# A Smorgasbord of Print

## The Development of Scholarly Publishing in the Swedish humanities, c. 1840–1880

Hammar, Isak

*Published in:*
History of European Ideas

*DOI:*
10.1080/01916599.2024.2430973

2024

*Document Version:*
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

HISTORY OF EUROPEAN IDEAS
https://doi.org/10.1080/01916599.2024.2430973



# A smorgasbord of print: the development of scholarly publishing in the Swedish humanities, c. 1840–1880

Isak Hammar

Department of History, Lund University, Lund, Sweden

**ABSTRACT**

This article traces publishing patterns in the Swedish humanities between 1840 and 1880; a period characterized by a new publishing regime yet bridging two dominant publication forms, the dissertation, and the disciplinary journal. Using the prominent historian Wilhelm Erik Svedelius as an entry point, the article charts how scholars in the humanities navigated the publishing landscape in a more diverse era in European historiography, before the advent of disciplinary platforms for research and boundary work. The article demonstrates that Svedelius and his contemporaries used a plethora – or smorgasbord – of formats and hybrid genres; learned journals, transactions, yearbooks, and commercial printers that together formed an ephemeral ecosystem shared across the humanities. In this pre- or semi-professional system, neither platforms nor formats were guarantors of epistemic value and forgotten genres such as printed speeches or biographies provided the opportunity to express scholarly tradecraft, evaluated by the community on the basis of their 'scientific' quality.

**KEYWORDS**

Scholarly publishing; disciplinary journals; learned journals; history of humanities; professionalization; dissertations

For I have written a great many things.

The memoirs of W.E. Svedelius, 1889

… , his writing proceeded with such a speed, that one might very well call it restless.

Obituary over W.E. Svedelius, 1889

## 1. Introduction

In 1888, retired professor Wilhelm Erik Svedelius (1816–1889) published a paper in *Historisk tidskrift* [*Historical Journal*] entitled 'On Historical Science and Historical Studies.'[1] Dealing with the burning question of what it took to be a professional historian, it was his first and only publication in what had at that time become the historical discipline's main national scholarly journal.[2] Around the same time as in several other European countries, Sweden had seen its own historical journal established in 1881 and similar in function to such titles as *Revue historique* and the *English Historical Review* it was fast becoming instrumental in the forging of a robust scientific community for Swedish historians.[3] Svedelius' contribution to the journal was the last work he published before he died and he was, as a testament to his inclusion in the Swedish inner circle of academic historians, lauded in an obituary in the very next issue.[4]

**CONTACT** Isak Hammar isak.hammar@hist.lu.se

This article has been corrected with minor changes. These changes do not impact the academic content of the article.

In the years that followed, Sweden seems to fit nicely into a general European pattern, where newly founded scholarly journals spearheaded professionalization of several disciplines in the humanities. Less scholarly attention has been given to the era directly preceding this phase of consolidation, when academic print culture in Europe was more diverse and uncertain. In this article, I will trace publishing patterns in the Swedish humanities between c. 1840 and 1880; four decades characterized by a new publishing regime yet bridging two dominant publication forms, the dissertation, and the disciplinary journal. Directing our attention to what came before the disciplinary journals, Svedelius' career is particularly informative since he with the aforementioned article at the tail end of his publication oeuvre, took an active part in both these relatively distinct phases of publishing history.[5] In addition, he left an extended autobiographical account that elaborated on his own strategies in this changing publishing landscape. As a leading representative of his field, he thus provides a rewarding case for tracing the coordinates by which a generation of scholars navigated this developmental yet formative phase, during which time, there was added pressure on professors to prove their skill in research but as of yet no standardized platforms for disciplinary research.[6] The publishing landscape, in short, was in a state of flux, presenting scholars with the question of how best to navigate the increasing pressure to prove their merit.[7] My aim is to discover the strategies employed by scholars in order to get their works published, tracking the use of particular formats or genres and their position in an infrastructure of scholarly print.

The academic world Svedelius entered into still relied heavily on the dissertation, often written in Latin, as the premier outlet for printed communication of academic knowledge.[8] In contrast, in the decades following his retirement, scholarly journals sprung up all over Europe as well as in other parts of the world, serving both as a reliable infrastructure that enabled knowledge to be circulated across different audiences and as arenas were disciplinary boundaries, ideals and identities could be negotiated.[9] As a case in point, the title of the paper, 'On Historical Science and Historical Studies' exemplified the kind of boundary work that these journals now provided a forum for.[10] In addition, journals set methodological standards via book reviews and dictated the scope of scholarly inquiry by accepting or rejecting contributions.[11] Finally, obituaries such as the one awarded Svedelius put the scholarly *persona* into focus, detailing how character traits and virtues coalesced to forge trustworthy scholars and provide reliable knowledge.[12]

As will become clear, Sweden displays both similarities and variations to such preceding, tentative, pre- or semi-professional phases in other countries as scholars arrived at the relatively firm format of the journal by trying alternative routes of publishing. More specifically, the prevalence and characteristics of learned, proto-scholarly periodicals varied as did the consideration scholars in the humanities showed them. While limited opportunities were offered by some European universities and commercial printers, national – and regional – settings differed. By focusing on the interim ecosystem that emerged in Sweden during the decades leading up to the introduction of disciplinary journals, my aim is to fixate one such elusive phase and its ecosystem for scholarly publishing, thereby also expanding a more general narrative of the role played by academic print in the humanities beyond the country's borders. As I will demonstrate, the framework for scholarly publications during this phase was both ephemeral and non-hierarchical in character, with scholars habitually looking to a written specimen's 'scientific' quality rather than the format or publication channel in order to judge its epistemic value.[13] In particular, I want to draw attention to the inherent pluralism of publishing that followed this creed, but also how the ecology hinged on formats and genres of scholarly publishing whose importance later diminished.

## 2. Wilhelm Erik Svedelius and the Swedish publication landscape

If the disciplinary journals are fairly well integrated in the general narrative of European professionalization of academia, scholarship on the publication practices *before* the advent of journals is patchy at best. To recover this epistemic ecosystem as it developed in Sweden, I will use the career, practices, and publication oeuvre of Svedelius as my entry point. However, as I will show, scholarly

publishing during this time frame was dependent on collaboration across the humanities. In order to fully grasp the publishing landscape c. 1840–1880, it will therefore be necessary to involve not only Svedelius' contemporaries in history but also representatives of other disciplines. While departing from the intellectual milieu of Swedish academia, the significance of how Svedelius and several of his colleagues understood and cultivated scholarly publications will hopefully serve to open up a larger vista of inquiry into the historical underpinnings of publishing in the humanities. As the writing of history, philosophy and linguistics developed into a profession during the nineteenth century, the early sites of these practices merit historiographical interest. One aspect of professionalization, as Porciani and Raphael has argued, was the replacing of old formats by new ones, geared to serve the needs of the new vocation.[14] As the case of Sweden shows, the learned journals catering to the humanities scholar at large, was challenged by the disciplinary journal addressing a specialized historian or philologist. But it would be a mistake to believe transformations into new formats happened overnight or that old formats, genres or audiences were abandoned instantly. Instead, useful questions include where scholarly prowess was demonstrated and boundary work negotiated before disciplinary journals entered the scene.

The fact that his most active years in academia lacked a disciplinary platform did not prevent William Erik Svedelius from having a distinguished career, proof of which was his membership in all three of Sweden's Royal academies. In 1856, he was appointed professor of history at Lund University, only to return to his alma mater Uppsala University in 1862 after he secured a prestigious chair in political science (*The Johan Skytte Professorship of Eloquence and Government*), a position he held until he retired in 1881. Nor did it keep him from publishing research or negotiate disciplinary standards. Still, his published oeuvre is pluralistic and arguably challenging to fully grasp from a modern viewpoint. In this pluralism, found also in the careers and practices of his peers in the humanities as a whole, we can uncover attitudes towards publishing both diverging from and aligning with twentieth century standards. Nevertheless, we will do well not to simplify this development nor to force our own concerns or preconceptions about the epistemological qualities of various scholarly formats on its different phases.[15]

Although providing exact numbers of publications is challenging as a result of the widespread practice to reformat and republish scholarly works, Svedelius published around sixty texts over the span of his career, including dissertations, monographs, articles, essays, educational material, and academic biographies. In particular, he was fond of the printed speech, produced in 'such a number, that you could almost say that he scattered them about' according to his obituary in *Historisk tidskrift*.[16] Like most of his contemporaries, international as well as national, he also partook in the reviewing of scholarly books.

More important than the number of publications is the fact that the bulk of his written accomplishments were published between two dominant scholarly formats. Compared to his predecessor at Lund University, Ebbe Bring, the last in the line of history professors at Lund to rely on the printed dissertation as his more or less only publication channel, the variety of both outlets and genres on Svedelius' record is certainly noteworthy. In contrast, serving as a good example of how quickly the next generation of scholars grew accustomed to relying on disciplinary journals, Simon J. Boëthius (1850–1924), appointed professor of history at Uppsala the same year that Svedelius died, and later, like Svedelius, Professor *Skytteanus* of eloquence and government, contributed original work to *Historisk tidskrift* almost every year between 1884 and 1892. Keeping the changing and still porous confines of a what constituted an article in mind, Boëthius published approximately four times as many original contributions to journals as Svedelius.

Around this time, publishing was clearly becoming more important in the humanities. In Svedelius' above-mentioned obituary in *Historisk tidskrift*, written by his successor Oscar Alin (1846–1900), his oeuvre and publishing habits were a distinct part of his legacy, embedded in the portrait offered readers of the journal. Although Svedelius in many ways embodied a traditional ideal of profound learnedness, Latin eloquence, oratorical talent and aptitude for teaching, he was also said to pursue his writing at times in an almost 'restless' manner and a large number of his contributions

were listed and characterized in positive terms.[17] Adding to this legacy, Alin made sure to stress the fact that this 'astonishing' productivity when it came to written scholarship never resulted in 'rushed work,' and that his accomplishments as an author were all the more impressive when considering that writing always came second to Svedelius' duties as a teacher. That Svedelius was able to achieve such productivity, despite his commitment to his students, was in turn explained by his conviction that such tireless efforts were his duty, a sentiment the obituary claimed to be a cornerstone of his character from an early age.[18] The portrayal of Svedelius as a productive author can be taken as an example of how disciplinary journals quickly became instruments for chiselling out common templates of what it meant and took to be a scholar, as well as the importance of publications within them.[19]

It is, however, not just Svedelius' list of publications or his standing in the community of scholars that offer guidance when considering the conditions for publishing at the time. Indeed, we are fortunate that the historian left a record of his own views on his scholarly writings, productivity (or lack thereof) and choice of outlet when, towards the end of his life, he set himself the task of writing an autobiography. In this posthumously published, and ostensibly widely read work, *Anteckningar om mitt förflutna lif* ['Notes on my bygone life'], he described in great detail the conditions he faced while in different phases of his academic career.[20] Clearly, it was important to Svedelius not be seen as 'idle' [overksam], or in a more humorous turn of phrase, an 'academic slowpoke' [akademisk sölkorf] and thus his publications were an important part of these recollections that he intended for a broader audience.[21] His ambitions in this regard, so far as we can guess them, warrants customary caution. He was not, nor presented himself to be, a neutral observer. In addition, by the time he put his memories to print, expectations on scholars to produce had no doubt likely become more pronounced. Yet, his personal involvement in issues of scholarly publication is instructive, his memoirs providing us with a useful starting point from where to pursue a larger view of publishing in this tentative phase. From there, we can expand our optics, zooming out from Svedelius to his generation of historians, and from history as a discipline to the humanities as a field of knowledge.

## 3. International framing c. 1840–1880

The decades of relative uncertainty in regard to publication practices that Svedelius provides us with a vantage point to explore corresponds to similar tentative phases in other countries, in and beyond Europe at around roughly the same time. Nevertheless, providing the larger picture of international comparison is not without its challenges, as a myriad of publication forms, outlets and traditions tend to obscure a bird's eye view. What may have counted as a respectable periodical format featuring scholarly topics in one country, could well have been of little consequence to the community of scholars in another, as genres, financing and audience are all intangible factors to be considered, making concrete comparisons difficult. In addition, many forms of periodical print were short lived and regional.

Bearing this in mind, Svedelius was far from alone in having to actively deal with new expectations on scholarly publishing. From 1850 onwards, around the time when history, to follow James Turner, 'began to vie for academic gravitas,' profound changes to academic culture were being implemented, albeit at varying pace in different countries.[22] Key aspects of these developments were the state's growing interest in scientific research, the specialization of scholarship and the professionalization of academic staff.[23] There is at the outset no reason to believe that Scandinavia took a radically different route towards professionalization, nor that the disciplinary journals played a less substantial role.[24] In Sweden, a milestone was reached with the new regulations of higher education issued in 1852, which stated that scientific skill should henceforth be the sole academic merit for hiring professors, a creed later strengthened in 1876 when also peer evaluation became a mandatory part of this process. Although Robert Townsend has cautioned against overly simplistic narratives of professionalization and brought attention to the lingering importance of 'a broader set of professional practices' extending beyond academic departments, the importance of

publications to showcase 'scientific scholarship' grew as a result of these changes, both in Sweden and in other countries, in time becoming, in the words of William Clark, 'the sine qua non of academic capital.'[25]

What seems clear is that until roughly the two final decades of the nineteenth century, European academic print culture was far less synchronized than what later became the case. While a few European countries had ventured more specialized journals in history even before the period in question, including the Belgian *Messager des sciences historiques* (1832) and the French *Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes* (1839), some countries had to wait until the early decades of the twentieth century before they had a historical journal of their own. Expanding our question to include the humanities in general, the picture becomes even more chaotic. In part, this is because of the changeable characteristics of so-called learned journals, that is periodicals with a more general, even eclectic scope but which nevertheless drew the interest of amateurs and professionals alike, such as the *Edinburgh Review*, the *Revue des deux mondes* and *Göttingische Gelehrte Anzeigen*. In addition, as noted by Pim Den Boer, there were also hundreds of local journals in France alone where history could be discussed and as Floris Solleveld points out, the number of learned journals in the early decades of the century 'runs in the thousands,' although far from this number would be part of the repertoire of the average scholar.[26] At the same time, some early journals were more focused on publishing sources than original scholarship, such as the Austrian *Der österreichische Geschichtsforscher* and *Archiv für Österreichische Geschichte* or the Italian *Archivio storico Italiano* but in some cases, as the publication landscape continued to evolve, titles that started as a collection of sources could also become increasingly specialized as the century progressed.[27]

To illustrate national variations, we can point to the fact that at the time when Svedelius began to develop his tradecraft in dissertations in the 1840s, the neighbouring Denmark had already launched a historical journal and by the time of his death 1889, Finland was still lacking one. At around the midpoint of Svedelius' career, the paragon of scholarly inspiration for Sweden, Germany, had, in the words of Margaret Stieg taken 'a quantum leap forward' with the publication of the first issue of the *Historische Zeitschrift* in 1859.[28] But the success of the groundbreaking journal had been preceded by two short-lived attempts, the *Historisch-Politische Zeitschrift*, founded in 1832 by Leopold von Ranke and the *Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaft* which ran between 1844 and 1848. In the meantime, Doris Goldstein has argued that British historians lacked any journals of such scholarly ambition as *Historische Zeitschrift* prior to the *English Historical Review* in 1886, although the decade-long attempts to get a journal running has been well documented and provides a telling case study of the competing aims and incentives that historians had to maneuver during the era in question.[29]

In order to provide a more detailed and concrete picture of the conditions for publishing during this period, I will draw on the publication oeuvres of individuals that belonged to Svedelius' generation, scholars that could no longer rely on the dissertation as a publication channel, nor had access to a disciplinary journal for the bulk of their careers.[30] Instructive examples for comparison can not only be found in history, but also in both classical and modern languages, as well as literary history and aesthetics.[31] Collectively, they highlight that the existing (if highly tenuous) infrastructures for publications during the decades in question were shared across – and in many cases beyond – the humanities.[32]

## 4. Dissertations

When Svedelius was a young scholar, the main – and in some cases only – strategy for publishing what he referred to as 'works of a scientific character' was to make use of the dissertation.[33] At a time when the market for academic literature was, according to Svedelius, so small that he would have had to approach commercial publishers 'as a proletarian hat in hand,' it had one huge advantage – it was free.[34] As part of an older European tradition of erudition, dissertations were initially written supplements to the oral examinations for students who wished to receive

an academic degree. But the growing impetus for academic staff to demonstrate their skill in research ostensibly pressured the system into becoming a publication outlet. Svedelius published three full-length treatises as dissertations between 1840 and 1851, the first two in Latin and the third in Swedish. In his memoirs, Svedelius described how, since there was no expectation that the student had written the dissertation upon which the examination was based, there had over time arisen an opportunity for those inhabiting the role of chair of the proceedings (also known as *praeses*) – a professor, adjunct or instructor (*docent*)– to publish as many and as lengthy scholarly texts as one could muster when presiding over examinations.[35] Having himself served as *praeses* as a young scholar, Svedelius called it a 'rotten old convention,' enabling academic staff to have their own writings published free of charge at the expense of the responding student, works, he added, that would otherwise remain unpublished.[36] It was even, he noted, possible to print entire books in the form of a dissertation. As it happens, he did so himself, thus clearly reaping the benefits of the system he later criticized. Between 1849 and 1851, at the time he was *adjunct* and therefore in need of scholarly merits, he published a dissertation written in an astonishing 46 parts, and accordingly defended by 46 different respondents. The topic had at that time already been the subject of both a prize essay (*prisskrift*) – a work that Svedelius had been sent to the Swedish Academy winning its 'grand prize' for best scholarly effort – and a journal article Svedelius had published in 1842. Svedelius obviously considered the dissertation to be one of his publications (it was later printed in its entirety under his name), noting that because it was written in Swedish, he got an extended readership and that people approached him for a copy as a result of the fact that dissertations were not customarily sold in book shops.[37]

Up until the middle of the century, the custom ensured that scholars could publish their writings within a framework provided by the universities. By way of example, the influential historian Fredrik Ferdinand (F.F.) Carlson (1811–1887), who incidentally in 1881 had, as the first president of the Swedish Historical Association, the honour of publishing the very first article in its new platform *Historisk tidskrift*, published three dissertations in Latin in the 1830s and 1840s. But in the following decades, this arrangement, brought on by new expectations of what it meant to be a scholar, was failing. A generation later, the previously mentioned Boëthius, only produced the one dissertation mandatory as part of his examination (1877). It was written in Swedish and published by a commercial publisher the following year. The regulations of 1852 was part of the new regime that undermined the age-old tradition, referred to by Svedelius as a 'taxation' placed on the student for the benefit of their teachers, but it was also ill-suited to accommodate increasing pressures to publish scholarly work.[38] Moreover, demands that the dissertation should be written by the student effectively undermined its use as a publication outlet for more senior scholars.[39] Thus, those keen to make a name for themselves had to look outside the universities for other options.

## 5. The learned journals 1840–1880

Prior to having their own disciplinary journals, historians, philologists, literary scholars, and philosophers both contributed to and edited what might be categorized as either learned, 'proto-scholarly,' as suggested by Claus Møller Jørgensen, or even 'proto-disciplinary' journals.[40] Considering the importance disciplinary journals would gain around the turn of the century as vehicles for showcasing scholarly skill and developing the identities of both disciplines and scholars, their forerunners is an apt place to start sketching the publication landscape prior to their introduction, as prototypes for journals like *Historisk tidskrift*. Despite this salient role for the later developments of professionalization, their scope and role in the learned world at large are, as pointed out by Floris Solleveld, 'an underexplored topic.'[41]

Of course, commercial periodicals with a focus on, in one form or another, the learned contributions of scholars were not an invention of the nineteenth century, although that is when they acquired several of their modern recognizable features.[42] By now it's well known that the history

of the journal traces back to *Journal des sçavans* and *Philosophical Transactions*, both created in 1665.[43] With this longer lineage in mind however, Anne Goldgar has still characterized journals as 'a new and different way of conducting business in the Republic of Letters' during the eighteenth century, intensifying and multiplying the 'circulation of information.'[44] It was, as Chad Wellmon has pointed out, the development of print technology that made scholarly knowledge 'manageable, accessible, and available,' thus ensuring a consolidation of the learned world.[45] With a focus on reviews and overviews of new literature as a way to keep scholars informed of international developments in their fields, the prominence of learned journals continued to grow during the nineteenth century, becoming increasingly academically oriented.[46] Pim Den Boer notes that general journals such as *Revue des deux mondes* and *Le Correspondent* had their fair share of historical subjects and were considered prestigious, as were the *Edinburgh Review* and *Quarterly Review* in Britain.[47]

In 1841, Svedelius was invited to join the editorial board of a newly launched journal called *Frey: tidskrift för vetenskap och konst* [tr. Journal for science and art]. Fellow historians FF Carlson, mentioned above, and Robert Mauritz Bowallius (1817–1902) were also part of a more informal group of editors, together with several literary historians and orientalists. In his memoirs, Svedelius explicitly connects the role played by periodicals such as *Frey* around the middle of the century to the dominant publishing practice of the previous era. More than just an opportunity for him and his peers to publish their work, Svedelius described *Frey* as an attempt to create 'a way out' of the dependance of dissertations.[48] For him, the journal presented such an opportunity at an early stage of his career, before having secured his first academic position as *adjunct*. *Frey* provided him with the platform to publish four historical papers and numerous lengthier reviews that also connected him to the historical and scholarly community at large.

An obvious characteristic that separated *Frey* and other journals of that era from later platforms like *Historisk tidskrift* was not only their disciplinary inclusiveness but also a diversity in terms of both form and content. This eclecticism, which could be found in similar publications in other counties, stemmed in part from a scarcity of material and in part from commercial considerations and Swedish learned journals in their effort to find an audience frequently combined scholarly with more generally oriented or literary texts. In that sense, the learned journal encapsulated the ideal of general erudition associated with the previous century, rather than foreshadowed the approaching specialization of science. Accompanying research-based papers dealing with a specific scholarly topic or problem were learned overviews, as well as essays on present-day issues such as educational reform or the state of the universities. Subject matter ranged from 'On the Origin and Development of Italian Poetry,' to 'Notes on Prehistoric Flora,' and 'Women in Ancient Greece.'

Predictably, these papers did not adhere to any uniform standard in regard to form, scope, or degree of specialization. Some, like Svedelius, quoted sources and used footnotes with reference to both primary sources and secondary scholarship but it was far from a pervasive ideal. Typically, a volume of *Frey* (separated over several issues) contained 5–10 of these academic papers of diverse character, 60–80 reviews of new literature and intermittently short notices on academic events, meetings, and job appointments, indicating that the journal, although open to the public, was geared towards the scholarly community.

There was a range of learned journals available to historians in the period 1840–1880, many of them sharing *Frey's* characteristics, their transdisciplinary wide-ranging scope illustrated by titles such as *Svensk tidskrift för litteratur, politik och ekonomi* [tr. Swedish journal for literature, politics and economy] or *Nordisk tidskrift för vetenskap, konst och industri* [tr. Nordic journal for science, art and industry] and *Nordisk tidskrift för politik, ekonomi och litteratur* [tr. Nordic journal for politics, economy and literature]. The lion's share of topics in these titles were easily traced to university disciplines, although not every author was a professional academic per se. Furthermore, humanists shared these platforms also with scholars from the natural sciences.[49] This was particularly true of the pan-Scandinavian journal *Nordisk universitets-tidskrift* [tr. Nordic university journal] which

featured, next to papers from historians, literary scholars, philologist, philosophers and theologians, also articles on botany, chemistry, zoology, and astronomy. In general, the journals seem to have envisioned a Scandinavian, rather than a pure Swedish scholarly audience.

None of these titles ever became a preferred outlet for any specific scholarly discipline. In the period, 1840–1880, Swedish historians employed a dozen different learned journals, including the ones mentioned above, to publish their work. Carl Gustaf Malmström (1822–1912), professor at Uppsala University between 1877 and 1882, published articles in *Frey*, *Svensk tidskrift* and *Nordisk universitets-tidskrift;* and Clas Theodor Odhner (1836–1904), professor at Lund University between 1871 and 1887, published eleven historical papers between 1860 and 1880 in seven different journals.

By way of comparison, classical philologists Christian Cavallin (1831–1890), professor of Greek language and literature between 1875 and 1890, and Albert T. Lysander (1822–1890), professor of Latin between 1962 and 1890, both at Lund University, navigated the same landscape. Cavallin, who published three articles in *Tidskrift för philologi and paedagogik* [tr. Journal for philology and pedagogy], also had contributions in *Nordisk universitets-tidskrift*, *Nordisk tidskrift för vetenskap, konst och industri*, *Pedagogisk Tidskrift* [tr. Pedagogical Journal], *Svensk tidskrift* (by that time renamed *Ny Svensk tidskrift* or The New Swedish Journal) while also debating the new Bible translation in several issues of *Teologisk tidskrift* [Theological journal].

Both Cavallin and Lysander also contributed papers to the Yearbook that Lund University had started in 1864 in an attempt to create a scholarly outlet, with one section dedicated to the humanities, theology and law and one to medicine and the natural sciences. In Uppsala, such a Yearbook had been launched in 1861 with a specific section for philosophy, linguistics, and history. The first year F.F. Carlson contributed the first article on history, followed by an article by philosopher Sigurd Ribbing and one by philologist Carl Säve.

With only a handful of articles being published each year, the role of the University Yearbooks for the ecology of scholarly print in the humanities was relatively limited. They were supplemented by the three Royal academies, which had also realized the value of their own annual publication series. For the humanities, these mainly consisted of printed versions of speeches, and they were not open to just any scholar. For Svedelius, however, the transactions of the Swedish Academy (*Svenska akademiens handlingar*) proved a valuable platform, wherein he published one of his first efforts, the prize-winning work mentioned above, and later, as a member of the academy, no less than eight of their recurring biographical eulogies – one of which was delivered at his own inauguration. In addition, the transactions of the Royal Swedish Academy of Letters, History and Antiquities, published Svedelius' inauguration speech, and the Royal Academy of Sciences his biography of one of its deceased members.

Even if they signalled the growing realization that Swedish scholarship was in need of new platforms, neither the yearbooks nor the transactions offered dependable channels for scholarly communication. The learned journals, however, did provide some much-needed scaffolding for the epistemic ecosystem. Although dependent on the interest of a general audience they were to a large degree controlled by an extended scholarly community. However, that meant that they also hinged on the commitment of scholars to perform editing duties and provide journal content. Clearly, they were commercially difficult ventures and generally short-lived. As a result, they were also an unpredictable infrastructure for scholarly publishing. In his memoirs, Svedelius mentioned that there was never much interest in sending in manuscripts to *Frey* nor were the public particularly eager to spend their money on academic writings. In 1850, after a 10-year run, it died of what Svedelius referred to as 'natural causes.'[50] Commenting on the editorial challenges, Svedelius put his finger on an apparent paradox of the era; on the one hand there was a need for scholars to create and curate outlets for their publications, but on the other, the journals were in constant need of content, much of which was in fact provided by the editorial board and in some cases their relatives and friends.

## 6. Editorial commitments

Learned journals gave scholars a chance to publish their research *gratis*, but in turn their existence depended on the unpaid labour of the scholarly community. Publishing and editorial commitments went hand in hand.[51] As a case in point, Svedelius' only scholarly articles between 1840 and 1880 were the ones he published as part of the editorial board of *Frey*. His colleagues employed the same strategy of using the platforms readily available to them as editors or members of the editorial boards. So too did German historians and natural scientists. Heinrich von Treitschke for instance made use of the fact that he was editor of *Preussische Jahrbücher* and made it his preferred publication outlet, and the Swedish chemist Jöns Jacob Berzelius (1779–1848) edited several journals that provided him space for his own works.[52] In fact, this practice did not disappear with the introduction of disciplinary journals; to a large degree, articles in the early years of the *American Historical Review* were likewise submitted by members of the editorial board.[53]

Gabriele Lingelbach has pointed out that editors of historical journals 'effectively set the standards of quality' simply by accepting or rejecting submitted articles.[54] For the Swedish learned, proto-disciplinary journals during this period however, this gatekeeping function was no doubt mitigated by the above-mentioned fact that, as Svedelius recalled, scholars weren't exactly 'itching' to write, and that he heard the editors of *Frey* often complaining of the lack of written works to fill the journal.[55] Policing scholarly boundaries was more likely to occur in the form of reviews, for which the editors took a large responsibility. Recognized as a central part of disciplinary formation, Sjang Ten-Hagen has recently posited that 'book reviewing has generally involved the implementation of scholarly and scientific norms, including epistemic virtues and vices.'[56] As often noted, an important rationale for the emergence of journals were to supply overviews and reviews of new scholarly literature. Indeed, while shorter papers could be published as off-print, the scholarly review was one genre that the journal was best suited to provide.

Members of editorial boards were expected to contribute reviews. Although Svedelius claimed that he would have preferred not to, citing his disinterest in the 'literary quarrel' they risked provoking, he was assigned books to review by his main editor.[57] His trepidations notwithstanding, he published nine reviews for the journal, and judging by the fact that he chose to not only include but also evaluate them in his memoirs, pointing to some reviews them as 'somewhat better' than the rest, their value was far from negligible. The scholarly review as an arena for boundary work is exemplified in several of his reviews pertaining to different volumes in a magisterial work on Swedish history written by Anders Fryxell (1795–1881), a historian of considerable renown in Sweden. Svedelius recalls that, despite his insignificant standing in the scholarly community at the time, he dared to 'be of another opinion' than Fryxell, which resulted in what he referred to as 'a small polemic' between the two.[58] In the first of his reviews of Fryxell, albeit delivered in a courteous tone, Svedelius remarked upon aspects of scholarly tradecraft, such as the use (and underuse) of sources and citations, source criticism, and the ability of other scholars to evaluate the claims presented.[59] Fryxell responded to Svedelius' criticisms in *Frey*, professing that the 'humane' and 'scientific' manner in which the reviews had been written, made it his duty to respond, noting also that while mild-mannered in tone, Svedelius' critique of his lack of citations, were in reality harsh criticism aimed at his credibility as a historian, of which he saw the need to protest.[60] In his memoir, Svedelius downplayed the altercation, even placing some of the blame on his editor who 'who told me what to write, and thusly I wrote.'[61]

Regardless, writing reviews not only filled the need of the editor, nor of the scholarly community trying handle the deluge of new books.[62] As illustrated by the 'altercation' between Svedelius and Fryxell, they presented an opportunity to establish your place in that community before the advents of disciplinary platforms. In addition, the review section offered scholars a recurring opportunity to showcase their scholarly prowess. With a hybridity of their own, reviews in learned journals tended to go beyond summary or critical judgment, at times bordering on original scholarship.[63]

## 7. Scholarly print beyond learned journals

If learned journals, as Svedelius suggested, had difficulty finding content, one of the reasons was likely due to the fact that not every scholar found it necessary to make use of them as platforms for their scholarly output. The journal article, in other words, was hardly mandatory for a successful career in academia at the time.[64] The contemporary of Svedelius, Carlsson, Odhner and Malmström, Sven Fromhold Hammarstrand (1821–1889), professor of history at Uppsala University from 1882, never published a historical paper in a journal, learned or disciplinary.[65] Similarly, several of Cavallin's and Lysander's colleagues in philology showed little interested in partaking in the journal infrastructure.

Journal articles made up a small part also in Svedelius' list of publications – six in total and only four during 1840–1880 – which included monograph-length treatises, a variety of shorter printed works, papers based on lectures, educational textbooks, speeches stemming from a number of different situations, and biographies that captured the lives and times of scholars, politicians, and historical actors (in themselves often delivered as speeches). Although there was considerable individualism in the publishing oeuvres of scholars in the humanities between 1840 and 1880, they often contained such a smorgasbord of different types of publications and offprints. While unsurprising given the tenuous structures of publishing as well as the gradual introduction of a new regime for publishing, the pluralism should not be seen as random or insignificant to the publication landscape. What might at first glance be mistaken for non-scholarly print, closer inspection reveals to be prevalent nodes in the epistemic ecosystem that also laced the different disciplines of the humanities closely together. In particular, printed speeches and biographies – the hybrid genre that was Svedelius' particular forte – not only stemmed from the ritualistic framework of the scholarly community, with its focus on oratory and membership in the academies, but often bespoke its virtues and boundaries via the commemoration of academic skills and moral character that its deceased members exemplified. Certainly, they showcased the author's esteem and proficiency as an orator, but they could also be valid manifestations of the abilities expected from a researcher.

These parameters all became visible when Svedelius was installed in the Royal Swedish Academy of Letters, History and Antiquities in 1859. Although about to be included in the scholarly elite in Sweden, Svedelius worried over that fact that he was expected to deliver not just any *pro forma* celebratory speech at the ceremony, but a 'scientific treatise' [vetenskaplig afhandling], 'a 'special work' based on learned research on a specific topic.'[66] After much pondering, he decided to use a topic from his lectures, reworked based on more extensive archival research. His efforts resulted in a paper – of which he read part at his ceremony – later published in the transactions of the academy and, in the same year, as an offprint with a commercial publisher. The treatise was 178 pages long and 15 years after his death described as a 'very good depiction of an important phase' in Swedish history.[67] Svedelius himself was more modest, calling it a well-written thesis, yet expounding a rather limited degree of learnedness.[68]

It was a crucial aspect of their value that biographies and speeches in many cases involved arduous scholarly work. Providing just one example, Odhner's biographical essay over the eighteenth century politican Ulrik Scheffer (1716–1799) was given its own review in *Historisk tidskrift* in 1893 with the reviewer reminding the reader that these biographies had developed from eulogies into 'scientific treatises,'[69] bringing to mind how dissertations had previously morphed into a channel for circulating scholarship. In the same journal's biography of Svedelius, it was remarked that Svedelius habitually wrote his extensive biographies in a way that they were 'not only a commemoration, but a real representation of the era'[70] and when Simon J. Boëthius gave a speech about Svedelius (later printed), he found that 'the biographic monograph,' was the 'domain of historical writing' in which Svedelius had achieved 'true greatness as an historian' and the 'form of historical authorship' where he had offered his greatest contribution to 'the young mind' as his historical speeches were so often delivered before the student body.[71] It was fitting then that, after Svedelius' death, his successor in the Royal Swedish Academy provided a detailed biography of the deceased

historian's entire life in his introduction speech, which in the printed version was more than a 100 pages long.[72]

Another tangible node supplementing what little infrastructure the learned community could provide at the time were the commercial printers, used by scholars either to find additional outlets (and perhaps sources of income) for previously published works or as their first choice. This route was unreliable for 'no name authors' and would sometimes require the writer to bear the costs.[73] Having saved up money for the purpose of getting published 'no matter the cost,' Svedelius recalls his surprise when he in 1853 through a friend found a publisher for his 'thick book' willing to actually pay him.[74] On the other hand, as their reputation grew, scholars would commonly collect speeches, essays or even longer treatises in compilations, often with such titles as Svedelius' 'Minor works' (1872).[75] The collection, intended according to the author as 'popular reading' for the 'educated public,' included 17 speeches and a-not-so-minor 230-page treatise on Mary Stuart and Elizabeth I. Svedelius also published a number of works intended for his students, including a handbook in political science and, after having noted that history as a subject in Lund in the 1850s was somewhat neglected, a treatise on historical studies aimed at young students at the university.

As already shown, there was considerable variation as to the length and scope of scholarly works. Book-length treatises were prized in the scholarly community, especially those 'monographs' that were published in serial form. Consequently, later disciplinary narratives of scholarly achievements have often been written around such decade long herculean efforts of multiple volumes conducted by a single representative of the field. Malmström's place in Swedish historiography for instance was assured by his *magnum opus* on the political history of Sweden during the eighteenth century published in six parts between 1855 and 1877. But although the focus on a scholar's 'life's work' is understandable, it easily obscures the prevalence of other publication practices surrounding more ambitious efforts. One of Svedelius' very first publications, his prize essay mentioned above, ran for almost three hundred pages of the annually published transactions of the Swedish Academy. In an example of similar hybridity, one of Odhner's most recognized scholarly achievements, his work on the peace of Westphalia, was first published in monograph form in 1875 and a year later in the transactions of Royal Swedish Academy of Letters, History and Antiquities, having also served as Odhner's introductory speech into the academy.

To be sure, Swedish scholars residing in the realm of 'the humanities' were not alone in, and seemingly not the first to experience 'a changing landscape of scientific publication,' either at home or abroad. By way of example, Jenny Beckman has highlighted the varied publication strategies of Berzelius during the first half of the nineteenth century, and Iain P. Watts has argued that publishing practices in 'the wider landscape' of print in Britain around 1800 were 'unstable, diverse and subject to challenge.[76]'

Nevertheless, the ubiquity of these fluid genres in the humanities of the second part of the nineteenth century challenges the attempt to paint a clean picture of the publication landscape, collapsing both the hierarchy and boundaries of different formats. As a result, quantitative analysis runs the risk of obscuring the qualitative aspects of an article or a speech, telling us precious little of the scholarly effort behind it or its estimated value as meritocratic currency. Moreover, because scholarly works were constantly reformatted and published more than once, genres and formats tended to blend together. A historian could publish a speech as a paper in a journal and a speech could have the dual purpose of combining a festive function with an ambition to present new research findings based on archival research. Albeit, unlike for instance Berzelius, Svedelius and most of his peers showed less interest in writing for an international audience, his strategies can also be read as a way of reaching different audiences.[77]

How then were the community supposed to judge this seemingly chaotic plethora of different scholarly genres and formats? Here, Svedelius' memoirs, containing frequent evaluation of his own publications, is particularly instructive when trying to decipher the publishing scripts of the period. For one thing, the publishing regime seems to have been ingrained in his scholarly mind

as he detailed what he had published in different eras of his career – sometimes pointing to his heavy teaching load to explain periods of less productivity – but was also careful to mention those efforts that never bore fruit. The fact that his obituary in *Historisk tidskrift* also mentioned his 'as of yet unprinted' works demonstrates that productiveness, if need be, went beyond what a scholar managed to get published.[78]

The key factor, however, is the way he actually presented his past achievements. Recurringly, the yardstick by which Svedelius valued his publications was not genre or format or even length but the degree to which they were *scientific*, or in his native tongue, 'vetenskaplig.'[79] As we have already seen, this was the concept by which Swedish scholars evaluated the tradecraft of members of their group, with no hesitation as to the concept's affinity to natural science. In an illustration of the importance of this way of framing of scholarship, Svedelius in a letter written in 1878, where he mused over different prospects for membership in the Swedish Academy, referred to a negative estimation of one of the candidates as being more of a 'book maker' [bokmakare] aiming to put food on the table for his family, than a 'scientific writer' [vetenskaplig författare].[80] In this same vein, he considered both speeches and biographical essays as valuable contributions if and when they could showcase learnedness, scholarly rigour and thoroughness, contributing something to the field of history. Just as a scholarly article in a learned journal that also *could* illustrate a scientific approach to history but could not be simply assumed to do so.[81]

This way of evaluating scholarly work was particularly germane when it came to one of Svedelius' strong points, printed oratory. Svedelius published close to 30 speeches from various occasions, some whose function was celebratory, and others where the occasion seemed but an excuse for the lengthy discussion of a historical topic. In printed form, speeches could contain footnotes and quotes from historical sources. If so, they could likely attain appreciation as 'scientific.' Some of them were instead aimed at a broader public with printed versions of Svedelius' speeches even advertised on sale in daily newspapers.[82] A final testament to their value, speeches and biographical essays could also be efficient formats for boundary work and the negotiation of the historian's professional identity. In a speech delivered at a jubilee, Svedelius took the opportunity to offer his listeners his thoughts on the difficulty task of writing history, summing up his own views on the virtues and vices needed to separate history from fiction and distinguish the historian from a fool.[83]

## 8. Conclusions

In this article, I have highlighted the importance of elusive formats and genres that have seldom been at the centre of scholarly attention. And as Alex Csiszar has reminded us, 'formats and genres have epistemic consequences.'[84] Bearing this in mind, the article has shown that academic genres between 1840 and 1880 – the article, the essay, the monograph, the speech – were not standardized, and that as a result these forms of scholarly output were not visibly ordered after a predetermined and agreed-upon hierarchy of academic value, connected to more or less prestigious platforms. In other words, it is worth reminding that contrary to later developments (and modern academic instincts), the journal article did not have a distinguishable script in terms of structure, referencing, referee processes or style.[85] Consequently, it was not automatically seen as a more 'scientific' and therefore more respected scholarly format, its value guaranteed by the journal that published it. In short, the emerging publishing regime did not yet dictate where and what to publish. The study therefore not only brings new light to an understudied phase in the history of scholarly publishing but challenges historiographical narratives that are overly concerned with either monographs *or* journal articles and their epistemic weight. If we are to understand how scholarship, disciplinary formation and scholarly personae – often described as encapsulated in the disciplinary journal – developed in various eras of publishing history, we need to look beyond such a dichotomy. Svedelius and his colleagues did not save their best original research, their boundary negotiations nor their concerns with virtues and vices for a single format or genre.

In time, the academic value of speeches and biographies would dissipate, and the journal become invaluable to professional careers.[86] The shift did not happen overnight. The mere existence of a new infrastructure does not mean the immediate abandonment of previous ones, however unstable. The article contributes to our understanding of the, shifting, historical role of scholarly – learned or disciplinary – journals in history and the humanities at large, with its traditional focus on 'great books,' a topic worthy of more concerted and extensive efforts in order to pinpoint the epistemic consequences they in fact had.[87] In contrast, the process by which journals rose to prominence, codifying and circulating scientific credibility and knowledge in the natural sciences, technology, and medicine has been a favoured area of research, approached with renewed vigour by historians of science for the past decades. The toolbox acquired from the comprehensive study of the scientific journal, gives historians of the humanities the opportunity to properly assess the impact of scholarly journals for both discipline-specific and shared practices of publishing, many of them with roots in the fertile ground of the nineteenth century. In view of the findings of this article, journals ought to have had an important role to play also in what Reba Stoffer has characterized as the 'complex story' of the formation of humanistic disciplines.[88] Most importantly in this regard, the study shows that a consequence of professionalization was the gradual abandonment of collaborative efforts of publishing between scholars in the humanities. But the results of this study also caution against assuming an identical trajectory for the history of the humanities as for the history of science, technology and medicine. It demonstrates, instead, that pluralism in humanities publishing, which still distinguishes many disciplines under that heading, has a long history.

## Notes

1. Wilhelm Erik Svedelius, 'Om historisk vetenskap och historiska studier', *Historisk tidskrift* 8 (1888): 29–78.
2. For historical writing in Sweden and Scandinavia in general, see Rolf Torstendahl, 'Scandinavian Historical Writing', in *The Oxford History of Historical Writing. Vol 4: 1800–1945*, ed. Stuart Mcintyre, Juan Maiguashca and Attila Pók (Oxford, New York, 2011), 263–82.
3. Rolf Torstendahl, *The Rise and Propagation of Historical Professionalism* (New York, 2015), 81. For the impact of historical scholarly journals, see Margaret F. Stieg, *The Origin and Development of Scholarly Historical Periodicals* (Tuscaloosa, Al., 1986); Robert B. Townsend, *History's Babel: Scholarship, Professionalization, and the Historical Enterprise in the United States, 1880–1940* (Chicago, 2013), 22–8; Gabriele Lingelbach, 'Historical Journals', in *Atlas of European Historiography: The Making of a Profession, 1800–2005*, ed. Ilaria Porciani, and Lutz Raphael (Basingstoke, 2010), 21.
4. O.A. [Oscar Alin], 'Wilhelm Erik Svedelius', *Historisk tidskrift* 9 (1889): 155–63.
5. For the history of scientific publishing in general, see e.g. Melinda Baldwin, *Making Nature: The History of a Scientific Journal* (Chicago, 2015); David Banks, *The Birth of the Academic Article: Le Journal des Sçavans and the Philosophical Transactions, 1665–1700* (Sheffield, 2017); Charles Bazerman, *Shaping Written Knowledge: The Genre and Activity of the Experimental Article in Science* (Madison, 1988); Alex Csiszar, *The Scientific Journal: Authorship and the Politics of Knowledge in the Nineteenth Century* (Chicago, 2018).
6. William Clark, *Academic Charisma and the Origins of the Research University* (Chicago, 2006).
7. Stieg, *Origin and Development*, 9; Claus Møller Jørgensen, 'Scholarly Communication with a Political Impetus: National Historical Journals', in *Setting the Standards: Institutions, Networks and Communities of National Historiography*, ed. Ilaria Porciani and Jo Tollebeek (Basingstoke, 2012), 70–88.
8. Bo Lindberg, *Disputation, dissertation, avhandling: historien om en genre* (Stockholm, 2022); Kevin Chang, 'From Oral Disputation to Written Text: The Transformation of the Dissertation in Early Modern Europe', in *History of Universities*, ed. Mordechai Feingold (Oxford, 2004), 129–87, on 156–8.
9. James Turner, *Philology: The Forgotten Origins of the Modern Humanities* (Princeton, 2014), 275; Gabriele Lingelbach and Michael Vössing, 'Serving the Profession: National Associations of Historians', in *Setting the Standards: Institutions, Networks and Communities of National Historiography*, ed. Ilaria Porciani and Jo Tollebeek (Basingstoke, 2012), 202–23, at 209; Tobias Dalberg, *Mot lärdomens topp: Svenska humanisters och samhällsvetares ursprung, utbildning och yrkesbana under 1900-talets första hälft* (Uppsala, 2018), 110.
10. Julian Hamann, 'The Making of the 'Geisteswissenschaften'. A Case of Boundary Work?', *FIW Working Paper* 7 (2017): 9.
11. See Møller Jørgensen, 'Scholarly Communication', 75.
12. For persona, see e.g. Lorraine Daston and H. Otto Sibum, 'Introduction: Scientific Personae and Their Histories', *Science in Context* 16 (2003): 1–8; Herman Paul, 'What is a Scholarly Persona? Ten Theses on Virtues, Skills and

Desires', *History and Theory* 53 (2014): 348–71; Mineke Bosch, 'Scholarly Personae and Twentieth Century Historians', *BMGN – – The Low Countries Historical Review* 131, no. 4 (2016): 33–54; Kirsti Niskanen and Michael J. Barany, 'Introduction: The Scholar Incarnate', in *Gender, Embodiment, and the History of the Scholarly Persona: Incarnations and Contestations*, ed. Kirsti Niskanen and Michael J. Barany (Cham, 2021), 1–17.

13. The Swedish word is *vetenskaplighet* and is more akin to the German notion of *Wissenschaftlichkeit* than the restrictive English usage of *scientific* as referring mainly to natural science, although the distinction was more porous in 19th century Sweden.
14. Ilaria Porciani and Lutz Raphael, 'Introduction', in *Atlas of European Historiography: The Making of a Profession, 1800–2005*, ed. Ilaria Porciani, and Lutz Raphael (Basingstoke, 2010), xi–xvii, on xv.
15. See also Leslie Howsam, *Past into Print: The Publishing of History in Britain 1850–1950* (London/Toronto, 2009), 69.
16. O.A. 'Wilhelm Erik Svedelius', 159.
17. Ibid., 158.
18. Ibid., 160.
19. On templates for historical personae, see Gadi Algazi, 'Exemplum and Wundertier: Three Concepts of the Scholarly Persona', *BMGN – Low Countries Historical Review* 131, no. 4 (2016): 8–32, at 12; Herman Paul, 'Introduction: Scholarly Personae: What They Are and Why They Matter', in *How to Be a Historian: Scholarly Personae in Historical Studies, 1800–2000*, ed. Herman Paul (Manchester, 2019), 1–14, on 11.
20. Wilhelm Erik Svedelius, *Anteckningar om mitt förflutna lif* (Stockholm, 1889). According to one review of Svedelius' memoirs, it was a highly anticipated publication among general readers because of his popular standing, causing readers to race to finish reading it. N.P.Ö, 'En självbiografi', *Ny svensk tidskrift* 11 (1890): 274–94, on 275.
21. Svedelius, *Anteckningar*, 516, 530.
22. Turner, *Philology*, 305. See also Johan Östling, *Humboldt and the Modern German University: An Intellectual History* (Lund, 2018), 50–5; Charles E. McClelland, *Berlin, the Mother of All Research Universities: 1860–1918* (Lanham, 2016), 75; and Paul Reitter and Chad Wellmon, *Permanent Crisis: The Humanities in a Disenchanted Age* (Chicago, 2021), 64–8.
23. Göran Blomqvist, 'Akademiska visioner under 1800-talets tre sista decennier', *Scandia* 59, no. 2 (1993): 205–56, on 205.
24. Cf. Torstendahl, 'Scandinavian Historical Writing', 51.
25. Townsend, *History's Babel*, 4; Clark, *Academic Charisma*, 259.
26. Pim Den Boer, *History as a Profession: The Study of History in France, 1818–1914* (Princeton, 1998), 330; Floris Solleveld, 'Afterlives of the Republic of Letters: Learned Journals and Scholarly Community in the Early Nineteenth Century', *Erudition and the Republic of Letters* 5 (2020): 82–116, on 98.
27. Illaria Porciani and Mauro Moretti, 'The Polycentric Structure of Italian Historical Writing', in *The Oxford History of Historical Writing. Vol 4: 1800–1945*, ed. Stuart Mcintyre, Juan Maiguashca and Attila Pók (Oxford, New York, 2011), 225–42, on 231.
28. Stieg, *Origin and Development*, 20.
29. Goldstein, 'The Organizational Development', 181. See also Doris S. Goldstein, 'The Origins and Early Years of the English Historical Review', *English Historical Review* 101, no. 398 (1996): 6–19; and Alon Kadish, 'Scholarly Exclusiveness and the Foundation of the *English Historical Review*', *Historical Research* 61, no. 145 (1988): 183–98.
30. For this article, the publication lists of 12 professors of history between 1850 and 1920 was initially analysed. In order to broaden the scope, these were then compared to a number of scholars from other disciplines including classical languages and literary history and aesthetics.
31. Around 1850, Sweden's two universities, Uppsala and Lund had (under different disciplinary designations) professors in Latin, Greek, oriental languages, history, philosophy (practical and theoretical), and, under varying titles, aesthetics. After a few decades disciplines such as linguistics, Nordic and modern languages and pedagogy were introduced, with some disciplines splintering into more specialized study. Before 1850, indicative of the low degree of specialization at the time, it was common for scholars to move between disciplines. Svedelius, for instance, received the title docent (instructor) in 'political science' before obtaining a salaried appointment as adjunkt in 'history and statistics' between 1850 and 1856 where he at times also acted as the extraordinarie (non-tenured) professor of history. Similar to the United States at the time, History and Political Science tended to overlap, see Townsend, *History's Babel*, 14–15.
32. It is worth emphasizing that the humanities during the 19th century was a contested field of knowledge that lacked clear boundaries. The term itself (Sw. 'Humaniora') was used arbitrarily for much of the century, at times more or less synonymously with classical learning. See e.g. Ian Hunter, 'The Mythos, Ethos, and Pathos of the Humanities', *History of European Ideas* 40, no. 1 (2014): 11–36, on 15.
33. Svedelius, *Anteckningar*, 363.
34. Ibid.
35. Ibid.

36. Svedelius notes however that no respondent was forced to pay for the whole thesis and that lengthier work therefore was divided over many respondents over the course of a semester. See *Anteckningar*, 364.
37. Svedelius, *Anteckningar*, 362.
38. Ibid., 363–4.
39. Lindberg, *Disputation*, 216.
40. Møller Jørgensen, 'Scholarly Communication', 75.
41. Solleveld, 'Afterlives', 84.
42. Aileen Fyfe, 'Journals and Periodicals', in *A Companion to the History of Science*, ed. Bernard Lightman (Chichester, 2016), 387–99 on 387; and Csiszar, *Scientific Journal*, 4. See also Peter Burke, 'The Republic of Letters as a Communication System: an Essay in Periodization', *Media History* 18, no. 3–4 (2012): 395–407.
43. Csiszar, *Scientific Journal*; Aileen Fyfe, Noah Moxham, Julie McDougall-Waters and Camilla Mørk Røstvik, eds., *A History of Scientific Journals: Publishing at the Royal Society, 1665–2015* (London, 2022).
44. Anne Goldgar, *Impolite Learning: Conduct and Community in the Republic of Letters, 1680–1750* (New Haven, 1995), 56.
45. Chad Wellmon, *Organizing Enlightenment: Information Overload and the Invention of the Modern Research University* (Baltimore, 2015), 45.
46. See also Margrit Rollmann, *Der Gelehrte als Schriftsteller: die Publikationen der Göttinger Professoren im 18. Jahrhundert* (Göttingen, 1988); Jonathan R. Topham, 'The Scientific, the Literary, and the Popular: Commerce and the Reimagining of the Scientific Journal in Britain, 1813–25', *Notes and Records* 70, no. 4 (2016): 305–24.
47. Den Boer, *History as a Profession*, 332.
48. Svedelius, *Anteckningar*, 365.
49. See Thomas Broman, 'The Profits and Perils of Publicity: *Allgemeine Literatur-Zeitung*, the Thurn und Taxis Post, and the Periodical Trade at the End of the Eighteenth Century', *Notes and Records* 69, no. 3 (2015): 261–76, on 262.
50. Svedelius, *Anteckningar*, 365.
51. See also Christiaan Engberts, *Scholarly Virtues in Nineteenth-Century Sciences and Humanities* (Cham, 2022), 69.
52. Stieg, *Origin and Development*, 29; Jenny Beckman, 'The Publication Strategies of Jöns Jacob Berzelius (1779–1848): Negotiating National and Linguistic Boundaries in Chemistry', *Annals of Science* 73, no. 2 (2016): 195–207, on 198.
53. Townsend, *History's Babel*, 25.
54. Lingelbach, 'Historical Journals', 21; see also Alison Fyfe and Anna Gielas, 'Introduction: Editorship and the Editing of Scientific Journals, 1750–1950', *Centaurus* 62 (2020): 5–20 on 13.
55. Svedelius, *Anteckningar*, 365.
56. Sjang ten Hagen, 'Evaluating Knowledge, Evaluating Character: Book Reviewing by American Historians and Physicists (1900–1940)', *History of Humanities* 7, no. 2 (2023): 251–77, on 254.
57. Svedelius, *Anteckningar*, 358.
58. Ibid., 357.
59. S-s [Wilhelm Erik Svedelius], Review of 'Berättelser ur Svenska Historien', *Frey: tidskrift för vetenskap och konst* 2, no. 2 (1842): 180–91.
60. Anders Fryxell, 'Om Behandlingen af Drottning Christina's historia: Anti-kritik', *Frey: tidskrift för vetenskap och konst* 2, no. 5 (1842): 499–508.
61. An analysis of the differing views of Svedelius and Fryxell can be found in Rolf Torstendahl, *Källkritik och vetenskapssyn i svensk historisk forskning 1820–1920* (Stockholm, 1964), on 117–21, with Torstendahl dismissing Svedelius' depiction of the ongoing debate.
62. Wellmon, *Organizing Enlightenment*, 51.
63. Engberts, *Scholarly Virtues*, 104.
64. See also Herman Paul, 'Historical Studies in Nineteenth-Century Germany: The Case of Hartwig Floto', in *The Palgrave Handbook of the History of Human Sciences*, ed. David McCallum (Basingstoke, 2022), 207–26, at 214–15.
65. Hammarstrand did contribute reviews in both *Nordisk Universitets-tidskrift* and *Svensk literatur-tidskrift*.
66. Svedelius, *Anteckningar*, 530.
67. Ragnar Törnebladh, 'Vilhelm Erik Svedelius', *Levnadsteckningar över Kungl. Svenska vetenskapsakademiens ledamöter* 5, no. 4 (Stockholm, 1906), 1–33, on 19.
68. Svedelius, *Anteckningar*, 530.
69. – rst, 'Minne af riksrådet m. m. grefve Ulrik Scheffer', *Historisk tidskrift* (1893), 7–10, on 7.
70. Olin, 'Svedelius', 159.
71. Simon J. Boëthius, 'Wilhelm Erik Svedelius. Tal', *Ny svensk tidskrift* 11 (1890): 137–51, on 145.
72. Sander, 'Inträdestal'.
73. Svedelius, *Anteckningar*, 363.
74. Ibid., 477.

75. Wilhelm Erik Svedelius, 'Tal till läsaren', *Smärre skrifter* (Stockholm, 1872), preface not paginated.
76. Beckman, 'Publication Strategies', 198; Iain P. Watts, "We Want No Authors': William Nicholson and the Contested Role of the Scientific Journal in Britain, 1797–1813', *The British Journal for the History of Science* 47, no. 3 (2014): 397–419, 398.
77. Cf. Beckman, 'Publication strategies'.
78. Olin, 'Svedelius', 158.
79. For scientific historical scholarship, see Townsend, *History's Babel*, especially 13–35.
80. Svedelius to Ljunggren, 24 Feb. 1878; Gustaf Ljunggrens samling, Lund University Library.
81. See also Nils Fredrik Sander, 'Inträdes-tal i Svenska akademien den 20 december 1889', *Svenska akademiens handlingar* 4 (1889): 7–104, on 47–9.
82. See for instance, *Upsalaposten*, 16 May, 1864.
83. Wilhelm Svedelius, 'Vid festen i Upsala till minne af fältslaget på Brunkeberg och Riksföreståndaren Sten Sture d. ä.', *Smärre skrifter*, 119.
84. Csiszar, *Scientific Journal*, 3.
85. Fyfe, 'Journals and Periodicals', 387; Mackenzie, *The Scientific Article*, 32.
86. On this development, see also Alex Csiszar, 'How Lives Became Lists and Scientific Papers Became Data: Cataloguing Authorship During the Nineteenth Century', *The British Journal for the History of Science* 50, no. 1 (2017): 23–60 on 47.
87. See Michiel Leezenberg, *History and Philosophy of the Humanities: An Introduction* (Amsterdam, 2018), 33.
88. Reba N. Soffer, *Discipline and Power: The University, History, and the Making of an English Elite, 1870–1930* (Stanford, 1994), 21.

## Acknowledgements

The author is grateful to Dustin W. Dixon and Floris Solleveld for providing constructive feedback on earlier drafts of this article.

## Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author(s).

## Funding

This article was supported by funding from Erik Philip-Sörensens Stiftelse [grant number H2021-009].

## Bibliography

Algazi, Gadi. "Exemplum and Wundertier: Three Concepts of the Scholarly Persona," *BMGN—Low Countries Historical Review* 131. 4 (2016): 8–32.
O.A. [Oscar Alin]. "Wilhelm Erik Svedelius," *Historisk tidskrift* 9 (1889): 155–163.
Baldwin, Melinda. *Making Nature: the History of a Scientific Journal* (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 2015).
Banks, David. *The Birth of the Academic Article: Le Journal des Sçavans and the Philosophical Transactions, 1665–1700* (Sheffield: Equinox Publishing Ltd, 2017).
Bazerman, Charles. *Shaping Written Knowledge: The Genre and Activity of the Experimental Article in Science* (Madison: Univ. of Wisconsin Press, 1988).
Beckman, Jenny. "The publication strategies of Jöns Jacob Berzelius (1779–1848): negotiating national and linguistic boundaries in chemistry," *Annals of Science*, 73:2 (2016), 195–207.
Blomqvist, Göran. "Akademiska visioner under 1800-talets tre sista decennier," *Scandia* 59.2 (1993): 205–256.
Bosch, Mineke. "Scholarly Personae and Twentieth Century Historians," *BMGN––The Low Countries Historical Review* 131.4 (2016): 33–54.
Broman, Thomas. "The Profits and Perils of Publicity: *Allgemeine Literatur-Zeitung*, the Thurn und Taxis Post, and the Periodical Trade at the End of the Eighteenth Century," *Notes and Records* 69.3 (2015): 261–276.
Burke, Peter. "The Republic of Letters as a Communication System: an Essay in Periodization," *Media History*, 18.3–4 (2012): 395–407.
Chang, Kevin. "From Oral Disputation to Written Text: The Transformation of the Dissertation in Early Modern Europe," in Mordechai Feingold, ed., *History of Universities* (Oxford: Oxford University Press 2004): 129–187.
Clark, William. *Academic Charisma and the Origins of the Research University* (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 2006).

Csiszar, Alex. "How lives became lists and scientific papers became data: cataloguing authorship during the nineteenth century" *The British Journal for the History of Science* 50:1 (2017), 23–60.
Csiszar, Alex. *The Scientific Journal: Authorship and the Politics of Knowledge in the Nineteenth Century* (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 2018).
Daston, Lorraine and H. Otto Sibum, "Introduction: Scientific Personae and Their Histories," *Science in Context* 16 (2003): 1–8.
Dalberg, Tobias. *Mot lärdomens topp: Svenska humanisters och samhällsvetares ursprung, utbildning och yrkesbana under 1900-talets första hälft* (Uppsala: Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis, 2018).
Den Boer, Pim. *History as a Profession: the Study of History in France, 1818–1914* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1998).
Engberts, Christiaan. *Scholarly Virtues in Nineteenth-Century Sciences and Humanities* (Cham: Palgrave Macmillan, 2022).
Fryxell, Anders. "Om Behandlingen af Drottning Christina's historia: Anti-kritik," *Frey: tidskrift för vetenskap och konst* 2.5 (1842): 499–508.
Fyfe, Aileen. "Journals and Periodicals," in Bernard Lightman, (ed.), *A Companion to the History of Science* (Chichester: John Wiley & Sons, 2016): 387–399.
Fyfe, Aileen, Noah Moxham, Julie McDougall-Waters and Camilla Mørk Røstvik, eds. *A History of Scientific Journals: Publishing at the Royal Society, 1665–2015* (London: UCL Press, 2022).
Fyfe Alison & Anna Gielas. "Introduction: Editorship and the editing of scientific journals, 1750–1950" *Centaurus* 62 (2020), 5–20.
Goldgar, Anne. *Impolite Learning: Conduct and Community in the Republic of Letters, 1680–1750* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995).
Goldstein, Doris S. "The Organizational Development of British Historical Profession, 1884–1921," *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research* 55.132 (1982): 180–193.
Goldstein, Doris S. "The Origins and Early Years of the English Historical Review," *English Historical Review* 101.398 (1896): 6–19.
Hamann, Julian. "The Making of the 'Geisteswissenschaften'. A Case of Boundary Work?" *FIW Working Paper* 7 (2017).
Howsam, Leslie. *Past into Print: The Publishing of History in Britain 1850–1950* (London/Toronto: British Library, 2009).
Hunter, Ian. "The Mythos, Ethos, and Pathos of the Humanities," *History of European Ideas* 40.1 (2014): 11–36.
Kadish, Alon. "Scholarly Exclusiveness and the Foundation of the *English Historical Review*," *Historical Research* 61.145 (1988):183–198.
Leezenberg, Michiel. *History and Philosophy of the Humanities: An Introduction* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2018).
Lindberg, Bo. *Disputation, dissertation, avhandling: historien om en genre* (Stockholm: Kungl. Vitterhets historie och antikvitetsakademien, 2022).
Lingelbach, Gabriele. "Historical Journals," in Ilaria Porciani, and Lutz Raphael, eds., *Atlas of European Historiography: The Making of a Profession, 1800–2005* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010).
Lingelbach, Gabriele and Michael Vössing. "Serving the Profession: National Associations of Historians," in Ilaria Porciani and Jo Tollebeek, eds., *Setting the Standards: Institutions, Networks and Communities of National Historiography* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012), 202–223.
McClelland, Charles E. *Berlin, the Mother of all Research Universities: 1860–1918* (Lanham: Lexington Books, 2016).
Møller Jørgensen, Claus. "Scholarly Communication with a Political Impetus: National Historical Journals," in Ilaria Porciani and Jo Tollebeek, eds., *Setting the Standards: Institutions, Networks and Communities of National Historiography* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012): 70–88.
Niskanen, Kirsti and Michael J. Barany. "Introduction: The Scholar Incarnate," in Kirsti Niskanen and Michael J. Barany, eds. *Gender, Embodiment, and the History of the Scholarly Persona: Incarnations and Contestations*, (Cham: Palgrave Macmillan, 2021), 1–17.
N.P.Ö, "En självbiografi," *Ny svensk tidskrift* 11 (1890): 274–294.
Östling, Johan. *Humboldt and the Modern German University: An Intellectual History* (Lund: Lund University Press, 2018).
Paul, Herman. "What is a Scholarly Persona? Ten Theses on Virtues, Skills and Desires," *History and Theory* 53 (2014): 348–371.
Paul, Herman. "Introduction: Scholarly Personae: What They Are and Why They Matter," in Herman Paul (ed.), *How to Be a Historian: Scholarly Personae in Historical Studies, 1800–2000* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2019), 1–14.
Paul, Herman. "Historical Studies in Nineteenth-Century Germany: The Case of Hartwig Floto," in David McCallum (ed.), *The Palgrave Handbook of the History of Human Sciences* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2022), 207–226.
Porciani Ilaria and Lutz Raphael. "Introduction," in Ilaria Porciani, and Lutz Raphael, eds., *Atlas of European Historiography: The Making of a Profession, 1800–2005* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010): xi–xvii.

Porciani Illaria and Mauro Moretti. "The Polycentric Structure of Italian Historical Writing," in Stuart Mcintyre, Juan Maiguashca and Attila Pók, eds., *The Oxford History of Historical Writing. Vol 4: 1800–1945* (Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press, 2011): 225–242.

Reitter Paul and Chad Wellmon. *Permanent Crisis: The Humanities in a Disenchanted Age* (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 2021).

Rollmann, Margrit. Der Gelehrte als Schriftsteller: die Publikationen der Göttinger Professoren im 18. Jahrhundert (PhD diss., Göttingen, 1988).

[-rst.] " Minne af riksrådet m. m. grefve Ulrik Scheffer," *Historisk tidskrift* 13 (1893): 7–10.

Sander, Nils Fredrik. "Inträdes-tal i Svenska akademien den 20 december 1889," *Svenska akademiens handlingar* 4 (1889): 7–104.

Soffer, Reba N. *Discipline and Power: The University, History, and the Making of an English Elite, 1870–1930* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1994).

Solleveld, Floris. "Afterlives of the Republic of Letters: Learned Journals and Scholarly Community in the Early Nineteenth Century," *Erudition and the Republic of Letters* 5 (2020): 82–116.

Stieg, Margaret F. *The Origin and Development of Scholarly Historical Periodicals* (Tuscaloosa, Al.: University of Alabama Press, 1986).

Svedelius, Wilhelm Erik. *Smärre skrifter* (Stockholm: P. A. Norstedt, 1872).

Svedelius, Wilhelm Erik. "Om historisk vetenskap och historiska studier," *Historisk tidskrift* 8 (1888): 29–78.

Svedelius, Wilhelm Erik. *Anteckningar om mitt förflutna lif* (Stockholm: Fahlcrantz, 1889).

S-s [Wilhelm Erik Svedelius]. Review of "Berättelser ur Svenska Historien," *Frey: tidskrift för vetenskap och konst* 2:2 (1842): 180–191.

ten Hagen, Sjang. "Evaluating Knowledge, Evaluating Character: Book Reviewing by American Historians and Physicists (1900–1940)," *History of Humanities* 7.2 (2023): 251–277.

Topham, Jonathan R. "The Scientific, the Literary, and the Popular: Commerce and the Reimagining of the Scientific Journal in Britain, 1813–25," *Notes and Records* 70.4 (2016): 305–324.

Törnebladh, Ragnar. "Vilhelm Erik Svedelius," *Levnadsteckningar över Kungl. Svenska vetenskapsakademiens ledamöter* 5.4 (Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1906): 1–33.

Torstendahl, Rolf. Källkritik och vetenskapssyn i svensk historisk forskning 1820–1920 (Stockholm: Svenska bokförl./ Norstedt, 1964).

Torstendahl, Rolf. *The Rise and Propagation of Historical Professionalism* (New York: Routledge, 2015).

Torstendahl, Rolf. "Scandinavian Historical Writing," in Stuart Mcintyre, Juan Maiguashca and Attila Pók, eds., *The Oxford History of Historical Writing. Vol 4: 1800–1945* (Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press, 2011): 263–282.

Townsend, Robert B. *History's Babel: Scholarship, Professionalization, and the Historical Enterprise in the United States, 1880–1940*, (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 2013).

Turner, James. *Philology: The Forgotten Origins of the Modern Humanities* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2014).

Watts, Iain P. "'We want no authors': William Nicholson and the contested role of the scientific journal in Britain, 1797–1813," *The British Journal for the History of Science* 47:3 (2014), 397–419, 398.

Wellmon, Chad. *Organizing Enlightenment: Information Overload and the Invention of the Modern Research University* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2015).