recueillies par l'expédition finnoise 1890 et publiées par la Société finno-ougriennes.* Helsinki. Imprimerie de la Société de littérature finnoise.
- Itkonen, Erkki. 1939. *Der ostlappische Vokalismus vom qualitativen standpunkt aus. Mit besonderer berücksichtigung des Inari- und skoltlappischen.* MSFOu 79.
- Itkonen, Erkki. 1945. Onko kantasuomessa ollut keskivokaaleja? *Vir.* 49:158-193.
- Itkonen, Erkki. 1946a. *Struktur und Entwicklung der ostlappischen Quantitätssysteme.* MSFOu 88.
- Itkonen, Erkki. 1946b. Zur Frage nach der Entwicklung des Vokalismus der ersten Silbe in den finnisch-ugrischen Sprachen, insbesondere im Mordwinischen. *FUF* 29:222-337.
- Itkonen, Erkki. 1947. Kuolanlapin vokatiivimuodoista. *Vir.* 51:192-197, 237-238.
- Itkonen, Erkki. 1948. Vokaalikombinaatiot ja vartalotyyppi. *Vir.* 52:124-143.
- Itkonen, Erkki. 1949. Arvid Genetz kielentutkijana. In: L. Harmaja, ed. *Arvid Genetz — Arvi Jännes. Elämänvaiheet ja elämäntyö*, 318-359. Porvoo / Helsinki. WSOY.
- Itkonen, Erkki. 1950. Das Perfekt des Partizips im Lappischen. *MSFOu* 98:271-304.
- Itkonen, Erkki. 1954. Zur Geschichte des Vokalismus der ersten Silbe im Tscheremissischen und in den permischen Sprachen.

FUF 31:149-345.

- Itkonen, Erkki. 1955. Onko itämerensuomessa jälkiä duaalista? *Vir.* 59:161-175.
- Itkonen, Erkki. 1957. Suomalais-ugrilaisen kantakielen äänne- ja muotorakenteesta. *Vir.* 61:1-23.
- Itkonen, Erkki. 1961. *Suomalais-ugrilaisen kielen- ja historian tutkimuksen alalta*. Tietolipas 20. SKS.
- Itkonen, Erkki. 1962a. Die Laut- und Formenstruktur der finnisch-ugrischen Grundsprache. *Ural-altaische Jahrbücher* 34:187-210.
- Itkonen, Erkki. 1962b. Beobachtungen über die Entwicklung des tscheremissischen Konjugationssystems. *MSFOu* 125:85-125.
- Itkonen, Erkki. 1966. *Kieli ja sen tutkimus*. Helsinki. WSOY.
- Itkonen, Erkki. 1976. Toimelasta Hallituskadulle. In: Tuomi 1976:28-34.
- Itkonen, Esa. 1978. *Grammatical Theory and Metascience*. Amsterdam / Philadelphia. John Benjamins.
- Itkonen, Esa. 1983. *Causality in Linguistic Theory*. London. Croom Helm.
- Itkonen, Esa. 1991. *Universal History of Linguistics: India, China, Arabia, Europe*. Amsterdam / Philadelphia. John Benjamins.
- Itkonen, Terho. 1957. Mellakoihin vai mellakoihin? *Vir.* 61:256-286
- Itkonen, Terho. 1958. Uusi suomen kielioppi. *Vir.* 62:75-108.
- Itkonen, Terho. 1959. -siin vai -hin monikon illatiivissa? In: Pertti Virtaranta et al., eds. *Verba docent: Juhlakirja Lauri Hakulisen 60-vuotispäiväksi 6.10.1959*, 372-389. SKST 263.
- Itkonen, Terho. 1974. Ergatiivisuutta suomessa I. *Vir.* 78:379-398.
- Itkonen, Terho. 1975. Ergatiivisuutta suomessa II. *Vir.* 79:31-65.
- Itkonen, Terho. 1976. Syntaktisten vaikutusyhteyksien luonteesta. *Vir.* 80:52-81.
- Itkonen, Terho. 1983. Välikatsaus suomen kielen juuriin. *Vir.* 87:190-229, 349-386.
- Iversen, R[agnvald]. 1921-1932. *Boknål og talemål i Norge 1560-1630*. I-II. [I. *Utsyn over lydverket*. 1921. DNVA 1920.5. Kristiania. Jacob Dybwad. II. *Utsyn over formverket*. 1932. DNVA 1931,4. Oslo. Jacob Dybwad.]
- Iversen, Ragnvald. 1923. *Norrøn grammatikk*. Kristiania. Aschehoug.
- Iversen, Ragnvald. 1944-1950. *Secret Languages in Norway I-III*. [I: *The Romany Language in Norway*. 1944. DNVA. 1944,3. Oslo. Jacob Dybwad. II: *The Rodi (Rotwelsch) in Norway*. 1945. DNVA 1945, 2. Oslo. 1945. Jacob Dybwad. III: *The Månsing in Norway*. 1950. DNVA 1950, 2. Oslo. Jacob Dybwad.]
- Iversen, Ragnvald. 1959. *Finsk på norsk grunn. Relikt-studier. Første del.* (= Det Kongelige Norske Videnskabers Selskabs Skrifter 1958. No. 6.) Trondheim. F. Bruns Bokhandel.
- Jacobsen, Lis, f. Rubin. 1910. *Studier til det danske Rigssprogs Historie. Fra Eriks Lov til Chr. III's Bibel. I. Lydhistorie*. København og Kristiania. Gyldendal / Nordisk Forlag.
- Jacobsen, Lis. 1912. *Kvinde og Mand. En Sprogstudie fra Dansk Middelalder*. København and Kristiania. Gyldendal.
- Jacobsen, Lis & Erik Moltke. 1941-1942. *Danmarks runeindskrifter*. I-III. København. Munksgaard.
- Jacobsen, Lis & Erik Moltke. 1942. *Danmarks runeindskrifter*. Lommeudgave. København. Munksgaard.
- Jacobsen, Lis & Christian Matras 1927-1928. *Færøysk-dansk ordbok*. Tórshavn. Føroya Fróðskaparfelag.
- Jahnsen, A. W. 1871. *Finska Språkets Satslära*. För läroverkens behof. Helsingfors. Finska Litteratur-sällskapets tryckeri.
- Jahr, Ernst Håkon, ed. 1992. *Language contact. Theoretical and empirical studies*. Trends in Linguistics. Studies and monographs 60. Berlin. Mouton de Gruyter.
- Jahr, Ernst Håkon, ed. 1993. *Language conflict and language planning*. Trends in Linguistics. Studies and monographs 72. Berlin. Mouton de Gruyter.
- Jahr, Ernst Håkon. 1996. Nynorsk språkforskning — en historisk oversikt. In: Henriksen et al. 1996:84-101
- Jahr, Ernst Håkon & Ingvild Broch, eds. 1996. *Language contact in the Arctic. Northern pidgins and contact languages*. Trends in Linguistics. Studies and monographs 88. Berlin. Mouton de Gruyter.
- Jahr, Ernst Håkon & Ove Lorentz, eds. 1981. *Fonologi / Phonology*. Studies in Norwegian linguistics 1. Oslo. Novus.
- Jahr, Ernst Håkon & Ove Lorentz, eds. 1983. *Prosodi / Prosody*. Studies in Norwegian linguistics 2. Oslo. Novus.
- Jahr, Ernst Håkon & Ove Lorentz, eds. 1985. *Morfologi / Morphology*. Studies in Norwegian linguistics 3. Oslo. Novus.
- Jahr, Ernst Håkon & Ove Lorentz, eds. 1989. *Syntaks / Syntax*. Studies in Norwegian linguistics 4. Oslo. Novus.
- Jahr, Ernst Håkon & Ove Lorentz, eds. 1993. *Historisk språkvitenskap / Historical linguistics*. Studies in Norwegian linguistics 5. Oslo. Novus.
- Jakobson, Roman. 1941. *Kindersprache, Aphasie und allgemeine Lautgesetze*. Uppsala. Almqvist & Wiksell.
- Jakobson, Roman, Gunnar M. Fant & Morris Halle. 1951. *Preliminaries to speech analysis. The distinctive features and their correlates*. Cambridge, Mass. MIT Press.
- Janhunen, Juha. 1977. *Samojedischer Wortschatz. Gemeinsamojedische Etymologien*. Castrenianumin toimitteita 17. Helsinki. Suomalais-ugrilainen Seura.
- Janhunen, Juha. 1981. Uralilaisen kantakielen sanastosta. *JSFOu* 77:219-274.
- Janhunen, Juha. 1982. On the Structure of Proto-Uralic. *FUF* 44:23-42.
- Janhunen, Juha. 1984. Altaillaisen hypoteesin nykytila. *Vir.* 88:202-207.
- Janhunen, Juha. 1986. *Glottal Stop in Nenets*. MSFOu 196.
- Janhunen, Juha. 1996. *Manchuria. An Ethnic History*. MSFOu 222.
- Jansson, Valter. 1945. *Eufemiavisorna. En filologisk undersökning*. Uppsala universitets årsskrift 1945:8. Uppsala. Lundequist.

- Jansson, Valter. 1951. *Nordiska vin-namn. En ortnamnstyp och dess historia*. Studier till en svensk ortnamnsatlas 8/Skrifter. Kungl. Gustav Adolfs akademien 24. Uppsala. Lundequist.
- Jensen, Ella. 1944. *Houlbjergmålet. Bidrag til Beskrivelse af en østjysk Dialekt*. Udv. f. Folkemaals Publ. A 6. Universitets-Jubilæets danske Samfund. København. Schultz.
- Jensen, Ella. 1959. *Nordsamsisk. Undersøgelse af Udtrykssystemet*. Udv. f. Folkemaals Publ. A 15. Universitets-Jubilæets danske Samfund. København. Schultz.
- Jensen, H. M. 1919-1926. *Brenderup-målet — Nordvestfyn*. Universitets-Jubilæets danske Samfund. København. Thiele.
- Jensen, J. M. 1897-1902. *Et vendelbomåls lyd- og formløre*. Universitets-Jubilæets danske Samfund. København. Samfundet.
- Jensen, Kristian. 1982. *Latinskolenes dannelse. Latinundervisningens indhold og formål fra reformationen til enevælden*. Antikken i Danmark. Bind 3. København. Tusculanum.
- Jensen, Kristian. 1988. The Latin Grammar of Philipp Melanchthon. In: Stella Revard, Fidel Rädle & Mario Di Cesare, eds. *International Congress of Neo-Latin Studies 6 1985 Wolfenbüttel. Acta conventus neo-latini Guelpherbyntani*, 513-519. Binghamton. N. Y. Center for Medieval & Renaissance texts & studies.
- Jensen, Per Anker. 1979. *Transformationel syntaks*. Anglica et americana 8. Copenhagen. Department of English. University of Copenhagen.
- Jensen, Povl Johs. ed. 1979. *Københavns universitet 1479-1979. Bind IX. Det filosofiske Fakultet. 2. del*. København. Gad.
- Jensen, Povl Johs. 1992. *Klassisk filologi indtil 1800*. Jensen & Grane 1992:69- 239.
- Jensen, Povl Johs. & Leif Grane, eds. 1992. *Københavns universitet 1479-1979. Bind VIII. Det filosofiske Fakultet. 1. del*. København. Gad.
- [Jensøn, Christen]. 1646. *Den Norske Dictionarium eller Glosebog, udi huilcken indeholdis mange Norske Gloser, og daglige Tale, adskillige Redskaber, Fuglis oc Fiskes, saa oc Diurs Naffne, som i Norge findis oc kaldis. Item Bondens Seyserserck oc Almanach, som kaldis Primstafven med sine Characteribus og forklaring. Alle dem udi Danmarck oc Norge. som haffuer lyst at vide det Norske Lands Vis og Maal, til en løstlig tids fordrift oc Kundskab, Colligerit oc forfattet*. Kiøbenhaffn. Peder Anderssøn.
- Jersinus, Janus Dionysius. 1623. *Epitome Grammaticæ Latinæ continens Prima Latinæ Lingvæ elementa, perspicuâ & methodicâ brevitæ incipientibus perquàm accomodata, Cum Præfatione De Methodo docendi Gram. & Ratione Lecturæ Compendiosâ, Ad mandatum & cum Privileg. S. R. M. speciali. Pro Scholis Daniæ & Norvegiæ. Hafniæ. Typis Sartorianis*.
- Jersinus, Janus Dionysius. 1624. *Grammatica Latina Præcepta Latinæ Lingvæ methodice et sufficienter continens, pro studijs adultiorum per Scholas Daniæ & Norvegiæ*. Hafniæ. Typis Sartorianis.
- Jespersen, Otto. 1885. *Kortfattet engelsk Grammatik for Tale- og Skriftsproget*. København. Carl Larsen.
- Jespersen, Otto. 1886. Til spørgsmålet om lydlove. *Nordisk Tidsskrift for Filologi* N. S. 7:207-245.
- Jespersen, Otto. 1887. Zur Lautgesetzfrage. *Internationales Zeitschrift für allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft* 3:188-216.
- Jespersen, Otto. 1891. *Studier over engelsk Kasus. Første Række. Med en Indledning: Fremskridt i Sproget*. København. Klein.
- Jespersen, Otto. 1894. *Progress in Language, with Special Reference to English*. London. Sonnenschein.
- Jespersen, Otto. 1897-1899. *Fonetik. En systematisk fremstilling af læren om sproglyd*. København. Schubothe.
- Jespersen, Otto. 1901. *Sprogundervisning*. København. Schubothe
- Jespersen, Otto. 1904a. *Phonetische Grundfragen*. Leipzig und Berlin. Teubner. [Part 2 of Jespersen 1897-1899.]
- Jespersen, Otto. 1904b. *How to teach a foreign language*. London. Allen & Unwin.
- Jespersen, Otto. 1905. *Growth and Structure of the English Language*. Leipzig. B. G. Teubner.
- Jespersen, Otto. 1906. *Modersmålets fonetik*. København. Schubothe. J. L. Lybecker og E. A. Hirschsprung.
- Jespersen, Otto. 1907. Mands Sprog og Kvindes Tale. *Gads Magasin* 1906-1907:581-592.
- Jespersen, Otto. 1909-1914. *Større engelsk grammatik*. I-II. København / Kristiania. Gyldendal / Nordisk Forlag.
- Jespersen, Otto. 1909-1949. *A Modern English Grammar on historical principles*. I-VII. Copenhagen. Munksgaard.
- Jespersen, Otto. 1913. *Sprogets logik*. Festskrift udgivet af Københavns universitet i anledning af Hans Majestæt Kongens fødselsdag den 26. september 1913. København. Schultz.
- Jespersen, Otto. 1916. *Nutidssprog hos børn og voksne*. København / Kristiania. Gyldendal / Nordisk Forlag.
- Jespersen, Otto. 1918. *Rasmus Rask: i hundreåret efter hans hovedværk*. Kjøbenhavn. Gyldendal.
- Jespersen, Otto. 1921. *De to hovedarter av grammattiske forbindelser*. Hist. Filos. Medd. Dan. Vid. Selsk. 4:3. København. Andr. Fred. Høst & Søn.
- Jespersen, Otto. 1922. *Language. Its nature, development and origin*. London. Allen & Unwin.
- Jespersen, Otto. 1924. *The Philosophy of Grammar*. London. Allen & Unwin. [reprinted 1925, 1929, 1933, 1948, 1951, 1955, 1958, 1963, 1968, etc.]
- Jespersen, Otto. 1925. *Menneskehed, nasjon og individ i sproget*. IFSK. Serie A:IVa. Oslo. Aschehoug.
- Jespersen, Otto. 1926a. *Lehrbuch der Phonetik*. Vierte Auflage. Leipzig und Berlin, Teubner. [Part 1 of Jespersen 1897-99]
- Jespersen, Otto. 1926b. *Sprogets udvikling og opståen*. København. V. Pios Boghandel - Povl Branner.
- Jespersen, Otto. 1928. L'étude de la langue maternelle en Danemark. *APhS* 3:63-76.
- Jespersen, Otto. 1933. *Essentials of English Grammar*. London. Allen & Unwin. [Reprinted 1933, 1935, 1938, 1943, 1946, 1948, 1950, 1953, 1954, 1956, 1957, 1959, 1960, 1962, 1966, 1969, 1972, 1974.]

- Jespersen, Otto. 1937. *Analytic Syntax*. Copenhagen. Levin & Munksgaard.
- Jespersen, Otto. 1938. *En sprogmands levned*. København. Gyldendal / Nordisk Forlag.
- Jespersen, Otto. 1941a. *Efficiency in linguistic change*. Hist. Filos. Medd. Dan. Vid. Selsk. 27:4. København. Munksgaard.
- Jespersen, Otto. 1941b. *Sproget ★ barnet ★ kvinden ★ slægten*. København. Gyldendal / Nordisk forlag.
- Jespersen, Otto. 1995. *A Linguist's Life*. An English Translation of Otto Jespersen's Autobiography with Notes, Photos and a Bibliography. Edited by Arne Juul, Hans F. Nielsen & Jørgen Erik Nielsen. Odense. Odense University Press. [An English version of Jespersen 1938.]
- Jespersen, Svend. 1931. Staldnavne. *Danske Folkemaal* 4:129-132.
- [Jessen, Bille Hansen]. 1889. *Den litteraire Retskrivning. Vedtægter samt orthographisk og grammatisk Raadgiver*. Kjøbenhavn. Gyldendal.
- Jessen, E[dwin]. 1861a. Om stavelsesmåls og "toneholds" gengivelse i lydskrift. *Tidskrift for Philologi og Pædagogik*. II:51-69. Kjøbenhavn. Otto Schwartz's Boghandel.
- Jessen, E[dwin]. 1861b. De almindeligst kendte levende sprogs lydbetegnelser sammenstillet med lydskriftens. *Tidskrift for Philologi og Pædagogik*. II:117-136, 206-217. Kjøbenhavn. Otto Schwartz's Boghandel.
- Jessen, E[dwin]. 1867. *Nyere skrifter om sprogets oprindelse*. Foredrag i det Kgl. Nordiske Oldskrift-selskab den 6. november 1866; nedskrevet senere. Særsk. avtrykk af Aarb. f. nord. oldk. og hist. 1867. Kjøbenhavn. Thieles Bogtrykkeri.
- Jessen, E[dwin]. 1868. *Dansk sproglære*. København. Gyldendal (F. Hegel).
- Jessen, E[dwin]. 1889. *Cultusministeriel Orthographi*. Kjøbenhavn. Hoffenberg & Trap's Etabl.
- Jessen, E[dwin]. 1891. *Dansk Grammatik*. Kjøbenhavn. Gyldendal (F. Hegel & Søn).
- Jessen, E[dwin]. 1893. *Dansk Etymologisk Ordbog*. Kjøbenhavn. Gyldendal (F. Hegel & Søn).
- Jóhannesson, Alexander. 1920. *Frumnorraen málfraði*. Reykjavík. Bókaverzlun Sigfúsar Eymundssonar.
- Jóhannesson, Alexander. 1923-1924. *Íslenzk tunga í fornöld*. Reykjavík. Bókaverzlun Ársæls Árnasonar.
- Jóhannesson, Alexander. 1956. *Isländisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Bern. Francke.
- Johannisson, Ture. 1945. *Hava och vara som tempusbildande hjälpverb i de nordiska språken*. Lund. Gleerup.
- Johannisson, Ture. 1973. *Ett språkligt signalement*. Nordistica Gothenburgensia 6. Göteborg.
- Jóhannsson, Jóhannes L. L. 1924. *Nokkrar sögulegar athuganir*. Reykjavík. Bókaverzlun Sigúsar Eymundssonar.
- Johansson, Karl Ferdinand. 1888. Miscellen. *Beiträge zur Kunde der indogermanischen Sprachen*. 13:111-128.
- Johansson, Monica. 1997. *Lexicon Lincopense. En studie i lexikografisk tradition och svensk språkvård vid 1600-talets mitt*. Göteborg. Meijerbergs arkiv för svensk ordforskning 21.
- Joki, A[ulis]. J. ed. 1944. *Kai Donners Kamassisches Wörterbuch nebst Sprachproben und Hauptzügen der Grammatik*. LSF 8.
- Joki, Aulis J. 1952. *Die Lehnwörter des Sajansamojedischen*. MSFOu 103.
- Joki, Aulis J. 1966 [1984]. *Maailman kielet*. Tietolipas 45. SKS.
- Joki, Aulis J. 1973. *Uralier und Indogermanen. Die älteren Berührungen zwischen den uralischen und indogermanischen Sprachen*. MSFOu 151.
- Jónasson, Jónas. 1896. *Ný dönsk orðabók með íslenzkum þýðingum*. Reykjavík. Ísafoldarprentsmiðja.
- Jónsdóttir, Margrét. 1996. Linguistics in Iceland before 1800. An overview. In: Henriksen et al. 1996:102-122.
- Jónsson, Bjarni. 1893. *Íslenzk málsgreinafræði*. Reykjavík. Ísafoldarprentsmiðja.
- Jonsson, Erik [= Eiríkur Jónsson]. 1863. *Oldnordisk Ordbog*. København. Det kongelige nordiske Oldskrift-Selskab.
- Jónsson, Jón Adalsteinn. 1959. Ágrip af sögu íslenzkrar stafsetningar. *Íslenzk tunga* 1:71-119.
- Jónsson, Magnús. 1856. *Stuttur leiðarvísir fyrir alþýðu til þess að skrifa íslenzku rjett og greinilega*. Reykjavík.
- [Jónsson, Runolfur]. Runolphus Jonas. 1651a. *Lingvæ septentrionalis elementa tribus assertionibus adstructa*. [Copenhagen]. Melchior Martzan.
- [Jónsson, Runolfur]. Runolphus Jonas. 1651b. *Recentissima antiqvissimæ lingvæ septentrionalis incunabula id est Grammaticæ Islandicæ rudimenta*. Hafniæ. Petrus Hakius.
- [Jónsson, Runolfur]. Runolphus Jonas. 1688. *Recentissima Antiquissimæ Lingvæ Septentrionalis Incunabula, Id Est Grammaticæ Islandicæ Rudimenta*. Oxoniæ. E Theatro Sheldoniano.
- Jónsson, Finnur. 1933. *Den islandske grammatiks historie til o. 1800*. København. Levin & Munksgaard.
- JSFOu = *Journal de la Société Finno-Ougrienne*. Helsinki.
- Judén, Jacob. 1818. *Försök till utredande af Finska språkets grammatik*. Wiborg. And. Cederwall.
- Juslenius, Daniel. 1745. *Suomalaisen Sana-Lugun Coetus, Jumalan avulla, Suurella työllä, pitkällä ajalla, monen neuwolla, Suomen Kielen Cunniaxi. /Fennici Lexici Tentamen, Dei auxilio, Prolixo labore, longo tempore, multorum consiliis. Lingvæ Fennicæ honori./ Finsk Orda-Boks Försök. Med Guds hielp, Genom widlyftigt arbete, på lång tid, med mångas råd, Till Finska Språkets heder*. Stockholm. Lars Salvius.
- Jussila, Raimo. 1987. Agricolan sanasto ja nyky-suomi. In: Esko Koivusalo, ed. *Mikael Agricolan kieli*, 203-228. SKS.
- Juusela, Kaisu. 1987. Muoto-opin arkisto 20-vuotias. *Vir*. 91:289-313.
- Kabell, Inge & Hanne Lauridsen. 1988. The first English-Danish dictionary: Friderik Bolling's Engelske Dictionarium (1678). *Lexicographica, series maior* 19:373-387.
- Kahle, Sigrid. 1991. *H. S. Nyberg. En vetenskapsmans biografi*. Stockholm. Norstedt.
- Kaimio, Jorma. 1979. *The Romans and the Greek Language*. SSFCHL 64.

- Kalima, Jalo. 1936. *Itämerensuomalaisten kielten balttilaiset lainasanat*. SKST 202.
- Kalima, Jalo. 1952. *Slaavilaisperäinen sanastomme. Tutkimus itämerensuomalaisten kielten slaavilaisista lainasanoista*. SKST 243.
- Kalkar, Chr. [Andr.]. H[erm.]. 1825. *Grammatikens Grundbegreber. Et Forsøg paa en almindelig Grammatik for Skolerne tilligemed et kort Anhang om det danske Sprogs Formlære*. Kjøbenhavn. Trykt hos Bernh. Schlesinger.
- Kalkar, Otto. 1881-1918. *Ordbog til det ældre danske Sprog (1300-1700)*. I-V. København.
- Kangasniemi, Heikki 1988. Mihin Virittäjä on virittänyt? *Vir.* 92:266-269.
- Kannisto, Artturi. 1938-1939. August Ahlqvists und Josef Budenz' Briefwechsel. *JSFOu* 50-51:49-104.
- Karker, Allan, Birgitta Lindgren & Ståle Løland, eds. 1997. *Nordens språk*. Oslo. Novus forlag.
- Karlgren, Bernhard. 1915-1926. *Études sur la phonologie chinoise*. I-IV. Archives d'études orientales vol. 15. Leiden/Uppsala. E. J. Brill/K.W. Appelberg.
- Karlgren, Bernhard. 1926. *Philology and ancient China*. IFSK. Serie A:VIII. Oslo. Aschehoug.
- Karlgren, Bernhard. 1940. Grammata serica, script and phonetics in Chinese and Sino-Japanese. *Bulletin of the Museum of Far Eastern Antiquities* 12:1-141.
- Karlgren, Bernhard. 1946. *Från Kinas språkvärld*. Göteborgs högskola forskningar och föreläsningar. Stockholm. Bonnier.
- Karlsson, Fred. 1977. *Johdatusta yleiseen kielitieteeseen*. Helsinki. Gaudeamus.
- Karlsson, Fred. 1983. *Suomen kielen äänne- ja muotorakenne*. Helsinki. WSOY.
- Karlsson, Fred. 1990. Constraint Grammar as a Framework for Parsing Unrestricted Text. In: Hans Karlgren, ed. *Proceedings of the 13th International Conference of Computational Linguistics*, Vol. 3:168-173. Helsinki.
- Karlsson, Fred. 1994a. *Linguistics in the Light of Citation Analysis*. Helsinki. Department of General Linguistics, University of Helsinki. Publications No. 23.
- Karlsson, Fred. 1994b. *Yleinen kielitiede*. Helsinki. Yliopistopaino. [New edition 1998.]
- Karlsson, Fred. 1997. *Yleinen kielitiede Suomessa kautta aikojen*. Helsinki. Department of General Linguistics, University of Helsinki. Publications No. 28.
- Karlsson, Fred. 1998a. *Kielitieteiden väitöskirjat Suomessa 1848-1997*. Helsinki. Department of General Linguistics, University of Helsinki. Publications No. 29.
- Karlsson, Fred. 1998b. Vuosien 1906-1915 kielioppikomitean mietinnön vastaanotto. *Vir.* 102:2-23.
- Karlsson, Fred. 2000. *E. N. Setälä vaarallisilla vesillä. Tieteellisen vallankäytön, käyttäytymisen ja perinteen analyysi*. SKST 765.
- Karlsson, Fred, Atro Voutilainen, Juha Heikkilä & Arto Anttila, eds. 1995. *Constraint Grammar. A Language-Independent Framework for Parsing Running Text*. Berlin & New York. Mouton de Gruyter.
- Karlsson, Göran. 1957. *Suomen kielen nukuksissa ja hereillä-tyyppiset paikallissija-adverbit*. SKST 250.
- Karsten, T[orsten]. E[vert]. 1915. *Germanisch-finnische Lehnwortstudien. Ein Beitrag zu der ältesten Sprach- und Kulturgeschichte der Germanen*. ASSF 45:2. Helsingfors.
- Karsten, T[orsten]. E[vert]. 1925. *Germanerna. En inledning till studiet av deras språk och kultur*. Natur och Kultur 42. Helsingfors. Söderström & Co.
- Karsten, T[orsten]. E[vert]. 1943-1944. *Finnar och germaner*. Helsingfors. Folkmålsstudier IX-X.
- Karttunen, Lauri. 1971a. Some observations on factivity. *Papers in Linguistics* 4:55-69.
- Karttunen, Lauri. 1971b. Implicative verbs. *Language* 47:340-358.
- Karttunen, Lauri. 1973. Presuppositions of compound sentences. *Linguistic Inquiry* 4:169-193.
- Karttunen, Lauri. 1977. Syntax and semantics of questions. *Linguistics & Philosophy* 1:3-44.
- Karttunen, Lauri & Stanley Peters. 1979. Conventional implicature. In: C.-K. Oh & D. A. Dinneen, ed. *Syntax and Semantics 11: Presupposition*, 1-56. New York. Academic Press.
- KDVS = *Kongelige Danske Videnskabernes Selskabs Historisk-Filologiske Meddelelser*. København. Munksgaard.
- Kellgren, Herman. 1854. *Om affix-pronomen i arabiskan, persiskan och turkiskan; samt Ibn-Mâliks Allâmîja med text-kritik och anmärkningar*. Helsingfors. Frenckell.
- [Kempe, Andreas]. Simon Simplex. 1688. *Die Sprachen des Paradieses, das ist, Begebene Anleitung der Natur zuerkennen, was vor Sprachen im ersten Anfange der Welt, im Paradeis, absonderlich bey dem Fall Adams und Eve seynd geredet worden. In einer Rede, von etlichen Hochgelehrten Persohnen, in ein Convent vorgehabt, und mit ihrer sämtlichen Vergnügung ausgeführet*. Aus dem Schwedischen im Teutschen übersetzt von Albrecht Kopman. [No place. No publisher.]
- Kessler-Mesguich, Sophie. 1992. Les grammaires occidentales de l'hebreu. In: Auroux 1992:251-270.
- Kettunen, Lauri. 1910. Descendentis-äännehistoriallinen katsaus Keski-Skandinavian metsäsuomalaisten kieleen. *Suomi* IV,8:1-150. Helsinki.
- Kettunen, Lauri. 1930. *Suomen murteet. I. Murrenäytteitä. II. Murrealueet*. SKST 188.
- Kettunen, Lauri. 1934. *Suomen kielioppi oppikouluille ja seminaareille*. Porvoo. WSOY.
- Kettunen, Lauri. 1940. *Suomen murteet. III. A. Murrekartasto. B. Selityksiä murrekartastoon*. SKST 188.
- Kettunen, Lauri. 1949. *Hyvää vapaata suomea. Ohjekirja suomen kielen käyttäjille*. Jyväskylä. K. J. Gummerus Osakeyhtiö.
- Kettunen, Lauri & Martti Vaula. 1938. *Suomen kielioppi sekä tyyli- ja runo-opin alkeet oppikouluille ja seminaareille*. Porvoo / Helsinki. WSOY.
- Kiefer, Ferenc. 1970. *Swedish Morphology*. Stockholm. Skriptor

- Kilpinen, W[olmar]. [also Volmari Kilpinen, Wolmar Styrbjörn Schildt]. 1857. Sananen Suomen kielen ulko-muodosta, ja venytys-merkistä. *Suomi* 16:81-84.
- Kinnander, Bengt. 1959. *Sammanhangsanalys. Studier i språkets struktur och rytm*. Skrifter utgivna av Institutionen för nordiska språk vid Uppsala universitet 5. Uppsala. Institutionen för nordiska språk vid Uppsala universitet.
- Kiparsky, Paul 1965. *Phonological Change*. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation. MIT, Cambridge, Mass.
- Kiparsky, Paul. 1982. From Cyclic Phonology to Lexical Phonology. In: H. van der Hulst & N. Smith, eds. *The Structure of Phonological Representations*, 131-175. Dordrecht. Foris.
- Kiparsky, Valentin. 1932. Johdatusta fonologiaan. *Vir.* 36:230-250.
- Kiparsky, V[alentin]. 1934. *Die gemeinlavischen Lehnwörter aus dem Germanischen*. AASF B XXXII:2.
- Kiparsky, Valentin. 1963. *Russische historische Grammatik. I. Die Entwicklung des Lautsystems*. Heidelberg. Carl Winter.
- Kiparsky, Valentin. 1967. *Russische historische Grammatik. II. Die Entwicklung des Formensystems*. Heidelberg. Carl Winter.
- Kiparsky, Valentin. 1975. *Russische historische Grammatik. III. Die Entwicklung des Wortschatzes*. Heidelberg. Carl Winter.
- Kiviniemi, Eero. 1971. *Suomen partisiippinimistöä. Ensimmäisen partisiipin sisältävät henkilö- ja paikannimet*. SKST 295.
- Kleinschmidt, Samuel. 1851. *Grammatik der grönländischen Sprache mit teilweisem Einschluss des Labradordialekts*. Berlin. Reimer.
- Klinge, Matti. 1986. *Senaatintorin sanoma. Tutkielmia suuriruhtinaskunnan ajoilta*. Helsinki. Otava.
- Klinge, Matti. 1993. *The Finnish tradition. Essays on structures and identity in the North of Europe*. Helsinki. Otava.
- Klinge, Matti. 1994. *Itämeren maailma*. Helsinki. Otava.
- Klinge, Matti, Rainer Knapas, Anto Leikola & John Strömberg. 1987. *Kuninkaallinen Turun Akatemia 1640-1808. Helsingin yliopisto 1640-1990*. Ensimmäinen osa. Helsinki. Otava.
- Klinge, Matti, Rainer Knapas, Anto Leikola & John Strömberg. 1989. *Keisarillinen Aleksanterin Yliopisto 1808-1917. Helsingin yliopisto 1640-1990*. Toinen osa. Helsinki. Otava.
- Klinge, Matti, Rainer Knapas, Anto Leikola & John Strömberg. 1990. *Helsingin yliopisto 1917-1990. Helsingin yliopisto 1640-1990*. Kolmas osa. Helsinki. Otava.
- Knorring, Frans von. 1844. *Språkforskningar. Första Häftet. Språk-ljuden*. Stockholm. Norstedt.
- Knudsen, K[nud]. 1847. *Et Par Puncter af Modersmaalets Grammatik*. Indbydelsesskrift til den offentlige Examen i Christiania Cathedralskole 1847. Christiania. F. Steens Bogtrykkeri.
- Knudsen, Knud. 1856. *Haandbog i dansk-norsk Sproglære*. Kristiania. J. Chr. Abelsted.
- Knudsen, K[nud]. [1865]. *Om norsk Uttale og Oplæsning*. Aftryk af en Avhandling i "Den norske Folkeskole". [No place. No publisher.]
- Knudsen, Knud. 1866. *Om tilnærmelse mellem Norsk, Dansk og Svensk*. Kristiania. Brøgger & Christie.
- Knudsen, K[nud]. 1876. *Den landsgyldige norske uttale*. Kristiania. Trykt på forfatterens kostning. Sælges ved Feilberg og Landmark.
- Knudsen, K[nud]. 1881. *Unorsk og norsk eller fremmedords avløsning*. Kristiania. Alb. Cammermeyer.
- Knudsen, K[nud]. 1884. *Latinskole uten latin*. Kristiania. Trykt på boksriverens kostning hos A.W. Brøgger. Sæljes ved Alb. Cammermeyer.
- Knudsen, Trygve. 1923. *P. A. Munch og samtidens norske sprogstrev*. Kristiania. Gyldendal.
- Knudsen, Trygve. 1949. *Pronomener*. Oslo. Universitetets studentkontor.
- Knudsen, Trygve. 1967. *Kasuslære*. 1-2. Oslo. Universitetsforlaget.
- Knudsen, Trygve & Alf Sommerfelt, eds. 1937-1957. *Norsk riksmålsordbok*. I-II. Oslo Aschehoug.
- Knudtzon, J. A. 1902. *Die zwei Arzawa-Briefe. Die ältesten Urkunden in indogermanischer Sprache*. Mit Bemerkungen von Sophus Bugge und Alf Torp. Leipzig. J. C. Hinrich.
- Kock, Axel. 1878. *Språkhistoriska undersökningar om svensk akcent 1*. Lund. C. W. K. Gleerups förlag.
- Kock, Axel. 1884-1885. *Språkhistoriska undersökningar om svensk akcent 2*. Lund. C. W. K. Gleerups förlag.
- Kock, Axel. 1896. *Om Språkets förändring* Populärt vetenskapliga föreläsningar vid Göteborgs Högskola III. Göteborg. Wettergren & Kerber.
- Kock, Axel. 1901. *Die Alt- und Neuschwedische Accentuierung unter Berücksichtigung der anderen nordischen Sprachen*. Quellen und Forschungen zur Sprach- und Kulturgeschichte der Germanischen Völker. Strassburg. Karl J. Trübner.
- Kock, Axel. 1906-1929. *Svensk ljudhistoria* I-V. Lund. Gleerup. [I: 1906; II: 1911; III: 1920; IV: 1921; V,1: 1923; V,2: 1929; Register till delarna I-V: 1929.]
- Kock, L[avrids]. O. [ca. 1660.] *Introductio ad lingvam Danicam, puta Selandicam, in usum exterorum Danica amantium methodo facili conscripta*. Manuscript, first published in Bertelsen I, 1915:35-74.
- Koerner, Konrad. 1982. On the Historical Roots of the Philology / Linguistics Controversy. In: A. Ahlqvist, ed. *Papers from the 5th International Conference on Historical Linguistics*. Amsterdam Studies in the Theory and History of Linguistic Science IV, 404-413. Amsterdam / Philadelphia. John Benjamins.
- Koerner, E. F. K[onrad]. 1994. *Historiography of Linguistics*. In: Asher 1994,3:1570-1578.
- Kofod, Bjarne. 1849. *Fullstændig norsk-dansk Sproglære. Nærmest til Brug for Ikke-Studerende og ved Selvunderviisning*. Christiania. Chr. Schibsted.
- Koivulehto, Jorma 1976. Vanhimmista germaanista lainakosketuksista ja niiden ikäämisestä. I, II. *Vir.* 80:33-47, 247-290.
- Koivulehto, Jorma. 1979. Phonotaktik als Wegweiser in der Lehnwortforschung. *FUF* 43:67-78.
- Koivulehto, Jorma. 1983. Seit wann leben die Urfinnen im Ostseeraum? Zur relativen und absoluten Chronologie der alten idg.

- Lehnwortschichten im Ostseefinnischen. *MSFOu* 185:135-157.
- Koivulehto, Jorma. 1994. Indogermanisch — Uralisch: Lehnbeziehungen oder (auch) Urverwandtschaft? In: Reinhard Sternemann, ed. *Bopp-Symposium 1992 der Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin*, 133-148. Heidelberg. Carl Winter Verlag.
- Koivulehto, Jorma. 1995. Zur indogermanisch-germanischen Kontinuität in der Nachbarschaft der Finnougrier. *Der Ginkgo Baum. Germanistisches Jahrbuch für Nordeuropa* 9:116-137.
- Koivusalo, Esko. 1975. Fennofilien murrekiista. *Suomi* 117,3:1-64
- Kolari, Veli. 1985. *Suomen slavistiikan vaiheita*. Helsingin yliopiston slaavilaisten kielten laitoksen raportteja 2. Helsinki.
- [Kolding, Poul Jensen]. 1622. *[Pavli Jani Coldingi] Etymologicum Latinum in quo dictiones latinæ ab originibus, definitionibus, significationibus et exemplis breviter ac dilucide traduntur, deducuntur et explicantur ad ordinem alphabeticum, addita etiam danica interpretatione*. Rostochii. Joachim Pedanus
- [Kolding, Poul Jensen]. P. J. C. 1626. *Dictionarium Herlovianum, Desumptum Ex Etymologico Latino*. Havnæ. Salomon Sartorius.
- Kolsrud, Sigurd. 1922. *Maal og maalgransking*. Oslo. Det norske samlaget.
- Kolsrud, Sigurd. 1951. *Nynorsken i sine målføre*. Oslo. Jacob Dybwad.
- Konow, Sten. 1949. Primar of Khotanese Saka. Grammatical sketch, chrestomathy, vocabulary, bibliography. *NTS XV:5-136*.
- Koptjevskaja-Tamm, Maria. 1993. *Nominalizations*. London. Routledge.
- Korhonen, Jarmo. 1977. *Studien zu Dependenz, Valenz und Satzmodell*. Teil I. Bern - Frankfurt am Main - Las Vegas. Peter Lang.
- Korhonen, Jarmo. 1978. *Studien zu Dependenz, Valenz und Satzmodell*. Teil II. Bern - Frankfurt am Main - Las Vegas. Peter Lang
- Korhonen, Jarmo. 1995. Emit Öhmann und sein Beitrag zur Finnischen Germanistik. *Der Ginkgo-Baum. Germanistisches Jahrbuch für Nordeuropa* 13:10-38.
- Korhonen, Mikko. 1967. *Die Konjugation im Lappischen: morphologisch-historische Untersuchung. I. Die finiten Formkategorien*. MSFOu 143.
- Korhonen, Mikko. 1969. Die Entwicklung der morphologischen Methode im Lappischen. *FUF* 37:203-362.
- Korhonen, Mikko. 1979. Entwicklungstendenzen des finnisch-ugrischen Kasusystems. *FUF* 43:1-21.
- Korhonen, Mikko. 1981. *Johdatus lapin kielen historiaan*. SKS.
- Korhonen, Mikko. 1986. *Finno-Ugrian language studies in Finland 1828-1918*. The History of Learning and Science in Finland 1828-1918. 11. Helsinki. SSF.
- Korhonen, Mikko. 1987. Les grammaires des langues finno-ougriennes; esquisse historique. *Histoire Epistomologie Language* IX:91-110.
- Korhonen, Mikko. 1989. Uralilaisten kielten ja kansojen tutkijoita. In: Löytönen 1989:216-271.
- Korhonen, Mikko. 1992. Remarks on the Structure and History of the Uralic Case System. *JSFOu* 82:163-180.
- Korhonen, Mikko 1993a. *Kielen synty*. [Posthumously edited by Ulla-Maija Kulonen.] Porvoo. WSOY.
- Korhonen, Mikko. 1993b. August Ahlqvist kielitieteilijänä. In: Anhava 1993:55-69.
- Korhonen, Mikko, Seppo Suhonen & Pertti Virtaranta. 1983. *Sata vuotta suomen sukua tutkimassa. 100-vuotias Suomalais-ugrilainen Seura*. Espoo. Weilin & Göös.
- Koskeniemi, Kimmo .1983. *Two-Level Morphology: A General Computational Model for Word-Form Recognition and Production*. Helsinki. University of Helsinki, Department of General Linguistics. Publications No. 6.
- Koskinen, Yrjö. 1860. *Finska Språkets Satslära. Ett försök*. Åbo. J. W. Lillja.
- Kristensen, Marius. 1905. Nordisk stednavnegranskning. Et historisk overblik. *Danske Studier*, 177-193.
- Kristensen, Marius. 1933. *Folkemaal og sproghistorie*. Universitets-Jubilæets danske Samfund 300. København. Thiele.
- Kristjánsson, Aðalgeir. 1996. Orðabókarstörf Konráðs Gíslasonar. *Íslenskt mál* 18:7-36.
- Kristoffersen, Kristian Emil. 1996. Marius Nygaards syntaktiske arbeid i eit vitskapshistorisk lys. In: Kjartan G. Ottósson, R. V. Fjeld & A. Torp, eds. *The Nordic languages and modern linguistics 9. Proceedings of The Ninth International Conference of Nordic and General Linguistics, University of Oslo, January 11-12, 1995*, 135-150. Oslo. Novus.
- Kristoffersen, Kristian Emil. 1997. Georg Fredrik Wilhelm Lund — den første norrønsyntaktikar. *Maal og Minne*, 55-74.
- Kroman, Erik. 1947. Musikalsk Akcent i Dansk. Med Tillæg: Svenske Indvandringer i Danmark i Oldtiden. *APhS* 20:1-266. [Also printed separately as a dissertation.]
- Krueger, John R. 1975. *The Kalmyk-Mongolian Vocabulary in Strahlenberg's Geography of 1730*. Asiatica Suecana. Early 16th Century Documents and Studies vol. I. The Royal Academy of Letters History and Antiquities. Stockholm. Almqvist & Wiksell.
- Krömmelbein, Thomas. 1997. *Ólafur Þórðarson Hvitaskald — Dritte Grammatische Abhandlung*. Studia Nordica 3. Oslo. Novus.
- Kuhn, Thomas S. 1970 [1962]. *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. Second, enlarged edition. Chicago. The University of Chicago Press.
- Kváran, Guðrún. 1996. Den islandske sproghistorie i det 19. århundrede. In: Henriksen et al. 1996:123-151.
- Kytö, Merja. 1991. *Manual to the Diachronic Part of the Helsinki Corpus of English Texts. Coding Conventions and Lists of Source Texts*. Helsinki. University of Helsinki, Department of English.
- Kytö, Merja & Matti Rissanen. 1988. The Helsinki Corpus of English Texts: Classifying and Coding the Diachronic Part. In: M.

- Kytö, O. Ihalainen & M. Rissanen, eds. *Corpus Linguistics, Hard and Soft. Proceedings of the Eighth International Conference on English Language Research on Computerized Corpora*, 169-179. Amsterdam. Rodopi.
- Kytömäki, Leena. 1993. *Suomen kielen verbiderivaation kuvaaminen 1600-luvulta nykypäiviin*. Turun yliopiston suomalaisen ja yleisen kielitieteen laitoksen julkaisuja 40. Turku.
- Källgren, Gunnel. 1979. *Innehåll i text*. Ord och stil. 11. Lund. Studentlitteratur.
- Källquist, Eskil. 1934. *Thet Svenska Språketz Klagemål. Litteraturhistorisk undersökning jämte text och tolkning*. Dissertation. Uppsala. Wretmans Boktryckeri A.-B.
- Kärnä, Aino. 1995. Sprache und Kultur — Emil Öhmann's Einführung in die Sprachwissenschaft. *Der Ginkgo Baum. Germanistisches Jahrbuch für Nordeuropa* 9:245-25.
- Körner, Rudolf. 1933. Ordklasserna och deras indelning. *Modersmåslärarnas förenings årsskrift*, 16-26.
- Körner, Rudolf. 1934. Bisatserna och deras indelning. *Moderna språk* 28:34-60.
- Körner, Rudolf. 1935. Objektet. *Moderna språk* 29:58-90.
- Körner, Rudolf. 1936. Formella och logiska kategorier i grammatiken. *Moderna språk* 30:191-197.
- Laakso, Johanna. 1995. Vaikutelmia Jyväskylän fennougristikongressista. *Vir.* 99:587-592.
- Labov, William. 1966. *The social stratification of English in New York City*. Washington, D. C. Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Lagerlöf, Petrus. 1694. *Dissertatio De Linguae Svecanae Orthographia*. Exercitii gratia tueri publice conabitur Olaus Troilus Zachrisson. [No place. No printer.]
- Lagus, Wilh. 1869. *Lärokurs i Arabiska Språket till Universitets-Ungdomens tjenst. I. Arabisk och allmän Semitisk Språkhistorie. II. Arabisk grammatik*. Helsingfors. Frenckell.
- Lagus, Wilh. 1874. *Lärokurs i Arabiska Språket till Universitets-Ungdomens tjenst. III. Arabisk Krestomati*. Helsingfors. Frenckell.
- Laine, Matti, Jussi Niemi, Päivi Koivuselkä-Sallinen & Jukka Hyönä 1995. Morphological Processing of Polymorphemic Nouns in a Highly Inflecting Language. *Cognitive Neuropsychology* 12:457-502.
- Laitinen, Lea, ed. 1987. *Isosuinen nainen. Tutkielmia naisesta ja kielestä*. Helsinki. Yliopistopaino.
- Lane, George S. 1968. The Lexical and Grammatical Materials in the Landsbökasafn. *Scandinavian Studies* 40:111-131.
- Lange, Frederik. 1826. *Det Græske Sprogs Grammatik til Skolernes Brug*. Kjøbenhavn. Gyldendal.
- Lange, Fredericus. 1836. *De Casuum Universis Causis et Rationibus. Commentatio grammatica*. Hauniaë. Ex officina Poppiana.
- Lange, Frederik. 1840. *Almindelig Grammatik. Et videnskabeligt Omrids*. Kjøbenhavn. Bianco Luno.
- Larsen, Amund B. 1907. *Kristiania bymål. Vulgærsproget med henblik på den utvungne dagligtale*. Utgitt av bymålslaget. Kristiania. Cammermeyers boghandel.
- Larsen, Amund B. & Gerhard Stoltz. 1912. *Bergens bymål*. Kristiania. Aschehoug.
- Larsen, Erik Vive. 1986. Paul Diderichsens sætningsskema og den nordiske syntaksforskning. Nogle centrale problemstillinger. *NyS* 16-17:131-148.
- Larsen, Mogens Trolle. 1994. *Sunkne paladser: historien om Orientens opdagelse*. København. Gyldendal.
- Latvala, Salu 1895. Lauseopillisia havaintoja Luoteis-Satakunnan kansankielestä. *Suomi* III,12:1-88.
- Laurén, Christer. 1972. *Predikanten som översättare. Mechtilds uppenbarelse i Jöns Buddes fornsvenska version — handskrift och översättningsteknik*. Borgå. Åbo Akademi.
- Leem, Knud. 1748. *En Lappisk Grammatica Efter den Dialect, som bruges af Field-Lapperne udi Porsanger-Fjorden Samt Et Register over de udi samme Grammatica anførte Observationers Indhold; Hvorhos er føyet et Blad af den berømmelige Historie-Skriveres Hr. Baron Ludvig Holbergs Kirke-Historie oversat i det Lappiske Tungemaal med en Analysis over et hvert Ord*. Kjøbenhavn. Gottman Friedrich Kiesel.
- Leem, Knud. 1756. *En Lappisk Nomenclator efter Den Dialect, som bruges af Fjeld-Lapperne i Porsanger-Fjorden*. Tronhiem. Jens Christensen Winding.
- [Leem, Knut]. Canutus Leemius. 1768-1781. *Lexicon Lapponicum bipartitum, Lapponico-Danico-Latinum & Danico-Latino-Lapponicum cum Indice Latino. I-II*. Nidrosiæ. Gerhardus Giese Salicath.
- Lefolii, H. H. 1871. *Sproglærens Grundbegreber, som de komme til Udtryk i Modersmaalets Sprogform. Bidrag til dansk Sproglære*. København. Reitzel.
- Lehtisalo, T[oiivo]. 1927. *Über den Vokalismus der ersten Silbe im juraksamojedischen. Anhang: Beobachtungen über den Vokalismus der ersten Silbe im ursamojedischen*. SKST 56.
- Lehtisalo, Toivo. 1933. Zur Geschichte des Vokalismus der ersten Silbe im Uralischen vom qualitativen Standpunkt aus. *FUF* 21:5-55.
- Lehtisalo, Toivo. 1936. *Über die primären ururalischen Ableitungssuffixe*. MSFOu 72.
- Lehtonen, Jaakko 1970. *Aspects of Quantity in Standard Finnish*. Studia Philologica Jyväskylän VI. Jyväskylä.
- Leino, Pentti. 1982. *Kieli, runo ja mitta. Suomen kielen metriikka*. SKST 376.
- Leino, Pentti. 1986. *Language and metre. Metrics and the metrical system of Finnish*. Studia Fennica 31. SKS.
- Leino, Pentti. 1989. Paikallissijat ja suhdesääntö: kognitiivisen kieliopin näkökulma. *Vir.* 93:161-219.
- Leino, Pentti. 1993. *Polysemia — kielen moniselitteisyys*. Kieli 7. Helsinki. Helsingin yliopiston suomen kielen laitos.
- Leino, Pentti. 1996. Paavo Siro suomen lauseopin kuvaajana. In: Siro 1996:11-43
- Leino, Pentti & Tiina Onikki, eds. 1994. *Näkökulmia polysemiaan*. Kieli 8. Helsinki. Helsingin yliopiston suomen kielen laitos.
- Leiwo, Matti. 1986 [1980]. *Lapsen kielen kehitys*. Helsinki. Gaudeamus.

- Lejeune, Michel, ed. 1949. *Actes du sixième congrès international des linguistes*. Paris. C. Klincksieck.
- [Leopold, C. G. af]. 1801. *Afhandling om svenska stafsättet*. Svenska Akademiens Handlingar Ifrån 1796, 1-36. Stockholm. Carl Delén och J. G. Forsgren.
- [Leopold, C. G. af]. 1837. Undersökning om grunderna till svenska stafsättet, med hänseende till Akademiens utgifna Stafningslära, och till fullständigare utveckling af hennes grundsatser. *Svenska Akademiens Handlingar Ifrån 1796* 17:1-168. Stockholm. A. G. Hellsten.
- Levander, Lars. 1925-1928. *Dalmålet. Beskrivning och historia*. I-II. Uppsala. Appelberg.
- Levin, I. 1844. *Haandbog i det danske Sprogs Grammatik, nærmest bestemt til Selvstudium. Hæfte 1. Lydlære og Kjønsløre. To Monographier*. Kjøbenhavn. Forlagt af Samfundet til den danske Literaturs Fremme. Bianco Luno.
- Levin, I. 1846. *Nogle Betragtninger over dansk Sprog og dansk Retskrivning*. Kjøbenhavn. I Commission hos F. H. Eibe. Trykt hos E. C. Løser. [Off-print from "Nordisk Literatur-Tidende" 1846, Nr. 43, 45, 48, 49.]
- Lie, Svein. 1976. *Innføring i norsk syntaks*. Oslo / Bergen / Tromsø. Universitetsforlaget.
- Liimola, Matti. 1963. *Zur historischen Formenlehre des Wogulischen. I. Flexion der Nomina*. MSFOu 127.
- Lind, E. H. 1905-1915. *Norsk-isländska dopnamn ock fingerade namn från medeltiden*. Uppsala. A.-B. Lundequistska bokhandeln.
- Lind, E. H. 1920-1921. *Norsk-isländska personbinamn från medeltiden*. Uppsala. Almqvist & Wiksell.
- Lind, E. H. 1931. *Norsk-isländska dopnamn ock fingerade namn från medeltiden*. Supplementband. Oslo. Det Norske videnskaps-akademi i Oslo.
- Lindberg, Bo. 1987. *Humanism och vetenskap. Den klassiska filologien i Sverige från 1800-talets början till andra världskriget*. Stockholm. Lärdomshistoriska samfundet. Almqvist & Wiksell International.
- Lindberg, Ebba. 1976. *Beskrivande svensk grammatik*. Stockholm. AWE / Gebers.
- Lindberg, Jac. Chr. 1822. *Hebraisk Grammatik*. Kjøbenhavn. Wahlske Boghandlings Forlag.
- Lindblad, Gösta. 1919. *Abraham Sahlstedt och den svenska substantivböjningen. Et bidrag til det svenska skriftspråkets historia*. Lund. Gleerup.
- Lindblom, Björn. 1986. Phonetic universals in vowel systems. In: J. Ohala & J. Jaeger, eds. *Experimental Phonology*, 1-44. New York. Academic Press.
- Lindblom, Björn, P. MacNeilage & M. Studdert-Kennedy. 1984. Self-organizing processes and the explanation of phonological universals. In: B. Butterworth, B. Comrie & Ö. Dahl, eds. *Explanations for Language Universals*, 181-203. The Hague. Mouton.
- Lindegaard, Erasmus. 1759. *Dissertatio de grammatices utilitate et necessitate*. Hafniæ. Typis Andræe Hartvigi Godiche.
- Lindelöf, Uno. 1890. *Die Sprache des Rituals von Durham*. Diss. Helsingfors.
- Lindelöf, Uno. 1892. Über die Verbreitung des sogen. *u-(o-)* Umlauts in der starken Verbalflexion des Altenglischen. *Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen und Litteraturen* 89:129-152.
- Lindelöf, Uno. 1895. *Grunddragen af Engelska språkets historiska ljud- och formlära*. Helsingfors. Wentzel Hagelstams förlag.
- Lindelöf, Uno. 1927. *Rituale Ecclesie Dunelmensis. The Durham Collectar*. London. Publications of the Surtees Society 140.
- Lindelöf, Uno & Joh. Öhquist. 1899a. *Kortfattad tysk grammatik*. Helsingfors. Otava.
- Lindelöf, Uno & Joh. Öhquist. 1899b. *Lyhennetty Saksan kielioppi*. Suomeksi sovitti A. R. Helsinki. Otava.
- Lindeman, Fredrik Otto. 1970. *Einführung in die Laryngaltheorie*. Unter Mitwirkung von Carl Hj. Borgström. Sammlung Göschen Band 1247/1247a. Berlin. Walter de Gruyter & Co.
- Lindeman, Fredrik Otto. 1987. *Introduction to the 'Laryngeal Theory'*. IFSK Series B:LXXIV. Oslo. Norwegian University Press.
- Lindeman, Fredrik Otto. 1996. *Studies in Comparative Indo-European Linguistics*. Presented on the Occasion of his Sixtieth Birthday March 3, 1996. Oslo. Novus.
- Lindgren, Kaj B. 1985. Emil Öhmann. Muistopuhe 11.3.1985. *ASF Year Book* 1984-85:131-135.
- Lindqvist, Axel. 1945. *Mannen, kvinnan och språket jämte andre essayer*. Stockholm.
- Lindqvist, Natanael. 1947. *Sydväst-Sverige i språkgeografisk belysning*. Skrifter utgivna genom landsmålsarkivet i Lund 2. Lund. Carl Bloms tryckeri.
- Lindroth, Sten. 1975-1981. *Svensk lärdomshistoria*. Stockholm. Norstedt.
- Lindroth, Hjalmar. 1911-1912. *J. Th. Bureus, den svenska grammatikens fader*. Samlingar utgifna af svenska forskriftsällskapet 42. Lund.
- Lindroth, Hjalmar. 1923. *Våra ortnamn och vad de lära oss*. Stockholm. Natur och Kultur.
- Lindroth, Hjalmar. 1926. *Ölands folkmål. Inledning, källöversikt, vokaler i starkton*. I. Göteborg. Wettergren & Kerber.
- Lindroth, Hjalmar. 1941. *De reflexiva pronomina. Et stycke tillämpad språketeori*. Göteborg. Erlanders.
- Lindroth, Hjalmar. 1945. *Ölands folkmål. Ölandskan på 1600- och 1700-talet*. II. Göteborg. Erlanders.
- Lindstam, Carl Sigfrid. 1946. *Nordisk rättstavning*. Stockholm. Skrifter utgivna av Nämnden för svensk språkvård 9.
- Lindstedt, T. 1926. Om satssammanflätning i svenskan. *Nysvenska Studier* 6:1-20.
- Lindström, Johan Adolf. 1847. *Försök att visa Grammatikalska Formers uppkomst i Finska språken, samt förvandtskap i andra språk*. Åbo. J. W. Liljas Förlag.
- Lindström, Johan Adolf. 1857. Något om lokal-kasus i Finskan. *Suomi* 16:27-31.
- Linell, Per. 1974. *Problems of psychological reality in generative phonology. A critical assessment*. RUUL 4. Uppsala.

University of Uppsala.

- Linell, Per. 1978. *Människans språk*. Lund. Liber.
- Linell, Per. 1979. *Psychological Reality in Phonology*. Cambridge Studies in Linguistics 25. Cambridge. Cambridge University Press.
- Linell, Per. 1982. *The Written Language Bias in Linguistics*. Linköping. University of Linköping. Studies in Communication 2.
- Linkomies, Edwin, see Flinck-Linkomies.
- Linn, Andrew Robert. 1996a. The creation of Norwegian and the creation of its creator. Stylistic features in works by and about Ivar Aasen. In: Henriksen et al. 1996:152-174.
- Linn, Andrew Robert. 1996b. Rasmus Rask and English. In: Vivian Law & Werner Hüllen, eds. *Linguists and their Diversions: a Festschrift for R. H. Robins on his 75th Birthday*, 307-331. Münster. Nodus Publikationen.
- Linn, Andrew Robert. 1997. *Constructing the Grammars of a Language. Ivar Aasen and nineteenth century Norwegian linguistics*. The Henry Sweet Society Studies in the History of Linguistics. Vol. 4. Münster. Nodus Publikationen.
- Lockwood, W. B. 1955. *An Introduction to Modern Faroese*. København. Munksgaard [Also published as Vol IV in the series *Færoensia by Selskabet til Udgivelse af færøske Kildeskrifter og Studier*.]
- Lockwood, W. B. 1956. Literary Language and Dialect in Faroese. *Archivum Linguisticum* 8:129-134.
- Lollesgaard, Johs. 1925. *Sprogfilosofien og Sprogforskningen i Danmark ved det 18. Aarhundredes Midte*. Løvstræde/København. P. Haase & Søns Forlag.
- Loman, Bengt. 1956. Om relationen mellan ordföljd och betydelse hos framförställda attributiva bestämningar till substantiviska huvudord. *ANF* 71:218-248.
- Loman, Bengt. 1958. Om relationen mellan ordföljd och betydelse hos hjälpverb. *ANF* 73:33-50.
- Loman, Bengt. 1986. En Inrättning, ägnad endast till Språkets förbättring. In: Allén et al. 1986:1-141.
- Loman, Bengt. 1993a. Bland negrer och sociolingvister — minnen från Washington. In: Torben Andersen, ed. *Sociolingvistiske temaer. Festschrift til professor Mogens Baumann Larsen*, 79-89. Aalborg. Aalborg Universitetscenter.
- Loman, Bengt. 1993b. En turistresa genom svenska språkhistorien. In: Lars Wollin, ed. *Studier i svensk språkhistoria 3. Förhandlingar vid Tredje sammankomsten för svenska språkets historia. Uppsala 15-17 oktober, 1992*, 13-30. Uppsala. Skrifter utgivna av Institutionen för Nordiska språk vid Uppsala Universitet.
- Loman, Bengt. forthcoming. Finländsk nordistik. Uncompleted manuscript intended to appear in the series *The History of Learning and Science in Finland 1828-1918*, published by SSF. Under completion by Erik Andersson, Ann-Mari Ivars & Peter Slotte.
- Loman, Bengt & Nils Jörgensen. 1971. *Manual för analys och beskrivning av makrosyntagmer*. Lund. Studentlitteratur.
- Lombard, Alf. 1954-1955. *Le verbe roumain. Étude morphologique*. T. 1-2. Skrifter utgivna av Kungl. humanistiska vetenskapssamfundet i Lund 52:1-2. Lund. C. W. K. Gleerup.
- Lotz, János. 1939. *Das ungarische Sprachsystem*. Ungerska institutets vid Stockholms högskola bokserie 3. Stockholm. Ungerska institutet.
- Lotz, John. 1954. Plan and publication of Noreen's Vårt Språk. *Studia Linguistica* 8:82-91.
- LSF = *Lexica Societatis Fenno-Ugricae*. Helsinki.
- Lund, G. F. V. 1862. *Oldnordisk Ordföljningslära*. Udgivet af Det Nordiske Literatursamfund. København. Berlingske Bogtrykkeri ved L. N. Kalckar.
- Lund, G. F. V. 1877. *Ordbog til de gamle danske landskabslove, de sønderjyske stadsretter samt øvrige samtidige sprogindesmærker (fra omtr. 1200 til 1300)*. København. Reitzel.
- Lund, Jens. 1932-1938. *Morsingmålets lyd- og formåere*. Jysk selskab for historie, sprog og litteratur. Aarhus. Universitetsforlaget.
- Lundberg 1867, see Rietz 1867.
- Lundell, J. A. 1879. *Det svenska landsmålsalfabetet. Till lika en öfversikt af språkljudens förekomst inom svenska mål*. Nyare bidrag till kännedom om de svenska landsmålen ock svenskt folklif. I.2. Stockholm. Norstedt.
- Lundell, J. A. 1884. Sur l'étude des patois. *Internationales Zeitschrift für allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft* 1:308-328. Leipzig. Johan Ambrosius Barth.
- Lundell, J. A. 1890. *Études sur la prononciation russe. I^e partie: compte rendu de la littérature. I^e livraison*. Upsala Universitets Årsskrift 1891. Filosofi, Språkvetenskap och historiska vetenskaper. I. Stockholm. Norstedt.
- Lundström, Sven. 1976. *Faculty of Arts at Uppsala University. Linguistics and Philology*. Uppsala University 500 Years Vol. 6. Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis, 47-62. Stockholm. Almqvist & Wiksell.
- Lyngby, K. J. 1853. *Udsagnsordenes bøjning i jyske lov og i den jyske sprogart*. København. F. H. Eibe.
- Lyngby, K. J. 1858. *Bidrag til en sønderjysk sproglære. Sprogartens forhold til de øvrige danske. Dens forgreninger. Sproglære for Braderup (Kjær Herred)*. København. F. E. Eibe.
- Lyngby, K. J. 1861. Den oldnordiske udtale. Oplyst ved den ældste afhandling om retskrivningen i Snorre-Edda. *Tidsskrift for Philologie og Pædagogik* 2:289-321.
- Lyttkens, I. A. & F. A. Wulff. 1885. *Svenska språkets ljudlära och beteckningslära jemte en afhandling om aksent*. Lund. Gleerup.
- Lyttkens, I. A. & F. A. Wulff. 1889. *Svensk uttals-ordbok*. Lund. Gleerup.
- Lyttkens, I. A. & F. A. Wulff. 1916. *Ordsfatt och ljudförråd i svenska språket*. Lund. Gleerup.

- Löfstedt, Einar. 1907. *Beiträge zur Kenntnis der späteren Latinität*. Inaugural-Dissertation. Uppsala Universitets Årsskrift. 1907. Filosofi, språkvetenskap och historiska vetenskaper. Stockholm. O. L. Svanbäck.
- Löfstedt, Einar. 1959. *Late Latin*. IFSK. Serie A:XXV. Oslo. Aschehoug.
- Løkke, Jakob. 1855. *Modersmaalets Formlære i udførlig Fremstilling*. Kristiania. Johan Dahl.
- Løkke, Jakob. 1865a. *Modersmålet Grammatik til Skolebrug*. Kristiania. Cappelen.
- Løkke, Jakob. 1865b. *Kort Omrids af Modersmålet Grammatik*. Christiania. J.W. Cappelen.
- Lökkegaard, Freede. 1992. Semitisk-østerlandsk filologi. In: Jensen & Grane 1992:477-509.
- [Lönnrot, Elias]. Kalevala 1835 = *Kalevala taikka Wanhoja Karjalan Runoja Suomen kansan muinosista ajoista*. 1. & 2. Osa. SKST 2.
- Lönnrot, Elias. 1841-1842. Bidrag til Finska Språkets Grammatik. *Suomi* 1841,4:11-39. 1841,5:29-47, 1842,4:36-44.
- Lönnrot, Elias. 1844. Muukalaisuudesta Suomessa. *Suomi* 4:159-184.
- [Lönnrot, Elias]. 1849. *Kalevala*. [Toinen painos.] SKST 14.
- Lönnrot, Elias. 1854[1856]. Ueber den Enare-lappischen Dialekt. *ASSF* IV:133-279.
- Lönnrot, Elias. 1874(66)-1880. *Suomalais-Ruotsalainen Sanakirja — Finskt-Svenskt Lexikon*. I-II. SKST 50.
- Löytönen, Markku, ed. 1989. *Matka-arkku. Suomalaisia tutkimusmatkailijoita*. SKS.
- Långfors, Arthur. 1907. *Li Regrés Nostre Dame par Huon le Roi de Cambrai*. Diss. Helsingfors.
- Maal og Minne*. Kristiania / Oslo 1909-.
- [Madsen, Jacob]. Jacobus Matthie Arhusiensis. 1586. *De literis libri duo. Quorum Priore Nativa pronuntiatio asseritur: Posteriore Sophistica confutatur*. Basileæ. Conradus Vvaldkirch.
- Madsen, Jacob. 1930-1931. Jacobi Matthie Arhusiensis (Jacob Madsen Aarhus) *De literis libri duo, herausgegeben und erläutert von Christen Møller und Peter Skautrup mit einer dänischen Übersetzung nebst einer Abhandlung über Text und Quellen von Franz Blatt*. I-II. *Acta Jutlandica* II-III. Århus.
- Madvig, Johan Nicolai. 1841a. *Latinsk Sproglære til Skolebrug*. Kjöbenhavn. Gyldendal.
- [Madvig, Johan Nicolai]. 1841b. *Bemærkninger i anledning ad Professor Madvigs latinsk Sproglære af dens Forfatter*. Kjöbenhavn. Gyldendal.
- Madvig, Johan Nicolai. 1842. *Afhandling om Sprogets Væsen og Udvikling*. I. Kjöbenhavn. Gyldendal.
- Madvig, Johan Nicolai. 1846. *Græsk Ordføiningslære, især for den attiske Sprogform*. Kjöbenhavn. Reitzel.
- Madvig, Johan Nicolai. 1875. *Kleine philologische Schriften*. Vom Verfasser deutsch bearbeitet. Leipzig. Teubner.
- [Madvig, Johan Nicolai]. 1955-63. *Johan Nicolai Madvig. Et mindeskrift*. Udgivet af det Kgl. Danske Videnskabernes Selskab og Carlsbergfondet. I-II. Kjöbenhavn. Munksgaard.
- Madvig, Johan Nicolai. 1971. *Sprachtheoretische Abhandlungen*. Im Auftrage der Gesellschaft für dänische Sprache und Litteratur herausgegeben von Karsten Friis Johansen. Kopenhagen, Munksgaard.
- [Magens, Joach. Melch]. 1770. *Grammatica over det Creolske Sprog som bruges paa de trende Danske Eilande, St. Croix, St. Thomas og St. Jans i America. Sammenskrevet og opsat af en paa St. Thomas Indfød Mand*. Kjöbenhavn. Gerhard Giese Salikath.
- Magerøy, Hallvard & Kjell Venås, eds. 1972. *Mål og namn. Studier i nordisk mål- og namnegransking*. Oslo / Bergen / Tromsø. Universitetsforlaget.
- Magnus, Olaus, see Olaus Magnus.
- Magnússon, Ásgeir Blöndal. 1989. *Íslensk orðsifjabók*. Reykjavík. Mál og menning.
- Malm, Anja, Leena Savolainen et al., eds. 1998. *Suomalaisen viittomakielen perussanakirja*. Helsinki. KL-Support Oy.
- Malmberg, Bertil. 1939. Vad är fonologi? *Moderna språk* 33:203-213.
- Malmberg, Bertil. 1954. *La phonétique*. Que sais-je? 637. Paris. Presses universitaires de France.
- Malmberg, Bertil. 1956. Distinctive features of Swedish vowels. Some instrumental and structural data. In: Morris Halle, Horace G. Lunt, Hugh McLean & Cornelis H. van Schooneveld, eds. *For Roman Jakobson. Essays on the occasion of his 60th birthday*, 316-321. The Hague. Mouton.
- Malmberg, Bertil. 1959. *Nya vägar inom språkforskningen*. Stockholm / Göteborg / Lund. Läromedelsförlagen.
- Malmberg, Bertil. 1991. *Histoire de la linguistique de Sumer à Saussure*. Paris. Presses Universitaires de France.
- Malmgren, Sven-Göran. 1991. Gustaf Sjöborgs Schwedische Sprachlehre für Deutsche och den svenska grammatiktraditionen 1750-1815. In: Sven-Göran Malmgren & Bo Ralph, eds. *Studier i svensk språkhistoria* 2. Nordistica Gothoburgensia 14. Acta Universitatis Gothoburgensis, 154-165. Göteborg.
- Malmkvist, Göran. 1995. *Bernhard Karlgren. Ett forskarporträtt*. Stockholm. Norstedt.
- Mark, Julius. 1949. Die finnische Grammatik von Henricus Crugerus. *FUF* 30:55-146.
- [Marsløv, Erik Olsen]. Ericus Olavius Marslovius [ed.] 1678. *Johannis Amosi Comenii Vestibulum ante Auream Lingvarum Januam structum Cum Analysis Etymologica & Cum Versione Danica, Accesserunt Qvædam orthographiæ Danicæ observationes*. [No place]. Apud Christianum Cassubium Privilegiarium Bibliopolam. [The appendix *Nogle Betænkninger og Regle om Skrive-Rictigheden udi ded Danske sprog* also in Bertelsen III 1919:1-10.]
- Marstrander, Carl J. 1915. *Bidrag til det norske sprogs historie i Irland*. DNVA 1915. No. 5. Kristiania. Jacob Dybwad.
- Marstrander, Carl. 1928. Om runene og runenavnens oprindelse. *NTS* I:85-188.
- Martinet, André. 1953. [Review of Togeby 1951.] *Word* 9:78-82.
- Martinet, André. 1937. La phonologie du mot en danois. *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris*. Nr. 113. Paris.
- Martinius, Matthias. 1689. *Hodegus Finnicus, Omnibus hanc linguam discere cupientibus valdè utilis Eller Finsk Wägwijsare*

Allom dem som Finska Tunmählet ex fundamento declinera, conjugera, construera och elliest lära willia ganska nyttig. Cum Analyti Grammaticâ, ut & Tabellâ in fine appositâ, quæ formationi Genitivi singularis inservit. Nunc ad multorum Finnicæ linguæ studiosorum desiderium in lucem productus, & necessariis observationibus, tam ad ipsam lecturam, quam scripturam Finnicam spectantibus Illustratus. Holmiæ. Joh. Georg. Eberdt.

- Martinussen, Bente. 1992. Anders Porsanger — teolog og språkforsker fra 1700-tallets Finnmark. *Nordlyd* 18:15-59.
- Matras, Daniel. 1625. *Compendium Gallicæ et Italicæ grammaticæ In usum Illustris Academiæ Soranæ, quæ in Daniâ est.* Hafniæ. Typis Salomonis Sartorii.
- Matras, Daniel. 1637. *Brevis Grammatica Gallica: oder Eine Kurze Französische Grammatica aus den Allerbesten, die bissher gedruckt worden, zusammen getragen.* Kopenhagen. Joackim Moltken.
- Matras, Daniel. [1663]. *En kort oc enfoldig Frandsøsk Grammatica. Oc nu effter nogles begiering fordansket oc til Trycken befordret av H[ans] S[ø]rrenssøn] B[ackleger].* Kiøbindhaffn. Georg Lamprecht.
- May, Michael. 1992. *Kognitiv semantik og diagrammatisk tænken: fra intuition til formalisering.* Working Papers in Cognitive Science. Framework Programme in Cognitive Science. Danish Research Council for the Humanities.
- Messerschmidt, D. G. 1962-1977. *Forschungsreisen durch Sibirien 1720-1727.* I-V. Eds. E. Winter, N. A. Figurovskij, G. Uschmann, G. Jarosch. Quellen und Studien zur Geschichte Osteuropas. 8:1-5. Berlin. Akademie-Verlag.
- Mey, Jacob L. 1993. *Pragmatics. An introduction.* Oxford. Blackwell.
- Meyer, Ernst A. 1937. *Die Intonation im Schwedischen. I. Die Svea-mundarten.* Studies in Scandinavian Philology 10. University of Stockholm. Stockholm.
- Meyer, Ernst A. 1954. *Die Intonation im Schwedischen. II. Die norrländischen Mundarten.* Studies in Scandinavian Philology 11. University of Stockholm. Stockholm.
- Michelson, Karin. 1988. *A Comparative Study of Lake-Iroquoian Accent.* Studies in Natural Language and Linguistic Theory. Dordrecht / Boston / London. Kluwer.
- Mielikäinen, Aila, ed. 1980. *Nykysuomalaisen puhekielen murros. Jyväskylän osatutkimus.* Raportti 1. Jyväskylän yliopiston suomen kielen laitoksen julkaisuja 20. Jyväskylä.
- Mielikäinen, Aila, ed. 1981a. *Nykysuomalaisen puhekielen murros. Jyväskylän osatutkimus.* Raportti 2. Jyväskylä. Jyväskylän yliopiston suomen kielen laitoksen julkaisuja 24.
- Mielikäinen, Aila, ed. 1981b. *Nykysuomalaisen puhekielen murros. Jyväskylän osatutkimus.* Raportti 3. Jyväskylä. Jyväskylän yliopiston suomen kielen laitoksen julkaisuja 26.
- Mielikäinen, Aila, ed. 1986. *Nykysuomalaisen puhekielen murros. Jyväskylän osatutkimus.* Raportti 4. Jyväskylä. Jyväskylän yliopiston suomen kielen laitoksen julkaisuja 32.
- Mikkelsen, Kr[istian Mathias]. 1894. *Dansk Sproglære med sproghistoriske Tillæg.* Haandbog for lærere og viderekomne. København. Lehmann & Stages Forlag.
- Mikkelsen, Kr[istian Mathias]. 1902. *Om det ny System i den danske Sproglære.* København. Lehmann & Stages Forlag.
- Mikkelsen, Kr[istian Mathias]. 1911. *Dansk ordføjningslære med sproghistoriske tillæg. Haandbog for viderekomne. og lærere.* København. Lehmann & Stages Forlag.
- Mikkola, J[ooseppi]. J[ulius]. 1897. Njeskol'ko zamjetok' po kashubskim' govoram' v severo-vostot _noj Pomeranii. *Izvestija otdelenija russkogo jazyka i slovesnosti Imp. Akad. Nauk, II,* Sankpeterburg, kn. 2:400-428.
- Mikkola, J[ooseppi]. J[ulius]. 1894. *Berührungen zwischen den westfinnischen und slavischen sprachen. I. Slavische lehnwörter in den westfinnischen sprachen.* MSFOu 8.
- Mikkola, J[ooseppi]. J[ulius]. 1899. *Betonung und Quantität in den westslawischen Sprachen I.* Helsinki. Hagelstam.
- Mikkola, J[ooseppi]. J[ulius]. 1913-1950. *Urslavische Grammatik. I (1913) Lautlehre, Vokalismus, Betonung. II (1942) Konsonantismus. III (1950).* Heidelberg. Carl Winter.
- Mikkola, J[ooseppi]. J[ulius]. 1928. Suomen kirjakielen kriisi. *Valvoja-Aika* 6:207-217.
- Moberg, Lennart. 1944. *Om de nordiska nasalassimilationerna mp>pp, nt>tt, nk>kk med särskild hänsyn till svenskan.* Undersökningar till en atlas över svensk folkkultur, språkliga serien, utgiven genom Natan Lindqvist. 1. Uppsala. Almqvist & Wiksells boktryckeri.
- Moberg, Lennart. 1979. Om den nordiska språkvetenskapen i Sverige för hundra år sedan. *Svenska Landsmål* 101-102:53-71.
- Moberg, P. 1815. *Försök till en Lärobok för Nybegynnare i allmänna och svenska Grammatiken. Innefattande tillika nogon Underrättelse för Utländingar, om vårt Språks Uttal och Beskaffenhet.* Stockholm. Marquardska Tryckeriet.
- Molbech, Christian. 1833. *Dansk Ordbog indeholdende det danske Sprogs Stammeord, tilligemed afledede og sammensatte Ord, efter den nuværende Sprogbrug forklarede i deres forskiellige Betydninger, og med Talemaader og Exempler oplyste.* I-II. Kiøbenhavn. Gyldendal.
- Molbech, Christian. 1840. *Bidrag til en Historie og Sprogschildring af de danske Bibeloversættelser fra det XIVde, XVde og XVIde Aarhundrede.* Kiøbenhavn. Schultz.
- Molbech, Christian. 1841. *Dansk Dialect-Lexicon, indeholdende Ord, Udtryk og Talemaader af den danske Almues Tungemaal i Rigets forskiellige Landskaber og Egne, forsaavidt som de ere fremmede for Skriftsproget og almindelig Sprogbrug.* Kiøbenhavn. Gyldendal.
- Molbech, Christian. 1857-1866. *Dansk Glossarium eller Ordbog over foreldede danske Ord af Diplomer, Haandskrifter og trykte Bøger fra det 13de til det 16de Aarhundrede.* I-II. Kiøbenhavn. I Thiele, II Gyldendal.
- Molbech, Christian. 1859. *Dansk Ordbog, indeholdende det danske Sprogs Stameord, tilligemed afledede og sammensatte*

- Ord, efter den nuværende Sprogbrug forklarede i deres forskellige Betydninger, og ved Talemaader og Exempler oplyste.* I-II. 2., forøgede og forrbedrede utg. København. Gyldendal.
- Morgenstjerne, Georg. 1926. *Report on a Linguistic Mission to Afghanistan.* IFSK Serie C I - 2. Oslo. Aschehoug.
- Morgenstjerne, Georg. 1927. *An Etymological Vocabulary of Pashto.* DNVA 1927,3. Oslo. Jacob Dybwad.
- Morgenstjerne, Georg. 1929-1967. *Indo-Iranian Frontier Languages.* I-III. IFSK. Serie B XI, XXXV, XL. Oslo. Aschehoug.
- Morgenstjerne, Georg. 1973. *Indo-Iranian Frontier Languages.* Second edition. I-IV. IFSK. Serie B LVIII. Oslo. Universitetsforlaget.
- Mosel, Ulrike & Even Hovdhaugen. 1992. *Samoan Reference Grammar.* Oslo. Scandinavian University Press.
- MSFOu = *Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne.* Helsinki.
- MSNH = *Mémoires de la Société Néophilologique de Helsinki.* Helsinki.
- Muhle, Henricus. 1692. *De origine linguarum variarum, Stirpeque ac Matre Græcæ. Latinæ & Germanicæ. Hebræâ dissertatio.* Kiloni. Sumptibus Joh. Seb. Richelii.
- Munch, P[eter]. A[ndreas]. 1848a. *Det gotiske Sprogs Formlære med korte Læsestykker og Ordregister.* Christiania. Feilberg & Landmarks Forlag.
- Munch, P[eter]. A[ndreas]. 1848b. *Sammenlignende Fremstilling af det danske, svenske og tyske Sprogs Formlære.* Christiania. Feilberg & Landmarks Forlag.
- Munch, P[eter]. A[ndreas]. 1848c. *Kortfattet Fremstilling af den ældste Nordiske Runeskrift og den i de ældste Rune-Indskrifter herskende Sprogform.* Christiania. Feilberg & Landmark.
- Munch, P[eter]. A[ndreas]. 1848d. [Review of Aasen 1848.] *NTVL* 2:282-298.
- Munch, P[eter]. A[ndreas]. 1850. Anmeldelse af Ivar Aasens og C. A. Holmboes Sprogarbeider. *NTVL* 4:335-380.
- Munch, P[eter]. A[ndreas]. & C[arl]. R[ichard]. Unger. 1847. *Det oldnorske Sprogs eller Norrøn sprogets Grammatik.* Christiania. Johan Dahl.
- Munthe, C. F. 1744. *Det Græskiske Sprogs Grammatica til Skolernes Brug i Danmark og Norge efter Kongelig Majestæts Allernaadigste Befaling.* Kjøbenhavn. Udi det Kongl. Væysen-Huses Bogtrykkerie og på dets forlag.
- Murtorinne, Eino. 1989. Suomalaiset lähetystyöntekijät Afrikan kartoittajina 1800-luvulla. In: Löytönen 1989:403-412.
- Mustanoja, Tauno F. 1960. *A Middle English Syntax. Part I: Parts of Speech.* MSNH 23.
- Musæus, Johannes. 1843. *Det danske Sprogs Grammatik.* Kristiania, P. J. Hoppes Forlag.
- Myhren, Magne, ed. 1976. *Amund B. Larsen. Skrifter.* Oslo. Universitetsforlaget.
- Münster, Sebastianus. 1544. *Cosmographia. Beschreibung aller Lender.* Basel. Apud Henrichus Petri. [First edition 1541.]
- Mæhlum, Brit. 1990a. *Dialektal sosialisering. En studie av barn og ungdoms språklige strategier i Longyearbyen på Svalbard.* Tromsø. Institutt for språk og litteratur, Universitetet i Tromsø.
- Mæhlum, Brit. 1990b. Codeswitching in Hemnesberget — Myth or Reality. *Tromsø Linguistics in the Eighties.* Tromsø Studies in Linguistics 11:338-355. Oslo. Novus.
- Mæhlum, Brit. 1992. *Dialektal sosialisering. En studie av barn og ungdoms språklige strategier i Longyearbyen på Svalbard.* Tromsøstudier i språkvitenskap 12. Oslo. Novus.
- Mæhlum, Brit. 1996. Norsk og nordisk sosiolingvistik — en historisk oversikt. In: Henriksen et al. 1996:175-224.
- Määttä, Urho. 1994. *Funktionaalinen selittäminen morfologiassa. Metateoriaa ja huomioita suomen ja sen sukukielten tutkimusperinteestä.* Opera fennistica & linguistica 7. Tampere. Tampereen yliopiston suomen kielen ja yleisen kielitieteen laitos.
- Määttä, Urho. 1998. Suomalaisesta kenttämorfologiasta. In: Määttä & Laalo 1998:1-24.
- Määttä, Urho & Klaus Laalo, eds. 1998. *Kirjoituksia muoto- ja merkitysopista.* Folia Fennistica & Linguistica 21. Tampere. Tampereen yliopiston suomen kielen ja yleisen kielitieteen laitos.
- Möller, Hermann. 1875. *Die Palatalreihe der Indogermanischen Grundsprache im Germanischen.* Leipzig. Rossberg Buchdruckerei.
- Möller, Hermann. 1906. *Semitisch und indogermanisch. Erster Teil. Konsonanten.* Kopenhagen. H. Hagerup.
- Möller, Herm. 1909. *Indoeuropæisk-semitisk sammenlignende Glossarium.* Kjøbenhavn. Schultz.
- Möller, Hermann. 1911. *Vergleichendes indogermanisch-semitisches Wörterbuch.* Göttingen. Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Møller, Kristen. 1945. *Nordiske artikelproblemer.* Udvalg for Folkemaals publikationer. Serie A; 7. Universitets-Jubilæets danske Samfunds Skriftserie; 343. København. Schultz.
- [Nannestad, Nicolai Engelhardt]. 1761. *En Dansk Donat for Børn, indeholdende de første og almindeligste Sprog-Grunde; viiste i det Danske, og tienende som en Forberedelse til at lære fremmede Sprog.* Kiøbenhavn. Joh. Christ. og Georg Christoph Berling.
- NAVF = Norges almenvitenskapelige forskningsråd. Oslo.
- Neikter, Jac. Fr. 1791. *Dissertatio de eruenda cognatione gentium ex cognatione linguarum.* Upsaliæ. Johann Edman.
- Neikter, Jac. Fr. 1800-1803. *Dissertatio de cognatione gentium ex lingvis eruenda.* I-VI [Part 7 by Pet. Svedelius]. Upsaliæ. Joh. Fred. Engman.
- Nesheim, Asbjørn. 1942. *Der lappische Dualis, mit Berücksichtigung finnisch-ugrischer und indo-europäischer Verhältnisse.* DNVA 1941:5.
- Nettelbladh, Casper. 1728. *Swedische Bibliotec.* Erste Stück. Stockholm. Joh. Henr. Russwurm.
- Neuman, Erik. 1973. Inledning till utgåvan av Latinskt-svenskt Glossarium efter Cod. Ups. C 20. utg. av Börje Tjäder. Uppsala. *Samlingar utgivna av Svenska Fornskriftssällskapet* 45:6.

- Nicander, Anders. 1737. *Oförgräpelige Anmärkingar öfver Svenska Skaldekonsten, jämte Förslag och Bevis, At den samma kan äfven bindas til de Reglor. Som det Latinska har til Rätte-snöre; Til deras Öfvertygande, som härtils påstått Wederspelet, i synnerhet Ut i Heroiske Verser.* Stockholm. Joann Laur. Horrn.
- Nickel, Klaus Peter. 1990. *Samisk grammatikk.* Oslo. Universitetsforlaget.
- Nielsen, Gunhild. 1959. *Musikalsk accent i Rømmålet.* Udvalg for Folkemaals publikationer, Serie A; 17. (Universitets-Jubilæets danske Samfunds Skriftserie; 389. København. Schultz.
- Nielsen, Karl Martin. 1960. Til runedanskens ortografi. *ANF* 75:1-78.
- Nielsen, Konrad. 1926-29. *Lærebok i lappisk utarbeidet på grunnlag av dialektene i Polmak, Karasjok og Kautokeino.* 1-3. Oslo. Brøgger.
- Nielsen, Konrad. 1945[1942]. Druck und Tonbewegung im Reichstürkischen. *NTS* XIII:5-58.
- Nielsen, Konrad & Asbjørn Nesheim. 1932-1962. *Lappisk ordbok. Lapp dictionary.* Vol. 1-5. Oslo. Aschehoug.
- Nielsen, Niels Åge. 1956. Ørentvistens jyske navne. In: Svend Aakjær, Kr[istian] Hald, Aage Hansen & Niels Åge Nielsen, eds. *Festskrift til Peter Skautrup 21. januar 1956*, 335-349. Aarhus. Universitetsforlaget.
- Niemi, Jussi, Matti Laine & Juhani Tuominen. 1994. Cognitive Morphology in Finnish: Foundations of a New Model. *Language and Cognitive Processes* 9:423-446
- Nikkilä, Osmo. 1985. *Apokope und altes Schriftfinnisch. Zur Geschichte der i-Apokope des Finnischen.* Proefschrift, Rijksuniversitet te Groningen. Groningen. Drukkerij van Denderen B. V.
- Nissen, N[iels]. Lang. 1801. *A. J. Sylvestre de Sacys Grundtræk af Almindelig Grammatik, indrettede efter Børns Fatteevne, til Indledning for Underviisningen i alle Sprog. Paa Dansk udgivet, og med Grundtræk af dansk Grammatik forøget.* Kjøbenhavn. Arnzen og Hartiers Forlag.
- Nissen, N[iels]. Lang. 1808. *A. J. Sylvestre de Sacys Grundtræk af Almindelig Grammatik, indrettede efter Børns Fatteevne, til Indledning for Underviisningen i alle Sprog. Paa Dansk udgivet, og med Grundtræk af dansk Grammatik forøget.* Kjøbenhavn. Arnzen og Hartiers Forlag. [2nd ed.].
- Nissen, N[iels]. Lang. 1816. *A. J. Sylvestre de Sacys Grundtræk af Almindelig Grammatik, indrettede efter Børns Fatteevne, til Indledning for Underviisningen i alle Sprog. Paa Dansk udgivet, og med Grundtræk af dansk Grammatik forøget.* Kjøbenhavn. Arnzen og Hartiers Forlag. [3rd ed.].
- Nissen, Ole Hartvig. 1843. Om den sammenlignende Sprogvidenskab. *NOR* 2:156-212.
- Nissilä, Viljo. 1962. *Suomalaista nimistöntutkimusta.* SKST 272.
- NM = *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen.* Helsinki.
- Noordegraaf, Jan, Kees Verstegh & Konrad Koerner. 1992. *The History of Linguistics in the Low Countries.* Amsterdam Studies in the Theory and History of Linguistic Science. Series III - Studies in the History of the Language Sciences, Vol. 64. Amsterdam / Philadelphia. John Benjamins.
- NOR = *Tidsskrift for Videnskab og Literatur.* Christiania.
- .Norberg, Matthias. 1804. *De origine Linguae Gothicae.* Londini Gothorum. Litteris Berlingianis. [= Norberg 1818:288-305].
- Norberg, Matthias. 1808. *De origine Linguae Graecae* Londini Gothorum. Litteris Berlingianis. [= Norberg 1818:354-364]
- [Norberg, Matthias]. 1818. *Matthiae Norbegi Selecta opuscula Academica.* Ed. Johannes Norman. Vol. II. Londini Gothorum. Litteris Berlingianis.
- Nordström, Johan, ed. 1924. *Georg Stiernhielm. Filosofiska fragment. Med inledning och kommentar.* I-II. Stockholm. Bonnier.
- Noreen, Adolf Gotthard. 1877. *Fryksdalsmålets ljudlära.* Akademisk Afhandling. Upsala. Esaias Edquists boktryckeri.
- Noreen, Adolf. 1879a. *Dalbymålets ljud- och böjningslära.* Nyare bidrag till kännedom om de svenska landsmålen ock svenskt folkli. I.3. Stockholm. Norstedt.
- Noreen, Adolf. 1879b. *Färömålets ljudlära. med ledning af C. Säves ock P. A. Säves ordsamlingar.* Nyare bidrag till kännedom om de svenska landsmålen ock svenskt folkli. I.8. Stockholm. Norstedt.
- Noreen, Adolf. 1884. *Altnordische Grammatik. 1. Altisländische und altnorwegische Grammatik.* Sammlung kurzer Grammatiken germanischer Dialekte. IV. Halle. Wilhelm Braune.
- Noreen, Adolf. 1889. *Geschichte der Nordischen Sprachen, besonders in altnordischer Zeit.* Grundriss der germanischen Philologie 4. Strassburg. Trübner.
- Noreen, Adolf. 1897-1904. *Altnordische Grammatik. 2: Altschwedische Grammatik.* Sammlung kurzer Grammatiken germanischer Dialekte. A, Hauptreihe; 8. Halle. Niemeyer.
- Noreen, Adolf. 1903-1923. *Vårt Språk.* Vol. 1-7. Lund. Gleerup.
- Noreen, Adolf. 1913. *Geschichte der nordischen Sprachen besonders in altnordischer Zeit.* 3. Auflage. Strassburg. Grundriss der germanischen Philologie 4.
- Noreen, Adolf. 1923. *Einführung in die wissenschaftliche Betrachtung der Sprache. Beiträge zur Methode und Terminologie der Grammatik.* Vom Verfasser genehmigte und durchgesehene Übersetzung ausgewählter Teile seines schwedischen werke "Vårt Språk". Halle (Saale). Max Niemeyer.
- Norsk Ordbok.* 1966-. *Ordbok over det norske folkemålet og det nynorske skriftmålet.* Oslo. Det norske samlaget.
- Norsk språk i dagens samfunn.* 1979. Innstilling. NAVF. Oslo.
- Nowak, Elke. 1987. *Samuel Kleinschmidts 'Grammatik der Grönländischen Sprache'.* Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft Band 4. Hildesheim. Georg Olms Verlag.
- Nowak, Elke. 1990. Zum Verhältnis von Sprachtheorie und Geschichte der Wissenschaft. Überlegungen anhand Samuel

- Kleinschmidts *Grammatik der grönländischen Sprache*. In: Hans-Josef Niederehe & Konrad Korner, eds. *History and Historiography of Linguistics. Papers from the fourth International Conference on the History of Language Sciences (ICHoLS) Trier, 24-28 August 1987*, 759-771. Amsterdam / Philadelphia. John Benjamins.
- Nowak, Elke. 1992. How to "Improve" a Language: The Case of Eighteenth Century Descriptions of Greenlandic. In: Anders Ahlqvist, ed. *Diversions of Galway. Papers on the History of Linguistics from ICHoLS V, Galway, Ireland, 1-6 September 1990*, 759-771. Amsterdam / Philadelphia. John Benjamins.
- NTS = *Norsk Tidsskrift for Sprogvidenskap*. Oslo.
- NTVL = *Norsk Tidsskrift for Videnskap og Litteratur*. Christiania.
- Nudansk Ordbog*. 1953. København. Politikens Forlag.
- Numminen, Jaakkko. 1987. *Yliopistokysymys*. Keuruu. Otava
- Nuorteva, Jussi. 1997. *Suomalaisten ulkomainen opinkäynti ennen Turun Akatemian perustamista*. Suomen Kirkkohistoriallisen Seuran toimituksia 177. Bibliotheca Historica 27. Helsinki.
- Nuutinen, Olli. 1995. *Komentaja kahteen elämään*. Helsinki. Otava.
- Nyberg, H[ans]. S[amuel]. 1928-1931. *Hilfsbuch des Pehlevi*. I-II. Uppsala. Almqvist & Wiksell.
- Nyberg, Hans Samuel. 1964-1974. *A Manual of Pahlavi I-II*. Wiesbaden. Otto Harrassowitz.
- Nyberg, H[ans]. S[amuel]. ed. 1943. *Orientering i språkvetsenskap*. Stockholm. Natur och kultur.
- Nygård, Sigurd. 1897. Danske personnavne og stednavne. En sproglig-historisk undersøgelse. *Historisk Tidsskrift* 7:82-109. København. Bianco Lunos Trykkeri.
- Nygaard, M[arius]. 1905. *Norrøn Syntax*. Kristiania. Aschehoug.
- Nyhuus, Haakon, ed. 1907-1913. *Illustreret norsk konversationsleksikon. I-VI*. Kristiania. Aschehoug.
- Nykysuomen sanakirja*. 1951-1961. I-VI. Porvoo - Helsinki. WSOY.
- Nyman, Martti 1977. Where does Latin *sum* come from? *Language* 53:39-60.
- Nyman, Martti, 1982. *Relational and Reconstructive Aspects of Grammatical Systematization*. University of Helsinki, Department of General Linguistics. Publications No. 8. Helsinki.
- Nyrop, Kristoffer. 1882. *Sprogets vilde skud. Populære strøbemærkninger om misforståede ord i daglig tale*. København. Reitzel.
- Nyrop, Kristoffer. 1886. *Adjektivernes kønsbøjning i de romanske sprog. Med en indledning om lydlov og analogi*. København. Reitzel.
- Nyrop, Kristoffer. 1891. *Nej. Et motivs historie*. København. Reitzel.
- Nyrop, Kristoffer. 1897. *Kysset og dets historie*. København. Nordisk Forlag.
- Nyrop, Kr[istoffer]. 1899-1930. *Grammaire historique de la langue française. I-VI*. Copenhagen / Leipzig / Paris. Nordisk forlag (Gyldendal) / Otto Harrassowitz / Alphonse Picard & Fils. [I. 1899. *Histoire générale de la langue française. Phonétique historique*. II. 1903. *Morphologie*. III. 1908. *Formation des mots*. IV. 1913. *Sémantique*. V. 1925. *Syntaxe. Noms et pronoms*. VI 1930. *Syntaxe. Particules et verbes*.]
- Nyrop, Kristoffer. 1901-34. *Ordenes liv. I-VI*. København. Gyldendal.
- NyS = *Nydanske studier & almen kommunikationsteori*. København.
- Nysted, Hans Olufsen. 1727. *Rhetorica Laica et Pagana, det er Læg-Mands Tale-Kunst og Bondens Vel-talenhed, Forfatted af en, som elsker vort Fæderne-Sprogs Held Og Nethed*. Kiöbenhafn. Willads Jersin. [In Bertelsen III. 1919:320-61.]
- Næs, Olav. 1952. *Norsk grammatikk I. Ordlære. Bokmål og nynorsk på bakgrunn av språkhistorie og dialekter*. Oslo. Fabritius.
- Næs, Olav. 1965. *Norsk grammatikk. Elementære strukturer og syntaks*. Oslo. Fabritius. [2nd revised edition of Næs 1952.]
- Ófeigsson, Jón. 1920-1924. Træk af moderne islandsk Lydlære. In: Blöndal 1920-1924:xiv-xxvii.
- Oftedahl, L[ars]. 1820. *Almindelig Grammatik eller Indledning til Underviisning i alle Sprog, fremsat efter en ny methode. Et Forsøg*. Christiansand. Trykt hos O. P. Moe af J. Johansen.
- Oftedahl, L[ars]. 1823. *Latinsk Grammatik*. Christiansand. Trykt hos O. O. Moe af S. A. Steen.
- Oftedal, Magne. 1956. *The Gaelic of Leurbost Isle of Lewis*. A Linguistic Survey of the Gaelic Dialects of Scotland. Vol. III. NTS. Suppl. bind IV. Oslo. Aschehoug.
- Ohlsson, Stig Örjan. 1991. *Urban Hjärnes Oförgräpelige Tanckar*. Lund. Ambla förlag.
- Ohlsson, Stig Örjan. 1992. *Språkforskaren Urban Hiärne*. Lund. Ambla förlag.
- Ohlsson, Stig Örjan. 1996. Hiärne och Amman. Et bidrag till fonetikens äldsta historia i Norden. In: Henriksen et al. 1996:225-236.
- Ojansuu, Heikki. 1901. *Suomen lounaismurteiden äännehistoria. 1. Vokaalioppi*. Suomi III:19. SKS.
- Ojansuu, Heikki. 1903. *Suomen lounaismurteiden äännehistoria. 2. Konsonantit*. Suomi IV:2. SKS.
- Ojansuu, Heikki. 1908. Beiträge zur Geschichte des auslautenden -k und -h im Finnischen. *FUF* 8:60-66.
- [Ólafsson, Mágnus]. Magnus Olavius. 1650. *Specimen Lexici Runici, obscuriorum quarundam vocum, quæ in priscis occurrunt Historiis & Poetis Danicis, enodationem exhibens*. Nunc in ordinem redactum Auctum & Locupletatum ab Olao Wormio. Hafniæ. Melchior Martzan.
- Olaus Magnus 1555. *Historia de gentibus septentrionalibus*. Romæ. [Swedish translation 1909-1951: *Historia om de nordiska folken* 1-5. by J. Granlund. Uppsala - Stockholm. Finnish selective translation by K. Hirvonen 1973: *Pohjoisten kansojen historia*. Suomea koskevat kuvaukset. Helsinki. - Faksimile 1976. Ed. J. Granlund. Stockholm.]
- Ólsen, Björn Magnússon, ed. 1884. *Den tredje og fjærde grammatiske afhandling i Snorres Edda tilligemed de grammatiske*

- afhandlingers prolog og to andre tillæg*. Samfund til udgivelse af gammel nordisk litteratur. XII. København.
- Olsen, Karen Marie. 1949. Synchronisk Beskrivelse af Aabenraa Bymaal. *Danske Folkemaal* 16:1-67.
- Olsen, Magnus. 1911. Filologien. *Det kongelige Fredriks Universitet 1811-1911: Festskrift II*:290-380. Kristiania. Aschehoug.
- Onikki, Tiina 1996. Kahden suunnan taitteessa. *Vir.* 100:259-267.
- Oppermann, Ludvig 1844. *Indledning til den danske Sproglære*. København. Reitzel.
- Ordbog over det danske sprog*. 1918-1956. Vol. 1-28. København. Det danske sprog- og litteraturselskab.
- Otto, Alfred. 1955. *Johannis Daci opera*. Corpus philosophorum Danicorum medii aevi. Concilio et auspiciis societatis linguae & litterarum Danicarum. Ediderunt Alfredus Otto & Henricus Roos. I. Hauniae. Gad.
- Otto, Alfred. 1963. *Simonis Daci opera*. Corpus philosophorum Danicorum medii aevi. Concilio et auspiciis societatis linguae & litterarum Danicarum. Ediderunt Alfredus Otto & Henricus Roos. III. Hauniae. Gad.
- Ottósson, Kjartan G. 1990. *Íslensk málhreinsun. Sögulegt yfirlit*. Rit Íslenskrar málnefndar 6. Reykjavík. Íslenskrar málnefndar.
- Ottósson, Kjartan G. 1992. *The Icelandic Middle Voice: The Morphological and Phonological Development*. Lund. University of Lund.
- Paasonen, H[eikki]. 1891. *Proben der mordwinischen volkslitteratur*. Erster band. Erzjanischer theil. JSFOu. IX.
- Paasonen, Heikki. 1893. *Mordwinische Lautlehre*. Helsinki.
- Paasonen, H[eikki]. 1897. *Die türkischen lehnwörter im mordwinischen*. JSFOu XV.
- Paasonen, Heikki. 1902. Über die türkischen Lehnwörter im Ostjakischen. *FUF* 2:81-137
- Paasonen, Heikki. 1907. Zur Frage von der Unverwandtschaft der finnisch-ugrischen und indoeuropäischen Sprachen. *FUF* 7:13-31.
- Paasonen, Heikki. 1917. *Beiträge zur finnischugrisch-samojedischen Lautgeschichte*. Sonderabdruck aus den 13-17. Bänden der Zeitschrift Keleti Szemle (Revue Orientale). Budapest.
- Palander, Gabriele. 1819. *Dissertatio academica formarum etymologicarum in linguis Fennica et Estonica parallelismum illustratura*. Aboæ. Frenckell.
- Palmblad, W. P. 1819. Om Hinduernes Fornhäfder. *Svea* 2:1-168.
- Parpola, Asko. 1994. *Deciphering the Indus script*. Cambridge. Cambridge University Press.
- Parpola, Asko, Seppo Koskeniemi, Simo Parpola & Pentti Aalto. 1969. *Decipherment of the proto-Dravidian inscriptions of the Indus Civilization: a first announcement*. Special publications. 1. Copenhagen. The Scandinavian Institute of Asian Studies.
- Paulinus, Simon. 1692. *Grammatica hebræa: In qua Pars potior Hebraismi restituti, Nervose & dilucide traditur, Addita quoque sunt Capp. IV. Genes. Hebraica, cum Versione Latina*. Aboæ. Johan Winter.
- Paunonen, Heikki. 1973. On Free Variation. *JSFOu* 72:285-300.
- Paunonen, Heikki. 1976a. Kotikielen Seura 1876-1976. *Vir.* 80:310-428.
- Paunonen, Heikki. 1976b. Allomorfiien dynamiikkaa. *Vir.* 80:82-107.
- Paunonen, Heikki. 1976c. Kotikielen Seura 1876-1976. *Vir.* 80:310-428.
- Paunonen, Heikki. 1982. Muuttuvat puhe-suomen muodot. In: M. Larmola, ed. *Kouluikäisten kieli*, 130-152. Tietolipas 88. Pieksämäki. SKS.
- Paunonen, Heikki. 1994. Kielen normit ja kielen ohjailun normit. *Tiede ja edistys* 1:17-28.
- Paunonen, Heikki. 1995 [1982]. *Suomen kieli Helsingissä. Huomioita Helsingin puhekielen historiallisesta taustasta ja nykyvariaatiosta*. Helsinki. Helsingin yliopiston suomen kielen laitos.
- [Pedersen, Christiern]. 1510. *Vocabularium ad usum dacorum ordine litterario cum eorum vulgari interpretatione*. Paris. [No printer.] Facsimile edition 1973 by Inger Bom & Niels Haastrup. København. Akademisk Forlag.
- Pedersen, Holger. 1895. Das indogermanische s im Slavischen. *Indogermanische Forschungen*. 5:33-87.
- Pedersen, Holger. 1899. *Sprogvidenskab*. Flensborg. Møller & Rasmussen, C. K. Thillerup Efterf. [printed separately in *Sønderjydske Aarbøger* 1899. 114-79.]
- Pedersen, Holger. 1903. Türkische Lautgesetze. (In Gestalt einer Besprechung von Vilh. Grønbech, *Forstudier til tyrkisk lydhistorie*. København 1902 [Lehmann & Stage].) *ZDMG* 57:535-561.
- Pedersen, Holger. 1909-1913. *Vergleichende Grammatik der keltischen Sprachen. Erster Band. Einleitung und Lautlehre. Zweiter Band, Bedeutungslehre (Wortlehre)*. Göttinger Sammlung indogermanischer Grammatiken. Göttingen. Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Pedersen, Holger. 1916a. *Et blik på sprogvidenskabens historie. Med særligt hensyn til det historiske studium av sprogets lyd*. *Festskrift udgivet i Anledning af Københavns Universitet i Anledning af Universitetets Aarsfest 1916*. 7-77. Festskrift udgivet af Københavns Universitet i Anledning af Universitetets Aarsfest November 1916. København. Schultz. [Also printed separately. København. Gad.]
- Pedersen, Holger. 1916b. *Russisk grammatik*. København. Gad.
- Pedersen, Holger. 1924. *Sprogvidenskab i det nittende aarhundrede: metoder og resultater*. Det nittende aarhundrede skildret af nordiske videnskabsmænd. XV. København. Gyldendal.
- Pedersen, Holger. 1931. *Linguistic Science in the Nineteenth Century*. Translated from the Danish, with revisions (authorized by the author) and indices, by John Webster Spargo. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press. [Re-edition 1962 and later, Bloomington, Indiana University Press, with the title *The Discovery of Language: Linguistic science in the 19th century*.]
- Pedersen, Holger. 1938. *Hittitisch und die anderen indoeuropäischen Sprachen*. Hist. Filos. Medd. Dan. Vid. Selsk. 25:2.

- København. Levin & Munksgaard.
- Pedersen, Holger. 1941. *Tocharisch vom Gesichtspunkt der indoeuropäischen Sprachvergleichung*. Hist. Filos. Medd. Dan. Vid. Selsk. 28:1 København. Munksgaard.
- Pedersen, Holger. 1983. *A Glance at the History of Linguistics. With particular regard to the historical study of phonology*. Translated from the Danish by Caroline C. Henriksen. Edited with an Introduction by Konrad Koerner. Amsterdam Studies in the Theory and History of Linguistic Science. Series III - Studies in the History of Linguistics. Vol. 7. Amsterdam / Philadelphia. John Benjamins.
- Pedersen, Inge Lise. 1996. Dialektforskningen i Danmark med særligt henblik på forholdet til strukturalisme og sociolingvistik. In: Henriksen et al. 1996:237-273.
- Peterson, Lena. 1995. Runologi. Forsök till ett aktuellt signalement. In: L. Elmevik, ed. *Saga och Sed. Kungl. Gustav Adolfs Akademiens Årsbok 1995*, 39-54. Uppsala.
- Pekkanen, Tuomo. 1975. Latinan kielen vaiheita Suomessa. *Historiallinen aikakauskirja* 73,4:285-295. Helsinki.
- Pekkanen, Tuomo. 1997. Latinan opetus Suomessa. *Tieteessä tapahtuu* 3:27-28.
- Penttilä, Aarni. 1926. *Suomen ja sen lähimpien sukukielten painotusoppia: kielipsykologinen tutkimus*. Turun Suomalaisen Yliopiston julkaisuja B III:2. Turku.
- Penttilä, Aarni. 1932. Grafeema- ja foneemasuomen suhteesta. *Vir.* 36:16-26.
- Penttilä, Aarni. 1957. *Suomen kielioppi*. Helsinki / Porvoo. WSOY.
- Persson, Per. 1912. *Beiträge zur indogermanischen Wortforschung. I. Worterklärungen. II. Zur Frage nach den sogenannten Wurzel-determinativen*. Skrifter utgifna af Kungl. Humanistiska vetenskaps-samfundet i Uppsala Band 10:1-2. Uppsala / Leipzig. A.-B. Akademiska bokhandelen / Otto Harrassowitz.
- Perusvoimavaraselvitys 1988 = *Perusvoimavaraselvitys*. Osa II. Korkeakouluneuvoston jaostojen esitykset perusvoimavarojen kehittämiseksi. Opetusministeriö. Korkeakouluneuvoston julkaisuja 4/1988.
- Perälä, Tauno. 1970. *Turun yliopisto 1920-1939*. Turun yliopisto. Turku. Kirjapaino Polytypos.
- Petersen, Carl S. 1908. *Brevvexling mellem N. M. Petersen og Carl Säve. Et Bidrag til Skandinavismens og den nordiske Filologis historie*. København. Det Schubothske Forlag.
- Petersen, Carl S. 1908-1909. Lavrids Kocks danske grammatik. *Nordisk Tidsskrift for filologi*. 3. R. Bd. 17. København. Gyldendal.
- Petersen, N[iels Matthias]. 1826. *Dansk orddannelseslære*. Odense. Trykt hos S. Hempel.
- Petersen, N[iels]. M[atthias]. 1829-1830. *Det danske, norske og svenska Sprogs Historie under deres Udvikling af Stamsproget*. Et af Samfundet til den danske Literaturs Fremme kronet Prisskrift. 1-2. Kjøbenhavn. Gyldendal.
- Petersen, N[iels]. M[atthias]. 1834. *Bidrag til Rasmus Kristian Rasks Levned*. [Rasmus Rask] samlede tildeels forhen utrykte Afhandlinger, udg. af H. K. Rask. 1ste Deel. København. Det Poppske Bogtrykkeri.
- Petersen, N[iels]. M[atthias]. 1837. *Kortfattet Dansk Retskrivningslære*. København. Selskabet for en forbedret Retskrivnings Udbredelse.
- Petersen, N[iels]. M[atthias]. 1852. *Nogle Bemærkninger om Modersmaalet*. Indbydelsesskrift til Kjøbenhavns Universitets Fest i Anledning af Hans Majestæt Kongens Fødselsdag den 6te Oktober 1852. Kjøbenhavn. Schultz.
- Petersen, N[iels]. M[atthias]. 1854. *De danske gerningsords teori*. København. Trykt hos S. L. Møller.
- Petersen, N[iels]. M[atthias]. 1861. *Nogle uddrag af forelæsninger, vedkommende de nordiske sprog*. Indbydelsesskrift til Kjøbenhavns Universitets Fest i Anledning af Hans Majestæt Kongens Fødselsdag den 6. October 1861. Kjøbenhavn. Schultz.
- Petræus, M. Nicolaus. 1627. *Compendium Grammaticæ Ebrææ. facili & plane methodô concinnatum, publice dictatum, & evulgatum*. Hafniæ. Impensis Salomonis Sartorii.
- Petræus, Æschillus. 1649. *Linguae Finnicæ brevis institutio, Exhibens vocum flexiones per Casus, Gradus & Tempora, nec non partium indeclinabilium significationem, dictionumque constructionem & Prosodiam ad Usum accommodata*. Aboæ. Petrus Wald.
- Pettersson, Gertrud. 1992. *Lagspråk och samhällsutveckling. Studier över svenskt lagspråk efter 1734*. Lundastudier i nordisk språkvetenskap A 46. Lund. Lund University Press.
- Pétursson, Magnús. 1974. *Les articulations de l'islandais à la lumière de la radiocinématographie*. Paris. Klincksieck.
- Pétursson, Sigurður. 1996. Studiet af latinsk grammatik i Island. In: Henriksen et al. 1996:274-296.
- Pfeif, Johannes Jacobus. 1713. *De Habitu & Instauratione Sermonis Svecani*. Holmiæ. Georg. Matthiæ.
- Phillipson, Robert et al. 1991. *Foreign / Second Language Pedagogy Research. A Commemorative Volume for Claus Færch*. Clevedon. Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- Pihl, Olaus Stockflet. 1748. *Dissertatio de vita et morte lingvarum*. Havnæ. E. Tupographéo J. N. Möller.
- Pinborg, Jan. 1967. *Die Entwicklung der Sprachtheorie im Mittelalter*. Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie und Theologie des Mittelalters. Band XLII - Heft 2. Münster. Aschendorffsche Verlagsbuchhandlung.
- Pinborg, Jan. 1975. Historiography of linguistics: Classical Antiquity: Greece. In: Thomas Sebeok, ed. *Current trends in linguistics* 13:69-126. The Hague / Paris. Mouton.
- Pinborg, Jan & Henricus Roos. 1969. *Boethii Daci opera. Modi significandi sive quaestiones super Priscianum Maiorem*. Corpus philosophorum Danicorum medii aevi. Concilio et auspiciis societatis linguae & litterarum Danicarum. Ediderunt Alfredus Otto & Henricus Roos. IV. Hauniae. Gad.
- Pipping, Hugo. 1890a. *Om klangfärgen hos sjungna vokaler. Undersökning utförd vid fysiologiska institutet i Kiel medels*

Hensens fonautograf. Helsingfors. Frenckell.

- Pipping, Hugo. 1890b. *Om Hensens fonautograf som ett hjälpmedel för språkvetenskapen*. Helsingfors. Frenckell.
- Pipping, Hugo. 1894. *Über die Theorie der Vocale*. ASSF 20:11.
- Pipping, Hugo. 1899. *Zur Phonetik der finnischen Sprache. Untersuchungen mit Hensen's Sprachzeichner*. MSFOu 14.
- Pipping, Hugo. 1902. I-Umlaut und U-Brechung in den nordischen Sprachen. *NphM* 4:1-19.
- Pipping, Hugo. 1906. Zur Theorie der Analogiebildung. *MSNH* IV:235-318.
- Pipping, Hugo. 1922. *Inledning till studiet av de nordiska språkens ljudlära*. Helsingfors.
- Pipping, Rolf. 1919a. *Erikskrönikans ljudlära enligt texten i cod. Holm. D 2*. Åbo. Åbo Tidnings- och Tryckeri AB.
- Pipping, Rolf. 1919b. *Erikskrönikans ordsfatt enligt texten i cod. Holm. D 2 samlad och ordnad*. SSLS 10.
- Pipping, Rolf. 1926. *Kommentar til Erikskrönikan*. SSLS 187.
- Pipping, Rolf. 1940. *Språk och stil*. Tammerfors. Söderström & Co Förlags Ab.
- Pirinen, Kauko. 1991. *Suomen kirkon historia 1. Keskiäika ja uskonpuhdistuksen aika*. Porvoo. WSOY.
- Platou, L. Stoud. 1806. *Dansk Chrestomathie eller Læse- og Declamations-Øvelser for Ungdommen*. Christiania. Trykt paa N. Wulfsbergs Forlag hos N. J. Berg
- Platzack, Christer. 1983. Existential sentences in English, German, Icelandic, and Swedish. In: Fred Karlsson, ed. *Papers from the 7th Scandinavian Conference of Linguistics*, 80-100. Publications No. 10. Department of General Linguistics. University of Helsinki. Helsinki.
- Platzack, Christer. 1985. Syntaktiska förändringar i svenskan under 1600-talet. In: S. Allén et al., eds. *Svenskans beskrivning* 15:401-417. Göteborg. Göteborgs universitet.
- Platzack, Christer. 1986. COMP, INFL, and Germanic Word Order. In: Hellan & Christensen 1986:185-234.
- Poirot, Jean. 1912. *Recherches expérimentales sur le timbre des voyelles françaises*. ASSF 42,2.
- Pontoppidan, Ericus E. 1668. *Grammatica Danica*. Hauniae. Typis Christiani Veringii. [In Bertelsen II 1917:3-426.]
- [Pontoppidan, Erik]. E. P. 1749. *Glossarium Norvagicum, eller Forsøg paa en Samling Af saadanne rare Norske Ord Som gemeenlig ikke forstaaes af Danske Folk, Tilligemed en Fortegnelse paa Norske Mænds og Qvinders Navne Det fælles Sprog Til Oplysning og Forbedring*. Bergen. Cristoph Kothert.
- Porsus, Matthias. 1594. *De nomenclaturis romanis, recens Danice factis, pari Græcarum recensione*. I-IV. Francoforti. Typis Joannis Feyrabendij.
- Porthan, H[enricus]. G[abrielle]. 1771. [Review of] Joannis Sainovics S. J. Tordaensis [...] *Demonstratio, Idioma Ungarorum et Lapponum idem esse* [...]. [Originally in *Tidningar Utgifne af et Sällskap i Åbo*, 1771. Reprinted in Henricis Gabriellis Porthan, *Opera Selecta*, V. SKST 21:129-139.]
- Porthan, Henricus Gabrielle. 1776-1778. *De poësi Fennica*. I-V. Aboæ. Impressit Joh. Christoph. Frenckell
- Porthan, Henricus Gabrielle. 1795. *Dissertatio academica sistens cogitationes quasdam de linguarum usu historico*. Aboæ. Frenckell.
- Porthan, Henricus Gabrielle. 1801. *Dissertatio academica de præcipuis dialectis lingvæ fennicæ*. Aboæ. Frenckell.
- Poulsen, Ib. 1994. *Radioavisens forståelighed*. København. Danmarks Radio.
- Posti, Lauri. 1942. *Grundzüge der livischen Lautgeschichte*. MSFOu 85.
- Posti, Lauri. 1948. On Quantity in Estonian. *JSFOu* LIV,2:1-14.
- Posti, Lauri. 1953. From Pre-Finnic to Late Proto-Finnic. Studies on the Development of the Consonant System. *FUF* 31:1-91.
- Pourel de Hatriz, Barth. 1650. *Covrt Et Droit sentier A la Langue Française. thet ähr: En Rätt Gånge-wägh eller Geenstigh. Till thett Fransyske Språket*. Stockholm. Jean Jeansson.
- Preisler, Bent. 1986. *Linguistic Sex Roles in Conversation. Social Variation in the Expression of Tentativeness in English*. Berlin. Mouton de Gruyter.
- Preisler, Bent. 1995. Theories, methodology and findings in language and gender research. In: Ingvild Broch, Tove Bull & Toril Swan, eds. *Proceedings of the 2nd Nordic conference on language and gender*. Tromsø 3.-5. November 1994, 71-84. Tromsø. Nordlyd 23.
- Protten, Christian. 1764. *En nyttig Grammaticalsk Indledning til Tvende hidtil gandske ubekjendte Sprog, Fanteisk og Acraisk, (paa Guld=Kysten udi Guinea,) efter den Danske Pronunciation og Udtale*. Kjøbenhavn. Udi det Kongl. Væysen-Huses Bogtrykkerie.
- Quilis, Antonio & Hans-J. Niederehe. 1986. *The History of Linguistics in Spain*. Amsterdam Studies in the Theory and History of Linguistic Science. Series III - Studies in the History of the Language Sciences, Vol. 34. Amsterdam / Philadelphia. John Benjamins.
- Quirk, Randolph, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech & Jan Svartvik. 1972. *A Grammar of Contemporary English*. London. Longman.
- Quirk, Randolph, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech & Jan Svartvik. 1985. *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London. Longman.
- Quousque tandem see Wilhelm Viëtor.
- Rajalen, B. 1683. *Brevarium Grammaticæ Latinæ, Clarè monstrans lingvæ rationem genuinam cui accessit quoque informandi modus cum exercitiis, futuro Latinitatis studioso*. [Turku]. Johannes Winter.
- Ramat, Paolo, Hans-J. Niederehe & Konrad Koerner. 1986. *The History of Linguistics in Italy*. Amsterdam Studies in the Theory and History of Linguistic Science. Series III - Studies in the History of the Language Sciences, Vol. 33. Amsterdam / Philadelphia. John Benjamins.

- Ramstedt, G[ustaf]. J[ohn]. 1902. *Über die konjugation des khalkha-mongolischen*. MSFOu 19.
- Ramstedt, G[ustaf]. J[ohn]. 1903. Das schriftmongolische und die Urgamundart phonetisch verglichen. *JSFOu* 21,2:1-56.
- Ramstedt, G[ustaf]. J[ohn]. 1935. *Kalmückisches Wörterbuch*. LSF III.
- Ramstedt, G[ustaf]. J[ohn]. 1939. *A Korean Grammar*. MSFOu 82.
- Ramstedt, G[ustaf]. J[ohn]. 1949. *Studies in Korean Etymology*. MSFOu 95.
- Ramstedt, G[ustaf]. J[ohn]. 1952-1966. *Einführung in die altaische Sprachwissenschaft*. I-III. MSFOu 104:1-3. Helsinki. Suomalais-ugrilainen seura. [I: 1957; II: 1952; III: 1966.]
- Rapola, Martti. 1919-1920. *Kantasuomalaiset pääpainottomain tavujen i-loppuiset diftongit suomen murteissa*. Suomi IV:17.
- Rapola, Martti. 1925. *Äännehistoriallinen tutkimus Abraham Kollaniuksen lainsuomennosten kielestä*. Suomi 5:5. SKS.
- Rapola, Martti. 1928. *Vanhan kirjasuomen toimi johdannaisineen*. Turun Suomalaisen Yliopiston julkaisuja B VI:1. Turku.
- Rapola, Martti. 1933 [1965/2]. *Suomen kirjakielen historia pääpiirteittäin. I. Vanhan kirjasuomen kirjoitus- ja äänneasun kehitys*. SKST 197.
- Rapola, Martti. 1960. *Sanojemme ensiesiintymiä Agricolasta Yrjö Koskiseen*. SKS.
- Rapola, Martti, ed. 1963. *Suomen kirjallisuus II. Ruotsin ajan kirjallisuus*. Helsinki. SKS ja Otava.
- Rapola, Martti. 1966. *Suomen kielen äännehistorian luennot*. SKST 283.
- Raschellä, Fabrizio D. ed. 1982. *The so-called Second Grammatical Treatise. An orthographic pattern of late thirteenth-century Icelandic*. Edition, translation, and commentary. *Filologia germanica, testi e studi* 2. Firenze. Felice Le Monier.
- Rask, Rasmus Kristian. 1811. *Vejledning til det Islandske eller gamle Nordiske Sprog*. Kjøbenhavn. Schubothe.
- Rask, R[asmus]. K[ristian]. 1817. *Angelsaksisk Sproglære tilligemed en kort Læsebog*. Sto[c]kholm. Mag. Wiborgs Forlag.
- Rask, Rasmus Kristian. 1818. *Undersøgelse om det gamle Nordiske eller Islandske Sprogs Oprindelse*. Kjøbenhavn. Gyldendal.
- Rask, Rasmus [Kristian]. 1820. Den Danske Grammatiks Endelser og Former af det islandske Sprog forklarede. *Det Skandinaviske Litteraturselskabs Skrifter* 17:75-150.
- Rask, R[asmus]. 1824. *Spansk Sproglære efter en ny Plan*. København. Beekens Forlag.
- Rask, Rasmus Kristian. 1825. *Frisisk Sproglære udarbejdet efter samme Plan som den islandske og angelsaksiske*. Kjøbenhavn. Beekens Forlag.
- Rask, Rasmus Kristian. 1826. Forsøg til en videnskabelig dansk Retskrivningslære. Med Hensyn til Stamsproget og Nabosproget. *Tidsskrift for nordisk Oldkyndighed* I:1-340. København. Trykt i det Poppeske Bogtrykkeri.
- Rask, R[asmus]. 1827. *Italiensk Formlære utarbejdet efter samme Plan som den spanske Sproglære*. København. Schultz.
- Rask, Rasmus. 1828. *Vejledning til Akra-Sproget på Kysten Ginea med et Tillæg om Akvambuisck*. København. S. L. Møller's Bogtrykkeri.
- Rask, Erasmus [sic]. 1830. *A Grammar of the Danish Language for the Use of Englishmen, together with Extracts in Prose and Verse*. Kjøbenhavn. Schultz.
- Rask, R[asmus Kristian]. 1832a. *Kortfattet Vejledning til det oldnordiske eller gamle islandske Sprog*. Kjøbenhavn. Reitzel
- Rask, Rasmus Kristian. 1832b. *Ræsonneret lappisk Sproglære efter den Sprogart, som bruges af Fjældlapperne i Porsangerfjorden i Finmarken. En Omarbejdelse af Prof. Knud Leems lappiske Grammatica*. Kjøbenhavn. Schubothe.
- Rask, [Rasmus] Erasmus. 1832c. *Nonnulla de pleno systemate Sibilantium in lingvis montanis, item de methodo Ibericam et Armenicam lingvam literis Europæis exprimendi*. Anniversaria in memoriam reipublicæ sacræ et literariæ cum universæ tum Danicæ nostræ instauratæ celebranda indicit regiæ universitatis Hauniensis rector cum senatu academico. Hauniæ. Schultz.
- Rask, Rasmus. 1838. *De fynske Bønders Sprog*. bearbejdet og udgivet af Poul Andersen. København. Schultz.
- Rask, Rasmus. 1843. *A Grammar of the Icelandic or Old Norse Tongue*. Translated from the Swedish by [Sir] George Webbe Dasent. London. W. Pickering / Frankfurt a. M. Jaeger.
- Rask, Rasmus Kristian. 1993. *Investigation of the Origin of the Old Norse or Icelandic language*. Translated by Niels Ege. TCLC XXVI.
- Rauch, Georg von. 1943. *Die Universität Dorpat und das Eindringen der frühen Aufklärung in Livland 1690-1710*. Schriftenreihe Sweden und Nordeuropa. Heft 3. Essen. Essener Verlagsanstalt.
- Raukko, Jarno & Jan-Ola Östman. 1994. *Pragmaattinen näkökulma Itämeren kielialueeseen*. Helsinki. Department of General Linguistics, University of Helsinki. Publications No. 25.
- Rautala, Helena. 1992. Forskning om språk och kön i Finland. In: Britt-Louise Gunnarsson & Caroline Liberg, eds. *Språk, språkbruk och kön. Rapport från ASLA's nordiska symposium Uppsala 7-9 november 1991*, 33-37. ASLA.
- Ravila, Paavo. 1929. Über eine doppelte Vertretung des urfinnischwolgaïschen *a der nichtersten Silbe im Mordwinischen. *FUF* 20:83-120.
- Ravila, Paavo. 1932. *Das Quantitätssystem des seelappischen Dialektes von Maattivuono*. MSFOu 62.
- Ravila, Paavo. 1941. Über die Verwendung der Numeruszeichen in den uralischen Sprachen. *FUF* 27:1-136.
- Ravila, Paavo. 1943. Uralilaisen lauseen alkuperäisistä rakenteesta. *Vir.* 47:247-263.
- Ravila, Paavo. 1944. Lauseopin periaatekysymyksiä. *Vir.* 48:105-131
- Ravila, Paavo. 1945. Suomalais-ugrilaisien kielten taivutuksen historiaa. *Vir.* 49:314-326.
- Ravila, Paavo. 1946. *Johdatus kielihistoriaan*. SKS.
- Ravila, Paavo. 1960a. Nominaalilause ja finiittimuodot. *Vir.* 64:245-250.

- Ravila, Paavo. 1960b. Probleme des Stufenwechsels im Lappischen. *FUF* 33:285-325.
- Ravila, Paavo. 1961. *Johdatus kielihistoriaan*. 2., uusittu painos. SKS.
- Ravila, Paavo. 1962. Transformaatioteoria. *Vir.* 67:1-16.
- Ravila, Paavo. 1967. *Totuus ja metodi. Kielitieteellisiä esseitä*. Porvoo / Helsinki. WSOY.
- Ravn, Hans Mikkelsen [Johannis Mikaëli Corvini]. 1634-1640. *Linguae danicae exercitatio*. Gl. kgl. Saml. 764 fol. Herlufsholm [Herloviae].
- Rehling, Erik. 1924. *Dansk Grammatik med Øvelser*. København. Aschehoug & Co.
- Rehling, Erik. 1932. *Det danske Sprog. Fremstilling for Lærere og Seminarier*. København. Schultz.
- Rehling, Erik. 1948. *Skriftlig form. Fremstillingens vanskeligheder*. København. Schultz.
- Rehling, Erik. 1949. *Dansk grammatik til skolebrug*. [Third revised edition of 1924 and 1925.] København. Aschehoug.
- Rein, Gabriel. 1829. *Doctrinae grammaticorum de declinationibus Fennicis brevis expositio*. Helsingforsia. Freneckell.
- Renvall, Gustavus. 1810-1811. I-II. *De orthoëpia et orthographia linguae Fennicae*. Aboæ. Freneckell.
- Renvall, Gustavus. 1815-1817. *De signis relationum nominalium in Lingua Fennica*. I-VIII. Aboæ. Freneckell.
- Renvall, Gustavus. 1826. *Suomalainen Sana-Kirja. Lexicon linguae Finnicae cum interpretatione duplici, copiosiore Latina, breviori Germanica*. Aboæ. Freneckell.
- Renvall, G[ustaf]. 1837. *Grammatiska uppsatser*. Åbo. Christ. Lvdv. Hjelt.
- Renvall, Gustaf. 1840. *Finsk språklära, Enligt den rena Vest-Finska, i Bokspråk vanliga Dialecten. Första delen, Finska språkets Formlära*. Åbo. Hos Christ. Ludv. Hjelt, på eget förlag.
- Rescher, Nicholas. 1978. *Scientific Progress: A Philosophical Essay on the Economics of Research in Natural Science*. Oxford. Blackwell.
- [Resen, Hans Poulsen]. 1610. *Den lidlle Logices Begyndelser, fordeligen at bruge, lige effter Latinen, for den femte Lectie i Børne scholer i Danmarck &c. Og ellers i almindelighed*. Kiøbinghaffn. [No printer or publisher.]
- Resenius, Petrus. 1677. *Atlas danicus dicatus august. Monarcho, Christiano V. Hafniæ*. [No publisher.]
- Rhode, Hans [Johannes Georg]. 1672. *Dend gandske Verden fuld af de Ting, som kand sees og sandses afmaled*. Kiøbenhafn. Hendrick og Jørgen Gøede.
- Riad, Tomas. 1992. *Structures in Germanic prosody*. Department of Scandinavian Languages. Stockholm.
- Richert, Mårten Birger. 1866. *Bidrag til läran om de konsonantiska ljudlagarna i äldre och nyare språk*. Uppsala. Edquist & Berglund.
- Rietz, Johan Ernst. 1867. *Ordbok öfver svenska allmoge-språket*. Lund. [= N. F. Lundberg. 1867. *Svenskt Dialekt-lexicon*. Malmø / Köpenhavn / Leipzig / London. B. A. Cronholm / Michaëllsen och Tillige / Alb. Fritsch/Williams & Norgate.]
- Riiho, Timo. 1980. Kommenttipuheenvuoro Matti Rissanen esitelmästä Filologisesta tutkimuksesta Suomessa 1900-luvulla. In: Häkkinen & Karlsson 1980:113-116.
- Ringbom, Håkan. 1987. *The Role of the First Language in Foreign Language Learning*. Clevedon - Philadelphia. Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- Ringgaard, Kristian. 1960. *Vestjysk Stød*. Århus. Universitetsforlaget.
- Rischel, Jørgen. 1967-1968. Diphthongization in Faroese. *ALH* 11:89-118.
- Rischel, Jørgen. 1972. Compound Stress in Danish without a Cycle. *ARIPUC* 6:211-228.
- Rischel, Jørgen. 1974. *Topics in West Greenlandic Phonology. Regularities Underlying the Phonetic Appearance of Wordforms in a Polysynthetic Language*. Copenhagen. Akademisk forlag.
- Rischel, Jørgen. 1975. Problemer ved en generativ beskrivelse af dansk tryk. *Selskab for Nordisk Filologi, årsberetning for 1971-1973*, 22-32.
- Rischel, Jørgen. 1982. On unit accentuation in Danish — and the distinction between deep and surface phonology. *ARIPUC* 16:191-239.
- Rischel, Jørgen. 1987. *Sproggranskeren Rasmus Kristian Rask. Forskerbedrifter og bristede forhåbninger*. Odense. Odense Universitetsforlag.
- Rischel, Jørgen. 1995. *Minor Mlabri. A Hunter-Gatherer Language of Northern Indochina*. Copenhagen. Tusculanum.
- Rissanen, Matti. 1980. Filologisesta tutkimuksesta Suomessa 1900-luvulla. In: Häkkinen & Karlsson 1980:103-111.
- Rissanen, Terhi. 1985. *Viittomakielen perusrakenne*. Helsinki. Department of General Linguistics, University of Helsinki. Publications No. 12.
- Rodriguez Matritense, Carolo. 1662. *Lingvæ Hispanicæ Compendium in usum eorum qui linguam Hispanicam compendiose addiscere cupiunt*. Hafniæ. Typis Matthiæ Godicchenii.
- [Rosenhane, Gustav]. Skogekår Bergbo. 1658. *Thet Swenska Språkets Klagemål, at thet, som sigh borde, icke ährat blifwer*. Stockholm. Henrich Keyser. [Second edition 1706 in Stockholm by Johann Henrich Werner.]
- [Rosenstein, Nils von]. 1801. *Svenska Akademiens Handlingar Ifrån År 1786*. Första Delen. Stockholm. Carl Delén & J. G. Forsgren.
- Ross, Hans. 1895. *Norsk Ordbog. Tillæg til "Norsk Ordbog" af Ivar Aasen*. Christiania. Alb. Cammermeyers Forlag.
- van Rossem, Cefas & Hein van der Voort. 1996. *Die Creol Taal. 250 Years of Negerhollands Texts*. Amsterdam. Amsterdam University Press.
- Rudbeck, Olavus. 1679. *Atlant Eller Manheim Dedan Japhets afkomme, de förnemste Keyserlige och Kunglige Slecter ut till hela werlden, henne att styra, utgågne äro, så och desse eftersökande Folck utogade, nembligen Skyttar, Borbarn, Asar, Jettar, Giotar, Phryger, Trojaner, Amaizor, Traser, Lyder, Maurer, Tussar, Kaller, Kiempar, Kimrar, Saxer,*

German, Swear, Longobarder, Wandaler, Herular, Gepar, Tydskar, Anglor, Paitar, Danar, Sidkampar, och flera de som i werket wisas skola. Atlantica Sive Manheim Vera Japheti posterorum sedes ac patria, ex qua non tantum Monarchæ & Reges ad totum fere orbem reliquum regendum ac domandum, Stirpesque suas in eo condensas, sed etiam Scythæ, Barbari, Asæ, Gigantes, Gothi, Phryges, Trojani, Amazones, Thraces, Libyes, Mauri, Tusci, Galli, Cimbri, Cimmerii, Saxones, Germani, Svevi, Longobardi, Vandali, Heruli, Gepidæ, Teutones, Angli, Pictones, Dani, Sicambri, aliique virtute clari & celebres populi olim exierunt. Upsalæ. Henricus Curio.

Rudbeck, Olavus. 1689. *Atlands Eller Manheims. Andra deel Uti hwilken innehålles Månans och Jordennes Dyrkan, Sampt huruledes den aldräförst är begynt längst uppe uthi Sverige hoos Kimmi-boerne, och sedan uthspridd worden til störste delen af heela Werlden; Hwilket alt så wäl af the Fremmandes, som Wåre egne Historier, i synnerheet af de Gamble och Underliga Gåtor, de der här till dagz aldrig warit af någon rätt förklarade, bewissadt warder. Och dessutan att effter Solennes och Månans lopp, Åretz rättelse omgång här aldräförst achtad och uthräknad är, tilljika med monge andre märkelige ting, som alt här till legat fördolde. Atlantica Sive Manheimii Pars Secunda In quâ Solis, Lunæ, ac Terræ cultus describitur. omnisque adeo Superstitionis hujusce origo parti Sveoniæ Septentrionali, Terræ puta Cimmeriorum vindicatur, ex quâ deinceps in Orbem reliquum divulgata est: Idque Scriptorum non tantum domesticorum, Sed etiam externorum, maxime vero veterum atque doctissimarum fabularum fide, qnatum [sic] explicatio, genuina nusquam ante hanc nostram in lucem prodiit. Accedunt demonstrationes certissimæ, quæ Septentrionales nostros, in maxime geminum Solis ac Lunæ motum, indeque pedentem accuratissimum temporum rationem, multo & prius & felicius, quam gentem aliam ullam olim penetrasse, ac etiam alia multa ad hanc usque diem incognita declarant.* Upsalæ. Henricus Curio.

Rudbeck, Olavus. 1698. *Atlands Eller Manheims Triie Del, Uti hwilcken beskrifwes Wåra Fäders äldsta Skrifter på Stenar, Böök och Näfwer, och när de detta begynt att giöra. sedan Gyllende Talets bemärkelse för hwart åhr, wåra himmels teckns ursprung och betydning, och huru de äro komne till the Greker och latiner. De sex första Tider eller Åldrar efter Noe flod, och huru wåra Atlänningars första regements skapnad warit, hwad uttåg och krig äro skiedde under Satur eller Bore och under hans sons Jofurs eller Thors regemente, och om wåras Schyters, Phenicers och Hamaifors uttåg under dem till Indo Schytien och Phenicien, eller in i Canaans- och Juda land, Förutan många artiga Gåtor uttrydde som här tills fördölgde legat. Atlantica seu Manheimii Pars tertia In qua vetustissima majorum nostrorum Atlantidum lapibus, fago atque cortici Runas suas incidendi ratio, unà cum tempore, quo illa primum cæperit, exponitur. Deinde Aurei Numeri singulis annis tributis, & Signorum Coelestium, quæ hinc ad Græcos & Latinos sunt translata, vera origo ac significatio traditur. Tum sex illæ a diluivio Noachi proximæ ætates, atque in illis prima Atlantidum nostrorum reipub. forma describitur: quæ migrationes & bella sub Boreo seu Saturno ejusque filio Thoro seu Jove gesta sunt, recensentur; & denique Scytharum, Phænicum & Amazonum his ducibus in Indo-Scythiam & Phæniciam seu Palæstinam e Sveonia sacræ expeditiones enarrantur. Quibus omnibus mythologiæ perplures, quarum sensus in hunc usque diem incognitus heic demum detectus prodit, jucundæ sanè & perquem utiles adjunguntur.* Upsalæ. Typis et impensis Auctoris.

Rudbeck, Olavus. 1702. *Atlands Eller Manheims Fjerde Del, Uti hwilcken beskrifwes åtskiliga Hendelsers tilsammanstemning i den Hälga Skrift mot de Hedniskes skrifter. Sedan Hwad wid Noachs tijd och under hans Barn och Barnabarn hafwer skielt A. M. 1600. Hwad An. M. 1800 skiedt är. Om hwad under Nachors, Tarachs och Mannens tijd och nästfölliande A. M. 1900 Händt är. Atlantica seu Manheimii Pars Quarta In qua agitur de consensu Sacri Codicis et scriptorum profanorum in rebus ultimæ antiquitatis. Deinde De rebus sub Diluivio et tempore huic proximo gestis A. M. 1600. De rebus ad Annum Mundi 1800 pertinentibus. De iis, quæ Nachori, Tarochi atque Manni, et quæ proxime sequebatur, ætate ad An. M. 1900 illustriora habentur. Reliqua capita, igne vorace combusta, desiderantur.* Upsalæ. Typis et impensis Auctoris.

Rudbeck, Olavus Jr. 1705. *Ichthyologiæ Biblicæ Pars Prima De Ave Selav. Cujus mentio fit Numer. XI:31. In qua Contra Cl. Bochartum & Ludolfum, non avem aliquam plumatam, nec Locustam fuisse, sed potius quoddam piscis genus, manifestis demonstratur argumentis. Additâ Brevi, Hebræam inter & antiquam Gothicam lingvam, analogiâ, ex occasione vocum Hebraicarum loc. cit. occurrentium.* Upsalis. Johan. Henr. Werner.

Rudbeck, Olavus Jr. 1717. *Specimen usus linguæ Gothicæ. in Eruendis atque illustrandis obscurissimis quibusvis Sacræ Scripturæ locis: addita analogia linguæ Gothicæ Cum Sinica. Nec non Finnonicæ Cum Ungarica.* Upsalis. Joh. Henr. Werner.

Runrön. Runologiska bidrag utgivna av Institutionen för nordiska språk vid Uppsala universitet. Uppsala. 1989-.

Ruoppila, Veikko. 1943. *Kotieläinten nimitykset suomen murteissa. I. Hevonen, nauta, lammas, vuohi.* SKST 222.

RUUL = *Reports from Uppsala University, Linguistics.* Uppsala

Ruus, Hanne. 1995. *Danske Kerneord. Centrale dele af den danske leksikalske norm, I-II.* København. Tusculanum.

Rydqvist, Johan Er. 1850-1883. *Det svenska språkets lagar. I-VI.* Stockholm. S. Magnus' förlag [II]/ Norstedt [II-V]/ F. & G. Beijer [VI].

Rydqvist, Johan Er. 1870. *Ljudlagar och skriflagar.* Stockholm. Norstedt.

Ryen, Else, ed. 1976. *Språk og kjønn.* Oslo. Novus.

Rygh, Oluf. 1897-1936. *Norske Gaardnavne. 1-19.* Kristiania / Oslo. Fabritius.

Räikkälä, Anneli. 1995. *Menneiltä vuosilta. Kielikello 1:3-17.*

Räsänen, Martti. 1934-42. *Türkische Sprachproben aus Mittel-Anatolien I-IV.* SO V, 2 (1934), VI,2 (1936), VIII,2 (1937), X,2 (1942).

- Räsänen, Martti. 1949. *Materialen zur Lautgeschichte der türkischen Sprachen*. SO XV.
- Räsänen, M[artti]. 1952. *Beiträge zu den türkischen Runeninschriften*. SO XII:6.
- Räsänen, Martti. 1957. *Materialen zur Morphologie der türkischen Sprachen*. SO XXI.
- Röepstorff, Fr. Ad. de. 1874. *Vocabulary of dialects spoken in the Nicobar and Andaman isles*. Port Blair. Chief Commissioner's Printing Press.
- Rørdam, Holger Fr[ederik]. 1891-1893. Dr. Erik Eriksen Pontoppidan, Biskob i Trondhjems Stift. *Kirkehistoriske Samlinger*. Fjerde Rekke, Annet Bind, 231-262. København. Gad.
- Saaby, Viggo. 1891. *Dansk Retskrivningsordbog*. København. Gyldendal.
- Saari, Mirja. 1975. *Talsvenska. En sociolingvistisk studie över syntaktiska drag i intervjusvar*. SNF 60.
- Saari, Mirja, Lars Huldén, Kristina Björklund & Pirjo Kukkonen, eds. 1990. *Nordistik i 150 år. Undervisning och forskning i nordiska språk och nordisk litteratur vid Helsingfors universitet 1840-1990*. Helsingfors. Meddelanden från institutionen för nordiska språk och nordisk litteratur vid Helsingfors universitet. Serie B:13.
- Saarimaa, E. A. 1930. *Huonoa ja hyvää suomea. Oikeakielisyysohjeita*. Porvoo. WSOY.
- Saarimaa, E. A. 1947. *Kielenopas*. Porvoo. WSOY.
- Sahlgren, Jöran. 1932. *Vad våra ortnamn berättar*. Studentföreningen Verdandis småskrifter 351. Stockholm. Bonnier.
- Sahlstedt, Abraham. 1747. *Försök till en svensk grammatik, Efter Det nu för tiden brukeliga sättet at tala och skrifwa*. Stockholm. Lars Salvii.
- Sahlstedt, Abraham. 1769a. *Svensk grammatik, Efter det nu för tiden I språket brukeliga sättet at tala och skrifwa. författad, Af Kogl. Wetenskaps Akademien Gillad, och Efter Des bestelling Utgifven*. Upsala. Tryckt hos Johan Edman, Kongl Acad. Boktr. På Bokhandlaren Askergrens bekostnad.
- Sahlstedt, Abraham. 1769b. *Grammaire Svédoise, contenant les regles de cette langue établies par l'usage d'à present. Avec l'approbation et apres les ordres de l'academie royale des sciences*. Stockholm. Charl. Abr. Askergren.
- Sahlstedt, Abraham. 1773. *Svensk ordbok Med Latinsk Uttolkning / Dictionarium Svecicum Cum interpretatione Latina*. Stockholm. Carl Stolpe.
- Sajavaara, Kari, ed. 1980. *Soveltava kielitiede*. Helsinki. Gaudeamus
- Sajnovics, Johannes. 1770. *Demonstratio. Idioma Ungarorum et Lapponum idem esse*. Regiæ scientiarum societati Danicæ prælecta. Hafniæ mense Januario. Hafniæ. Gerhard Giese Salicath.
- Salminen, Tapani, ed. 1996. *Typological and Historical Studies in Language by Mikko Korhonen. A memorial volume published on the 60th anniversary of his birth*. MSFOu 223.
- Salonius, A. H. 1920. *Vitæ patrum, Kritische Untersuchungen über Text, Syntax und Wortschatz det spätlateinischen Vitæ Patrum*. Skrifter utgivna av Humanistiska Vetenskapssamfundet i Lund 2. Lund. Gleerup.
- SAML = Skrifter om Anvendt og Matematisk Lingvistik. Udgivet af Institut for anvendt og matematisk lingvistik, Københavns Universitet.
- Sammallahti, Pekka. 1977. *Norjansaamen Itä-Enontekiön murteen äänneoppi*. MSFOu 160.
- Sammallahti, Pekka. 1988. Historical Phonology of the Uralic Languages: with special reference to Samoyed, Ugric, and Permic. In: D. Sinor, ed. *The Uralic Languages: Description, History, and Foreign Influences*. Handbuch der Orientalistik, 8. Abt.: Handbook of Uralic Studies 1:478-554. Leiden. Brill.
- Sammallahti, Pekka. 1996. History of Finno-Ugric Linguistics in the Nordic Countries. In: Henriksen et al. 1996:297-323.
- Sandfeld Jensen, Kr. 1900. *Rumenske Studier I. Infinitiv og udtrykkene derfor i rumænsk og Balkansprogene. En sammenlignende undersøgelse*. København. Siegf. Michaelsens efterfølger (Einar Möller).
- Sandfeld Jensen, Kr. 1913. *Sprogvidenskabten. En kortfattet fremstilling af dens metoder og resultater*. København og Kristiania. Gyldendal / Nordisk forlag.
- Sandfeld, Kr. 1923. *Sprogvidenskabten. En kortfattet fremstilling af dens metoder og resultater*. Anden udgave. København og Kristiania. Gyldendal / Nordisk forlag.
- Sandfeld, Kr. 1926. *Balkanfilologien. En oversigt over dens resultater og problemer*. Festskrift udgivet af Københavns Universitet i anledning af Universitetets aarsfest November 1926. København. Bianco Luno.
- Sandfeld, Kr. 1928. *Syntaxe du francais contemporain. I. Les pronoms*. Paris. Honoré Champion.
- Sandfeld, Kr. 1930. *Linguistique balkanique. Problèmes et résultats*. Collection linguistique publiée par La société de linguistique de Paris. Paris. Honoré Champion.
- Sandfeld, Kr. 1936. *Syntaxe du francais contemporain. II. Les propositions subordonnées*. Paris. E. Droz.
- Sandfeld, Kr. 1943. *Syntaxe du francais contemporain. III. L'Infinitif*. Copenhagen / Paris. Gyldendal / Nordisk Forlag / E. Droz.
- Sandfeld, Kr. & Hedvig Olsen. 1936. *Syntaxe Roumaine. I*. Paris. Libraire E. Droz.
- Sandfeld, Kr. & Hedvig Olsen. 1960-1962. *Syntaxe Roumaine. II-III*. Copenhagen. Munksgaard.
- Sandvad, Holger. 1931. *Stainingsmålet*. Jysk forening for historie og sprog. Aarhus.
- Santesson, Lillemor. 1986. Tryckt hos Salvius. En undersökning om språkvården på ett 1700-talstryckeri med särskild hänsyn till ortografi och morfologi. Lund. Lundastudier i nordisk språkvetenskap Serie A 37. Lund University Press
- Saukkonen, Pauli & Marjatta Haipus & Antero Niemikorpi & Helena Sulkala. 1979. *Suomen kielen taajuusanasto*. Porvoo. WSOY
- Scaliger, Julius Caesar. 1540. *De Causis Linguae Latinae. Libri tredecim*. Lugduni. Apud Sib. Gryphium.

- Schlegel, Johan Henrich. 1763. *Afhandling om det Danske Sprogs Fordeele og Mangler, I Sammenligning med det Tydske og det Franske Sprog*. København. Nicolaus Møller.
- Schlyter, Carl Johan. 1877. *Ordbok till Samlingen af Sveriges gamla lagar*. Lund. Berlingska Boktryckeriet. I kommission hos C. W. K. Gleerup.
- Schmitter, Peter. 1982. *Untersuchungen zur Historiographie der Linguistik: Struktur - Methodik - theoretische Fundierung*. Tübingen. Gunter Narr.
- [Schnabel, Marcus]. 1784. *Prøve paa hvorvidt det gamle Norske Sprog endnu er til udi det Hardangerske Bonde-Maal. Første Stykke*. Kgl. Norske Videnskabers Selskabs Skrifter Vol. XII. København.
- Schreiner, E. 1871. *Latinsk Sproglære til Skolebrug*. Kristiania. Cappelen.
- Schreuder, H[ans]. P[aludan]. S[mith]. 1850. *Grammatik for Zulu-Sproget. Med Fortale og Anmærkninger af C. A. Holmboe*. Christiania. Fabritius.
- Schroderus, Ericus. 1631. *Lexicon Latino-Scondicum*. Holmiae. Henricus Käyser
- Schroderus, Ericus. 1637. *Lexicon Latino-scondicum. Quo Quattuor celebriores totius Europæi linguæ atque Idiomatica orbis, scilicet Latinum, Suecicum, Germanicum & Venedicum seu Finnicum, parvulis Musarum alumnis methodice inculcantur, aliisque hasce linguas discendi cupidis, pure & simpliciter. absque superflua peregrinarum vocum admixtione proponuntur; in patriæ commodum, & Scondiotarum usum, non oscitanter editum*. Holmiæ Sueonum. Henricus Keyser.
- Schroderus, Ericus Johannis. 1929. *Dictionarium quadrilingue: Suedicum, Germanicum, Latinum, Græcum*. Med en inledning utgivet av Bengt Hesselman. Uppsala. Almqvist & Wiksell.
- [Schultz, N. S.]. 1826. *Kortfattet Norsk Sproglære, udarbejdet til Brug for Søndagsskolen i Trondhjem*. Trondhjem. Trykt af T. A. Høeg.
- [Schulz, Peder]. 1724. *Danskens Skriverigtighed. Indbefattendes En kort Undervisning Saavel om Det Danske Sprog at bogstavere, som og Ordenes foranderlige Endelse, Tillæg og Brug i Stilen. (Saa vidt Etymologien angaar.) Landsens Egne, samt Fremmede, til Tieneste; dennem fornæmmelig til gode, som det egentlig kunde vedkomme at vide Orthographien og det retteste af Prent og Skrift*. Kjøbenhavn. Povel Joh, Phoenixbergs Bogtrykkeri. [In Bertelsen IV 1920:3-153.]
- Schütte, Gudmund. 1922. *Jysk og østdansk Artikelbrug*. Hist. Filos. Medd. Dan. Vid. Selsk. 7:2. København. Høst & Søn.
- Seip, Didrik Arup. 1931. *Norsk språkhistorie til omkring 1370*. Oslo Aschehoug.
- Seip, Didrik Arup. 1959. *Norsk og nabospråkene i slutten av middelalderen og senere tid*. Oslo. Aschehoug.
- Sellberg, Lars. 1993. *Av kärlek til Fosterland och Folk. Gabriel Djurklou och dialectforskningen*. Institutionen för idé- och lärdomshistoria. Uppsala universitet. Skrifter nr. 11. Uppsala. Uppsala universitet.
- Selskab for nordisk filologi. 1937. *Fra Rask til Wimmer. Otte foredrag om Modersmaalsforskere i det 19. Aarhundrede*. København. Gyldendal / Nordisk Forlag.
- Seth, Ivar. 1952. *Universitetet i Greifswald och dess ställning i svensk kulturpolitik 1637-1815*. Uppsala. Wretmans boktryckeri.
- S[etälä], E[emil]. N[estor]. 1880. *Suomen kielen lause-oppi. Oppikirjan koe*. Helsinki. K. E. Holm.
- Setälä, E[emil]. N[estor]. 1883. Lauseopillinen tutkimus Koillis-Satakunnan kansankielestä. *Suomi* II,16:1-235.
- Setälä, E[emil]. N[estor]. 1886. Zur Geschichte der Tempus- und Modusstamm-bildung in den finnisch-ugrischen Sprachen. Akademische Abhandlung. Helsingfors. Druckerei der finnischen Litteratur-Gesellschaft. [Also published 1887 in *JSFOu* II.]
- Setälä, E[emil]. N[estor]. 1890. *Yhteissuomalaisten klusiilien historia. Luku yhteissuomalaisesta äännehistoriasta*. SKS.
- Setälä, E[emil]. N[estor]. 1891. *Nykyaikuisen kielentutkimuksen periaatteista*. Yleistajuista kielitiedettä 1. Porvoo. WSOY.
- Setälä, E[emil]. N[estor]. 1892. Lisiä Suomalais-ugrilaisen kielentutkimuksen historiaan. *Suomi* 3,5:181-350.
- Setälä, E[emil]. N[estor]. 1894. Oikeakielisyydestä suomen kielen käytäntöön katsoen. *Valvoja* 81-99, 190-217.
- Setälä, E[emil]. N[estor]. 1896. Ennakkotiedonanto: Über quantitätswechsel im finnisch-ugrischen. Nachtrag I. Über den vorfinnischen vokalismus. *JSFOu* XIV,3:24-51.
- Setälä, E[emil]. N[estor]. 1898. *Suomen kielioppi. Äänne- ja sanaoppi. Oppikoulua ja omin päin opiskelua varten*. Helsinki. Otava.
- Setälä, E[emil]. N[estor]. 1901. Über transskription der finnisch-ugrischen sprachen. Historik und vorschläge. *FUF* 1:5-52.
- Setälä, E[emil]. N[estor]. 1906. Zur herkunft und chronologie der älteren germanischen lehnwörter in den ostseefinnischen sprachen. *JSFOu* XXIII,1:1-50.
- Setälä, E[emil]. N[estor]. 1909. Ein Plan für finnisch-ugrische Wörterbücher. *FUF* 9:1-16.
- Setälä, E[emil]. N[estor]. 1921. *Kielentutkimus ja oikeakielisuus*. Helsinki. Otava.
- Setälä, E[emil]. N[estor]. & Matti Sadeniemi 1951. *Suomen kielioppi. Äänne- ja sanaoppi*. Oppikoulua ja omin päin opiskelua varten. Kolmastoista painos. Helsinki. Otava.
- Setälä, E[emil]. N[estor]. & Matti Sadeniemi. 1970. *Suomen kielioppi. Äänne- ja sanaoppi*. Oppikoulua ja omin päin opiskelua varten. Kahdeksastoista painos. Helsinki. Otava.
- Sigurd, Bengt. 1955. Rank order of consonants established by distributional criteria. *Studia Linguistica* 9:8-20.
- Sigurd, Bengt. 1961. The code shift in old Norse. *Studia Linguistica* 15:10-21.
- Sigurd, Bengt. 1965. *Phonotactic Structures in Swedish*. Lund. Uniskol.
- Sigurd, Bengt. 1966. Generative grammar and historical linguistics. *ALH* X,1:35-48.

- Sigurd, Bengt. 1967. *Språkstruktur. Den moderna språkforskningens metoder och problemställningar*. Stockholm. Wahlström & Widstrand.
- Sigurd, Bengt. 1986. Ordboken, ordlistan och några andra av Svenska Akademiens språkliga insatser under 1900-talet. In: Allén et al. 1986:143-231.
- Sigurd, Bengt, ed. 1994a. *Computerized grammars for analysis and machine translation*. Travaux de l'Institut linguistique de Lund 29. Lund. Lund University Press.
- Sigurd, Bengt. 1994b. Språken vid Lunds Universitet. In: *Kungl. Humanistiska Vetenskapssamfundet i Lund. Årsberättelse 1993-1994*, 2-28. Lund.
- Sigurd, Bengt. 1995. Om språkvetenskaplig forskarutbildning och doktorernas försörjningsmöjligheter. *Kungl. Vitterhets Historie och Antikvitets Akademiens Årsbok 1995*, 162-165.
- Silfverstolpe, Axel Gabr[iel]. 1811. *Försök till en enkel, grundriktig, och derigenom oföränderlig Bokstafverings-Teori för Svenska Språket*. Stockholm. Marquardska Tryckeriet.
- Silfverstolpe, Axel Gabriel 1814. *Försök till en ny uppfattning af Huvud-Grunderna för allmänna språkläran*. Stockholm. Elméns och Granbergs Tryckeri.
- Silvestre de Sacy, Antoine-Isaac. 1799. *Principes de grammaire générale, mis à la portée des enfants, et propres à servir d'introduction à l'étude de toutes les langues*. Paris. Delance & Lesueur.
- Silvestre de Sacy, A[ntoine]. I[saac]. 1806. *Grundreglorna af den allmänna språkläran. Lämpade efter fattingsgåfvan hos Barn och brukbara såsom en förberedelse till lärandet af alla Språk*. Öfversättning af Jacon Borelius. Upsala. J. Fr. Edman.
- Siro, Paavo. 1941. Lauseoppi uuden logiikan valossa. *Vir.* 45:192-205.
- Siro, Paavo. 1943. Jaolliset ja jaottomat substantiivit. *Vir.* 47:276-290.
- Siro, Paavo. 1944. Lauseopin periaatekysymyksistä vieläkin. *Vir.* 48:406-420.
- Siro, Paavo. 1949. *Puhumista merkitsevät verbit itämerensuomalaisissa kielissä. Ilmausyhteyksiin pohjautuva merkityso pillinen tutkimuskoe*. SKS.
- Siro, Paavo. 1956. *Die finnischen Lokalkasus als Bestimmungen des Verbuns. Untersuchungen zur finnischen Syntax*. Annales Universitatis Turkuensis B 57. Turku.
- Siro, Paavo. 1964a. *Suomen kielen lauseoppi*. Helsinki. Tietosanakirja Oy.
- Siro, Paavo. 1964b. Infinitiivin asema suomen kieliopissa. *Sananjalka* 6:20-26.
- Siro, Paavo. 1975. *Sijakielioppi*. Helsinki. Gaudeamus.
- Siro, Paavo. 1996 *Lauseopin periaatteita*. Kaksitoista artikkelia. [Edited by Pentti Leino.]. Helsinki. Helsingin yliopiston suomen kielen laitos.
- Sjöborg, Gustaf. 1796. *Schwedische Sprachlehre für Deutsche*. Stralsund. bey Christian Lorenz Strucks Witwe und Leipzig, in Kommission bey Heinrich Gräff.
- Sjögren, And[reas]. Joh. 1821. *Ueber die finnische Sprache und ihre Literatur*. St. Petersburg. N. Gretsck.
- Sjögren, Andreas Joh. 1832. *Ueber den grammatischen Bau der syrjänischen Sprache mit Rücksicht auf die finnische*. Akademie der Wissenschaften zu St. Petersburg. Memoires, sixieme série. Tome I:149-169. St. Petersburg.
- Sjögren, Andr[reas]. Joh. 1844. *IRON ÆVZAGAXUR das ist ossetische Sprachlehre nebst kurzen ossetisch-deutschen und deutsch-ossetischen Wörterbuche*. St. Petersburg. Gedruckt bei der kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Sjögren, A[ndreas]. J[oh]. 1848. *Ossetische Studien mit besonderer Rücksicht auf die indo-europäischen Sprachen. Erste Lieferung. Die Selbstlauter*. St. Petersburg. Bei der kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften,
- Sjöstedt, Gösta. 1936. *Studier över r-ljuden i sydkandinaviska mål*. Skrifter utgivna genom Landsmålsarkivet i Lund 4. Lund.
- Skautrup, Peter. 1927-1930. *Hardsystemål. Ordforråd I-II*. København. Th. Linds Efterfølger Lauritz Schmiegelow.
- Skautrup, Peter. 1944-1970. *Det danske Sprogs Historie*. I-IV. København. Gyldendal / Nordisk Forlag. [I: 1944; II: 1947; III: 1953; IV: 1968; V: 1970.]
- Skautrup, Peter. 1949. Kostaldens navne i danske dialekter. En dialektgeografisk skitse. In: Peter Skautrup & Axel Steensberg, eds. *Festskrift til museumsforstander H. P. Hansen, Herning, på 70-årsdagen den 2. oktober 1949*, 356-369. Århus og København. Aarhus Stiftsbogtrykkeri.
- Skrefsrud, Lars O. 1873. *A grammar of the Santhal language*. Benares. Printed at the Medical Hall Press, Benares, for the Calcutta School Book and the Vernacular Literature Society.
- SKS = Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura. Helsinki.
- SKST = Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seuran Toimituksia. SKS. Helsinki.
- Skulerud, Olai. 1922-1938. *Tinnsmaalet. Ei utgreiding um ljod- og formverket i maalføret i Tinn i Nord-Aust-Telemark under jamføring med andre norske og andre nordiske maal, med maalprøvor og ei ordliste*. I. Halle a. S. Niemeyer. II. Oslo. Olaf Norli.
- Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove. 1981. *Tvåspråkighet*. Lund. Liber.
- Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove & Robert Phillipson, eds. 1995. *Linguistic Human Rights. Overcoming Linguistic Discrimination*. Berlin / New York. Mouton de Gruyter.
- Sköld, Hannes. 1936. *Materialen zu den iranischen Pamirsprachen*. Skrifter utg. av Kungl. humanistiska vetenskapssamfundet i Lund 21. Lund.
- SLS = Svenska litteratursällskapet i Finland. Helsingfors.
- Smári, Jakob Jóh. 1920. *Íslenzk setningafræði*. Reykjavík. Bókaverzlun Ársæls Árnasonar.

- Smith, C[asper]. W[ilhelm]. 1845. *Grammatik der polnischen Sprache*. Berlin. B. Behr's Buchhandlung.
- Smith, Casper Wilhelm. 1857-1859. *De locis quibusdam grammaticae linguarum balticarum et Slavonicarum. I-III*. Havniae. Gyldendal (F. Hegel).
- Smith, Casper Wilhelm. 1864. *Grammatik der polnischen Sprache*. Zweite, neu bearbeitete Auflage. Berlin. B. Behr's Buchhandlung (E. Bock).
- [Smith, Henrik]. 1520. *Hortulus synonymorum*. (Edition 1974 by Inger Bom. Universitets-Jubilæets Danske Samfund skriftserie 452. København. Akademisk Forlag.)
- Smith, Henrik. 1563. *Libellus vocum Latinarum cum interpretatione Danica, ex optimis Latinæ linguæ scriptoribus, in usum iuuentutis Danicæ congestus, accessit index vocum luculentissimus, pueris frugem haud mediocrem allaturus*. Malmogiæ. Henricus Faber.
- Smith, Svend. 1944. *Bidrag til Løsning af Problemer vedrørende Stødet i dansk Rigssprog. En eksperimentalfonetisk Studie*. København. Kaifers Boghandel.
- SNF = *Studier i nordisk filologi*. Utgivna av Svenska litteratursällskapet i Finland. Helsingfors.
- SO = *Studia Orientalia*. Helsinki.
- [Sohlberg, H. F.]. 1863. *Lärobok i allmän och svensk grammatik för Elementarläroverket i Finland*. Åbo. J.W. Lilja & Co:s förlag.
- Solla Price, Derek de. 1963. *Little Science, Big Science*. New York. Columbia University Press
- Sommerfelt, Alf. 1922. *The Dialect of Torr, Co. Donegal*. I. Phonology. DNVA 1921,2. Christiania. Jacob Dybwad.
- Sommerfelt, Alf. 1924. [Review of Jespersen 1922.] *Maal og Minne*, 153-157.
- Sommerfelt, Alf. 1925. "La philosophie linguistique Française". Réponse à M. Hjalmar Falk. *Bulletin de la Société Linguistique de Paris*. XXV:22-33.
- Sommerfelt, Alf. 1929. [Review of Brøndum-Nielsen 1928[-1973].] *Bulletin de la société de linguistique de Paris* 30:168-171.
- Sommerfelt, Alf. 1930. Sur la propagation des changements phonétiques. *NTS* IV:76-128.
- Sommerfelt, Alf. 1934. *Hvordan sproget blir til. En oversikt over sprogets rolle i samfundene*. Cappelen's bibliotek for kultur og natur. Oslo. Cappelen.
- Sommerfelt, Alf. 1935. *Sproget som samfundsorgan*. Universitetets radioforedrag. Oslo. J. M. Stenersens forlag.
- Sommerfelt, Alf. 1938. *La langue et la société. Caractères sociaux d'une langue de type archaïque*. IFSK. Serie A:XVIII. Oslo. Aschehoug.
- Sommerfelt, Alf. 1939. *Hva er rase? Antropologiske typer, språk, folk og nasjonalitetsproblemer i nutidens Europa*. Oslo. Johan Grundt Tanum.
- Sommerfelt, Alf. 1947. *Almen språkvitenskap. Det propedeutiske kursus*. Oslo. Universitetets studentkontor.
- Sommerfelt, Alf. 1948. *Språket og menneskene*. Oslo. Cappelen.
- Sommerfelt, Alf. 1952. *Almen språkvitenskap. Det propedeutiske kursus*. 2. utg. Oslo. Universitetets studentkontor.
- Sommerfelt, Alf. 1954. Language, Society and Culture. *NTS* XVII:5-81.
- Sommerfelt, Alf. 1962. *Diachronic and synchronic aspects of language*. Selected articles. *Janua Linguarum Series major VII*. 's-Gravenhage. Mouton & Co.
- Sotavalta, Arvo. 1936. *Die Phonetik und ihre Beziehungen zu den Grenzwissenschaften. Abgrenzung und Analyse des Untersuchungsgebietes*. AASF B XXXI:3.
- Soterus, Henricus, ed. 1631. *Svecia siue de Suecorum Regis Dominiis et opibus*. Lygd. Batav. [Elzevir].
- Sovijärvi, Antti. 1938. *Die gehaltenen, geflüsterten und gesungenen Vokale und Nasale der finnischen Sprache. Physiologisch-physikalische Lautanalysen*. AASF B XLIV:2.
- Sovijärvi, Antti. 1962. Röntgenkinematographisch-akustische Untersuchungen über die Artikulation der Diphthonge. In: Aalto & Sovijärvi 1962:111-125.
- Spegel, Haquin. 1712. *Glossarium Sveo-Gothicum eller Swensk-Ordabook, Inrättat Them til en wällmeent Anledning, som om thet härliga Språket willia begynna någon kunskap inhämta*. Lund. Abrah. Habereger.
- Språkvitenskapens forhold til samfunnsvitenskapene*. 1977. Konferanserapport. NAVF. Oslo.
- SSA 1992 = *Suomen sanojen alkuperä. Etymologinen sanakirja*. Ensimmäinen osa. A - K. Editors: Erkki Itkonen, Ulla-Maija Kulonen, Reino Peltola, Marita Cronstedt, Eino Koponen, Meri Puomies, Klaas Ph. Ruppel, Satu Tanner. SKST 556.
- SSF = Societas Scientiarum Fennica. Helsinki.
- SSFCHL = *Societas Scientiarum Fennica. Commentationes Humanarum Litterarum*. Helsinki.
- SSLS = *Skrifter utgivna av Svenska litteratursällskapet i Finland*. Helsingfors.
- SSSPH = *Stockholm Studies in Scandinavian Philology*. Stockholm.
- Stahl, Henricus. 1637. *Anführung zu der Esthnischen Sprach, auff Wolgemeinten Rath, und Bittliches Ersuchen, publiciret*. Revall. Druckts Chr. Reusner der älter, in Verlegung des Authoris.
- Stang, Christian S. 1957. *Slavonic Accentuation*. Oslo. Universitetsforlaget.
- Stang, Chr[istian]. S. 1966. *Vergleichende Grammatik der Baltischen Sprachen*. Oslo / Bergen / Tromsø. Universitetsforlaget.
- Steenstrup, Johannes C. H. R. 1894. Nogle Bidrag til vore Landsbyers og Bebyggelsens Historie. *Hist. Tidsskr. Sjette Rk.* 5:313-366.
- Steenstrup, Johannes C. H. R. 1896. Nogle Undersøgelser om Guders Navne i de nordiske Stedsnavne. *Hist. Tidsskr. Sjette Rk.* 6:353-388.
- Steinsholt, Anders. 1964 [1940]. *Målbryting i Hedrum*. Skrifter frå Norsk Målførearkiv ved Olav T. Beito. XIXI. Oslo / Bergen

/ Tromsø. Universitetsforlaget.

- Steinsholt, Anders. 1972. *Målbryting i Hedrum 30 år etter*. Skrifter frå Norsk Målførearkiv ved Olav T. Beito. XXVI. Oslo / Bergen / Tromsø. Universitetsforlaget.
- Sten, Holger. 1938. *Nægtelserne i Fransk. En historisk-syntaktisk Fremstilling*. Kjøbenhavn. Nyt Nordisk Forlag. Arnold Busck.
- Sten, H[olger]. 1952a. *Les temps du verbe fini (indicatif) en français moderne*. Hist. Filos. Medd. Dan. Vid. Selsk. 33:3. København. Munksgaard.
- Sten, Holger. 1952b. L'infinitivo impressoal et l'infinitivo pessoal en port. mod. *BF* 13:83-142, 201-224.
- Sten, H[olger]. 1956. *Manuel de phonétique française*. [Copenhague.] Munksgaard.
- Sten, Holger. 1973. *L'emploi des temps en portugais moderne*. København. Munksgaard.
- Stiernhielm, Georg. [?1643] *Magog Aramaeo-Gothicus*. Upsaliae. Eschillius Matthiae.
- Stiernhielm, Georg. 1671. De linguarum origine. In: *D. N. Jesu Christi SS. Evangelia Ab Ulfila Gothorum in Moesia Episcopo Circa Annum à Nato Christo CCCLX ex Græco Gothicè translata, nunc cum Parallelis Versionibus, Sveo-Gothicâ, Norrænâ, seu Islandicâ, & vulgatâ Latinâ edita*. Stockholmiae. Nicolaus Wankif.
- Stipa, Günter Johannes. 1990. *Finnisch-ugrische Sprachforschung von der Renaissance bis zum Neupositivismus*. SUST 206.
- Stjernström, G. & A. Noreen, eds. 1881. *En svensk ordeskötsel angående bokstäfver, ord och ordesätt*. Med inledning, anmärkingar och register. Skrifter utg. af Sv. literatursällsk. 4. Uppsala. Edv. Berling.
- Stockfleth, N[ils]. V[ibe]. 1840. *Grammatik i det Lappiske Sprog, saaledes som det tales i Nord-Finnmarken*. Første Del. Bogstav- og Formlæren. Christiania. Gröndahl.
- Stockfleth, Nils Vibe. 1852. *Norsk-lappisk Ordbog*. Christiania. Cappelen.
- Storm, Joh. 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, Joh. 1887. *Franske Taleøvelser. En systematisk Fremstilling af det franske Talesprog gennem Samtaler af det daglige Liv, ordnede efter Grammatiken. Melletrin*. [Also with French title: *Dialogues Français. Enseignant la grammaire et la phraséologie du français parlé. Cours moyen*.] Kjøbenhavn. Gyldendal (F. Hegel & Søn).
- Storm, Joh. 1888. *Det nynorske Landsmaal. En Undersøgelse*. Kjøbenhavn. Gyldendal (F. Hegel & Søn).
- Storm, Joh. 1896. *Norsk Sprog. Kraakemaal og Landsmaal*. Kjøbenhavn. Gyldendal (F. Hegel & Søn).
- Storm, Joh. 1903. *Landsmaalet som Kultursprog*. Rigsmaalsforeningens Smaaskrifter VIII. Kristiania. Rigsmaalsforeningens Forlag.
- Storm, Joh. 1904-1906. *Norsk Retskrivning*. I-II. Kristiania. Cammermeyers Boghandel.
- Strahlenberg, Philipp Johann von. 1730. *Das Nord- und Ostliche Theil von Europa und Asia. In so weit solches Das ganze Russische Reich mit Sibirien und das grossen Tatarey in sich begriffet, In einer Historisch-Geographischen Beschreibung der alten und neuern Zeiten, und vielen andern unbekannten Nachrichten vorgestellt, Nebst einer noch niemals ans Licht gegebenen Tabula Polyglotta von zwey und dreyssigerley Arten Tatarischer Völcker Sprachen und einem Kalmuckischen Vocabulario. Sonderlich aber Einer grossen richtigen Land-Charte von den benannten Ländern und von verschiedenen Kupfferstichen, so die Asiatische-Scythische Antiquität betreffen; Bey Gelegenheit der Schwedischen Kriegs-Gefangenschaft in Russland, aus eigener sorgfältigen Erkundung, auf denen verstatteten weitten Reisen zusammen gebracht und ausgefertiget*. Stockholm. In Verlegung des Autoris.
- Strahlmann, Johann. 1816. *Finnische Sprachlehre für Finnen und Nicht-Finnen, mit Beziehung auf die Aehnlichkeit der finnischen Sprache mit der ungarischen, und einem Anhang von finnischen Idiotismen und Vergleichung der finnischen und ungarischen Etymologie, mit einem Auszuge in diesen Sprachen verwandten Wörter*. St. Petersburg. M. C. Iversen.
- Strömberg, N. 1852. *Svensk språklära, med afseende på språkets historiska utveckling upptaganande äfven gotiskan, fornorskan och fornsvenskan i jämförelse med de svenska landskapsmolen*. Stockholm. Zacharias Häggström.
- Strömqvist, Sven, Hrafnhildur Ragnarsdóttir, Olle Engstrand, Helga Jonsdóttir, Elizabeth Lanza, Matti Leiwo, Åsa Nordqvist, Ann Peters, Kim Plunkett, Ulla Richtoff, Hanne G. Simonsen, Jorma Toivainen & Kirsti Toivainen. 1995. The Inter-Nordic Study of Language Acquisition. *Nordic Journal of Linguistics* 18:3-29.
- Ståhl, Magnus Laur. 1834. *Biographiske underrättelser om professorer ved Kongl. Universitetet i Lund, ifrån dess inrättning till närvarande tid*. Christianstad. L. Littorins förlag.
- Ståhle, Bertel. 1997. *Universitetet och forskarna — från stagnation till förnyelse. Universitetsforskare, forskarutbildning och forskarrekrytering i Norden*. Nord 1996:39. Köpenhamn. Nordiska ministerrådet.
- Ståhle, Carl Ivar 1975. *Vers och språk i vasatidens och stormaktstidens diktning*. Stockholm. Norstedt.
- Suhonen, Seppo 1973. Lisiä Vhaelin kielioopin vaiheisiin. *JSFOu* 72:424-426.
- Sundwall, Johannes 1915. Die kretische Linearschrift. *Jahrbuch des deutschen Archäologischen Instituts* 1915:41-64.
- Sundwall, Johannes. 1931. *Die Entstehung des phoenikischen Alphabets und die kretinische Schrift*. Acta Academiae Aboensis A 7:4. Åbo. Åbo Akademi.
- Sundwall, Johannes. 1957. *Symbolische Elemente in der minoischen A-linearen Schrift*. SSFCHL XXIII:5.
- Suojanen, M. K. 1985. *Mitä Turussa puhutaan? Raportti Turun puhekielen tutkimuksesta*. Publications of the Department of Finnish and General Linguistics of the University of Turku, 23.
- Suojanen, M. K. & Päivikki Suojanen 1982, ed. *Sosiolingvistiikan näkymiä*. Helsinki. Gaudeamus.
- Suolahti [Palander], Hugo. 1909. *Die deutschen Vogelnamen. Eine wortgeschichtliche Untersuchung*. Strassburg. Verlag von

- Karl J. Trübner.
- Suolahti [Palander], Hugo. 1929. *Der französische Einfluss auf die deutsche Sprache im dreizehnten Jahrhundert*. [I.] MSNH 8.
- Suolahti [Palander], Hugo. 1933. *Der französische Einfluss auf die deutsche Sprache im dreizehnten Jahrhundert. II.* MSNH 10.
- SUS-Publications 1995 = *Publications of the Finno-Ugrian Society 1885-1985*. Helsinki. Société Finno-Ougrienne.
- Svartvik, Jan, ed. 1990. *The London-Lund Corpus of spoken English. Description and research*. Lund studies in English 82. Lund. Lund University Press.
- Svedbom, P. E. 1843. *Utkast till satslära med hufvudsakligt afseende på svenska språket. Jemte talrika uppgifter till syntaktiska öfningar för nybegynnare*. [Ledtråd vid den första undervisningen i modersmålet. Efter en ny plan utarbetad av P. E. Svedbom. Stockholm. Norstedt.
- SVEJ 1984 = *Suomen väestön esihistoriallisest juuret. Bidrag till kännedom av Finlands natur och folk*. Utgivna av Finska Vetenskaps-Societeten. H. 131. Helsinki.
- Svenonius, Enevaldus. 1662. *Gymnasium Capiendæ Rationis humanæ; In quo. auxiliante Deo O. M. nec non annuente Venerando Senatu: per exercitationes Academicas Decem, quæ in XX. Disputationes publicas sunt distributæ, sobrius Philosophiæ in Theologiâ usus. novâ inventione ac methodo perspicuè demonstratur. Quibus, præter nonnullas alias, peculiaris accessit, circa Exercitationem quintam, Digressio de lingua latina*. Aboæ. Petrus Hansonius.
- Svenska Akademiens grammatik 1836, see [Enberg, Lars Magnus] 1836.
- Svenskt Biografiskt Lexikon*. 1918-(1989). Vol. 1-(26). Stockholm. Bonnier / Norstedt.
- Svensson, Jan. 1993. *Språk och offentlighet. Om språkförändringar i den politiska offentligheten*. Lundastudier i nordisk språkvetenskap A:47. Lund. Lund University Press.
- Sveriges runinskrifter*. 1900- Utgivna av Kungl. Vitterhets historie och antikvitets akademien. Stockholm. Almqvist & Wiksell.
- Swan, Toril. 1992. Forskning om språk og kjønn i Norge. In: Britt-Louise Gunnarsson & Caroline Liberg, eds. *Språk, språkbruk och kön. Rapport från ASLA's nordiska symposium Uppsala 7-9 november 1991*, 45-51. ASLA.
- Swedberg, Jesper. 1716. *Shibboleth. Svenska Språkets Rycht och Richtighet*. Skara. Tryckt hos sal. Kiellbergs Änckia.
- Swedberg, Jesper. 1722. *En kort Svensk Grammatica*. Stockholm. Andr. Biörkman.
- Sweet, Henry. 1877. *A Handbook of Phonetics including a popular exposition of the principles of spelling reform*. Clarendon Press Series. Oxford. At the Clarendon Press.
- Syv, Peder P. 1663. *Nogle betenkninger om det Cimbriske Sprog*. Kiøbenhavn. [No publisher or printer.] [In: Bertelsen I 1915:77-272.]
- Syv, Peder P. 1685. *Den danske Sprog-Kunst eller Grammatica samt ett tilheng om dette Sprogs Skrive-riktighed*. København. Joh. Phil. Bockenhoffer. [In: Bertelsen III 1919:149-250.]
- [Syv, Peder P.]. P. S. 1692. *Prøve Paa en Dansk og Latinsk Ord-Bog, Item Specimen lexicæ Latio-Danici*. Kiøbenhavn. Bekaastet af Auctore, Tilkiøbs hos Cristian Gertsen. Tryct hos Conrad Hartvig Neuhoft.
- Söderberg, Sven & Erik Brate. 1900-1906. *Ölands runinskrifter*. Stockholm. Almqvist & Wiksell.
- Söderhjelm, Werner. 1895. Über Accentverschiebung in der dritten Person Pluralis im Altfranzösischen. *Öfversigt af Finska Vetenskaps-Societetens förhandlingar XXXVII* (1894-95):62-92.
- Söderhjelm, W[erner]. & N. Tötterman. 1892. *Fransk språklära*. Helsingfors. Otava.
- Söderlind, Johannes. 1976. English. *Faculty of Arts at Uppsala University. Linguistics and Philology. Uppsala University 500 Years*. Vol. 6. Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis, 1-10. Stockholm. Almqvist & Wiksell.
- Söderwall, Knut Fredrik. 1870. *Huvudepokerna av svenska språkets utbildning*. Lund. Gleerup.
- Söderwall, Knut Fredrik. 1884-1918. *Ordbok öfver svenska medeltids-språket*. I-III. Lund. Berlingska boktryckeri- och stilgjuteri-aktiebolaget.
- Sørensen, John Kousgård, ed. 1968-1996. *Danske sø- og ånavne*. 1-8, København. Reitzel.
- Sørensen, Finn & Carl Vikner. 1989. *Modallogik og semantik*. Institut for Datalingvistik. Handelshøjskolen i København. København.
- Tamm, Fredrik. 1887. *Fonetiska kännetecken på lånord i nysvenska riksspråket*. Upsala universitets årsskrift 1887. Upsala. Edv. Berling.
- Tamm, Fredrik. 1899. *Om avledningsändelser hos svenska adjektiv, deras historia och nutida förekomst*. Skrifter utgifna af K. Humanistiska Vetenskapssamfundet i Upsala. VI.8. Upsala. Almqvist & Wiksell.
- Tamm, Fredrik. 1900. *Sammansatta ord i nutida svenskan undersökta med hänsyn till bildning av förleder*. Skrifter utgifna af K. Humanistiska Vetenskapssamfundet i Upsala. VII.1. Upsala. Almqvist & Wiksell.
- Taraldsen, Knut Tarald. 1978. On the NIC, vacuous application and the *that-trace* filter. Mimeographed, Cambridge, Mass., MIT. [Indiana University Linguistics Club, 1980.]
- Taraldsen, Knut Tarald. 1981. The theoretical interpretation of marked extractions. In: Adriana Belletti, Luciana Brandi & Luigi Rizzi, eds. *Theory of Markedness in Generative Grammar: Proceedings of the 1979 GLOW Conference*. Pisa. Scuola normale superiore di Pisa.
- Tarvainen, Kalevi. 1977. *Dependenssikielioppi*. Helsinki. Gaudeamus.
- TCLC = *Travaux du Cercle Linguistique de Copenhague*. Copenhague.
- TCLP = *Travaux du Cercle Linguistique de Prague*. Prague.

- Tegnér, Esaias. 1874. Om språk och nationalitet. Originally published in *Svensk Tidskrift*. Reprinted in Tegnér 1922:96-164.
- Tegnér, Esaias. 1880. *Språkets makt öfver tanken*. Ur vår tids forskning. Populära skildringar, under redaktion af Prof. Gustaf Retzius utgifna af Stiftelsen Lars Hiertas minne. 26. Stockholm. Samson & Wallin.
- Tegnér, Esaias. 1886. *Natur och onatur i fråga om svensk rättstavning*. Upsala. Almqvist & Wiksell.
- Tegnér, Esaias d.y. 1892. *Om genus i svenskan*. Stockholm. Kungl. Boktryckeriet.
- Tegnér, Esaias. 1922-1930. *Ur språkens värld*. I-III. Stockholm. Bonniers.
- Teleman, Ulf. 1965. Svenskans genusmorfem. *ANF* 80:217-230.
- Teleman, Ulf. 1969a. On Gender in a Generative Grammar of Swedish. *Studia Linguistica* XXIII:27-67.
- Teleman, Ulf. 1969b. *Studies in a generative grammar of modern Swedish*. Doctoral dissertation. Lund.
- Teleman, Ulf. 1969c. Grammatik för gymnasiaster. In: Loman, Bengt et al., eds. *Språket i blickpunkten*, 98-131. Skrifter utgivna av Svenskläraryrket 110. Lund. Gleerups.
- Teleman, Ulf. 1972. *Tre uppsatser i grammatik*. Lundastudier i nordisk språkvetenskap. Lund. Studentlitteratur.
- Teleman, Ulf. 1974. *Manual för grammatisk beskrivning av talad och skriven svenska*. Lundastudier i nordisk språkvetenskap C:6. Lund. Studentlitteratur.
- Teleman, Ulf. 1984. Bestämt och obestämt. Fem 1600-talsgrammatiker på upptäcktsfärd bland modersmålets artiklar. In: Bernt Fossetøl, Kjell Ivar Vannebo, Kjell Venås & Finn-Erik Vinje, eds. *Festskrift til Einar Lundeby*. 3. oktober 1984, 96-111. Oslo. Novus.
- Teleman, Ulf, Staffan Hellberg & Erik Andersson. 1999. *Svenska Akademiens grammatik*. Svenska Akademien. I distribution hos Norstedts Ordbok. Stockholm.
- Terserus, Adolphus Elai. 1640a. *Grammatica Latina Terseriana Quam Benedicente Altissimo Compendiosis præceptis, nec minùs distinctâ faciliq̄ Methodo ad naturalem docendi discendiq̄ Modum accommodatam adornavit, magnoque inserviendæ patriæ desiderio, superatis laboribus & difficultatibus plurimis discentium bono reliquit*. Arosiæ. Petrus Waldius.
- Terserus, Adolphus Elai. 1640b. *Donatus Terserianus id est Ratio Flectendi Seu Prima Lingvæ Latinæ, super Dictionum Latinarum partes flexibiles, Rudimenta, in brevissimos nec minùs perspicuos canones ità redacta & delineata, ut solo fermè intuitu percipi addiscique possint a Tyronibus*. [Arosiæ]. Typis Consistorij Aros.
- Thalbitzer, William. 1904. *A phonetical study of the Eskimo language. Based on observations made on a journey in North Greenland 1900-1901. With a historical introduction about East Eskimo, a comparison of the Eskimo dialects, a new collection of Greenlandic folk-tales, song and music, and a map of the Eskimo territories*. Reprint from Meddelelser om Grønland. Vol. XXXI. Copenhagen. Bianco Luno.
- Thalbitzer, William. 1911. *Eskimo. An Illustrative Sketch*. Extract from Handbook of American Indian languages (Bulletin 40), part 1, of Bureau of American Ethnology (Boas). Washington. Government Printing Office.
- Thelander, Mats. 1985, ed. *Sven Hofs Swänska språkets rätta skriftsätt (1753) med ordstatistik och flera register i ny utgåva*. Uppsala. Institutionen för nordiska språk. Uppsala universitet.
- Therkelsen, Rita. 1996. *Det bundne og den fri kreativitet i og gennem sproget. Introduktion til mediationsteorien*. Roskilde. Roskilde Universitetsforlag.
- Thesleff, Arthur. 1901. *Wörterbuch des Dialekts der finnländischen Zigeuner*. Helsingfors. Druckerei der finnischen Literatur-Gesellschaft.
- Thomsen, Vilh[elm]. 1869. *Den gotiske sprogklasses indflydelse på den finske. En sproghistorisk undersøgelse*. København. Gyldendal.
- Thomsen, Vilh[elm]. 1890. *Beröringer mellom de finske og de baltiske (litauisk-lettiske) Sprog. En sproghistorisk undersøgelse*. Vidensk. selsk. Skr., 6. Række, historisk og filosofisk Afd. I.1. København. Bianco Luno.
- Thomsen, Vilh[elm]. 1894. Déchiffrement des inscriptions de l'Orkhon et de l'Iénissei. Notice préliminaire. *Bulletin de l'Académie Royale des Sciences et des Lettres de Danmark* 1893:1-15. Copenhagen. Bianco Luno.
- Thomsen, Vilh[elm]. 1896. *Inscriptions de l'Orkhon déchiffrées*. MSFOu 5.
- Thomsen, Wilhelm. 1899. Remarques sur la parenté de la langue étrusque. *Extrait du Bulletin de l'académie royale des sciences et des lettres de Danmark* 4:373-398. Copenhagen. Bianco Luno (F. Dreyer).
- Thomsen, Vilh[elm]. 1902. *Sprogvidenskabens historie. En kortfattet fremstilling*. København. Gad.
- Thomsen, Vilh[elm]. 1913-1918. Une lettre méconnue des inscriptions de l'Iénissei. *JSFOu* 30.
- Thomsen, Vilhelm. 1916. *Turcica. Études concernant l'interprétation des inscriptions turques de la Mongolie et de la Sibérie*. MSFOu 37.
- Thomsen, Vilh[elm]. & Ludv[ig]. Wimmer. 1908. *Bornholmsk Sproglære*. Særtryk af J. C. S. Espersen med indlæg og tillæg udg. af Det Kgl. Danske Videnskabernes Selskab. København. Bianco Luno.
- Thorberg, Abraham. 1785. *Utkast til en kritisk historia om österländska språket*. Upsala. Johan Edman.
- Thorell, Olof. 1973. *Svensk grammatik*. Stockholm. Esselte.
- Thorkelsson, see Porkelsson.
- Thors, Carl-Eric. 1949. Substantivering av adjektiv i fornsvenskan. *SNF* 36-38. *SSLS* 322.
- Thors, Carl-Eric. 1957. Den kristna terminologien i fornsvenskan. *SNF* 45. *SSLS* 359.
- Thorsen, P. K. 1886. *Bidrag til nörrejsk lydlære*. Utgivet af universitets-jubilæets danske samfund. København. Thieles bogtrykkeri.

- Thorsen, P. K. 1889. *Sprogarten på Sejerø*. København. Universitet-Jubilæets Danske Samfund.
- Thorsen, P. K. 1894. Glidning og Spring i sprogomdannelse. In: [no editor], *Festskrift til Vilhelm Thomsen fra Disciple*, 309-334. København. Gyldendal.
- Thráinsson, Höskuldur. 1978. On the Phonology of Icelandic Preaspiration. *Nordic Journal of Linguistics* 1:3-54.
- Thráinsson, Höskuldur. 1979. *On Complementation in Icelandic*. [Ph.D. Dissertation, Harvard University.] New York. Garland Publishing.
- Thráinsson, Höskuldur. 1996. Linguistics in Iceland in the 20th century. In: Henriksen et al. 1996:324-364.
- Þórolfsson, Björn Karel. 1925. *Um íslenskar orðmyndir á 14. og 15. öld og breytingar þeirra úr forn málinu*. Reykjavík.
- Tiderus, A. J. 1640. *Grammatica Latina in gratiam discentium magna ex parte, in sueticum idioma, qua fieri potuit fidelitate, translata*. Holmiae. Typis & suptibus Joh. Laur. Horrn.
- Tiällman [sic], N[ils]. 1679. *Grammatica Latina In usum Discipulorum quorundam Holmensium*. Holmiae. Henricus Keyser.
- Tiällmann, Nils. 1696. *Grammatica Suecana, Äller En Svensk Språk- Ock Skrif-Konst, Välment sammanskriften, ock i liuset gifen, mäd egen bekostnad*. Stockholm. Henrich Keiser.
- Togeb, Knud. 1951. *Structure immanente de la langue française*. TCLC VI. Copenhagen. Nordisk Sprog- og Kulturforlag .
- Togeb, Knud. 1965. *Fransk grammatik*. København. Gyldendal.
- Togeb, Knud. 1978. *Choix d'articles 1943-1974. Edité par Michael Herslund*. Études Romanes de l'Université de Copenhagen. Revue Romane numéro spécial 15. Copenhagen. Akademisk Forlag.
- Togeb, Knud. 1982-1985. *Grammaire française*. Publié par Magnus Berg, Ghani Merad et Ebbe Spang-Hanssen. Copenhagen. Akademisk forlag.
- Togeb, Ole. 1993. *PRAXT. Pragmatisk tekstteori*. Aarhus. Aarhus universitetsforlag.
- Toivainen, Jorma. 1980. *Inflectional Affixes Used by Finnish-speaking Children Aged 1-3 Years*. SKST 359.
- Toivonen, Y. H., ed. 1948. *K. F. Karjalainens Ostjakisches Wörterbuch*. I-II. LSF 10.
- Toivonen, Y. H. 1955. *Suomen kielen etymologinen sanakirja*. I. LSF 12:1.
- Toivonen, Y. H. 1956. Über die syrjänischen Lehnwörter im Ostjakischen. *FUF* 32:1-169.
- Torp, Alf. 1881. *Die Flexion des P_li in ihrem Verhältniss zum Sanskrit*. Universitäts-Programm für das erste Halbjahr 1881 herausgegeben von Sophus Bugge. Christiania. A.W. Brøgger.
- Torp, Alf. 1889. Vokal- og konsonantstammer. *Akademiske afhandlinger til Professor Dr. Sophus Bugge ved hans 25-aars jubilæum den 2^{den} mai 1889 fra taknemmelige elever*, 81-97. Kristiania. Alb. Cammermeyer.
- Torp, Alf. 1902. Bemerkungen zu den Arzawa-Briefen. In: Knudtzon 1902:108-124.
- Torp, Alf. 1905. *Etruscan Notes*. DNVA 1905,1. Christiania. Jacob Dybwad.
- Torp, Alf. 1919. *Nynorsk etymologisk ordbok*. Oslo. Aschehoug.
- Torp, Alf & Hjalmar Falk. 1898. *Dansk-norskens lydhistorie med særligt hensyn paa orddannelse og bøjning*. Kristiania. Aschehoug.
- Trampe, Peter af & Åke Viberg. 1972. *Allmän språk teori och grammatik. En introduktion*. Lund. Gleerup.
- Trostius, Martinus. 1627. *Grammatica Ebraea generalis*. Hafniae. Typis Sartorianis.
- Trubetzkoy, N. S. 1939. *Grundzüge der Phonologie*. TCLP 7. Prague. Cercle Linguistique.
- Tunkelo, E. A. 1908. *Alkusuomen genitiivin funktioista. I, 1*. Alkusuomen genitiivi relatiivisen nimen apugloosana. Semologinen tutkimuskoe. SKST 120.
- Tunkelo, E. A. 1919-1920. *Alkusuomen genitiivin funktioista. I, 2*. Alkusuomen genitiivi absoluuttisen nimen apugloosana. Semologinen tutkimuskoe. SKST 120.
- Tuomi, Tuomo, ed. 1976. *Sanojen taivalta. Puoli vuosisataa Sanakirjasäätiön toimintaa*. Suomi 121:2. SKS.
- Turson, Jon. 1561. *Vocabularius rerum: cum omnibus fere verbis singularum coniugationum*. Hafniae. [No printer.]
- Þorkelsson, Jón. 1876. *Supplement til islandske Ordbøger*. Reykjavík. Hinn lærði skóli í Reykjavík.
- Þorkelsson, Jón. 1879-1885. *Supplement til islandske Ordbøger, anden Samling*. Reykjavík. Hinn lærði skóli í Reykjavík.
- Þorkelsson, Jón. 1890-1897. *Supplement til islandske Ordbøger. Tredje Samling*. Reykjavík. Foreningstrykkeriet.
- Þorkelsson [=Þorkelsson], Jón. 1899. *Supplement til islandske Ordbøger. Fjerde Samling*. København. A. F. Høst & Søn. UAJb = *Ural-Altäische Jahrbücher*. Wiesbaden.
- Uldall, H. J. 1933. *A Danish phonetic reader*. London. University of London Press.
- Uldall, H. J. 1935 [1936]. The phonematics of Danish. In: Daniel Jones and D. B. Fry, eds. *Proceedings of the Second International Congress of Phonetic Sciences*, 54-57. Cambridge. Cambridge University Press.
- Uldall, H. J. 1957. *Outline of Glossematics, part I, General Theory*. TCLP 10,I [2 ed. 1967 with an introduction by Eli Fischer-Jørgensen and a bibliography].
- Ulvestad, Bjarne. 1976. Grein sú er máli skiptir. Tools and traditions in the First Grammatical Treatise. *HL* 3:203-223.
- Varming, L. 1862. *Det jydsk folkesprog. Grammatisk fremstillet*. Kjøbenhavn. H. Hagerup.
- [Vaugelas, Claude Favre de]. 1647. *Remarques sur la langue française utiles a ceux qui veulent bien parler et bien écrire*. Paris. Iean Camusat & Pierre Le Petit.
- Venås, Kjell. 1984. *For Noreg og Ivar Aasen. Gustav Indrebø i arbeid og strid*. Oslo. Novus.
- Venås, Kjell. 1990. *Norsk grammatikk. Nynorsk*. Oslo. Universitetsforlaget.
- Venås, Kjell. 1992. *I Aasens fotefar. Marius Hægstad*. Oslo. Novus.
- Venås, Kjell. 1996. *Då tida var fullkomen: Ivar Aasen*. Oslo. Novus.

- Verelius, Olaus. 1675. *Compendiosa ad Runographiam Scandicam antiqvam recte intelligendam. / En kort underwijsning Om Then Gambla Swea-Götha Runa-Ristning*. Upsalæ. Henricus Curio.
- Verelius, Olaus. 1691. *Index Lingvæ Veteris Scytho-Scandiæ sive Gothicæ ex vetusti ævi monumentis; maximam partem manuscriptis, collectus atqve opera Olai Rudbecki editus*. Upsalæ. [No printer.]
- Verner, Karl. 1876. Eine ausnahme der ersten lautverschiebung. *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 32:97-130.
- Verner, Karl. 1881. [Review of Kock 1878.] *Anz. f. deutsches altertum u. deutsche sprache* 7:1-13.
- Verner, Karl. 1903. *Afhandlingar og breve*. Udgivne af Selskab for germansk filologi med en biografi ved Marius Vibæk. København / Leipzig. J. Frimodts forlag / Otto Harrassowitz.
- Vhael, Bartholdus G. 1733. *Grammatica Fennica, Adcuratiore methodo, penitore cura, observatione, & labore, reserans antiqvissimæ hujus, ac natura sua præstantissimæ linguæ adyta, ejus peculiarem, ab aliis Europæis linguis differentem genium, flexiones & conjugationes, orientalibus, primæve imprimis, adfines illustrans*. Aboæ. Johan Kiämpe.
- Via. Published by Engelska språklärföreningen i Finland.
- Viberg, Åke 1984. The verbs of perception: a typological study. In: Brian Butterworth, Bernard Comrie & Östen Dahl, eds. *Explanations for Language universals*, 123-160. New York. Mouton.
- [Videnskabernes Selskab]. 1793-1905. *Dansk Ordbog udgiven under Videnskabernes Selskabs Bestyrelse*. I-VII. København. N. Møller og Søn, Schultz, Kjøpping og Løser.
- Quousque tandem [Wilhelm Viëtor]. 1882. *Der sprachunterricht muss umkehren!* Heilbronn. Henninger.
- Vigfússon, Guðbrandur. 1874. *An Icelandic-English Dictionary*. Based on MS. Collections of the Late Richard Cleasby. Enlarged and Completed by Gudbrand Vigfússon, M.A. Oxford.
- Vihonen, Sakari. 1978. *Suomen kielen oppikirja 1600-luvulla. Kielipiillinen ajattelu 1600-luvun suomen kielen oppikirjoissa*. Studia Philologica Jyväskyläensia 11. Järvenpää.
- Vihonen, Sakari. 1983. Suomen kielen kuvaus 1600-luvun kieliopeissa. Collegium Scientiæ. Suomen oppihistorian kehityslinjoja keskiajalta Turun akatemian alkuaikoihin. *Suomen kirkkohistoriallisen seuran toimituksia* 125:121-155. Helsinki. Suomen kirkkohistoriallinen seura.
- Vihonen, Sakari. 1998. Suomen kielen oppikirja 1600-luvulla. Kielipiillinen ajattelu 1600-luvun suomen kielen oppikirjoissa. Paperituloste PC-versiosta, uudistettu ja tarkistettu 1998. Kotipaja. [Updated version of Vihonen (1978).]
- Vikner, Sten. 1995. *Verb movement and expletive subjects in the Germanic languages*. New York. Oxford University Press.
- Vilkuna, Maria. 1989. *Free Word Order in Finnish. Its Syntax and Discourse Functions*. SKST 500.
- Vilkuna, Maria. 1992. Referenssi ja määräisyys suomenkielisten tekstien tulkinnassa. *Suomi* 163. SKS.
- Vilppula, Matti. 1976. Murresanakirjan etäistä taustaa. In: Tuomi 1976:67-70.
- Vir. = *Virittäjä. Kotikielen Seuran aikakauslehti*. Helsinki.
- Virtaranta, Pertti. 1958. *Pääpainollisen tavun jälkeisen soinnillisen dentaalispirantin edustus suomen murteissa*. SKST 252
- Vogt, Hans. 1938. Esquisse d'une grammaire du géorgien moderne. *NTS* IX:5-114, X:5-188.
- Vogt, Hans. 1940. *The Kalispel Language. An outline of the grammar with texts, translations, and dictionary*. DNVA. Oslo. Jacob Dybwad.
- Vogt, Hans. 1942. The structure of the Norwegian monosyllables. *NTS* XII:5-29.
- Vogt, Hans. 1944 [1948]. Le système des cas en ossète. *ALH* IV:17-41.
- Vogt, Hans. 1945. *Forelesninger i almen språkvitenskap*. Oslo. Universitetets Studentkontor.
- Vogt, Hans. 1963. *Dictionnaire de la langue Oubykh*. IFSK Serie B:LII. Oslo. Universitetsforlaget.
- Vogt, Hans. 1971. *Grammaire de la langue géorgienne*. IFSK. Serie B:LVII. Oslo. Universitetsforlaget.
- Vogt, Hans. 1988. *Linguistique caucasienne et arménienne*. Studia Caucasologica II. Edited by Even Hovdhaugen & Fridrik Thordarson. IFSK. Serie B:LXXXVI. Oslo. Norwegian University Press.
- Vorstius, M. Johannes. 1657. *De lingua omnium prima, deque hujus, ut Scriptura vocat, Confusione*. [No place, no printer.]
- Vuoriniemi, Jorma 1973. *Ollin kieli nykysuomen kuvastimessa. Semanttis-interpretatiivi tutkimus*. SKST 312.
- Väänänen, Veikko. 1937. *Le latin vulgaire des inscriptions Pompéiennes*. Diss. Helsinki.
- Väänänen, Veikko. 1966 [1958]. *Le latin vulgaire des inscriptions Pompéiennes*. Troisième édition augmentée. Abhandlungen der deutschen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin. Klasse für Sprachen, Literatur und Kunst. Jahrgang 1958:3. Berlin. Akademie-Verlag. [2nd ed. 1958, 1st ed = Väänänen 1937].
- Väänänen, Veikko. 1962. *Introduction au latin vulgaire*. Paris. Librairie C. Klincksieck.
- Walberg, Emanuel. 1922. *La vie de Saint Thomas le martyr*. Skrifter utgivna av Kungl. humanistiska Vetenskapssamfundet i Lund V. Lund. C. W. K. Gleerup.
- Wallenius Westmannus, Gabriel A. F. 1682. *Project af Swensk Grammatica. Harigt och wälment å Papperet gifwit*. Åbo. Johan Winter.
- Wallensköld, Axel. 1909. La construction du complément des comparatifs et des expressions comparatives dans les langues romanes. *MSNH* V:375-478.
- Wallensköld, Axel. 1922. *Kortfattad lärobok i ido för självstudium*. Helsingfors. Holger Schildts Förlagsaktiebolag.
- Wallin, Georg August. 1839. *De praecipua inter hodiernam Arabum linguam et antiquam differentia dissertatio*. Helsingforsiae. Frenckell.
- Wallin, G[eorg]. A[ugust]. 1855. Ueber die Laute des Arabischen und ihre Bezeichnung. *ZDMG* 9:1-69.
- Walton, Stephen J. 1991. *Ivar Aasens nedre halvdel*. Oslo. Det Norske Samlaget.

- Walton, Stephen [J.] 1996. *Ivar Aasens kropp*. Oslo. Det Norske Samlaget.
- Wandal, Peder J. 1651. *Catalogus CCC Vocabulorum Danicorum, quæ non tam cognationem cum sanctâ Ebræâ lingvâ habent, quam eidem natales suos debere comperiuntur. Det er: En Fortegnelse Paa 300 Danske Ord oc Gloser, Som icke alleeniste komme offuer-eens med det hellige Ebræiske Tungemaal, men end oc haffue deraff deris oprindelse oc begyndelse. Alle dennem som haffe lyst oc kiarlighed til det hellige Hebræiske Sprock, oc voris Danske Fædernelands Tungemaal til Villie oc Tieniste sammenskreffuit*. Schlesswig. [No printer.]
- Warelius, Anders. 1848. Bidrag till Finlands kânnedom i ethnographiskt hânseende. *Suomi* 7:47-130.
- Weinstock, John, ed. 1978. *The Nordic Languages and Modern Linguistics* 3. Proceedings of the Third International Conference of Nordic and General Linguistics. Austin. The University of Texas.
- Weisse, J. P. 1871. *Latinsk Grammatik til Skolebrug*. Kristiania. P. F. Steensballe.
- Wellander, Erik. 1938. *Riktig svenska*. Stockholm. Svenska Bokförlaget Norstedts.
- Wennola, J[uhon]. H[eikki]. 1897. Äänneopillisiä havainnoita Pohjois-Pohjanmaan rantamurteesta. *Suomi* III,13.
- Werfel, Joh[annes]. 1811. *Kort dansk Sproglære for Skoler og for dem, der nyde Huusunderviisning*. Kjøbenhavn. P. D. Kiøpping.
- Werner, Otmar. 1964. Die Erforschung der färingischen Sprache. Ein Bericht über Stand und Aufgaben. *Orbis* XIII:481-544.
- Werner, Otmar. 1965. Nachtrag zu: Die Erforschung der färingischen Sprache. Ein Bericht über Stand und Aufgaben. *Orbis* XIV:75-87.
- Wessén, Elias. 1941a. *De nordiska språken*. Utgiven av Filologiska föreningen vid Stockholms högskola. Lund. Bloms boktryckeri.
- Wessén, Elias. 1941b. *Svensk språkhistoria 1. Ljudlära och formlära*. Utgiven av Filologiska föreningen vid Stockholms högskola. Lund. Bloms boktryckeri.
- Wessén, Elias. 1943. *Svensk språkhistoria 2. Ordbildningslära*. Utgiven av Filologiska föreningen vid Stockholms högskola. Lund. Bloms boktryckeri.
- Wessén, Elias. 1956. *Svensk språkhistoria 3. Grundlinjer till en historisk syntax*. Stockholm Studies in Scandinavian Philology 18. Stockholm. Almqvist & Wiksell.
- Westerdahl, Christer. 1990. *Från Norrtjärn till Konstantinopel. Mathias Norberrg (1747-1826)*. Örnsköldsviks museums småskriftserie 24 / Svenska forskningsinstitutet i Istanbul Skrifter. 3. [Stockholm]. Svenska forskningsinstitutet i Istanbul.
- Westergaard, Nils Ludvig. 1840-01. *Radices linguæ Sanscritæ ad decreta grammaticorum definivit atque copia exemplorum exquisitorum illustravit*. Bonnæ ad Rhenum. H. B. König / Havniæ. Typis fratrum Berling.
- Westergaard-Nielsen. Chr. 1946. *Låneordene i det 16. århundredes trykte islandske litteratur*. Bibliotheca Arnamagnæana 6. København. Ejnar Munksgaard.
- Western, Aug[ust]. 1921. *Norsk riksmåls-grammatikk*. Kristiania. Aschehoug.
- Whitney, William Dwight. 1867. *Language and the Study of Language: Twelve Lectures on the Principles of Linguistic Science*. New York. Scribner, Armstrong & Co.
- Whitney, William Dwight. 1879. *Sanskrit Grammar. Including both the classical language, and the older dialects, of Veda and Brahmana*. Bibliothek indogermanischer Grammatiken 2. Leipzig. Breitkopf und Härtel.
- Whitney, W[illiam]. D[wight]. 1880. *Språket, dess lif och utveckling*. Öfversättning och bearbetning med författarens tillstånd verkstâld af Gustaf Stjerneström. Stockholm. A.W. Björks förlag.
- Whitte, H. K. 1842. *Hebræisk Sproglære til Skolebrug*. København. Gyldendal.
- Wichmann, Yrjö. 1893. *Wotjakische sprachproben*. Im auftrage der Finnisch-Ugrischen Gesellschaft gesammelt und herausgegeben. I. Lieder, gebete und zaubersprüche. JSFOu. XI,1.
- Wichmann, Yrjö. 1897. *Zur Geschichte des Vokalismus der ersten Silbe im Wotjakischen mit Rücksicht auf das Syrjänische*. Diss. Helsinki.
- Wichmann, Yrjö. 1903. *Die tschuwassischen lehnwörter in den permischen sprachen*. MSFOu 21.
- Wichmann, Yrjö. 1913-1918[1913]. Beiträge zur tscheremissischen nominalbildungslehre. *JSFOu* 30,6:1-42.
- Widding, Ole. 1931. Benævnelser på "Forpløjning" i danske Dialekter. *Danske Folkemaal* 4:116-128.
- Widmark, Gun. 1959. *Det nordiska U-omljudet. En dialektgeografisk undersökning*. Institutionen för nordiska språk vid Uppsala universitet. Stockholm. Almqvist & Wiksell.
- Widmark, Gun. 1991. Fornvästnordiska förleder i omljudsperspektiv. *Studia Philologiae Scandinavicae Upsaliensis* 19. Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis. Uppsala. Almqvist & Wiksell.
- Wiedemann, Ferdinand Joh. 1847a. *Versuch einer Grammatik der syrjänischen Sprache nach dem in der Übersetzung des Evangelium Matthäi gebrauchten Dialekte*. Reval. Franz Kluge.
- Wiedemann, Ferdinand Joh. 1847b. *Versuch einer Grammatik der tscheremissischen Sprache nach dem in der Evangelienübersetzung von 1821 gebrauchten Dialekte*. Reval. Franz Kluge.
- Wiik, Kalevi. 1959. Suomen ominaisuudennimen johtamisesta. *Vir*. 63:331-339
- Wiik, Kalevi. 1965. *Finnish and English Vowels*. Turun yliopiston julkaisuja B 94. Turku.
- Wiik, Kalevi. 1967. *Suomen kielen morfofoneemiikkaa*. Turun yliopiston fonetiikan laitoksen julkaisuja 3. Turku.
- Wiik, Kalevi. 1988. *Kolme ja puoli vuosisataa suomalaista ja virolaista kieliopinkirjoitusta; nominien taivutus*. Turun yliopiston suomalaisen ja yleisen kielitieteen laitoksen julkaisuja 34. Turku.
- Wiik, Kalevi. 1989. *Suomen kielen morfofonologian historia I. Nominien taivutus 1649-1820*. Turun yliopisto, fonetiikka.

- Turku.
- Wiik, Kalevi. 1990. *Suomen kielen morfofonologian historia II. Nominien taivutus 1820-1845*. Turun yliopiston, fonetiikka. Turku.
- Wiik, Kalevi. 1991. *Suomen kielen morfofonologian historia III. Nominien taivutus 1845-1850*. Turun yliopisto, fonetiikka. Turku.
- Wiklund, K[arl]. B[ernhard]. 1890. *Lule-lappisches wörterbuch*. MSFOu 1.
- Wiklund, K[arl]. B[ernhard]. 1891. *Laut- und Formenlehre der Lule-lappischen Dialekte*. Göteborgs Kongl. Vetenskaps och Vitterhets Samhälles handlingar. Ny tidsföljd. 25:te Heftet. Stockholm. Norstedt.
- Wiklund, K[arl]. B[ernhard]. 1892. Das Kolalappische Wörterbuch von A. Genetz. *JSFOu* X:217-246.
- Wiklund, K[arl]. B[ernhard]. 1893. Die südlappischen forschungen des herrn Dr. Ignacz Halász. *JSFOu* XI,2:1-27.
- Wiklund, K[arl]. B[ernhard]. 1896. *Entwurf einer urlappischen lautlehre. I. Einleitung, quantitätsgesetze, accent, geschichte der hauptbetonten vokale*. MSFOu 10,1.
- Wiklund, K[arl]. B[ernhard]. 1901. *Lärobok i lapska språket*. Uppsala. Lundequist.
- Wiklund, K[arl]. B[ernhard]. 1906. Zur lehre vom stufenwechsel im lappischen. *FUF* 6:5-16.
- Wikström, M. W. 1832. *Försök till en Finsk Grammatika, framställande en enda Declination och en enda Conjugation*. Wasa. C. A. Londicer.
- Wilse, J. N. 1780. *Norsk Ordbog, eller Samling af Norske Ord i sær de som bruges i Egnen af Spydeberg og viidere paa den Østre-kant af Norge, med Forerindring om Mundarten, samt Tillæg af nogle Egnens Ordsprog og Egen-navne*. Som Bilage K til Spydebergs Beskrivelse og ellers at faae for sig selv. Christiania. S. C. Schwach.
- Wimmer, Ludv[ig]. 1868. *Navneordenes böjning i ældre dansk oplyst af oldnordisk og andre sprog i vor sprogæt*. København. Vilhelm Priors Boghandel.
- Wimmer, Ludv[ig]. 1870a. *Oldnordisk formlære til brug ved undervisning og selvstudium*. København. Chr. Steen & Söns Forlag.
- Wimmer, Ludv[ig]. 1870b. *Oldnordisk læsebog. Med tilhørende ordsamling*. København. Chr. Steen & Söns Forlag.
- Wimmer, Ludv[ig]. 1874a. Runeskiftens Oprindelse og Udvikling i Norden. *Aarbøger for nordisk Oldkyndighed og Historie*, 1-270. [Also offprint: København. V. Priors Boghandel.]
- Wimmer, Ludv[ig]. 1874b. *Fornnordisk formlära*. Lund. C. W. K. Gleerups.
- Wimmer, Ludv[ig]. 1887. *Die runenschrift*. Berlin. Weidmannsche Buchhandlung.
- Wimmer, Ludvig. 1893-1908. *De danske Runemindesmærker*. I-IV. København. Gyldendal.
- Wimmer, Ludv[ig]. 1914. *De danske Runemindesmærker*. Haandudgave ved Lis Jacobsen. København / Kristiania. Gyldendal.
- Wimmer, Ludvig & Finnur Jónsson, eds. 1891. *Eldre Edda Håndskriftet Nr. 2365 4to gl. kgl. Samling på det store kgl. bibliothek i København (Codex regius af den ældre Edda) i fototypisk og diplomatisk gengivelse*. Udgivet for Samfundet til udgivelse af gammel nordisk litteratur. København. Møller & Thomsen.
- Winter, E. & B. A. Figurovskij. 1962. Einleitung. In: Messerschmidt 1962:1-20.
- Winter, Werner, ed. 1965. *Evidence for Laryngeals*. Janua Linguarum. Series Major XI. The Hague. Mouton & Co.
- Wiwel, H. G. 1901. *Synspunkter for dansk sproglære*. København. Det nordiske Forlag. Bogforlaget Ernst Bojesen.
- Wollin, Lars, ed. 1984. *Tiällmannstudier*. NORDLUND 4. Lund. Institutionen för nordiska språk.
- Wollin, Lars. 1992a. Drömmen om Runverket. Johannes Bureus och den äldsta runologin. *Runrön. Blandade runstudier* 1:173-201. Uppsala. Institutionen för nordiska språk. Uppsala universitet.
- Wollin, Lars. 1992b. Hat Jöns Budde im 'Catholicon' geblättert? In: Lennart Elmevik & Erich Schöndorf, eds. *Niederdeutsch in Skandinavien III. Akten des 3. nordischen Symposions "Niederdeutsch in Skandinavien" in Sigtuna 17.-20. August 1989*, 77-99. Berlin. Erich Schmidt
- Wood, Sidney. 1979. A Radiographic analysis of constriction locations for vowels. *Journal of Phonetics* 7:25-43.
- von Wright, Georg Henrik. 1988. Tankar om vetenskapernas historiografi. *Sphinx. SSF Yearbook 1988*. Series B. Papers and Essays, 79-84. Helsinki.
- Wulff, Kurt. 1934. *Chinesisch und Tai. Sprachvergleichende Untersuchungen*. Hist. Filos. Medd. Dan. Vid. Selsk. 20:3. København. Levin & Munksgaard.
- Wulff, Kurt. 1942. *Über das Verhältnis des malajo-polynesischen zum indochinesischen*. Hist. Filos. Medd. Dan. Vid. Selsk. 27:2. København. Munksgaard.
- Wurst, Raimund Jakob. 1836. *Praktische Sprachdenklehre für Volksschulen. nach Dr. K. F. Beckers Ansichten bearbeitet*. Reutlingen. Joh. Conr. Mäcken.
- ZDMG = *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*. Wiesbaden.

- Ziegenbalg, Bartholomæus. 1716. *Grammatica Damulica, quæ per varia paradigmata, regulas & necessarium vocabulorum apparatus, viam brevissimam monstrat. qua lingua Damulica seu Malabarica, quæ inter Indos Orientales in usu est, & hucusque in Europa incognita fuit facile disci posit in usum eorum qui hoc tempore gentes illas ab idolatria ad cultum veri Dei, salutemque æternam Evangelio Christi perducere cupiunt.* Halæ Saxanum. Litteris & impensis Orphanotrophei.
- Äimä, Frans. 1914. *Phonetik und Lautlehre des Inarilappischen.* MSFOu 42, 43.
- Äimä, Frans. 1938. *Yleisen fonetiikan oppikirja.* SKST 208.
- Öhman, Sven. 1966. Coarticulation in VCV utterances: spectrographic measurements. *Journal of the Acoustic Society of America* 39:151-168.
- Öhman, Sven. 1967. Word and sentence intonation: A quantitative model. *Speech Transmission Laboratory, QSPR* 2-3:20-54. Stockholm. Department of Speech Transmission. Royal Institute of Technology.
- Öhmann, Emil. 1918. *Studien über die französischen worte im deutschen im 12. und 13. jahrhundert.* Helsinki.
- Öhmann, Emil. 1924. *Der s-plural im deutschen.* AASF B XVIII:1.
- Öhmann, Emil. 1925. Eräitä uusimpia virtauksia uusfilologian alalla. *Valvoja-Aika* 3:335-345.
- Öhmann, Emil. 1947. *Kieli ja kulttuuri. Kielitieteen peruskysymyksiä.* Helsinki. Otava.
- Örsted, Johannes. 1753. *De linguæ universalis possibilitate.* Hafniæ. Typis hæredum Berlingianorum excudebat Ludolph. Henr. Lillie.
- Österberg, Olof. 1916. *Teckenspråket, Med rikt illustrerad ordbok över det av Sveriges dövsamma använda åtbördsspråket.* Uppsala. P. Alfr. Perssons förlag.
- Östergren, Olof. 1919-1972. *Nusvensk ordbok.* Stockholm. Wahlström & Widstrand.
- Östman, Jan-Ola. 1981. *You know: A Discourse-Functional Approach.* Pragmatics and Beyond II:7. Amsterdam. John Benjamins.

Name index (referring to the printed pages, not to the pages in this .pdf file)

Note: the alphabetical sequence followed here treats Æ/Ǽ (æ/ä) and Å (å) as equal to A/a, and Ø/Ö (ø/ö) as equal to O/o. Icelandic and Faroese accented vowels (Á, á, É, é, etc.) are placed with the unaccented ones. Names with initial P are at the end of the list. — Example of the order: Agrell, Åhlander, Ahrenberg, Äimä, Ganander, Gårdenfors, Gardiner, Gårding, Garfield, Nicander, Osthoff, Östman, Ottelin, Vendell, Þórólfsson.

Aakjær, Svend 416
 Aalto, Pentti 9, 28, 98, 114, 132, 138, 139, 264, 274-276, 284, 287, 365-367, 376, 452, 469, 470, 543
 Aaltonen, Olli 545
 Aarsleff, Hans 6, 7, 350, 483, 562
 Aasen, Ivar 54, 132, 136, 167, 190-193, 209-211, 224, 238-240, 243, 246, 247, 254, 290, 301, 302, 411, 435, 555
 Abel, Ivar 110
 Adelong, Johann Christoph 85, 158
 Aelfric 15
 Agrell, Jan 105, 112, 115, 120, 286
 Agrell, Sigurd 277, 324, 461
 Agricola, Mikael 46, 47, 232, 406
 Andersen, Poul 242, 420-422
 Andersen, Torben 561
 Anderson, Stephen 512, 519, 552
 Andersson, Aksel 83
 Andersson, Erik 352, 483
 Andersson, Lars-Gunnar 483, 512, 521
 Andersson, Roger 15
 Andersson, Thorsten 416
 Andreae, Nicolaus 52
 Andresen, Julie 1, 4, 568
 Andrésson, Guðmundur 63
 Andrews, Avery 519
 Ansgar[ius] 14
 Anttila, Arto 540
 Anttila, Raimo 483, 510, 512, 515, 540, 542, 547, 553
 Anward, Jan 526
 Aphelen, Hans von 98, 127
 Aquilonius, Bertel Knudsen 109, 110
 Areskoug, Hugo 430
 Århus, Jacob Madsen 43, 59, 86
 Aristotle 568
 Árnason, Jón 64
 Árnason, Kristján 501, 513
 Barthes, Roland 357
 Bartholin, Rasmus 41, 44

Åhlander, Lars 558
 Ahlbäck, Olav 414
 Ahlman, Erik 360, 361
 Ahlqvist, Anders 483, 559
 Ahlqvist, August 122, 137-139, 177-180, 235, 236, 246, 267, 282, 297, 425, 436
 Ahlsén, Elisabeth 527
 Ahrenberg, Lars 496
 Aikio, Marjut 556
 Äimä, Frans 314, 366, 367
 Airila, Martti 340, 341, 392
 Akiander, Matthias 292, 293
 Alanus, Hans Jensen 43
 Alanus, Johannes [Janus] 36, 108
 Alhoniemi, Alho 325, 553
 Allén, Sture 359, 447, 495, 537, 557
 Allwood, Jens 495, 497, 512, 521, 535
 Almqvist, Herman 136, 288
 Almqvist, Carl Jonas Love 214, 255, 256
 Aminoff, Torsten 246
 Amsler, Mark 6
 Amundsen, Leiv 171
 Andenæs, Ellen 536
 Andersen, Børge 419
 Andersen, Harry 431
 Andersen, Henning 165, 483, 541, 542
 Andersen, Nikolaj 420
 Arnholtz, Arthur 67, 315
 Aro, Jussi 466
 Arpi, Rolf 241
 Asher, R. E. 300
 Askedal, Jon Ole 524
 Aslacus, Cunradus Bergensis 37
 Aslaksson, Cort 37
 Aspelin, Johan Reinhold 283
 Aubert, Ludvig Cæsar Martin 165, 262-264, 302
 Aurén, Johan August 215, 294
 Aurivillius, Carl 39
 Aurivillius, Ericus O. 83, 90, 91
 Austin, J. L. 534
 Avellan, Gustaf Adolf 203, 268
 Bacon, Roger 127
 Baden, Jacob 34-36, 74, 75, 109, 110, 125, 141, 143, 160
 Bakker, Peter 64
 Bally, Charles 403
 Bandle, Oskar 409, 427
 Bang, N. F. 95
 Barr, Kaj 374, 459
 Basbøll, Hans 483, 513-515
 Bautil, J. Göransson 55

- Bæksted, Anders 432
 Becanus, Goropius 108, 114
 Bech, Gunnar 373, 463, 487
 Becker, Karl Ferdinand 146, 262
 Becker, Reinhold von 201-203, 205, 233, 235
 Beckman, Natanael 94, 334, 402, 556
 Behaghel, Otto 382, 393
 Beito, Olav Toreson 555
 Bell, Alexander Graham 130, 296
 Benediktsson, Hreinn 16, 20, 21, 321, 337, 358, 359, 496, 502, 512, 513
 Benediktsson, Jacob 253, 445
 Benfey, Theodor 297, 303
 Bennike, Valdemar 245, 421
 Benson, Sven 416, 430
 Bentzen, Ruth 370-372
 Bentzien, Wilh. Barthol. 142
 Benveniste, Émile 318
 Berg, Ruben G:son 320
 Bergbo, Skogekär 56
 Bergman, Brita 495, 529
 Bergman, J. 28
 Björnsson, Páll 39
 Björnståhl, Jonas 286
 Blatt, Franz 308
 Bleken, Brynjulv 211, 439
 Blinkenberg, Andreas 308, 449, 450
 Bloch, J. Victor 242
 Bloch, Jørgen 232
 Bloch, Søren 141, 143, 144, 159, 197
 Blom, Jan-Petter 530, 531
 Blomqvist, Jerker 559
 Blomstedt, Oskar 138
 Blöndal, Björg 444
 Blöndal, Sigfús 254, 367, 395, 444, 445
 Bloomfield, Leonard 305, 356, 357, 504
 Bo/Boethius 16-19
 Boas, Franz 305, 310, 356, 563
 Boddling, Paul Olaf 290
 Böðvarsson, Árni 445
 Bøgh, Matth. 141
 Boivie, P. G. 84, 147-149, 214
 Bojesen, E. 145, 146, 199
 Bolling, Frederik Andersen 59, 97
 Bonaparte, Louis-Lucien 245
 Bondevik, Jarle 210, 247
 Bopp, Franz 168, 172, 173, 216, 263, 268, 297, 305,
 Broch, Olaf 277, 310, 319, 320, 323, 338, 368, 462, 565
 Brodda, Benny 329, 539
 Brøndal, Viggo 308, 314, 315, 317-319, 321, 322, 334, 336, 347-350, 360, 389, 416, 450, 564, 565
 Bergroth, Hugo 440
 Bergsland, Knut 102, 310, 323, 332, 357, 361, 374, 386, 398, 439, 440, 450, 473, 475, 508, 556, 565, 566
 Bergsveinsson, Svein 368
 Bernadotte, Jean-Baptiste-Jules 141, 269
 Bernstein, Basil 505, 530, 531
 Berntsen, Ruth 427
 Bertelsen, Henrik 44, 68-73, 86, 87
 Bertram, Charles Julius 97
 Biese, Yrjö M. 454
 Billius Suecus, Johannes 33
 Birch, David 210
 Birch, Frederik Sneedorff 299
 Birkeland, Harris 332, 466
 Bjerrum, Anders 417, 419
 Bjerrum, Marie 159, 252, 365, 391, 420
 Bjørkvold, Eva 207
 Björling, C. F. E. 295
 Björne, Lars 3
 Bjørnson, Bjørnstjerne 232, 238
 372
 Borelius, J. 146
 Borgehammar, Stephan 15
 Borgstrøm, Carl Hjalmar 310, 318, 332, 333, 338, 339, 342, 358, 359, 375, 464, 465, 508, 547, 566
 Borrichius, Olaus 30, 108, 109
 Böhthlingk, Otto von 272, 281, 291, 298
 Botin, Anders af 31, 57, 85
 Brahe, Per 48, 76
 Brahe, Tyge 37
 Branch, Michael 133, 173, 279
 Brandt, Margareta 558
 Brasen, Janus Olai 108
 Brate, Erik 259
 Braunmüller, Kurt 21
 Bredsdorff, Jacob Hornemann 164, 165, 223, 230, 257, 292, 300
 Breivik, Leiv Egil 506
 Brenner, Henrik 99, 114
 Briem, Halldór 207
 Brink, Lars 531, 545
 Broch, Ingvild 506, 536
 Broch, Jens Peter 288
 Brøndum-Nielsen, Johannes 10, 67, 388, 404-406, 418, 431, 442
 Brøndum-Nielsen, Johs. 320
 Broocman, Carl Ulric 57, 213
 Bruce, Gösta 524, 544
 Brugmann, Karl 151, 181, 226, 305, 371, 458

- Brunchmann, Andreas 110
 Brunér, Edvard 264
 Brunstad, Endre 210
 Bruun, Thomas 266
 Budde, Jöns 415
 Budenz, József 139
 Bugge, Alexander 464
 Bugge, Sophus 135, 170, 171, 258, 301, 374, 464
 Bugge, Søren Bruun 260, 261
 Bühler, Karl 403
 Bull, Tove 536
 Bureus, Andreas 82
 Bureus, Johannes 55, 56, 61, 258
 Bursill-Hall, G. L. 16
 Bybee, Joan 523
- Cajanus, Erik 111
 Campanius Holm, J. 123
 Campanius Holm, Thomas 100, 101
 Campanius, John 99, 100
 Christiansen, Hallfrid 315, 332, 358, 428
 Christiansen, Reidar 464
 Cleasby, R. 254
 Clitau, Thomas 88
 Cohen, Marcel 450
 Colding, Poul Jensen 43
 Collan, Fabian 141
 Collin, Fredericus 112
 Collinder, Björn 315, 342, 376, 382, 385, 386, 408, 440, 508, 548, 549
 Columbus, Samuel 56, 90
 Comenius, Johann Amos 59, 86, 87
 de Condillac, Etienne Bonnot 141, 147, 148, 213
 Cooper, Robin 495
 Corander, Henrik Constantin 189
 Cordemoy, Gerauld 127
 Cortsen, S. P. 170, 172
 de Courtenay, Baudouin 401
 Coward, Gorgus 397
 Crugerus, Henricus 75
 Curtius, Georg 216, 226, 264
- Daa, Ludvig Kristensen 176, 232
 Dacus, Johannes 19
 Dichman, Carl Frederik 75, 146
 Diderichsen, Paul 73, 103, 125, 158, 159, 315, 316, 320, 322, 326, 327, 350-352, 360, 387-390, 403, 405, 478, 505, 509, 518, 520, 534, 550-552, 555, 557, 564
 Dik, Simon 509
 Dimitrova-Vulchanova, Mila 519
 Dirks, Moses L. 473
- Canel, Peter 97
 Cannelin, Knut 392, 436
 Carlson, Lauri 522, 535
 Carlson, Rolf 544
 Carnap, Rudolf 335
 Carpenter, William 207
 Caspari, Carl Paul 288
 Castrén, M. A. 3, 132, 139, 173-177, 188, 194, 280-283, 298, 301, 302, 378, 383, 384, 468, 524, 563
 Cederschiöld, Gustaf 153, 342, 536
 Celsius, Anders 26
 Charpentier, Jarl 375
 Chomsky, Noam 6, 305, 306, 317, 350, 361, 479, 483, 497, 508, 514, 517, 519, 551, 557
 Christensen, Arthur 459
 Christensen, Balthasar 419
 Christensen, Christian Becker 389
 Christensen, Kirsti Koch 517
- Dacus, Simon 19
 Dahl, B. T. 197, 199, 441
 Dahl, Christopher 259, 260
 Dahl, Hans 441
 Dahl, Jákup 390
 Dahl, Östen 497, 503, 508, 512, 517, 521, 523, 524, 542, 557
 Dahl, Otto Chr. 290, 472, 560, 565, 566
 Dahlerup, H. B. 145
 Dahlerup, Verner 223, 251, 442
 Dahlstedt, Karl-Hampus 495
 Dal, Ingerid 315, 455
 Dalin, Anders Fredrik 256
 Dampe, J. J. 230
 Danielsson, Olof August 136, 169-171, 195, 265, 276, 301
 Darwin, Charles 130, 216
 Dasent, George 220
 Deen, Nicolaas 64
 Degen, Carl Ferdinand 158, 159
 Delbrück, Berthold 182, 383
 Delitzsch, Friedrich 465
 Dempwolff, Otto 472
 Devoto, Giacomo 318
 Djupedal, Reidar 247
 Djurklou, Nils Gabriel 133, 249
 Donatus, Aelius 33, 77, 567
 Donner, H. W. 453
 Donner, Kai 378, 379, 469
 Donner, Otto 5, 111, 112, 137, 165, 170, 178, 179, 282-284, 327, 378, 468, 549
 Dufva, John L. 149
 Dumézil, Georges 474

- Dybeck, R. 258
 Dybvad, Christoffer 43
 Dyvik, Helge 542
- Ebbesen, Sten 17
 Edgren, Hjalmar 270, 273
 Egede, Paul 102
 Egerod, Søren 471, 472
 Egilsson, Sveinbjörn 253
 Ehrström, Erik Gustaf 187, 275
 Eidissen, Inger 309
 Einarsson, Jan 526
 Einarsson, Stefán 368, 396
 Ejerhed, Eva 518, 538
 Ejskjær, Inger 245, 419, 422
 Ekblom, Richard 277, 461
 Eurén, Gustaf Erik 203-205, 212
 Europaeus, David Emanuel Daniel 176, 178, 293
- Faarlund, Jan Terje 240, 483, 521, 524, 541, 555
 Fabricius, Otho 102
 Falk, Alf 225
 Falk, Cecilia 541
 Falk, Hjalmar 172, 224, 225, 304, 323, 331, 338, 339, 396, 445
 Falk, Paul 456
 Fant, Gunnar 315, 333, 355, 359, 369, 543, 544, 564, 566
 Færch, Claus 526
 Feilberg, Henning 251, 418, 421
 Ferguson, Charles A. 486, 496, 531
 Fiellström, Petrus 53, 64, 80
 Figurowskij, B. A. 122
 Findings, Rune 433
 Finnbogason, Guðmundur 437
 Finnsson, Hannes 64
 Fischer-Jørgensen, Eli 127, 308, 309, 315, 322, 333, 350, 351, 358, 363, 364, 390, 488, 513, 544, 545, 564
- Flensburg, Nils Otto 165
 Gårdenfors, Peter 522
 Gardiner, Alan 318, 395, 414
 Gårding, Eva 368, 499, 544
 Garfield, Eugene 306
 Garstein, Oskar 37
 Geijer, Per Adolf 136, 456
 Geitlin, Gabriel 139, 253, 274, 275
 Gellerstam, Martin 541
 Genetz, Arvid 180-184, 189, 204, 205, 213, 235, 246, 282, 293, 297, 379, 385, 391
 Gerner, Henrik 87, 88, 107
 Gesenius, Wilhelm 285
 Gesner, Henrik 108
- Ekwall, Eilert 416, 455, 564
 Elbro, Carsten 526
 Elert, Claes-Christian 324, 359, 370, 498, 513, 517
 Eliasson, Stig 497, 513
 Ellegård, Alvar 504-506, 508
 Elmevik, Lennart 433
 Enberg, Magnus 214
 Endresen, Rolf Theil 561
 Engberg-Pedersen, Elisabeth 520, 529
 Engdahl, Elisabet 483, 517, 518, 521
 Engelhardt, Roderich von 28
 Enkvist, Nils Erik 293, 294, 337, 454, 486, 496, 500, 504, 506, 524, 534
- Erdmann, Axel 136, 269
 Eriksson, Ulrik 430
 Espersen, J. C. S. 242, 251
 Florinus, Henrik [Henricus] 61, 62
 Flydal, Leiv 310, 357, 455
 Foldvik, Arne Kjell 296
 Fortescue, Michael 554
 Fourquet, Jean 322
 Fowler, Murray 450
 Franke, Felix 154
 Frei, Henri 318
 Fretheim, Thorstein 535
 Friðriksson, Halldór Kr. 207, 237
 Fries, Sigurd 430
 Friesen, Otto von 258, 432
 Friis, Jens Andreas 194, 212, 255, 439
 Frisk, Hjalmar 376
 Fritzner, Johan 212, 253-255, 445
 Fröberg, Karl-Erik 539
 Frösén, Jaakko 532
 Fuglsang, N. S. 144
- von der Gabelentz, Georg 263, 342, 371
 Gadd, Pehr Adrian 57
 Gagnepain, Jean 357
 Ganander, Christfrid 62, 63, 128
 Ganandrus, Henricus 53, 81
 Gezelius, Johannes 36, 37, 65
 Gierow, Krister 286
 Girard, Abbé 72
 Gíslason, Konráð 95, 186, 190, 198, 206, 207, 216, 217, 224, 237, 238, 253, 254, 426
- Gjellerup, S. M. 34
 Glahder, Jørgen 435
 Gorosch, Max 329, 361
 Gotlænder, Søren Poulsen Judichær 44, 67
 Gottlund, Karl Axel 188, 234
 Gottskálksson, Oddur 409
 Grammont, Maurice 340, 351
 Granlund, Åke 417

- Granström, Björn 544
 Greenberg, Joseph 306
 Gregersen, Frans 10, 159, 322, 350, 483, 504, 531, 543, 551
 Greimas, A. J. 357
 Grimes, Barbara F. 11
 Grimm, Jacob 120, 166, 167, 169, 172, 197, 208, 210, 216, 217, 221, 225, 247, 297, 305, 372
 Groening, Michael 98
 Grønbech, Kaare 467
 Grønbech, Vilhelm 466, 467
 Gyarmathi, Sámuel 216
 Gyldenstolpe, Michaël Olsson Wexionius 110, 111
- Haberland, Hartmut 502, 524, 534
 Habermas, Jürgen 534
 Hagberg, August 267
 Hagberg, Carl August 195, 267
 Hagerup, E. H. 242, 251
 Hagström, Björn 552
 Haislund, Niels 451
 Haji_ová, Eva 486, 496
 Hakanen, Aimo 553
 Hakkarainen, Heikki J. 455
 Häkkinen, Kaisa 253, 327, 385, 549, 554
 Hakulinen, Auli 483, 486, 509, 526, 534, 536, 537, 553
 Hakulinen, Lauri 335, 393, 394, 408, 425, 426, 436, 553
 Halén, Harry 283
 Hallager, Laurents 52
 Hallander, Lars Gunnar 324
 Halldórsson, Björn 253
 Halldórsson, Halldór 408, 409, 445
 Halle, Morris 333, 355, 359, 369, 514, 564
 Hasselrot, Bengt 456
 Hast, Sture 66
 Hauen, Niels von 88
 Haugen, Einar 20, 192, 238, 320, 333, 359, 405, 427-429, 439, 444, 498
 Hauger, Brigitte 150, 151
 Hægstad, Marius 193, 194, 331, 410, 426
 Hedin, Sven 232
 Heggstad, Leiv 397
 Heiberg, Ludvig 130, 157-159
 Heikel, A. O. 283
 Heikel, Ivar A. 7, 264
 Heikel, Wilhelm 141
 Heikkilä, Juha 540
 Heikkilä, Kaino 379
 Helander, Dick 403
 Heldmann, And. 84
 Helgason, Jón 94, 409
- Grot, Jacob 275, 276
 Grubb, Nic. 64
 Grundtvig, N. F. S. 136
 Grundtvig, Svend 232, 296
 Grundtvig, Vilhelm 421
 Guðfinnsson, Björn 395, 427, 438
 Guðmundsson, Valtýr 395
 Gumperz, John J. 530, 531
 Gunnarsson, Britt-Louise 536
 Gunnarsson, Jón 518
 Gussgard, Jostein 555
 Gustafsson, Fridolf 264
 Halvorsen, Per-Kristian 483
 Hämäläinen, Albert 121, 122
 Hammarberg, Björn 523, 525
 Hammarström, Göran 333, 359, 483
 Hammer, H. 441
 Hammerich, L. L. 315, 373, 473
 Hammershaimb, Venceslaus Ulricus 200, 390, 435
 Hannaas, Torleiv 51, 81
 Hänninger, Nils 404
 Hansegård, Nils Erik 525, 526
 Hansen, Aage 73, 364, 388, 389, 406, 421, 442, 551
 Hansen, Erik 534, 551, 552
 Hansen, Maurits Christopher 190
 Hanson, Kristin 514
 Hanson, Ola 289
 Hanssen, Eskil 493
 Hansson, Åke 430
 Harder, Peter 504, 507, 523, 534
 Härmä, Juhani 483
 Harpestreng, Henrik 251
 Harris, James 147
 Harris, Zellig S. 305, 325, 342, 358, 504
 Hasselbrink, Gustav 386
 Hellan, Lars 517, 519, 522, 524
 Hellberg, Lars 416
 Hellberg, Staffan 58, 537, 557
 Hellquist, Elof 227, 329, 402, 412, 413, 448
 Helsingius, M. Daniel 35
 Heltoft, Lars 352, 518, 520, 534, 552
 Hendriksen, Hans 373, 459
 Henne, Henry 324
 Henriksen, Carol[ine] [C.] 70, 71, 88, 191, 192, 197, 536
 Henriksen, Hans 447
 Hermann, Jesper 526, 551
 Hermannsson, Halldór 51, 95
 Hermodsson, Lars 324
 Hernlund, Hugo 89
 Herslund, Michael 330, 483, 486, 509, 513, 514, 519
 Hertzberg, Frøydis 75, 166, 207, 263, 272, 526
 Hesselman, Bengt 65, 90, 320, 402, 412

- Hiärne, Urban 94, 127
 Hicques, George 79
 Hildeen, Esaias 78
 Hilmarsson, Jörundur 547
 Hintikka, Jaakko 522, 542
 Hjärne, Urban 92, 126, 128
 Hjelmquist, Erland 527
 Høegh-Guldberg, Fred. 142
 Hoenigswald, Harry 498
 Hof, Sven 93, 94
 Hoff, Ingeborg 429
 Hoffory, Julius 217, 268, 269, 296
 Hofland, Knut 538
 Holberg, Ludvig 44, 87, 442
 Holm, Gösta 430, 541
 Holm, Lars 65, 218
 Holm, Nils 100
 Holm, Pelle 447
 Holm, Viggo 251
 Holma, Harri 466
 Holmberg, Anders 517-519, 524
 Holmboe, Christopher Andreas 166, 167, 212, 272, 289, 290
 Holmer, Nils 100, 308, 319, 324, 465, 476, 567
 Holst, Albertus Christophorus 108
 Holt, Jens 308, 315
 Holtmark, Anne 21
 Hormia, Osmo 62
 Horn, Fr. Winkel 69
 Hornby, Rikard 417
 Hovdhaugen, Even 15, 18, 19, 33, 52, 82, 105, 107, 166, 263, 272, 330, 502, 511, 543, 560
 Itkonen, Terho 394, 395, 424, 509, 510, 516, 520, 532, 550, 553, 554
 Iversen, Ragnvald 397, 409, 411, 461
 Iverson, Gregory 513

 Jacobsen, Lis 320, 326, 391, 405, 406, 431, 432, 435, 442, 536
 Jacobsen, Thorkild 465, 483
 Jahnsson, A. W. 181, 204, 392
 Jahr, Ernst Håkon 396, 428, 429, 493, 500, 502-504, 506
 Jakobson, Roman 318, 333-335, 341, 346, 355, 358, 359, 369, 513, 564
 Janhunen, Juha 469, 515, 524, 549, 561
 Jännes, Arvi 180
 Janson, Tore 561
 Jansson, Sven B. F. 432
 Jansson, Valter 413
 Jarring, Gunnar 324, 375, 470
 Jarvella, Robert 528

 Hjemslev, Louis 159, 303, 305, 308, 309, 314, 315, 318, 319, 321, 322, 324, 330, 334, 342-344, 349-351, 355-358, 360-362, 373-375, 387, 389, 398, 419, 420, 455, 459, 467, 474, 475, 478, 487, 509, 551, 564, 565
 Hødnebo, Finn 410
 Høysgaard, Jens Pedersen 26, 71-75, 88, 89, 125, 127, 128, 143, 160, 196, 197, 220, 231, 388
 Huldén, Lars 365, 414
 Hultman, O. F. 415
 Hultman, Tor 526, 557
 von Humboldt, Wilhelm 134, 146, 151, 154, 178, 265, 297, 305, 387
 Hummelstedt, Eskil 414
 Hurskainen, Arvi 561
 Hyldgaard-Jensen, Karl 503
 Hyltenstam, Kenneth 495, 523, 525
 Hymes, Dell H. 531

 Ibsen, Henrik 232, 238, 269
 Idman, Nils 112, 113
 Ihalainen, Ossi 538
 Ihre, Johan 119-121, 123, 286
 Iivonen, Antti 546
 Ikola, Osmo 325, 395, 402, 408, 553
 Immonen, Kari 313
 Indrebø, Gustav 309, 410, 411, 415
 Ísleifr 14
 Itkonen, Erkki 184, 328, 337, 366, 379, 380, 382, 384-386, 444, 511, 516, 563
 Itkonen, Esa 542
 Jensen, Arthur M. 362
 Jensen, Ella 419
 Jensen, H. M. 419
 Jensen, J. M. 419
 Jensen, Kristian 33, 34
 Jensen, Kristian Sandfeld cf. Sandfeld (Jensen), Kristian
 Jensen, Martin Kloster 368
 Jensen, Povl J. 34
 Jensøn, Christen 51
 Jernsletten, Nils 494
 Jernudd, Björn 483
 Jersin, Jens Dinesen [Jersinus, Janus Dionysius] 34, 43
 Jespersen, Otto 153, 154, 159, 168, 267, 268, 270, 294, 296, 300, 305, 308, 310, 314, 316, 320, 330, 338, 342, 343, 345-349, 355, 360-363, 365, 383, 387-389, 392, 393, 395, 397, 402, 425, 449, 451, 467, 478, 531, 536, 558, 564, 565
 Jespersen, Svend 421

- Jessen, Edwin 187, 198, 223, 224, 232, 292
 Johannes 16, 18, 19
 Jóhannesson, Alexander 308, 408, 409, 445
 Johannisson, Ture 403
 Jóhannsson, Jóhannes L. L. 409
 Johanson, Lars 561
 Johansson, Carl Theodor 272, 301
 Jonas, Runolphus 79
 Jónasson, Jónas 253
 Jones, Daniel 355, 513
 Jones, William 156, 268
 Jónsdóttir, Margrét 50, 63, 80
 Jónsson, Arngrímur 33, 50
 Jónsson, Bjarni 50, 207
 Jónsson, Erik 253
 Jónsson, Finnur 80, 187
 Jónsson, Jón 237
 Jónsson, Runolfur 79, 80
 Jörgensen, Nils 505, 535
 Judén, Jacob 201
 Juslenius, Daniel 48, 62, 78, 112, 233, 252
 Jussila, Raimo 47
 Juteini, Jaakko 201
 Juusela, Kaisu 554
- Kabell, Inge 59
 Kahle, Sigrid 460
 Kaila, Eino 335
 Kaimio, Jorma 532, 533
 Kalima, Jalo 376, 381
 Kempe, Andreas 24, 116
 Kessler-Mesguich, Sophie 38
 Kettunen, Lauri 392, 393, 422, 423, 425, 426, 437
 Keyser, J. Rudolf 167, 192, 193
 Kiefer, Ferenc 329, 516
 Kielland, Alexander 192, 238
 Kilpinen, Volmari 235
 Kinnander, Bengt 403
 Kiparsky, Paul 483, 498, 510, 514, 515, 564
 Kiparsky, Valentin 315, 335, 359, 360, 462, 463, 514, 565
 Kivi, Aleksis 178, 236
 Kiviniemi, Eero 553
 Kjellman, Hilding 456
 Kleinhans, Edmund 308
 Kleinschmidt, Samuel 291, 298, 473
 Klinge, Matti 1, 8, 29, 38, 40, 47, 48, 233, 275
 Klippi, Anu 534
 Kloster-Jensen, Martin 309
 Kluge, Friedrich 412
 von Knorring, Frans Peter 292
 Knös, O. V. 136
 Knudsen, Gunnar 416
- Johansson, Karl 169, 170
 Johansson, Karl Ferdinand 165, 171, 195
 Johansson, Lars 483
 Johansson, Monica 64
 Johansson, Stig 538
 Joki, Aulis J. 444, 469, 470, 548, 549
- Kalkar, Chr. Andr. Herm. 142
 Kalkar, Otto 252
 Källgren, Gunnel 535, 538, 539
 Källquist, Eskil 56
 Kangasmaa-Minn, Eeva 337, 553
 Kangasniemi, Heikki 552
 Kanger, Stig 542
 Kannisto, Artturi 139, 283
 Kaplan, Ron 539
 Karjalainen, K. F. 283
 Karker, Allan 1
 Karlgren, Bernhard 307, 310, 314, 321, 355, 376, 470, 471, 478, 565, 566
 Karlgren, Hans 317, 320, 321, 329, 539
 Karlsson, Fred 540, 553
 Karlsson, Göran 395, 553
 Kärnä, Aino 341
 Karsten, Tor[sten] Evert 314, 376, 408, 414, 417, 463
 Karttunen, Lauri 483, 510, 521
 Katlev, Jan 389
 Kay, Martin 539
 Keckman, Karl Niklas 137, 188
 Kellgren, Herman 139, 287
 Knudsen, Knud 190, 192, 211, 238-240
 Knudsen, Trygve 315, 332, 397, 446
 Knudtzon, Jørgen Alexander 310, 374
 Kock, Axel 84, 135, 227-229, 296, 300, 314, 324, 330, 375, 404, 411, 412, 564
 Kock, Lavrids Olufsen 59, 67, 68
 Koerner, E. F. K. 6, 510
 Kofod, Bjarne S. 209
 Koitto, Anna-Kaisa 553
 Koivulehto, Jorma 549, 550, 554
 Koivusalo, Esko 78, 233
 Kok, Johannes 242
 Kolari, Veli 275
 Kolding, Poul Jensen 43, 59
 Kollanius, Abraham 406
 Kolsrud, Sigurd 315, 332, 339, 428, 429
 Konow, Sten 314, 318, 374, 460
 Koptjevskaja-Tamm, Maria 523, 524
 Korhonen, Jarmo 453, 520
 Korhonen, Mikko 9, 53, 123, 172, 175, 177, 178, 183-185, 282, 316, 327, 378, 524, 541, 548, 550, 554, 563
 Körner, Rudolf 403

- Koskenniemi, Kimmo 539
 Koski, Mauno 325
 Koskinen, Yrjö 141
 Kratzenstein, C. G. 127
 Kristensen, Marius 245, 405, 416, 421
 Kristiansen, Knut 461
 Kristjánsson, Aðalgeir 254
 Kristoffersen, Gjert 483
 Kristoffersen, Kristian Emil 223, 397
 Krohn, Kaarle 185
 Kroman, Erik 421
 Krömmelbein, Thomas 22
 Krueger, John R. 121, 122
 Ku_era, Henry 538
 Kuhn, Thomas S. 10, 11, 338, 424, 563, 567
 Kukkonen, Antti 443
 Kulonen, Ulla-Maija 541
 Kury_owicz, Jerzy 318
 Kvaran, Guðrún 207, 224, 237, 437
 Kytö, Merja 538
 Kytömäki, Leena 553
- Laakso, Minna 534
 Labov, William 439, 505, 529, 530, 532
 Leem, Knud 53, 54, 64, 81, 163, 211, 447
 Lefolii, H. H. 197-199
 Lehiste, Ilse 553
 Lehtisalo, Toivo 378
 Lehtonen, Jaakko 546
 Leibniz, G. W. 75, 114, 119, 279
 Leino, Pentti 335, 515, 522, 552
 Leinonen, Marja 483
 Leiwo, Matti 483, 512, 526, 527
 af Leopold, Carl Gustaf 240
 Leskien, August 181, 195, 226, 305, 462
 Levander, Lars 429
 Levin, Israel 197, 198, 232
 Lidén, Per Evald 165, 314
 Lidforss, Edvard 267
 Lie, Arthur Gotfred 289
 Lie, Jonas 238
 Lie, Svein 541, 555
 Lind, H. 418
 Lindberg, Bo 7
 Lindberg, Ebba 557
 Lindberg, J. C. 285
 Lindblad, Gösta 93
 Löfstedt, Bengt 457
 Löfstedt, Einar 264, 457, 458
 Løkke, Jacob 208
 Løkkegaard, Freede 38, 110
 Løland, Ståle 1
- Koskenniemi, V. A. 328
 Ladefoged, Peter 486, 496
 Läßler/Leffler, Fredrik 226
 Lagercrantz, Eliel 337, 516
 Lagerlöf, Petrus 90, 91
 Lagus, Wilhelm 139, 287, 288
 Laine, Matti 527
 Laitinen, Lea 537
 Lakoff, George 522
 Lamb, Sidney M. 350, 357
 Lane, George S. 64, 206
 Lange, Frederik Olaus 149, 150
 Långfors, Arthur 452, 458
 Larsen, Amund B. 193, 247, 427
 Larsen, Erik Vive 352
 Larsen, Mogens Baumann 505, 531
 Larsen, Mogens Trolle 289
 Larsson, Kent 526
 Lassen, Christian 272
 Latvala, Salu 246
 Laurén, Christer 415
 Lauridsen, Hanne 59
 Leech, Geoffrey 538
- Lindblom, Björn 483, 495, 508, 543, 544, 564, 566
 Lindegaard, Erasmus 30
 Lindelöf, Uno 270, 271, 451, 453, 454
 Lindeman, Fredrik Otto 487, 547
 Linder, Nicolaus 135
 Lindgren, Birgitta 1
 Lindgren, Kaj B. 453
 Lindqvist, Axel 315, 342
 Lindqvist, Natanael 430
 Lindroth, Hjalmar 55, 82, 314, 315, 319, 334, 413, 415, 429, 430
 Lindroth, Sten 9
 Lindstedt, Jouko 483, 524
 Lindstedt, T. 518
 Lindström, Johan Adolf 203
 Linell, Per 496, 512, 513, 515, 516, 535, 542, 543
 Linkomies, Edwin 328, 457, 458
 Linn, Andrew Robert 190-192, 209, 210
 Linné, Carl 26, 99
 Linsén, Johan Gabriel 187
 Lizelius, Antti 47, 48
 Ljunggren, K. G. 319
 Lockwood, W. B. 391, 435
 Lollesgaard, Johs 110
 Loman, Bengt 214, 226, 240, 324, 403, 407, 414, 447, 498, 504, 505, 530-532, 535
 Lombard, Alf 319, 456
 Lönnrot, Elias 173, 177, 188, 189, 201, 212, 213, 234,

- 235, 240, 252, 253, 282, 312
 Lorentz, Ove 396, 506
 Lorimer, David L. R. 311
 Lotz, John 333, 400
 Løvborg, Eilert 269
 Lund, G. F. V. 218, 223, 252
 Lund, Jens 419
 Lund, Jørn 531, 545
 Lundahl, Per 416
 Lundell, J. A. 136, 249, 276, 277, 291, 296, 298, 301, 316, 461, 471
 Lyell, Charles 216
 Lyngby, K. J. 217, 223, 232, 242, 243, 245, 247, 251
 Lyttkens, I. A. 267, 295, 368
- Määttä, Urho 337, 359, 516
 Madsen, Jacob 126, 300
 Madvig, J. N. 8, 125, 145, 146, 150, 151, 153, 162, 167, 171, 186, 187, 212, 232, 261-265, 285, 297, 298, 300, 342
 Markey, T. L. 405, 444
 Marsh, George P. 220
 Marsløv, Erik Olsen 86
 Marstrander, Carl 257, 310, 318, 374, 432, 464, 465, 566
 Martinet, André 318, 324, 358, 450
 Martinius, Matthias 77, 78
 Martinus 16, 17, 19
 Martinussen, Bente 54, 55
 Mathesius, Vilém 318
 Matras, Christian 390, 391, 435, 489
 Matras, Daniel 96
 May, Michael 522
 Mæhlum, Brit 505, 530, 531
 McCawley, James D. 498, 506
 McNeilage, Peter 544
 von Mehren, A. F. 288
 Meillet, Antoine 308, 310, 323, 340, 347, 383, 475
 Meinhof, Carl 310
 Melanchthon, Philipp 33, 34, 77
 Melander, Johan 456
 Messell, John Andreas 269, 270
 Messerschmidt, D. G. 122
 Muhle, Henricus 109
 Munch, Peter Andreas 132, 166, 167, 193, 207, 208, 216, 217, 257, 390
 Münster, Sebastian 110
 Munthe, C. F. 36
 Murray, James 136
 Murtorinne, Eino 289
 Musæus, Johannes 208, 209
 Mustanoja, Tauno F. 454, 564, 566
 Myhren, Magne 247
- Maegaard, Bente 526, 539
 Magens, Joachim Melchior 103, 104
 Magga, Ole Henrik 494, 556
 Magga, Tuomas 494
 Magnus, Albertus 127
 Magnus, Olaus 110
 Magnússon, Árni 64, 94, 95
 Magnússon, Jón 80
 Maling, Joan 519
 Malm, Anja 529
 Malmberg, Bertil 305, 319, 324, 329, 334, 342, 354, 355, 359, 361, 362, 369, 456, 543, 564, 566, 567
 Malmgren, Sven-Göran 85
 Malmkvist, Göran 470
 Malmström, Sten 324
 Manlius, Johannes 68
 Mannerheim, Carl Gustaf 470
 Marconi, Guglielmo 130
 Mark, Julius 75
 Mey, Jacob 502, 508, 534
 Meyer, Ernst A. 228, 314, 354, 368, 369, 544
 Meyer, Gustav 181
 Michaelson, Karl 456
 Mielikäinen, Aila 532
 Mikkelsen, Kristian Mathias 197, 199, 387, 388
 Mikkola, J. J. 276, 376, 436, 462, 463, 565
 Mithun, Marianne 554
 Moberg, Lennart 84, 214, 226, 429, 430
 Moberg, P. 147
 Modeer, Ivar 416
 Moe, Ingebret Moltke 193
 Molbeck, Christian 222, 248, 250-254, 441, 442
 Møller, Christen 308
 Møller, Herman 268, 269, 300
 Møller, Kristen 421
 Moltke, Erik 431, 432
 Monberg, Torben 560
 Montague, Richard 521
 Montelius, Oscar 407
 Morgenstjerne, Georg 310, 314, 374, 460, 566
 Mosel, Ulrike 560
 Moth, Matthias 8, 59, 60
- Naert, Pierre 324, 334
 Naess, Arne 542
 Nannestad, Nicolai 74, 125
 Næs, Olav 309, 397, 555
 Neikter, Jacob Frederik 123, 124
 Nelson, W. 538
 Nesheim, Asbjørn 310, 386, 446, 447
 Nettelbladh, Casper 112
 Nicander, Anders 84, 85, 227

- Nickel, Klaus Peter 556
 Nida, Eugene 358, 504
 Niebuhr, Carsten 39
 Niederehe, Hans-J. 4
 Nielsen, Gunhild 420
 Nielsen, Karl Martin 431, 432
 Nielsen, Konrad 310, 314-316, 398, 439, 440, 446, 447, 470
 Nielsen, Niels Åge 420, 421
 Niemi, Jussi 206, 527
 Nieminen, Eino 463
 Nikanne, Urpo 483
 Nikkilä, Osmo 48
 Nissen, Niels Lang 26, 140-144, 208
 Nissen, Ole Hartvig 165
 Nurmela, Tauno 452
 Nuutinen, Olli 479
 Nyberg, Hans Samuel 319, 333, 460
 Nygaard, Marius 218, 396, 397
 Nygård, Sigurd 416
 Nyhuus, Haakon 303
 Nyman, Martti 541, 547
 Nyrop, Kristoffer 153, 168, 270, 317, 448, 449, 451, 565
 Nysted, Hans Olufson 45, 60, 70
- Oelinger, Albert 68
 Ófeigsson, Jón 367
 Oftedahl, Lars 144, 145
 Oftedal, Magne 332, 465, 566
 Ögmundarson, Jón helgi 14
 Ohlsson, Stig Örjan 92, 126, 127
 Öhman, Sven 497, 508, 543, 544
 Öhmann, Emil 341, 453, 565, 566
 Öhquist, Joh. 271
 Ojansuu, Heikki 417, 422
 Oksaar, Els 324
 Oksanen, A. 178
 Palmblad, W. P. 165
 Palomäki, Ulla 553
 Pálsson, Guttormur 206
 Pamp, Bengt 416
 P_nini 542
 Papi, Antonio 27
 Paris, Gaston 451, 456
 Parpola, Asko 560
 Parpola, Simo 560
 Paul, Hermann 182, 226, 305, 335, 341, 383, 403
 Paulinus, Simon 38
 Paunonen, Heikki 137, 516, 532, 553
 Pedersen, Christiern 42, 58
 Pedersen, Holger 5, 6, 168, 297, 300, 303, 308, 309, 314, 330, 351, 370-374, 459, 463,
 Nissilä, Viljo 417, 553
 Norberg, Dag 457
 Norberg, Mathias 267, 286
 Nordal, Sigurður 310, 437
 Nordberg, Bengt 495, 530, 532
 Nordström, Johan 56
 Noreen, Adolf 9, 64, 84, 90, 135, 136, 169, 171, 186, 195, 218, 226, 228, 241, 248, 249, 276, 297, 298, 301, 329, 330, 342, 375, 382, 391, 395, 397, 399-402, 404, 409, 411, 412, 416, 429, 564
 Nowak, Elke 102, 103, 291
 Numminen, Jaakko 489
 Nuorteva, Jussi 15
- Ólafsson, Eggert 50
 Ólafsson, Guðmundur 64
 Ólafsson, Jón 64, 80, 94, 95
 Ólafsson, Magnús 63, 106
 Olde, E. M. 267, 456
 Olrik, Axel 416
 Ólsen, Björn M. 15, 22, 190, 207, 308, 426, 445
 Olsen, Hedvig 450
 Olsen, Karen Marie 419
 Olsen, Magnus 171, 258, 319, 431
 Onikki, Tiina 426, 522
 Oppermann, Ludvig H. F. 146
 Óresnik, Janez 513
 Orry, Mathurin René 269
 Örsted, Johannes 30, 125
 Östergren, Olof 320, 447
 Östman, Jan-Ola 483, 534
 Ottelin, Carl Gustaf 275
 Otto, Alfred 19, 20
 Ottósson, Kjartan 49, 50, 94, 189, 237, 438, 517
- Paasonen, Heikki 183, 283, 284, 377, 379, 467
 Palander, Gabriele 111, 452, 465, 467, 563
 Pedersen, Inge Lise 419, 422, 498, 531
 Pekkanen, Tuomo 32, 138, 547
 Peltola, Reino 444
 Penn, William 100
 Penttilä, Aarni 315, 335, 360, 366, 392, 394, 395, 402, 508, 553
 Perälä, Tauno 328
 Perlmutter, David 498
 Persson, Ingmar 558
 Persson, Per 169, 170, 195, 265, 301, 371, 375
 Peters, Stanley 521
 Petersen, Carl S. 67, 194
 Petersen, Magnus 258
 Petersen, Niels Matthias 132, 133, 152, 159, 186, 194,

- 197, 200, 208, 210, 214, 221, 222,
231, 232
- Peterson, Lena 433
- Petersson, Herbert 375
- Petræus, Eskil 29, 38, 47, 75-77
- Petri, Laurentius 55
- Petri, Olaus 55
- Pettersson, Gertrud 542
- Pétursson, Magnús 546
- Pétursson, Sigurður 15, 33
- Platzack, Christer 352, 483, 517-519, 524
- Plunkett, Kim 527
- Poirot, Jean 365, 366
- Pontoppidan, Erik E. 51, 67-71, 75, 86-89
- Porkka, Volmari 282
- Pors, Mads 59
- Porsanger, Anders 54, 128, 439
- Porthan, Henrik Gabriel 31, 38, 48, 49, 62, 98, 113,
128, 138, 172, 233, 245, 279
- Porzig, Walter 335
- Possevino, A. 82
- Postal, Paul 498
- Posti, Lauri 380, 381, 490
- Pott, August Friedrich 166, 216, 304
- Poulsen, Ib 526
- Poulsen, Johan Hendrik 489
- Pourel de Hatrize, Barth 96
- Preisler, Bent 536
- Protten, Christian 102
- Quilis, Antonio 4
- Quirk, Randolph 538, 558, 564
- von Qvanten, Emil 293
- Qvigstad, J. K. 310, 316, 399
- Radloff, Wilhelm 284
- Rehling, Erik 387, 388
- Rein, Gabriel 188
- Rekdal, Olaug 493
- Renvall, Gustav 202, 233-235, 252
- Resen, Hans Poulsen 43
- Resen[ius], P. H. 63, 101
- Rhode, Hans 59, 87
- Riad, Tomas 524, 541
- Richert, Mårten 169, 194, 195, 226
- Rietz, Johan Ernst 256
- Ringbom, Håkon 525
- Ringgaard, Kristian 365, 420
- Rischel, Jørgen 102, 159, 364, 488, 513-515, 545, 552,
554, 561
- Rissanen, Matti 455, 538
- Rissanen, Terhi 529
- Rodriguez Matritense, Carolo 96, 97
- Pfeif, Johannes Jacobus 92
- Phillipson, Robert 526, 533
- Pihl, Olaus Stockflet 30
- Pike, Kenneth 358, 390, 476, 504, 561
- Pinborg, Jan 13, 16-20, 559
- Pipping, Hugo 228, 291, 293, 294, 298, 316, 365, 413
- Pipping, Rolf 413, 414
- Plato 17, 105, 108, 115, 117, 568
- Platou, L. Stoud 46
- Ragnarsdóttir, Hrafnhildur 527
- Räikkälä, Anneli 436
- Rajalen, Bartholdus 35
- Ramat, Paolo 4
- Ramstedt, Gustaf John 305, 355, 467-469, 478, 565
- Ramus, Petrus 33, 37, 126
- Rapola, Martti 46, 47, 335, 337, 406, 422-424, 426
- Räsänen, Martti 467, 469
- Raschellà, Fabrizio D. 21, 22
- Rask, Rasmus 26, 98, 103, 120, 132, 137, 141,
156-165, 167, 172, 173, 185, 186,
189, 191, 197, 198, 200, 206, 207,
210-212, 216, 217, 219-223, 225,
230-232, 235-237, 242, 247, 253,
268, 272, 273, 281, 286, 291, 292,
297, 298, 300, 301, 303, 372, 439,
473, 501, 563, 565
- Rauch, Georg von 28
- Raukko, Jarno 534
- Rautala, Helena 536, 537
- Rautanen, Martti 289
- Ravila, Paavo 328, 336, 337, 340, 360, 379, 382-384,
408, 508, 510
- Ravn, Hans Mikkelsen 44, 67, 69, 89
- Ravn, Otto E. 465
- de Röepstorff, Fr. Ad. 289
- Rögnvaldsson, Eiríkur 502
- Roos, Henrik 13, 18, 20
- Rørdam, Holger Fr[ederik] 68
- Rosengren, Inger 483, 558
- Rosenhane, Gustav 56
- von Rosenstein, Nils 57, 58, 240
- Rosetti, A. 318
- Roskilde, Peder Jensen 67
- Ross, Hans 193, 247, 254, 255
- Ross, John Robert 498
- Rossem, Cefas van 104
- Rostgaard, Frederik 59, 60
- Roth, R. 272
- Rudbeck, Olof Jr. 56, 112, 117-119
- Rudbeck, Olof Sr. 48, 56, 63, 65, 92, 108, 114, 116,
117, 119, 163

- Rundgren, Fritjof 466
 Runeberg, J. L. 173, 413
 Ruong, Isak 440
 Ruoppila, Veikko 426
 Ruus, Hanne 522
 Rydqvist, Johan 214, 225, 226, 256
 Ryen, Else 536
 Sadeniemi, Matti 204, 443
 Sadock, Jerrold 554
 Sägval Hein, Anna 495
 Sahlgren, Jöran 329, 415, 416
 Sahlstedt, Abraham 31, 93
 Sajavaara, Kari 512, 525
 Sajnovics, János [Johannes] 31, 54, 113, 121, 216
 Salberg, Johan 83, 84
 Salminen, Tapani 548
 Salenius, A. H. 458
 Salvius 89
 Sammallahti, Pekka 80, 382, 383, 483, 514, 548, 549,
 554, 556
 Sandfeld (Jensen), Kristian 168, 315, 338, 449-451
 Sandvad, Holger 419
 Santesson, Lillemor 89
 Sapir, Edward 305, 349, 356, 439, 476
 Saukkonen, Pauli 553
 Šaumjan, S. K. 350
 de Saussure, Ferdinand 151, 226, 305, 330, 334, 335,
 340-342, 349, 351, 356, 357, 360,
 375, 403, 439, 475
 Säve, Carl 194, 248
 Säve, Per 248
 Sechehaye, A. 318, 351
 Segerberg, Krister 542
 Seip, Didrik Arup 310, 332, 410, 411
 Sellberg, Lars 133, 249
 Selmer, Ernst 310, 338, 368
 Serenius, Jacob 65
 Setälä, Eemil Nestor 8, 10, 178, 180-185, 188, 204-206,
 235, 246, 253, 276, 297, 300-302,
 314, 327, 328, 330, 335, 338, 366,
 377-380, 382, 385, 391, 392, 394,
 402, 407, 408, 422, 424-426, 435,
 436, 443, 446, 453, 469, 490, 499,
 564
 Seth, Ivar 29
 Shannon, Claude 305
 Sievers, Eduard 228, 291, 293, 296, 363, 403
 Sigurd, Bengt 139, 255, 324, 359, 447, 510, 511, 513,
 539
 Sigurdsson, Halldór Ámann 502
 Silfverstolpe, A. G. 147, 148, 241
 de Sacy, Antoine-Isaac Silvestre 26, 140-142, 146, 147,
 208, 213, 272, 287
 Rygh, Oluf 219, 415, 418
 Ryti, Risto 328
 Saaby, Viggo 232
 Saari, Mirja 532
 Saarimaa, E. A. 393, 437
 Saxén, Ralf 392, 417
 Saxo 136
 Scaliger, Julius Caesar 86-88
 Schiefner, Anton 176, 280, 281
 Schildt, Wolmar Styrbjörn 235
 Schlegel, Fr. 268, 286
 Schlegel, Johan Henrich 45, 46
 Schleicher, August 216, 305
 Schlyter, Carl Johan 218
 Schmidt, J. 271
 Schmidt, Valdemar 288
 Schmitter, Peter 6
 Schnabel, Marcus 51, 52
 Schottelius, Justus Georg 68
 Schreiner, E. 262
 Schreuder, Hans Paludan Smith 272, 289, 290, 298
 Schroderus, Ericus 61, 62, 65
 Schuchardt, Hugo 342, 383, 425
 Schultz, N. S. 208
 Schultze, Samuel 66
 Schulz, Peder 70, 87
 Schütte, Gudmund 421
 Searle, John 534
 Simon 16, 19
 Simonsen, Hanne Gram 527
 Simonsson, Nils 460, 483
 Siro, Paavo 325, 335, 336, 379, 384, 393, 395, 408,
 443, 500, 512, 553
 Sjöborg, Gustaf 85
 Sjögren, Anders Johan 172, 173, 177, 201, 273, 274,
 279, 280, 282, 297, 298, 563
 Sjöstedt, Gösta 430
 Skautrup, Peter 44, 89, 222, 223, 308, 405, 406, 420,
 421, 435
 Sköld, Hannes 375
 Skrefsrud, Lars 290
 Skulerud, Olai 428
 Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove 533
 Skytte, Johan 55
 Smári, Jakob 396
 Smith, Casper Wilhelm 167, 276, 277
 Smith, Henrik 59
 Smith, Svend 365, 420
 Snellman, Johan Vilhelm 173, 188
 Socrates 17

- Söderberg, Sven 259
 Söderbergh, Ragnhild 527
 Söderblom, Nathan 170
 Söderhjelm, Werner 271, 293, 451, 452, 455
 Söderwall, Knut Fredrik 195, 196, 252, 256
 Solander, David 99
 Sørensen, Finn 519, 522
 Sørensen, J. 417
 Sotavalta, Arvo 318, 360
 Sovijärvi, Antti 366, 367
 Spang-Hanssen, Henning 315, 488, 526
 Sparrman, Anders 99
 Spiegel, Haquin 65, 119
 Sperber, Hans 335, 394, 425
 Springer, Karl 100
 Staaf, Erik 456
 Stahl, Henricus 76, 77
 Ståhl, Magnus Laur. 129
 Stähle, Carl Ivar 499, 541
 Stang, Christian 374, 375, 462
 Steckzén, Jonas 267
 Steenstrup, Johannes C. H. R. 416
 Steinholt, Anders 530
 Steinthal, Heymann 154, 178, 387
 Stemann, Ingeborg 395
 Sten, Holger 451
 Stender-Pedersen, Adolf 308
 Stephens, George 266, 267
 Stiernhielm, Georg 55, 56, 65, 107, 114, 115, 119, 128
 Stipa, Günter Johannes 75, 113, 114, 122
 Svantesson, Jan-Olof 561
 Svartvik, Jan 324, 483, 537, 538, 558, 564
 Svedbom, P. E. 146
 Svenonius, Enevald[us] 111, 112
 Svensson, Jan 526, 541
 Sverdrup, Georg 260, 314
 Sverdrup, Johan 193
 Svonni, Mikael 494
 Swan, Toril 536
 Swedberg, Jesper 65, 91, 92, 128
 Sweet, Henry 186, 194, 296
 Syv, Peder 59, 60, 68-71, 75, 86-89, 106, 107
 Szantyr, Anton 457

 Tallqvist, Knut 288, 465, 466
 Talvio, Maila 462
 Tamm, Fredrik 229, 230
 Taraldsen, Knut Tarald 483, 519, 524
 Tarvainen, Kalevi 512
 Techmer, Friedrich 181
 Tegnér, Esaias 153, 241, 256, 341, 342
 Teleman, Ulf 58, 84, 352, 483, 499, 505, 508, 517, 526, 535, 557

 Solov'ev, Sergej 275
 Sölvason, Sveinn 50, 95
 Sommerfelt, Alf 8, 305, 310, 311, 314, 315, 318-320, 323, 329-332, 334, 338-340, 346, 352-354, 374, 405, 446, 464, 472, 566
 Stjernström, G. 90
 Stockfleth, Nils Vibe 194, 212, 255
 Stokoe, William 528
 Stoltz, Gerhard 427
 Storm, Gustav 135
 Storm, Johan 154-156, 239, 247, 270, 291, 296, 298, 301, 302, 368, 429
 von Strahlenberg, Philipp Johann 99, 112, 121-124, 128, 279, 283
 Stråhlman [Strahlmann], Johan 200, 201
 Strömberg, N. 84, 215, 324
 Strömkvist, Sven 527
 Studdert-Kennedy, Michael 544
 Sturlason, Snorri 22, 119, 136
 Suetonius 5
 Suhonen, Seppo 78
 Sundén, M. 136
 Sundman, Marketta 483
 Sundwall, Johannes 458
 Suojanen, Matti K. 512, 532, 553
 Suojanen, Päivikki 512
 Suolahti, Hugo 451-453
 Svabo, Jens Christian 200

 Terserus, Adolphus Elai 33, 35
 Terserus, Johannes Elai 29
 Thalbitzer, William 314, 315, 472, 473
 Thelander, Mats 94, 530, 532
 Therkelsen, Rita 357
 Thesleff, Arthur 274
 Thomassøn, Jørgen 51
 Thomsen, Vilhelm 5, 151-153, 164, 165, 167, 168, 170-172, 177, 179, 243, 251, 270, 276, 277, 283, 284, 291, 296-298, 300-303, 308, 330, 337, 343, 344, 372, 376, 407, 408, 448, 449, 466, 472, 549, 563, 565
 Thorberg, Abraham 123
 Thorell, Olof 557
 Thors, Carl-Eric 414, 417
 Thorsen, P. K. 232, 243, 245
 Thráinsson, Höskuldur 337, 427, 483, 502, 513, 515, 518, 519, 546
 Tiällman[n], Nils 36, 83, 84
 Tiderus, A. J. 77
 Togeby, Knud 308, 315, 333, 350, 450, 451, 559, 565
 Togeby, Ole 483, 520, 534

- Toivainen, Jorma 527
 Toivonen, Y. H. 381, 443, 444
 Torp, Alf 156, 165, 170-172, 224, 225, 374, 396, 445
 Torp, Hjalmar 225
 af Trampe, Peter 511
 Trendelenburg, Johann Georg 259, 260
 Trostius, Martinus 38
 Trubetzkoy, N. S. 318, 334, 346, 358-360, 474
 Tuneld, Ebbe 255
 Tunkelo, E. A. 382, 402
 Tuominen, Juhani 527
 Turson, Jon 59
 Tuulio [Tallgren], Oiva 452, 455, 458
 Twaddell, W. Freeman 318
- Uldall, Hans Jørgen 315, 350, 355, 356, 358
 Ulvestad, Bjarne 20
 Unger, Carl Richard 207, 216, 217, 270, 390
- Väänänen, Veikko 452, 454, 458, 459, 565, 566
 Vamling, Karina 523, 524
 Vannebo, Kjell Ivar 500, 541, 555
 Varming, L. 245
 Vasmer, Max 463
 Vater, J. S. 202
 Vaugelas, Claude Favre 90
 van der Voort, Hein 104
 Vorstius, M. Johannes 108
 Vossler, Karl 425
 Vuoriniemi, Jorma 443, 521
- Wackernagel, Jacob 458
 Wahlund, C. 136
 Walberg, Emanuel 455, 456
 Wallenius, Gabriel 82, 83
 Wallensköld, Axel 451, 452, 455
 Wallin, Georg August 132, 286, 287, 293
 Wallis, John 118
 Walton, S. 190
 Wandal, Peder 109
 Wande, Erling 553
 Warelius, Antero 245, 246
 Weaver, Warren 305
 Webster, Noah 249
 Weisgerber, Leo 335, 339, 394
 Weisse, Johan Peter 262, 263
 Wellander, Erik 440
 Weman, Carl Gustaf 48
 Werfel, Johannes 142
 Wertheimer, Max 366
 Wessén, Elias 227, 307, 413, 432, 441, 556
 Westerdahl, Christer 286
 Westergaard, Niels Ludvig 167, 272, 273
- Tommola, Hannu T. 524
 Tornaeus, Johannes Jonae 53
 Vaala, Martti 392
 Venås, Kjell 190, 193, 309, 331, 555
 Vendryes, J. 318, 351
 Ventris, Michael 458
 Verelius, Olaus 106
 Verner, Karl 167-169, 226, 277, 291, 296, 298, 300,
 301, 365, 411, 463, 563, 565
 Vhael, Bartholdus G. 78, 80, 81, 200, 201
 Viberg, Åke 511, 523, 525
 Viëtor, Wilhelm 153, 154
 Vigfússon, Guðbrandur 254
 Vihonen, Sakari 75-77
 Vikner, Carl 522
 Vikner, Sten 483, 518, 519, 524
 Vikør, Lars 483
 Vilkuna, Maria 520, 524
 Vilppula, Matti 425
 Vinje, Aasmund Olavsson 193
 Virtaranta, Pertti 424, 425, 553
 Vising, Johan 314, 456
 Vogt, Alf 332
 Vogt, Hans 8, 311, 318, 323, 332, 338, 339, 357, 358,
 361, 374, 439, 450, 474-476, 565,
 566
 Westergaard-Nielsen, Christian 445
 Westerlund Selmer, Ernst cf. Selmer, Ernst
 Western, August 396, 397
 Whitfield, Francis J. 350
 Whitney, William Dwight 151, 153, 273
 Wichmann, Yrjö 183, 283, 284, 377, 379
 Widding, Ole 419, 421, 445
 Widmark, Gun 430
 Wiedemann, Ferdinand Johann 282
 Wiener, Norbert 305
 Wigger, Geirr 493, 503, 526
 Wiik, Kalevi 202, 205, 325, 337, 360, 367, 500, 509,
 512, 514, 545, 553
 van Wijk, N. 318
 Wikander, Sten 461
 Wikander, Stig 319, 355
 Wikberg, Kay 500
 Wiklund, Karl Bernhard 182, 183, 283, 314, 385, 408
 Wikström, M. W. 189

Wilse, J. N. 51
Wilster, Christian 44
Wimmer, Ludvig 135, 186, 187, 190, 207, 217, 223, 232, 251, 257, 258, 266, 431, 432
Winter, E. 122
Winter, Werner 375
Wisén, Theodor 135, 195
Wiwel, H. G. 387, 388, 397
Wollin, Lars 16, 55, 84
Wood, Sidney 544
Worm, Ole 39, 63
von Wright, Georg Henrik 542
Wulff, Fredrik 267, 295, 368
Wulff, Kurt 471, 472
Wulfila 56, 114, 257
Wundt, Wilhelm 305, 335, 382
Wurst, Raimund Jakob 146

Zaenen, Annie 519
Ziegenbalg, Bartholomæus 101
Zipf, G. K. 345
Zwirner, Eberhard 367

Þórðarson, Ólafur 22
Þorkelsson, Jón 190, 218, 254
Þorláksson, Guðbrandur 95
Þórólfsson, Björn K. 409