

HENRYK STRUVE

Letters to Piotr Chmielowski (selection)*

Warsaw, Leszno 33, 18 November 1902

Dear Professor!

To prevent our letters from crossing paths again, I hasten to reply to your letter of the 16th of this month, and briefly report that, during discussions with my colleagues on the Committee, a form was found which seems to me to be the most suitable for the future of your translations, should you agree to it. The form would be such that, as a result of my application, it would not be me, but you, who would be granted the allowance for the printing and publishing of your translation. In the Committee's reports it would read as follows: "An allowance has been granted to Mr Piotr Chmielowski for the publication of a translation of such text, constituting part of the "Philosophical

* The manuscripts of the letters published here, dating from 1902 to 1904, are housed at the Ossoliński National Institute in Wrocław ("Letters from Henryk Struve to Piotr Chmielowski", ref. 4812/1) and at the Jagiellonian Library ("Letters from Chmielowski to Struve", accession ref. 2/60).

Library.”¹ With this form, everyone can see that I have nothing to do with the financial side of the publication. Do you perhaps agree with this form?

As for Kant, it would be possible to print it in any Kraków printing house – at your discretion, provided that it adheres as closely as possible to the format and prices of the local printing house. Besides, the Ginca Printing House, where the Philosophical Library has thus far been published, is so accommodating that making corrections in distant places presents no difficulties. I have corrected most of the “Introduction” in England, and the work progressed regularly without any harm being done. But that is at your discretion. When do you plan to get down to Kant in earnest? Before this, of course, the Fund’s subsidy would have to be obtained. It is impossible to count on it absolutely – because of the enormous expenses the Fund incurs which are constantly growing day by day, not at all in relation to the Fund’s income. Each year we spend thousands on permanent publications – such as “Dictionary of the Polish Language,” “Gloger’s Encyclopaedia,” “The Vistula,” “Philosophical Review,” “The Encyclopaedia of Education,” etc. At the moment, the publishers of the “Great Encyclopaedia” have also come forward with a request for 3000 roubles in aid – and since the publishers are at present people working in the scientific field – not booksellers or publishers by profession, such a request must not be dismissed outright. For this reason, obtaining such a substantial sum for the translation of a work that will undoubtedly seem obsolete to some members of the Committee may be difficult in view of the many pressing publications of original works, independent studies, etc. In any case – as far as I understand the situation – I cannot proceed with Kant until the printing of Gołuchowski has progressed far enough for me to anticipate its imminent completion, that will be, I believe, in January or February. Is that too late for you? If so, I would have to come forward earlier – but the effect would be doubtful. As for Mr Piątkowski’s antinomies, I am under no commitment at all. Their translation is also undoubtedly inferior to [the translation of I. Kant’s book titled] *Prolegomena to Any Future Metaphysics*, which I revised to the best of my ability. I therefore believe that you, Sir, may trans-

¹ On the activity of Henryk Struve, cf., *inter alia*, Damian W. Makuch, “Autorytet profesora. Henryk Struve i jego uczniowie w świetle korespondencji”, in: *Szkoła Główna. Kregi wpływów* 2, eds. Urszula Kowalczyk, Łukasz Książczyk (Warsaw 2019), 49–79.

late them yourself, without taking into account Mr Piątkowski's translation. I am curious to know your opinion on Hume. I have written to Mr Twardowski on this matter, but have not yet received a reply. This query of mine is merely a form, as I am almost certain that the work on Hume in Lviv has barely begun. – As for the word 'atlooking' (*Anschanung*) I would have some doubts, it seems to me a bit stretched and at the same time not clear. I would translate it either as an 'intuition' or 'outlook' (as in *Prolegomena*). *Ansicht* then could probably usually be rendered by 'an opinion about something.' But of course I am by no means restricting your independence as an interpreter, all the more so if you explain the reasons for the use of this word. After all, I unhesitatingly recognise your superior competence in this matter. I would also like to add a word about the submission of the manuscript. It would be most desirable if I found a personal opportunity not to have the censorship formalities in place still before printing, as I wish to censor myself in the correction sheets. I send greetings and express my sincere regards.

Henryk Struve

Warsaw, Leszno 33, 26 November 1902

Dear Professor!

At this very moment I have received a letter from Professor Twardowski in which, after offering his excuses for the delay in his response as a result of the trip to Vienna, he wrote me the following, verbatim, concerning Hume:

"As regards the translation of Hume, I can report that the greater part of the work has already been translated into Polish, and at present I myself am urging the translator to complete the work without any further delay, as I would like to read this treatise of Hume's in a Polish translation during the summer semester, and for this reason I would like the translation to be printed not later than mid-April. I therefore think that there is no need for Professor Chmielowski to get down to translation himself. Perhaps, however, we

could suggest to Professor Chmielowski that he translate another treatise by Hume, which could also be very useful in the Polish edition, namely the treatise on the principles of morality.”

From this, Dear Sir, you can see that I am bound, as far as Hume is concerned, by this commission with Professor Twardowski. As a matter of fact, I myself have no longer counted on having a translation made, when for so long, in spite of letters received from Professor Twardowski on various other subjects, he did not say a word about this one. It is a good thing that I keep precise notes on these matters and that I took up this matter with Professor Twardowski, as it could have eventually turned into a great source of unpleasantness. I expect that you have not yet started translating Hume. I would not think of his ethical works at the moment, since, in my opinion, the “Philosophical Library” has more important works to assimilate into our literature. Kant above all, and in keeping with your intention, I will apply to the Mianowski Fund² for an allowance for the publication of the *Critique of Pure Reason* in your translation, – to the amount of 2500 roubles. The Gins Printing House will provide me with a detailed cost estimate for printing and paper for 50 sheets.³ However, at the moment I am concerned with the most convenient time to submit this application. On 13 December, the Committee meets again. However, for this meeting there are already very considerable demands on behalf of the Philosophical Faculty, namely, 3,000 roubles for the “Great Encyclopaedia,” 1,000 roubles for the “Educational Encyclopaedia,” 800 roubles for “Gloger’s Polish Encyclopaedia” plus various private items. If I had made a request for 2,500 roubles for Kant at this meeting, I would have exhausted the entire fund disposed of at this meeting almost exclusively for our department, and the Committee members already grumble at times that other faculties have been neglected lately, which, by the way, is not true. In any case, it would be more convenient for me to make my application as late as January 1903. I would just like to know whether you would agree to risk working on Kant before the decision of the Mianowski Fund is

² The Józef Mianowski Fund for the Promotion of Science was the largest and most important Polish scientific organization established in the Russian partition on 12 July 1881.

³ The printing house of Alexander Gins (1821–1908) operated in Warsaw from 1852 to 1909.

taken. I am accustomed to great caution in such matters, so I will most certainly not prejudge the Committee's decisions, although, in view of the overall situation, I expect that the Committee will *nolens volens* agree in January to allocate this sum to Kant, i.e. to a matter that is in fact of great importance for our thinking, especially in view of the possibility of enriching our literature with a translation by your pen. Should you not wish to take this risk, then please let me know, and I will then apply on the 13th of December, even if it is not to the advantage of other requests from our department. I consider it my duty to remain completely open in this matter towards you.

I send you my cordial handshake and the assurance of my sincere regards,

Henryk Struve

Warsaw, Leszno 33, 3 December 1902

Dear Professor!

Having received Gołuchowski's manuscript,⁴ I immediately set about its final preparation for print. First of all, I read it in its entirety. I found nothing serious to comment on. On the contrary, the translation is so fluent – purely Polish – that it reads like an original work, – which I also noted in my editorial preface, appended here for your information.

On reading the manuscript, only the following minor comments occurred to me. First, on the title. Do you not think that it would have been more appropriate to write: "Philosophy in relation to the life of whole nations and individuals" instead of: "The relation of philosophy to etc." It is not only the accuracy of the translation that, in my opinion, speaks in favour of such titling, but also the content, in which it is philosophy viewed from this side that constitutes the main subject? What do you think of this? Naturally, without your permission, I will not change the title, – but it may be that you have inadvert-

⁴ See footnote 2.

ently not considered these two possible forms of the title, and on closer examination may consent to a change. I do not insist on the other form, if you have reasons in favour of yours.

Your doubts regarding page XIV of the original, and manuscript sheet XI verso seem reasonable to me. The German phrase: “entweder weiler eingesehen hat, dass an auch nichts daran gewesen,” can, I think, be accurately rendered only with the words: “he realised that nothing was worthwhile.” The expression: “he did not put anything of his own into it,” does not seem to be precise to me – moreover, in the course of thought, the author does not mean it at all. I therefore think that you can accept this change.

The sentence marked out on page 34 *recto* (original page 140) gives me no reason to comment. Only the word: *Gemüth* in the translation: ‘mind,’ could provoke some doubt, but I know well that to render *Gemüth* one could only exceptionally say ‘heart.’ Usually one has to make do with the expression ‘mind,’ without, however, completely painting the content of the German term. ‘Mind’ corresponds in part to the word *Geist*, although for it we have ‘spirit.’ In fact, the greater richness of our language is revealed here, for we have ‘heart’ and ‘mind’ and ‘spirit,’ and the Germans for this area of concepts only: *Gemüth* and *Geist*.

Aside from these comments, I have nothing to add. I will send the thing to the printers tomorrow. As far as the fee is concerned, I have already indicated on the postcard that the advance is at your disposal – the final settlement, of course, will only be possible once the piece is in print, when we shall know exactly how many sheets of printing it will cover.

I send my heartfelt gratitude for the translation and a sincere handshake,

Henryk Struve

Bałucz, post office in Łask, Piotrków Governorate, 9 January 1903

Dear Professor!

In reply to your kind letter of the 30th of last month, I would like to inform you that, as per the information received from the Office of the Mianowski Fund, a mistake regarding the 50 roubles was made in the Bank of Warsaw or of Kraków. In any case, the 50 roubles due to you will be sent. At the time, we at the office of the Fund settled the matter strictly in accordance with the Committee's decision, which granted a non-refundable allowance of 250 roubles as a fee for the translation of Gołuchowski. Having received the missing 50 roubles, will you kindly send to the Fund's office (7 Niecka Street) a formal receipt for the 250 roubles you have received on this account – we need such a receipt as proof of the relevant expenditure. I thank you sincerely for your kind sending of the *Stylistics*.⁵ I will probably receive it and will read it with great interest upon my return to Warsaw – (on the 16th of this month). I will also raise the matter of the Kant translation at the next meeting of the Mianowski Fund Committee. I shall not fail to report on its outcome

I send my sincere greetings and the expression of my true esteem,

Henryk Struve

⁵ The book in question is Piotr Chmielowski's book entitled *Stylistyka polska wraz z nauką kompozycji pisarskiej* [Polish stylistics with the study of writing composition] (Warsaw 1903).

Warsaw, Leszno 33, 18 January 1903.

Dear Sir!

I hasten to announce that the Mianowski Fund Committee yesterday on principle granted an allowance of up to 2,500 roubles for the translation of Kant's *Critique of Pure Reason*. Formally, these matters will be settled at the meeting next Saturday – as there were so many matters yesterday that this one of ours could be brought up in principle only. In any case, the thing is secured, and you may confidently begin work on the translation. Admittedly, it took some effort – it was necessary to convince the opposition of the relevance of the translation and of the necessity to benefit from the circumstances in the midst of which this work can now be accomplished – but in the end the cause of reason and necessity prevailed, despite the amount of money needed for it. I therefore only wish you good health, so that you can undertake and complete this difficult work without hindrance!

Notification and receipt for 250 roubles of fee for translation of Gołuchowski was received by the office.

I conclude with cordial greetings and the expression of my sincere regard,

Henryk Struve

Warsaw, Leszno 33, 3 February 1903

Dear Professor!

I apologise for my somewhat delayed reply to your letter of the 23rd of last month. During that time, however, I was overburdened with numerous activities, to the extent that I was not able to devote even the last two public holidays to correspondence, as I usually do – but needed to work on a term

paper for the “Encyclopaedia of Education.” Having finished it, I hasten to write back to you.

The most important issue raised in your letter is the commentary on the *Critique of Pure Reason*. To my knowledge, the best among the more recent editions of the *Critique of Pure Reason*, supplied with appropriate comments and explanations, are: Erich Adickes’s edition of 1889, Benno Erdmann’s edition of 1878, the 5th edition of 1900, and finally Karl Vorlander’s edition of 1899. The Adickes edition seems to me to be the handiest, although Erdmann’s 5th edition contains a great deal of informative comments on the text itself (mainly the 2nd edition of the original, which naturally you take as the basis for your translation too). Should you not possess either of these works, I would strongly advise you to import the Adickes edition and adhere to it in your translation, taking into account his remarks on the text etc. It is an edition with explanatory notes, far better than either Kirchmann’s or Kernbach’s: the former succumbs too much to his individual tendencies, whereas Kernbach appears to me not quite critical enough in editing the *Critique of Pure Reason*. It would also be good to have Benno Erdmann on hand – for a comparison with Adickes and a critical review of both, – but ultimately Adickes, I think, is sufficient.

All these, however, are merely editions of the *Critique of Pure Reason*, admittedly with numerous, instructive comments, some of them substantive – but they are not commentaries in the strict sense of the word. The sort of matter-of-fact commentary that you need and wish to have at hand, and which is indeed necessary if you wish to introduce the reader to the material understanding of Kant, is issued by Hans Vaihinger, an immense work, reckoned at 5 volumes. To my knowledge, only 2 volumes have come out to date (*Commentar zur Kritik der reinen Vernunft*, vol. I, 1881, vol. II, 1892), and they include some carefully worded, strictly scientific explanations of the prefaces and introductions to the 1st and 2nd original editions and to the “Transcendental Aesthetic.” This commentary will be a great aid to you, not only for the substantive explanations, but also in the translation itself. It will complement Adickes and, I believe, satisfy you completely. I have not come across a further 3rd volume so far – it seems to me that it is not yet out, – although it was announced.

As for the expenses for bringing these works – it may be possible to cover them in the end from the costs allocated for the publication of the Critique. The Committee of the Mianowski Fund granted us, as you know, 2500 roubles – 1250 on the fee and 1250 on printing etc. The Gins Printing House charges for printing and paper etc. 50 sheets is less than 1200 roubles (I don't have the exact bill at hand), – hence a certain sum would always remain at our disposal to cover the expenses for books etc. But, of course, only within the allotted sum, and assuming that the printing itself does not reach this sum.

As far as terminology is concerned, whether foreign or native, I am also of the opinion that it is better to use a foreign term that is understandable to any educated reader, rather than, following the example of Kazimierz Twardowski, to forge terms on our own. I am therefore not sure whether it is right to write *'myślący'* [thinking] instead of *'inteligentny'* [intelligent]. 'Intelligence' has a broader meaning than 'thought.' Hence, the term *'myślący'* [thinking] seems to me somewhat narrow, denoting only the existence of an object in thought, but not the penetration of that object by thought, which is expressed by the term 'intelligibility.' In principle, though, I am not opposed to this Polonization, although in the first instance the original term should be added in brackets, or in a footnote, to guide the reader towards the association with this Polish term, which the original has in mind. I would be more dubious about the substitution of 'reflection' – a term that is quite understandable and assimilated – with 'deliberation' or 'cogitation.' In the latter terms there is no hint of that turn of thought, or of spirit towards itself, which is the essence of reflection. It is possible to reflect on an object independent of us, to deliberate on anything – whereas the reflexive activity of reflection is unique and does not have this subjective, outwardly turned character. What do you think? In any case, I, as the editor of the "Philosophical Library," do not intend to restrict your view of things in any regard whatsoever, as I may point out in the preface that I do not feel entitled to impose my terminology, or my views at all, on an interpreter such as yourself.

As for 'judgement' (*Urtheilskraft*), I would have an objection here as to its being an action, where it is about the power or capacity for a certain action is in question. Thus, another way to say it would be 'ability' or 'strength' or 'power to discern.' Perhaps this would be better than 'power of judgement,'

bearing in mind the essential content of Kant's work in particular bearing this title, – but since Kant himself knew well that *Urtheil* is actually strictly logical in character and therefore falls with the nature of things into the scope of mind and reason (*Verstand*), and yet for his explorations of aesthetic taste etc. he employed this term – I do not know whether it is appropriate to correct him and not translate *Urtheil* by 'judgement,' or 'judging.' *Kraft* is used in German for abbreviation in place of *Urtheilsvermögen*.

Anschauung also gave me a lot to think about at one time – and I settled on a 'view.' Perhaps you will be happier. Also with regard to the *Voraussetzung*, the 'pre-assumption' has its own drawbacks – but it seems to me that one can say: 'pre-assume' – as you say 'assume.' It would do no harm if our language were forced into certain compound formations – so essential for the accurate, and concise, expression of thoughts.

I had a long row with the censors over Gołuchowski.⁶ Before my departure for the countryside, the censor assured me that he would settle the matter forthwith – meanwhile, I returned, – and he had not yet taken the manuscript in hand, I am only to get it back some days from now and the negotiations will begin – I believe that the volume will go into print very soon. In any case, I would like the thing to come out in May at the latest.

I send my warm greetings,

Henryk Struve

⁶ Cf. footnote 2.

Warsaw, Leszno 33, 11 February 1903

Dear Sir!

I am currently in receipt of a work: *Dzieje krytyki literackiej w Polsce* [*The history of literary criticism in Poland*],⁷ with the inscription “*ad antare*,” and I hasten to express my heartfelt thanks for your kind remembrance of me. I will read the work with deep interest and undoubtedly with great benefit to myself, and with many desired insights to complement my materials for *Historia filozofii w Polsce* [*History of Philosophy in Poland*], especially in the field of aesthetics. So for this, too, my most sincere thanks in advance.

As a supplement to what I wrote in my last letter about the editions of Kant’s *Critique of Pure Reason*, I would like to add, since I inadvertently failed to mention it – although it will probably be known to you – that the Berlin Academy has undertaken a new complete edition of Kant’s works, letters, etc. The *Critique of Pure Reason*, however, has not yet come out, but is to be edited and annotated etc. by Benno Erdmann, who has already, as I mentioned, published the *Critique of Pure Reason*. The Berlin Academy edition will be more complete as far as the compiled material is concerned – but will probably not be released to the public any time soon. So far, 3 volumes of Kant’s letters have been issued.

As for Gołuchowski, I had disputes with the censors. The first censor, who had the manuscript in preparation, after a long wait, excused himself for not being able to read the manuscript and demanded that it be rewritten – he did not even agree to my request that the correction sheets be presented to him. It was only through the mediation of the chairman that I obtained another censor, who recently handled the matter. Should I send you the revision? If you would also like to have it, the printer would send one copy to you and another to me, and you would return the revision with your corrections to me – I would collate my corrections and yours and send them to the printing

⁷ The author refers to Piotr Chmielowski’s book of 1902.

house. I kindly ask for a brief reply on this matter. Kind regards and a hearty handshake.

Henryk Struve

Warsaw, Leszno 33, 9 March 1903

Dear Sir!

I apologise for the delay in replying to your last letter, but these days I have been so absorbed, in addition to my usual intensive activities, with deadline-driven work and public lectures in Warsaw and Łódź, that despite my best intentions, correspondence has been put aside. Moreover, I was awaiting a letter from Mr Tyszyński, which arrived only recently.

As a result of my recommendation, Mr Tyszyński agrees to an increase in the editorial fee to 500 roubles, 200 of which are payable immediately and 300 upon the completion of the publication, i.e. after it has been printed in its entirety. Furthermore, he raises the total cost of the publishing house to 2000 roubles, - so after the deduction of the 500 roubles the remaining sum is 1500 roubles for the printing, paper and collection of materials, - which, I believe, will be sufficient, assuming the printing of no more than 60 sheets, which can be taken into account in the selection of works for printing. The most difficult issue concerns said collection of materials and supplying them to you. Mr Tyszyński does not have a complete set of these magazines, i.e. "Biblioteka Warszawska," a part of "Ateneum," etc., so he cannot provide them himself. The editors of "Biblioteka Warszawska" did promise to let him use their collection if he needed to transcribe articles. However, Mr Tyszyński would like to know what the cost of such a transcription would be and whether the printing and delivery of the materials could be effected at the cost of the 1500 roubles, as he would not be able to allocate more than 2000 roubles for this purpose. Couldn't you, Sir, roughly estimate the cost of printing and collecting the materials? Or perhaps you have someone in Kraków who

could undertake this task, and either search through antiquarian magazines or transcribe articles as needed? This has been the only difficulty in this matter so far – as generally Mr Tyszyński is very pleased that it is you who wish to undertake this publication, and he also expects that, through your firm, this publication will find its way to the public more easily than if edited by anyone else. To this end, he has agreed to an increase in fees and costs in general. He himself also intends to write to you directly as soon as he receives further information from me regarding the collection of these materials. Accordingly, I would ask you to kindly clarify this matter, should it be possible to do so.

As I see it, Kant's translation is progressing swiftly. As for Kant's expressions – *willkürlich* and *nach Belieben gesetzt* - regarding causality, I think an explanation is given on page 216 [*Critique of Pure Reason*] by Erich Adickes, where Kant distinguishes – *subjective Folge der Apprehension* – from objective apprehension. The former he calls *ganz beliebig*. In this thought he also speaks of *willkürliche Synthesis* and *willkürliche Gedanken Verbindung* on pages 236 and 237. Other places which you may have in mind, – in particular the expression – *nach Belieben gesetzt* – I have not yet found. In future, I would request that in any such question you should point to a page corresponding to the Adickes edition. The necessity and universality of the category of cause is explicitly based by Kant on the objective facts of experience – naturally with his understanding of both objectivity and experience as results related to the activity of mental categories. Alongside this, he supposes a subjective connectivity of thought and “phenomena” – characterized by arbitrariness and randomness. As I said, on page 216 he gives a clear explanation in this regard. I also think that the contested words have the ordinary meaning in Kant's case too – as concerning symptoms, denoted also in our language by the words ‘arbitrariness,’ ‘arbitrarily.’

I send my sincere regards and a hearty handshake,

Henryk Struve

Warsaw, Leszno 33, 27 March 1903

Dear Professor!

I have written to my son regarding the issue of Tyszyński's writings, and he will continue to correspond with you directly. It appears to me that the purpose of my mediation has been achieved.

I shall now respond to the issues on Kant. Kant's sentence (p. 177 [*Critique of Pure Reason* in Adickes edition]) concerns the concept of reality: "*das Reale, worauf wenn es nach Belieben gesetzt wird, jederzeit etwas anderes folgt*" [B 183]. This concept – i.e. the simple fact of the recognition of reality, Kant posits as arbitrary, or at least as capable of being arbitrary, conjectural. To me, something imposes itself as a fact of reality – whether in consciousness itself or as something acting on the consciousness. The origin of this recognition of the fact of reality is not investigated by Kant as such here, but he merely wants to state that since we accept something as real, then something invariably results from it, flows out of it (*jederzeit etwas andere folgt*), and in this precisely he sees the general scheme of causality. Whether the mere recognition of something as real is itself based on causality – that may be the question – because reality can directly impose itself and it is only when we recognise it, postulate it (*setzen*) that the category of causality begins to operate. Indeed, without the recognition of something existing, causality would have no object to refer to. This, it seems to me, is Kant's thought, and it is absolutely right. – It is true – I concede your point, that the recognition of the real, as a reality, is in fact already a symptom of the inference from a subjective impression of the reality of something giving rise to that impression, and so is already based on causality as a real relation between phenomena. Yet Kant remains in the realm of subjectivism, and in doing so he inflicts – in my view – a violation on the natural conditions of cognition of things.

As for the terms – *transcendental* and *transcendent* – I do not think it is possible to simplify Kant in the translation itself, as this would be, after all,

a departure from the original. What can be done is to note in a remark that it should be something else.

Contradictorisch – is usually translated: as ‘on the contrary,’ – but ‘quite the contrary’ seems to me to be just as good, maybe even better because it is stronger.

As for ‘substance,’ I see no reason, as far as I am concerned, why one should renounce a term so well established in scientific and philosophical terminology, perfectly understandable to all the educated. In fact, for the Polish reader, the word ‘*rozłoga*’ or the old word ‘*podłoże*’ is always less understandable than ‘*substancja*.’ I am not at all a purist in such matters. I can understand the adoption of a Polish term where no universally accepted scientific term has been coined to date – but to eradicate existing and well-understood terms simply on account of their foreign origin does not seem rational to me. This is a formalism that is easily detrimental to the very content and accessibility of the lecture.

Inhärenz can, in my opinion, be rendered best and most intelligibly by ‘property.’ (*właściwość*). ‘Affliction’ (*przypadłość*) has a meaning that is not clear enough due to its connotations. The argument in favour of ‘property’ is also that it is related to ‘property’ in the sense of an attribute of a thing, which is what is mainly at issue here. What is your view on this?

Do you have to hand excerpts from Paulsen’s book on Kant in Dawid’s translation? Dawid has added to this translation on pages 375–444 exceptions from *Critique of Pure Reason* and *Critique of Practical Reason*. From the former: Introduction, [Transcendental] Aesthetic § 1-8. ‘Intuition’ (*intuicja*) is interpreted by [David] as ‘views’ (*poglądy*). Meanwhile, he often speaks of ‘*principia*,’ where one might say ‘principles’ (*zasady*). In general, the translation seems quite meticulous, though I had no reason to compare it closely with the original.

On Sunday the 29th of this month, I will be away for two and a half weeks until 15 April. My address is the village of Bałucz, post office Łask, Piotrków Governorate. I shall also spend a few days in Poznańskie province. I kindly ask you to send my letters and corrections to Gołuchowski at the time indicated, to the address given.

Wishing you a Happy Easter and good health, I send you the expression of my true esteem and a hearty handshake,

Henryk Struve

PS. I am about to collect Gołuchowski's corrections. The printing is due to finish in mid-May at the latest.

Bałucz, post office of Łask, Piotrków Governorate, 10 April 1903

Dear Sir!

It is only today that I have received the letter of the 31st of last month here, as I have spent the last 10 days in the Poznańskie province with good friends of mine. Unfortunately, I did not return too uplifted, – either by the government action, nor by the local reaction – which, according to my view of things, should be more concerned with organic, economic, and mental work than with political agitation – which is fruitless. Only by the raising of all states, and in particular the landowners, to the position of the economic and intellectual culture of the Germans, can the influx of Germans be repelled and can we be saved from annihilation. And it is precisely in this cultural, and specifically this economic direction, that too little is being done – after all, words, however beautiful, are no substitute for economic virtues, providence, frugality, conscientious and persevering work in a well-defined direction. Still, there is some improvement in this respect, compared to the past – so let us hope it continues to get even better! And what about us! – Where there are not even any examples of higher culture!

But to the point! There is no longer a possibility of sending the manuscript of Kant to Bałcz, as a week from today, on the 17th of this month, I am already going to return to Warsaw. So, I will await the manuscript there, – and I shall read it with all the more eagerness, as I am writing an article on Kant for the “Great Encyclopaedia,” in which, as I hear, you have a share. Natural-

ly, I will mention in this article the forthcoming translation of the *Critique of Pure Reason*. Around 8 June I will leave Warsaw, first on family business to Russia, and then in July to England for good, – although I will still have to be in Warsaw in September due to post-summer examinations. I am letting you know about this for your information regarding the sending of the manuscript. Would you please also kindly let me know if you wish to have an advance on account of the translation you have made – or would you prefer to receive the fee in full upon completion of the entire work, at the commencement of printing?

As for terminology, naturally I would not think to impose any constraints on you.

As regards *Subsistenz*, the difficulties are indeed quite considerable – since this term cannot be identified directly with substantiality. Would not the word ‘*podkład*’ (foundation) be proper for *Subsistenz* – if one is no longer to say ‘*subsystemcja*’ – as is said – or if need be – ‘*egzystencja*’ (existence) etc.

I received sheet 3 of Gołuchowski’s correction here and immediately sent it to the printing house. I am very pleased that the matter of Tyszyński’s edition is convenient for you. I admire your energy and relentless work, which is so clearly evident in your translation of Kant. I wish you many years of such work!

Although this letter is probably already late for Easter, I nevertheless send my warm wishes. Yours sincerely,

Henryk Struve

Warsaw, Leszno 33, 26 April 1903

Dear Professor!

Yesterday, I received the manuscript of [the] 398-page translation of Kant, which passed through the postal censor’s office, and I admire the ease and perseverance with which the translation is progressing, – as it is to be com-

pleted in its entirety in May. We shall therefore begin printing as soon as Gołuchowski is completed, which will also be in May. Before I submit the manuscript for publication, I will go through the beginning, – and then I am also counting on a correction. — I have agreed with the printer Gins on this matter, so that he will not be discouraged by the changes in the proofreading and its slowness. Naturally, I will not make any major change without consulting you first, – as the translator in charge. Gins has brought separate fonts for [the printing of the translation of Kant's *Critique of Pure Reason*] and assures me that he has so many of them that a delay in the correction will not hold up the printing of the sheets already revised. Once we begin printing in May, I believe that we will finish the whole thing if not this year, then early next year, – that is, on the centenary of Kant's death. – When I have the whole manuscript, I will present it to the Committee of the Mianowski Fund and demand 2/3 of the envisaged translation fee. The rest will be settled after the entire thing is published in print. The meeting of the Committee in May will take place on the 23rd – perhaps by that time I will have if not the whole manuscript then a finished part at least by the middle of May – and this will be sufficient for the above financial arrangement.

Owing to the enormous volume of work, I am currently not going into the details of the translation you have referred to, – but I will take all your comments scrupulously into account when I review the manuscript, and then I shall express my opinion.

For the moment, I thank you sincerely for 'Stylistics,' which was sent to me on behalf of the Author. I can only repay you for this valuable new work with a small pamphlet – the lecture "Art and Society" – which I enclose. I am looking forward to finally settling down in Eltham in the countryside near London, where, like you in Zakopane – I will also bury myself in the quiet and work, I think, incomparably more than the restless, tense and anxious Warsaw allows me to.

I conclude, enclosing warm greetings and a firm handshake,

Henryk Struve

Warsaw, Leszno 33, 17 May 1903

Dear Sir!

I apologise for being a little late in replying to the letter of the 8th of this month, but I have been so absorbed with my scheduled work that I have not been able to get down to anything else, especially as the turbulence around examinations has already begun.

I hasten to respond to the questions raised. First, as regards Zabellewicz. I was already familiar with the news from Kraushar⁸ as well. But I was immensely surprised that I was not familiar with his [i.e. Zabellewicz's] *Treatise on Philosophy*, [delivered] at the meeting of the Royal Warsaw University on 8 October 1819, - because in my time I had looked through all such publications and read philosophical articles, making the appropriate notes. Naturally, I would have already mentioned Zabellewicz in the "Introduction" because of this work, - but I did not know it. I could not understand where it came from, until things became very clear once I requested these records from the University Library. It turns out that the Library has neither the issue of the 1819 annual, i.e. the second sitting of the year, on 8 October, nor that of 1823. And so Zabellewicz escaped my attention. I should have made a note of these omissions and looked for the paper elsewhere, but I apparently failed to do so. It was only these days that I read this work by Zabellewicz in the Zamoyski Library. Moreover, I do not remember at all that I was to supply you with biographical information about Zabellewicz from the Archives of the Academic District Curator. When was it that you wrote to me about this? I find nothing in the letters I have looked through. Has some earlier letter of yours gone missing, - or is my memory failing me so much already? I note such things down right away, in the heat of the moment, which makes it all the more hard for me to comprehend that I can recollect nothing in this matter. I shall try to make up for this lack, and if I have not enough time to do so myself - (as I am

⁸ Aleksander Kraushar (1843–1931) – Polish historian, publicist.

already getting ready to move to England – I am selling things off, etc., while at the same time pursuing my current duties and work) – then I shall go to Bieliński,⁹ for whom I have obtained permission to work in the Archives, – he most probably either already has the materials for the biographies of the professors from the early [period of the history] of the University collected, or he is in the process of collecting them. I will not neglect this matter now.

And now about Kant. I have already sought permission from the censor's office to present the work in correction sheets rather than manuscripts. We will begin printing after the completion of Gołuchowski, which is expected to be in 2 or 3 weeks' time.

As for *beweglicher* or *unbeweglicher*. Apparently the commentators differ, – since Kirchman and Kehrbach have *unbeweglicher*, and Adickes, I think deliberately, *beweglicher*. I will have a look in the University Library at the 1st and 2nd editions to come to my own judgement in this regard. I have marked this place for myself in my Adickes – and will keep the results of the comparison in mind when I revise. I think I would go with *unbeweglicher* as resulting from the sense of this place. In any case, I will write to you about the result of the comparison.

As for *Willkür* – Adickes, p. 438 – I think that this word cannot be rendered otherwise than by 'samowola' (self-will), – for in German too, the word has the identical meaning. Although Kant does not intend to indicate only the ordinary meaning of the word, he also has in mind its connection with the will in general – but this also applies to our self-will. After all, when one takes the words literally, they denote a will that guides itself. Suffice it to say that it is rare to find two words so closely denoting one and the same concept and its associations – like *Willkür* and 'samowola' – so, it seems to me, there is no reason to look for another Polish word for *Willkür*.

Next Saturday there will be a meeting of the Mianowski Fund Committee. I intend to request payment of 2/3 of the fee – but I would like to receive information that the second part of the manuscript has been sent – or at least that the manuscript has been completed, so that I can state this firmly in my

⁹ Józef Bieliński (1848–1926) – Polish historian, physician, researcher of scientific and educational institutions. Author of, *inter alia*, monographs devoted to the history of universities in Vilnius and Warsaw.

letter to the Committee. I expect to receive word of this. Anyway, as a last resort, the promise of completion in your last letter will suffice for me.

I send you my sincere greetings and regards,

Henryk Struve

Warsaw, Leszno 33, 20 June 1903

Dear Professor!

After a week's hassle I am finished with my business here, – so I briefly report that Gołuchowski is now published. Wende will send you the requested 10 copies plus one – he has been given the appropriate instructions from the Mianowski Fund Committee. They are slowly beginning to put Kant together. I enclose a sample. The printer will send you the correction soon. Please send it to me at the following address Dr H. Struve, “Fairholme” Elderslie Road, Eltham, Kent, England. I am leaving here in the first days of next week – I am not undertaking any other trips – I am only taking care of business in the countryside – and I will be in Eltham around 10 July. In September I will be in Warsaw again – to take care of final matters – especially also because of the post-summer exams, as my last official activity at the University. Please accept my warmest greetings and sincere regards,

Henryk Struve

PS. As to the printing [of the translation of Kant's *Critique of Pure Reason*], especially the footnotes etc., I have discussed it thoroughly with Gins and everything will, I expect, be well taken care of according to wishes.

“New Home” 13 Elderslie Road, Eltham
Kent, England, 14 August 1903

Dear Sir!

I am writing on an important matter concerning the Explanatory Notes. It appears that a combined revision of the Explanatory Notes with the text itself is necessary, as you anticipated and requested. It is my observation that the Explanatory Notes touch on fundamental questions of the theory of cognition, on which we may hold different opinions. How should we proceed in such instances? You will surely agree that I, as the Editor, publishing your translation with the Explanatory Notes, cannot leave such fundamental differences unnoticed on my part – as the reader would have to assume that we are in complete agreement as to the content of the Explanatory Notes, i.e. that I, as the Editor, fully share the critical opinions of the translator, i.e. you, Sir. In cases of fundamental difference, then, I would have to indicate my philosophical standpoint. If we did not want to appear before an audience with such differences, – then it would be appropriate not to raise the kind of issues on which we fundamentally disagree. I do not, however, see any serious reason why the position of both the translator and the editor should not be indicated. How do you stand on this issue? An example will best explain the whole matter. Explanatory Note 9 deals with “experience.” You refer to Ueberweg on this matter and apparently share his view that Kant makes a mistake in denying the universality and necessity of the results of experience without any evidence. Well, if this objection were to remain in this Note, I would have to add the following footnote on my part:

Note by the Editor of the “Philosophical Library.” Kant does not himself substantiate in detail the view that experience by itself does not lead to results with the meaning of universality and necessity. However, it is clear that, according to him, empirical views, theories etc. are subject to constant change, corresponding to the change of material taken from outside, from the sensory world. The slightest new discovery may change empirical views hitherto regarded as certain. Meanwhile,

our mind and the laws by which it is governed in its action constitute the fixed, unchanging, and universal basis among men for experience itself, for the very import from outside of empirical material. These laws of the mind, which Kant calls its *a priori* content, are never subject to any change for us, despite the progress of empirical knowledge and the changing views founded on it.

I shall not venture to explain my position on this matter further – I do not share Kant’s view that space and time, and the laws of mind in general, are merely *a priori*. They are *a priori*, – because in acting, in taking on any content, the mind is already based on it, but from this it does not follow that space and time are not simultaneously something real outside the mind. The mutual confirmation of the content of the mind with the objective content, given by experience – that is the ultimate criterion of truth – not only subjective, formal, not only empirical, but the ultimate truth, accessible to man. But I will not go into these things further – in fact, I touch upon them in the “Introduction.” All I am concerned with now is whether you agree with such footnotes to your Explanatory Notes. I will confine myself merely to the essential ones. In the given case, the whole matter of the difference of opinion could be resolved if you agreed to remove the critical note on Kant in this 9th Notes, – and if in general the Notes were only informative and not critical. It was Kirchmann, it seems to me, who spoiled his edition of Kant by adding his critical remarks to it. It is an either-or. Either write a critical study of Kant, or a critical commentary on every major sentence, – or let Kant remain Kant, and have the reader make up his own mind about him, – being given only factual explanations.

And as to other Notes. No. 11 on mathematics, No. 12 quoting Trentowski as to Kant’s work being “based on an obvious misunderstanding of its task,” No. 17 Schopenhauer’s accusation that Kant commits “gabinesyas;” these could not be left without my annotations.¹⁰ So, either you, Sir, will agree to the changes in the Explanatory Notes removing the criticisms on which we dissent, – or I will have to, as I see it, add at times longer annotations to indicate my own position. As I said, I see nothing inappropriate in this myself,

¹⁰ Cf. J. H. Kirchmann, *Erläuterungen zu Kant’s Kritik der reinen Vernunft* (Berlin: Heimann, 1870).

although I do not know what the readers will say about it. I believe, from reading the 22 Explanatory Notes, that it would be possible to resolve the controversy by omitting the critical remarks, – but this I leave entirely to your discretion. In the revision, I add everywhere the page of the text to which the Explanatory Note refers, so that the reader can find the text to which the Note refers. – Should you agree in principle to the erasure of the controversy, I would send you, as for the 9th Note also the other ones, for your consideration, and perhaps we could arrive at an agreement, without indicating our respective philosophical positions.

I'm sending warm greetings and a handshake,

Henryk Struve

“New Home” 13 Elderslie Road, Eltham, Kent, England, 22 August 1903

Dear Professor!

Having read all the Explanatory Notes, I find that they are indeed almost entirely informative. We have already agreed on No. 9. The only remaining Notes are Nos. 11 and 17, over which I have some qualms. No. 11 concerns mathematics. The information about Riemann and Helmholtz is not quite accurate and, as information, may be misleading to the reader. Indeed, both of them, and especially Helmholtz, accentuate the empirical character of geometrical “certainties” – but at the same time they recognise the apriorism of space and time itself in the mental-physical organization and base their mathematical theories of *n*-dimensions etc. on it. The ‘view,’ (*pogląd*) or as you say, the spatial and temporal ‘perception’ (*ogłąd*) itself is not in them the result of experience, but lies *a priori* in the organization of the mind. In turn, the detailed expression of this given conception of space and time, and thus the “certainties” pertaining to it, derive from empirical data, complementing the apriorism of space and time itself. Helmholtz elaborated extensively on this theory of his, which is a certain modification of Kantianism. Ueberweg

himself, whom you cite, puts it this way, in [*Grundriss der*] *Geschichte der Philosophie*, ed. 9, vol. IV, 1902, p. 230 et seq. He says: “Er (Helmholtz) giebt zwar die apriorische Anschauung von Raum und Zeit gewissermassen (not only gewissermassen) zu, will aber ihre Entwicklung namentlich von Bewegungsempfindungen abhängig machen und stellt so der nativistischen eine empiristische Raumtheorie entgegen. Die Apriorität des Causalitätsgesetzes nimmt er unbedingt an.” — The quotations from *Geschichte der Philosophie. Die Neuzeit*. §16 I was unable to confirm. In the 9th edition, vol. III, 1901 as *Geschichte der Philosophie. Die Neuzeit* in §16, he discusses Spinoza. Hence, I think it might be better to refer to the indicated place from Ueberweg. And under Kant (§ 34) I find no place in Ueberweg to justify the sentence about Riemann and Helmholtz given in the explanatory note. For the sake of accuracy, I therefore propose a complement, marked at Explanatory Note No. 11. The citation of Mill and Bain is no longer an informative statement, but an argument to prove the empirical origin of the principles of mathematics. I agree ultimately to leave the citation in place, but I wish to point out on the matter itself that James, also an excellent empiricist in the field of psychology and the theory of cognition, has convincingly demonstrated the internal contradiction of Mill’s inductivism. When Mill deals with the question: what serves as the basis for the generalization of detailed facts (we have investigated 100, 1000 individual facts; by what right do we apply the results of this investigation to a 1001 accident that we have not investigated and to the rest that are equally unexamined? – What is the principle for generalization?), – he then replies that this principle is the idea of the uniformity of the world system. Well, – and where does this idea originate? Mill will once again reply, that it comes from a generalization of detailed facts. James rightly observes that such a proof reminds him of that Indian who when asked what the earth rests on, – answered on the Elephant, – and what the Elephant stands on – naturally on the earth. The principles of all generalization, and therefore also in the mathematical field, reveal apriorism precisely, i.e. a certain fixed organization of the mind, which precedes all intellectual action, and therefore all generalization. After all, nor can the function of a physical organism be reduced to external factors alone, which, although necessary, are not sufficient to explain the organism’s activity. This activity is effected according to laws

inherent in the organism, although fundamentally in harmony with the laws of the external world influencing the organism, stimulating its activities and providing it with materials for processing and assimilation. – But, as I said, I will not insist on removing Mill and Bain as arbitrators in this dispute, – nor will I add a comment on my part, – leaving the matter entirely to your philosophical conviction, – only as regards Helmholtz the addition pointed out seems to me to be necessary precisely from the informative side, – while the matter itself – the dispute about the origin of mathematical principles – remains a matter of concern to the reader, – without the empiricist theory being imposed upon him.

My remarks as to No. 17 are given in my revision, – and I will make changes in this one as well as in No. 11 of the Explanatory Notes. In the revision for the printer only after I have received your reply. I am glad that these small differences can be easily reconciled, – without publicly stating their underlying basis. As for the critical harassment from our other quasi-philosophical authors – I suppose we cannot avoid it altogether – because these men harass out of principle, – and to this end they will invariably find something to pick on in the best of things. We are confident that we are doing our part – and the translation is exemplary in every sense – better than the Russian and French translations that I am familiar with, – it reads so lightly – and does justice to accuracy, – I am simply delighted with it and, when juxtaposing each sentence with the original, I admire the dexterity, lightness and accuracy of the choice of words and expressions.

I send you my hearty greetings,

Henryk Struve

New Home, Elderslie Road, Eltham, Kent. England, 25 February 1904

Dear Professor!

With this letter I send you my preface to the translation of Kant. I ask you to read it and to return it as promptly as possible, so that I can send it, together with your Introduction, to the printers. I expect that you will not have any objections to my purely object-oriented presentation of the genesis of this translation and its inclusion in the "Philosophical Library." Nor do I foresee that you will dislike the excerpt from your letter to me on this subject. But it is so characteristic of your undertaking that I believe it has a wide appeal and will arouse the reader's interest. If, however, you should have anything to say against it, or against this or that paragraph of the preface in general, I pray you to speak frankly and openly, for I myself have written frankly and openly on this subject.

Thank you for the postcard that I received today with comments on sheet 44 and for the correction of sheet 45. I will deal with the matter immediately. – I also thank you for your wishes regarding my eyes. They are better – but, unfortunately, not yet good. The inflammation returns after just an hour's or, at most, after two hours' work – my eyes fill with tears and I cannot see. The doctor consoles me that it will pass and insists on my having a complete rest for a few months, – but I am afraid that after such a break I will completely forget to read and write! In keeping with Darwin's principle of atrophy of organs not in use. Moreover, I am afraid that this is not just a trick on the part of the Doctor – and perhaps of those in my circle, – as the Doctor is conscientious and an excellent specialist – that they require me to rest for a longer period of time so that I become accustomed to gradually giving up the use of my sight altogether. They assure me that this is a vain suspicion on my part – but when, after months of great restraint and treatment, – the condition does improve, but does not return to normal, are my fears not justified?

But I apologize for these random confessions. So we reach the end with Kant. I have checked the numbering of the footnotes – it is perfectly good

in my revision with the exception of that footnote about the drop of water, which is not in its proper place in the text – i.e. there is no footnote number marked in the text. I do not know what remedy there is for this, I think the reader should be warned about it in the errata.

With my sincere regards, I send you my warmest greetings,

Henryk Struve

Letters transcribed from manuscripts by Łukasz Ratajczak
University of Warsaw
ORCID: 0000-0003-4999-4002
e-mail: l.ratajczak@uw.edu.pl