

MARIUSZ PANDURA

UNIVERSITY OF WROCLAW, POLAND
E-MAIL: MARIUSZ.PANDURA@UWR.EDU.PL

ORCID: 0000-0001-5875-2705

RADOSŁAW KULINIAK

UNIVERSITY OF WROCLAW, POLAND
E-MAIL: KORNIK90@POCZTA.ONET.PL

ORCID: 0000-0002-0090-6609

Roman Witold Ingarden's academic lectures on *Kant's Criticism* in Lviv

Abstract: After the retirement of Kazimierz Twardowski and Mścisław Wartenberg, research on Kant's philosophy in Lviv significantly declined. This tradition was resumed and continued with great success only by Roman Witold Ingarden. The present article explains the origins of Ingarden's lectures on *Kant's Criticism* in Lviv. It also presents the main theses of Ingarden's lectures.

Keywords: Ingarden, Kant, critical philosophy, transcendentalism, history of philosophy, history of Polish humanities

Introduction

Polish philosophy, reviving with great difficulty after the years of partition, in the early 20th century gained two translations of Immanuel Kant's works.¹ These were the translations of the *Prolegomena* and the *Critique of Pure Reason*. An informal arrangement between Henryk Struve, Kazimierz Twardowski, and Władysław Weryho on this matter fulfilled its task perfectly. However, this was not the end of their role in popularizing Kant's philosophy. Although the aged Professor Struve retired and, as a retiree, left Warsaw, going to Eltham, England, to his daughter, where he remained until his death, his close associates still remained in his homeland. At the time of Struve's departure, Twardowski and Weryho realized that they were about to forever lose an excellent publisher and organizer of philosophical life in Poland. All that remained was for them to continue, as best they could, the work that had been well begun. Weryho, however, was not inclined to take part in further ventures. He was completely absorbed in publishing matters on the editorial board of the *Przegląd Filozoficzny* [*Philosophical Review*]. He also became involved in the activities of the Polish Psychological Society and the Psychological Workshop. Actually, Weryho rather assisted Struve in Kantian matters from the beginning and only passed on news from Warsaw to Lviv. With Struve gone, Weryho's activities were brought to an end. The last thing he did in 1904 was to prepare an extensive anniversary issue of the *Przegląd Filozoficzny*, which contained, besides an article by Piotr Chmielowski, "Kant w Polsce" ["Kant in Poland"], various other Kantian items relating directly to the then celebrated 100th anniversary of Kant's death.² Twardowski, in

¹ While writing this article, we incorporated some elements of our earlier text published in Polish: Radosław Kuliniak, Mariusz Pandura, "Roman Witold Ingarden na tropach filozofii Immanuela Kanta" [Roman Witold Ingarden on the trail of the philosophy of Immanuel Kant] in: Roman W. Ingarden, *Lwowskie wykłady o Krytycyzmie Kanta z roku akademickiego 1935/1936* [Lviv lectures on "Kant's Criticism" from the academic year 1935/1936], ed. Radosław Kuliniak, Mariusz Pandura (Kęty: Wydawnictwo Marek Derewiecki, 2021), 11–145. In addition to previous content, we also included here our latest findings.

² See Piotr Chmielowski, "Kant w Polsce" ["Kant in Poland"], *Przegląd Filozoficzny* [*Philosophical Review*] 7(4) (1904): 379–394; Józefa Kodusowa, "Znaczenie Kanta dla filozofii współczesnej" ["The importance of Kant for contemporary philosophy"], *Przegląd Filo-*

turn, occupied with lectures and the organization of the structures of the Polish Philosophical Society, did not have much time for further promotion of Kant's philosophy. He was looking for a successor and coordinator of Polish Kantian research. And he soon found him. This was his student Hersz Bad (1869–1942). He was the one to continue the well-started research in the future. To begin with, Hersz Bad participated in the dispute with Struve and Grzymała-Piątkowski over the translation of the *Prolegomena*. He devised the formation of further initiatives and reported on his research to Twardowski.³

zoficzny [*Philosophical Review*] 7(4) (1904): 395–406; Adam Woroniecki, “Zależność Jana Śniadeckiego od I. M. Degeranda. Przyczynek do poznania stosunku Jana Śniadeckiego do Kanta” [“Jan Śniadecki's dependence on J. M. De Gérando. A contribution to understanding Jan Śniadecki's attitude towards Kant”], *Przegląd Filozoficzny* [*Philosophical Review*] 7(4) (1904): 407–421; Władysław M. Kozłowski, “Kant i zagadnienia palące wieku (Kant jako publicysta)” [“Kant and pressing issues of the century (Kant as a political commentator)”], *Przegląd Filozoficzny* [*Philosophical Review*] 7(4) (1904): 422–446; Henryk Struve, “Immanuel Kant oraz dziejowa doniosłość jego krytycyzmu, Warszawa, 1904 (streszczenie)” [“Immanuel Kant and the historical significance of his criticism, Warszawa, 1904 (summary)”], *Przegląd Filozoficzny* [*Philosophical Review*] 7(4) (1904): 447–451. In the “Reports” section, Jakub Lewkowicz discussed twelve works devoted to Kant, most of which were published in the book “Zu Kants Gedächtnis” (see *Zu Kants Gedächtnis. Zwölf Festgaben zu seinem 100jährigen Todestage*, ed. Hans Vaihinger, Bruno Bauch (Berlin: Reuther and Reichard, 1904); Jakub Lewkowicz, “Sprawozdania” [“Book reports”], *Przegląd Filozoficzny* [*Philosophical Review*] 7(4) (1904): 453–461). Also, the “Wiadomości bieżące” [“Current news”] section in this issue of “Przegląd Filozoficzny” was devoted mostly to events related to the Kantian anniversary (see “Wiadomości bieżące” [“Current news”], *Przegląd Filozoficzny* [*Philosophical Review*] 7(4) (1904): 466–479). Three articles on Kant, which were originally intended to be included in this issue of the journal, were finally published only in the middle of the following year (see: Mścisław Wartenberg, “Kantowska argumentacja przeciwko idealizmowi” [“Kant's argument against idealism”], *Przegląd Filozoficzny* [*Philosophical Review*] 8(2) (1905): 111–126; Ignacy Wasserberg, “Kilka uwag o krytycyzmie Kanta (Odczyt, wygłoszony w 100-tą rocznicę zgonu Kanta w ‘Kole Filozoficznym’ U. J. w Krakowie)” [“A few remarks on Kant's criticism (Lecture given on the 100th anniversary of Kant's death at the ‘Philosophers Circle’ of the Jagiellonian University in Kraków)”], *Przegląd Filozoficzny* [*Philosophical Review*] 8(2) (1905): 127–134; Jakub Lewkowicz, “Nauka Kanta o Bogu w oświetleniu krytycznym” [“Critical remarks on Kant's doctrine of God”], *Przegląd Filozoficzny* [*Philosophical Review*] 8(2) (1905): 135–144).

³ See, for example, Hersz Bad's “style and pen” in his reports on Kantian literature, published in *Przegląd Filozoficzny* [*Philosophical Review*]. Cf., e.g., Hersz Bad, “Bruno Bauch. Luther und Kant”, *Przegląd Filozoficzny* [*Philosophical Review*] 8(3) (1905): 280–281; Hersz Bad, “Dr. Sitzler. Zur Blattversetzung in Kants Prolegomena”, *Przegląd Filozoficzny* [*Philosophical Review*] 8(3) (1905): 281; Hersz Bad, “Gerland V., Immanuel Kant, seine geographi-

After 1904, however, neither efforts for new translations of Kant's works nor work on the reception of Kantian philosophy stopped. Further translations were successively produced. We should mention here first of all the two, almost simultaneous, translations of the *Critique of Practical Reason*.⁴ These came out in 1911. Twardowski wanted to once again build on these achievements and to turn them into an event celebrating the founding of the *Ruch Filozoficzny* [Philosophical Movement]. He saw in the interest in Kant's philosophy an important support for his initiatives. His plans, however, were derailed by the polemic initiated at this time between the translators of Kant's work and their supporters and opponents. A while later, another transla-

schen und anthropologischen Arbeiten", *Przegląd Filozoficzny [Philosophical Review]* 10(3) (1907): 401–402.

⁴ Immanuel Kant, *Krytyka praktycznego rozumu [Critique of practical reason]*, transl. Feliks Kierski (Lwów: Polskie Towarzystwo Filozoficzne, 1911). Cf. Immanuel Kant, *Krytyka praktycznego rozumu [Critique of practical reason]*, transl. Benedykt Bornstein (Warszawa: E. Wende, 1911). See also Hersz Bad's review of these translations: Hersz Bad, "Kant I. *Krytyka praktycznego rozumu. (Kritik der praktischen Vernunft)*. Przekładu dokonał Feliks Kierski. Przekład przejrzał i wstępem zaopatrzył Prof. Dr. M. Wartenberg. [...] Kant I. *Krytyka praktycznego rozumu. Z oryginału przełożył oraz wstępem i przypisami zaopatrzył Benedykt Bornstein pod redakcją Henryka Goldberga*" ["Kant I., *Critique of practical reason. (Kritik der praktischen Vernunft)*. Translated by Feliks Kierski. The translation was reviewed and given an introduction by Prof. Dr. M. Wartenberg. [...] Kant I. *Critique of practical reason*. Translated from the original, given an introduction and notes by Benedykt Bornstein, edited by Henryk Goldberg"], *Ruch Filozoficzny [Philosophical Movement]* 11(7) (1911): 142b–144b, and a review by Adam Żółtowski: "Immanuel Kant. *Krytyka praktycznego rozumu. Z oryginału przełożył oraz wstępem i przypisami zaopatrzył Benedykt Bornstein. [...] Tenże. Krytyka praktycznego rozumu. (Kritik der praktischen Vernunft)*. Przekładu dokonał Feliks Kierski. Przekład przejrzał i wstępem zaopatrzył prof. dr. M. Wartenberg" ["Immanuel Kant. *Critique of practical reason*. Translated from the original, given an introduction and notes by Benedykt Bornstein. [...] The same. *Critique of practical reason. (Kritik der praktischen Vernunft)*. Translated by Feliks Kierski. The translation was reviewed and given an introduction by Prof. Dr. M. Wartenberg"], *Książka* 12(5) (1912): 213–214. Cf. also the review by Adam Zieleńczyk: "Immanuel Kant. *Krytyka praktycznego rozumu. Przekładu dokonał Feliks Kierski. [...] Tenże. Krytyka praktycznego rozumu. Z oryginału przełożył, oraz wstępem i przypisami zaopatrzył Benedykt Bornstein*" ["Immanuel Kant. *Critique of practical reason*. Translated by Feliks Kierski. [...] The same. *Critique of practical reason*. Translated from the original, given an introduction and notes by Benedykt Bornstein"], *Przegląd Filozoficzny [Philosophical Review]* 14(3) (1911): 430–436. Zieleńczyk also discusses both translations, Kierski's and Bornstein's.

tion was published, namely the *Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals*.⁵ The translation was prepared, under the explicit guidance of Twardowski in Lviv, by his close associate Mściśław Wartenberg.⁶ At the same time, a second

⁵ Immanuel Kant, *Uzasadnienie metafizyki moralności* [*Groundwork of the metaphysics of morals*], transl. Mściśław Wartenberg (Lwów: Polskie Towarzystwo Filozoficzne, 1906). Cf. also the review of this translation written by Hersz Bad: Hersz Bad, "Grundlegung Kanta w tłumaczeniu polskim" ["Kant's *Grundlegung* in Polish translation"], *Przegląd Filozoficzny* [*Philosophical Review*] 11(3) (1908): 181–198.

⁶ Wartenberg was one of the leading Polish experts on Kant's philosophy in the first half of the 20th century. His works concern primarily Kantian philosophy. See: Mściśław Wartenberg, *Kants Theorie der Causalität. Vierter Teil: Kritik* (Witkowo: Cegielski, 1899); Mściśław Wartenberg, *Kants Theorie der Kausalität mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Grundprinzipien seiner Theorie der Erfahrung. Eine historisch-kritische Untersuchung zur Erkenntnistheorie* (Leipzig: H. Haacke, 1899); Mściśław Wartenberg, "Der Begriff des 'transscendentalen Gegenstandes' bei Kant – und Schopenhauers Kritik desselben. Eine Rechtfertigung Kants (I)", *Kant-Studien* 4 (1900): 202–231; Mściśław Wartenberg, "Sigwarts Theorie der Kausalität im Verhältnis zur Kantischen. Eine Festgabe zum 28. März 1900 (I)", *Kant-Studien* 5 (1901): 1–20; Mściśław Wartenberg, "Sigwarts Theorie der Kausalität im Verhältnis zur Kantischen. Eine Festgabe zum 28. März 1900 (II)", *Kant-Studien* 5 (1901): 182–207; Mściśław Wartenberg, "Der Begriff des 'transscendentalen Gegenstandes' bei Kant – und Schopenhauers Kritik desselben. Eine Rechtfertigung Kants (II)", *Kant-Studien* 5 (1901): 145–177; Mściśław Wartenberg, *Obrona metafizyki. Krytyczny wstęp do metafizyki* [*In defense of metaphysics. A critical introduction to metaphysics*] (Warszawa: E. Wende; Kraków: D. E. Friedlein, 1902), 92–158; Mściśław Wartenberg, "O Krytyce praktycznego rozumu i jej stosunku do Krytyki czystego rozumu" ["On the Critique of practical reason and its relation to the Critique of pure reason"], in: Immanuel Kant, *Krytyka praktycznego rozumu* [*Critique of practical reason*], transl. Feliks Kierski (Lwów: Polskie Towarzystwo Filozoficzne, 1911), V–XXXVII; Mściśław Wartenberg, "Zagadnienie czasu" ["The question of time"], in: *Księga pamiątkowa ku czci Bolesława Orzechowicza* [*Commemorative book in honor of Bolesław Orzechowicz*], vol. 2 (Lwów: Towarzystwo dla Popierania Nauki Polskiej, 1916), 551–604. On Mściśław Wartenberg see: Stanisław Borzym, "Wartenberg jako krytyk Kanta" ["Wartenberg as a critic of Kant"], in: *Dziedzictwo Kanta. Materiały z sesji Kantowskiej* [*Kantian legacy. Proceedings of the Kantian session*], ed. Jan Garewicz (Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1976), 188–218; Tomasz Kubalica, "Johannes Volkelt i Mściśław Wartenberg. Neokantowska filozofia Kanta w Polsce" ["Johannes Volkelt and Mściśław Wartenberg. Neo-Kantian philosophy in Poland"], *Studia z Historii Filozofii* [*Studies in the History of Philosophy*] 5(4) (2014), publ. 2015: 185–204; Anna Musioł, "Mściśława Wartenberga wykładnia metafizyki w perspektywie filozofii Immanuela Kanta" ["Mściśław Wartenberg's interpretation of metaphysics from the perspective of Immanuel Kant's philosophy"], *Studia z Historii Filozofii* [*Studies in the History of Philosophy*] 5(4) (2014), publ. 2015: 205–225; Małgorzata Przeniosło, "Mściśław Wartenberg (1868–1938). Filozof, profesor Uniwersytetu Jana Kazimierza we Lwowie" ["Mściśław Wartenberg (1868–1938). Philosopher, professor at

translation of the *Prolegomena* was issued, prepared by Twardowski's collaborator Benedykt Borstein. At the same time, it was the last translation to come out of Twardowski's inspiration, in the pre- and inter-war period.⁷

Thus, in 1918, Polish philosophy already had the translation of Kant's main works. We could say that Twardowski thereby realized the original idea on which he had worked with Struve and Weryho. Remarkably, it all started with the *Prolegomena* and ended with the re-translation and publication of a new translation of the same work by Kant. What is odd is that for almost twenty years that followed, almost nothing was accomplished in terms of translations of Kant's works. And although there were no new translations of Kant's works, the reception of Kantian philosophy did not stop at all. Polish philosophers continued to develop their interests and publish works on Kant's philosophy. The occasions were two Kantian jubilees. Any further development of these works was hindered by the First World War followed by the difficult situation of Lviv and the local University. It was not until the second half of the 1920s that academic work there returned to normal. It should be noted that Kant's philosophy in Lviv was rather appreciated. Twardowski and his colleagues systematically strove to include Kant's philosophy in didactic courses. He resolved to educate students by instilling in them the knowledge of Kant. Kant even became an axis around which he organized all his lectures. He gave academic lectures in the format "before Kant" and "after Kant." He was assisted in this work in Lviv by Wartenberg and other colleagues. Over the years they continued the well-launched work of promoting Kant's philosophy, despite various obstacles. Twardowski was hoping to find a worthy successor in Lviv after his retirement, and a continuator of his previous efforts. That person appeared quite unexpectedly. It was Roman Witold Ingarden (1893–1970), not particularly well-liked because of his difficult character, but appreciated for his sharpness of mind and action. It was Ingarden who completed the Kantian work initiated by Twardowski in Lviv.

the John Casimir University in Lviv"], *Wschodni Rocznik Humanistyczny* [Eastern Humanities Yearbook] 16(3) (2019): 201–210.

⁷ Immanuel Kant, *Prolegomena do wszelkiej przyszłej metafizyki, która będzie mogła wystąpić jako nauka* [Prolegomena to any future metaphysics that will be able to present itself as a science], transl. Benedykt Bornstein (Warszawa: Gebethner i Wolff, 1918).

Kant's philosophy in the academic lectures of Kazimierz Twardowski, Mściśław Wartenberg and other lecturers in Lviv

In Lviv, there was a tradition of teaching German philosophy, oriented directly towards Kant. It was initiated by Euzebiusz Czerkawski (1822–1896).⁸ The philosophy of Kant was also taught at Lviv University by Aleksander Skórski (1851–1928)⁹. Later on, Kant was taught by Twardowski and Wartenberg. They carried on this tradition by giving original lectures and exercises. As late as the winter semester of 1903/1904, Twardowski interpreted excerpts from the *Critique of Pure Reason* in his higher seminar. In the same academic year, in the winter semester, he also held a lecture on modern philosophy entitled *The Development of Philosophy in the Nineteenth Century*, which also discussed separately Kant's philosophy and its reception in eighteenth- and nineteenth-century German philosophy. In the summer semester of 1903/1904, Twardowski was joined by Wartenberg, with a lecture entitled *On the Life and Work of Kant*. In the academic year 1904/1905, Wartenberg lectured on the *Introduction to Philosophy and Encyclopaedia of the Philosophical Sciences* (with particular emphasis on Kant and Hegel). He also repeated his lecture *On the Life and Work of Kant*. In the following academic year, 1905/1906, in the summer term, Wartenberg taught *On the Ethical Views of Kant*. In the academic year 1906/1907, Twardowski conducted two groups of a higher philosophy seminar, one of which was devoted to the *Critique of Practical Reason*.

⁸ This description of Kant's lectures in Lviv is based on various volumes of the "Spis wykładów w C. K. Uniwersytecie imienia Cesarza Franciszka I we Lwowie" ["List of lectures at the Imperial and Royal Francis I University in Lviv"] and the "Spis wykładów. Uniwersytet Jana Kazimierza we Lwowie", 1919/1920–1938/1939 ["List of lectures at the University of John Casimir in Lviv"].

⁹ Skórski devoted some parts of his extensive monograph to the influence of Kant on the Polish philosopher Jan Śniadecki (see Aleksander Skórski, *Jan Śniadecki wobec współczesnej metafizyki niemieckiej i dzisiejszych dążeń filozoficznych krytycznie przedstawiony* [A critical presentation of Jan Śniadecki's views towards contemporary German metaphysics and philosophical endeavours today] (Lwów: Gubrynowicz i Schmidt, 1890), 47–53 and 93–102. One of Skórski's early articles, written in 1873 but published only at the end of his life in 1924, also concerned Kant's philosophy (see Aleksander Skórski, "Krytycyzm Kanta wobec zagadnień życia" ["Kant's criticism and issues of life"], *Przegląd Filozoficzny* [Philosophical Review] 27(3–4) (1924): 131–145).

In the summer semester of the same academic year, however, he read *Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals*. In turn, Wartenberg lectured in the winter semester of the same year on the *History of Modern Philosophy until Kant*. Meanwhile, as part of a philosophy seminar, he undertook a reading of some passages from Kant's *Critique of Judgment* and a dissection of his aesthetic. In the academic year 1908/1909, Twardowski analysed the content of *Critique of Pure Reason* in both semesters. In the academic year 1909/1910, in the winter semester, Twardowski resolved to give a one-hour lecture on the *Development of Modern Philosophy until Kant*. In the academic year 1910/1911, in the winter and summer semesters, Wartenberg undertook another lecture on *Kant's Philosophy*. In turn, in the winter and summer semesters of the academic year 1912/1913, Twardowski conducted a *Reading and Interpretation of Kant's Prolegomena*.

The following year, the First World War broke out. It was difficult to hold any classes. Twardowski moved from Lviv to Vienna. Classes resumed in the normal course in the summer of 1918. Wartenberg then lectured on *Kant's Relation to Metaphysics*. He also conducted a philosophy seminar, where he analysed the *Critique of Pure Reason*. Moreover, he lectured on *Kant's Ethics*. In the academic year 1922/1923, on the other hand, in trimesters I and II, Twardowski, as part of the philosophy seminar, conducted a reading and interpretation of the *Critique of Pure Reason*. He also continued this work in the 1922/1923 trimester at the philosophy seminar. He read the *Critique of Pure Reason* with his students. These were Twardowski's last classes on Kant's philosophy that he taught at the University of Lviv. Thereafter, only Wartenberg lectured on Kant and his philosophy in Lviv, again on *Kant's Ethics*, and in the third trimester, of the academic year 1923/1924, additionally on *Kant's Science of Paralogisms and the Antinomies of Pure Reason*. In the academic year 1924/1925 Wartenberg gave two more lectures on *Kant's philosophy* in the first trimester: *The Metaphysicians of Modern Philosophy until Kant* and *Kant's Relation to Metaphysics*. During the academic year 1927/1928, he continued to lecture on *Kant's Philosophy*. The following academic year 1928/1929, however, brought the reading and interpretation of the *Critique of Pure Reason* in Wartenberg's philosophy seminar. Wartenberg's classes on Kant also took place in the academic year 1931/1932, when he discussed *Kant's Three Critiques*. In the fol-

lowing academic year, 1932/1933, the last academic year he taught at the University of Lviv, he lectured on *The History of Philosophy after Kant*.

Roman Witold Ingarden on Kant in Lviv

After Twardowski stopped his lectures on Kant in 1924, i.e., just after another Kantian jubilee, a break occurred in his teaching work in Lviv. This gap was not filled by Wartenberg, who, although continuing to lecture on Kant, tended to do it chaotically and with long interruptions due to illness. However, it should be emphasized that it was thanks to Wartenberg that Kant's philosophy was still present in Lviv. After Twardowski ceased to lecture on it, only Wartenberg continued to do so for years. However, the situation changed when both of our great philosophers, i.e., Twardowski and Wartenberg, retired. Not only did a void develop in the teaching of Kant's philosophy, but also an acute lack of a successor and continuator of this research became apparent. Fortunately, this did not last too long. Ingarden emerged, a new researcher into Kant's philosophy.

Ingarden's interest in Kant can be traced back to his youth, and his middle school philosophy classes taught by Twardowski's students. It was thanks to Bandrowski and Zawirski that the young Ingarden became fascinated with the philosophy of Kant and Bergson. Naturally, he did not participate in Polish attempts to prepare accurate translations and reception of these philosophies, but was undoubtedly informed about them. Both in the gymnasium library and in the family library, he found translations and studies devoted to Kant, if only those published by *Przegląd Filozoficzny* in 1904. Later, at a time when Ingarden was deciding on his higher education, he conducted a search on his own, familiarizing himself with all that was taught at the University of Lviv. He found a lot of interesting information about lectures, *inter alia*, devoted to Kant.

The turning point for Ingarden was his studies in Göttingen and Freiburg. Having attended classes with Husserl, the young student had to be thoroughly familiar with Kant and his philosophy. Ingarden possessed a five-volume edition of Kant's works and had unrestricted access to all the possible com-

mentaries on them. This was vital, as one could not attend Husserl's classes without being thoroughly acquainted with the fundamentals of the philosophy taught there. Thus, Ingarden matured as a philosopher under Husserl, studying Kant and his philosophy from their roots.

After his return to free Poland, Ingarden's interest in Kant seemed to have waned for a while. Having thrown himself into the vortex of his academic career, he was forced to put his former fascinations on hold. They resurfaced when he was awarded a Paris scholarship in 1927/1928, when on a journey in the autumn of 1927 he visited Husserl. In Freiburg, he found his Master feeling lonely and frustrated. The reason for his ill feeling was Martin Heidegger, then a rising star in German philosophy. Heidegger used Husserl's research and subsequently broke out from his influence. Husserl resented his student for this. A conflict ensued, which no one was able to resolve. His hope was still pinned on Ingarden, who appeared in Freiburg at the right moment. The phenomenological milieu, Husserl's former students, expected Ingarden to discern the matter thoroughly during his stay in Freiburg. In the end, after hearing Husserl, Ingarden ended up in Marburg, where Heidegger was teaching.¹⁰ He reviewed the whole affair and mitigated the conflict. On this occasion, he attended Heidegger's lectures on Kant's philosophy. It was then that the philosophy of the thinker from Königsberg once again sparked his scientific interest. Ingarden, while listening to Heidegger's lectures, prepared extensive notes, and later, on his return from the scholarship, proceeded to compile his own lectures on Kant on their basis. Let us point out, however, that Ingarden prepared to lecture on Kant in Lviv for several long years. He was no longer able to attend Twardowski's classes on Kant, as Twardowski had finished them when Ingarden returned to the University of Lviv, this time as a lecturer. What remained were classes with Wartenberg. However, Ingarden remembered very well his ineptitude from the time when he began his Lviv studies. This did not encourage him to attend Wartenberg's lectures again. On the other hand, Ingarden could not appear as Wartenberg's competitor. After Twardowski, Wartenberg had retained a monopoly in Lviv, so

¹⁰ See Roman W. Ingarden, *Die Mitschriften von den Vorlesungen Martin Heideggers über die Phänomenologische Interpretation von Kants Kritik der reinen Vernunft (Wintersemester 1927/28)*, ed. Radośław Kuliniak, Mariusz Pandura (Berlin: Peter Lang, 2020).

to speak, on the teaching of Kant's philosophy. He taught for almost ten years after Twardowski had stopped teaching this philosophy. During that time, knowledge of Kant declined considerably. It could be said to have regressed to the period of the peak interest in it, which had been initiated by Struve, Weryho, and Twardowski. Wartenberg gave lectures on Kant in the old neo-Kantian style, rarely reaching for original Kantian criticism. This situation was unacceptable to Ingarden. Nonetheless, he did not take any action. He patiently waited for the right moment. This happened less than two years after Twardowski and Wartenberg had left for well-deserved retirement.

Roman Witold Ingarden's academic lecture *On Kant's Criticism*

After the retirement of Twardowski and Wartenberg, two competing philosophers remained in Lviv. Vying for primacy were Roman Witold Ingarden and Kazimierz Ajdukiewicz. Class schedules were no longer arranged as they had been in Twardowski's time. Instead, everyone had to win students on their own. In the first year after Twardowski and Wartenberg left, Ingarden conducted his own philosophical-aesthetic seminar. There were also lectures on *The History of Ancient Philosophy* and *The Main Directions of the Modern Theory of Cognition*.¹¹ Ingarden saw very quickly that after Twardowski and Wartenberg a gap had developed in the lectures and practicals previously promoting Kant's philosophy. In the spring of 1935, he planned and submitted his next original classes. These were lectures on *Kant's Criticism*, which he intended as a preliminary part to a broader project. In the future, Ingarden intended to teach students a lecture on neo-Kantian philosophy.¹² Moreover, he planned practicals, i.e., a reading of Kant's *Prolegomena*, which had been repeated in Lviv many times before.¹³ In doing so, he followed in Twardow-

¹¹ Cf. "Spis wykładów. Uniwersytet Jana Kazimierza we Lwowie na rok akademicki 1934/35" ["List of lectures at the John Casimir University in Lviv for the academic year 1935/35"] (Lviv, 1934), 40.

¹² Ibidem.

¹³ Ibidem.

ski's footsteps. He was continuing his pattern of lecturing, while in reality, the two differed, and fundamentally, in their interpretation of Kant. Twardowski offered a typically historical-philosophical lecture, while Ingarden's approach was additionally marked by phenomenological elements. The clear influence of Husserl and Heidegger was noticeable.

The first characteristic moment in Ingarden's lecture was his approach to Kantian criticism. He continued what Struve had proposed earlier. The references to the *Critical Introduction to Philosophy* can be seen very clearly. Struve noted in his work: "Kant was the first to subject both the innate and acquired content of the mind (*a priori and a posteriori*) to critical dissection, and sought to strictly define the significance of the principles of reason and the data of experience in the cognition of things."¹⁴

This clue led Ingarden, while still studying with Husserl, to a completely different interpretative level. In Ingarden's approach, the fundamental differences between what Struve had proposed and what Twardowski had taken up thereafter can be seen. For Ingarden, "return to Kant" did not mean "return with Kant." It was not constructing Polish philosophy from scratch. Nor did Ingarden associate the slogan "Zurück zu Kant!" with the renewal that had to take place in our philosophical milieu based on Kantian criticism. He was clearly leaning towards a different interpretation of the famous slogan by Zeller and Liebmann.¹⁵ Already under Husserl, he became acquainted with the phenomenological interpretation of such a "return to Kant." According to Husserl, this meant nothing less than "not to be confined to Kant alone." Kant's philosophy had to be put in order and given a synthetic representation. When starting his lecture, Ingarden thought it appropriate to present an evolutionary view of Kant's philosophy, and then to move on to the constitution of the "subjective organization of the mind," to reconcile it with the "objective factors", mainly so that a fundamental problem would emerge in the presentation, namely "Kant's influence in the epistemological field." Ingarden was necessarily keen to give a thoroughly contemporary lecture, paralleling what

¹⁴ See Henryk Struve, *Wstęp krytyczny do filozofii czyli Rozbiór zasadniczych pojęć o filozofii* [*Critical introduction to philosophy or Analysis of fundamental concepts of philosophy*], 2nd rev. ed. (Warszawa: E. Wende, 1898), 95.

¹⁵ *Ibidem*.

he had heard from Heidegger in Marburg. He intended to translate the teachings he had heard into a more comprehensible language.

But let us return to Ingarden's lecture. Following in the footsteps of Husserl and Heidegger, he wondered how to present phenomenological content to his students in Lviv. His intention was to interpret Kant directly from a phenomenological position. He did not want to be original in this respect, like Husserl or Heidegger. Instead, he preferred to lecture Kant calmly and without much exaggeration. Above all, he recommended the reading of the original second edition of the *Critique of Pure Reason* of 1787. He could not imagine reading this work without consulting the fundamental and well-known commentaries by Friedrich Ueberweg, Wilhelm Windelband and Kuno Fischer. Thus, the works by Ueberweg were read in Lviv under Ingarden (*Grundriss der Geschichte der Philosophie von Thales bis auf die Gegenwart*, Vol. 1–3, published in Berlin in 1863–1866, and in particular Vol. 3: *Die Neuzeit*); by Windelband (*Die Geschichte der neueren Philosophie in ihrem Zusammenhange mit der allgemeinen Cultur und den besonderen Wissenschaften dargestellt*, Vol. 1–2, Leipzig 1878–1880, especially Pt. 2: *Die Kantische Philosophie* and Pt. 3: *Die nachkantische Philosophie*); and finally those by Fischer (*Geschichte der neuern Philosophie*, Vol. 3: *Entstehung und Begründung der kritischen Philosophie. Die Kritik der reinen Vernunft*, Mannheim 1860, and Vol. 4: *Das Lehrgebäude der kritischen Philosophie. Das System der reinen Vernunft*, Mannheim 1860). Both volumes have a common supplementary title: *Immanuel Kant. Entwicklungsgeschichte und System der kritischen Philosophie*).¹⁶ Also, Ingarden recom-

¹⁶ See Kuno Fischer, *Geschichte der neuern Philosophie*, vol. 3: *Entstehung und Begründung der kritischen Philosophie. Die Kritik der reinen Vernunft* (Mannheim: Friedrich Bassermann, 1860); Kuno Fischer, *Geschichte der neuern Philosophie*, vol. 4: *Das Lehrgebäude der kritischen Philosophie. Das System der reinen Vernunft* (Mannheim: Friedrich Bassermann, 1860); Friedrich Ueberweg, *Grundriss der Geschichte der Philosophie von Thales bis auf die Gegenwart*, pt. 1: *Die vorchristliche Zeit* (Berlin: Mittler, 1863); Friedrich Ueberweg, *Grundriss der Geschichte der Philosophie von Thales bis auf die Gegenwart*, pt. 2: *Grundriss der Geschichte der Philosophie der patristischen und scholastischen Zeit* (Berlin: Mittler, 1864); Friedrich Ueberweg, *Grundriss der Geschichte der Philosophie von Thales bis auf die Gegenwart*, Tl. 3: *Die Neuzeit* (Berlin: Mittler, 1866); Wilhelm Windelband, *Die Geschichte der neueren Philosophie in ihrem Zusammenhange mit der allgemeinen Cultur und den besonderen Wissenschaften dargestellt*, vol. 1: *Von der Renaissance bis Kant* (Leipzig: Breitkopf und Härtel, 1878); Wilhelm Windelband, *Die Geschichte der neueren Philosophie in ihrem*

mended the reading of the more recent edition of these two volumes, which came out under a new title *Immanuel Kant und seine Lehre* (Pt. 1: *Entstehung und Grundlegung der kritischen Philosophie* and Pt. 2: *Das Vernunftsystem auf der Grundlage der Vernunftkritik*, both published in 1882 in Munich).¹⁷ Nor could Ingarden imagine a student failing to refer to Friedrich Paulsen's work, already published in Polish (*Immanuel Kant i jego nauka*, Warszawa 1903).¹⁸ Whereas for those who were more interested in the genesis than in analyzing the content of Kantian philosophy, he recommended Piotr Chmielowski (*Kilka słów o „Krytyce czystego rozumu”*, pp. X–XL, in: *Immanuel Kant, Krytyka czystego rozumu*, trans. Piotr Chmielowski, ed. Henryk Struve, Warszawa 1904).¹⁹ Apart from those, there were other specific recommendations. Ingarden made no secret of his affection for the work of Karl Vorländer (*Kant als Deutscher*, Darmstadt 1919; *Kants Weltanschauung aus seinen Werken*, Darmstadt 1919, or *Immanuel Kant. Der Mann und das Werk*, Bd. 1–2, Leipzig 1924).²⁰

It is clear that Ingarden placed high demands on those studying Kant's philosophy. Of course, in the earlier lectures by Twardowski and Wartenberg, the indicated readings also must have appeared. Their reading was required, but the recommendations were advisory, not obligatory. Ingarden, on the other hand, clearly advised what should be read and why. He was not afraid of overwhelming students with excessive reading in his classes, or even of dissatisfaction caused by an excess of work. He had the impression that among the audience would be students who were eager to learn Kant's philosophy in de-

Zusammenhänge mit der allgemeinen Cultur und den besonderen Wissenschaften dargestellt, vol. 2: *Von Kant bis Hegel und Herbart* (Leipzig: Breitkopf und Härtel, 1880).

¹⁷ See Kuno Fischer, *Immanuel Kant und seine Lehre*, pt. 1: *Entstehung und Grundlegung der kritischen Philosophie* (München: Friedrich Bassermann, 1882); Kuno Fischer, *Immanuel Kant und seine Lehre*, pt. 2: *Das Vernunftsystem auf der Grundlage der Vernunftkritik* (München: Friedrich Bassermann, 1882).

¹⁸ See Friedrich Paulsen, *I. Kant i jego nauka [I. Kant and his teachings]*, transl. Jan Władysław Dawid (Warszawa: Red. "Głosu", 1902).

¹⁹ See Piotr Chmielowski, "Kilka słów o Krytyce czystego rozumu" ["A few words about the *Critique of Pure Reason*"], in: *Immanuel Kant, Krytyka czystego rozumu [Critique of Pure Reason]*, transl. Piotr Chmielowski (Warszawa: E. Wende, 1904), X–XL.

²⁰ See Karl Vorländer, *Kant als Deutscher* (Darmstadt: Otto Reichl, 1919); Karl Vorländer, *Kants Weltanschauung aus seinen Werken* (Darmstadt: Otto Reichl, 1919); Karl Vorländer, *Immanuel Kant. Der Mann und das Werk*, vol. 1–2 (Leipzig: Felix Meiner, 1924).

tail. There was only one goal: to learn about Kant and move on to his contemporary interpretations. Ingarden communicated his intention clearly. He said:

Notably, I have to present the views of so-called neo-Kantianism in the second trimester. It is impossible to do so without adequate information on Immanuel Kant's theory of cognition. Given that Kant has not been taught at our University in recent years, I must fill this gap myself. For this reason, I will not present to you the whole of Kant's philosophy, but confine myself to his epistemological considerations, primarily from the period of his so-called "Criticism." Nor will I be able to outline this very manifold historical background against which the *Criticism* arose. The philosophical traditions at work here go back a long way, and it is necessary to properly present the main motifs, issues, and solutions, the conceptual apparatus of modern European philosophical thought. It would be impossible to do this in a one-semester lecture; therefore, I will limit myself only to what is most indispensable for understanding Kantian criticism. Knowledge of such cognition of Kant is necessary for understanding, not only neo-Kantianism, but in general the currents and views of almost the entire epistemology of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. For Kant's views – regardless of whether their veracity should be acknowledged or not – undoubtedly represent a turning point in modern epistemology and even European philosophy in general. Indeed, there are historians of philosophy who are inclined to contrast pre-Kantian and post-Kantian philosophy when elaborating modern philosophy. It is true that Kant advanced some completely new thoughts within the theory of cognition and was the first to actually create a comprehensive system of theories of cognition. As well as that, he brought epistemological research to the forefront of all philosophical considerations, although he himself did not confine himself to epistemology. The entirety of philosophical considerations took on a different form thanks to Kant, regardless of whether Kant's immediate successors knew how to preserve this form. It is true, moreover, that the influence of Kant's philosophy on the development of European philosophy has been immense and has certainly not yet ceased. One might say that every eminent philosopher in the nineteenth century and to this day has not only encountered Kant's views in some way, but moreover has responded to them either positively or negatively.²¹

²¹ Roman W. Ingarden, *Lwowskie wykłady o Krytycyzmie Kanta z roku akademickiego 1935/1936* [Lviv lectures on "Kant's Criticism" from the academic year 1935/1936], ed. Radosław Kuliniak, Mariusz Pandura (Kęty: Wydawnictwo Marek Derewiecki, 2021), 151–152.

This was a completely new approach to Kant's philosophy. No one before Ingarden in Lviv had reached so far and been so concrete in their presentation of Kantian criticism. Twardowski and Wartenberg sometimes made digressions in which they returned in thought, when lecturing on Kant, as far back as the Greek sources of philosophy. With Ingarden it was different: a simple style and strict adherence to the main topic. It was a lecture in which the student not only acquired knowledge of Kant, but also learned to think independently. The central theme was epistemological problems in Kant. Then, Ingarden intended to review the directions flowing from and dependent on the influence of Kant's philosophy. First, however, he focused on an overview of what Kantian criticism was and what it gave to philosophy. Taking into account the possibility of students completely unfamiliar with the intricacies of Kantian thought attending his classes, he preceded the whole thing with a historical background and a division of Kant's works, which at the same time included an explanation of the essential diversity of his philosophy, long divided into pre-critical and critical. A turning point was Kant's professorial work (*De mundi sensibilis atque intelligibilis forma et principiis*, from 1770), beginning the process towards the creation of the *Critique of Pure Reason*. In this, Ingarden indicated the evolutionary nature of Kant's philosophy. He wrote about it:

For more than 10 years Kant worked on his topics without publishing a thing, only to then write this work in a matter of months. The speedy edition had a detrimental effect on the shape of the text; it became heavy and inaccessible, making it much more difficult to understand the most essential thoughts. Not surprisingly, the work has been understood in many different ways, and various interpretations of it have led to the emergence of different directions of Kantianism. An array of commentaries on the work also appeared. Immediately after its publication, the reactions of readers made Kant aware of the difficulty and inaccessibility of his work. Therefore, in 1783, Kant promulgated a writing that was intended to prepare readers to understand the Critique, i.e. the *Prolegomena zu einer jeden künftigen Metaphysik die als Wissenschaft wird auftreten können*.²²

²² Ibidem, 156.

This evolutionism of Kant's thought, which Ingarden discovered independently, coupled with a detailed analysis of his works, became the determinant of subsequent presentations of his philosophy. Ingarden's interest lingered around the critical recognition of the process of cognition, initially developing in Kant in academic and pre-critical study, with the first period of study leading through the professorial dissertation and the second leading to the findings in the *Prolegomena*. The culmination, in turn, was the critical phase, initiated by the publication of the *Critique of Pure Reason*. Ingarden wrote:

The reason this is important is that some interpreters of Kant, and of his criticism in particular, are inclined to believe that the central issue that led Kant to his critical position was the epistemological problem of the justification of objectivity and the necessity of mathematical cognition and of strict mathematical natural science, and that the means of solving this was precisely none other than the conception of time and space as the necessary forms of pure intuition. Without prejudging for the moment how the case stands with regard to the *Critique of Pure Reason*, it must be said that if indeed the epistemological issues mentioned are the starting point of Kantian 'criticism,' then the dissertation *De mundi sensibilibus...* is not yet the first step towards 'criticism,' and if indeed it is such a step, then Kant's critical position has at its base not only (but at least) the said epistemological issues. While it cannot be denied that in the *Dissertation* from 1770, there are places that clearly indicate that Kant was already aware at that time of the connection that existed between his conception of time and space and the question of the objectivity and apodicticity of mathematical cognition (I will touch on this later), this issue is raised only in passing, and does not form the axis or the source of the *Dissertation's* argument.²³

In turn, in the second part of his lectures, Ingarden discussed the philosophy presented in Kant's main works. It was divided into two main currents: dogmatic, whose peak of development was the thought of Leibniz and Wolff, and sceptical, whose apogee occurred in the thought of British empiricism in Locke, Berkeley, and Hume. Characteristic was the critical turn towards what Kant called transcendental philosophy. For Ingarden, Kant's critical philosophy was an extension of the evolutionary sequence of his philosophy. It led

²³ Ibidem, 174.

through dogmatism to scepticism. Its culmination was a broad synthesis of both these currents. Dogmatism and scepticism were not opposing views, but stages in the development of a critique of reason. On the one hand, they were linked to the presentation of intuitive forms of sensuality and principles. On the other hand, they represented stages in the development of pure reason itself, constituting a synthesis of judgements and categories.

The second part of Ingarden's lectures was an attempt to reconstruct Kant's critique. In his interpretation, Ingarden used a juristic metaphor taken from Kant, seeing in "the concept of judgement the capacity for mature thinking." In this, he pointed to intellect and reason as important moments of critical thinking. Ingarden supported his own argumentation on Kantian categories, showing our cognitive functions as a moment of positive thinking. On the other hand, this aimed to discuss the critique of pure reason, based on "eternal and immutable" laws. Ingarden thus justified his conception of Kant's philosophy as a reassertion of reason in its "just grounds." In turn, he rejected the "unfounded claims" of the senses. In addition to the critical moment ("rejection"), the *Critique of Pure Reason* contained a constructive moment ("consolidation"). This was substantiated by Ingarden by pointing to Kant's distinction between three types of synthesis. Without these, the *Critique of Pure Reason* could only rely on experience alone. It was only later that the conception established on the basis of experience could be the object of cognition. In this way, Ingarden finally stopped at the point where the most important conceptual disputes were taking place. His point was that, in Kant's case, what actually takes place is not judging, but evolutionary thinking. According to Ingarden, by establishing the laws of reason we gain the authority of reason itself.

Conclusion

For Ingarden, the *Critique of Pure Reason* did not constitute a critique of specific beliefs. Like Kant, he regarded it as a critique of "the power of reason in general." Unlike the critique of specific beliefs, the critique, referring to reason itself, aimed at examining "its capacity for all pure *a priori* cognition." Thus, this critique had a propeaedeutic function. This is why, according to In-

garden, Kant's critical project met with such resistance. Among other things, it has been alleged that his *Critique of Pure Reason* overlooks the fundamental and absolute dependence of reason on language. Ingarden appreciated Kant's *Critique of Pure Reason* by looking at it from the point of view of criticism, i.e., from the perspective of reason that establishes, legitimises and resolves. This view of the critique of reason, in turn, worked towards its emancipation, i.e., towards an institutional view of transcendental philosophy, which in Kant's case was a critical theory.

With his lecture on Kant in Lviv, Ingarden undoubtedly encouraged students to study the basics of this difficult philosophy. Unfortunately, this was a one-off event. The promises he made to conduct further classes on Kant's philosophy were not fulfilled. The reason was the launch of the "Aristotelian Seminar," to which Ingarden devoted the last years of his work in Lviv. What can be said is only that, with his lecture on Kant, he in a way concluded and crowned the plans of his great predecessors. In teaching about Kant's transcendental philosophy, he recapitulated all the critical views of the development of metaphysics as a science. By recognizing, after Kant, the impossibility of the future occurrence of metaphysics as a science, he not only provided a reason for polemics, but above all for philosophizing that rested on thinking of Kant as the greatest of philosophers in history.

References

- Bad Hersz. 1905. "Bruno Bauch. *Luther und Kant*". *Przegląd Filozoficzny* [*Philosophical Review*] 8(3): 280–281.
- Bad Hersz. 1905. "Dr. Sitzler. *Zur Blattversetzung in Kants Prolegomena*". *Przegląd Filozoficzny* [*Philosophical Review*] 8(3): 281.
- Bad Hersz. 1907. "Gerland V., *Immanuel Kant, seine geographischen und anthropologischen Arbeiten*". *Przegląd Filozoficzny* [*Philosophical Review*] 10(3): 401–402.
- Bad Hersz. 1908. "*Grundlegung Kanta w tłumaczeniu polskim*" [Kant's *Grundlegung* in Polish translation]. *Przegląd Filozoficzny* [*Philosophical Review*] 11(3): 181–198.
- Bad Hersz. 1911. "Kant I. *Krytyka praktycznego rozumu. (Kritik der praktischen Vernunft)*. Przekładu dokonał Feliks Kierski. Przekład przejrzał i wstępem zaopatrzył Prof. Dr. M. Wartenberg. [...] Kant I. *Krytyka praktycznego rozumu*. Z oryginału

- przełożył oraz wstępem i przypisami zaopatrzył Benedykt Bornstein pod redakcją Henryka Goldberga” [“Kant I., *Critique of practical reason*. (*Kritik der praktischen Vernunft*). Translated by Feliks Kierski. The translation was reviewed and given an introduction by Prof. Dr. M. Wartenberg. [...] Kant I. *Critique of practical reason*. Translated from the original, given an introduction and notes by Benedykt Bornstein, edited by Henryk Goldberg”]. *Ruch Filozoficzny* [*Philosophical Movement*] 11(7): 142b–144b.
- Borzym Stanisław. 1976. “Wartenberg jako krytyk Kanta” [“Wartenberg as a critic of Kant”]. In: *Dziedzictwo Kanta. Materiały z sesji Kantowskiej* [*Kantian legacy. Proceedings of the Kantian session*], ed. Jan Garewicz, 188–218. Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.
- Chmielowski Piotr. 1904. “Kant w Polsce” [“Kant in Poland”]. *Przegląd Filozoficzny* [*Philosophical Review*] 7(4): 379–394.
- Chmielowski Piotr. 1904. “Kilka słów o *Krytyce czystego rozumu*” [“A few words about the *Critique of Pure Reason*”]. In: Immanuel Kant, *Krytyka czystego rozumu* [*Critique of Pure Reason*], transl. Piotr Chmielowski, X–XL. Warszawa: E. Wende.
- Fischer Kuno. 1860. *Geschichte der neuern Philosophie*. vol. 3: *Entstehung und Begründung der kritischen Philosophie*. *Die Kritik der reinen Vernunft*. Mannheim: Friedrich Bassermann.
- Fischer Kuno. 1860. *Geschichte der neuern Philosophie*. vol. 4: *Das Lehrgebäude der kritischen Philosophie*. *Das System der reinen Vernunft*. Mannheim: Friedrich Bassermann.
- Fischer Kuno. 1882. *Immanuel Kant und seine Lehre*. pt. 1: *Entstehung und Grundlegung der kritischen Philosophie*. München: Friedrich Bassermann.
- Fischer Kuno. 1882. *Immanuel Kant und seine Lehre*. pt. 2: *Das Vernunftsystem auf der Grundlage der Vernunftkritik*. München: Friedrich Bassermann.
- Ingarden Roman W. 2020. *Die Mitschriften von den Vorlesungen Martin Heideggers über die Phänomenologische Interpretation von Kants Kritik der reinen Vernunft (Wintersemester 1927/28)*, ed. Radosław Kuliniak, Mariusz Pandura. Berlin: Peter Lang.
- Ingarden Roman W. 2021. *Lwowskie wykłady o Krytycyzmie Kanta z roku akademickiego 1935/1936* [*Lviv lectures on “Kant’s Criticism” from the academic year 1935/1936*], ed. Radosław Kuliniak, Mariusz Pandura. Kęty: Wydawnictwo Marek Derewiecki.
- Kant Immanuel. 1906. *Uzasadnienie metafizyki moralności* [*Groundwork of the metaphysics of morals*], transl. Mściśław Wartenberg. Lwów: Polskie Towarzystwo Filozoficzne.
- Kant Immanuel. 1911. *Krytyka praktycznego rozumu* [*Critique of practical reason*], transl. Benedykt Bornstein. Warszawa: E. Wende.
- Kant Immanuel. 1911. *Krytyka praktycznego rozumu* [*Critique of practical reason*], transl. Feliks Kierski. Lwów: Polskie Towarzystwo Filozoficzne.

- Kant Immanuel. 1918. *Prolegomena do wszelkiej przyszłej metafizyki, która będzie mogła wystąpić jako nauka* [*Prolegomena to any future metaphysics that will be able to present itself as a science*], transl. Benedykt Bornstein. Warszawa: Gebethner i Wolff.
- Kodisowa Józefa. 1904. "Znaczenie Kanta dla filozofii współczesnej" ["The importance of Kant for contemporary philosophy"]. *Przegląd Filozoficzny* [*Philosophical Review*] 7(4): 395–406.
- Kozłowski Władysław M. 1904. "Kant i zagadnienia palące wieku (Kant jako publicysta)" ["Kant and pressing issues of the century (Kant as a political commentator)"]. *Przegląd Filozoficzny* [*Philosophical Review*] 7(4): 422–446.
- Kubalica Tomasz. 2015. "Johannes Volkelt i Mściśław Wartenberg. Neokantowska filozofia Kanta w Polsce" ["Johannes Volkelt and Mściśław Wartenberg. Neo-Kantian philosophy in Poland"]. *Studia z Historii Filozofii* [*Studies in the History of Philosophy*] 5(4): 185–204.
- Kuliniak Radosław, Mariusz Pandura. 2021. "Roman Witold Ingarden na tropach filozofii Immanuela Kanta" ["Roman Witold Ingarden on the trail of the philosophy of Immanuel Kant"] In: Roman W. Ingarden, *Lwowskie wykłady o Krytycyzmie Kanta z roku akademickiego 1935/1936* [*Lviv lectures on "Kant's Criticism" from the academic year 1935/1936*], ed. Radosław Kuliniak, Mariusz Pandura, 11–145. Kęty: Wydawnictwo Marek Derewiecki.
- Lewkowicz Jakub. 1904. "Sprawozdania" ["Book reports"]. *Przegląd Filozoficzny* [*Philosophical Review*] 7(4): 453–461.
- Lewkowicz Jakub. 1905. "Nauka Kanta o Bogu w oświeceniu krytycznym" ["Critical remarks on Kant's doctrine of God"]. *Przegląd Filozoficzny* [*Philosophical Review*] 8(2): 135–144.
- Musioł Anna. 2015. "Mściśława Wartenberga wykładnia metafizyki w perspektywie filozofii Immanuela Kanta" ["Mściśław Wartenberg's interpretation of metaphysics from the perspective of Immanuel Kant's philosophy"]. *Studia z Historii Filozofii* [*Studies in the History of Philosophy*] 5(4): 205–225.
- Paulsen Friedrich. 1902. *I. Kant i jego nauka* [*I. Kant and his teachings*], transl. Jan Władysław Dawid. Warszawa: Red. "Głosu".
- Przeniosło Małgorzata. 2019. "Mściśław Wartenberg (1868–1938). Filozof, profesor Uniwersytetu Jana Kazimierza we Lwowie" ["Mściśław Wartenberg (1868–1938). Philosopher, professor at the John Casimir University in Lviv"]. *Wschodni Rocznik Humanistyczny* [*Eastern Humanities Yearbook*] 16(3): 201–210.
- Skórski Aleksander. 1890. *Jan Śniadecki wobec współczesnej metafizyki niemieckiej i dzisiejszych dążeń filozoficznych krytycznie przedstawiony* [*A critical presentation of Jan Śniadecki's views towards contemporary German metaphysics and philosophical endeavours today*]. Lwów: Gubrynowicz i Schmidt.

- Skórski Aleksander. 1924. „Krytycyzm Kanta wobec zagadnień życia” [“Kant’s criticism and issues of life”], *Przegląd Filozoficzny [Philosophical Review]* 27(3–4) (1924), 131–145.
- “Spis wykładów. Uniwersytet Jana Kazimierza we Lwowie”, 1919/1920–1938/1939 [“List of lectures at the John Casimir University in Lviv”], Lwów 1919–1938.
- “Spis wykładów w C. K. Uniwersytecie imienia Cesarza Franciszka I we Lwowie”, 1876/1877–1918/1919 [“List of lectures at the Imperial and Royal Francis I University in Lviv”], Lwów 1876–1919.
- Struve Henryk. 1904. “Immanuel Kant oraz dziejowa doniosłość jego krytycyzmu, Warszawa, 1904 (streszczenie)” [“Immanuel Kant and the historical significance of his criticism, Warszawa, 1904 (summary)”]. *Przegląd Filozoficzny [Philosophical Review]* 7(4): 447–451.
- Struve Henryk. 1898. *Wstęp krytyczny do filozofii czyli Rozbiór zasadniczych pojęć o filozofii [Critical introduction to philosophy or Analysis of fundamental concepts of philosophy]*. 2nd rev. ed. Warszawa: E. Wende.
- Ueberweg Friedrich. 1863. *Grundriss der Geschichte der Philosophie von Thales bis auf die Gegenwart*. pt. 1: *Die vorchristliche Zeit*. Berlin: Mittler.
- Ueberweg Friedrich. 1864. *Grundriss der Geschichte der Philosophie von Thales bis auf die Gegenwart*. pt. 2: *Grundriss der Geschichte der Philosophie der patristischen und scholastischen Zeit*. Berlin: Mittler.
- Ueberweg Friedrich. 1866. *Grundriss der Geschichte der Philosophie von Thales bis auf die Gegenwart*. Tl. 3: *Die Neuzeit*. Berlin: Mittler.
- Vaihinger Hans, Bruno Bauch (eds.). 1904. *Zu Kants Gedächtnis. Zwölf Festgaben zu seinem 100jährigen Todestage*. Berlin: Reuther und Reichard.
- Vorländer Karl. 1919. *Kant als Deutscher*. Darmstadt: Otto Reichl.
- Vorländer Karl. 1919. *Kants Weltanschauung aus seinen Werken*. Darmstadt: Otto Reichl.
- Vorländer Karl. 1924. *Immanuel Kant. Der Mann und das Werk*. vol. 1–2, Leipzig: Felix Meiner.
- Wartenberg Mściśław. 1899. *Kants Theorie der Causalität. Vierter Teil: Kritik*. Witekowo: Cegielski.
- Wartenberg Mściśław. 1899. *Kants Theorie der Kausalität mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Grundprinzipien seiner Theorie der Erfahrung. Eine historisch-kritische Untersuchung zur Erkenntnistheorie*. Leipzig: H. Haacke.
- Wartenberg Mściśław. 1900. “Der Begriff des ‘transscendentalen Gegenstandes’ bei Kant – und Schopenhauers Kritik desselben. Eine Rechtfertigung Kants (I)”. *Kant-Studien* 4: 202–231.
- Wartenberg Mściśław. 1901. “Der Begriff des ‘transscendentalen Gegenstandes’ bei Kant – und Schopenhauers Kritik desselben. Eine Rechtfertigung Kants (II)”. *Kant-Studien* 5: 145–177.

- Wartenberg Mścisław. 1901. "Sigwarts Theorie der Kausalität im Verhältnis zur Kantischen. Eine Festgabe zum 28. März 1900 (I)". *Kant-Studien* 5: 1–20.
- Wartenberg Mścisław. 1901. "Sigwarts Theorie der Kausalität im Verhältnis zur Kantischen. Eine Festgabe zum 28. März 1900 (II)". *Kant-Studien* 5: 182–207.
- Wartenberg Mścisław. 1902. *Obrona metafizyki. Krytyczny wstęp do metafizyki [In defense of metaphysics. A critical introduction to metaphysics]*. Warszawa: E. Wende; Kraków: D. E. Friedlein.
- Wartenberg Mścisław. 1905. "Kantowska argumentacja przeciwko idealizmowi" [Kant's argument against idealism]. *Przegląd Filozoficzny [Philosophical Review]* 8, 2: 111–126.
- Wartenberg Mścisław. 1911. "O Krytyce praktycznego rozumu i jej stosunku do Krytyki czystego rozumu" ["On the Critique of practical reason and its relation to the Critique of pure reason"]. In: Immanuel Kant, *Krytyka praktycznego rozumu [Critique of practical reason]*, transl. Feliks Kierski, V–XXXVII. Lwów: Polskie Towarzystwo Filozoficzne.
- Wartenberg Mścisław. 1916. "Zagadnienie czasu" ["The question of time"]. In: *Księga pamiątkowa ku czci Bolesława Orzechowicza [Commemorative book in honor of Bolesław Orzechowicz]*, vol. 2, 551–604. Lwów: Towarzystwo dla Popierania Nauki Polskiej.
- Wasserberg Ignacy. 1905. "Kilka uwag o krytycyzmie Kanta (Odczyt, wygłoszony w 100-tą rocznicę zgonu Kanta w "Kole Filozoficznym" U. J. w Krakowie)" ["A few remarks on Kant's criticism (Lecture given on the 100th anniversary of Kant's death at the "Philosophers Circle" of the Jagiellonian University in Kraków)"]. *Przegląd Filozoficzny [Philosophical Review]* 8(2): 127–134.
- "Wiadomości bieżące" ["Current news"]. 1904. *Przegląd Filozoficzny [Philosophical Review]* 7(4): 466–479.
- Windelband Wilhelm. 1878. *Die Geschichte der neueren Philosophie in ihrem Zusammenhange mit der allgemeinen Cultur und den besonderen Wissenschaften dargestellt*. vol. 1: *Von der Renaissance bis Kant*. Leipzig: Breitkopf und Härtel.
- Windelband Wilhelm. 1880. *Die Geschichte der neueren Philosophie in ihrem Zusammenhange mit der allgemeinen Cultur und den besonderen Wissenschaften dargestellt*. vol. 2: *Von Kant bis Hegel und Herbart*. Leipzig: Breitkopf und Härtel.
- Woroniecki Adam. 1904. "Zależność Jana Śniadeckiego od I. M. Degeranda. Przyczynek do poznania stosunku Jana Śniadeckiego do Kanta" ["Jan Śniadecki's dependence on J. M. De Gérando. A contribution to understanding Jan Śniadecki's attitude towards Kant"]. *Przegląd Filozoficzny [Philosophical Review]* 7(4): 407–421.
- Zieleńczyk Adam. 1911. "Immanuel Kant. Krytyka praktycznego rozumu. Przekładu dokonał Feliks Kierski. [...] Tenże. Krytyka praktycznego rozumu. Z oryginału przełożył, oraz wstępem i przypisami zaopatrzył Benedykt Bornstein" ["Immanuel Kant. Critique of practical reason. Translated by Feliks Kierski. [...] The same. Critique of practical reason. Translated from the original, given an intro-

duction and notes by Benedykt Bornstein”]. *Przegląd Filozoficzny [Philosophical Review]* 14(3): 430–436.

Żółtowski Adam. 1912. “Immanuel Kant. *Krytyka praktycznego rozumu*. Z oryginału przełożył oraz wstępem i przypisami zaopatrzył Benedykt Bornstein. [...] Tenże. *Krytyka praktycznego rozumu*. (*Kritik der praktischen Vernunft*). Przekładu dokonał Feliks Kierski. Przekład przejrzał i wstępem zaopatrzył prof. dr. M. Wartenberg” [“Immanuel Kant. *Critique of practical reason*. Translated from the original, given an introduction and notes by Benedykt Bornstein. [...] The same. *Critique of practical reason*. (*Kritik der praktischen Vernunft*). Translated by Feliks Kierski. The translation was reviewed and given an introduction by Prof. Dr. M. Wartenberg”]. *Książka* 12(5): 213–214.