DOMINIKA CZAKON
NATALIA ANNA MICHNA
LESZEK SOSNOWSKI

Jagiellonian University in Kraków

On the Difficult Academic and Personal Relationship of Roman Ingarden and Kazimierz Twardowski

Abstract

The present article has the character of a historical review concerning an important part of the biography of Roman Witold Ingarden. In his memoirs, Ingarden included several facts and accusations, and mentioned individuals who, in his opinion, had a negative influence on the development of his academic career, especially regarding his ability to obtain a position at Jan Kazimierz University in Lviv. The reasons for this, which were various and numerous, appeared from the moment Ingarden obtained habilitation. Not without significance were the opinions of his fellow philosophers concerning phenomenology in general and Ingarden's research papers in particular. In each case, the focal point at which all academic and organisational events concerning philosophy converged was the person of Kazimierz Twardowski. A discussion of the period of their collaboration in Lviv is preceded by a presentation of the situation some years earlier, in which Ingarden combined work as a middle-school teacher, original philosophical work, and, finally, work on habilitation.

Key words: Roman Ingarden, Kazimierz Twardowski, Edmund Husserl, Jan Kazimierz University of Lviv, habilitation

In the Service of Philosophy

As Ingarden's correspondence shows, his relationship with Twardowski was very close, even cordial, although not devoid of the formalism resulting from the customs of that time. Ingarden kept Twardowski informed about private matters and turned to him for advice on academic, publishing, and occupational issues, the most important being the issue of habilitation. In a letter dated 20 February 1922, he wrote to Twardowski that "a decision is necessary as to which mistress to serve exclusively – philosophy or school".¹ At the roots of this problem lay varied, though equally strong, factors: on one hand, the need for his own development, on the other, the need to support his family. Reconciling these needs was possible only on condition of making philosophy his profession as an academic teacher; this, in turn, demanded the fulfilment of certain requirements.

In the same letter, Ingarden posed a question about the possibility of achieving habilitation with Twardowski, accompanying it with doubts and reservations: "I wanted to form an idea as to whether the matter of potential habilitation lay in the realm of possibility or not".² Twardowski cut them off by writing:

I'll be very glad if you apply for habilitation in Lviv. I believe that your papers to date provide a full guarantee that you possess the capacity to effectively prepare and apply for a docenture in philosophy. On this [sic!] point, I have no doubts. More than once I have thought that you should become habilitated in philosophy [17 March 1922].

Twardowski's opinion was consistent with Ingarden's inner conviction regarding the choice of a path in life. From his recollections, there emerges

¹ All letters quoted in the text, unless otherwise indicated, derive from The Roman Ingarden Digital Archive, accessed February 15, 2019, <http://ingarden.archive.uj.edu.pl>. See also: *Korespondencja Romana Witolda Ingardena z Kazimierzem Twardowskim* [The Correspondence of Roman Witold Ingarden with Kazimierz Twardowski], eds. Radosław Kuliniak, Dorota Leszczyńska, and Mariusz Pandura (Kęty: Wydawnictwo Marek Derewiecki, 2016).

² The notation of quotations has been modernised; for the originals, see: The Roman Ingarden Digital Archive.

an internal certainty concerning his possession of knowledge and philosophical skills. Now Twardowski confirmed this conviction, not for reasons of courtesy, writing:

For I know you as an individual who takes the task of philosophy [...] seriously [...] thus I'm convinced that by choosing the profession of an academic teacher of philosophy, you'll be acting in accordance with your deepest passions and moving in the direction your talent has destined for you. Accordingly, I invite you to begin work on your habilitation thesis [17 March 1922].

During the exchange of formal and academic information, there were personal confessions which raised the contact between the philosophers to the plane of a personal relationship. In his letter of 13 August 1922, Twardowski, wishing to lift the spirits of Ingarden, who was exhausted from his many responsibilities, recalled the period of his own habilitation in Vienna, when he had a wife and daughter to support. As a result, he understood Ingarden well, and therefore came forward with a proposal to help in the Ministry of Education if Ingarden were to make efforts to obtain a reduction in class hours, efforts which could be supported by the Council of the Faculty of History and Philosophy.

There is ample proof of Twardowski's understanding and kindness. In inviting Ingarden to the first Polish Philosophical Congress in Lviv, he added in justification that "it's very important to me that the Congress should not lack a representative of the direction represented by Husserl" [20 January 1923; 8 April 1923]. However, responding to Ingarden's concerns about the comprehensibility of the abstract he had sent for the Congress materials ("due to its compact length, I had to give just the skeleton of my reasoning, which must have affected its intelligibility" [8 July 1923]), he replied with disarming honesty: "For those who are unaccustomed to Husserl's views and terminology, it [the abstract]'ll probably be incomprehensible and would remain so even if you made it twice or three times as long. For the 'initiated', however, I think it'll be comprehensible" [19 July 1923].

In his letters, Twardowski noted Ingarden's reviewing activity, which he considered to be "highly positive", since it contributed to the "revival

of the philosophical movement” in Poland.³ But at the same time, he expressed his concern with a request that Ingarden should “concentrate on preparation of the habilitation work and achieve habilitation as urgently as possible. Subsequently, the transfer to Lviv would go through, and thus substantial succor would arrive for our depleted philosophical group in Lviv!” [20 January 1923]. The care with which Twardowski sketched out the near future for Ingarden is endearing, as is the remark about support for the group of Lviv philosophers, in which he indirectly expressed appreciation of the results of Ingarden’s work.

Ingarden understood these nuances, and thus in his reply to Twardowski expressed “gratitude to you for introducing me to philosophical studies, which enabled me to subsequently continue my studies in Göttingen”. At the time, Ingarden considered Lviv his home town, to which he would gladly return, not only for sentimental considerations, which would lead him to renew his old “nodes”, but also because he had discovered its academic atmosphere, which Warsaw and other Polish cities lacked [27 January 1923].

At the beginning of August, Ingarden sent Twardowski his post-doctoral dissertation. In an accompanying letter, he wrote that he was doing so “with my heart in my mouth”. His fears stemmed from his perception that in Poland he could not “count on any sympathy for the general position I occupy. Most likely it’ll be what’s happened here more than once already: a fight not over my own statements, but over the fact that, allegedly, Husserl is speaking through me in everything I say” [5 August 1923]. He repeated these fears in the next letter he sent that month, writing: “the results of my dissertation would again be rejected because ‘that’s Husserl’ and that a polemic would be launched against Husserl instead of me” [16 August 1923]. Twardowski himself had given Ingarden the basis for such thinking, having written two weeks earlier of “initiation” in the thought of Husserl. Although these fears were not shared by Twardowski himself, they were not unfounded.

At the end of October, Twardowski wrote to Ingarden that he was reading the paper “with great interest” and that his “reading, or rather study, of the paper is proceeding very slowly”, since he wished “to immerse [himself] thoroughly in [Ingarden’s] thought processes, for both material and

³ This refers to Ingarden’s reviews concerning Leon Chwistek and Tadeusz Kotarbiński.

personal reasons". The second, personal consideration is not quite clear; it seems that it should be understood as the expression of a personal attitude towards Ingarden, and thus as the confirmation of a friendly relationship. On the other hand, the material attitude is understandable, even natural, since the assessment of the paper, and consequently, the acceptance of Ingarden's habilitation, depended on this attitude. Twardowski went on to write: "You've put an enormous amount of effort into your research, and what I've seen of your paper so far most strongly predisposes me in its favour [...] I don't think, generally, that our communication will encounter any obstacles" [29 October 1923]. He confirmed this three months later, accepting Ingarden's dissertation on essential questions. At that point he wrote: "I wished to immediately give you some solid information [...] your paper on essential questions complies most fully with the requirements I've established for a habilitation thesis, and, based on this paper, I'm prepared to conduct your habilitation in philosophy" [10 February 1924].

Habilitation and the Game of Appearances

During the period in question, Twardowski was certainly kind to Ingarden, challenging his hesitation and helping him in his academic development. The evidence is abundant and of a varied nature. Twardowski wrote a summary of Ingarden's habilitation dissertation, and tactfully – as Ingarden believed – postponed the habilitation colloquium due to "poor relations with the Department" ("he couldn't proceed with my habilitation, since it would be *a limine* [Latin: from the outset] a lost cause"⁴). The picture of a benevolent guardian was supplemented by information Twardowski included in the same letter concerning the composition of the habilitation commission. "I just wish to draw attention to the fact that, in addition to myself, the habilitation committee includes Prof. Wartenberg, who, as you doubtless are aware, attaches importance to acquaintance with Kant" [10 February 1924]. Ingarden took Twardowski's warning seriously, replying fearfully:

⁴ Roman Ingarden, "Dzieje mojej 'kariery uniwersyteckiej'" [The History of My 'University Career'], *Kwartalnik Filozoficzny* 27, no. 2 (1999): 190.

I thank you as well for calling my attention to Prof. Wartenberg's requirements. I'd already thought about this myself, with some trepidation, since Kant is one of those philosophers that is so difficult and at the same time obscure that I've never been able to acquaint myself with his philosophy to the extent I ought to [14 February 1924].

Even further, Twardowski suggested possible problems with respect to Wartenberg: "For me, certain misgivings are connected with the fact that your paper is to be read by Prof. Wartenberg". These fears concerned the "formal competencies" of both professors; on a certain issue, Wartenberg occupied a "position opposed" to that of Twardowski; as a result, "the issue was left at a standstill – and who knows whether it'll fall through completely?" Twardowski associated Wartenberg's position with his state of health and expressed anxiety as to whether he himself might not be "similarly surprised in the matter of your habilitation. I am naturally willing to conduct it, even, possibly, in opposition to Prof. Wartenberg, but the matter may be delayed if he makes it difficult (as I suspect) to arrange" [16 March 1924]. Ingarden did not know, of course, on which issue Wartenberg opposed Twardowski; nor did he know how real the threat from Wartenberg was. However, he must have felt anxiety, despite Twardowski's declaration that he was prepared to conduct Ingarden's habilitation, difficulties notwithstanding.

Either way, Ingarden received the overt warning which was undoubtedly the point of Twardowski's words. Treating it seriously, Ingarden understood, of course, that he might become a victim of a game which for him was a mystery – all the more so given that prior to the habilitation process he had had no personal contact with Wartenberg, nor were there any theoretical similarities in their work. He wrote about this directly in his reply to Twardowski:

I was worried a little about potential difficulties in connection with Mr Wartenberg [...]. Thus, theoretically, nothing connects me with Prof. Wartenberg; I suppose that everything divides us; thus I suppose my work is incapable of pleasing Mr Wartenberg. But too bad [19 March 1924].

In view of the above, Ingarden was surprised to receive a letter from Wartenberg, in which the latter, anticipating the course of events, put paid

to the issue of the alleged threat from his side. The letter certainly included a clear acknowledgment of the situation and understanding of the difficult situation in which Twardowski had embroiled Ingarden. Wartenberg wrote: "You will not encounter any difficulties from me" [6 April 1924]. The assurance astonished Ingarden himself. Was it an expression of the courtesy of an elder department colleague? Would it have been necessary if there had been no such difficulties at all? Was Wartenberg suggesting that it might have been different in the case of other individuals? He was aware, of course, of internal games and thus was not simply, in this manner, warning his younger colleague. Ultimately, the course of the examination confirmed Wartenberg's warning, for he understood well the ambiguous context of Ingarden's situation. It is possible to assume that he was giving his younger colleague a clear signal not to carry over his relationship with Twardowski to Wartenberg. What, then, characterised this relationship?

Twardowski, at that time, was making efforts to create a third chair for Kazimierz Ajdukiewicz. The plan was unsuccessful, due, *inter alia*, to Wartenberg's opposition. In forcing the project through, however, Twardowski acquired additional enemies within the department. Aware of the prevailing mood, and not wishing to expose Ingarden to failure, Twardowski expressed in a letter to the latter the suggestion that the date of the colloquium should be postponed. Concealing the formal reasons ("faculty politics") at the expense of transparency ("someday, I [will] tell you what it's all about"), using emotional arguments ("a terrible coincidence"), and creating an atmosphere of secrecy ("I'm writing this to you in complete confidence"), he assured Ingarden that the delay would have no negative effects ("this coincidence will not damage your interests"). With Ingarden's welfare in mind, he suggested that his habilitation should not "be placed on the faculty agenda before a certain other matter is settled", and in conclusion pushed full disclosure of the matter off into the future ("when, someday, I tell you what it's all about, you'll probably agree that I was right") [10 February 1924]. This letter sheds light on Twardowski's game, in which Ingarden, although reduced to the role of a pawn, proved himself a capable player.

The colloquium was finally held on 27 June 1924; from Ingarden's memoirs we learn that he fielded questions from Twardowski, Wartenberg, Ryszard Ganszyniec, and mathematicians, among whom Hugo Steinhaus

took the leading role. From the perspective of many years, he assessed them as trivial or malicious. At the time, however, Ingarden could not accurately assess personal relationships among university personnel; he gradually came to understand them only following his introduction to the environment as a *privatdozent*. He learned then that Twardowski had “terrible relationships” with Wartenberg, Ganszyniec, and the other departments, particularly with the mathematicians. The reasons were essentially similar, being based on a conflict of interest. Wartenberg did not accept his “tactless behaviour in trying to force Ajdukiewicz into the third chair in Lviv”.⁵ Ganszyniec, a classical philologist, had his “accounts to settle with Twardowski concerning the history of philosophy”. The mathematicians were engaged in a collective dispute with Twardowski concerning the third chair, since they were promoting Leon Chwistek for the position, with whom Ingarden was, in a literal sense, “embroiled”, due to his critical review of Chwistek’s book *Wielość rzeczywistości* [The multiplicity of realities]; this may have constituted an additional element in the mathematicians’ reluctance. Ingarden, being promoted by Twardowski, was automatically perceived as “his man”, making him a potential victim of these games, which could be easily played for the promotor’s behaviour.

One can reflect here on the emotions to which outstanding academics with unblemished moral reputations were subject, and imagine the various intrigues and slanders which must have taken place behind the scenes of official meetings of university bodies. To Ingarden, these were foreign and remote, since at that time he was experiencing another kind of stress related to his habilitation. Its confirmation was delayed for nine months – months full of pressure and doubt. Twardowski informed Ingarden as follows: “the approval of your habilitation arrived – just today” and sent his congratulations “on this and your formal admission to the faculty of our University”. He added that he wished “that this ‘admission’, in the practical and not merely in the legal sense, might be accomplished as soon as possible” [18 March 1925]. The desired document confirmed Ingarden’s

⁵ Concerning the issue of the third chair for Ajdukiewicz, see: Ryszard Jadcak, “Kazimierz Ajdukiewicz w Warszawie w latach 1926-1928,” *Nowa Krytyka* no. 5 (1995): 179-90.

right to lecture on philosophy. The actual previous co-operation had acquired a formal framework; still lacking was the “spatial” dimension mentioned by Twardowski. In order to accomplish this, in August of that year Ingarden relocated from Toruń to Lviv, at which point he began work as a *privatdozent*.

It may have seemed that nothing now stood in the way of the young independent researcher – who, importantly, enjoyed the support of Twardowski himself – being quickly awarded a chair in the Department of Philosophy of Jan Kazimierz University. This, however, did not happen, and the desired chair was, for the next eight years, the subject of a dispute which aroused strong emotions. Ingarden did not obtain the chair until 1933, at which point he became a full-fledged member of the university faculty. Naturally the question arises: what were the reasons for this delay? Ingarden’s son, Roman Stanisław Ingarden, responds without hesitation that Twardowski himself was an obstacle to Ingarden’s university career: “despite his habilitation in 1924, he was not admitted to the university faculty for many years, among other reasons due to Twardowski, with whom he began his philosophical studies in Lviv and with whom he achieved habilitation”.⁶ Roman Stanisław, however, recalled many friendly contacts with Twardowski, “with whom my father always wanted to maintain the best possible relationship despite all the humiliations he had suffered thanks to him”.⁷ Such an inconsistent picture of Twardowski, as presented here in two powerful sentences, may come as a surprise.

A Bitter Friendship

The issue of habilitation had been concluded, as was natural given that the applicant had met all of the formal and substantive requirements. This matter, however, was not at all unambiguous, as we learn from a conversation between Ingarden and Twardowski at a time when they were already departmental colleagues. Ingarden noted in his memoirs that “in 1928,

⁶ Roman Stanisław Ingarden, “Wstęp do *Archiwaliów ojca*” [Introduction to My Father’s Archives], *Kwartalnik Filozoficzny* 27, no. 2 (1999): 173.

⁷ Ibid., 179.

Twardowski told me that prior to my habilitation, the Warsaw professors had ‘expressed astonishment’ that Twardowski wanted to conduct my habilitation”.⁸ These professors were Twardowski’s former students, such as Stanisław Leśniewski and Tadeusz Kotarbiński, who did not value Ingarden as a philosopher. Why, then, did Twardowski decide to support Ingarden in his habilitation efforts, given that he held (as it turned out) an opinion similar to that of his students?

The role Twardowski played in Ingarden’s life had both a bright and a dark side. The former represented the period prior to habilitation, the latter the period that followed. The matter of the chair at Jan Kazimierz University undoubtedly casts a personal shadow on Twardowski. The first stage of the efforts of various academics to obtain this chair took place in the first few months of 1924, ending in failure. As Ingarden was still awaiting his colloquium, these efforts did not concern him at all. The situation was different in the final months of 1926, for it seemed to Ingarden that he would find a positive solution to his personal and professional problems. Accordingly, he wrote that Twardowski “pushed through the creation of the third chair in Lviv. I thought it was for me”. In both cases, however, the chair was intended for Ajdukiewicz, who, in his role as son-in-law, was naturally (due to family ties) supported by Twardowski.⁹ Even though ultimately this chair was not created, Ingarden realised that Ajdukiewicz was a powerful rival – all the more because Ingarden was essentially competing with Twardowski himself. Roman Stanisław Ingarden observed in this context that “Twardowski was able to triumph in nearly every situation in order to support [Ajdukiewicz]; he was an incredibly intelligent and experienced tactician of university politics”.¹⁰ In the light of knowledge of Twardowski’s actions, one must agree with this opinion, even if it is not positive in every aspect.

Having begun his academic work, Ingarden signalled his interest in obtaining the university chair. Confirmation of this can be found in Twar-

⁸ Ingarden, “Dzieje,” 191.

⁹ See Ryszard Jadcak, “Lwowski okres w działalności naukowo-dydaktycznej Kazimierza Ajdukiewicza” [The Lviv Period in the Academic and Didactic Activity of Kazimierz Ajdukiewicz], *Edukacja Filozoficzna* 21 (1996): 249–58.

¹⁰ Ingarden, “Wstęp,” 179.

dowski's response to him on 19 November 1925: "I told him that there were no prospects for creating a third philosophy chair; nor is it known how Wartenberg would view his candidacy – thus it's likely his lot to wait until one of the present professors dies or retires".¹¹ Two things are striking here: the re-introduction of Wartenberg in the role of a bogey, and the prophetic – from today's perspective – words concerning the conditions for Ingarden's assumption of the chair.

It must have been with bitter satisfaction that in this context Ingarden read a letter from Husserl in which the latter wrote to him concerning his own retirement and the commission tasked with choosing his successor. Husserl, who, in an advisory role, was able to propose his own successor, added a passage of importance for Ingarden in this letter: "If you were to undergo habilitation in Germany and, in the best case, submit one more dissertation, you'd be in the running – in any case, you'd have, given the number of positions to be filled, good prospects of obtaining an ordinary professorship" [Freiburg, 26 December 1927]. Ingarden could not expect such a high evaluation in Poland. He was obliged to work for several years to come in order to strengthen his position to the point of being taken seriously in his efforts to obtain the chair.

In July of the following year, Husserl sent Twardowski, "as a globally recognised representative of Polish philosophy", a request to support Ingarden's efforts to obtain a university chair in Poland. Twardowski, however, in a letter dated 17 August 1928, refused him and added an important remark: "even those who cannot be accused of a lack of understanding have, given the small number of chairs of philosophy in Poland, objections to one of them being entrusted to a representative – as they say – of a particular philosophical direction".¹² One of those who could not be accused of a lack of understanding was certainly Twardowski, who supported himself with an impersonal argument about an opinion-forming philosophical

¹¹ Kazimierz Twardowski, *Dzienniki*, vol. 1: 1915-1927 [Diaries. Vol. 1, 1915-27], ed. Ryszard Jadcak (Warszawa: Polskie Towarzystwo Filozoficzne; Toruń: Wydawnictwo Adam Marszałek, 1997), 205.

¹² See Ryszard Jadcak, "Kilka faktów o Romanie Ingardenie w świetle korespondencji Kazimierza Twardowskiego" [Some Facts Concerning Roman Ingarden in Light of the Correspondence of Kazimierz Twardowski], *Kwartalnik Filozoficzny* 21, no. 1 (1993): 20.

milieu. It is also not difficult to discern what he meant by “a particular philosophical direction”.

In closing this aspect of the issue, let us invoke Husserl’s letter dated December of that year, in which he informs Ingarden of Twardowski’s refusal and of the fact that he does not trust him.

I would like to earnestly ask you to speak to him exclusively on academic subjects, and never to bring up fears regarding your career [...]. Follow your own agenda, as far as possible; in the end you will force these empty heads to nod under the weight of your achievements [23 December 1928].

It may be assumed that Husserl’s correspondence with Twardowski brought results opposite to those intended. The latter did not appreciate phenomenology; he misjudged Ingarden as a philosopher, writing that he was “completely incomprehensible” and that his works were worthless. This probably explains the position held by Twardowski, who, while giving Ingarden a negative answer, nearly simultaneously initiated efforts to create a chair for Ajdukiewicz, efforts which dragged on for the next two years before culminating in a positive outcome in March 1928. During this period, Twardowski, or his students, held talks at the level of the highest state offices. Twardowski himself attended a meeting with Prime Minister Kazimierz Bartel; Tadeusz Czeżowski and Tadeusz Kotarbiński intervened with the ministry; and Twardowski’s brother Julius staged another intervention with Bartel. Thus one must agree with the opinion of Roman Stanisław Ingarden that Twardowski was, in fact, an excellent “tactician of university politics”. Ajdukiewicz was appointed as an associate professor in Lviv on 24 February 1928, simultaneously vacating his chair at the University of Warsaw.

Ingarden had been interested in the Warsaw chair; he even obtained the sympathetic support of Władysław Witwicki, who had come forward with this suggestion. In Warsaw, however – as Ingarden wrote – “various tricks were played to keep me from the chair”. It even reached the point that, after various typographical errors had been employed to obstruct Ingarden’s candidature, “it was declared that this was supposed to be a chair of the *history* of philosophy”, even though it had been occupied by Jan

Łukasiewicz and Ajdukiewicz. To himself, Ingarden mocked the creators of the new conditions, as it was clear that both of these philosophers had “as much in common with the history of philosophy as I do with Chinese”.¹³ As a result of this “manoeuvring”, as Ingarden stated, the chair that had previously belonged to philosophy was transformed into a chair of archaeology, which was then occupied by Kazimierz Michałowski. “They preferred to lose the philosophy chair rather than let me speak” – thus Ingarden himself concluded his description of the Warsaw incident.

In the fall of 1928, Twardowski became ill, and in June 1929 applied for retirement. “It began to seem”, wrote Ingarden, “that prospects were opening up for me in Lviv. And then Twardowski began to play an extremely clever game”.¹⁴ This game was not on behalf of someone – Ajdukiewicz had already received his chair – but against someone. In this “delaying game”, Ingarden’s application was held in the dean’s office from June 1929 to January 1930; it was not formally accepted until 30 April 1930. A committee established to appoint a new professor in June failed to meet, as a result of Twardowski’s game, until the autumn of that year. During this time, Ingarden suggested to the dean that Husserl should be asked for his opinion on the matter. The suggestion was rejected, although a precedent existed in the case of Chwistek, who, in a similar situation had presented the opinions of Bertrand Russell and Ernst Mach. Meanwhile, in December, Ingarden’s book *Das literarische Kunstwerk* [*The Literary Work of Art*], which “made a huge impression on the Department”, appeared. “Ajdukiewicz and Twardowski understood that it was now impossible to reject me”.¹⁵

In January 1931, a committee meeting was held concerning the appointment of a professor to Twardowski’s vacant chair. Twardowski had written in *Dziennik* [Diary] on 16 January 1931: “today an event occurred, one very important in my life, filling me with a sense of certain tragedy”. What was it that Twardowski perceived at that time as a personal failure? At the meeting in question, in which Władysław Podlacha, the dean of the Department of Humanities, Wartenberg, and Ajdukiewicz participated,

¹³ Ingarden, “Dzieje,” 195.

¹⁴ Ibid., 196.

¹⁵ Ibid., 197.

Twardowski himself abstained, accepting their verdict in advance. The dean sent ten inquiries to professors of other universities, with a request to indicate their choice for Twardowski's successor. With regard to the chair of philosophy, a majority of these professors systematically indicated Ingarden, as did two Lviv scholars, albeit "with very serious reservations". In reference to this, Twardowski suggested that "it would be a lesser evil to leave the Chair vacant". He thus undermined the approach of Wartenberg and Ajdukiewicz, who "saw important positive qualities in Ingarden".¹⁶ Ultimately, Ingarden was unanimously chosen for the chair.

In a private conversation, Ajdukiewicz asked Twardowski who he would have decided on had the choice been his to make. Twardowski replied, without hesitation, that "he would have exerted every effort to bring Władysław Witwicki to Lviv". Ajdukiewicz, however, rejected this candidature, observing that "after all, Witwicki is so naive in philosophical matters". Twardowski retorted that "he would fertilise the minds here, revive, move, and encourage young people to take up philosophy, whereas Ingarden will scare them away". It can be assumed that these conflicting opinions concerning Witwicki and Ingarden involve several issues, among them methods of practising philosophy, subjects of research, and requirements to be set for students. Witwicki had been Twardowski's first doctoral student; they had known each other for a very long time; mentally, they were suited to one another. This was not the case with Ingarden, although he was undoubtedly a superior academic and a more profound philosopher. This, however, had no influence on Twardowski's opinion: "so the chair that I've 'vacated' will be occupied by Ingarden. I don't want to write about it – what I said earlier suffices, that it weighs tragically on my soul!"¹⁷

On 11 February 1931, the Faculty Council accepted the committee's selection. Despite this, the "delaying game" continued, each of its elements based on disdain for Ingarden. Thus the year 1931 came to a close. In the spring of the following year, Chwistek delivered his lectures on aesthetics

¹⁶ All quotations in this paragraph: Kazimierz Twardowski, *Dzienniki*, vol. 2: 1928-1936 [Diaries. Part II, 1928-36], ed. Ryszard Jadcak (Warszawa: Polskie Towarzystwo Filozoficzne; Toruń: Wydawnictwo Adam Marszałek, 1997), 188. Ingarden, "Dzieje," 200.

¹⁷ Twardowski, *Dzienniki*, vol. 2, 188.

at the Department of Humanities and the Ingarden affair took several new and rapid turns. "Ajdukiewicz felt himself threatened. Suddenly he became cordial". His report on the merits and achievements of Ingarden failed, however, to convince the authorities in the ministry, and therefore, Ingarden received no appointment in 1932 either.

[F]our years have passed since Twardowski last conducted a philosophical seminar. Wartenberg has practically ceased to lecture. [...] What was it to anybody that I was wasting my best efforts on things that had nothing in common with learning? [...] Twardowski, with his behind-the-scenes arrangements, knew how to stop many things in their tracks; meanwhile, he feigned friendliness and kindness towards me.¹⁸

As a result of the delaying game and the procrastination of Twardowski and Ajdukiewicz, the third chair of philosophy in the Humanities Department was abolished. The only chance of obtaining a position – as Ingarden learned in Warsaw – was the retirement of Wartenberg, which occurred at the close of the academic year. In the meantime, it came to light that Chwistek, wishing to assume Wartenberg's place, intervened in the ministry against the appointment of Ingarden as professor. Chwistek's game spurred Twardowski to action; the latter, "from fear of Chwistek, and concern for the fate of Ajdukiewicz", asked Tadeusz Czeżowski for help.¹⁹ This move proved effective, as Ingarden received the appointment. Thanks to Wartenberg, who, in retiring, indicated Ingarden as his successor, the issue of the chair ended in success. This was, it seems, the only positive moment in Ingarden's struggle of several years for the chair. Finally, on 11 December 1933, Ingarden received his appointment as professor at the University of Lviv.

¹⁸ Ingarden, "Dzieje," 199.

¹⁹ Twardowski, *Dzienniki*, vol. 2, 200.

Bibliography

- Husserl, Edmund. "Letters to R. Ingarden." The Roman Ingarden Digital Archive. Accessed February 15, 2019. http://ingarden.archive.uj.edu.pl/en/archiwum/?keyword&rodzaj&autor=edmund-husserl&kategoria_cari&miejsce&osoba&rok&decade.
- Ingarden, Roman. "Dzieje mojej 'kariery uniwersyteckiej'" [The History of My 'University Career']. *Kwartalnik Filozoficzny* 27, no. 2 (1999): 183-201.
- Ingarden, Roman. "Letters to K. Twardowski." The Roman Ingarden Digital Archive. Accessed February 15, 2019. http://ingarden.archive.uj.edu.pl/en/archiwum/?keyword&rodzaj&autor=kazimierz-twardowski&kategoria_cari&miejsce&osoba&rok=0&decade=0.
- Ingarden, Roman Stanisław. *Roman Witold Ingarden. Życie filozofa w okresie toruńskim (1921-1926)*. Toruń: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Mikołaja Kopernika, 2000.
- Ingarden, Roman Stanisław. "Wstęp do *Archiwaliów* ojca" [Introduction to My Father's Archives]. *Kwartalnik Filozoficzny* 27, no. 2 (1999): 171-81.
- Jadczyk, Ryszard. "Kazimierz Ajdukiewicz w Warszawie w latach 1926-1928" [Kazimierz Ajdukiewicz in Warsaw, 1926-28]. *Nowa Krytyka* no. 5 (1995): 179-90.
- Jadczyk, Ryszard. "Kilka faktów o Romanie Ingardenie w świetle korespondencji Kazimierza Twardowskiego" [Some Facts Concerning Roman Ingarden in Light of the Correspondence of Kazimierz Twardowski]. *Kwartalnik Filozoficzny* 21, no. 1 (1993): 13-22.
- Jadczyk, Ryszard. "Lwowski okres w działalności naukowo-dydaktycznej Kazimierza Ajdukiewicza" [The Lviv Period in the Academic and Didactic Activity of Kazimierz Ajdukiewicz]. *Edukacja Filozoficzna* 21 (1996): 249-58.
- Jadczyk, Ryszard. *Mistrz i jego uczniowie*. Warszawa: Scholar, 1997.
- *Korespondencja Romana Witolda Ingardena z Kazimierzem Twardowskim* [The Correspondence of Roman Witold Ingarden with Kazimierz Twardowski], edited by Radosław Kuliniak, Dorota Leszczyna, and Mariusz Pandura. Kęty: Wydawnictwo Marek Derewiecki, 2016.
- Majewska, Zofia. *Książeczka o Ingardenie. Szkic biograficzny*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej, 1995.
- Twardowski, Kazimierz. *Dzienniki*. Vol. 1: 1915-1927 [Diaries. Vol. 1, 1915-27], edited by Ryszard Jadczyk. Warszawa: Polskie Towarzystwo Filozoficzne, Toruń: Wydawnictwo Adam Marszałek, 1997.

- Twardowski, Kazimierz. *Dzienniki*. Vol. 2: 1928-1936 [Diaries. Vol. 2, 1928-36], edited by Ryszard Jadczyk. Warszawa: Polskie Towarzystwo Filozoficzne, Toruń: Wydawnictwo Adam Marszałek, 1997.
- Twardowski, Kazimierz. "Letters to R. Ingarden." The Roman Ingarden Digital Archive. Accessed February 15, 2019. http://ingarden.archive.uj.edu.pl/en/archiwum/?keyword&rodzaj&autor=kazimierz-twardowski&kategoria_cari&miejsce&osoba&rok=0&decade=0.
- Wartenberg, Mściśław. "Letter to Ingarden of 6 April 1924." Ingarden Family Archives (private collection).
- Woleński, Jan. *Filozoficzna szkoła lwowsko-warszawska*. Warszawa: PWN, 1985.

Dominika Czakon , PhD in philosophy. Employed as an assistant professor at the Institute of Philosophy, Jagiellonian University. Main researcher of the research project “The Roman Ingarden Digital Archive,” financed by the Ministry of Science and Higher Education of the Republic of Poland. Deputy editor-in-chief of the philosophical-aesthetical quarterly *The Polish Journal of Aesthetics*. Research activities deal with aesthetics, hermeneutics, and the philosophy of Roman Ingarden. Recently has published a book on the hermeneutic interpretation, based on a proposition of H.-G. Gadamer.

Natalia Anna Michna , PhD in philosophy. Employed as an assistant professor at the Institute of Philosophy, Jagiellonian University in Cracow, Poland. Principal developer of the research project “The Roman Ingarden Digital Archive,” financed by the Ministry of Science and Higher Education of the Republic of Poland. Director of the project “The Concept of Female Experience and the Problem of Feminist Aesthetics,” financed by the National Science Center in Poland. Deputy editor-in-chief of the philosophical-aesthetic quarterly *The Polish Journal of Aesthetics*. Has recently published a book entitled *Women and Culture: The Problem of Experience in Feminist Philosophy* (2018). Research interests concern feminist philosophy, feminist aesthetics, contemporary art, and the aesthetics and philosophy of Roman Ingarden.

Leszek Sosnowski , professor and (habilitated) doctor conducting scientific and didactic activity at the Institute of Philosophy, Jagiellonian University. Director of the research project “The Roman Ingarden Digital Archive,” financed by the Ministry of Science and Higher Education of the Republic of Poland. Founder and editor-in-chief of the philosophical-aesthetic quarterly *The Polish Journal of Aesthetics*. Co-author of the ‘Dictionary of the Philosophical Concepts of Roman Ingarden’ (2001), which he intends to translate into English.