Following Kant’s footsteps in Spain
Reflections on Wincenty Lutosławski’s report in the first issue of *Kant-Studien*

**Abstract:** In 1876, Hans Vaihinger, a German philosopher and professor at the University of Halle, founded the journal *Kant-Studien*. One of the main objectives of this project was to investigate the impact of Kantian philosophy outside Germany. The first correspondent for the journal was a Polish philosopher and national activist – Wincenty Lutosławski. His report on the study of the Spanish reception of Kant was published in the first issue of the journal *Kant-Studien* in 1897 under the title “Kant in Spanien.” In my article I present the history of the emergence of Lutosławski’s report and I describe the Polish encounters with Spanish culture and philosophy in the 19th century.
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Introduction

The year 1896 marked the founding of the journal Kant-Studien in Halle.¹ The originator of this venture was Hans Vaihinger.² A key task of the newly founded journal, in parallel with the popularisation of Kant’s philosophy, was to explore the extent of its influence in other European countries. The first direction the editors of Kant-Studien turned to was Spain, the country with one of the longest philosophical traditions. The designated area of research required finding the right person with advanced knowledge of Kant and familiarity with Spanish culture, in addition to having contacts in the local intellectual circles. Such high demands were met by Wincenty Lutosławski (1863–1954), a Polish philosopher, national activist, and prominent expert on Plato. Vaihinger, in addition to being confident in Lutosławski’s philosophical competence, was well aware of his family ties. Lutosławski’s wife was the well-known Spanish poetess Sofia Casanova (1861–1958). Moreover, during his numerous travels, Lutosławski made a number of lucrative acquaintances in intellectual circles, especially among the Madrid elite. Thus, Vaihinger’s decision to make Lutosławski the first foreign correspondent of the Kant-Studien, following in Kant’s footsteps in Spain, is not at all surprising.

The result of Lutosławski’s research was an article published in the first issue of Kant-Studien entitled Kant in Spanien,³ the reading of which to this day is a sine qua non condition when it comes to reliable research on the Spanish reception of Kant’s philosophy.

¹ I have addressed the problem of Kant’s reception in Spain in two already published articles: Dorota Leszczyna, “Kant w Hiszpanii – czyli o zapomnianej historii sprawozdania Wincentego Lutosławskiego”, Ruch Filozoficzny 69(1) (2012): 59–68 and Dorota Leszczyna, “Recepcja filozofii transcendentalnej Immanuela Kanta w XIX-wiecznej Hiszpanii”, in: Idea transcendentalizmu od Kanta do Wittgensteina, ed. Przemysław Parszutowicz, (Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Instytutu Filozofii i Socjologii PAN, 2011), 145–163. The present article is an extended version of the research presented in the aforementioned publications and, at the same time, an attempt at their synthesis.
Lutosławski’s first encounters with Spain

Lutosławski’s fascination with Spain began in his early youth. Its origins can be traced to his reading of Miguel de Cervantes’s famous work *Don Quijote de la Mancha*, which left a great impression on the young philosopher. One of Lutosławski’s greatest dreams became a journey in the footsteps of the knight errant across the scorched plains of the Castilla la Mancha region. Lutosławski gradually began to realise this dream while still studying in Dorpat (modern: Tartu), where he attended Waldemar Masinga’s lectures on Spanish language and literature. Lutosławski then wrote:

My first encounter with Spain was in Dorpat in 1884. The University’s docent, Waldemar Masing, was returning from Spain at the time and announced lectures on Spanish language and literature. I was particularly interested in these lectures as Masing was giving the Spaniards precedence among all the nations of Europe regarding the most mature literary form – the drama. And, as I had also read Don Quixote as a child, I had a particular fondness for Spaniards and desired to learn more about them.¹

After completing his studies in Dorpat in 1886, Lutosławski planned to make several journeys. Initially, he dreamt of going to America, Africa, or Australia. However, he had to abandon these plans owing to a lack of sufficient funds. He only travelled to London and then reached Spain via Portugal. The country appealed to him so much that he ventured to spread its virtues among the Poles. He wrote:

It is my wish to make Spain more accessible to my fellow countrymen and encourage them to visit this beautiful country and take a rest after the hardships of our lives among this cheerful people, free in every way, and living without this fever that consumes us. [...] Such a journey for a young man would be a pleasant memory for his old age, a collection of most interesting impressions and experi-

ences, a rich source of intellectual development, and a cure from many physical maladies.\(^5\)

After visiting the most interesting Spanish cities, seeing the most important monuments, and touring the most splendid museums, Lutosławski decided to become acquainted with the most outstanding representatives of Spanish culture. He received a recommendation from a Lisbon writer, whose name he was unable to remember, as the man died soon after and they never met again. The recommendation, however, paved the way for him to enter the Spanish salons. The first person he became acquainted with was the poet Gaspar Núñez de Arce (1834–1903), who, as Lutosławski described it: “from the first meeting welcomed me with extraordinary kindness and spoke with great sincerity about what moved him most deeply.”\(^6\) Núñez de Arce’s poetry reminded Lutosławski of the work of the Polish poet and playwright Adam Asnyk, “with the main difference that Asnyk did not despair about the future.”\(^7\)

Núñez de Arce encouraged Lutosławski to read the work of another outstanding poet of the time, Ramón Campoamor (1817–1901). In *Pierwsze wrażenia iberyjskie [First Iberian Impressions]*, he wrote that he did not wear black glasses, led a cheerful life, wrote mostly about his own life experiences, without extreme exaltation, but always with humour.\(^8\) Campoamor, full of joie de vivre, nevertheless wrote poems “full of gruff pessimism,”\(^9\) in which he expressed his deep disillusionment with Spain. Unlike Núñez de Arce, he did not battle Spanish decadence, but compounded it by sowing defeatism. Despite these vices, it was to Campoamor that Lutosławski owed the most.

From the ‘Spanish Goethe,’ a term used to refer to Campoamora, Lutosławski received a recommendation to make the acquaintance of two other important figures. The first was Leopoldo Augusto de Cueto (1815–1901), a writer, literary historian, and diplomat who was granted the title of Mar-

---

\(^5\) Ibidem, 233.
\(^6\) Ibidem, 241.
\(^7\) Ibidem, 242.
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\(^9\) Ibidem, 243.
quis de Valmar by King Alfonso XII in 1877. He was Spain’s ambassador to Washington, Copenhagen, and Vienna, and “became highly renowned in the scholarly world for his historical research in the field of ancient literature.”

It was in his house, where literary and philosophical meetings were held, that Lutosławski met many eminent personalities who played an important role in his later research on Kant in Spain.

The second person, met through Campoamor, was a woman who caused a major turnaround in the life of the Polish philosopher. In his conversations with Campoamor, Lutosławski expressed his desire to meet a female representative of Spanish literature. As he himself wrote in his memoirs:

Campoamor smiled benevolently, as if to say that he understood my scientific curiosity perfectly, and said to me: «This is not as easy a matter young man as it appears to you. I have been studying women for several decades and have not yet grasped them. Besides, they are more capable of other arts and charms than of poetry. But among the ones I know, one young girl writes best, a cruel pessimist, whom you will be pleased to meet. In our country, she is a rare example of a woman able to support her family, her mother, and younger brothers, with her pen.»

This is how Lutosławski received the address of Sofia Casanova, whom he went to see on his birthday on 6 June 1886. This single encounter was enough for him to fall in love with a young girl with Celtic features, full of passionate contempt for life. Years later, he recalled this first meeting: “This woman will be my wife.” At the same time, he added that “what he wrote was a kind of an involuntary divination, expressed automatically, without the participation of the will or the senses.” Lutosławski was fully aware of the folly of such an idea. He wrote:

Marriage to a foreigner with no will to live, requiring the atmosphere of the Spanish capital for the development of her just blossoming talent – seemed to me

10 Ibidem, 244.
11 Ibidem, 246.
12 Ibidem, 247.
13 Ibidem.
at that very moment absurdity and madness. [...] I decided not to explain these words to anyone and I tucked away the book with the dedication and divination.\textsuperscript{14}

In March 1887, in Madrid, this foreboding came true and Sofía Casanova became the wife of the Polish philosopher. It was not, however, a compatible marriage. Lutosławski was aware of the differences that divided them. He was already aware of this before the wedding, to which he was led not by love but by “psychological compulsion.”\textsuperscript{15} His goal was to have his desired son, not a wife, because, as he claimed, “the constant presence of a woman in a life dedicated to the acquisition of knowledge seemed a serious impediment.”\textsuperscript{16} In his marriage to Sofía, Lutosławski did not get a son, but four daughters. Nevertheless, from her he received something much more important, something that defined his further life – Spain and its cultural richness. Thanks to this marriage, he almost automatically entered the circles of the Madrid intellectual elite, including the philosophical elite, a fact that proved particularly important from the perspective of his future research on Kant in Spain.

**Following Kant’s footsteps in Spain. Lutosławski’s research at the turn of 1896–1897**

When, in 1896, Vaihinger asked Lutoslawski to research the reception of Kant in Spain and prepare a report on it for the first issue of *Kant-Studien*, the Polish philosopher acquiesced and approached the task as an interesting one. He began the realisation of this mission with several library searches in the most important libraries of Madrid, including the National Library. Although he was aware of Madrid’s poor library resources, he was somewhat surprised to find that hardly any works by or about Kant were to be found in them. Thus, he decided to visit some of the most prominent representatives of Spanish philosophy of the time, mostly professors and lecturers at Madrid’s Central University. The thinkers who hosted Lutosławski included: José Ma-
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nuel Ortí y Lara (1826–1904), Nicolás Salmerón (1838–1908), Marcelino Menéndez y Pelayo (1856–1912), Urbano González Serrano (1848–1904), and Matías Nieto Serrano (1813–1902).

The first of his interlocutors, Ortí y Lara, was a representative of Spanish neo-Thomism. He was marked by an extremely hostile attitude to German philosophy. He saw it as a breeding ground for heresy, dangerous to the dogmas of the Catholic religion. Particularly sinister to him seemed to be the monistic tendencies of Kant’s philosophy, which he interpreted as an expression of covert pantheism and atheism, the consequence of which was the ludicrous aspiration to uproot the Spanish universities from the yoke of the Church. Among other things, he wrote: “A university independent of the Church is the same as science independent of religion, as reason independent of faith, as man independent of God, all these postulates point to one and the same thing: [...] the appalling sovereignty of reason, its preposterous pride.”

Ortí y Lara, in keeping with his own value system, saw no need to support the project of the Kant-Studien authors. In fact, he considered it an expression of an empty and unsubstantiated bibliomania, driven by a “sinful curiosity.” As José Luís Villacañas Berlanga wrote: “At the mere sound of Kant’s name, Ortí y Lara threatened to notify the relevant services, which caused justifiable fear, given that the Inquisition was still active in Spain at the time.” Lutosławski himself commented on the views of the Spanish neo-Thomist in a more measured fashion. He admitted that he was somewhat fooled by Ortí y Lara’s appearance, who presented himself as “an elderly man, amiable, making an impression of a clergyman.”

17 José Manuel Ortí y Lara, Impugnación del discurso pronunciado en la solemne inauguración del año académico de 1857 a 1858 en la Universidad Central por el Doctor D. Julián Sanz del Río (Granada: Imprenta y Librería de D. José María Zamora, 1857), 44.
Faced with Ortí y Lara’s reluctance, Lutosławski was forced to seek help from other representatives of Spanish philosophical thought. He thus went to the home of Salmerón, a famous supporter of the philosophy of Karl Christian Friedrich Krause, head of the Department of Metaphysics at the Central University of Madrid and former president of the First Spanish Republic. Salmerón told Lutosławski that he became acquainted with Kantian philosophy through French-language translations and doubted that anyone in Spain had read Kant in the original.21 This was a rather surprising declaration, especially since Salmerón must have known that in 1883 the first Spanish translation of *Critique of Pure Reason*, made directly from German, was written by José del Perojo y Figueras, Kuno Fisher’s student. According to Villacañas Berlanga, Salmerón was driven by sheer malice and resentment towards Perojo y Figueras, prompting him to conceal this critical fact from Lutosławski. Salmerón, however, did not fail to present to the Polish philosopher his own reflections on Kant. In his opinion, Kantian thought had a decisive influence on the whole of philosophy, but he himself did not agree with its distinction between a phenomenon and a thing in itself, since, in his opinion, it was the phenomenon that constituted true reality.22 This was the basis for Lutosławski’s report classifying Salmerón as a positivist, although the Spanish philosopher himself preferred to describe himself as a monist or Krause-positivist.23

For his research on Kant, Lutosławski also went to the home of the eminent Spanish historian Marcelino.24 Menéndez y Pelayo gave Lutosławski some important information and dates concerning the early reception of Kant’s philosophy in Spain. According to him, brief references to Kant could be found in Spain as early as the 1880s and 1890s. The first were to appear in the journal “Memorial Literario Instructivo y Curioso de la Corte de Madrid.” It was issued in Madrid between 1784 and 1797. Lutosławski, follow-

21 Ibidem.
22 Ibidem.
ing the clue given to him by Menéndez y Pelayo, tracked down all the issues of this journal. However, he found no single mention of Kant in any of them. This conundrum was finally cleared up, almost a century after Lutosławski’s expedition, by another Kant scholar in Spain, namely José Miguel Palacios. In his article “La filosofía de Kant en España del siglo XIX”, he argued that the futility of Lutosławski’s search in this matter was due to an unintentional error and oversight by Menéndez y Pelayo, who gave the Polish philosopher the wrong journal title.25 The first references to Kant appeared not in the Memorial Literario, but in a periodical with a similar title: Mirador Literario o Biblioteca Periódica de Ciencias y Artes, which also began to be published in Madrid, but somewhat later, i.e. from October 1801.26 It was the 1802 issue there that contained what was probably the first Spanish work on Kant, an anonymous report devoted to Désiré Joseph Mercier’s reflections on the philosophy of Kant and Fichte.27 In the same journal, in issue XXVIII of 1803, Palacios found another text dealing with Kantian philosophy, specifically a review of a Dutch work on Kant by Johannes Kinker.28 In 1804, in yet another Madrid journal Variedades de Ciencias, Literatura y Artes, a Spanish translation of a review of a work by Joseph Marie, Baron de Gérando appeared, titled Histoire comparée des systems de philosophie, discussing quite generally the aspects of Kant’s philosophy.29

These early and rather cursory references to Kant were not accessible to Lutosławski, who nevertheless continued to diligently search libraries and pay visits to more Spanish intellectuals. Among them was Urbano Gonzalez Serrano, a philosophy teacher at the Madrid grammar school and at the Institute of St. Isidore. In his report, Lutosławski mentioned several of his works that make brief references to Kant. He wrote about the 1887 Diccionario en-

26 Ibidem.
27 More on this subject in Villacañas, Kant en España, 155–165.
28 Johannes Kinker, Essai d’une exposition succiencte de la Critique de la Raison Pure de’ Emmanuel Kant (Amsterdam: Chez La Veuve Changuion & Den Hengst, 1801).
29 See more broadly on this subject in Ramón Ceñal, “La filosofía española en la segunda mitad del siglo XIX”, Recista de Filosofía 58–59 (1956): 403–444.
Lutosławski’s last interlocutor was Matías Nieto Serrano, a Madrid-based Kantist, physician, and president of the Royal Academy of Medicine. He decided to present his own interpretation of Kantian philosophy to Lutosławski. The Polish philosopher devoted to it a separate part of his report, which he entitled *Kant von Standpunkt eines spanischen Kantianers.*

Nieto Serrano’s philosophical conception, presented by Lutosławski in *Kant-Studien*, was an attempt at a synthesis of Renouvier and Kant. The influence of the German philosopher, however, was greater. Nieto Serrano read both *Critique of Pure Reason* and *Critique of Practical Reason* in French translations. It was under their influence that he produced works such as: *Bosquejo de la ciencia vivente* (Madrid 1867), *La naturaleza, el espíritu y el hombre* (Madrid 1884) and *Biología del pensamiento* (Madrid 1891). Nieto Serrano wrote: “Reading the works of certain philosophers, particularly Kant, has been a source of light for me. It made me grasp the necessity of laws for phenomena, and since then I have felt what I now understand to be true, in the light of reflection, each time more strongly.”

Despite his decidedly scientific formation, and unlike many of his Spanish intellectual contemporaries, Nieto Serrano was not a proponent of positivism. Rather, as Juan Arana rightly observes he was: “a classical philosopher who proclaimed the dependence of science on philosophy.” The central point of his philosophical conception is relationalism, with its origin in Kant’s transcendental idealism. Moreover, Nieto Serrano rejected ontology based on the notion of substance, since, as he himself wrote: “A substantial relation, in complete isolation, is not a relation, but it is nothing. In order to avoid this situation, it loses its substantial character and assumes an adjectival char-

---


31 Cit. from M. Nieto Serrano, *Biología del pensamiento* (Madrid: Enrique Teodoro, 1891), VIII.

acter, referring to both subject and object.” The Spanish philosopher saw Kant’s transcendental aesthetics as the starting point for the problem of objectivity. Also, he took over Kant’s concept of phenomenon and transcendental analytics, formulating his own notion of law.

Lutosławski’s report *Kant in Spanien* and conclusions to be drawn from it

Lutosławski’s report was published in the first issue of *Kant-Studien* in 1897. Alongside the conceptions indicated above, it contained references to the most important research on Kant in Spain at the time. In it, we find brief notes on various Spanish examples of Kant’s reception. First, listed in order by Lutosławski are the concepts of: Toribio Núñez Sessé with the conditions he presented and the relationship between Kant and Bentham and Bernardin Fernández del Velasco, who, apart from Kant, also wrote about the concepts of Bacon, Herder, and Pestalozzi. Both conceptions were an expression of the authors’ reformist activity towards the intellectual and moral renewal of Spain, representing an expression of Kant’s Enlightenment optimism.

Among Kant’s early Spanish scholars, Lutosławski also mentions such figures as Juan Donoso Cortés, author of *Lecciones de derecho politico*, who devoted the last chapter of his work to German philosophy, including that of Kant, and Jaime Balmes, who in a work entitled *Filosofía Fundamental* presented the concept of synthetic *a priori* judgements, the forms of intuition, the category of causality and rational psychology.

---

34 See Toribio Núñez Sessé, *Espíritu de Bentham. Sistema de la ciencia social* (Salamanca: Bernardo Martín, 1820) and *Carta de Núñez a Bentham*, ed. Vicente Blanco (Salamanca: Imprenta de Vicente Blanco, 1822).
35 See Lutosławski, “Kant in Spanien”: 222.
Lutosławski also mentions the activities of the leader of Spanish Krauseism, Julián Sanz del Río, author of *Biografías comparadas. Kant-Krause*,38 Isaac Núñez Arenas, who reflected on Kant’s distinction between beauty and sublimity,39 and Patricio Azcárate, author of a four-volume work on modern philosophical systems entitled *Exposición histórico-crítica de los sistemas filosóficos modernos*.40

Much attention was given by Lutosławski in his report to José María Rey y Heredia’s reception of Kant. What is important, he presented his reflections from the work *Teoría transcendental de las cantidades imaginarias*, which was published in Madrid in 1865. It contained references to Kant’s grasp of mathematics, as well as an extract and a translation of a passage concerning the role of categories in Kant, together with their entire table.41

A separate section of Lutosławski’s report dealt with Spanish translations of Kant’s works. He was the first to mention an attempt to translate Kant’s *Die metaphysischen Anfangsgründe der Rechtslehre*. A translation of this work was prepared by Gabino Lizarag in 1873. The translation was published under the title *Principios metafísicos del derecho de Kant*. Logic was the next work by Kant to be translated into Spanish, albeit not from the German original, but from Tissot’s French edition. The translation was undertaken by Alejo García Moreno and Juan Ruvira. It was published in Madrid in 1875. In 1876, also in Madrid, Alejo García Moreno and Juan Ruvira additionally produced two other translations of Kant’s works. They translated and published *Kritik der Urtheilskraft* (*Crítica del juicio de Kant*) and *Kritik der praktischen Vernunft* (*Crítika de la razón práctica de Kant*). In 1877, in turn, a Spanish translation from Tissot’s French edition of extensive excerpts from Kant’s *Vorlesungen über Metaphysik* was published by Juan Uña. In 1880, on the other hand, Ad-

41 See comments on this subject in José María Rey y Heredia, *Teoría transcendental de las cantidades imaginarias* (Madrid: Imprenta Nacional, 1865), 10–12. See also Lutosławski, “Kant in Spanien”: 222.
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Olfo Zozaya translated and published Kant’s *Metaphysik der Sitten* (*Fundamentos de una metafísica de costumbres de Kant*). Lutosławski also mentions the first translation and edition of Kant’s *Kritik der reinen Vernunft*, which was made in 1883 by José del Perojo y Figueras.

Lutosławski’s article also included information on the research of J. Moreno Nieto, Fray Zeferino Gonzalez, Ares y Sanz, F. Caminero, Menendez y Pelayo, and in the final passages on Marti de Eixala and Francisco Javier Llorens.42

The result of Lutosławski’s studies on the reception of Kant in Spain and his meetings and conversations with the Madrid philosophers was – as can be seen in his “Report” – not entirely satisfactory. Lutosławski’s relation was based on general oral accounts, rather inaccurate bibliographical records, and equally general descriptions of the works he managed to locate. From these considerations, however, it is possible to conclude that Spaniards at the end of the nineteenth century were familiar with Kant’s philosophy. However, they did not become acquainted with it, in most cases, through German sources, but indirectly through French and Italian translations. It is also worth noting that Kant’s thought was received and modified in Spain through its different interpretations. Among these, Karl Christian Friedrich Krause’s conception, which combined elements of Kant’s, Fichte’s, Schelling’s, and Hegel’s philosophies, achieved the greatest notoriety. Another source of information on Kant, although much less influential than Krause’s concept, was neo-Kantianism, which reached Spain around 1875 through the aforementioned Perojo y Figueras, a Cuban by origin who obtained his doctorate in Heidelberg from Kuno Fischer and, upon his return, began to disseminate his philosophy among his compatriots.

Conclusion

Lutosławski’s “Report” played a significant role in Spanish studies of Kant. It reinforced interest in this subject matter, which remains the subject of in-

42 See Lutosławski, “Kant in Spanien”: 228.
depth research and discussion to this day. All the works published hitherto, devoted to the Spanish reception of Kant’s philosophy, take Lutosławski’s text as their starting point, while considering it a ‘shameful testimony’ to the decadence of Spain of that time. It should be noted, however, that it was not only that the Polish philosopher influenced Spain, but that Spain left a deep imprint on his life as well. It also influenced many of his friends. Suffice it to mention that the Spanish home of Lutosławski and his wife Sofía, located in Galicia at Playa de la Mera (the Lutosławskis also owned a house in Krakow), attracted numerous Polish poets, writers, and artists. It was visited, amongst others, by: Tadeusz Miciński with Maria Dobrowolska, and Stanisław Przybyszewski with his then wife Dagny Juel, a Norwegian. Przybyszewski’s visit caused Lutosławski many problems, as he wrote in his letters to his Spanish friend Francisco Giner de los Ríos. There, he complained that “the Satanist had disturbed his peace of mind, without any benefit to him or to himself, but with great and various unpleasantries.”43 He also deplored the fact that he would have to pay for his return journey, otherwise the man would not leave at all, pointing out that, to his misfortune, he had sent him money twice to come to Spain.

Considerably better recollections of his stay than Lutosławski’s were given by Przybyszewski himself, who was enchanted by Spanish art painting, especially by Goya and El Greco, and by the Gothic architecture of the cathedrals in Burgos and Toledo. Years later he wrote about this in his book Moi Współczesni. Wśród obcych [My contemporaries. Amongst Strangers] in the following words: “It is to Lutosławski that I owe Spain! […] Oh, what an impact it has had on my mental and creative life!”44 Przybyszewski also described his Spanish impressions in his letters to the Polish poet Zenon Przesmycki, pseudonym “Miriam,” expressing his admiration for the unspoilt nature of the northern regions of Spain.45

---

43 Gabriela Makowiecka writes about this, quoting Lutosławski, in: Po drogach polsko-hispańskich (Kraków: Wydawnictwo Literackie, 1984), 349.
Spain also had an influence on the further intellectual life of Lutosławski, who gave a series of lectures on Spanish mysticism in Kraków in the academic year 1899/1900. He also tried, albeit in vain, to root in Poland the model of Spanish pedagogy, specifically the ‘system of open lay education’ of which the spiritual father was Giner de los Ríos, and which was exemplified by the Institución Libre de Enseñanza, founded by him in 1875. Lutosławski spent more than two years arguing the matter with the conservative authorities of the Jagiellonian University, which ultimately refused him the chair and had various commissions sent against him. As a result of these events, Lutosławski decided to leave and go to Switzerland with his lectures. He reappeared in Kraków some years later, but did not take up a job at the university there ever again.
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