

books that in one way or another stem from it: *Between Man and Man*, *Good and Evil*, *Eclipse of God*, *The Knowledge of Man*, and much of *Pointing the Way* and *A Believing Humanism: Gleanings*. This whole series represents Buber's developing philosophical anthropology, his understanding of the totality and uniqueness of the human, as it also represents Buber's application of his philosophy of dialogue to theory of knowledge, psychology, education, ethics, aesthetics, social philosophy and the philosophy of religion.

Buber's teaching of "personal making present" "inclusion" and "confirmation" is of the greatest importance for his philosophy of dialogue in general and for its application to family life, education, and psychotherapy in particular. Yet it is only in *Between Man and Man* and *The Knowledge of Man*, not in *I and Thou*, that it is developed. *The Knowledge of Man* stands, indeed, as the culmination and crown of Buber's theory of knowledge, his philosophical anthropology, and his ontology. Along with his misunderstanding of the dialectic between I-Thou and I-It, Walter Kaufmann's serious mismeeting with Martin Buber is his failure to bring Buber's philosophical anthropology into his assessment of Buber as a philosopher.

MAURICE FRIEDMAN

Department of Philosophy  
San Diego State University  
California

MAURICE FRIEDMAN'S LETTER is ill designed to teach us anything about dialogue. It is an example of psychohistory at its worst.

(1) He reads carelessly but claims to fathom my wishes:

"Kaufmann wishes to dismiss the significance of Buber's philosophy of dialogue as a whole, reserving his praise for Buber's translation of the Bible and his telling of Hasidic tales."

In fact, I did not praise his translation and I have no wish whatsoever to dismiss his ideas about dialogue. It is precisely his notion of dialogue that keeps haunting me, although I am dissatisfied with the way Buber worked it out philosophically. He tended to rely far too much on intense feeling while disparaging reason, and he often failed to note how this invited illusions rather than genuine dialogue. The examples he gives of I-You relationships, not only in *I and Thou* but also in his later works, illustrate this danger: Buber's relation to a tree or to a person glimpsed across a room, without the exchange of a single word. His very short Hasidic tales are masterpieces to my mind but also illustrate the same danger: the genuine You of the Hasidic masters is not recognised and Buber does not enter into a genuine dialogue with them. He relies so much on his own intense feelings that the resulting portrait of Hasidism is extremely subjective. People like those he creates in his wonderful stories never existed.

It is Buber's theory of translation, worked out in dialogue with Franz Rosenzweig, that merits the highest praise and seems much more important to me than either their translation of the Bible or Rosenzweig's translations of Judah Halevi. Here I find an unequivocal insistence on the imperative that the translator must listen to the distinctive voice of someone else and make himself the mouthpiece of the You, allowing the author to address readers who have no other way of hearing him.

Professor Friedman and others may find this small praise, and he, like many other translators, has never learned this lesson. Yet translation is merely one form of reading and interpretation, and what Buber said about translation carries over into these fields and indeed into our relation to other human beings. It is for this reason that I have included Buber among the nine major figures with whom I deal at length in my trilogy, *Discovering the Mind* (1980). I realise that my lecture, printed in *ENCOUNTER*, was anything but the last word on the subject; and since I delivered it I have done a lot more work on these questions, trying to get things clearer.

(2) Friedman's "translation from the German" of a snippet from one of my published letters to Buber is shockingly inaccurate.

(3) To discover the reasons for my alleged wish to dismiss what in fact I am not dismissing, Friedman relies on his recollection of two conversations, one with me, the other with Rafael Buber. The remark he ascribes to me I do not recall, and in any case it remains totally unclear what it could have meant in context. What I do recall is that after hearing the second version of my lecture in New York in February 1978, Friedman told me that this time he liked it *even* better than in Israel the month before. What Rafael Buber may have said to Friedman about me, I do not know; but he was in no position to know much about my attitude toward Martin Buber before 1969. Rafael and I had never met before he came to Princeton in 1969 to ask me to make a new translation of *I and Thou*. I told him, as I had also told Martin Buber long before November 1958, that I had mixed feelings about *I and Thou*. I also suggested that he ask Maurice Friedman to translate the book. But I shall not descend to the level of reporting what Rafael Buber said to me about Friedman.

While I regret the uncharacteristic *ad hominem* character of Friedman's letter, I am grateful for the opportunity he has given me to clear up some misunderstandings.

ONE FINAL REMARK. My so-called "ambivalent attitude toward Buber" does not spring from any disappointment. Unlike Friedman, I am obviously not a disciple, and in her long introduction to the first volume of her edition of Buber's *Briefwechsel*, Grete Schaeder has analysed my relationship to Buber at length with really extraordinary sensitivity. Is my attitude toward Nietzsche or Hegel "ambivalent" and in need of psychological explanations? Many scholars will surely agree with me that it is possible to admire a philosopher in many ways while at the same time disagreeing with him on very important matters. And I have learned from Nietzsche rather than Buber that precisely this stance facilitates genuine dialogue.

WALTER KAUFMANN

Princeton University  
Princeton, New Jersey

## Yalta

READERS of Nikolai Tolstoy's arresting article on the Victims of Yalta in the June issue of *ENCOUNTER* will be interested to know that conditional planning permission has been granted for a memorial fountain to be put up in