



Things are different elsewhere: An intellectual history of intellectual history in Sweden

Anton Jansson

To cite this article: Anton Jansson (2021) Things are different elsewhere: An intellectual history of intellectual history in Sweden, *Global Intellectual History*, 6:1, 83-94, DOI: [10.1080/23801883.2019.1657634](https://doi.org/10.1080/23801883.2019.1657634)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/23801883.2019.1657634>



© 2019 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group



Published online: 26 Aug 2019.



[Submit your article to this journal](#)



Article views: 2163



[View related articles](#)



[View Crossmark data](#)



Citing articles: 1 [View citing articles](#)

Things are different elsewhere: An intellectual history of intellectual history in Sweden

Anton Jansson 

Department of Literature, History of Ideas, and Religion, University of Gothenburg, Gothenburg, Sweden

ABSTRACT

In the 2010s, intellectual history has been experiencing growth and success internationally. There have been discussions about the identity and status of the field, often including taking recourse to its history. Such historiography focuses on the larger countries, which means leaving out one country where the historical study of ideas have been successfully institutionalized, namely Sweden. This article deals with the Swedish discipline *idéhistoria*, founded in 1932, and will introduce and situate the discipline within discussions of the international field of intellectual history, considering in what sense *idéhistoria* is a form of intellectual history. The findings are that if intellectual history is defined closely to the Cambridge School tradition, then *idéhistoria* is different, but if intellectual history is a field which more generally studies human thought, knowledge and ideas in their historical contexts, then *idéhistoria* is one nationally distinct but successful form of intellectual history. Having kept strong ties to the history of science, but also developing in other directions throughout its history, the discipline is today eclectic, held together more by institutional means than a strong kernel in methodology or practice. Still, for those advocating a broader intellectual history, *idéhistoria* may be seen as an interesting example.

KEYWORDS

Intellectual history; history of humanities; history of science; *idéhistoria*; Sweden; interdisciplinarity

1. Introduction

In the introduction to his book *What Is Intellectual History?*, leading intellectual historian Richard Whatmore writes about a peculiar encounter he had when teaching at a doctoral course in Sweden.

I was at a conference for Swedish graduate students in intellectual history in September 2014 at the University of Umeå and it became clear very quickly that no student had heard of Pocock, that no student had studied any of Skinner's methodological essays, and that the inspiration for their research was altogether Foucault. The kinds of work the Swedish students were doing was mainly concerned with the history of technology in the twentieth century; one of the most interesting results was that many of them were employed to teach undergraduates in science schools. Things are very different elsewhere.¹

CONTACT Anton Jansson  anton.jansson@lir.gu.se  Department of Literature, History of Ideas, and Religion, University of Gothenburg, Box 200, 405 30 Gothenburg, Sweden

© 2019 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>), which permits non-commercial re-use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited, and is not altered, transformed, or built upon in any way.

Things are very different elsewhere, indeed. But how are things different, and how are things alike? In this essay, I will discuss in what sense the Swedish discipline of *idé- och lärdomshistoria* (short *idéhistoria*), founded in 1932, may be considered to actually be intellectual history.

In the 2010s, intellectual history has been experiencing a growth and large success internationally, and there have been a number of books and articles published which try to convey its basic foundations and identity, as well as to inspire new work and theoretical innovation.² While some of the debaters involved have lamented the lack of heated debates and conflicting perspectives,³ it is unavoidable that the 'speech acts' involved include normative positions about the identity of and practice in the field.

Still, it wouldn't be intellectual history if most of the authors discussing the field did not turn to its history when understanding the contemporary positions and founding their own convictions. The historiography however, even when the field is thought of as international, has a quite clear geographic focus: the United Kingdom (Skinner, Pocock, Burrow) and the United States (Lovejoy, LaCapra) are central, with the usual digressions into the larger continental players France (Foucault, Derrida) and Germany (Meinecke, Koselleck). There are certainly reasons for this, as it is natural that the larger countries can be expected to exert a great influence, but the picture may be enriched.

There is one country which has had a history of ideas tradition which – in the words of the German historiographer of intellectual history Timothy Goering – has been 'significantly more successful' than the others, namely Sweden.⁴ But Sweden, while sometimes being dutifully mentioned in passing,⁵ is generally invisible in deliberations of intellectual history, and a discussion of the relation between intellectual history as an international field and the Swedish discipline of *idéhistoria* is lacking.⁶ This article aims to remedy this by introducing and situating *idéhistoria* within the discussions of the disparate but blooming international field of intellectual history.

Quentin Skinner refuted arguments about the alleged antiquarianism and therefore irrelevance of intellectual history by claiming that history may constitute an alterity which can make us stand back from our current assumptions and provide us with 'a broader sense of possibility.'⁷ In a sense, this article seeks to do a similar manoeuvre. Not primarily temporally, but rather spatially or culturally, not taking recourse to a different point in time, but to a different place, thus 'decentering European intellectual space.'⁸ The wider purpose of the article then is to enrich and broaden debates about intellectual history by providing a point of comparison, a case where intellectual history has experienced a unique institutionalization and been successful as a discipline for almost a century.

This will be done by providing a short (intellectual) history of *idéhistoria*, as the understanding of the status, content and identity of a discipline is to be found in its historical development. In doing this, I will make use of existing characterizations, historiographies and reminiscences of the discipline throughout its history, as well as programmatic texts and speeches, and not least exemplify with existing research throughout its history. I hope to be able to bring out the basic tenets in such a way that it resonates with the international field of intellectual history.

A note on language: the short form of the discipline under scrutiny here is *idéhistoria*, which literally means history of ideas. However, the traditional and at most universities used version is *idé- och lärdomshistoria* (short for *idéhistoria och lärdomshistoria*). This

is normally translated into ‘history of ideas and learning,’⁹ while *lärdom* could also be translated into ‘erudition’ or ‘scholarship.’ The long title of the discipline connotes that it leans toward the study of the institutionalized academic and scientific knowledge and intellectual life, rather than ideas in a more general sense (which has however been challenged, as we will see). To make clear when I am speaking about the discipline, I will use the Swedish (short) form *idéhistoria* for the Swedish discipline and practice, and *idéhistoriker* (historians of ideas), for the ones practising it. It should also be mentioned that the formal English translation of the discipline name by the *idéhistoriker* themselves is History of Ideas and Science, or History of Science and Ideas, owing to the discipline’s interest in the history of science and its orientation towards this field from its foundation, something which we will now go on to sketch.

2. Genesis: Uppsala 1932

Idéhistoria saw the light of the day in 1932, with the establishment of a professor’s chair at Uppsala University, the oldest Swedish university. The new chair was awarded to Johan Nordström, a young literary historian, held to be an exceptionally talented researcher, and was realized through a donation from a rich Stockholm businessman.¹⁰ The donation coincided with the tercentenary of the death of the Gustavus Adolphus of Sweden, the mythical protestant hero of the Thirty Years War, credited for establishing Sweden as a great power in Europe. This had some significance. The donor had patriotic leanings and a donation for the study of the Era of Swedish Empire (*Stormaktstiden*, roughly 1611–1721) was in his interest. Nordström, as a specialist in the seventeenth century and a scholar of Gustavus Adolphus and nationalist ideas of the era, suited this well. Nordström, however, had more radical leanings, and did not intend to forge his professorship in a patriotic fashion.¹¹ But the donation was made public at the celebration of the anniversary of Gustavus Adolphus’ death in Uppsala in 1932.

Nordström came from a tradition of history of literature which did not so much study fiction, poetry or drama, but the learned literature. His dissertation had been on the philosophical fragments of the seventeenth-century Swedish poet Georg Stiernhielm, connecting those to the European intellectual life at the time, and Nordström had also written a much-noticed work on the Renaissance. The new professor himself invoked the tradition of *historia literaria* in his inaugural lecture, and then claimed the connections between this older tradition of studying the learned literature with the growing international field of history of science.¹² Nordström was impressed by the works of George Sarton, the founder of the journal *Isis* and the History of Science Society. The two corresponded for many years and became personal friends.¹³ To Nordström’s interest in history of science, which seems only to have grown over the years, was added another alleged influence, however. Nordström also had a hermeneutic line of influence, often referred to Wilhelm Dilthey, and methodologically it may be claimed that *Einfühlung* and *Verstehen* were keywords, in the quest to discover the ‘moral atmosphere’ of past eras and let history ‘gain movement and life in the eyes of our mind.’¹⁴

After Nordström was installed as a professor, he published no more large books. Instead his energy went into establishing the discipline and subject of *idéhistoria* further. Leading a student seminar and supervising doctoral students were important activities, but there were also others. In 1934, he founded The Swedish History of

Science and Ideas Society (*Lärdomshistoriska samfundet*). To this society he recruited members broadly; he personally wrote to members of the educated public, a strategy which turned out to be successful. In 1950, the society had around 3000 members.¹⁵ From 1936, the members of the society all received a yearbook, *Lychnos*, the ‘scientific journal’ of *idéhistoria*, which thereby was not only one of the first history of ideas journals in the world, but also one of the most widely circulated in terms of subscribers.¹⁶ In *Lychnos*, new research was published; it contained reviews of literature and international periodicals, as well as notices and news from the field around the world. The main language was Swedish, but *Lychnos* also published texts in English, German and French.

While the exact influences of Sartre, Dilthey and their traditions of course may be discussed,¹⁷ they point to the identity of *idéhistoria* at its genesis: it was a relatively broadly conceived discipline, with connections to positivist history of science as well as hermeneutic historiography. The ideal was from the start to study learning, ideas and science in an externalist fashion and make connections between the scientific, intellectual, political and cultural arenas in general. As it was a humanist history of science and learning, it was often critical towards historiography provided by the scientists themselves, and scepticism against internalism and whiggish history has been consistent.¹⁸

There have been further ways of trying to define the Nordström tradition or ‘school,’ which of course was defining for *idéhistoria*, since the discipline for decades was what took place at Nordström’s chair in Uppsala. In the Nordström tradition, as it has been portrayed by later followers, the empirical material was in focus. Thorough discussions of theory and method were rare: neither Nordström nor his immediate successors had any large interest in theory or method. Its practice was **basic source criticism** combined with ‘subconscious positivism mixed with some *Einfühlung*’ – or, as put elsewhere: ‘common sense and historical empathy.’¹⁹ To this was added a consideration of writerly craft. A literary but accessible style was expected by a budding *idéhistoriker*. This rhymed with an ambition to also communicate with the wider public, and many *idéhistoriker* have been public intellectuals and popularizers of humanist knowledge, which can be said to have provided an external legitimacy to the discipline. The Nordström legacy and tradition, however, came to be challenged over time.

3. Establishment and diversification: twentieth-century developments

The very first dissertation in *idéhistoria* – a study of eschatology in Sweden at the time of the Protestant Reformation – was defended in 1942 by Henrik Sandblad. Sandblad would later go on to be the first professor of *idéhistoria* outside of Uppsala, when he was appointed professor at the University of Gothenburg in 1966 (although the teaching was inaugurated already in 1957). Sandblad could thus, together with Nordström and Nordström’s successor in Uppsala Sten Lindroth, count as one of the founding fathers of the discipline. But there is yet another founding figure who was not from Uppsala, and who was never himself formally professor of *idéhistoria*.

Gunnar Aspelin was professor of theoretical philosophy at the University of Lund, but did not do analytic philosophy of the sort which increasingly established itself as dominant in Sweden, but rather historically minded investigations of philosophy, and often used the label *idéhistoria*, history of ideas, for his activity.²⁰ When he retired in 1964 and was succeeded by a less historically minded philosopher, instead *idéhistoria* was established as a

small but independent discipline.²¹ In Lund, then, the history of philosophy came to be an important dimension of the discipline of *idéhistoria*. Teaching here began in 1966 (led by yet another of Nordström's earlier students), but the first professorship was established only in 1989.²²

But impulses from the more philosophically oriented Lund tradition also travelled to Gothenburg. One of Aspelin's philosophy students, Sven-Eric Liedman, got his PhD in *idéhistoria* in Gothenburg in 1966, with a work on organicist thought in Germany in the early nineteenth century. This was an expansion of the limits of *idéhistoria* in that it was the first dissertation which exclusively dealt with a non-Swedish topic. This was met with some scepticism, as Sten Lindroth in Uppsala claimed that it was not 'real' *idéhistoria*.²³

Liedman succeeded Sandblad as professor in Gothenburg, and was to become one of Sweden's most famous public intellectuals. Trained in philosophy, and engaged in (not least Marxist) political theory, he came to colour the practice in Gothenburg, where not only the history of philosophy, but also political thought and contemporary continental philosophy have been important dimensions of the discipline.²⁴ This development, which also spread, was helped by the fact that both the disciplines of political science and philosophy in the post-war era increasingly became oriented toward less historically inclined Anglo-Saxon research practices, leaving the fields open to *idéhistoriker*.²⁵

With a general post-war expansion of higher education in Sweden followed a diffusion also of *idéhistoria*.²⁶ Umeå University in the north of Sweden got its first professor in 1970, and Stockholm University in 1978, which meant that the discipline was established in all major universities.²⁷ It should be emphasized that it was never a sub-discipline to history or literature, but a discipline in its own right, with independent undergraduate teaching on all levels and its own postgraduate programmes, etc.

With establishment followed diversity. To Umeå came the leftist-oriented Ronny Ambjörnsson who obtained his PhD in Gothenburg with a dissertation on the author and public intellectual Ellen Key. He launched a programme of writing the 'history of ideas of the people,' inspired by the history of mentalities approach of Philippe Ariès, which was practically performed by him in a famous study on the culture and ideas of the early twentieth-century workers' movement around Umeå.²⁸ As with the focus on Swedish or foreign topics, the question of whether the discipline should consider ideas outside of the intellectual and scientific arenas had already been a controversial topic for debate during the first decades of the discipline.²⁹ Ambjörnsson's work may be seen as a definite proof of the fact that the ideas studied were not anymore only those of the learned or intellectuals.

So, the establishment of *idéhistoria* throughout Sweden was a dialectic process in which the success of Nordström's tradition also meant a challenge, or at least a broadening of it, reforming the discipline into something new. An externalist or contextualist humanist-historical perspective on ideas was retained. But there had been inroads of new topics outside of the learned and scientific Swedish literature, and of new theoretical and methodological perspectives, when traditional humanist practices had come to be seen as, if not outdated, then at least insufficient. Generic terms for humanist methods and objects such as *Einfühlung*, *Zeitgeist*, tradition, influence, and currents gave way to more technical ones such as paradigm, ideology, discourse, episteme, reception, gender systems, materiality, and boundary work.³⁰ All this meant that at the close of the century, *idéhistoria* looked

different than it had done when inaugurated, and this was a trend which would not be halted.

4. Contemporary position: *idéhistoria* in the twenty-first century

At the turn of the century, the editor of a volume of new essays in *idéhistoria* introduces it by saying that the Nordström tradition no longer defines the practice. Now, 'the perspectives are manifold,' he writes; at the symposium from which the essays originated there was no agreement: 'In what direction research in *idéhistoria* is heading, the participants of the symposium could not agree: the roads are many.'³¹

A glance at the dissertations published in 1999 and 2000 confirms the editor's claim of manifoldness at the time.³² There are some classical themes such as works on the Royal Swedish Academy of Science, and the Swedish Museum of Natural History. There were also works on the history of philosophy, physics, and astronomy in Sweden. A related but broader study was on chemistry and agriculture in the nineteenth century. There were dissertations on more societal issues such as the creation of a public arena in Sweden around 1800, the ideology of Swedish social democracy, a couple of studies of the history of antisemitism in Sweden, as well as post-war nationalism in Tanzania. Themes stemming from outside of the Swedish borders were also common in works on more philosophical issues. There were theses on Freud's psychoanalysis, revolution in the thought of Albert Camus and Frantz Fanon, cosmopolitanism in Immanuel Kant, and Theodor Adorno and modern art.

After the 75th anniversary of the discipline, in 2008, Henrik Björck and Nils Andersson published a historical volume gathering programmatic texts, debates and articles about the identity of the discipline. Apart from texts which depicted the developments sketched above, there were new texts presenting developments since the closing decades of the twentieth century which now were deemed to have a place within the discipline: *Begriffsgeschichte*, new cultural history, mediality and materiality, gender, postcolonialism, and environmental history.³³ *Idéhistoriker* thus seem energetic recipients of international developments and trends within historical and humanist scholarship generally.

An interesting very recent development is the introduction of the budding research field known as history of knowledge or *Wissensgeschichte* into Sweden. This field, which can be conceived of as a broadening of the history of science, has not mainly been imported by *idéhistoriker* though many of them connect to it.³⁴ Instead, the hub for this field, *kunskapshistoria* in Swedish, has come to be located at the history department in Lund (not the department of *idéhistoria*). This is not due to the fact that it would be too dissimilar to the Swedish discipline but rather the other way round; the reaction from *idéhistoriker* seems to be that 'this is what we've always been doing' and that in Sweden this is merely old wine in new bottles and not necessary to import as something new.³⁵

To conclude this historical survey, it may be appropriate to also illustrate the development of *idéhistoria* with a statistical picture, recently compiled by professor Ingemar Nilsson.³⁶ In 2014, he provided a complete survey of doctoral dissertations in the discipline between 1942 and 2013. He also gives some statistics, including a categorization of research area or topic of the dissertations. Though there are unavoidable methodological complexities with such a categorization (why exactly the selected categories, how to sort those who could fall into many, etc.), this gives an interesting quantitative picture

of research interests. The clear winner in Nilsson's categorization is history of science/technology, with 66 dissertations. Second he places general history of ideas with 40, after which comes political thought, and philosophy with 26 each. Pedagogy, society and medicine follow (19, 19, 17) and there are a few categories with fewer numbers (gender, biography, religion, theory of history/science).³⁷

I have illustrated mainly with dissertations, but the tendencies are similar in what senior researchers are doing. A new magisterial work on the history of the Royal Swedish Academy of Science was penned by *idéhistoriker*, and prominent researchers are working on history of medicine, history of technology, environmental history and their intersections.³⁸ But while the history of science, technology and medicine are strong currents, there have also been recent monographs on the legacy of GWF Hegel, an unfinished Benedictine encyclopaedia of eighteenth-century France, and the history of abortion in Sweden.³⁹ The perspectives are manifold, as are the topics.

5. Concluding discussion

Internationally, it may be relevant to discuss intellectual history as a 'field' within the broader and more institutionalized 'discipline' of history.⁴⁰ In Sweden, things are different. Here, *idéhistoria* is a discipline in its own right, and has arguably been so since the 1930s, and never as a sub-discipline to history. However, while being a discipline, it could be questioned whether it is a field.

In one of the more recent assessments of the identity of *idéhistoria*, it is pointed out that *idéhistoriker* orient themselves, especially internationally, toward a lot of different fields: history of science, medicine, technology, gender, knowledge, culture, philosophy, etc.⁴¹ There are institutions holding the field together, such as the journal/yearbook *Lychnos* which is still going strong, a (now triannual) national conference and cooperation between the different universities on undergraduate and postgraduate education. But, while there are some kernels to it, the discipline must be seen as highly pluralist, both in subject and methodology.

In a sense, one may even talk about this pluralism as an inner 'interdisciplinarity,' and *idéhistoria* as a 'busy intersection'⁴² where researchers oriented toward a lot of different fields meet and discuss in the same local and national seminars, workshops and conferences. A non-institutionalized field may need a stronger kernel of its practice and identity, and the establishment of *idéhistoria* as a discipline means that it is held together rather by institutional means, which has allowed for the eclecticism of content and practice.

For those cheering for eclecticism in intellectual history,⁴³ this can be considered as something positive, but this has also been seen as a worrying possible weakness, inhibiting the possibility of developing strong specialized milieus locally, when researchers are differently oriented. Other worries about the discipline are also raised in relation to a perceived crisis of the humanities,⁴⁴ where especially smaller disciplines may face a hard time legitimizing themselves in the future.

Of course, one field toward which *idéhistoriker* orient themselves internationally is intellectual history. However, answering the question posed at the outset in what sense *idéhistoria* is a form of intellectual history is complicated by the fact that also intellectual history internationally is often said to be defined by being eclectic and resistant to any single globalized definition.⁴⁵

If intellectual history is understood as a field where the stress is on the history of political thought and where the influence of the Cambridge School is decisive,⁴⁶ then – even though some *idéhistoriker* would qualify – *idéhistoria* in general is something else.⁴⁷ But if intellectual history is conceived as a broad and eclectic way of studying human thought, knowledge and ideas in their historical contexts,⁴⁸ then *idéhistoria* certainly qualifies as one distinct national form of a larger international tradition or practice. For those lamenting the dominance of political thought or the disentangling of history of science from intellectual history,⁴⁹ *idéhistoria* may even be seen as an example of and role model for a broadly conceived academic study of human thought.

Notes

1. Whatmore, *What Is Intellectual History?* 11.
2. Apart from Whatmore's book referred above, see Moyn and Sartori, *Global Intellectual History*; Haugaard Jeppesen, Stjernfelt, and Thorup, *Intellectual History: Five Questions*; McMahon and Moyn, *Rethinking Modern European Intellectual History*; Whatmore and Young, *A Companion to Intellectual History*; Goering, *Ideengeschichte heute*.
3. Too much 'happy eclecticism' may inhibit 'serious debate': McMahon and Moyn, "Introduction," 11.
4. Goering, "Ideen- und Geistesgeschichte," 25.
5. Whatmore, *What Is Intellectual History?* 27; Goering, "Ideen- und Geistesgeschichte," 25–7.
6. One notable exception is Liedman, "A Success Story." This article however did not connect thoroughly to the international field and has lost its topicality somewhat. Another presentation of the Swedish discipline for an international audience is Frängsmyr, *History of Science*. This small volume however, apart from being dated, was aimed towards the audience of historians of science (versions of the texts were published in *Isis*), and not intellectual historians.
7. Skinner, *Liberty before Liberalism*, 117.
8. Jalava, Nygård, and Strang, *Decentering European Intellectual Space*.
9. Frängsmyr, "The Establishment"; Whatmore, *What Is Intellectual History?* 27. Goering translates it into German as 'Ideen- und Gelehrten-geschichte.' Goering, "Ideen- und Geistesgeschichte," 26. A more precise German translation would be *Lehr-tumsgeschichte*, with the obvious disadvantage that *Lehr-tum* is not really a German word.
10. Details about the establishment of the chair can be found in Lindroth, "Johan Nordström 1891–1967"; Frängsmyr, "Johan Nordström"; Frängsmyr, "Johan Nordströms professor."
11. The nationalist dimension was however somewhat of a nuisance for Nordström. Some national socialists, including the donor Carlberg's own son, wanted to invoke the works of Nordström in their patriotism, something which Nordström however strongly opposed. Frängsmyr, "Johan Nordström," 131–2.
12. Nordström, "Om idé- och lärdomshistoria."
13. Frängsmyr, "The Establishment," 33–9.
14. Nordström, "Om idé- och lärdomshistoria," 28–9; Frängsmyr, "Johan Nordström," 134–5.
15. Frängsmyr, "Johan Nordström," 139.
16. *Ibid.*, 138–9.
17. Possibly the references to international traditions were more legitimizations of an already existing indigenous way of working, than actual influence. This argument is held forward in Björck, "Till frågorna."
18. Nordström, "Om idé- och lärdomshistoria," 28; Lindberg and Nilsson, "Sunt förnuft."
19. Gunnar Eriksson, "After 1932," 54. See also Lindberg and Nilsson, "Sunt förnuft," 79. That there were some explications about 'the Nordström school' around 1980 is probably due to the fact that by this time, the discipline was diversified, and new theoretical and methodological perspectives, as well as subject matters had started to make inroads into the discipline,

which challenged the established tradition and created the demand to actually formulate positively what has hitherto been more tacit knowledge. See more below.

20. Aspelin, *Vägarnas möte*.
21. Nordin, "Hur det började."
22. For more about the local history in Lund, see Broberg, Hanson, and Mansén, *Idé- och lärdomshistoria i Lund*; Norris, Broberg, and Nordin, *Idé- och lärdomshistoria i Lund*.
23. At least according to Liedman himself: Liedman, *Blickar tillbaka*, 126.
24. A history of the discipline in Gothenburg was published in 1997: Björck, *Idé- och lärdomshistoria i Göteborg*.
25. Liedman, "A Success Story," 49.
26. Social science, science, technology and medicine were more prioritised by the modernist social democratic government of Sweden in the post-war era, and while the humanities could even be construed as a problem, the humanistic faculties also grew, and continued to attract students. See Östh Gustafsson, "The Discursive Marginalization."
27. Today *idéhistoria* is also represented in one form or another at other institutions, such as Södertörn University, Karlstad University, and the Royal Institute of Technology in Stockholm.
28. Ambjörnsson, "Om möjligheten"; Ambjörnsson, *Den skötsamme arbetaren*.
29. Andersson and Björck, *Idéhistoria i tiden*, 113–28.
30. These examples are taken from an unpublished manuscript of a lecture held by Professor Bo Lindberg in 2014. Lindberg, "History of Ideas."
31. Nilsson, "Förord," 5.
32. Information about all the dissertations is gathered in the article Nilsson, "Idé- och lärdomshistoria i Sverige."
33. Andersson and Björck, *Idéhistoria i tiden*, 238–44; 279–334.
34. A couple of introductions to the field: Daston, "The History of Science"; Östling et al., "The History of Knowledge."
35. Östh Gustafsson, "Kunskapshistoriens samtidsrelevans."
36. Nilsson, "Idé- och lärdomshistoria i Sverige."
37. *Ibid.*, 129.
38. Kärnfelt, Grandin, and Jülich, *Kunskap i rörelse*; Sörlin and Wormbs, "Environing Technologies."
39. Burman, *Flykten från Hegel*; Lennerhed, *Kvinnotrubbel: abort i Sverige*; Holmberg, *The Maurists' Unfinished Encyclopedia*.
40. Breckman, "Intellectual History," 275; Baring, "Intellectual History and Poststructuralism," 59.
41. Kaiserfeld, "Samarbete på vinst och förlust."
42. Breckman, "Intellectual History," 286.
43. *Ibid.*, 287.
44. Östh Gustafsson, "The Discursive Marginalization," 353ff.
45. Gordon, "What Is Intellectual History"; McMahon and Moyn, "Introduction"; Young, "Introduction."
46. It is rarely programmatically stated that this is what intellectual history should be, but in practice, this is relatively often how it appears. See for instance Whatmore, *What Is Intellectual History?* where he in the preface offers an inclusive definition of intellectual history (and claims that the label 'Cambridge School' could be abandoned), but in the book explicitly focuses on Skinner and Pocock, and mainly gives example from political thought. For a critique of the dominance of political thought, see Catana, "Intellectual History."
47. The works of Skinner – and to some but a lesser degree, Pocock – are known and taught, and some *idéhistoriker* work closely to the traditions of the Cambridge School. But it has never dominated. Whatmore's experience that Foucault was a more natural reference point than Skinner seems to be reasonable. It could also be mentioned that the Cambridge School has been received and practiced in Sweden by scholars from other disciplines, such as political

science and human rights studies: Edling and Mörkenstam, “Quentin Skinner”; Halldenius, *Mary Wollstonecraft*.

48. This is for instance close to how the editors of *Intellectual History: Five Questions* define it: Haugaard Jeppesen, Stjernfelt, and Thorup, “Preface,” iv.
49. Collini, “The Identity of Intellectual History,” 17; Tresch, “Cosmologies Materialized.”

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author.

ORCID

Anton Jansson  <http://orcid.org/0000-0003-2477-7482>

Bibliography

- Ambjörnsson, Ronny. “Om möjligheten av en folkets idéhistoria.” *Lychnos* (1983): 158–165.
- Ambjörnsson, Ronny. *Den skötsamme arbetaren: idéer och ideal i ett norrländskt sågverkssamhälle 1880–1930*. Stockholm: Carlsson, 1988.
- Andersson, Nils, and Henrik Björck, eds. *Idéhistoria i tiden: perspektiv på ämnets identitet under sjuttiofem år*. Stockholm: Brutus Östlings bokförlag Symposion, 2008.
- Aspelin, Gunnar. *Vägarnas möte: idéhistoriska essäer 1927–1972*. Lund: Doxa, 1974.
- Baring, Edward. “Intellectual History and Poststructuralism.” In *A Companion to Intellectual History*, edited by Richard Whatmore and Brian Young, 48–60. Chichester: Wiley, 2016.
- Björck, Henrik. “Till frågorna om idéhistoriens egenart och rötter.” *Lychnos* (1996): 25–57.
- Björck, Henrik, ed. *Idé- och lärdomshistoria i Göteborg 1997: ställningar och förhållanden efter fyrtio år*. Göteborg: Institutionen för idé- och lärdomshistoria, 1997.
- Breckman, Warren. “Intellectual History and the Interdisciplinary Ideal.” In *Rethinking Modern European Intellectual History*, edited by Darrin M. McMahon and Samuel Moyn, 275–293. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.
- Broberg, Gunnar, Hertha Hanson, and Elisabeth Mansén, eds. *Idé- och lärdomshistoria i Lund: 25 år*. Edited by Gunnar Broberg. Lund: Avdelningen för idé- och lärdomshistoria, 1991.
- Burman, Anders. *Flykten från Hegel: den postmoderna vänsterns genealogi*. Hågersten: TankeKraft, 2016.
- Catana, Leo. “Intellectual History and the History of Philosophy: Their Genesis and Current Relationship.” In *A Companion to Intellectual History*, edited by Richard Whatmore and Brian Young, 129–140. Chichester: Wiley, 2016.
- Collini, Stefan. “The Identity of Intellectual History.” In *A Companion to Intellectual History*, edited by Richard Whatmore and Brian Young, 7–18. Chichester: Wiley, 2016.
- Daston, Lorraine. “The History of Science and the History of Knowledge.” *KNOW: A Journal on the Formation of Knowledge* 1, no. 1 (2017): 131–154.
- Edling, Max, and Ulf Mörkenstam. “Quentin Skinner: From Historian of Ideas to Political Scientist.” *Scandinavian Political Studies* 18, no. 2 (1995): 119–132.
- Eriksson, Gunnar. “After 1932: The Nordström Tradition.” In *History of Science in Sweden: The Growth of a Discipline, 1932–1982*, edited by Tore Frängsmyr, 48–60. Uppsala: Avdelningen för vetenskapshistoria, 1984.
- Frängsmyr, Tore. “Johan Nordström och lärdomshistoriens etablering i Sverige.” *Lychnos* (1983): 131–149.
- Frängsmyr, Tore. “The Establishment of History of Science in Sweden.” In *History of Science in Sweden: The Growth of a Discipline, 1932–1982*, edited by Tore Frängsmyr, 25–47. Uppsala: Avdelningen för vetenskapshistoria, 1984.

- Frängsmyr, Tore, ed. *History of Science in Sweden: The Growth of a Discipline, 1932–1982*. Uppsala: Avdelningen för vetenskapshistoria, 1984.
- Frängsmyr, Tore. "Johan Nordströms professur." *Lychnos* (2006): 318–323.
- Goering, D. Timothy. "Ideen- und Geistesgeschichte in Deutschland – eine Standortbestimmung." In *Ideengeschichte heute: Traditionen und Perspektiven*, edited by D. Timothy Goering, 7–53. Bielefeld: Transcript, 2017.
- Goering, D. Timothy, ed. *Ideengeschichte heute: Traditionen und Perspektiven*. Bielefeld: Transcript, 2017.
- Gordon, Peter E. "What Is Intellectual History? A Frankly Partisan Introduction to a Frequently Misunderstood Field." Unpublished article, 2013. Accessed January 10, 2019. https://scholar.harvard.edu/files/pgordon/files/what_is_intell_history_pgordon_mar2012.pdf.
- Halldenius, Lena. *Mary Wollstonecraft and Feminist Republicanism: Independence, Rights and the Experience of Unfreedom*. London: Pickering & Chatto, 2015.
- Haugaard Jeppesen, Morten, Frederik Stjernfelt, and Mikkel Thorup, eds. *Intellectual History: Five Questions*. Copenhagen: Automatic Press/VIP, 2013.
- Haugaard Jeppesen, Morten, Frederik Stjernfelt, and Mikkel Thorup. "Preface." In *Intellectual History: Five Questions*, iii–v. Copenhagen: Automatic Press/VIP, 2013.
- Holmberg, Linn. *The Maurists' Unfinished Encyclopedia*. Oxford: Voltaire Foundation, 2017.
- Jalava, Marja, Stefan Nygård, and Johan Strang, eds. *Decentering European Intellectual Space*. Leiden: Brill, 2018.
- Kaiserfeld, Thomas. "Samarbete på vinst och förlust. Trender inom idéhistorisk forskning." *Lychnos* (2014): 173–181.
- Kärnfelt, Johan, Karl Grandin, and Solveig Jülich, eds. *Kunskap i rörelse: Kungl. Vetenskapsakademien och skapandet av det moderna samhället*. Göteborg: Makadam, 2018.
- Lennerhed, Lena. *Kvinnotrubbelt: abort i Sverige 1938–1974*. Hedemora: Gidlund, 2017.
- Liedman, Sven-Eric. "A Success Story: History of Ideas and Science in Sweden." *Intellectual News* 2, no. 1 (1997): 44–55.
- Liedman, Sven-Eric. *Blickar tillbaka*. Stockholm: Bonnier, 2008.
- Lindberg, Bo. "History of Ideas – The Swedish Tradition." Unpublished manuscript.
- Lindberg, Bo, and Ingemar Nilsson. "Sunt förnuft och historisk inlevelse. Den nordströmska traditionen." In *Humaniora på undantag? Humanistiska forskningstraditioner i Sverige: en antologi*, edited by Tomas Forser, 79–107. Stockholm: PAN/Norstedt, 1978.
- Lindroth, Sten. "Johan Nordström 1891–1967." *Lychnos* (1967–68): 3–20.
- McMahon, Darrin M., and Samuel Moyn. "Introduction: Interim Intellectual History." In *Rethinking Modern European Intellectual History*, edited by Darrin M. McMahon and Samuel Moyn, 3–12. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.
- McMahon, Darrin M., and Samuel Moyn, eds. *Rethinking Modern European Intellectual History*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.
- Moyn, Samuel, and Andrew Sartori, eds. *Global Intellectual History*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2013.
- Nilsson, Ingemar. "Förord." In *Idéhistoriska perspektiv: symposium i Göteborg, mars 2000*, edited by Ingemar Nilsson. Göteborg: Institutionen för idé- och lärdomshistoria, Göteborgs universitet, 2000.
- Nilsson, Ingemar. "Idé- och lärdomshistoria i Sverige och dess doktorsavhandlingar (med en bibliografi över avhandlingar i idé- och lärdomshistoria)." *Lychnos* (2014): 127–158.
- Nordin, Svante. "Hur det började." In *Idé- och lärdomshistoria i Lund 50 år*, edited by Matthew Norris, Gunnar Broberg, and Svante Nordin, 25–40. Lund: Avdelningen för idé- och lärdomshistoria, 2016.
- Nordström, Johan. "Om idé- och lärdomshistoria: installationsföreläsning den 4 mars 1933." *Lychnos* (1967–68): 21–29.
- Norris, Matthew, Gunnar Broberg, and Svante Nordin, eds. *Idé- och lärdomshistoria i Lund 50 år*. Lund: Avdelningen för idé och lärdomshistoria, 2016.

- Östh Gustafsson, Hampus. "The Discursive Marginalization of the Humanities: Debates on the 'Humanist Problem' in the Early 1960s Swedish Welfare State." *History of Humanities* 3, no. 2 (2018): 351–376.
- Östh Gustafsson, Hampus. "Kunskapshistoriens samtidsrelevans." *Historisk tidskrift* 138, no. 4 (2018): 678–687.
- Östling, Johan, David Larsson Heidenblad, Erling Sandmo, Anna Nilsson Hammar, and Kari H. Nordberg. "The History of Knowledge and the Circulation of Knowledge." In *Circulation of Knowledge: Explorations in the History of Knowledge*, edited by Johan Östling, Erling Sandmo, David Larsson Heidenblad, Anna Nilsson Hammar, and Kari H. Nordberg, 9–33. Lund: Nordic Academic Press, 2018.
- Skinner, Quentin. *Liberty Before Liberalism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- Sörlin, Sverker, and Nina Wormbs. "Environing Technologies: A Theory of Making Environment." *History and Technology* 34 (2018): 101–125.
- Tresch, John. "Cosmologies Materialized: History of Science and History of Ideas." In *Rethinking Modern European Intellectual History*, edited by Darrin M. McMahon and Samuel Moyn, 153–172. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.
- Whatmore, Richard. *What is Intellectual History?* Cambridge: Polity, 2016.
- Whatmore, Richard, and Brian Young, eds. *A Companion to Intellectual History*. Chichester: Wiley, 2016.
- Young, Brian. "Introduction." In *A Companion to Intellectual History*, edited by Richard Whatmore and Brian Young, 1–4. Chichester: Wiley, 2016.