

*Historische Untersuchungen über Kant's Prolegomena.* Von BENNO ERDMANN. Halle a. S.: Niemeyer, 1904. Pp. 144.

Most students of Kant are acquainted with Prof. Erdmann's edition of the text of the *Prolegomena* published in 1878. In an elaborate Introduction, the editor sought to establish the view that the treatise in its present form was the result of a twofold "Redaction" on the part of its author, and believed himself able to distinguish the sections to be ascribed to each. In consequence of repeated complaints about the difficulty and obscurity attaching to the mode of writing followed in his chief work, Kant, according to this view, resolved, soon after the appearance of the *Critique* in 1781, to prepare a popular presentation of the main principles of his philosophy. The project, however, was never carried out; apparently not so much as a commencement was made. After a few months it was dropped in favour of another scheme, that, namely, of composing a short compendium or abstract of his system, "for the use, not of pupils, but of future teachers". The fulfilment of this latter design had almost reached completion when the Garve-Feder review of the *Critique* appeared anonymously in the Göttingen *Gelehrte Anzeigen* of 19th January, 1782. Then Kant became aware of the extent to which a misconstruction of his philosophical position was possible, and the discovery led to a further change of plan with respect to the little volume upon which he was engaged, as also to a corresponding remodelling of the sections he had ready for publication. By the end of August, 1782, the *Prolegomena* was substantially *druckfertig*, although it was not given to the public until the middle of the year 1783.

Such very briefly was Erdmann's theory of the way in which the *Prolegomena*, as we now have it, came to be written. In editing the text, he printed those passages which he regarded as the later insertions and additions, together with such as appeared to him to have been composed after the change of plan in January, 1782, in smaller type than the rest. The principal sections thus indicated were the whole of the preface, 3, parts of 4 and 5, the three *Anmerkungen* to 13, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 39, and everything after and including 57. Erdmann's theory gave rise in Germany to a good deal of discussion. It was disputed notably in an able Essay (which appeared originally in the *Altpreuussische Monatschrift*, xvi., 1, and was afterwards republished separately) by Dr. Emil Arnoldt, who contended that the alleged composite character of the *Prolegomena* could not be maintained on the ground either of internal or external evidence. Erdmann did not reply at the time, but after an interval of twenty-five years he has recently had occasion to go into the matter again by reason of the task entrusted to him of editing the *Prolegomena* for the Berlin Academy edition of Kant's Collected Works. The present monograph contains the result of his renewed investigation.

So far as the internal evidence is concerned, the author does not consider it necessary to undertake any fresh examination of the text. With a few minor modifications he adheres to the analysis made by him in 1878. He is here occupied almost exclusively with the external evidence, the materials of which have been greatly enriched by the three valuable volumes of Kant's Correspondence which Rudolf Reicke has edited for the Berlin Academy Edition. A further source of information made use of is the Correspondence of Hamann, particularly the letters addressed during the years 1781-1783 to Herder and to Hartknoch, then Kant's publisher. Erdmann does not claim, even now, to be in possession of a conclusive proof, but he is of opinion that the additional material supports and confirms his hypothesis to such a degree

that it may fairly be regarded as established. The evidence presented is, in fact, cumulative in character. All the passages bearing upon the subject in the sources mentioned are quoted and commented upon in three laborious chapters dealing respectively with Kant's original plan of a popular exposition of the doctrines of the *Critique*, with his later idea of issuing a short *Auszug*, and with the subsequent remodelling of the latter into the *Prolegomena*. Altogether, Prof. Erdmann's case seems a strong one, and he has, at all events, given us an interesting piece of original research throwing not a little light upon the line of thought that was occupying Kant's mind in the period between the appearance of the first and second editions of the *Critique*.

Incidentally, the author attempts to show from the Correspondence that in the *Erläuterungen* of Schulze, published in 1784, no portion of any unfinished work of Kant, done whilst the idea of a popular exposition was contemplated by him, could have been incorporated, as was suggested by Arnoldt in the Essay above referred to. Further, in an Appendix, Erdmann discusses and rejects the supposition of Vaihinger that an accidental misplacement of some pages of Kant's manuscript by the printer has occurred at the beginning of the *Prolegomena*, whereby a part of the passage dealing with mathematical judgments, together with the whole passage dealing with metaphysical judgments, has been transferred to § 4, although evidently belonging to the end of § 2. This appears to us the weakest portion of Erdmann's book, and Vaihinger's reply to his objection in the *Kantstudien* (ix., 539 *sqq.*) is certainly deserving of the reader's notice.

The perusal of this volume has occasioned in us a feeling of regret that Prof. Erdmann did not reproduce, in the *Anmerkungen* to the fourth volume of the Berlin Academy edition, the full text of the Göttingen review, so difficult now to obtain a sight of. This document, unimportant enough in itself, is indispensable for tracing the sequence of thought which led to the revisions in the second edition of the *Critique*, and to have made it accessible to Kantian students would have increased the value to them of the great undertaking now being carried out with such scholarly care and thoroughness.

G. DAWES HICKS.

*Die buddhistische Philosophie in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung. Erster Teil: die philosophische Grundlage des älteren Buddhismus.* Von Prof. Dr. MAX WALLESER. Heidelberg: Carl Winter's Universitätsbuchhandlung, 1904. Pp. 148.

It is to be regretted that this interesting and suggestive little work should have been cast in its present form. It consists partly in an attempt, formidable enough even to matured Indologists, to establish identities and historical sequences between ancient works in the Buddhist literatures of India, Ceylon, China, Japan and Tibet, partly in an inquiry into how far Buddhism, as revealed in its canonical and semi-canonical books, can be said to amount to a systematic philosophy. The testing measures applied are the attitude of Buddhist thought towards the problems of external reality, of the nature of the ego, and of personal responsibility as affecting future existence (commonly called Karma). It is evident that the *Grundlage* of any great movement of thought cannot be exhausted by these three inquiries, especially where, as in the present case, the documentary evidence is exceptionally rich. The theory of external perception is by no means the fundamental touchstone of ancient philosophising. This, however, cannot be maintained as emphatically