

In search of Lutoslawski

Nathan A. GREENBERG

Wincenty Lutoslawski (1863-1954) is the most notorious in the English-speaking scholarly community – it is no small part of the story that English is the language of Lutoslawski's major book (1). Within that community, there is, for the most part, little more than the vague notion that a man named Lutoslawski, a Polish scholar, more or less established the outlines of our understanding of the chronology of Plato's Dialogues and that he and his methods are the objects of criticism, some of which may be justified. Note, for example, his sole mention in Guthrie's monumental *History of Greek Philosophy* :

"The method (of stylometry) was independently pursued by the German Dittenberger (1881) and then by the Pole Lutoslawski (1897), whose claim to determine the order of the dialogues with mathematical exactitude was somewhat overdone and led to criticism." (2)

Lutoslawski also figures prominently in a famous article of 1953 by G.E.L. Owen, "The Place of the *Timaeus* in Plato's Dialogues", and in its equally famous response in 1956 by H.F. Cherniss, "The Relation of the *Timaeus* to Plato's Later Dialogues" (3). Owen gives the stylometry of Lutoslawski short shrift (4). He then goes on to support a later analysis (5) of Platonic clausulae largely, one suspects, because it allows an earlier dating of the *Timaeus*. Cherniss' response with regard to Lutoslawski is terse, since he mainly wishes to demolish Owen's reliance on the clausulae :

"Many of Owen's criticisms of the stylometrists are well founded, and have often been made before. The more sober practitioners of the method have themselves criticised the shortcomings of the pioneer, Campbell, and the mechanical procedure and excessive claims of Lutoslawski and of von Arnim in his later work in this field." (6)

Finally, there has been a recent elaborate utilization of Lutoslawski by Sayre who somewhat hesitantly attempts to remove "the shortcomings so evident" in the criteria of Lutoslawski (7).

Despite the accessibility of the language, Lutoslawski's book is forbidding in length and technicality and it is rarely read. The long third chapter, although it is the smaller part of a book of over 500 pages, is the crucial one. The remainder of the work is an extended analysis of Platonic philosophy which has been allowed to lapse into a decent obscurity (8). It is, however, very well written and it is hard to believe that English is not the writer's native tongue.

Its survey of previous work on the problem of Plato's chronology is very interesting and very useful. There are passages in which Lutoslawski sounds a very sane note :

"Our classification is here proposed not as definitive, but only as a first attempt at a numerical evaluation of stylistic affinities. Future inquirers dealing with many thousands of compared peculiarities may find reasons for a different classification." (p. 151)

One finds the tentative tone and the idea of a first approximation very congenial. So also : "A distinction of only four degrees of importance of stylistic marks might ultimately prove insufficient." (p. 193)

There is even something inspiring in the clarion call for others to participate in the great task :

"Each year in all countries hundreds of students dedicate their time to classical philology. If but one in a dozen undertook a study of Plato's style, within ten years our knowledge of Platonic chronology would have progressed more than in these twenty centuries." (p. 72)

Less fetching is the role that each of these investigators is to play :

"The task of investigating every detail of style seems immense, but the number of persons fit for such work is much greater than the number of those capable of passing judgment on Plato's philosophical doctrine." (*Ibid.*)

This is not a very generous sentiment, and it is one of history's ironies that Lutoslawski himself turns out not to be a member of the elect. In the end, however, it is upsetting to find the tentative tones noted above combined in jarring fashion with the claim for certainty :

"The future science of *stylometry* may improve our methods beyond the limits of imagination, but our chief conclusions can only be confirmed, never contradicted by further research." (p. 193)

Similarly, the "hypothesis" at the bottom of page 151 becomes the "law" at the top of page 152. To be sure, Lutoslawski "tests" his law on pp. 153-161, but one may question the sufficiency of the test (9). Our purpose here, however, is not to go into the details of the flaws in Lutoslawski's large book on Plato. Ritter's review of 1921 and Brandwood's dissertation of 1959 (10) are quite sufficient accounts of these. We are, rather, interested in the personality that truly had a wide and intriguing view of the future possibilities of stylometry and at the same time could behave in such discordant fashion.

So it was that we set out on the trail of Lutoslawski. There were intriguing remarks in his book on Plato : "The peculiar method of research used in the present work is a result of the author's previous study of natural sciences and mathematics (1881-1885)". (p. ix) Again : "As a Pole, the author may possibly be more impartial than the representatives of other nations more active in Platonic research." (*Ibid.*, p. viii). The tone is interesting. Early search produced the following :

"Lutoslawski was a colorful personality. At one time he advocated and practiced yoga, at another he tried to establish an experimental community (in Algeria) for the sole purpose of producing geniuses. He was one of the most striking examples of Polish messianistic philosophers, believing that Poland was created in order to suffer and thus to save the world." (11)

The following biographical details are gleaned from an article by Mollenhauer, an enthusiastic and uncritical admirer (12).

Lutoslawski was born in Warsaw in 1863. After early private education on his father's estate near Warsaw, he had two years' study of mathematics, science and architecture in the Polytechnicum in Riga. He entered the University of Dorpat in 1883 where he studied philosophy under Gustav Teichmueller. In 1885 he took a degree in chemistry and one in philosophy, having condensed eight years of study into the years 1883 to 1885. In 1885 he went to Paris to study romance languages and in 1886 he went to London. In 1888 he published his first book, *Erhaltung und Untergang der Staatsverfassungen nach Plato, Aristoteles und Macchiavelli*.

From 1890 to 1893 he taught philosophy, logic, and psychology in the University of Kazan. He left Kazan to travel and visit the United States and elsewhere. After ten years of study he published his work on Plato. The final version was completed in "a lonely hamlet on the Spanish seashore". After leaving Spain, Lutoslawski took a degree at Helsingfors in 1898. In January, 1900, he began his lectures in the University of Krakow. Before the year was out he was in conflict with the Austrian authorities because of his nationalism.

As a result, he taught philosophy at the Universities of Geneva and Lausanne in 1901-2. Through the friendly influence of William James he was invited to give the Lowell Institute Lectures for 1907 followed by a year of lectures throughout the United States including visits with the late Professor George R. Noyes of the University of California. After his American tour he settled in Warsaw. In 1913, with the help of his wife, he founded what he called the Forge in Chateau Barby, a sort of philosophical seminary for intensive study. During the 1919 Paris Peace Conference he wrote reports for the Polish Boundary Commission and lectured at the Sorbonne. He taught in Wilno for the next ten years. In 1934, he settled in Krakow.

The entry in *Who Was Who, 1951-1960* has some additional details of interest : He was married twice, in 1887 and in 1913, four daughters from the first marriage and a son and daughter from the second. He lectured at Cracow University from 1945-48, but the lectures were stopped by the government because of their anti-materialistic character. His recreations were listed as : travel, friendship, and extensive international correspondence, chiefly on postcards.

The obituary notice in the N.Y. Times, (Jan. 5, 1955, p. 23) after mentioning his book on Plato, adds :

"Dr. Lutoslawski wrote many other books on various subjects including reincarnation, in which he believed, various aspects of mysticism and personality. He wrote fluently in Polish, German, French, Spanish, English, Portuguese, Italian, classical Greek, Latin and Russian. He had known and discussed many things with Mahatma Gandhi and William James, the American psychologist and philosopher, who were among the many notable scholars he numbered among his acquaintances."

We can add the names of Henry Sidgwick, Lewis Campbell, and Constantin Ritter (with whom he corresponded). Indeed, we can detect a pattern in the contacts of Lutoslawski with a number of eminent men of his time. What is noteworthy is not the fact that Lutoslawski met such but the fact that these meetings proved so impressive that we find reverberations of them in print. For example, Lutoslawski met the eminent professor of philosophy, Henry Sidgwick in 1894. They had such an unusual conversation that Sidgwick wrote an account of it in the journal, *Mind*, without, however, giving Lutoslawski's name (13).

Lutoslawski's relationship with the eminent Harvard philosopher and psychologist, William James (1842-1910), is quite well documented (14). Lutoslawski met James in 1893. They began a correspondence which lasted until 1909. James entertained him in his home, endeavored with varying success to obtain lectureships and other appointments for him, read and promoted his writings (15). It is clear that Lutoslawski aroused James' admiration (16). But at the same time, "Lutoslawski's zeal was a little too much - even for James. 'These Slavs', he said, 'seem to be the great radical livers-out of their theories' (17). The preceding sentence from that same letter of 1899 reads :

"He is a *wunderlicher Mensch* : abstractly his scheme is divine, but there is something on which I can't yet just lay my defining finger that makes one feel that there is some need of the corrective and critical and arresting judgment in his manner of carrying it out."

The same letter describes Lutoslawski as "an extraordinary Pole, 36 years old, author of philosophical writings in seven different languages, ... and knower of several more, handsome, and to the last degree genial."

In 1904, James declined to endorse a project of Lutoslawski :

"Your Polish University in London interests me very much, but when you ask me to become its honorary president I have to say no ... My name is already identified with so many unorthodox things, such as psychical research, anti-imperialism, mind-cure medicine, etc., that if I were now to figure as a Polish patriot the only place left for me in public esteem here would be the lunatic asylum !" (18)

James' correspondence with Flournoy is more revealing. "He is," wrote James, "a most lovable man (within safe limits) but sadly psychopathic. Really, I think a genius." (19) Flournoy was less charitable, viewing this "strange mentality" with considerable uneasiness, especially after Lutoslawski confided that he felt himself to be the Messiah foretold by Adam Michiewicz and others. Flournoy confessed that their Polish friend's conversation suggested incipient paranoia, and that he seemed "not quite yet up to the messianic role (20)." Flournoy, a professor in Geneva, reported on some of Lutoslawski's activity there :

"I enjoyed my contacts with this strange mentality, so spontaneous and full of flights of enthusiasm, – but ... I had to play, with respect to his grandiose projects, the ... part of a cold shower. I don't know at what point he is in his enterprise of the *University of Michiewicz*; ... as long as he remains in the airy heights of speculation, all goes well, and he certainly has genius, as you say. ... At the beginning he had an enormous success with his course (which I was never able to attend, unfortunately), but then he made an error with his immoderate language : for example, he bluntly preached the assassination of the Tzar – or at least (I wasn't there) his auditors so understood him – and that didn't please either the non-nihilist Russians in his audience, or the Swiss. ... He announced a course for the summer semester, but did not reappear. ... (21)"

Another letter from James casts further light on his ambivalence toward Lutoslawski. From a letter of June 14, 1904 :

"... Which reminds me of Lutoslawski & his wonderful manuscript. He too is casting wistful eyes on America – this time as a free lecturer. I feel like discouraging him, and I have to admit that to some extent I am animated by selfish fears. I am too easily a prey to 'cranks', and in my own badly neurasthenic condition, too much contact with them poisons me. ... his gifts are enormous; ... The trouble with men of

his type, however intense their affections & elevated their emotions may be, seems to be a certain profound superficiality (if one may use such a phrase) which leaves them deficient in moral delicacy when that is most needed." (22)

Finally a letter of Jan 3. 1908 :

"Lutoslawski came and went, and seems now very well lodged in California. His Boston lectures were weak and amateurish (history of Poland) and altogether, tho his *energies* may have increased and grown more continuous, his mind seems to me to have deteriorated. Egotism & silliness are all ! He got no Yoga pupils here."

Some of the peculiar ideas of Lutoslawski at this time find expression in his book, *World of Souls* (23). In the preface, William James wrote : "Wincenty Lutoslawski honours philosophy; he even adores it, along its platonising traditions; but he finds little use for its sceptical scruples and inhibitions (p. 5)." For example, Lutoslawski describes a strangely Platonic ideal of scholarly reading :

"This truly scholarly reading is a much more difficult critical activity than the mere deciphering of the most difficult text. Such a reader will take for the first time a new book in his hands and will find out in a moment what he wants to know about author or subject, allowing for the imperfections of indexing and guessing rightly under what wrong heading the required information may be concealed; he will move in the greatest library with ease, and a critical insight into the defects of its organisation, even if that library happens to be the Reading Room of the British Museum, the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris, or the Congress Library in Washington; he will be able to gather everywhere the greatest amount of information from given books in the shortest time, to give a clear and correct account of all the works he has ever read, to judge of their value and to connect all these details into a new structure which explains the subject of earlier investigations better than any preceding attempt; he will discover new realities behind the appearances observed by all, new meanings resulting clearly from a given amount of evidence thoroughly searched before (pp. 29-30)."

He then footnotes this extraordinary passage with the following extraordinary sentence :

"This kind of reading is illustrated in chapters i-iii of the author's *Plato's Logic*, in which every opinion expressed by any scholar on Plato's works has been utilised for the final and definitive solution of the problem of the chronology of Plato's dialogues."

There are numerous other such passages. Lutoslawski retells the details of his mystical experience of 1885. We are told elsewhere (24) that it occurred in May on a day when Lutoslawski was reading the *Symposium*. "Suddenly came immediate intuitive certainty, with the evidence of mathematical axioms, and it came to stay (p. 198)." "It is true that only very few human beings obtain an absolute certainty, first of their immortality, then of their pre-existence (25), finally of their sexual destiny." (p. 207)

The contact with Lewis Campbell was described by Campbell himself in the first paragraph of a lengthy review :

"My best friends will smile, while those who know me less may be inclined to scoff at my predicament in calling attention to a volume where some early work of mine receives unwonted benediction. But circumstances, wholly unforeseen, have been too strong for me. In the spring of 1891 I had a letter from Kazan in Russia. It was in English, and the signature was unknown to me. I learned from it that the labour I had spent with eager hope in 1864-66, the first fruits of my Greek Professorship, had not been after all in vain; but had given light to an earnest seeker after truth who was ready to afford me the recognition hitherto withheld : namely, that in my introduction to the *Sophistes and Politicus*, published in 1867, I had really made a long step towards the solution of the problem of the chronological order in which the Platonic Dialogues were composed. This meant much more to me than the terms of general commendation, welcome as they had been, which so distinguished a person as the late Master of Trinity, Dr. W.H. Thompson, had accorded to me. The friendship thus formed by correspondence with Professor Lutoslawski was cemented some years afterwards through personal intercourse, and when I found that my Polish friend was above all things ambitious of making his views known in English, I could not withhold such aid as lay within my power, although I knew that in giving it I might be exposed to some natural misconstruction (26)."

We do not know what that aid was. A reviewer noted Campbell's reaction :

"It was not in human that Professor Campbell should not be pleased, nor can we expect him to scrutinize too closely the details of a work the general conclusions of which are so acceptable (27)."

In 1921, Constantin Ritter published an extensive survey of stylometric approaches to Plato (28), in which, among other things, he describes his contact with Lutoslawski. We only touch on a few non-technical points. The central German succession of scholars in this field consisted of Dittenberger, Schanz, and Ritter himself. This should be kept in mind as one compares the accounts of their work given by Lutoslawski and by Ritter. One of the most valuable parts of Lutoslawski's book is the survey of previous work in the field. Adept as he was in so many languages, Lutoslawski was particularly well situated to overcome the linguistic provincialism which plagued (and continues to plague) international scholarship. However, he wished to do more than simply survey the field; he wanted to make a contribution. One important component of that contribution was to give Lewis Campbell the credit due him as originator of the stylometric approach. As a result, Lutoslawski tended to downgrade the achievements of the German scholars and to exaggerate Campbell's work (29). Ritter, in turn, felt called upon to place Campbell's work back in proper perspective. The process was not a pretty one, although he took pains to express his respect for Campbell. The villain is Lutoslawski, not Campbell (30). In response to Lutoslawski's claim to have placed stylometrics on an improved "scientific" bases, Ritter shows no mercy. His criticism is cutting and telling (31). In accordance with the rich reactions which Lutoslawski tended to provoke, Ritter even produced a sort of Platonic myth, in which Lutoslawski is like the doctor who prescribes old fashioned Peruvian bark instead of the refined quinine we have in the mean time learned how to extract. Quite picturesque. Ritter wants to warn the inexperienced about Lutoslawski so as not to be detoured and "sich zu rechnerischen Spielereien verlocken lasse (32)." He adds information about Lutoslawski's activities :

"In addition, we learn of well received lectures which Lutoslawski delivered to learned societies in Oxford, Glasgow, Edinburgh, Manchester, and Paris on his 'Discovery of the Utility of Accidental Stylistic Features', whereby

'special lexicons of an author receive a completely new importance'. We also hear that, due to the impact of these lectures, the Oxford Philosophical Society has decided to replace the inadequate Plato Lexicon of Ast with a new one, and that the London Hellenic Society as well as the French Académie des Inscriptions had decided to support this undertaking. Soon thereafter he asked me if I would assume the leadership (as also Zeller once suggested to me). I had to refuse. Then Campbell himself wished to take over its conduct and issued a prospectus, but he soon died. I do not know the present status of the matter (33)."

We see here continued testimony of Lutoslawski's characteristic modes of persuasion, including both public presentations and personal contacts. Did Campbell issue his prospectus at the suggestion of Lutoslawski? We do not know. As we have seen above, Lutoslawski later offered the honorary presidency of his proposed Polish university in London to James.

It is time to attempt some summation of Lutoslawski's contribution. One can divide Lutoslawski's famous third chapter into at least three parts. The first is a general defense of the method of stylometrics. The second is the survey of previous work in the field incorporating the listing of 500 selected criteria of style and culminating with the weighted tabulation of those criteria. The third consists of testing the findings in the tabulation and drawing conclusions therefrom. We have seen how the second and third sections have been the objects of justified criticism. Lutoslawski was not equitable in his treatment of his predecessors and he endowed his conclusions with undue certainty. It is in the first part of the chapter that some of his major talents come to the fore. For there can be no doubt that Lutoslawski was a visionary of a grand sort. There is a prophetic fervor, a beckoning to the future, as he defends stylometry and calls for an army of scholars to rise and storm the bastions of our ignorance. He is at his charming best as he notes with selfdeprecatory chagrin that Plato "would have smiled at those who count words in his writings (p. 65)." He overflows with ideas, traces out grandiose huge projects: "A knowledge of the words invented by an author and only once used by him is an important factor in determining questions of style and ascription. We need a full index of such words invented by all authors who lived in Plato's time (p. 67)." This makes almost no sense at all, but appearing as it does, in the midst of a spate of ideas, it is almost persuasive. He outlines

vocabulary studies of all sorts : poetic words, foreign words, rare words, and common words. With regard to the latter, he has the following interesting idea : "Even if we knew the exact number of times each word occurred, there would still remain the task of calculating the opportunities for its occurrence (p. 68)". He adds a very interesting pilot comparative study of the proportions of different parts of speech in the first 500 words of the *Protagoras* and the *Laws* (p. 71). He calls for studies of "the length, construction, and interdependence of phrases; the rhythm produced intentionally or resulting naturally from the order of words selected (p. 71)". And all this long before the advent of computers.

Lutoslawski was, as the sociologists say, a marginal figure. As a Pole, he was the eternal foreigner in every modern scholarly community. It was a role he relished, allowing him, as he thought, to become the great synthesizer, crossing linguistic and cultural barriers. Just so, he saw himself bridging the gap between the physical sciences and humanistic studies and, finally, he saw himself as a bridge between the past and the present. The beliefs in immortality and reincarnation are suggestive. His fantastic portrayal of himself as the perfect philosopher-scholar bears no small resemblance to the Platonic philosopher-king.

A final assessment of his role in the history of Plato studies and in the history of stylometrics must remain subject to debate. There were clearly flaws in his treatment of the subject, but it may be that Ritter and his predecessors had done about as much as could reasonably be done. Their results were good, and fairly strongly established. Without being aware of notions of statistical error, they had not overrefined their results. Going further would have been subject to rapidly diminishing returns, a great deal of effort for very little added result. It was only with Owen's attempt to displace the *Timaeus*, that interest in the matter grew up again. As a result, despite the flaws in his work, Lutoslawski became the great publicizer of the new orthodoxy in the chronology of the Platonic dialogues and this may have been a useful role. With the invention of the computer, the logistics of research have changed and it may now be possible to respond to the width of Lutoslawski's vision with greater circumspection.

Notes

- (1) *The Origin and Growth of Plato's Logic* (London : Longmans, Green, and Co.: 1897, reissued, 1905). Only the latter has been available to me.
- (2) (Cambridge Univ. Pr. 1975) vol. IV, p. 49. It is quite misleading to say that Lutoslawski's pursuit of the "method" was independent, nor would Lutoslawski have claimed as much. In his soberer passages, he saw himself as a synthesizer of the previous researches of others.
- (3) Both articles are conveniently reprinted in R. E. Allen, *Studies in Plato's Metaphysics* (London, 1965). (References are to pagination in Allen).
- (4) Owen's major criticisms of Lutoslawski :
 - (a) Lutoslawski assumed a stylistically uniform *Laws* as the final work.
 - (b) Lutoslawski forgot in practice that the *Timaeus'* unique content should not allow its vocabulary to be used as a test of dating.
 - (c) "And he (Lutoslawski) discovered, after compiling his much-quoted tables on the opposite principle, that the opportunity for the occurrence of more or fewer stylistic pointers in a work bears no proportion to its volume. His admission that only equal amounts of text should have been compared (p. 185) had the effect of largely invalidating his own and most earlier and later attempts to order the dialogues by relative affinities of style". (Allen, *ibid.*, p. 314).

In response to these points, it is not clear how or why the assumption of a uniform *Laws* should have been modified or omitted. The two sentences in Owen's third point seem to be in conflict. If the occurrence of 'pointers' has no relation to volume, then there is no need to use samples of uniform size. (Sayre repeats this criticism in rather uncritical fashion. See below, note 7, page 260). In fact, Lutoslawski took varying volumes very much into account. He was, however, confused on the subject of words occurring only once in a dialogue. He saw no good way of comparing a *hapax* in a long work with one in a short, since a word cannot occur less than once and still be present (p. 146).

 - (d) "Cases arose in which Campbell and Lutoslawski were compelled to exercise their discretion. ... The effect was, reasonably, to discredit mechanical stylometry ..." (Allen, *ibid.*, p. 314).

Again, Owen seems to have missed an important point. The goal was not and is not a "mechanical" process. The point is worth emphasizing, for Owen's assumption was and is a common one. Lutoslawski, to his credit, insisted that the opposite was the case, although his use of his notorious table does approach the mechanical. The lesson needs repeating. The arrival of the computer did not mean that analysts no longer need to apply critical acumen.
- (5) L. Billig, "Clausulae and Platonic Chronology", *J. Philol.*, 35 (1920), pp. 225-256.
- (6) Allen, *ibid.*, p. 341. Cherniss here gives references to Reader and Ritter.

- (7) Kenneth M. Sayre, *Plato's Late Ontology : A Riddle Resolved*, Princeton Univ. Press, 1983 :
- "My purpose in this brief discussion is not to remake Lutoslawski's method into a reliable technique for detecting chronological differences among the dialogues. I doubt that this can be done at all, and surely am not prepared to undertake it myself. Nevertheless, it would be unrealistic to assume that stylistic indicators are of *no* value with respect to chronology; and it would appear to be an interesting exercise in itself to approach Lutoslawski's data with a set of criteria that avoid the shortcomings so evident in his (p. 264)."
- A central thesis for Sayre is that the *Timaeus* is earlier than the *Parmenides* or at least not clearly later than the second part of the *Parmenides*. As one might expect, Sayre's results indicate that the *Timaeus* is earlier, but close inspection reveals a basic flaw : he has not made allowance for the fact that the *Timaeus* contains practically no exchanges of question and answer. When such allowance is made, Sayre's result no longer holds.
- (8) Contemporary reviewers rightly concentrated on the stylometric chapter, but a few took the remainder of the book to task. Susemihl, *Woch. f. d. kl. Philol.* 15 (1898) pp. 453-454, characterised some of the argumentation as worthy of the prosecution in the Zola case. The reviewer in *The Athenaeum* of Jan. 29, 1898, said "that the necessities of the case lead our author to indulge in a good deal of special pleading (p. 146)."
- (9) None of the seventeen "tests" applied by Lutoslawski (pp. 154-161) contradicted his findings, but this is far from being equivalent to confirmation. As we see below, Ritter likened the good results to those of a physician prescribing Peruvian bark, i.e., it works after a fashion.
- (10) L. Brandwood, *The Dating of Plato's Works by the Stylistic Method - A Historical and Critical Survey*, University of London, 1958. For Ritter, see below, note 28.
- (11) Henryk Skolimowski, *Polish Analytical Philosophy : A Survey and a Comparison with British Analytical Philosophy*, (London : Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1967), p. 28.
- (12) Bernhard Mollenhauer, "Lutoslawski and the Knight among the Nations", *The American Slavic and East European Review* 13 (1954), pp. 245-251.
- (13) H. Sidgwick, "A Dialogue on Time and Common Sense", *Mind*, 19 (1894), pp. 441-448. Lutoslawski reports the conversation in "A Theory of Personality", *Mind* 47 (1922) pp. 54-55, adding the footnote that : "He (Sidgwick) did not even understand that it was not fair to call a Pole a Russian professor because he taught at a Russian University". The account is repeated in W. Lutoslawski, *The World of Souls* (London, 1924), p. 199.
- (14) James wrote a preface, dated August, 1899, for Lutoslawski's *The World of Souls* (London, 1924) and in the Introduction, Lutoslawski describes that relationship as he saw it. We have in addition, H. James, ed., *The Letters of William James* (Boston, 1920), two

volumes); R. B. Perry, *The Thought and Character of William James* (Boston, 1935, two volumes); and R. C. Le Clair, ed., *The Letters of William James and Theodore Flournoy* (Madison, 1966).

- (15) Perry (above, note 14), p. 213.
- (16) Lutoslawski has excerpted a number of such remarks of admiration from their correspondence in *The World of Souls*, p. 15.
- (17) Perry (above, note 14), p. 213.
- (18) Perry (above, note 14), p. 216.
- (19) Letter of April 24, 1902, in Le Clair (above, note 14), p. 117.
- (20) Le Clair (above, note 14), pp. 107-108.
- (21) Le Clair (above, note 14), pp. 118-119.
- (22) Le Clair (above, note 14), p. 157.
- (23) The book had a checkered history told at length in the introduction. Lutoslawski wrote the book in 1897 in English but could not find a publisher until 1924. However, James knew and admired a German version published in 1899, as well as the original manuscript. He wrote the preface in order to help Lutoslawski find a publisher in English, pp. 14-15.
- (24) Mollenhauer (above, note 12), p. 246.
- (25) Lutoslawski expended great effort in arguing that pre-existence and palingenesis did not run counter to Catholic doctrine. See *World of Souls*, p. 200, and letter of Flournoy in Le Clair (above, note 14), p. 155.
- (26) *The Fortnightly Review* 69 (1898) pp. 36 ff.
- (27) *The Nation* Vol. 67, N° 1731, p. 168. The review continues: "The point of view of a cis-Atlantic critic is more objective, and, while recognizing the praiseworthy industry and ingenuity that has gone to the making of this book, he may and must warn the general reader and the young student against accepting its elaborate refinements of method and its confident conclusions as science."
- (28) Constantin Ritter, "Bericht ueber die in den letzten Jahrzehnten ueber Platon erschienenen Arbeiten", *Bursian's Jahresbericht ueber die Fortschritte der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft*, vol. 187 (1921) : pp. 1-227.
- (29) For example: "... Dittenberger had the great merit of extending the stylistic study to the relative frequency of synonyms; herein he developed independently an idea to which Campbell had alluded in a footnote (p. xxxii) when he quoted fourteen words of increased frequency in the later dialogues." (Lutoslawski, pp. 103-104). Only a very charitable reading of Campbell's note will extract Dittenberger's idea out of it.
- (30) The major citation is Ritter (above, note 28), pp. 131-132.
- (31) Here is a major citation: "Das Gegenteil von dem, was er da zu seinem Ruhme verkundet, duerfte richtig sein. Lutoslawski hat die Methode sprachlicher Untersuchungen zum Behuf mechanischer

Anwendung vergroebert und ihr dadurch bei einsichtsvollen Beurteilern gewiss nur geschadet. ... Als ob hundert, 2-, 3-, 5 hundert zweifelhafte, gar verschiedene Deutung zulassende Indizien ueberhaupt die Beweiskraft von wenigen wirklich guten, mit denen sie zusammengeworfen werden, erhoehen koennten !" (Ritter (above, note 28), p. 128).

(32) Ritter (above, note 28), p. 131.

(33) Ritter (above, note 28), pp. 127-128. (My translation).