

MIROŚLAW SKARŻYŃSKI  
Kraków

## JAN BAUDOIN DE COURTENAY AND HENRYK UŁASZYN IN LIGHT OF THEIR CORRESPONDENCE

**Keywords:** history of Polish linguistics, scientists' correspondence, Jan Baudouin de Courtenay, Henryk Ułaszyn

### Abstract

The paper presents the history of the friendship between Jan Baudouin de Courtenay and his disciple Henryk Ułaszyn, a linguist and a professor in three Polish universities, which lasted almost from the time they first met in Cracow in 1898 until Baudouin's death. Baudouin not only became an academic guide to Ułaszyn, but was also the man who shaped his worldview and ethical principles. Baudouin, in turn, found in Ułaszyn not only an intelligent disciple, but also a man with a similar way of thinking. This paper is based on Baudouin's letters found a few years ago and subsequently published, as well as on Ułaszyn's memoirs, which are presently being prepared for publication.

1. Those interested in the person of Baudouin de Courtenay know that he left behind an abundant correspondence, only a small part of which has been published. His letters to Adolf Černý (Bešta 1972 and Durčanský, Skrzyński 2005), to Vatroslav Jagić (Dzendzeliwskyj 1996), and a set of letters to some Polish addressees (Stachurski 2002) have been printed over the years. The correspondence between Baudouin and Giuseppe J. Mikkoli (Pullat, Smoczyńska 2004) as well as that between Baudouin and Hugon Schuchardt (Eismann, Hurch 2008) has also been published. However, many letters still remain in archives and libraries, although their exact locations have been noted by Edward Stachurski (2002: 7, footnotes 5, 6). Unfortunately, the letters written to Baudouin no longer exist, as they were burnt together with his remaining collections in a fire at the linguist's Warsaw apartment in 1944.

According to the estimates of Edward Stachurski (2002), in Polish alone Baudouin wrote more than 700 letters to a variety of people. However, this number now needs to be increased due to the 156 letters and postcards written to Henryk Ułaszyn

(Skarżyński, Smoczyńska 2007),<sup>1</sup> which will be discussed further in this paper, as well as the 56 letters to Kazimierz Nitsch and the 33 letters to Jan Rozwadowski, all of which were found in the Scholarship Archives of the Polish Academy of Science and the Polish Academy of Learning in Cracow (Skarżyński 2007a,b, 2008).

The letters of the scholars of that time are of considerable importance for those investigating the history of linguistics from 19<sup>th</sup> and the beginning of 20<sup>th</sup> c. Those were, after all, times in which academic conventions and conferences were extremely rare. For this reason academic and personal contacts were maintained not in the conference rooms and their lobbies, but through written correspondence. The fact that H. Schuchardt's Archives in Graz contain about 13,000 letters (Eismann, Hurch 2008: 6) cannot be considered surprising: this was the method through which views were exchanged, discussions were conducted and information was passed on about what was happening in academic circles. This is exactly the character of the above-mentioned correspondence between Baudouin and Schuchardt in the years 1884–1922, which was almost entirely devoted to linguistic issues, to the question of the origin of pidgins, the problems of etymology and the international auxiliary language, amongst other topics of interest, all of which preoccupied both scholars.

For historians of scholarship the preserved letters of academics are thus an invaluable source of information not only about the way various scholarly conclusions were reached, but also about life within the academic environment. They additionally allow one to get to know the personality of a given author, rather than simply his academic views. Whereas old academic texts make it possible to write a history of scholarship in the sense of the development of ideas, theories and paradigms, the investigation of correspondence offers the additional possibility to reconstruct the ground on which the theories were developed, both in the sense of the scholarly communities and the individuals themselves.

The preserved letters written by Baudouin de Courtenay to Henryk Ułaszyn to be discussed in this paper are not only a source of interesting information about their author, but also a testimony to the friendship which was born between the professor and his former student, and which lasted until the end of Baudouin's life.

2. It is first necessary to briefly introduce Henryk Ułaszyn, the addressee of the letters, as he has been sadly somewhat forgotten. This is regrettable because many of his findings within the field of diachrony belong to the basic aspects of historical grammar studied by Polish philology students, for instance, the process of depalatalisation  $\check{e} > 'a, e > 'o$  was thoroughly analysed by Ułaszyn (Ułaszyn 1905) as well as the assimilation processes which took place in consonantal groups and led to their simplification (Ułaszyn 1956). It is also no longer commonly known that linguistics owes the term *morphoneme* (*morfonema*) to Ułaszyn (Ułaszyn 1931).

Ułaszyn also provided the first synthetic study of descriptive word formation in linguistic literature, at first in the form of a broad encyclopaedic article

<sup>1</sup> They were found in H. Ułaszyn's scholarly legacy stored in the Archives of the Polish Academy of Sciences in Warsaw by doc. dr hab. Magdalena Smoczyńska.

(Ułaszyn 1915), which was subsequently included in the academic publication, *Gramatyka języka polskiego (A grammar of the Polish language)* (GJP 1923). Without going into the details of Ułaszyn's scholarly output, I will only mention that it includes works belonging to the present-day fields of sociolinguistics, lexicology, lexicography, writers' language studies, onomastics, language correctness and language culture, and methodology of teaching (cf. *Introduction to Ułaszyn 2009*).

3. Henryk Ułaszyn was born in 1874 in Ukraine, into a family who were part of the gentry. He studied in Kiev, Cracow, briefly in Vienna (V. Jagić's seminar) and finally in Leipzig, where after the defence of his doctoral dissertation under the supervision of August Leskien he was active as a "private scholar" (*Privatgelehrter*) until 1914, maintaining himself on his part of the income from his family's property that he was entitled to receive. He cooperated with the Cracow circle, publishing in „Materiały i Prace Komisji Językowej Akademii Umiejętności”, „Rocznik Sławistyczny”, the Warsaw „Prace Filologiczne”, and other periodicals, including some from Germany („Archiv für slavische Philologie”, „Wörter und Sachen”). Altogether, between the years 1901 and 1914, he published 96 linguistic texts, as well as 126 articles and reviews which did not pertain to linguistic issues. The latter are book reviews from fields other than linguistics as well as journalistic texts on social and worldview matters.

It was only after WWI that, having lost his income from the family property, he was forced to take a paid job and was given the Polish Language chair at the University of Lviv in 1920, from whence he moved after a year to the University of Poznań. From 1945 up to his death in 1956 he was a professor at the University of Łódź.

4. Ułaszyn met Baudouin in 1897 in Cracow, where he went after studying History of Culture for three years at the University of Kiev. The impression that Baudouin made on him was so powerful that he decided to study linguistics. He attended Baudouin's lectures, participated in his *privatissima* at his flat on Pędzichów Street and was involved in his *conversatorium* seminars which took place at the university.

This is how, after many years, Ułaszyn remembered his first meeting with the professor:

W Krakowie domem, z którym zadzierzgnęły się najwcześniej i najściślej, najzaufaniej stosunki towarzyskie był dom profesora Baudouina de Courtenay. Że tak się stało, było to niewątpliwie skutkiem bardzo życzliwego ustosunkowania się do mnie samego profesora.

Przybywszy do Krakowa, od wielu kolegów usłyszałem bardzo dużo dobrego o BdC jako o człowieku i o jego przyjaznym stosunku do młodzieży, w zupełności odbijającym od stosunku innych profesorów. Traktował ich jako młodszych kolegów i interesował się ich zainteresowaniami naukowymi. Szczególnie kolega Franciszek Nowicki, medyk, Polak z Kaukazu, namawiał mnie na złożenie BdC. Więc też poszedłem.

Przyjął mnie w saloniku w szlafroku, oderwawszy się od pracy w sąsiednim pokoju. Okazał bardzo duże zainteresowanie moimi studiami. Radził mi zawrzeć znajomość właśnie ze świeżo upieczonym doktorem Kazimierzem Nitschem [...]. Obdarzył mnie

całą paczką swoich prac. A oprócz tego wypożyczył i kilka książek językoznawczych do przestudiowania. Wróciłem do domu literalnie obładowany. Zwróciło moją uwagę, że wśród książek pożyczonych mi do przestudiowania znajdowały się stare wykłady Maxa Müllera<sup>2</sup> o języku. Zwróciłem na to uwagę. Odpowiedział, że tam jest bardzo dużo dobrego jeszcze i dziś, ale najważniejsze, że książka pisana jest w ten sposób, że budzi zainteresowanie do zjawisk językowych i podsuwa dużo myśli. Będą ustępy trudne, dodał, nie należy się z nimi zrażać, można je na razie przeskoczyć.

Byłem oczarowany mą wizytą; pierwszy raz w życiu poczułem, że ktoś się zainteresował moimi zainteresowaniami i podał mi pomocną dłoń. Stałe stosunki moje z BdC od tego czasu nie ustały ani na chwilę, już aż do końca życia jego, zresztą bardzo długiego (Ułaszyn w druku).<sup>3</sup>

Their correspondence began in 1898 when Ułaszyn travelled to Vienna for a semester. At that point Baudouin was already approaching the end of his time at Cracow University. It was common knowledge that the Ministry of Education in Vienna had decided, on the basis of political rather than academic premises, not to extend Baudouin's professorial contract at Cracow University. This was due not only to the activity of the Galician conservatists, who disliked his views on social morality, but also as a result of the action of the Hungarian Government, which accused Baudouin of pan-Slavonic agitation in Slovakia, in those days a part of the Crown of St. Stephen. The termination of his contract as professor, however, took place against the wishes of the Board of the Faculty of Philosophy of the Jagiellonian University, in which the majority took Baudouin's side.

<sup>2</sup> Max Müller (correctly Friedrich Max Müller) (1823–1900), a German philologist and orientalist, the creator of European Indology, a professor of modern languages and comparative philology (later also comparative theology) at Oxford. Here reference is made to his two-volume book *Lectures on the science of language*, 1864.

<sup>3</sup> In Cracow the house in which the earliest and strongest ties were formed, the most enduring of social bonds, was the home of Professor Baudouin de Courtenay. The fact that it happened in this manner was doubtlessly the result of the very friendly attitude of the professor towards me.

On my arrival in Cracow I heard much good about BdC, both about the man himself and also about his friendly attitude towards young people, completely unlike the attitude of other professors. He treated them as younger colleagues and was curious about their academic interests. It was a particular friend of mine, Franciszek Nowicki, a medical student and a Pole from the Caucasus, who persuaded me to pay BdC a visit. And thus I went.

He received me in a small living room in his dressing-gown, having interrupted his work in a neighbouring room. He showed a great interest in my studies. He suggested that I should get to know Kazimierz Nitsch, who had recently gained his doctorate [...]. He gave me a great parcel of his works as a gift. And apart from that he also lent me a couple of linguistic books to study. I returned home literally laden. It came to my attention that among the books he had lent me there were certain old lectures about language, lectures which had been given by Max Müller.<sup>2</sup> I commented on this. He replied that there was still a lot of good in them today, but the most important thing was that the book was written in such a manner that it aroused interest in linguistic phenomena, provoked many thoughts which could then be reflected upon. There will be difficult fragments, he added, but one should not be discouraged by them, they may be skipped.

I was enchanted by my visit; it was the first time in my life that I felt that someone was curious about my interests and had given me a helping hand. My relations with BdC continued and did not terminate from that time onwards, not even for a while, until the end of his life, which in any case was a very long life (Ułaszyn in print).

Ułaszyn rather ineffectually attempted to make the Polish circles in Vienna defend his professor. He finally abandoned these efforts after some persuasive letters written by Jan M. Rozwadowski, an Indo-European scholar and at that time a reader at the Jagiellonian University, who saw the danger in Polish socialist activists using the case of Baudouin for their own political aims (Rozwadowski, a letter to H. Ułaszyn of 19.02.1898). Echoes of this case can be found in one of Baudouin's letters:

[...] Dziękuję Panu bardzo, że Pan przeciwdziałał zgromadzeniu w mojej sprawie z udziałem posłów i robotników. Byłoby to właśnie mieszanym polityki do nauki, a przecież przeciwko temu protestowała młodzież ucząca się. Takie zgromadzenie wszystkich Polaków, po większej części niemających żadnego wyobrażenia ani o znaczeniu nauki w ogóle, ani w szczególności o moim stanowisku naukowym, obniżyłoby tylko sprawę i nadałoby jej nieprzyjemny i wcale niepożądany charakter [...] (Kraków 14 III 1899).<sup>4</sup>

Baudouin's departure to Saint Petersburg from Cracow was the reason Ułaszyn decided to continue his studies in Leipzig (Ułaszyn in print).<sup>5</sup> From that time onwards the correspondence became regular, and with the passage of time the professor – student relationship evolved into a professional but friendly relationship, with some strong private, even intimate, accents.

From the very beginning Baudouin had high academic hopes of Ułaszyn, therefore, he invited him to participate in the work on the *Słownik staropolski* (*The Old Polish dictionary*). In one of the letters we find Baudouin's detailed instruction on how to analyse the lexical material, and even some sketched models of index cards.

When Ułaszyn asked Baudouin to suggest a theme for his doctoral dissertation, the latter sent him a list of subjects worth analysing:

[...]

- 1) Zastępstwo, a raczej kontynuacja prasłowiańskich *ǔ* (*o*) i *ĩ* (*o*) na obszarze językowym polsko-kaszubskim i czesko-słowackim (albo: w językach polskim, czeskim i słowackim) Tu musi być dane m.i[n]. objaśnienie polskich *wioska*, *dzionek* itp.
- 2) Takież samo (podobne) rozpatrzenie kontynuacji prasłowiańskich *r̥*, *r̥i*, *l̥*, *l̥i*,
- 3) Objaśnienie, dlaczego w języku polskim mamy *mróz*, *chlód*, *ród*, *róg*, *bób*, *złób*..., ale *nos*, *płot*, *kot*, *rok*, *pop* itp., porównawczo z językiem czeskim i słowackim. (Nb. Tutaj trzeba uwzględnić to, co się znajduje w moim *O древнопольском языке*).

<sup>4</sup> Thank you very much for taking action against the gathering, organising for my sake the participation of Members of Parliament and workers. It would have indeed been an interference of politics with scholarship, and this is what the students protested against. Such a gathering of all the Poles, mostly having no idea either about the meaning of scholarship in general, or my academic status in particular, would only have lowered the level of the issue and given it an unpleasant and a most undesirable character [...] (Cracow 14.03.1899).

<sup>5</sup> Ułaszyn writes in his memoirs: "Therefore, I was sad when Mr and Mrs Baudouin were not in Cracow any longer. Admittedly, it happened at a time when I was in a way immersed in social relations, but I had felt in the Baudouins' house as if in my own family home. And professional discussions were lacking too [...]" (Ułaszyn in print).

- 4) Alternacje psychofonetyczne, czyli korelacje w deklinacji lub też w koniugacji polskiej.
- 5) Zera fonetyczne (tj. braki głoski, [-], a raczej fonemy) w języku polskim, kontynuujące nie *ǔ* (*ǔ*), *ǐ* (*ǐ*), ale inne samogłoski (*tak*\_, *nikt*\_, *tam*\_, *lepiej*\_, inf. -*ć*\_ itp.).
- 6) Element psychiczny w fonetyce polskiej, a mianowicie: odróżnienie tych różnic i zmian, które dokonywają się jedynie przez wymawianie (w samym procesie fonacyjnym) od różnic i zmian istniejących także psychicznie, czyli należących do języka w ścisłym znaczeniu tego wyrazu.
- 7) Kontynuacje polskie, kaszubskie, słowackie i czeskie spółgłosek przedniojęzykowych ześrodkniojęzykowych („zmiękczonej”, „spalatalizowanych”), tak w połączeniach z *j* (*i*) (*tj*, *dj*, *sj*, *zj*, *lj*, *rj*, *nj*), jako też pod wpływem następujących nigdyś po nich samogłosek średniojęzykowych.
- 8) Kontynuacja polskich prasłowiańskich samogłosek *e* (*a*) i *ě* (*rb*).
- 9) Pochodzenie grup spółgłoskowych w rodzaju *tř* (*trzoda*, *trzonek*), *śr* (*środa*) itp.
- 10) Opracowanie gramatyczne jednego z zabytków staropolskich, np. *Kazań świętokrzyskich* lub tp.
- 11) O związku rodzajowości (masc. fem., neutr.) z wyglądem formalnym rzeczowników polskich (Petersburg, 7/20 XI 1901).<sup>6</sup>

It should be noted that the list which is quoted gives us a certain insight as to what issues from the fields of Polish Language as well as Slavonic Studies needed analysing by the up and coming Polish academic linguistics of that time. This generation, to which belonged Ułaszyn, Nitsch, as well as the somewhat older Rozwadowski and Jan Łoś, among others, were the first generation of Polish linguists not only educated in European linguistics but prepared to conduct academic work.

In terms of his doctoral dissertation Ułaszyn presented a work on the depalatalisation of the Proto-Slavonic *e*, which led to his renown as an excellent methodologist

<sup>6</sup> [...]

- <sup>1)</sup> A substitution, or rather a continuation of the Proto-Slavonic *ǔ* (*ǔ*) and *i* (*ǐ*) in the Polish-Kashubian and Czech-Slovak linguistic area (or: In the Polish, Czech and Slovak languages). Here an explanation of the Polish *wioska*, *dzionek*, etc. must be given among others.
- <sup>2)</sup> The same (similar) analysis of the continuation of the Proto-Slavonic *r*, *r̃*, *l*, *l̃*,
- <sup>3)</sup> An explanation of why in Polish we have *mróz*, *chlód*, *ród*, *róg*, *bób*, *źlób*..., but *nos*, *płat*, *kąt*, *rok*, *pop*, etc., as compared with the Czech and the Slovak languages (please note that it needs to be considered here what I wrote in my *О древнепольском языке*).
- <sup>4)</sup> Psychophonetic alternations, i.e. correlations in Polish declension or conjugation.
- <sup>5)</sup> Phonetic zeros (i.e. sounds missing, [-], or rather phonemes) in the Polish language continuing not *ǔ* (*ǔ*), *ǐ* (*ǐ*), but other vowels (*tak*\_, *nikt*\_, *tam*\_, *lepiej*\_, inf. -*ć*\_, etc.).
- <sup>6)</sup> A psychological element in Polish phonetics, namely: a distinction between those differences and changes which take place only through articulation (in the actual phonation process) and the differences existing also in the psychological sense, i.e. belonging to language in the strict sense of the word.
- <sup>7)</sup> Polish, Kashubian, Slovak and Czech continuations of the centralised front consonants (“softened”, “palatalised”), both in combination with *j* (*i*) (*tj*, *dj*, *sj*, *zj*, *lj*, *rj*, *nj*), and under the influence of the central vowels which once followed them.
- <sup>8)</sup> A continuation of Proto-Slavonic vowels *e* (*a*) and *ě* (*rb*).
- <sup>9)</sup> The origin of consonantal clusters like *tř* (*trzoda*, *trzonek*), *śr* (*środa* -), etc.
- <sup>10)</sup> A grammatical analysis of one of the Old Polish records, e.g. of the *Kazania świętokrzyskie* (The Holy Cross Sermons) or other similar texts.
- <sup>11)</sup> About the connection between gender (masc. fem., neutr.) and the formal look of Polish nouns (Saint Petersburg, 7/20.11.1901).

and a reliable researcher in the Slavonic world. Soon afterwards Baudouin advised his student that he should think about a post-doctoral degree in, e.g. Cracow, or a Master of Arts degree in Russia, which would enable him to work at one of the Russian universities.<sup>7</sup>

Pyta mię Pan o radę co do swej przyszłości. Otóż nie wiem, dokąd się Pan chce skierować: czy za granicę, np. do Austrii, czy też do „любезного отечества”. W pierwszym razie można by się habilitować w jakim uniwersytecie, np. we lwowskim lub krakowskim. W drugim zaś wypadku, jeżeli Pan myśli o karierze uniwersyteckiej, należałoby zwrócić się do którego z uniwersytetów rosyjskich z prośbą o przypuszczenie do egzaminu magisterskiego. Przypuszczam, że wybrałby Pan sobie nie filologię słowiańską (m.in. egzamin z paru historii literatury), ale tylko językoznawstwo porównawcze (сравнительное языковедение). Egzamin ustny stanowią: gramatyka porówn[awcza] jęz[yków] arioeurop[ajskich], sanskryt, grecki, łacina (Petersburg, 10/23 XII 1904).

Egzamin magisterski, o ile sędzę, nie będzie dla Pana trudny. W Petersburgu np. zdawałby Pan z głównych przedmiotów (gram[atyka] porówn[awcza] i sanskryt) u mnie, a ja chyba nie potrzebowałbym żądać żadnego osobnego przygotowywania, po zdaniu egz[aminu] doktorskiego w Lipsku. Pozostają jeszcze osobno łacina i grecki jako przedmioty dodatkowe, ale tu, w Petersburgu, a sędzę, że także gdzie indziej, dość poważnie traktowane. Wymagają gramatyki naukowej (którą Pan oczywiście oświadczył) oraz: z łaciny trzech komedii Terencjusza lub Plauta; z greckiego trzech tragedii i coś tam niby z epigrafiki. Oprócz egzaminu ustnego pisze się także, dzięki inercji i głupocie prawodawców, odpowiedź piśmienną (*clausura*) z głównego przedmiotu, ale to wierutne głupstwo. Żadne przepisy szczegółowe nie istnieją, oprócz tego, że trzeba zdać egzamin z wymienionych przedmiotów i przedstawić rozprawę. Na rozprawę może Pan wziąć ten sam temat, co na doktorską w Lipsku, byle go tylko rozszerzyć i nieco zmodyfikować (Petersburg, 17/30 I 1905).<sup>8</sup>

<sup>7</sup> In Russia up to 1917 the Master of Arts degree (*магистр*), introduced in 1803 by an *ukas* [order] of Alexander I, was an intermediate degree available to candidates (*кандидат* – it existed up to 1884) who had graduated with honours, however, it had to be taken prior to a doctoral degree (*доктор*). The degree was obtained after passing an oral and written examination and undertaking the defence of a dissertation before the Board of the Faculty, although at some universities one also had to deliver a public lecture. The requirements concerning a Master of Arts degree were comparable with the requirements for a Doctor of Philosophy degree at European universities, hence a doctorate awarded in the West could be recognised in Russia only after completing the procedure of nostrification at certain Russian universities.

<sup>8</sup> You are asking my advice concerning your future. Well, I do not know where you want to go from here: whether abroad, e.g. to Austria, or to „любезное отечество”. In the first case you could do a postdoctoral degree at a university, e.g. Lviv or Cracow. Otherwise, if you are thinking about an academic career, you would have to apply to one of the Russian universities for admission to an MA examination. I assume that you would not choose Slavonic Philology (among others, there is an examination in a number of Histories of Literature), but only comparative linguistics (сравнительное языковедение). The oral examination comprises the comparative grammar of Aryan-European languages, Sanskrit, Greek, and Latin (Saint Petersburg, 10/23.12.1904).

The MA examination, I think, will not be difficult for you. In Saint Petersburg you would e.g. take an examination in two main subjects (comparative grammar and Sanskrit) before me, and I think I would not require any separate preparation from you after you have passed

In the end Ułaszyn did not take Baudouin's advice, deciding on Leipzig and his individual academic work beyond the constraints of academia.

5. In 1908 the first volume of „Rocznik Sławistyczny”, which is still in existence, appeared, established by J. Rozwadowski, J. Łoś and K. Nitsch as a private academic journal. The editorial staff published two reviews of the book, „Dzieje języka polskiego” (*A history of the Polish language*), written by Alexander Brückner, a professor of Berlin University, a philologist and a distinguished researcher in Polish culture, language and literature. Baudouin de Courtenay was the author of one review, Ułaszyn of the other and both were rather critical. The reviews immediately became the subject of a sharp dispute between Ułaszyn and Brückner, which lasted for nearly three years. This issue involved linguists from Saint Petersburg and Moscow, as well as Cracow, Warsaw, Vienna, Leipzig, Berlin and Paris, either as participants or observers.

Both adversaries published polemic brochures (Brückner 1909; Ułaszyn 1909, 1910), and Ułaszyn brought two law suits against Brückner, winning on both occasions. This also led to the break-up of the editorial staff of a very important linguistic journal „Archiv für slavische Philologie”, whose editor, V. Jagić, was unable to take a firm stand with regard to a groundless accusation of falsifying a quotation with which Brückner burdened Ułaszyn in the columns of the „Archiv”. Jagić's indecisiveness and misjudgement were the reason why August Leskien left the editorial staff. Aleksander Brückner, on the other hand, having been defeated in court also had to step down from the editorial staff. A further unfortunate decision by Jagić meant that finally the „Archiv” was only left with the editor-in-chief, i.e. himself.

This topic is addressed in many of Baudouin's letters, who was also treated unpleasantly by Brückner in his brochure „Filologia i lingwistyka” (*Philology and linguistics*). It is mainly, however, a reaction to Ułaszyn's letters in which he relates the course of the affair, as Baudouin himself was not actively involved in the argument, limiting himself to expressing his opinions about Brückner in his letters and morally supporting his former student. He wrote in one:

[...] Brückner jest po prostu psychopatą: *mania grandiosa* (megalomania) w połączeniu z *manią persecutionis*. A przy tym dziwnie jest tępy w pojmowaniu faktów językowych. Nie odróżnia nawet liter od dźwięków. Człowiek ten jest klęską w „nauce polskiej”, o ile o takiej nauce mowa być może [...] (Petersburg, 20 III/3 IV 1907).

---

the doctoral examination in Leipzig. Latin and Greek still remain as additional but separate subjects, although here in Saint Petersburg, and I think also elsewhere, they are treated quite seriously. They demand scientific grammar (which you have obviously mastered) as well as three comedies by Terence or Plautus in Latin, three tragedies in Greek and also something supposedly from epigraphy. Apart from the oral examination one also writes, due to the inertia and stupidity of the employers, a written answer (*clausura*) on the main subject, but this is complete nonsense. No detailed regulations exist, apart from the fact that one has to take examinations in the aforementioned subjects and present a dissertation. You can take the same subject for your dissertation as for the doctoral one in Leipzig, as long as it is extended and somewhat altered (Saint Petersburg, 17/30.01.1905).



[...] Br[ückner] jest po prostu osobistością zwyrodniałą pod względem moralnym i dlatego tak chętnie robi innym zarzuty moralnie uwłaczające. Przypuszczam, że Jagić nie czytał wcale jego artykułu przed wydrukowaniem. Jeżeli zaś czytał, to jest to z jego strony szpetny postępek. Oczywiście powinien Pan napisać całkiem obiektywne wyjaśnienie i zażądać od Jagicia, ażeby je wydrukował. Na odpowiedź w ścisłym znaczeniu tego wyrazu taki spodlony facet, jak Brückner, wcale nie zasługuje [...]. (Petersburg, 9/22 IV 1908).<sup>9</sup>

But when the case was over, and the emotions had subsided, Baudouin did not refuse to write Brückner's biography for a Russian encyclopaedia, about which he informed Ułaszyn:

Do *Encyklopedii* rosyjskiej Brockhousa i Jefrona mam pisać artykuł o Brücknerze, a nie mam absolutnie czasu na wyszukiwanie odpowiedniej bibliografii i charakterystyki. Pan jest specjalistą od Brücknera. Wobec tego zwracam się do Pana z prośbą o łaskawe wskazanie mi, gdzie mógłbym znaleźć wykaz najważniejszych dzieł Brücknera, jego charakterystykę itd.

Jakie z jego dzieł uważa Pan za najważniejsze? Jakie kierunki jego działalności Pan by uwzględnił?

Filolog – historyk literatury – historyk – odkrywca bezceństw Cyryla i Metodego itd., itd. Za wszelkie uwagi będę Panu niezmiernie wdzięczny. Sam postaram się być całkiem obiektywnym i uwzględnić zasługi naukowe B[rückner]-a (Petersburg, 21 X/3 XI 1911).<sup>10</sup>

One of Baudouin's characteristic features is clearly shown here – an ability to separate issues from people, and their merits from their less laudable behaviour. It is also impossible not to notice a short but rather spiteful remark towards Ułaszyn, that of “You are a Brückner specialist”.

<sup>9</sup> Brückner is simply a psychopath: *mania grandiosa* (megalomania) combined with the *mania persecutionis*. And at the same time he is strangely slow-witted in understanding facts about language. He does not even distinguish letters from sounds. This man is a disaster in “Polish scholarship”, if one can talk about such a scholarship at all [...] (Saint Petersburg, 20.03/3.04.1907).

[...] Br[ückner] is simply a degenerate personality in moral terms and, therefore, he very willingly accuses others of morally insulting things. I assume that Jagić did not read his article before printing it at all. And if he did read it, it is an ugly act on his part. Of course, you should write a thoroughly objective explanation and demand that Jagić should print it. Such a debased individual as Brückner does not deserve an answer in the strictest sense of the word at all [...] (Saint Petersburg, 9/22.04.1908).

<sup>10</sup> I am to write an article about Brückner for the Russian *Encyclopaedia* by Brockhaus and Jefron, and I have absolutely no time to search for a suitable biography and description of his character. You are a Brückner specialist. Therefore, I turn to you with a request to kindly tell me where I could find a list of Brückner's most important works, a description of his character, etc.

Which of his works do you consider the most important? Which areas of his activities would you highlight?

A philologist – a historian of literature – a historian – a discoverer of the outrages of Cyril and Methodius, etc., etc. I would be extremely grateful to you for any comments. As for myself, I will try to be thoroughly objective and emphasize B[rückner]'s academic merits (Saint Petersburg, 21.10./3.11.1911).

6. Baudouin's preserved letters (despite the lack of the letters from Ułaszyn) allow one to form a picture of their correspondence. They exchange information about the academic literature being published, offprints of their own work, news about events in Saint Petersburg and Leipzig. However, private, intimate motifs are not lacking, either. It is noticeable how the original master – disciple relationship becomes enriched over time with a bond of camaraderie or even friendship. It can be noted that Ułaszyn wrote to Baudouin about personal issues, treating him as a person who was very close to him. One can also see Baudouin's extremely friendly and cordial attitude to his former student, and the form of address, "Dear Colleague", additionally encourages Baudouin to share personal information to a greater extent than is known in letters to his other friends.

[...] Proszę się nie dziwić, że tak długo nie odpisuję. Nie mając zajęć obowiązkowych i zarobkowych dla pokrycia olbrzymich wydatków na utrzymanie rodziny i na kształcenie dzieci w rozmaitych mądrościach i sztukach pięknych (to ostatnie pochłania mi do 1000 rubli rocznie), nie ma Pan też wyobrażenia o tej katorzce, w jakiej ja tu żyję. Obecnie mam 14 godzin tygodniowo (6 uniw., 6 Kursa Żeńskie, 2 Akad. Pedagogiczna, a tu właściwie 4, gdyż na dostanie się do niej i powrót trzeba tramwajami 2-ch godzin). A do tego dodać słownik Dala i całą kupę różnych głupstw i paskudztw. W dodatku w ostatnich czasach bolała mię silnie prawa ręka (ból „reumatyczne” czy też „newralgiczne” i coś niby w rodzaju lekkiego sparaliżowania). Chorowały też dzieci, dwie młodsze córki. Pojutrze wyjeżdża córka druga, malarka,<sup>11</sup> do Paryża na dalsze studia (Petersburg (10/23 XI 1908).

Bardzo bym pragnął zabrać głos w sprawie pisowni, ale, niestety, duszą mię i paraliżują moje zajęcia bieżące. Dawno przestałem być człowiekiem pracującym naukowo, a zamieniłem się na bydlę robocze lub też katorżnika, pracującego bez wytchnienia na utrzymanie całej falangi istot ludzkich. Pomimo tej ogłupiającej pracy sam żyję w jak najgorszych warunkach. Straciłem właściwie wszelką ochotę do życia. Bo jeżeli w tym wieku trzeba być jeszcze bydlęciem roboczym, toć chyba nie warto żyć. W rozpoczynającym się semestrze czeka mię 22 godziny tygodniowo samych wykładów, nie licząc czasu na komunikację, na egzaminy, na posiedzenia itd. Istnie piekło. Wobec tego może Pan sobie wystawić, jak łatwo mi jest zabrać się do jakiej pracy naukowej, choćby tylko o pisowni. Przecież do tego trzeba to i owo przejrzeć, a ja muszę trzymać swe książki i szpargały w chaosie i nieporządku, gdyż mam ciasne mieszkanie, podobne raczej do trumny niż do mieszkania, a nie ma ani jednej osoby, która by chciała pomóc mi w utrzymaniu porządku. Za tę obmierzłą dziurę, która się nazywa moim mieszkaniem, płacę 1 500 rubli rocznie! Mówię tu oczywiście o tej części mieszkania, w której powinien bym pracować.

Zanim się zabiorę do pisowni, muszę wprzód załatwić się z kilku innymi pracami, które mi od dawna leżą na karku i ciążą na sumieniu (Petersburg, 8/21 I 1914).<sup>12</sup>

<sup>11</sup> Zofia Baudouin de Courtenay (1887–1967) studied painting in Saint Petersburg, Cracow, Vienna, Munich, and Paris. Within the independent Poland she was engaged in the renovation of church interiors, and after WWII she lectured in the High School of Fine Arts in Warsaw.

<sup>12</sup> [...] Please do not be surprised that I have not responded for a long time. Not having full-time, paid work to cover the huge expenditure in supporting my family and educating my children in various kinds of wisdom and the fine arts (the latter takes up to 1000 roubles per year), you cannot possibly imagine the penal servitude in which I live here. At present I have 14 hours

These examples of Baudouin's opinions are also known from some of his letters to other addressees, but it is only in a letter to Ułaszyn that can one find such a bitter-sweet comment:

[...] Śp. Stanisław syn Pawła Mikucki często powtarzał o różnych ludziach: „tak, tak, pracuje w dzień jak wół, a w nocy jak byk”. Ja o sobie mogę zastosować tylko pierwszą połowę tej charakterystyki. W dzień pracuję istotnie jak wół, a raczej jak koń dorożkarski lub tramwajowy, i to jedno już wyklucza możliwość stosowania do mnie drugiej połowy, nie mówiąc już o „*преклонном возрасте*” i „*маститой*”, *polonice* „sędziwości” [...] (Saint Petersburg, 26 IV/9 V 1909).<sup>13</sup>

Baudouin's letters additionally make interesting references to events and personalities in the academic world of that time. Through them we become acquainted with the scholar's personal views about people and their work, sometimes sharp and critical, sometimes even malicious.

Broszurę Brugmanna i Leskiena o *Künst[liche] Weltsprachen*<sup>14</sup> przysłano mi ze Strasburga jako dar autorów. Uwagi krytyczne są w znacznej części słuszne, ale jednostronne, a nawet polegają bądź to na nieporozumieniu, bądź też na umyślnej niechęci rozumienia tego, o co chodzi. Prawdopodobnie coś w tej sprawie napiszę.

---

a week (6 university, 6 courses for women, 2 pedagogical academy, and in fact 4 more for getting there and back as it takes two hours by tram). And add to this Dal's dictionary and a whole heap of various ridiculous and unpleasant things. In addition to this, recently I have had a serious pain in my right hand (“rheumatological” or “neuralgic” pain, something like a light paralysis). Also the children, my two younger daughters, have been ill. The day after tomorrow my second daughter, a painter,<sup>11</sup> is leaving for Paris in order to pursue further studies (Saint Petersburg (10/23.11.1908).

I would very much like to express my opinion on the issue of spelling, sadly, however, my soul and myself are paralysed by my current activities. A long time ago I stopped being an academic doing research work, and changed into a drudge or else a convict sentenced to hard labour, working non-stop in order to maintain a whole host of human beings. Despite this stupefying work, I myself live in the worst possible conditions. In fact, I have lost any desire to live on. Because, if at my age one still has to be a drudge, life is probably not worth living. In the semester which is beginning now I am expected to have 22 hours of lectures each week, without counting the time needed for commuting, examinations, meetings, etc. Absolute hell. Therefore, you can imagine how it is not easy for me to get to any academic work, even if only concerning spelling. After all, one needs to look over this or that for this reason or that, and I have to keep my books and papers in chaos and disorder as I have too small an apartment, similar to a coffin rather than an apartment, and there is no single person who would like to help me with keeping order. This abominable hovel, which I call my apartment, costs me 1,500 roubles per month! I am obviously speaking about the part of the apartment in which I should be working.

Before I get down to the spelling, I must first deal with a few other things which have long been incumbent on me and caused qualms of conscience (Saint Petersburg, 8/21.01.1914).

<sup>13</sup> [...] The late Stanisław, son of Paweł Mikucki, often said about various people: “Yes, yes, in the day he works like an ox, and at night like a bull”. I can only apply the first half of this description to myself. Indeed, in the day I really work like an ox, or rather like a cart or a tram horse, and this without doubt excludes the possibility of referring the latter part to me, not to speak about „*преклонный возраст*” and „*маститый*”, *polonice* “old age” [...] (Saint Petersburg, 26.04./9.05.1909).

<sup>14</sup> K. Brugmann, A. Leskien, *Zur Kritik der künstlichen Weltsprachen*, Strassburg 1907.

Główne nieporozumienie polega na traktowaniu esperanto i i[n.], jako претендующих na wprowadzenie w życie w tym samym stopniu jak języki plemienne i narodowe (Petersburg, 30 V/10 VI 1907)

Broszurę Brugmanna i Leskiena o *Weltsprachen* otrzymałem. Może coś o niej napiszę. Zdaje mi się, że obaj ci panowie nie zdają sobie jasno sprawy z tego, czym właściwie powinien być taki język i jak się na niego należy zapatrywać. Prócz tego Brugmann zdradza złośliwość i zaciętrzewienie, nie licujące z powagą *Geheimrata*, chociaż traktowanie z góry i „bez nogę” wynika z poczucia wielkiej wyższości dygnitarza naukowego nad *profanum vulgus*. Nie jestem wcale ani esperantystą, ani też zwolennikiem jakiego innego j[ęzyk]-a międzynarodowego, ale utrzymuję, że jest to kwestia poważna i nie mamy prawa zbywać ją kpinami i lekceważącym traktowaniem (Warszawa, 28 VI 1907).<sup>15</sup>

Baudouin also evaluated Ułaszyn's work, which the latter sent to him:

Odczytałem je uważnie właśnie dziś i jestem sobie za to wdzięczny. Mówię o *Miscellaneach językowych*.<sup>16</sup> Podziały one na mnie *anregend*, tj. wzbudziły różne myśli i pchnęły do uogólnień. Pańskie objaśnienie *kv* i *kř* uważam za bardzo trafne. W ten sam sposób objaśniałem to dla siebie i w swoich wykładach [nieczytelne], że *kw* ≤ *kū* (nie *u* [2 wyrazy nieczytelne pod stemplem pocztowym]) itd. Pańskie uogólnienia prowadzi prostą drogą do dalszych uogólnień; dowodzi to ich wielkiej wartości.

*Józwę* (*Józef*, *Józwa*) objaśnia Pan także bardzo trafnie. W ogóle nie żałuję czasu użytego na uważne przeczytanie Pańskiej książki (Petersburg, 25 V/7 VI 1912).<sup>17</sup>

<sup>15</sup> I have been sent from Strasbourg Brugmann and Leskien's brochure about *Künstl[iche] Weltsprachen*<sup>14</sup> as a gift from the authors. The critical comments are to a large extent justified, but one-sided, and they could even be described either as a misunderstanding or else as a deliberate unwillingness to understand what is going on. I will probably write something about this issue. The main misunderstanding consists of the fact that Esperanto and other languages are treated as if they aspired to be introduced into life to the same extent as tribal and national languages are (Saint Petersburg, 30.05./10.06.1907).

I did receive Brugmann and Leskien's brochure about *Weltsprachen*. Perhaps I will write something about it. It occurs to me that these two gentlemen do not clearly see what in fact such a language should be and how to view it. Apart from that Brugmann shows malice and doggedness, which are incompatible with the seriousness of *Geheimrat*, although the fact that he looks down on people and treats them coldly stems from a sense of the great superiority an academic dignitary has over *profanum vulgus*. I am not at all either an Esperantist or a follower of some other international language, but I do claim that it is a serious issue and we have no right to dismiss it with mockery and disrespect (Warsaw, 28.06.1907).

<sup>16</sup> This refers to the first series of the *Miscellanea językowe* (*Language miscellanea*) by H. Ułaszyn of 1911, containing the articles: 1. Asymilacja spółgłosek pod względem dźwięczności (Consonant assimilation in terms of their sonority), 2. Próba wyjaśnienia form: *bez*, *przez*, *przed*, (An attempt to explain the forms: *bez*, *przez*, *przed*). 3. Pol. Trucizna (The Polish *trucizna* ('poison')), 4. Do historii pol. bies 'daemon' (A contribution to the history of the Polish *bies* 'daemon'). 5. Pol. gwarowe *Józwa*, (dialectal Polish *Józwa*), 6. Złodziejsko-pol. lipo 'oko, okno' (The Polish-thief *lipo* 'eye, window'), *Materiały i Prace Komisji Językowej AU*, vol. 5.

<sup>17</sup> I read them carefully just today and for myself I am grateful for this. I am talking about the *Miscellanea językowe* (*Language miscellanea*).<sup>16</sup> They had an *anregend* effect on me, i.e. they inspired different thoughts and pushed me towards some generalisations. I consider your explanation of *kv* and *kř* to be very apt. I explained it to myself in the same way and in my

It is regrettable that from among the preserved letters a number are probably missing (there is a gap between August 1913 and April 1914), those which might refer to his court case connected with the brochure „Национальный и территориальный признак в автономии”, С-Петербург 1913.<sup>18</sup> Only two letters have been preserved. It is hard to imagine that in such a difficult period for Baudouin Ułaszyn did not ask him how the case was progressing. In one of the preserved letters Baudouin wrote:

[...] Żyję tu jak we młynie diabelskim, nie mając ani chwili czasu na skoncentrowanie się. Do różnych przyjemności dołączyła się w ostatnich czasach konieczność dostarczania materiałów dla moich obrońców. Podano skargę kasacyjną do Senatu, ale na to słaba nadzieja, gdyż Senat tyleż wart, co i Izba Sądowa. Jest to po prostu zemsta polityczna. Ja sam nie uważam nawet spodziewanego siedzenia w twierdzy czy też w więzieniu za nieszczęście; warunki bowiem życia petersburskiego są nie o wiele lepsze od więzienia [...] (Petersburg, 4/17 IV 1914).

[...] Moja sprawa jest tymczasem w zawieszeniu (jak już pisałem do Lyonu); czeka na wyrok senatu co do kasacji. Mała na to nadzieja, gdyż wyrokujące o tym wydziały senatu składają się z samych prawie „czarnoszczecińców”,<sup>19</sup> a jak trafnie wyraził się jeden z kolportujących albumy i kalendarze podpułkowników, zostałem skazany nie przez izbę sądową, ale tylko przez „sojuzników”. Grupa moich przyjaciół (profesorów i akademików) przygotowuje zapiskę (broszurę) w mej sprawie; ma ona być wydrukowana jako „rękopis”, a więc nie pójdzie do handlu księgarskiego [...] (Petersburg, 6/19 IV 1914).<sup>20</sup>

The letter of 6(19).04.1914 is the last before WWI. Baudouin spent the war and then both revolutions (both the February and the Bolshevik) in Saint Petersburg.

---

lectures [illegible], that  $kw \leq k\mu$  (not  $u$  [2 words illegible under a postmark]), etc. Your generalisations lead straight to other generalisations; this proves their great value.

You also explain *Józwa* (*Józef, Józwa*) very aptly. I do not regret the time spent on the careful reading of your book at all (Saint Petersburg, 25.05/7.06. 1912).

<sup>18</sup> *Narodowa i terytorialna cecha autonomii* (*The national and territorial feature of autonomy*), Polish translation, cf. Baudouin 2007.

<sup>19</sup> A jocular travesty of the noun *czarnosecinniec* ‘a member of the black military unit’, the way of the Union of the Russian Nation (aka. People) established in 1905 (*Союз русского народа*), an ultra-nationalistic, anti-Semitic and monarchist organisation calling for pogroms against the Jews.

<sup>20</sup> [...] I live here as if on a rollercoaster, not having even a moment to concentrate. The various pleasures have recently been extended by a necessity to supply my advocates with materials. A cassation complaint was submitted to the Senate, but this is a slim chance, as the Senate is as useful as the Court Chamber. It is simply a political revenge. I myself do not even consider the expected imprisonment in the fortress or prison a misfortune, as the living conditions in Saint Petersburg are not much better than prison [...] (Saint Petersburg, 4/17.04. 1914).

[...] In the meantime my case has been suspended (as I have already written from Lyon); it is awaiting the verdict of the Senate concerning the cassation. It is a slim hope, as the Senate departments adjudicating it consist of almost only „czarnoszczecińce”,<sup>19</sup> and as one of the lieutenant colonels distributing albums and calendars aptly expressed it, I was sentenced not by the Court Chamber, but by the „sojuzniks”. A group of my friends (professors and academics) are preparing a note (a brochure) with reference to my case; it is to be printed as a “manuscript”, and thus it will not be distributed via the bookshops [...] (Saint Petersburg, 6/19.04.1914).

The outbreak of the war found Ułaszyn in Ukraine, in Kiev, where he worked in Polish grammar schools and in 1917 co-organised Polish Academic Courses (The Polish University College). Both finally managed to return to Poland. Baudouin, as we know from his other letters, tried to find out about Ułaszyn's fate, especially as there was circulating in linguistic circles an unverified piece of news that he had been shot dead by the Bolsheviks. They finally found each other.

As we know, Baudouin not only lost most of his library in Saint Petersburg, but first and foremost all the academic materials he had collected throughout his lifetime, only some remnants of which he would recover after a few years.

Ułaszyn lost his family property, and also a part of his book collection as well as the complete manuscript of a Polish grammar on which he had been working for a number of years.

In his first post-war letter Baudouin wrote to Ułaszyn:

Szanowny i Kochany Panie Kolego!

Dzięki za listy z 11[?] X i z 19 XII, otrzymane kilka dni temu. Ponieważ Pan zaadresował je do Uniwersytetu, więc czekały one tam na mnie około tygodnia, dopóki się sam nie stawiłem w sekretariacie Uniwersytetu.

Chodziły tu o Pana rozmaite pogłoski, nawet że Pana rozstrzelano; raz mieli tego dokonać „bolszewicy”, drugi raz „ukraińcy”. Toteż za bytności mojej w Krakowie, 27–29 XI, bardzo się ucieszyłem, dowiedziawszy się, że Pan przybył do Lwowa, a nawet, jak mówiono 29-go, do Krakowa, co zresztą okazało się plotką. Z Pańskim towarzyszem podróży, Appelem,<sup>21</sup> widziałem się już 2 razy. Niezmiernie bym się uradował, gdyby Pan zajął do Warszawy. W pierwszych dniach lutego jadę do Lublina na wykłady 6-o-tygodniowe [sic!] we zdwojonej liczbie (10–12 g. tyg.). Dziś przyjechał tu Nitsch i zatrzymał się u Ehrenkreutzów,<sup>22</sup> ale go jeszcze nie widziałem.

List pisany przez lotnika dostał się do moich rąk przez RGO<sup>23</sup> (zdaje się, że tak się nazywa ta instytucja, która ogłaszała w gazetach adresy listów, przez nią otrzymanych) [...] (Warszawa, 1 I 1920).<sup>24</sup>

<sup>21</sup> Karol Appel (1857–1930), a linguist, for many years a teacher of French in grammar schools, from 1918 a professor of the Chair of General Linguistics which was created for him at the University of Warsaw. He remained under the influence of Baudouin's linguistic views.

<sup>22</sup> A reference to Baudouin's daughter Cezaria (1883–1967) and her second husband Stefan Ehrenkreutz (1880–1944), a law historian.

<sup>23</sup> The Central Protection Committee – a charity organisation working in the years 1916–1918 in the Congress Kingdom of Poland. In this case it is rather a reference to the Polish Red Cross established in 1919 (then: The Polish Red Cross).

<sup>24</sup> Respectful and Dear Colleague!

Thank you for the letters of 11[?].10 and 19.12, which I received a few days ago. Since you addressed them to the university, they waited for me there for about a week until I went to the University Secretariat myself.

There were various rumours about you here, even that you had been shot; once this was apparently done by the “Bolsheviks”, another time by the “Ukrainians”. That is why, when I was in Cracow on 27–29.11., I was very happy to learn that you had arrived in Lviv, and even as was mentioned on 29<sup>th</sup> in Cracow, which turned out to be gossip anyway. I have seen your travelling companion, Appel twice already. I would be extremely happy if you called on me in Warsaw. At the beginning of February I am going to Lublin for a six-week course of lectures, double in number (10–12 hours per week). Today Nitsch has arrived here and has stopped by at the Ehrenkreutzes,<sup>22</sup> but I have not yet seen him.

7. The following years proved to be difficult for both of them. However, they were academically and didactically active. Baudouin at the Universities of Warsaw and Lublin, Ułaszyn first in Lviv, then in Poznań. They were also both involved in organising the Society of Polish Language Lovers and the Polish Linguistic Society.

Additionally, they both pursued journalistic careers and gave lectures, becoming involved in a fight against the nationalist tendencies and clericalism, which were fast gaining prominence in the new Poland. In this sphere of Ułaszyn's activity one can clearly see how much he accepted Baudouin's ethical and social views, although with regard to faith he was not as radical as his professor. Baudouin was an agnostic, who finally formally left the Catholic Church. Ułaszyn searched for God, which also made him leave the church, but he converted to Protestantism. Both of them were firm opponents of "Catholic Imperialism", the denominational state, the imposition or banning of religion.

Baudouin was for a time active in the Polish Freethinkers Society, and also as editor of „Myśl Wolna” until the society was taken over by a group of communists (the case was discussed in a couple of letters). In the later years (1930–1935) Ułaszyn joined „Racjonalista”, a periodical published by the Warsaw Intellectuals Circle of the Polish Freethought Union.

They both became subject not only to attacks from the national and Catholic press, but also to assaults from the nationalist youth (the National Democrats) (Baudouin in Cracow, Ułaszyn a few times in Poznań).

8. In 1921 those Polish linguists who were favourably disposed to Baudouin decided to organise a celebration for him in honour of the 50<sup>th</sup> anniversary of his academic life, taking the latter to have begun in 1870, when his work, *О древнепольском языке до XIV-го столетия*, was first published in Leipzig. Ułaszyn, at that time already a professor at Lviv University, suggested that his university should give Baudouin the title, *doctor honoris causa*, but this was never realised:

Bardzo przykrą sprawą na Wydziale była sprawa Baudouina de Courtenay. W roku 1920 przypadł jubileusz pięćdziesięciolecia jego pracy naukowej, a właściwie od wydania jego znakomitej rozprawy o języku polskim do XIV stulecia włącznie. Zamierzyłem uczcić go uroczystym posiedzeniem w Towarzystwie Miłośników Języka Polskiego oraz wystaraniem się o udzielenie mu przez Uniwersytet Lwowski honorowego doktoratu. Obie sprawy upadły. O pierwszej piszę osobno, omawiając prace TMJP, do drugiej właśnie przechodzę.

Chyba na wiosnę roku 1920 postawiłem na Wydziale poparty odpowiednim pismem wniosek o udzielenie w roku jubileuszowym Baudouinowi de Courtenay doktoratu *honoris causa*. Natychmiast ze sprzeciwem wystąpił zagorzały endek-ukrainofob i antysemita profesor Andrzej Gawroński.<sup>25</sup> Naturalnie nie znalazłem

---

The letter written by the pilot reached me via the CPC<sup>23</sup> (I think this is the name of the institution which announced in the newspapers the addresses of the letters which it received) [...] (Warsaw, 1.01.1920).

<sup>25</sup> Andrzej Gawroński (1885–1927), a student of G. Blatt at Lviv University, then of E. W. Windisch and B. L. Lindner in Leipzig. An orientalist and Indologist. From 1912 a senior lecturer in Sanskrit Philology at the Jagiellonian University, and from 1916 a professor of the Chair

wystarczające poparcie i wniosek mój upadł. Nie udało się więc urządzić ani uroczystego posiedzenia TMJP poświęconego Baudouinowi de Courtenay, ani udzielenia doktoratu *honoris causa*. Nie można jednak powiedzieć, że nic zupełnie nie zrobiono; przeciwnie, miałem w kole slawistycznym założonym przeze mnie na Uniwersytecie Lwowskim dwa odczyty o Baudouinie de Courtenay. W pierwszym omówiłem całościowo działalność naukowej Baudouina de Courtenay, w drugim zaś jego znakomitą jubileuszową pracę o języku polskim do XIV w. (Ułaszyn w druku).<sup>26</sup>

The failure concerning the *honoris causa* doctorate became one of the reasons (the other being the case of Mojżesz Schorr's professorship<sup>27</sup>) why Ułaszyn initially stepped down from the Faculty Board, and then decided to move to Poznań, incidentally, finding himself in the National Democrats den.

Ułaszyn's adoration of Baudouin was growing with time and, therefore, he carefully followed all the press releases about Baudouin, he spoke in his defence, even in 1934 engaging in an epistolary dispute with Kazimierz Nitsch as an editor of „Język Polski”, standing up for Baudouin's *phonema* against the *phoneme*, accusing Nitsch of changing the original term used by his master and friend.

Even during the last years of his life Ułaszyn wrote in „Język Polski” (Ułaszyn 1955) against Witold Doroszewski's claim that Baudouin held a materialistic worldview, which in the Polish reality of that time could be equated with following the so-called “scientific worldview” in a primitive-reduced Bolshevik sense.

9. Baudouin became greatly disappointed with the free Poland in which the tendencies and phenomena against which he had fought with his pen during his days in pre-

---

of Comparative Linguistics at the University of Lviv. He was one of the founders of the Polish Linguistic Society and the Polish Orientalist Society. Jerzy Kuryłowicz was a student of his in Lviv. As regards A. Gawroński's strongly nationalist and anti-Semitic views, he inherited them from his father, the well known historian and novelist, Franciszek Rawita-Gawroński.

<sup>26</sup> A very unpleasant case at the Faculty was the matter of Baudouin de Courtenay. 1920 was the year of the fiftieth anniversary of his academic work, in fact since the publication of his exquisite dissertation about the Polish language up to and including 14<sup>th</sup> century. I was planning to celebrate it with a solemn meeting of the Society of the Polish Language Lovers and to arrange for the University of Lviv to grant him an honorary doctorate. Both matters fell through. I refer to the first one separately, while discussing the SPLL activities, so I will just pass on to the latter.

Probably in the spring of 1920 I put forward a proposal at the Faculty, supported by a suitable document, to give Baudouin de Courtenay the *honoris causa* doctorate in his jubilee year. An immediate objection was voiced by a staunch National Democrat, Ukrainephobe, and anti-Semite, professor Andrzej Gawroński.<sup>25</sup> Naturally, I did not receive sufficient support and my motion fell through. Thus, I was unable to either organise the solemn meeting of the SPLL devoted to Baudouin de Courtenay, or award him the *honoris causa* doctorate. One cannot, however, say that nothing was done whatsoever; on the contrary, I delivered two lectures about Baudouin de Courtenay in the Slavonic Circle established by myself at the University of Lviv. In the first I discussed the entirety of Baudouin de Courtenay's research work, and in the second, on the other hand, his exquisite jubilee work concerning the Polish language up to 14<sup>th</sup> century (Ułaszyn in print).

<sup>27</sup> Mojżesz Schorr (1874–1941), a Semitology specialist, an orientalist, a historian, a rabbi, a senator of the Republic of Poland, a member of the AU Orientalist Commission, from 1925 a professor at Warsaw University. In fact, his professorship in Lviv fell through due to racist rather than scholarly reasons.



revolutionary Russia, the nationalism, the persecution of national minorities as well as the growing clericalization, were rapidly becoming increasingly obvious.

A few days after the assassination of Piłsudski he wrote to Ułaszyn:

W r. 1914 pułk rosyjski, złożony w więcej niż połowie z Polaków, odbierał Sandomierz od austriackiego pułku krakowskiego; a dziś już obchodzimy się bez „rosyjskiego” i „austriackiego”. Przypomina się wiersz Słońskiego Edwarda *W okopach*, kiedy to Polacy z okopów rosyjskich i austriackich wzajemnie godzili w piersi swoje, myśląc o wskrzeszeniu „tej, co nie zginęła”. Czy i teraz marzono o jej „wskrzeszeniu”, czy też raczej o jej grzebaniu? Aleć było to wściekle musowane i podżegane, i musiało wybuchnąć w tej czy innej formie. Gdyby „zwycięstwo” przechyliło się na drugą stronę, przypuszczalnie szalałaby wściekła zemsta i tępienie przeciwników. W każdym razie z naruszaniem 7 przykazania walczono gorliwie za pomocą zajadłego naruszania 5 przykazania. Prawdziwy dom wariatów, opętańców i „wścieklistów”.

Kiedy 28 lutego r. 1861 od kul „moskiewskich” padło na ulicach Warszawy aż „pięciu poległych”, był wielki larum, a Deotyma napisała uroczysty wiersz.

12–15 maja r. 1926 padło lub umarło z ran przeszło 400, a rannych jest 1000 kilku-set i jakoś musimy się z tym pogodzić. A były to nie „moskiewskie” kule (Warszawa, 22 IV 1926).<sup>28</sup>

**10.** In Baudouin’s letters from the 1920s one can see a growing discouragement, a sense both of hopelessness and of a wasted life, a depressive state intensified by the loss of his scholar’s workshop, the news about scholars murdered or dead either because of hunger or disease in Bolshevik Russia – his acquaintances, friends and students. Some other things also contributed to this state. Called “the enemy of Poland”, “honorary”, i.e. deprived of full university rights and half of his salary, the professor,<sup>29</sup> had to again (now over 70) look for additional sources of income, as during the Saint Petersburg days.

<sup>28</sup> In 1914 a Russian regiment, over half of which consisted of Poles, took over Sandomierz from the Austrian Cracovian regiment, and today we are already managing without “Russian” and “Austrian”. It reminds me of a poem by Edward Słoński, *W okopach* (“In the trenches”), in which Poles from the Russian and Austrian trenches struck each other’s chests thinking about the revival of “the one which has not yet succumbed”. Did they then also dream about her “revival” or rather about her burial? But those feelings were fiercely enforced and instigated, and had to burst out in this or that form. If “victory” had tipped towards the other’s favour, there would have presumably been a mad revenge and an extermination of the enemy. In any case, the violation of the seventh commandment was fought against fervently by means of the furious violation of the fifth commandment. A true asylum of the lunatic, the fanatic, and the “madmen”.

When on 28 February 1861 the “Moscow” bullets killed as many as “five dead” in the streets of Warsaw, there was a big uproar, and Deotyma wrote a solemn poem.

Between 12–15 May, 1926 more than 400 people fell or died of wounds, and there are about one thousand and several hundred wounded, yet somehow we must become reconciled to this. And these were not the “Moscow” bullets (Warsaw, 22.04.1926).

<sup>29</sup> Baudouin was not the only one to fall victim to the nationalist zeal at the reorganised Warsaw University, as there were also a number of other scholars in a similar situation. They were subjected to the procedure of verification, contrary to the regulations in operation at the Stabilisation Commission, which was Polonising the University of Warsaw, since it was forbidden to those who had previously been professors of other universities.

[...] I tutaj ceny są straszliwe i rosną jak na drożdżach. Tego, co otrzymuję w uniwersytecie, wystarcza na pokrycie zaledwie połowy wydatków. Muszę więc dorabiać wykładami w czterech innych zakładach naukowych (Wolna Wszechnica Polska 4 g., w przyszłym semestrze 6 g.; Państwowy Instytut Pedagog. 2 g., w prz[yszłym] sem[estrze] 1 g.; Kursy Miłkowskiego 4 g., tylko do 15 marca; w Żydowskim Seminarium Nauczyciel. 1 g., później podobno 2 g.). Mam teraz w Uniwersytecie 5 g., a w innych zakładach 11 g., razem 16. Prócz tego zarabiam bazgraniem artykułów do czasopism. Może Pan sobie wyobrazić, czy podobna w takich warunkach pracować naukowo. Zresztą ja sam patrzę na pracę naukową i w ogóle na naukę, jako na rzecz całkiem zbędną (Warszawa, 6 II 1921).<sup>30</sup>

Baudouin's letter in which, when replying to Ułaszyn, he describes his road to linguistics is particularly interesting:

[...] Prawdę powiedziawszy, jestem przeważnie samoukiem (autodydakta), przynajmniej co do ogólnych poglądów. W Szkole Głównej dawała mi materiał gramatyka polska wykładana przez Józefa Przyborowskiego. Květa wykłady języka czeskiego nosiły charakter formalny i scholastyczny, ale także działały. Duże miało znaczenie czytanie dzieł H. Steinthala.

Już w Szkole Głównej w 3-im roku studiów, a więc ± w r. 1864–65 powziąłem myśl o „pogodzeniu Boppa z księdzem Malinowskim”, tj. o ewolucji w skracaniu tematów deklinacyjnych na korzyść końcówek. Oczywiście blagier powierzchowny J. Papłoński mógł działać tylko jako przykład odstrasżający.

Za granicą (1867–68) w Pradze nie wyniosłem żadnych korzyści naukowych od zarozumiałego i zapatrzonego w siebie księdza M. Hattali. W Jena [sic] Schleicher na swych wykładach parafrazował tylko swoje *Compendium* i jako skostniały dogmatyk nie mógł działać podniecająco. Oprócz niego zacząłem chodzić na *Althochdeutsch* jakiegoś prywatdocenta (Bechstein?), ale wkrótce porzuciłem, bo nie było warto. Natomiast słuchałem nadzwyczaj pouczające *publicum* E. Hackela i wykłady również publiczne, o elektryczności, zdaje się, Schäffera.

Schleicher prowadził też domowe zajęcia sanskrytem. W Berlinie skoncentrowałem się na *Wedach*, które obrabiałem gorliwie i z zapalem, od 4-ej rano do 9-ej wieczorem. Słuchałem też wykładów *Rigwedy* A. Webera.

*Einige Fälle der Wirkung der Analogie...* napisałem w Jena [sic] całkiem niezależnie od Schleichera; wykreślił on wstęp do tej pracy, który ja bardzo ceniłem (właśnie o skracaniu tematów na korzyść końcówek).

W Petersburgu Srezniewski oddziaływał nadzwyczaj szkodliwie i przygniatająco, a z Kos[s]owiczem ćwiczyłem się praktycznie w sanskrycie i trochę także w „zendzie”

<sup>30</sup> [...] And here the prices are horrendous and increasing really fast. What I receive at the university is barely sufficient to cover a half of my expenditure. Therefore, I must make extra money by giving lectures in four other academic institutions (The Free Polish University, 4 hours, in the next semester 6 hours; the State Pedagogical Institute 2 hours, in the next semester 1 hour; Miłkowski Courses, 4 hours, only until 15 March, in the Jewish Teacher Seminar, 1 hour, later apparently 2 hours). Now I have five hours at the University, and in the other institutions 11 hours, altogether 16. Apart from this I also earn a living by scribbling articles for journals. You can imagine how it is possible to do research work in such circumstances. In any case, I myself look at research work and scholarship together as a completely useless thing (Warsaw, 6.02.1921).

(tj. języku Awesty i Gathara). Wyjechawszy w r. 1872, poświęciłem się prawie wyłącznie badaniom dialektologicznym.

Tylko 3 (2½) wiosenne miesiące r. 1873 słuchałem w Mediolanie wykładów Ascolego. Szczególnego wpływu nie wywarły.

Co do Leskiena i i[nnych], to także bywałem na ich wykładach w r. 1874–5. W r. 1870 chodziłem na wykłady Curtiusa. Ale nie może być mowy o uważaniu mnie za ich ucznia. Przeciwnie, w r. 1870 doktoryzowałem się w Lipsku, głównie na podstawie *Einige Fälle*...

Leskien jako referent musiał to gruntownie przestudiować i uważnie przeczytać. O ile się zdaje, właśnie ta lektura skłoniła go ostatecznie do przejścia na wiarę „analogistów”, tj. do budowania wykładów morfologii na podstawie psychicznej. Jeżeli Kryński pisze, że „zagranica” wywarła wpływ na moją „metodę”, to jest to niedokładność. Ale mocno żałuję, że nie nauczyłem się u Niemców umiejętności oszczędzania czasu, wyciągania jak najwięcej wniosków z niewielkiej liczby materiału. Ja marnowałem czas na zbieranie i gromadzenie niezliczonej ilości materiałów wszelakiego gatunku i z najrozmaitszych dziedzin. Mógłbym opracować co najwyżej ich setną część. Ale i tego nie jestem w stanie dokonać. Materiały te bowiem, wraz ze wszystkimi mymi rękopisami i *unicami* pozostały w Petersburgu i prawdopodobnie poszły albo na podpałkę w piecach, albo na papierosy dla krasnoarmiejców, albo jeszcze na co gorszego. *Sub specie aeternitatis* jest to drobiazg, ale, jak o *Alte Geschichte* Heinego, można powiedzieć „...wem sie jetzt passiert, dem bricht das Herz entzwei” [...] (Warszawa, 17 VIII 1921).<sup>31</sup>

<sup>31</sup> [...] Frankly speaking, I am mostly a self-taught person (an autodidact), at least with regard to some general views. In the Main School I found my material in the Polish grammar lectures by Józef Przyborowski. Květ's lectures on the Czech language were of a formal and scholastic character, but they were also effective. The reading of H. Steinthal's works was likewise very influential.

As early as the third year of the Main School, and thus more or less in 1864–65, I made a resolution about “reconciling Bopp with Reverend Malinowski”, i.e. about the evolution of the shortening of the declensional stems for the sake of the endings. Obviously, the superficial braggart J. Papłoński could only act as an off-putting example.

Abroad (1867–68) in Prague I did not benefit academically from the arrogant and self-opinionated Reverend M. Hattala. In Jena Schleicher only paraphrased his own *Compendium* in his lectures and as a stiff dogmatist he was unable to act in a stimulating way. Apart from his course I started to attend *Althochdeutsch* through some *privatdozent* (Bechstein?), but I soon gave it up as it was not worth it. On the other hand, I listened to the extremely educational *publicum* of E. Hackel and to lectures about electricity, also public, by Schäffer, I think.

Schleicher also ran a home class in Sanskrit. In Berlin I focused on Vedas, which I analysed fervently and enthusiastically from 4 am to 9 pm. I listened to the lectures on *Rigvedas* by A. Weber.

I wrote *Einige Fälle der Wirkung der Analogie*... in Jena quite independently from Schleicher; he wrote an introduction to this work, which I highly appreciated (on the subject of shortening stems for the sake of endings).

In Saint Petersburg Srezniewski behaved in a particularly harmful and overwhelming manner, whereas with Kos[s]owicz I practised Sanskrit and also a little of the „Zend” (i.e. the language of the Avesta and Gathara). On leaving in 1872, I devoted my time almost exclusively to dialectological studies.

It was only for 3 (2½) spring months in 1873 that I listened to the 3 lectures of Ascoli in Milan. They did not have any particular influence.

As for Leskien and the others, I also attended their lectures in 1874–5. In 1870 I went to Curtius's lectures. However, I cannot be considered their disciple whatsoever. On the contrary, in 1870 I took my doctor's degree in Leipzig, mainly on the basis of *Einige Fälle*... ☞

This is the last of Baudouin's preserved letters dated 24.08.1929:

Odp. na list z 16 bm. Jestem jak we młynie lub w deptaku,<sup>32</sup> na nic nie mam czasu i o wszystkim zapominam. W ogóle niedołążnieję, tępieję, głupieję. Po zupełnym spokoju i świeżym powietrzu w Świdrze dostałem się 10 bm. (przed 2 tyg.) do warszawskiego zaduchu i piekła. Na każdym kroku spotykają mię zawody i ciosy. Drętwiąjące nogi uniemożliwiają mi swobodne przenoszenie się z miejsca na miejsce. Pograżony w *taedium vitae*, pragnę Nirwany. *Laisse-nous oublier que nous avons vécu.* [...] Zdaje mi się, że moje nogi nie pozwolą mi pojechać do Pragi, chociaż referat (o izoglosach) zgłosiłem [...]?<sup>33</sup>

Ułaszyn dedicated a brochure to his master and friend on the fifth anniversary of his death (Ułaszyn 1934), which was published by the Slavonic Circle that he had established in Poznań.

When remembering Baudouin during his time in Cracow, Ułaszyn writes:

Ci dwaj wybitni ludzie, Baudouin de Courtenay i Zdziechowski<sup>34</sup> wywarli na mój światopogląd niewątpliwy wpływ – i nie tylko na światopogląd, lecz też i na moją postawę wobec życia i tego, co ono niesie w rodzinie, w stosunkach w narodzie, w ludzkości. Czuję dla nich głęboką wdzięczność i wierzę, że to właśnie dzięki nim szczęśliwie przebrnąłem przez życie, nie rzucając się z krańcu w kraniec i nie poddając się wszelakim ciosom, jakie napotykałem na drodze mego żywota. Cześć ich kochanej zacnej pamięci (Ułaszyn w druku).<sup>35</sup>

---

As its reviewer, Leskien had to study it thoroughly and read it carefully. It would appear that this reading finally made him convert to the faith of the “analogists”, i.e. to structuring his lectures on morphology following a psychological basis. If Kryński writes that the “foreign countries” influenced my “method”, this is an inadequacy. However, I deeply regret that I did not acquire the ability to save time and draw as many conclusions as possible from the small amount of the material from the Germans. I wasted time in gathering and collecting an uncountable amount of material of any kind and from various fields. I could analyse a hundredth part of it at most. But I am unable to do even this, as these materials, alongside all my manuscripts and *unicas*, remained in Saint Petersburg and were probably either used as kindling in ovens or as cigarettes for the Red Army soldiers, or even for something worse. *Sub specie aeternitatis* is a minor thing, but as in Heine's *Alte Geschichte* one could say „... *wem sie jetzt passiert, dem bricht das Herz entzwei*” [...] (Warsaw, 17.08.1921).

<sup>32</sup> Here the noun ‘treadmill’ is used in the sense of ‘a circle worn down by horses walking in a treadmill’; it was also used metaphorically as a description of monotonous and stupefying work.

<sup>33</sup> The answer to the letter of 16<sup>th</sup> of the month. I am feeling as if in a mill or on a treadmill,<sup>32</sup> I have no time for anything and I am forgetting everything. I am altogether growing decrepit, dull, and silly. After complete peace and fresh air in Świdz I landed on 10<sup>th</sup> of this month (two weeks ago) in the Warsaw stuffiness and hell. And at every step I experience disappointments and blows. My legs, which are going numb, are making it impossible for me to move freely from place to place. Immersed in *taedium vitae*, I desire Nirvana. *Laisse-nous oublier que nous avons vécu.* [...] It seems that my legs will not allow me to go to Prague, although I did submit my proposal for a paper (about isoglosses) [...]?

<sup>34</sup> Marian Zdziechowski (1861–1938), a philosopher, historian, literary critic, from 1899 a professor at the Jagiellonian University, from 1919 a professor at Vilnius University, a member of the Academy of Learning. A friend of Baudouin, with whom he shared his moral views, although with different opinions about the sources of morality (Zdziechowski was a very religious man).

<sup>35</sup> Those two outstanding men, Baudouin de Courtenay and Zdziechowski,<sup>34</sup> undoubtedly influenced my worldview – and not only my worldview, but also my attitude towards life and to what the family means, in relations within the nation, in humanity. I feel deeply grateful

Now, by way of closing this sketch about the friendship of these two scholars it should be noted that Ułaszyn's wish was to be buried in the Evangelical Reformed Cemetery in Warsaw next to Baudouin's grave. The wish was granted.

## References

- Baudouin de Courtenay J. 2007. *Miejcie odwagę myślenia. Wybór pism publicystycznych z lat 1898–1917*. [Preparation of the manuscript, introduction, footnotes and publication by M. Skarżyński]. [= Biblioteka Klasyki Polskiej Myśli Politycznej, vol. XVIII]. Kraków.
- Bešta T. (ed.) 1972. *Listy Jana Baudouina de Courtenay do A. Černego*. Wrocław, Warszawa, Gdańsk.
- Brückner A. 1910. *Filologia i lingwistyka. Szkic polemiczny Aleksandra Brücknera*. Lwów.
- Durčanský M., Skrzyński T. 2005. Dodatek k edicím listů Jana Baudouina de Courtenay Adolfovi Černému. – *Pracé z Archivu Akademie věd, řada A, svazek 8*. [Slovanstva a věda v 19. a 20. století]: 227–287.
- Dzendzeliwskij 1996 = Дзэндзелівський Й. О. 1996. Матеріали до історії польської та слов'янської філології. IV Листування Я. Бодуена де Куртене з В. Ягичем. [= *Prace Filologiczne* XLI]
- Eismann W., Hurch B. (eds.) 2008. *Jan Baudouin de Courtenay – Hugo Schuchardt Korrespondenz*. Heidelberg.
- GJP = Łoś J., Nitsch K., Rozwadowski J., Ułaszyn H. 1923. *Gramatyka języka polskiego*. Kraków.
- Pullat R. [In Zusammenarbeit mit M. Smoczyńska] (ed.) 2004. *Briefwechsel zwischen Jan Baudouin de Courtenay und Jooseppi J. Mikkola aus den Jahren 1898–1926*. Kraków.
- Rozwadowski = *Listy Jana M. Rozwadowskiego do Henryka Ułaszyna*. [manuscript. Materiały Henryka Ułaszyna. Archiwum PAN III-162, R]. Warszawa.
- Skarżyński M., Smoczyńska M. (eds.) 2007. *Listy Jana Baudouina de Courtenay do Henryka Ułaszyna z lat 1898–1929*. [= Biblioteka LingVariów, vol. I]. Kraków.
- Skarżyński M. (ed.) 2007a. *Nieznane listy Jana Baudouina de Courtenay do Kazimierza Nitscha z lat 1905–1928*. [pars I: 1905–1910]. *LingVaria* 2.1(3): 167–190.
- Skarżyński M. (ed.) 2007b. *Nieznane listy Jana Baudouina de Courtenay do Kazimierza Nitscha z lat 1905–1928*. [pars II: 1910–1928]. *LingVaria* 2.2(4): 149–176.
- Skarżyński M. (ed.) 2008. *Nieznane listy Jana Baudouina de Courtenay do Jana M. Rozwadowskiego*. – *LingVaria* 3.(5): 205–234.
- Stachurski E. (ed.) 2002. *J. N. Baudouin de Courtenay. Listy z lat 1870–1927*. Kraków.
- Ułaszyn H. 1905. *Über die Entpalatalisierung der ursl. e-Laute im Polnischen*. Leipzig.
- Ułaszyn H. 1909. *An die Leser des Archivs für slavische Philologie. (Audiatur et altera pars)*. Lepizig.
- Ułaszyn H. 1910. *Filologia i lingwistyka prof. A. Brücknera*. Lwów.
- Ułaszyn H. 1915. *Słowotwórstwo*. – *Encyklopedia Polska*. [vol. III]. Kraków: 1–37.
- Ułaszyn H. 1931. *Laut, Phonema, Morphonema*. – *Travaux du cercle linguistique de Prague* IV: 53–61.
- Ułaszyn H. 1934. *Jan Baudouin de Courtenay. Charakterystyka ogólna uczonego i człowieka (1845–1929)*. [reprint *LingVaria* 2(8), 2009]. Poznań.

---

to them and I believe that it is thanks to them that I have happily managed to wade through life not moving from one extreme to the other, and not yielding to any blows which I encountered along my path in life. In honour of their dear and respected memory (Ułaszyn in print).

- Ułaszyn H. 1955. W sprawie światopoglądu J. Baudouina de Courtenay. – *Język Polski* XXXV: 233–235.
- Ułaszyn H. 1956. *Ze studiów nad grupami spółgłoskowymi w języku polskim*. Wrocław.
- Ułaszyn H. 2009. *Studia onomastyczne i socjolingwistyczne*. [= *Klasycy Nauki Poznańskiej* vol. 41. Introduction and text selection by M. Skarżyński and B. Walczak]. Poznań.
- Ułaszyn H. in print. *Z Kopii watej na katedry uniwersyteckie. Wspomnienia*. [Preparation of the manuscript, footnotes and publication by M. Skarżyński]. Kraków.

