studia z HISTORII FILOZOFII
4(14)/2023
ISSN 2083-1978
e-ISSN 2391-775X
http://dx.doi.org/10.12775/szhf.2023.029

Tomasz Kupś
Nicolaus Copernicus University in Toruń, Poland
e-mail: Tomasz.Kups@umk.pl
ORCID: 0000-0001-6773-1180

Information on the worldwide reception of Kant's philosophy in *Przegląd Filozoficzny*. Selection. 1897–1904

Abstract: The reception of Immanuel Kant's philosophy in Poland was achieved in many different ways. One of these was the presentation of Kantian literature in the pages of *Przegląd Filozoficzny*. Moreover, it took place through various reporting sections, supervised by Kazimierz Twardowski. It was up to him to decide to whom and with what work to entrust for review. Reports, reviews and other dissertations were written in a fair, concise manner, reflecting mainly the content of the reviewed work. The reporting section was continued after 1911 by Kazimierz Twardowski in *Ruch Filozoficzny*. This does not mean that the section was discontinued in *Przegląd Filozoficzny*. It continued to develop, showcasing the achievements of world philosophy, including Kantian philosophy.

Keywords: Immanuel Kant, reception of critical philosophy, *Przegląd Filozoficzny*

Introduction

The publication of the first issue of *Kant-Studien* in 1897 coincided with the inauguration of *Przegląd Filozoficzny* [*Philosophical Review*]. Władysław Weryho (1868–1916), publisher and editor of the *Philosophical Review*, intended to render the journal he edited available for information on world philosophy, including Kant's philosophy. Weryho was greatly supported in this endeavour by two great promoters of the development of Polish philosophy, leading representatives of Polish science and philosophy at the time, namely Henryk Struve (1840–1912) and Kazimierz Twardowski (1866–1938). The idea was to provide the Polish reader with as much expert information as possible on world philosophy, especially Kant. This was not without reason. Among other things, Weryho wrote:

> the salient feature of today's development of the sciences and natural sciences is that they have attained self-knowledge, i.e., a clear understanding of their tasks and means. Drawing on the experimental method, they have led their bravest representatives to conclusions, entering the field of philosophy. A widespread turn to Kant became apparent. Natural scientists, having abandoned non-critical materialism, began to dissect the ultimate principles and limits of cognition, to strictly separate the certain from the uncertain, and to carefully assess the degree of probability of various theories. The likes of du Bois-Reymond, Helmholtz, Huxley, Tyndall, Wundt, Mach are excellent specialists, and at the same time representatives of today's philosophy.[1]

Learning the principles of Kantian criticism required becoming familiar with the achievements of leading scholars and, therefore, keeping abreast of the most important world literature. In addition to uniting the scientific community, stimulating the pursuit of the theoretical foundations of their disciplines and encouraging young people to undertake philosophical and scientific research, it was precisely informing people about the achievements

[1] Władysław Weryho, "Słowo wstępne" ["Foreword"] *Przegląd Filozoficzny* 1(1) (1897–1898): V. In the main text the quotes are given in my own translation. In the footnotes, they are given in the original Polish.

of the world philosophy of science that was one of the goals that Weryho set for *Przegląd Filozoficzny*.[2] It was the time when Kant's philosophy was much talked about in post-partition Poland, now being reborn after years of annexation. The leading Polish philosophical journal *Przegląd Filozoficzny* published discussions of monographs by world scholars and reported on how the work on a new edition of the philosopher's collected works was progressing. This gave a sense of involvement in the very centre of important scientific developments and supported the process of revival of our philosophy.

This overview addresses and discusses what was written about Kant in the *Philosophical Review*. We indicate works, reviews, and accounts of philosophical conventions where Kantian philosophy was extensively presented. We are interested in achievements both worldwide and in Poland. We highlight philosophers who followed world trends and competently participated in current philosophical disputes.

Kant's philosophy in the first annuals of the *Philosophical Review*

Already in volume one, the first annual issue of the *Philosophical Review* of 1897, a discussion of two works by Alfred Fouillée (1838–1912) appeared in the section "Krytyka i Sprawozdanie" ["Criticism and Report"]). These were: *Le mouvement la positiviste et la conception sociologique du monde* (Paris 1896) and *Le mouvment idéaliste et la réaction contre la science positive* (Paris 1896).[3] This elaboration was prepared by Regina Maliniak.[4] In one of the fragments from her report, Maliniak observed that today it is very often that:

[2] Ibidem, I.

[3] *Przegląd Filozoficzny* 1(1) (1897–1898): 112–117. The first four annuals (1897–1898 and 1898–1899, 1900 and 1901) have a separate pagination for each journal. From 1902 onwards, the pagination is uniform for all four journals in the annual.

[4] Regina Maliniak (upon her marriage she adopted her husband's surname: Winawer; sometimes her surname was also recorded as Winawerowa, or Maliniakówna-Winawerowa) was an author as well as a translator (she translated a monograph concerning Fechner).

> We place [...] a question mark at the limit of our knowledge, but we cannot assert or negate anything about the absolute; modern philosophy abandons the noumenon and deals with phenomena, manifested in and through consciousness. Fouillée criticizes the doctrines of Renouvier and Hodgson, who dogmatically reject unknowable being, as well as Kant and Spencer, who dogmatically accept it. For Kant, on the other hand, the thing-in-itself was necessary for the grounding of morality.
>
> Fouillée agrees with Kant that there are certain forms from which the mind cannot free itself; but while Kant sees them as a priori forms, he, as an evolutionist, maintains that it is necessary to investigate the way in which they came into being. It is necessary to take a biological standpoint and study the interplay and interaction between the individual and the environment.[5]

It was thus a presentation of a certain episode in the history of the dispute between Kantianism and evolutionism. According to the author of the study: "There must be a fundamental unity between thought and object. This is indeed the case with Kant, according to whom 'science has a relative value, while according to Hegel, thought and reality are equalised (*adäquat*)."'[6]

In turn, Fouillée himself states: "he takes an indirect route and says that we come to know things not as they are in themselves, but also not only as they are for us; we express the world in terms contingent on our way of cognizing, but this contingency is one of the real relations."[7] And by this he proves to be "a monist and at the same time an evolutionist."[8] The paper under review contributes important information to our discussions about the dispute ongoing since Kant and Hegel between the proponents of biologism and evolutionism and a philosophy practised in the Kantian style.

At the initiative of Kazimierz Twardowski, the custom of publishing bibliographical listings of various works published around the world was inaugurated in the same annual of the *Przegląd Filozoficzny*. In the section "Bibliografia" ["Bibliography"], works were usually arranged by discipline: "History

[5] *Przegląd Filozoficzny* 1(1) (1897–1898): 115.
[6] Ibidem, 116.
[7] Ibidem.
[8] Ibidem.

of Philosophy," "Metaphysics, Theory of Cognition and Methodology," "Natural Sciences and Mathematics," "Psychology," "Ethics," "Aesthetics," as well as "Pedagogy" and "Social Sciences." In the first annual in question, the discipline "History of Philosophy" listed 20 works, which also included two studies on Kant's philosophy: Abroteles Eleftheropulos, *Über das Verhaltnis zwischen Platons und Kants Erkenntnistheorie. (Habilitationsschrift)* and Dr. M. Kronenberg's monograph, *Kant. Sein Leben und seine Lehre*. By contrast, under the discipline of "Ethics," among the five titles listed, a note was included about the work of Dr. Ludwig Pick, *Die Ethik des Judentums von Kants Moralprinzip aus betrachtet*. A further note on worldwide research on Kant appeared in the same first issue of the magazine in journal No. 2 under the section "Przegląd Czasopism" ["Review of Periodicals"]. It contained information about the *Kant-Studien* (Vol. 2, Iss. 2 and 3 of December 1897), published in Hamburg and Leipzig by Hans Vaihinger. It provided information about the contents of this volume as well. Of particular note is Erich Fromm's article, entitled "Das Kantbildnis der Gräfin K. Ch. A. von Keyserling." Moreover, works on the reception of Kant's philosophy in the USA, England, and Russia are cited.[9]

Similar notes appeared in *Przegląd Filozoficzny* of 1900, in the third annual, journal two. This time the information concerned volumes III and IV of *Kant-Studien*.[10] Among the works published there, noteworthy are the article on the reception of Kant's philosophy in the Netherlands (in volume three) as well as Vaihinger's work "Eine französische Kontroverse über Kants Ansicht vom Kriege" (in volume four). Meanwhile, issue three of *Przegląd Filozoficzny* of the same year, 1900, in journal four under the heading "Review of Journals," listed the titles of the papers published in issue 2, volume 112 of *Zeitschrift für Philosophie und philosophische Kritik*.[11] It featured Władysław Kozłowski's (1832–1898) discussions and summaries of articles by Volkelt, Jodl, Falcenberg, Adickes, Konig, Busse, Bromse, Lutosławski, and Doring, including an important work by Karl Vorlander entitled *Eine Socialpadagogik auf Kantische Grundlage*. It is, as Kozłowski puts it: "a report on Natorp's work: *Sozialpädagogik. Theorie der Willenserziehung auf*

[9] *Przegląd Filozoficzny* 1(2) (1897–1898): 142.
[10] *Przegląd Filozoficzny* 3(2) (1900): 120.
[11] *Przegląd Filozoficzny* 3(4) (1900): 111–116.

der Grundlage der Gemeinschaft."[12] Notable among the other titles is Friedrich Heman's analytical report containing a detailed dissection of Friedrich Paulsen's work *Immanuel Kant. Sein Leben und seine Lehre*. We should add that only two years later, in 1902, a Polish translation of this work was published. Paulsen's monograph was translated by Jan Władysław Dawid (1859–1914).[13] The review prepared by Kozłowski also included discussions of articles by Edmund König, Paul Stern, Georg Siebert-Corben, and Ferdinand Tönnies.

Kant's philosophy at international philosophical congresses

Important information on world research into Kant's philosophy was provided by Władysław Kozłowski's Report on the First International Congress of Philosophy, held in Paris from 1 to 5 August 1900 (although it was originally scheduled for 2–7 August 1900).[14] This detailed "Report" was published in *Przegląd Filozoficzny* in 1901. About the congress itself, its rapporteur wrote:

> The final year of the passing century was marked by the first International Congress of Philosophy, held from 1 to 5 August in Paris. Modest in its organization, it was devoid of all the ostentation, entertainments, and receptions that accompanied many other congresses. Instead, it was distinguished by the richness of content of its well-filled sessions, and left in the minds of its participants, in addition to the abundance of new thoughts and stimuli for work that the encounter of so many eminent minds may provide in a field where every discussion inevitably led to general and fundamental questions, not only a portrayal of the variety of currents of thought and lines of study, represented by different schools and different nationalities, but also pleasant memories of personal contact, and friendly relations, forged on the basis of intellectual sympathies or related philosophical con-

[12] *Przegląd Filozoficzny* 3(4) (1900): 114.

[13] Friedrich Paulsen, *I. Kant i jego nauka*, transl. Jan Władysław Dawid (Warsaw: ed. "Głos", 1902). The Polish translation of this work was supplemented by a translation of excerpts from *Critique of Pure Reason* and *Critique of Practical Reason*.

[14] "International congress of philosophers", *Przegląd Filozoficzny* 3(2) (1900): 126–129.

> victions. The initiative for the congress was taken by several people affiliated to the *Revue de Métaphysique et de Morale*, with Mr Xavier Léon at the head.
>
> In the modest classrooms of the lycée, Louis le Grand (opposite the Sorbonne), only just abandoned by students leaving for their holidays, representatives of philosophy from three parts of the world came together – such as Canada and the United States, as well as Indian philosophy, had representatives here – with thoughts and views quite unique for this establishment, echoing on the walls of these rooms.
>
> The congress opened on Wednesday the 1st of August. The morning session was entirely dedicated to the formalities: the reception of entry cards by the incoming members, the constitution of the general presidium and of the sections, the distribution of the detailed programme of the meetings.
>
> The congress was divided into 4 sections. I) General Philosophy and Metaphysics; II) Ethics; III) Logic and History of Knowledge; IV) History of Philosophy. All sections had separate sittings in the mornings and joint sittings in the afternoons. Of the latter, each was devoted to one of the main sections of the congress, and the subjects of the sessions were communiqués which, either by virtue of their content or their communicators, represented the greater interest.[15]

The philosophy of Kant, which is of interest to us, was discussed in Section IV (History of Philosophy), in sub-section 12, entitled "Kant's Criticism and Psychology." The first paper to address the themes of Kant's philosophy was a lecture by François Evellin (1835–1910). Evellin devoted his lecture to the dialectic of antinomy in Kant. Kozłowski wrote:

> Kant's teaching rests on antinomies. The author confines himself to a critique of the first of them.
>
> Thesis: the world has its beginning in time; it is limited in space; antithesis: the world is infinite in time and space. Kant wants to prove that pure reason does not reach reality. The author thinks that the contradiction lies not in pure reason, but

[15] Władysław Kozłowski, "Kongres filozoficzny międzynarodowy". *Przegląd Filozoficzny* 4(1) (1901): 63–64.

> in the incompatibility with the sensible reason. In order to grasp reality, reason turns it into a phenomenon; it can therefore only reach it by an indirect route. As a dialectical power, it instinctively developed a method whose formula is as follows: the reality of certain facts requires the reality of certain principles. The manifestation of any given occurrence compels us to suppose that the series of preceding occurrences is not infinite; for if it were such, it could not end; in fact, it ends with the occurrence under consideration.[16]

The lecture itself, according to Kozłowski's further account, provoked a lively discussion. Participants included Ribert and Hémon, while Henri Bergson concluded it, according to Kozłowski, as follows:

> Both disputants agree that 1º) there exists a real world distinct from the mind; 2º) we aspire, as a result of natural drive, to expand the part of the world we comprehend. The dispute is over whether this pursuit of the mind is due to a spontaneous drive (Mr Evellin), that is, to the pressure exerted on it from the outside by an already realised infinity (Mr Ribert).[17]

This problem was later vigorously discussed in the circles of Polish philosophy by Benedict Bornstein in *Zasadniczy problemat teoryi poznania Kanta* [*The fundamental problems of Kant's theory of cognition*] and in *Kant i Bergson. Studium o zasadniczym problemacie teorii poznania* [*Kant and Bergson. A study on the fundamental problems of the theory of cognition*], by Henryk Bolcewicz in *Kant a Hume* [*Kant versus Hume*], by Władysław Biegański in *Teoria poznania ze stanowiska zasady celowości* [*A theory of cognition from the standpoint of the principle of purposefulness*], and by Adam Żółtowski in *O antynomiach Kanta ze szczególnym uwzględnieniem drugiej* [*On Kant's antinomies with particular reference to the second one*].

Another important note on Kant's philosophy from the World Congress of Philosophy was an account of a paper given in the second section, on ethics, presided over by Alphonse Darlu (1849–1921). Kozłowski wrote:

---

[16] Ibidem, 68.
[17] Ibidem.

> Upon the opening of the session Mr Darlu reads out the communiqué: *Can a moral doctrine independent of metaphysics be constituted?* The doctrine of morals (*la morale*) is virtually a set of rules of conduct, prescribed and sanctified by society at a given moment, and as such independent of any doctrine. But as consideration opens, two questions arise: 1°) what is the cause for these rules? 2°) what is their justification? The first is answered by the history of custom; the second, by ethical theories. There exist various types of ethical theories: object-oriented and inductive (e.g. Durkheim: ethics is only the history of customs, belonging to sociology), subject-oriented and intuitive (Kant's ethics of duty). The idea of duty is primordial and cannot be derived, just as impressions of colour or dimensions of space cannot be derived. It expresses the relation of reason to will in the human individual. After all (the dualism of human nature, although incomprehensible, requires a higher unity. Hence the metaphysical questions: the unity of mind, the existence of God, eternal life. Ethics is thus a branch, independent, intermediate between knowledge and metaphysics.[18]

This communication was followed by a public discussion involving Albert Leclére (1867–1920) and the Norwegian philosopher, Kristian Birch-Reichenwald Aars (1868–1917) – the former in defence of the deduction of ethical principles from absolute being; the latter against this deduction.

In another section of the congress, Édouard Le Roy (1870–1954) presented a memorandum by Joseph Wilbois (1874–1952) on the argument in favour of freedom, drawn from physical relativism. What was more broadly at issue was the basis of scientific determinism, opposed to freedom. The following was the subject of a discussion initiated by Louis Couturat (1868––1914), who represented Kant's position:

> As to the *apriori* nature of general principles: external objects succumb by necessity to laws which are laws of thought, for they exist only insofar as they are framed in categories of thought. The laws of nature fit into numerous equally meaningful formulas, but because these formulas all represent actual relations of phenomena. An effect on nature would not be possible if knowledge did not have an objective sublimity.[19]

[18] Ibidem, 69.
[19] Ibidem, 70.

Alexander Vasilyev (1867–1953), a Russian philosopher from Kazan, took the opposite view, when speaking during a discussion of determinism in Joseph Boussinesqu (1842–1929). Meanwhile, Giuseppe Peano (1858–1932) of Turin referred to "some analytical examples, based on particular solutions from the equations on which Boussinesqu relied, and [several] mechanical arguments."[20] Kozłowski himself, on the other hand, took the position of combining freedom with determinism and sought this solution in Kant's theory of cognition. He wrote:

> These concepts [i.e., the concept of freedom and the concept of determinism – T.K.] belong to two distinct empirical worlds (subjective and objective). This is the solution offered by Kant. After all, there exists a domain where these two worlds come into contact with each other and affect each other: the domain of action. The solution to the question closer to us is therefore to be found in social philosophy; it needs it, since the human act belongs subjectively to the world of freedom, objectively to the world of necessity.[21]

In the discussion that followed, Jacques Hadamard (1865–1963) voiced his opinion, reducing it to an attempt at defining the science of human societies. In turn, Couturat pointed out that "the theory sketched by Mr Hadamard stands in opposition to Leibniz's view, for whom the infinity of particular determinations meant as much as their arbitrariness."[22] Jules Tannery (1848–1910), on the other hand, posed the question: "can we create for ourselves any notion of freedom? A notion that would be more than a simple negation of definiteness, a notion that is strict and definite?"[23] Meanwhile, Ernst Schröder (1841–1902) cited the 'mechanical paradox' that had been brought to him by "the famous and prematurely deceased physicist Hertz." Hadamard, on the other hand, made an observation "about borderline cases, possible in mathematics and physics." He included them in the area of indeterminacy. Tannery confirmed Hadamard's argument, while stating that "indeterminacy

[20] Ibidem.
[21] Ibidem, 70–71.
[22] Ibidem, 71.
[23] Ibidem.

is not itself freedom." The Polish scientist Samuel Dickstein (1851–1939), in turn, made a point about mathematical solutions being different from empirical or real solutions. All these remarks had Kant's philosophy and findings as their references, although the discussion was between mathematicians.

In the next section, Charles Le Verrier read Dovalvé's communication on Bayle's ethics. It included remarks on "Bayle's conception of the role of reason in morality," which made him a predecessor of Kant. Le Verrier wrote:

> Bayle does not confine himself to negationist scepticism. He is a rationalist. In ethics, his rationalism was based on three principles: theological, psychological, and critical. The latter consists in distinguishing between two kinds of reason: transcendent and human. One of them is the guiding force in morality.[24]

This thread was then taken up by the Swiss philosopher Jean-Jacques Gourd (1850–1909). He pointed out in his rejoinder the profound difference existing between the dogmatic absolute establishment in Kant and Bayle's scepticism.

Still during another section, Daniel Halévy (1872–1962) communicated to the assembled audience a memorial by Mr David George Ritchie (1853––1903), Scottish professor of logic and mathematics at the University of St Andrews (in Scotland), "On Plato's *Parmenides* and his relation to Aristotelian criticism." The author of the paper referred to Wincenty Lutosławski's conception of the chronology of Plato's works, and in particular to the dialogue *Parmenides*. At this, he disagreed with Lutosławski and Campbell "that Plato in this dialogue would turn to the theory of ideas and move towards conceptualism in Kant's spirit."[25]

The "Journal Review" within *Przegląd Filozoficzny*

An extremely interesting and useful section within *Przegląd Filozoficzny* was the aforementioned "Przegląd Czasopism" ["Journal Review"]. It was not limited to a discussion of the content of national periodicals. A large part

[24] Ibidem, 74.
[25] Ibidem, 82.

of it concerned journals published in Germany, France, and Italy, as well as in Great Britain, Sweden, Switzerland, and the Czech Republic. The section was mainly run by associate editors of the *Philosophical Review*. The reviews were either very short and synthetic, or long and factual, dealing with various strands of research conducted around the world. They included information about the type of journal and its content. An effort was made to prepare the notes with great care, paying attention also to the usefulness of the text in question.

For example, in the 1901 annual 4, journal 2 of *Przegląd Filozoficzny* a note was placed on articles published in *Zeitschrift für Philosophie und pilosophische Kritik Archiv für Geschichte der Philosophie*. Among others, one significant work by Matin Bollert entitled "Materie in Kants Ethik" and a lesser-known work by Wilhelm Koppelmann entitled "Ein neuer Weg zum Begründung der Kantischen Ethik und der formalistischen Ethik" were mentioned. Reference was also made to the publication in Germany by Karl Vorlander, as part of an edition of Kant's collected works, of the philosopher's correspondence *Kants Briefwechsel bis 1748*.

In turn, in annual 4, journal 3 of 1901 in the "Przegląd Czasopism" section, several notes prepared by Władysław Kozłowski were published referring to the contents of *Archiv für systematische Philosophie*. These discussions concerned journals 3 and 4 from volumes IV and V of the German journal. Noteworthy among them was one of the many papers by Paul Natorp, an article entitled "Zur Streitfrage zwischen Empirismus und Kritizismus". Kozłowski seeks to introduce the Polish reader to yet another great work by the German co-founder of the Marburg neo-Kantian school. Natorp's article was not concerned only with Kant's philosophy, but with the general issue of the opposition between empiricism and criticism. Kant never attributed necessity to hypotheses, which was a property of the first principles. The key question to be answered is: "can one do without these principles?"[26] In other words:

> Is the construction of hypotheses arbitrary and not founded on any law other than logical identity? The analysis responds negatively to this question. Then:

[26] Władysław Kozłowski, "Paul Natorp. *Zur Streitfrage zwischen Empirismus und Kritizismus*", *Przegląd Filozoficzny* 4(3) (1901): 387.

> "does not the prediction or production of new facts by means of the logical combination of concepts show the dependence of these facts on the mind? The author shows that there is no raw experience (preceding logical operations) and that fact is the highest degree of intellectual determination, which knowledge approaches continuously without ever reaching it."[27]

Morevoer, "Przegląd Czasopism" published information about the ongoing work on the publication of a new edition of Kant's works. These were usually reprints of information coming in from the *Kant-Studien*. They reported on further developments. This was based, *inter alia*, on information published in the *Kant-Studien* by Ernst von Aster (1880–1948).

Kantian Jubilees

The pinnacle of the engagement of *Przegląd Filozoficzny* was the preparations for the Kantian anniversaries: the 100th anniversary of Kant's death (jubilee in 1904) and the 200th anniversary of his birth (jubilee in 1924). In 1904, the 100th anniversary of Kant's death saw the publication of a number of commemorative texts on Kant's philosophy. Amongst them were: Stanisław L. Brzozowski, "Kant. (W stuletnią rocznicę śmierci)" ["Kant. (On the centenary of his death)"], *Głos*, Vol. 19, Iss. 8 and 9; Ludwig Busse, "Przemowa do studentów Królewieckich, wygłoszona na komersie pamiątkowym w setną rocznicę śmierci Kanta (przekład)" ["Address to the students of Königsberg, delivered at a memorial commemoration on the centenary of Kant's death (translation)"] *Przegląd Filozoficzny*, Vol. 7, Iss. 4; Cezary Jellenta (Napoleon Hirszband), "Stulecie Kanta" ["Kant's centenary"], *Ateneum*, Vol. 2, Iss. 2; Wiktor Strusiński, "Rocznica śmierci Kanta" ["The anniversary of Kant's death"], *Krytyka*, Vol. 6, Iss. 3; "Obchód Kantowski w Królewcu (12 i 13 lutego 1904 r.)" ["Kant celebration in Königsberg (12 and 13 February 1904)"], *Przegląd Filozoficzny*, Vol. 7, Iss. 4; "Trzy krótkie noty w sprawie Jubileuszu Kantowskiego" ["Three short notes on the Kantian Jubilee"], *Przegląd Filozoficzny*, Vol. 7, Iss. 1. Most notably, there was also the jubilee issue of *Przegląd*

[27] Ibidem.

Filozoficzny, Vol. 7, Iss. 4, where – in addition to the already mentioned article by Ludwig Busse – important texts by several leading Polish authors were published: Piotr Chmielowski's "Kant w Polsce" ["Kant in Poland"], Józefa Kodisowa's "Znaczenie Kanta dla filozofji współczesnej" ["Kant's significance for contemporary philosophy"]; Adam Woroniecki's, "Zależność Jana Śniadeckiego od I.M. Degeranda (Przyczynek do poznania stosunku Jana Śniadeckiego do Kanta)" ["Jan Śniadecki's relations to I.M. Degerand (A contribution to understanding Jan Śniadecki's attitude towards Kant)"]; Władysław Kozłowski's "Kant i zagadnienia palące wieku. (Kant jako publicysta)" ["Kant and the pressing issues of the century. (Kant as a publicist)"]. In addition, it featured a number of brief presentations by Polish and foreign authors (translated into Polish by Jakób Lewkowicz): Henrik Struve, Erich Adickes, Max Adler, Bruno Bauch, Friedrich Hemann, Eugen Kühnemmann, Friedrich Paulsen, Alois Riehl, Geo Runze, Friedrich Alfred Schmid, Franz Staudinger, Ernst Troeltsch, and Wilhelm Windelband.[28] The jubilee issue was planned with even greater vigour. Other texts planned for publication are announced in the second volume of the same annual of *Przegląd Filozoficzny.*[29]

Conclusion

Reporting on the achievements of world philosophy was one of the important missions of *Przegląd Filozoficzny*, edited by Władysław Weryho, with the assistance of Kazimierz Twardowski. The reporting section was developed to include current information on important events and important publications (including information on Kant's philosophy). From 1911, Twardowski moved the section to Lviv, to *Ruch Filozoficzny*, which he founded. Also in *Ruch Filozoficzny*, an important part of the reporting section was news

[28] The editors notified readers of the great interest in the commemorative publication: "Owing to the volume of material for the Kantian issue of *Przegląd Filozoficzny*, we were compelled to divide it into two parts." The second volume, however, despite the announcement, did not appear. "Od Redakcji", *Przegląd Filozoficzny* 7(4) (1904): 381.

[29] *Przegląd Filozoficzny* 7(2): 124.

about current developments in Kantian philosophy – its reception and criticism. The reports on texts devoted to Kantian philosophy continued to be prepared by Władysław Kozłowski, Władysław Tatarkiewicz, and Roman Ingarden. Thus, Kant's philosophy continued to be represented and assimilated in Poland under the partitions. Finally, the time also came for further polemics around Kantian philosophy. Unlike the polemics at the beginning of the 19th century, this time the disputes around Kant concerned translations of the philosopher's most important works. The most important of these polemics concerned the *Prolegomena*. In this episode, one of Twardowski's older students in Lviv, Hersz Bad, played the most vital role. Hersz Bad was also an important rapporteur and author of valuable discussions of Kantian literature, which he published in *Przegląd Filozoficzny* in the following years.

References

[n.n.]. 1900. "Międzynarodowy zjazd filozofów". *Przegląd Filozoficzny* 3(2): 126–129.

[n.n.]. 1904. "Jubileusz Kanta". *Przegląd Filozoficzny* 7(1): 108–110.

[n.n.]. 1904. "Obchód Kantowski w Królewcu. (12 i 13 lutego 1904 r.)." *Przegląd Filozoficzny* 7(4): 466–467.

[n.n.]. 1924. "Dwuchsetletnia rocznica urodzin Kanta" [*The bicentenary of Kant's birth*] *Przegląd Filozoficzny* 27(1–2): 130.

Bad Hersz. 1905. [Review:] "Bruno Bauch. Luther und Kant". *Przegląd Filozoficzny* 8(3): 280–281.

Bad Hersz. 1905. [Review:] "Dr. Sitzler. Zur Blattversetzung in Kants Prolegomena. (Przyczynek do sprawy o pomieszaniu kartek w Prolegomenach Kanta)". *Przegląd Filozoficzny* 8(3): 281.

Bad Hersz. 1905. [Review:] "Dr. Tom. Kein. Hamlet und der Melancholiker in Kants 'Beobachtungen über das Gefühl des Schönen und Erhabenen'. (H. i melancholik w Kanta „Rozważaniach o uczuciu piękna i wzniosłości"). *Przegląd Filozoficzny* 8(4): 382–383.

Bad Hersz. 1905. [Review:] "G. Gerland. Immanuel Kant, seine geographischen und antrophologischen Arbeiten". *Przegląd Filozoficzny* 7(4): 381.

Bad Hersz. 1905. [Review:] "H. Vaihingera. Das Kantjubiläum im Jahre 1901". *Przegląd Filozoficzny* 8(4): 383.

Bad Hersz. 1907. "G. Gerland. Immanuel Kant, seine geographischen und anthropologischen Arbeiten. KSt. X (1905), 4-5. Dokończenie (see Przegl. Filoz. VIII, 4, p. 381)". *Przegląd Filozoficzny* 10(3): 401–402.

Bornstein Benedykt. 1913. *Kant i Bergson. Studium o zasadniczym problemacie teorii poznania* [*Kant and Bergson. A study on the fundamental problem of the theory of cognition*] Warszawa: s.n. [overprint from: *Przegląd Filozoficzny* 16(2–3): 129–199].

Brzozowski Stanisław. 1904. "Kant. (W stuletnią rocznicę śmierci)" ["Kant. (On the centenary of his death) "]. *Głos. Tygodnik naukowo-literacki, społeczny i polityczny* 19(8): 122–123; 19(9): 155.

[Busse Ludwik]. 1904. "Przemowa do studentów królewieckich, wygłoszona na komersie pamiątkowym w setną rocznicę śmierci Kanta" ["Address to the students of Königsberg, delivered at the commemorative event on the centenary of Kant's death"]. *Przegląd Filozoficzny* 7(4): 467-471.

Handelsman Marceli. 1924. "O znaczeniu Kanta. W dwóchsetną rocznicę urodzin" ["On the significance of Kant. On the bicentenary of his birth"]. *Wiadomości Literackie* 1(19): 1.

Jellenta Cezary (Hirszband Napoleon). 1904. "Stulecie Kanta" ["Kant's centenary"]. *Ateneum* Y. 2, 1904, 1(2): 113–118.

Kozłowski Władysław. 1901. "Kongres filozoficzny międzynarodowy". *Przegląd Filozoficzny* 4(1): 63–96.

Kozłowski Władysław. 1901. "Paul Natorp. Zur Streitfrage zwischen Empirismus unii Kritizismus". *Przegląd Filozoficzny* 4(3): 387.

Lewkowicz Jakób. 1904. [Review:] "Bruno Bauch. Die Persönlichkeit Kants (Osobowość Kanta). 'Zu Kants Gedächtnis', herausgegeben von H. Vaihinger u. B. Bauch". *Przegląd Filozoficzny* 7(4): 455.

Lewkowicz Jakób. 1904. [Review:] "Dr. Max Adler. Immanuel Kant zum Gedächtnis! (Pamięci Immanuela Kanta) Abhandlungen und Vorträge, herausgegeben von dem sozialwissenschaftlichen Verein in Wien. Nr 11". *Przegląd Filozoficzny* 7(4): 454–455.

Lewkowicz Jakób. 1904. [Review:] "Erich Adickes. Auf wem ruht Kants Geist? (W kim żyje duch Kanta?) Arch. für syst. Philosophie, Band X Heft I, 1904". *Przegląd Filozoficzny* 7(4): 453–454.

Lewkowicz Jakób. 1904. [Review:] "Eugen Kühnemann. Herder und Kant. (Herder i Kant). 'Zu Kants Gedächtnis' herausgegeben von H. Vaihinger u. B. Bauch". *Przegląd Filozoficzny* 7(4): 457–458.

Lewkowicz Jakób. 1904. [Review:] "F. Paulsen. Zum hundertjährigen Todestage Kants. (W setną rocznicę śmierci Kanta). 'Zu Kants Gedächtnis', herausgegeben von H. Vaihinger u. B. Bauch", *Przegląd Filozoficzny* 7(4): 458.

Lewkowicz Jakób. 1904. [Review:] "Geo Runze. Emerson und Kant. (Emerson i Kant). 'Zu Kants Gedächtnis', herausgegeben von H. Vaihinger u. B. Bauch", *Przegląd Filozoficzny* 7(4): 459.

Lewkowicz Jakób. 1904. [Review:] "Heman F. Immanuel Kants philosophisches Vermächtnis (Testament filozoficzny Kanta). 'Zu Kants Gedächtnis', herausgegeben von H. Vaihinger u. B. Bauch". *Przegląd Filozoficzny* 7(4): 455–457.

Lewkowicz Jakób. 1904. [Review:] "Riehl A. Helmholtz in seinem Verhältnis zu Kant. (Helmholtz w stosunku do Kanta). 'Zu Kants Gedächtnis', herausgegeben von H. Vaihinger u. B. Bauch", *Przegląd Filozoficzny* 7(4): 458–459.

Lewkowicz Jakób. 1904. [Review:] "Schmid F. A. Kant im Spiegel seine Briefe. (Kant w świetle listów swoich). 'Zu Kants Gedächtnis', herausgegeben von H. Vaihinger u. B. Bauch", *Przegląd Filozoficzny* 7(4): 459.

Lewkowicz Jakób. 1904. [Review:] "Staudinger F. Kant Bedeutung für die Pädagogik der Gegenwart. (Znaczenie Kanta dla pedagogiki współczesnej). 'Zu Kants Gedächtnis', herausgegeben von H. Vaihinger u. B. Bauch", *Przegląd Filozoficzny* 7(4): 460.

Lewkowicz Jakób. 1904. [Review:] "Troeltsch E. Das Historische in Kants Religionsphilosophie. (Moment historyczny filozofii religji Kanta). 'Zu Kants Gedächtnis', herausgegeben von H. Vaihinger u. B. Bauch", *Przegląd Filozoficzny* 7(4): 460–461.

Lewkowicz Jakób. 1904. [Review:] "Windelband W. Nach hundert Jahren. (Po stu latach). 'Zu Kants Gedächtnis', herausgegeben von H. Vaihinger u. B. Bauch", *Przegląd Filozoficzny* 7(4): 461.

Maliniak Regina. 1897–1898. [Review:] "Alfred Fouillée. Le mouvement la positiviste et la conception sociologique du monde (Paris, Alcan, 1896). – Alfred Fouillée. Le mouvment idéaliste et la réaction contre la science positive (Paris, Alcan, 1896)", *Przegląd Filozoficzny* 1(1): 112–117.

Skórski Aleksander. 1924. "Krytycyzm Kanta wobec zagadnień życia" ["Kant's criticism of questions of life"]. *Przegląd Filozoficzny* 27(3–4): 131–145.

Sobeski Michał. 1914. "Krytycyzm jako podstawa estetyki Kanta" ["Criticism as the foundation of Kant's aesthetic"]. *Literatura i Sztuka. Dodatek do Dziennika Poznańskiego* 6(21): 321–324.

Strusiński Wiktor. 1904. "Rocznica śmierci Kanta". *Krytyka* 6(3): 239.

Sztern Mieczysław. 1924. "Sprawozdania o jubileuszowej literaturze Kantowskiej". *Przegląd Filozoficzny* 27(3–4): 255–260.

[Twardowski Kazimierz]. 1908. *Dziesięciolecie Przeglądu Filozoficznego. Spis autorów i szczegółowy indeks treści, zawartej w 10 rocznikach*. Warszawa: Druk Tow. Akc. S. Orgelbranda S-ów.

Weryho Władysław. 1897–1898. "Słowo wstępne" ["Foreword"], *Przegląd Filozoficzny* 1(1): I–VII.

Woleński Jan. 1992. "Przegląd Filozoficzny 1897-1949" ["Philosophical Review 1897–1949"]. *Przegląd Filozoficzny* 1(1): 7–17.