



HOKKAIDO UNIVERSITY

Title	Piotr Preis, Izmail Sreznevskii, and Kashubia
Author(s)	Treder, Jerzy
Description	ISBN: 9784938637576 Приложение 1
Relation	Россия и русские глазами инославянских народов : язык, литература, культура 1. [野町素己編集]
Citation	スラブ・ユーラシア研究報告集, 3, 145-166
Issue Date	2010-12
Doc URL	https://hdl.handle.net/2115/47693
Type	departmental bulletin paper
File Information	SEP3_007.pdf



Piotr Preis, Izmail Sreznevskii, and Kashubia

Jerzy Treder

The Russian interest in Kashubia coincided with the publication of an account of a journey to Prussia, Russia, and Poland (1777–1778) by Bernoulli, a Swiss, who described, among other things, the Kashubian village of Szczepkowice, situated to the south of Łebsko Lake, also characterizing the linguistic situation.¹ This could have had an impact on the edition of the St. Petersburg dictionary *Сравнительные словари всех языков и наречий* (1787–1789), which took into account and included the Kashubian vocabulary gathered from the Kashubians of that region.²

1 J. Treder, *Kontakty naukowe Floriana Ceynowy z Rosjanami*, in *Słownik Floriana Ceynowy* (Biblioteka Kaszubska, Wejherowo 2001), p. 11.

2 H. Popowska-Taborska, *Słownictwo kaszubskie w osiemnastowiecznych porównawczych słownikach Europy i Azji*, “Rocznik Sławistyczny” XLIX z. 1 (1994), pp. 41–46; H. Popowska-Taborska, *Raz jeszcze o materiałach kaszubskich* in “*Słownikach porównawczych języków i narzeczy Europy i Azji*,” “Rocz. Gd.” LVIII/1 (1998), pp. 163–171; А. Д. Дуличенко, *Из архивных кашубологических находок в России: первая рукописная кашубская грамматика и другие документы XVIII–XIX вв.*, in *Badania kaszuboznawcze w XX wieku*. Material pokonferencyjny eds. J. Borzyszkowski i C. Obracht-Prondzyński (Gdańsk, 2001), pp. 239–241. insists that they were collected by the Reverend Kummer from Stolp (Słupsk), while Popowska-Taborska (Popowska-Taborska, *Raz jeszcze*) believes that Duličenko must have found a different collection of words containing 455 words. Unfortunately, the manuscript of Haken’s dictionary *Hinterpommersche Idioticon*, bought in 1790 by Ewald F. von Hertzberg,

Bernoulli's account should have also raised the attention of Anton, a Slavist and Lusatian himself, who collected the Kashubian lexis from this region of Pomerania.³ Mrongovius, too, living in Danzig and interested in the Kashubians, could have obtained this knowledge indirectly through Slavists such as Dobrovský and Šafařík.⁴

The scant information on the Kashubians was known only to a narrow circle. The knowledge might have been deeper if the contents of Mrongovius' manuscript *Słowniczek kaszubski* had been known. The manuscript was based on field research (1826), partly inspired by Rumiancov, the Russian chancellor and minister of education, who learned about the Kashubians from a review of Mrongovius' dictionary from 1823, written by Keppen, a Russian scholar; in the desire to learn more, he wrote to Mrongovius on this matter. Rumiancov was interested in the culture of small and little known peoples and in this case, he was especially intrigued by Mrongovius' casual comment from 1823 that Kashubian is partly similar to Russian, a point later picked up by Ceynowa. In fact, the "misunderstanding" can be traced to Keppen, who took Mrongovius' apt remark about the stress in Kashubian as referring to similarity between the two languages in general.⁵ Below, I will write more about other "misunderstandings" linked with Mrongovius' research.

which contained a description of the linguistic situation of the eastern part of Western Pomerania, is missing (Z. Szultka, *Studia nad rodowodem i językiem Kaszubów* (Gdańsk, 1992), p. 27, quoting K. Gassen, *Die Anfänge neu-niederdeutscher Literatur in Pommern 1770–1780*, P. Jb. 29: (1935), pp. 160–161). Haken also corresponded with Anton.

3 K. G. Anton, *Erste Linien eines Versuches über der alten Slaven Ursprung, Sitten, Gebräuche, Meinungen und Kenntnisse*, Theil I–II (Leipzig, 1783–1789); reprint: Bautzen 1976; F. Hinze, *Karl Gottlob von Antons kaschubische Studien (Zu den Anfängen der kaschubischen Lexikographie)*, *Studia 2 filologii polskiej i słowiańskiej* V (1965), pp. 297–305; Popowska-Taborska, *Raz jeszcze*.

4 J. Tredner, *Mrongowiusz jako kaszubolog. W dwusetną rocznicę zamieszkania w Gdańsku*, in *Gdańskie studia językoznawcze* VII (2000), pp. 165–236.

5 W. A. Francew, *Fl. Cenowa i prof. Izmael Srezniewski (Przyczynek do historii stosunków naukowych kaszubsko-rosyjskich)*, "Gryf" IV (1912) nr 4, pp. 39–40, 54.

In mid-nineteenth-century Kashubian studies, a significant role can be attributed to three Russian Slavists,⁶ Preis,⁷ Sreznevskii,⁸ and Hilferding⁹—and two Poles, Mrongovius from Masuria and Ceynowa

6 The following works were also used: М. Г. Булахов, *Восточнославянские языковеды. Библиографический словарь*, том 1 (Минск, 1976), pp. 202–203; *Славяноведение в дореволюционной России. Библиографический словарь* (Москва, 1979), pp. 283–284; *Język kaszubski. Poradnik encyklopedyczny*, ed. J. Treder (Gdańsk, 2002).

7 Piotr Ivanovič Preis (1810–1846), philologist, expert in Slavonic studies, the first professor of the chair of the history of literature and comparative grammar of Slavic languages at the University of St. Petersburg (1843).

8 Izmail Ivanovič Sreznevskii (1812–1880), philologist, Slavist, and paleographer, professor in Kharkov and St. Petersburg. In 1840, he copied Anton's Kashubian manuscripts, found in the archive in Görlitz; the manuscripts were in Anton's possession since the end of the eighteenth century, after he acquired them from Haken (from Stolp).

9 Aleksandr Fiodorovič Hilferding (1831–1872) philologist, expert in Slavonic studies, folklorist, ethnographer, and historian; he conducted research on the history and the language of the Baltic Slavs. From his letter addressed to Sreznevskii (Ostend, August 21 September 2 1856), after a one-month voyage around Kashubia, we learn that from Kashubia “...вывез я отуда пропасть всякого этнографического и филологического добра [...], целое наречие, вообразите, новое словянское наречие: не кашубское, а словинское. Да, в самом деле, между Leba See a Garden See, которые увидите на карте, есть несколько деревень за б о л о т о м так об них говорят, где тип народа совсем рознится от польского и кашубского, где наречие какое-то архаистическое, с разными признаками языка [...] балтийских славян, где жители называют себя Slovinstji ledze и где лет через двадцать пять одного словинского человека не будет. Месяц целый прошатался я между Данцингом и Слупском, отыскал Цейнову, с ним попутешествовал четыре дня, а остальное время представлен был своим средствам, т.е. чудотворной силе водки и жевательного табаку. И с помощью этих непобедимых союзников сколько я записал по корчмам Кашубчины и словинским!” (in: *Документы к истории славяноведения в России* (Москва, 1948), pp. 7–8). He published this in the book *Остатки славян на южном берегу Балтийского моря*, St. Petersburg, 1862. It was discussed by Zmorski (“Przegląd Europejski,” vol. II (1862), pp. 213–242). Smoler, a Lusatian, translated it into German (“Zeitschrift

from Kashubia. Their research was interlinked, while Hilferding, whom we also take into account, made a crowning achievement in his work *Остатки славян на южном берегу Балтийского моря*¹⁰ as he “broke open the first window towards them [that is, the Slovincians—J. T.] from the Slavic side”¹¹; the latter made use of studies by other scholars, such as Preis, especially in regard to his generalizations, and collected linguistic material, especially the glossary.¹² This work carved a pathway to deeper analyses of Kashubian.

Preis was involved in teaching in Dorpat. In the years 1839–1842, he and Sreznevskii independently set out on a scholarly journey on which they met. Preis’ destination was Kashubia,¹³ while Sreznevskii’s—Silesia.¹⁴ The

für Slavische Literatur, Kunst und Wissenschaft,” Bautzen I (1862), pp. 81–97, II (1864), pp. 81–111); Chapters 1–4 were translated into Polish by Starzyńska (“Gryf” 1921–22), while a full version by Kolberg (printed in 1965 in *Dziela wszystkie*, vol. 39. *Pomorze*); a new translation by Perczyńska, entitled *Resztki Słowian na południowym wybrzeżu Morza Bałtyckiego*, edited and provided with an afterward by Popowska-Taborska and Tredner (Danzig, 1989). Hilferding was most preoccupied with the Slovincians from the Gardna and Smółdzino regions and the Kabatians (Kabatkowie) from the area of Cecenowo and Główeczyce. He adds abounding documentation and a good description of the Kashubian tongue (along with a dictionary, containing 1800 words, apart from his “own” 800, as well as those taken from Mrongovius via Preis, Ceynowa, and Lork). He concluded that the linguistic difference between the Slovincians, Kabatians, and Kashubians “lay in their respectively closer or farther similarity to Polish.”

10 A. F. Hilferding, *Resztki Słowian na południowym wybrzeżu Morza Bałtyckiego* (Gdańsk, 1989).

11 S. Ramułt, *Kilka słów o Słowieńcach pomorskich*, “Lud” VI (1900), p. 93.

12 *Донесеніе П. Прейса, г. Господну Министру Народного Просвещенія, из Берлина, от 20 Іюня 1840 года*, “Журнал Министерства Народного Просвещенія,” Санкт-Петербург 1840, ч. XXVIII номер 11 отд. IV, pp. 1–24.

13 *Ibid.*

14 Kucharska, Nasz, Rospond, *Wieś śląska w 1840 r. Relacje z podróży naukowej I.I. Sreznevskiego po Śląsku*. *Prace i materiały etnograficzne*, vol. XXVII, Wrocław, 1973. After 130 years, Kucharska edited (along with a translation) Sreznevskii’s manuscript texts: *Zapiski o narzeczach śląskich* and *Pieśni ludowe Górnoszlązaków*; Nasz commented on the ethnographical materials, while Rospond commented on the dialectological materials.

aims and the route of the journey were decided earlier,¹⁵ for example, the meeting with Bopp in Berlin and the meeting with Šafařík in Prague were preplanned. They prepared for the journey by referring to Slavonic literature, for example, the works of Anton and Dobrovský; these works guided them in determining their detailed aims, the rest being planned on the way.

In 1840, Sreznevskii stayed in Breslau at the home of Professor Purkini, a Czech Slavophil well oriented in Kashubian matters. Here, Sreznevskii met some Lusatians such as Smolerj, the tutor of Purkini's children. Sreznevskii's second stay in Breslau, in 1842, coincided with the studies (from fall 1841) of Ceynowa (1817–1881), a Kashubian who was a frequent guest of Purkini. Ceynowa became well known after having delivered his paper in the Slavic Literary Society in 1843 *On the Germanization of the Kashubians* (he was a member of the Society since May 1842) as well as for his publication of Kashubian folklore texts (1843). It seems quite possible that the Russian and the Kashubian might have met; perhaps a confirmation of this fact could be found in Sreznevskii's correspondence? Ceynowa would have been a nearly perfect informant for the Russian, despite being an amateur in linguistics and a beginner in folklore studies, but nevertheless possessing knowledge of Kashubian. Similarly, Preis Mrongovius (1764–1855) proved to be a valuable source, despite the fact that as a native of Mazuria, he did not speak Kashubian.

Of the three Russians, only Preis personally met this first field researcher of Kashubia. Sreznevskii exchanged letters with Ceynowa at the time the latter was occupied with the description of Kashubia and was laying the foundations of the literary language. Hilferding, on the other hand, traveled with him around Kashubia and exchanged views. The Kashubian learned quite a bit from the two Russians, and also from Preis, though indirectly—through his report that came out at the same time as Ceynowa's brochure.¹⁶ The Russian Slavophiles also owed much to Ceynowa (a doctor and a Slavophil as well) in terms of shared infor-

15 Francew, *Fl. Cenowa i prof. Izmael Srezniewski*, p. 52.

16 F. Ceynowa, *Wuwogj nad mówą kaszebską, w: Trze rosprawe przez Stanjislawa...* (Kraków, 1850), pp. 38–64.

mation and materials. Shortly after 1861, the contact between Ceynowa on one side and Sreznevskii and Hilferding on the other broke off, perhaps due to the Polish Uprising of 1863. Ceynowa could also have felt bitter about not having his dictionary or grammar book printed. Upon Ceynowa's departure for the Slavic conference in St. Petersburg, the following of his works came out in print: *Zemjobroz dokladni, mapa pjirszo* [linguistic atlas of Western Prussia], map 1 (see the note at the end of the book), *Trze rozprave*,¹⁷ and the first volume (*zeszyt*) of *Skarb kaszébsko-słowjnskjè mòvé* (1866).

1. Piotr Ivanovič Preis

Preis's name cannot be found in textbooks on the history of linguistics. However, he has had an impact on Kashubian research, though, as it has turned out quite recently, undeservedly. Without doubt, his scholarly report, first in the field of the Kashubian language, brought forward Kashubian issues in general, inspiring further research on Kashubia not only among the Russians, but also inspiring Ceynowa and later, two Poles: Biskupski and Ramułt. Furthermore, Preis left some works worthy of publication, *Заметки о польском и кашубском наречиях* (1840), containing a Polish-Kashubian dictionary, a copy of Szadowski's *Ojczyszcz*, and a manuscript of a lecture *Польское наречие с Кашебским*.¹⁸ The impact of Preis' report was immediate (for instance, Šafařík) and lasted 150 years. Fortunately, the report was based on Mrongovius' authentic data and incorporated the latter's points and thoughts.

It is true that "Preis' report remained an oracle for posterity for a long time."¹⁹ Sreznevskii must have been acquainted with it, as he makes references to it in his *Замечания о наречии кашебском*,²⁰ known

17 J. Karnowski, *Dr Florian Ceynowa* (Gdańsk, 1997); praca z 1922 r. pp. 68, 80.

18 Дуличенко, *Из архивных кашубологических находок*, p. 242.

19 Karnowski, *Dr Florian Ceynowa*, p. 17.

20 А. Д. Дуличенко, *И. И. Срезневский. Замечания о наречии кашебском*. Публикация, вступительная статья и примечания А. Д. Дуличенко. – *Известия Российской Академии наук, Серия литературы и языка*, т. 56, Москва, 1997, номер 1, январь – февраль, с. 52–60.

earlier from Ceynowa's Kashubian translation review, entitled *Móje spóstrzeženjo prze przezieranju wuwog Ismaela Sreznjevskjeho nad móvą Kaszebską*.²¹ The Kashubian did not make many references to Preis' work, probably sensing the character of his research, since he wrote, "Tej za pomocą teho sameho Mrągi czele Mrongoviusa... napjiseł pon Prais s Pjotrogarde (Petersburga) rosprave wó móvje Kaszebski e posleł ją dodom, dze ję vedrekovala."²² Most regrettably, Sreznjevskii and Ceynowa did not comment directly on Preis' report. It is not evident whether Mrongovius was acquainted with it, as he kept silent on the issue, but he probably could not imagine such an outcome. The report was translated into Polish three times²³ and referred to by Hilferding in the 1850 version,²⁴ and through him, by Ceynowa and Stremler, as well as Miklosich in his etymological dictionary.²⁵ It also had an impact on Šafařík's *Slavanské narodopisi* (1842).²⁶

Nowadays, after Mrongovius' manuscripts have been discovered in St. Petersburg²⁷ and Szczecin,²⁸ there is no doubt that Preis' description

21 F. Ceynowa, *Móje spóstrzeženjo prze przezieranju wuwog Ismaela Sreznjevskjeho nad móvą kaszebską*, ed. J. Treder, in *Słownik Floriana Ceynowy*, Biblioteka Kaszubska (Wejherowo, 2001), pp. 61–106.

22 Ceynowa, *Wuwogj nad móvą kaszebską*, p. 39.

23 *Raport P. Preussa, b. profesora gimnazjum dorpackiego, Berlina pod dniem 20 czerwca 1840 roku Ministrowi Oświecenia Narodowego Uwarów z Dziennika Ministeryum Ośw. w Petersburgu*, "Magazyn Powszechny Użytecznych Wiadomości" R. VII 1840 zeszyt IX, pp. 201–211; *O narzeczku kaszubskim z raportu p. Preissa do Ministra Oświecenia Publicznego w Rosji. Z Berlina 20. czerwca 1840 r. przestanego* (translated from Russian), "Orędownik Naukowy" nr 26–27 (Poznań, 1843), pp. 203–205, 209–213; *O języku kaszubskim*, w: *Kile słow wó Kaszebach e jich zemi przez Wójkasena tudzież Rzecz o języku kaszubskim ze zdania sprawy Prajsa* (Kraków, 1850), pp. 20–36.

24 Hilferding, *Resztki Słowian*, p. 175.

25 Treder, *Mrongowiusz jako kaszubolog*, p. 221.

26 Francew, *Fl. Cenowa i prof. Izmael Srezniewski*, p. 60.

27 H. Popowska-Taborska, W. Boryś, *Leksyka kaszubska na tle słowiańskim*, Warszawa 1996, p. 18.

28 Z. Szultka, *Nowe spojrzenie na kaszubskie badania K. C. Mrongowiusza*, SO 48/49 1991/1992, pp. 213–240.

of Kashubian and the glossary, perhaps apart from the layout and irrelevant parts, is a mere incorporation of Mrongovius' work, especially his general comments on Kashubian. How was Preis, basing his opinion on this modest material, able to come to the conclusion that the "language of the Kashubians"²⁹ or the "Kashubian language"³⁰ – from the Russian Язык Кашубов³¹ – is "nearly extinct today," "not similar to Russian in the least; its construction leaves no doubt that it is a branch of a Lechitic dialect," and finally that "just like the language of the Baltic Slavs, it belongs to the Polish dialects."³²

Preis admitted that "this conclusion is in accordance with Mrongovius' present view, which classified the Kashubians as remnants of the Wends."³³ Francev was of the opinion that the long talks that Preis had with Mrongovius allowed him to come to such conclusions, while Mrongovius' guidance helped him find his way in "the new field."³⁴ Yet, the opinion that Mrongovius was merely preoccupied with vocabulary must be regarded as a great oversimplification³⁵; was this why Preis and Sreznevskii were less devoted to noting down words? Indeed, Mrongovius was mainly a lexicographer, who encouraged the recording of "the Kashubian *idioticon*"; but he also appreciated phonetics and was himself a great phonetician. His original *Słowniczek kaszubski* is the best proof: it includes lists of words that differ only in pronunciation (for example, *chłopc* versus *chwopc*), the usage of distinct symbols (for example, *oa* with an arc for *gnoat*), the marking of stress (for example, *szczężùle*), and many comments.³⁶ *Słowniczek*, containing comparative, etymological, and phonetic elements, was to justify the general conclusions about the genesis of Kashubian and its relationship with Polish and other languages. Preis used only an abridged version of Mrongovius' work; he

29 *Raport P. Preussa, b. professora gimnazjum dorpackiego*, p. 201.

30 *O języku kaszubskim*, p. 20.

31 *Донесение П. Прейса*, p. 2.

32 *Raport P. Preussa, b. professora gimnazjum dorpackiego*, p. 206.

33 *Ibid.*

34 Francev, *Fl. Cenowa i prof. Izmael Srezniewski*, pp. 54,55.

35 *Донесение П. Прейса*, p. 2.

36 Tredér, *Mrongowiusz jako kaszubolog*, pp. 189–190.

did not fully appreciate it and made many simplifications, adding his own errors.³⁷ It would have been more beneficial if Preis had simply edited and printed Mrongovius' work, just like Sreznevskii did with some of Ceynowa's works. Other scholars, like Sreznevskii and Hilferding, would have been able to gain deeper knowledge from it.

The analysis of Mrongovius' conclusions and methodology proves that he aimed to verify Dobrovský's division of the Slavic languages into southeastern and western ones, having aptly observed some analogies (for example, stress, the suffix *-iszcze*, and certain words), but nowhere did he try to prove a lasting relationship between Kashubian and Russian.³⁸ Neither did he associate Kashubian with Lusatian, pointing rather to Polabian as belonging to, along with Kashubian, the old Pomeranian dialects; by the way, *Wenden* and *wendischen* are terms he used for the Pomeranian (that is, Baltic) Slavs (along with Polabians), while for the Lusatians, he used the term *Lausitz*. Furthermore, Mrongovius was well aware of the local differentiation of the so-called *Muttersprache* (language spoken at home) and official language (for example, that spoken at church) and believed that "Kashubian is a dialect of Polish" (1842).³⁹

Among others, Wójcicki found Preis' conclusions vague and inconsistent. He sarcastically criticized Preis for relying too much on Mrongovius and for the lack of his own materials.⁴⁰ Nevertheless, from the point of view of most other scholars, Preis proved that Kashubian was part of Polish. Brylowski's opinion from 1827 might have had a deciding impact in this matter, as he wrote about Mrongovius' *Słowniczek*: "In reality Kashubian differs only slightly from Polish."⁴¹ It is possible that Brylowski took this opinion directly from Mrongovius. To summarize, the vagueness of Preis' conclusions is an outcome of using "second-hand" materials, too many generalizations, and the mistake of not separating Mrongovius' points properly.

37 *Ibid.*, p. 206.

38 cf. Francew, *Fl. Cenowa i prof. Izmael Srezniewski*, pp. 53, 54.

39 Treder, *Mrongowiusz jako kaszubolog*, pp. 226–231.

40 Francew, *Fl. Cenowa i prof. Izmael Srezniewski*, p. 54.

41 Karnowski, *Dr Florian Ceynowa*, p. 11.

Preis' attitude towards Mrongovius also casts a dark shadow on his own work: he did not stress his extensive reliance on Mrongovius, writing in fact that his work was based "upon information gathered from Mrongovius, Marwic, and Borkowski. I have learned a great deal from the Kashubians. In the Berlin Library, one can find a brief collection of words and *Ojczyzna nasz* in Kashubian."⁴² Actually, it is not clear what Preis could have learned from Marwic and Borkowski as they have not contributed in any way to Kashubian. In the text of Preis' work, one cannot find any references to unnamed Kashubians. In Danzig, he probably also found, in Mrongovius' dictionaries,⁴³ the cited catechism of Pontanus from 1643 "w tém narzeczu" and therefore an edition thoroughly modernized in 1752 and reprinted by Mrongovius (1828), this being the source of his opinion that "the catechism is basically written in Polish."⁴⁴ Preis also received a copy of Mrongovius' manuscript *Sammlung einiger Kaschubischen Wörter...*, a work based on research conducted among the Kashubians in the Cecenowo parish.⁴⁵ Moreover, Mrongovius equipped him with a letter of recommendation to Józef Łukasiewicz, the Poznań publisher of "Orędownik Naukowy."⁴⁶ What also seems significant is the fact that there is no Kashubian text in either Preis' or Mrongovius' work.

2. Izmail Ivanovič Sreznevskii

Sreznevskii and Hilferding, unlike Preis, have their place in the history of linguistics, although none of the Russian (or Soviet) encyclopedias or syntheses mention—like in the case of Preis—their Kashubian research.⁴⁷ Not even Hilferding's book is mentioned.⁴⁸ Nevertheless, specialists in the field remember that it has played a significant role in

42 *Raport P. Preussa, b. profesora gimnazyum dorpackiego*, pp. 201–202.

43 Popowska-Taborska, Boryś, *Leksyka kaszubska*, pp. 15–17.

44 *Raport P. Preussa, b. profesora gimnazyum dorpackiego*, p. 202.

45 Popowska-Taborska, Boryś, *Leksyka kaszubska*, p. 18.

46 Tredér, *Mrongowiusz jako kaszubolog*, p. 210.

47 Булахов, *Восточнославянские языковеды*.

48 Hilferding, *Resztki Słowian*.

Schleicher's classification of languages, including the Lechitic languages ("lechische Sprachgebiet"). Nowadays, it is clear that Hilferding adopted and developed the notion from Preis, who used the term *отрасль диалекта Лехитов*⁴⁹ in Polish translation, *gałąź dialektu Lechitów* ("a branch of the Lechites' dialect")⁵⁰ and *gałąź mowy Lachów*,⁵¹ in his work *ветвь Славянской речи, которую можно назвать Ляшскою*,⁵² in Polish, *gałąź mowy słowiańskiej, którą można nazwać lechicką (lacką)* ("a branch of a Slavic tongue, which can be called Lechitic"). Preis, in turn, adopted the concept (without the terminology) from Mrongovius.

Sreznevskii's impact on Kashubology was of a very different character from Preis'. Contrary to Preis, he did not venture to print the materials that he had at his disposal (his own as well as Anton's and Preis'), judging them to be weak and unsure.⁵³ Sreznevskii's copy of these materials has been recently edited by Duličenko,⁵⁴ while Anton's original materials were commented on by Hinze⁵⁵ and Popowska-Taborska.⁵⁶ Sreznevskii's manuscripts that Duličenko is planning to edit

49 *Донесение П. Прејса*, p. 2.

50 *Raport P. Preussa, b. profesora gimnazjum dorpackiego*, p. 201.

51 *O języku kaszubskim*, p. 22.

52 Hilferding, *Resztki Słowian*.

53 This brings to mind Mrongovius, who did not venture to publish his own materials nor did he engage in polemics with Preis. Only part of the materials was finally published in the reports of the Association of Pomeranian History and Antiquities in Stettin. It is not clear what the deciding factor was that withheld him from having the materials printed: 1. the narrowness and uncertainty of the materials that were incorporated in his dictionaries (Popowska-Taborska, Boryś, *Leksyka kaszubska*, pp. 15–17); 2. the influence of the abovementioned Association along with Brylowski's verification; 3. the political entanglement of Kashubian research; or 4. the fact that he simply had not managed to have them ready before Preis. Actually, Sreznevskii bore a grudge against Mrongovius for doing so little for Kashubia, while Ceynowa excused him (Francew, *Fl. Cenowa i prof. Izmael Srezniewski*, p. 55).

54 Дуличенко, И. И. *Срезневский*.

55 Hinze, *Karl Gottlob von Antons*.

56 H. Popowska-Taborska, *Oryginalna wersja "kaszubskiego słowniczka" Karla Gottloba Antona*, SFPS XXXIV (1998), pp. 145–156.

as well, *Замечания о наречии Кашебском, Замечания касательно Кашебского наречия* and *Кашубы*,⁵⁷ can confirm this uncertainty of the materials; the last one had already been cited by Francev.⁵⁸ In another manuscript entitled *Наречие Славян Прибалтийских*⁵⁹ written after 1854, that is after Hilferding's stay in Polabia, to which he refers in the work, Sreznevskii characterized (on the basis of scant notes) the language of the Drevani separately as "a Polish dialect."

Just like Preis, Sreznevskii was hesitant in judging the relationship between Kashubian and Polish. He wrote 1. *Наречие Кашебское, сколько ни отличается оригинальными особенностями, есть, однако, без сомнения нарече языка Польского...*⁶⁰ and added *Главное отличие [...] от языка Польского (литературного) заключается в произношении*; 2. *Поляки прусские называются Кашубами или Кишибами и наречие их весьма резко отличается от Польского* (Sreznevskii's manuscript, cited above, prepared for publication). Ceynowa did not comment upon this. It cannot be inferred from their correspondence whether the Russian was aware that Ceynowa treated Kashubian as an independent Slavic language. In fact, he begins his *Wiwogj nad móvą kaszébską* with the following sentence: "Me Kaszebji godome móvą słovjanską, to je: pódobną jak Pólosze, Serbovje, Łużanamji zvańi, nji dovní Pólabjanji, Czechovje, Resce, Serbovje Naddunajsci, Bulgarze."⁶¹ However, Sreznevskii knew that Kashubian was for Ceynowa "in some cases closer to Russian."⁶²

Nevertheless, Sreznevskii played an important, though rather indirect, role as an authority in Slavic Studies and an organizer of research through the Russian Academy. He stimulated the study on Kashubia, especially Ceynowa's—in collecting and printing materials in the

57 Дуличенко, *Из архивных кашубологических находок*, p. 243.

58 Francew, *Fl. Cenowa i prof. Izmael Srezniewski*, p. 81.

59 I. I. Srezniewski, *O narzeczcu Słowian nadbałtyckich*. Rękopis I. I. Srezniewskiego z poł. XIX w. (original and translation), GŚJ IX (2005), pp. 109–123.

60 Дуличенко, *И. И. Срезневский*, p. 55.

61 Ceynowa, *Wiwogj nad móvą kaszébską*.

62 Francew, *Fl. Cenowa i prof. Izmael Srezniewski*, p. 83.

“Известия ОРЯС” (1852–1863) that he edited himself. The following works were printed due to their cooperation.

These comprised a) **linguistic works**, such as the abovementioned *Móje spóstrzeženjo...* (1850),⁶³ the first scholarly work in Kashubian in most part and also the oldest Kashubian translation from Russian, summarizing contemporary knowledge about Kashubian. The work was completed upon the request of Sreznevskii, who wanted Ceynowa to pass judgment on *Замечания о наречии кашебском* from 1840,⁶⁴ in which the Russian scholar included an ordered collection of materials (gathered mainly from Kashubians serving in the Prussian Army, whom he met in Breslau and Berlin in 1840) that he found disputable. Some of his conclusions are questionable; in comparison, Preis’ seem more relevant. He constantly makes comparisons with Polish (treating Kashubian as a dialect of Polish). It is not clear why Ceynowa translated Sreznevskii’s work into Kashubian. While stating in the introduction that “moj sposób pji-sanjo ju v *Hażeczce dlo Kaszebov* sę znajdeje,”⁶⁵ he perhaps wanted to prove that it was possible to write about linguistics in Kashubian; furthermore, he demonstrated his ability in Russian.

Ceynowa had the opportunity to express his opinion on many matters, but he chose to limit himself to the those raised by the Russian, adding only some new points regarding the current state of the Kashubian language; stress (giving many examples, perhaps due to Mrongovius’ comment about the similarity between Kashubian and Russian); and other characteristics of Kashubian. He also added the paradigm of the verb *reszac*. However, he left out *Ojczenasz* and Anton’s dictionary. It seems that he had not been acquainted with the above works by that time but made use of them later on. Interestingly enough, Francev was familiar with the Russian original text as he inserted a final note, referring to the fact that it contained the Kashubian *Ojczenasz*.⁶⁶ Nevertheless, he printed the Kashubian version enriched by Ceynowa—even though it omitted

63 Francew *Fl. Cenowa i prof. Izmael Srezniewski*; Treder, *Kontakty naukowe Floriana Ceynowy*.

64 Дуличенко, И. И. *Срезневский*.

65 Ceynowa, *Wiwogj nad mówą kaszebską*, p. 39.

66 Francew, *Fl. Cenowa i prof. Izmael Srezniewski*, p. 166.

Ojczenasz and Anton's dictionary—which was a justified choice, considering that the Kashubians were most interested in Ceynowa's views and examples.

In 1851, Sreznevskii concluded that Ceynowa added to *Замечания* “many interesting and original ideas.”⁶⁷ He had aimed to edit them and send them to print but did not fulfill his plans. It was probably too great a work to undertake due to the vastness of Ceynowa's information and materials. From 1840 to 1850, *Замечания* just lay there waiting. He needed Ceynowa to verify many parts, just like Preis, earlier, needed Mrongovius. It is worth mentioning that Ceynowa almost never fully accepted Sreznevskii's conclusions, and the main controversy between them lay in the form of spelling (Ceynowa promoted his literary spelling, while Sreznevskii, a semi-phonetic one). Furthermore, Ceynowa, in most cases, referred to Kashubian from Eastern Pomerania (Pomorze Gdańskie), while Sreznevskii's material originated from Western Pomerania. Obviously, they differed greatly in the number, relevance, and reliability of the given examples: Sreznevskii gave about 165 (from two to five for every point), while Ceynowa—1600 (which seems excessive, as his point would have been clear with just a few).

Ceynowa's text was first printed by Francev⁶⁸ and then by Tred-er,⁶⁹ who compared it with Sreznevskii's manuscript original edited by Duličenko.⁷⁰ The latter stressed Ceynowa's pioneering role in the study of Kashubia. Nevertheless, it was not until 1912 that the text could be used for scholarly purposes though then, in a richer and more critical version; the mere fact that it was in Kashubian provided an array of new examples and a living illustration of the way Kashubian functioned. The editors of the texts added their own comments to the conclusions of Sreznevskii and Ceynowa and Duličenko commented on the spelling and the paradigm of the verb *reszac*,⁷¹ while Tred-er provided a lengthy study of *Ceynowa's knowledge of Kashubian in the light...* (*Wiedza Ceynowy o*

67 *Ibid.*, p. 85.

68 *Ibid.*

69 Tred-er, *Kontakty naukowe Floriana Ceynowy*.

70 Дуличенко, И. И. *Срезневский*.

71 *Ibid.*, p. 53.

kaszubszczyźnie w świetle...), with a reference to Preis and Hilferding.⁷² The limits of this article do not make it possible to present more detail on this matter.

In 1850, Ceynowa sent *Eine kleine Sammlung kaschubischer Wörter, welche eine grössere Ähnlichkeit mit der russischen, als mit der polnischen Sprache haben* to St. Petersburg. “Already the title hints at his endearment to the Russians. Ceynowa followed here Mrongovius’s reflections,”⁷³ not grasping at once the latter’s intentions. Ceynowa’s manuscript is a collection of about 1150 Russian words that are similar to their Kashubian counterparts, with the stress marked, for example, *август* – *augüst*, *балка* – *bālka*, *вид* – *vjid*, *горцы* – *gorce* (mountain people). It was not a dialectological dictionary, since it demonstrates, for instance, a scrupulous attachment to the completeness of derivatives or pairs of verb aspects. No wonder Sreznevskii expressed his doubts: “It contains a short collection of Kashubian words similar to Russian ones. Even though the mere text cannot satisfy a scholar, it is worth some attention and support [by the Academy].”⁷⁴ However the opinion of Francev (who cites the introduction of the work and the words beginning with the letter *A*) seems exaggerated, when he states “не имеет научной цены и значения.”⁷⁵ After all, it contained many authentic Kashubian words, some unregistered before, for example, *vjilk* or “cabbage.” Popowska-Taborska has edited the original work with annotations.⁷⁶ Hilferding might have known about this text, but did not use it in his *Остатки...*

Сборник основных слов кашубского наречия, published in St. Petersburg in 1861, contains about 1340 words, different from those collected in the abovementioned work, with the labial pronunciation of *o*

72 Treder, *Kontakty naukowe Floriana Ceynowy*, pp. 27–60.

73 Karnowski, *Dr Florian Ceynowa*, p. 39.

74 Francew, *Fl. Cenowa i prof. Izmael Srezniewski*, pp. 82–83.

75 В. А. Францев, *К истории так называемого кашубского возрождения (Хр. Ц. Мронговиус и Фл. Ценова в их сношениях с русскими учеными)*, Известия отделения русского языка и словесности Императорской Академии Наук 1912 г. кн. 3, p. 65.

76 Popowska-Taborska, *Mały zbiór wyrazów kaszubskich*, in *Słownik Floriana Ceynowy* (2001), pp.131–166.

marked. Some words might have originated from the materials collected by Anton, for example, *czopk/kłobuk*, *gafla/vjidelce*, *kuchna/kurva*, and *szata/ruchna*, and by Mrongovius, for example, *jotrocznjik* and *kluska*.⁷⁷ The dictionary was initially a register of Kashubian-German equivalents, but it was finally printed as a register of Kashubian-Russian equivalents.⁷⁸ The translations are sometimes erroneous. Ceynowa sent the work to Sreznevskii via Hilferding, who took an interest in it due to his work on his own glossary in *Осѣткѣ...*; he incorporated it save the errors (for example, *brzech*, *jalóvica*, and *sizęń*, sometimes with reference to *Сборник* in “Известия,” for example, *rzegac* and *znija*), which he was the first to notice.⁷⁹ Baudouin de Courtenay referred to it as “completely pointless,” but Breza, with reason, defended it.⁸⁰

Kurze Betrachtungen über die kaszubische Sprache als Entwurf zur Grammatik, sent to Sreznevskii in 1860, is the first Kashubian grammar book. Duličenko—the initiator and author of the fully philological edition of the grammar (1998)—mistakenly linked its origin with Ceynowa’s work from 1850,⁸¹ entitled in German *Bemerkungen über die Kaschubische Sprache* in a letter from 1851.⁸² Interestingly, Ceynowa announced (in “Szkola Narodowa” 1850, no. 16) the printing of *Zarys gramatyki kaszubskiej czyli porównanie narzecza kaszubskiego z językiem polskim*,⁸³ while in a letter to Father Malinowski from 1862, he called it *Krotkj spôgląd na różnjcę mjedze mową kašebšką e jazeke pólskjm*.⁸⁴ This may have led to the erroneous conclusion by Duličenko

77 Tredér, *Mrongowiusz jako kaszubolog*, p. 215.

78 Popowska-Taborska, W. Boryś, *Leksyka kaszubska*, pp. 24–25.

79 Hilferding, *Resztki Słowian*, pp. 174–175.

80 E. Breza, *Leksykografia kaszubska (historia, osiągnięcia, potrzeby)*, w: *Florelium linguisticum...*, red. J. Tredér i A. Lewińska (Gdańsk, 2002); przedruk pracy z 1974 r., p. 70.

81 Ceynowa, *Wuwogj nad mówą kaszebską*.

82 Francew, *Fl. Cenowa i prof. Izmael Srezniewski*, p. 68.

83 A. Bukowski, *Regionalizm kaszubski* (Poznań, 1950), p. 25.

84 Karnowski, *Dr Florian Ceynowa*, p. 70.

that the work was completed by the end of the 1840s.⁸⁵ The contents of the introduction of the book do not bear any visible resemblance to his other works, especially those on mythology and etymology, though his knowledge of history is somewhat similar to *Kile słov...*⁸⁶; some etymologies for example, *Bog: bōjec, Mogiła*, can be found in Mrongovius⁸⁷; further, Brylowski wrote about tombs and laments.⁸⁸ He did not know Hilferding's book at that point. In my opinion, the 1860 grammar justifies the thesis that Ceynowa started off writing in Kashubian, among others, linguistic essays, and only later did he elaborate his theory of literary Kashubian, engaging in the thorough study of certain areas (for example, 1848) and finishing off with a grammar book in 1879.

One cannot agree with Duličenko that the St. Petersburg version is more of a description of Kashubian dialects than the Poznań grammar book,⁸⁹ which dialectologists erroneously considered to be a description of the dialect of Sławoszyno, Ceynowa's home village. Smoczyński, after an analysis of the materials, concluded that "Ceynowa's language seems quite balanced and thus makes an impression of a much greater similarity and closeness with general Polish than the present language of his home village."⁹⁰ He referred to Ceynowa's Polonization, which must have been even greater, considering the fact that Smoczyński took *Skôrb* into account, which contained the Slovincian and Kabatian texts from Hilferding's book, although linguistically normalized by Ceynowa. Without considering them, Ceynowa's Kashubian would be even more concurrent with Polish.⁹¹ Thus, in *Kurze Betrachtungen...* Ceynowa re-

85 F. Ceynowa, *Kurze Betrachtungen über die Kaŝubische Sprache als Entwurf zur Grammatik*, hrsg., eingeleitet und kommentiert von A. D. Duličenko und W. Lehfeldt, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht in Göttingen (1998), p. 12.

86 Ceynowa, *Wuwogj nad mówą kaszebską*.

87 Treder, *Mrongowiusz jako kaszubolog*, p. 224.

88 Karnowski, *Dr Florian Ceynowa*, p. 10.

89 Ceynowa, *Kurze Betrachtungen*, p. 22.

90 P. Smoczyński, *Stosunek dzisiejszego dialektu Sławoszyna do języka Ceynowy*, in *Konferencja Pomorska (1954). Prace językoznawcze* (Warszawa, 1956), p. 81.

91 J. Treder, *Niektóre cechy kaszubszczyzny tzw. zrzeszeńców*, in *Problem statusu językowego kaszubszczyzny* (Gdańsk, 1992), p. 77; Treder in Hilferding,

ferred only to the area of Kashubia proper, and the conclusion that Ceynowa aimed to codify literary Kashubian in this work remains feasible. Hilferding argued on this issue: “He took the tongue of his native area as a norm...; the norm, in fact, is much closer to the Polish language than the Kashubian dialect, especially that of the Slovincians of Pomerania, and much farther from Polish than the Kashubian tongue of the southern part of the Wejherowo district as well as the Kartuzy and Kościerzyna districts.”⁹² Finally, the comparison made by Duličenko to the Poznan grammar book must have led to the conclusion that these were two separate works (this fact being referred to earlier): “The written outline differs greatly from the published grammar book, both in the content and spelling. In my view, these are two different things.”⁹³

The works printed as a result of collaboration also included b) **ethnographical works**, printed in *Pomniki i wzory języka i literatury ludowej słowiańskiej* as *Образцы кашебского наречия*⁹⁴ - the general title given by Sreznevskii, the author of a two-page introduction that brings nothing new, just general information on Kashubia including boundaries and statistics (according to Ceynowa, it has a population of 300,000) and about Ceynowa and his works, especially those published by Sreznevskii in “Известия.” The information comes from Šafarík’s booklet, mentioned earlier, and *Móje spóstrzeženjo*... It contains the following Kashubian texts:

1. *Przesłowjo kaszebskje* (out of the 514 sent, proverbs 495 were printed, save the *obszenica*; every fifth one was numerated).⁹⁵ In 1856, in Warsaw, Wójcicki edited a very similar collection of Ceynowa,⁹⁶ and later, much of it could be found in his *Skarb* (1866);

Resztki Słowian, p. 249; J. Tredér, *Hilferding nadal wiarygodny*, SFPS 31 (1993), p. 281.

92 Hilferding, *Resztki Słowian*, p. 99.

93 Karnowski, *Dr Florian Ceynowa*, p. 69.

94 F. Ceynowa, *Образцы кашебского наречия*, w: *Памятники и образцы народного языка и словесности*, z. I (St. Petersburg, 1852–1856), pp. 95–112.

95 Францев, *К истории так*.

96 J. Tredér: *O Ceynowie na marginesie dawnych i najnowszych prac*, *Rocz. Gd LV/2* (1995), p. 62.

2. *Pjesn ledovo: Zołnerz* (twenty-two stanzas) and a *dumka* on match-making entitled *Na 'ni stronie goj* (four stanzas), in the original version and a German translation, but the translation was not printed,⁹⁷ and the larger part of it was later summarized in Hilferding's book⁹⁸; and
3. *Zabobone, gusła e jinsze fraszki* – twenty-seven texts, most of which are one-sentence texts.

Resulting from their cooperation, c) **other works** included answers to questions raised by the Academy on 1. the area where the Kashubians live; 2. the characteristics of the Kashubian tongue and the ascertainment of dialects; 3. books printed in Kashubian, dating from Pontanus in 1643; and 4. some folk songs and proverbs with Kashubian pronunciation in the different dialects. Ceynowa took up this job, working at a slow pace, but the outcome did not always please the Academy. For instance, he outlined the boundaries in a general fashion, enumerating the most important towns and simply referring to his essay *Wuwogj nad mówną kaszébską* (1850). He generally described dialect differences, enclosing ethnographical texts and a booklet, *Rozmówa Pólocha s Kaszebą*, etc.⁹⁹

The present article aims to bring up to date Francev's reliable, although ninety-year-old, study (also containing important documents), which was not referred to in Karnowski's essay on Ceynowa, although the author heavily relied on it and sometimes translated it almost word by word. The essay seems most outdated in its description of the relationship between Preis and Mrongovius. Francev and Karnowski dispelled the imputations (for example, Pobłocki's) about Ceynowa's political entanglement or work through foreign commission,¹⁰⁰ although these issues are not commented on in the present article. However, these groundless

⁹⁷ Ibid., p. 63.

⁹⁸ Hilferding, *Resztki Słowian*, p. 167.

⁹⁹ Francev, *Fl. Cenowa i prof. Izmael Srezniewski*, pp. 68–70.

¹⁰⁰ Francev, *Fl. Cenowa i prof. Izmael Srezniewski*, p. 60; Karnowski, *Dr Florian Ceynowa*, p. 41; Treder, *Mrongowiusz jako kaszubolog*, pp. 172–176.

imputations shed light on the historical circumstances of the research in the field discussed, often accompanied by political implications, as the Kashubians and Kashubia became involved in grand politics.

The intention of the present analysis is to combine the old synthetic approaches and conclusions with new ones and to interpret everything anew. The issues discussed above were numerously discussed by many authors, for example, Duličenko.¹⁰¹ Five people, that is, three Russians and two Poles, were involved in the problems concerning Kashubian-Russian scholarly relations of the mid-nineteenth century. Scholars have already reached agreement in regard to many aspects, but many other problems, especially the detailed ones, still await deeper analysis (as they have an impact on more general issues).

After Mrongovius's (and Preis's) initial research, it was Ceynowa who stimulated the Russians' interest in Kashubia, especially Sreznevskii's. Their cooperation was a continuation of the relations that the Russian Academy had established with Mrongovius. However, the information gained from Ceynowa, mainly based on literature, was too laconic and could not be depended upon. Sreznevskii did not have new Kashubian materials at his disposal, but as an authority in the Slavic languages, he played a leading role in the research. Moreover, the widespread connections that Ceynowa maintained with St. Petersburg, Stettin, Warsaw, Cracow, Danzig, the Czechs, and the Lusatians could have influenced mid-nineteenth-century Slavic studies greatly. The impact would have been greater if Ceynowa's works had been published right upon completion. With the contribution of the Russians, six of his extensive and varied works were completed. Thanks to Sreznevskii, Ceynowa became acquainted with Anton's Kashubian materials (published only in part); but for the reference in Ceynowa's works, Anton's contribution would have remained unknown for a longer period.

Preis's contribution can be limited to the systematization of examples and passing on of Mrongovius's generalizations and conclusions. Perhaps in this way could Preis, younger and better oriented in Slavic

101 А. Д. Дуличенко, *Kashubiana в русской славистике XIX века*. – Вестник Ленинградского государственного университета, серия 2, История, языковедение, литературоведение, 1988, вып. 1 (№ 2), январь, с. 76–79.

studies than Mrongovius, be of service to this diligent philologist. What is interesting is that the shortest version of his report was most widely cited.¹⁰² Sreznevskii, with all his uncertainty, resembles Mrongovius somewhat; hesitantly, and making many simplifications, he repeated the materials and conclusions of Preis (or rather attributed to Preis), adding some of his own materials (rather more than Preis) and those of Anton. On his way, he encountered Ceynowa, a bold Kashubian and a non-linguist, but one who followed Mrongovius' ready Kashubian program that was so much more than just theoretical. It made a conscious point of establishing a separate Kashubian language, being more than a mere dialect of the Baltic Slavs.

Dating from Ceynowa's work, two separate entities can already be distinguished: the Kashubian dialects and the literary language. The Russians, critically approaching Ceynowa's information, only began to discern them (actually starting from Hilferding). They sent out Hilferding in order to a) verify the information collected in the framework of the program realized by Rumiancev, Mrongovius, and Sreznevskii; b) carry out his own field research and acquire texts in particular dialects; and c) reach the far northwestern ends of the Slav lands (they knew from Anton, Šafařík, and perhaps Mrongovius about the existence of the Slovincians). Hilferding partly "controlled" and supplemented Ceynowa, who was not delivering fully explicit materials and information, sometimes due to the language of his own appended brochures. Also, Hilferding was already well acquainted with this part of Europe (for example, he was on a course of Polish-German relations) and maybe even knew the Polish language as he had lived in Warsaw. Furthermore, he might have simply had more "luck" in his field research (longer and more intensive than Mrongovius'). He reached the "mythical" Slovincians, rousing the admiration of well-wishers and surprising adversaries (Germans such as Knopp and some Germanized Kashubians). Hilferding owed most to his field research. Actually, it is worth asking how much of it was composed of Ceynowa's indirect contribution.

Finally, it is necessary to stress that due to the communication between the Russians and Kashubians, the research program was enriched

102 *O języku kaszubskim.*

and substantiated. Mrongovius had an outline of a plan before 1823, but he expanded it under the influence of Rumiancov into a nine-point plan (sent to Stettin), which corresponded to Sreznevskii's four-point plan endorsed by the Russian Academy. Mrongovius was acquainted with Wutstrack's plan that contained an updated report of Haken. In this way, he learned about Pontanus and of the ethnonym *Kabatkowie*.¹⁰³

103 Tredér, *Mrongowiusz jako kaszubolog*.