Studia Linguistica Universitatis Iagellonicae Cracoviensis 131 (2014): 279–286
doi:10.4467/20834624SL.14.016.2324
www.ejournals.eu/Studia-Linguistica

MAREK STACHOWSKI
Jagiellonian University in Krakow
stachowski.marek@gmail.com

BERNHARD JÜLG, CRACOW AND THE VON DER GABELENTZ FAMILY*

Keywords: history of linguistics, Jagiellonian University, Chinese linguistics, Mongolian linguistics, Kalmuck language

Abstract

A comparison of two books (GG; JG), newly published by the Harrassowitz Verlag and concerning history of Oriental (mostly Kalmuck and Chinese) linguistic studies in 19th century Europe is presented in this article, along with an analysis of some information on Bernhard Jülg's studies and scholarly plans during his stay in Cracow.

The almost simultaneous publication of two books (JG somewhat earlier than GG, but both in 2013) concerning the history of Oriental studies and the famous German family von der Gabelentz does not happen every day. This remarkable fact was the first stimulus for me to write a comparative study on what can be learned from these publications.

The two books are differently structured. GG is composed of a biography and a bibliography while JG presents letters that are nothing but raw material for further research. GG tells about Georg[1] von der Gabelentz (1840–1893), JG about Georg's Father, Hans Conon von der Gabelentz (1807–1874). Finally, JG also gives some information about Bernhard Jülg (1825–1886) while GG is essentially devoted entirely to Georg von der Gabelentz.

Let us start our remarks with Bernhard Jülg, a philologist far less known today than any of the von der Gabelentz family. Walraven's monograph (JG) contains

* I would like to thank Robert Woodhouse (Brisbane) for his criticism and help with English.

1 Actually, he had three given names: Hans Georg Conon. In order to make a clear distinction between him and his father Hans Conon he is usually only called Georg.

a portrait of Jülg (p. 6) and six photographs of his publications (p. 145–150). This fact, along with Jülg's name at the first place in the title of the monograph, suggests a good and informative read on Jülg. Unfortunately, a mere two pages (p. 10sq.) are devoted to his life whereas about three and a half pages (p. 7–10) are about Hans Conon von der Gabelentz. In addition, the book closes with a biographical sketch of von der Gabelentz by Oskar Bonde (p. 151–156), reprinted from an 1874 issue of *Altenburger Zeitung*. The lack of a bibliography of Jülg's works will disappoint anyone hoping to find much information on the little known Jülg, rather than on quite well known Hans Conon von der Gabelentz.

The correspondence, as presented in JG, comprises letters from February 1846 to August 1874, the year of Hans Conon's death (p. 16–133 and 138–139, with four photographs of Hans Conon's handwritten pages with Chinese logograms on p. 134–137), five letters from Georg von der Gabelentz to Jülg, written between 1874 and 1890, that is after Hans Conon's death (p. 141–144), as well as one letter written after Jülg's death (1886) by his wife Antonie to Georg von der Gabelentz (p. 140).

Thus, the main body of the published correspondence includes Jülg's letters written from Cracow (1853–1863) to Hans Conon von der Gabelentz. Jülg's sojourn at the Jagiellonian University in Cracow is mentioned by Władysław Kotwicz (1872–1944) in his short history, unpublished during his lifetime, of Oriental studies in Poland, saying that from Cracow Jülg established contact with Józef Szczepan Kowalewski (1801–1878) who was very helpful to Jülg (K. Stachowski 2012: 226). Confirmation of this information can be found in Jülg's letters: Kowalewski made a copy of a saga about the khan Arǰi-Borǰi[2] for him[3] and explained to him various aspects of the original text.[4] The most explicit confirmation of Kotwicz's opinion, however, is to be found in Jülg's dedication[5] in his edition of Kalmuck[6] tales and his acknowledgment in its Preface:

> Allen denen, die mich bei dieser Arbeit mit Rath und That unterstützt haben, spreche ich meinen wärmsten Dank aus. Dieser gebührt von allen im vollsten Masse dem edlen, liebenswürdigen Herrn Wirklichen Staatsrathe Professor Kowalewski in

[2] For the English text of the saga see Busk (1873: 252); for the explanation of the name Arǰi-Borǰi see ibidem 393. In her presentation, Busk is heavily dependent on Jülg's edition (1868) of the saga (see Busk 1873: v).

[3] Jülg's letter of 20.12.1866: "Bezüglich des Ardschi Bordschi bin ich gut dran, als neben Ihrer guten Hdschr. auch Kowalewski eine solche, ganz treffliche hat und sie mir abschrieb" (JG 110sq.).

[4] Jülg's letter of 03.08.1862: "Vortrefflich hat mir Kowalewski Manches erläutert, nur dauert Correspondenz nach Kasan zu lange." (JG 88).

[5] "Dem Herrn Wirklichen Staatsrath Professor D[r.] J. St. Kowalewski in Warschau" (Jülg 1868: III). The initial "St." in the dedication comes as a surprise because it stands for *Stanisław* in Polish while Kowalewski's second given name was actually *Szczepan*. Kowalewski wrote "S." in his signature, as shown under his portrait in Kotwicz (1948: 16).

[6] Two forms of this ethnonym are allowed in English today: *Kalmuck* and *Kalmyk*. The former is attested in English texts as far back as in the early 17th century (1613: *Colmackes*; 1617: *Calmuck*) while *Kalmyk* seems to first appear in the 1902 edition of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* and to be in relatively frequent use only from the second half of the 20th century on (see Podhajecka 2013: 165, 237). Since the form *Kalmyk* did not exist in 19th century English I decided to use only *Kalmuck* here in order to correlate the English guise with the lifetime of the persons we are talking about.

> Warschau für die beispiellose aufopfernde Mühe, mit der er mir den ganzen Ardschi-Bordschi abschrieb, sowie für alle die gehaltvollen Mittheilungen, die er mir aus dem reichen Borne seines Wissens auf meine vielfachen Anfragen stets unermüdet und auf das zuvorkommendste machte. Semper honos nomenque Tuum laudesque manebunt! (Jülg 1868: VII)

It is unfortunate that Walravens does not explain, comment on or supplement the letters he edits.[7] If a reader is not in a position to personally consult Jülg (1868) he cannot know what Jülg's attitude towards Kowalewski was like after the translation of Arǰi-Borǰi was done.[8]

All this gives the impression that Jülg was just an ordinary Mongolian linguist, which is not really true. In 1853 he was invited from Lwów (Lemberg, Lviv) to Cracow to take up the post of a full professor of Classical Philology.[9] In subsequent years he would also work on Slavic Philology[10] and teach Sanskrit.[11]

---

[7] Nevertheless, his publications that present partially unknown and generally hardly accessible source materials are of particular concern for further research. Unfortunately, this is not always the case with other editors. Let us give but one example: the title of Hartmut Kästner's book (2012), *Otto Böhtlingk und Jakutien*, seems to promise information on Otto Böhtlingk and Yakutia. In actuality, however, this is a thin booklet with a 25 page standard biography (p. 5–29) without new archive materials, followed by a photomechanical reprint of the first Yakut prose text (96 pages long) that is easily accessible in German, American and Russian editions. Thus, the scholarly value of such a contribution is far lower than that of any publication of Walravens.

[8] The true character of the relations between B. Jülg and H. C. von der Gabelentz is not discussed in this edition either. At first sight they were absolutely exemplary. Nevertheless, Jülg (1868) only briefly mentions Hans Conon – unlike Kowalewski – in the closing part of the Introduction, together with two other persons ("Meinen Freunden, den Herren […] Akademiker von Schiefner […], Geheimen Rath von der Gabelentz auf Poschwitz bei Altenburg, Schulrath Halder […] danke ich gleichfalls für die Förderung meiner Arbeit") although he seems to have obtained much help from Hans Conon. On the other hand, Hans Conon made a two year break in their correspondence (from August 1856 to August 1858) and did not feel any need to explain this break when writing his first letter to Jülg on 09.08.1858; the letter begins with the following lines: "Ew. Wohlgeboren mögen es freundschaftlich entschuldigen, wenn ich in unsere Correspondenz eine Unterbrechung von zwei Jahren eintreten ließ" (JG 68). In addition, we shall see below that Jülg, who wished to leave Cracow and find a post in Germany in 1860, asked Hans Conon if there was a job for him in von der Gabelentz's middle school; Hans Conon did not even mention this question in his answer (see fn. 12 and 13 below). Did Jülg's muted acknowledgment of his gratitude (1868) result from Hans Conon's attitude towards him (the real one, not just warm words in his letters) in previous years (1856–58, 1860)?

[9] Jülg's letter of 18.01.1853: "Damit Sie übrigens wissen, wo ich weile, muß ich Ihnen, hochverehrter Gönner, mittheilen, daß ich plötzlich mit dem Wechsel des Jahres zur ordentlichen Professur der klassischen Literatur an der Krakauer Universität berufen worden bin mit 1200 fl. C.M., nach zehnjähriger Dienstleistung mit 1400 fl. C.M. und zwanzigjähriger 1600 fl. C.M. Ich mußte so schnell abreisen, daß ich in Lemberg nichts mehr ordnen konnte." (JG 53).

Hans Conon's reaction, in his letter of 22.10.1853, was as follows: "Über die Versetzung nach Krakau unter, wie es scheint, günstigen Bedingungen freue ich mich aufrichtig und um so mehr, als Sie dadurch Deutschland wieder etwas näher gerückt sind." (JG 54).

[10] Jülg gave lectures on Slavic comparative grammar and reviewed books on Slavic languages. He wrote, for instance, on Jan Kollár's book *Staroitalia slavjanská* (Vienna 1853) as follows: "Ganz Italien war slawisch; sämtliche umbrische, etruskische, lateinische pp. pp. Inschriften sind slawisch […]. Das Ganze ist werthlos; schade für das Papier von fast 900 Quartseiten. Ich werde dieser Tage in den Beilagen zur *Wiener Zeitung* eine Kritik geben." (letter of 31.08.1853; JG 62). ☞

Jülg needed a lot of books concerning various languages. It soon became clear that he was spending more money on books than he could earn. This compelled him to undertake new duties and jobs that would allow him to pay off his debts. On the other hand, the spare time he would like to have had for his Kalmuck studies dwindled as a result with each passing semester. Jülg regularly – in almost every letter – complains about his lack of time. Nevertheless he seems to have been happy with his job in Cracow until 1860 – the year in which he starts to speak of "today's situation" and inconveniences.[12] Also Hans Conon seems to understand him perfectly.[13] Again, the editor does not explain this unexpected change of Jülg's state of mind.

The problem was that all this happened in the period of the Partitions of Poland. Cracow belonged to Austria whose Germanisation policy was extremely hard in the years 1853–60 (it should be remembered that Jülg came to Cracow exactly in 1853 so that his being invited should be viewed as part of the Germanisation, a fact he probably was unaware of):

> The academic community was deeply shaken by the decision taken by the Austrian authorities, announced to the Jagiellonian University on 31st December 1852 […] to suspend its autonomy and appoint a government supervisor. […] The culminating act completing the Austrian authorities' programme of Germanisation was the imposition, as of the 1853/1854 academic year, of German as the mandatory language of instruction for all teaching in all the faculties except Theology, optional (non-obligatory) subjects and Polish literature. (HJU 101).

> The Austrian authorities were very reluctant over making concessions to the Jagiellonian University. […] The decree of 4th February 1861 restored Polish as the language of instruction in most subjects. (HJU 102).

> [T]he authorities in Vienna were accustoming themselves more and more to the realisation that the Polonisation of the Jagiellonian University was an inevitability. Finally, on 30th April 1870, the Emperor issued his consent to the use of Polish as the language of instruction and in the University's internal administration, except for the teaching of German language and literature. (HJU 103).

Jülg writes ‹Kollar› instead of ‹Kollár›. Walravens reads Kollár's given name (cited by Jülg as the initial "J." only) with the short vowel: *Jan* which is correct because Kollár's book was written in Czech. His original Slovak name had a long vowel: *Ján*.

[11] Jülg's letter of 29.10.1860: "In diesem Semester habe ich auf wiederholtes Bitten mich zu einem Sanskrit-Colloquium bewegen lassen." (JG 79).

One cannot but regret that nobody asked Jülg to teach Kalmuck… He might have been the first (non-Hebraic) Orientalist in Cracow. Modern lessons in Oriental philology would be launched in Cracow by Tadeusz Kowalski (1889–1948) only in the academic year 1914/15 (Dobosz 2013: 91) and they would be focused on Near Eastern languages.

[12] Cf. for instance, Jülg's letter of 29.10.1860: "Die gegenwärtigen Verhältnisse machen den Aufenthalt in Krakau sehr unangenehm. Wüßte ich eine irgendwie convenable Stelle in Deutschland, ich entschlösse mich sofort hinzuziehen. Haben Sie keine Stelle für mich an Ihrem Gymnasium?" (JG 79).

[13] H. C. von der Gabelentz's letter of 31.10.1860: "Daß Ihre Stellung in Krakau neuerdings verleidet ist, begreife ich, wenn aber die dortige Universität gänzlich polonisirt und von deutschen Elementen purificirt werden soll, wäre es dann nicht Sache des Gouvernements, Ihnen eine andere Stelle anzuweisen?" (JG 79).

Less wonder that the re-Polonisation was not to Jülg's liking, even in its initial stage because Jülg left Cracow in 1863, that is seven years before the Emperor's consent of 1870. Nevertheless, his opinion was somewhat amazing at times. When Hans Conon von der Gabelentz spoke of Jülg's suffering from "Polonism, Panslavism, or whatever it is called"[14] Jülg quite correctly answered that the spirit in Cracow cannot possibly be called "Panslavism" but, in the same letter, he added, with sharp irritation (and an exclamation mark), that Poles are not interested in Panslavism because they find no nation besides themselves worthy of interest.[15] Indeed, the unheard-of wish of Poles to have Polish as the language of instruction and administration at a Polish university in Poland instead of teaching, learning and administrating in German obviously was a good reason to get irritated.

Walravens is doubtless right when he calls Hans Conon von der Gabelentz more important than Bernhard Jülg (JG 7).[16] Nevertheless, some etymological opinions expressed by Jülg in his letters are very interesting for historians of linguistics today. Let us give some examples:

The Mongolian etymology of Slavic *xorǫgy* (= modern Polish *chorągiew*) 'flag, banner' is usually connected with a study by Ligeti (1949). However, Jülg suggested this connection almost ninety years earlier.[17] Similarly, Shichiro Murayama explained the Russian word *čaj* 'tea' as a reflex of a North Chinese nominal composition built-up of two meanings: 'tea' and 'leaf' (Murajama 1975). Bernhard Jülg was quite close to the correct etymology seventy five years earlier.[18] Other etymological suggestions of him are less spectacular from today's point of view. Nevertheless, he appears to have been a talented etymologist and it is a great pity that his etymological ideas are not better known today.

Let us move on now to the house von der Gabelentz. First, the question of their name. This old and respectable German family originally had West Slavic (or just

---

[14] H. C. von der Gabelentz's letter of 17.05.1861: "[…] leiden Sie noch unter dem Polonismus, Panslavismus oder wie man es sonst nennen soll?" (JG 81).

[15] Jülg's letter of 24.05.1861: "[…] Panslawismus müssen Sie diese Erscheinung hier wenigstens nicht nennen; die Polen kennen den Panslawismus nicht, der ihnen ein Greuel ist, bei ihnen existirt nur der Polonismus; außer ihnen gibt es kein Etwas bedeutendes Volk auf der Erde!" (JG 81).

[16] Walravens' original formulation is: "Der bedeutendere und talentiertere war zweifellos Gabelentz […]" (GJ 7). There can be no doubt that Hans Conon was more important than Jülg both in contemporary social life and in the evolution of linguistics in Europe. However, the question of talent is quite different. It is hard to say what Jülg would have achieved if he had had money enough to entirely focus on his studies. His financial situation, as well as the missing family tradition of academic education and the lack of a large private library, which would have been a matter of course in a baron's (German *Freiherr* von der Gabelentz) house, were extremely important factors in his career and scholarly efficiency.

[17] Jülg's letter of 15.04.1860: "Im Verlaufe der letzten Studien bin ich auf mehrere Worte gestoßen, welche die Mongolen den Slawen gebracht haben; so wohl auch deńgi (tengge), chorągiew (orongga) […]" (JG 75).

[18] In addition, he was apparently not the first person who thought about this possibility, cf. Jülg's letter of 04.05.1860: "Czaj habe ich bisher gedacht sei […] tᶜschâ-ie. Rochet Manuel pratique p. 178 Blätter-Thee, ob richtig? Burj. u. tungus. cai und sai." (JG 76).

In the same letter the problem of possible Mongolian origin of Polish *towar* 'merchandise' is mentioned: "Ob mong. tawar oder poln. towar ursprünglich, ist mir noch nicht klar." (ibid.).

Czech?) roots which can also be deduced from their surname containing a geographical name *Gabelentz* with its *g-* for an original *y-* (in both German and West Slavic spelled ‹j›), so typical of some German dialects.[19] Thus, the spelling ‹Gabelentz›, nowadays pronounced with *g-*, actually reflects the former spelling *Jabelentz* < Czech *Jablenec* (Décsy 1973: 207). Their coat of arms shows a pitchfork (German *Gabel*) in the shield which clearly points to the fact that the emblem was designed when the family was Germanised, pronounced their name with *g-* and associated it with *Gabel* 'pitchfork' while the original Czech form *Jablenec* should be rather connected with Czech *jabloň* 'apple tree' so that the initial meaning of the place name *Jablenec* will approximately have been 'a place/village with numerous apple trees'.

Hans Conon von der Gabelentz was interested in various languages, among them Chinese. It is absolutely obvious that he had no (or, nearly no)[20] access to spoken Chinese for many years. But then the situation totally changed. In 1861, he tells Jülg that his daughter is soon coming back from China with her children who nearly always speak Chinese among themselves.[21] Since Walravens adds no explanation, the reader cannot know why Hans Conon's daughter was in China and why her own children spoke Chinese rather than German. Fortunately, the other book discussed here, namely GG provides answers to both questions. Hans Conon's daughter Pauline (1836–1885) married Richard von Carlowitz-Maxen (1817–1886) in 1855. Her husband founded a trading firm that had also its agencies in China. The couple spent quite a few years in that country because of Richard's commercial activities. They went to China in May 1855, Pauline returned in July 1862, and Richard only in 1873 (GG 22 and fn. 41). Their children Hans and Clementine were both born in China and they had a Chinese amah called Agui, in the sources mostly spelled ‹Aqui› (GG 53) who was brought with them to Germany.[22]

At that time Hans Conon's son Georg, the future author of a world-famous Chinese grammar, first published in 1881 and subsequently republished many

---

[19] One can hear a jokingly used German quasi-spelling code "Jot wie Gustav" or just "Jot wie Justav" even today.

[20] "[…] sowohl Georg wie sein Vater Conon waren nie in Ostasien gewesen. Nach den Familienaufzeichnungen zu urteilen legte der Vater Conon weniger Wert auf Erfahrungen im Sprechen als im Lesen und Verstehen seiner linguistischen Studienobjekte und strebte Sprechfertigkeiten auch kaum an. […] Soweit bekannt, hatte Conon nur einmal Chinesen getroffen, und zwar bei einem Besuch am 26. Januar 1853 in Halle. Es handelte sich hier möglicherweise um die beiden südchinesischen Handelsleute, die am 17. Oktober 1822 auch Goethe in Weimer besucht hatten und über die Heinrich Heine ein Gedicht schrieb. Auch der […] Berliner Sinologe Wilhelm Schott pflegte zeitweilig Umgang mit diesen." (GG 52 sq.).

I cannot say whether Hans Conon's reluctant attitude towards practical speaking skills resulted from his scholarly views or, maybe, from the fact that they virtually were beyond his reach. Furthermore, it seems to be unknown whether he tried to speak Chinese in Halle.

[21] H. C. von der Gabelentz's letter of 31.05.1861: "Nach den letzten Briefen aus China habe ich Hoffnung, daß meine Tochter diesen Winter oder nächstes Frühjahr mit ihren Kindern herauskommt; ich werde dann das Vergnügen haben, in meiner eigenen Familie Chinesisch sprechen zu hören, da die Kinder unter sich sich ausschließlich dieser Sprache bedienen – oft zum Verdruß ihrer Mutter, der es nicht gelungen ist, während ihres sechsjährigen Aufenthalts dort sich das Verständniß derselben anzueignen." (JG 84).

[22] Their portraits (also that of the Chinese amah) can be seen in a photomontage in GG 121.

times, the latest edition probably being that of 2012 (Dogma Publishing), was twenty-two and studying law in Leipzig. Unfortunately, it remains unknown if the Chinese conversations of his nephews influenced his interests and affected his future career and, by the same token, contributed to the evolution of Chinese linguistics in Europe.

This example shows that the reader can benefit from simultaneously working with both of these books since they quite often complement each other.

GG opens with an introduction (p. 8–15) presenting the general intellectual situation of Oriental studies in 19th century Europe. This part can readily be recommended as a good, instructive read to all students of Oriental philologies and those interested in the history of philology and linguistics.

The further parts of Gimm's book are: a biography of Georg von der Gabelentz (p. 9–73); a (very) general assessment of Georg's work (p. 74–75); Georg's "Lebensregeln" (p. 77 sq.), i.e. "rules of life" in form of twenty aphorisms – some of them, being too long and somewhat too bombastic, offend against modern sense of stylistics; some other can be used as aphorisms even today.[23]

Georg's bibliography is presented in chronological order. It comprises altogether 334 items[24] and is compound of 328 published titles (p. 79–117), two reprints made in the 20th century (p. 117) and four unpublished items (p. 118). Apart from the two reprints, Georg von der Gabelentz is thus the author of 332 works. Of course, they give much material for a historical discussion today. Unfortunately, the author of GG neither presents their reception nor discusses their role and value in Georg's lifetime and/or today although he puts the phrase "Materialien zu Leben und Werk" in the title of his book. Some information can, it is true, be found in the closing part of Georg's biography (p. 74 sq.) but the two pages are filled with quotations from someone else's works rather than with Gimm's own analyses.

In short: JG presents, first of all, raw material for further research while GG is both a biobibliographical source for researchers and an instructive read for undergraduates. The best results can be achieved if both books are used simultaneously and compared with each other. The reader should hope that the authors will also one day publish their analyses and assessments of the scholarly output of Hans Conon and Georg von der Gabelentz, as well as of that of Bernhard Jülg.

References

GG = Gimm M. 2013. *Georg von der Gabelentz zum Gedenken. Materialien zu Leben und Werk* [= Sinologica Coloniensia 32]. Wiesbaden.

HJU = Stopka K., Banach A. K., Dybiec J. 2000. *The history of the Jagiellonian University*. Kraków.

[23] This is the case with Rule 13: "Man muß selbst ohne Streben sein, um erfolgloses Streben zu verhöhnen" (Gimm 78), i.e. 'Only those who make no efforts themselves can deride anyone else's failed efforts'.

[24] With a typo on p. 118: the two last items have the same number 333.

JG = Walravens H. 2013 (ed.). »*… Ihr ewig dankbarer B. Jülg*«. *Briefwechsel der Sprachwissenschaftler Bernhard Jülg (1825–1886) und Hans Conon von der Gabelentz (1807–1874)*; bearbeitet und herausgegeben von… [= Sinologica Coloniensia 31]. Wiesbaden.

Busk R. H. 1873. *Sagas from the Far East; or, Kalmouk and Mongolian traditionary tales. With historical preface and explanatory notes*. London.

Décsy Gy. 1973. *Die linguistische Struktur Europas. Vergangenheit – Gegenwart – Zukunft*. Wiesbaden.

Dobosz K. 2013. *Szkice z dziejów orientalistyki w okresie międzywojennym ze szczególnym uwzględnieniem postaci Tadeusza Kowalskiego* [unpublished M.A. thesis]. Kraków.

Jülg B. 1868. *Die neun Märchen des Siddhi-Kûr nach der ausführlicheren Redaction und die Geschichte des Ardschi-Bordschi Chan*. Innsbruck.

Kästner H. 2012: *Otto Böhtlingk und Jakutien*, Leipzig.

Kotwicz W. → Stachowski K. 2012.

Kotwicz W. 1948. *Józef Kowalewski orientalista (1801–1878)*. Wrocław.

Ligeti L. 1949. L'étymologie mongole du slave *chorǫgy* 'drapeau'. – *Etudes slaves et roumaines* 2: 46–56.

Murajama Š. [= Murayama Sh.] 1975. Ètimologija russkogo slova *čaj*. – *Ètimologija* 1975: 81–83.

Podhajecka M. 2013. *Russian borrowings in English: a dictionary and corpus study*, Opole.

Stachowski K. 2012. Władysława Kotwicza niepublikowany *Rzut oka na losy orjentalistyki w Polsce* (1938). – *LingVaria* 7.2: 207–237.