



Josef Moural

AN ERROR IN THE CZECH EDITION OF MASARYK–RADLOV CORRESPONDENCE*

В опубликованном в 2015 г. чешском издании переписки Т. Г. Масарика с Э. Л. Радловым редакторы ошибочно идентифицируют книгу, о которой идет речь в письмах, и в итоге допускают хронологическую ошибку, оставляя одно письмо без датировки. Они повторяют (и усугубляют) ошибку, допущенную ранее российским исследователем Е. Ф. Фирсовым в книге 2005 г. «Т. Г. Масарик и российская интеллектуальная среда». Указанная ошибка обусловлена игнорированием перевода второго «Исследования» Д. Юма на немецкий язык, сделанного Масариком в 1883 г. (об этом переводе упоминается в соответствующих письмах Радлова). Редакторы же полагают, что Радлов сначала ожидает, а затем получает пражскую инаугурационную лекцию Масарика о Юме и исчислении вероятностей («Počet pravděpodobnosti a Humova skepse», 1883), а затем ожидает сокращенную версию этой лекции на немецком языке («Dav. Humes Skepsis und die Wahrscheinlichkeitsrechnung», 1884). Печально, что некогда широко известная работа Масарика о Юме в настоящее время остается вне сферы внимания большинства чешских ученых-масариковедов. Например, Ярослав Опат (директор нового Масариковского института Чешской АН) в монографии о философии и политике Масарика в 1882–1893 гг. только называет указанное сочинение Масарика («Eine Untersuchung über die Prinzipien der Moral von David Hume», 1883), а затем полностью его игнорирует.

Ключевые слова: Т. Г. Масарик, Э. Л. Радлов, масариковедение, Д. Юм, Я. Опат, Е. Ф. Фирсов.

In the Czech edition of T. G. Masaryk's correspondence with E. L. Radlov published in 2015, the editors misidentify a book, referred to in the letters, and as a consequence chronologically misplace one letter preserved without dating. They repeat (and magnify) the error committed already by their Russian colleague E. F. Firsov in his book "Т. Г. Масарик и российская интеллектуальная среда" (2005). They all fail to take into account Masaryk's translation of David Hume's second "Enquiry" into German (1883), to which Radlov's expressions such as "your Hume", "Hume" and "your Hume translation" refer in the relevant letters. Instead, the editors assert that Radlov first expects and then receives Masaryk's Prague inaugural lecture on Hume and the calculus of probabilities ("Počet pravděpodobnosti a Humova skepse", 1883), and next expects Masaryk's shortened and modified German version of it ("Dav. Humes Skepsis und die Wahrscheinlichkeitsrechnung", 1884). This is rather significant also as an indication of the rather widespread ignorance of Masaryk's translation of Hume (which could have been, for a while, his internationally best known work) among the Czech Masaryk scholars: thus Jaroslav Opat (the founding director of the new Masaryk Institute of the Czech Academy of Sciences) in his 470-pages-long monograph on Masaryk's philosophy and politics in 1882–1893 first considers it Masaryk's own work ("Eine Untersuchung über die Prinzipien der Moral von David Hume", 1883) and then ignores it completely.

Keywords: T. G. Masaryk, E. L. Radlov, Masaryk scholars, D. Hume, Ja. Opat, E. F. Firsov.

* See the Czech original [8].

In the recently published volume of Thomas G. Masaryk's correspondence with Poles, Russians and Ukrainians [1], the editors misidentify a book, referred to in the letters, and as a result they probably misplace one letter preserved without dating. We are concerned with the early phase of Masaryk's correspondence with Ernest Leopoldovich (or Lvovich) Radlov (1854–1928): the two young men met in Vienna in the first quarter of 1882 [12, p. 331], enjoyed "frequent and long conversations" [12, p. 339] and Radlov even spent the summer 1882 with Masaryk and his young family in the Moravian village Hrušovany at Masaryk's invitation [12, p. 338]. Radlov studied philosophy and became a translator (he translated into Russian Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics* and *On Interpretation*), librarian (he worked in the main St. Petersburg's public library for the most of his life, and in 1917–1924 was its director), an editor of the highest rank (together with Vladimir Solovyov he supervised the philosophical portion of the esteemed 86-volumes Russian encyclopedia of Brockhaus and Efron, published 1890–1907, having written himself over 100 entries, and he edited a number of translations of philosophical works into Russian), a Privy Councillor and a corresponding member of the Russian Academy of Sciences.

According to the editors, Radlov in his letters from 1883 (unfortunately, Masaryk's letters from this period are lost) alludes to Masaryk's intention of sending him a copy of his inaugural lecture¹ *Počít pravděpodobnosti a Humova skepse* [7], then reports his receiving and reading it [1, p. 230, 232], and next alludes to Masaryk's intention of sending him also the German version of the lecture [1, p. 234; 6]. Yet looking closely at Radlov's formulations, we realize rather quickly that there is something wrong with this story. In the letter printed as the first (dated March 1, 1883), Radlov writes: "Ihren Hume erwarte ich mit Vergnügen, obgleich ich diese ethischen Abhandlungen einer alten französischen Übersetzung (Ende des vorigen Jahrhunderts) besitze" [1, p. 229]². Now if Radlov really meant Masaryk's inaugural lecture, it would be rather strange that he characterizes it as ethical investigations, and even stranger that he already owns its almost hundred years old French translation.

Still, the informal character of letters between friends might leave open a possibility that we are facing here some kind of joke that

¹ On the occasion of assuming the professorship of philosophy in 1882 at the newly established Czech-language branch of the old Charles University in Prague, then bearing the name Charles-Ferdinand University.

² Here and elsewhere, I reproduce the dates as found in the manuscripts and do not open the question of their possible conversion between Julian and Gregorian calendar – it makes no difference to the argument of my paper.

is difficult to penetrate for the uninitiated: let us move ahead and see what comes next. In the following letter from April 27, Radlov writes: “Hume habe ich erst gestern bekommen und angefangen zu lesen. Ein fein geschriebenes Buch. Einiges lässt sich jedoch gegen Hume sagen... Es fiel mir auf, dass er z. B. Gerechtigkeit und Billigkeit als 2 identische Begriffe gebraucht, obgleich sie es nicht sind, und alles, was Hume sagt, bloss auf die Gerechtigkeit passt, nicht aber auf die Billigkeit” [1, p. 231]. Again, if Radlov referred to Masaryk’s inaugural lecture, it sure is strange that there is no discussion of justice and entitlement in it.

After next letter from October that contains nothing related to Hume, the editors place an undated letter that starts with the following parenthesized sentence: “(Ihr Buch habe ich für die Bibliothek angeschafft)” and continues: “Meinong’s Hume Studien habe ich erhalten und danke sehr; habe gedacht, es wäre Ihre Hume Übersetzung” [1, p. 233]. According to the editors, Radlov refers here to Masaryk’s German translation (rather, a modified and much shortened version) of his inaugural lecture allegedly expected by Radlov after he received and read the original Czech version [1, p. 234]; and since Masaryk could expect its appearance no sooner than towards the end of 1883, they order the letter chronologically between the end of October and the break 1883/4 (and, to complete the picture, let me remind you that the two volumes of Alexius Meinong’s *Hume Studien* appeared in 1877 and 1882).

It is striking that the editors nowhere discuss – and apparently do not consider at all – the possibility that Radlov refers to Masaryk’s translation of David Hume’s *An Enquiry concerning the Principles of Morals* into German (published 1883) [4]. Yet such identification dispels by one stroke all the accumulated mysteries: it is a series of ethical investigations, it would not be surprising that Radlov already owns its French translation from 18th century, and it contains discussion of justice and entitlement. Besides, we know that during the summer Radlov was spending with the Masaryks, preparing the Hume translation for print was a high priority and Masaryk occasionally had to leave for Vienna to see his publisher [12, p. 338] (the foreword of the translation is dated July 1882), so that it would be only natural that Radlov is interested to see the result of the effort he witnessed and almost participated in.

If it is true that Radlov refers to Masaryk’s Hume translation, there is no reason any more to place the undated fourth Radlov’s letter several months after the first two (as the editors’ reason was that the translation they have in mind would be available only about a year later than the Czech original, allegedly received in April 1882). And indeed, looking at its content we are strongly inclined to believe

that this letter most likely precedes the rest of Radlov's extant letters. For Radlov writes there, first, that "die Dame hat wohl Ihnen schon geschrieben" [1, p. 233] – the lady in question is E. A. Dobromyslova, who decided to translate Masaryk's book *Das Selbstmord als soziale Massenerscheinung der modernen Zivilisation* [5]³ into Russian (and whose letter to Masaryk from February 14, 1883 is extant and included in the edition). Second, Radlov sends Masaryk her address, admitting that it perhaps is superfluous [1, p. 234] (that is, if she indeed already wrote herself). Third (and this point is strongly persuasive), Radlov writes that the news from Dobromyslova got delayed because his expectation to see her around Christmas have not materialized [1, p. 234]: but clearly a delay picked up around Christmas is a lame excuse in a letter from November (preceded by at least three other letters between March and October), and similarly Radlov's uncertainty whether the lady already wrote to Masaryk (in which case Masaryk already has her address) strongly suggest that the letter precedes the other known letters (in which Radlov without further ado simply reports news concerning Dobromyslova). Further, if we accept the proposed identification of Masaryk's "Hume translation", it is clear that the undated letter should precede April 26, 1883, when Radlov already receives the translation (in this letter still only expected)⁴.

To conclude: it is practically certain that in the letters from March 1 and April 27, 1883, Radlov refers to Masaryk's translation of Hume, and it is very likely that the same translation is referred to also in the undated fourth letter placed by the editors in November or December but much more likely preceding the March letter⁵. It is worth noticing that there is a strong tendency among the Czech Masaryk scholars to ignore or neglect his Hume translation: so e.g. in the large book by Jaroslav Opat (the founder and first director, 1990–1997, of the Masaryk Institute at the Czechoslovak – later Czech – Academy of Sciences) *Filozof a politik T. G. Masaryk, 1882–1893* it is first announced to be Masaryk's own piece of writing (!) [10, p. 14]⁶

³ This work was accepted as *Habilitationschrift* by the Vienna university.

⁴ If the proposed ordering of letters is accepted, it is also much more likely that the Masaryk's book obtained for the St. Petersburg library according to the parenthesized first sentence of the letter is the *Selbstmord* rather than the – not yet existing – Czech-language brochure with the inaugural lecture, suggested by the editors [1, p. 234].

⁵ Readers wishing to learn more about Masaryk's relation to Hume's philosophy may consult [9, p. 272–275].

⁶ In due fairness, one should notice that the book is an enlarged version of a text published first in samizdat (1985) and prepared when Dr. Opat was deprived of access to foreign resources and rare books.

and then ignored. Such misconception is apparently quite widespread: see e.g. Jan Pochman's bibliography (1995) [11, p. 98] – and yet Masaryk's Hume translation perhaps was for quite a while his most acclaimed work at the international academic scene (thus e.g. Edmund Husserl makes Masaryk's translation the core reading in his Winter Semester 1908–1909 seminar [14, p. 121]⁷, etc.). A while ago, the Moscow scholar Evgeniy Firsov fell victim to the same error as the Czech editors in his edition of Masaryk's correspondence with Radlov [3, p. 17, 48–50] and in a related article [2].

References

1. Doubek, V., Květina, J. (eds.), *Korespondence T. G. Masaryk – Slované: Poláci, Rusové a Ukrajinci* [Correspondence of T. G. Masaryk and Slavs: Poles, Russians and Ukrainians], vol. 1, Prague: Masarykův ústav AV ČR, 2015.
2. Firsov, Ye.F., *Dva myslitelya – dva druga: Tomash Masarik i Ernest Radlov v perepiske (konets XIX – nachalo XX veka)* [Two thinkers – two friends: Tomas Masaryk and Ernest Radlov in correspondence (late 19 – early 20 centuries)], URL: www.mecenat-and-world.ru/25-28/masarik.htm.
3. Firsov, Ye.F., *T.G. Masarik i rossiyskaya intellektual'naya sreda (po arkhivam Chekhii i Rossii). Ch. 1: Tomash Masarik i Ernest Radlov v nauchnoy i družeskoj perepiske* [Masaryk and the Russian intellectual environment (on the archives of the Czech Republic and Russia). Part 1: Tomas Masaryk and Ernest Radlov in scientific and friendly correspondence], Moscow: Poligrafizdat, 2005.
4. Hume, D., *Eine Untersuchung über die Prinzipien der Moral* [An enquiry concerning the principles of morals], translated by T. G. Masaryk, Wien: Carl Konegen, 1883.
5. Masaryk, T.G., *Das Selbstmord als soziale Massenerscheinung der modernen Zivilisation* [Suicide as a social mass phenomenon of modern civilization], Wien: Carl Konegen, 1881.
6. Masaryk, T.G., *Dav. Hume's Skepsis und die Wahrscheinlichkeitsrechnung: ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Logik und Philosophie* [Dav. Hume's skepticism and the probability calculus: a contribution to the history of logic and philosophy], Wien: Carl Konegen, 1884.
7. Masaryk, T.G., *Počet pravděpodobnosti a Humova skepse: historický úvod v teorii indukce* [The calculus of probabilities and Hume's scepticism: a historical introduction into theory of induction], Prague: J. Otto, 1883.
8. Moural, J., Omyl ve vydání Masarykovy korespondence [A mistake in the publication of Masaryk's correspondence], in *Filosofický časopis* [Philosophical journal], 2018, no. 66.
9. Moural, J., The reception of David Hume in Czech thought, in Jones, P. (ed.), *The Reception of David Hume in Europe*, London, New York: Thoemmes Continuum, 2005.

⁷ On Husserl's further using of Masaryk's translation in his lectures see [13, p. 140–141].

10. Opat, J., *Filozof a politik T. G. Masaryk, 1882–1893* [Philosopher and politician T. G. Masaryk, 1882–1893], Prague: Melantrich, 1990.
11. Pochman, J., A selected bibliography of the most significant works by T. G. Masaryk, in *Czech Sociological Review*, 1995, no. 3.
12. Polák, S., *T. G. Masaryk: Za ideálem a pravdou, vol. 1 (1850–1882)* [T. G. Masaryk: For the sake of the ideal and truth, vol. 1 (1850–1882)], Prague: Masaryk institute AS ChR, 2000.
13. Schuhmann, K., Husserl and Masaryk, in Novák, J. (ed.), *On Masaryk: Texts in English and German*, Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1988.
14. Schuhmann, K., *Husserl-Chronik: Denk- und Lebensweg Edmund Husserls* [Husserl chronicle: Thought and life of Edmund Husserl], The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1977.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31119/phlog.2018.3.9>