

Murawski 2014 Review: Comments

1. *Heading* (two paragraphs)
 - a. The format was specified by the journal.
 - b. I specified my title in place of the name of my Department.
2. Paragraph *Reconstructed in 1918*. There was no major university in the former German partition until Poznań was founded several years later. The university at Wilno opened in the former Russian partition after the 1919 war.
3. Paragraph *The book spills*. It's hard to believe the remark on page x that there was no philosophical reflection on mathematics and logic in Poland before World War I. Chapter 1 contradicts that.
4. Paragraph *Chapter 2 features*
 - a. I opted to use the priestly name of Bocheński because his initials are usually given as I. M. But I opted not to preface his name with *Father*, as I did in the index to the Tarski book. If I do that here, I have to deal with Salamucha as well. [Reconsider](#).
 - b. I left Bocheński out of the genealogy because he wasn't a student of any of the others.
 - c. Because Tarski was not a professor, Mostowski officially studied under Kuratowski. I opted not to mention that.
5. Paragraph *The works of*. To the penultimate sentence I originally appended "and one more: Władysław Mieczysław Kozłowski." I left this out as inconsequential. [Reconsider](#).
6. Paragraph *In his introduction*. I rephrased these questions because in general they were wordy or repetitive, and the first two were unclear.
7. Paragraph *Roman Murawski is*
 - a. There is more than one university in Poznań, so I need to use the full name.
 - b. Murawski was born in 1949; his father was Czesław. Roman earned the doctorate in mathematics in 1979 under Wiktor Marek, and credentials in Catholic theology in 1980 and 1985. He habilitated in 1992, became a professor in 1993, and department head in 1996. He has been writing books on foundations and philosophy of mathematics and logic since 1976. His career has been entirely in Poznań, with occasional visits elsewhere. <http://www.staff.amu.edu.pl/~rmur/>.
 - c. The other Roman Murawski was born in 1930 and is apparently still alive, a Salesian priest. He earned the doctorate at the Pontifical Salesian Academy in 1972. He has been writing books on Catholic liturgy and biography since 1989. <http://tnfs.pl/wydarzenia/108-ks-prof-roman-murawski-sdb>.
 - d. The added researchers are Twardowski, Kokoszyńska, Drewnowski, Salamucha, and Bocheński.

- e. Pages 60-69 = 7.5 inches x 10 = 75 inches. Total tabulated below = 12.1 inches \approx 16%.
- | | | | | | |
|----|-----|----|-----|----|-----|
| 60 | 1.6 | 64 | 1.1 | 68 | 2.3 |
| 61 | 0.8 | 65 | 2.0 | 69 | 1.8 |
| 62 | 1.1 | 66 | 0.7 | | |
| 63 | 1.5 | 67 | 1.0 | | |
8. Paragraph *Before returning to*
- a. I put this material here because I didn't want to end with a negative tone.
 - b. I set the bulleted material one point smaller to alleviate the negative tone.
 - c. Syntax error (1). In these examples *since* appears to be used with adverb syntax, but its only adverbial meaning has to do with time past, which is inappropriate here.
 - i. p. 79: "Since they are actually axioms of existence (postulating the existence of certain objects), and 'no logical principle can introduce existence otherwise than in a hypothetical form' (1927a, p. 202)."
 - ii. p. 82: "Since it is not a science about reason but rather about forms of reasoning that we use in all eductions or argumentations."
 - iii. p. 143: "Since Bocheński was a follower of Kant, and then of neo-Thomism."
 - iv. p. 172: "[Since] logic is the only means to revive scientists, showing them the norms of sincof a given theme and the norms of maturity of their works' (1925–1929, vol. 1. p. 4)."
 - d. Syntax error (3) contains a diction error as well: *closeness* should be *closedness*. The original, in this case, was in English!
 - e. Syntax error (5) occurred in translating from French, not Polish. The original text is "oeuvre que le développement considerable des ces théories rend de plus en plus nécessaire."
 - f. Many Kotarbiński quotations are given twice, in Polish from 1961 and in English from 1966, the latter translated by Olgierd Wojtasiewicz and edited by G. Bidwell and C. Pinder. Murawski did not credit that team.
 - i. p. 92 quotes 1957a, 16, which is probably translated in 1966.
 - ii. p. 93 quotes 1962, 9–10, translated in 1966.
 - iii. p. 95 quotes 1961, 130–131, 140, translated in 1966, 104–105, 113.
 - iv. p. 96 quotes 1961, 132, 136, translated in 1966, 106, 109.
 - v. p. 97 quotes 1961, 133,141,289 translated in 1966, 106–107, 113, 243
 - vi. p. 98 quotes 1961, 291–294, 370, translated in 1966, 245–247, 315.
 - vii. p. 99 quotes 1961, 370, 373, translated in 1966, 315, 317.
 - viii. p. 100 quotes 1961, 375, 377–379, translated in 1966, 319, 321–322.
 - ix. p. 101 quotes 1961, 379, translated in 1966, 323.
9. *Additional errors* that I recorded but am not including in this review
- a. Pretentious obscure words
 - i. P. 5: *soteriological aim* (having to do with the saving of humanity through Christ)

- ii. P. 184: *epicherematic concluding* (the latter should probably be *reasoning*). An epicherema is a syllogism, to one or both of whose premises, its proof is added (from an 1807 logic text by Richard Kirwan).
 - b. Typographical: page 35, *typology* should be *topology*.
 - c. Connectives
 - i. P. 3: “an expression that was successfully introduced by a man of great talent ... can become in the mathematical language either a great simplification of science or art to reach the truth and a source of important inventions.” The original text was not supplied.
 - d. Diction
 - i. P. 44: *binegation* should probably be *joint denial*.
 - ii. P. 46: *memorial* should be *memorandum*.
 - iii. P. 48: *argument in favor of his diverse philosophical questions* is unintelligible.
 - iv. P. 100: *deductibility* should be *deducibility*.
 - v. P. 169: *connectedness* might be right, but so rarely used as to require explanation; but it should probably be *transitivity*.
 - e. Misuse of genitive case is less frequent in this book than in other English texts by Poles. But, on p. 171 is “The library...contains numerous Sleszyński’s scripts.”
 - f. Misuse of articles is also less frequent. But, goal (7) on p. ix seems to suggest that concepts of philosophy of mathematics and logic during 1900–1950 were limited to logicism, intuitionism, and formalism. That error is probably due to misuse of *the* before *concepts*, and misuse of *namely*.
 - g. Translation of Sniadecki is worse than that of Murawski. Translations for Biegański are better. Translation of Stamm seems good. Why the variance?
- 10. Paragraph *Several themes prevail*
 - a. In the Tarski book I quote Arianna Betti 2011 on Twardowski’s emphasis on “small philosophy.”
 - b. This book reports intense intellectual interaction among a rather small number of people—still small even if we should count the junior members of these circles who are not featured here. Experience suggests that we are seeing the top of a pyramid. Also, note that the early publications form part of a body of expository mathematical writing. Addressed to whom? The base of the pyramid? Supposing these efforts were somewhat successful, members of that base must have floated upward, forming strata of society that are sophisticated and aware of and articulate about these matters. Who were they?
- 11. Paragraph *In contrast, several*
 - a. Page x: “...not forgetting the influences, especially the environmental or institutional ones, to which scientists were receptive.”
 - b. Lists of academic credentials do not constitute cultural background.
- 12. Paragraph *This lack of*

- a. The story on pp. 148-149 of the disappearance of philosophical remarks from Kuratowski & Mostowski 1959 and Mostowski 1969 is startling. On pp. 156–157, Murawski pussy-foots delicately about the possible influence of the Communist regime on Mostowski’s writing. I doubt that that is necessary nowadays. And shouldn’t he be concerned as well with influences of other isms on writings in the 20s and 30s?
- b. Both Peano and Twardowski come to mind as militants against imprecision.
- 13. Paragraph *From this book*. I particularly learned about the early scholars and about applications to religion and probability.
- 14. *References*
 - a. Woleński has a number of publications that provide cultural information. I felt I should cite at least one. I chose this one because its title is general and complements Kuratowski’s and Kuzawa’s, and Murawski cites it, too.
 - b. Murawski does not cite the other references.
- 15. *Word count* 1660 total. Without the heading, it’s 1612. Without heading or references, it’s 1448.
- 16. *Additional comments not incorporated in the review*
 - a. *Hoene–Wroński*
 - i. P. 6: relative vs. absolute principles is not explained.
 - ii. He is the one of these preliminary figures whose name is known to most mathematicians, so he should have been given more space. He was influential in differential equations, but neither the body text nor the biosketch reveals that. The mixture of religion and mathematics is intriguing.
 - b. *Struve*
 - i. It is not clear what Struve was about.
 - ii. Why did he go to England at age 63?
 - iii. Why did he use a pseudonym?
 - c. *The interplay between philosophy and psychology* is interesting, particularly with Struve and Biegański.
 - d. *Dickstein*
 - i. He is very interesting for his part in publishing Polish works and translations. There is no mention however, of the Mianowski Fund. There is a big story missing about how the Poles in the Russian partition learned about contemporary math.
 - e. *Sierpiński*. This section is weak.
 - f. *Janiszewski*. This section is very clear, particularly on realism versus idealism. He didn’t take sides!
 - g. Murawski is writing about the *philosophy of mathematical practice*, in the sense of Reuben Hersh. Hurray!
 - h. A theme emerges: reflections on philosophy of mathematics influencing mathematical exposition for the general literate public. And in reverse: popular or expository writing as the vehicle for conveying thoughts in philosophy of mathematics. The stress on *Poradnik* is remarkable.

- i. *Chwistek and Steinhaus*
 - i. Chwistek is very interesting, but there is no mention at all of his art!
 - ii. P. 46. In my experience, Chwistek seems best known to Poles as an artist and theorist of art, not as a logician.
 - iii. P. 43. Steinhaus's views on beauty in mathematics and in general are indicated, and he was a prime expositor in that regard. One wonders whether his close connection with Chwistek, a theorist of art, had anything to do with this.
 - iv. P. 50: "Chwistek concluded that constructing deductive systems on the basis of philosophy is pointless—such a system cannot be built due to the degree of the complexity of philosophical investigations. Perhaps this means, "to provide a basis for."
- j. *Twardowski*
 - i. This section is very clear but doesn't do justice to his organizational achievements and his influence on others.
 - ii. It relates his work to that of Tarski and Kokoszyńska, which gave me trouble.
 - iii. I opted not to mention that his tenet that *judgments* not *statements* are truth bearers, which is opposite to Tarski's.
- k. *Łukasiewicz*
 - i. His polemic with Zaremba was unknown to me.
 - ii. His dispute with the Wiener Kreis as to experimental verifiability of logical truths was unknown to me.
 - iii. So were details of his discovery of many-valued logic.
- l. *Zawirski*. There is useful information here on nonstandard logic.
- m. *Kotarbiński*. This section is very good on the notion of truth.
- n. *Ajdukiewicz*
 - i. This is good on the methodology of the deductive sciences.
 - ii. The article carries into the postwar era.
- o. *Tarski*. Tarski's philosophy is examined here more closely than others', perhaps because of his stature and the fact that he wrote so little.
- p. *Kokoszyńska*. This would have been helpful to me.
- q. *Cracow circle*. This is very interesting and was unknown to me.
- r. *Mostowski*
 - i. This section could be regarded as a demonstration of what many of the studies during the 1920s and 1930s led to or permitted.
 - ii. Here too is emphasis on mathematical exposition. I didn't know about that.
- s. *Bornstein*. He wrote a book in English that Mac Lane reviewed in JSL 4(1939): 133–134. He called it "grandiloquent, naive, and confused."
- t. *Sleszyński*. There is more emphasis here on exposition and surprising material on methodology.

- u. *Zaremba*. He and Cracovians advocated logic as a tool for mathematical practice and didactics, versus the Varsovians' regarding it as an independent subject.
 - v. *Wilkosz*. Evidently our everyday use of equivalence classes had still not become standard in Wilkosz's audience.
17. Note to Dennis Smolarski

Dear Dennis,

Thank you so much for looking up Murawski's connection with liturgy. I was confused. I found an English CV of my subject author, born in 1949, that indicates that he has degrees in theology, earned after his PhD:

<http://www.staff.amu.edu.pl/~rmur/>.

The book under review includes more information than usual about Polish logicians' interest in theology, which is what triggered my curiosity. I didn't find any publications of this author in that area, and taking your word that he is not famous for that interest, I opted not to say anything about it. However, I did find this Polish CV of an author, a Salesian, with the same name born in 1930:

<http://tnfs.pl/wydarzenia/108-ks-prof-roman-murawski-sdb>.

WorldCat lists many Polish works of his on liturgy, and mixes them with my author's (although it is possible to tweak it to separate them out). So I included a note to say that my author is different from that earlier one.

Thanks again,

18. Cover letter, reproduced in the email body.

Dear Prof. Scanlan,

Here is my review for HPL of Roman Murawski's 2014, *The philosophy of mathematics and logic in the 1920s and 1930s in Poland*. My word processor counts 1660 words total, 1448 without the heading and references. I hope that doesn't exceed your limit.

The review is overall positive, with only one negative comment about its content: lack of cultural-background information. The other negative comments, about its editing, are confined to the paragraphs beginning *Before returning to* (which has several indented displays) and *The lack of*. I don't think these are polemic.

Beware: this text contains the Polish characters *ę, ł, Ł, ń, ó, ś, Ś, and Ź*. They don't all occur in some fonts—for instance my standard font—and thus may require special treatment.