

FRANS PLANK (Konstanz)

The Smith-Schlegel Connection in Linguistic Typology: Forgotten Fact or Fiction?

Summary

It has recently become customary to assert, following COSERIU (1968), that ADAM SMITH's *Dissertation on the origin of languages* (1761) has directly influenced the typological scheme(s) of AUGUST WILHELM SCHLEGEL (1818) and probably also of FRIEDRICH SCHLEGEL (1808), and that the SMITH-SCHLEGEL connection has gone unnoticed in the historiography of typology and linguistics in general. The present paper refutes the second assertion by drawing attention to AUGUST FRIEDRICH POTT, who had pointed out the SMITH-SCHLEGEL connection in an important contribution to the 19th century typology debate (in his *Wilhelm von Humboldt und die Sprachwissenschaft* of 1876). The first assertion is then argued to be untenable in its present form, on the grounds that, regardless of the circumstantial evidence, the actual similarities between the language classifications of ADAM SMITH and the SCHLEGELS are not such as to warrant the assumption of anything like direct influence.

“... eine Erzgroteske ...”
Friedrich Schlegel, *Philosophische Lehrjahre*
(*Philosophische Fragmente, Erste Epoche, II*,
Zur Philosophie, No. 1045, 1797)

1 The accredited history of linguistic typology used to begin with FRIEDRICH SCHLEGEL's *Ueber die Sprache und Weisheit der Indier* (1808) and AUGUST WILHELM SCHLEGEL's *Observations sur la langue et la littérature provençales* (1818). Recently, however, this time-honoured belief has been challenged, and the new versions of the history of typology, which are swiftly superseding the old, now tend to begin with ADAM SMITH's *Considerations concerning the first formation of languages, and the different genius of original and compounded languages* (1761) or, a little earlier, with the Abbé GABRIEL GIRARD's *Les vrais principes de la langue françoise* (1747), or earlier still. Now, at least as far as the SMITH-SCHLEGEL connection is concerned, it seems to me appropriate to urge more caution and care on those eager to write and rewrite the history of typology. While not intending primarily to evaluate and to shed new light on the typological contributions of ADAM SMITH and the brothers SCHLEGEL as such, I would like to suggest that some recent claims about the relationship between them are questionable, firstly, in so far as they exaggerate the extent to which the SMITH-SCHLEGEL connection has previously been ignored, and, secondly, in so far as they tend to misrepresent the nature of the alleged relationship.

2 It is above all EUGENIO COSERIU who must be (and usually is) credited with directing the attention of linguistic historiographers to ADAM SMITH the typologist, in a

the first, after AUGUST WILHELM SCHLEGEL, to notice the typological significance of SMITH's *Dissertation on the origin of languages* (the full title of which essay was given in § 1 above); at least he asserts that, as far as he knows, ADAM SMITH the typologist is missing from all “Darstellungen und Bibliographien der Sprachtypologie” and “Geschichten der Sprachwissenschaft” (1968: 46). COSERIU's opinion seems to have been endorsed by all subsequent commentators. Thus, NARR (1970: 14), WINDROSS (1980: 286), and AARSLEFF (1982: 349) all basically echo COSERIU in asserting that in COSERIU's paper “zum ersten Mal auf die Bedeutung von Smith für die Entwicklung der Sprachtypologie hingewiesen wird” (NARR), in noting “the striking absence of ADAM SMITH in any discussion or bibliography of language typology” (WINDROSS), or in complaining that “the historiography of the subject has never taken note of this fact” (AARSLEFF). Even allowing for some variation in precisely what extent of ignorance is being claimed by these authors, I submit that it was not as complete as even the weakest of these claims (probably COSERIU's own) would seem to suggest.

Taking into account a piece of information that was available to NARR (1970) and others (presumably including COSERIU 1968), it would actually strike me as almost unbelievable that ADAM SMITH's work should have been ignored by, or remained unknown to, all those concerned with the development of linguistic typology in the wake of FRIEDRICH SCHLEGEL and his brother AUGUST WILHELM. This key piece of information is that an extract of FRIEDRICH SCHLEGEL's *Ueber die Sprache und Weisheit der Indier*, viz. the part dealing with language, was, in French translation, printed alongside ADAM SMITH's *Dissertation*, also in French, in a single volume, translated, annotated, and edited by J. MANGET, as early as 1809. As already noted by COSERIU, AUGUST WILHELM SCHLEGEL himself had drawn attention to this collective volume, though without providing bibliographic detail, in note 6 of his *Observations*: “Cette classification fondamentale des langues a été développée par mon frère Frédéric de Schlegel, dans son ouvrage sur la langue et l'antique philosophie des Indiens, dont la première partie a été traduite en français à la suite du traité d'Adam Smith sur l'origine des langues.” It is true, commentators have occasionally omitted the reference to the collective SMITH-SCHLEGEL publication when quoting this note of AUGUST WILHELM's (e.g. NÜSSE 1962: 47). Nevertheless, the fact that someone, J. MANGET, had been aware of a certain mutual interest of ADAM SMITH's and FRIEDRICH SCHLEGEL's views on language, and had therefore taken upon himself the task of publishing the relevant works of both authors in one volume, and the fact that this volume was mentioned (if not precisely identified) in AUGUST WILHELM SCHLEGEL's work that has been universally recognized as at least terminologically elaborating on FRIEDRICH's typological views, should easily have sufficed to ring a bell right at the beginning of the ensuing typology debate, at least with the more conscientious participants in, and historiographers of, this debate. However, these two facts do not seem to have roused many of those concerned: apparently, AUGUST WILHELM SCHLEGEL's reference to a joint SMITH-SCHLEGEL publication was not followed up (in print) until 1968, and MANGET's volume must likewise have failed to reach a wide audience, partly no doubt owing to the availability of more accessible rival publications of its contents in the original languages as well as in French translations.

At least one distinguished linguist, however, is known to have owned and read MANGET's joint SMITH-SCHLEGEL volume: AUGUST FRIEDRICH POTT. The recently

volume. Clear proof that POTT had also read it, or at least been aware of the possible significance of its contents, is given by an important work of this vigorous participant in the 19th century typology debate. In no less conspicuous a publication than his introduction to his edition of WILHELM VON HUMBOLDT'S introduction to his *Kawi* work, *Wilhelm von Humboldt und die Sprachwissenschaft* (1876, 21880), does POTT refer to MANGET'S SMITH-SCHLEGEL volume of 1809. In the context of a partly polemical discussion of STEINTHAL'S successive evaluations of HUMBOLDT'S significance, inspiration, and influence, POTT calls to mind a truism:

"Oft genug begegnet man in der Geschichte der Wissenschaften einem Gedanken, der schon einmal gedacht, allein, weil nicht in der rechten Weise gedacht, oder zu früh gekommen, erst durch spätere Wiederaufnahme zu seinem Rechte und fruchtbringendem Gedeihen gelangte." (1880: XLI)

The last example he chooses to illustrate this point is this:

"Auch schiene es nicht so ganz unrecht, wenn man Friedr. Schlegel's berühmte Unterscheidung von synthetischen (oder Flexions-) und analytischen Sprachen, welche er in seinem Buche über Sprache und Weisheit der Inder (1808) aufstellte, schon durch Adam Smith gleichsam vorbereitet ansähe. Vgl. Essai sur la première formation des langues. Trad. de l'anglais d'Adam Smith, à Genève 1809, worin bei Entgegensetzung von den neueren Sprachen mit Griechisch und Latein die häufige Ersetzung von Declination und Conjugation durch Präpositionen, Pronomina und sonstige Hülfsörter richtig als wichtigstes Unterscheidungszeichen erkannt worden. Deshalb hat denn auch der Französische Uebersetzer J. Manget zugleich eine Uebersetzung des ersten Buches von dem Schlegel'schen Werke angefügt." (1880: XLIII)¹

Admittedly, the distinction between synthetic and analytic languages which POTT here attributes to FRIEDRICH SCHLEGEL is, at least terminologically, due to AUGUST WILHELM SCHLEGEL. Notwithstanding this seeming inaccuracy, we thus find an early recognition of the SMITH-SCHLEGEL connection in a rather crucial contribution to the great 19th century typology debate.²

One might quibble over the proper categorization of POTT'S *Wilhelm von Humboldt und die Sprachwissenschaft* in order possibly to evade the conclusion that ADAM SMITH'S name has not always been missing from all "Darstellungen und Bibliographien der Sprachtypologie" and "Geschichten der Sprachwissenschaft", as claimed by COSERIU and others. Most inappropriate is perhaps POTT'S self-categorization: this book hardly qualifies as a straightforward introduction to HUMBOLDT'S *Ueber die Verschiedenheit des menschlichen Sprachbaues und ihren Einfluss auf die geistige Entwicklung des Menschengeschlechts*. It does not seem so inappropriate to me to categorize at least parts of this book as a "Darstellung der Sprachtypologie", if from the point of view of one deeply involved in the development of this discipline. In his *Offenes Sendschreiben* which HEYMAN STEINTHAL wrote in reply to POTT'S attacks, he also perceives historiographic qualities of this HUMBOLDT introduction of sorts ("... ein Stück Ge-

schichte der neuern Sprachwissenschaft . . ., das sich auch neben Benfey's 'Geschichte' noch recht wohl sehen lassen kann" (1877: 320)). Thus, it would seem that the recent rediscovery of the SMITH-SCHLEGEL connection indeed must be regarded as further confirmation of POTT'S Law, quoted above, concerning the apparent novelty of scientific (in the case at hand: historiographic) ideas.

To some extent, the latter-day neglect of A. F. POTT'S works may excuse the apparent unawareness of their predecessor on the part of the modern rediscoverers of the typological SMITH-SCHLEGEL connection. If these modern rediscoverers turn out to be experts on HUMBOLDT or, ironically, to have actually included POTT'S *Wilhelm von Humboldt und die Sprachwissenschaft* in the Bibliography of an article deploring the universal ignorance of this connection and chiding others for having paid no attention to POTT'S *Humboldt* (as did AARSLEFF 1982), one is nevertheless tempted not to exonerate them completely. What is ultimately of much greater historiographic interest, however, is the question of the contemporary or subsequent impact of this further suggestion of a SMITH-SCHLEGEL connection, which this time was considerably less oblique than AUGUST WILHELM SCHLEGEL'S own previous allusion and in addition supplied the bibliographic details that should have enabled anybody to get hold of the book documenting the connection, which might otherwise have remained relatively unknown.

So far as I can determine, the immediate and future impact of POTT'S awarding priority to ADAM SMITH rather than the SCHLEGELS was nil: for almost a century, the SCHLEGELS indeed continued to be celebrated as the originators of morphological typology, while ADAM SMITH did not owe a bit of his continuing reputation to his alleged achievements as a linguistic typologist. Certainly there were later writers on whom POTT'S reference to the SMITH-SCHLEGEL connection could have had an impact. Although the early phase of the typology debate was almost over at the time POTT'S HUMBOLDT introduction was first published, a number of further efforts were made to elaborate morphological typology as inherited from the founding fathers, by authors such as M. MÜLLER, F. MISTEL, F. F. FORTUNATOV, F. N. FINCK, N. J. MARR, E. SAPIR and others. Taking into account the impenetrability of many of POTT'S writings, there is of course the possibility that they simply remained unread. Judging from other authors' references, however, this seems on the whole not to have been the fate of his *Wilhelm von Humboldt und die Sprachwissenschaft*, which as usual lacked a table of contents but, since its second edition, was provided with person, subject, and word indexes (compiled by ALOIS VANÍČEK, not POTT himself) including a reference to SMITH. Granting that *Wilhelm von Humboldt und die Sprachwissenschaft* was read by at least some of those concerned with typology, there is still the possibility that they inadvertently overlooked the SMITH reference, because in the later passages where POTT enters into details of the current typology controversy, he himself also omits SMITH and takes his departure essentially from the SCHLEGELS. Interestingly, when dealing again with language classification "nach physiologischen Unterschieden in dem Sprachbaue" only a few years later, in the first instalment of his *Einleitung in die allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft*, POTT once more pays homage to the originality of the SCHLEGELS while again omitting ADAM SMITH:

"Die älteren Formationen, namentlich Sanskrit und die beiden klassischen Sprachen, gelten den Gebrüdern SCHLEGEL (Erfinder dieser Unterscheidung war FRIED-

¹ POTT adds a note referring to BRIAN HOUGHTON HODGSON'S *On the aborigines of India. Essay the first: Kócc, Bódo and Dhundil tribes* (Calcutta 1847, p. 140), where SMITH'S distinction of "Ur- und abgeleiteten Sprachen" has apparently been considered inapplicable to these Himalaya languages.

² After this paper had been submitted for publication, ROUSSEAU (1984: 405) has come to my attention (by courtesy of the author), where POTT'S recognition of the SMITH-

dem auf Indiens geistige Schätze zuerst in Deutschland ernstere Aufmerksamkeit hingelenkt wurde) als synthetisch; deren jüngere Sprößlinge (die romanischen oder neulateinischen Sprachen, Neugriechisch, Prakrit-Idiome) als analytisch, weil sie sich in rückläufiger Bewegung wieder der Auflösung zuneigen und oft die grammatischen Funktionen durch Umschreibung ausdrücken." (1884: 55)

Note that, as if to emphasize his previous attribution of priority on the occasion of his revelation of the SMITH-SCHLEGEL connection (quoted above), POTT insists on crediting FRIEDRICH with the discovery of the synthetic-analytic distinction, although he must have been aware that it was only AUGUST WILHELM who introduced these terms. At any rate, ADAM SMITH here is passed over in silence, as apparently was to be his destiny in typological circles for a long time. Had he simply been forgotten even by so conscientious (if not always very well organized) a reader and chronicler as AUGUST FRIEDRICH POTT? Or did POTT, and others after and maybe before him, intentionally keep silent about the SMITH-SCHLEGEL connection, for one reason or another?

Indeed various, more or less honourable reasons suggest themselves for not highlighting the SMITH-SCHLEGEL connection in typology (cf. § 3); but to conclude this section it is appropriate also to record the recent discovery of another typological connection which AUGUST FRIEDRICH POTT would have had the potential to anticipate.

As ADAM SMITH acknowledged in a letter to GEORGE BAIRD (cf. RAE 1895: 160), it was GABRIEL GIRARD's *Les vrais principes de la langue française* (1747) "which first set me thinking upon these subjects", and the grammatical articles in the *Encyclopédie* (1751 ff.), where GIRARD is often referred to, provided him with "a good deal of entertainment". And in fact there is also sufficient textual evidence to suggest that SMITH's language classification certainly owes a great deal to GIRARD's distinction between "langues analogues", "langues transpositives" and "langues mixtes ou amphilo-giques", which also influenced *Encyclopédie* authors such as NICOLAS BEAUZÉE, who took over GIRARD's scheme with slight modifications (and proper acknowledgements) also in his *Grammaire générale ou exposition raisonnée des éléments nécessaires du langage* (1767).³

POTT, this section's hero, owned BEAUZÉE's *Grammaire générale* of 1767, as is shown by the catalogue of his library (LEOPOLD 1983: 93), and was familiar enough with its contents to summarize it in the first instalment of his *Einleitung in die allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft*, and to praise it as "Selten geworden, aber auch gediegen und noch heute lesenswert" (1884: 10). Although POTT's summary of BEAUZÉE is part of the chapter "Philosophie der Sprache und sog. Allgemeine Grammatik" (whereas the analytic-synthetic distinction is discussed in the section "Einleitung und Gruppierung der Sprachen" of the later chapter "Naturwissenschaftlich-geschichtliche Seite [der Sprache]"), he pays most attention to BEAUZÉE's views on the limits of cross-linguistic variation and to what kinds of variation BEAUZÉE is aware of despite his emphasis on invariants:

"Ihm ist auch nicht unbekannt p. XVIII, daß die Laute nicht in allen Sprachen die nämlichen sind; einige den Dienst der Präpositionen durch ebensoviele Kasus [richtiger Postpositionen, wie in Sprachen finnischen Stammes, so Baskisch und Peruanisch [POTT's comment, not mine—FP]] ersetzt hätten; andere den der Kasus umgekehrt durch Präpositionen, wie die romanischen. Es gibt, schließt er, plusieurs

moyens [freilich, freilich!] de marquer les mêmes points de vue, er sucht aber die Wahl jener in mehr zufälligen Ursachen, während dieselbe [the choice of 'les points de vue'?? — FP] doch meist tiefer in dem Grundtypus gewisser Sprachklassen begründet ist." (1884: 11)

POTT goes on to quote BEAUZÉE on how the observable differences between languages are supposed to reduce to "des points fixes", to a limited number of "principes généraux", to "un assez petit nombre des éléments nécessaires du langage", and concludes with quoting a list of BEAUZÉE's acknowledged predecessors, which includes GIRARD.⁴

Apparently BEAUZÉE's slightly modified GIRARDIAN language classification did not remind POTT of ADAM SMITH's; nor did POTT care to comment on the obvious parallel at least between certain formal parameters of the classificatory schemes of BEAUZÉE/GIRARD and the SCHLEGELS. One again wonders how the GIRARD/BEAUZÉE-SCHLEGEL connection, as well as the SMITH-SCHLEGEL connection, could come to be so thoroughly ignored, even though the basic information which has caused present-day historiographers to date the beginning of linguistic typology from ADAM SMITH or GABRIEL GIRARD rather than FRIEDRICH and AUGUST WILHELM SCHLEGEL had always been available to those familiar with standard works of mainstream late 19th century typology. But maybe there is no need to be surprised about this ignorance or continual non-acknowledgement of individual predecessors: If the similarities between the typological conceptions of individual authors had been perceived, by the respective authors themselves, as the common core of basic knowledge about the patterning of language variation, this would to some extent account for their reluctance to attribute this elementary collective knowledge to one or another author who had happened to enunciate it in print, perhaps in a partly new formulation of his own making. The following section suggests that the similarities seized upon by modern historiographers in their attempts to trace the development of linguistic typology by revealing influences among individual authors indeed are of this kind.

3 If the SMITH-SCHLEGEL connection is a fact, it was not always as forgotten as modern historiographers would have it. But is it a fact? Or rather, what kind of fact has it recently been claimed to be, and on what evidence?

COSERIU, the originator of the new view, calls ADAM SMITH "ein[en] bemerkenswerte[n] Wegbereiter der Sprachtypologie" and, more specifically, asserts that "gerade die Theorie August Wilhelm Schlegels zum grossen Teil von ihm abhängt" (1968: 46), that "Smith, zumindest was die Sprachtypologie betrifft, sogar einen sehr wichtigen Einfluss ausgeübt hat, da die seit August Wilhelm Schlegel traditionelle Unterscheidung zwischen synthetischen und analytischen Sprachen von ihm stammt" (1968: 47), that in fact "Alle sprachtypologischen Ideen von Smith kehren bei August Wilhelm Schlegel in dessen *Observations* wieder" (1968: 50), and that one is entitled to assume "dass sich Schlegel in seinem Werk . . . vorgenommen hatte, eine Synthese zu schaffen, eben der Sprachtypologie Friedrich Schlegels und der Ideen von Adam Smith" (1968: 53). COSERIU finally concludes that AUGUST WILHELM SCHLEGEL knew ADAM SMITH's *Dissertation* but failed to acknowledge its tremendous influence on his own typological thinking, except very obliquely in two references to the French translation of SMITH's *Dissertation* in the (not properly identified) MANGET volume

⁴ GIRARD's name, incidentally, is missing from the Index of Names compiled by the editor

(see above § 2) and to SMITH's evaluation of ancient and modern languages, wrongly attributing to SMITH a preference of modern languages (1968: 53f.). Elsewhere COSERIU states, perhaps even more strongly, that "Die Theorie von Smith wird sowohl was die rein typologische Einteilung betrifft, als auch die strukturelle Seite, als auch die Abstraktion und den ästhetischen Verfall später von August Wilhelm Schlegel übernommen werden" (1972a: 188). Most other writers on this subject (including NARR 1970, LAND 1977, AARSLEFF 1982, and presumably HAGGBLADE 1983) have not hesitated to endorse COSERIU's pronouncements. MONREAL-WICKERT (1977: 69f.), on the other hand, while not categorically excluding an influence of SMITH on AUGUST WILHELM SCHLEGEL,⁵ finds it improbable that SCHLEGEL actually owed his typology to SMITH, and instead opts for positing a direct influence of BEAUZÉE's *Langue* article in the *Encyclopédie* on AUGUST WILHELM SCHLEGEL.

Other writers again have gone a step further than COSERIU and have claimed an influence of ADAM SMITH also on FRIEDRICH SCHLEGEL's typological scheme, notably NARR (1970: 14) and DRESSLER (1973: 470), who summarily sees both SCHLEGELS as 'dependent' on SMITH. Indeed COSERIU himself elsewhere speculates that FRIEDRICH SCHLEGEL's relevant passages can be read as repeatedly alluding to ADAM SMITH: "In diesem ganzen Kapitel [III] scheint übrigens F. Schlegel mehrmals auf Adam Smith anzudeuten, obwohl er ihn nicht ausdrücklich nennt." (1972b: 116)—which I suppose can be read as an assertion, or at least a suspicion, that FRIEDRICH SCHLEGEL's typological ideas were not developed entirely independently of those of ADAM SMITH. HAGGBLADE (1983: 18) prefers to reserve her judgement on the ADAM SMITH-FRIEDRICH SCHLEGEL connection, but alleges that "Land saw similarities between FRIEDRICH SCHLEGEL's and SMITH's system" (1983: 13); however, I can find no mention of FRIEDRICH SCHLEGEL whatsoever in LAND's article which HAGGBLADE includes in her references, albeit with the wrong year of publication (1974 rather than 1977) and the wrong volume number (*Journal of the History of Ideas* 35 rather than 38). Perhaps HAGGBLADE meant to refer to BERRY (1974), listed among her references with LAND's year of publication and volume number, since in BERRY's article the brothers SCHLEGEL are indeed mentioned collectively, though only in passing and without any indication that either of them might have been influenced by SMITH.

Let us assume, for the sake of the argument, that claiming an intellectual influence of one scholar on another is tantamount to claiming, firstly, that the influenced scholar knows the work (or at any rate the personal opinions) of the scholar by whom he is supposed to be influenced, and, secondly, that the influenced scholar could not have developed his ideas, as expressed in his writings or other sources, in the way and at the time he has developed them, without his knowledge of the influencing scholar's ideas. Let us also assume that it was some such notion of influence which the historiographers mentioned above (with the possible exception of A. F. POTT) had in mind when claiming an influence of the typological ideas of ADAM SMITH on those of AUGUST WILHELM SCHLEGEL or FRIEDRICH SCHLEGEL or both. What is the textual and/or circumstantial evidence that has been, or can be, marshalled in support of these claims?

The evidence utilized by linguistic historiographers in the wake of (POTT and) COSERIU is almost exclusively textual; only MONREAL-WICKERT (1977: 69) speculates

about possible (not actual) circumstantial evidence linking ADAM SMITH's work with AUGUST WILHELM SCHLEGEL via Paris. This state of historiographical affairs strikes me as rather surprising: it would seem to be the circumstantial rather than the textual evidence on which best to rest one's case for an influence of ADAM SMITH on both SCHLEGELS. An argument on circumstantial grounds may indeed appear promising (at least in so far as it would seem difficult to prove the alternative claim—no influence—on circumstantial grounds alone), but it is bound to crumble under the weight above all of the textual evidence, which in my opinion has been badly misinterpreted by recent 'discoverers' of a SMITH-SCHLEGEL connection.

As was pointed out above, it is evident from two references to ADAM SMITH's *Dissertation* in the text of his *Observations* that AUGUST WILHELM SCHLEGEL knew of SMITH's work, though his recollection of it, concerning the superiority of ancient or modern languages, seems to have been somewhat inaccurate—if we assume, charitably, that he did not intentionally distort SMITH's position on this issue.⁶ What is clear from the text of his *Observations* is that one source of A. W. SCHLEGEL's knowledge of SMITH's *Dissertation* was the joint SMITH-FRIEDRICH SCHLEGEL volume edited by J. MANGET in 1809. Circumstantial evidence would be required to show that A. W. SCHLEGEL knew of SMITH's relevant work even earlier. While presently lacking hard and fast evidence of this kind, I believe it can be considered very likely that A. W. SCHLEGEL had indeed become familiar with SMITH's work on previous occasions, in Paris (as suspected by MONREAL-WICKERT 1977: 69) as well as in Germany, where ADAM SMITH the moral and economic theorist enjoyed tremendous, if not (among Romanticists) entirely positive, popularity around the turn of the century (cf. ECKSTEIN 1926: XXXII–XXXIV, TREUE 1951, HANISCH 1978). And *The dissertation on the origin of languages* had been appended to the widely read *The theory of moral sentiments* since its third edition in 1767 (as has finally transpired even to linguistic historiographers), which, moreover, was the edition that served as the basis of the first German translation appearing in 1770.

However, it is with regard to the MANGET volume of 1809 that circumstantial evidence affords us a most instructive perspective on A. W. SCHLEGEL's knowledge of SMITH. Maybe still in pursuance of an earlier plan,⁷ FRIEDRICH SCHLEGEL, in a letter to AUGUST WILHELM of March 18th, 1808, i.e. while his *Indier* book was being typeset, asks a favour of his brother:

"Sobald das Werk über Indien fertig ist, wünschte ich daß Du Dir Mühe gäbest einen *Extrait* davon in dem *Publiciste* etwa zu veranstalten. Wirst Du das in der Entfernung können?" (KÖRNER 1958 I: 522)

⁶ It seems to me arguable whether SMITH's position indeed was completely misrepresented by A. W. SCHLEGEL: SMITH does recognize advantages of modern languages over ancient ones, in particular in respect of simplicity, and so does A. W. SCHLEGEL, who admits that the modern languages may be considered "parfaitement adaptées aux besoins actuels de l'esprit humain" (1846: 167). Thus, what A. W. SCHLEGEL is guilty of here may only be to have suppressed SMITH's esteem of the ancient languages on largely aesthetic criteria.

⁷ Cf. the letter to his prospective publisher GEORG REIMER of March 16th, 1805: "Was ich im 1ten Theile zu geben dachte, ist außer einer allgemeineren Einleitung 1) eine Abhandlung über die indische *Sprache*. Dieses ist die Grundlage des Ganzen, und

What appeared in the Parisian journal *Publiciste* in 1808 was not an extract of *Ueber die Sprache und Weisheit der Indier* but merely an announcement and a review, which had not been solicited by AUGUST WILHELM but, at least the announcement (cf. *Kritische Friedrich-Schlegel-Ausgabe* 8: CCIII), by FRIEDRICH himself. However, there in fact did appear, in Geneva in the following year, an extract of FRIEDRICH's *Indier* book, viz. that translated by J. MANGET and published in conjunction with his French translation of ADAM SMITH's *Dissertation*—and J. MANGET of Geneva happened to be the editor-in-chief of *Publiciste*! The allegedly favourable reception of this partial edition of FRIEDRICH's work in France induced the SCHLEGELS to try to get the whole book published in French translation. It was again J. MANGET who agreed to take on this task, was apparently working on the translation in the winter of 1809–1810, but eventually gave up (cf. letter of A. W. SCHLEGEL to SCHLEIERMACHER of December 4th, 1809: "Sein [Friedrich's] Buch über die indische Sprache und Weisheit, wovon unsere Philosophen auch nichts wissen wollen, wird seinen Ruf in Europa gründen: es wird gegenwärtig in Paris übersetzt." (BÄUMER 1898: 597); letter of FRIEDRICH to AUGUST WILHELM SCHLEGEL of January 16th, 1810: "Dem Uebersetzer meines indischen Werks weiß ich für jetzt nichts zu sagen, als alles mögliche Verbindliche was Du nur immer gut und schicklich findest." (KÖRNER 1958 II: 105); letter of FRIEDRICH to AUGUST WILHELM SCHLEGEL of July 7th, 1810: "Ist die Uebersetzung meines indischen Werks von Manget nicht zu Stande gekommen, thut mir doch recht herzlich leid." (KÖRNER 1958 II: 147)). A full French version of the *Indier* book, *Essai sur la langue et la philosophie des Indiens*, finally appeared in Paris in 1837, translated by A. MAZURE; but, what is presently of greater significance, AUGUST WILHELM SCHLEGEL, apparently before J. MANGET had been commissioned to undertake the translation, had approached yet another potential translator, viz. HELMINA DE CHÉZY, a close acquaintance of FRIEDRICH and, among other things, editor of COTTA's *Französische Miscellen*, Paris socialite, and companion and short-time wife of ANTOINE LÉONARD DE CHÉZY, FRIEDRICH's teacher of Persian and, later, first occupant of the chair of Sanscrit at the Collège de France:

"Wie wäre es, wenn Sie die Schrift meines Bruders über die Indier übersetzen? Das Stück davon über die Sprache, welches ein gewisser Manget, als Anhang einer Schrift gleichen Inhalts von Adam Smith übersetzt oder im Auszug gegeben, hat viel Aufmerksamkeit erregt und ist sehr günstig angezeigt worden." (October 6th; 1809; KÖRNER 1958 III: 441—my emphasis, FP)

Nowhere in his published writings did AUGUST WILHELM SCHLEGEL acknowledge the relationship of FRIEDRICH SCHLEGEL's and ADAM SMITH's views on language to be so close! Recall that in his reference to the joint SMITH-SCHLEGEL volume in his *Observations*, which otherwise is reminiscent of the crucial passage in this letter, he does not repeat that the two writings published together by 'a certain Manget' in his opinion are 'of the same content'.

Turning to the younger SCHLEGEL, who generally anticipated the ideas on which his older brother used to thrive, did FRIEDRICH too know of ADAM SMITH's relevant work at the time he conceived and wrote his *Ueber die Sprache und Weisheit der Indier*—i.e., at least between 1802, when he went to Paris, where he began editing the journal *Europa*, reflected on the contrast between the West and the East and consequently took up the study of oriental languages such as Persian and later Sanskrit (which he and

write a grammar of Persian from a comparative perspective,⁸ and late September 1807, when he finally sent the manuscript to the publisher from Cologne?

It has been claimed at least twice that there is direct textual evidence in *Ueber die Sprache und Weisheit der Indier* to the effect that FRIEDRICH SCHLEGEL knew ADAM SMITH the linguist. On pp. 186/187 (not 185/186 as it reads in the Index) of volume 8 of the *Kritische Friedrich-Schlegel-Ausgabe*, i.e. in the last chapter of the "Erstes Buch. Von der Sprache", FRIEDRICH SCHLEGEL refers to "SMITH", without first name, and the editors according to their index take this to be a reference to ADAM SMITH. HAGG-BLADE's (1983: 18, 20) similar interpretation of this reference deserves to be quoted *in extenso*:

"When Schlegel does refer to Smith in a footnote (1808: 81), he does so in a paragraph discussing grammatical means of modification in the English language.² At this point, Schlegel admits that he knows of Smith's work but says that it was not available to him." (Note 2: "Although no first name is given, this footnote appears to refer to Adam Smith because of the nature of the discussion.")

Nowhere in the entire 6th chapter of the First Book does FRIEDRICH SCHLEGEL even mention the English language: he mentions the unavailable works of SMITH and others in the course of discussing the "bretagnische Mundart der keltischen Sprache"—and since ADAM SMITH is not known to have published on Breton, FRIEDRICH SCHLEGEL here certainly does not admit that he knows of ADAM SMITH's work.⁹

Notwithstanding the lack of textual evidence, FRIEDRICH SCHLEGEL clearly did know, among other works of ADAM SMITH, *The theory of moral sentiments*—and would typically comment on it as follows in his *Philosophische Fragmente*:

"In d[er] Kantischen Moral ist etwas von d[er] Theory of moral sentiment, welches eine Erzgroteske ist, und von d[er] mittelmäßigen Humischen Vernunftmoral — auch etwas Candide und etwas Emile." (1797; *Kritische Friedrich-Schlegel-Ausgabe* 18: 115)¹⁰

While never referring to SMITH the linguist, FRIEDRICH SCHLEGEL is unlikely to have skipped the Appendix of *The theory of moral sentiments*, dealing with a subject matter that was to become of some importance for himself. In fact, given FRIEDRICH SCHLEGEL's well-documented fancy for devising schemes for an encyclopedia, he is quite likely to have come across SMITH's *Dissertation* published separately in French translation in the *Encyclopédie méthodique: Grammaire et littérature* of CHARLES-JOSEPH

⁸ Cf. his letter to AUGUST WILHELM of January 15th, 1803: "Ich bin sehr entschlossen, eine Persische Grammatik zu schreiben, mit durchgängiger Rücksicht auf die Indische und Deutsche Sprache. Es wird also dieses Buch ein von dem Interesse derer die bloß Persisch lernen wollen, unabhängiges historisches Interesse haben." (WALZEL 1890: 507).

⁹ I had failed to identify the SMITH SCHLEGEL really had in mind here, but JEAN ROUSSEAU suggests to me that it was a certain DONALD (rather than ADAM) SMITH, more precisely Capt. DONALD SMITH of the 84th Regiment, whose article 'Remarks on some corruptions which have been introduced into the orthography, and pronunciation of the Gaëlic; with proposals for removing them, and restoring the purity of the language' had appeared in *Prize essays and Transactions of the Highland Society of Scotland*, vol. 1, 324–343 (Edinburgh 1799). According to ROUSSEAU, SCHLEGEL cannot have consulted this work in the Bibliothèque Nationale, which had not acquired it before 1817.

¹⁰ 'Grotesque', by the way, is not simply derogatory, but is also used as a technical term; elsewhere SMITH's major works are characterized as "die drei großen Essays der Engli-

PANCKOUCKE of 1784 (the relevant volume of which, incidentally, was also owned by A. F. POTT—cf. LEOPOLD 1983: 67), or in one of the two other early French translations (cf. NOORDEGRAAF 1977), while in Paris.¹¹ A negative piece of circumstantial evidence perhaps also deserves to be considered. At the time he wrote up *Ueber die Sprache und Weisheit der Indier*, "Herr Friedrich mit der leeren Tasche" (as CLEMENS BRENTANO once aptly characterized him) also lectured, in Cologne, on ancient and modern history and on the history of philosophy, ethics and other philosophical subjects (in another not very successful effort to overcome his chronic pecuniary deficiency): nowhere in these lectures does he explicitly mention ADAM SMITH, although the Scottish philosopher's moral and economic views are on more than one occasion recognizable as the implicit target of SCHLEGEL's critique.¹²

If we may thus take for granted that both SCHLEGELS knew of ADAM SMITH's *Dissertation* before writing their own respective works on language (and *Weisheit* or literature), could it be that they, and others after them, had reasons to conceal, or at any rate not to blaze abroad, this knowledge? Hardly. Since anybody in German Romanticist circles was more or less supposed to know of ADAM SMITH's ideas, who after all was their favourite *bête noire*, why deny knowing a piece of his dealing with language, easily one of the most popular concerns of the Romanticists? However, as soon as influence rather than plain knowledge is at issue, things are radically different. There must have been every reason for leading German Romanticists to deny having been directly influenced, unless negatively, by someone like ADAM SMITH! The case of ADAM MÜLLER, the (among other things) economist and social philosopher and sometime close collaborator of FRIEDRICH SCHLEGEL (who got to know him personally in May or June 1808), is very instructive here: having enthusiastically praised ADAM SMITH in an early article (1801), MÜLLER soon retracted and, devoting a substantial part of his future writings to attacking SMITH, prided himself (not quite accurately) to have been his first opponent in Germany (cf. HANISCH 1978). Considering this ideological context, it is, thus, certainly bold (not to say grotesque) of recent historiographers to impute to AUGUST WILHELM SCHLEGEL, on no evidence whatever, an intention to create a synthesis of FRIEDRICH's typology and the ideas of ADAM SMITH, of all people. It would have been a very mischievous intention indeed, and one very difficult to keep secret, given the contemporary notoriety of the author of the ideas synthesized. He would hardly have mentioned SMITH by name in his *Observations* when he had been keen on avoiding revealing associations. And his efforts at getting FRIEDRICH's *Ueber die Sprache und Weisheit der Indier* fully translated into French, even if an ancillary consideration here was thus to extract it from the ideologically somewhat unfortunate tie-up with SMITH's *Dissertation* in the MANGET volume, hardly justify the uncharitable allegation that the main purpose of this manoeuvre was to cover up the SCHLEGELS' indebtedness to ADAM SMITH.

The prospect, thus, is not bright for uncovering unambiguous circumstantial acknowledgement of a direct influence of ADAM SMITH on the SCHLEGELS. Firstly, there is the ideology of German Romanticism which is likely to have precluded revelations of intellectual debts to ADAM SMITH and the disreputable doctrines of Enlighten-

ment in general. Secondly, there is an emerging political nationalism (in FRIEDRICH SCHLEGEL's case a rather uneasy bed-fellow of a pan-occidental euphoria at least during his first Paris episode) which increasingly tended to prevent German scholars, provided they continued to read foreign literature at all, from being excessively candid in acknowledging and maybe even perceiving their scholarly indebtedness to foreign, especially French and British, colleagues. These two factors would seem to account for the following kind of remarks which the SCHLEGELS were prone to make later in their careers, in public, as it were, rather than in semi-private notebooks:

"Sind einige Philosophen in England eigne Geisteswege, abgesondert von jener allgemeinen Bahn gegangen, so hat dies meistens keinen bedeutenden, oder doch keinen allgemeinen Erfolg gehabt; auch sind die mir bekannten Versuche der Art an sich nicht sehr merkwürdig oder ausgezeichnet." (F. SCHLEGEL, *Geschichte der alten und neuen Literatur. Vorlesungen, gehalten zu Wien im Jahre 1812*; quoted from the *Kritische Ausgabe* 6: 343)

"Wenn zum Beispiel, wie es vor einiger Zeit in Schottland geschehen ist, ein berühmter Lehrer dessen, was man in seinem Lande, nicht eben paßend, Philosophie nennt, über die neueren deutschen Philosophen von Kant bis auf unsere Zeit wegwerfend aburtheilt, ohne die Sprache zu kennen, ohne die Schriften gelesen zu haben, ohne auch nur das Bedürfnis ächter Spekulation zu ahnden, welches jene große und merkwürdige Bewegung der Geister hervorgerufen, so haben wir nichts weiter darauf zu antworten, als daß er noch gar nicht weiß, wovon die Rede ist, und daß diese Dinge weit über seinen Horizont hinausliegen." (A. W. SCHLEGEL, *Abriß von den europäischen Verhältnissen der deutschen Litteratur* (1825); quoted from BÖCKING's edition of the *Sämmtliche Werke* 8: 210)¹³

A third factor, though one intimately related to the ideological and political ones, probably is that AUGUST WILHELM SCHLEGEL, when propagating Oriental Studies in Germany since about 1815, used to highlight his brother's *Ueber die Sprache und Weisheit der Indier* as the cornerstone of the new discipline, and, correspondingly, to play down British and French achievements.¹⁴ The fundamental importance, not only for Oriental Studies per se but also for "die allgemeine Sprachkunde", which he ascribed to his brother's work, should have inclined AUGUST WILHELM SCHLEGEL not to emphasize possible predecessors of, let alone immediate influences on, FRIEDRICH, and thus ultimately himself.

The historiographically awkward position we end up in, thus, is that even if there has been a direct influence of ADAM SMITH the typologist on AUGUST WILHELM SCHLEGEL or both SCHLEGELS, which cannot be ruled out on circumstantial grounds, this connection is unlikely to be demonstrable beyond reasonable doubt on circumstantial evidence alone. It is time to turn to relationships between the texts, seen within the intellectual climate of the periods of their origin, to determine whether there in fact is sufficient similarity to warrant the assumption of an influence of the earlier writer on the later ones.

It ought to be self-evident that a rough similarity of topics does not suffice to prove influence. Thus, from the fact that the SCHLEGELS as well as SMITH address themselves

¹³ A. W. SCHLEGEL, incidentally, goes on to comment also on common faults of German scholarly literature, and accounts for one as follows: "Das Bestreben neu zu sein, was bei der allgemein verbreiteten Aufklärung, bei der regen wissenschaftlichen Thätigkeit nicht leicht ist, hat zuweilen zu absichtlicher Paradoxie verleitet" (ibid. p. 211).

¹⁴ Cf. his CHÉZY review of 1815 in: *Sämmtliche Werke*, ed. BÖCKING, 12: 437, or later official

¹¹ FRIEDRICH SCHLEGEL's French reading is best reconstructed from the three Philosophy Notebooks he kept at Paris; see *Kritische Friedrich-Schlegel-Ausgabe* 18: 423–501,

to the general topic of language evolution and, *eo ipso*, language variation, it hardly follows that they must have been under his influence. Similarity of trivial details like-wise ought to be discarded. For example, even if it could be argued that FRIEDRICH SCHLEGEL's occasional characterization of "affixation" as "mechanical" may have been inspired by ADAM SMITH's comparison of language evolution with the evolution of "mechanical" engines, no one would seriously bank a lot on this peripheral coincidence. What needs to be demonstrated is that, without being able to draw on SMITH's *Dissertation*, FRIEDRICH SCHLEGEL could not have developed his distinction of "Sprachen durch Affixa" and "Sprachen durch Flexion", or, at any rate, that AUGUST WILHELM SCHLEGEL could not have added "langues sans aucune structure grammaticale" to his brother's bipartite classification, with "langues à inflexions" being further subdivided into "langues analytiques" and "langues synthétiques". Despite recent claims to the contrary, this has never been demonstrated.

Since one of the more specific claims (*viz.* COSERIU's original one) has been that it was only AUGUST WILHELM's elaboration of FRIEDRICH SCHLEGEL's original classification which was crucially influenced by SMITH's *Dissertation*, it is appropriate to point out that AUGUST WILHELM's typological scheme is not really substantially different from FRIEDRICH's in the first place. It is rather obvious from FRIEDRICH SCHLEGEL's account that his affixal and inflecting types were not intended to be entirely homogeneous (cf. *Kritische Ausgabe* 8: 153ff., 313). On the one hand, as FRIEDRICH SCHLEGEL's wide notion of "Affix" included separate function words (adpositions, auxiliaries) as well as agglutinative affixes in today's sense, it was more or less only a terminological innovation for AUGUST WILHELM to split the "Sprachen durch Affixa" into "langues qui emploient des affixes" and "langues sans aucune structure grammaticale" (cf. 1846: 159). On the other hand, FRIEDRICH SCHLEGEL's distinction between "Sprachen durch Affixa", specifically those with "angefügten Partikeln" (i.e. with agglutination in the modern sense), and "durch Flexion" was not meant to be necessarily categorical, but rather to allow of continuous transition. Thus, when AUGUST WILHELM distinguished, non-categorically, the synthetic and analytic subtypes of "langues à inflexions", with fully synthetic languages representing the inflectional prototype, he again did not much more than to give terminological recognition to FRIEDRICH's observation that different (ancient and modern) "Sprachen durch Flexion" differ in the degree to which they are inflecting, i.e. utilize "innere Flexion" or "Hülfsverba und Präpositionen" instead. (Recall from § 2 that POTT insisted on attributing the distinction to FRIEDRICH.) Therefore, if AUGUST WILHELM's terminological subclassification of synthetic and analytic inflecting languages was effectively anticipated by FRIEDRICH, COSERIU (and others) might as well have claimed that already FRIEDRICH, rather than only AUGUST WILHELM SCHLEGEL, had been under ADAM SMITH's influence, on purely textual grounds.¹⁵

As a matter of fact, COSERIU's typological influence claim (as is evident in particular from COSERIU 1972b) boils down to the synthetic-analytic distinction: ADAM SMITH's distinction between languages with declensions and conjugations (diachronically speaking, "original languages") and languages which instead employ prepositions and auxiliary verbs and personal pronouns ("compounded languages", diachronical-

ly) was the model, it is said, of AUGUST WILHELM SCHLEGEL's synthetic and analytic subclasses, with SCHLEGEL adding articles and adverbial expression of comparative and superlative as hallmarks of analyticity. (In his *De l'étymologie en général*,¹⁶ A. W. SCHLEGEL mentions relative pronouns (instead of synthetic participles) as a further characteristic of analytic languages (1846: 139), without actually identifying, however, the respective kinds of languages by the technical terms 'analytic' and 'synthetic'.) The other alleged similarities between SMITH and (AUGUST WILHELM) SCHLEGEL are not strictly speaking typological: they concern the aesthetic and maybe 'logical' evaluations of the different kinds of languages, and the historical evolution of one kind (the analytic) from the other (the synthetic), exclusively or predominantly or at least occasionally as a result of language mixture.¹⁷ And AUGUST WILHELM SCHLEGEL's tripartite typology of "langues sans aucune structure grammaticale/langues qui emploient des affixes/langues à flexions" is admitted by COSERIU not to derive from ADAM SMITH. Thus, when COSERIU wrote that *all* of SMITH's typological ideas recur in AUGUST WILHELM SCHLEGEL's *Observations*, was this perhaps a slightly roundabout way of communicating that ADAM SMITH's only typological idea was to distinguish languages with declensions and conjugations from languages without? This would be to underrate SMITH's *Dissertation* (for a thorough exposition of which see in particular LAND 1977); but I suppose it fairly accurately identifies the properly typological common denominator of ADAM SMITH and the SCHLEGELS. And to attribute this agreement to direct influence seems to me a gross exaggeration.

That all languages are different but some are more different from one another than others is an observation unlikely to escape anybody who takes an interest in language variety. And if this interest concentrates on the ancient and modern Standard Average European languages, whether or not these include Sanskrit, one of the first differences to catch the eye even of a linguistically naive observer is that between one group of languages (in general the ancient ones or the older stages of the modern languages) relatively rich in declension and conjugation (i.e. in inflectional morphology) and another group more or less destitute of such morphological machinery. At the time the SCHLEGELS wrote their linguistic treatises, but also at the time ADAM SMITH had written his, there was considerable interest with precisely this focus. Two broad issues relating to language variation in particular were vigorously debated in scholarly communities all over Europe in the second half of the 18th century: one concerned word order, specifically the relationship between the actual sequential arrangement of subject, verb, and object and underlying conceptual order, with French authors holding the spotlight in the controversial continuation of the Scholastic discussion of "ordo naturalis" and "ordo artificialis"; the other concerned more general questions of how to evaluate, aesthetically and otherwise, different languages.¹⁸ From both points of departure one was bound to arrive at the recognition of the ob-

¹⁶ This essay is often assumed to have been published in 1828, but is most conveniently available in BÖCKING's edition of A. W. SCHLEGEL's works written in French of 1846. JEAN ROUSSEAU suggests to me that this may indeed be the first publication, and that the essay was not composed later than 1815.

¹⁷ Analogous evaluational and evolutionary considerations may also be found in FRIEDRICH SCHLEGEL's *Ueber die Sprache und Weisheit der Indier*, if perhaps in more rudimentary form than in AUGUST WILHELM's *Observations*.

¹⁸ For brief surveys of the first issue see MONREAL-WICKERT 1977: 53ff., 99ff., and of the

vious formal differences between the kinds of languages that have come to be labelled synthetic and analytic. Languages such as French, where the actual surface arrangement of the major clause constituents was (by some, including GIRARD and BEAUZÉE) believed to be more or less analogous to the underlying, conceptual "ordre analytique" (or "logique"), tended to dispense with inflectional morphology whereas languages such as Latin, allowing of much surface inversion or transposition, tended to need compensatory morphological coding devices. And even superficial comparisons of the grammatical structure of ancient and modern languages, with the aim of elucidating their virtues and drawbacks according to one or another set of criteria, could not but involve references to the abundance or dearth of inflectional morphology, whatever was made of this formal difference in the respective evaluations.

Thus, if all the SCHLEGELS were keen on 'discovering' was the classification of languages as, in AUGUST WILHELM's terms, synthetic and analytic, they could have turned to practically any source to find out that this discovery had already been made more than once in 'writings of—roughly—the same content'. They could have found an even more elaborate classification, resembling AUGUST WILHELM's final one, in the work of a proto-Romanticist such as JOHANN GOTTFRIED HERDER, who in an essay *Beschluss über das Ideal der Sprache* (quoted from POTT 1880: CLVI) distinguished between languages which indicate "die Verbindung der Begriffe" by "blosse Abänderung des Ausdrucks für eine jede Idee", by "*Zwischensetzung kleiner Worte*", or by "blosse Stellung der Ideen", and who in his prize essay of 1772, *Abhandlung über den Ursprung der Sprache*, also recognized "Sprachen ganz ohne Grammatik". They could have found similar classifications in the work of French Enlightenment authors, whose influence upon his own work HERDER had done little to conceal, or, for that matter, in ADAM SMITH's *Dissertation*, likewise betraying French influence. They could of course have found something similar in earlier authors, such as JOHN LOCKE, who in his *Some thoughts concerning education* of 1693 had also noted that "the Genius and manner of the Latin Tongue" differed from that of the modern languages in that here various terminations of last syllables are employed rather than preceding particles to indicate the various "significations" of nouns and verbs (1968: 272). All of these sources are known, or are likely, to have been available to both SCHLEGELS.¹⁹ Of course, given the contemporary obviousness of the formal classification at issue, irrespective of whether or not it happened to be recognized terminologically, the SCHLEGELS did not have to muster up much ingenuity to come up with some such classificatory scheme themselves. Needless to emphasize, it would require a lot of ingenuity, or rather phantasy, to reconstruct, on the basis of the texts and their intellectual contexts, a direct influence of ADAM SMITH the typologist on AUGUST WILHELM SCHLEGEL or both SCHLEGELS, with regard to schemes of formal language classification.

Although a thorough discussion of the linguistic significance of the relevant three works by ADAM SMITH and FRIEDRICH and AUGUST WILHELM SCHLEGEL is beyond the scope of this paper, one fact needs to be pointed up which is self-evident but has nevertheless managed to be blurred in the recent rediscovery of SMITH as the SCHLE-

GELS' predecessor in matters typological: the classificatory schemes on formal criteria are *not* the sole nor the major concerns of any of the respective works, nor can they be conveniently isolated from the fabric of the dense and often not very explicit argumentation of which they are part and parcel.

First of all, in neither case can the typological classifications be appreciated independently of the evolutionary scenarios, which are not just for the fun of it given much greater overall prominence by all three authors. In fact, it seems to me arguable that in all three cases the structural classifications gain interest not in their own right but only in so far as they identify possible or impossible stages of linguistic and intellectual development. While SMITH and the SCHLEGELS agree in recognizing the importance of language and socio-cultural mixture, the SCHLEGELS, and in particular AUGUST WILHELM, appear to pay more attention to the possible gamut, and the limitations, of type changes. AUGUST WILHELM SCHLEGEL's synthetic-analytic distinction is certainly motivated above all diachronically; and not even these terms themselves (*pace* COSERIU 1968: 52) seem to me to be unambiguously structural rather than evolutive: at least they were occasionally understood by 19th century typologists (e.g. POTT, cf. the above quote from his *Einleitung* 1884: 55) as evolutive, with analysis operating on something that had previously been synthesized. The non-linguistic employment of the terms "synthèse" and "analyse" in A. W. SCHLEGEL's *De l'étymologie en général* too is revealing in so far as it points to their provenance as characterizations of stages in the evolution of intellectual faculties, analysis being associated with mathematical faculties and synthesis being "le grand principe aussi bien de la philosophie que de la poésie" (1846: 138).²⁰ Secondly, though presented from an evolutionary perspective, or from that of 'conjectural history' in SMITH's case, the analytic-synthetic and other formal classifications are linked to, and cannot be appreciated without, more or less explicit views on further, more fundamental structural and referential-semantic properties of languages. Especially in SMITH's case it is evident that the declension/conjugation issue crucially hinges on his theory of the parts of speech, the relationships between these, and the mental operations by which to arrive at them.

To the extent that they have proceeded as if ADAM SMITH and FRIEDRICH and AUGUST WILHELM SCHLEGEL had devoted their relevant writings exclusively or well-delimitably to matters of language classification on formal criteria, recent historiographic attempts to put the record straight concerning priorities, thus, appear to have been essentially beside the point. They were bound to miss most that is potentially important or original with the authors concerned. Even if there were significant parallels between them, exaggerated concern with only one, on the whole rather peripheral, aspect of their works would have managed to keep them off the record.

4 No doubt there are similarities between the linguistic works of ADAM SMITH and the brothers SCHLEGEL, which have been recognized at least once before their recent

¹⁹ In the interest of completeness of documentation note that AUGUST WILHELM SCHLEGEL by no means denies being familiar with Enlightenment authors; cf. the appendix to his *De l'étymologie en général*: «J'ai lu une dissertation manuscrite d'un philosophe très-corrup de l'école des encyclopédistes, où l'étymologie est appliquée au système de Locke

²⁰ It should be admitted, though, that A. W. SCHLEGEL occasionally seems to use 'analytic' and 'synthetic' as purely structural terms, e.g. (as pointed out to me by JEAN ROUSSEAU) in his review of 1815 of the GRIMM's *Altdeutsche Wälder*: "sie [the German language] zeigt uns nämlich den allmählichen Übergang von der synthetischen zur analytischen Grammatik" (*Sämmtliche Werke*, ed. BÖCKING, vol. 12: 407), even though the context here too is

rediscovery; but they clearly are of a kind to rule out the assumption of a direct and significant influence of ADAM SMITH the typologist on the SCHLEGELS. Those eager to rewrite the history of linguistic typology are well-advised to look for even earlier predecessors of the SCHLEGELS than SMITH; if typology is no more than classification of languages, on structural rather than historical criteria, all authors who cared to comment on the fact that some languages are more similar to, or different from, one another than others deserve a leaf of the laurel wreath previously shared by the SCHLEGELS. If historiographers of typology, however, were interested to record at what time occasional observations about language variety really came to fruition, with classifications according to linguistically relatively arbitrary criteria being superseded by empirically supported conceptions of linguistic types as systems, or 'organisms', 'où tout se tient', my advice would be rather to postpone the beginnings of typology—probably until WILHELM VON HUMBOLDT. But even then the SCHLEGELS, the Abbé GIRARD, probably ADAM SMITH and others would deserve to retain a few leaves of the laurel: with their typological schemes they have prepared the ground of systemic typology to a greater extent than they are often given credit for today in the customary (mis-)representations of the Dark Ages of purely morphological typology.²¹

²¹ I am most grateful to JEAN ROUSSEAU for his detailed commentary on an earlier (November 1984) version of this article, which I only received, however, after the typescript had already been submitted for publication in ZPSK. I hope I have, nevertheless, managed to take up most of his points.

References

- AARSLEFF, H. (1982): *Wilhelm von Humboldt and the linguistic thought of the French Idéologues*, in: AARSLEFF, *From Locke to Saussure. Essays on the study of language and intellectual history*, 335–355, Minneapolis.
- BAUMER, G. (1898): *Ein ungedruckter Brief August Wilhelm von Schlegels an Schleiermacher*, in: *Euphorion* 5, 505–511.
- BEAUZÉE, N. (1765): *Langue*, in: *Encyclopédie, ou Dictionnaire raisonné des sciences, des arts et des métiers, par une Société des gens de lettres*, ed. by D. DIDEROT & J. LE ROND D'ALEMBERT, vol. 9, 249–266.
- (1767): *Grammaire générale, ou Exposition raisonnée des éléments nécessaires du langage, pour servir de fondement à l'étude de toutes les langues*, Paris.
- BERRY, C. J. (1974): *Adam Smith's Considerations on language*, in: *Journal of the History of Ideas* 35, 130–138.
- COSERIU, E. (1968): *Adam Smith und die Anfänge der Sprachtypologie*, in: *Wortbildung, Syntax und Morphologie, Festschrift Hans Marchand*, ed. by H. E. BREKLE & L. LIPKA, 46–54, The Hague. (English translation in: *Historiographia Linguistica* 10 (1983) 1–12.)
- (1972a): *Die Geschichte der Sprachphilosophie von der Antike bis zur Gegenwart. Eine Übersicht, Teil II: Von Leibniz bis Rousseau*, Tübingen.
- (1972b): *Über die Sprachtypologie Wilhelm von Humboldts. Ein Beitrag zur Kritik der sprachwissenschaftlichen Überlieferung*, in: *Beiträge zur vergleichenden Literaturgeschichte. Festschrift für Kurt Wais zum 65. Geburtstag*, ed. by J. HÖSLE, 107–135, Tübingen.
- DRESSLER, W. U. (1973): *Sprachtypologie*, in: *Lexikon der germanistischen Linguistik*, ed. by H. P. ALTHAUS, H. HENNE & H. E. WIEGAND, 470–474, Tübingen.

- Gefühle*, ed. by W. ECKSTEIN, XI–LXXI. Hamburg, (Philosophische Bibliothek 200a/b; 2nd edn. 1977).
- GIRARD, G. (1747): *Les vrais principes de la langue françoise, ou La parole réduite en méthode, conformément aux loix de l'usage, en seize discours*, Paris, 2 vols.
- HAGGBLADE, E. (1983): *Contributors to the beginnings of language typology*, in: *Historiographia Linguistica* 10, 13–24.
- HANISCH, E. (1978): *Der 'vormoderne' Antikapitalismus der Politischen Romantik. Das Beispiel Adam Müller*, in: *Romantik in Deutschland. Ein interdisziplinäres Symposium*, ed. by R. BRINKMANN, 132–146, Stuttgart, Sonderband der Deutschen Vierteljahresschrift für Literaturwissenschaft und Geistesgeschichte 52.
- HERDER, J. G. (1772): *Abhandlung über den Ursprung der Sprache*, Berlin, (ed. by H. D. IRMSCHER, Stuttgart 1966).
- KÖRNER, J., ed. (1926): *Die Brüder Schlegel. Briefe aus frühen und späten Tagen der deutschen Romantik. Briefe von und an Friedrich und Dorothea Schlegel*, Berlin.
- ed. (1958): *Krisenjahre der Frühromantik. Briefe aus dem Schlegelkreis*, Bern, 3 vols., 2nd edn. (1st edn. Brunn 1936).
- LAND, S. K. (1977): *Adam Smith's 'Considerations concerning the first formation of languages'*, in: *Journal of the History of Ideas* 38, 677–690.
- LEOPOLD, J. (1983): *The letter liveth. The life, work and library of August Friedrich Pott (1802–1887)*, Amsterdam.
- LOCKE, J. (1693): *Some thoughts concerning education*, (reprinted in: *The educational writings of John Locke*, ed. by J. L. AXTELL, 111–338, Cambridge 1968).
- LOHNER, E., ed. (1974): *August Wilhelm Schlegel, Kritische Schriften und Briefe, VII: Ausgewählte Briefe*, Stuttgart.
- MANGET, J., ed. (1809): *Essai sur la première formation des langues, et sur la différence du génie des langues originales et des langues composées, traduit de l'anglais d'Adam Smith. Avec des notes. Suivi du premier livre des Recherches sur la langue et la philosophie des Indiens, extrait et traduit de l'allemand de F. Schlegel*, Genève.
- MONREAL-WICKERT, I. (1977): *Die Sprachforschung der Aufklärung im Spiegel der großen französischen Enzyklopädie*, Tübingen.
- NARR, G. (1970): *Einleitung*, in: ADAM SMITH, *A dissertation on the origin of languages*, ed. by G. NARR, 3–14, Tübingen.
- NOORDEGRAAF, J. (1977): *A few remarks on Adam Smith's Dissertation (1761)*, in: *Historiographia Linguistica* 4, 59–67.
- NÜSSE, H. (1962): *Die Sprachtheorie Friedrich Schlegels*, Heidelberg.
- PANCKOUCKE, CH.-J., ed. (1784): *Encyclopédie méthodique: Grammaire et littérature*, Paris & Liège, 2nd. vol.
- POTT, A. F. (1880): *Wilhelm von Humboldt und die Sprachwissenschaft*, Berlin, 2nd edn. (1st edn. 1876).
- (1884): *Einleitung in die allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft*, in: *Internationale Zeitschrift für Allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft* 1, 1–68, (reprinted in A. F. POTT, *Einleitung in die allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft*, preceded by the same author's *Zur Literatur der Sprachenkunde Europas*, ed. by E. F. K. KOERNER, Amsterdam 1974).
- RAE, J. (1895): *Life of Adam Smith*, London.
- ROUSSEAU, J. (1984): *La naissance de la typologie chez P. E. Du Ponceau et A. W. Schlegel (1816–1819)*, in: *Matériaux pour une histoire des théories linguistiques*, ed. by S. AUROUX et al., 399–413, Lille.
- SCHLEGEL, A. W. (1815): *Recension der Altdutschen Wälder*, hrsg. durch die Brüder Grimm, reprinted in: *Sämmtliche Werke*, ed. BÖCKING, vol. 12, 383–426, Leipzig 1847.
- (1818): *Observations sur la langue et la littérature provençales*, reprinted in: *Œuvres de M. Auguste-Guillaume de Schlegel, écrites en français*, ed. by E. BÖCKING, vol. 2, 149–250, Leipzig 1846.
- (1828?): *De l'étymologie en général*, reprinted in: *Œuvres*, ed. BÖCKING, vol. 2, 103–148, Leipzig 1846.
- (1846f.): *Sämmtliche Werke*, ed. by E. BÖCKING, Leipzig.
- SCHLEGEL, F. (1796–1828): *Philosophische Lehrjahre 1796–1806, nebst philosophischen*

- SCHLEGEL, F. (1808): *Ueber die Sprache und Weisheit der Indier. Ein Beitrag zur Begründung der Alterthumskunde*, Heidelberg, reprinted in: *Kritische Ausgabe* 8, 105–433. (French translation: *Essai sur la langue et la philosophie des Indiens*, Paris 1837.)
- (1958ff.): *Kritische Friedrich-Schlegel-Ausgabe*, ed. by E. BEHLER et al., München/Zürich, 35 vols.
- SMITH, ADAM (1761): *Considerations concerning the first formation of languages, and the different genius of original and compounded languages*, in: *Philological Miscellany* (London) 1, 440–479. (Reprinted as an appendix of the 3rd (1767) and following editions of *The theory of moral sentiments*; in NARR 1970; and in vol. IV of the Glasgow Edition of the *Works and Correspondence of Adam Smith: Lectures on Rhetoric and Belles Lettres*, ed. by J. C. BRYCE, Oxford 1983.)
- (1767): *The theory of moral sentiments. To which is added A dissertation on the origin of languages*, London & Edinburgh. (German translation: *Theorie der moralischen Empfindungen*, Braunschweig 1770.)
- STEINTHAL, H. (1877): *Offenes Sendschreiben an Herrn Prof. Pott*, in: *Zeitschrift für Völkerpsychologie und Sprachwissenschaft* 9, 304–323. (Reprinted in STEINTHAL, *Kleine sprachtheoretische Schriften*, ed. by W. BUMANN, 512–531, Hildesheim 1970.)
- TREUE, W. (1951): *Adam Smith in Deutschland. Zum Problem des 'Politischen Professors' zwischen 1776 und 1810*, in: *Deutschland und Europa. Historische Studien zur Völker- und Staatenordnung des Abendlandes, Festschrift für Hans Rothfels*, ed. by W. CONZE, 101–133, Düsseldorf.
- WALZEL, O. F., ed. (1890): *Friedrich Schlegels Briefe an seinen Bruder August Wilhelm*, Berlin.
- WINDROSS, M. (1980): *Adam Smith on language*, in: *Linguistica Antverpiensia* 14, 277–288.

Dr. FRANS PLANK, Universität Konstanz, Philosophische Fakultät, Fachgruppe Sprachwissenschaft