

Arthur Schopenhauer

Arthur Schopenhauer

*New Material by Him and about
Him by Dr. David Asher*

Edited and Translated by

Dan Farrelly

Cambridge
Scholars
Publishing



Arthur Schopenhauer:
New Material by Him and about Him by Dr. David Asher

Edited and Translated by Dan Farrelly

This book first published 2015

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

Lady Stephenson Library, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2PA, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Copyright © 2015 by Dan Farrelly

All rights for this book reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the copyright owner.

ISBN (10): 1-4438-7435-3

ISBN (13): 978-1-4438-7435-9

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements	vii
Translator/Editor's Preface and Notes	ix
David Asher's Preface	xiii
Arthur Schopenhauer's Letters to the Editor in the Years 1855-1860	xv
Schopenhauer's Letters to Dr. David Asher	1
Appendix	37
Supplement A	41
Arthur Schopenhauer's Views on Music Particular points about Schopenhauer's views on music	
Supplement B	59
Salomon Ibn-Gebirol and Arthur Schopenhauer	
Supplement C	65
About Individual Character	
Recent Schopenhauer Reception	79
I. French	
II. English	
III. Recent German Voices	
Endnotes	95

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to thank Ilse Nagelschmidt for her collaboration and advice, from which I benefited greatly in the course of preparing this translation. Claus Canisius and Lorraine Byrne Bodley were helpful with information on numerous points, and my colleagues Eamonn Jordan, Lilian Chambers, and Rachael Kilgallon encouraged me with their warm enthusiasm. Una, patient and positive as always, contributed with her translator's eye and ear for correct "collocations" and with her understanding of the rigours of the translator's trade.

TRANSLATOR/EDITOR'S PREFACE AND NOTES

Of the c. 500 letters written by Schopenhauer, those written to David Asher are of considerable importance and are certainly worth making available to an English-speaking readership. Asher's own letters to Schopenhauer are not extant, as is the case with many of Schopenhauer's other correspondents. Asher received the first letter from the philosopher on 16 June 1855 and was in correspondence with him until Schopenhauer's death in 1860. Asher's prowess as a linguist was much admired by Schopenhauer, who even sought (without success) to have him translate his major philosophical work into English. He realized that he had in this "apostle" someone who was not only dedicated to him but who was, more importantly, a man with a profound understanding of his thought.

It is disturbing to read of Schopenhauer's reference to Asher's first communication as coming to him from the "tribe of Israel". If not exactly contemptuous, this expression was certainly derogatory and reflected the anti-Jewish attitude which was prevalent at the time. In later letters to Asher, Schopenhauer made it clear that he detested the optimism of the Jewish religion – as well as that of Islam. But he could not be labelled anti-Semitic and he tolerated this younger man's daring criticism, according to which Schopenhauer's premises were fundamentally correct but from which, with his insistence on pessimism, he was drawing the wrong conclusions.

Schopenhauer admired Asher's assiduity (in promoting the philosopher's work) and intellectual gifts. However, in the thirty years following Schopenhauer's death, Asher's intellectual productivity developed much further. Along with his prowess as a language teacher, he achieved distinction as a scholar way beyond Schopenhauer's expectations. The article cited below summarizes the life and achievements of this dedicated "apostle" of Schopenhauer.

[From *The 1901 Jewish Encyclopedia*]

Asher, David

"German educationist and philosophical writer born at Dresden Dec. 8, 1818 died in Leipsic Dec. 2, 1890. He received his early education at the Jewish school of his native city, and subsequently entered the gymnasium there, being one of the first Jews admitted to the institution. As his mother was unable to support him, his stay there was short. Asher then learned the trade of carving and gilding, thereby supporting himself as a journeyman artisan during his travels to various cities of Germany and Austria. On the invitation of a wealthy relative he went to London, where he learned English at a private school— subsequently becoming assistant teacher there— and at the same time assiduously studied philosophy, philology, Hebrew, and modern languages. Later, Asher held various offices in the Jewish congregation and was tutor to the children of the chief rabbi of England. Upon his return to Germany he obtained the degree of doctor of philosophy at the Berlin University. Settling in Leipsic, he soon acquired reputation as an English instructor, having among his pupils many persons of high rank. For seven years he held the post of English master at the Commercial School and for eight years that of examiner of candidates for higher schools at the university. He was also a member of the Academy for Modern Languages, in Berlin, and official interpreter to the Royal Law Courts of Leipsic. A linguist of the first order, he was engaged in literary work of varied character, and diligently contributed to most of the leading German journals, as well as to the English periodicals the *Times*, *Athenæum*, *Academy*, and *Jewish Chronicle*. For the last he translated Dr. Döllinger's Address on the *History of the Jews of Europe*.

Asher distinguished himself as an interpreter of the philosophy of Schopenhauer and as an ardent champion of his own coreligionists, energetically combating anti-Semitic attacks.

The more important of his numerous works and articles, original and translated, are: *Outlines of the Jewish Religion*; *England's Dichter und Prosaiker der Neuzeit*; *A Manual on the Study of Modern Languages in General, and of the English Language in Particular* with a preface by Dean French; *Offenes Sendschreiben an Arthur Schopenhauer*; *Arthur Schopenhauer als Interpret des Göthe'schen Faust*; *Der Religiöse Glaube. Eine Psychologische Studie*; *Arthur Schopenhauer. Neues von Ihm und über Ihn*; *Das Endergebniss der Schopenhauer'schen Philosophie*; *Exercises on the Habitual Mistakes of Germans in English Conversation*, etc., 3 vols.; *Die Wichtigsten Regeln der Englischen Syntax*; *Entertaining Library for*

the Young, with Explanatory Notes and Complete Vocabularies, etc., 2 vols.; *Ueber den Unterricht in den Neueren Sprachen*; *Die Grundzüge der Verfassung Englands*; *Die Kunst zu Lesen*; *Selichot*, with a new English Translation; *Büddinger's 'Way of Faith, ' or the Abridged Bible*, translated from the German; *Buckle's Essays*, translated into German; *Contributions to the History of the Development of the Human Race*, by Lazarus Geiger, translated from the German; *Das Naturgesetz in der Geisterwelt*, by Henry Drummond, translated into German."

Bibliography : *Jew. Chron.* Dec. 5, 1890, p. 8 Dec. 12, 1890, p. 9.

Notes

Double inverted commas are used throughout, except for quotations within quotations. Where Schopenhauer himself writes English phrases or sentences, these are included in double inverted commas.

Square brackets in the main text are, generally, those used by Asher himself. Round brackets are insertions in the text by the editor/translator.

Footnotes: Asher's footnotes and editorial footnotes are merged, with the result that the numbers do not reflect Asher's original numbering. Editorial footnotes are in square brackets.

Titles of books are italicized and titles of essays are in double inverted commas.

DAVID ASHER'S PREFACE

Repeated inquiries about Schopenhauer's letters to me which were published in the now extinct *Deutsches Museum* have moved me to publish them as a separate book, accompanied, of course, as they must be, by the same Introduction, which I think is essential. The aim is to make them more accessible to the public and to give them an independent existence. I believed I might use this occasion to include, in an appendix, the articles of mine which were mentioned in the letters and were scattered around in different journals and have been honoured by the attention given them in Ueberweg's *History of Philosophy*.¹ A further appendix would also include and give at least some account of the newer voices which have been heard, foreign and German, relating to Schopenhauer. May this little book be kindly received by his friends and devotees as a contribution to knowledge about himself and his philosophy.

Leipzig, September 1871.

ARTHUR SCHOPENHAUER'S LETTERS TO THE EDITOR IN THE YEARS 1855-1860

Introduction

Repeatedly encouraged by followers and admirers of Schopenhauer who have read some of the letters appearing below, I have at last decided to publish all of the letters he wrote to me. I should long since have done this for my own sake, because the letters of Schopenhauer published in 1863 by Lindner and Frauenstädt have shown my relationship to him in a light which does not reflect the truth. See letters 48² and 68³ in: *Arthur Schopenhauer. Von ihm. Über ihn* (Berlin, 1863, Hayn). Out of the 'little apostle', as will be seen in the following letters, later became the 'active apostle whom the departed honoured with our correspondence until the end of his life. Should one find that Schopenhauer was only interested in pandering to his own vanity, that the letters are full of invective against others and praise of himself, and that the request to communicate to him everything written about him is repeated in them with the constancy of a refrain, this is no fault of mine. For my own part, I felt very honoured by the correspondence with him and have always thought of these letters as my most precious treasure, as warming and cheering sun rays falling into a life visited by difficult trials. But why conceal it? First Gwinner's biography, but especially the letters published by Frauenstädt, have disappointed me and taught me the sad lesson that with Schopenhauer the man has to be separated from the ingenious philosopher. This is not to contest the recent claim, made with such insight and presented so brilliantly, that the system stemmed from his subjectivity,⁴ but it will not be possible to deny that the ethical part of his system bears little relation to its author's way of living.⁵ Still, the following letters will be welcome to the master's followers, since they show him in the period when his philosophy was achieving ever greater recognition and when, after such a long period of neglect, he intoned a hymn of jubilation and his prophecies seemed to be fulfilled. At the same time they fill a gap which was left by the break with Frauenstädt, which occurred in 1856. From that time until his death in September 1860 he wrote to him on one single occasion (l.c.

page 711), whereas precisely in this period, to my pleasure, he wrote most frequently to me.

Naturally, the letters had to be published with diplomatic exactness. With regard to the offence given to many of the persons mentioned in the letters, what Lindner and Frauenstädt had already published removed all worry from me, since the same and similar invectives are already present in the letters to these gentlemen. The persons concerned will, under the circumstances, easily know how to cope. Of course, anything that constituted an affront had to be omitted. I would also like to have left out the passages concerning myself so as to avoid being accused of vanity; but since, along with the praise, I did not withhold passages in which he criticizes me, one balances the other. Besides, no one shrinks from displaying any distinction shown him by a prince, and if I have deserved even a small part of his sometimes lavish praise, who could blame me if I decorate myself with it as with an order conferred by an intellectual prince?

Also the letters I am publishing which were sent to me by Baron von Quandt will doubtless be read with great satisfaction by devotees of Schopenhauer. I have not seen anything in writing that speaks more favourably for Schopenhauer as a person. The warmth with which his friend speaks of him is the finest – because the most disinterested – testimony that has been accorded him. It expresses the love that passes over all failings. To emulate such an example has to be the task of everyone to whom the memory of Schopenhauer is dear no matter what.

Notes

¹ Friedrich Ueberweg, *Grundriß der Geschichte der Philosophie*, I-III, 1863-1866.

² [Schopenhauer wrote: "Einliegend ein Huldigungsschreiben vom Stamm Israel, welches mir gelegentlich zurück erbitte. Wenn das hebräische Zeug auch seine Richtigkeit hätte, so ist es ja gar nicht zur Sache. Gedenke Dem nicht zu antworten."]

I am including a written tribute from the tribe of Israel which I would like you to return to me some time. If this Hebrew stuff is right in some respects it is not really to the point. I do not intend to reply.]

³ ["Statt zu warten, dass aus Leipzig Ihnen die Lerchen gebraten in's Maul flögen, habe sogleich an das neue Apöstelchen daselbst geschrieben und sende Ihnen anbei dessen Antwort, die Ihnen interessant seyn wird, und welche auch sowohl von seiner Rechtgläubigkeit als seinem apostolischen Eifer erfreuliches Zeugnis liefert."]

Instead of waiting for a response from Leipzig I wrote immediately to my new little apostle and am sending you herewith his answer, which will be of interest to you and bears gratifying witness both to his orthodoxy and to his apostolic zeal.]

⁴ This refers to the book published by R. Hayn, Berlin, 1684 [This has to be A.W. Hayn, 1863.]

⁵ [This is contested by Hübscher in the Introduction to his *Arthur Schopenhauer Gesammelte Briefe* (Bonn: Bouvier Verlag Herbert Grundmann, 1978), p.iv.]

SCHOPENHAUER'S LETTERS TO DR. DAVID ASHER

1

Dear Doctor,

Please accept my warmest thanks for your well thought out Open Letter¹ which is so favourable to me. It is more a letter of praise than an attack. But do not expect me to engage in a controversy, which is something I do not do. I prefer to leave it to my system to justify itself and find its way in the world as best it can. But, of course, my followers can be of assistance. Furthermore, I shy away from all letter-writing. But I want to draw your attention to an error you made on page 12 in the footnote: the passage you refer to is not that of a scholastic philosopher but of Cicero.²

I will be very pleased if you complete the lengthier piece you are planning, because I welcome every fairly conducted discussion of my work.

Yours,
Very sincerely,
Arthur Schopenhauer
Frankfurt am Main, 16 June 1855

Dear Doctor Asher,

The repeated interest you have shown me makes me take the liberty of approaching you with the request for information about something of considerable interest to me. In January several newspapers carried the news that the Philosophy Faculty in Leipzig has advertised a competition. The topic for the prize is 'An Exposition and Critique of Schopenhauerian Philosophy'. I hoped, in vain, to find more detail about it in the Leipzig Repertorio. Dr Frauenstädt also knows nothing more about it than what is in that notice. It should not be difficult for you, dear Doctor, since you are on the spot, to gather news about it and to oblige me by passing it on to me. The topic has to be available in a fuller form and also in Latin, perhaps printed, in which case I would ask you to send it to me³ without postage paid. It should at least be on a notice board where you might be good enough to write down the few lines for me. Perhaps you have heard something by word of mouth regarding the drift of the thing. I suspect that there is nothing well-intentioned behind it since I am hated by the followers of Herbart in that faculty. That doesn't matter. I am happy about this even so.

I wait in hope for your favour and remain,

Yours devotedly,
Arthur Schopenhauer
Frankfurt am Main, 6 January 1856

3

Dear Doctor,

Many thanks for the issue of the Journal⁴ you sent me and still more for your contribution to it. It has given me much pleasure. I attach special importance precisely to this part of my work, which has hardly ever been discussed at all – only, as far as I know, by Noak about five years ago in a ‘Metaphysics’ (I have forgotten the title).⁵ It was only half a page but so concise that it had everything in it. A real feat. In general, you have achieved all that was possible in the limited space. A couple more pages would have been beneficial. I would especially have liked you to say clearly what I mean by ‘ideas’, namely, just the Platonic ideas, the enduring forms of transitory natural beings, and not to have spoken (page 191⁶) of ‘idea’ in the singular. This is misleading for people because it takes them back to their woolly notions.

I think I have not thanked you for the programme you sent me with the competition question,⁷ which of course throws little light on the subject. A Leipzig student who visited me said that the initiative came from the philosophical department of Professor Weiß. The students there had had a disputation about my philosophy.

Thank you again for your activity in spreading word of my philosophy.

Yours devotedly,
Arthur Schopenhauer
Frankfurt am Main, 20 July 1856

PS. I forgot to mention in the above how happy I am with what you said about my philosophy in your introductory remarks, especially your exposé of the great fundamental difference between my philosophy and that of all other philosophers (page 191⁸). It is truly amazing that for thousands of years people have been wrong about the fundamental constitution of our being on which so much else depends, while anyone who is without prejudice and is capable of making a judgement must know that things are just the other way round from what has been assumed.

Dear Doctor Asher,

Many thanks for the information you sent me.⁹ It is entirely new to me. I am glad of it, although I know that a *Candidatus theologiae* is not permitted to agree with my philosophy as a whole. It is my wish and hope to see the works printed.

Back in England again! What it is to be young! Above all I would like to give you, belatedly, the assurance that, however many have already written about my philosophy, no one has so clearly and with such definition stressed its true worth as you have done in your essay about my music, page 190f.¹⁰ This is not flattery but the plain truth which I have realized on reading it again. I am only concerned that the periodical has a very limited circulation.

I am glad to see that you have written an article about my priority question.¹¹ I have expressed my opinion about this in *Parerga* vol. 1 pp. 124f. and hope that you have taken this into account.¹² Should it have escaped your notice there might be time to follow it up. Precisely at this moment when there are efforts from all sides to do me down they have laden me again with Schelling's priority although Hillebrand, in his *Geschichte der deutschen Literatur*,¹³ acknowledged the injustice of this criticism. But then a certain theologian Fricke recently comes along, in the *Blätter für literarische. Unterhaltung*,¹⁴ and tries to disparage me in every possible way and highlights that passage from Schelling from which I am supposed to have taken everything. Similarly, Weiße, who already in a review of the new Schelling edition in the same journal¹⁵ even criticized me for my clarity, comes back at me again in the *Protestantische Kirchenzeitung* no. 38, says all kinds of bad things about me and even says I am a disciple of Schelling. The source of his ire is that last autumn he paid me a visit and was not received. Menin aeide, thea.¹⁶ This is also probably the reason that he reproaches me with being 'heartless'.

Cornill's book¹⁷ is by no means malicious. He even says good things about me. But the good fellow has learnt nothing and therefore understands little. He has no familiarity with Kantian philosophy and speaks accordingly as an innocent, naïve realist; and then when with my philosophy he encounters, as is inevitable, something that he cannot understand and see how it fits in, he shouts about contradictions and justifies himself by citing passages torn out of context. To accuse an author of contradictions is as much as to say that he is an idiot who does not know what he is saying. One should therefore never assume and say

that there is a contradiction until it is clear that no interpretation is possible. I have often been praised for my strict logical consistency. Once he has acquired some sound learning the contradictions will automatically disappear.

I will give you a parallel to your Hebrew discovery.¹⁸ I had already read in the *Times* that Max Müller (in his introduction to *Rig Veda* which he edited, both text and notes in 1854, or also in his “small essay”, as the *Times* calls it, on the Veda and the Zend-Avesta) said: “‘*Brahm*’ means originally force *will*, *wish*, and the propulsive power of creation.”¹⁹

The bookseller Frisch, Artaria’s successor, went to unbelievable trouble to procure the “small essay” for me: but it does not exist as such but is to be found in Bunsen’s *Hippolytus*, – to which I have no access. You will have more opportunity there than I have in my Abdera. “Make the best of it.”²⁰ – One is also reminded of the Italian “*bramare*”, to have a strong desire (heftig wünschen).

With best wishes
Yours devotedly,

Arthur Schopenhauer
Frankfurt am Main
12 November 1856

Dear Doctor Asher,

Thank you for your new post, which I find very interesting, and may you always give me the pleasure of receiving similar things. (You do not need to pay postage on anything.) I am very happy with your essay in the *Litt. Blättern*,²¹ but I cannot help making a couple of comments:

1. I would have like you to have pointed out that all that Schelling has said in lectures or elsewhere comes *after* me, since the first edition of my main work was published in November 1818 and dated 1819. Only his "Essay on Freedom" (1809) appeared before my work.

2. As regards Weiß (*sic*) you have failed to criticize exactly what I had drawn to your attention: that he censures and mocks me precisely for the clarity of what I say. In his opinion, what I have to say takes little effort to understand and he attributes my successes to this very fact. In this he commits precisely the injustice which the Spaniard Iriarte mocks in the forty-second of his excellent and unique *Fabulae literariae*, where the concluding moral says:

Si; que hai quien tiene la hinchzon por mérito,
Y el hablar liso y Llano por d'èmerito.
(Yes, there are people who hold bombast for merit
And simple plain speech for a fault.)

Weiß wrote this criticism in a footnote, which you perhaps overlooked. If you were to find the occasion still to rub this into him and sprinkle some of the above Spanish pepper into the wound it would give me much pleasure.

The winner of the runner-up prize is probably the son of Professor Bähr (at the Art Academy [Kunst-Akademie] in Dresden) who is a very enthusiastic devotee of my philosophy and visited me in two summers. Last summer his son came as well. He is a student from Leipzig who moved to Heidelberg and told me he wanted to answer the competition question. Only he is (if I am not badly mistaken) a student of law, whereas student of philosophy is on the programme. I would like to see his answer in print,²² since it is undoubtedly the antidote to Seidel's answer, which gives me the impression that Weiß has found a publisher for it.

I hope soon to see your second piece on music in the *Anregungen*,²³ assuming that you will not have insisted on payment from a journal which is still in its infancy.

Yours devotedly,
Arthur Schopenhauer
Frankfurt am Main, 15 December 1856

Many thanks, dear Doctor Asher, for your fine, glorious poem.²⁴ It was given to me yesterday by the same youth who brought me the card with your birthday greetings. He also read me your poem. Doctor Sattler did not want to print the poem because it was “too polemical”, which shows that he is a philistine. The poem is not a direct polemic against anyone. It complains, in quite general terms, about the injustice I have experienced. If everyone was so scrupulous we would have no Aristophanes, no Persius, no Rabener, and no *Xenien* of Goethe, and so on. He is a dyed-in-the wool pedantic philistine. “put him down as such”. I received another very good poem on my birthday together with a glorious bunch of flowers (in February) from an anonymous person and many a sign of friendly interest from near and far – for example, an essay by Doctor Bahnsen on my geometrical theories, hastily included in 21st February issue of *Schulzeitung für Holstein, Schleswig und Lauenburg*; a letter from Harlem in Holland asking for a portrait of me [to be made] without the realization that there is one already. I am now being painted by two artists simultaneously in the same sitting: by Luntenschütz, who is finishing his second portrait, and by Göbel who is the best and most famous of the painters here. All of this will be followed by engravings. People can see that it is time – because of my 70th year. But things are going well. I have my full strength and am healthy.

I am glad that you have given your second article on music to the *Anregungen*.²⁵ I just regret that it is brief. Bähr's book²⁶ exceeds all expectations. It is excellent. It is hard to believe that such a young man could achieve this. He has completely understood and assimilated Kant and myself. I am really looking forward to Seydel's book. He is hesitating. Perhaps, having seen Bähr's book, he is worried that readers will have a different judgement from that of the Faculty, for whom it is enough that he is against me:

Come on, Doctor, smartly,
Out with your sword.

In any case, his work will be inferior to that of Bähr. My warmest greetings,

Arthur Schopenhauer
Frankfurt am Main, 16 March 1857.

Many thanks, dear Doctor Asher, for the many and varied interesting items of news.

-----²⁷

Seydel's book²⁸ is wretched beyond all expectation. To seek out contradictions is the lowest form of criticism of a book and system, practised by all blockheads²⁹ – paging backwards and forwards to find sentences which, when taken out of context, cannot be reconciled with one another. This method, however, proves too much: not only that I am wrong but that I am an idiot who does not know what he is saying and at every step breaks the most fundamental rule of logic. Cornill³⁰ has also gone down this well-trodden path on which one continually meets with pure rogues.³¹ To dismantle a philosophical system it is necessary to understand it fully, to go into it deeply and then to show that the fundamental ideas are wrong. But Seydel understood his task very well: it was entirely focused on tearing me down, no matter how, justly or unjustly. And for this he was duly awarded his gold medal and a diploma into the bargain, and the Faculty has prostituted itself³² by crowning this slovenly work and not rewarding Bähr's excellent book. The reading public (who by the same token are of a higher kind) will judge differently from the Faculty and will at the same time ponder how it (the Faculty) used the money that was given to it for the encouragement of talent. The whole story will serve to further and expand my reputation. Seydel has evinced a high level of stupidity in two things: 1) that from the outset he has shown his malicious determination to disparage me – but who will believe him? 2) that he praises a parable of mine without understanding it and wrongly interprets it in terms of theodicy!³³ Anyone of sound mind will understand it and see what Seydel is!

I was very pleased with the news from Danzig.³⁴ – What you say about Gebirol³⁵ I find almost exactly, only more fully, in the *Centralblatt* of 11 July, so that I am inclined to think that this review is by you, but it is signed B.B. and I was not aware that you wrote for this journal. In any case, there is some connection with you. I would, indeed, like to see the book in order to assess the extent of its correspondence with me. But I do not want to order it yet. We are sure to hear more about it: perhaps the library here will buy it. I do feel antipathy towards everything Hebraic and Islamic.

I don't want to write my biography or have anyone else write it.³⁶ The short sketch that I made at Erdmann's request, which was also used by Frauenstädt, and two similar ones in Mayer's *Conversations-Lexikon* in

Hildburghausen and Pierer's *Real-Lexikon*, are enough. I have no wish to expose my private life to the cold gaze of curious and ill-disposed readers.

Yours,
Arthur Schopenhauer
Frankfurt am Main, 15 July 1857.

Dearest Doctor,

Much and all as I would like to oblige you I cannot bring myself to read a long manuscript³⁷ and give an appraisal of it. This is a *corvée*, and at 70 I am at an age where one is legally dispensed from all such labour. I have more printed material, even material sent to the publisher, than I can cope with – and now a handwritten manuscript! – You can have it back at any time. – Regarding your difficulty in finding a publisher, take heart: I offered my Parerga manuscript free to three publishers and was rejected; then Frauenstädt gave it to Hain (sic), and gratis.³⁸

On the basis of your article in the *Blätter für literarische Unterhaltung*³⁹ I have procured and read Gebirol: it is a dreadfully boring book, mainly because one is never quite sure what he is really saying since he is always concerned with his own *entia rationis*. But he can certainly be seen as my predecessor, since he teaches that the will is all and does all in everything. But that is also the sum of his wisdom. He teaches it only *in abstracto* and repeats it a thousand times. He is to me as a glow-worm, shining at night in a thick fog, is to the sun. Nonetheless he has still grasped the main idea, even on page 7 where he sees the existence of the objective world as purely in the knowing subject;⁴⁰ yet his thought is still dull and impoverished, and of course this is attributable to his time and situation: – and it is further weakened by the two-fold translation.⁴¹

It wouldn't occur to me to read Schellings Mythologies. Seyerlen's? essays?⁴² qu'est que c'est? (sic).

My philosophy is catching on: Professor Knoodt in Bonn and Doctor Körber in Breslau have lectured on it during the summer. I have had many visitors in the summer, amongst them two Russians from Moscow and Petersburg; two Swedes, one of them from Upsala; a royal ambassador and imperial count; two ladies and all kinds of people. I can judge the dissemination of my philosophy much better from the letters and visits than from publications, of which I think I probably know only a half. In the last issue but one of the *Central-Blatt*⁴³ the last mine of a series blew up. The series was started by the anger of Professor Weiß about refusing to receive him. Bang! Now I am dead. – The good Leipzig gentlemen don't know that with such rubbish they are only damaging themselves: "the engineer blown up by his own petard." Shakespeare. Recently I have again refused the visit of a scribbler and I hope that he too will lay mines à la Weiß: the bang is to my liking, the harm befalls them. And so courage! all you scribblers.

Since you have become completely like an Englishman you would be well qualified to translate my works. You have given proof of a fundamental grasp of them at the beginning of your essay in the *Anregungen*. I think you would make more impact with this than with your novel.⁴⁴ As a model I recommend to you the few pages which Oxenford, in the Westminster Review, April 1853,⁴⁵ translated so well that "I [was] quite amazed": he caught not just the meaning, but the style, my manner and attitudes. Astounding. As in a mirror! I would very much like to see your translation before you send it off, "to prevent all possibility of a mistake, and to see that all be right". I understand English as I do German. As a rule every Englishman, in the first quarter hour, thinks I am his countryman. "Think about it."

"Sincerely yours",
Arthur Schopenhauer
Frankfurt am Main, 22 October 1857.

PS. A year ago *Modern German Philosophy* appeared as a reprint from the Manchester Papers 1856 Manchester 1s 6d. Just arrived in Mannheim – Weigel and Asher in Berlin replied that it is out of print. I am now having it looked for in Manchester. Perhaps you know something about it. Hopefully there is something about me in it. In any case it shows the interest there is in England for German philosophy.