INTRODUCTION

Establishing HoLLT: The History of Language Learning and Teaching

Nicola McLelland and Richard Smith

The History of Language Learning and Teaching as a Field of Study

In this introduction, we set ourselves two tasks. First, as this three-volume collection marks the culmination of our AHRC-funded project ‘Towards a History of Modern Foreign Language Teaching and Learning’ (AH/J012475/1), we reflect on the emergence of an international community of scholarship focused on what has come to be called — following McLelland and Smith (2014a) — the History of Language Learning and Teaching (HoLLT), and we describe how this is becoming established as a newly emerging interdisciplinary, intercultural and plurilingual field of enquiry. Second, we outline what the present collection contributes to this developing field, and how it helps indicate future directions of research.

These three volumes, following on from McLelland and Smith (2014a) and Smith and McLelland (2018a), represent the first time that a substantial collection of research studies in the field of history of language learning and teaching has been published in an English-dominant country. Relevant studies have appeared in several countries over the years, most consistently in the area of French as a second/foreign language, but there has not, until recently, been a recognizable discourse community of historians of language learning and teaching communicating together across both language and geographical borders.

As we explain more fully below, there are biases of focus over the three volumes which reflect their origins in a UK-based research network project, albeit one with strong connections to Continental Europe. Almost all the chapters started life as papers at a conference we organized in July 2014 at the University of Nottingham. The conference was the last of a series of three events which were designed to bring together potentially interested UK-based academics and teacher educators in the field of modern foreign language teaching with some of those we knew in Continental Europe who were already doing relevant historical research. The conference followed on from two smaller workshops in the previous two years (at the Universities of Nottingham and Warwick, respectively), which themselves
led to the publication of McLelland and Smith (2014a) and Smith and McLelland (2018a), respectively. Thus, with only a few exceptions (to be explained further below), the chapters in this collection were not commissioned for purposes of coverage but represent instead an illustrative sample of original, in-depth studies in the broad field of HoLLT, reflecting the specialist interests of those who heard about and chose to present papers at the conference at the time.

Nevertheless, we hope that both the substantial amount of research on display here and our arrangement of chapters across the three volumes will encourage the kind of ‘transnational comparison of factors of language teaching and learning’ which is mentioned as a desideratum by Reinfried (this volume). As Reinfried points out, the juxtaposition of papers can provoke ‘new insights [...]’, even though such links are not usually made explicitly by the authors of papers themselves. In the interests of moving beyond possible silos in research, we have deliberately avoided either a country- or a language-based arrangement of papers, instead taking a broadly chronological approach. Following this introduction and the similarly meta-historical chapter by Reinfried, Volume I contains studies of language learning and teaching in sixteenth- to eighteenth-century Europe, from French didactics in late medieval and early modern England (Critten) to the early grammatography of Portuguese as a foreign language (Fonseca). Although these two book-end chapters focus on England, the overall geographical and linguistic range is wide, extending from Russia in the east to Spain in the south-west of Europe, and taking in Latin, Czech and Italian as well as French and Portuguese. Similarly, Volume II (19th–20th Century Europe) begins and ends with issues relating specifically to French language learning in England (Cohen, Daniels) but covers a variety of European languages and settings overall, including, for example, German in Spain (Marizzi) and English in Germany (Giesler, Doff). The chronological focus of Volume III (Across Cultures) is also on the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, but with a thematic arrangement which similarly mixes target languages and regions. Part I contains papers on ‘The Place of Culture in Language Teaching’, mainly in early to mid-twentieth-century Germany and England, while Part II consists of chapters on ‘Language Learning beyond Europe’, from Arabic learning by nineteenth-century visitors to Egypt (Mairs) to the late twentieth-century ‘wave’ of secondary school Japanese studies in New Zealand (Harvey). Overall, the scope of this collection is deliberately broad, with contributions covering aspects of the history of language learning and teaching in Western Europe (the majority), but also Eastern Europe, Africa, China, Japan, India, the USA and New Zealand.3

Part I of Volume III particularly foregrounds an often only implicit thread running through the history of language teaching, even though it is one whose effects can outlast learners’ knowledge of the language itself: the teaching of culture, whether this be ‘high’ or ‘everyday’ culture, and of cultural values (Risager 2007). Culture has to date received relatively little explicit attention in the historiography of language teaching, which has tended to focus more on tracing the historical development of methods (although see McLelland 2015a: 249–334). It was partly for this reason that we adopted the theme of ‘Connecting Cultures’ for our conference,
to invite a focus on this important area of language teaching (history), at the same time as highlighting needs to connect the different traditions, or ‘cultures’ of language teaching themselves, across different regions and languages. The relevance of historical research into culture teaching is clearly articulated by Klippel (Vol. III), who argues that the foundation for the ways in which English-speaking cultures are represented in today’s English language textbooks in Germany were already laid in the late nineteenth century. On the other hand, there have been changes in approach which illuminate shifting perceptions of self and other: Ruisz’s analysis of debates on cultural representation in German English-language teaching after World War II is illuminating in this respect (Vol. III), while Sharp’s study of ‘cultural readers’ of the 1920s and 1930s for German learners of English (in the same volume) reveals a focus on representations of the English or British (generally conflated!) in an era before mass migration, on the basis of their Celtic, Anglo-Saxon, Viking and Norman heritages, which now seems archaic. Both Byram and Schleich (Vol. III) are interested in language learning in the context of internationalism and internationalization. Schleich’s study of the International Scholars’ Correspondence network — a pen-friend service run for school pupils in Germany, France, Britain and the USA in the period before World War I — reflects a belief (to some extent explicitly pacifist) in the power of a ‘standing army of correspondents’ who would help promote peace and understanding between nations. Comparative studies of cultural representations like that of Wegner (Vol. III), who compares the representation of German culture to school pupils learning the language in twentieth-century England and France, are relatively rare, but can be particularly fruitful. Wegner shows how differing aims of modern foreign language teaching in England and France reveal ‘specific politics and ideologies as well as traditions and changes in educational goals’, differences that are determined by national rather than common European concerns, such as the concern in France with analysis of Germany as the ‘enemy’ (until after World War II) and a greater focus on Germany’s culture heritage, compared with an emphasis in England both on overcoming insularity and on economic interests, reflected in a greater emphasis on communicative skills. ‘Interculturality’ is brought to the fore in this collection, then, both as topic and as a characteristic of the range of authors and contexts assembled here.

With some exceptions, however, scholars brought together in the general area denoted here by ‘HoLLT’ have not until now tended to view it in the unified form we have been arguing for, since it has not hitherto ‘existed’ as a disciplinary space. (It is therefore not surprising to find that the authors in this collection do not yet refer much to work outside the domains — different language or area traditions, or, more typically, different disciplinary formations — they themselves identify with.) Nevertheless, whereas in previous work we have referred to ‘building’ the field of HoLLT, we now wish to explain how the publication of this book can be seen to mark, or at least accompany, its establishment. For overviews of previous research in the area see McLelland and Smith (2014b), McLelland (2017, chapter 2) and Smith and McLelland (2018b). Here, we merely note that what pre-existed HoLLT as a
newly unified — or unifying — field of enquiry was a set of separate centres or strands of research, for example the history of French teaching, or history of English studies in Germany, coalescing around a particular learned society in the first case (SIHFLES: see below) or universities (Augsburg; the Ludwig-Maximilians-University, Munich; Bremen) in the second case, or involving separate pieces of work in separate disciplines, with researchers working very much in isolation from one another. We note the existence, based in France, but with wider reach, of SIHFLES (Société Internationale pour l'Histoire du Français Langue Étrangère ou Seconde); in Italy, CIRSIL (Centro Interuniversitario di Ricerca sulla Storia degli Insegnamenti Linguistici); in Spain, SEHEL (Sociedad Española para la Historia de las Enseñanzas Lingüísticas); and in Portugal APHELLE (Associação Portuguesa para a História do Ensino das Línguas e Literaturas Estrangeiras). In the Netherlands, the Peeter Heyns Society has been in existence for the past twenty years, while in Germany the Matthias-Kramer Society was founded in 2013, though on the back of several decades of work by a number of German scholars. Independently of our own efforts, most of these different centres of research had already been coming together to some extent. For example, SIHFLES, CIRSIL, SEHEL, APHELLE and the Peeter Heyns Society held joint conferences in Spain (Granada, 2008) and Italy (Gargnano, 2011), yielding themed journal issues that to some extent transcended language or geographical boundaries: on multilingualism in European language teaching (Fernández Fraile and Suso López 2009) and on women in the European history of language learning and teaching (Finotti and Minerva 2012), respectively. Our funded network was in part inspired by these first steps already taken on the European continent, and our 2014 conference — to our knowledge, the first ever conference on the history of language learning and teaching held in the UK — was designated the third in this series of joint initiatives. As a UK base for this collaboration, we drew on the further support of the Henry Sweet Society for the History of Linguistic Ideas, itself founded in 1983.

For fuller discussion of the benefits of establishing HoLLT on a sound basis as an ‘overall, language-independent yet language-interdependent, geographically discrete and yet geographically intertwined’ field of study (Smith and McLelland 2018b: 4), we refer the reader to McLelland and Smith (2014b), and Smith (2016). Here, we merely reiterate two key points. The history of language learning and teaching has, like any historical enquiry, its intrinsic value: recovering our shared past. At a basic and practical level, also, knowledge or — in the absence of knowledge — assumptions about language learning in the past underpin the understanding of language teaching today: its place in society, its teachers and learners, its methods, its assessment. There are key questions relating to all of these at any time, but especially so now, at a crucial moment when modern language learning is generally acknowledged to be in crisis in the UK4 and in other English-dominant nations, and where the learning of languages other than English in other parts of the world is similarly under pressure.5 To repeat the argument advanced by Smith (2016: 76), ‘historical evidence is needed as a basis on which to build appropriate reform efforts [...]’. Historical research into applied linguistic antecedents [and, we would
add here, foreign language teaching antecedents more widely conceived] can place present-day conceptions [...] in perspective and reveal their historically constituted limitations’. Largely for this reason, we see developing historical awareness as a keystone in language teacher education (see Smith and McLelland 2018b) and in language education reform (Smith and Imura 2004).

As we shall argue more fully below, HoLLT also has a potentially powerful role to play when it intersects with the critical examination of histories of colonialism, missionary work and postcolonial experience, whose legacies continue today, not least in the area of ELT (English Language Teaching).

In our previous publications, we have written of ‘building the history of language learning and teaching’ (McLelland and Smith 2014a, 2014b), and of establishing what Smith (2016) has termed ‘Applied Linguistic Historiography’. These previous contributions have been concerned with arguing for the establishment of a new field (in the former case) and discussing appropriate methods of inquiry (in the latter case). Alongside these more or less scholarly reflections, we have also been engaged in a project to build HoLLT in practical terms, first by means of the two workshops and the conference which gave rise to most of the papers here, then followed by the establishment in 2015 of a research network with much wider reach (the AILA Research Network on History of Language Learning and Teaching (www.hollt.net), which has itself organized two international events, with the next planned for summer 2018. The publication of this set of three volumes will, we trust, serve to place HoLLT even more firmly on the disciplinary map.

In further justification of the idea that, partly as a result of these efforts, HoLLT is becoming ‘established’ or ‘disciplinarized’, we structure the remainder of this introductory chapter according to the following themes: HoLLT in relation to the overt intention of our original network project — generating interest in historical research among modern language specialists in Britain and the English-speaking world; HoLLT and the History of ELT; HoLLT in Europe; HoLLT beyond Europe, including colonial and postcolonial relationships; and, finally, historiographical and interdisciplinary achievements in advancing the field of HoLLT.

**HoLLT and Modern Languages in Britain and the English-speaking World**

Apart from the history of teaching of culture, highlighted above, these three volumes can be seen to establish two further areas as important domains of research within HoLLT: first, HoLLT in Britain and the English-speaking world more generally, and, second, HoLLT with regard to ELT.

With few exceptions, chiefly focused on the early modern period, Britain — like the rest of the English-speaking world — has had very little history of researching HoLLT, and has been slow to begin to emulate earlier work in (especially) France and Germany. Notwithstanding the pioneering work in the history of English language teaching by Howatt (1984; 2nd edn with Widdowson, 2004), more recent work by Smith (e.g. 1999, 2003, 2005, 2009), and, for languages other than English, by McLelland (2015a, 2017), basic research with primary sources has been limited,
especially for the period since about 1800, both about language learning in Britain, and about learning English as a foreign language.

Our collection helps fill gaps in both these hitherto under-researched areas. Indeed, one of our intentions in bringing scholars from abroad to events in the UK in 2012–14, including the conference which gave rise to this publication, was, precisely, to stimulate interest in historical research in Britain. Given that there are a number of papers by UK-based researchers in this collection, we feel we succeeded, to an extent, in this aim, even though more than half the research studies in the collection as a whole were carried out by researchers based outside Britain. Thirteen of the chapters deal with language learning in Britain: these range from Critten’s study of French learning in the medieval period and Luhtala on Latin in sixteenth-century England to Italian in the early modern period (Gasperin) and Portuguese in the seventeenth to nineteenth centuries (Fonseca), all in Volume I; and, in Volumes II and III, Latin, French and other languages in the nineteenth (Cohen, Kirk, Lorch), early twentieth (Ashby and Przedlacka, Byram, Martinez, Wegner) and later twentieth centuries (Daniels, Scott and, again, Wegner). The chapters about Britain in these volumes signal, then, a growing interest in Britain's language learning history, and McLelland (2017) — the first overarching history of language learning and teaching in Britain — benefited tremendously from, and cites fully, the research of many of the contributors to the present collection.

Nevertheless, lacunae remain, not just in terms of chronological spread but also in areas of focus. The study of representing a ‘target’ culture — the ‘hidden curriculum’ of language teaching (Byram 1989: 1) — has been a prominent focus in recent language pedagogy (e.g. Byram 1993, 2008, Risager 2006, 2007), but one that has barely been matched by historical studies (Wegner (1999) and McLelland (2015a: 249–334), are exceptions that, thus far, have only proved the rule). More primary research on the social history of language learning and teaching in the twentieth century is also needed, extending the work of scholars such as Cohen (1996, 1999, and Vol. II here) for French in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. So, too, there is a need for critical analysis of the complex history of assessment, akin to that undertaken for ELT by Weir et al. (2013) and Weir and O’Sullivan (2017). There is also further work to be done on the history of bilingual and supplementary languages education, or the presence of these languages in our societies risks erasure from history. Finally, there is also a need for comparative work on languages advocacy and policy. Comparisons across the devolved nations of Britain are a first desideratum, but there are also lessons to be learned from comparisons with other Anglophone countries and beyond. Here our collection invites comparison among Anglophone countries as far apart as the USA (Bale) and New Zealand (Harvey), but also within the devolved nations of the United Kingdom (Scott on Scotland, Daniels on England). It is interesting to see a decline in languages study in places as far apart as Scotland and New Zealand, as well as the complaints about a lack of coherent policy from both Scott and Harvey. Even if, as Reinfried (this volume) observes, such connections are not yet obvious to contributors in this collection themselves, their juxtaposition here for the first time will, we hope, encourage greater awareness of points of comparison and contrast in future work.
As to what value HoLLT might have for future advocacy and policy-making, Bale’s and Martinez’s studies of advocacy for Spanish in the USA and in Britain are striking. Bale concludes that, in the USA in the first half of the twentieth century, making the case for Spanish on pragmatic grounds failed. The dramatic decline of German from American schools was not just the result of World War I, but was part of ‘general homogenization’ towards a ‘single national identity’, where Spanish could no more find an easy way in than could German. As for the UK, Martinez’s study shows that public interest in promoting a language was not always matched by individual demand — Spanish was often introduced on the basis of its anticipated utility to learners, only to be dropped later owing to lack of demand. The words of E. W. J. Jackson in the early 1920s, cited by Martinez, are telling: ‘Of course [firms] would consider the ability to deal with such correspondence [in Spanish] an asset in any clerk they employed, but as far as I am able to gather it is an asset they are not willing to pay for’. A prescient echo through time, too — as Britain embarks on compulsory language learning in primary schools from age eight — is the concern about shortage of expertise expressed a century ago in 1917 by the President of the Board of Education, that with regard to the teaching of Spanish, ‘it is too soon to say whether the supply of competent teachers will be adequate’ to meet the desire of many Local Education Authorities to introduce Spanish more widely (Martinez, Vol. II).

**HoLLT and the History of English Language Teaching (ELT)**

The decline of modern languages in the UK charted by Daniels and Scott (Vol. III) is matched by the rise of English Language Teaching (ELT), which in turn goes hand in hand with declining interest in learning languages other than English in many parts of the world beyond Britain too. Given this seemingly inexorable rise of ELT, it is striking that while there has been a scholarly society dedicated to research into the history of French as a foreign or second language for more than twenty-five years (cf. Besse 2014), there is, as yet, no such equivalent for the history of ELT, and there has been comparatively little research into the history of the learning and teaching of English as a foreign language (cf. Howatt and Smith 2014, Linn 2016: 13–14) beyond certain centres. The fact that Volumes II and III of this collection contain a number of chapters in the area of history of English learning and teaching (nine in all) gives rise to hopes for further development. Partly, this may be promoted by the way the collection brings to a wider readership work which has been going on for a number of years in some German universities (particularly at Ludwig-Maximilians University, Munich, under the leadership of Friederike Klippel until her retirement in 2015) (Klippel, Schleich, Sharp, Ruisz, all Volume III); and at the University of Bremen (Doff, Giesler, Volume II, Hethey, Volume III). Much of this work relates to the nineteenth century, when English first began to come into the curriculum in the developing school system in Germany. As Doff makes clear, the development of education for girls, and the way English was taught to them, had a significant influence on overall methodological developments towards teaching practical language skills and not (so much) about the language. Focusing
particularly on schooling in Bremen, Giesler provides insights into another way in which relatively practical goals became incorporated into school curricula, this time in a manner seeming to prefigure present-day interest in teaching language through content. In Volume III, while Klippel provides a broad overview of eighteenth- and nineteenth-century textbooks and their cultural contents, Sharp subjects textbooks from the 1920s to particular examination, from the same cultural perspective. Sharp, Hethey and Ruisz all highlight and explain the influence of a particular way of viewing culture — *Kulturkunde* — which was prevalent in the 1920s and 1930s and which continued to have influence after the Second World War.

One further centre where the history of English language teaching has begun to develop is at the University of Milan, as represented in this collection by Pedrazzini and Nava (both, Vol. II). Their chapters complement one another in the way they explore a relatively recent period of history (the 1980s and 1990s) when communicative language teaching spread around the world and was adopted and adapted in different ways in different countries. These studies of different geographical contexts (Germany and Italy) for the learning and teaching of English correspond well with the call in Howatt and Smith (2014) for studies of English teaching history which are grounded in local realities and which might thereby serve as a necessary counterweight to the centre to periphery methods-based narratives which pervade the field of ELT and dominate teacher education worldwide (see also Hunter and Smith 2012).

India is another context in which research into the history of English teaching has been developing (cf. Sridhar and Mishra 2016), and Dixit and Padwad in their chapter (Vol. III) draw lessons for current English language education policy from an overview of national curricular developments since Independence. The focus of this work, as of most of the chapters concerned with the history of English teaching in these volumes, is on relatively recent history, as may seem to befit the recency of its rise when compared with French and Italian, at least in European contexts. Nevertheless, the learning and teaching of English has a longer history in former British colonies like India, while ‘local’ histories of ELT have hardly begun to be uncovered outside a few countries (represented in this collection by Germany and Italy). The historiography of English language learning and teaching worldwide is evolving, but there are many lacunae, and we hope that these volumes will help stimulate more interest in History of ELT around the world.

**HoLLT in Europe**

Much research in the area of HoLLT has tended to be nationally based, whether focusing on the history of teaching a particular national language (e.g. French; cf. Besse, 2014) or the history of language learning and teaching in a particular country (e.g. Svanholt 1968 on Denmark; Hulshof et al. 2016 on the Netherlands). Our *Language & History* special issue (McLelland and Smith 2014a), which brought together state-of-the-art overviews of the histories of teaching French, German, Spanish, and English was a first step towards overcoming these disciplinary
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Establishing boundaries; our special issue of *The Language Learning Journal* containing histories of language learning traditions in particular countries or regions — Britain, France and Switzerland, Germany, the Low Countries, Portugal and Spain — has been another (Smith and McLelland 2018a).

In the present collection, our broadly chronological approach again juxtaposes chapters dealing with different geographical areas and language traditions. We hope that, in this way, readers will be helped to discover significant similarities and differences across languages, across language learning traditions, and through time. The shared experience of the Reform Movement in Europe, c. 1880–1920, is one area of convergence, highlighted as a common reference point in a number of studies here, including Linn (Vol. II) and Schleich (Vol. III), who, in their respective studies of early periodicals and pen-friend networks, each highlight Europe-wide developments. Another, much earlier, trans-European phenomenon is the common recycling of dialogue books across languages and borders in the medieval and early modern periods — see the contributions by Cuevas, Viémon, and Villoria and Suso, in Volume I. Their careful textbook analyses add, too, to our understanding of language learning as part of a shared European cultural history and European book trade, with materials adapted and re-printed for new audiences. For example, we know that Veneroni’s *Maître italien* (Paris 1768) enjoyed widespread transmission through France, the Netherlands, Germany and England. However, Cuevas shows in his chapter here that Courville’s *Explicación de la gramática francesa* (Madrid, 1728) — previously viewed as a work in its own right — is no more than a translation into Spanish of the introduction of Veneroni’s work, an introduction to grammar intended ‘pour les dames et ceux qui ne scavent pas le Latin’, thus adding a Spanish chapter to the complex reception history of this single text.

The cross-Europe traffic in language learning materials is also illustrated by Viémon’s study, tracing the transformation of pronunciation rules from Berlaimont (1527) to Reixac i Carbó (1749). Villoria and Suso López take another small part of this complex Berlaimont tradition, with its point of origin in a 1556 edition of Berlaimont’s *Dictionarium*, to present examples of the variety of adaptations of dialogues, re-used in publications in sixteenth-century Spain, England and the Netherlands, in texts ranging from vocabularies and dialogues to full manuals, adapted in very different ways for different age groups, for men and women, and in different parts of Europe. Just as Courville translated Veneroni’s introduction to grammar for women, so too some of the reception of Berlaimont texts involved repackaging them as materials especially suited to women and girls as learners. Baretti, too, was writing, at least in part, for girls like the lively young Miss Hetty named as his pupil in his dialogues (see de Gasperin, Vol. II). (The place of gender in the European history of language teaching is examined in two other contributions in Volume II: Doff’s study of English-language education for girls and women in nineteenth-century Germany, noted above, and Cohen’s illuminating study of gendered attitudes to oral proficiency in nineteenth-century England.)

Such recycling underlines that publishing language manuals and textbooks was a business, and they were as subject to the publisher’s desire to turn a profit as any
other book. Thus, the (often unacknowledged) recycling of materials was not just a feature of the pre-modern period. The nineteenth century saw a renewed blossoming of patented ‘Methods’ that promised sales trading on recognized ‘brands’, some of whose history can be traced through the contributions in this collection too: Thimm’s method applied to Arabic features among the sources examined by Mairs (and see McLelland 2015b for its application to Chinese); Fonseca (Vol. II) finds an 1883 Ahn manual for English speakers to learn Portuguese;12 Ahn and Ollendorff were adapted for Greek learners of French (Mytaloulis), and the main focus of Mytaloulis’s attention — a textbook for Greek learners of French — is itself a re-purposing of a manual first written for French learners of English, complete with culturally specific references to London’s Vauxhall Gardens. Untangling the complex relationship between patented methods like those of Ahn, Ollendorff and Thimm and their imitations remains a research desideratum, and one that would require international cooperation. Its interest lies not just in accurate cataloguing for book historians, but also in promising insights into the diffusion of beliefs about language learning and teaching through time and space, for many adaptations and imitations maintained only certain aspects of the innovations and improvements touted by their originators.

There are also themes traceable over long periods of time in this collection. One case in point is the place that grammar should have in teaching children, a persistent issue, whether for fifteenth-century Latin in England (Luhtala), modern languages in seventeenth-century Finland (Randen), Italian in eighteenth-century England (de Gasperin) or languages in early twentieth-century Russia (Protassova). Another aspect of this is the way ‘modern’ approaches are shown clearly to have antecedents in previous experience — Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) in nineteenth-century Germany, for example (Giesler, Vol. II), or monolingual methods, more generally, in medieval and early modern England (Critten, Vol. I).

Building on previous thematic work on language learning in Europe as alluded to above, then, the papers in this collection help support our contention, expressed in Smith and McLelland (2018a: 4), that ‘the task of developing a (unified) European history of language learning and teaching seems to be becoming steadily more possible’.

**HoLLT beyond Europe; Colonial and Postcolonial Relationships**

The present collection differs in scope from McLelland and Smith (2014a) and Smith and McLelland (2018a) in that we have deliberately sought to extend its range beyond the European focus of those two collections. Reinfried (this volume) celebrates the headway made in moving from national perspectives to a European perspective on HoLLT, but it needs to be recognized that Europe itself was a colonial force beyond its borders, and language learning in the colonial encounter remains significantly under-researched. The structuring of the three volumes (with the first two focused on Europe, and only Part 2 of the third moving ‘beyond Europe’) is certainly itself Eurocentric, but the structure is centrifugal in aspiration,
reflecting our desire to promote research in and into areas of the world outside Europe, whilst acknowledging some of the important work already in existence (e.g. Vigné 2000 on the teaching and learning of French in the French empire, Sanchez-Summerer 2011, 2012 on French in Palestine; Rokkaku 1988 on Japanese language teaching in China).

Part 2 of Volume III offers case studies of language learning in colonial contexts in both directions: colonialists learning about the culture of the colonized space in question, and those colonized learning the colonialists’ language — Europeans learning Arabic (Mairs), Westerners learning Chinese (Gianninoto); but also Chinese learning German (McLelland), German in Cameroon (Boulleys), English in post-independence India (Dixit and Padwad), language-learning in Jordan (Odeh and Zanchi). There are also cases of non-European colonial and postcolonial relationships (Japanese learning Chinese in the chapters by Chang Zou and Yang Tiezheng); and new forms of influence, including explicit cultural diplomacy alongside economic influence: Spanish in the USA (Bale), French in Jordan (Odeh and Zanchi) and the learning of Japanese in New Zealand (Harvey). The number of chapters dealing with HoLLT beyond Europe is relatively small, and are in some cases first steps into very unfamiliar territory for European scholars of language learning, but our intention is that they will help open up the field of HoLLT beyond its historical Eurocentric biases, this being a major aspiration of the ongoing HoLLTnet network, noted above, under the auspices of AILA (L’Association Internationale de Linguistique Appliquée).

For example, the insights provided into language learning traditions in Asia in Volume III suggest some new avenues for research into both the learning of non-European languages and of language learning beyond Europe. The contributions by Chang Zou, Yang Tiezheng and McLelland all bring to light approaches to language learning in early twentieth-century China and Japan that are — while influenced by Western ideas — quite different to the contemporary European traditions of the time (cf. Rokkaku 1988), while Gianninoto’s examination of materials for learning Chinese unearths an early instance of corpus-driven vocabulary selection in language teaching, with a very early case of a corpus of over a million characters being used to guide character selection and arrangement in Martin’s (1897) Analytical Reader of Chinese.

The potential of comparative studies becomes apparent if we look across some of the studies in this collection to examine assumptions about the colonized ‘other’. Prendergast advises his imagined learner of the Indian language Telugu to ‘divest himself of the habit of omitting every word which may, either classically or logically, be deemed superfluous. These standards are altogether inapplicable in the East’. (Prendergast 1872: 174, cited by Lorch, Vol. II). Whatever the truth of the matter for Telugu, the claim was applied to the whole of the undifferentiated ‘East’ — but contradicts similarly sweeping rules of thumb for English learners of Chinese: ‘It is a safe rule [...] to begin by cutting out all superfluities. It [i.e. what one wants to say] should, in fact, be treated as one would treat a telegraphic message’ (Hillier 1907: 44, cited in McLelland 2015b: 134–35). Britain’s colonial subjugation of other
parts of the world was, then, reflected in the language English speakers were given to use with the colonized in these settings: in the teach-yourself Arabic manuals discussed by Mairs (Vol. III), in some of Prendergast’s manuals (Lorch, Vol. II), and in manuals of Chinese (McLelland 2015b).

Interdisciplinary and Historiographical Achievements

We end by considering the progress made in establishing HoLLT not just in terms of coverage but also with regard to methodological and interdisciplinary historiographical advances. Our contributors to this collection include practitioner-researchers (former language teachers such as Daniels), teacher educators (Byram and others), phoneticians (Ashby and Przedlacka), specialists in the history of linguistics (Linn and others) and specialists in individual languages (for example, Luhtala for Latin, and many others). Although all the authors share an allegiance to primary sources, relatively few (Cohen, Rjéoutski, and others) are historians by primary training; many more engaged in HoLLT were originally trained in another primary discipline and have come to history later. The present collection therefore provides models of historical research which will be useful to those starting out in this field or seeking to move beyond the range of approaches with which they are most familiar. The collection illustrates the potential of widening the range of methodological approaches in the historiography of language learning and teaching, as well as the potential of a wider range of sources, and given the disparate backgrounds of those working in HoLLT, this is an area where we have much to learn from one another.

The fact that some authors have come to history relatively recently from a main concern in other areas broadens the range of research methodologies available to all, to mutual benefit. In particular, some chapters in this collection show a clear social scientific influence, evident in their explicitness about epistemological assumptions and about method. Criado introduces an applied linguistic approach, adopting a framework for textbook analysis that is heavily influenced by current second language acquisition theory. Similarly, Scott’s framework for analysis of recent language education policy in Scotland is influenced by work in the field of language policy research. Compared to more traditional historiographical work, top-down (relatively theory-driven) approaches, though skilfully handled in these cases, can run risks of anachronism (as well as of ignoring evidence which does not fit a particular ‘model’), but they may also be more readily seen to have higher relevance value — that is, to be easily readable and/or acceptable — within the disciplines from which they derive methodologies, since they adopt models or methodological approaches which are already familiar within those disciplines.

Meanwhile, other studies in this collection illustrate the range of sources at our disposal, and how to interpret them. For the medieval and early modern periods in Europe, teaching materials themselves are often the only available sources for the history of learning and teaching languages, as Klippel notes in her contribution (Vol. III): ‘Treatises on language teaching were relatively rare — Seidelmann (1724)
is an early example [...] Journals dealing with educational matters only began to be published in the late eighteenth century’. Teachers’ handbooks (as exploited by Hidden, Vol. II) do not pre-date the Reform Movement of the late nineteenth century. However, textbooks have been in use for many centuries and, for many periods, they ‘are the historian’s most valuable source’ (Klippel, Vol. III). Several studies in our collection exemplify the value of examining such teaching materials as primary sources. Critten, for example, argues that surviving fifteenth-century materials can be interpreted as evidence of monolingual target-language teaching of French in late-medieval England. He concludes with a plea against a teleological approach to HoLLT: the present-day focus on using the target language in the classroom is not the high-point of steady improvement, but merely the latest in a series of stages in a history of continuities and discontinuities. Luhtala also offers a close analysis of materials for teaching Latin in pre-Humanist and Humanist materials for English learners of Latin. Taking a seemingly minor point of detail — teaching the rules of ‘concord’ (agreement) — she shows how Humanists sought to move away from Scholasticism to simplify the teaching of grammar for young learners, but also demonstrates that some pre-Humanists had already been working towards that goal, with simple catechistic questions to teach, for example, how to recognize the subject and object.

In the era before treatises and journals, prefaces to language textbooks might often be the only opportunity to set out and critique ideas on language learning and teaching. Textbook paratexts, indeed, can be as informative as the texts themselves, such as the ‘Essay on the Proper Method for Teaching and Learning that Language’ by Chambaud (1750), a French teacher in England who introduced targeted grammar exercises in teaching language some decades ahead of Meidinger (1783) (see McLelland 2017: 95–99). So, too, annotations and inscriptions in textbooks may tell us something about who used them and how, as Mairs (Vol. III) demonstrates with regard to Arabic phrasebooks. The materials produced by learners themselves can also be valuable sources — a specialized case in point is that of the letters produced by pen-friends and examined as part of Schleich’s study of the so-called ‘International Scholars’ Correspondence’ network of the early twentieth century (Vol. III; see also Schleich 2015).

A number of our contributors have responded to the call (first made by Stern 1983: 87, 114, echoed by Smith 1999: 3 and McLelland 2015a: 7) for detailed biographical studies of figures in HoLLT. Fidlerová’s study (Vol. I) of the career and work of the writer, translator and textbook author František Jan Tomsa (1751–1814) provides an insight into the complexity of teaching a language in a multilingual context such as the Austro-Hungarian Empire. Fidlerová argues for the potential polyfunctionality of Tomsa’s works, suggesting that Tomsa’s publications may have had a role not just as manuals for German-speaking learners of Czech as a foreign language, but also in promoting Czech to those who were first-language speakers of the language but had not been educated in it, and so contributing to currents of linguistic patriotism at the time. In Volume II, Provata examines the history of teaching French in Greece through the case of the author Ioannis Carassoutsas (1824–1873), while Lorch’s close
examination of the biography of Thomas Prendergast (1806–1886) offers clues as to why this former civil servant in India, himself never a language teacher, took it into his head during his retirement in Cheltenham to develop his own ‘Mastery Method’ of language learning. Like Lorch, Mairs (Vol. III) reveals the potential of close biographical study of textbook authors to take us beyond ‘the words on the page’. As Mairs observes, her answer to the question of how ‘an Arabic–German bilingual who died in Austria in 1876 [came] to be the author of an English guide to self-instruction in Arabic that was published after his death in 1883 [...] tells us much about the language publishing business in the late nineteenth century’.

Both McLelland (2015a: 8–10) and Smith (2016) have argued for attention to be paid to a wider variety of primary sources, and the present collection offers some exemplary demonstrations of how recent research is increasingly able to do so. Ashby and Przedlacka’s chapter in Volume II is a case study for the role of material culture — in this case technological objects themselves — to assess the role of history of technology in language teaching. They offer a sober assessment of the claims made for sometimes outlandish phonetic equipment to transform the learnability of languages. While the supposed utility of the equipment served to justify the funding of phonetics laboratories, their assessment suggests that the claims were the first of a whole series of promises to revolutionize language teaching via technological innovations (radio, television, language laboratories, computers) with less impact than expected.13

Linn (Vol. III) — matching the emergence of periodical studies as a field of enquiry in the last few decades (cf. the newly founded JEPS: The Journal of European Periodical Studies) — turns his attention to the emergence of the first specialized journals and their role in the development of a modern language teaching community of practice, before, during and after the so-called Reform Movement of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Linn shows how a journal such as Phonetische Studien (from 1894 known as Die neueren Sprachen) provided language scholars and teachers with a vehicle through which to give voice to modern foreign language teaching as an independent discipline.

Rjéoutski’s work on language learning in eighteenth-century Russia (Vol. I), Turcan’s history of French in Moldavia (Vol. II), and Martinez’ study of efforts to encourage Britons to learn Spanish in the nineteenth and first half of the twentieth century (Vol. II) all draw on unpublished papers preserved in government archives. Rjéoutski finds details of army cadets’ language learning in the Russian State Archive for the History of the Armed Forces. Turcan was able to use minutes of meetings relating to school curricula, teacher training, and the preparation of teaching materials in Moldavia. Martinez similarly draws on rich material preserved in the UK National Archives, including Board of Education minute papers and records of school inspections, including classroom observations; similar files exist for other languages under the same reference (ED12 in the National Archives; note also ED24) but are still under-explored, except for Russian (cf. Muckle 2008: 260). Martinez also draws on newspaper reports and correspondence, as does Bale (Vol. III), in his study of advocacy for Spanish teaching in the USA in the first half of the twentieth century. Both Bale and Martinez are thus able to compare (and
to some extent contrast) the uptake of Spanish classes with the **public discourse** about its value — an important dimension in the history of language teaching and learning in the twentieth century and beyond. **Official published reports and guidelines** on language learning are similarly valuable sources for understanding both the reality of and the hopes attached to language learning. Besides Externemann (Vol. II) and Wegner (Vol. III) in this collection, see in particular Byram’s (Vol. III) examination of the Leathes Report (1918), and Cohen’s (Vol. II) reading of the Clarendon and Taunton reports (1864, 1868), showing the very gendered perception — with influence, she argues, on the overall status — of ‘oral’ ability. As Cohen puts it, her evidence shows ‘that the history of the “oral” and its meanings can be a means of identifying ideas and shifts in language education since the eighteenth century’. Indeed the status of the ‘oral’ remains relevant today in the contested territory between teaching language skills and modern languages as a ‘discipline’.

For more recent times, **oral history** testimony can also be a valuable source, including, for example, our interview with John Trim, shortly before his death in 2013, and reproduced in Smith and McLelland (2014). The limitations of first-memory reminiscence are commented upon by Daniels (Vol. II), but the potential value of oral history data for triangulating with other sources has also been shown in this collection (Pedrazzini, Scott, Vol. II).

**Conclusion**

At the beginning of this Introduction we described HoLLT as a ‘newly emerging interdisciplinary, intercultural and plurilingual field of enquiry’. The chapters in our three-volume collection — contributed by a combination of both established experts and scholars new to the territory — accurately represent the status of this still-emerging field, whose researchers come from different language backgrounds and from normally separate disciplines. In combination, as we hope we have shown, they offer a basis from which to explore further the territory of HoLLT in the Anglophone world, in Europe, and — we very much hope — increasingly in other parts of the world too, to scholarly benefit and to the practical benefit of language education professionals and policy-makers. While far from the last word in the history of language learning and teaching, the contributions in our collection exemplify a range of methodological and theoretical approaches, establish the field of HoLLT, and so also map out some of the paths that can lead towards more comparative and ‘global’ histories of language learning and teaching in the future.
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Notes to the Introduction

1. This project has been a jointly conceived and led one from the start, and this introduction is likewise a collaborative effort. The order of authors is alphabetical only.
2. ‘Connecting Cultures? International Conference on the History of Language Teaching’. The conference was supported by the Henry Sweet Society for the History of Linguistic Ideas, SIHFLES (Société internationale pour l’histoire du français langue étrangère ou seconde), APHELLE (Associação Portuguesa para a História do Ensoino das Línguas e Literaturas Estrangeiras), CIRSIL (Centro Interuniversitario di Ricerca sulla Storia degli Insegnamenti Linguistici), PHG (Peeter Heynsgenootschap) and SEHEL (Sociedad Española para la Historia de las Enseñanzas Lingüísticas).
3. Indeed, three chapters in Volume III — those by Rachel Mairs, Vera Boulleys, and Jeff Bale — were not originally presented at the conference but were separately invited, to broaden the geographical coverage of the collection.
5. The Council of Europe’s ‘mother tongue + 2’ policy — the aspiration that pupils should learn two languages in addition to their own language — is at least in part an attempt to maintain diversity in language learning in the knowledge that, for the majority of pupils on the European Continent, the first foreign language offered in schools will be English. On attitudes to English in Europe in the face of this reality and in the face of domain loss to English (e.g. in higher education), see Linn et al. (2013).
7. Note especially the journal dedicated to the history of teaching French as a foreign language, Documents pour l’histoire du français langue étrangère ou seconde, already publishing for over a quarter of a century (see Besse 2014), and key studies by German scholars such as Schröder (1980–1985), Klippel (1994), Hüllen and Klippel (2000), Glück (2002).
8. Given that Britain is not famed for its language learning prowess, past or present, it is striking to note that London was productive as an early centre for publication of Portuguese learning materials, with the first being published in 1692 — see Fonseca (Vol. II).
12. Note also the reception of Åhn in Spain discussed by Lombardero Caparrós (2016).