

synthetisch zustande bringen, so, daß die Einheit dieser Handlung zugleich die Einheit des Bewußtseins (im Begriffe einer Linie) ist, und dadurch allererst ein Objekt (ein bestimmter Raum) erkannt wird.") The notion of constructing a concept is a technical one for Kant ("Einen Begriff aber konstruieren, heißt: die ihm korrespondierende Anschauung a priori darstellen." Op. cit., B741)—to construct a concept of space would be to produce a representation of a determinate region of space in accordance with some determining principle.

* Maimon, Salomon (1753–1800): Self-educated philosopher from Lithuania who appeared on the Berlin scene in the later 1780's. His *Versuch über die Transzendentalphilosophie* (1790) was a critical study of the *Kritik der reinen Vernunft*; Kant had already seen some of it in manuscript, sent to him by Marcus Herz. In his letter of May 26, 1789 (#362), he describes to Herz how he had been on the point of returning the manuscript unread, with a note saying that he was too busy, but that on glancing at it he had realized its quality and had seen that none of his opponents had understood the *Kritik* as well as had M.

^b Herz, Marcus (1747–1803): Student and subsequently close friend of Kant's. Medical doctor and, from 1786, Professor of Philosophy in Berlin.

ⁱ Selle, Christian Gottlieb (1748–1800): Medical doctor in Berlin, involved in experiments in animal magnetism. Kieseewetter regarded the experiments as fraudulent, but absolved S. of complicity.

^j *Berlinische Monatsschrift*: A liberal journal, founded in 1783, in which Kant frequently published. The editor in question was Johann Erich Biester (1749–1816), who was also Librarian of the Royal Library in Berlin.

* Elsner, Christoph Friedrich (1749–1820): Professor of Medicine at Königsberg, who attended Kant in his final illness.

A FURTHER NOTE ON PAUL MARHENKE'S "THE PHENOMENALISTIC INTERPRETATION OF KANT'S THEORY OF KNOWLEDGE"

IN AN INTRODUCTORY NOTE to a paper, "The Phenomenalistic Interpretation of Kant's Theory of Knowledge," which was found in the effects of the late Paul Marhenke, Professor of Philosophy at the University of California, Berkeley, and which was printed in the April, 1964 issue of this *Journal* I mentioned that an intensive inquiry failed to reveal when this paper was written or for what occasion. I have recently received a note from Professor Jacob Loewenberg, Professor Emeritus in the Department of Philosophy at Berkeley, informing me that the paper was written while Paul Marhenke was a student at Berkeley and was written for Professor Loewenberg's Seminar on Kant, during the session of 1925–26. Professor Loewenberg writes that "the seminar dealt with certain selected topics crucial in or growing out of the *Critique of Pure Reason*. Among those who in addition to Paul were in the seminar, I remember distinctly (largely because of their superior performance) Donald C. Williams and the late A. P. Usenko. I am not quite sure whether or not Philip Wiener was also enrolled."

AVRUM STROLL

University of California, San Diego

A REPLY TO WALTER KAUFMANN

WALTER KAUFMANN, in his article, "Nietzsche in the Light of his Suppressed Manuscripts"¹ converts a review of Erich F. Podach's book, *Friedrich Nietzsche's*

¹This *Journal*, II, 2 (Oct., 1964), pp. 205–225.

Werke des Zusammenbruchs into a bitter personal attack on Podach and an even more vitriolic assault on me. Every author and scholar is entitled to his own opinion, and had Kaufmann soberly stated his case by simply announcing that, to his mind, the re-editing of Nietzsche's works according to the genuine manuscripts now available in Weimar has not changed one iota of the true character of the philosopher's last books, then his efforts would certainly have been unexceptionable. Prof. Kaufmann could simply have said, "Much ado about nothing! Podach's findings will, by no means, alter the image of Nietzsche among philosophers. Period." Indeed, this is precisely what Kaufmann's elaborate tirades and invectives come to if one reduces them to their objective content. But he chose to pick a genuine "querelle d'Allemand." He attacks me because I have "uncritically" accepted in two reviews Podach's editing and claims, and not enough, according to him, I have "added original errors."

Let us dispose first of the latter claim. At no place in his article does Kaufmann explain these "added errors." He only mentions in a footnote (p. 208) that my "remarks about the committee and the *Gesamtausgabe* . . . misrepresent not only the facts but also Podach's claims." What facts and what claims? I am at a loss to find them and challenge anyone who has read my reviews to point them out to me. The contrary of what Kaufmann claims is true: he himself omitted two men, the nephews of Mme Foerster, Richard, and Max Oehler, who were mentioned by Podach in connection with the *Gesamtausgabe*.

In contrast to Kaufmann, we shall try to leave aside all *argumenta ad hominem* and revert to scholarly observations. (This will be, however, terribly difficult, because Professor Kaufmann's tone seems so unphilosophical.) Kaufmann recognizes that Podach has contributed "five genuinely important books" to the Nietzsche literature, and later he even mentions the author's sixth book. He even recommends one of these books for an English translation. But at the same time, he blames Podach for not being a philosopher. Question: Does Podach anywhere claim to be one? He does hold a Ph.D. in anthropology and has the title of *Honorary Professor* of the Stuttgart Technische Hochschule. Professor Kaufmann, who seems to become angry whenever he mentions Podach's books on Nietzsche, should finally face the facts of life: by a quirk of fate, Podach was the first to get hold of important material on Nietzsche, material which no one else had seen before because it was hidden in some Hamburg attic. This happened in 1930, when the editor of a well-known Berlin newspaper, *Achtuhr-Abendblatt*, who was a friend of Podach, inherited from a member of his family a strongbox. This strongbox contained the original of Nietzsche's case record from the Jena Psychiatric Hospital. The editor gave Podach this precious case history, and permitted him to publish it as a book after it had first appeared as a serialized article in the aforementioned paper. This book was entitled *Nietzsches Zusammenbruch*. It was translated into many languages and made a great stir in Europe—because it established beyond any doubt the fact that Nietzsche was a victim of general paresis due to syphilitic infection. Previous to this time Elisabeth Foerster-Nietzsche had successfully suppressed this fact by suing those who dared to publish the truth.

This writer, who as early as 1927 authored the book, *Nietzsche und die*

Frauen,² was among the few who publicly denounced the falsifications of the Nietzsche-Archiv. I, therefore, was glad to find in Podach a co-fighter against the mess in Weimar. I had discovered long before I read Podach's first publication that Mme Foerster had succeeded in having blackened, by court-order, several passages in C. A. Bernoulli's *Overbeck und Nietzsche*.³ These passages pertained to Nietzsche's love for Cosima Wagner, his famous "Ariadne." I had also shown the true relation between Nietzsche and Lou Andreas Salomé, which Mme Foerster had likewise misrepresented. Mme Foerster and all who followed her lead had misconstrued the biographical facts concerning Nietzsche, and it was only when Podach was able to publish his works that the record was finally set straight.

After World War II, when the entire material of the Nietzsche-Archiv was stored in the Goethe-Schiller Archives in Weimar, Podach was again in a privileged position, for he gained access to this building, which is located in East Germany. The point is that Podach was again the first and only one to see the original Nietzsche manuscripts, and he has done a splendid job as far as Nietzsche philology goes. Even Kaufmann must recognize this, for he praises with one stroke what he attacks with the next. It is true that Podach despises most heartily the majority of the German "scholars" involved in Nietzsche research. But his contempt is by them thoroughly deserved, as I know from my own experience in this field. When I gathered material for my book I was appalled by either the trashy or pompous character of a vast portion of the German Nietzsche literature. In fact, it is my feeling that Kaufmann would never have attacked Podach so viciously if the latter had not included Kaufmann among those he found to be misled by the inaccuracies of Karl Schlechta. Professor Kaufmann seems a good deal more sensitive to criticism than his own criticism of others would indicate as fitting. But there are more facts and details to speak about:

1) When talking about Volkman-Schluck, who has written a booklet about "Die Wüste wächst! Weh dem, der Wüsten birgt!," Kaufmann feels obliged to defend the man because he is a professor of philosophy, and because Heidegger has called him his ablest and most promising disciple. Does Heidegger loom as a philosophical authority in Kaufmann's eyes? Has he forgotten that Heidegger became a supporter of Hitler? Even if the "great" man did condescend to talk with Kaufmann, can a philosopher be forgiven for joining the Nazis? By the way, Podach discusses in his last two works my interpretation, as well as that of Thomas Mann, of this strange poem by Nietzsche. I have devoted nine pages to it in the chapter "Repression and Imagery. *Zarathustra* as a sex-psychological problem."⁴ I am afraid that Kaufmann, who should know better, overlooks a typical weakness of German academics, namely, their complete lack of humor.

2) In his discussion of *The Antichrist* Professor Kaufmann bases his criticism on a number of small details which seem to me far beyond the scope of a genuine philosopher. Granted that Podach shows the same tendency, and that Kaufmann

²Published, Leipzig, 1931.

³Jena, 1908.

⁴In my *Nietzsche und die Frauen*, pp. 133-141.

finds both he and Hofmiller are "prigs," at least Podach and Hofmiller do not claim to be arbiters of philosophy, nor are they guilty of criticizing in others the very tendencies they themselves show. And is it not rather petty to make disparaging remarks about Hofmiller simply on the grounds that his is not a professor of philosophy? Kaufmann forgets that philosophy is only one of Nietzsche's fields, and not even his most accomplished; there are others, such as literary and cultural criticism, psychology, socio-political prophecy, and poetry, in all of which he excelled. He was, with Schopenhauer, the father of modern depth psychology. Furthermore, Hofmiller was, as a literary critic, as much entitled to judge Nietzsche as was Georg Brandes, the great Danish literary historian whose praise made the author of *Zarathustra* as happy as did that of the Swedish playwright, Strindberg.

3) I also need to take this opportunity to emphasize a fact known to everyone who has read what I have written about Nietzsche. Kaufmann tries to convey the impression that I reject Nietzsche as much as Podach does. The fact that I consider Podach's cleaning up of the Augean stable of German Nietzsche "research" and pseudo-philology a remarkable feat does not mean that I accept his ever-growing criticism and condemnation of Nietzsche himself. How I evaluate Nietzsche can best be seen in my essay "Hegel, Nietzsche and the Nazi Lesson."⁵

4) Kaufmann's attempt to devalue Podach's work reaches its most vitriolic point in his discussion of what happened to *Ecce Homo*. He cannot deny Podach's claim that this famous book was never actually finished by Nietzsche himself, who had the manuscript sent back and forth to and from the publisher several times. The intermingling of this work with *Nietzsche contra Wagner* and even with *The Twilight of the Idols* is reflected in the distraught correspondence which went on in the last days before Nietzsche's collapse in Turin; it also reveals an important fact which Kaufmann seems deliberately to forget: in the last weeks and even months of 1888 Nietzsche's mind underwent a steadily increasing deterioration. This makes it ludicrous to take any of his actions and "decisions" seriously, or to think of him as a normal man. Kaufmann ignores a simple fact known today by every layman with the most rudimentary knowledge of psychiatry and psychology. Mental disorders do not suddenly happen, but develop slowly over a period of months, sometimes years, before the actual onset of the psychoses. Nietzsche's correspondence and most of his works written in 1888 show distinctly the mark of his growing insanity. Most of the so-called "facts" he mentions in his letters to his publisher are pure fantasy; he had not, as he claims, found any French or Italian translator for *Ecce Homo*; some of those he mentions had not even been approached by him, but were only prospects.

Why did Nietzsche hesitate to publish the finished parts of *Ecce Homo*, the dubious fragment later edited and "beautified" by Peter Gast? Because he himself felt, in his lucid moments, that something was wrong with this work, the childish megalomania of which appalls even the greatest admirers of the author of *Zarathustra*. What serious writer in his right mind would offer his readers chapters

⁵ *The Humanist*, XII, 3 (May-June, 1952), pp. 111-115 and 4 (July-Aug., 1952), pp. 179-182.

titled "Why I am so Wise," "Why I am so Intelligent," or "Why I am Writing such Good Books"? To call this one of his best books, as Kaufmann does, is to insult Nietzsche; to compare this pseudo-autobiography with Goethe's *Dichtung und Wahrheit* and Plato's *Apology* is a literary blasphemy unmatched in the annals of philosophical and literary criticism. One has to be rather naive to fall for this mishmash of violent half-truths simply because they are couched in Nietzsche's brilliant style, the only thing left of better times. Erwin Rhode, a connoisseur of Nietzsche's life and thought, and always very fond of his old class-mate and friend, despite their philological dissensions, called *Ecce Homo* "half-crazy" (*halb-blödsinnig*). This has remained the consensus among sensible critics, whether the original manuscript was tampered with or not.

Professor Kaufmann is also rather infelicitous in his comparisons, to make a last point on this imbroglio. He finds an analogy between the Weimar mess of falsified manuscripts and the large body of Hegel's remarks not edited by the philosopher himself, but compiled posthumously by his students. Hegel was for many years a regular lecturer at the Berlin University, and he frequently made "off-the-cuff" remarks on various subjects of his philosophy, which his admiring audience was only too eager to preserve for posterity. These notes were, of course, in keeping with the mainstream of Hegelian thought, and it was perfectly legitimate to collect them in order to clear up some points that might have been left obscure in the philosopher's principal works. Hegel's works found, fortunately, serious scholars who edited them in a most conscientious and reliable way. Where, I ask, is the *tertium comparationis* with the cheap machinations of the Nietzsche Archiv? There is none.

To conclude, there is one more question. What is the rationale of Kaufmann's comments, why does he choose to make his criticisms in such an emotionally charged, *ad hominem* manner?

HENRY WALTER BRANN

Washington, D. C.