



THE POLISH
CHRISTIAN PHILOSOPHY
IN THE 20TH CENTURY

A Companion

to Polish
Christian Philosophy
of the 20th and 21st
Centuries

IGNATIANUM UNIVERSITY PRESS

Publishing Series

THE POLISH CHRISTIAN PHILOSOPHY IN THE 20TH CENTURY

Mieczysław Gogacz • Stanisław Kamiński • Kazimierz Kloskowski

Kazimierz Kłósak • Feliks Koneczny • Mieczysław Albert Krąpiec

Piotr Lenartowicz • Tadeusz Styczeń • Tadeusz Ślipko • Józef Tischner

Karol Wojtyła • Jacek Woroniecki • Zofia Józefa Zdybicka

A Companion to Polish Christian Philosophy of the 20th and 21st Centuries

Scientific Board

Artur Andrzejuk, Tadeusz Biesaga SDB, Józef Bremer SJ,
Piotr Duchliński, Fr. Grzegorz Hołub, Fr. Jarosław Jagiełło,
Adam Jonkisz, Fr. Jan Krokos, Anna Latawiec, Anna Lemańska,
Damian Leszczyński, Fr. Ryszard Moń, Zbigniew Pańpuch,
Ewa Podrez, Paweł Skrzydlewski, Fr. Jan Sochoń,
Krzysztof Stachewicz, Fr. Kazimierz M. Wolsza, Fr. Władysław Zuziak

Editorial Board

Fr. Maciej Bała, Piotr Stanisław Mazur

<https://pchph.ignatianum.edu.pl>



THE POLISH
CHRISTIAN PHILOSOPHY
IN THE 20TH CENTURY

A Companion

to Polish Christian Philosophy of the 20th and 21st Centuries

Edited by
Piotr S. Mazur
Piotr Duchliński
Paweł Skrzydlewski

Translated by
Laura Bigaj

Ignatianum University Press

Krakow 2020

© Copyright by Akademia Ignatianum w Krakowie, 2020

This publication was financed within the frame of the Minister of Science and Higher Education programme: “Monuments of Polish philosophical, theological and social thought of the 20th and 21st century,” conducted in 2016–2020.

Project no. 0033/FIL/2016/90

Reviewers

Fr. Stanisław Janeczek

Włodzimierz Tyburski

Ryszard Wiśniewski

Supervising editor

Roman Małecki

Proofreading

Aeddan Shaw

Jacek Pawłowicz

Index of names

Dariusz Piskulak

Typesetting

Lesław Sławiński

Cover design

PHOTO DESIGN – Lesław Sławiński

ISBN 978-83-7614-473-3

Ignatianum University Press

ul. Kopernika 26 • 31–501 Krakow, PL

tel. +48 12 39 99 620

wydawnictwo@ignatianum.edu.pl

<http://wydawnictwo.ignatianum.edu.pl>

Table of contents

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	7
INTRODUCTION	
<i>Piotr S. Mazur, Piotr Duchliński, Paweł Skrzydlewski</i>	9
1. LOGIC AND METHODOLOGY OF SCIENCES	
<i>Adam Jonkisz, Jacek Poznański SJ</i>	19
2. METAPHYSICS	
<i>Fr. Tomasz Duma</i>	51
3. EPISTEMOLOGY	
<i>Piotr Duchliński, Jarosław Kucharski</i>	75
4. PHILOSOPHY OF NATURE	
<i>Anna Lemańska</i>	99
5. PHILOSOPHY OF MAN	
<i>Fr. Władysław Zuziak</i>	123
6. ETHICS	
<i>Fr. Ryszard Moń, Ewa Podrez</i>	145
7. AXIOLOGY	
<i>Krzysztof Stachewicz</i>	167
8. AESTHETICS AND PHILOSOPHY OF ART	
<i>Roman Konik</i>	195

9. PHILOSOPHY OF GOD AND RELIGION	
<i>Andrzej Gielarowski</i>	217
10. SOCIAL PHILOSOPHY	
<i>Paweł Skrzydlewski, Piotr S. Mazur</i>	249
11. PHILOSOPHY OF CULTURE	
<i>Tomasz Homa SJ, Urszula Tes</i>	271
12. HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY	
<i>Marek Urban CSsR</i>	295
INDEX OF NAMES	321

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

- AIK** Akademia Ignatianum w Krakowie [Jesuit University Ignatianum in Krakow]
- ATK** Akademia Teologii Chrześcijańskiej w Warszawie [Academy of Catholic Theology in Warsaw]
- ChAT** Chrześcijańska Akademia Teologiczna w Warszawie [Christian Theological Academy in Warsaw]
- IFiS PAN** Instytut Filozofii i Socjologii Polskiej Akademii Nauk [Institute of Philosophy and Sociology of Polish Academy of Sciences]
- KUL** Katolicki Uniwersytet Lubelski [Catholic University of Lublin]
- PAN** Polska Akademia Nauk [Polish Academy of Sciences]
- PAT** Papieska Akademia Teologiczna [Pontifical Academy of Theology]
- PAU** Polska Akademia Umiejętności [Polish Academy of Arts and Sciences]
- WSNS** Wyższa Szkoła Nauk Społecznych w Warszawie [Higher School of Social Sciences in Warsaw]
- PRL** Polska Rzeczpospolita Ludowa [Polish People's Republic]
- PWSZ** Państwowa Wyższa Szkoła Zawodowa w Chełmie [The State School of Higher Education in Chełm]
- PWT** Papieski Wydział Teologiczny [Pontifical Faculty of Theology]
- UAM** Uniwersytet im. Adama Mickiewicza w Poznaniu [The Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań]
- UG** Uniwersytet Gdański [University of Gdańsk]
- UJ** Uniwersytet Jagielloński [Jagiellonian University]
- UJK** Uniwersytet Jana Kochanowskiego w Kielcach [The Jan Kochanowski University in Kielce]
- UMCS** Uniwersytet Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej w Lublinie [The Maria Curie Skłodowska University in Lublin]
- UMK** Uniwersytet Mikołaja Kopernika w Toruniu [The Nicolaus Copernicus University in Toruń]
- SWPS** Szkoła Wyższa Psychologii Społecznej w Warszawie [Warsaw School of Social Psychology]
- UO** Uniwersytet Opolski [University of Opole]
- UP** Uniwersytet Pedagogiczny w Krakowie [Pedagogical University of Krakow]

- UPJPII** Uniwersytet Papieski Jana Pawła II w Krakowie [Pontifical University of John Paul II in Krakow]
- US** Uniwersytet Szczeciński [University of Szczecin]
- UŚ** Uniwersytet Śląski w Katowicach [University of Silesia in Katowice]
- UW** Uniwersytet Warszawski [University of Warsaw]
- UWM** Uniwersytet Warmińsko-Mazurski w Olsztynie [University of Warmia and Mazury in Olsztyn]
- UWr** Uniwersytet Wrocławski [University of Wrocław]
- WFTJ** Wydział Filozoficzny Towarzystwa Jezusowego w Krakowie [Faculty of Philosophy of the Society of Jesus in Krakow]
- WSD** Wyższe Seminarium Duchowne [The Higher Theological Seminary]
- WSEZiNS** Wyższa Szkoła Edukacji Zdrowotnej i Nauk Społecznych w Łodzi [Academy of Health Education and Social Sciences in Łódź]

Piotr Stanisław Mazur
Jesuit University Ignatianum in Krakow

Piotr Duchliński
Jesuit University Ignatianum in Krakow

Paweł Skrzydlewski
The State School of Higher Education in Chełm

INTRODUCTION

The aim of the *Companion to Polish Christian Philosophy of the 20th and 21st Centuries* is a synthetic presentation of the academic achievements of thinkers whose manner of philosophizing may be regarded as belonging to a broadly conceived category of Christian philosophy. Numerous works on the history of philosophy have highlighted its unique features and the role it played, especially in the times of real socialism (1945–1989) when Marxism was the philosophy promoted by the authorities. At that time, Christian philosophy was a sign of pluralism and openness to different thinking trends developed in Western Europe, something which could not be explored by Polish philosophical scholars at the time due to censorship. At the same time, because of its very nature, Christian thought made it possible for all of the philosophy practiced in Poland in that period to maintain pluralism.¹ The current literature may allow us to become familiar with many aspects of Christian philosophy in Poland, but there is no single monograph that presents it as a whole, showing the contribution it has made to shaping the philosophical culture of Poland over the last 120 years.

The Christian philosophy which developed in Poland in the 20th century is an integral part of its entire intellectual culture. That is why any omission or conscious ignorance of this fact means that subsequent interpretations lose an important factor in understanding its identity. For many years, especially in the period of communism,

¹ J. Skoczyński, J. Woleński, *Historia filozofii polskiej* (Kraków: Wydawnictwo WAM, 2010).

negative stereotypes concerning Christian philosophy were promoted and the scientific achievements of Christian thinkers, as well as the importance of their contribution to Polish culture and education, were understated. The dominance of naturalist tendencies Polish philosophy and in the world in general makes it difficult to reliably evaluate the achievements of Christian philosophers even now, at the beginning of the 21st century. There are still many people who question the value and significance of Christian philosophy, pushing it into the murky corners of academia, and treating it as ideologically infected, overly religious way of thinking that hinders the development of science, culture and philosophical education.

Among its various social and cultural changes, Christian philosophy has been struggling over its own identity for a long time. It is because this thought is a historical product. It was established in a specific time, under the influence of particular cultural conditions related to the adaptation of the Christian doctrine to the image of the world shaped by ancient philosophy. The fact of the historical existence of this philosophy has not been generally questioned, but its methodological and epistemological status has raised many doubts. That is why as a result, many of the past discussions on the subject focused not on its historical dimension, but on its methodological.² Many of the philosophers who developed this type of philosophy felt the need to justify the way of philosophizing they had adopted, especially due to the fact that such a justification was—to a greater or lesser extent—required by the cultural context in which a particular concept of Christian philosophy was being shaped. The discussion on Christian philosophy which was carried out in the 1930s has not been definitely closed,³ continuing to rage even now and also

² S. Swieżawski, “O roli, jaką chrześcijaństwo wyznacza filozofii,” *Znak*, no. 7–8(422–423) (1999), pp. 19–30; J.A. Kłoczowski, “Filozofia chrześcijańska? Dyskusja w kontekście encykliki ‘Fides et ratio’,” in *Polska filozofia wobec ‘Fides et ratio’*, ed. M. Grabowski (Toruń: Wydawnictwo UMK, 1999).

³ H. Gouhier, “Gilson et la philosophie chrétienne,” in H. Gouhier, *Étienne Gilson. Trois essais: Bergson – La philosophie chrétienne – L’art* (Paris: Vrin, 1993), pp. 41–47. A reconstruction of this dispute of 1830s is presented in the article: R.J. Fąfara, R. Lizut, “Spór o rozumienie ‘filozofii chrześcijańskiej’ między É. Gilsonem a H. Gouhierem,” *Człowiek w Kulturze*, no. 19 (2007), pp. 331–355; J. Maritain, “O filozofii chrześcijańskiej,” in idem, *Pisma filozoficzne*, trans. J. Fenrychowa (Kraków: Znak, 1988); É. Gilson, *Chryścianizm a filozofia*, trans. A. Więkowski (Warszawa: Instytut Wydawniczy Pax, 1988); S. Swieżawski, “O roli, jaką chrześcijaństwo wyznacza filozofii,” *Znak*, no. 7–8(422–423) (1990), pp. 19–30;

in Poland.⁴ However, its validity has been confirmed by the works of authors who have tried to describe the methodological status of this philosophy, as well as the disciplines which are given the epithet of “Christian,” e.g. “Christian ethics.”⁵ Following the idea of Paul Ricoeur, we can say that Christian philosophy still inspires philosophers coming from different research traditions.⁶

Christian philosophy has never been an intellectual monolith and, at least from the historical point of view, we can speak about different ways of articulating and practicing it. It was the case when it was formed, and it is the case now. However, it seems that in all the particular ways of practicing it, we can follow the thought of Gilson, speaking about the “Christian philosophy as such.”⁷ It is a philosophy without names, a philosophy of “pure” problems and “pure” concepts, as well as their subjective and methodological consequences. Such a view of Christian philosophy makes it possible for us to discern a kind of common Christian philosophical experience which has been expressed in different research traditions. Just like in the historical development

P. Chojnacki, *Wybór pism*, eds. M. Szyszkowska, C. Tarnogórski (Warszawa: Instytut Wydawniczy Pax, 1987); S. Kamiński, *Filozofia i metoda. Studia z dziejów metod filozofowania* (Lublin, Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL, 1989); M. Gogacz, “Czym jest filozofia chrześcijańska,” *Za i Przeciw*, no. 14 (1981), pp. 6–23; K. Szalata, *Filozofia chrześcijańska. Na marginesie wielkiej debaty od encykliki ‘Aeterni Patris’ do ‘Fides et ratio’* (Warszawa: Fundacja Polska Raoula Follereau, 2004); J. Ratzinger, “Wiara, filozofia, teologia,” in idem, *Prawda w teologii*, trans. M. Mijska (Kraków: Wydawnictwo M, 2005).

⁴ Z.J. Zdybicka, E.I. Zieliński, “Chrześcijańska filozofia,” in *Powszechna encyklopedia filozofii*, vol. 2, ed. A. Maryniarczyk (Lublin: Polskie Towarzystwo Tomasza z Akwinu, 2001), pp. 167–173.

⁵ S. Gałęcki, “O możliwości istnienia filozofii chrześcijańskiej,” *Ruch Filozoficzny*, no. 3 (2016), pp. 117–132; P. Duchliński, A. Kobyliński, R. Moń, E. Podrez, *Inspiracje chrześcijańskie w etyce* (Kraków: Akademia Ignatianum w Krakowie; Wydawnictwo WAM, Kraków).

⁶ K. Stachewicz, “O filozofii chrześcijańskiej. Kilka uwag z perspektywy historycznej i futurologicznej,” *Logos i Ethos*, no. 2 (2013), pp. 219–234 (online version); J.A. Kłoczowski, “Filozofia chrześcijańska? Dyskusja w kontekście encykliki ‘Fides et ratio’,” in *Polska filozofia wobec ‘Fides et ratio’*, ed. M. Grabowski (Toruń: Wydawnictwo UMK, 1999); W. Chudy, “Filozofia chrześcijańska – rozum i wiara,” *Ethos*, no. 3–4 (2007), pp. 45–66; J. Grzeszczak, “‘Christus philosophicus’ jako aktualne przesłanie sztuki wczesnochrześcijańskiej. Uwagi na marginesie wykładu kard. Josepha Ratzingera ‘Wiara, filozofia, teologia’,” *Filozofia Chrześcijańska* 6 (2009), pp. 31–45.

⁷ É. Gilson, *Jedność doświadczenia filozoficznego*, trans. Z. Wrzeszcz (Warszawa: Instytut Wydawniczy Pax, 1968).

of Christian philosophy in 20th century Poland, on the one hand, we can see that there are a number of ways of practicing it, and, on the other hand—there is a certain unity to the Christian philosophical experience, which makes it possible to capture the unique features of this way of philosophizing.

The concept of “Christian philosophy” was coined in the course of fierce discussions between its adherents and detractors. Perhaps “Christian” philosophy is something we can speak about in the context of certain inspirations, i.e. in the context of discovering rather than justifying. And Christianity, as a religious tradition, can be the source of different problem situations which a philosopher may explain with the use of particular conceptual categories typical of a given age and image of the world functioning at that time. The idea of “Christian philosophy” is ambiguous and, as a result, unclear. Moreover, it expresses the combination of different aspects, such as the historical and the objective, and thus there are various problems related to its application. On the one hand, we mean a certain cultural phenomenon (both in the past and now); on the other hand, we question whether it is correct to use such a name for philosophy; on yet another, we are trying to establish a criterion based on which a given thinker or concept may be classified as belonging to that philosophical trend. In none of those aspects have definite decisions been made.

The concept of Christian philosophy is of a typological nature. It functions as a descriptive or valuing idea, but—in different types of discourses—it usually functions in both roles at the same time. As a typological category, it enables the capture of specific features of the phenomenon in question, taking into account its modifications occurring at different levels of its historical development. However, the *Companion* does not perform a general typological (semiotic) analysis of Christian philosophy in terms of the reconstruction of the common assumptions and their consequences for particular branches of philosophy. Also, its authors do not attempt to provide a systematic answer to the question of who is a typical Christian philosopher and who is not. Therefore, there is a problem of the criteria that would make it possible to identify (or classify) a given philosopher as the one that represents the thinking formation (trend, school) that may be called Christian philosophy. Thus, the *Companion to Polish Christian Philosophy of the 20th and 21st Centuries* is the result of the interpretation—both by the editors of the volume and the authors of particular

chapters—of what Christian philosophy is, and what it is like in particular conditions of the 20th and at the beginning of the 21st century in Poland. However, such an interpretation is never accidental, and it is based on the identification of particular philosophers and the whole environments as “Christian” or on the identification of the nature of their philosophy as “Christian” in the contemporary scientific discourse.

Referring to the category of the “research tradition” delineated by the modern philosopher of science Larry Laudan, we can say that the Christian philosophy which developed in Poland over the course of the last century constitutes precisely such a tradition. It includes a number of different ways of practicing philosophy (neo-Thomist, phenomenological, hermeneutical, dialogic or analytic manner) fulfilled by different philosophical schools or individual thinkers who have been very restrained in terms of identifying with any formalized philosophical school. Some of these concepts of Christian philosophy, e.g. Louvain or traditional Thomism, seem to belong to the past, and have no real influence on the shape of the contemporary philosophical culture and education. Other concepts, such as existential Thomism or phenomenology, still retain an influence—to a greater or lesser degree. Yet other concepts, such as analytic Christian philosophy, are accelerating and will in the future perhaps create a new paradigm for the practice of Christian philosophy. The changing mentality of contemporary has forced Christian philosophers to modify the current ways of carrying out the discourse. It has led to transformations in the Christian research tradition related to the disappearance of old ways of conceptualizing the Christian experience and the appearance of new ones. The dynamics of those changes have been captured in particular chapters of the *Companion* where not only have the authors tried to outline the history of the Christian philosophy of the 20th century, but they have also attempted to specify the subject of its current discourse. Nevertheless, the book does not indicate the primacy of one way of practicing Christian philosophy over another—neither in a substantive nor in a methodological manner. The authors, representing different environments and views, have tried to remain neutral, both in terms of describing and evaluating the disputes or differences among particular kinds of Christian philosophy.

Particular chapters of the *Companion* were prepared by authors who are either representatives of Polish Christian philosophy or have

been analyzing this field for many years. The subject of their analyses includes philosophical texts (monographs, scientific and popular scientific articles) coming from different periods of the development of Polish Christian philosophy. In the reconstruction of these original achievements, they have referred to both the source texts and the monographs in question which they have tried to assess more or less critically. They usually implement the analytic and hermeneutic method for the analysis and interpretation of philosophical texts. That is why this has meant that their articles contain numerous lecturing and reconstruction elements related to particular issues or views, taking into account the different contexts which have determined their creation and development. The presentation of trends, schools or individual authors is limited to a reconstruction report so that the reader can receive the presentation of views that is as reliable as possible. Therefore, a marginal role is played by the interpretation and evaluation of the reconstructed opinions or solutions they suggest. The manner of presenting Polish Christian philosophy adopted by the *Companion* unfortunately precluded the possibility of us showing some of the many valuable publishing or institutional initiatives that have appeared within this philosophy. Thus, we should at least briefly mention the existence of some of the journals promoting Christian philosophy in the 20th century and in the first two decades of the 21st century (e.g.: *Roczniki Filozoficzne* [*Philosophical Annuals*], *Collectanea Theologica*, *Studia Philosophiae Christianae*, *Analecta Cracoviensia*, *Przełąd Tomistyczny* [*Thomist Review*], *Zeszyty Naukowe KUL* [*Scientific Journals of the Catholic University of Lublin*], *Ethos*), as well as the edition of *Encyklopedia filozofii* [*Encyclopaedia of Philosophy*] by Ignacy Mysłicki (1874–1935), Church encyclopaedias by Fr. Michał Nowodworski (1831–1896) and Fr. Zygmunt Chełmicki (1851–1922), as well as the recent monumental works in the form of *Encyklopedia katolicka* [*Catholic Encyclopaedia*], *Leksykon filozofii klasycznej* [*Lexicon of Classical Philosophy*], *Powszechna encyklopedia filozofii* [*Universal Encyclopaedia of Philosophy*] and *Encyklopedia filozofii polskiej* [*Encyclopaedia of Polish Philosophy*]. Particular environments of Christian philosophy have produced a number of valuable publishing series including various fields of philosophy. At the beginning of the 21st century, the research on broadly understood Christian philosophy was gradually becoming institutionalized, opening up a new stage in that thought in Poland. Several important scientific-research institutions were

opened to deal with the promotion of Christian philosophy. They include: Polskie Towarzystwo Tomasza z Akwinu [Polish Association of Thomas Aquinas], Centrum Kopernika Badań Interdyscyplinarnych [Copernicus Center for Interdisciplinary Studies], Instytut ks. Józefa Tischnera [The Tischner Institute], Centrum Badań im. Edyty Stein UAM w Poznaniu [Edith Stein Research Centre at UAM in Poznań], and Centrum Etyki Chrześcijańskiej im. Tadeusza Ślipki SJ [Tadeusz Ślipko Centre for Christian Ethics] at the Jesuit University Ignatianum in Krakow.

One of the most difficult issues which the authors of the *Companion* came across was specifying whether a given philosopher should be classified to the research tradition of Christian philosophy. They used several flexible criteria while analyzing this issue. The basic criterion for being a part of Christian research tradition was the metaphysical self-declaration (identification or approval) of a given thinker. On the one hand, this criterion is related to the worldview; on the other hand—it is methodological. It requires expressing one's support for a particular religious tradition and specific way of practicing philosophy in which the main methodological criterion (the negative criterion) is the non-contradiction of philosophical theses with the data of Christian religious revelation. In case of the lack of such a clear self-declarations, a given philosopher was classified as a supporter of Christian philosophy based on the access to a given scientific environment (school) which, as a whole (e.g. on the basis of the program), declared such a view, or—in the case of individual authors—on their discussion of so-called typical problems characteristic of Christian philosophy. And although such criteria are ambiguous, they made it possible for us to outline the most important problems and indicate the main representatives of the Polish Christian philosophy of the 20th and 21st century. While studying the development of Christian thought in Poland, we can discern a certain regularity: the philosophers of the older generation (e.g. from the beginning of the 20th century, in the interwar period, and up to the 1970s) emphasized their access to Christian philosophy, and the thinkers of the younger generation—although they take up the same or similar problems in one form or another (reconstruction, reinterpretation)—usually refrain from unambiguous methodological or even worldview self-declarations.

Polish Christian philosophy, as a certain type of the culture of philosophizing, developed under the influence of certain historical

and cultural factors.⁸ That is why the reconstruction of output and achievements of its representatives in the 20th and 21st century included the historical and systematic aspect. The authors wanted, in a possibly objective and journalist manner, to present the most important successes, consciously avoiding the evaluation of particular concepts and related solutions, and not just present—in an uncritical manner—the fact that there were many particular ways of practicing Christian philosophy in Poland. As the editors, we wished to make a study of the views that were created in the past, to highlight the modern image of Christian philosophy, and to emphasize its presence and influence on the contemporary culture of philosophizing.⁹ We wanted the readers to receive quite a reliable companion of reviews, on the basis of which they can work out their own general (not one-sided) opinion on the Polish Christian philosophy of the 20th and 21st century, and on its involvement in shaping the philosophical culture in Poland and in the world. In order to meet these requirements, we suggested the general scheme of the chapter structure which included: the outline of the historical context in which given issues were shaped; the presentation of the most important trends, schools or individual thinkers who dealt with a given subject; the debates that were conducted around given issues; and the presentation of the contemporary status of a given area of philosophy, taking into account the current development of the research. At the same time, the authors of particular chapters were free to choose the way of fulfilling the above guidelines, so that each of them could take into account the specific features of a given field of philosophy.

The *Companion* includes the presentation of the twelve most important areas of philosophy: logic and methodology of sciences, metaphysics, epistemology, the philosophy of nature, the philosophy of man, ethics, axiology, aesthetics and the philosophy of art, the philosophy of God and religion; social philosophy, the philosophy of culture, and the history of philosophy. Due to the structural assumptions and volume limitations, it was necessary to reduce the number of the discussed fields of philosophy. As a result, there was not enough space

⁸ S. Janeczek, “Między filozoficzną historią filozofii a historią kultury. Z rozważań nad metodą historii filozofii w Polsce,” *Roczniki Filozoficzne KUL* 55, no. 1 (2007), pp. 89–105.

⁹ S. Swieżawski, *Zagadnienie historii filozofii* (Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1966).

for a separate presentation of Christian bioethics or philosophy of science. And the philosophy of politics and social philosophy, just like the issue of the philosophy of God (natural theology) and the philosophy of religion, due to the similarity of the subjects, have been presented in one chapter.

We realize that the *Companion* might not satisfy the maximalist aspirations of the readers who will use it to find the complete presentation of Polish Christian philosophical thought in the 20th and 21st century. Nevertheless, the book shows that, for the last 120 years, this thought has been shaped by Christian philosophers who truly cared about the authentic science and culture of philosophizing, one free of administrative pressure and political correctness. The originality of their solutions shaped a unique type of the culture of philosophizing. Their presentation is a part of the promotion of Christian philosophy carried out by different environments and, in the current legal and cultural situation, philosophy increasingly has to fight for its identity, both as a philosophy (among other scientific disciplines) and as Christian philosophy (among other philosophical trends). We hope that the *Companion*, which is addressed to both Polish and international readers, will help to develop their knowledge of Polish Christian philosophy and refute many of the unfair stereotypes associated with it.

Adam Jonkisz
Jesuit University Ignatianum in Krakow
Jacek Poznański SJ
Jesuit University Ignatianum in Krakow

1.

LOGIC AND METHODOLOGY OF SCIENCES

Certainly, there is no uniquely Christian methodology of sciences or—all the more—a uniquely Christian logic. That is why this presentation is focused on the results concerning logic and methodology of sciences achieved in the centers of 20th century Christian thought, and it is limited to the places and people of greater significance—usually to the founders of a given center or school. Nevertheless, we shall also provide some information about their co-workers and students—mainly the followers and continuators whose works were important for Christian philosophy, and we shall mention those who apply logic and methodological skills learnt in a given place outside Christian philosophy.

Logic is understood in a broad manner: it includes logical semiotics, formal logic and the methodology of sciences, traditional and mathematical logic, as well as studies of historians and philosophers of logic; and the methodology of sciences, apart from the general methodology shared with logic, also includes methodologies of particular disciplines, especially the methodology of philosophy and theology.¹

¹ The presentation starts with the outline of the historical context (limited to the Polish logic and philosophy which was inspired by Christianity). In the main part, we have described the centers of Christian thought in which logic and methodology was developed, as well as the most important people connected with those centers; in the third part we have presented the main achievements,

HISTORICAL AND IDEOLOGICAL CONTEXT

The most important context and the basic source of the achievements of logic and methodology developed in the centers of Christian thought was the scientific environment called the Lviv-Warsaw school, created by Kazimierz Twardowski (1866–1938), which, in the interwar period (1918–1939), conducted intensive logical and methodological research.² The representatives of the school not only applied logic in their philosophizing, but many of them contributed to the development of the world's formal logic, e.g. Jan Łukasiewicz (1878–1956), Stanisław Leśniewski (1886–1939), Alfred Tarski (1901–1983); moreover, they believed that logic was a necessary component of teaching and upbringing.³ Also, the postwar centers of the research on formal logic, semiotics and methodology were shaped by the scientists connected with the School. The Wrocław center was co-created by Jerzy Śłupecki (1904–1987), Jerzy Łoś (1920–1998) and Ludwik Borkowski (1914–1993). In Warsaw and Łódź Tadeusz Kotarbiński (1886–1981) was working, in Poznań—Kazimierz Ajdukiewicz (1890–1963; since 1955 at UW and PAN in Krakow), and at UJ—Zygmunt Zawirski (1882–1948). In Toruń, Tadeusz Czeżowski (1889–1981) and Stanisław

and in the last one—the remarks on their meaning, discussions and current research. The layout of these considerations—which includes the historical context and combines the chronological order with the description according to people, the main achievements and current research—may result in some repetitions, but it makes it possible for the reader to view the logic and methodology developed in the centers of Polish Christian thought in the 20th century from many different angles.

² The history of Polish logic before World War II is divided into the periods: preparatory period (1900–1917; Henryk Struve [1840–1912], Władysław Biegański [1857–1917]) and peak (1918–1939). Cf. J.J. Jadacki, “Logika,” in *Historia nauki polskiej*, vol. 4, part 3, ed. Z. Skubała-Tokarska (Wrocław-Warszawa: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, 1987), pp. 550–551, 556–562; J. Woleński, “Polish Logic,” in idem, *Historico-Philosophical Essays*, vol. 1 (Kraków: Copernicus Center Press, 2012), pp. 213–230. The division into the periods before and after World War II was adopted in, e.g. M. Tkaczyk, U. Wybraniec-Skardowska, “Logika polska,” in *Encyklopedia filozofii polskiej*, vol. 1, ed. A. Maryniarczyk (Lublin: Polskie Towarzystwo Tomasza z Akwinu, 2011), pp. 880–890.

³ The output of the philosophers of the School, especially in logic, methodology (including the methodology of philosophy) and epistemology is presented in the monograph by J. Woleński: *Filozoficzna szkoła lwowsko-warszawska* (Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1985).

Jaśkowski (1906–1965), and later—Leon Gumański (1921–2014) were working. The departments of logic were created at the faculties of philosophy and history and at the faculties of humanities, and logic was introduced into the curricula of many studies. Not only formal logic, but also the logical theory of language and the logical theory of science were developed. In 1953 the journal *Studia Logica* was created (Institute of the Philosophy and Sociology of PAN), and in 1965—the *Reports on Mathematical Logic* (UJ).⁴

Neo-Thomism developed according to the Louvain School (Désiré Mercier), which combined the studies on the medieval philosophy with the modern philosophy and the results of natural sciences (the idea of modernization: *vetera novis augere*),⁵ was—at least until 1980s—basic for the philosophy inspired by Christianity, institutionally connected with the Catholic Church.

After 1945, the main centers of the (neo)Thomist philosophy were the Faculty of Christian Philosophy at KUL (since 1946), the Faculty of Theology at UJ (up to 1954) and the Faculty of Philosophy at ATK (since 1954). Within Polish Thomism, the most influential was existential Thomism developed at KUL since 1950s by Stefan Swieżawski (1907–2004), Jerzy Kalinowski (1916–2000), Mieczysław Albert Krąpiec OP (1921–2008), Fr. Stanisław Kamiński (1919–1986), Antoni Bazyli Stępień (1931–) and Stanisław Majdański (1935–), which, in the 1960s, resulted in significant publications and the creation of the so-called Lublin Philosophical School in which philosophy is practiced

⁴ It is true that most of the achievements in Polish logic in the 20th century are the work of the School and its students or researchers referring to its curriculum. Cf. J.J. Jadacki, “Szkola Lwowsko-Warszawska i jej wpływ na filozofię polską drugiej połowy XX wieku,” in *Historia filozofii polskiej. Dokonania – poszukiwania – projekty*, eds. A. Dziedzic, A. Kołakowski, S. Pieróg, P. Ziemiński (Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Semper, 2007), pp. 126–137; a synthetic presentation of the development of the centres and achievements in formal logic, semiotics and methodology was included in: S. Kamiński, “Rozwój logiki i metodologii nauk w Polsce po II wojnie światowej,” *Roczniki Filozoficzne* 24, no. 1 (1976), pp. 113–122; also, it has to be admitted that, after 1950, the fruitful interaction between logic and philosophy weakened. Cf. J. Skoczyński, J. Woleński, *Historia filozofii polskiej* (Kraków: Wydawnictwo WAM, 2010), pp. 537–538.

⁵ Cf. A.B. Stępień, “O stanie filozofii tomistycznej w Polsce,” in *W nurcie zagadnień posoborowych*, vol. 2, ed. B. Bejze (Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Sióstr Loretanek-Benedyktynek, 1968), pp. 97–126; J. Skoczyński, J. Woleński, *Historia filozofii polskiej*, pp. 513–516.

as an autonomous discipline although it uses the results of logic, methodology and historical research. In Kraków, at the Pontifical Academy of Theology, at the end of 1970s, Fr. Michał Heller (1936–) and Fr. Józef Życiński (1948–2011), the supporters of philosophizing in the context of science and interdisciplinary dialogue, initiated the common research of philosophers and scientists, which were later carried out in the Interdisciplinary Research Centre.

CENTERS AND SCIENTISTS

Roman Catholic Higher Seminaries

The canon of seminaries' lectures on philosophy also included traditional logic. Logic and methodology of sciences was lectured sometimes by the active researchers such as Fr. Józef Iwanicki (1902–1995) (who also worked in the Seminary in Włocławek) and Fr. Leopold Regner (1912–1997)—the author of the handbook of logic⁶—who lectured at the Seminary in Tarnów. The need to introduce logic into teaching philosophy and theological studies was postulated by, i.a., Fr. Jan Salamucha (1903–1944) and Kamiński. Salamucha emphasized that modern logic should be introduced into the *curriculum* of the philosophical education of future Catholic priests,⁷ and Kamiński postulated that broadly understood logic (semiotics, formal logic, element of general methodology and methodology of particular sciences) and the history of logic should be lectured in seminaries.⁸

Theological faculties of state universities

After the regaining of its independence in 1918, theological faculties in Poland functioned at the universities in Kraków, Lviv, Vilnius and Warsaw.⁹ At least one of (usually) twelve departments at each

⁶ L. Regner, *Logika* (Kraków: Polskie Towarzystwo Teologiczne, 1973).

⁷ J. Salamucha, "Nauczanie logiki w seminarjach duchownych," in *Pamiętnik siódmego zjazdu w Wilnie, 19.IV. – 21.IV.1933* (Wilno: Drukarnia Archidiecezjalna, 1934), pp. 171–182.

⁸ S. Kamiński, "Czy logika jest dyscypliną praktyczną?" *Ateneum Kapłańskie* 57, no. 2 (1958), pp. 228–233.

⁹ At UW, in 1920, the Faculty of Evangelical Theology was opened, and in 1925—the Study of Orthodox Theology.

dealt with Christian philosophy, including logic. After 1945, the Catholic faculties of theology were re-opened in Kraków and Warsaw, but in 1954 they were removed from the universities and their staff was invited to form the Academy of Catholic Theology (ATK) in Warsaw. The Faculty of Evangelical Theology was separated from the University of Warsaw in 1954, and, along with the Section of Old Catholic Theology, it was transformed into the Christian Academy of Theology. Since 1957 it also includes the Section of Orthodox Theology.

The works of Fr. Franciszek Gabryl (1866–1914) were important for logic. He presented the results of his logic research in handbooks.¹⁰ Later, significant researchers included Fr. Stanisław Kobyłecki (1864–1939) and Fr. Piotr Chojnacki (1897–1969). Kobyłecki claimed that formal logic and metaphysics have the same material object, i.e. relations, and they differ with each other about the aspect of analyzing the relations. From 1926, Chojnacki worked at the Faculty of Catholic Theology at UW, and in 1954—after the creation of ATK, he was appointed the dean of the Faculty of Christian Philosophy. Also, he was the head of the Department of Logic, Methodology of Sciences and the Theory of Cognition. Before the war, he dealt with the methodology of ontology and the relation between mathematical logic and metaphysics—especially the specification of the terminology of metaphysics and reasoning carried out in it (he believed that the problem with formalizing metaphysics results from the analogy of its terms). After the war, he explored the development of the concept of science and scientific methods, as well as the methodology of philosophy.¹¹

The Kraków Circle

The group called the Kraków Circle was the most significant for the logic research carried out in the 20th century by philosophers inspired by Christianity. The Circle was rooted in Łukasiewicz's program of scientific philosophy, i.e. philosophy that refers to the classical philosophy in terms of problems and tasks, but is developed with a new method modeled on the axiomatic-deductive method.¹² During

¹⁰ F. Gabryl, *Logika formalna* (Kraków: Uniwersytet Jagielloński, 1899), especially, idem, *Logika ogólna* (Kraków: Uniwersytet Jagielloński, 1912).

¹¹ P. Chojnacki, *Teoria poznania i metodologia ogólna nauk* (Warszawa: Wydział Teologii Katolickiej UW, 1948).

¹² J.M. Bocheński, *Wspomnienia* (Kraków: Philed, 1994), p. 124.

the meeting at the Scientific Catholic Institute in Kraków, Łukasiewicz justified the postulate of renewing the Thomist philosophy and theology, and making it more scientific. Lectures were also given by Jan Franciszek Drewnowski (1886–1978), Jan Salamucha and Józef Maria Bocheński OP (1902–1995).¹³ Konstanty Michalski CM (1879–1947), who led the meeting, emphasized that the use of modern logic—of which Poland was one of the world’s leading centers—shall make Thomism remain a rational and exact philosophy.¹⁴

At the University of Warsaw (UW), Salamucha studied mathematical logic, mathematics and natural science disciplines. He listened to the lectures of, i.a., Leśniewski, Łukasiewicz and Kotarbiński.¹⁵ In 1927, at the Faculty of Theology, he obtained the degree of a doctor in Christian philosophy (*Teoria wynikania modalnego Arystotelesa* [*Aristotle’s Theory of Modal Implication*], his thesis supervisor was Kobyłecki), and in 1936 he obtained the habilitation. He was the most prominent representative of the Circle. He believed that philosophical research can include the whole of reality, but—at the same time—he used the results of mathematical logic, formalization that specifies and simplifies reasoning, as well as axiomatization that orders the statements with the inference relation. He wanted to give theology and theodicy the form of deductive science. Also, his works on the history

¹³ The meeting was held on 26th September 1936, during the 3rd Polish Philosophical Congress; it is believed to be the beginning of the Circle, and among its founders was also Bolesław Sobociński (1906–1980). The materials from the meeting are included in *Myśl katolicka wobec logiki współczesnej* (Poznań: Księgarnia św. Wojciecha, 1937). The achievements of the Kraków Circle are listed by Bocheński in: *Wspomnienia*, pp. 125–126. See also the texts by Z. Wolak, *Neotomizm a Szkoła Lwowsko-Warszawska* (Kraków: Ośrodek Badań Interdyscyplinarnych, 1993); idem, “Reakcje na J. Salamuchy analizę logiczną dowodu ‘z ruchu’ św. Tomasza,” in *Logika i metafizologia*, ed. Z. Wolak (Tarnów–Kraków: Biblos, Ośrodek Badań Interdyscyplinarnych, 1995), pp. 59–76; idem, *Koncepcje analogii w Kole Krakowskim* (Tarnów: Biblos, 2005); J. Woleński, “Polish Attempts to Modernize Thomism by Logic (Bocheński and Salamucha),” in idem, *Historico-Philosophical Essays*, vol. 1, pp. 51–66; R. Murawski, “Filozofia logiki i matematyki w Kole Krakowskim,” *Filozofia Nauki* 22, no. 2 (2014), pp. 21–35.

¹⁴ K. Michalski, “Wstęp,” in *Myśl katolicka wobec logiki współczesnej*, pp. 7–8.

¹⁵ Z. Wolak, *Neotomizm a Szkoła Lwowsko-Warszawska*, pp. 88–95; idem, “Światopogląd, filozofia i logika u ks. Jana Salamuchy,” in *Logika i metafizologia*, ed. Z. Wolak, pp. 47–58; J.J. Jadacki, K. Świętorzecka, “Myśliciel o sercu walecznym. O życiu Jana Salamuchy,” in J. Salamucha, *Wiedza i wiara. Wybrane pisma filozoficzne* (Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL, 1997), pp. 15–27.

of logic are important. They are based on extensive and diligently studied sources. Henryk Hiż (1917–2006) and Andrzej Grzegorzczak (1922–2014) declared themselves to be Salamucha’s students in the discipline of logic.

Drewnowski studied philosophy, mathematical logic and mathematics at UW from Leśniewski, Łukasiewicz and Kotarbiński.¹⁶ In 1927, he obtained the degree of the doctor of philosophy based on the dissertation *Podstawy logiki Bernarda Bolzano* [*The Foundations of Bernard Bolzano’s Logic* (Kotarbiński was his supervisor)]. The concept of philosophy included in his *Zarys programu filozoficznego* [*Outline of the Philosophical Program*]¹⁷ is considered to be the manifesto of the Kraków Circle, although—contrary to the other members of the Circle—he suggested basing the Thomist philosophy not only on the formal logic, but also on other areas of knowledge (semiotics, methodology, praxeology).¹⁸ He promoted symbolization and formalization, and his particular achievement is the theory of signs in which he described the general method of precise formulation of concepts and statements in natural and humanistic sciences, as well as in philosophy and theology.

Bocheński made himself familiar with the works of Polish logicians, especially Salamucha, during the philosophical studies (Fribourg in Switzerland), which he completed with the title of a doctor.¹⁹ He also owed his philosophical formation to Konstanty Michalski (1879–1947), Zygmunt Zawirski, Czesław Znamierowski (1888–1967), Florian Znaniecki (1882–1958) and Łukasiewicz. In 1938, he obtained habilitation at the Faculty of Theology of the Jagiellonian University (UJ), on the basis of the dissertation: *Z historii logiki zdań modalnych* [*On the History*

¹⁶ Cf. Z. Wolak, *Neotomizm a Szkoła Lwowsko-Warszawska*, pp. 70–81; S. Majdański, “Ani scjentyzm, ani fideizm. U progu nowoczesnej syntezy filozoficznej, czyli Jana Franciszka Drewnowskiego program precyzacji filozofii klasycznej,” in J.F. Drewnowski, *Filozofia i precyzja. Zarys programu filozoficznego i inne pisma*, eds. S. Majdański, S. Zalewski (Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL, 1996), pp. 5–52.

¹⁷ J.F. Drewnowski, “Zarys programu filozoficznego (part 2),” *Przegląd Filozoficzny* 37, no. 2 (1934), pp. 150–181; part 3: *Przegląd Filozoficzny* 37, no. 3 (1934), pp. 262–292.

¹⁸ J.F. Drewnowski, *Filozofia i precyzja. Zarys programu filozoficznego i inne pisma*, pp. 55–147.

¹⁹ Z. Wolak, *Neotomizm a Szkoła Lwowsko-Warszawska*, pp. 81–87; J. Bocheński, “Autoprezentacja,” in idem, *Logika i filozofia. Wybór pism*, trans. T. Baszniak et al., ed. J. Parys (Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, 1993), pp. vii–xxix.

of the *Logic of Modal Sentences*].²⁰ In the period of the Kraków Circle, he defended the idea of applying mathematical logic to traditional philosophy: although it is rooted in mathematics, logic guarantees the precision of thinking also in other fields of knowledge in terms of speaking and thinking; also, it makes it possible to apply deduction in a reliable manner and, at the same time, it is symbolic, and therefore neutral in term of content. He emphasized the fundamental role of classical bivalent logic, although he appreciated the multitude of systems in logic, and the possibility to use multivalent logics in theology. In the last period of his philosophical activity, he applied the method of the logical analysis of language. Logic (formal logic, semiotics, methodology of sciences) was the model of rationality for him. He published, i.a., *Die zeitgenössischen Denkmethode*²¹ and studies in the history of logic *Formale Logik*.²²

Catholic University of Lublin (KUL)²³

Before the war, at KUL (founded in 1918) there was no research in modern logic and methodology. The only logician was Fr. Stanisław Domińczak (1880–1936; since 1925 in Vilnius), who mainly dealt with the logic of Aristotle and scholastic logic. Fr. Henryk Jakubanis (1879–1949) taught traditional logic based on the handbooks of Biegański and Gabryl.

After 1945, the situation of logic at KUL changed with the creation of the Faculty of Philosophy (in November 1946) and the Section of Theoretical Philosophy with the Department of Logic. That Department, directed (up to 1962) by Fr. Antoni Korcik (1892–1969), was the basis for the thematic seminar, monographic lectures and specializations in logic. Iwanicki conducted the lectures on the methodology of philosophy (with the elements of general methodology) and,

²⁰ J.M. Bocheński, *Z historii logiki zdań modalnych* (Lwów: Wydawnictwo oo. Dominikanów, 1938).

²¹ Idem, *Die zeitgenössischen Denkmethode* (Bern: A. Francke, 1954). Polish edition: *Współczesne metody myślenia*, trans. S. Judycki (Poznań: W drodze, 1992).

²² Idem, *Formale Logik* (Freiburg–München: Verlag Karl Alber, 1956).

²³ The information on KUL come from, i.a., S. Majdański, C. Wojtkiewicz, “Logika na Katolickim Uniwersytecie Lubelskim (Z okazji 50-lecia Uczelni),” *Roczniki Filozoficzne* 17, no. 1 (1969), pp. 123–170; S. Janeczek, *Filozofia na KUL-u. Nurty – osoby – idee* (Lublin: Redakcja Wydawnictw KUL, 1998).

in following years, separate classes in the general methodology of sciences, methodology of non-philosophical sciences, and the methodology of philosophy. In 1952, the Department of the Methodology of Sciences was created. Its founder and the first director was Iwanicki, and from 1956—Kamiński. In 1992 the Department of the Methodology of Philosophy was created, directed by Fr. Józef Herbut (1933–2018).

As for the research included in the scope of this article, the scientists at KUL mainly worked on the history of logic and methodologies of the particular sciences (especially methodologies of: classical metaphysics, ethics, the philosophy of nature, the history of philosophy), they combined the contemporary methodology of sciences and metaphilosophy with logic, and they developed the philosophy of science and the philosophy of logic. Apart from Korcik, the history of logic was explored by Kamiński, and Fr. Witold Michałowski (1921–2004) and Regner, both connected with KUL. The research on the methodology of philosophy and the applicability of logic in philosophy was carried out by Kalinowski, Iwanicki, Kamiński, Antoni Bazyli Stępień (1931–); on the methodology of ethics—Tadeusz Styczeń SDS (1931–2010); on the methodology of the history of philosophy—Stefan Swieżawski; on the methodology of natural sciences and the methodology of the philosophy of nature—Fr. Stanisław Mazierski (1915–1993), and that research was continued by their students: Fr. Zygmunt Hajduk (1935–)—the student of Kamiński and Mazierski, Andrzej Szostek MIC (1945–)—the student of Styczeń, Jacek Wojtysiak (1967–) and Arkadiusz Gut (1970–)—the students of Stępień. After the direction of the Department of Logic was taken over by Borkowski (in 1975–1984), more intensive research on the formal logic—especially non-classical logics, was taken up. His follower, Stanisław Kiczuk (1938–; directing the department in 1985–2010), dealt with temporal logics, the logics of change and causal sentences. Kiczuk's students include: Marek Lechniak (1962–), Paweł Garbacz (1972–), Bożena Czernecka-Rej (1970–), and Marcin Tkaczyk OFMConv (1976–). Zdzisław Dywan (1951–; in the area of logic, the student of Borkowski), the founder of the Laboratory of Artificial Intelligence and then—the Department of the Foundations of Informatics (in 1996), dealt with the axiomatization of deductive systems, the logic of programming and the history of logic. Piotr Kulicki (1969–) is Dywan's student.

Korcik studied philosophy at the Faculty of Theology of UW, under the supervision of Kobyłecki. After he defended his doctoral dissertation (1930, supervised by Łukasiewicz), he dealt with the history of logic. Up to 1939 he worked at the University of Vilnius; from 1945—at KUL. In his continuous lectures, he went beyond the traditional logic; he conducted the first seminar on the history of logic; he established the library of the Department of Logic at KUL. He prepared and conducted many monographic lectures concerning the selected issues from the history of ancient and medieval logic—e.g. the creation and development of logic in ancient Greece, Aristotle's syllogism, the theory of Stoics' sentences, the origins of medieval logic—as well as modern logic. His classes were attended by, i.a., Kamiński, Leon Koj (1929–2006), Tadeusz Kwiatkowski (1930–), and the doctoral students of Korcik included Michałowski and Regner.

Kalinowski studied law and philosophy at KUL, and he worked there from 1946 to 1957 (from 1952 to 1956 he was the dean of the Faculty of Philosophy). In 1947, he defended an Aristotelian-Thomist doctoral dissertation, and in his habilitation dissertation of 1951 (*Logika zdań praktycznych* [*The Logic of Practical Sentences*]) he presented the system of the logic of norms (independent of the results of George Henrik von Wright). He organized and conducted (since the end of 1953) the metaphilosophical seminar at the Faculty of Philosophy mainly dedicated to the methodology of the traditional philosophy. The program and research of the seminar included the combination of classical philosophy with the approach referring to the achievements of the Lviv-Warsaw school and to the postulates of the Kraków Circle, although the radical suggestions for logicizing traditional philosophy were rejected (the research was later continued at Kamiński's seminar of the methodology of sciences).²⁴ The participants of the seminar included Koj, Stępień, Tadeusz Kwiatkowski, Władysław Stróżewski (1933–), Mieczysław Gogacz (1926–), Witold Marciszewski (1930–), and Majdański. In France (since 1958), Kalinowski maintained contact with the scientific environment of KUL, and he continued the research on logic and the methodology of sciences. He translated some texts by Tarski and Leśniewski into French. Koj considered himself to be the student of Kalinowski (and Swieżawski).

²⁴ J. Czerkawski, "Lubelska szkoła filozoficzna na tle sytuacji w powojennej Polsce," *Roczniki Filozoficzne* 45, no. 1 (1997), pp. 171–172.

Swieżawski finished his philosophical studies and defended his doctoral dissertation at Jan Kazimierz University (UJK) in Lviv (1932; Ajdukiewicz was the supervisor). At KUL he worked from 1946, heading the Department of the History of Medieval and Modern Philosophy (1948–1978). Apart from significant (in the international scale) works on the history of philosophy, his text: *Zagadnienie historii filozofii* [*The Issue of the History of Philosophy*]²⁵ (1966) was particularly important in the discussions on the methodology of history and the history of philosophy. His seminars were attended by, i.a., Marciszewski, Stróżewski, Koj, Stępień, Jan Czerkowski (1939–2007) and Wojciech Chudy (1947–2007) (in their statements they often emphasized the high methodological level of those classes).

Mazierski completed his studies in Christian philosophy at UW with a doctorate (*Pojęcia konieczności w filozofii św. Tomasza z Akwinu* [*The Concepts of Necessity in the Philosophy of St. Thomas Aquinas*]; his supervisor was Chojnacki). At KUL he worked from 1952—he co-created the Specialization of the Philosophy of Nature (started in 1957), and from 1965 he was the director of the Department of the Philosophy of Inanimate Nature. In his works on the methodology of natural sciences²⁶ and the methodology of the philosophy of nature,²⁷ he emphasized the necessity to take into account the results of empirical sciences and the necessity of the research on their philosophical assumptions and implications (especially the effectiveness of the mathematization of natural sciences). His students include Fr. Mieczysław Lubański (1924–2015; mathematics, the philosophy of mathematics and natural sciences), Heller (cosmology, the philosophy of science, the methodology of the philosophy of nature), Hajduk (the methodology of natural and formal sciences, the methodology of the philosophy of nature), Kazimierz Jodkowski (1950–; the methodology and philosophy of science), Fr. Józef Turek (1946–2010; the methodology and history of cosmology), Adam Jonkisz (1953–; the logic and

²⁵ S. Swieżawski, *Zagadnienie historii filozofii* (Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1966).

²⁶ S. Mazierski, *Determinizm i indeterminizm w aspekcie fizykalnym i filozoficznym* (Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL, 1961); idem, *Prawa przyrody. Studium metodologiczne* (Lublin: Redakcja Wydawnictw KUL, 1993).

²⁷ Idem, *Prolegomena do filozofii przyrody inspiracji arystotelesowsko-tomistycznej* (Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL, 1969); idem, *Elementy kosmologii filozoficznej i przyrodniczej* (Poznań: Księgarnia św. Wojciecha, 1972).

methodology of sciences, the philosophy of science), Marek Szydłowski (1952–; cosmology, the philosophy of science).

At KUL, Kamiński obtained (1949) a doctorate based on the dissertation: *Fregego dwuwartościowy system aksjomatyczny zmiennych zdaniowych w świetle współczesnej metodologii nauk dedukcyjnych* [Frege's Bivalent Axiomatic System of Sentence Variables in the Light of the Modern Methodology of Deductive Sciences]. He was the head (1956–1986) of the Department of the Methodology of Sciences. He conducted research on logic (syllogistic, the theory of reasoning), the history of logic (medieval semiotics, the history of the theory of definition, mathematical induction, and the deductive method), methodology of particular sciences, the theory and history of science and the philosophy of science. The methodology of classical metaphysics occupies a special place in his research. At first, he was the supporter of using logic in the philosophical issues according to the Kraków Circle; later he disputed with that program (especially with Drewnowski), although he emphasized the need to specify the philosophy with semiotic-methodological tools. Also, he worked out the methodological characteristics of particular fields of philosophy (the philosophy of God, man, religion, history, as well as ethics and theology), and the typology of different conceptions and methods of philosophizing. The collection of his 335 scientific works includes the monographs: *Pojęcie nauki i klasyfikacja nauk* [The Concept of Science and the Classification of Sciences]²⁸ and *Z teorii i metodologii metafizyki* [On the Theory and Methodology of Metaphysics].²⁹ The group of Kamiński's students includes Marciszewski, Koj, Tadeusz Kwiatkowski, Majdański, Andrzej Bronk SVD (1938–), Herbut; and in the next generations: Urszula Żegleń (1949–), Jerzy Kopania (1945–), Kazimierz Trzęsicki (1947–), Tadeusz Szubka (1958–), Rafał Wierchosławski (1960–), Monika Walczak (1973–), Paweł Kawalec (1971–), Agnieszka Lekka-Kowalik (1959–), and Fr. Robert Kublikowski (1969–). Marciszewski carried out research in many different fields of science: the history of logic and

²⁸ S. Kamiński, *Pojęcie nauki i klasyfikacja nauk* (Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL, 1961).

²⁹ S. Kamiński, M.A. Krąpiec, *Z teorii i metodologii metafizyki* (Lublin, Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL, 1962). The collections of Kamiński's articles on methodology (mainly methodology of philosophy) and semiotics were published in five volumes of his *Pisma wybrane* (1989–1998).

methodology of sciences, the logic of convictions and rhetoric, and the philosophy of mind and informatics. Herbut dealt with the methodology of philosophy and the logical analysis of religious language. He was the editor of *Leksykon filozofii klasycznej* [*The Lexicon of Classical Philosophy*].³⁰ His student and follower in Opole is Fr. Kazimierz M. Wolsza (1960–). Bronk explores the philosophy of science and the methodology of sciences, especially humanistic sciences, social sciences (pedagogy) and religiologic sciences; Majdański—semiotics and the methodology of philosophy, Żegleń—logical semiotics and the philosophy of logic and language, Szubka—analytic philosophy and its history, as well as the methodology of philosophy.

Academy of Catholic Theology (ATK)³¹

At the Faculty of Christian Philosophy of ATK, since 1954, the Department of Ontology and Logic existed, and later (since 1957)—the Department of Logic, General Methodology of Sciences and the Theory of Cognition (Chojnacki was the first head). In 1966 the specialization in the formal logic was opened, as well as the specialization in the general and particular gnoseology, as well as general and particular epistemology with the general methodology of sciences. In 1982 separate departments were created: the Department of Logic, Methodology of Sciences, Methodology of System-Information Sciences, as well as the specialization in the logic and methodology of sciences. In ATK, logic was explored by, among others, Iwanicki and his student Edward Nieznański (1938–), Fr. Marcei Molski (1914–1990) and Tomasz Chodkowski (1939–), and then—Fr. Roman Tomanek (1956–) and Kordula Świętorzecka (1968–); the philosophy of mathematics, cosmology and informatics was analyzed by Lubański, and the general methodology of sciences and the methodology of philosophy—by Iwanicki, Chojnacki, Andrzej Siemianowski (1932–2008; mainly connected with Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań; at ATK between 1970–1974; he criticized the neo-Thomism of the Lublin School of

³⁰ *Leksykon filozofii klasycznej*, ed. J. Herbut (Lublin, Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL, 1997).

³¹ The information on ATK (since 1999—Cardinal Stefan Wyszyński University in Warsaw) is mainly taken from K. Świętorzecka, R. Tomanek, “Logika i metodologia nauk,” in *Wydział Filozofii Chrześcijańskiej na ATK 1954–1999*, eds. J. Bielecki, J. Krokos (Warszawa: Wydawnictwo UKSW, 2001), pp. 169–188.

Philosophy), Fr. Mieczysław Bombik (1938–). Within the last two decades of the 20th century, the classes and research on logic or methodology were carried out by, i.a., Henryk Stonert (1923–1992) and Mieczysław Omyła (1941–).

Iwanicki studied philosophy, theology and mathematics in Strasbourg where he obtained a doctorate (1933). He gave lectures on logic at the Faculty of Theology of UW; on the methodology of sciences at the Faculty of Philosophy of KUL; on logic and the methodology of sciences at the Faculty of Christian Philosophy at ATK. He was interested in the rationalistic philosophy of the 17th century (e.g. Leibniz's and Morin's mathematical proofs for the existence of God). He worked on the method of creating scientific terminology, especially in psychology, and on applying the logical-mathematical methods in philosophy; in logic he carried out comparative research on the systems of natural deduction and axiomatic systems,³² emphasizing the advantages of natural deduction, and on Aristotle's syllogism.

Nieznański was (from 1982) the head of the Department of Logic of ATK. He dealt with the formalization of the philosophical argumentation, the methodology of sciences and logical semiotics (he applied it to the concepts of the classical philosophy); he created and analyzed formal ontologies. He dedicated many works to the formalization of the arguments for God's existence developed in theodicy.³³

Bombik, the student of Chojnacki, Iwanicki and Nieznański (at ATK from 1970, the head of the Department of the Methodology of Sciences from 1992), dealt with the theory of definition, logical errors, and the application of logic to theology. One of Nieznański's students is Świątorzecka (at ATK since 1990).

³² J. Iwanicki, *Dedukcja naturalna i logistyczna* (Warszawa: Polskie Towarzystwo Teologiczne, 1949).

³³ See, i.a. E. Nieznański, "Formalizacyjne próby ustalenia logiko-formalnych podstaw stwierdzania pierwszych elementów rozważanych w tomistycznej teodycei," in *W kierunku formalizacji tomistycznej teodycei*, ed. E. Nieznański (Warszawa: Akademia Teologii Katolickiej, 1980), pp. 7–194; E. Nieznański, "Logical Analysis of Thomism: The Polish Programme That Originated in 1930's," in *Initiatives in Logic*, ed. J. Srzednicki (Dordrecht: Springer 1987), pp. 128–155; idem, "Formalized Proofs of the Existence of God," *Collectanea Theologica* 64 (1994), pp. 109–122; idem, "World Models in Formalized Systems of Theodicy," *Studia Philosophiae Christianae* 47, no. 1 (2011), pp. 89–96.

Pontifical Academy of Theology (PAT)

After the removal of the Faculty of Theology from UJ, a didactic-scientific center was created within the structures of the Church, which, in 1974, obtained the status of the Pontifical Faculty of Theology (since 2009 its name has been the Pontifical University of John Paul II). It comprised several philosophical departments, including the Department of Formal Logic, General Methodology of Sciences and Theory of Cognition, which was directed by Fr. Kazimierz Kłósak (1911–1982). The Faculty of Philosophy, created in 1976, *de facto* started to function after the creation of the Pontifical Academy of Theology (1982). From 1980, the Department of Logic and Methodology was directed by Życiński (he defended his doctoral dissertation on theology under the supervision of Kłósak, 1976; on philosophy—under the supervision of Lubański, 1979). Later the department was divided into the Department of Logic and the Department of the Philosophy of Science. Logical and methodological issues were also taken up in the Centre for Interdisciplinary Research associated with the Faculty of Philosophy of PAT. Heller and Życiński's students, educated in 1990s, who dealt with logic and methodology, included Fr. Jerzy Dadaczyński (1959–; the philosophy of formal sciences, the history of logic); Fr. Adam Olszewski (the philosophy of logic); Fr. Zbigniew Wolak (1957–; the methodology and history of Polish logic); Janusz Mączka SDB (1960–; the methodology and history of the philosophy of nature), Krzysztof Śleziński (1962–; the philosophy of natural science, the history of metaphilosophy), Wiesław Wójcik (1959–; the methodology and history of science), Paweł Polak (1976–; the philosophy/history of science).

The Faculty of Philosophy of the Society of Jesus (from 2011—Jesuit University Ignatianum in Krakow)

Before the II World War, in Jesuit centers—mainly in Kraków, logic and methodology were explored by, among others: Jan Nuckowski SJ (1867–1920), Franciszek Kwiatkowski SJ (1888–1949) and Stanisław Bednarski SJ (1896–1942). Nuckowski published the handbook entitled *Początki logiki ogólnej dla szkół* [*The Basics of the General Logic for Schools*],³⁴ Franciszek Kwiatkowski lectured philosophy since

³⁴ J. Nuckowski, *Początki logiki ogólnej dla szkół* (Kraków: J. Czarnecki, 1903).

1932, and in the compendium *Filozofia wieczysta w zarysie* [*The Outline of Perennial Philosophy*]³⁵ he presented (in vol. 3) the synthesis of the traditional logic, as well as the characteristic features of the scientific method. Methodology was also analyzed by Bednarski.

After the war, between 1948–1996, logic and the general methodology at the Faculty (and in other seminaries in Kraków) were taught by Czesław Michalunio SJ (1919–2013).³⁶ Since 1997, logic and the methodology of sciences was taught by Józef Bremer SJ (1953–).³⁷ When the Jesuit Faculty of Philosophy became the University School of Philosophy and Education “Ignatianum,” i.a. the Department of the Methodology of Sciences was created. Since 1999, it was directed by Ludwik Grzebień SJ (1939–); in 2006–2009 the head of the Department of Logic was Jerzy Perzanowski (1943–2009)³⁸ who was previously connected with Jagiellonian University and Nicolaus Copernicus University in Toruń.

³⁵ F. Kwiatkowski, *Filozofia wieczysta w zarysie*, vol. 3: *Filozofia Boga, filozofia obyczaju* (Kraków: Wydawnictwo Apostolstwa Modlitwy, 1947).

³⁶ C. Michalunio, *Logika. Zarys wykładów* (Kraków: Wydział Filozoficzny Księży Jezuitów, 1976). Michalunio studied philosophy at UJ where he wrote the Master’s Thesis: *Sylogistyka Arystotelesa w ujęciu niektórych autorów polskich XX-go wieku* (1953). At that time (ca. 1965), Jan Długosz SJ (1901–1981) was another author of a book on mathematical logic. The manuscript of the work was not published until 2008. See J. Długosz, *Rachunek sensu jednej i dwu zmiennych* (Kraków: Wyższa Szkoła Filozoficzno-Pedagogiczna Ignatianum; Wydawnictwo WAM, 2008).

³⁷ J. Bremer, *Wprowadzenie do logiki* (Kraków: Wydawnictwo WAM; Wyższa Szkoła Filozoficzno-Pedagogiczna Ignatianum, 2006).

³⁸ Perzanowski used the tools of logic in theological and metaphysical issues, i.a. he analyzed them with logical means and he formalized ontological proofs included in the argumentation of Descartes and Leibniz. See J. Perzanowski, “Ontological Arguments II: Cartesian and Leibnizian,” in *Handbook of Metaphysics and Ontology*, vol. 2, eds. H. Burkhardt, B. Smith (Munich: Philosophia Verlag, 1991), pp. 625–633; J. Perzanowski, “Teofilozofia Leibniza,” in G.W. Leibniz, *Pisma z teologii mistycznej* (Kraków: Znak, 1994), pp. 221–352; as to the argumentation of Anselm and Ch. Hartshorne, see J. Perzanowski, “O wskazanych przez Ch. Hartshorne’a modalnych krokach w dowodzie ontologicznym św. Anzelma,” in *Filozofia/logika: filozofia logiczna 1994*, eds. J. Perzanowski et al. (Toruń: Wydawnictwo UMK, 1995), pp. 77–96.

THE MOST IMPORTANT ACHIEVEMENTS

The history of logic

Most of the research activities referred to Aristotelian and medieval logic.³⁹ According to Łukasiewicz's approach, they were characterized by looking at the past logic from the perspective of modern logic. Such an approach was visible, i.a., in the works of Salamucha, in the articles written by Korcik, and in Bocheński's monograph *Formale Logik*,⁴⁰ which included the results of long-term research on the history of logic from ancient times (Greece, India) up to the 20th century. Books on the history of logic were also published by Kamiński, Regner (syllogistic, Apuleius, axiomatization in the works by Bolzano), Michałowski (Galenos, Boethius, Abelard, Leśniewski's logic), Czesław Wojtkiewicz MIC (the logic of John of St. Thomas). Those studies were based on the analysis of source editions, and some of them on manuscripts. Also, some texts related to the logic of the 20th century were published: in Krakow Wolak published the results of the research on the heritage of the Kraków Circle⁴¹; in Lublin the scholarly achievements of Drewnowski was elaborated,⁴² and, due to the cooperation of the researchers from ATK and UW, the works of Salamucha were published.⁴³

Logicization of theodicy

The possibility to formalize the system of metaphysics had already been discussed before World War II by Salamucha and Drewnowski, and, after the war, especially by Bocheński and Nieznański.⁴⁴

³⁹ For a collection of works written before the end of 1950s, see: J. Iwanicki, "Problematyka filozoficzna w ciągu ostatniego 50-lecia w Polsce," *Ateneum Kapłańskie* 58, no. 1–3 (1959), pp. 267–274.

⁴⁰ J.M. Bocheński, *Formale Logik*, op. cit.

⁴¹ The research on the heritage of the Kraków Circle was also carried out by Woleński, Jadacki and Murawski.

⁴² J.F. Drewnowski, *Filozofia i precyzja. Zarys programu filozoficznego i inne pisma*, eds. S. Majdański, S. Zalewski, op. cit.

⁴³ J. Salamucha, *Wiedza i wiara. Wybrane pisma filozoficzne*, eds. J.J. Jadacki, K. Świętorzecka (Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL, 1997).

⁴⁴ The approaches to the formalization of *quinquae viae* are described by E. Nieznański, "Drogi i bezdroża formalizacji teodycei od Salamuchy do Gödla,"

The subject of the logical research was the part of Thomist theodicy related to the justification of the thesis on the existence of the First Being. Salamucha presented the attempt to logical reconstructions the proof *ex motu* from *Summa contra gentiles* (I, 13).⁴⁵ He used the classical sentential calculus and the basic concepts of the set theory, referring to *Principia Mathematica* by Alfred North Whitehead and Bertrand Russell, as well as their symbolism. The article marked the beginning of the works and discussions on applying logic in philosophy.⁴⁶ After the war, the first reference to those discussions was probably the unpublished MA thesis of Koj, *Poglądy ks. Salamuchy na uściślenie filozofii* [*Fr. Salamucha's Outlook on Clarifying Philosophy*] (1954), which includes methodological remarks based on Salamucha's article. In 1956, Johannes Bendiek OFM published a study on the logical structure of the arguments for the existence of God. The research of Salamucha, Bendiek and Bocheński was taken up by Francesca Rivetti Barbó, and the logical analysis of the first argument was presented by Bowman L. Clarke. Referring to Salamucha, Korneliusz Policki SDS (1949–) suggested a different formalization of the argument from movement,⁴⁷ and the contributions to the formalization of the First Way of St. Thomas were published by, among others, Georg Klaus, Marciszewski, Tadeusz Kwiatkowski, Laurent Larouche, and Krystyna Błachowicz. Nieznański achieved particularly important results in the formalization of the arguments for the existence of God (the study of 1980⁴⁸ and many articles) and classical ontology (with the elements of the philosophy of God). Also, he formalized the argument *ex causae efficiens* (1982, 1984⁴⁹;

in *Logika i metafizyka*, ed. Z. Wolak (Tarnów–Kraków: Biblos, Ośrodek Badań Interdyscyplinarnych, 1995), pp. 100–113.

⁴⁵ J. Salamucha, “Dowód ‘ex motu’ na istnienie Boga. Analiza logiczna argumentacji św. Tomasza z Akwinu,” *Collectanea Theologica* 15, no. 1 (1934), pp. 53–92.

⁴⁶ Z. Wolak, “Reakcje na J. Salamuchy analizę logiczną dowodu ‘z ruchu’ św. Tomasa,” in *Logika i metafizyka*, ed. Z. Wolak, p. 59.

⁴⁷ K. Policki, “W sprawie formalizacji dowodu ‘ex motu’ na istnienie Boga,” *Roczniki Filozoficzne* 23, no. 1 (1975), pp. 19–30.

⁴⁸ E. Nieznański, “Formalizacyjne próby ustalenia logiko-formalnych podstaw stwierdzenia pierwszych elementów rozważanych w tomistycznej teodycei,” in *W kierunku formalizacji tomistycznej teodycei*, ed. E. Nieznański, pp. 7–194.

⁴⁹ Idem, “W poszukiwanie Pierwszej Przyczyny z pomocą logiki formalnej,” *Analecta Cracoviensia* 14 (1982), pp. 51–60; idem, “Formalisierung des Gottesbeweises *ex ratione causae efficientis*,” *Salzburger Jahrbuch für Philosophie* 27–29 (1984), pp. 79–84.

the first formalization, of 1969, is the work of Wilhelm Karl Essler) and *ex contingentia*, in the version coming from Gottfried W. Leibniz, supported by the principle of the sufficient reason.

The program of the Kraków Circle was referred to by Bocheński at the end of 1980s, which resulted in the formalization of all the five ways of St. Thomas.⁵⁰ The analyses *quinque viae* are included in Bocheński's program of the so-called studies on God, in which he included some issues concerning the nature of God. Based on the text of *Summa theologiae* by St. Thomas (*STh* I, q. 4–11), he logically described twenty-two theses related to God's attributes, giving forty-three formal proofs for them (those results were unique in the philosophy of God at that time).⁵¹

As for the other issues in theodicy: in 1938 Bocheński presented the logical and formal analysis and formalization of the proof for the immortality of the soul from *Summa theologiae* (I, 75, 6)⁵²; Nieznański (referring to the research of Curt Christian of 1957) analyzed, in 1976, the concepts of God, His omnipotence and omniscience⁵³; in 1984 Czesław Oleksy presented the logical analysis of the problem of predestination and religious fatalism (developing the results of Paul Weingartner of 1974)⁵⁴; in 1983 Nieznański (1983) used the 16-element Boolean algebra as a model of the scholastic theory *de modis essendi*⁵⁵; the concept of authority was analyzed by Bocheński⁵⁶ and Nieznański⁵⁷ who applied the logic of beliefs.⁵⁸

⁵⁰ J.M. Bocheński, "Die fünf Wege," *Freiburger Zeitschrift für Philosophie und Theologie* 36, no. 3 (1989), pp. 235–265; idem, *Logika i filozofia. Wybór pism*, pp. 469–503.

⁵¹ Idem, *Gottes Dasein und Wesen. Logische Studien zur Summa Theologiae I, qq. 2–11* (München: Philosophia Verlag, 2003), pp. 98–116.

⁵² Idem, "Analisi logica di un testo di S. Tommaso d'Aquino (I, 75, 6)," in idem, *Nuove lezioni di logica simbolica* (Roma: Angelicum, 1938), pp. 147–155.

⁵³ E. Nieznański, "Curta Christiana rachunek pojęć wszechmocy, wszechwiedzy i Boga," *Studia Theologica Varsaviensia* 14, no. 2 (1976), pp. 301–305.

⁵⁴ C. Oleksy, "Próba zastosowania środków logiki współczesnej do zagadnień fatalizmu religijnego i predestynacji," *Studia Teologiczne*, no. 2 (1984), pp. 257–282.

⁵⁵ E. Nieznański, "16-elementowa algebra Boole'a jako model klasycznej teorii *de modis essendi*," *Studia Philosophiae Christianae* 19, no. 1 (1983), pp. 125–132.

⁵⁶ J.M. Bocheński, "Analysis of Authority," in idem, *The Logic of Religion* (New York: NYU Press, 1965), pp. 162–173; J.M. Bocheński, *Was ist Autorität? Einführung in die Logik der Autorität* (Freiburg: Herder, 1974).

⁵⁷ E. Nieznański, "Logika przekonań a wiara oświeconych," *Studia Philosophiae Christianae* 21, no. 1 (1985), pp. 157–162.

⁵⁸ Cf. K. Wolsza, "Teodycea sformalizowana," in *Filozofia Boga. Część II. Odkrywanie Boga*, eds. S. Janeczek, A. Starościc (Lublin: Wydawnictwo KUL, 2017),

The concept of analogy

The scholastic concept of analogy was analyzed by Drewnowski,⁵⁹ Salamucha⁶⁰ and Bocheński.⁶¹ Drewnowski, using his theory of sign, analyzed the analogy of cognition, the analogy of being, and the analogy as the method of reasoning, as well as the transcendental and theological analogy. Salamucha only mentioned the idea of interpretation—based on the concept of typical polysemy—of the concepts of the analogy of proportionality and attribution (but not the analogy of being, which is the basic concept in theology and theodicy). Bocheński, while introducing the concept of the so-called semantic complex—the many-termed relation among language, a given name, its content and designatum—carried out a semantic analysis of the concepts of polysemy and analogy, and especially—the analogy of attribution; he also revealed flaws of numerous traditional formulas and solutions in the field of analogy. The scholastic idea of analogy was later analyzed by Herbut, and the concepts of analogy worked out in the Kraków Circle—by Wolak. Analogy in the context of science and cognitive processes was explored by the scholars connected with KUL: Adam Biela (1947–) and Fr. Zdzisław Chlewiński (1929–), Andrzej Falkowski (1953–) and Piotr Francuz (1960–).

The methodology of philosophy and theology

The first comprehensive study of the methodology of classical philosophy is the work of Krąpiec and Kamiński.⁶² The applicability of logic in theology and in the analysis of religious sentences and the ways of their justification was discussed by Bocheński in the *Logic of Religion* (1965).⁶³ Later, the research on the methodology of metaphysics was

pp. 195–218; M. Bombik, “Sprawa stosowania dzisiejszej logiki we współczesnej teologii,” *Śląskie Studia Historyczno-Teologiczne* 23–24 (1990–1991), pp. 170–172. Source materials from the “formalized theodicy” and translations of foreign books (up to 1970s) were collected by Nieznański (*W kierunku formalizacji tomistycznej teodycei*, ed. E. Nieznański).

⁵⁹ J.F. Drewnowski, *Zarys programu filozoficznego*, pp. 3–38, 150–181, 262–292.

⁶⁰ J. Salamucha, “O możliwościach ścisłego formalizowania dziedziny pojęć analogicznych,” in *Mysł katolicka wobec logiki współczesnej*, pp. 122–153.

⁶¹ J.M. Bocheński, “Wstęp do teorii analogii,” *Roczniki Filozoficzne* 1 (1948), pp. 64–82. Cf. Z. Wolak, *Koncepcje analogii w Kole Krakowskim*, op. cit.

⁶² S. Kamiński, M.A. Krąpiec, *Z teorii i metodologii metafizyki*, op. cit.

⁶³ J.M. Bocheński, *The Logic of Religion*, op. cit.

carried out by Edmund Morawiec CSsR (1930–2019; the role of intellectual intuition, the structure of metaphysics and its language, the relation of metaphysics and natural sciences). Herbut presented the explanatory role of metaphysical hypotheses and the ways of checking them,⁶⁴ as well as the possibility to apply the transcendental method in metaphysics.⁶⁵ The methodology of the theory of cognition was explored by Stępień,⁶⁶ and Bronk analyzed, among others, the methodology of philosophical hermeneutics, pedagogy and religious sciences. The methodology of ethics was researched by Kamiński, Tadeusz Ślipko SJ (1918–2015), Styczeń, and Szostek. Styczeń dedicated a number of works to metaethical issues.⁶⁷ He analyzed the basics of ethics, its methodological status (scientific status) and the relation to other disciplines (also non-philosophical ones).

A lot of methodological research activities were related to the philosophy of nature. The analyses of Mazierski and Kłósak⁶⁸ were taken up by their students. Heller and Życiński justified the need to practice philosophy (not only the philosophy of nature) in the context of science. Heller showed how to apply the modern mathematical tools to reconstruct the old theories of nature⁶⁹; Życiński, while analyzing the connections between philosophy, theology and natural sciences, justified the possibility of falsifying the philosophical theses and the so-called theistic naturalism⁷⁰; Hajduk characterized the methodological status of the philosophy of nature⁷¹; Turek explored

⁶⁴ J. Herbut, *Hipoteza w filozofii bytu* (Lublin: Redakcja Wydawnictw KUL, 1978).

⁶⁵ Idem, *Metoda transcendentalna w metafizyce* (Opole: Wydawnictwo Św. Krzyża, 1987).

⁶⁶ A.B. Stępień, *O metodzie teorii poznania* (Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL, 1966); *Studia metafizyczne*, vol. 1: *Dyscypliny i metody filozoficzne*, eds. A.B. Stępień, T. Szubka (Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL, 1993).

⁶⁷ *Zwłaszcza: T. Styczeń, Zarys etyki. Część I: Metaetyka* (Lublin: Katolicki Uniwersytet Lubelski, 1974).

⁶⁸ K. Kłósak, *Z teorii i metodologii filozofii przyrody* (Poznań: Księgarnia św. Wojciecha, 1980).

⁶⁹ For example M. Heller, *Fizyka ruchu i czasoprzestrzeni* (Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, 1993).

⁷⁰ J. Życiński, *Wszechświat emergentny. Bóg w ewolucji przyrody* (Lublin: Wydawnictwo KUL, 2009).

⁷¹ Z. Hajduk, *Filozofia przyrody. Filozofia przyrodoznawstwa. Metakosmologia* (Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL, 2007).

the methodological aspects of cosmology⁷² and the relations between scientific facts and philosophy⁷³; and Jodkowski—the methodological aspects of the relation of science, philosophy and theology.⁷⁴ His research has been continued by his student, Piotr Bylica (1976–).

SIGNIFICANCE AND DISCUSSIONS

Among the achievements of the logicians and methodologists connected with Polish Christian philosophy in the 20th century, the work of the philosophers of the Kraków Circle is particularly valuable. It referred to the fundamental problems in Christian philosophy and theology. Their logical analysis, and then methodological reflection on them, resulted in: the formalizations of the proofs for the existence of God, the logical concepts of analogy, the proposals of specifying the theological language, and the methodological program aiming at making philosophy and theology more scientific. Such results and postulates (their program) were new, not only in the context of contemporary European Thomism and the applications of logic, but they also turned out to be inspiring and basic for future generations of researchers—not only in Poland. On a global scale, the Circle was a unique research team which carried out an original plan of logicization of philosophy, especially theodicy. The achievements of its members and continuators make the Polish logicians of the 20th century among the best international scholars dealing with this issue, and the tradition of research on the application of logic to philosophy and theology has been continued to this day in Poland.⁷⁵

⁷² J. Turek, *Wszechświat dynamiczny. Rewolucja naukowa w kosmologii* (Lublin: Redakcja Wydawnictw KUL, 1995).

⁷³ Idem, *Filozoficzne interpretacje faktów naukowych* (Lublin: Wydawnictwo KUL, 2009).

⁷⁴ K. Jodkowski, *Metodologiczne aspekty kontrowersji ewolucjonizm – kreacjonizm* (Lublin: Uniwersytet Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej, 1998).

⁷⁵ For example: J. Woleński, “Pięć dróg Akwinaty,” *Principia* 5 (1992), pp. 67–83; R. Kleszcz, “Logika, wszechmoc, Bóg,” *Filo-Sofija* 19, no. 4 (2012), pp. 37–52; *Logic in Theology*, eds. B. Brożek, A. Olszewski, M. Hohol (Kraków: Copernicus Center Press, 2013); D. Łukasiewicz, “Fatalizm logiczny i teologiczny a przedwiedza Boża. Krytyka argumentu antyredukcyjnego Lindy Zagzebski,” *Analiza i Egzystencja*, no. 24 (2014), pp. 5–19; idem, “Wszechmoc Boga a teologia przypadku,” *Filo-Sofija* 30, no. 3 (2015), pp. 169–179.

Among the issues analyzed by the logicians and methodologists, the dominant ones include meta-scientific problems which mainly refer to the application of logic to philosophy and theology, as well as methodological issues concerning these two disciplines developed—if not only, then at least mainly—in the neo-Thomist approach. In this respect, the achievements of Kamiński are particularly important, as well as the works and achievements of many scholars in the field of the history of logic and the methodology of philosophical disciplines. The results obtained in logic itself by Kalinowski, Bocheński and Borkowski, and in the methodology of sciences—by Kamiński, are more widely known, but in terms of the subject matter they are not connected with Christian thought.

The most important discussion carried out in the environment of Christian thinkers was related to the program of the Kraków Circle, i.e. the application of mathematical logic in traditional philosophy, especially metaphysics.⁷⁶ In this discussion, initiated by Jan Łukasiewicz's program of the logicization of philosophy,⁷⁷ Jakubanis and Chojnacki acknowledged the importance of (traditionally understood) logic for philosophy, but the dispute intensified after the criticism (inspired by the defense of Thomism) of the views of the Lviv-Warsaw School (mainly Jan Łukasiewicz), published by Fr. Augustyn Jakubisiak (1884–1945).⁷⁸ While replying to the criticism, Łukasiewicz corrected the faulty thesis of Jakubisiak and explained his own point. The issues and problems noticeable in this dispute were later developed. It turned out that the main reason for the reluctance of the defenders of neo-scholasticism to the new logic was the conviction that such logic assumes the philosophical approach that contradicts Christian thought. They claimed that logic is anti-metaphysical, or that it distorts metaphysics through mathematization, conventionalism and nominalism, as well as pragmatism, positivism and atheism. However, Łukasiewicz, Bocheński and Salamucha emphasized that the modern logic took over the traditional logic; that one cannot

⁷⁶ The description of the discussion: J. Woleński, *Szkoła Lwowsko-Warszawska w polemikach* (Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Scholar, 1997), pp. 134–164. Z. Wolak, *Neotomizm a Szkoła Lwowsko-Warszawska*, pp. 24–49; J. Iwanicki, "Problematyka filozoficzna w ciągu ostatniego 50-lecia w Polsce," pp. 268–270.

⁷⁷ J. Łukasiewicz, "O metodę w filozofii," *Przegląd Filozoficzny* 31, no. 1–2 (1928), pp. 3–5.

⁷⁸ A. Jakubisiak, *Od zakresu do treści* (Warszawa: Druk. Artystyczna, 1936).

connect the application of logic only with neo-positivism (in which the new logic was being developed); and that—contrary to the anti-metaphysical declarations of neo-positivists—it is possible to specify metaphysics in a logical manner.⁷⁹

The pre-war dispute was continued afterwards, especially in the environment of KUL.⁸⁰ Kamiński emphasized the limitations of applying the formal logic in philosophy, and he saw their main source in the nature of metaphysical cognition which does not yield—without distortions—to the attempts of formalization.⁸¹ However, he believed that philosophy can use semiotics in the analysis of the language of metaphysics, formal logic in the characteristics of the relations among its theses, and the methodology of sciences in elaborating the methods of metaphysics. In 1964, Kamiński and Zofia Józefa Zdybicka USJK (1928–) published the article: *O sposobie poznania istnienia Boga* [On the Way of Cognizing the Existence of God]⁸²; a year later, the criticism of the opinions expressed in this article was outlined by Drewnowski.⁸³ Referring to that criticism, Kamiński and Zdybicka emphasized that they had never claimed that reasoning in metaphysics may be at odds with the laws of logic, and they expressed the belief that not all the methods proper for the justification of the theses of metaphysics can be elaborated formally.⁸⁴ In the 1980s, this dispute was continued by Nieznański and Gogacz.⁸⁵

⁷⁹ The opinions of those authors, as well as Pastuszka and Chojnacki, are collected in: *Mysł katolicka wobec logiki współczesnej*, pp. 61–83. The replies of Łukasiewicz, Bocheński, Salamucha, *ibidem*, pp. 12–26, 87–121.

⁸⁰ The disputes and their background are described in: S. Kiczuk, “Spór o stosowalność logiki do filozofii klasycznej w Szkole Lubelskiej,” *Roczniki Filozoficzne* 44, no. 1 (1996), pp. 5–19.

⁸¹ S. Kamiński, M.A. Krąpiec, *Z teorii i metodologii metafizyki*, pp. 360–361.

⁸² S. Kamiński, Z. Zdybicka, “O sposobie poznania istnienia Boga,” *Znak*, no. 6(120) (1964), pp. 635–661.

⁸³ J. Drewnowski, *Filozofia i precyzja. Zarys programu filozoficznego i inne pisma*, eds. S. Majdański, S. Zalewski, pp. 224–233.

⁸⁴ S. Kamiński, Z. Zdybicka, “W odpowiedzi na uwagi Jana Fr. Drewnowskiego,” *Znak*, no. 2–3(128–129) (1965), pp. 355–365.

⁸⁵ See their replies: *W kierunku Boga*, ed. B. Bejze (Warszawa: Akademia Teologii Katolickiej, 1982), pp. 402–422.

LOGIC AND THE METHODOLOGY OF SCIENCES AT THE BEGINNING OF THE 21ST CENTURY

Modern researchers refer to the logical and methodological works of the Christian thinkers of the 20th century. KUL has a strong center of logic in which the following scholars work: Lechniak (many-valued logics, the logics of beliefs), Kulicki (the head of the Department of the Fundamentals of Informatics; he deals with computer logic, axiomatic systems of term logic), Garbacz (the applications of logic in philosophy and formal ontology in informatics), Czernecka-Rej (the philosophy of logic, non-classical logics), Tkaczyk (the head of the Department of Logic since 2010; he deals with non-classical logics and the applications of logic in philosophy), and Robert Trypuz who analyses denotic logic and formal ontology of actions. In the general methodology of sciences, as well as in the methodology of the philosophy, the research is carried out by: Wierzchosławski—the methodology of social sciences, science studies, Walczak—the methodology of multi-disciplinary research, the methodology of cultural studies, Kawalec—the methodology of sciences and the methodology of economy; the philosophy of science and the theory of scientific knowledge, Szubka—the methodology of analytic philosophy, Gut—the methodology of cognitive sciences, Zbigniew Wróblewski (1967–)—the methodology of natural sciences and cognitive sciences, Lekka-Kowalik—the methodology and axiology of science, Kublikowski—definitionism and anti-definitionism, and Paweł Gondek (1966–)—the methodology of the metaphysics of existential Thomism, Wojciech Daszkiewicz (1977–)—the methodology of the autonomous philosophy of culture.

The research mentioned in this text is also carried out in other scientific centers, such as UPJPII: Wolak—Polish logic, Olszewski—the philosophy of logic, the applications of logic in theology, Dadaczyński—the history of logic, the philosophy of mathematics, Robert Piechowicz (1977–)—logical semiotics, Polak—the philosophy of science, the methodology of the philosophy of nature; at UKSW in the Section of Logic and Methodology of Sciences: Świętorzecka—modal logics and the theory of definition, formalizations of the proofs for the existence of God, the history of logic, Tomanek—formalizations of the arguments of St. Anselm, Fr. Marek Porwolik (1971–)—analysis of the formalizations of the classical philosophical arguments,

Anna Latawiec (1951–)—the philosophy of nature and natural sciences, Anna Lemańska (1953–)—the methodology of the philosophy of nature and natural sciences; at the Jesuit University Ignatianum in Krakow: Bremer—logic, the methodology of cognitive science and neuroscience, Jonkisz—logic, the methodology of sciences, the philosophy of science, Piotr Stanisław Mazur (1968–)—the methodology of classical philosophy, Jacek Poznański SJ (1974–)—the philosophy of science, science studies, Piotr Duchliński (1978–)—the methodology of philosophy and the humanities.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bocheński, J.M. "Analisi logica di un testo di S. Tommaso d'Aquino (I, 75, 6)," in idem, *Nuove lezioni di logica simbolica*, pp. 147–155. Roma: Angelicum, 1938.
- . "Analysis of Authority," in idem, *The Logic of Religion*, pp. 162–173. New York: NYU Press, 1965.
- . "Autoprezentacja," in idem, *Logika i filozofia. Wybór pism*, trans. T. Baszniak et al., ed. J. Parys, pp. vii–xxix. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo
- . "Die fünf Wege," *Freiburger Zeitschrift für Philosophie und Theologie* 36, no. 3 (1989), pp. 235–265.
- . *Die zeitgenössischen Denkmethode*n. Bern: A. Francke, 1954.
- . *Formale Logik*. Freiburg–München: Verlag Karl Alber, 1956.
- . *Gottes Dasein und Wesen. Logische Studien zur Summa Theologiae I, qq. 2–11*. München: Philosophia Verlag, 2003.
- . *Logika i filozofia. Wybór pism*, trans. T. Baszniak et al., ed. J. Parys. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, 1993.
- . *Was ist Autorität? Einführung in die Logik der Autorität*. Freiburg: Herder, 1974.
- . *Wspomnienia*. Kraków: Philed, 1994.
- . *Współczesne metody myślenia*, trans. S. Judycki. Poznań: W drodze, 1992.
- . "Wstęp do teorii analogii," *Roczniki Filozoficzne* 1 (1948), pp. 64–82.
- . *Z historii logiki zdań modalnych*. Lwów: Wydawnictwo oo. Dominikanów, 1938.
- Bombik, M. "Sprawa stosowania dzisiejszej logiki we współczesnej teologii," *Śląskie Studia Historyczno-Teologiczne* 23–24 (1990–1991), pp. 165–172.
- Bremer, J. *Wprowadzenie do logiki*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo WAM, Wyższa Szkoła Filozoficzno-Pedagogiczna Ignatianum, 2006.

- Chojnacki, P. *Teoria poznania i metodologia ogólna nauk*. Warszawa: Wydział Teologii Katolickiej UW, 1948.
- Czerkawski, J. "Lubelska szkoła filozoficzna na tle sytuacji w powojennej Polsce," *Roczniki Filozoficzne* 45, no. 1 (1997), pp. 166–190.
- Długosz, J. *Rachunek sensu jednej i dwu zmiennych*. Kraków: Wyższa Szkoła Filozoficzno-Pedagogiczna Ignatianum, Wydawnictwo WAM, 2008.
- Drewnowski, J.F. *Filozofia i precyzja. Zarys programu filozoficznego i inne pisma*, eds. S. Majdański, S. Zalewski. Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL, 1996.
- . "Zarys programu filozoficznego (part 1)," *Przegląd Filozoficzny* 37, no. 1 (1934), pp. 3–38; part 2: *Przegląd Filozoficzny* 34, no. 2 (1934), pp. 150–181; part 3: *Przegląd Filozoficzny* 34, no. 3 (1934), pp. 262–292.
- Gabryl, F. *Logika formalna*. Kraków: Uniwersytet Jagielloński, 1899.
- . *Logika ogólna*. Kraków: Uniwersytet Jagielloński, 1912.
- Hajduk, Z. *Filozofia przyrody. Filozofia przyrodoznawstwa. Metakosmologia*. Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL, 2007.
- Heller, M. *Fizyka ruchu i czasoprzestrzeni*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, 1993.
- Herbut, J. *Hipoteza w filozofii bytu*. Lublin: Redakcja Wydawnictw KUL, 1978.
- . *Metoda transcendentálna w metafizyce*. Opole: Wydawnictwo Św. Krzyża, 1987.
- Historia filozofii polskiej. Dokonania – poszukiwania – projekty*, eds. A. Dziedzic, A. Kołakowski, S. Pieróg, P. Ziemiński. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Semper, 2007.
- Iwanicki, J. *Dedukcja naturalna i logistyczna*. Warszawa: Polskie Towarzystwo Teologiczne, 1949.
- . "Problematyka filozoficzna w ciągu ostatniego 50-lecia w Polsce," *Ateneum Kapłańskie* 58, no. 1–3 (1959), pp. 255–293.
- Jadacki, J.J. "Logika," in *Historia nauki polskiej*, vol. 4, part 3, ed. Z. Skubała-Tokarska, pp. 548–578. Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, 1987.
- Jadacki, J.J., Świątorzecka, K. "Myśliciel o sercu walecznym. O życiu Jana Salamuchy," in J. Salamucha, *Wiedza i wiara. Wybrane pisma filozoficzne*, pp. 15–27. Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL, 1997.
- . "Szkoła Lwowsko-Warszawska i jej wpływ na filozofię polską drugiej połowy XX wieku," in *Historia filozofii polskiej. Dokonania – poszukiwania – projekty*, eds. A. Dziedzic, A. Kołakowski, S. Pieróg, P. Ziemiński, pp. 126–148. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Semper, 2007.
- Jakubisiak, A. *Od zakresu do treści*. Warszawa: Druk. Artystyczna, 1936.
- Janeczek, S. *Filozofia na KUL-u. Nurty – osoby – idee*. Lublin: Redakcja Wydawnictw KUL, 1998.

- Jodkowski, K. *Metodologiczne aspekty kontrowersji ewolucjonizm – kreacjonizm*. Lublin: Uniwersytet Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej, 1998.
- Kamiński, S. “Czy logika jest dyscypliną praktyczną?” *Ateneum Kapłańskie* 57, no. 2 (1958), pp. 228–233.
- . *Pojęcie nauki i klasyfikacja nauk*. Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL, 1961.
- . “Rozwój logiki i metodologii nauk w Polsce po II wojnie światowej,” *Roczniki Filozoficzne* 24, no. 1 (1976), pp. 113–122.
- Kamiński, S., Krąpiec, M.A. *Z teorii i metodologii metafizyki*. Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL, 1962.
- Kamiński, S., Zdybicka, Z. “O sposobie poznania istnienia Boga,” *Znak*, no. 6(120) (1964), pp. 635–661.
- . “W odpowiedzi na uwagi Jana Fr. Drewnowskiego,” *Znak*, no. 2–3(128–129) (1965), pp. 355–365.
- Kiczuk, S. “Spór o stosowalność logiki do filozofii klasycznej w Szkole Lubelskiej,” *Roczniki Filozoficzne* 44, no. 1 (1996), pp. 5–19.
- Kleszcz, R. “Logika, wszechmoc, Bóg,” *Filo-Sofija* 19, no. 4 (2012), pp. 37–52.
- Kłósak, K. *Z teorii i metodologii filozofii przyrody*. Poznań: Księgarnia św. Wojciecha, 1980.
- Kwiatkowski, F. *Filozofia wieczysta w zarysie*, vol. 3: *Filozofia Boga, filozofia obyczaju*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Apostolstwa Modlitwy, 1947.
- Leksykon filozofii klasycznej*, ed. J. Herbut. Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL, 1997.
- Logic in Theology*, eds. B. Brożek, A. Olszewski, M. Hohol. Kraków: Copernicus Center Press, 2013.
- Łukasiewicz, D. “Fatalizm logiczny i teologiczny a przedwiedza Boża. Krytyka argumentu antyredukcyjnego Lindy Zagzebski,” *Analiza i Egzystencja*, no. 26 (2014), pp. 5–19.
- . “Wszechmoc Boga a teologia przypadku,” *Filo-Sofija* 30, no. 3 (2015), pp. 169–179;
- Łukasiewicz, J. “O metodę w filozofii,” *Przegląd Filozoficzny* 31, no. 1–2 (1928), pp. 3–5.
- Majdański, S. “Ani scjentyzm, ani fideizm. U progu nowoczesnej syntezy filozoficznej, czyli Jana Franciszka Drewnowskiego program precyzacji filozofii klasycznej,” in J.F. Drewnowski, *Filozofia i precyzja. Zarys programu filozoficznego i inne pisma*, eds. S. Majdański, S. Zalewski, pp. 5–52. Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL, 1996.
- Majdański, S., Wojtkiewicz, C. “Logika na Katolickim Uniwersytecie Lubelskim (Z okazji 50-lecia Uczelni),” *Roczniki Filozoficzne* 17, no. 1 (1969), pp. 123–170.
- Mazierski S. *Determinizm i indeterminizm w aspekcie fizycznym i filozoficznym*, Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL, Lublin 1961.
- . *Elementy kosmologii filozoficznej i przyrodniczej*. Poznań: Księgarnia św. Wojciecha, 1972.

- . *Prawa przyrody. Studium metodologiczne*. Lublin: Redakcja Wydawnictw KUL, 1993.
- . *Prolegomena do filozofii przyrody inspiracji arystotelesowsko-tomistycznej*. Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL, 1969.
- Michalski, K. "Wstęp," in *Mysł katolicka wobec logiki współczesnej*, pp. 7–11. Poznań: Księgarnia św. Wojciecha, 1937.
- Michalunio, C. *Logika. Zarys wykładów*. Kraków: Wydział Filozoficzny Księży Jezuitów, 1976.
- Murawski, R. "Filozofia logiki i matematyki w Kole Krakowskim," *Filozofia Nauki* 22, no. 2 (2014), pp. 21–35.
- Mysł katolicka wobec logiki współczesnej*. Poznań: Księgarnia św. Wojciecha, 1937.
- Nieznański, E. "16-elementowa algebra Boole'a jako model klasycznej teorii *de modis essendi*," *Studia Philosophiae Christianae* 19, no. 1 (1983), pp. 125–132.
- . "Curta Christiana rachunek pojęć wszechmocy, wszechwiedzy i Boga," *Studia Theologica Varsaviensia* 14, no. 2 (1976), pp. 301–305.
- . "Drogi i bezdroża formalizacji teodycei od Salamuchy do Gödla," in *Logika i metafizyka*, ed. Z. Wolak, pp. 99–117. Tarnów–Kraków: Biblos; Ośrodek Badań Interdyscyplinarnych, 1995.
- . "Formalisierung des Gottesbeweises *ex ratione causae efficientis*," *Salzburger Jahrbuch für Philosophie* 27–29 (1984), pp. 79–84.
- . "Formalizacyjne próby ustalenia logiko-formalnych podstaw stwierdzenia pierwszych elementów rozważanych w tomistycznej teodycei," in *W kierunku formalizacji tomistycznej teodycei*, ed. and trans. E. Nieznański, pp. 7–194. Warszawa: Akademia Teologii Katolickiej, 1980.
- . "Formalized Proofs of the Existence of God," *Collectanea Theologica* 64 (1994), pp. 109–122.
- . "Logical Analysis of Thomism: The Polish Programme That Originated in 1930's," in *Initiatives in Logic*, ed. J. Szrednicki, pp. 128–155. Dordrecht: Springer, 1987.
- . "Logika przekonań a wiara oświeconych," *Studia Philosophiae Christianae* 21, no. 1 (1985), pp. 157–162.
- . "W poszukiwanie Pierwszej Przyczyny z pomocą logiki formalnej," *Analecta Cracoviensia* 14 (1982), pp. 51–60.
- . "World Models in Formalized Systems of Theodicy," *Studia Philosophiae Christianae* 47, no. 1 (2011), pp. 89–96.
- Nuckowski, J. *Początki logiki ogólnej dla szkół*. Kraków: J. Czarnecki, 1903.
- Oleksy, C. "Próba zastosowania środków logiki współczesnej do zagadnień fatalizmu religijnego i predestynacji," *Studia Teologiczne*, no. 2 (1984), pp. 257–282.
- Perzanowski, J. "O wskazanych przez Ch. Hartshorne'a modalnych krokach w dowodzie ontologicznym św. Anzelma," in *Filozofia/logika: filozofia*

- logiczna* 1994, eds. J. Perzanowski et al., pp. 77–96. Toruń: Wydawnictwo UMK, 1995.
- . “Ontological Arguments II: Cartesian and Leibnizian,” in *Handbook of Metaphysics and Ontology*, vol. 2, eds. H. Burkhardt, B. Smith, pp. 625–633. Munich: Philosophia Verlag, 1991.
- . “Teofilozofia Leibniza,” in G.W. Leibniz, *Pisma z teologii mistycznej*, trans. M. Frankiewicz, pp. 221–352. Kraków: Znak 1994.
- Policki, K. “W sprawie formalizacji dowodu ‘ex motu’ na istnienie Boga,” *Roczniki Filozoficzne* 23, no. 1 (1975), pp. 19–30.
- Regner, L. *Logika*. Kraków: Polskie Towarzystwo Teologiczne, 1973.
- Salamucha, J. “Dowód ‘ex motu’ na istnienie Boga. Analiza logiczna argumentacji św. Tomasza z Akwinu,” *Collectanea Theologica* 15, no. 1 (1934), pp. 53–92.
- . “Nauczanie logiki w seminarjach duchownych,” in *Pamiętnik siódmego zjazdu w Wilnie, 19.IV. – 21.IV.1933*, pp. 171–182. Wilno: Drukarnia Archidiecezjalna, 1934.
- . “O możliwościach ścisłego formalizowania dziedziny pojęć analogicznych,” in *Mysł katolicka wobec logiki współczesnej*, pp. 122–153. Poznań: Księgarnia św. Wojciecha, 1937.
- . *Wiedza i wiara. Wybrane pisma filozoficzne*, eds. J.J. Jadacki, K. Świętorzecka. Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL, 1997.
- Skoczyński, J., Woleński, J. *Historia filozofii polskiej*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo WAM, 2010.
- Stępień, A.B. *O metodzie teorii poznania*. Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL, 1966.
- . “O stanie filozofii tomistycznej w Polsce,” in *W nurcie zagadnień poborowych*, vol. 2, ed. B. Bejze, pp. 97–126. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Sióstr Loretanek-Benedyktynek, 1968.
- Studia metafizyczne*, vol. 1: *Dyscypliny i metody filozoficzne*, eds. A.B. Stępień, T. Szubka. Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL, 1993.
- Styczeń, T. *Zarys etyki. Część I: Metaetyka*. Lublin: Katolicki Uniwersytet Lubelski, 1974.
- Swieżawski, S. *Zagadnienie historii filozofii*. Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1966.
- Świętorzecka, K., Tomanek, R. “Logika i metodologia nauk,” in *Wydział Filozofii Chrześcijańskiej na ATK 1954–1999*, eds. J. Bielecki, J. Krokos, pp. 169–188. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo UKSW, 2001.
- Tkaczyk, M., Wybraniec-Skardowska, U. “Logika polska,” in *Encyklopedia filozofii polskiej*, vol. 1, ed. A. Maryniarczyk, pp. 880–890. Lublin: Polskie Towarzystwo Tomasza z Akwinu, 2011.
- Turek, J. *Filozoficzne interpretacje faktów naukowych*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo KUL, 2009.
- . *Wszechświat dynamiczny. Rewolucja naukowa w kosmologii*. Lublin: Redakcja Wydawnictw KUL, 1995.
- W kierunku Boga*, ed. B. Bejze. Warszawa: Akademia Teologii Katolickiej, 1982.

- W kierunku formalizacji tomistycznej teodycei*, ed. and trans. E. Nieznański. Warszawa: Akademia Teologii Katolickiej, 1980.
- Wolak, Z. *Koncepcje analogii w Kole Krakowskim*. Tarnów: Biblos, 2005.
- . *Neotomizm a Szkoła Lwowsko-Warszawska*. Kraków: Ośrodek Badań Interdyscyplinarnych, 1993.
- . “Reakcje na J. Salamuchy analizę logiczną dowodu ‘z ruchu’ św. Tomasza,” in *Logika i metafizologia*, ed. Z. Wolak, pp. 59–76. Tarnów–Kraków: Biblos; Ośrodek Badań Interdyscyplinarnych, 1995.
- . “Światopogląd, filozofia i logika u ks. Jana Salamuchy,” in *Logika i metafizologia*, ed. Z. Wolak, pp. 47–58. Tarnów–Kraków: Biblos; Ośrodek Badań Interdyscyplinarnych, 1995.
- Woleński, J. *Filozoficzna szkoła lwowsko-warszawska*. Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1985.
- . “Pięć dróg Akwinaty,” *Principia* 5 (1992), pp. 67–83.
- . “Polish Attempts to Modernize Thomism by Logic (Bocheński and Salamucha),” in idem, *Historico-Philosophical Essays*, vol. 1, pp. 51–66. Kraków: Copernicus Center Press, 2012.
- . “Polish Logic,” in idem, *Historico-Philosophical Essays*, vol. 1, pp. 211–261. Kraków: Copernicus Center Press, 2012.
- . *Szkoła lwowsko-warszawska w polemikach*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Scholar, 1997.
- Wolsza, K. “Teodycea sformalizowana,” in *Filozofia Boga. Część II. Odkrywanie Boga*, eds. S. Janeczek, A. Starościc, pp. 195–218. Lublin: Wydawnictwo KUL, 2017.
- Życiński, J. *Wszeczeńświat emergentny. Bóg w ewolucji przyrody*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo KUL, 2009.

2.

METAPHYSICS

At present, metaphysics is understood in different manners and ways. According to Stanisław Kamiński, we can distinguish two ways of approaching it. In the general sense, metaphysics includes ontology, theories of object and all fundamental theories of reality. The above mentioned author identifies metaphysics *sensu stricto* with the peripatetic trend.¹ It is characterized by the orientation at things, in the starting point it takes into account experience, it bases explanations on the first principles of being and cognition, and it searches for the final causes for the explained aspects of being.² Such metaphysics has mainly been practiced in Church environments.³ Its rebirth in Poland in the 20th century was largely influenced by Louvain University, at which most Polish Catholic philosophers of the first part of the century studied.

THE MAIN TRENDS AND PERIODS

For the most part, the history of “Christian metaphysics” in the Polish philosophy of the 20th century coincides with the history of

¹ S. Kamiński, *Filozofia i metoda* (Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL, 1993), pp. 124ff.

² Idem, “Osobliwość metodologiczna teorii bytu,” *Roczniki Filozoficzne* 27, no. 2 (1979), pp. 35ff.

³ It is confirmed by, inter alia, W. Tatarkiewicz, *Historia filozofii*, vol. 3 (Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1988), p. 364.

peripatetic-Thomist metaphysics. Its periodization corresponds to the general division of that century—the beginning of the age, interwar period, post-war period, and the time after 1989. At the beginning of the 20th century, metaphysics was mainly developed at theological faculties in Lviv and Kraków. After World War I, the number of such institutions increased: the Catholic University of Lublin (KUL), theological faculties in Warsaw and Vilnius, as well as the Kraków Faculty of Philosophy of the Society of Jesus were opened. Just after World War II, metaphysics was only practiced at KUL and ATK. In time, new centers appeared: the Pontifical Faculty of Theology in Wrocław (1968) and Poznań (1974), the Pontifical Academy of Theology in Kraków (1981), and the University of Philosophy and Pedagogy Ignatianum (at present—Jesuit University Ignatianum) in Kraków (1990). Throughout the century, diocesan and monastic seminaries for priests have also been dealing with metaphysics. The conditions significantly changed after 1989, since when the Church universities have been able to apply for recognition from the state without any ideological restrictions.

From the beginning of the 20th century to World War II, the metaphysics of traditional Thomism, called the conservative or handbook Thomism, was popular. The representatives of that trend considered the philosophy of St. Thomas Aquinas exhausted, so they did not believe it should be enriched with the achievements of other philosophical trends or exact sciences. They thought it did not require any completions or modifications. They referred to the interpretation of the thought by St. Thomas from the times of the second scholasticism, especially to Cajetan, John of St. Thomas, as well as Francis Suárez who was influenced by Duns Scotus. Apart from the second scholasticism, traditional Thomism was also strongly influenced by Christian Wolff. This way, new elements were included into Thomism, and it was difficult to distinguish the authentic thought of Aquinas from the influences of other trends. In this form, metaphysics was included into Thomistic handbooks. In general, it was worldview-oriented—often subjected to the Catholic theology and apologetic objectives. It presented Saint Thomas as the continuator of Aristotle's metaphysics. The representatives of this version of Thomism were: in Warsaw—Fr. Stanisław Kobyłecki (1864–1939); in Lublin—Henryk Romanowski (no dates available), Jacek Woroniecki OP (1878–1949); in Gniezno and Poznań—Fr. Aleksander Żychliński (1889–1949);

in Vilnius—Fr. Michał Klepacz (1893–1967).⁴ This trend was often accused of futile speculation and confessional burden.⁵

A new metaphysical trend appeared in Poland along with the Louvain Thomism, which is often called assimilating, open, critical or precisising Thomism. It was characterized by an epistemological approach as it was derived from the criticism of cognition. Basically, it was Thomism without any apologetic objectives, although its supporters tried to comply with the Church's teaching. It was open to new philosophical trends and exact sciences the output of which was to complement the philosophical synthesis.⁶ There were attempts to adjust the principles of Thomism to modern sciences, not only by referring to the authority of St. Thomas, but also by trying to maintain the internal consistency of explanations while describing the new facts. Revelation was treated only as a “negative norm.”⁷ The representatives of the Louvain Thomism in the above mentioned period were: in Lublin—Fr. Idzi Radziszewski (1871–1922); in Warsaw—Fr. Piotr Chojnacki (1897–1969); in Lviv—Fr. Kazimierz Wais (1865–1934), Fr. Jan Stepa (1892–1959); in Kraków—Fr. Franciszek Gabryl (1866–1914); in Poznań—Fr. Kazimierz Kowalski (1896–1972).⁸

Another form of modernizing the metaphysics of St. Thomas Aquinas was suggested by the representatives of the so-called Kraków Circle: Fr. Jan Salamucha (1903–1944), Józef Bocheński OP (1902–1995), Bolesław Sobociński (1906–1980), and Jan Franciszek Drewnowski

⁴ S. Kobyłecki, *Metafizyka w psychologii* (Kraków: Drukarnia “Czasu”, 1906); H. Romanowski, *Stara a nowa metafizyka* (Warszawa–Kraków: Druk i Lit. F. Kasprzykiewicz, 1923); J. Woroniecki, *Katolickość tomizmu* (Lublin: Nakładem Uniwersytetu Lubelskiego, 1924). See more in K. Szałata, “Obrona filozofii tomistycznej na początku dwudziestego wieku (Idzi Radziszewski, Henryk Romanowski, Jacek Woroniecki, Henryk Romanowski),” *Studia Philosophiae Christianae* 21, no. 2 (1985), pp. 193–208.

⁵ A.R. Bańka, “Polscy neoscholastycy wobec filozoficznego programu Szkoły Lowańskiej,” *Studia z Filozofii Polskiej* 2 (2007), p. 110.

⁶ *Ibidem*, p. 98.

⁷ *Ibidem*, p. 108.

⁸ P. Chojnacki, “Możliwości uwspółcześnienia filozofii tomistycznej,” *Przegląd Filozoficzny* 36, no. 3 (1933), pp. 199–223; *idem*, “Okresy i kierunki filozofii neotomistycznej,” *Ateneum Kapłańskie* 34, (1934), pp. 350–368; K. Wais, *Ontologia czyli Metafizyka ogólna* (Lwów: Nakładem Tow. “Biblioteka religijna”, 1926); F. Gabryl, *Metafizyka ogólna czyli nauka o bycie* (Kraków: Księgarnia Spółki Wydawniczej Polskiej, 1903); K. Kowalski, *Podstawy filozofii* (Gniezno: Nakładem “Studia Gnesnensia”, 1930).

(1886–1978). In order to achieve this, they used formal logic through which they tried to precise the most important theses of Thomism. They were new attempts—not only against the background of the Polish philosophy. They aimed at making Thomism scientific to oppose neo-positivism that was expansive at that time and claimed to have science monopoly.⁹

After World War II, traditional Thomism was continued, although in a much narrower scope: at KUL—Fr. Stanisław Adamczyk (1900–1971), in Poznań—Fr. Marian Kowalewski (1914–1996); at ATK and KUL Louvain Thomism was also practiced—Fr. Kazimierz Kłósak (1911–1982), Fr. Stanisław Mazierski (1915–1993) and Fr. Józef Iwanicki (1902–1995).¹⁰ In the 1950s, the metaphysics of existential Thomism appeared, which deals with an actually existing being, takes up all the fundamental issues of the classical philosophy, and is independent of both the exact sciences and the Revelation. It does not refer to apriorism or universalization, and it does not analyze the quantitative-qualitative, or the formal, aspect of the reality, but rather its existential aspect. It enables analogous and transcendental cognition that allows us to ultimately explain the reality in the necessary aspects. As noted by Kamiński, “it becomes modernized not when it imitates all the contemporary philosophies, but when it gets to know thinking experience and satisfies metaphysical requirements because of which the contemporary philosophies were created.”¹¹ Other philosophical disciplines are its applications, which is why they are called “particular metaphysics.” They maintain their own subject at the starting point, and in their explanations they refer both to the method and to the premises of general metaphysics. The representatives of metaphysics perceived in such a way were: Stefan Świeżawski (1907–2004), Mieczysław Albert Krąpiec OP (1921–2008), Jerzy Kalinowski (1916–2000), Fr. Stanisław Kamiński (1919–1986),

⁹ A.B. Stępień, “O stanie filozofii tomistycznej w Polsce,” in *W nurcie zagadnień posoborowych*, ed. B. Bejze, vol. 2 (Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Sióstr Loretanek-Benedyktynek, 1968), p. 100.

¹⁰ S. Adamczyk, *Metafizyka ogólna czyli ontologia* (Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL, 1960); M. Kowalewski, *Wstęp do filozofii* (Poznań: Pallottinum, 1958); K. Kłósak, *Materializm dialektyczny* (Kraków: Wydawnictwo Mariackie, 1948); idem, *W poszukiwaniu Pierwszej Przyczyny*, vol. 1–2 (Warszawa: Instytut Wydawniczy Pax, 1955–1957).

¹¹ S. Kamiński, *Filozofia i metoda*, pp. 116ff.

Fr. Andrzej Wawrzyniak (1936–2013), Antoni Bazyli Stępień (1931–), and Zofia Józefa Zdybicka USJK (1928–) from KUL; Mieczysław Gogacz (1926–), Fr. Bronisław Dembowski (1927–2019), Edmund Morawiec CSsR (1930–2019) from ATK, and Fr. Bogdan Bakies (1935–2012) from WSD in Łódź.¹²

One of the kinds of existential metaphysics was the metaphysic of consequent Thomism formulated by Gogacz. It is focused on the principles of an existing being (*quidditas, subsistentia, esse*) which are manifested in the transcendentals and existential relations.¹³ A lot of philosophers were also interested in the so-called phenomenologizing Thomism, within which the thought of St. Thomas was enriched with the analyses of phenomenologists. Such attempts were made by, inter alia, Fr. Karol Wojtyła (1920–2005), Antoni Stępień (KUL), Władysław Stróżewski (1933–) from UJ, and Fr. Marian Jaworski (1926–) from ATK, PAT. However, the so-called transcendentalizing Thomism, which was treated as a variant of Louvain Thomism, was not very popular. It was a specific synthesis of the philosophy of St. Thomas with the transcendental method.¹⁴ Fr. Stanisław Kowalczyk (1932–) from KUL and Stanisław Ziemiański SJ (1931–) from AIK¹⁵ also dealt with the metaphysics referring to the peripatetic tradition. Following

¹² S. Swieżawski, *Byt. Zagadnienia metafizyki tomistycznej* (Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL, 1948); idem, *Święty Tomasz na nowo odczytany* (Kraków: Znak, 1983); M.A. Krąpiec, *Metafizyka. Zarys teorii bytu* (Lublin: Redakcja Wydawnictw KUL, 1978); idem, *Teoria analogii bytu* (Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL, 1959); M.A. Krąpiec, S. Kamiński, *Z teorii i metodologii metafizyki* (Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL, 1962); A.B. Stępień, *Wprowadzenie do metafizyki* (Kraków: Znak, 1964); Z. Zdybicka, *Partycypacja bytu* (Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL, 1972); M. Gogacz, *Elementarz metafizyki* (Warszawa: Akademia Teologii Katolickiej, 1987); E. Morawiec, *W kierunku metafizyki egzystencjalnej* (Warszawa: W kierunku metafizyki egzystencjalnej, 1984); E. Morawiec, P. Mazanka, *Metafizyka klasyczna wersji egzystencjalnej. Podstawowe zagadnienia z metafizyki* (Warszawa: Wydawnictwo UKSW, 2006).

¹³ K. Bańkowski, "Tomizm konsekwentny na tle odmian tomizmu," *Studia Philosophiae Christianae* 32, no. 2 (1996), pp. 217ff.

¹⁴ F. Gruszka, "Próby stosowania metody transcendentalnej w filozofii neoscholastycznej," *Studia Philosophiae Christianae* 11, no. 1 (1975), pp. 5–26; J. Herbut, "Problem metody transcendentalnej," *Roczniki Filozoficzne* 26, no. 1 (1978), pp. 51–67.

¹⁵ S. Kowalczyk, *Metafizyka ogólna* (Lublin: Redakcja Wydawnictw KUL, 1998); S. Ziemiański, *Teologia naturalna. Filozoficzna problematyka Boga* (Kraków: Fakultet Filozoficzny Towarzystwa Jezusowego, 1995).

mainly this tradition, Tadeusz Styczeń SDS (1931–2010) from KUL worked out the metaphysical-anthropological bases for ethics.

After 1989, the interest in traditional Thomism faded and the idea of the formalization of metaphysics did not find many adherents either. Other trends were continued to a smaller or greater extent. The metaphysics of existential Thomism was explored by Henryk Kiereś (1943–), Andrzej Maryniarczyk SDB (1950–), Krzysztof Wroczyński (1950–), Włodzimierz Dłubacz (1952–), Piotr Jaroszyński (1955–), Fr. Piotr Moskał (1955–) from KUL, Fr. Ignacy Dec (1944–) from PWT in Wrocław, Fr. Jan Sochoń (1953–), Fr. Paweł Mazanka (1960–) from UKSW, Fr. Bogdan Czupryn (1957–) from WSD in Płock.¹⁶ Consequent Thomism was developed by Tadeusz Klimski (1948–2013) from UKSW and Władysław Kubiak FDP (1949–) from WSD in Łańciew. The research on phenomenologizing Thomism was also taken up by Fr. Jan Krokos (1952–) from UKSW, and transcendentalizing Thomism was analyzed by Fr. Józef Herbut (1933–2018) from KUL and Fr. Franciszek Gruszka (1941–) from WSD in Katowice. The main differences among the above mentioned variants of Thomistic metaphysics referred to understanding the subject of the research, as well as the autonomy and neutrality of its starting point. Moreover, the way of using the philosophy of St. Thomas, as well as the issue of the unity of philosophical cognition and the relation of metaphysics with other areas of philosophy, were understood in a different manner. To a large extent, the approach to the above mentioned issues depended on the adopted methods characterized by significant discrepancies among particular kinds of neo-Thomism.¹⁷

¹⁶ A. Maryniarczyk, *Zeszyty z metafizyki*, vol. 1–7 (Lublin: Polskie Towarzystwo Tomasza z Akwinu, 1998–2015); idem, *Metoda metafizyki realistycznej* (Lublin: Polskie Towarzystwo Tomasza z Akwinu, 2003); W. Dłubacz, *U źródeł koncepcji Absolutu. Od Homera do Platona* (Lublin: Wydawnictwo KUL, 2003); J. Sochoń, *Spór o rozumienie świata* (Warszawa: Instytut Wydawniczy Pax, 1998); idem, *Przygodność i tajemnica* (Warszawa: Wydawnictwo UKSW, 2003); P. Jaroszyński, *Metafizyka i sztuka* (Lublin: Polskie Towarzystwo Tomasza z Akwinu, 1996); idem, *Metafizyka czy ontologia?* (Lublin: Polskie Towarzystwo Tomasza z Akwinu, 2011); P. Moskał, *Religia i prawda* (Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL, 2008).

¹⁷ See more in K. Mikucki, *Tomizm w Polsce po II wojnie światowej* (Kraków: Akademia Ignatianum; Wydawnictwo WAM, 2015); D. Piętka, “O nurtach neo-scholastyki polskiej w wieku XX z metodologicznego punktu widzenia,” *Ruch Filozoficzny* 69, no. 1 (2012), pp. 79–96.

Metaphysical/ontological problems, from the perspective of modern philosophy, especially the philosophy of dialogue, phenomenology and hermeneutics, were analyzed by: Józef Tischner (1931–2000), Karol Tarnowski (1937–), Jan Andrzej Kłoczowski OP (1937–), Fr. Roman Rożdżeński (1945–) from PAT, now: UPJPII, Antoni Jarnuszkiewicz SJ (1949–) from AIK, Fr. Marek Jędraszewski (1949–) from UAM, Tadeusz Gadacz (1955–) from UP in Kraków; and in the context of the philosophy of the mind: Urszula Żegleń (1949–) from UMK and Józef Bremer SJ (1953–) from AIK. The foundations of metaphysics in empirical sciences were explored by Fr. Michał Heller (1936–) from PAT and Fr. Józef Życiński (1948–2011) from PAT and KUL, creating a kind of Christian positivism.¹⁸ Referring to the Thomist, phenomenological and analytical traditions, Stanisław Judycki (1954–) from UG and Jacek Wojtyśiak (1967–) from KUL also took up metaphysical issues. Piotr Gutowski (1961–) from KUL dealt with the metaphysics of process philosophy and American pragmatism.

THE MOST IMPORTANT ACHIEVEMENTS

The contribution of Polish metaphysicians to the heritage of philosophy consisted both in the introduction of new notions and suggesting solutions to the problems that were being discussed. In both cases, the philosophical and cultural-social context had a significant influence on the research that was carried out. The dispute with modernism was just such a context from the turn of the centuries, until World War II (1939). The official response of the Church was the encyclical of Pius X *Pascendi dominici gregis* (1907) which condemned modernism, as well as the announcement of 24 Thomistic theses (1914) and the order to take an anti-modernism vow (1910–1967). Modernism was for the historical nature of truth, relying only on the Bible (without the Church Fathers), negation of natural theology, theory of immanence (i.a. psychological explanation of the genesis of religion), phenomenalism and secularism. The second area of discussion went outside the Church. It mainly referred to positivism, empirio-criticism and neo-positivism, which based the only certain knowledge

¹⁸ J. Życiński, *Transcendencja i naturalizm* (Kraków: Copernicus Center Press, 2014).

on the empirical scientific method. It was a scientist approach supporting epistemological, and often also ontological naturalism. As a consequence, either the possibility of cognition was questioned, or the existence of supernatural reality was doubted. Theology and metaphysics were not considered scientific. Their place was to be taken by positive knowledge.

In response to modernism, the representatives of traditional Thomism suggested the return to the philosophy of St. Thomas. They believed it was the only effective tool that could help them oppose the new trends. However, they did not limit themselves to describing the doctrine of St. Thomas. In light of the doctrine, they tried to interpret the current problems, extending their understanding. Thus, Kobyłecki presented the experimental foundations and the universality of causation and the principle of causality.¹⁹ Romanowski believed that only metaphysics makes it possible to formulate the true image of the world based on the most universal principles and facts; he showed the consequences of separating the cognition from the real world. Woroniecki criticized naturalism; he was for objectivism and universalism, and he used the metaphysics of St. Thomas in the theory of a human person, social philosophy, ethics and the theory of upbringing. Żychliński explored the natural and supernatural cognition of God, emphasized the meaning of metaphysical proofs based on the principle of causality, and he connected the basis of human cognition with the objective obviousness.

The representatives of Louvain Thomism went much further, as they suggested opening up to new philosophical trends and exact sciences. They tried to modernize Thomism using the criticism of cognition. Gabryl approached the typical issues of Thomist metaphysics—such as being, analogy, transcendentals, compositions of being, or causes of being—in a critical manner. Wais rationally justified religious truths, proved the correctness of the theory of the creation of the world by God, and defended the principle of purposefulness.²⁰ Radziszewski presented the limitations of exact sciences

¹⁹ S. Ziemiański, “Kobyłecki Stanisław,” in *Encyklopedia filozofii polskiej*, vol. 1, ed. A. Maryniarczyk (Lublin: Polskie Towarzystwo Tomasza z Akwinu, 2011), p. 659.

²⁰ W. Gretka, “Wais Kazimierz,” in *Encyklopedia filozofii polskiej*, vol. 2, ed. A. Maryniarczyk (Lublin: Polskie Towarzystwo Tomasza z Akwinu, 2011), p. 776.

and explained the problem of religion from the philosophical point of view. Following critical realism, Stepa explained the cognizability of the world, while Kowalski explicated the issue of analogy and substance.

The undertakings of the Kraków Circle were a creative attempt to revive Thomism and deepen it from within.²¹ Salamucha carried out a logical reconstruction of the proofs for the existence of God by St. Thomas Aquinas, he precised the formulation of analogical concepts from the side of logic, and he presented the role of logic in Christian philosophy. Bocheński enriched the modern logic with the achievements of the medieval logic and, using logical tools, he precised the theory of analogy. Drewnowski reflected on scholasticism in the context of the requirements of modern science.

After World War II, “Christian metaphysics” was mainly developed in the context of the discussion with Marxism. However, the most influential representatives of such metaphysics did not only mean to criticize Marxism. They also wished to show that it was possible to practice another concept of philosophy that solves philosophical problems better than Marxism. This was the aim of Swieżawski, Krąpiec, Kalinowski, Wojtyła, and Kamiński, who, in the 1950s at KUL, laid the foundation for the Lublin Philosophical School. Because of its tasks, the school was oriented at metaphysics. The development of this area, a new, existential formula of which was mainly suggested by Krąpiec, was to be facilitated by historical research (especially on the thought of St. Thomas Aquinas) initiated by Swieżawski, as well as the methodological and logical analyses by Kalinowski and Kamiński.²² The realistic metaphysics that was worked out this way was used in anthropology, ethics and philosophy of the law, which was mainly dealt with by Kalinowski, Wojtyła and Krąpiec.

The supporters of Marxism considered it as a scientific and realistic philosophy, as opposed to the philosophy related to Christianity which they found non-scientific and idealistic. It is not surprising, therefore, that one of the first problems to be broadly discussed with regard to the Thomist metaphysics was the issue of its scientific quality and realism, which resulted in the necessity to think about an

²¹ M. Gogacz, “Filozofia chrześcijańska w Polsce odrodzonej,” *Studia Philosophiae Christianae* 5, no. 2 (1969), p. 59.

²² *Ibidem*, pp. 63ff.

adequate method of cognizing this area. In this respect, the achievements of Catholic philosophers were significant.

Due to the scientific nature of metaphysics, Chojnacki tried to specify and then coordinate the principles of philosophy and exact sciences in order to create the synthesis of human cognition. Kalinowski dealt with arranging traditional metaphysics in terms of methodology. Krąpiec investigated the possibility of neutrality of the subject of metaphysics and justified its autonomy; he precised the existential approach to the being as the subject of metaphysics, he justified the status of metaphysics as the philosophy of being, and he presented the specific features of metaphysical cognition. Kamiński considered the scientificity of metaphysics, confronted that area with the contemporary methodology of sciences, and determined the way of explaining and justifying metaphysical statements. The work of Krąpiec and Kamiński *Z teorii i metodologii metafizyki* [*On the Theory and Methodology of Metaphysics*] was unique, as, in an entirely new manner, it presented the methodological characteristics of the classical metaphysics, emphasizing, i.a. the limitations of deduction and formal logic in metaphysical argumentation that result both from the nature of the modern logic and from metaphysical cognition.²³ Stępień differentiated between worldview and philosophy, and he tried to take into account the achievements of analysts and phenomenologists. Majdański, using the tools of the contemporary logical semiotics, analyzed transcendental concepts and the functor “is.”

As far as realism is concerned, we should emphasize the achievements of Swieżawski and Krąpiec. The former, inspired by Jacques Maritain and Étienne Gilson, started studying existential metaphysics of St. Thomas in Poland, seeing, in the existence (*esse*), the factor that enables cognitive contact with the reality. The latter made an important contribution to explaining the issue of learning about the existence of being, which comprised of elaborating the theory of existential judgments and deepening the understanding of metaphysical experience and the transcendental properties of being. He proved that the method of abstraction does not meet the requirements related to the cognition of the existence of being. It is because, as a rule, this method narrows the subject of metaphysical cognition, limits metaphysics to operations on ideas, loses the beings' individuality,

²³ A.B. Stępień, “O stanie filozofii tomistycznej w Polsce,” pp. 114–116.

and—first of all—removes the existential aspect from the area of cognition.²⁴ Those requirements are neither met by other methods popular in the 20th century, applied also by Thomists: phenomenological, transcendental, axiomatic or analytical methods.²⁵ That is why Krąpiec suggested a metaphysical separation that requires the real existence of the subject, while maintaining its neutrality. Due to such separation, we can reach constitutive elements that determine the existence of being in different aspects. It is about separating, in a particular being or aspect, of such factors without which that being or aspect of being cannot exist. Although this method is rooted in the philosophy of St. Thomas, its final shape and theoretical justification was developed by the representatives of the Lublin School of Philosophy.

The research on separation which had been initiated by Krąpiec was continued by Maryniarczyk. Metaphysical separation is based on existential judgments the analysis of which makes it possible for us to discover the foundations of human cognition. The act of an existential judgment includes the whole metaphysical experience, as it possibly contains the whole being in question. The original affirmation of the existence of being in the existential judgment is marked by directness, pre-reflectiveness and over-truthfulness. To a large extent, metaphysical cognition is clarification of what is included in existential judgments, which is why those judgments specify the nature, scope and objective of such cognition. Because of the fact that the cognition is based on existential judgments, its nature is objective, oriented at truthfulness and transcendental. The application of the separation method in anthropology has been more extensively investigated by Piotr Stanisław Mazur (1968–).

The studies on the method of metaphysics were significantly enriched by Swieżawski who emphasized the role of the historical aspect of the research, which was named *historism*.²⁶ It postulated taking into account the context of a discovery and the historical development

²⁴ A. Maryniarczyk, "Tomizm egzystencjalny a dziś filozofii," in *Filozofować dziś*, ed. A. Bronk (Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL, 1995), p. 292.

²⁵ M.A. Krąpiec, *Poznawać czy myśleć* (Lublin: Redakcja Wydawnictw KUL, 1994), pp. 181–204; M. Gogacz, "Tomizm egzystencjalny na tle odmian tomizmu," in *W kierunku Boga*, ed. B. Bejze (Warszawa: Akademia Teologii Katolickiej, 1982), pp. 59–81.

²⁶ M. Gogacz, "Tomizm egzystencjalny na tle odmian tomizmu," pp. 65ff.

of problems, especially in terms of rightness, as well as aporeticness, inconsistency, or unclearness of the suggested solutions. Referring to historicism allows, i.a., make a given problem more precise, indicate the proper aspect of the research, and select the proper research method, due to which one can progress in explanations, avoid the previous mistakes and eliminate pseudo-problems.

Kamiński contributed a lot to the elaboration of the methodology of metaphysics, as he detailed, i.a. the activities of explaining and justifying the theses of metaphysics. He determined that those activities are of intuitive-reductive nature. They include the gradual clarification of the concept of being, during which, in the inner structure of being, one discovers the reasons that make the existential fact in question non-contradictory. In order to achieve this, one uses negative argumentation, i.e. making the sentence, that contradicts the one that is being justified, absurd, reducing the thesis negation to contradiction, or indicating the incomppliance of the thesis negation with the facts.²⁷

An important achievement of the Polish metaphysics includes studies in the theory of analogy. Particularly valuable texts were those of Krąpiec who, i.a. distinguished the transcendental analogy of being based on the necessary and transcendental relations of being. They were pioneer studies on a global scale. Moreover, Chojnacki dealt with applying analogy to the creation of metaphysical concepts, and Bejze broadly used it in the cognition of God.

Polish philosophers significantly contributed to deepening metaphysical considerations related to the most important philosophical problems, such as the world, man and God. Kłósak elicited the meaning of the metaphysical principle of causality, and proved the possibility of the temporal beginning of the universe. Iwanicki carried out the criticism of dialectical materialism. Krąpiec presented the limitations of monism and arguments for pluralism, and he largely developed the theory of the structure of being, substance, substantial form, and matter. Gogacz formulated the theory of the internal reasons of an individual being, indicating that such reasons include the act of existence, essence, form and material potency. Mazierski explicated the concept of necessity and determinism. Stróżewski described the main concepts of being, and he highlighted the subject of “non-existence,” transcendentality of beauty, and value. Ziemiański modernized the Thomist

²⁷ S. Kamiński, *Filozofia i metoda*, p. 119.

argumentation for the existence of the Absolute, referring to the ideas derived from natural sciences.

The philosophers dealing with metaphysics analyzed the argumentation for the existence of God. Adamczyk interpreted the kinetic argument in a new way. Kłósak confronted the traditional arguments for the existence of God with the modern natural science history, proving the superficiality of the argumentation based on the second law of thermodynamics and the theory of expanding universe. Iwanicki proved the limitations of theodical argumentation formulated by Descartes and Leibniz. Krąpiec indicated the metaphysical foundations of the proofs for the existence of God, eliciting the existential aspect of the Absolute theory. Nieznański carried out the formalization of some parts of Thomist natural theology. Kamiński analyzed the logical value of Thomist proofs. Gogacz used the attribute of independence to deduce other absolute attributes of God. Zdybicka developed the theory of participation and specified the metaphysical foundations of the fact of religion. Fr. Bohdan Bejze presented the argument for the existence of God “from analogy” and used analogy to the cognition of divine attributes, and Kowalczyk indicated the value of anthropological argumentation for the existence of God and criticized pantheist and atheistic approaches.

In the Thomist tradition, metaphysics was also used in developing anthropological problems. Kłósak and Iwanicki analyzed the concept of the human soul from that angle, while Krąpiec holistically developed the metaphysics of the man in which he interpreted the human fact with metaphysical tools. Objectivized metaphysics based on the philosophy of being was complemented by Wojtyła with his subjective approach. Wojtyła referred to the broadly understood experience of the man, analyzing it with the phenomenological method.

Since the 1990s, Christian metaphysicians have continued the research of their predecessors, taking up the discussion with postmodernism the representatives of which have negated the truth of the so-called grand narratives and argued for unsolvability of problems, relativism, constructivism, and religious syncretism. Morawiec presented the holistic concept of classical metaphysics. Kiereś used realistic metaphysics both to build the theory of art and theory of the society, and to prove the utopian nature of postmodernism and contemporary aesthetical and political theories. Dec presented the issues related to the transcendence of man in nature. Maryniarczyk

developed the issue of the systemicity of metaphysics, the philosophical theory of *creatio ex nihilo*, and he deepened the understanding of transcendentals. Wroczyński investigated the issue of the existential foundations of the law. Dłubacz studied the problem of the Absolute in Greek philosophy. Krokos modernized the understanding of truth and foundations of human cognition. Sochoń analyzed the issue of atheism, monism, accident, and he reflected on culture, religion, creation, and language. Jaroszyński discussed the problem of beauty and metaphysical foundations of art, and he differentiated between metaphysics and ontology against the background of the whole philosophical tradition. In the light of realistic metaphysics, Moskal presented the fact of Christian religion. Klimski used metaphysical statements concerning the structure of being, existence and transcendentals to analyze anthropological problems. Kubiak elaborated the theory of relations of being. Judycki formulated a series of modernized arguments for the existence of soul as the principle of the mind. In his natural theology, he presented the arguments for the existence of God using various analytical means derived from, i.a. the Anselmian and Cartesian tradition. Applying the tools of the contemporary analytic philosophy, Wojtysiak suggested a new type of argumentation for the existence of God and human soul.

INFLUENCE IN POLAND AND ABROAD

In the interwar period, it was difficult to talk about the international influence of Polish Christian metaphysics, as, at that time, it was gradually coming back to life, or—actually—emerging. That is why Polish thinkers assimilated the trends developed in the West within the neo-scholastic renewal. It influenced the organization of academic centers in which the philosophers paid much attention to Thomism as the basis for the Christian worldview. That is why after Poland regained independence, this philosophy had an important influence on the way Polish philosophers understood metaphysics. The Louvain Thomism played a particularly important role, as it seemed to be modern philosophy that took into account the whole contemporary scientific, philosophical and cultural context.

A significant change in the reception of Christian metaphysics occurred after World War II. Although the communist authorities

made it impossible for scholars to contact foreign universities in the first period, the voice of Polish philosophers gradually started to be heard in European debates. Nevertheless, the group of such philosophers was small, as actually only two environments—KUL and ATK—functioned in Poland at that time. Swieżawski took part in the sittings of the Second Vatican Council as a lay auditor. He cooperated with Maritain and Gilson in formulating the existential interpretation of the metaphysics of St. Thomas Aquinas. Krąpiec, Kalinowski, Kamiński, Stępień and Zdybicka²⁸ published the results of their research in congress languages. After the communist dictatorship softened, they promote Polish metaphysical thought during conferences in Western Europe and North America. More and more Polish philosophers went for foreign apprenticeships during which they not only learnt about the current status of the research carried out in the West, but they also transposed Polish achievements to those places. The pontificate of Karol Wojtyła—John Paul II also contributed to the interest of foreign philosophers in Polish metaphysics. As a philosopher, John Paul II often referred to the heritage Polish philosophical thought in his papal teachings.

The influence of Christian metaphysics on the Polish philosophy was much limited due to the censorship, hindering the activity of Church environments, as well as pressure exerted on the state universities which, at that time, were totally dominated by the Marxist philosophy. Nevertheless, Church environments appreciated particularly the newest studies on Thomist metaphysics which, in the first period of the Polish People's Republic (PRL), were the only antidote to the promoted Marxist vision of the world and man.

The situation started to normalize after 1989. Metaphysics developed within Christian philosophy quickly gained respect, as—after a time of coercion—the Polish intellectual space had huge gaps in deepened philosophical reflection. Metaphysical texts started to be published in periodicals and state publishing houses. Christian philosophers

²⁸ M.A. Krąpiec, *Metaphysics: An Outline of the History of Being*, trans. Th. Sandom (New York: Peter Lang, 1991); idem, *Person and Natural Law*, trans. M. Szymańska (New York: Peter Lang, 1993); *W 700-lecie śmierci św. Tomasza z Akwinu. Próba uwspółcześnienia jego filozofii*, eds. S. Kamiński, M. Kurdziałek, Z.J. Zdybicka (Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL, 1976), *Theory of Being: To Understand Reality*, eds. S. Kamiński, M. Kurdziałek, Z.J. Zdybicka (Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL, 1980).

were invited to give various lectures and employed at state universities. The existing Church universities were reinforced, and new ones appeared, in which the metaphysical research carried out at the time of PRL was continued. Also, studies were taken up that confronted the achievements of Polish philosophers with what was worked out in metaphysics in the West. The formulated realistic metaphysics, especially that of the representatives of the Lublin Philosophical School, influenced not only other philosophical disciplines, but also other areas of knowledge, including social sciences, law or theology. At that time, the philosophers such as Tischner, Heller and Życiński, who dealt with metaphysical/ontological problems from the point of view of modern philosophical directions, also established their reputation in the West.

DISCUSSIONS AND DISPUTES

In the pre-war period, the discussions were mainly carried out between the representatives of the conservative version of Thomism and the supporters of opening Thomism to science and new philosophical trends. The former were accused of dogmatic treatment of St. Thomas' ideas and ahistoricity, while the latter were said to yield to modernist tendencies, especially reducing the truth to the historical context.

Similar discussions were also present during the PRL period, due to which particular issues were detailed. The most important was the contribution of the Lublin Philosophical School. They (e.g. Krąpiec, Stępień, Kamiński) criticized the traditional Thomism, saying that its representatives fail to understand St. Thomas, in particular his concept of being, which determined the whole vision of the reality and metaphysics at the same time. They raised similar objections against the Louvain Thomism, claiming, in addition, that it resigns from the autonomy of metaphysical cognition, which questioned its cognitive value.

In terms of other metasubjective issues, the dispute also concerned the method of metaphysics—some philosophers supported abstraction; others—separation. Moreover, Krąpiec and Kamiński wrote a lot of works criticizing the formalization of metaphysics (discussed by, inter alia, the Kraków Circle), proving that logical tools are

insufficient in formulating metaphysical statements. Numerous disputes related to metaphysical cognition, and—within its frames—the cognition of existence in existential judgments, perception of metaphysical experience, or the relation between metaphysics and theory of cognition. The way of understanding transcendentals was discussed, and sometimes the scholars had very diverse approaches to its nature and function in metaphysical cognition. Moreover, the supporters of Thomism criticized the theory of values developed especially on the basis of phenomenology, wishing that it would be replaced with the metaphysics of goodness. At the same time, the criticism of Thomistic metaphysics, formulated by Tischner from the perspective of hermeneutics and philosophy of dialogue, referring to, i.a. the uniqueness of a person's experience, became very popular.²⁹

Already in PRL, Polish metaphysicians were inspired by and involved in the discussions with the trends popular in the Western Europe, such as existentialism, phenomenology, hermeneutics, and analytic philosophy. Since the 1990s a broad dispute with postmodernism has been carried out.

Kiereś, Jaroszyński and Sochoń used arguments that referred to the realistic metaphysics in the criticism of subjectivism, relativism, deconstructionism and contextualism which were typical of the post-modern thought. Mazanka carried out a critical analysis of the philosophical conditions of the crisis of the modern culture and the sources of secularism in the European culture. Fr. Jacek Grzybowski (1973–) from UKSW referred to metaphysics in the discussions on the philosophical foundations of politics and national identity. Fr. Maciej Bała (1966–) from UKSW was involved in the debate concerning the philosophical foundations and limitations of the modern atheism.

In 1990s and in the first decade of the 21st century, a lot of Christian metaphysicians have taken up a dialogue with naturalist philosophy, which, in the 20th century, became—especially in the West—an official paradigm of philosophizing. Within the philosophy of the mind, Judycki defended the substantiality of the subject. Wojtysiak disputed with naturalism in the area of ontology and natural theology, proving—through the tools of analytic philosophy—that many statements of the traditional philosophy of being are correct, e.g. the principle of

²⁹ J. Tischner, "Schyłek chrześcijaństwa tomistycznego," *Znak*, no. 1(187) (1970), pp. 1–20.

sufficient reason. Within the Thomistic metaphysics, the discussion with naturalism was also taken up by Mazur, indicating the latter's explanatory limitations in terms of the nature of human subject. Fr. Stanisław Wszolek (1958–) from UPJPII presented a more acquiescent approach to naturalism, aiming at the preparation of the concept of metaphysics taking into account philosophy and exact sciences. Ireneusz Ziemiński (1965–) from US disputed with the statements adopted in Christian metaphysics concerning, i.a. the general manner of practicing Christian metaphysics, as well as many detailed problems, such as evil, the existence of God, and God's responsibility for the existence of evil in the world.

METAPHYSICS AT THE BEGINNING OF THE 21ST CENTURY

Now, at the beginning of the 21st century, the development of the Polish metaphysical reflection is being continued. It is not only present in the traditional centers of Christian philosophy (Lublin, Warszawa, Kraków), but also in new faculties of theology and at state universities. In quite an extensive range of issues that have been taken up within metaphysics in the recent years, we should emphasize the research on the cognition of the existence of beings carried out by Jacek Wojtysiak (KUL), Paweł Milcarek (1966–), Adam Roslan (1972–) from UKSW, as well as the understanding of truth—Tomasz Pawlikowski (1970–) from WSEZiNS in Łódź, Tomasz Bartel (1952) from the Bogdan Jański Academy in Warsaw, interpersonal relations—Artur Andrzejuk (1965–) from UKSW and the personal existence of the man—Stanisław Judycki (1954–) from UG, Krzysztof Andrzej Wojcieszek (1958–) from Pedagogium – WSNS in Warsaw, Piotr S. Mazur (AIK), Arkadiusz Gudaniec (1970–) from KUL, or the research in the metaphysics of culture—Wojciech Daszkiewicz (1977–). An important contribution are the new approaches to traditional issues, such as hylomorphism—Zbigniew Pańpuch (1968–) from KUL, act and potency—Michał Głowala (1975–) from UW, subject and properties—Marek Piwowarczyk (1976–) from KUL, analogy—Fr. Andrzej Sołtys (1967–) from the Rzeszow University of Technology, relation—Fr. Tomasz Duma (1968–) from KUL, transcendentals—Aleksander Lisowski (1969–) from UKSW, and the theory of creation—Fr. Grzegorz Szumera (1970–) from WSD in Częstochowa. Within the analytic

metaphysics, the research is carried out by Tadeusz Szubka (1958–). We should appreciate the contribution to the studies in the methodology of the metaphysics of existential Thomism—Paweł Mazanka (UKSW), Paweł Gondek (1966–) from KUL, as well as taking into account metaphysical aspects in explaining epistemological problems, especially following the ideas of transcendental Thomism Fr. Dariusz Oko (1960–) from UPJPII, Monika Walczak (1969–) from KUL, Aleksander R. Bańka (1979–) from UŚ, Dariusz Piętka (1968–), Michał Zembrzuski (1982) from UKSW. Also, metaphysical issues occur in the works on the philosophy of religion—Fr. Krzysztof Śnieżyński (1972–), Fr. Miłosz Hołda (1983–) from UPJPII, and the philosophy of God—Jerzy Tupikowski CFM (1967–) from PWT in Wrocław, Fr. Tomasz Stępień (1969–) from UKSW. Moreover, we have to emphasize the role of studies showing the application of metaphysics in ethics and bioethics—Tadeusz Biesaga SDB (1950–), Fr. Grzegorz Hołub (1969–) from UPJPII, Ewa Podrez (1952–) from UKSW, Jarosław Paszyński SJ (1970–) from AIK, Krzysztof Stachewicz (1966–) from UAM, the philosophy of the law—Fr. Tadeusz Guz (1959–) from KUL, Marek Piechowiak (1962–) from SWPS University, Katarzyna Stępień (1971–) from KUL, the philosophy of culture—Paweł Tarasiewicz (1968–) from Adler-Aquinas Institute, Imelda Chłodna-Błach (1978–) from KUL, the philosophy of society—Paweł Skrzydlewski (1970–) from PWSZ Chełm, Jacek Grzybowski (UKSW), and the philosophy of language—Gabriela Besler (1964–) from UŚ. It is also worth noting the research aiming at coordinating Christian philosophy with the scientific image of the world—Zenon Roskal (1960–) from KUL, Fr. Adam Świeżyński (1974–) from UKSW, Fr. Tadeusz Pabjan (1972–) from UPJPII, Zbigniew Wróblewski (1967–) from KUL. Interesting studies on the relation of Russian philosophy with the classical metaphysics have been conducted by Fr. Piotr R. Mrzygłód (1971–) from PWT Wrocław. Also, the syntheses of various philosophical and scientific traditions are attempted. Piotr Duchliński (1978–) from AIK suggests an aporetic classical philosophy in which he takes into account Thomism, phenomenology, and the contemporary philosophy in the context of science. Fr. Stanisław Wszolek (UPJPII), Fr. Kazimierz Wolsza (1960–) from UO, Andrzej Gielarowski (1969–) and Magdalena Kozak (1981–) from AIK develop broadly understood Christian metaphysics within the frames of the contemporary philosophy—mainly existentialism, phenomenology,

hermeneutics, analytic philosophy, and the philosophy of dialogue. These approaches are connected with—on the one hand—the discussion with naturalistic philosophy, and—on the other hand—being open to the various trends of contemporary philosophy. Moreover, we have to pay attention to translations of the texts of classical authors that are important from the point of view of metaphysics. Since the turn of the 20th and 21st century, the following texts have been published in Polish: Aristotle's *Metaphysics*,³⁰ *On Creation and Destruction*³¹ and *On the Heavens*³²; the first Polish translations of St. Thomas Aquinas: *The Disputed Questions on Truth*,³³ *The Disputed Questions on the Power of God*,³⁴ *Commentary on Aristotle's "Hermeneutics"*³⁵; *Temistios' Paraphrase of the Book XII of Aristotle's "Metaphysics"*³⁶; or the collected work *Metafizyka* [*Metaphysics*; in series "Dydaktyka Filozofii", vol. 6].³⁷ Within the research project related to the Lublin School of Philosophy, lectures on theodicy and the commentary on Aristotle's *Metaphysics* by Krąpiec,³⁸ which had not been published before, have been edited.

³⁰ Arystoteles, *Metafizyka*, trans. T. Żeleźnik (Lublin: Redakcja Wydawnictw KUL, 1996).

³¹ Idem, *O powstawaniu i niszczeniu*, trans. A. Pokulniewicz (Warszawa: Verbinum, 2008).

³² Idem, "O niebie," in A. Pokulniewicz, *Zagadnienie pierwszych przyczyn skończoności świata w traktacie Arystotelesa "O niebie"* (Warszawa: Verbinum, 2010).

³³ Tomasz z Akwinu, *Kwestie dyskutowane o prawdzie*, trans. A. Anduszkiewicz, L. Kuczyński, J. Ruszczyński (Kęty: Wydawnictwo Antyk, 1998); *S. Thomae Aquinatis Quaestiones disputatae de veritate = Dysputy problemowe o prawdzie*, trans. A. Białek (Lublin: Redakcja Wydawnictw KUL, 1999).

³⁴ Św. Tomasz z Akwinu, *Kwestie dyskutowane o mocy Boga*, vol. 1–5, trans. Z. Bomert et al. (Kęty–Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Marek Derewiecki; Instytut Tomistyczny, 2008–2011).

³⁵ Idem, *Komentarz do "Hermeneutyki" Arystotelesa*, trans. A. Stefańczyk (Lublin: Polskie Towarzystwo Tomasza z Akwinu, 2013).

³⁶ Temistiusz, *Parafraza księgi XII "Metafizyki" Arystotelesa*, trans. M.A. Komsta (Lublin: Polskie Towarzystwo Tomasza z Akwinu, 2018).

³⁷ *Metafizyka*, part 1–2, eds. S. Janeczek, A. Starościc (series: Dydaktyka Filozofii, vol. 6) (Lublin: Wydawnictwo KUL, 2017).

³⁸ M.A. Krąpiec, *Teodycea. Problem poznawalności istnienia Boga* (Lublin: Wydawnictwo KUL, 2017); idem, *Komentarz do "Metafizyk" Arystotelesa* (Lublin: Wydawnictwo KUL, 2018).

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adamczyk, S. *Metafizyka ogólna czyli ontologia*. Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL, 1960.
- Bańka, A.R. "Polscy neoscholastycy wobec filozoficznego programu Szkoły Lwańskiej" (series: *Studia z Filozofii Polskiej*, vol. 2), pp. 87–116. Bielsko-Biała–Kraków: Scriptum, 2007.
- Bańkowski, K. "Tomizm konsekwentny na tle odmian tomizmu," *Studia Philosophiae Christianae* 32, no. 2 (1996), pp. 211–219.
- Chojnacki, P. "Możliwości uwspółcześnienia filozofii tomistycznej," *Przegląd Filozoficzny* 36, no. 3 (1933), pp. 199–223.
- . "Okresy i kierunki filozofii neotomistycznej," *Ateneum Kapłańskie* 34 (1934), pp. 350–368.
- Dłubacz, W. *U źródeł koncepcji Absolutu. Od Homera do Platona*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo KUL, 2003.
- Gabryl, F. *Metafizyka ogólna czyli nauka o bycie*. Kraków: Księgarnia Spółki Wydawniczej Polskiej, 1903.
- Gogacz, M. *Elementarz metafizyki*. Warszawa: Akademia Teologii Katolickiej, 1987.
- . "Filozofia chrześcijańska w Polsce odrodzonej," *Studia Philosophiae Christianae* 5, no. 2 (1969), pp. 49–79.
- . "Tomizm egzystencjalny na tle odmian tomizmu," in *W kierunku Boga*, ed. B. Bejze, pp. 59–81. Warszawa: Akademia Teologii Katolickiej, 1982.
- Gruszka, F. "Próby stosowania metody transcendentnej w filozofii neoscholastycznej," *Studia Philosophiae Christianae* 11, no. 1 (1975), pp. 5–26.
- Herbut, J. "Problem metody transcendentnej," *Roczniki Filozoficzne* 26, no. 1 (1978), pp. 51–67.
- Jaroszyński, P. *Metafizyka czy ontologia?* Lublin: Polskie Towarzystwo Tomasz z Akwinu, 2011.
- . *Metafizyka i sztuka*. Lublin: Polskie Towarzystwo Tomasz z Akwinu, 1996.
- Kamiński, S. *Filozofia i metoda*. Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL, 1993.
- . "Osobliwość metodologiczna teorii bytu," *Roczniki Filozoficzne* 27, no. 2 (1979), pp. 33–49.
- Kłósak, K. *Materializm dialektyczny*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Mariackie, 1948.
- . *W poszukiwaniu Pierwszej Przyczyny*, vol. 1–2. Warszawa: Instytut Wydawniczy Pax, 1955–1957.
- Kobyłecki, S. *Metafizyka w psychologii*. Kraków: Drukarnia "Czasu", 1906.
- Kowalczyk, S. *Metafizyka ogólna*. Lublin: Redakcja Wydawnictw KUL, 1998.

- Kowalewski, M. *Wstęp do filozofii*. Poznań: Pallottinum, 1958.
- Kowalski, K. *Podstawy filozofii*. Gniezno: Nakładem "Studia Gnesnensia", 1930.
- Krąpiec, M.A. *Człowiek i prawo naturalne*. Lublin: Redakcja Wydawnictw KUL, 1999. English edition: *Person and Natural Law*, trans. M. Szymańska. New York: Peter Lang, 1993.
- . *Metafizyka. Zarys teorii bytu*. Lublin: Redakcja Wydawnictw KUL, 1978. English edition: *Metaphysics: An Outline of the History of Being*, trans. Th. Sandok. New York: Peter Lang, 1991.
- . *Teoria analogii bytu*. Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL, 1959.
- Krąpiec, M.A., Kamiński, S. *Z teorii i metodologii metafizyki*. Lublin Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL, 1962.
- Maryniarczyk, A. *Metoda metafizyki realistycznej*. Lublin: Polskie Towarzystwo Tomasz z Akwinu, 2003.
- . "Tomizm egzystencjalny a dziś filozofii," in *Filozofować dziś*, ed. A. Bronk, pp. 283–300. Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL, 1995.
- . *Zeszyty z metafizyki*, vol. 1–7. Lublin: Polskie Towarzystwo Tomasz z Akwinu, 1998–2015.
- Mikucki, K. *Tomizm w Polsce po II wojnie światowej*. Kraków: Akademia Ignatianum; Wydawnictwo WAM, 2015.
- Morawiec, E. *W kierunku metafizyki egzystencjalnej: studium historyczno-analityczne*. Warszawa Akademia Teologii Katolickiej, 1984.
- Morawiec, E., Mazanka, P. *Metafizyka klasyczna wersji egzystencjalnej. Podstawowe zagadnienia z metafizyki*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo UKSW, 2006.
- Moskal, P. *Religia i prawda*. Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL, 2008.
- Piętka, D. "O nurtach neoscholastyki polskiej w wieku XX z metodologicznego punktu widzenia," *Ruch Filozoficzny* 69, no. 1 (2012), pp. 79–96.
- Romanowski, H. *Stara a nowa metafizyka*. Warszawa–Kraków: Druk i Lit. F. Kasprzykiewicz, 1923.
- Sochoń, J. *Przygodność i tajemnica*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo UKSW, 2003.
- . *Spór o rozumienie świata*. Warszawa: Instytut Wydawniczy Pax, 1998.
- Stępień, A.B. "O stanie filozofii tomistycznej w Polsce," in *W nurcie zagadnień posoborowych*, vol. 2, ed. B. Bejze, pp. 97–126. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Sióstr Loretanek-Benedyktynek, 1968.
- . *Wprowadzenie do metafizyki*. Kraków: Znak, 1964.
- Swieżawski, S. *Byt. Zagadnienia metafizyki tomistycznej*. Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL, 1948.
- . *Święty Tomasz na nowo odczytany*. Kraków: Znak, 1983.
- Szałata, A. "Obrona filozofii tomistycznej na początku dwudziestego wieku (Idzi Radziszewski, Henryk Romanowski, Jacek Woroniecki, Henryk Romanowski)," *Studia Philosophiae Christianae* 21, no. 2 (1985), pp. 193–208.

- Theory of Being: To Understand Reality*, eds. S. Kamiński, M. Kurdziałek, Z.J. Zdybicka. Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL, 1980.
- W 700-lecie śmierci św. Tomasza z Akwinu. Próba uwspółcześnienia jego filozofii*, eds. S. Kamiński, M. Kurdziałek, Z.J. Zdybicka. Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL, 1976.
- Wais, K. *Ontologia czyli Metafizyka ogólna*. Lwów: Nakładem Tow. "Biblioteka religijna", 1926.
- Woroniecki, J. *Katolickość tomizmu*. Lublin: Nakładem Uniwersytetu Lubelskiego, 1924.
- Zdybicka, Z. *Partycypacja bytu*. Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL, 1972.
- Ziemiański, S. *Teologia naturalna. Filozoficzna problematyka Boga*. Kraków: Fakultet Filozoficzny Towarzystwa Jezusowego, 1995.

Piotr Duchliński
Jesuit University Ignatianum in Krakow
Jarosław Kucharski
Jesuit University Ignatianum in Krakow

3.

EPISTEMOLOGY

In the 20th century, the connections between epistemology and Christianity (or rather—theism) consisted in the fact that the former provided a broader theoretical perspective to the philosophy of God, the philosophy of religion, and to other types of discourses which took up those topics. Epistemology practiced by Christian philosophers was to provide the basis for building a consistent theist synthesis that linked various types of cognition. Epistemological research was carried out within various concepts, schools and trends: mainly the Thomist, phenomenological and analytic ones.¹ Those perspectives had their specific variants in which unique epistemic concepts, that aspired to maximalist approaches, were developed. That is why such an epistemology was both pluralistic and polemical as compared with other philosophical trends. First, it disputed with the dominant Marxist epistemology which, in the second half of the 20th century, officially

¹ Neither of the authors used the term: “Christian theory of knowledge” or “Christian epistemology.” At first, Thomist authors used the name: *logika maior* or *logica materialis*, as opposed to *logica formalis* which dealt with logical issues. Moreover, to specify the research on cognition, the following names were used: “noetics,” “criteriology,” “gnoseology” or the “criticism of cognition.” Later, Thomist authors also applied the terms: “theory of knowledge,” “metaphysics of cognition” and “epistemology.” And the authors who referred to phenomenology used the names: “theory of knowledge” or the “philosophy of knowledge.” The supporters of philosophy in the context of science, as well as analysts, used the name “epistemology” and the “philosophy of science”—the latter was particularly used with reference to the analysis of scientific cognition in the aspect of diachrony and synchrony.

promoted a materialistic interpretation of cognitive processes, and, at the turn of the 20th and 21st century, it argued with various trends of naturalistic epistemology.²

SCHOOLS, APPROACHES, PEOPLE

At the beginning of the 20th century and during the interwar period (1918–1939) the following thinkers contributed the most to the development of epistemological research: Fr. Kazimierz Wais (1865–1934), Fr. Franciszek Gabryl (1866–1914), Fr. Idzi Radziszewski (1871–1922), and Fr. Bohdan Rutkiewicz (1887–1933). All of them fulfilled the idea of practicing neo-Thomist philosophy in connection with exact sciences. Their ideas fall within the scope of Louvain Thomism. Gabryl developed noetics. He understood the necessity of combining epistemological research with psychological concepts. In his works related to memory images, he referred to the research of the psychologists such as Piotr Semenenko (1814–1886), Fr. Ignacy Hołowiński (1807–1855), Wawrzyniec Surowiecki (1769–1827). He considered noetics to be the necessary preparation for metaphysics.³ He argued for direct realism and an essentialist interpretation of Thomist metaphysics. Wais, too, saw the necessity of referring to the data of empirical sciences in practicing epistemology. He took up many important issues, such as the intelligence of animals or the problem of hypnotism.⁴ He disputed with evolutionary ideas, defending the teleology of nature. He investigated many epistemological issues against the background of general psychology and philosophical anthropology, especially in the context of the psycho-physical problem.

² *Wobec filozofii marksistowskiej. Polskie doświadczenia*, ed. A.B. Stępień (Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL, 1990). During the dominance of Marxism, such epistemology was the testimony of pluralism open to different philosophical concepts which, because of the censorship, were not known to the supporters of philosophy determined by politics. That is why in the Christian circles, the most important philosophical trends creatively developed in Western Europe, could be received. In general—such epistemology developed in different cultural and environmental conditions which, at different times, stimulated it to a smaller or larger degree.

³ F. Gabryl, *Noetyka* (Lublin: Towarzystwo Wiedzy Chrześcijańskiej, 1931).

⁴ K. Wais, *Dziwy hipnotyzmu* (Lwów: “Biblioteka Religijna”, 1923); idem, *Co sądzić o inteligencji zwierząt* (Tarnów: n.p., 1908), idem, *Spirytyzm* (Lwów: Nakładem “Przeglądu Teologicznego”, 1920).

Following the thought of Kant, he claimed that epistemology is the necessary preparation for ontology as the general theory of being. He accepted the gnoseological realism and its role in the argumentation for the existence of God. That is why epistemological analyses are important for theodicean considerations. Epistemological referring to the Louvain tradition was also developed by Radziszewski who perceived the neo-Thomist philosophy through the postulates for the renewal of neo-Thomism formulated by Mercier.⁵ He defined the theory of knowledge as criteriology. Its task was working out both the general and detailed criteria of cognition. He acknowledged the priority of criteriology over the general metaphysics. He emphasized that—due to the research in criteriology—we can validate epistemological realism and release ourselves from skepticism. He also took up epistemological research in general psychology. He indicated the necessity of a dialogue between Christian philosophy and scientific thought. However, he did not claim that philosophy was to merge the data of exact sciences; he rather believed it should search for the ultimate reasons that can explain this data. Following the ideas of Louvain neo-Thomism, he thought it was necessary to use the data of exact sciences (both natural sciences and humanities, e.g. ethnology) in practicing philosophy.

Fr. Piotr Chojnacki (1897–1969) also referred to Louvain Thomism. In his epistemological views he followed the thought of St. Thomas, Kant and phenomenologists (Husserl). He carried out systematic research in philosophical epistemology, using the data of modern psychology.⁶ He claimed that, although philosophical epistemology has subjective and methodological specific features, it should not be isolated from the arrangements of psychology and biology. He practiced philosophical psychology, strongly rooted in the contemporary empirical knowledge of psychology. He conducted a number of studies comparing Aristotelian-Thomist thought with the thought of Kant and Husserl. He was interested in man's thinking—its structure and functions. In order to understand it, he referred to the data of the empirical sciences. He searched for the biological and psychological foundations for abstract thinking. He carried out the analysis of the methodological

⁵ S. Janeczek, *Filozofia na KUL-u. Nurty – osoby – idee* (Lublin: Redakcja Wydawnictw KUL, 1998).

⁶ P. Chojnacki, *Wybór pism* (Warszawa: Instytut Wydawniczy Pax, 1987); *idem, Pojęcia i wyobrażenia w świetle psychologii i epistemologii* (Kielce: Drukarnia "Jedność", 1928).

status of Christian philosophy. Also, he demanded the specification of Thomist philosophy with the tools of the modern logic and methodology of sciences.

Fr. Kazimierz Kłósak (1911–1982) also philosophized within the frames of the Louvain version of neo-Thomism. He saw the necessity of referring to the data of natural sciences in his philosophical research. However, he did not deal with epistemological issues directly but while working out the methodology of the philosophy of nature. He was inspired by the epistemology of Maritain, which he critically discussed in the context of the disputes around the method of the contemporary philosophy of nature. He took up some epistemological issues while investigating the existence and nature of the souls, and the psychophysical relation. Basically, he accepted the gnoseological realism and genetic empiricism. He saw the advantages of abstract cognition in creating general ideas and intellectual intuition in justifying the subjective theological theses. For the purpose of the methodology of the philosophy of nature, which was being created, he partially modified the traditional theory of three-stage abstraction.⁷

Some representatives of the Jesuit School referred to Louvain neo-Thomism. Stanisław Ziemiański SJ (1931–) was in favor of using the data of natural sciences in practicing general metaphysics, especially in theodicy, while formulating the arguments for the existence of God. He claimed that, in its starting point, the theory of knowledge is methodologically independent of general metaphysics. He claimed that epistemology precedes metaphysics because it provides the latter with the realistic concept of learning about the existence. In the epistemological research, he demanded using the data of cognitive psychology and biology.⁸ He argued for epistemological realism, genetic empiricism, abstractionism and intuitionism. He saw a particular value of epistemology in theodicy and philosophy of nature. Another Jesuit—Piotr Lenartowicz SJ (1934–2017) dedicated a separate book to epistemology, suggesting an epistemology that would be compliant with natural sciences.⁹ He was a physician (genetics) and philosopher.

⁷ K. Kłósak, *Z teorii i metodologii filozofii przyrody* (Poznań: Księgarnia św. Wojciecha, 1980).

⁸ S. Ziemiański, *Teologia naturalna. Filozoficzna problematyka Boga* (Kraków: Fakultet Filozoficzny Towarzystwa Jezusowego, 1995).

⁹ P. Lenartowicz, *Elementy teorii poznania* (Kraków: Wydawnictwo WAM; Akademia Ignatianum, 2014).

He supported the Louvain interpretation of Aristotelian-Thomist philosophy. He believed that natural sciences—especially biology, do not question Thomist philosophy. The discoveries of the contemporary biology confirm what Aristotle and St. Thomas discovered in epistemology, e.g. it does not invalidate the category of substance. Only the interpretations of scientism led to questioning Aristotle's authority and presenting him as the opponent of the modern biology. Also, Roman Darowski SJ (1935–2017), following rather the Suaresian (traditional) Thomism, discussed epistemological issues, but only with regard to the systematic presentation of the philosophy of man.¹⁰ In principle, it was neo-Thomist epistemology without any significant modernizations.

Epistemological research within the so-called traditional Thomism was carried out by Fr. Stanisław Adamczyk (1900–1971).¹¹ He argued for the essentialist interpretation of neo-Thomism which pays attention to the role of abstraction in constructing the subject of metaphysics—the idea of “being as a being.” In *Krytyka ludzkiego poznania* [*The Criticism of Human Cognition*], he discussed the formal object of human cognition—precisely, the formal object of human intellect. He proved that there is only one formal object (*obiectum formale*) of the human mind, i.e. a being perceived in its generality. In his epistemological research, he was interested in the ontic structure of the act of cognition: in the cognitive act he distinguished the subject's awareness of the object and the so-called cognitive assimilation of the object by the subject. In the ontic structure of a cognitive act he distinguished two stages: introductory and the proper one, which is connected with the intentional specification of the object in the so-called “*species expressa*” form. In epistemology he supported gnoseological realism, the classical concept of truth and the priority of the criticism of human cognition over the general ontology. He disputed with various modern concepts of epistemological empiricism and skepticism. He carried out a detailed analysis of the Thomist theory of sensual cognition, making it more specific and complete.

In existential Thomism, particular merits for the development of Thomist epistemology are those of Mieczysław Albert Krąpiec OP

¹⁰ R. Darowski, *Filozofia człowieka. Zarys problematyki* (Kraków: Wydawnictwo WAM, 1996).

¹¹ S. Adamczyk, *Krytyka ludzkiego poznania* (Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL, 1962).

(1921–2008). In *Realizm ludzkiego poznania* [*The Realism of Human Cognition*], he presented his own project of the metaphysics of human cognition, the task of which is the ultimate explanation of such cognition as a detailed category of being.¹² He was for the methodological autonomy of epistemology as compared to the so-called detailed sciences of cognition. He believed that in the arrangement of philosophical disciplines, epistemology does not precede metaphysics as the science of being. Metaphysics is the first science, and epistemology is its part, and it is basically subject to the objectives of metaphysics. Contrary to what the supporters of human cognition claimed, epistemology does not validate the starting point of the theory of being. The object of cognition is a real being which we experience already in the spontaneous cognition, and in metaphysics we explain it. He emphasized the objective starting point of epistemology. He claimed that the reflective starting point leads to the problem of the “cognitive bridge,” as there is no passage from knowledge to existence. In epistemology, a critical discussion with skepticism, empiricism and phenomenalism is taking place. An important role is also played by the method of historicism, as it secures an epistemologist against the mistakes that had already been made by various philosophers. It secures the correct “construction” of the starting point. In epistemology, he supported epistemological realism; he emphasized the role of spontaneous (common sense) approaches in the starting point for practicing philosophy; and he paid attention to the role of the reflection accompanying (*in actu exercito*) the performance of cognitive activities. Krąpiec’s innovative achievement is elaborating the concept of the cognition of existence within the frame of the so-called existential judgments in which pre-reflective, signless and pre-propositional affirmation of the act of existence of a real being is taking place. Also, he re-interpreted the traditional concept of intentional being, presenting it as the product of the activities of human intellect made from the network of relations, which, in the non-intellectual reality, corresponds with the real states of things. Krąpiec’s epistemological views are shared by his students: Zofia Zdybicka USJK (1928–)—within the scope of the philosophy of God and religion, Andrzej Maryniarczyk SDB (1950–)—in metaphysics and anthropology, Piotr Jaroszyński

¹² M.A. Krąpiec, *Realizm ludzkiego poznania* (Lublin: Redakcja Wydawnictw KUL, 1995).

(1955–)—in aesthetics and the philosophy of culture, Henryk Kiereś (1943–)—in the theory of art, aesthetics and theory of knowledge, Tomasz Duma (1968–)—in the metaphysics of relations, Katarzyna Stępień (1972–)—in the theory of the law and philosophy of human rights, Paweł Skrzydlewski (1970–)—in the philosophy of social being, Piotr Stanisław Mazur (1968–)—in philosophical anthropology and the metaphysics of cognition. It is worth paying attention to Maryniarczyk, who developed the epistemological aspects of the method of separation; the method of forming the object of the theory of being. The problem of reflection (especially *in actu exercito*) in the starting point of metaphysics, and the analysis of different types of clearness of metaphysical cognition, taking into account the Thomist, phenomenological and analytical traditions, was investigated by Wojciech Chudy (1947–2007).¹³

Fr. Stanisław Kamiński (1919–1986)¹⁴ took up epistemological issues within the frames of the methodological research. The epistemological analyses referred to the common, scientific, theological and philosophical knowledge. In the epistemological research, he reached for the Aristotelian-Thomist tradition, the analytic tradition related to the Lviv-Warsaw School, and, partially, for phenomenological tradition (Roman Ingarden, Antoni Bazyli Stępień). He was particularly interested in the epistemology of science and in this area he was the most successful. In epistemology he supported direct realism, intuitionism, and the analyticalness grounded in the object of cognition, disposition of the cognitive power and in the applied conceptual apparatus. Kamiński's students and academic successors: Andrzej Bronk SVD (1938–), Fr. Józef Herbut (1933–2018), Stanisław Majdański (1935–), Urszula Żegleń (1949–), Elżbieta Wolicka (1937–2013), Agnieszka Lekka-Kowalik (1959–), took up different epistemological threads within the methodology of humanities, axiology of science, metaphysics (in the area of the analysis of analogy and metaphysical hypotheses), semiotics, or—more systematically—within the frames of the philosophy of the mind. Zygmunt Hajduk SDS (1935–) discussed

¹³ W. Chudy, *Rozwój filozofowania a pułapka refleksji* (Lublin: Redakcja Wydawnictw KUL, 1995).

¹⁴ S. Kamiński, *Jak filozofować? Studia z metodologii filozofii klasycznej* (Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL, 1989), idem, *Nauka i metoda* (Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL, 1992).

many epistemological issues (especially concerning the philosophy of science) in various reconstructions of modern methodology.

The representatives of Lublin Thomism also referred to phenomenology. Fr. Karol Wojtyła (1920–2005)¹⁵ was the first one to do this. He was in favor of using the phenomenological method in anthropology and philosophical ethics. He took up epistemological issues while carrying out anthropological and ethical investigations. Such epistemology was characterized by: realism, empiricism and cognitive intuitionism, the acceptance of the classical concept of truth, and reductive argumentation. In *Osoba i czyn* [*The Acting Person*] Wojtyła develops practical theory of knowledge in which he analyses the recognition, in human conscience, of objective moral truth and moral goodness. Wojtyła's epistemology in the area of ethics was or is continued by: Tadeusz Styczeń SDS (1931–2010), Andrzej Szostek MIC (1945–), Wojciech Chudy, Marek Czachorowski (1956–), Fr. Alfred Marek Wierzbicki (1957–), and Tadeusz Biesaga SDB (1950–).

Epistemological research within the frames of the so-called phenomenologizing Thomism was carried out by Antoni Bazyli Stępień (1931–). Inspired by Ingarden's phenomenology, he suggests an innovative (from the point of view of neo-Thomism) approach to epistemological issues. He distinguishes two basic philosophical disciplines characterized by a different starting point and a different method of analyzing an object: metaphysics and the theory of knowledge. Epistemology deals with cognition as a conscious experience—as an informer, and it searches for the ultimate reasons for its truthfulness. It deals with the conditions of practicing the theory of knowledge (the meta-epistemological aspect). As a science, it should be non-dogmatic and epistemologically self-sufficient. It does not take over the methods of other exact sciences. It has its own method of analyzing cognitive experiences and justifying statements. Contrary to metaphysics, which is a subject science, theory of knowledge is a meta-science.¹⁶ Epistemology is methodologically independent of metaphysics. It is maximalistic cognition, and it aims at the ultimate understanding (explanation) of the phenomenon of human

¹⁵ K. Wojtyła, *The Acting Person*, trans. A. Potocki, ed. A.-Th. Tymieniecka (Boston: D. Rediel Publishing Company, 1979).

¹⁶ A.B. Stępień, *O metodzie teorii poznania* (Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL, 1966).

knowledge. That is why at the stage of explaining, it becomes the metaphysics of cognition. Theory of knowledge is divided into the general and detailed one; the latter deals with the analysis of various types of human cognitions.

Stępień's epistemological research has been developed by Stanisław Judycki (1954–). Referring to phenomenological and analytic inspirations, he practices anti-naturalist oriented epistemology and the philosophy of the mind. Aristotelian-Thomist tradition is also present in his analyses, especially in the concept of the soul as the principle of the mind. He advocates anthropological dualism, and he presents positive arguments for the existence and nature of soul and the personal identity of the subject. He uses epistemological research in the analyses concerning natural theology and the philosophy of religion.¹⁷ Jacek Wojtyśiak (1967–) develops epistemological investigations following the neo-Thomist, phenomenological and analytic tradition (with the clear emphasis on the latter). In the epistemology understood in the anti-naturalistic manner, he uses the tools of modern logical semiotics, e.g. in the analysis of the classical concept of knowledge or the basic epistemological notions. He applies realistic epistemology arrangements for the argumentation for the existence of God. Apart from epistemology, he also develops the philosophy of God and religion which is clearly influenced by the theistically-oriented analytic philosophers. And Fr. Jan Krokos (1952–), inspired by the Thomist and phenomenological tradition, develops research in the theory of practical cognition. Such research is related to the epistemological problem of consciousness, the cognition of moral truth, making moral decisions, etc.¹⁸ In practicing epistemology, he indicates the complementarity of the research methods used by neo-Thomists, phenomenologists (especially realistic ones), and analysts (of the anti-naturalist provenience). Also, he took up the research on the history of intentionality, on the basis of which he worked out his unique concept of the intentionality of the mind.

In epistemological research, Fr. Stanisław Kowalczyk (1932–), representing the Lublin School of Philosophy, also referred to Thomist,

¹⁷ S. Judycki, *Bóg i inne osoby. Próba z zakresu teologii filozoficznej* (Poznań: W drodze, 2010).

¹⁸ J. Krokos, *Sumienie jako poznanie* (Warszawa: Wydawnictwo UKSW, 2003), idem, *Odślanianie intencjonalności* (Warszawa: Liberi Libri, 2013).

Augustinian and phenomenological tradition. He appreciated the role of the subjective starting point in practicing philosophy. In his research he analyzed the structure of experience, the role of intuition in cognition, the function of the body in the cognitive process, etc. He wrote a handbook on the theory of knowledge. He also indicated the role of realistic epistemology in constructing theodicean arguments for the existence and nature of God. Also, epistemological analyses of Fr. Franciszek Sawicki (1877–1952) fall within the scope of Augustinian neo-Thomism. These analyses supported critical realism and rationalism. Sawicki's reception of phenomenology is particularly interesting—especially in terms of the approach to Max Scheler. As early as in the 1930s, Sawicki used the phenomenology of Scheler and anthropology of St. Thomas Aquinas to analyze timidity.¹⁹

Mieczysław Gogacz (1926–) carried out epistemic research within consequent Thomism. The analyses were related to the epistemological point of view of his concept of metaphysics, as well as the structure of human intellect. Gogacz's important epistemological achievement is his own concept of the structure and function of the intellect. A number of epistemological issues also appear with regard to the problems of the methodology of the history of philosophy. Epistemology of consequent Thomism is developed by Gogacz's student—Artur Andrzejuk (1965–) and his students: Michał Zembrzuski (1982–) and Magdalena Płotka (1982–).

In analytic Thomism, represented by the members of the Kraków Circle—Jan Franciszek Drewnowski (1886–1978), Fr. Jan Salamucha (1903–1944) and Józef Maria Bocheński OP (1902–1995), a postulate was raised to modernize neo-Thomist philosophy through the means of modern mathematical logic (logistic). While opting for the scientific concept of philosophy, the supporters of the Kraków Circle saw the necessity to renew Thomist epistemology. In applying logic, they saw the fulfillment of the idea of scholastic postulate for scientific strictness and the way to overcome the conceptual vagueness present in different handbook approaches to neo-Thomism. Although the above-mentioned authors did not dedicate any separate work to epistemological issues, they are present in their logical considerations. It is because they practiced realistic epistemology,

¹⁹ F. Sawicki, *Fenomenologia wstydlivosti* (Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Studium Filozoficzno-Religijnego S.U.J.P., 1938).

distancing themselves from any forms of irrationalism, skepticism and tight empiricism characteristic of various kinds of positivism.

In the phenomenological tradition, epistemological research within this kind of Christian philosophy was developed by Andrzej Półtawski (1923–). In epistemological analyses, he combined the phenomenological-descriptive approach with the data of psychology and ethology. Półtawski's epistemological views were shaped in the discussion with both the phenomenological tradition (Husserl's transcendental idealism) and the empirical tradition (especially with the supporters of *sense data*). Following Henri Ey, he popularized the concept of the personal mental model of the world, which he later used in the discussion with various epistemological concepts. And, following Erwin Strauss, he developed the concept of sympathetic experience of the world as an alternative for the empirical concept of sensual data. Epistemological views with reference to ethics and axiology were shaped under the overwhelming influence of the analyses by Wojtyła whose ideas were commented on and continued by Półtawski.²⁰ Półtawski's epistemological views were developed by Robert Piąt (1959–) and Marek Maciejczak (1952–), complementing them with the achievements of the philosophy of the mind, cognitive science and the philosophy of language.

Fr. Józef Tischner (1931–2000), at first under the influence of Ingarden's phenomenology, analyzed the issue of Husserl's transcendental "I". Then, influenced by the French phenomenology and hermeneutics, he carried out extensive analyses of the so-called conscientive consciousness. Strictly epistemological issues are present in Tischner's works only in the first period of his activity, when he was strongly influenced by the classical phenomenology, as well as hermeneutics and existentialism.²¹ Heidegger's philosophy influenced many of his epistemological ideas (e.g. the concept of truth and cognition based on judgement. In the later periods of philosophy, epistemological threads give way to axiological analyses, and then—to the philosophy of drama and agathology. In his epistemological research, Tischner did not take into account the results of exact sciences;

²⁰ A. Półtawski, *Realizm fenomenologii: Husserl, Ingarden, Stein, Wojtyła* (Toruń: Wydawnictwo Rolewski, 2000).

²¹ J. Tischner, *Studia z filozofii świadomości* (Kraków: Instytut Myśli Józefa Tischnera, 2006).

he proclaimed epistemological and methodological autonomy of gnoseology. Tischner's student—Fr. Roman Rożdżeński (1945–) refers to the phenomenological tradition in his epistemological analyses. He practices the so-called philosophy of cognition the objective of which is the analysis of the essence of cognitive processes. It is the philosophy of cognition of the phenomenological-existential origin, so it is an autonomous field of knowledge, independent of exact sciences as well as of metaphysics the subject of which is being. The philosophy of cognition has its own research subject and method, which it does not borrow from other sciences. Rożdżeński carries out his research in the historical and objective aspect (clearly omitting the metaobjective aspect)—analyzing different epistemological concepts both in terms of capturing the essence of cognition, and in the systematic aspect—in which, under the influence of Husserl, and especially Heidegger, he shows how a given subject experiences the world and its phenomena. Only occasionally he disputes with other approaches to epistemology. Inspired by Heidegger, he criticizes, e.g., the neo-Thomist concept of cognition about existence through existential judgments. In his analyses, Rożdżeński omits the tradition of analytic philosophy, and he hardly ever refers to some philosophers of language. In the younger generation, epistemological research of a hermeneutical and phenomenological nature has been continued by Fr. Marek Sołtysiak (1963–), and research related to the Anglo-Saxon analytic tradition—Fr. Miłosz Hołda (1983–).

Fr. Antoni Siemianowski (1930–) and Waldemar Kmieciowski (1964–) refer to phenomenological tradition in epistemological research. At first, Siemianowski was influenced by Thomism; later—by the realistic phenomenology of Hildebrand, adopting a critical approach towards the neo-Thomist tradition, especially in axiology, anthropology and epistemology. Inspired by Ingarden's epistemology, Siemianowski and Kmieciowski suggested the concept of the phenomenological theory of knowledge as a science independent of empirical sciences, which has its own method of research and the subject of which is the idea of cognition available within the eidetic cognition.²² Siemianowski carries out the epistemological research especially within the axiology of phenomenological origin. Under the

²² A. Siemianowski, W. Kmieciowski, *Zarys teorii poznania: ujęcie fenomenologiczne* (Gniezno: Gaudentinum, 2006).

influence of Hildebrand, he opts for axiological intuitionism and epistemological realism. He criticizes the modern forms of irrationalism, empiricism, scientism and skepticism, which question the possibility to carry out maximalistically-ranging epistemological research, and to obtain the truth and objectivity of cognition. Also, Krzysztof Stachewicz (1966–) conducts epistemological research of the phenomenological origin in the field of axiology and ethics, in connection with searching for the new foundations of moral philosophy.²³

Epistemological research within the diachronically and synchronically practiced philosophy of science was conducted as part of philosophy practiced in the context of science called by its creators—Fr. Michał Heller (1936–) and Fr. Józef Życiński (1948–2011)—“Christian positivism” or “naturalistic theism.”²⁴ In general, practicing philosophy requires breaking the so-called epistemological isolationism, which does not take into account the data of exact (natural) sciences. “Epistemology without isolation wards, suggested by the authors, emphasizes the significant role of natural sciences in the development of philosophy; practicing philosophy without referring to the data of those sciences does not make any sense. Also, meta-scientific disputes within modern philosophy have a heuristic importance for the development of philosophy. Życiński’s achievements are particularly significant in this respect, as he developed his own suggestion of the philosophy of science, taking up discussions with various versions of epistemological externalism, defending the classical theory of truth, and showing the subjective conditions that determine the acceptance of scientific theories. Although Heller did not write any separate epistemological work, he takes up numerous epistemological threads in the works dedicated to the philosophy of nature (especially in methodological issues) and cosmology. In different works, both Heller and Życiński paid attention to the fact that one cannot practice epistemology without taking into account the data of empirical sciences. Heller’s most recent works include references to cognitive science—

²³ K. Stachewicz, *Problem ugruntowania moralności. Studium z etyki fundamentalnej* (Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe “Semper”, 2006), idem, *Milczenie wobec dobra i zła. W stronę etyki sygetycznej i apofatycznej* (Poznań: Wydział Teologiczny UAM, 2012).

²⁴ M. Heller, J. Życiński, “Epistemologiczne aspekty związków filozofii z nauką,” in *Filozofować w kontekście nauki*, eds. M. Heller, J. Życiński, A. Michalik (Kraków: Polskie Towarzystwo Teologiczne, 1987), pp. 7–17.

the interdisciplinary study of the mind and its processes. Thus, according to the youngest students and supporters of Heller, i.a. Bartosz Brożek (1977–) and Mateusz Hohol (1987–), another version of philosophy practiced in the context of science is philosophy in the context of cognitive science. The point is to practice epistemology not as a speculative branch of philosophy, but as knowledge that takes into account confirmed empirical data related to the neuronal foundations of cognitive processes. It is because scientific data makes it possible to reformulate many traditional epistemological problems (e.g. the problem of Kant), which results in their new solutions. Thus, epistemological research has to be of interdisciplinary nature. Such a strategy enables the construction of the concepts of human cognition that are compliant with the scientific image of the world and free from common-sense (anti-heuristic) intuitions and exotic speculations that led to regress at the cost of any progressivity. Within the analyzed concept of philosophy, selected epistemological problems are analyzed by Fr. Stanisław Wszolek (1958–) with regard to the suggested model of the rationality of religious faith.²⁵ And the epistemological research inspired by Życiński is continued, based on the contemporary philosophy of science, by Fr. Zbigniew Liana, who particularly takes into account the thought of Kant and Popper. In terms of the context, epistemological issues are discussed in the works of Janusz Mączka SDB (1960–), Fr. Tadeusz Pabjan (1972–) and Fr. Wojciech Grygiel (1969–).

Epistemological issues were also present in the works of authors developing the philosophy of nature from the thought of Kłósak, related to the Faculty of Christian Philosophy at the Cardinal Stefan Wyszyński University in Warsaw (former Academy of Catholic Theology). Epistemological problems of the theory of information, and the issue of the subject and object of cognition were discussed by Fr. Mieczysław Lubański (1924–2015). Also, he discussed the epistemology of scientific cognition and classification of sciences. Anna Latawiec (1951–) analyzed the problem of simulation, its kinds and ways of using in different types of cognition. Also, she discussed various epistemological problems concerning the consciousness and construction of the virtual world. Moreover, Anna Lemańska (1953–) tried detailed epistemology, especially with reference to methodological

²⁵ S. Wszolek, *Racjonalność wiary* (Tarnów: Biblos, 2003).

issues related to the philosophy of nature and natural science, as well as the philosophy of mathematics. And Fr. Adam Świeżyński (1974–), as part of scientific research on the issue of miracles, develops the epistemology of knowing miraculous phenomena, using the tools of the contemporary science and theory of information by Lubański. In terms of the context, epistemological issues are also present in the works by Fr. Grzegorz Bugajak (1966–).²⁶

DISCUSSIONS AND DISPUTES

In the 20th century it is worth noting several important epistemological discussions that included both the so-called disputes in the family and disputes between the philosophical schools based on different assumptions. Family disputes include those that took place within the Thomist paradigm. The most important of them were related to various suggestions concerning the perception of the Thomist epistemology. They either referred to the holistic way of practicing the theory of knowledge or to selected issues. The supporters of the Louvain Thomist did not take up epistemological discussions directly, but they conducted some disputes while preparing the methodology of the philosophy of nature. As an example, we can mention the dispute between Kłósak and Krąpiec and the Lublin School of Philosophy

²⁶ M. Lubański, *Filozoficzne zagadnienia teorii informacji* (Warszawa: Akademia Teologii Katolickiej, 1975); M. Heller, M. Lubański, S.W. Ślaga, *Zagadnienia filozoficzne współczesnej nauki. Wstęp do filozofii przyrody* (Warszawa: Akademia Teologii Katolickiej, 1980); A. Latawiec, *Pojęcie symulacji i jej użyteczność naukowa* (Warszawa: Wydawnictwa ATK, 1993); G. Bugajak, J. Kukowski, A. Lemańska, D. Ługowska, A. Świeżyński, *Tajemnice natury. Zarys filozofii przyrody* (Warszawa: Wydawnictwo UKSW, 2009); A. Lemańska, *Filozofia przyrody a nauki przyrodnicze* (Warszawa: Akademia Teologii Katolickiej, 1998); A. Lemańska, "Zagadnienie eksperymentu w matematyce (w świetle teorii fraktali i chaosu deterministycznego)," in *Byt, logos, matematyka. Filozofia – logika, filozofia logiczna 1995. Księga pamiątkowa bloku ontologiczno-logicznego VI Polskiego Zjazdu Filozoficznego, Toruń 5–9 września 1995 r.*, eds. J. Perzanowski, A. Pietruszczak (Toruń: Wydawnictwo UMK, 1997), pp. 401–408; A. Świeżyński, *Epistemology of Miracle: Scientific Inexplicability, Religious Sense and System Approach Towards the Epistemology of Miracle* (Warszawa: Wydawnictwo UKSW, 2012); G. Bugajak, "Epistemologiczny status koncepcji Wielkiego Wybuchu i jej filozoficzne implikacje," in *Z zagadnień filozofii przyrodznawstwa i filozofii przyrody*, vol. 17, eds. A. Lemańska, M. Lubański (Warszawa: Wydawnictwo UKSW, 2004), pp. 15–112.

on the role of abstraction in forming the subject of the theory of being. Ziemiański disputed with Krąpiec from the point of view of the Louvain Thomism. The subject of controversy included both the general way of practicing epistemology and the detailed issues concerning the cognition of the real existence. Ziemiański took up the issue of the role of abstract cognition in creating the concept of existence. Due to the criticism of abstraction by Krąpiec, he raised the objection of nominalism against the latter. Ziemiański also suggested that the interpretation of St. Thomas' *De Trinitate* by Krąpiec is not relevant to the text by Aquinas.

More dynamic discussions, in which the exchange of ideas took place, were carried out within the field of existential Thomism. In 1960s disputes were carried out with traditional Thomists—Fr. Stanisław Adamczyk (1900–1971) on the way of practicing the theory of knowledge (Stępień). Existential Thomists (Krąpiec, Kamiński) rejected epistemology perceived as the criticism of cognition which is to make metaphysical cognition “more critical.” Polemics and discussions also took place among the existential Thomists themselves. For the Lublin environment, the most significant dispute was that of Krąpiec and Stępień (who represented phenomenologizing Thomism). Their dispute concerned both the general way of practicing the theory of knowledge and some detailed issues, such as the role of experience in the starting point of the general theory of being, or the issue of cognition about existence. Stępień aimed at working out the way of practicing Thomist epistemology under the influence of Ingarden's realistic phenomenology, which was related to reformulating the problems and introducing new language. The dispute has not been ultimately resolved. Within existential Thomism, two suggestions of practicing epistemology remained: the first one according to Krąpiec, and the other one—modified with the elements of phenomenology in the version of Stępień. Stępień also carried out some discussions with Ingarden's concept of practicing epistemology. On its basis, he formulated his own, modified version of epistemology, which partially combined Ingarden's approach with the Thomist approach. Apart from the disputes with Ingarden's epistemology, Stępień debated with analytic epistemology, practiced especially by the philosophers from the Lviv-Warsaw School and the Marxist School. In the Lublin School of Philosophy, epistemological issues were also discussed with regard to the concept of ethics. An example of such discussion is the one between Krąpiec and Styczeń.

Within the phenomenological paradigm, Tischner carried out discussions with the representatives of existential Thomism (Krapiec) and consequent Thomism (Gogacz). The debate mainly included anthropological and ethical problems. Epistemological issues were not the main subject of the disputants' attention, as they only occurred from time to time. Tischner claimed that Thomists look at the whole philosophy in a systemic manner, losing the specific features of various types of cognitive experiences and their hermeneutical exploration. And, inside the phenomenological approach, disputes were carried out that referred both to the general manner of practicing epistemology and to the selected problems. Tischner disputed with Ingarden with regard to transcendental idealism and the general manner of (anti-naturalist) practicing the theory of cognition. In general, he defended Husserl's interpretation, indicating different interpretative possibilities concerning the opinion of the creator of phenomenology, which does not have to be perceived in the category of idealism. Inspired by Ingarden, Półtawski disputed with Husserl's transcendental idealism, suggesting practicing realistic epistemology that would also refer to psychological and ethological studies (Lorenz). Using the concepts of Strauss and Ey, he disputed with various kinds of empiricism and phenomenalism, both in the interpretation of perception and in describing the structure and functioning of consciousness. In the dispute between Tischner and Thomism, he definitely supported Thomism, because he was not totally convinced of the epistemology suggested by Krapiec and Stępień. Rożdżeński occasionally discussed with Thomists, but he referred to the project of Husserl's epistemology in a more holistic and critical manner. He also discussed detailed issues concerning external observation and a priori cognition, clearly distancing himself from the solutions suggested by analytic epistemologists.

The supporters of philosophy in the context of science hardly ever decided to carry out open discussions with, e.g., Thomists or phenomenologists. They were more interested in the debates concerning cosmology and philosophy of nature. Some of them, like Heller, claimed that one should not dispute with Thomists but practice philosophy in science, which—as its development shows—already has significant achievements. That is why he expressed his unfavorable judgment only occasionally, critically referring to the holistic way of practicing Thomist philosophy and paying special attention to its

separation from natural sciences. Życiński did not take up open disputes with Thomism either. Occasionally (e.g. in interviews), he criticized the so-called epistemology of isolation wards which seemed to be supported by existential Thomists. In his objections, he rather focused on the attempt to show why Thomism practices isolationist epistemology which actually leads to the separation from well-confirmed empirical data. The attempt to confront those opinions, from the point of view of suggested metaphilosophies, was already made in 1980s by Bronk; in 1990s—by Fr. Zbigniew Wolak (1957–); and recently—Piotr Duchliński (1978–).²⁷ The latter, referring to cognitive psychology, (naturalized) cognitive science and other areas of modern philosophy (especially philosophy in the context of science), suggests the modification of the way of practicing Thomist epistemology, which is reflected in detailed solutions, e.g. elaborating the cognition of real existence while using the concept of embodied cognition. Duchliński's ideas have been questioned by Wojtyśiak who indicates the limitations of the suggested solutions, saying that if they were fully adopted, they would lead to a kind of post-Thomism. Ziemiański also became involved in the dispute, seeing in Duchliński's suggestions a way to modernize neo-Thomist epistemology.

As for the supporters of the so-called Kraków Circle, it is worth mentioning that they did not carry out wide-ranging epistemological disputes, e.g. with Thomists or phenomenologists. If they disputed with someone (e.g. Drewnowski), they rather referred to the role of using logic in practicing philosophy. They also discussed with existential Thomists (Krąpiec, Kamiński, Zdybicka) on using formalization in the reconstruction of Thomas' ways to prove the existence of God. The reconstruction of this debate makes it possible to capture the epistemological assumptions hidden at the root of relevant argumentations and adopted by both parties.

The contemporary epistemological disputes within the broadly understood Christian philosophy mainly refer to the conflict between naturalism and anti-naturalism. In this respect, it is worth noting the disputes carried out by Judycki, both with selected foreign authors and with the Polish ones. The discussions conducted by Judycki refer

²⁷ P. Duchliński, *Odłony doświadczenia istnienia świata realnego. Rozważania wstępne* (Kraków: Akademia Ignatianum w Krakowie; Wydawnictwo WAM, 2016).

to the naturalized epistemology and the philosophy of the mind. They are related to the creation of the anti-naturalist theory of knowledge and anthropology, which would play a heuristic role in the theist discourse, especially in the argumentation for the existence of God. The cognitive science discussions carried out by Józef Bremer SJ (1953–) are important for the issues concerning epistemology, as well as anthropology and ethics). In his works, he discusses the most important problems mentioned by cognitive scientists: consciousness, free will, conscience. He critically analyses the discussion on the soul in the naturalized cognitive science and the philosophy of the mind. Noticing the good influence of cognitive scientists on the research on those problems, he indicates a series of objective and methodological limitations in their solutions. Wojtysiak disputes with naturalism, too, both in epistemology and natural theology. Particularly interesting are the disputes carried out with Jan Woleński—a supporter of naturalism.

INFLUENCE AND DEVELOPMENT

While talking about the influence of epistemology practiced within the tradition of Christian philosophy, we have to take into account the particular periods of time in which it developed. In the interwar period (1918–1939), the influence of epistemology developed within traditional or Louvain Thomism on the international environment was quite small. Rather, particular authors, going abroad for studies, learnt about new ideas which they later brought to Poland and developed. After 1945, when doctrinal Marxism started to dominate in Poland, contacts with the West were hindered. Also, epistemological concepts developed on the Thomist, phenomenological or analytic basis could not break through the limitations imposed by the authorities. As a result, many important and innovative concepts lost the ability to influence the epistemological research developed in Europe. The situational requirement related to the social and political circumstances resulted in the fact that those concepts only affected the local thought.

After 1989, when the political situation underwent a dramatic change, the epistemological concepts that had been developed in previous decades gained no international importance. Since 1960s, the Thomist epistemology of Krapiec has not been creatively developed

or confronted with other epistemological concepts. Although some metaphysical issues (e.g. the problem of existential relations or the body) were discussed by the students of Krąpiec, epistemological aspects—apart from developing the problem of metaphysical cognition (the method of separation) were actually untouched. It was unlike with the suggestion of Stępień which has been creatively (with some modifications) continued by his students and academic successors. It might be said that it has been significantly developed due to the influences of the analytic philosophy (especially the philosophy of the mind). In this respect, an important role was played by the following authors: Judycki—the philosophy of the mind, anthropology, and Wojtyśiak—epistemology, the philosophy of God, Krokos—the theory of practical cognition, Arkadiusz Gut (1970–)—analytic epistemology, cognitive science. And Monika Walczak (1969–) from “the school of Kamiński” performed a critical reconstruction of epistemological ideas of the transcendental Thomist—Bernard Lonergan. Epistemological problems developed within transcendental Thomism are also present in the works of Herbut’s student and scientific follower—Fr. Kazimierz M. Wolsza (1960–).

Neo-Thomist epistemology takes up innovative interpretative attempts aiming at proving the progressive nature of that concept. Mazur made a significant interpretative step related to the application of separation as a method in philosophical anthropology, in particular—in learning the nature of “I”. Duchliński confronts Thomist epistemology with the modern philosophical trends (cognitive science, cognitive psychology) to indicate that the realism of human knowledge may be defended not only through paraphrasing the texts of St. Thomas, but also through applying newer achievements, e.g. phenomenologizing cognitive science. The epistemology developed especially by Lenartowicz is only partially continued by, e.g., Duchliński. And Bremer practices philosophical epistemology in a strict connection with naturalized cognitive science.

Phenomenological epistemology in its pure form has only been developed by Siemianowski and Kmieciowski. Tischner’s students have not developed epistemological studies, except for Rożdżeński and Sołtysiak. Selected epistemological issues appear in the works of the authors referring to the thought of Tischner: Karol Tarnowski (1937–), due to the problem of the experience of faith, and Jan Andrzej Kłoczowski OP (1937–)—due to the issue of a religious

experience. Partially, epistemological issues (or rather problems concerning the philosophy of consciousness) were discussed by Fr. Władysław Zuziak (1952–) in his analyses on the moral consciousness in the works of Jean Nabert and Georges Bastide. Półtawski's epistemological research is continued in the important works of Piłat concerning epistemology, the philosophy of the mind (especially those concerning the personal mental model of the world) and recently—moral philosophy, as well as in the works of Maciejczak on epistemology, phenomenology, especially that of Maurice Merleau-Ponty, and the philosophy of language in the historical and objective aspect.

If the modern continuators of the philosophy in the context of science take up an epistemological reflection, they only do it within the interdisciplinary cognitive science. It is difficult to determine whether the present generation of the students of Heller and Życiński still supports the idea of Christian positivism and, just like its founders, is for the ontological anti-naturalism. The interdisciplinary research carried out within the Copernicus Center for Interdisciplinary Studies follows methodological naturalism and, while the status of such naturalism raises no objections, certain doubts result from the ontological naturalism assumed by some authors. Irrespective of various uncertainties, the supporters of the philosophy in the context of science generally emphasize that the reflection that is carried out within Christian philosophy cannot ignore the scientific image of the world.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adamczyk, S. *Krytyka ludzkiego poznania*. Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL, 1962.
- . *Tomistyczna teoria zmysłowego poznania*. Tarnów: Seminarium Duchowne, 1938.
- Bocheński, J.M. *Logika i filozofia. Wybór pism*, trans. T. Baszniak et al., ed. J. Parys. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, 1993.
- Chojnacki, P. *Pojęcia i wyobrażenia w świetle psychologii i epistemologii* Kielce: Drukarnia "Jedność", 1928.
- . *Wybór pism*. Warszawa: Instytut Wydawniczy Pax, 1987.
- Chudy, W. *Rozwój filozofowania a pułapka refleksji*. Lublin: Redakcja Wydawnictw KUL, 1995.

- Darowski, R. *Filozofia jezuitów w Polsce w XX wieku. Próba syntezy – słownik autorów*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo WAM, 2001.
- Drewnowski, F. *Filozofia i precyzja. Zarys programu filozoficznego i inne pisma*, eds. S. Majdański, S. Zalewski, Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL, 1996.
- Duchliński, P. *Odstłony doświadczenia istnienia świata realnego. Rozważania wstępne*. Kraków: Akademia Ignatianum w Krakowie; Wydawnictwo WAM, 2016.
- . *W stronę aporetycznej filozofii klasycznej. Konfrontacja tomizmu egzystencjalnego z wybranymi koncepcjami filozofii współczesnej*. Kraków: Akademia Ignatianum; Wydawnictwo WAM, 2014.
- Gabryl, F. *Noetyka*. Kraków: Uniwersytet Jagielloński, 1900.
- Heller, M. *Filozofia i wszechświat*. Kraków: Universitas, 2006.
- Kamiński, S. *Jak filozofować. Studia z metodologii filozofii klasycznej*. Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL, 1989.
- Kłósak, K. *Z teorii i metodologii filozofii przyrody*. Poznań: Księgarnia św. Wojciecha, 1980.
- Krąpiec, M.A. *Realizm ludzkiego poznania*. Lublin: Redakcja Wydawnictw KUL, 1995.
- Krokos, J. *Odstanianie intencjonalności*. Warszawa: Liberi Libri, 2013.
- . *Sumienie jako poznanie. Fenomenologiczne dopełnienie Tomaszowej nauki o sumieniu*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo UKSW, 2004.
- Janeczek, S. “Ksiądz Idzi B. Radziszewski – filozof i założyciel Katolickiego Uniwersytetu Jana Pawła II,” in *Ks. Idzi Benedykt Radziszewski. Pisma*, eds. S. Janeczek, M. Maciołek, R. Charzyński, pp. 7–21. Lublin: Wydawnictwo KUL, 2009.
- Judycki, S. *Świadomość i pamięć. Uzasadnienie dualizmu antropologicznego*. Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL, 2004.
- Maciejczyk, M. *Brentano i Husserl. Pytanie epistemologiczne*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo UKSW, 2001.
- Mazur, P.S. *Zarys podstaw filozofii człowieka*. Kraków: Księgarnia Akademicka, 2017.
- Piłat, R. *Umysł jako model świata*. Warszawa: Instytut Filozofii i Socjologii PAN, 1999.
- Półtawski, A. *Realizm fenomenologii: Husserl, Ingarden, Stein, Wojtyła*, Toruń: Wydawnictwo Rolewski, 2000.
- Rozmowy o filozofii*, eds. A. Zieliński, M. Bagiński, J. Wojtysiak. Lublin: Redakcja Wydawnictw KUL, 1996.
- Salamucha, J. *Wiedza i wiara. Wybrane pisma filozoficzne*. Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL, 1997.
- Stępień, A.B. *O metodzie teorii poznania*. Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL, 1966.
- . *Teoria poznania. Zarys kursu uniwersyteckiego*. Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL, 1971.

- Wais, K. *Co sądzić o inteligencji zwierząt*. Tarnów: [n.p.], 1908.
- . *Dziwy hipnotyzmu*. Lwów: “Biblioteka Religijna”, 1923.
- . *Spirytyzm*. Lwów: Nakładem “Przeglądu Teologicznego”, 1920.
- Wojtysiak, J. *Filozofia i życie*. Kraków: Znak, 2007.
- . “Nowe spojrzenie na problem Gettier’a,” in *IX Polski Zjazd Filozoficzny. Księga streszczeń, 17–21 września 2012*, eds. A. Kuzior, A. Kiepas, J. Rąb, pp. 228–229. Gliwice–Katowice–Wiśła: Katedra Stosowanych Nauk Społecznych, Politechnika Śląska; Instytut Filozofii, Uniwersytet Śląski, 2012.
- Wszolek, S. *Racjonalność wiary*. Tarnów: Biblos, 2003.
- Życiński, J. *Teizm i filozofia analityczna*, vol. 1. Kraków: Znak, 1985.
- . *Teizm i filozofia analityczna*, vol. 2. Kraków: Znak, 1988.

4.

PHILOSOPHY OF NATURE

The characteristics of the 20th century philosophy of nature practiced in Poland by Christian philosophers should be placed in a much broader context, i.e. the history of the philosophy of nature and metaphilosophical discussions related to its subject and existence as a philosophical discipline. That necessity results from the specific features of what is today defined as the philosophy of nature. It is because we should be aware of the fact that the very term “philosophy of nature” is ambiguous—it has been used to denote, i.a., emerging natural sciences (Isaac Newton entitled his work: *Philosophiae Naturalis Principia Mathematica*), cosmology, and today—the philosophy of natural sciences. Thus, it is first necessary to provide both the historical and the methodological-epistemological context referring to the philosophy of nature.

HISTORICAL AND IDEOLOGICAL CONTEXT

The philosophy of nature can be perceived as the oldest philosophical discipline because it was born in Greece when the Ionic philosophers started to ask questions about the principle of things. Nevertheless, its existence has been questioned for at least two reasons. First, it is not easy to distinguish the philosophy of nature from metaphysics; in some philosophical systems philosophical reflection on nature was treated as an integral part of metaphysics. Second, modern natural science has become a problem for the existence of the philosophy of nature. The creation of natural sciences resulted

in questioning the reasonableness of practicing the philosophy of nature. Since the subject of the research of both the philosophy of nature and natural sciences includes the same natural reality, and natural sciences have worked out better and more effective methods of analyzing that reality, the philosophy of nature—according to many philosophers and natural scientists—lost its reason for being. What is more, modern natural sciences grew, in a way, out of philosophy, and the research method—the experimental method—has become the main factor of the separation of natural sciences from philosophy.¹

Also, the situation in natural sciences at the beginning of the 20th century was important for practicing the philosophy of nature and its topics. At that time, quantum mechanics, as well as the theories of relativity, special and general one, were created. Also, Darwin's theory of evolution was accepted. The results obtained in those theories destroyed the image of an unchanging, static universe. It was necessary to work out such an image of natural reality that would better match the results obtained in the new theories of physics and biology. The creation of that image has become one of the tasks of the philosophers of nature.

The problem with treating the philosophy of nature as a full philosophical discipline—its insufficiently specified relations with natural sciences on the one hand, and the close connection with metaphysics on the other hand—resulted in the fact that the issues falling within the scope of the philosophical reflection on the world of nature were hardly ever discussed by the Polish Christian philosophers.²

¹ The doubts concerning the reasonableness of practicing the philosophy of nature were also raised and reflected in the discussions carried out in the 20th century among the Christian philosophers in Poland.

² It is not easy to specify who a Christian philosopher of nature is. Is it only about the philosopher's religious faith, or about the specific content of his ideas that should match the teaching of the Church? In both cases, one comes across certain difficulties. In the former case, it would be necessary to evaluate the philosopher's worldview. In the second, the problem is that, up to 1960s, the Christian philosophy of nature was only practiced within the Thomist philosophy. Going beyond neo-Thomism, and, at the same time, taking up the issues falling within the scope of broadly understood Christian philosophy, only took place in the second half of the 20th century. Nevertheless, the ideas of the philosophers of nature, who broke up with neo-Thomism, are not always welcome. They are often criticized for incompliance with the teaching of the Church.

In the 20th century philosophy of nature in Poland, we can distinguish three periods of its development: the first one, before the outbreak of World War II (1939); the second period—from 1944 to the 1970s; and the third one—up to the present times. Such a division is caused by, just like in other areas of philosophy, external factors and not internal changes in the philosophy of nature itself.

The first period, from the end of the 19th century up to the outbreak of World War II, was the time in which the foundations for the neo-Thomist philosophy of nature were shaped. It is worth mentioning that, until 1914, the territory of Poland was partitioned, which also influenced philosophy as the exchange of thoughts and common studies was hindered. Only after 1918 scientific institutions started to emerge, offering proper conditions for developing philosophy, including the philosophy of nature. In the interwar period (1918–1939), at the Jagiellonian University in Kraków, a group of philosophers and natural scientists developed interesting solutions to detailed philosophical problems. Although not all of them can be called Christian philosophers of nature, their achievements certainly influenced the philosophers of the neo-Thomist trend. What is more, the tradition of this school initiated the whole trend of the philosophy of nature consciously breaking with neo-Thomism, but keeping the connections with the teaching of the Church.

The second period in the development of the philosophy of nature started after 1945. It was a difficult time for the Christian philosophers of nature because its representatives had to confront both the official philosophy of dialectical materialism and the development of natural sciences which, in philosophy, resulted in neo-positivism, scientism and, as a consequence, negation of the reasonableness of practicing the philosophy of nature.

The third period, which started in 1960s, is characterized by the transformation of the traditional philosophy of nature into the philosophy of natural sciences that discusses some detailed problems from the philosophy of nature, and into the so-called philosophy in science.

PHILOSOPHY OF NATURE UP TO 1939

Before the outbreak of World War II, what predominated in the environment of Christian philosophers was neo-Thomist philosophy,

reborn after Pope Leo XIII published his encyclical *Aeterni Patris* in 1879. In particular, neo-Thomism took over the concept of material being worked out by St. Thomas Aquinas, i.e. the theory ofhylomorphism. This theory, along with other detailed issues concerning the properties of material beings, time, space, and movement, was the basis for developing the philosophy of nature within the trend of neo-Thomism.

Neo-scholasticism in Poland derived its ideas from two foreign centers: Vienna and Louvain, where numerous Polish philosophers studied. Louvain was particularly important for the philosophy of nature, as at that time Louvain philosophers “believed that Thomism is reborn through the assimilation of achievements in other philosophical directions and in exact sciences.”³ Such a style of practicing neo-scholasticism was represented by the philosophers connected with various places, e.g.: Fr. Franciszek Gabryl (1866–1914) and Konstanty Michalski CM (1879–1947) connected with Kraków; Fr. Kazimierz Wais (1865–1934) and Fr. Jan Piotr Stepa (1892–1959)—with Lviv; Fr. Piotr Chojnacki (1897–1969)—with Warsaw.⁴ As Józef Iwanicki states, in this period, “the Polish representatives of scholasticism faced the issue of confronting Thomism, appealing to experience, with the achievements of natural sciences and the concepts formulated by other trends.”⁵ It is worth mentioning that confronting the philosophy of nature with the results of natural sciences, or developing it through reference to those results, has a long tradition in Poland, reaching the age of Enlightenment. The scholars who actively developed natural sciences were often philosophers at the same time. In this context, it is worth mentioning the Polish scholars—Jan and Jędrzej Śniadecki.⁶ That parallel development of the natural sciences and philosophy was caused by floating borders between the natural sciences: physics, cosmology, chemistry, biology, which grew from

³ M. Gogacz, “Filozofia chrześcijańska w Polsce Odrodzonej (1918–1968),” *Studia Philosophiae Christianae* 5, no. 2 (1965), p. 52.

⁴ J. Iwanicki, “Problematyka filozoficzna w ciągu ostatniego 50-lecia w Polsce,” *Ateneum Kapłańskie* 58, no. 1–3 (1959), pp. 255–258.

⁵ *Ibidem*, p. 258.

⁶ Jan Śniadecki (1756–1830) was an astronomer, mathematician, philosopher; his brother—Jędrzej Śniadecki (1768–1838) was a physician, biologist, philosopher and author of the work: *Teorya jestestw organicznych* [*Theory of Organic Beings*].

philosophy, and the philosophy of nature. At the turn of the 19th and 20th centuries, natural scientists were becoming more aware of the methodological separateness of exact sciences. The methodological-epistemological reflection on their fields of study was taken up by, i.a.: Benedykt Dybowski (1833–1930) and Józef Nusbaum-Hilarowicz (1859–1917)—biology, Władysław Biegański (1857–1917)—medicine, Marian Smoluchowski (1872–1917)—physics.

The general situation in philosophy and science and the influence of the Louvain environment facilitated the development of neo-Thomist philosophy in Poland. At that initial period, the philosophy of nature was not treated as a separate philosophical discipline. The problems related to that scope were discussed within the whole trend of neo-scholastic philosophy. That is why it is difficult to talk about the philosophers of nature, because, as a rule, their main subject of interest was metaphysics. Even before World War I broke out, two works were created that were significant for the development of the philosophy of nature. They were: *Kosmologia ogólna* [General Cosmology] by Kazimierz Wais⁷ and *Filozofia przyrody* [The Philosophy of Nature] by Franciszek Gabryl.⁸

After Poland regained its independence in 1918, the Catholic University of Lublin (KUL) was created and its dominant philosophical approach was neo-Thomism. It influenced the philosophy of nature because its contents were clearly subject to the Thomist philosophy. Later, in other philosophical communities, the influence of the Lviv-Warsaw School is seen in the philosophy of nature.

Due to the connection between Christian philosophy and Thomism (KUL, seminars for priests), up to World War II the philosophy of nature was clearly overshadowed by metaphysics. The issues falling within the scope of the philosophy of nature appeared in the margin of metaphysical studies related to material being, or within the context of some arguments for the existence of God—those in the premises of which there were some references to the properties of things from the field of nature. Such submission of the philosophy of nature to neo-Thomism resulted in adopting hylomorphism as a theory of material being. In consequence, in time, the neo-Thomist philosophy of nature closed itself in a specific conceptual network,

⁷ K. Wais, *Kosmologia ogólna* (Warszawa: Gebethner i Wolff, 1907).

⁸ F. Gabryl, *Filozofia przyrody* (Kraków: Uniwersytet Jagielloński, 1910).

and it was more and more difficult for it to carry out dialogue with other philosophical trends and with natural sciences.

In this first period, the most important work on the philosophy of nature was Kazimierz Wais' two-volume book entitled *Kosmologia szczegółowa* [*Particular Cosmology*]. The first volume was published in 1931; the second—finished by Jan Stepa—in 1932. *Kosmologia szczegółowa* is the completion of *Kosmologia ogólna* [*General Cosmology*] which had been written a quarter of a century before. Stepa writes about Wais' epoch-making work which, in his opinion, includes: *Kosmologia ogólna*, two volumes of *Kosmologia szczegółowa* and *Bóg, Jego istnienie i istota* [*God, His Existence and Essence*] (second edition, Lviv 1930).⁹

In the first part of *Kosmologia szczegółowa*, Wais deals with the issues concerning living organisms. He searches for the reply to the question about the principle of life, and then about the origin and evolution of living organisms. He presents various opinions on those subjects. Also, he refers to the research of natural scientists. Also, in a detailed manner, he presents the arguments of the supporters and opponents of evolution. What is more, although Wais is skeptical about some views concerning evolution, he does not exclude the possibility that some species changed into others. Moreover, he claims that evolutionism can be reconciled with religious faith. Wais does not exclude the possibility that evolution takes place in nature, but he rejects such perception of evolution in which the creation of species was accidental or caused only by the laws of physics.¹⁰ Thus, allowing the possibility of evolutionary changes, Wais sees their ultimate cause in God and not in nature itself. He describes it in the following manner: "God could create all the species at the same time, in a virtual state. Thus, although seemingly similar to one another, the original cells—being enlivened with various substantial forms—would constitute different natural species from the very beginning."¹¹ Therefore, in the dispute between evolutionists and creationists, Wais is placed somewhere in between. He accepts creationism, but he does not treat it as a direct interference of God with the course of natural

⁹ J. Stepa, "Przedmowa," in K. Wais, *Kosmologia szczegółowa*, part 2 (Gniezno: Nakładem "Studia Gnesnensia", 1932), p. 3.

¹⁰ K. Wais, *Kosmologia szczegółowa*, part 1 (Gniezno: Nakładem "Studia Gnesnensia", 1931), p. 364.

¹¹ *Ibidem*, pp. 370–371.

events. Wais' opinion may be treated as precursory for the concept of evolutionary theism worked out in the second half of the century.

Wais is not closed to what the theories of evolution talk about nature, and he tries to work out an opinion that would reconcile orthodoxy with the results of natural sciences. A student of Wais, Jan Stepa, discusses an analogous issue. Stepa focuses on confronting hylomorphism with the physical theory of the matter structure. This issue is discussed in his work: *Tomizm wobec elektronicznej teorii o budowie materii* [*Thomism and the Electronic Theory of the Matter Structure*],¹² and in the last chapter of the second part of *Kosmologia szczegółowa* by Wais, written according to the request of the author who was already ill, and entitled: *Hylemorfizm wobec najnowszej teorii elektronicznej* [*Hylomorphism and the Newest Electronic Theory*] (pp. 151–162). The author describes the structure of an atom as it was perceived at that time, and gives the arguments for the thesis that an atom can be perceived as a being compound of matter and form. It is worth adding that a similar problem, but with reference to the atom's nucleus, was discussed 25 years later by Fr. Tadeusz Rutowski (1929–2018), a teacher at the seminary in Płock.¹³

Also, Franciszek Kwiatkowski SJ (1888–1949) refers to the results of natural sciences in the article of 1930, entitled: “Hylemorfizm a najnowsze teorie przyrodnicze” [*Hylomorphism and the Newest Natural Theories*].¹⁴ Also, in his main work—*Filozofia wieczysta w zarysie* [*Outline of Eternal Philosophy*], Kwiatkowski dedicates one of the parts of the second volume to the *Philosophy of the Inanimate World*¹⁵ (Kraków 1947). In the text, he compares the theory of hylomorphism with the theories of physics.

Bohdan Rutkiewicz (1887–1933), a professor at KUL, uses the theory of hylomorphism to explain the unity and functioning of living organisms. In *Przegląd Filozoficzny* of 1926, he published the article: “Pojęcie organizmu i hylemorfizm” [*The Notion of an Organism and*

¹² J. Stepa, *Tomizm wobec elektronicznej teorii o budowie materii* (Łomża: [n.p.], 1932).

¹³ T. Rutowski, “Hylemorfizm wobec budowy jądra atomowego,” *Roczniki Filozoficzne* 6, no. 3 (1958), pp. 75–97.

¹⁴ F. Kwiatkowski, “Hylemorfizm a najnowsze teorie przyrodnicze,” *Nasza Myśl Teologiczna* 1 (1930), pp. 32–33.

¹⁵ Idem, *Filozofia wieczysta w zarysie*, vol. 2: *Filozofia bytu, filozofia świata nieorganicznego, filozofia duszy* (Kraków: Wydawnictwo Apostolstwa Modlitwy, 1947).

Hylomorphism].¹⁶ The philosopher's main subject of interest is the problem of purposefulness in animate nature. He already dealt with this issue in 1913 in the article: "Zagadnienie celowości w morfologii i fizjologii" [The Issue of Purposefulness in Morphology and Physiology].¹⁷ His main work on the subject is: *Współczesny antymechanizm biologiczny i podstawy finalizmu* [The Contemporary Biological Anti-Mechanism and the Foundations of Finalism].¹⁸ Rutkiewicz criticizes the views of: John Haldane, Eugenio Rignano, Henry Bergson, and, to justify his anti-mechanist opinion, he uses the arguments of Hans Driesch. Also, Rutkiewicz emphasizes that "an important moment in the teleological determination—a moment that makes it different from the causal-mechanist determination, is the dependence of the present on the future—the dependence of what is happening on what is to happen; the dependence of what is on what will be."¹⁹ He pays attention to the fact that the teleological interpretation of biological phenomena depends on the fact that living organisms constitute the wholes which, in a teleological manner, determine the processes taking place in them. What is more, Rutkiewicz emphasizes that such a whole "is expressed in the organization of the world of living creatures, taken in their group."²⁰ In consequence,

... in the teleological determination of the living phenomena, we take into account both the individualistic and the over-individualistic moment. In order to indicate that one great over-individual whole is expressed in the world of living creatures, we can, first of all, refer to the fact that the basic physiological types (animals, green plants, microbes, the ones that absorb nitrogen and those which change ammoniac compounds into nitrogenous compounds, and nitrogenic compounds into nitrates) into which the world of living organisms is divided, complement one another from the point of view of metabolism, doing it in such a way that the world of the living—as a whole—can last and develop.²¹

¹⁶ B. Rutkiewicz, "Pojęcie organizmu i hylemorfizm," *Przegląd Filozoficzny* 29, no. 1–2 (1926), pp. 1–28.

¹⁷ *Miesięcznik Kościelny* (1913) March, April, May.

¹⁸ B. Rutkiewicz, *Współczesny antymechanizm biologiczny i podstawy finalizmu* (Lublin: Gebethner i Wolff, 1929).

¹⁹ *Ibidem*, p. 82.

²⁰ *Ibidem*, p. 85.

²¹ *Ibidem*, pp. 85–86.

Rutkiewicz concludes that the submission of organisms to larger wholes and related finalism can be explained if we assume the existence of an “over-individual element or a Being transcending particular organic beings.”²²

It is true that neo-Thomism imposed the frames of the philosophy of nature and Catholic philosophers defended, i.a., hylomorphism, but—at the same time—they did not avoid the disputes with the supporters of different views, especially materialistic or scientist ones, and they used the current knowledge of nature. Nevertheless, staying within the frames of neo-Thomist philosophy made it difficult to separate the philosophy of nature (cosmology) from metaphysics. The issues from the philosophy of nature were often included into the field of metaphysics, or the philosophy of nature was treated as particular or applied metaphysics. The Thomist philosophy of nature started to regain independence of metaphysics after 1945, mainly due to the works by Fr. Kazimierz Kłósak (1911–1982) who opened the neo-Thomist philosophy into natural sciences in a more evident manner.

Now it is worth mentioning that some threads falling within the scope of the philosophy of nature were also taken up by the philosophers of the so-called Kraków Circle. Although its members: Józef Maria Bocheński OP (1902–1995), Jan Franciszek Drewnowski (1896–1978), Bolesław Sobociński (1906–1980), and Fr. Jan Salamucha (1903–1944) were focused on the issues concerning logic, some of them, e.g. Salamucha, discussed the topic of time, space, determinism, etc. The analyses of those philosophers were characterized by their precise language and exactness.

The attempt to arrange the metatheoretical issues and indicate the place of the philosophy of nature among philosophical disciplines was made by Bolesław Gawecki (1889–1984) who, before World War II, was connected with the environment of the Kraków philosophers of nature.²³ In the article: “Co to jest filozofia przyrody?” [What is the Philosophy of Nature], he concludes that the philosophy of nature is

²² Ibidem, p. 107.

²³ In the interwar period, a group of philosophers dealing with the issues related to the philosophy of nature worked at the Faculty of Philosophy of the Jagiellonian University. They combined these issues with the results of exact sciences. The group included Władysław Heinrich, Tadeusz Garbowski, Joachim Metallmann, Zygmunt Zawirski, and Władysław Natanson.

particular ontology.²⁴ We should mention that Gawecki was not a Thomist and he built his own original philosophical system outside that approach.²⁵

As it has already been mentioned, KUL was the place in which neo-Thomism was developed in the interwar period (1918–1939) and in which, after 1945, the Lublin School of existential Thomism was shaped. However, the philosophy of nature was not developed as an independent philosophical discipline there. Texts related to this subject constituted but a small part of the works on the Thomist metaphysics practiced in that environment.

In this first period, achievements concerning the philosophy of nature were not too impressive, although the scholars took up some issues important from the point of view of the philosophy of nature and related to the development of natural sciences, e.g. hylomorphic structure of a material being and the physical theory of the structure of matter; the problem of purposefulness in nature, or evolutionism. Thus, the issues concerning the philosophy of inanimate and animate nature were discussed. Especially Wais treated cosmological issues (instead of “the philosophy of nature,” Wais used the term “cosmology”) in a holistic manner, including the issues concerning the essence, origin and evolution of life into the area of particular cosmology.

PHILOSOPHY OF NATURE AFTER 1945

The outbreak of World War II disrupted the research on the philosophy of nature. Moreover, after 1944, the social-political situation in Poland changed significantly. Lviv and Vilnius became a part of the Soviet Union and the professors from those universities had to look for jobs at the universities in Lublin, Kraków and other Polish cities. All those factors exerted an important influence on the development and teaching of philosophy.

²⁴ B. Gawecki, “Co to jest filozofia przyrody?” in *Księga Pamiątkowa ku czci Prof. W. Heinricha* (Kraków: Księgarnia Jagiellońska, 1927).

²⁵ Idem, *Filozofia rozwoju. Zarys stanowiska filozoficznego* (Warszawa: Instytut Wydawniczy Pax, 1967); idem, *Zagadnienie przyczynowości w fizyce* (Warszawa: Instytut Wydawniczy Pax, 1967).

Marxism started to rule at state universities. At first, before closing the theological faculties at the Jagiellonian University and the University of Warsaw, Christian philosophy was present there. In 1954 state authorities closed both of those faculties, and the Academy of Catholic Theology (ATK) was created (in 1999 it was renamed as the Cardinal Stefan Wyszyński University). However, the Faculty of Theology of UJ survived outside the official university structures and it still functioned in Kraków according to the decree of the Holy See of 1959. In 1974, as a result of the effort made by the archbishop of Kraków—Karol Wojtyła, the Faculty of Theology was renamed as the Pontifical Faculty of Theology (PWT). After Cardinal Wojtyła was elected as a pope, the Pontifical Academy of Theology was created (in 1981). In 2009 it was transformed into the Pontifical University of John Paul II. At the university level, Christian theology was only practiced at KUL and ATK. The Pontifical Faculty of Theology, just like seminaries for priests, did not have the rights of a university; in particular, they could not award scientific degrees. Nevertheless, the research on philosophy was carried out at the Pontifical Faculty of Philosophy. What was important for the philosophy of nature was the fact that Cardinal Wojtyła organized the meetings of philosophers and natural scientists during which the scholars discussed important aspects of philosophy, science and theology. After 1978, those meetings were organized in Castel Gandolfo. A number of scientists from Poland and other countries took part in them, which made it possible for Polish philosophers of nature to carry out discussions and exchange views with other people.

After the end of World War II (1945), following an initial period of stagnation, research on the philosophy of nature was taken up in three environments: at KUL, ATK and PWT. Also, the differences among the three places in understanding the philosophy of nature became clearer.

At KUL, the philosophy of nature was perceived as an integral part of Thomist metaphysics. Thus, the philosophers did not pay attention to the results of natural sciences because they believed that they are of negligible importance for philosophy in general, and for the philosophy of nature in particular. It was the opinion of Mieczysław Albert Krąpiec OP (1921–2008)—a metaphysician, Fr. Stanisław Kamiński (1919–1986)—a methodologist, and Jerzy Kalinowski (1916–2000)—a logician.

At ATK, the philosophy of nature, both in the substantial and institutional aspect, was created by Kazimierz Kłósak who was influenced by Louvain Thomism—especially Jacques Maritain. Kłósak believed that the philosophy of nature is a philosophical discipline independent of metaphysics. Also, he clearly separated the philosophy of nature from natural sciences, postulating the use of the achievements of natural sciences to solve philosophical problems. In Kraków, probably under the influence of pre-war traditions present at the Faculty of Philosophy of UJ, the studies on the philosophy of nature were carried out with the support of philosophers and natural scientists. In 1970s it was codified in the Centre for Interdisciplinary Studies (OBI). Since 1978, OBI has been publishing a journal dedicated to the problems related to the philosophy of nature: *Zagadnienia Filozoficzne w Nauce* [*Philosophical Problems in Science*].

Those three visions of practicing the philosophy of nature were represented by brilliant scholars who created their own philosophical schools: in Lublin—by Fr. Stanisław Mazierski (1915–1993); in Warsaw—by Kazimierz Kłósak, and in Kraków—somewhat later—by Fr. Michał Heller (1936–). It has to be added that Kazimierz Kłósak was connected with all the three places: in Kraków—with the seminary and the Faculty of Theology; with the Faculty of Christian Philosophy at KUL, and in Warsaw—with the Faculty of Christian Philosophy at ATK. However, he only left the continuators of his thought in Warsaw.

Stanisław Mazierski was one of the organizers of the Specialization of the Philosophy of Nature which started working in 1957 at the Faculty of Christian Philosophy at KUL. Also, he was the author of the handbook of the philosophy of nature entitled: *Elementy kosmologii filozoficznej i przyrodniczej* [*Elements of Philosophical and Scientific Cosmology*].²⁶ In the handbook he included the lecture on the traditional philosophy of inanimate nature within the neo-Thomist approach. It is worth emphasizing that Mazierski connected the results of natural sciences with Thomism in a harmonious manner. Also, he referred to the views of the authors from outside the neo-Thomist philosophy.

Mazierski's main subject of interest were the issues connected with the laws of nature. Its habilitation dissertation entitled: *Determinizm*

²⁶ S. Mazierski, *Elementy kosmologii filozoficznej i przyrodniczej* (Poznań: Księgarnia św. Wojciecha, 1972).

i indeterminizm w aspekcie fizykalnym i filozoficznym [*Determinism and Indeterminism in the Physical and Philosophical Aspect*]²⁷ is dedicated to the determinism of the quantum mechanics. It has been an important problem of the philosophy of nature. Mazierski dedicated many of his articles, as well as the monograph: *Prawa przyrody. Studium metodologiczne* [*The Laws of Nature: A Methodological Study*] to the analysis of the laws of nature understood both as the regularities actually occurring in nature, and as perceiving them in the laws of science.²⁸

A co-creator of the Specialization of the Philosophy of Nature at KUL was also Fr. Stanisław Adamczyk (1900–1971). The philosophy of nature was not his main subject of interest, but, just like Mazierski, he wrote a handbook of the philosophy of inanimate nature: *Kosmologia* [*Cosmology*] in which he justified the theory of hylomorphism.²⁹

Another philosopher who carried out his studies at KUL was Fr. Włodzimierz Sedlak (1911–1993). He was the creator of bioelectronics, according to which there is a bioplasma as the fifth state of matter present only in living organisms.³⁰ Sedlak notices the differences between animate matter and inanimate matter already at the level of quanta.

Kazimierz Kłósak practiced the philosophy of nature within the trend of neo-Thomist philosophy. His views are clearly influenced by the concept of Maritain and Teilhard de Chardin who was not a Thomist. Kłósak adopted the theory of hylomorphism; in particular, he tried to justify the hylomorphic structure of being referring to Einstein's mass-energy equivalence.³¹ However, what is worth emphasizing is the fact that, in his analyses, Kłósak uses the results of natural sciences, as well as some elements from other philosophical systems. From this point of view, his analyses on the process of evolution are interesting: Kłósak argues that evolutionism can be combined with creationism. He believes that God did not have to create the species

²⁷ Idem, *Determinizm i indeterminizm w aspekcie fizykalnym i filozoficznym* (Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL, 1961).

²⁸ Idem, *Prawa przyrody. Studium metodologiczne* (Lublin: Redakcja Wydawnictw KUL, 1993).

²⁹ S. Adamczyk, *Kosmologia* (Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL, 1963).

³⁰ W. Sedlak, *Bioelektronika* (Warszawa: Instytut Wydawniczy Pax, 1979).

³¹ K. Kłósak, "Zasada 'równoważności' masy bezwładnej i energii a ontyczna struktura materii," in *Z zagadnień filozofii przyrodznawstwa i filozofii przyrody*, vol. 2, ed. K. Kłósak (Warszawa: Akademia Teologii Katolickiej, 1979), pp. 173–216.

directly, but that He can act through the natural reality He had created and endowed with the powers able to produce life and new species. Thus, Kłósak combines creationism with evolutionism, suggesting a solution that falls within the scope of evolutionary theism.³² It should be added that Kłósak initiated publishing the following series of books at ATK: “Z zagadnień filozofii przyrodoznawstwa i filozofii przyrody” [On the Problems of the Philosophy of Natural Sciences and the Philosophy of Nature], which was the space in which the philosophers of nature, natural scientists, and philosophers of science exchanged their views. Twenty volumes were published in this series of books.

In Kraków, at PWT, apart from Kłósak, his student—Tadeusz Wojciechowski (1917–2000) practiced the philosophy of nature. His philosophical view falls within the scope of neo-scholasticism, although Wojciechowski was also inspired by other philosophical trends. Also, he was for using the results of natural sciences in philosophy. He suggested an interesting concept of the creating of philosophy with the “bottom-up” method. The results of natural sciences were to be the starting point of the system. Although, in one of his works,³³ he uses this method to build philosophical anthropology, the method is universal and it can be successfully used in practicing the philosophy of nature. Referring to the image of the microworld, Wojciechowski transforms the theory of hylomorphism into the concept he called meromorphism.³⁴ According to this theory, material bodies consist of physical particles maintaining their substantial forms. These particles are merged into a new being by a form which Wojciechowski calls the “specific form” that updates the ability of the particles to create a given

³² As Kazimierz Klokowski emphasizes: “Kłósak’s analyses on the creation opened new research ways. Particularly, they indicated the necessity to treat cosmos, biocosmos, in a more dynamic manner—not only as a being that «receives» the action of the First Cause, but also as a being that co-acts in the creation of the world, life or man. In such a context, the formula: *creatio ex nihilo sui et subiecti* becomes clearer and more understandable for the contemporary man.” K. Klokowski, “Profesora Kazimierza Kłósaka koncepcja kreacjonizmu,” *Studia Philosophiae Christianae* 28, no. 2 (1992), p. 74.

³³ T. Wojciechowski, *Wybrane zagadnienia z filozoficznej antropologii* (Kraków: Polskie Towarzystwo Teologiczne, 1985).

³⁴ Idem, “O hylsystemizmie,” *Roczniki Filozoficzne* 6, no. 3 (1958), pp. 27–73; idem, *Teoria hylemorfizmu w ujęciu autorów neoscholastycznych* (Warszawa: Akademia Teologii Katolickiej, 1967).

being. The concept of meromorphism takes into account the hierarchical structure of the material world to a degree that is much higher than hylomorphism.

The philosophy of nature within the neo-Thomist approach was also practiced by the Jesuits: Stanisław Ziemiański SJ (1931–) and Piotr Lenartowicz SJ (1934–2012) from the Jesuit University Ignatianum in Krakow. The philosophy of inanimate nature was just one of the subjects of interest of Ziemiański. In his works on the philosophy of nature, he uses the results of natural sciences which he interpreted from the neo-Thomist point of view. His cosmological ideas were discussed in his article: “Wprowadzenie do filozofii przyrody nieożywionej” [Introduction to the Philosophy of Inanimate Nature].³⁵

First of all, Piotr Lenartowicz dealt with the philosophy of animate nature and philosophical anthropology. In the work: *Elementy filozofii zjawiska biologicznego* [*Elements of the Philosophy of a Biological Phenomenon*] (Kraków 1986) he presents an interesting concept of a living phenomenon. Lenartowicz treats life as a process for which the notion of a “life cycle” is crucial. In his opinion, a life process is characterized by a repeatable rhythm of being born and dying. A specific generation grows up due to organizing the absorbed inanimate matter, and while dying it “sinks into it” again. This cycle of being born and dying is a continuous phenomenon that is repeated in further generations.

The neo-Thomist philosophy of nature was also lectured in seminars for priests—i.a. by Fr. Ludwik Wciórka (1928–2000) in Poznań, above-mentioned Fr. Tadeusz Rutowski (1929–2018) in Płock, and Fr. Ryszard Kijowski (1931–2013) in Nysa, for whom the philosophy of nature was the main subject of interest.

However, it seems that the neo-Thomist philosophy of nature exhausted its ability to explain the world of nature. The research on the subject was carried out in the increasingly limited scope, and the discussions started to be carried out within the metasubjective area. The scholars attempted to work out the concept of the philosophy of nature. Those issues had already been discussed before 1939 by Bolesław Gawecki who also continued his research after 1945.

³⁵ S. Ziemiański, “Wprowadzenie do filozofii przyrody nieożywionej,” *Rocznik Wydziału Filozoficznego Towarzystwa Jezusowego w Krakowie* 5 (1993–1994), pp. 149–189.

In foreign neo-scholasticism, several approaches were worked out as for the status of the neo-Thomist philosophy of nature. Since most neo-scholastics adopted the traditional division of sciences according to three degrees of abstraction, scholars tried to place philosophy on one of the levels of abstraction. However, neo-Thomists could not reach an agreement as to where to place the philosophy of nature. Some of them placed it, together with natural sciences, on the first degree of abstraction; others—with metaphysics, on the third level of abstraction; still others treated it as the so-called *scientia media*, locating it between the first and second, and the third degree of abstraction. This variety of opinions shows—on the one hand—the difficulties of neo-Thomists with the status of the philosophy of nature, and—on the other hand—the problems with the classification of sciences using the concept of the three-level abstraction. In the contemporary methodology of sciences this classification lost its validity. At present, the classifications of sciences first of all take into account the structure of the data of scientific theories, and not the ways of creating concepts within them. That is why some Thomists, while trying to determine the status of the philosophy of nature, no longer refer to the concept of abstraction. This way, they usually treat the philosophy of nature as a philosophical discipline independent of both natural sciences and metaphysics.³⁶ Kłósak and Mazierski got actively involved in those metasubjective discussions. In his work: *Prolegomena do filozofii przyrody inspiracji arystotelesowsko-tomistycznej* [*Prolegomena to the Philosophy of Nature of the Aristotelian-Thomist Inspiration*]³⁷ Mazierski discusses the issues concerning the subject and method of the philosophy of nature. He treats abstraction as the main method of creating philosophical notions. It is worth emphasizing that Mazierski does not include the philosophy of nature into metaphysic, as it used to be at KUL, but he also sees the advantages that the philosophy of nature can derive from the results of natural sciences. Mazierski's views on the status of the philosophy of nature are traditional and fall within the scope of the main trend of neo-Thomist philosophy.

³⁶ More on this subject: M. Lubański, S.W. Ślaga, "Zagadnienie teorii filozofii przyrody," *Analecta Cracoviensia* 14 (1982), pp. 64–66.

³⁷ S. Mazierski, *Prolegomena do filozofii przyrody inspiracji arystotelesowsko-tomistycznej* (Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL, 1969).

Kłósak departed from the neo-scholastic solutions in the theory of the philosophy of nature. Although he uses the output of neo-Thomist methodologists and logicians, he adopts the solutions as for the status of the philosophy of nature that are much more modern than Mazierski's. Kłósak was improving his metaphilosophical view until the end of his life. In 1980, his main work summarizing his analyses within this scope was published: *Z teorii i metodologii filozofii przyrody* [*On the Theory and Methodology of the Philosophy of Nature*].³⁸ Kłósak treats the philosophy of nature as a philosophical discipline that is independent of metaphysics. He also postulates that it should be based on philosophical facts that should be philosophically interpreted scientific facts. Moreover, he worked out an original method of justifying philosophical theses, namely the method of extracting ontological implications of reductive type. However, it seems that Kłósak's concept was not appreciated. His view was criticized from two distinct points of view. It was opposed by the "traditionalists" for whom, in particular, opening the philosophy of nature to natural sciences was unacceptable. On the other hand, Kłósak's Thomism was unacceptable for, e.g., Michał Heller who got more involved in metasubjective discussions after Kłósak's death.

Michał Heller created his own original vision of practicing the philosophy of nature as the philosophy in science. He connects philosophy strongly with natural sciences because he believes that the latter are full of philosophical problems hidden both in the assumptions of their natural theories and in the obtained results. According to Heller, Thomist philosophy is outdated and it cannot suggest any solutions to philosophical problems. Heller presents two conditions that should be met by the theory falling within the scope of the philosophy of nature so that

... it is worth taking up a critical discussion. Thus, (1) it cannot be a theory that ignores the results of natural sciences in the area to which it refers; (2) it cannot ignore at least the basic methodological rules elaborated by the contemporary philosophy of sciences. Breaching the first condition makes a given philosophical concept

³⁸ K. Kłósak, *Z teorii i metodologii filozofii przyrody* (Poznań: Księgarnia św. Wojciecha, 1980).

an anachronism; failure to meet the second condition may result in methodological anarchy.³⁹

Metasubjective problems related to the philosophy of nature in 1980s and 1990s were also discussed by, i.a., Zygmunt Hajduk SDS (1935–),⁴⁰ Józef Turek (1946–2010)⁴¹ and Anna Lemańska,⁴² although the emphasis was clearly shifted towards the relation between the philosophy of nature and natural sciences. It was connected with looking for the place for the philosophy of nature in the situation in which many problems traditionally studied in the philosophy of nature were, in a way, taken over by natural sciences. Those problems became the focus of attention of the section of the philosophy of nature at the VII Polish Philosophical Meeting in Szczecin in 2004. The lectures given were later published in *Roczniki Filozoficzne*.⁴³

STUDENTS AND CONTINUATORS

At the end of the 1960s, Christian philosophers of nature started to depart from neo-Thomism. It resulted from the appearance of new problems implied by natural sciences, especially quantum mechanics, genetics, and the theory of evolution. The categories of the neo-Thomist philosophy of nature became insufficient to explore the issues related to the elementary level of scientific reality, determinism, the essence of life, and evolution. Also, the methodological and epistemological analysis of natural theories became necessary. On the one hand, opening the philosophy of nature to the results of natural sciences resulted in the inclusion of science classes (physics, biology, chemistry, astronomy, mathematics) into the curricula of studies in the philosophy of nature at KUL and ATK. It was important for the issues that were taken up. On the other hand, the interests

³⁹ M. Heller, *Filozofia świata* (Kraków: Znak, 1992), p. 173.

⁴⁰ Z. Hajduk, *Filozofia przyrody. Filozofia przyrodoznawstwa. Metakosmologia* (Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL, 2004).

⁴¹ J. Turek, *Filozoficzne interpretacje faktów naukowych* (Lublin: Wydawnictwo KUL, 2009).

⁴² A. Lemańska, *Filozofia przyrody a nauki przyrodnicze. Wybrane zagadnienia z teorii filozofii przyrody* (Warszawa: Akademia Teologii Katolickiej, 1998).

⁴³ *Roczniki Filozoficzne* 53, no. 2 (2005); *Roczniki Filozoficzne* 54, no. 1 (2006).

of the philosophers of nature clearly shifted towards the philosophy of natural sciences.

At KUL the issues concerning the philosophy of nature were discussed by the continuators of Mazierski and Sedlak: Zygmunt Hajduk, Fr. Józef Turek (1946–2010), Józef Zon (1948–), Marian Wnuk (1948–), and their students: Zenon Roskal (1960–), Zbigniew Wróblewski (1977–), Fr. Dariusz Dąbek (1963–), Fr. Jacek Golbiak, Andrzej Zykubek (1970–), and Zuzanna Kieroń. Their studies are focused on the philosophy of natural science, the philosophy of cosmology, as well as environment protection issues, rather than on the traditional problems of the philosophy of nature.

At ATK, also the students of Kłósak depart from the traditional neo-Thomist philosophy of nature. Fr. Mieczysław Lubański (1924–2015) dealt with the philosophy of information technology⁴⁴ and mathematics. Although Lubański, somehow marginally, touches the issues falling within the scope of the philosophy of nature, he suggests an interesting solution concerning the nature of reality, treating information as an important element that shapes nature. Fr. Szczepan Witold Ślaga (1934–1995) continued Kłósak's studies in the philosophy of animate nature. His attempts to modernize the concept of the essence of life by Thomas Aquinas are interesting.⁴⁵ Fr. Kazimierz Kloskowski (1953–1999) dealt with the problem of chance in the processes of abiogenesis and evolution, introducing the idea of self-determinism that includes the cooperation of determinist laws of nature with random events.⁴⁶ Ślaga and Kloskowski became involved in the discussions of evolutionists with creationists, supporting evolutionary creationism. Anna Latawiec (1951–), apart from the philosophy of medicine, deals with the problem of biological information.⁴⁷

⁴⁴ M. Lubański, "Informacja – system," in M. Heller, M. Lubański, S.W. Ślaga, *Zagadnienia filozoficzne współczesnej nauki. Wstęp do filozofii przyrody* (Warszawa: Akademia Teologii Katolickiej, 1992), pp. 15–153.

⁴⁵ S.W. Ślaga, "Życie – ewolucja," in M. Heller, M. Lubański, S.W. Ślaga, *Zagadnienia filozoficzne współczesnej nauki*, pp. 349–352.

⁴⁶ K. Kloskowski, *Zagadnienie determinizmu ewolucyjnego. Studium biofilozoficzne* (Gdańsk: Wydawnictwo "Stella Maris", 1990).

⁴⁷ A. Latawiec, "Koncepcja informacji biologicznej," in *Z zagadnień filozofii przyrodoznawstwa i filozofii przyrody*, vol. 5, ed. K. Kłósak in cooperation with M. Lubański and S.W. Ślaga (Warszawa: Akademia Teologii Katolickiej, 1983), pp. 151–259.

And Anna Lemańska (1953–), while focusing first of all on the philosophy of mathematics, analyses the issue of the mathematicity of nature. In the next generation of philosophers, at UKSW Fr. Grzegorz Bugajak (1966–) discusses cosmology and relations between science and faith. Fr. Adam Świeżyński (1974–), in turn, is interested in the problems concerning the philosophy of animate nature: the essence, origin and evolution of life, the evolutionary concept of death. At ATK/UKSW the studies in bioethics and environment protection were derived from the philosophy of nature. Such studies are carried out by Fr. Bernard Hałaczek (1936–), Fr. Józef Marcelli Dołęga (1940–2014) and Zbigniew Łepko SDB (1952–).

In Kraków, Christian philosophers dealt with various problems from the border of philosophy and sciences. Also, in the background of their analyses there are some issues related to science and religion. It resulted from the cooperation between philosophers and natural scientists—in particular the so-called philosophizing natural scientists. One of them was a great physicist—Jerzy Janik (1927–2012) who participated in scientific seminars organized by Cardinal Wojtyła. In the Copernicus Centre for Interdisciplinary Studies, scholars take up philosophical considerations concerning different problems created by natural sciences outside a specific philosophical system. It has resulted in transferring the traditional, neo-Thomist philosophy of nature into a specifically perceived philosophy of natural science or the philosophy in science. This style of philosophizing is preferred by: Fr. Michał Heller, Fr. Józef Życiński (1948–2011), Janusz Mączka SDB (1960–), Fr. Włodzimierz Skoczny (1956–), and Fr. Tadeusz Pabjan (1972–).

Heller treats the philosophy of nature as the search for philosophical problems connected with natural theories. He deals with cosmology and in this area he seeks his philosophical inspirations.⁴⁸ One of the main philosophical problems to which Heller dedicated many of his publications is the issue of the mathematicity of nature and rationality of the universe. The problem of the rationality of nature was also the subject of interest for Józef Życiński,⁴⁹ who was connected with the Kraków based philosophers of nature and with KUL.

⁴⁸ J. Heller, *Wobec Wszczęściwiata* (Kraków: Znak, 1971); idem, *Podglądanie Wszczęściwiata* (Kraków: Znak, 2008).

⁴⁹ J. Życiński, *Świat matematyki i jej materialnych cieni* (Kraków: Copernicus Center Press, 2013).

At the Jesuit University Ignatianum, the philosophy of nature is now studied by Bogdan Lisiak SJ (1958–), Robert Janusz SJ (1960–) and Jacek Poznański SJ (1974–). Also, the philosophy of nature is the main subject of interest for some lecturers of seminaries for priests. Fr. Wiesław Dyk (1952–), who is a professor of the seminar and University of Szczecin, deals with the origins of life; Kazimierz Mikucki CR (1951–), a lecturer in the seminaries of Resurrectionist Congregation in Kraków and Lviv, carries out metaphilosophical studies also related to the philosophy of nature.

In this outlined “map” of the contemporary philosophy of nature, we have focused on the Catholic scientific centers, assuming that the philosophy they practice can be described as Christian. However, in the philosophical solutions presented by the philosophers from those communities, the references to Christian philosophy are not always present. It results from the fact that in the second half of the 20th century, in the Polish philosophy of nature, the departure from neo-Thomism made philosophy lose its systemic quality and solve detailed problems that were often provided by exact sciences. Also, it is difficult to determine the borders between the philosophy of nature, and the philosophy of natural science or the ontology of the scientific theory.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adamczyk, S. *Kosmologia*. Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL, 1963.
- Gabryl, F. *Filozofia przyrody*. Kraków: Uniwersytet Jagielloński, 1910.
- Gawecki, B. “Co to jest filozofia przyrody?” in *Księga Pamiątkowa ku czci Prof. W. Heinricha*. Kraków: Księgarnia Jagiellońska, 1927.
- . *Filozofia rozwoju. Zarys stanowiska filozoficznego*. Warszawa: Instytut Wydawniczy Pax, 1967.
- . *Zagadnienie przyczynowości w fizyce*. Warszawa: Instytut Wydawniczy Pax, 1969.
- Gogacz, M. “Filozofia chrześcijańska w Polsce Odrodzonej (1918–1968),” *Studia Philosophiae Christianae* 5, no. 2 (1965), pp. 49–79.
- Hajduk, Z. *Filozofia przyrody. Filozofia przyrodoznawstwa. Metakosmologia*. Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL, 2004.
- Heller, M. *Filozofia świata*. Kraków: Znak, 1992.
- . *Podglądanie Wszechświata*. Kraków: Znak, 2008.

- . *Wobec Wszechświata*. Kraków: Znak, 1971.
- Iwanicki, J. “Problematyka filozoficzna w ciągu ostatniego 50-lecia w Polsce,” *Ateneum Kapłańskie* 58, no. 1–3 (1959), pp. 255–293.
- Kloskowski, K. *Zagadnienie determinizmu ewolucyjnego. Studium biofilozoficzne*. Gdańsk: Wydawnictwo “Stella Maris”, 1990.
- Kłósak, K. *Z teorii i metodologii filozofii przyrody*. Poznań: Księgarnia św. Wojciecha, 1980.
- . “Zasada ‘równoważności’ masy bezwładnej i energii a ontyczna struktura materii,” in *Z zagadnień filozofii przyrodoznawstwa i filozofii przyrody*, vol. 2, ed. K. Kłósak, pp. 173–216. Warszawa: Akademia Teologii Katolickiej, 1979.
- Kwiatkowski, F. *Filozofia wieczysta w zarysie*, vol. 2: *Filozofia bytu, filozofia świata nieorganicznego, filozofia duszy*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Apostolstwa Modlitwy, 1947.
- Latawiec, A. “Koncepcja informacji biologicznej,” in *Z zagadnień filozofii przyrodoznawstwa i filozofii przyrody*, vol. 5, ed. K. Kłósak in cooperation with M. Lubański and S.W. Ślaga, pp. 151–259. Warszawa: Akademia Teologii Katolickiej, 1983.
- Lemańska, A. *Filozofia przyrody a nauki przyrodnicze. Wybrane zagadnienia z teorii filozofii przyrody*. Warszawa: Akademia Teologii Katolickiej, 1998.
- Lenartowicz, P. *Elementy filozofii zjawiska biologicznego*. Kraków: WAM, 1986.
- Lubański, M. “Informacja – system,” in M. Heller, M. Lubański, S.W. Ślaga, *Zagadnienia filozoficzne współczesnej nauki. Wstęp do filozofii przyrody*, pp. 15–153. Warszawa: Akademia Teologii Katolickiej, 1992.
- Lubański, M., Ślaga, S.W. “Zagadnienie teorii filozofii przyrody,” *Analecta Cracoviensia* 14 (1982), pp. 61–77.
- Mazierski, S. *Determinizm i indeterminizm w aspekcie fizycznym i filozoficznym*. Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL, 1961.
- . *Elementy kosmologii filozoficznej i przyrodniczej*. Poznań: Księgarnia św. Wojciecha, 1972.
- . *Prawa przyrody. Studium metodologiczne*. Lublin: Redakcja Wydawnictw KUL, 1993.
- . *Prolegomena do filozofii przyrody inspiracji arystotelesowsko-tomistycznej*. Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL, 1969.
- Rutkiewicz, B. *Współczesny antymechanizm biologiczny i podstawy finalizmu*. Lublin: Gebethner i Wolff, 1929.
- . “Zagadnienie celowości w morfologii i fizjologii,” *Miesięcznik Kościelny* (1913) March, April, May.
- Rutowski, T. “Hylemorfizm wobec budowy jądra atomowego,” *Roczniki Filozoficzne* 6, no. 3 (1958), pp. 75–97.
- Sedlak, W. *Bioelektronika*. Warszawa: Instytut Wydawniczy Pax, 1979.
- Stepa, J. *Tomizm wobec elektronicznej teorii o budowie materii*. Łomża: [n.p.], 1932.

- Ślaga, S.W. "Życie – ewolucja," in M. Heller, M. Lubański, S.W. Ślaga, *Zagadnienia filozoficzne współczesnej nauki*, pp. 285–411. Warszawa: Akademia Teologii Katolickiej, 1992.
- Turek, J. *Filozoficzne interpretacje faktów naukowych*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo KUL, 2009.
- Wais, K. *Kosmologia ogólna*, Gebethner i Wolff, Warszawa 1907.
- . *Kosmologia szczegółowa*, part 1. Gniezno: Nakładem "Studia Gnesnensia", 1931; part 2. Gniezno: Nakładem "Studia Gnesnensia", 1932.
- Wojciechowski, T. "O hylosystemizmie," *Roczniki Filozoficzne* 6, no. 3 (1958), pp. 27–73.
- . *Teoria hylemorfizmu w ujęciu autorów neoscholastycznych*. Warszawa: Akademia Teologii Katolickiej, 1967.
- . *Wybrane zagadnienia z filozoficznej antropologii*. Kraków: Polskie Towarzystwo Teologiczne, 1985.
- Ziemiański, S. "Wprowadzenie do filozofii przyrody nieożywionej," *Rocznik Wydziału Filozoficznego Towarzystwa Jezusowego w Krakowie* 5 (1993–1994), pp. 149–189.
- Życiński, J. *Świat matematyki i jej materialnych cieni*. Kraków: Copernicus Center Press, 2013.

5.

PHILOSOPHY OF MAN

Alongside the problem of the world and God, the problem of man occupies a central place in Christian thought. It is within the Christian philosophy that the personal status of the man and his personal relation with God has been discovered. The truth about a person and their dignity is the core of Christian anthropology irrespective of the multitude of philosophical trends represented by Christian philosophers. It also refers to the Christian philosophy of the man practiced in the 20th century in Poland which was characterized by the clash of the classical metaphysical personalism with the axiological personalism inspired by modern and contemporary philosophical concepts. At the same time, from the beginning of this century, especially under the influence of the philosophy of Max Scheler, anthropology has been separated and shaped as an independent philosophical discipline.

HISTORICAL AND CONCEPTUAL OUTLINE

In Europe, in the second half of the 19th century and at the beginning of the 20th century, positivism combined with naturalism strongly influenced Christian philosophy. In order to answer those influences, Pope Leo XIII, in his encyclical *Aeterni Patris* (1879) encouraged the philosophers of Catholic universities to read the thought of St. Thomas Aquinas anew. It resulted in shaping three neo-Thomist trends: the Louvain trend (Désiré Mercier), neo-Thomism which originated at the Catholic University Sacro Cuore in Milan, and the traditional neo-Thomism practiced at the pontifical universities in Rome

and Spain. At that time, Poland was under the partitions and it was difficult to practice independent, original Polish philosophy.

Polish philosophy started to develop in an intensive manner, both institutionally and scientifically, during the interwar period (1918–1939). The representatives of the Lviv-Warsaw School worked hard; phenomenology (Roman Ingarden) and the so-called Kraków philosophy of nature developed. The philosophy of man inspired by Christianity—apart from Kraków or Warsaw—was mainly developed at the Catholic University of Lublin which was opened in 1918.

At that time, positivist concepts dominated, according to which speaking about God and the soul—due to the lack of the subject of those concepts—was groundless. In opposition to those trends, Polish neo-Thomists—in an “apologetic” manner—indicated the insufficiency of the reductionist vision of the world and the man, and the meaningfulness of speaking about what is spiritual in man.

Special attention should be paid to the Louvain trend in Poland in which the philosophers emphasized the need to know the exact sciences (biology, psychology, physics or sociology) while opposing the scientific tendencies of positivism. Louvain neo-Thomists saw the necessity to consider empirical data in their philosophical reflections. It was particularly important for practicing the philosophy of man. That kind of thinking is characteristic of the philosophy of Fr. Idzi Radziszewski (1871–1922), who later established the Catholic University in Lublin. It is enough to mention his doctoral dissertation about Darwin and Spencer written under the supervision of Mercier. Later, this trend also included the philosophy of man by Fr. Konstanty Michalski (1879–1947), and by his student—Fr. Kazimierz Kłósak (1911–1982).

Michalski’s scientific output is varied. Apart from the lectures on the history of philosophy, he focused on the philosophy of man. After the second period of scientific and didactic activity at the Jagiellonian University, and his experience of imprisonment in the German concentration camp of Sachsenhausen, he wrote the book: *Między heroizmem a bestialstwem* [*Between Heroism and Bestiality*] the subject of which was the concern for saving what is spiritual in man.¹ The cruelty and evil, which entered the human history in the 20th century,

¹ K. Michalski, *Między heroizmem a bestialstwem* (Kraków: Wydawnictwo Mariackie, 1949).

significantly weakened European culture. Michalski believed that its restoration could take place through heroism. The heroic element comes from the activity of the soul which, going towards the truth, opposes any fears. In the spiritual desire, human soul “leans” towards God, fulfilling higher objectives, such as moral perfection, artistic and scientific creativity, and the defense of the Homeland.

Contrary to the empirical-rational trend, in other approaches philosophers emphasized the rational element of philosophy combined with the analysis of Aquinas’ texts, without the need to refer to exact sciences. That kind of thinking was also present in the neo-Thomist philosophy in Poland in the first part of the 20th century, which was represented by: Fr. Franciszek Gabryl (1866–1914), Fr. Kazimierz Wais (1865–1934), Fr. Franciszek Sawicki (1877–1952), and Jacek Woroniecki OP (1878–1949). All of them discussed anthropological issues from the perspective of Thomist philosophy. Apart from writing general handbooks that included the history of philosophy and its particular chapters, they focused on reconstructing and reinforcing the tradition of Thomist philosophy from the previous ages.

The philosophy of Stefan Pawlicki CR (1839–1916) also falls within the scope of this trend. However, due to his courage of thinking and the fact that he took into account the results of the natural sciences in philosophy, some scholars believe that he was not a Thomist but a philosopher who tried to build a modern Christian philosophy in the context of empirical sciences, one which located itself between the extremes: positivism and Kantianism. Pawlicki believed that, due to cognitive skills, man finds his reason for being in an independent being which is God. The starting point of his philosophy of man is the experience of a human person which comprises the awareness of one’s own existence. This experience, as something direct and obvious, is the basis for philosophical reflections. He also claimed that the role of reason consists in making man able to get to know the natural moral law within which the basis of the social order is family and the right to private property. He did not agree with the scientist concept of the society because he believed that the human world is not evolving from the animal world. Pawlicki believed that the law specified by the man is secondary as compared to the basic human rights the infringement of which means negating the man’s autonomy.

After the war, apart from neo-Thomism, many other philosophical trends appeared in Poland: Marxist philosophy, existential

philosophy, phenomenology, philosophy of dialogue, and analytic philosophy. In this context, the Christian philosophy of man extended its research perspectives, opening up to phenomenology—Fr. Karol Wojtyła (1920–2005), Fr. Józef Tischner (1931–2000), Władysław Stróżewski (1933–), Fr. Antoni Siemianowski (1930–); partially—to theist existentialism—Fr. Józef Tischner, Karol Tarnowski (1937–), Fr. Marek Jędraszewski (1949–), Fr. Władysław Zuziak (1952–); and to the philosophy of dialogue—Fr. Józef Tischner, Tadeusz Gadacz (1955–), Jan Andrzej Kłoczowski OP (1937–). To a lesser degree, we can also notice the influence of analytic philosophy present in the works of, i.a. Józef Maria Bocheński OP (1902–1995), and somewhat later—in the publications of other authors.

After 1945, Polish philosophers, wishing to defend Christian ideas, were forced to work out some arguments against Marxist philosophy. The Marxist concept of man imposed by the current authorities in an administrative manner (non-Marxist philosophers were eliminated from universities, faculties of theology were removed, publications in-compliant with the official propaganda were destroyed or censored, etc.) was criticized by Christian thinkers. It is worth mentioning the dispute of Fr. Kazimierz Kłósak (1911–1982) with dialectical materialism (Adam Schaff), and the dispute of Tadeusz Ślipko SJ (1918–2015) with Marek Fritzhand and Henryk Jankowski related to the concept of man and ethics, as well as the publications of Roman Darowski SJ (1935–2017) concerning Marxist philosophy. We need to emphasize the important role of the Lublin School of Philosophy, the representatives of which—especially Antoni Bazyli Stępień (1931–), also took up the discussion with Marxism. Other brilliant representatives of that school—Fr. Karol Wojtyła and Mieczysław Albert Krąpiec OP (1921–2008) proved that Marxism is based on an anthropological error. The school creatively renewed and systematically developed the Thomist metaphysics, philosophy of man and ethics. Contrary to Marxism, Wojtyła emphasized the subjectivity of the man of work. Work and its ethos was also the subject of Tischner’s reflection, which significantly contributed to questioning the Marxist concept of the man and work. Apart from Christian philosophies, the social thought of the Church (the teachings of Cardinal Stefan Wyszyński; 1901–1981) exerted a great influence on arousing the awareness of human freedom and dignity. Because of the latter’s activity, the influence of the Marxist philosophy and the communist propaganda in Polish society was weakened.

Apart from the trends inspired by neo-Thomism in the Christian philosophy of man in the second half of the 20th century, the Augustinian approach appeared which was developed by: Tischner, Stróżewski, Gadacz, or Stanisław Kowalczyk (1932–). While Thomas Aquinas said that the man is the most perfect being in the visible world, the Augustinian philosophical stream emphasized the close connection of a human person with the world of values. Thus, the metaphysics of a person cannot be reduced to the ontology of being and substance as it must also include axiology. A person is sensitive to the world of values, and the fulfillment of values influences the person's development. In the philosophy of the subject which referred to the Platonic-Augustinian tradition, the scholars also underlined the role of the person in cognition and moral action.

THE MAIN APPROACHES AND REPRESENTATIVES

The Christian philosophy of man developed in the 20th century can be divided according to the following trends: existential Thomism, consequent Thomism, natural-evolutionary approach, and phenomenological-existential approach.

Existential Thomism

Among the representatives of various kinds of the neo-Thomist trend in Poland, it is especially worth mentioning the Lublin Philosophical School initiated by Stefan Swieżawski (1907–2004), Jerzy Kalinowski (1916–2000), and developed by Mieczysław Albert Krąpiec OP (1921–2008) and his colleagues: Fr. Karol Wojtyła (1920–2005), Fr. Stanisław Kamiński (1919–1986), Antoni Bazyli Stępień (1931–), and Zofia Józefa Zdybicka USJK (1928–). Swieżawski was a student of Kazimierz Twardowski (1866–1938), although he practiced philosophical anthropology according to Thomist philosophy. At the same time, he noticed the value of modern philosophy—especially its anthropocentric moderation and emphasis on subjectivity. It is worth mentioning that he edited the *Treatise on Man* by St. Thomas Aquinas, which was published in Polish and Latin.

During his studies and scientific work, Krąpiec became familiar with the philosophy of St. Thomas Aquinas and the interpretation of Thomism as set out by Étienne Gilson. He reinforced and creatively

developed existential Thomism in Polish philosophy. He tried to work out a philosophy of man based on metaphysics, claiming that philosophical anthropology is methodologically independent of detailed anthropologies. That is why it is neither a synthesis of the data of exact sciences nor the existential experience that expresses the praxistic orientation of the contemporary man. It is because it has its own data to be explained in the form of the direct experience of man's existence. This data is explained through a phenomenological description, and its content is explained through the (intuitive-reductive) method proper for general metaphysics. The man discovers his identity and reality in the basic existential judgment: "I exist." "I" is the center of "my" acts, i.e. my deeds and experiences. The combination of "I" and "my" leads to the concept of a person perceived as the "self of a reasonable nature." "I" is immanent in "my acts" as their author, but, at the same time, it cannot be reduced to the acts as it is transcendent as compared to them. Krąpiec perceives man as the substance consisting of an act and possibility, emphasizing his psychological and physical unity.² In his approach, the man is not only an individual, a biological organism, but he is also a personal being who has a reasonable nature and who shapes himself through work and culture (cognition, decisions, creativity and religion). A human person is the subject able to reflect on himself, who actualizes himself in various acts that accompany him in family and social life. Each person is an ontically independent structure. Being the subject of his own thoughts, experiences and actions, he transcends nature and society. In the personalism of Krąpiec, the autonomy of a person is the starting point for the philosophy of politics and law.³

The philosophy of man worked out by Krąpiec was developed by Fr. Marian Jaworski (1926–), Zofia Józefa Zdybicka, Fr. Ignacy Dec (1944–), Piotr Jaroszyński (1955–), Andrzej Maryniarczyk SDB (1950–), Henryk Kiereś (1943–), and Wojciech Chudy (1947–2007). At present, this trend is represented by Zbigniew Pańpuch (1968–), Arkadiusz Gudaniec (1970–) and, in the Kraków environment, Piotr Stanisław Mazur (1968–). Also, this trend is followed by Stanisław

² M.A. Krąpiec, *Ja-człowiek. Zarys antropologii filozoficznej* (Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL, 1974).

³ Idem, *Człowiek jako osoba* (Lublin: Polskie Towarzystwo Tomasza z Akwinu, 2005).

Kowalczyk, who was inspired by the achievements of the Lublin School of Philosophy, trying to complete it with the ideas of St. Augustine and Maritain. Thomism makes it possible to approach a person in a systemic manner, while Augustinianism and modern philosophy enable presenting the man in his existential anxiety, providing the subjective and axiological perspective. The personalist vision of the man worked out by Kowalczyk combines the phenomenology of the man with the metaphysics of the man. Just like in Wojtyła's thought, it is the expression of adjusting the philosophy of being with the philosophy of consciousness. In his *Zarys filozofii człowieka* [*Outline of the Philosophy of Man*], Kowalczyk carried out a reliable presentation of various trends and concepts of the man throughout ages in the European philosophy.⁴ His interests were focused on the social philosophy and the philosophy of culture.

A graduate of KUL, Czesław Stanisław Bartnik (1929–2020) worked out an original concept of personalism. His historical personalism, which he described as realistic or universalistic, attempts to combine the achievements of the Augustinian and Thomist traditions, but it also uses some elements of Teilhard de Chardin and Hegel's dialectics. In this all-encompassing system of personalism, a dynamic person, who is perceived in a direct and certain manner, is a kind of a "synthesis" of spirit and matter, and constitutes the third type of beingness. The subject of the self both links and breaks the dualism of spirit and matter. A person comprises subjectivity and objectivity, transcending the ideas of materialism and spiritualism. Being both the objective and meaning of philosophical reflection, and the reference point for being, a person is the key to know all reality and can be the foundation for creating a universal system comprising theology, metaphysics, anthropology and ethics. The concept of a person helped the philosopher to build the holistic theological-philosophical approach within which he worked out some elements of his own methodology, epistemology, hermeneutics and ontology.⁵ It is worth to emphasize not only the systemic use of the concept of a person, but also rich, multifaceted and dynamic understanding it both in the synchronic and diachronic dimension. Another thinker who

⁴ S. Kowalczyk, *Zarys filozofii człowieka* (Sandomierz: Wydawnictwo Diecezjalne, 1990).

⁵ C.S. Bartnik, *Personalizm* (Lublin: Oficyna Wydawnicza Czas, 1995).

did not belong to the Lublin School of Philosophy, but whose concept of man referred to Thomism in its Suaresian (essentialist) type, was Darowski. He supported the neo-Thomist theory of man's psychological and physical unity. In time, he extended his research perspective, which is clear in the handbook *Philosophical Anthropology* in which he discussed the main trends in the philosophy of man, he reviewed the key aspects of the structure of being and man's cultural activity, and he raised the thesis that, because of the unlimited nature of his acts, maintaining the proper proportion to the First Being, "in some way a human being is absolute."⁶ Also, his confrontation of Christian thought with Marxism is noteworthy.⁷

Consequent Thomism

Mieczysław Gogacz (1926–) is the originator of consequent Thomism. In his approach, the philosophy of man is a separate field of metaphysics that takes the form of detailed metaphysics. He treated anthropology as a separate area of knowledge independent of exact sciences. He emphasized the methodological connection of the man with the general theory of being. The man, as a person, is a psychophysical unity which develops due to his freedom and reason.⁸ Making relations as a result of spontaneous reaction to another person is a natural consequence of being a person. The act of existence is the first principle of each being, including man as a person. The basis for personal relations are transcendental signs of existence: the relation of love is based on the reality of people, the relation of faith is based on truth, and the relation of hope is based on goodness.⁹ Based on those relations, we can specify the most fundamental human communities: the family and the nation, which are included in the group of natural communities. Apart from natural communities, Gogacz enumerates a supernatural community: the Church. According to the author of consequent Thomism, each community is united and

⁶ R. Darowski, *Philosophical Anthropology: Outline of Fundamental Problems* (Krakow: The Ignatianum Jesuit University; Publishing House WAM, 2014), p. 153.

⁷ Idem, *La théorie marxiste de la vérité* (Rome: [n.p.], 1973).

⁸ M. Gogacz, *Wokół problemu osoby* (Warszawa: Instytut Wydawniczy Pax, 1974).

⁹ Idem, *Człowiek i jego relacje* (Warszawa: Akademia Teologii Katolickiej, 1985).

constituted by the common goodness of its subjects. He believes that it is not the world of nature, but the environment of people that is the adequate space of meaning for man.

In the environs of Warsaw's UKSW, anthropological issues, especially in ethical analyses, were occasionally raised by Tadeusz Ślipko SJ (1918–2015). At this moment, philosophical anthropology in the perspective of the philosophy of culture was developed by Fr. Jan Sochoń (1953–). Essentially he is a supporter of Thomist anthropology, complemented with phenomenological and hermeneutical threads. Due to the ethical research, anthropological problems also appear in the works by Fr. Ryszard Moń (1951–) and Ewa Podrez (1952–). Those authors clearly depart from the Thomist way of practicing philosophical anthropology. Although they maintain a lot of its theses, they enrich them with threads coming from French philosophy, as well as postmodernism and structuralism.

Natural-evolutionary approach

While forming his anthropological views, Kazimierz Kłósak often used the achievements of the natural sciences. Since the data of empirical cognition was his starting point, he analyzed a lot of issues from the philosophy of man, e.g. the problem of human acts or the issue of the soul. Not only did he develop his anthropology in systematic works, but also in disputes, including those with Marxist philosophy.

Kłósak took up anthropological reflections within two areas: one of them was investigating the man in his natural and cultural environment, and the other one included the metaphysical stage adequate for philosophical anthropology. Although he derived his conclusions mainly from empirical sciences, in terms of investigating human soul he took into account introspective data. Basically, he was for the peripatetic-Thomist concept of substantial soul.¹⁰ In this respect, he did not take into account the contribution of natural science history into understanding the essence of man. Also, introspection helped Kłósak adopt the thesis concerning the non-material nature of higher psychological phenomena, and, in consequence, on the non-material nature of the soul. In order to reconcile these statements

¹⁰ K. Kłósak, "Substancjalność duszy ludzkiej ze stanowiska doświadczenia bezpośredniego," *Przegląd Powszechny*, no. 229 (1950), pp. 1–20.

with the data from psychophysiology, he assumed that human thought is the expression of incarnate, and not pure, spirit, and its subject is the man perceived as a psychophysiological whole. In the context of the question concerning the relation between body and soul, he raised the thesis on the unity of matter and spirituality, which constitute a whole and are not separate substances. He also dealt with selected issues concerning anthropogenesis. In the context of evolutionary sciences related to man, he considered two issues: the origin of the body and the creation of the soul. He believed that evolutionary mechanisms are only sufficient with reference to the physical area, i.e. to bodies. In terms of the origin of the soul, he was for the concept of creating it by God *ex nihilo*.¹¹

The reflections of neo-Thomist philosophers as to philosophical anthropology included not only subjective issues, but also meta-subjective aspects. The specific features of philosophical anthropology in the context of other disciplines, the subject of its research, and the research methods applied in such anthropology were also investigated. Kłósak claimed that, although the philosophy of man should be inspired by the achievements of empirical sciences, it is different from natural disciplines, i.a. due to the broader scope of research and the method which makes it possible to analyze the man in the aspect different than in natural anthropology. Also, the specific nature of the philosophy of man can be noted while comparing it to other philosophical disciplines, as none of them takes the whole human being as the subject of the research. The specific features of anthropology is also rooted in epistemological arguments, as the ontic complexity of the man, who is a physical and spiritual being, results in the necessity to use various research methods while recognizing the reality which man experiences.

Just like Kłósak, Fr. Tadeusz Wojciechowski (1917–2000) dealt with man in the context of empirical disciplines.¹² He enriched philosophical anthropology with the results of natural anthropology while trying to work out the philosophical concept of man compliant with evolutionism. He was quite bold in his ideas, indicating that, in light

¹¹ Idem, "Zagadnienie pochodzenia duszy ludzkiej a teoria ewolucji," *Roczniki Filozoficzne* 8, no. 3 (1960), pp. 53–123.

¹² T. Wojciechowski, *Wybrane zagadnienia z filozoficznej antropologii* (Kraków: Polskie Towarzystwo Teologiczne, 1985).

of the Christian thought, we can imagine the creation of the human soul within the evolutionary development of the man. His ideas were criticized by more traditional thinkers who indicated that such concepts are not in compliance with the teaching of the Church.

Wojciechowski discussed anthropological issues in the context of the question on the entire essence of the man, i.e. his origin, nature and meaning of existence. He claimed that modern anthropology approaches the man in a dynamic matter. This results from, i.a., the evolutionary attitude in anthropology. Wojciechowski believed that such an approach is the key to understanding man better in his physical, bodily dimension. Also, the approach was the basis for taking up further reflections on a person that went beyond biological issues. He avoided both biologizing and spiritualizing a person, as, in his opinion, man belonged both to the natural and supernatural order. He agreed with the “top-down” criticism (i.e. the philosophy of man practiced only according to the principles of metaphysics), and he supported a “bottom-up” anthropology that took into account the perspective of natural sciences concerning man. He aimed to develop a complex image of a person as a being rooted in the animal world. He noted the advantages of progressing interdisciplinarity as well as the disappearance of artificial divisions among different disciplines. He paid attention to the biological side of human existence in its evolutionary dimension, which resulted in the need to rethink a lot of fundamental issues, such as, e.g. the creation of the soul and its relation with the body.

Wojciechowski analyzed various issues concerning the evolutionary theory of cognition and he opted for a moderate version of it. Human cognition is characterized by transcendence in the form of transgressing its particular stages. Transcendence occurs through spirituality which, in its essence, is what makes man different to the animals. As a bodily-spiritual being, man can be perceived (at least in his biological dimension) as the result of evolutionary processes, but he cannot be reduced to them as he transcends them in the spiritual dimension. The problem of man’s spirituality includes the issues such as the origin of the soul and its relation with the body and immortality. The hitherto research indicates, on the one hand, the continuity of the psyche of man and animals, and, on the other hand, the appearance of a significant novelty in the form of human spirit. It means that there is a barrier between man and animals.

Since it was impossible to explain the spiritual aspect with evolutionary mechanisms, Wojciechowski raised the issue of the genesis of the human soul. He noted that the previous philosophical assumptions determined the way of solving that problem. He analyzed both the neo-Thomist hylomorphism, according to which, because of its spiritual nature, the human soul had to be created by God out of nothingness, and the syntheses of Catholic faith with the evolutionary emergence of human spirituality, which include, e.g. the concept of Teilhard de Chardin. The human soul is created through God's intervention, but it does not have a creative power; rather, the existing substance is, this way, lifted to a higher level. Thus, in the process of hominization, an animal psyche is changed into a human psyche.

Another representative of this trend is Fr. Ludwik Wciórka (1928–2000) who, at the beginning of his scientific work, dealt with the philosophy of Kant, but later extended his ideas with a deep study of evolutionary and natural thought. He was inspired by the views of Teilhard de Chardin. He tried to work out the genesis of man in a more detailed manner, taking into account the data of empirical, philosophically interpreted, studies.¹³

One of the most fundamental questions of philosophical anthropology referred to the way in which man is immanent and transcendent with reference to the world of nature. Wciórka believed that what makes man unique among other beings is his subjectivity, and negating this dimension of a human being should be seen as the reflection of reductionism. He criticized the evolutionary vision of the world in the monist version, referring to Aristotle's concept of causality, and to the existence of human subjectivity which is connected with the specific way in which people exist. In Wciórka's opinion, biological transformism led to the creation of man as a unique being in nature.

He adopted the thesis that there is no conflict between the theses of science and the statements of religion concerning man. Biology approaches a different aspect of human reality. A person is both the result of the act of creation and the product of evolution. In this approach, creation is not understood as a historical event, but as a relation of dependence between God and man. A metaphysical doctrine

¹³ L. Wciórka, *Filozofia człowieka* (Warszawa: Ośrodek Dokumentacji i Studiów Społecznych, 1982).

of creation and the theory of evolution are complementary. Thus, traditional concepts of a person have not been disavowed by modern concepts, but they rather enriched and completed with new elements obtained through the phenomenological method. In the context of the theory of evolution, the theory of Teilhard de Chardin (which he specified as the phenomenology of the world) is of particular significance.

Wciórka disputed with various anthropological concepts. He criticized the dualism of body and soul in the version of Plato and Descartes, approving the hylomorphism of St. Thomas. He noted the difficulties of Thomism in the attempts to explain the existential status of the soul perceived as a form of a body. He claimed that, in the modern philosophical thought, the relational model of a person dominates, which expresses the asubstantial attitude of that thought. The relational approach perceives the man in a dynamic manner, which makes it possible to better explain a person in the aspect of his/her presence in the world.

Within the circle of the natural-evolutionary philosophy of the man, it is also worth mentioning philosophers such as Feliks Hortyński SJ (1869–1927) and Piotr Lenartowicz SJ (1934–2012). The latter claimed it necessary to consider the formal element (soul) in explaining the complexity and synergy of life processes, and he questioned the evolutionary interpretation of paleontological data. He emphasized that the discovery of fossil remnants does not determine the existence of indirect links between primates and man, and that they can be explained as different kinds of the same species, i.e. a human being. In his opinion, there has always existed an impassable border between human intelligence and the instrumental intelligence of animals.¹⁴

Apart from the above-mentioned thinkers of the natural-evolutionary approach, a rich tradition of practicing the philosophy of man in a close contact with empirical sciences (biology, physics, medicine) is represented by: Fr. Mieczysław Lubański (1924–2015), Bernard Hałaczek (1936–), Fr. Józef Życiński (1948–2011), and Michał Heller (1936–). Modern anthropological studies are mainly taken up with reference to cognitive science and neurosciences. In philosophy, within the context of science developed by Heller and Życiński and their students, anthropological threads are analyzed in the spirit of

¹⁴ P. Lenartowicz, *Ludy czy małpoludy. Problem genealogii człowieka* (Kraków: Wyższa Szkoła Filozoficzno-Pedagogiczna Ignatianum, 2010).

naturalist theism. It is believed that man appeared according to the principles of biological evolution which, by those philosophers, is interpreted as a tool of creating the world by God. In the past, Wojciechowski was one of only a few Catholic philosophers in Poland who studied the issues of traditional anthropology in the context of developing brain sciences, but now many philosophers from the Polish scientific circles are investigating this concept, e.g. Arkadiusz Gut (1970–), Zbigniew Wróblewski (1967–) and Justyna Herda (1978–).

Phenomenological-existential approach

Inspired by the phenomenology of Edmund Husserl and Max Scheler, some representatives of the Kraków environment, mainly Fr. Karol Wojtyła and Fr. Józef Tischner, developed a more open philosophy of man which they extended with new elements. Wojtyła noted the need to enrich the Thomist approach to morality with Scheler's phenomenology, and the necessity of taking into account man's ethical experience and subjectivity in research. Tischner, in turn, while investigating the issue of freedom and alienation of the man of work, emphasized man's openness to the world of values and the meaning of the interpersonal dialogic relation.

Existentialism combined with nihilism (Jean-Paul Sartre), which was getting more and more popular, was confronted with Christian philosophical thinking (Fr. Józef Tischner, Karol Tarnowski, Tadeusz Gadacz, Fr. Marek Jędraszewski, Fr. Władysław Zuziak, Fr. Ryszard Moń). Inspired by the philosophical thought of Gabriel Marcel, Emmanuel Lévinas and Paul Ricoeur, as well as the French philosophy of the spirit, thinkers who follow that trend emphasize man's openness to transcendence (God).

Wojtyła's adequate anthropology deserves our special attention. It is rooted in the mysticism of St. John of the Cross who treated religious experience as a personalist encounter with God. Another source of Wojtyła's philosophy of man was Thomism. However, he believed that Thomism has to be completed with the analysis of a subjective side of experience that uses the phenomenological method worked out by Scheler. Nevertheless, in Scheler's philosophy itself, Wojtyła saw the danger of subjectivism and idealism. He took on some ideas related to the role of feelings in the structure of a person, or the idea of love being a reply to value, but he rejected the absolutization of

awareness that results in an incomplete image of a person. Wojtyła's interest in phenomenology was selective. He used it to work out the method of describing experiences, and he used Thomism to elaborate and explain the data from the experience. Also, he was inspired by Thomism in understanding a person as an individual substance of a rational nature and as the author of an act. However, Wojtyła rejected Scheler's actualistic concept of a person, according to which a person is a unity of dynamic acts given in an experience, which, as the latter indicated, excludes the person's causality and responsibility. Thus, Wojtyła rejected both metaphysical and phenomenological reductionism, trying to, in learning about the man, use the phenomenological method while maintaining metaphysical foundations. He did not perceive awareness as a cognizing subject, but, following Aquinas, he treated it only as an aspect of human being. Awareness is not active; it has two functions: mirroring and reflective. Due to the former, awareness mirrors the contents already learnt by the intellect which become objectivized, gaining a kind of obviousness for the subject. The latter (reflective function) helps awareness to interiorize, i.e. subjectivize the contents in the subject's personal experience. Awareness plays an important role, as, because of it, being "I" not only consists in being *suppositum*, but also in being the subject experiencing its subjectivity. Wojtyła emphasized the influence of emotions on the intensification of experiences. He claimed that only self-knowledge can prevent the emotionalization of awareness.

Wojtyła noted that an act is a conscious and free deed of man which reveals a person.¹⁵ His "adequate anthropology" is an original concept. It carries the truth of man as such, independent of his conditions of living, acting and cognizing. In Wojtyła's approach, the man is both the subject and object of cognition. The author of *The Acting Person* saw the need to work out the "human experience" as the completion of the objective perspective with the subjective perspective. In the "adequate anthropology," the man-person was presented through the analysis of a human act as the adequate personal dynamism. An act is what reveals the essence of the man as a person. Wojtyła distinguishes the "man's action" (act) from "what is happening within the man" (becoming active). As the only creature in the world, a person

¹⁵ K. Wojtyła, *The Acting Person*, trans. A. Potocki, ed. A.-Th. Tymieniecka (Boston: D. Rediel Publishing Company, 1979).

is able to perform acts, so the natural sphere of their existence is the area of morality. Because of acts, a person becomes “more and more specific; more and more somebody.” Moral experience as the experience of an act is connected with causality which assumes the acting person’s consciousness and freedom enabling him/her to implement certain values. This creates the structure of deciding about oneself (which encompasses self-ruling and self-owning), as well as being responsible for oneself and other people. The conditions and signs of such responsible deciding about oneself are transcendence and integration of a person in an act. Integration consists of mastering all the dynamisms in order to prepare the proper ground for transcendence perceived mainly as the creative transgression of oneself. It is done through awareness which, due to its reflective function, interiorizes an act and places it within the structure of the acting person. This way, the potentials included in the human subject are made real, i.e. a certain self-fulfillment of the acting person occurs.

The cognition of the man-person is the adequate way leading to showing the fullness of humanity, i.e. who the person is and what he/she can become like. However, irrespective of what the person is becoming like, and irrespective of the values he/she selects, the person is a special and non-reducible value in themselves. The expression of such value is an ontic dignity rooted in the fact that the man-person is always the “subject of existing and acting” (*suppositum*).

Wojtyła’s rich philosophical heritage is being continued by his students and followers in academic centers, mainly in Kraków, Lublin and Warsaw: Tadeusz Styczeń SDS (1931–2010), Andrzej Szostek MIC (1945–), Jerzy Gałkowski (1937–), Adam Rodziński (1920–2014), Wojciech Chudy (1947–2007), Jan Galarowicz (1949–), and Jarosław Kupczak OP (1964–), as well as in social and cultural institutions, such as the Centre of John Paul II in Kraków, the Institute of John Paul II in Lublin, or the Centre of the Thought of John Paul II in Warsaw.

While Wojtyła tried to extend the Thomist concept of the philosophy of man based on the phenomenology of Scheler, Tischner, departing from Thomism, developed the subjective perspective in the Christian philosophy of man. In his investigations, he reached for phenomenology (Husserl, Scheler, Ingarden, Węgrzecki), existentialism (Kierkegaard, Marcel, Heidegger), the philosophy of dialogue (Lévinas), hermeneutics (Ricoeur), the Biblical thought, or even belles-lettres.

Tischner worked out a philosophy of man based on the axiological experience enriched with the dialogic perspective and hermeneutics, eliciting the role of symbol and metaphor in the cognition of man. The philosophy of dialogue helped him to elicit the meaning of the relation with others, including God and the world. In time, Tischner focused on the agathology of goodness which was the basis for his further research. Searching for his own way to the truth about man resulted in the following works: *Myślenie według wartości* [*Thinking According to Values*],¹⁶ *Filozofia dramatu* [*The Philosophy of Drama*]¹⁷ and *Spór o istnienie człowieka* [*The Dispute about Man's Existence*].¹⁸

Tischner questioned the adequacy of the Thomist vision of man. To be more precise, he rejected the so-called Thomist Christianity. His dispute with the Thomism of the Lublin School of Philosophy was to provide Christian thought with the tools for more comprehensive philosophizing about man. He indicated that, while analyzing man in the existential dimension, we note that he is more the subject of hope and suffering, who recognizes himself in a dialogue with others, than the object of reliable metaphysical knowledge. The insufficiency of Thomism in anthropology was also indicated by Wojtyła and Stępień. Moreover, Tischner disputed with Marxism. Although he saw its positive aspect of fighting with the abuse of working people, he did not accept its materialistic and atheistic vision of the reality.

Phenomenology open to existential perspectives directed Tischner towards the philosophy of drama. In his approach, drama is determined by the two poles in human life: goodness that gives us righteousness, and evil which accuses us. The world filled with beings is the stage of human drama. Finally, man can be saved provided that he recognizes himself in the horizon of goodness and open himself to its influence.

Since Tischner was largely influenced by the thought of Lévinas, Ricoeur, Heidegger and the philosophers of dialogue, he was often criticized for a lack of originality. However, those inspirations resulted from an open way of philosophizing. It was said that Tischner overemphasized the axiological layer of man, but we should remember that he was a representative of the more and more popular trend

¹⁶ J. Tischner, *Myślenie według wartości* (Kraków: Znak, 1982).

¹⁷ Idem, *Filozofia dramatu* (Kraków: Znak, 1999).

¹⁸ Idem, *Spór o istnienie człowieka* (Kraków: Znak, 1998).

in which it is emphasized that, instead of being, the man *is becoming*, constituting the meaning of his existence over and over again. In Tischner's opinion, such constituting occurs through the world of values.

The philosophy of man according to Tischner exerted a strong influence on other thinkers. His philosophical thought was developed by numerous followers. They include: Aleksander Bobko (1960–)—the philosophy of man, social philosophy; Tadeusz Gadacz—the philosophy of religion, dialogue and freedom, Jarosław Jagiełło (1958–)—anthropology in German philosophy, the thought of Józef Tischner; Roman Rozdzeński (1945–)—epistemology, metaphysics; Zbigniew Stawrowski (1958–)—philosophy inspired by Hegel, social philosophy; Władysław Zuziak (1952–)—ethics, social philosophy. Tischner's works have been translated into many modern languages, including French and Russian. It is particularly worth noting the efforts of the Tischner Institute in Kraków which documents his works, inspires events and publications aiming at promoting Tischner's philosophical thought. Also, we should mention the Tischner Days organized every year since 2001 by UPJPII, UJ, National Academy of Theatre Arts in Krakow, the Znak Social Publishing Institute, and the Tischner Institute.

DISCUSSIONS AND DISPUTES

Two kinds of discussion were held within Christian anthropology: the first one referred to the so-called internal problems, related to the way of practicing the philosophy of man and the assimilation of the new ways of doing philosophy, e.g. phenomenology and hermeneutics. Within the neo-Thomist anthropology there was a discussion on the starting point for anthropology and the role experience plays in it (Krapiec, Stępień). Scholars discussed the problems related to the methodological status of anthropology, which led to the dispute between the supporters of the autonomous and non-autonomous (Krapiec, Kłósak) way of doing anthropology. There was a discussion with evolutionism (Kłósak, Wojciechowski, Wciórka) concerning the Christian interpretation of phylogenetics. Philosophers discussed the adjustment of the methods of modern philosophy, especially phenomenology and hermeneutics, to the traditionally perceived philosophy of man. It was reflected in the debate on Wojtyła's concept described

in *Osoba i czyn* [*The Acting Person*].¹⁹ As for the external discussions, after 1945 they focused on Marxism. They referred to the problem of the man's existential status. Christian thinkers accused Marxists of materialism and reductionism (Kłósak, Stępień, Kowalczyk, Ślipko, Fr. Jerzy Troska; 1941–). Other important discussions of 1980s included the dispute of Tischner with Thomism. Tischner believed that metaphysics does not allow for investigating the problem of man. This conviction led him into a dispute with neo-Thomism as developed by Krąpiec. According to Tischner, that trend, adopting the objective perspective, does not take into account the experience of man as a conscious subject. He indicated that describing the man with the use of metaphysical concepts (such as substance, existence, essence) cannot provide us with the full explanation of human experience, because it does not take into account the axiological dimension of human existence. And Krąpiec criticized Tischner saying that the latter had constructed a relationist concept of the man. In the metaphysical approach, a relation is an accidental and non-autonomous being which is created between consciousness and what such consciousness perceives. Thus, assuming that what is accidental determines man, leads to the negation of the existence of real, ontic factors that constitute him. Krąpiec believed that the attempt to connect the metaphysical approach to man with the axiological approach might hinder the analysis of the being that really exists.

The dispute between Tischner and Krąpiec, as well as other neo-Thomists, may be perceived as the suggestion to open philosophical anthropology to other research perspectives that go beyond the metaphysical approach to human nature. Tischner said that, while formulating the answers to the question: "who is man?", metaphysics ignores the issue of human subjectivity. Both Thomist solutions and the phenomenological method failed to formulate the satisfactory concept of the man. That is why Wojtyła tried to find a compromising solution to this dispute, developing his own philosophical anthropology. In this anthropology, he tried to combine the subjective and objective approach to the man. After 1989, the discussions on the Christian philosophy of man focused on new anthropological concepts that questioned the ontic status of the man and his axiological position. The most important of those discussions included the

¹⁹ *Analecta Cracoviensia* 5 (1973), pp. 49–263.

debates with liberal anthropology (Kowalczyk, Paweł Skrzydlewski; 1970–), feminism (Marek Czachorowski; 1956–, Skrzydlewski) or the transhumanist anthropology. A lot of Christian thinkers (e.g. Stanisław Judycki; 1954–, Jacek Wojtysiak; 1967–) took up anthropological discussions with various forms of materialism developed by cognitive sciences and neurosciences. They criticized materialism for breaking the man's psychophysical unity (Gudaniec). They rejected the concepts that proclaim the fictionality of human self (e.g. Włodzisław Duch; 1954–), and, as a consequence, the fictionality of man's subjectiveness (Mazur). The discussions on the problem and nature of human soul return (Judycki). In such discussions the emphasis is put on the limitations of cognitive anthropologies in solving the classical philosophical issues (Józef Bremer SJ; 1953–). The beginning of the 21st century was marked by the return of the debates concerning the man's phylogenetics (Życiński, Heller, Herda) and its Christian interpretation carried out within naturalist theism. The dispute referred to those authors who promoted materialistic evolutionism that closed the path to the non-reductive explanation of the man's spirituality. Skeptical voices also appeared in such debates (e.g. Ireneusz Ziemiński; 1965–) concerning the nature and arguments for the existence of human soul. Also, some scholars are trying to develop Wojtyła's philosophical anthropology in the context of the discussion with various opinions on the area of analytic philosophy (Fr. Grzegorz Hołub; 1969–). Moreover, there are some discussions with transhuman anthropology which suggests the creation of a new post-human (Hołub, Tadeusz Biesaga SDB; 1950–, Agnieszka Lekka-Kowalik; 1959–, Fr. Tomasz Kraj; 1963, Piotr Duchliński; 1978–, Anna Bugajska; 1984–, et al.).

CHRISTIAN PHILOSOPHY OF MAN AT THE BEGINNING OF THE 21ST CENTURY

In the 21st century, the Christian philosophy of man is being developed in such scientific centers as KUL, UKSW, UPJPII, AIK, and PWT in Warsaw. It is characterized by the pluralism of methods and subjects. It comprises many different schools and approaches. Apart from the Thomist interpretation related to the Lublin School of Philosophy, where Thomist anthropology is developed, the concepts referring

to phenomenology and hermeneutics are present in the contemporary discourse. The approach according to which anthropology takes into account the achievements of the contemporary natural sciences, neurosciences and cognitive sciences is becoming more and more popular. And the scholars do not aim at treating anthropology as the synthesis of the data of various sciences, but as a more holistic vision permeated with the Christian worldview. A characteristic feature of the Polish Christian philosophy of man, as developed by the youngest generation, is pluralism and openness to various trends of philosophizing.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bartnik, C.S. *Personalizm*. Lublin: Oficyna Wydawnicza Czas, 1995.
- Cackowski, Z. *Człowiek jako podmiot działania praktycznego i poznawczego*. Warszawa: Książka i Wiedza, 1979.
- Darowski, R. *La théorie marxiste de la vérité*. Rome: [n.p.], 1973.
- . *Philosophical Anthropology: Outline of Fundamental Problems*. Kraków: The Ignatianum Jesuit University; Publishing House WAM, 2014.
- Dec, I. *Transcendencja bytu ludzkiego w ujęciu twórców szkoły lubelskiej*. Wrocław–Lublin: Papieski Wydział Teologiczny, 1991.
- Fritzhand, M. *Człowiek, humanizm, moralność. Ze studiów nad Marksem*. Warszawa: Książka i Wiedza, 1961.
- Gogacz, M. *Człowiek i jego relacje*, Warszawa: Akademia Teologii Katolickiej, 1985.
- . *Wokół problemu osoby*. Warszawa: Instytut Wydawniczy Pax, 1974.
- Ingarden, R. *Książeczka o człowieku*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Literackie, 1972.
- Kłósak, K. "Immanencja i transcendencja człowieka w odniesieniu do przyrody," in *O Bogu i o człowieku*, vol. 1: *O Bogu dziś*, ed. B. Bejze, pp. 165–177. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Sióstr Loretanek-Benedyktynek, 1968.
- . "Substancjalność duszy ludzkiej ze stanowiska doświadczenia bezpośredniego," *Przegląd Powszechny*, no. 229 (1950), pp. 1–20.
- . "Zagadnienie pochodzenia duszy ludzkiej a teoria ewolucji," *Roczniki Filozoficzne* 8, no. 3 (1960), pp. 53–123.
- Kowalczyk, S. *Zarys filozofii człowieka*. Sandomierz: Wydawnictwo Diecezjalne, 1990.
- Krapiec, M.A. *Człowiek i prawo naturalne*. Lublin: Redakcja Wydawnictwa KUL, 1993.

- . *Człowiek jako osoba*. Lublin: Polskie Towarzystwo Tomasza z Akwinu, 2005.
- . *Ja-człowiek. Zarys antropologii filozoficznej*. Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL, 1974.
- . *Kim jest człowiek*. Warszawa: Wydział Nauki Katolickiej Kurii Metropolitalnej Warszawskiej, 1987.
- Lenartowicz, P. *Ludy czy małpoludy. Problem genealogii człowieka*. Kraków: Wyższa Szkoła Filozoficzno-Pedagogiczna Ignatianum, 2010.
- Schaff, A. *Filozofia człowieka*. Warszawa: Książka i Wiedza, 1965.
- Suchodolski, B. *Kim jest człowiek?* Warszawa: Wiedza Powszechna, 1974.
- Swieżawski, S. *Traktat o człowieku*. Kęty: Antyk, 2000.
- Tischner, J. *Filozofia dramatu*. Kraków: Znak, 1999.
- . *O człowieku: wybór pism filozoficznych*. Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, 2003.
- . *Spór o istnienie człowieka*. Kraków: Znak, 1998.
- Wciórka, L. *Filozofia człowieka*. Warszawa: Ośrodek Dokumentacji i Studiów Społecznych, 1982.
- Węgrzecki, A. *O poznawaniu drugiego człowieka*. Kraków: Akademia Ekonomiczna, 1982.
- Wobec filozofii marksistowskiej. Polskie doświadczenie*, ed. A.B. Stępień. Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL, 1990.
- Wojciechowski, T. *Wybrane zagadnienia z filozoficznej antropologii*. Kraków: Polskie Towarzystwo Teologiczne, 1985.
- Wojtyła, K. *Człowiek w polu odpowiedzialności*. Lublin–Rzym: Instytut Jana Pawła II KUL, Ośrodek Dokumentacji Pontyfikatu Fundacji Jana Pawła II, 1991.
- . *Osoba i czyn*. Kraków: Polskie Towarzystwo Teologiczne, 1969. English edition: *The Acting Person*, trans. A. Potocki, ed. A.-Th. Tymieniecka. Boston: D. Rediel Publishing Company, 1979.
- . *Rozważania o istocie człowieka*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo WAM, 1999.
- Życiński, J. *Trzy kultury. Nauki przyrodnicze, humanistyka i myśl chrześcijańska*. Poznań: W drodze, 1990.

Fr. Ryszard Moń
Cardinal Stefan Wyszyński University in Warsaw
Ewa Podrez
Cardinal Stefan Wyszyński University in Warsaw

6.

ETHICS

Christian ethics is a rational reflection on morality. It takes into account religious argumentation, but it uses standard arguments of an empirical-rational nature. Like all kinds of ethics, it depends on a certain image of the world and existing culture. It usually assumes the Aristotelian-Thomist concept of metaphysics, epistemology and anthropology. Sometimes it refers to the statements of phenomenology or the philosophy of dialogue. In Christian ethics, the existence of God is the ultimate argument in justifying the objective normative order.¹ The basic concepts of such ethics result from the Christian vision of a person's dignity, conscience or natural law. Christian ethics is normative, as it specifies how one should act in the moral dimension and how he should justify his moral obligations and duties.

HISTORICAL AND IDEOLOGICAL CONTEXT

Christian ethics, just like all 20th century philosophy in Poland, was formed in changing cultural and social circumstances. Those conditions influenced where, and, to some extent, how it was practiced, which gave it a specific nature. That is why the presentation of Christian ethics in Poland since 1918 until now requires a discussion of the different concepts taught within this period at the Catholic University

¹ P. Duchliński, A. Kobyliński, R. Moń, E. Podrez, *Inspiracje chrześcijańskie w etyce* (Kraków: Akademia Ignatianum w Krakowie, Wydawnictwo WAM, 2016), pp. 11–22.

of Lublin, the Academy of Catholic Theology in Warsaw (now: the Cardinal Stefan Wyszyński University in Warsaw), at the Pontifical Faculty of Theology in Kraków (now: the Pontifical University of John Paul II), and in other scientific centers. The division includes two periods: 1918–1939 and 1945–2018.

The first university where systematic ethical considerations were taken up was the Catholic University of Lublin. It was created in 1918, i.e. at the time when Poland regained independence after 120 years of partitions carried out by Russia, Austria and Prussia. A year later the University of Poznań opened, and the Stefan Batory University in Vilnius was reopened. In the area which had been controlled by Austria, two universities (in Kraków and Lviv) had been functioning throughout the period and, in the land controlled by Russia, the University of Warsaw was operational, but they were all supervised by the occupants' representatives in Vienna and Moscow.

In the interwar period, at the Catholic University of Lublin (KUL), philosophy and ethics were studied at the Faculty of Humanities. One of the teachers of those subjects was Jacek Woroniecki OP (1878–1949) with whom Feliks Bednarski OP (1911–2006) cooperated. Only after World War II, in 1946, a separate Faculty of Philosophy was opened at KUL. In 1945, communist authorities closed two faculties of theology existing at the Jagiellonian University in Kraków, and at the University of Warsaw. Then, the Academy of Catholic Theology was opened in Warsaw (ATK), with three faculties: the faculty of theology, Christian philosophy and canon law. In Kraków, in 1959, the Pontifical Faculty of Theology (PWT) was created. After the political change of 1989, Christian ethics was also taught at other universities, mainly at new faculties of theology, which were opened at that time. At KUL, in the interwar period, the scholars practiced ethics following the trend of essentialist Thomism, and, after World War II, they turned towards existential Thomism and personalism that combined Thomism with phenomenological tradition. At ATK traditional and consequent Thomism dominated, and at PWT the scholars referred to various trends in Thomism, phenomenological axiology and the philosophy of dialogue.

THE PERIOD BETWEEN 1918–1939

In the interwar period, ethics was practiced within the traditional Thomism, mainly at KUL, where Jacek Woroniecki was its most important representative. He claimed that all individualistic approaches are closely related to intellectualism, and the latter is based on the previously gained theoretical knowledge, which is why it ignores the meaning of human will in the process of decision-making. Thus, it leads to the moral fall of modern societies and to negative changes in pedagogy as it becomes the science of education and not upbringing, since it breaks its bonds with ethics. Woroniecki rejected all sentimentalism. He believed that the man, while making decisions, follows his conscience which may be erroneous. Thus, he advocated constant upbringing of a person. Woroniecki was convinced of the fact that the man is improved in the society, which is why he developed social philosophy that was to facilitate the process of upbringing. Inspired by St. Thomas, he suggested detailed solutions showing how man can improve himself to act in compliance with the moral principles.² Woroniecki's ethics was an upbringing ethics, which is confirmed by the title of his most important book.³

Woroniecki often cooperated with Feliks Bednarski, who first gave lectures at the Philosophical-Theological Institute of the Dominican Order in Kraków, and then (since 1956) taught at Angelicum in Rome. The ethics he created was an alternative to the Lviv-Warsaw School and the views of the Warsaw neo-positivists who questioned the scientific nature of Thomism. He distinguished three types of ethics: religious-theological, philosophical and empirical one. In each of them he separated the historical and systematic part. He treated ethics as a methodically arranged set of statements on the morality of human behavior. He claimed that ethical norms can be justified on the basis of the analysis of reality.⁴ That is why he tried to work out

² R. Polak, "Woroniecki Jacek Adam," in *Encyklopedia filozofii polskiej*, vol. 2, ed. A. Maryniarczyk (Lublin: Polskie Towarzystwo Tomasza z Akwinu, 2011), pp. 838–841.

³ J. Woroniecki, *Katolicka etyka wychowawcza*, vol. 1–3 (Lublin: Wydawnictwo KUL, 2013).

⁴ K. Malinowski, "Bednarski Feliks," in *Encyklopedia filozofii polskiej*, vol. 1, ed. A. Maryniarczyk (Lublin: Polskie Towarzystwo Tomasza z Akwinu, 2011), pp. 88–91.

a proper methodology that would show the statements of Aquinas better. Bednarski believed that the subject of ethics includes assessments and norms that are ultimately justified and explained through the establishment, in a reasonable manner, of their compliance with the ultimate goal.⁵

Bednarski claimed that the formal reason of the subject of ethics includes the most general principles originating from the analyses of human nature, i.e. from the reflection on its tendencies. Thus, he suggested to practice ethics with a deductive method. He wanted to perform (with reference to the Lviv-Warsaw School) the axiomatization of ethics, which, however, was criticized by numerous Thomists. The axiomatization of ethics was to consist in the application of bivalent logic in upbringing ethics and, strictly speaking, in the science of natural law. Just like Woroniecki, Bednarski tried to build an upbringing ethics based on Thomist science. He characterized upbringing by showing four reasons: material (student), causative (teacher), objective (perfection of human personality) and formal (leading the students higher). He mainly focused on the objective reason. Upbringing itself was to include improving (shaping) the mind, will and emotionality. Also, it was important to care about physical education.⁶

Moral issues were also discussed in the Kraków Faculty of Philosophy of the Society of Jesus (WFTJ), created in 1932, and later transformed into the University of Philosophy and Pedagogy (at the moment: Jesuit University Ignatianum). Until 1970s, the professors of WFTJ developed ethics mainly in the spirit of essentialist Thomism shaped under the influence of the thought of Francis Suárez. After 1970, other philosophical trends became more and more influential: existentialism and psychology (Antoni Jarnuszkiewicz SJ; 1949–); the philosophy of dialogue (Jakub Gorczyca SJ; 1950–); philosophy and analytic bioethics (Piotr Aszyk SJ; 1968–). The ethics of Tadeusz Ślipko SJ (1918–2015), who acted in the environment of the former ATK, was the most similar to that of Thomism.

A number of important ethical issues were taken up by the members of the so-called Kraków Circle created in 1936: Józef Bocheński OP (1902–1995), Jan Franciszek Drewnowski (1896–1978),

⁵ F. Bednarski, "Zgodność konstytutywna wartości moralnej w etyce św. Tomasza z Akwinu," *Studia Philosophiae Christianae* 25, no. 1 (1989), p. 76.

⁶ K. Malinowski, "Bednarski Feliks," p. 90.

and Fr. Jan Salamucha (1903–1944). Aiming at renewing Catholic thought in accordance with the methodology of logic, they suggested practicing scientific philosophy, including scientific ethics, in such a way that would take into account the data of the experience, Christian tradition and rational justifications for valid assessments and norms of behavior. Bocheński perceived ethics in the neo-Thomist spirit. He believed that it was a normative science which determines the general objective of human behavior and then analyses psychological structures of human acts in which the ultimate goal is made real. In this way, in ethics, we reach the issue of the ultimate ethical norm, i.e. the principle which is to be the basis for evaluating an act. Bocheński took up the issue of shaping the moral character, the role of practical wisdom and the ethics of war.⁷ Salamucha, in turn, discussed many issues related to Catholic ethics, such as the issue of the relativity or non-relativity of moral norms, as well as various problems in social ethics and the ethics of individual life.

THE SECOND HALF OF THE 20TH CENTURY

After World War II, Christian ethics was still practiced at KUL, but not only there. Also, the ethics of the newly created ATK dealt with it—especially Tadeusz Ślipko. He claimed that ethics is based on the conditions of metaphysical, anthropological, epistemological and theodical nature. They can be found in the theory of being the formal subject of which, i.e. “a being as a being” determines the unity and consistency of the philosophical system. Also, metaphysics provides the schemes of argumentation, mainly deduction and reduction. Ślipko said that moral experience analyzed by ethics flows from the common cognition. Supporting the moderate genetic empiricism, he appreciated the role of intuition in discovering moral truths.

Ślipko believed that ethics deserves the name “Christian” not only due to methodological reasons, but also because of historical reasons. In his opinion, metaethics is the methodological reflection on ethics. He called his own ethics axiomatic. It is because, he believed that, apart from experiencing the ultimate goal and natural law, such

⁷ J.M. Bocheński, *Etyka* (Kraków: Wydawnictwo Philed, 1995); idem, *De virtute militari. Zarys etyki wojskowej* (Kraków: Wydawnictwo Philed, 1993).

ethics takes into account the element of values. He claimed that Christian ethics is a scientific knowledge the nature of which is intersubjectively verifiable and intersubjectively communicable. He perceived it as a philosophical-normative discipline which tries to reach those arguments that specify the transcendent reality of morality as compared to the data of the experience.⁸

Ślipko believed that the phenomenon of morality is not constructed by an ethicist, but it is given to him through experience. He claimed that ethics has to move from the phenomenological description of a moral experience to more advanced research methods that make it possible to validate specific theoretical-practical statements that express constitutive features of morality. He claimed that all fields of ethics are connected in terms of contents, and there are genetic, methodological, epistemological and metaphysical connections among them.

In his considerations, Ślipko referred to the concept of values, and not happiness perceived as the ultimate goal that determines the quality and direction of human actions. It was reflected in the selection of a method. He postulated that ethics should be based on “facts.” He distinguished two kinds of ethical experience: internal, consisting in becoming conscious of one’s own moral intuitions, and external as the experience of social moral awareness available in the form of a verbal message. At the second stage of the research, he suggested a rational analysis of available facts and anthropological assumptions. The following three elements are consequences of his ethics: the study of happiness as the ultimate goal (eudaimonology), the theory of values (axiology), and the study of moral law (deontology).

Ślipko made some modifications in Thomist approaches. He assumed that there is an asymmetry between the unlimited desire for happiness and the number of goods being able to satisfy that desire. That is why he referred to the Christian study of God who satisfies human desires. Happiness, as the man’s goal, indicates a certain direction, but it does not ultimately justify the correctness of moral actions. It does not constitute, from within, the fulfillment of tasks which man faces. It does not specify what is right and what is wrong, as this is determined by moral values and by the moral imperative. Therefore, he believed that axiology is more important than eudaimonology.

⁸ T. Ślipko, *Zarys etyki ogólnej* (Kraków: Wydawnictwo WAM, 2004), p. 41.

In axiology Ślipko gave values the role of certain models that have their constitutive principle. The principle includes the dignity of a person and the relation of adequacy between the internal purposefulness of action and human nature that is ordered in terms of purposefulness and perfection, i.e. serves the man's improvement. Ślipko completed the traditional Thomism with the concept of coordination of the axiological scope of moral values. He claimed that moral values are related with one another, and such a relation creates an effective defensive mechanism that protects those values against aggression. He also dedicated much time to the issues concerning bioethics.⁹

In 1946–1957, at KUL, Józef Keller (1911–2002) taught ethics influenced by Thomism and wrote several books dedicated to that philosophical discipline.¹⁰ Also, it is worth mentioning Jerzy Kalinowski (1916–2000), worked at KUL in 1950s. In 1957 he moved to France where he dealt with the issues at the border between logic and ethics.¹¹ At the same time, Józef Maria Bocheński also practiced ethics inspired by Thomism. Bocheński was connected with the University of Fribourg, but he also published many texts in Polish. He linked Thomist philosophy with analytic philosophy.

It was not easy to teach ethics at KUL in 1950s, because the situation with the university personnel was hard. The communist authorities forced some professors to quit the job, but due to the efforts of Jerzy Kalinowski (as the dean), several well-known professors of various specializations were employed. One of them was Fr. Karol Wojtyła (1918–2005) who started working at that university in 1954. Using the work of Max Scheler, he elaborated the ontology of a person, basing it on five pillars: the concept of consciousness, the philosophy of freedom, the concept of the man's connection with values, the analysis of bodiliness and the theory of intersubjectivity.¹²

In ethical considerations Wojtyła referred to understanding experience, especially that of the man and his act. He tried to connect the ideas of Scheler with the theses of Immanuel Kant, because he

⁹ T. Ślipko, *Granice życia. Dylematy współczesnej bioetyki* (Warszawa: Akademia Teologii Katolickiej, 1988).

¹⁰ J. Keller, *Etyka. Zagadnienia etyki ogólnej* (Warszawa: Instytut Wydawniczy Pax, 1954); idem, *Etyka katolicka* (Warszawa: Instytut Wydawniczy Pax, 1957).

¹¹ J. Kalinowski, *Le problème de la vérité en morale et en droit* (Lyon: Vitte, 1967).

¹² J. Galarowicz, "Człowieczeństwo a moralność w filozofii K. Wojtyły," *Logos i Ethos*, no. 1 (1991), p. 55.

was convinced that the ethical nature of an experience is determined by the experience of duty and not value. It was because he perceived the experience of value as too broad, and man's experience—as too narrow. Only the experience of duty sends us both to the axiological layer and to the normative layer, which is, first of all, revealed in the experience of guilt.¹³ He understood duty as “the experiential form of the reference to (or dependence on) the moral truth, to which the freedom of the person is subordinate.”¹⁴

Wojtyła was certain that ethics is strictly connected with anthropology. He claimed that the notion of importance, which makes it possible to distinguish value from goodness, is important for ethical considerations. He linked goodness with being, and value—with the experiences of the subject. Thus, the bridge between the philosophy of goodness and axiology is anthropology, which presents the man as a being who experiences values.¹⁵ Wojtyła modified Scheler's understanding of values. He believed that the place of value in hierarchy depends on the perfection of a being, which is why the value of a person is the highest value. He compared personal values with objective values which improve man, but only in some aspects.

While Kant reduced morality to duty, and Scheler—to experiencing values, Wojtyła combined those two approaches. However, in his opinion, the most important was duty as it determines morality more than value.¹⁶ Therefore, morality is the axiological-normative content, and not just axiological content.¹⁷ A norm is a truth about God, an axiological truth, which is what Wojtyła treated as a special reality. He perceived it as unprejudiced perception of things.¹⁸ Truth has an axiological, and not only epistemological meaning. It encompasses the whole human cognition and love. He considered Plato's idea of goodness as truth about goodness.

¹³ Ibidem, p. 58.

¹⁴ K. Wojtyła, *The Acting Person*, trans. A. Potocki, ed. A.-Th. Tymieniecka (Boston: D. Rediel Publishing Company, 1979), p. 156.

¹⁵ J. Galarowicz, “Człowieczeństwo a moralność w filozofii K. Wojtyły,” p. 61.

¹⁶ K. Wojtyła, “Problem teorii moralności,” in *W nurcie zagadnień posoborowych*, vol. 3, ed. B. Bejze (Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Sióstr Loretanek-Benedyktynek, 1969), p. 240.

¹⁷ Idem, *Wykłady lubelskie* (Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL, 1986), p. 175.

¹⁸ W. Stróżewski, “Tak – tak, nie – nie (kilka uwag o prawdzie),” *Ethos*, no. 2–3 (1988), pp. 30–32.

An important element of Wojtyła's ethics is understanding conscience as the subjective experience of a norm. Only the internal conviction of goodness generates duty included in the norm. Thus, norms are not what enslaves us, but what we choose voluntarily. Conscience is creative and it does not only include the application of the norms we know in particular situations. Therefore, freedom and responsibility are two sides of the same reality. Wojtyła believed that ethics implies religion, because among the recognized duties there is a duty which has a reference to God. Rejecting His existence, we are unable to explain the duties we face in such a convincing manner. Thus, Wojtyła opposed Scheler who treated ethical experiences as independent of religious experiences.

The successor of Wojtyła in the department of ethics of the Catholic University of Lublin was Tadeusz Styczeń SDS (1931–2010). In his research he often referred to the ideas of his predecessor and teacher, yet he was following his own path. He treated ethics as a theory of morality, and, to be more precise, a theory of moral obligation to act, given in an experience.¹⁹ He claimed that ethics is independent in its starting point, as it refers to a specific experience that cannot be compared with other experiences. However, while considering what ethics is, he emphasized that it must use other disciplines, especially philosophical anthropology and metaphysics. Thus, he distinguished ethics, as a normative discipline, from ethology, i.e. a discipline that indicates what is right or wrong in a given culture. The ideas of Styczeń evolved. First, he mainly referred to the concept of human dignity, which is why some scholars describe that period as “dignitive” (*dignitas*—dignity). Later (after 1988), he paid more attention to the issue of truth as a warrant of human freedom, which was called a “veritative” period (*veritas*—truth).²⁰

In the first period, he disputed with eudaimonism and deontology. He supported personalism, i.e. an ethical approach emphasizing the individual value of a person and postulating its full affirmation. It did not mean that Styczeń rejected the above-mentioned ethical approaches, but that he showed their shortages. His main objection

¹⁹ A. Szostek, “Styczeń Tadeusz,” in *Powszechna encyklopedia filozofii*, vol. 10, ed. A. Maryniarczyk (Lublin: Polskie Towarzystwo Tomasza z Akwinu, 2009), p. 409.

²⁰ *Ibidem*.

against eudaimonism was that the approach did not show the moral duty as unconditional, but only hypothetical, i.e. depending on the desired goal, that is, happiness (or, rather, what the man perceives as happiness). Styczeń accused heteronomous deontology, which searched for the ultimate justification of an act in God's will, of identifying moral duty with the will of an external authority. Also, he claimed that autonomous deontology (according to Kant) is not rational, or, more precisely, it does not justify moral duty, which results in depriving the subject of its rationality (the right to ask about the reasons that justify the obligation).

Styczeń was convinced that moral duty, found in an experience, has four characteristic features: it is categorical, unconditional, rational and subjective. In his opinion, duty does not flow from the desire for happiness (understood in a specific manner), but from the acknowledged dignity of oneself and another man. In Styczeń's opinion, our main duty is affirming people, as well as other creatures, depending on the rank of their beingness. The awareness of the fact that a person is not entirely perfect made him look for the final justification of that dignity in the relation with God (Absolute) as the person's Creator and ultimate goal. Thus, he assumed that in the end one must acknowledge that God is the ultimate goal of morality.²¹

In the second period of his activity, Styczeń focused on showing the meaning of the very act of stating the truth. He said that each logical judgment is a self-imperative irrespective of its content. It makes us obliged to follow the truth we recognize. In each act of cognition, the man activates his freedom. That is why if he does not act in compliance with the truth he had recognized, he denies himself and infringes his own identity. Thus, ethics turns out to be a normative anthropology because it shows the experience of the man as a person. While learning something, man becomes a witness of the truth about himself and the surrounding world. Styczeń believed that the obligation to respect a person's dignity is secondary as compared to the obligation to respect truth for itself.²²

He ascribed methodological autonomy to ethics, in particular in the starting point. This experience shows that morality is an interpersonal relation. That fact generates the need to recognize its ends,

²¹ Ibidem, p. 410.

²² Ibidem.

i.e. to show the man as the subject of an act and as the object towards which the subject's action is directed. The ultimate explanation of morality requires explaining the problem of the man.²³ This is carried out by philosophical anthropology with metaphysics. However, it cannot be a deductive justification. It should be a reductive process that consists of connecting statements on normative facts with adequate statements about the man and existence in general. And, since both the statements of ethics and other disciplines constantly require a critical evaluation, Styczeń determined that ethics, as a philosophical discipline (especially meta-ethics) needs epistemic control, so it has to be connected with epistemology.

Styczeń claimed that ethics should take into account the person both as the subject and the object to whom the subject's action is directed. That is why he rejected some concepts of ethics, claiming that they show moral obligation in a selective manner. Styczeń wanted to avoid both maximalism and ontological minimalism. That is why he suggested the metaphysical description of morality. He said that duty is something real—it is something a really existing person owes another really existing person. “A real person is the *object* of that duty, its source, as well as the *criterion* of what he/she deserves. Also, a real person is the *subject* of that duty.”²⁴ Thus, he added that duty does not exist outside a being. It is clearly different from what Kant wrote concerning this issue. Kant believed that an obligation is the command of a practical reason and it has nothing to do with the reality existing outside the mind.

Another important ethicist was Fr. Józef Tischner (1931–2000), who taught at the Pontifical Faculty of Theology in Kraków, and then at the Pontifical Academy of Theology and the National Academy of Theatre Arts. Using phenomenology and the philosophy of dialogue, he built ethics in which the concept of goodness was prior to the concept of being. This way, he created agathology (*agathon*—goodness). He believed that Goodness influences human relations and gives them proper shape. When a man is aware of the priority of goodness over being, he starts acting in a different way than he would if he only followed norms. Thus, we may say that there is a similarity between

²³ T. Styczeń, “Zarys etyki – metaetyka,” in idem, *Metaetyka. Nowa rzecz czy nowe słowo*, ed. A. Szostek (Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL, 2011), p. 361.

²⁴ Ibidem, p. 377.

Tischner and Wojtyła, especially in the way they understand goodness and its role. However, Tischner believed that there is a unity of Truth, Goodness and Beauty, but it is subject to differentiation according to the way of experiencing them.

It seems that Tischner had two reasons for why he gave agathology the priority over ontology. First, he wanted to avoid the difficulties with explaining the relation between the man as a finite being and God as an absolute Being. This is because he did not know how to deduce goodness from being. He perceived being as an abstract category, and goodness—as something we do not experience at the third level of abstraction, as beings, but in life, especially in the meeting with another You. Also, he wanted to avoid interpreting the man's activity in causative categories, and, at the same time, he wanted to present him as a creator. He tried to describe human subjectivity in a different way than with the language of ontology. That is why he often focused on the issue of freedom which he analyzed not only in philosophical, but also in social-political terms, which was influenced by political changes in Poland that started in 1980s.

Tischner paid considerable attention to the issue of values, considering them in the context of human existence. He concluded that they exist in an objective manner, and they are important and binding, although their proper recognition depends on the man. Values create a certain hierarchy in which the place of a given value is determined by its permanence, indivisibility, ability to give meaning to other values, and influence on the quality of human life. The basic value is truth which opens man to other values, but the highest value is goodness which is the earthly sign of the absolute and transcendent Goodness, i.e. God. Values are “valuable” because they refer to goodness, and not the other way round. Man can access them because he is free and That is why the higher the value is, the more freedom it takes to access it. Turning towards God, who is the source of all values, and, at the same time, *summum bonum*, is the act that requires maximum human freedom.

As a subject, man thinks according to values. Tischner distinguished between an “axiological self,” recognized already in a pre-reflective manner, from a “cognizing self.” “Axiological self” activates “axiological hunger,” i.e. desire, which is different than needs that are reduced to finiteness and temporality. Desire drives us towards infinity and leads us to Goodness, as a result of which it places the man in

the ethical and religious perspective. Thus, both truth and goodness are available in the interpersonal reality, and they are not established in an abstract manner.²⁵

Tischner's considerations on solidarity, social bonds and justice are very important. He demonstrates a new understanding of freedom that cannot be found in the philosophical thought of the western countries. Freedom cannot negate what belongs to the community because such negation leads to loneliness and other forms of violence. Freedom is not escaping from others. On the contrary, its nature is social. Such perception of freedom made Tischner reject the concept of nature as the determinant of norms of human activity. The man can become free through acting together with others.²⁶ Freedom is a phenomenon that occurs among people. It is the ability to shape oneself. Tischner does not refer to ontology, because, in a very detailed manner, he describes the man's inner experience. It is because the man is not just passive, but he is someone who creates because this is what Goodness called him to do.

NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL INFLUENCE

Karol Wojtyła, who was elected Pope John Paul II in 1978, definitely exerted the greatest influence on Polish and foreign philosophers. His views were commented and popularized by Robert Spaemann, John Crosby, Josef Seifert, Rocco Buttiglione and other scholars. Also, Tischner was much appreciated in Poland and abroad. His influence on various social groups was significant. The ideas of other ethicists did not become so popular. However, we have to admit that the handbooks written by Ślipko or Woroniecki have been used by several generations.

It was similar with Styczeń, who was one of the closest cooperators of John Paul II. As an ethicist, he took up many actions to support the protection of unborn children. He tried to influence the laws

²⁵ J. Tischner, "Impresje aksjologiczne," *Znak*, no. 2–3(188–189) (1970), pp. 204–219; idem, *Studia z filozofii świadomości* (Kraków: Instytut Myśli Józefa Tischnera, 2006); W.P. Glinkowski, "Tischner Józef," in *Encyklopedia filozofii polskiej*, vol. 2, pp. 714–717.

²⁶ J. Tischner, "Wyzwolenie," *Więź*, no. 10(336) (1986), p. 7.

concerning that issue, which were being prepared in the Polish parliament. As for his purely scientific contribution, it is worth noting the words of an Italian philosopher Buttiglione who concluded that Styczeń, in a very innovative manner, solved the problem formulated by Hume regarding moving from descriptive to normative judgments. According to the Italian thinker, Styczeń showed what “gives the man unity that makes him the man: it is truth, the knowledge of truth. ... It means that truth in a logical sense is strictly connected with truth in an existential sense. It also means that not only an emotion, not only a feeling, but the knowledge of truth is what constitutes a person.”²⁷

In the environment of KUL, personalist ethics was also developed by Jerzy Gałkowski (1937–), especially in understanding human work, and Andrzej Szostek MIC (1945–) who, in his research, focused on the contemporary German moral theology developed after *Humani generis*, and, in terms of subjects, on conscience and different concepts of justifying moral norms. Wojciech Chudy (1947–2007) developed Wojtyła’s personalism within the scope of general ethics, pedagogy, as well as social ethics, especially the problem of lying. Fr. Alfred Marek Wierzbicki (1957–) has been continuing the research in personalist ethics. Moreover, he carried out the reception of some Italian philosophers, such as Antonio Rosmini or Augusto Del Noce.

A variant of Christian ethics was also formulated within the so-called philosophy in the context of science, i.e. Christian naturalism, developed by Fr. Michał Heller (1936–) and Fr. Józef Życiński (1948–2011), as well as their students, connected with the former PAT (now UPJPII). The supporters of this concept claim that Christian ethics should be created within the scientific image of the world. Heller formulated several remarks on the axiology of science. Życiński worked out some elements of Christian axiology of axionormative nature. While elaborating them, he referred to the theory of evolution, the data of natural sciences, as well as the personalist philosophy present in the teachings of John Paul II. The students of Heller and Życiński discuss various issues related to normativity, principles of practical reasoning, and the influence of cognitive science on the creation of the philosophy of law.

²⁷ “Dzisiejsze moralne zwycięstwo jutro można przegrać. Rozmawiają Rocco Buttiglione i ks. Tadeusz Styczeń,” trans. P. Mikulska, *Ethos*, no. 3 (2001), p. 308.

DISCUSSIONS AND DISPUTES

After World War II, ethics in Poland faced a great challenge, namely Marxist ideology. Many thinkers, such as Tadeusz Kotarbiński (1886–1981) and Tadeusz Czeżowski (1889–1981), rejecting the assumptions of Marxism, attempted to build an ethics independent of any religion. Such ethics was mainly practiced at the universities in Warsaw and Toruń (after World War II and the change of Polish borders, most scientists from Vilnius and Lviv moved to those two cities). It was somehow completed in the Lublin environment, where Karol Wojtyła, Tadeusz Styczeń and Helmut Juros SDS (1933–) taught. However, they did not entirely agree with the propositions of independent ethics practiced by the above-mentioned authors. The scholars from Lublin asked what makes human action bad or good. They believed that if we only take into account the objective of human action, we blur both the selflessness of achievements and the unconditionality of the requirement to fulfill particular acts.

Apart from the disputes among Polish ethicists, Marxists, and the representatives of the Lviv-Warsaw School, we should mention the discussions in the group of Christian ethicists. Mieczysław Albert Krąpiec OP (1921–2008), as a Thomist, disputed with Tadeusz Styczeń who was supported by Andrzej Szostek MIC (1945–), Helmut Juros, Mieczysław Gogacz (1926–), Edward Kaczyński OP (1937–), and Fr. Andrzej Wawrzyniak (1936–2013). Thomists claim that morality is a derivative of the decision made by the man with reference to the existing norms. However, the personalists from Lublin believe that in a moral experience we take into account the existing duty. Thus, the duty is earlier than the decision which, after a consideration, the acting subject would make with reference to its fulfillment. For Thomists duty is not real and it is mainly applicable in law-making. Its nature is not real because, before making a decision, morality does not yet exist.²⁸

Another reason for the above-mentioned dispute was the way of understanding ethics. The supporters of personalism claimed that Krąpiec treats ethics as the explanation of decisions, which is why

²⁸ M.A. Krąpiec, "O obiektywne podstawy moralności," *Roczniki Filozoficzne KUL* 32, no. 2 (1984), p. 193.

he does not distinguish the material subject from formal subject, i.e. the reason why something is considered good or evil.²⁹ It is because Thomists claim that a norm can be read from human nature and formulated as a command: “you must do good.” However, the personalists from Lublin believe that the main principle is: *persona est affirmanda propter se ipsam*. In their opinion, this frees ethics from the objection that the norms it formulates are not selfless.

Also, the above-mentioned dispute referred to the relation between ethics and anthropology. Thomists accused personalists of not distinguishing ethics from philosophical anthropology. Styczeń claimed that ethics is a normative anthropology because it shows who the man is and, at the same time, specifies through which acts he should be affirmed as a person. The analysis of the above-mentioned dispute shows another feature that specifies the Polish ethics of the end of the 20th century. The participants of the discussion paid much attention to methodological issues, just like in the Lviv-Warsaw School. The only difference was that they extended the very understanding of experience. They did not reduce it only to the experience that is applicable in exact sciences.

While discussing the polemics carried out by Polish Christian ethicists, it is worth mentioning another dispute of Tischner’s with Styczeń and Ślipko. It mainly referred to the interpretation of the natural law included in the encyclical by John Paul II: *Veritatis splendor* and in the *Catechism of the Catholic Church*. Tischner believed that these texts presented an ontological and objectivist perception of human nature, which he did not accept, because, in his opinion, not all the people are unanimous as to their nature. Styczeń said that Tischner does not see the difference between what is commonly acknowledged as to human nature and what constitutes a generally valid judgment concerning that nature. Styczeń claimed that “the lack of unanimity in this respect is not an argument against the general validity of judgments on human nature and moral norms that express that nature.”³⁰ He believed that, if there was such unanimity, John Paul II would not have to issue the encyclical. Moreover, he claimed

²⁹ T. Styczeń, “Spór z eudajmonizmem czy o eudajmonizm?” *Roczniki Filozoficzne KUL* 31, no. 2 (1983), p. 70.

³⁰ Idem, “Wolność z prawdy żyje,” in idem, *Wolność w prawdzie*, ed. K. Krajewski (Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL, 2013), p. 208.

that Tischner weakens or even breaks the cognitive relation between learning and the thing we learn. He agreed with Tischner that intellect is a part of human nature, but Styczeń concluded that it is intellect that approaches human nature in a cognitive manner, at least in some of its aspects, while in other aspects that nature remains unknown. Also, Styczeń criticized Tischner for the statement that for ethics it is not important to unequivocally specify nature and its laws. He believed that emphasizing the epistemic dimension is annulling what *Veritatis splendor* is about. Moreover, he accused Tischner of unconsciously making the mistake called a “naturalist illusion” or a “naturalist error.” Such an error consists in moving from what is acknowledged towards normative statements, i.e. from “is” to “should.” And, according to Styczeń, this is why Tischner treated some explanations included in *Veritatis splendor* as entirely worthless.³¹ Ślipko expressed his opinion on this matter, too, writing, i.a. the following words: “Tischner fails to note the huge thinking gap between what is real and what is substantial, also within the category of moral evil.”³²

In the contemporary ethical debates within the area of Christian ethics, the issues related to naturalism in justifying moral norms are taken up by Barbara Chyrowicz SSpS (1960–) and Jacek Wojtyśiak (1967–), and to theist foundations of Christian ethics—by Wojtyśiak. Debates with transhumanism in terms of moral improvement of the man are taken up by Teresa Grabińska, Fr. Grzegorz Hołub (1969–), Tadeusz Biesaga SDB (1950–), and Piotr Duchliński (1978–).

CHRISTIAN ETHICS AT THE BEGINNING OF THE 21ST CENTURY

At the beginning of this century, the group of ethicists of KUL includes thinkers of various generations, such as: Gałkowski, Szostek, Chudy, Wierzbicki, Kazimierz Krajewski (1949–), Jan Kłós (1958–), Chyrowicz, and, from the younger generation: Małgorzata Borkowska-Nowak (1976–), Fr. Marcin Ferdynus (1981–) and Jacek Fydrych (1974–). Ethical issues are also discussed by Thomists: Piotr Jaroszyński

³¹ Ibidem, p. 209.

³² T. Ślipko, “Filozoficzne aspekty moralności aktu ludzkiego w encyklice ‘Veritatis splendor’,” in *W prawdzie ku wolności. W kręgu encykliki ‘Veritatis splendor’*, ed. E. Janiak (Wrocław: Papieski Fakultet Teologiczny, 1994), p. 255.

(1955–), Andrzej Maryniarczyk SDB (1950–) and Wojtysiak. That environment also includes Jarosław Merecki SDS (1960–), Marek Czachorowski (1956–) and Stanisław Judycki (1954–) who discusses ethical problems (e.g. the idea of goodness, justification of norms and evaluations) while carrying out other kinds of research. The ethicists connected with KUL develop different kinds of personalism, but they are trying to enrich their research with the heritage of modern philosophy. Wojtyła's ethical views are also developed by various thinkers from outside KUL, e.g. Andrzej Póltawski (1923–), Władysław Stróżewski (1933–), Fr. Antoni Siemianowski (1930–), and Krzysztof Stachewicz (1966–). At UPJPII, ethical studies referring to classical and modern ethics, i.a. within the scope of social ethics, are carried out by Fr. Władysław Zuziak (1952–). Also, he carried out the reception of some French philosophers who took up the issue of moral consciousness (Jean Nabert, Georges Bastide). Within the last few years, while disputing with postmodernism, he analyzed the texts of the French spiritualist Louis Lavelle, and he performed a historical review of the main ethical approaches. Ślipko's ethical studies are basically continued by the employees of the Cardinal Stefan Wyszyński University in Warsaw, the Jesuit University Ignatianum in Krakow (AIK), and UPJPII in Kraków, at the Department of General and Applied Ethics. In 2016, the Tadeusz Ślipko Centre for Christian Ethics was created at AIK in Kraków. The Centre works on the modern interpretation of Christian ethics, taking into account the methods, paradigms and problems of the contemporary philosophy which is mainly represented by the approaches such as phenomenology, existentialism or hermeneutics. Such works are continued at two complementary levels: the first one includes the discussion on the heritage of ethics; the other one—on its modern interpretations. Ethical studies are carried out by, i.a. Ewa Podrez (1952–)—the issue of tolerance and compromise; Piotr Duchliński—the issues of normativity, the role of images of the world in ethics (especially Christian); Fr. Andrzej Kobylński (1965–)—Italian philosophy and the problem of nihilism; Fr. Ryszard Moń (1951–)—the issues related to personalism and the philosophy of Emmanuel Lévinas. Piotr Stanisław Mazur (1968–) takes up various problems from the borders of Thomist detailed ethics and social philosophy (human providence). Piotr Lichacz (1976–) from IFiS PAN shows in his works that the ethics worked out by Thomas Aquinas provides many heuristic tools for solving contemporary

ethical dilemmas studied by neuroethicists, taking into account hard neuroscientific data.

Bioethics inspired by Christian personalism is currently being developed by philosophers from various scientific centers. Barbara Chyrowicz from KUL approaches the so-called hybrid kinds of bioethics in a critical manner. She practices detailed ethics referring to personalism and modern analytic ethics. The research on detailed ethics at KUL is also carried out by Kłos and Wojciech Lewandowski (1982–). At UPJPII in Kraków, Biesaga and Hołub practice personalist bioethics which is inspired by realistic phenomenology, and particularly the anthropology of Karol Wojtyła and his students. At AIK, bioethical problems are discussed by Jarosław Kucharski (1978–), who, referring to the tradition of analytic philosophy, suggests a contractualist approach to the problem of moral norms. Tischner's ethical views are being developed by, i.a. thinkers such as Tadeusz Gadacz (1955–), Karol Tarnowski (1937–), Aleksander Bobko (1960–), Jarosław Jagiełło (1958–), Zbigniew Stawrowski (1958–), and Andrzej Gielarowski (1969–).

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bednarski, F. *Przedmiot etyki w świetle zasad św. Tomasza z Akwinu*. Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL, 1956.
- . "Zgodność konstytutywna wartości moralnej w etyce św. Tomasza z Akwinu," *Studia Philosophiae Christianae* 25, no. 1 (1989), pp. 59–78.
- Bocheński, J.M. *De virtute militari. Zarys etyki wojskowej*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Philed, 1993.
- . *Etyka*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Philed, 1995.
- Darowski, R. "Ślipko Tadeusz Tomasz," in *Encyklopedia filozofii polskiej*, vol. 2, ed. A. Maryniarczyk, pp. 684–688. Lublin: Polskie Towarzystwo Tomasza z Akwinu, 2011.
- Duchliński, P., Kobyliński, A., Moń, R., Podrez, E. *Inspiracje chrześcijańskie w etyce*. Kraków: Akademia Ignatianum w Krakowie; Wydawnictwo WAM, 2016.
- "Dzisiejsze moralne zwycięstwo jutro można przegrać. Rozmawiają Rocco Buttiglione i ks. Tadeusz Styczeń," trans. P. Mikulska, *Ethos*, no. 3 (2001), pp. 307–318.
- Galarowicz, J. "Człowieczeństwo a moralność w filozofii K. Wojtyły," *Logos i Ethos*, no. 1 (1991), pp. 55–73.

- Glinkowski, W.P. "Tischner Józef," in *Encyklopedia filozofii polskiej*, vol. 2, ed. A. Maryniarczyk, pp. 714–717. Lublin: Polskie Towarzystwo Tomasza z Akwinu, 2011.
- Kalinowski, J. *Le problème de la vérité en morale et en droit*. Lyon: Vitte, 1967.
- Keller, J. *Etyka katolicka*. Warszawa: Instytut Wydawniczy Pax, 1957.
- . *Etyka. Zagadnienia etyki ogólnej*. Warszawa: Instytut Wydawniczy Pax, 1954.
- Krąpiec, M.A. "O obiektywne podstawy moralności," *Roczniki Filozoficzne* 32, no. 2 (1984), pp. 187–194.
- Malinowski, K. "Bednarski Feliks," in *Encyklopedia filozofii polskiej*, vol. 1, ed. A. Maryniarczyk, pp. 88–91. Lublin: Polskie Towarzystwo Tomasza z Akwinu, 2011.
- Polak, R. "Woroniecki Jacek Adam," in *Encyklopedia filozofii polskiej*, vol. 2, ed. A. Maryniarczyk, pp. 838–841. Lublin: Polskie Towarzystwo Tomasza z Akwinu, 2011.
- Stróżewski, W. "Tak – tak, nie – nie (kilka uwag o prawdzie)," *Ethos*, no. 2–3 (1988), pp. 30–32.
- Styczeń, T. *Etyka niezależna*, ed. K. Krajewski. Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL, 2012.
- . *Objawiać osobę*, ed. A.M. Wierzbicki. Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL, 2013.
- . "Spór z eudajmonizmem czy o eudajmonizm?" *Roczniki Filozoficzne KUL* 31, no. 2 (1983), pp. 66–76.
- . "Wolność z prawdy żyje," in idem, *Wolność w prawdzie*, ed. K. Krajewski, pp. 193–226. Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL, 2013.
- . "Zarys etyki – metaetyka," in idem, *Metaetyka. Nowa rzecz czy nowe słowo*, ed. A. Szostek, pp. 265–390. Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL, 2011.
- Szostek, A. "Styczeń Tadeusz," in *Powszechna encyklopedia filozofii*, vol. 10, ed. A. Maryniarczyk, pp. 408–411. Lublin: Polskie Towarzystwo Tomasza z Akwinu, Lublin 2009.
- Ślipko, T. *Bioetyka. Najważniejsze problemy*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo WAM, 2009.
- . "Filozoficzne aspekty moralności aktu ludzkiego w encyklice 'Veritatis splendor'," in *W prawdzie ku wolności. W kręgu encykliki "Veritatis splendor"*, ed. E. Janiak, pp. 245–258. Wrocław: Papieski Fakultet Teologiczny, Wrocław 1994.
- . *Granice życia. Dylematy współczesnej bioetyki*. Warszawa: Akademia Teologii Katolickiej, 1988.
- . *Zarys etyki ogólnej*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo WAM, 2004.
- . *Zarys etyki szczegółowej*, vol. 1–2. Kraków: Wydawnictwo WAM, 2005.
- Tischner, J. *Etyka a historia. Wykłady*. Kraków: Instytut Myśli Józefa Tischnera, 2008.

- . *Etyka Solidarności*. Kraków: Znak, 2003.
- . “Impresje aksjologiczne,” *Znak*, no. 2–3(188–189) (1970), pp. 204–219.
- . *Myślenie według wartości*. Kraków: Znak, 1982.
- . *Studia z filozofii świadomości*. Kraków: Instytut Myśli Józefa Tischnera, 2006.
- . “Wyzwolenie,” *Więź*, no. 10(336) (1986), pp. 3–11.
- Wojtyła, K. *Człowiek w polu odpowiedzialności*, ed. A. Szostek. Lublin–Rzym: Instytut Jana Pawła II KUL, Ośrodek Dokumentacji Pontyfikatu Fundacji Jana Pawła II, 1991.
- . *Miłość i odpowiedzialność*. Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL, 1986.
- . *Osoba i czyn*. Kraków: Polskie Towarzystwo Teologiczne, 1985. English edition: *The Acting Person*, trans. A. Potocki, ed. A.-Th. Tymieniecka. Boston: D. Rediel Publishing Company, 1979.
- . “Problem teorii moralności,” in *W nurcie zagadnień posoborowych*, vol. 3, ed. B. Bejze, pp. 217–260. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Sióstr Loretanek-Benedyktynek, 1969.
- . *Wykłady lubelskie*. Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL, 1986.
- Woroniecki, J. *Katolicka etyka wychowawcza*, vol. 1–3. Lublin: Wydawnictwo KUL, 2013.

AXIOLOGY

One of the significant challenges faced by Christian thought in the 20th century was the appearance of the philosophy of value, axiology and the language of values.¹ The category termed “value” was becoming increasingly popular, not only in philosophy or humanist-social disciplines, but also in the social, political, media and colloquial discourse. While searching for a dialogue with new trends and building its new, late modern identity, Christian philosophy could not avoid entering a dialogue, often confrontational, with axiology. This particularly (though not entirely) referred to ethics, but it also involved fundamental analyses in metaphysics or the theory of cognition.

Historical and ideological context

In compliance with the historiographic data, the 20th century is understood as the period that started when World War I finished (1918) and lasted, more or less, until the end of the century perceived

¹ The problem of terminology, which is strongly related to theoretical and methodological decisions, mainly refers to the title concept of Christian philosophy. I discussed this issue in another text. See K. Stachewicz, “O filozofii chrześcijańskiej. Kilka uwag z perspektywy historycznej i futurologicznej,” in idem, *Mysleć prawdę i dobro. W kręgu filozofii, religii i etyki* (Poznań: Wydział Teologiczny UAM, 2016, pp. 35–50. Here we are only focusing on the necessary suggestion for understanding that expression in this chapter. The representatives of Christian philosophy shall, first of all, include those philosophers who are institutionally related to the Church (priests, lecturers at Catholic universities or seminaries) and/or who refer to direct inspirations by the Christian thought in a positive/affirming manner.

in a chronological manner (2000). For Poland, the year 1918 is also related to the creation of the country after the war, and to the beginning of education and science in new institutional circumstances. The period specified below in the history of Polish Christian axiology is clearly divided into two stages. The first one, lasting up to the Second Vatican Council, is the time in which Christian thought was functioning within quite a strictly specified scholastic philosophy, and the second one is pluralism of various approaches and directions in Christian philosophy. This exerted an important influence on the development of Christian axiological thought.² However, first we should outline the origin and development of the concept of value in the European philosophy. It will be a good starting point that will outline the necessary background for the analysis and reconstruction of the works of Polish Christian axiologists in the 20th century.

The beginning of the conceptual category of value in social-humanist disciplines is clearly related to political economy, so, in terms of the source, such category belongs to the area of economy. Adam Smith, one of the creators of classical economy, in his book: *Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations* of 1776, built the theory of exchange value while searching for understanding the nature of value in the exchange of goods. Karl Marx, in turn, created the theory of “surplus value” (*Capital*, so-called volume IV of 1867). For him, value is the work necessary to manufacture goods, so, also in this case, value is strictly related to work: work is the source of value. Values were becoming the correlates of price and exchangeability of goods, entering the areas of quantification and specification so that we could compare and rank them. It is worth to remember about it, because philosophical concepts usually, despite having a rich “life,” maintain their original, source meanings, often hidden under thick layers of other meanings.

The first philosopher who used the category of “value” was Immanuel Kant. Things had a relative value for him, and they constituted the synonym of price, but a person and his/her dignity was an absolute and unconditional value. A little later, the notion of value was used by Friedrich Nietzsche who described the phenomenon of resentment, diagnosing (and, in a way, predicting) extreme nihilism as the state in which “values lose their value,” or postulating the revalorization of all

² K. Stachewicz, “Soborowy przełom w rozumieniu filozofii chrześcijańskiej,” in idem, *Mysleć prawdę i dobro*, pp. 51–70.

values. The broad reception of values in philosophy is related to the second half of the 19th century when the German idealism in its classical form broke down, and metaphysics, in its traditional understanding, seemed to be an intellectual fossil. In such a perspective, the scholars quite quickly discovered the lack of what the Aristotelian-Thomist being used to provide. The category of value seemed to be a “compensation for deficit” (Robert Spaemann), a good replacement of being that was supposed not to raise such theoretical problems as those related to being. The philosophy of value was created (*Wertphilosophie* and *Wertlehre* of the neo-Kantianism from Baden), and the language of value influenced the epistemological discourse (superseding “truth”), the ethical discourse (superseding “goodness”), the aesthetical discourse (superseding “beauty”), the religious discourse (superseding “God” by *sacrum*), the logical discourse, the philosophy of politics, the philosophy of law, etc. Apart from ontological questions, the questions that used to be typically epistemological appeared: about the way value exists, about its nature and essence, definitions, issues related to the structure of values and the foundation of their hierarchization. This way, the path to create axiology was determined and justified. The appearance of axiology (etymology: ἀξιολογία—decent, proper, adequate, worthy of effort; ἀξία—value of a thing, price) is connected with the Austrian philosopher, Christian von Ehrenfels, and his book entitled *System der Werttheorie* (vol. 1–2, 1897–1898), in which he worked out a general idea of value that, until that time, had been perceived in the multitude of its particular meanings. According to von Ehrenfels, value is the function of desires (*Begehrens*)—this way, psychologism stayed in the theory of value for a long time. While the above mentioned thinker used the expression “theory of value,” Paul Lapie reached for the term “axiology,” but, generally, only with reference to moral values.³ A few years later, Eduard von Hartmann first used the term “axiology” with reference to all values.⁴ In 1937, Oskar Kraus published the book *Werttheorien*⁵ in which he synthetically outlined the current status of the concept of value, and this event

³ P. Lapie, *Logique de la volonté* (Paris: F. Alcan, 1902).

⁴ E. von Hartmann, *Grundriss der Axiologie oder Wertwägungslehre* (Bad Sachsa: Hermann Haacke, 1908).

⁵ O. Kraus, *Die Werttheorien. Geschichte und Kritik* (Brünn–Wien–Leipzig: R.M. Rohrer, 1937).

may be treated as the completion of the process of creating axiology understood as the general theory of value. For many thinkers of the time it seemed to be the future theoretical foundation for most humanities and social disciplines.

THE BEGINNING OF THE RECEPTION OF AXIOLOGY IN POLISH CHRISTIAN PHILOSOPHY

In the first half of the 20th century, the Polish philosophical thought practiced within institutionalized Catholicism (we mean, first of all, seminaries for priests and faculties of theology) was dominated by neo-scholastic approaches.⁶ Axiological studies, which actually reflected the subjective turn in philosophy that occurred in modern times, were ignored, and the category of value was hardly ever mentioned in the texts of Polish neo-scholastic thinkers. As an example, we can mention the classical handbook of ethics written by a great Dominican philosopher, Jacek Woroniecki OP: *Katolicka etyka wychowawcza* [*The Catholic Educational Ethics*], or the monograph *Etyka katolicka* [*The Catholic Ethics*] by Fr. Jan Szymeczko (1885–1961). Franciszek Kwiatkowski SJ, in his handbook: *Filozofia wieczysta w zarysie* [*The Outline of Perennial Philosophy*], mentioned the neo-Kantian and phenomenological concept of value, but he only presented it, without making any use of it. Christian thinkers did not want to use the category of “value” in a positive manner in ethics or epistemology because of the negative associations with Nietzsche’s idea of the revalorization of all values, relativist axiology, psychologism, and the slogans of nihilism. References to axiology can be found in the writings of philosophers connected with neo-scholasticism or, more broadly, Christianity, such as Witold Rubczyński (1864–1938) (axiological moral order is rooted in a higher order, due to which moral values are transcendent and indestructible),⁷ Henryk Struve (1840–1912) (the divine order of the world gives moral values objectivism)⁸ and Feliks Koneczny

⁶ On the beginnings of the Polish neo-scholastic philosophy—cf. C. Głombik, *Początki neoscholastyki polskiej* (Katowice: Uniwersytet Śląski, 1991).

⁷ W. Rubczyński, *Etyka*, vol. 3 (Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL, 1936), pp. 71–139.

⁸ S. Borzym, *Filozofia polska 1900–1950* (Wrocław–Warszawa–Kraków: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, 1991), pp. 57–59, 158ff.

(1862–1949), in his historiosophy and theory of civilization with its axiological hierarchization.⁹

A certain hope for the Christian thought of the neo-scholastic approach was carried by the phenomenological ethics of values which, because of adopting the material *a priori*, warranted objectivist and, in some trends, also absolutist foundations for the philosophy of morality. One of the first Polish authors writing about the philosophy of early Husserl was Konstanty Michalski CM (1879–1947), who dedicated his doctoral dissertation of 1911 to the analysis of Husserl's fight with psychologism. Also, he indicated that Thomist historicism, based on the principle *conservatio est continua creatio*, protects us against axiological relativism showing the historical changeability of values and norms.¹⁰ In his most famous book: *Heroizm i bestialstwo* [*Heroism and Bestiality*], he often referred to axiological terminology. Fr. Józef Pastuszka (1897–1989), in the innovative synthesis entitled *Filozofia współczesna* [*Modern Philosophy*], successfully recapitulated the axiology of the Baden School, as well as the theory of value of ethics and anthropology by Max Scheler, giving his readers a reliable knowledge of this issue.¹¹

Fr. Franciszek Sawicki (1877–1952) was interested in values and axiological narratives. He was a Christian thinker open to new philosophical trends, who treated the philosophy of value as one of the fundamental elements of modern philosophy.¹² In his articles on this subject, he mainly discussed the ideas of Scheler (he called him a “brilliant thinker”) who built material ethics on the basis of values. Sawicki claimed that the philosophy of values strongly influences Catholic philosophy and pedagogy, which is why it is necessary for the Polish Christian thought to draw on its achievements. The concept of value

⁹ J. Skoczyński, *Koneczny. Teoria cywilizacji* (Warszawa: Instytut Filozofii i Socjologii PAN, 2003).

¹⁰ K. Michalski, “Zagadnienia współczesnej filozofii dziejów,” in idem, *Nova et vetera*, ed. S. Rospond (Kraków: Wydawnictwo Instytutu Teologicznego Księży Misjonarzy, 1998), pp. 410–424; S. Borzym, *Filozofia polska 1900–1950*, p. 160.

¹¹ J. Pastuszka, *Filozofia współczesna*, vol. 2 (Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL, 1936), pp. 22–33, 105–142.

¹² F. Sawicki, “Poznanie wartości,” *Polonia Sacra*, no. 4 (1952), p. 181. In one of its fragments we read: “In modern philosophy, the primary place is occupied by the theory of value.”

is, in his opinion, included “in goodness.”¹³ Sawicki noticed a similarity between objectivist trends in axiology and the Christian thought: “modern philosophy returns to the deep thought of St. Augustine according to which all truth and all goodness is the reflection of God as the eternal truth and absolute goodness.”¹⁴

For Sawicki, values include what is useful, pleasant, beautiful and noble. He distinguished personal, material, sensual, vital, spiritual, and moral-religious values. Nietzsche’s call for the revalorization of values (and, according to Sawicki, it was the most popular slogan related to values) was, in Sawicki’s opinion, the beginning of a conflict between the Christian thought and the philosophy of value. However, the author of *Filozofia miłości* [*The Philosophy of Love*] hoped that phenomenology and neo-Kantianism shall help to prevent such conflict. It is because Sawicki believed that, in those approaches, the objective nature of values, the primacy of spiritual qualities and the eternal axiological order are emphasized.¹⁵ He understood the values themselves as the qualities and attributes of being—the assets for which something deserves respect. Sawicki divided values into relative ones (those which satisfy the needs) and absolute ones (those which deserve respect as such: goodness, truth, beauty), distinguishing—like Scheler—sensual, vital, spiritual and religious values.¹⁶ An important axiological issue that absorbed Sawicki was developing the knowledge of values. In the contemporary thought, he distinguished two fundamental theories of learning about values: irrational and intellectual. In the former, the organ of cognition includes feelings, and affective and volitional thinking (e.g. Henry Maier) is presented as the opposite of intellectual

¹³ “Under a different name (especially in connection with the concept of goodness), the notion of value has always been the subject of philosophical considerations, but only in the 19th century the general concept of value was introduced to philosophy, and the philosophy of value became a separate, independent discipline”. F. Sawicki, “Poznanie wartości,” p. 181.

¹⁴ F. Sawicki, “Wiara i filozofia współczesna,” in *Księga pamiątkowa ku uczczeniu dziesięciolecia biskupstwa J.E. Księdza Biskupa Dra Stanisława Okoniewskiego, Biskupa Chełmińskiego* (Pelplin: Nakładem Seminarjum Duchownego, 1936), pp. 18–19.

¹⁵ Ibidem, p. 18: “Windelband, Rickert, Scheler conclude that there is a world of eternal values of truth, goodness and beauty, similar to Plato’s world of divine ideas, and that the world of eternal values has its ontological basis in the divine being who is, at the same time, an absolute being and the One of all values.”

¹⁶ F. Sawicki, “Poznanie wartości,” p. 182.

cognition. Sawicki notes that the irrational theory refers to thinking that is “not purely irrational. Such thinking has its logic, but it is a separate logic; a logic that does not consist in intellectual, but emotional obviousness, and that does not declare an objective reality, but a reality which is desired and dreamed about.”¹⁷ The intellectual theory emphasizes the act of reason in learning about values. Human intellect gets to know the values just like other subjects, and feelings only respond to that knowledge. Sawicki searches for his own solution, saying that, on the one hand, intellect is “able to get to know the values on its own,” and, on the other hand, “intellect does not learn about values without the proper emotional experience.”¹⁸ Sawicki postulates an integral approach to the man’s cognitive powers in which the intellect, will and feelings constitute a certain whole, the elements of which cannot be isolated and opposed to one another. The mind influences emotions, and emotions influence intellectual cognition, which, in the case of values, is obvious.¹⁹ In such a perspective, Sawicki writes: “Using the emotional experience, the mind creates notions and value judgments that permeate and enlighten emotional life. This way, what originally was irrational, gradually takes up a relatively rational shape.”²⁰

Paweł Siwek SJ (1893–1986) discussed axiology in an article published in 1938, entitled *Problem wartości* [*The Problem of Value*], in which he tried to work out his own opinion on this issue. He concluded that value is the central problem of philosophy. For Siwek, value is the formal reason for goodness which, in its essence, is indefinable: “value seems to be something most general; something basic; something original.”²¹ That is why the term “value” cannot be reduced to *genus proprium*, understood as something more general and original. Siwek extends the ability to experience values related to feeling pleasure or sorrow to the world of animals as creatures provided with sensual life. It is, because, in metaphysical terms, “value is what matches the immanent finalism of a living being.”²² According to Siwek, such

¹⁷ Ibidem, p. 184.

¹⁸ Ibidem, p. 186.

¹⁹ “A feeling has a certain cognitive function as compared to values.” Ibidem, p. 191.

²⁰ Ibidem, p. 193.

²¹ P. Siwek, “Problem wartości,” *Przegląd Filozoficzny* 41, nr 1 (1938), p. 77.

²² Ibidem, p. 80.

immanent finalism has three basic classes: vegetative, sensual and intellectual, which is why three groups of values exist. The third one is typical of people who are able to get to know goodness as such and thus can capture all the groups of values. Also, in people, the will discovers values as the object of its love. The values discovered by the man are always characterized by a form of imperfection, limitation; they all include something “non-valuable,” which is where the expression “mixed values” come from. A pure, “non-mixed value,” does not exist in the world of actual experience, but in the reality that is necessary and not subject to time and space conditions, i.e. in God.²³ According to Siwek, God of philosophy is pure, non-mixed value. “Only in Him the formal reason for goodness (value) matches the subject that has a value (in its perfect identity).”²⁴ All other values are relative, and calling some of them absolute is not entirely proper, as they are absolutely necessary to achieve the absolute value, i.e. God. Therefore, for the Polish Jesuit, the purposefulness and immanent character of human nature are the basis for thinking about values, because outside those categories it is impossible to speak about values.

Fr. Władysław Wicher (1888–1969), in his handbook: *Podstawy teologii moralnej* [*The Foundations of Moral Theology*], in the chapter related to human acts, synthetically discussed axiological concepts related to moral value. For him, moral value is “moral content,” and the counterpart of “value” in the language of scholasticism was “goodness.”²⁵ There is no doubt that his interest in axiology exerted some influence on his students who included Wojtyła and Ślipko.

While summarizing the first period of the reception of axiology in Polish Christian thought, we have to note that the first authors who wrote about axiology and the philosophy of value carried out introductory reconstructions, ordered and classified theories, and formulated working propositions, indicating other possibilities of reinforcing values than those that appeared in the works of axiologists. It is worth noting that Polish thinkers quickly registered new trends in the European philosophy. In terms of axiology, their most important authorities included Scheler and the supporters of neo-Kantianism.

²³ Ibidem, pp. 82–83.

²⁴ Ibidem, p. 83.

²⁵ W. Wicher, *Podstawy teologii moralnej* (Poznań–Warszawa–Lublin: Księgarnia św. Wojciecha, 1969), p. 225.

The above-mentioned Christian philosophers mainly interpreted values in the perspective of neo-scholastic ethics and the philosophy of human act, action and behavior. We may get the impression that they focused more on a fashionable word than on a philosophical category, which was reflected in a naive identification of values and traditionally perceived goodness. At that time, it was difficult to speak about a form of Christian axiology. Rather, it was learning a new terminology and getting accustomed to the issues generated by axiological disputes. Nevertheless, the role of those innovative works was very important.

AXIOLOGY AND THOMIST PHILOSOPHY

Critical reconstruction (with the elements of naive translation)

Thinkers supporting this approach made the effort of conducting a reliable and critical reconstruction of axiological opinions, and they often adopted naive translations in which they made doubtful assumptions that goodness = value. In this way, they changed the words from the vocabulary of the classical tradition, such as goodness or virtue, into values, i.e. they took over the word and not the philosophical category. This is a creative continuation of the approach adopted in the previous period. Such critical reconstructors of axiology in ethics include Fr. Karol Wojtyła (1920–2005) who studied the critical analysis of Scheler's axiological ethics in the context of Christian ethics, or Tadeusz Biesaga SDB (1950–), who dealt with the critical reconstruction of the foundations of Hildebrand's axiological ethics.²⁶ For Wojtyła, the ethics of Scheler's values is generally unsuitable for building the system of Christian ethics, but it can be helpful in analyzing "ethical facts in the phenomenal and experimental aspect."²⁷ According to Wojtyła, the ethics of values must be completed with the order of classical metaphysics and only in such an approach it explains the fact of morality. Nevertheless, it is an element that is necessary for the

²⁶ T. Biesaga, *Dietricha von Hildebranda epistemologiczno-ontologiczne podstawy etyki* (Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL, 1989).

²⁷ K. Wojtyła, "Ocena możliwości zbudowania etyki chrześcijańskiej przy założeniach systemu Maxa Schelera," in idem, *Zagadnienie podmiotu moralności*, eds. T. Styczeń et al. (Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL, 1991), p. 123.

complete analysis of morality carried out in moral theology. In *Elementarz etyczny* [*Ethical Primer*], he wrote that “Christian ethics teaches the man how he can and should give his actions the value of objective goodness ... The man’s whole moral life is spent on experiencing values; it is from them that such life derives its colors, if we can put it this way.”²⁸ And, in the spirit of Thomist solutions, Wojtyła connected values in the ontological sense with truth and goodness. Fr. Stanisław Kamiński (1919–1986) suggested an important and impressive arrangement of various concepts and theories of value, contributing much to the methodology of axiology.²⁹ Many critical, interesting comments to the phenomenologically justified ethics of values and to the concept of moral experience developed within this approach were formulated by Tadeusz Styczeń SDS (1931–2010), who suggested a theory of value based on personal dignity (a dignity-based axiology).³⁰ Feliks Bednarski OP (1911–2006) was close to the naive reception of axiology in classical ethics, as he perceived axiology as a classical Thomist axiology and translational reception of axiology.³¹ Andrzej Szostek MIC (1945–) adopted a similar approach in modernizing the language of classical ethics by introducing the language of values.³² The latter also presented an interesting perception of personalism as a detailed axiologism.

²⁸ Idem, *Elementarz etyczny* (Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL, 1983), p. 73. As the subjective criterion for the hierarchization of values, Wojtyła suggested we should adopt the effort made by the man who tried to fulfil the values. Higher values cost more and, objectively, they contain more goodness.

²⁹ S. Kamiński, “Jak uporządkować rozmaite koncepcje wartości,” in idem, *Jak filozofować? Studia z metodologii filozofii klasycznej*, ed. T. Szubka (Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL, 1989), pp. 293–306.

³⁰ T. Styczeń, “Problem możliwości etyki jako empirycznie uprawomocnionej i ogólnie ważnej teorii moralności. Studium metaetyczne,” in idem, *Etyka niezależna*, ed. K. Krajewski (Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL, 2012), pp. 133–152.

³¹ F.W. Bednarski, “Zasada konstytutywna wartości moralnej w etyce św. Tomasza z Akwinu,” *Studia Philosophiae Christianae* 25, no. 1 (1989), pp. 59–78; idem, “O celowościowym ujmowaniu moralności i norm etycznych,” *Roczniki Filozoficzne* 27, no. 2 (1979), pp. 129–143 (“What the act aims at is the goal of the act, and the goodness that satisfies the actual or seeming need of human life is called value,” p. 133).

³² For example A. Szostek, *Wokół godności, prawdy i miłości. Rozważania etyczne* (Lublin: Redakcja Wydawnictw KUL, 1995), pp. 100–114; idem, “Wokół afirmacji osoby,” *Roczniki Filozoficzne* 32, no. 2 (1984), p. 154ff.

Building realistic axiology

This approach was supported by those philosophers who, without leaving the opinion of Thomism, carried out a more or less radical reinterpretation of the category of value worked out in the contemporary axiology, and built the basis for realistic axiology that are often advanced from the theoretical point of view. The philosophers who formulated their propositions in this spirit included Jerzy Kalinowski (1916–2000)—a deductive model of moral values derived from the scheme of classical metaphysics³³; Adam Rodziński (1920–2014)—the philosophy of culture on the basis of axiology and original contributions to axiological thinking about anthropological and ethical problems in the spirit of relationism³⁴; Antoni Bazyli Stępień (1931–)—aesthetics based on axiology and ordering-critical studies on phenomenological axiology³⁵; Jerzy Gałkowski (1937–)—the application of axiological terminology in the analysis of the phenomenon of work and in the tools of a historian of ethics³⁶; Ewa Podrez (1952–)—critical reconstruction that synthesizes the axiology of selected Polish Thomists, and the creative application of the apparatus of personalist axiology in analyzing the phenomenon of tolerance³⁷;

³³ J. Kalinowski, *Teoria poznania praktycznego* (Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL, 1960); cf. E. Podrez, *Człowiek, byt, wartość. Antropologiczne i metafizyczne podstawy aksjologii chrześcijańskiej* (Warszawa: Instytut Wydawniczy Pax, 1989), pp. 21–32.

³⁴ A. Rodziński, *Na orbitach wartości* (Lublin: Redakcja Wydawnictw KUL, 1998); idem, “O wartościach seksualnych w optyce personalistycznej,” in idem, *Osoba, moralność, kultura* (Lublin: Redakcja Wydawnictw KUL, 1989), pp. 69–78; idem, “O specyficzności wartościowania moralnego” and “O niektórych naturalnych płaszczyznach wartościowania moralnego,” in ibidem, pp. 139–152 and 153–162. Cf. E. Podrez, *Człowiek, byt, wartość*, pp. 32–48.

³⁵ A.B. Stępień, *Propedeutyka estetyki* (Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL, 1986); idem, “Z problematyki doświadczenia wartości,” in idem, *Studia i szkice filozoficzne*, ed. A. Gut, vol. 2 (Lublin: Redakcja Wydawnictw KUL, 2001), pp. 73–83. (“Value—what makes something precious—occurs (appears) as a special kind of feature, rank, dignity, nature of something [the value bearer],” p. 74); idem, “Wprowadzenie do problematyki relacji: metodologia nauk a sfera wartości,” in ibidem, vol. 1, pp. 246–251.

³⁶ J. Gałkowski, *Człowiek, praca, wartości* (Lublin: Wydawnictwo KUL, 2012); idem, *Wolność i wartość. Z podstawowych zagadnień etyki Jana Dunsza Szkota* (Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL, 1993).

³⁷ E. Podrez, *Człowiek, byt, wartość*, op. cit.; eadem, *Moralne uzasadnienie tolerancji. Studium z etyki personalistycznej* (Warszawa: Wydawnictwo ATK, 1999).

Józef Maria Bocheński OP (1902–1995)—indicating three superstitions connected with the concept of value: mixing value with valuation, accepting the historical changeability of value, and the relativity of values³⁸; Fr. Stanisław Kowalczyk (1932–)—eclectically built personalist axiology and naive translation of goodness into value which, in many texts of this author, plays a creative role aimed at the popularization and communication of these ideas.³⁹

Tadeusz Ślipko SJ (1918–2015)⁴⁰ probably built the most consistent and, at the same time, original system of Christian axiology based on Thomism. As a representative of traditional Thomism, he suggested axiological basis for classical ethics, although his unique way of understanding values departs from any axiologies called “idealistic” by Thomists. Ślipko was not so much interested in values as such, as in moral values. He wrote: “The term expresses the entirety of the states of our moral conscience. The subject of those states are the general ideals of the man’s moral behavior, such as justice, faithfulness, truthfulness, courage, or love. Also, the term may imply the opposites of those elements in the form of so-called anti-values, e.g. injustice, treason, lie, cowardice or hatred.”⁴¹ In his opinion, values are the data of a moral experience, and not a theoretical construct; they belong to the real world and seem to be transsubjective, unequalled ideals of moral

³⁸ J.M. Bocheński, *Sto zabobonów. Krótki filozoficzny słownik zabobonów* (Paryż: Instytut Literacki, 1987), pp. 111–112.

³⁹ S. Kowalczyk, *Podstawy światopoglądu chrześcijańskiego* (Warszawa: Ośrodek Dokumentacji i Studiów Społecznych, 1980), pp. 141–261; idem, *Człowiek w poszukiwaniu wartości. Elementy aksjologii personalistycznej* (Lublin: Wydawnictwo KUL, 2006); idem, *Kim jest człowiek?* (Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Wrocławskiej Księgarni Archidiecezjalnej, 1992), pp. 105–112. In this book we read, i.a. “Nature is not enough for a thinking and free person, so the person creates the world of culture. Culture is created by different types of values, especially higher values: truth, goodness, beauty and religious life ... Value is a specific quality of being studied in relation to the man who is gaining knowledge and making choices” (p. 105). And: “Value is also specified as: goodness, meaning, objective, perfection, idea, profit, etc.” (p. 106).

⁴⁰ An interesting study of Fr. Ślipko’s axiology was written by Piotr Duchliński: “Od fenomenologii do metafizyki wartości. Aksjologia tomistyczna Tadeusza Ślipko,” in *Życie etycznie – życie etyką. Prace dedykowane Ks. Prof. Tadeuszowi Ślipko SJ z okazji 90-lecia urodzin*, ed. R. Janusz (Kraków: Wyższa Szkoła Filozoficzno-Pedagogiczna Ignatianum; Wydawnictwo WAM, 2009), pp. 77–106. The author emphasizes a strongly theist, personalist and perfectionist nature of the axiology by Fr. Ślipko.

⁴¹ T. Ślipko, *Zarys etyki ogólnej* (Kraków: Wydawnictwo WAM, 1984), p. 167.

action that are common, socially reinforced and pertaining to the awareness of each man.⁴² Thus, moral values are ideal models, patterns of behavior, norms, prototypes of humanity, forms calling for the achievement of perfection (“be a complete person”) which is possible but never reaches its highest level in man. While making the man perfect, values indicate the way of fulfilling the objectives (“model causality,” “eidetic models”); they are absolute and unchanging. Searching for the constitutive principle of moral values perceived this way, Ślipko finds it in the nature of a person understood integrally and ordered in a purposeful manner.⁴³ This principle specifies the objective content of moral values, establishing the ideal model of the perfection of the man as a person, and, at the same time, it respects the dignity of a person as being towards (*esse ad*) the fulfilment of one’s personal perfection.⁴⁴ In the order of being, the foundation of values is the reasonable nature of the man, which is constituted by the free subjectivity of a person and his/her dignity.⁴⁵ However, the immanent order, in which the previous arrangements worked, has to be placed within the transcendent order as the ultimate principium. The prototype of human perfection is contained in God. This is a clearly an Augustinian intuition. The issue of the conflict of values, abundantly represented in the scientific heritage of Ślipko, is solved by the ethicist through the introduction of the principle of coordination of values and their hierarchization that regulates all their mutual references on the level of absolute values (and there is no axiological conflict here) and not the actual action of the man who follows the values (and through wrong interpreting and ranking them, which generates conflicts).⁴⁶ Ślipko also understands natural law in the axiological perspective.⁴⁷ Roman Darowski SJ (1935–2017) was right to call Ślipko’s ethics

⁴² Ibidem, p. 169.

⁴³ Ibidem, pp. 196ff.

⁴⁴ R. Darowski, “Charakterystyka twórczości naukowej Tadeusza Ślipki SJ,” in *Życie etyczne – życie etyką*, p. 67.

⁴⁵ Ibidem, p. 68.

⁴⁶ T. Ślipko, *Zarys etyki ogólnej*, pp. 206–222. Cf. P. Aszyk, *Konflikty moralne a etyka* (Kraków: Wydawnictwo WAM, 1998). Author, a student of Fr. Ślipko, worked out an interesting proposition on the basis of the theory that is being discussed.

⁴⁷ Ibidem, pp. 253–264, 273. He wrote: “... in its scope, natural law is located within the frames of the world of values which permeate that law with their axiological content” (p. 256).

an “axionomical version” of Christian ethics.⁴⁸ It is because, in this case, we are not dealing with the typical teleologically oriented eudaimonist ethics, but with its radically axiological reinterpretation.

Mieczysław Gogacz (1926–), the author of the so-called consequent Thomism, took a slightly different direction although he also built Thomist axiology. He wrote: “Briefly speaking, value is the recognition of a being as goodness for us. And, more precisely, such goodness is, for us, the basis for recognizing something as value.”⁴⁹ And, in another fragment: “value is lasting of the causal effect in the man through basic relations connecting him with people, when, by his understanding and decision, the man cares for maintaining those relations as the goal and task. Thus, value is what has been recognized and accepted, and what lasts.”⁵⁰ For a person, what is valuable are the relations with the being who is good for him/her; thus, value is the lasting of this relation: “value is the lasting of a relation when we recognize it as valuable for us and we want to remain in this.”⁵¹ Thus, values have to be cared for, cherished, and maintained with the actions of the intellect and will. Gogacz does not connect values with the perception of the transcendental features of a being, but he indicates real relations, so he locates values in the area of an interpersonal being and not cognition. Those valuable relations include being with persons, cherishing personal relations—they constitute a “house of people,” “an atmosphere of a person.” Values are neither an independent nor a dependent being; they are not relations, but the lasting of relations, as we want to cherish and stay in a given relation; relations are the causes for values.⁵² The man lives in the world of people and not values. Gogacz definitely rejects the perception of values as unattainable ideals (cf. the concept of Ślipko), claiming that, in upbringing, we should direct the person towards people and not towards models and ideals, because the latter cannot be attained so they only

⁴⁸ R. Darowski, “Charakterystyka twórczości naukowej Tadeusza Ślipki SJ,” p. 61. Ślipko himself called his ethics “axiodeontological.”

⁴⁹ M. Gogacz, *Elementarz metafizyki* (Warszawa: Akademia Teologii Katolickiej, 1987), p. 126.

⁵⁰ Idem, *Ku etyce chronienia osób. Wokół podstaw etyki* (Warszawa: Pallottinum, 1991), p. 94.

⁵¹ Ibidem, pp. 94, 178.

⁵² Ibidem, p. 178 (“value is the lasting of relations as we recognize it as valuable for us and we want to remain in this”).

leave the man with the sense of unfulfilled goals. According to Gogacz, this is the way of functioning of idealistic pedagogy which makes the man subject to thinking, ideas, models, etc.⁵³ Personal relations are characterized by diversity and the same refers to values. However, it is important to elicit the most important among such relations: love, faith and hope. These basic interpersonal relations are, according to Gogacz, the starting point for building ethics:

The objective of ethics is building rules that facilitate metanoia, so that the man—serving another man with truth and goodness, which are transcendental properties of a person, arousing faith and hope, and, due to the man's existence, arousing love—can, through his understandings and improvements in rational decisions, make hope, faith and love last among people.⁵⁴

Meanwhile, in idealistic axiology, values are “artificial thinking composites” that locate the man in a dream.⁵⁵ Gogacz's understanding of values seems to match the traditionally understood perfectionism, so it annuls the axiological breakthrough in perceiving values. After the concept of Ślipko, this is the second theory of realistically understood values that was created by a Polish neo-Thomist.

Mieczysław Albert Krąpiec OP (1921–2008) had an ambivalent approach to axiology and the category of “value.” On the one hand, he often discussed the philosophy of value and located it within metaphysics, and, on the other hand, he definitely warned us against thinking according to values. First of all, he emphasized that the category of value started functioning in philosophy on the basis of Kant's division of the order of *sein* from *sollen*. This way, the order of duty became the area of values to be fulfilled by the man, and the value as such became the “correlate of an intentional act of will.”⁵⁶ Values do not exist; they have to be fulfilled. In his late texts, Krąpiec wrote:

⁵³ Ibidem, pp. 90–91; idem, *Podstawy wychowania* (Niepokalanów: Wydawnictwo Ojców Franciszkanów, 1993): “Values as intellectual compositions result from idealism in culture and locate us in idealism, i.e. in thinking that ignores real persons. That is why we contrast wisdom with values” (p. 37).

⁵⁴ Ibidem, pp. 98–99.

⁵⁵ Idem, *Osoba zadaniem pedagogiki. Wykłady bydgoskie* (Warszawa: Oficyna Wydawnicza “Nawo”, 1997), pp. 50–51.

⁵⁶ M.A. Krąpiec, “Filozofia bytu a zagadnienie wartości,” in idem, *Odzyskać świat realny* (Lublin: Redakcja Wydawnictw KUL, 1999), p. 261.

“This is the basis of a huge mistake. Today we live in the so-called theory of the culture of values, but this is an enormous misunderstanding. This is introducing subjectivism to human objectivism.”⁵⁷ It is better to speak about truth and goodness than about values. In his earlier texts, Krąpiec tried to assimilate “value” with the language of Thomism, noticing its rich tradition in classical thought.⁵⁸

In his opinion, moral duty is reading the necessity to fulfill one’s personal potential on this path.⁵⁹ Values are assigned to the achievement of the man’s *optimum potentiae*. Krąpiec even interpreted St. Thomas’ aretology as “a great theory of personal values.”⁶⁰ He was for restoring value (*sollen*) to the order of being (*sein*), trying to overcome Kant’s dichotomy and perceive values as the area of human action in which man dynamically fulfils his potential. His metaphysical understanding of values is reflected in the following definition: “a being that is given a quality and that really exists (in various forms of nature and culture) as the object of our intentional cognitive and desired acts, takes up the name of a value.”⁶¹ Values seem to be real qualities of a being, registered by the powers of cognition and desire. Axiology is included in the theory of being.⁶² In his later texts, Krąpiec definitely departed from using the term “value.” He said that, in classical philosophy, we do not use the term “value” to express being as

⁵⁷ *O etyce. Z ojcem prof. Mieczysławem A. Krąpcem rozmawia Piotr Jaroszyński* (Lublin: Polskie Towarzystwo Tomasza z Akwinu, 2014), pp. 117–118.

⁵⁸ M.A. Krąpiec, “Człowiek i wartości,” in idem, *Człowiek – kultura – uniwersytet*, selected and edited by A. Wawrzyniak (Lublin: Redakcja Wydawnictw KUL, 1982), p. 43.

⁵⁹ *Ibidem*, p. 45: “The nature of a complex being, which is updated through the fulfilment of its potential, is the ratio of real, specific moral duties.” Cf. idem, *Człowiek i prawo naturalne* (Lublin: Redakcja Wydawnictw KUL, 1993), p. 44: “That state of being, which is to occur in proper conditions, already is an intellectually perceived value, which can be expressed in a normative sentence that also refers to reality in its dynamic aspect, interpreted in transcendentalizing cognition.”

⁶⁰ *Ibidem*, p. 54.

⁶¹ M.A. Krąpiec, “Kultura i wartość,” in idem, *Człowiek – kultura – uniwersytet*, p. 122. “Value is the quality of being, provided that a being is the subject of intentional acts of cognition and desire” (idem, “Filozofia bytu a zagadnienie wartości,” p. 262).

⁶² Idem, “Filozofia bytu a zagadnienie wartości,” p. 265: “Thus, theory of values suggests that the theory of being is more original, not only in the ontic, but also in epistemological aspect.”

the object of desire; the object of desire is “goodness.”⁶³ In his opinion, axiology is irreversibly marked with subjectivism and cognitive apriorism, and Thomists who use the name “value” are unaware of the fact that they “subjectivize an actually existing reality.”⁶⁴ At the beginning of 1990s, the scholars broadly discussed the issue of Christian values with regard to the project of the new constitution, and the text of Andrzej Bronk SVD (1938–) is a very interesting voice in the context of Christian philosophy.⁶⁵

Isolationism and the radical rejection of axiology

Indicating the idealistic origin of the category of value, some Thomists negate the meaning and the point of using axiological categories in classical philosophy. The representatives of such approach include Piotr Jaroszyński (1955–) and Henryk Kiereś (1943–). The former indicates that superseding beauty by aesthetical and artistic values has far-reaching cultural consequences, such as exposing ugliness in modern art or replacing mimetic relations with mythosophical thinking, which finally leads to decadence.⁶⁶ Jaroszyński notes: “identifying beauty with aesthetic value is not a neutral, purely terminological act, but it modifies the perception of beauty in a certain manner.”⁶⁷ The author emphasizes that the common meaning of the word “value” does not match its technical meanings in axiology. The latter has the aspect of opposing being and nature, which results in breaking culture from the existential relation with reality. This leads to the destruction of truth, goodness and beauty. For Jaroszyński, the problem of values is a pseudo-problem because there is no such thing

⁶³ Idem, “Wartość,” in *Powszechna encyklopedia filozofii*, www.ptta.pl/pef/pdf/w/wartość.pdf [access: 12.01.2018].

⁶⁴ Ibidem. Here, we also read: “The word ‘value’ became a buzzword in the modern culture, especially in the area of ethics separated from the sources of understanding being and goodness. In cognition, the separation from the actually existing reality builds the foundations of cognition and interpersonal communication.”

⁶⁵ A. Bronk, “Wartości chrześcijańskie (uwagi amatora),” in idem, *Zrozumieć świat współczesny* (Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL, 1998), pp. 179–202.

⁶⁶ P. Jaroszyński, “Piękno czy wartość?” in *Poznanie bytu czy ustalanie sensów?*, eds. A. Maryniarczyk, M.J. Gondek (Lublin: Polskie Towarzystwo Tomasza z Akwinu, 1999), pp. 183–187.

⁶⁷ Idem, *Spór o piękno* (Poznań: Wydawnictwo Fonopol, 1992), p. 88.

as values, and introducing that concept into culture leads to its destruction and intellectual chaos.⁶⁸ Kiereś says that replacing beauty with values leads to relativism in aesthetics and to anti-aesthetics. Values as ideals are a derivative of the a priori concept of reality (thus, also art), pushing us into the wilderness of idealism.⁶⁹ Zofia Józefa Zdybicka USJK (1928–) also protested against replacing the concept of God with the value of *sacrum*. She indicated far-reaching consequences of such a replacement, not only in the philosophical, but also in the existential aspect.⁷⁰ It is worth mentioning that, in her earlier works, she often used axiological terminology with reference to the analysis of philosophical issues related to religion, treating “value” as a term mainly understood in the colloquial sense, without the awareness of the meanings the notion carries with itself.⁷¹

AXIOLOGY AND NON-SCHOLASTIC CHRISTIAN PHILOSOPHY

Phenomenological approach

Roman Ingarden (1893–1970), one of the greatest Polish thinkers, created a strong group of phenomenologists in Poland. Many of his students and followers were inspired by Christianity, and some of them directly declared that they practiced Christian philosophy. Sometimes, thinking according to values became their basis for philosophizing. In the perspective of values, Władysław Stróżewski (1933–) presented the analyses of such phenomena as the work of art, the man (axiological structure of the man),⁷² love, authority, patriotism, etc.⁷³ Also, he built an interesting concept of values in the perspective of the classical

⁶⁸ Idem, “Spór o wartości: spór czy pseudospór?” *Człowiek w Kulturze* 2 (1994), pp. 43–49.

⁶⁹ *O sztuce. Z ojcem prof. Mieczysławem A. Krąpcem rozmawia Henryk Kiereś* (Lublin: Polskie Towarzystwo Tomasza z Akwinu, 2012), pp. 103–108.

⁷⁰ Z.J. Zdybicka, “Bóg czy Sacrum?” in *Poznanie bytu czy ustalanie sensów?*, pp. 189–217.

⁷¹ Idem, *Religia i religioznawstwo* (Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL, 1988), pp. 159–198.

⁷² W. Stróżewski, *O wielkości. Szkice z filozofii człowieka* (Kraków: Znak, 2002), pp. 28–64, 108–132.

⁷³ Idem, *W kręgu wartości* (Kraków: Znak, 1992); idem, *Wokół piękna. Szkice z estetyki* (Kraków: Universitas, 2002).

theory of transcendentals.⁷⁴ In his opinion, man may only create the conditions for the appearance *in reale* of ideal values as their actual analogates.⁷⁵ He dedicated many of his original works to the issue of the value of beauty, perceiving them as *arche* of all the values; the source and principle of all the systems of values.⁷⁶ Karol Tarnowski (1937–) analyzed religious faith and related issues in axiological perspective.⁷⁷ Also, in many of his texts he dealt with theoretical problems related to values, discussing for and against the axiological approach to analyzed problems in philosophy.⁷⁸ Marian Grabowski (1951–) used axiological tools to analyze the phenomenon of moral guilt, love, and, in his original philosophical concept, philosophical exegesis of Biblical texts.⁷⁹ Jan Galarowicz (1949–), in the books popularizing philosophy, consistently uses the terminology and the way of thinking that is typical of axiology, although taking into account personalism, mainly that suggested by Karol Wojtyła. He reconstructed the classical ethics of values (Scheler, Hartmann, Hildebrand and Ingarden) in the two-volume book entitled *W drodze do etyki odpowiedzialności* [*On the Way to the Ethics of Responsibility*].⁸⁰ It is particularly worth noting his studies collected in the volume *Powrót do wartości* [*Return to Values*], in which he works out many interesting and inspiring perceptions of values and their application in various areas of human existence (e.g. axiology of the house), and he orders the previously elaborated concepts and theories of values.⁸¹

⁷⁴ Idem, *Istnienie i wartość* (Kraków: Znak, 1981), especially the chapter “Transcendentalia i wartości” [*Transcendentals and Values*], pp. 11–96.

⁷⁵ Idem, *W kręgu wartości*, pp. 57–75.

⁷⁶ Idem, *Logos, wartość, miłość* (Kraków: Znak, 2013), pp. 64–77.

⁷⁷ K. Tarnowski, *Usłyszeć niewidzialne. Zarys filozofii wiary* (Kraków: Instytut Myśli Józefa Tischnera, 2005).

⁷⁸ Idem, *Pragnienie metafizyczne* (Kraków: Znak, 2017), see especially the part: “Pytanie o wartości” [*Asking about Values*], pp. 161–236; idem, *Człowiek i transcendentja* (Kraków: Znak, 1995), see especially the part “W stronę wartości” [*Towards Values*], pp. 261–359.

⁷⁹ M. Grabowski, *Krajobraz winy. Próba analizy fenomenologicznej* (Toruń: Wydawnictwo UMK, 2001); idem, *Historia upadku. Ku antropologii adekwatnej* (Kraków: Wydawnictwo WAM, 2011).

⁸⁰ J. Galarowicz, *W drodze do etyki odpowiedzialności*, vol. 1–2 (Kraków: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PAT, 1997–1998).

⁸¹ Idem, *Powrót do wartości* (Kraków: Petrus, 2011); idem, *Nowy elementarz etyczny* (Kraków: Petrus, 2011).

Andrzej Półtawski (1923–) dedicated several original studies to the theory of moral values. He found their basis in the person's dignity, and he perceived human existence as moral becoming. The man's position in the world is central and entirely distinguished. Reason and freedom are the conditions necessary for the fulfillment of moral values. Półtawski analyzed the placement of moral values between ontology and metaphysics in Ingarden's works, and he built the basis for the axiologically founded philosophy of culture.⁸² Fr. Antoni Siemianowski (1930–) consistently based all his analyses—both ethical and anthropological—on axiological thinking. He considered the issue of values in theory and life, discovering values, their history and nature, man in the world of values, and the forms of his participation in the world of axiological values. His thinking in the approach of realistic phenomenology shows the adequacy of the language of values on the basis of philosophy. Freedom, love, sexuality, faithfulness, responsibility, justice, tolerance, politics and business—Siemianowski describes all of these with the language of value; he explains it is the axiological perspective, pointing also to the normative sphere based on values. He particularly emphasizes the relation between value and freedom—in the world of freedom the man is free, and freedom gains its deepest meaning in and through values.⁸³ Jakub Gorczyca SJ (1950–) carried out a critical reconstruction of the category *Wertantwort* being the axis of Hildebrand's axiology.⁸⁴ He also used the axiological perspective in his version of fundamental ethics.⁸⁵ Fr. Władysław Zuziak (1952–) included thinking according to values

⁸² A. Półtawski, *Realizm fenomenologii. Husserl – Ingarden – Stein. Odczyty i rozprawy* (Toruń: Wydawnictwo Rolewski, 2001), pp. 53–83; idem, *Po co filozofować? Ingarden – Wojtyła – skąd i dokąd?* (Warszawa: Oficyna Naukowa, 2011), pp. 387–426.

⁸³ A. Siemianowski, *Człowiek a świat wartości* (Poznań: Wydawnictwo Wydziału Teologicznego UAM, 2015); idem, *Wokół etyki wartości* (Poznań: Wydawnictwo Wydziału Teologicznego UAM, 2014); idem, *Szkice z etyki wartości* (Gniezno: Gaudentinum, 2006); idem, *Zrozumieć miłość. Fenomenologia i metafizyka miłości* (Bydgoszcz: Labirynt, 1998).

⁸⁴ J. Gorczyca, *Il valore e la risposta dell'uomo. Capisaldi del pensiero filosofico di Dietrich von Hildebrand* (Roma: Pontificia Università Gregoriana, 1984); idem, "Dietricha von Hildebranda koncepcja poznania wartości moralnych," *Analecta Cracoviensia* 19 (1987), pp. 427–439.

⁸⁵ Idem, *Zarys etyki fundamentalnej. Być dla drugiego* (Kraków: Wydawnictwo WAM, 2014).

into his analyses concerning social ethics, and he made Polish philosophical thought more familiar with the axiology of Louis Lavelle, showing its attractiveness in the context of the diagnose of the post-modern crisis of values.⁸⁶

In his works, Tadeusz Gadacz (1955–) often refers to axiology and explores the meaning of values important for the man that constitute a specific *ethos* understood as the man's living environment.⁸⁷ Krzysztof Stachewicz (1966–) performed an axiological reinterpretation of the classical version of the ethics of natural law, indicating that its foundations are respected in radically different theoretical coordinates by the ethics of values, and that they better match the data of a moral experience.⁸⁸ In another fragment he noticed that, while the axiological basis of ethics functions within the phenomenology of morality quite well, in order to build integral fundamental ethics we also need metaphysics, and here axiology is no longer useful and we have to reach for the category of being, existing.⁸⁹ In his numerous studies and articles, Stachewicz indicates many limitations of the category "value" which is often applied in ethics in a naive manner.⁹⁰

In 1982, Fr. Józef Tischner (1931–2000), a student of Ingarden and one of the first firm critics of Thomism in Polish Christian thought, published a book entitled *Myślenie według wartości* [*Thinking According to Values*]. The axiological perspective was also characteristic of the previous analyses of Tischner, but in the above-mentioned book it took the full shape. He wrote: "In order to act properly in this

⁸⁶ W. Zuziak, *Społeczne perspektywy etyki* (Kraków: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PAT, 2006); idem, *Aksjologia Louisa Lavelle'a wobec ponowoczesnego kryzysu wartości* (Kraków: Wydawnictwo WAM, 2012).

⁸⁷ T. Gadacz, *O umiejętności życia* (Kraków: Znak, 2002); idem, *O ulotności życia* (Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Iskry, 2008); idem, *O zmienności życia* (Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Iskry, 2013).

⁸⁸ K. Stachewicz, *W poszukiwaniu podstaw moralności. Tomistyczna etyka prawa naturalnego a etyka wartości Dietricha von Hildebranda* (Kraków: Universitas, 2001).

⁸⁹ Idem, *Problem ugruntowania moralności. Studium z etyki fundamentalnej* (Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe "Semper", 2006).

⁹⁰ Idem, *Żyć i rozumieć. Szkice o człowieku i moralności* (Poznań: Wydawnictwo Wydziału Teologicznego UAM, 2013). Especially the chapters: "O wartościach. Kilka uwag filozofa" [Several Remarks on Values by a Philosopher], pp. 292–303; "Czy wartości są fundamentem moralności i etyki?" [Are Values the Foundation for Morality and Ethics?], pp. 304–323.

small world of ours, we have to be able to read values.”⁹¹ The world without values is not the world of man, so axiology is the optimum perspective in which we can understand the reality of the man, life and the world. Hope, freedom, man’s development, encounter with God, death, melancholy, work, experiencing beauty, levels of human relations—Tischner described these phenomena using axiological instruments. He worked out an interesting concept of the “axiological ‘I’” understood as an “irreal” value existing along with objective values.⁹² Values constitute the score of human existence. In *Etyka wartości i nadziei* [*The Ethics of Values and Hope*], Tischner appreciated the personalist moment, indicating that value includes another person, myself and various aspects of the relation between people.⁹³ He noticed that the original source of moral experience is not the experience of value, but discovering another man, his presence; the encounter with him.⁹⁴ Such appreciation of another person and a strong inspiration by the thought of Lévinas led Tischner to the clear shift from axiology to agathology. Agathological experience shows that, at the actual level, it is not the way it should be—that there is a certain illusion in the world. This experience opens the axiological aspect in the light of which the man searches for a compensation—for a way of counteracting what should not take place. Tischner stopped asking about the way values exist, and he started to explore the way man exists in relation to values. The ontology of values or goodness was becoming alien to him. Goodness does not ask me to accept its existence; it asks me to give bread to the hungry man. In his later texts, Tischner stopped using the language of values, looking for the fundamental category of human existence: drama. He even started to indicate the threats of axiological rhetoric—in *Spór o istnienie człowieka* [*The Dispute over the Existence of Man*] he shows the threat of the objectification of goodness in values; its anesthetization.⁹⁵ His distance to values

⁹¹ J. Tischner, *Myślenie według wartości* (Kraków: Znak, 1982), p. 483.

⁹² Idem, *Świat ludzkiej nadziei. Wybór szkiców filozoficznych 1966–1975* (Kraków, Znak, 1975), pp. 162–182.

⁹³ Idem, “Etyka wartości i nadziei,” in D. von Hildebrand, J. Tischner, J. Paściak, J.A. Kłoczowski, *Wobec wartości* (Poznań: W drodze, 1982), p. 52. In *Myślenie według wartości* he wrote: “The key to axiology is the encounter with another man” (p. 489).

⁹⁴ Idem, “Etyka wartości i nadziei,” p. 85.

⁹⁵ Idem, *Spór o istnienie człowieka* (Kraków: Znak, 1998), p. 177.

was also expressed in Tischner's sarcastic question-lecture: "Today even Christians defend Christian values. However, St. Paul did not do anything of the kind. Does it mean that Christian values were unknown to him?"⁹⁶ The evolution of Tischner's thought, from thinking according to values to distancing to such thinking, is a very interesting process worthy of a separate long article.⁹⁷ Anyway, the contribution of this thinker into the Polish Christian axiology of the phenomenological and dialogic approach is unquestionable.

Scientist-analytic approach and axiological applications in the Christian philosophy of education, society and literature

Bolesław Gawecki (1889–1984), who was close to Thomism and analytic thinking, referred to axiological terminology while building the basis of his philosophy.⁹⁸ And Andrzej Grzegorzczak (1922–2014), a logician and philosopher close to the Christian thought, in his analysis of human action and moral behaviors, often referred to the experience of value.⁹⁹ He built his concept of ethics on the basis of values understood in the spirit of psychologism.¹⁰⁰ Fr. Zygmunt Hajduk (1935–) and Agnieszka Lekka-Kowalik (1959–) have built original concepts of the axiology of science.¹⁰¹ The issue of values in the context

⁹⁶ Idem, "Tajemnica kilku pojęć teatralnych," *Tygodnik Powszechny* of 11 May 2008, p. 24.

⁹⁷ K. Stachewicz, "Józefa Tischnera myślenie według czy przeciw wartościom?" in idem, *Życie i rozumieć. Szkice o człowieku i moralności*, pp. 336–348.

⁹⁸ For example B.J. Gawecki, *Filozofia rozwoju. Zarys stanowiska filozoficznego* (Warszawa: Instytut Wydawniczy Pax, 1967), pp. 28–34. He wrote: "A value is a feature ascribed to an object by a subject or a group of subjects if that feature makes the object directly or indirectly desired in aiming at a particular goal" (p. 31).

⁹⁹ For example A. Grzegorzczak, *Mała propedeutyka filozofii naukowej* (Warszawa: Instytut Wydawniczy Pax, 1989), pp. 50–60. "The whole energy of human behavior flows from experiencing values" (p. 51). The author treats "values" as the synonyms of "goods."

¹⁰⁰ Idem, *Etyka w doświadczeniu wewnętrznym* (Warszawa: Instytut Wydawniczy Pax, 1989). According to the author, moral values are spiritual values of interpersonal relations and they are especially expressed through respect, justice and kindness (pp. 138ff.). Cf. also: idem, *Filozofia czasu próby* (Warszawa: Instytut Wydawniczy Pax, 1984).

¹⁰¹ Z. Hajduk, *Nauka a wartości. Aksjologia nauki. Aksjologia epistemiczna* (Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL, 2008); A. Lekka-Kowalik, *Odkrywanie aksjologicznego wymiaru nauki* (Lublin: Wydawnictwo KUL, 2008).

of natural sciences has often been discussed by Fr. Michał Heller (1936–), who, while considering the relation between values and empirical disciplines, has analyzed the axiological foundation of rationality and methodological options,¹⁰² and has built an interesting axiology of scientific work.¹⁰³

It is also worth mentioning the development of axiology or operationalization of its categories in the areas that are not related to philosophy so tightly, but clearly refer to it. We do not have enough space to, at least briefly, analyze the approaches that are sometimes very interesting, so let us only mention particularly important researchers, indicating in footnotes their example texts: Andrzej Tyszczyk (1955–)—the philosophy of literature,¹⁰⁴ Fr. Marian Nowak (1955–)—the philosophy of education and philosophical foundations of pedagogy,¹⁰⁵ Leon Dyczewski OFMConv (1936–2016)—the philosophy of culture, society and mass-media,¹⁰⁶ Fr. Marek Dziewiecki (1954–)—psychology, theory of education,¹⁰⁷ Fr. Janusz Mariański (1940–)—the philosophy of society and the philosophical foundations of sociology,¹⁰⁸ Fr. Kazimierz Popielski (1935–)—humanist psychology and logotherapy.¹⁰⁹ There are many other names that could

¹⁰² M. Heller, *Granice nauki* (Kraków: Copernicus Center Press, 2014), especially the chapter “Nauka i wartości” [*Science and Values*], pp. 149–190.

¹⁰³ Idem, *Jak być uczonym*, selected and edited by M. Szczerbińska-Polak (Kraków: Znak, 2009); idem, *Moralność myślenia* (Kraków: Copernicus Center Press, 2015), pp. 27–42.

¹⁰⁴ A. Tyszczyk, *Estetyczne i metafizyczne aspekty aksjologii literackiej Romana Ingardena* (Lublin: Redakcja Wydawnictw KUL, 1993); idem, *Od strony wartości. Studia z pogranicza teorii literatury i estetyki* (Lublin: Wydawnictwo KUL, 2007).

¹⁰⁵ M. Nowak, *Teorie i koncepcje wychowania* (Warszawa: Wydawnictwa Akademickie i Profesjonalne, 2008); idem, “Pedagogika personalistyczna,” in *Pedagogika*, vol. 1, eds. Z. Kwieciński, B. Śliwerski (Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, 2003), pp. 232–247.

¹⁰⁶ L. Dyczewski, “Wartości kulturowe ważne dla polskiej tożsamości,” in *Tożsamość polska w odmiennych kontekstach*, eds. L. Dyczewski, D. Wadowski (Lublin: Wydawnictwo KUL, 2009) pp. 149–180; idem, *System wartości w świadomości młodego pokolenia* (Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL, 1980).

¹⁰⁷ M. Dziewiecki, *Wychowanie w dobie ponowoczesności* (Kielce: Wydawnictwo Jedność, 2002).

¹⁰⁸ J. Mariański, *Kryzys moralny czy transformacja wartości?* (Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL, 2001).

¹⁰⁹ K. Popielski, *Psychologia egzystencji. Wartości w życiu* (Lublin: Wydawnictwo KUL, 2009); K. Popielski, P. Mamcarz, *Trauma egzystencjalna a wartości* (Warszawa:

be added to this list, and the above-mentioned examples confirm the abundance of creative applications of the axiological heritage in Polish Christian thought.

SUMMARY

The first stage of the reception of axiology in Polish Christian thought only included reconstructing and referring to it, with attempts to reconcile axiology with traditional Christian thought. We should bear in mind that Christian thinkers were subject to very strict norms specified by *ratio studiorum*. Also, many Church environments were overactive in caring for orthodoxy, which suppressed the scholars' originality and willingness to search for new paths also in the Christian philosophy. Roman Darowski SJ wrote: "One of the consequences of such an approach to innovation in philosophy and theology was intentional avoidance of everything that was new and the proclamation of old and safe views only."¹¹⁰ Axiology came from the thought of Kant and Nietzsche who were not close to the scholastic way of thinking. Thus, the references to the philosophy of values, which are positive in the texts of some authors, have to be considered as a sign of their creative approach to Christian thought. The post-conciliar period is characterized by much braver attempts to reconsider ethics in new axiological and not classical (metaphysical) aspects. In Polish Thomism, the approaches of Ślipko and Krąpiec deserve particular attention. We have to emphasize both the creative influence of positive approaches—which gave axiology thinking ideas taken from the classical neo-Kantian, phenomenological or existential axiology, and, in Thomist thought, indicated the new ways of expressing the classical philosophical truths, and the influence of negative approaches to axiology that made it possible to note the weaknesses of the axiological perception of philosophical problems, to indicate

Wydawnictwo Difin, 2015); *Wartości dla życia*, ed. K. Popielski (Lublin: Wydawnictwo KUL, 2008); *Człowiek, wartości, sens. Studia z psychologii egzystencji: logoteoria i nooteoria, logoterapia i nooterapia*, ed. K. Popielski (Lublin: Redakcja Wydawnictw KUL, 1996).

¹¹⁰ R. Darowski, *Filozofia jezuitów w Polsce XX wieku. Próba syntezy – słownik autorów* (Kraków: Wyższa Szkoła Filozoficzno-Pedagogiczna Ignatianum; Wydawnictwo WAM, 2001), p. 280.

the alternative ways of understanding values, and to avoid the naive application of axiology in classical philosophy.

Apart from scholastic approaches, a creative approach to axiology in Polish Christian thought was reflected in the paradigm of broadly understood phenomenology in which many philosophers tried to use axiological categories in ethics, anthropology, metaphysics or epistemology. Karol Wojtyła was one such philosopher. In his habilitation dissertation he took up the problem of using Scheler's axiological ethics in Christianity, as a result of which he opened new research spaces in Polish phenomenology and Christian philosophy. Creative concepts and interesting ideas appeared, and some philosophers identified the limitations of thinking according to values in philosophy. Tischner, Stróżewski, Siemianowski, and Tarnowski are the authors that deserve special attention in this respect.

The above synthetic remarks are just a small contribution to the elaboration of this broad subject. They point to the abundance of the axiological thought elaborated within the contemporary Polish Christian philosophy. Many of the outlined concepts and intuitions require development and continuation.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Darowski, R. "Charakterystyka twórczości naukowej Tadeusza Ślipki SJ," in *Życie etyczne – życie etyką. Prace dedykowane Ks. Prof. Tadeuszowi Ślipko SJ z okazji 90-lecia urodzin*, ed. R. Janusz, pp. 59–77. Kraków: Wyższa Szkoła Filozoficzno-Pedagogiczna Ignatianum; Wydawnictwo WAM, 2009.
- Duchliński, P. "Od fenomenologii do metafizyki wartości. Aksjologia tomistyczna Tadeusza Ślipko," in *Życie etyczne – życie etyką. Prace dedykowane Ks. Prof. Tadeuszowi Ślipko SJ z okazji 90-lecia urodzin*, ed. R. Janusz, pp. 77–106. Kraków: Wyższa Szkoła Filozoficzno-Pedagogiczna Ignatianum; Wydawnictwo WAM, 2009.
- Gadacz, T. *O umiejętności życia*. Kraków: Znak, 2002.
- Galarowicz, J. *Nowy elementarz etyczny*. Kraków: Petrus, 2011.
- . *Powrót do wartości*. Kraków: Petrus, 2011.
- Gogacz, M. *Elementarz metafizyki*. Warszawa: Akademia Teologii Katolickiej, 1987.
- . *Ku etyce chronienia osób. Wokół podstaw etyki*. Warszawa: Pallottinum, 1991.

- Hajduk, Z. *Nauka a wartości. Aksjologia nauki. Aksjologia epistemiczna*. Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL, 2008.
- Jaroszyński, P. "Piękno czy wartość?" in *Poznanie bytu czy ustalanie sensów?*, eds. A. Maryniarczyk, M.J. Gondek, pp. 183–187. Lublin: Polskie Towarzystwo Tomasza z Akwinu, 1999.
- . *Spór o piękno*. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Fonopol, 1992.
- Kowalczyk, S. *Człowiek w poszukiwaniu wartości. Elementy aksjologii personalistycznej*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo KUL, 2006.
- Krąpiec, M.A. *Człowiek – kultura – uniwersytet*, selected and edited by A. Wawrzyniak. Lublin: Redakcja Wydawnictw KUL, 1982.
- . *Odzyskać świat realny*. Lublin: Redakcja Wydawnictw KUL, 1999.
- Podrez, E. *Człowiek, byt, wartość. Antropologiczne i metafizyczne podstawy aksjologii chrześcijańskiej*. Warszawa: Instytut Wydawniczy Pax, 1989.
- Popielski, K. *Psychologia egzystencji: wartości w życiu*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo KUL, 2009.
- Rodziński, A. *Na orbitach wartości*. Lublin: Redakcja Wydawnictw KUL, 1998.
- . *Osoba, moralność, kultura*. Lublin: Redakcja Wydawnictw KUL, 1989.
- Siemianowski, A. *Człowiek a świat wartości*. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Wydziału Teologicznego UAM, 2015.
- . *Szkice z etyki wartości*. Gniezno: Gaudentinum, 2006.
- . *Wokół etyki wartości*. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Wydziału Teologicznego UAM, 2014.
- Stachewicz, K. *W poszukiwaniu podstaw moralności. Tomistyczna etyka prawa naturalnego a etyka wartości Dietricha von Hildebranda*. Kraków: Universitas, 2001.
- . *Życie i rozumieć. Szkice o człowieku i moralności*. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Wydziału Teologicznego UAM, 2013.
- Stróżewski, W. *Istnienie i wartość*. Kraków: Znak, 1981.
- . *W kręgu wartości*. Kraków: Znak, 1992.
- Ślipko, T. *Zarys etyki ogólnej*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo WAM, 1984.
- Tarnowski, K. *Pragnienie metafizyczne*. Kraków: Znak, 2017.
- Tischner, J. *Myślenie według wartości*. Kraków: Znak, 1982.
- . *Spór o istnienie człowieka*. Kraków: Znak, 1998.
- . *Świat ludzkiej nadziei. Wybór szkiców filozoficznych 1966–1975*. Kraków: Znak, 1975.

AESTHETICS AND PHILOSOPHY OF ART

The problem of Polish Christian aesthetics in the 20th century is connected to the discussion of the specific features of this area of philosophy. Since 1750, thanks to Alexander Baumgarten, aesthetics has been described as a philosophical discipline aimed at learning about what can be cognized through the senses (*cogitatio sensitiva*).¹ In time, aesthetics became a discipline that involved the cognition of art and its products. As a separate philosophical discipline, aesthetics had to overcome the skeptical approach resulting from numerous controversies connected with the solving of basic issues, such as: the origin of a creative act, the value and nature of beauty, and the nature of aesthetical values.² The 20th century brought new concepts of practicing aesthetics discernible in the works of Theodor Adorno, Walter Benjamin, Umberto Eco, Jacques Derrida, John Dewey, Nelson Goodman, Marshall McLuhan, Abraham Moles, Jürgen Habermas,

¹ A. Baumgarten, *Meditationes philosophicae de nonnullis ad poëma pertinentibus* (Hallae: Grunert, 1735). In the dispute on the normative foundations for aesthetics, the scholars paid attention to the fact that aesthetics, despite the popularization of its name in the 18th century, is a discipline with a long tradition starting from the philosophical reflection on art in ancient times, through the studies of scholastics, up to the modern thought.

² Such difficulty resulted from the adoption of the post-Cartesian epistemological skepticism which reduced sensual cognition to the area of subjective judgments. As a result, art was only perceived as a set of relative judgements that cannot be the subject of strictly philosophical cognition. The philosophy of the 20th century reinforced that cognitive skepticism.

Jean-François Lyotard, Gianni Vattimo, and Paul Virilio.³ Also, the representatives of aesthetics include Roman Ingarden (1893–1970) who dealt with systematic aesthetics, and Władysław Tatarkiewicz (1886–1980) who was interested in the history of aesthetics. They exerted a significant influence on the shape of the reflection on art in 20th century Poland, including on the theoreticians who can be classified as Christian aestheticians. The aesthetics practiced by the latter goes beyond the area of epistemology, because, in their studies on art, they included ontology, metaphysics, axiology, anthropology, as well as ethics. The research program of Polish Christian aesthetics has never been specified in the form of a uniform scientific manifesto but is rather a certain vision of the common studies and objectives. Despite different research emphases and approaches, Christian aesthetics maintains a relative consistency, separateness and autonomy.

HISTORICAL AND IDEOLOGICAL BACKGROUND

Adam Chmielowski CFA (1845–1916) influenced the shape of aesthetics practiced at the beginning of the 20th century. In 1876, in the journal *Ateneum*, he published the text: “O istocie sztuki” [On the Essence of Art]⁴ in which he briefly characterized the artistic duty as well as its aesthetical, pedagogical and religious dimension. According to Chmielowski’s assumptions, an artist should not treat his artistic activity as a hobby or an additional task, because being an artist is not a profession, such as a lawyer or a teacher, but the goal of life. Being a painter is the pain to search for and expose beauty. An artist has the ability to see the world in a specific manner that results from his/her unique imagination. According to Chmielowski, an artist is not just a copyist, observer or master in using artistic materials, but he/she is a kind of intermediary between the world of the imagination and the visible reality. It is also worth mentioning the views of Stanisław Witkiewicz (1851–1915). His artistic and writing activity

³ Already the initial analysis of those concepts shows that we should rather speak about various kinds of aesthetics than about one aesthetics.

⁴ S. Skwarczyńska, “Adama Chmielowskiego rozprawa ‘O istocie sztuki’,” in eadem, *Studia i szkice literackie* (Warszawa: Instytut Wydawniczy Pax, 1953), pp. 507–525.

was dedicated to the function of art. In his opinion, art should be the element that connects an individual, the society and broadly understood nature. The aesthetical analyses of Witkiewicz may be the platform for existential investigations in religion, art and philosophy. He believed that the honesty of the artistic utterance would be warranted by what can be found in a man's soul—in his approach to the Absolute. In the letters to his son (Witkacy), Witkiewicz wrote: “what is in your painting has to match what you see in the depth of your soul.”⁵

In the first half of the 20th century, the reception of aesthetics in Poland was mainly related to the academic environments in Kraków and Lviv. It is especially worth mentioning the group connected with the quarterly *Verbum*—a Catholic journal published in the inter-war period. The leader of the group was Fr. Władysław Kornilowicz (1884–1946), a personalist referring to Thomas Aquinas and Maritain. In the context of aesthetics, it is worth mentioning Teresa Landy (1894–1972), who published in *Verbum* some essays on Polish literature (Zofia Nałkowska, Maria Dąbrowska, Witold Gombrowicz). In compliance with the neo-Thomist approach, she analyzed the philosophical concepts of the studied literary texts from the perspective of ultimate reasons. In the discussion, she analyzed the issues concerning metaphysics, ethics and broadly understood axiology.

From the outbreak of World War II up to the beginning of the 1990s, art was practiced in the conditions of totalitarian oppressions: Nazism and communism. While the Nazi ideology (1939–1945) took the form of cultural fight (*Kulturkampf*) with the heritage of Polish culture, communism (1945–1989) forced socialist realism which did not question ideological issues. During the Nazi occupation, the Germans stole or destroyed material traces of Polish culture, and they killed the representatives of the Polish intellectual elite. The Catholic Church played an important role at that time, supporting the secret cultural activity of Polish people through publications, concerts, educational and scientific activity. The Church also helped the Polish nation in the times of socialist realism. The situation of artistic enslavement

⁵ S. Witkiewicz, *Listy do syna*, eds. B. Danek-Wojnowska, A. Micińska (Warszawa: Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy, 1969). Letter of 21 January 1906, pp. 224–225. See also: idem, *Sztuka i krytyka u nas (1884–1898)* (Lwów: Towarzystwo Naukowe we Lwowie, 1889); idem, *Mysli* (Warszawa: Towarzystwo Wydawnicze “Ignis”, 1923).

resulted in the creation of a specific, endemic kind of Polish art, which also influenced the way of studying such art. In official aesthetics, only the Marxist approach to art was acceptable. Any other points of view were treated as a form of rebellion or reaction. Thus, in the atmosphere of communist enslavement, the independence of scientific studies was connected with religion, which, both during the German occupation and in the times of communism, protected the national identity, and—in culture—facilitated the cultivation of fundamental values and was often the only area of creative and scientific independence.

In the second half of the 20th century, aesthetics was practiced in Poland both by individuals and by the whole academic groups. Theoreticians, starting from a specific methodological basis, tried to notice the strict connection between a creative act and the concept of beauty. Also, they took into account the network of specific relations that linked an artifact with the recipient. Many aestheticians referring to the heritage of Ingarden and Tatarkiewicz carried out pioneering studies, facilitating the development of a common aesthetics. As noted by Antoni Bazyli Stępień (1931–), the Polish aesthetics of the 20th century—mainly practiced in Warsaw, Kraków, Łódź, Toruń, Poznań and Lublin—was characterized by a multitude of studies and a variety of directions demonstrated in numerous journals dedicated to aesthetics.⁶ Most aesthetic debates were carried out in the annual *Estetyka* [*Aesthetics*] (in the years 1960–1964) founded by Antoni Bazyli Stępień (1931–), and continued in the journal *Studia Estetyczne* [*Aesthetical Studies*]. With reference to the aesthetic thought of Ingarden, a lot of texts on phenomenological aesthetics were created. Their authors included: Maria Gołaszewska (1926–2015), Janina Makota (1921–2010), Antoni B. Stępień, Władysław Stróżewski (1933–), and Leopold Blaustein (1905–1944). In the spirit of the neo-Thomist aesthetics, perceived, first of all, as the philosophy of art, it is worth mentioning the works of Stefan Swieżawski (1907–2004), Antoni B. Stępień and Mieczysław Albert Krąpiec OP (1921–2008). Henryk Elzenberg (1887–1967) dealt with aesthetics in the context of axiology; Mieczysław Porębski (1921–2012) and Katarzyna Rosner (1939–)—with semiological aesthetics, and the aesthetical thought

⁶ A.B. Stępień, *Propedeutyka estetyki* (Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL, 1986), p. 20.

with the particular emphasis on fine arts was represented by Władysław Strzemiński (1893–1952), Mieczysław Porębski and Jan Białostocki (1921–1988). Aesthetics practiced in the spirit of Marxism and post-Marxism was represented by Stefan Morawski (1921–2004), Stefan Żółkiewski (1911–1991), Teresa Kostyrko, and Alicja Kuczyńska (1952–). Also, it is worth mentioning the works of Mieczysław Wallis (1895–1975) who opted for a multifaceted approach to aesthetical phenomena, combining the philosophy of art with the analyses related to the history of art. Other important works include the texts by Stanisław Ossowski (1897–1963) on sociological aesthetics; the texts by Władysław Witwicki (1878–1948) on the psychology of feelings, and the texts by Stefan Szuman (1889–1989) in which he emphasized the pedagogical aspect of art.

In the 20th century, the Polish aesthetic environment was not only characterized by the pluralism of aesthetic methods and utterances, but also by the interdisciplinarity of studies. Many valuable aesthetic observations were created outside the main trend of research interests (e.g. Krąpiec). Also, aesthetic analyses were carried out by philosophers who, to a larger or smaller extent, could be classified as the representatives of Christian aesthetics.

SPECIFIC FEATURES OF THE POLISH CHRISTIAN AESTHETICS

Specific features of Polish Christian thought in the 20th century are determined by the two basic and, at the same time, complementary, aspects of studies. The first one is the criticism of the phenomena occurring in culture and the dispute with the modern aesthetic concepts. The other one includes working out one's own opinion on the analyzed aesthetical problems. That is why we can speak about the research in the critical and systematic aspect.

In the critical aspect, the problem of anti-art and broadly understood de-aestheticization became the subject of research. Christian aestheticians noted that artistic activities in anti-art limit the role of reason in the creative act, making those activities extrarational. Moreover, such a form of art is deprived of dialogic power. The products of anti-art do not refer us to anything but themselves; they are self-reflexive—they contain the elements that self-confirm the constructed creative model. Practicing anti-art, as well as theoretical reflection on it,

is the consequence of adopted philosophical approaches (they are often adopted in an uncritical or even unconscious manner). Some forms of anti-art promote the view of the neutrality of an artifact and aesthetic feelings as compared with the reality, as a result of which they separate art and creation from traditional values and morality. Anti-art carries the vision of the man who lost the desire to search for the truth, and, at the same time, is unwilling to contemplate nature and answer the most basic questions. According to Henryk Kiereś (1943–), epistemological premises (the lack of arguments appropriate for the nature of a given issue) are moved from aesthetic studies to the area of anthropology and metaphysics: “the lack of an argument is the sign that we do not understand a given subject (e.g. art); and if we do not understand the subject, to some extent we do not understand ourselves.”⁷ That symptom of the fall of art, the consequence of which is the weakness of the theoretical reflection on it, has deeper roots; it reveals the fundamental crisis of the man, because art always reflects the creator’s mind. In other words, the crisis of art and aesthetics is, to a certain degree, the crisis of the mind, as the Western approach traditionally perceives culture as the emanation of human intellect. Thus, art stops performing its basic role and function. It is not the embodiment of truth; it does not search for beauty; it is not the carrier of harmony and order. It starts dealing with the exploration of the creator’s personality and it is reduced to accidental gestures, which results in its significant dehumanization. The critics of such art try to find the reasons for this state of affairs. It is generally admitted that the rejection of traditional values in art resulted from the disillusionment with the causal power of the mind, i.e. with the faith in the existence of universal principles that specify the order of being and cognition. In such a perspective, art must turn towards anti-art which rejects the tradition of Christian culture and attempts to desacralize it.

The representatives of Christian aesthetics also evaluated modern aesthetics in a critical manner. They concluded that Baumgarten’s aesthetics is the consequence of Cartesian rationalism which was skeptical of sensual cognition, reducing it to the level of subjective opinions—contrary to objective and universal cognition, i.e. intellectual cognition. That is why theoretical reflection on art, which is reduced to the post-Cartesian philosophical approach, is characterized by the

⁷ H. Kiereś, *Spór o sztukę* (Lublin: Redakcja Wydawnictw KUL, 1996), p. 72.

relativity of judgments and subjectivity of assessments, and the knowledge of art boils down to subjective and individual judgments, which raises obvious doubts as to the scientific nature of aesthetics itself. The consequence of such methodology is the separation of human cognition from the actual reality. Thus, metaphysical or *stricte* axiological issues become excluded from aesthetics. The objection against the extreme sensualism in aesthetical studies can be noticed in methodological corrections, completions or, in some cases, in the total rejection of the consequences of the extreme Cartesian dualism in the analyses of such philosophers as Krąpiec or Kiereś.

In the systematic aspect, Christian aestheticians turned towards the philosophical tradition understood as the philosophy of art. They emphasized that the beginning of aesthetics as a theoretical reflection on art reaches the ancient tradition. They believed that we can even speak about advanced philosophical reflection on art since Plato's dialogues (*Timaeus*, *Gorgias*) and Aristotle's *Poetics*. Art inspired by ancient times (the postulate of harmony between the man and the world), which connects the creative act with creative intellect and reflection on nature, which searches for beauty as the highest value, and which is intentional (the ideological message is given to the recipient in a clear manner), constitutes the essence of aesthetic thought. According to such methodology of the research, one of the tasks of aesthetics is outlining the border between art and non-art, i.e. a kind of a fight for art which is characterized by artistic sophistication and transcendental meaning. In consequence, Christian aesthetics raises essential questions for unchanging laws, protecting aesthetics itself against closing it in situational, contextual or descriptive aesthetics (which only registers and typologizes creative actions). That is why in Christian philosophy, we can define aesthetics as a discipline dealing with beauty and its essence. Christian aesthetics, which deals with the philosophical analysis of a work of art and artistic creation, tries to establish some criteria of aesthetical evaluation. It does not limit itself to the area of subjective cognitive conditions, but it analyses a broader context. Taking into account cultural relations and introducing classical concepts (such as *mimesis* or *catharsis*) into the scope of analyses, it also studies the connection between art and axiology or metaphysics.

Christian aesthetics assumes the existence of absolute values. In the neo-Thomist approach (which mainly refers to Maritain and

Gilson), it focuses on investigating the problem of beauty, maintaining aesthetical studies in strict relation with the knowledge of being (metaphysics). Such a discipline worked out its own research methods and analyses. Christian aestheticians became interested in the issues such as: the ontology of a work of art (the structure of a work of art, relations within such a structure), the issue of aesthetical values (which accompany the reception of a work of art), artistic values (occurring during the creative act), or the way a work of art exists. In this tradition, the issue of Christian art and the relation between art and religion has become a specific area of research. Treating aesthetics as a theory that analyses beauty is not only justified in philosophical tradition, but it also results from fundamental assumptions which indicate that beauty is ascribed to being and results from the essence of being; what is more, being as such is perceived as being oriented at values. That is why Christian aesthetics, while analyzing aesthetical experiences, tries to find and describe objective conditions accompanying such an act, taking into account both subjective and objective circumstances. Generally, we may conclude that the object of aesthetics perceived in this way combines metaphysical concept of transcendentals with the philosophy of art, with the special emphasis on the theory of values. The axiological aspect of aesthetics does not limit a work of art only to the value of beauty, but makes it possible to notice other concretizations, such as truth or goodness. Stróżewski directly determines that the argument of metaphysical art is, first of all, truth. Even beauty becomes secondary in comparison to the idea of truth.⁸ According to Christian aesthetics, the essence of art consist in the fact that a work of art does not draw the recipient's attention to itself, but it shows another reality in which other values are hidden. Moreover, aesthetical studies of this kind fall within the scope of other philosophical disciplines, e.g. the analysis of an aesthetical experience strongly correlates with the philosophy of man, and the issue of beauty—with the general theory of being.

⁸ W. Stróżewski, *Wokół piękna. Szkice z estetyki* (Kraków: Universitas, 2002), p. 133.

THE MAIN APPROACHES AND REPRESENTATIVES

The panorama of Polish Christian aesthetics of the second half of the 20th century and the beginning of the 21st century is quite impressive. It comprises different philosophical trends (mainly Thomism and phenomenology) and many important thinkers who have worked in the Lublin environment (KUL)—Mieczysław Albert Krąpiec OP, Zofia Józefa Zdybicka USJK (1928–), Antoni Bazyli Stępień, Henryk Kiereś, Piotr Jaroszyński (1955–), Karol Klauza (1947–); in Kraków (UPJPII, UJ)—Fr. Józef Tischner (1931–2000), Władysław Stróżewski, Paweł Taranczewski (1940–); and in Warsaw (UKSW)—Ewa Podrez (1952–), Fr. Jan Sochoń (1953–). The aesthetical reflections of Karol Wojtyła/John Paul II (1920–2005) occupies a separate place in the above-mentioned overview.

Existential Thomism

In the Lublin environment, aesthetical issues have been mainly discussed with reference to existential Thomism (Krąpiec, Kiereś, Jaroszyński, Zdybicka), sometimes combined with phenomenology (Stępień).

In the philosophical heritage of Krąpiec, among the analyses related to the metaphysical and anthropological foundations of culture, we can find some fragments dedicated to the theoretical approach to beauty.⁹ Krąpiec divides man's rational actions into three main areas: science, morality and art, ascribing them, respectively, truth, goodness and beauty as the supreme goal of action. He analyses art in the spirit of neo-Thomist cognitive realism, concluding that the reference to that tradition makes it possible to solve the basic problems of the contemporary humanist culture.¹⁰ In the aesthetic reflection of Krąpiec we can distinguish two basic threads: the first one concerns the theory of art as such (definition, functions and objectives); the second

⁹ Primarily the works: *Realizm ludzkiego poznania* (Lublin: Redakcja Wydawnictw KUL, 1995); *U podstaw rozumienia kultury* (Lublin: Redakcja Wydawnictw KUL, 1991); *Człowiek i kultura* (Lublin: Polskie Towarzystwo Tomasza z Akwinu, 2008); "Od pomysłu do wykonania – dzieło sztuki," *Cywilizacja*, no. 11 (2004), pp. 10–17.

¹⁰ *O polskiej kulturze humanistycznej. Z ojcem profesorem M.A. Krąpcem rozmawia Piotr S. Mazur* (Lublin: Polskie Towarzystwo Tomasza z Akwinu, 2011).

one—the questions about the essence of art, its arguments, and the connection of art with the real world and culture (the culture-forming aspect of art against humanist problems). In the aesthetics of Krąpiec, considerations related to the perception of art play a fundamental role. In his opinion, various branches of art are connected with rational and purposeful actions aimed at transforming the reality which the artist faces (irrespective of whether such actions shall include thoughts, things or gestures). It is because a creative act occurs when the artist formulates an image that changes into a concept and then—into an object. Such creative actions have to be based on a model; a norm. The ultimate criterion of artistic creation is always transcendental beauty understood as the subject and goal; such beauty is the reason why the subject which learns about an artifact moves from the cognitive to the contemplative phase. Experiencing beauty is of a contemplative nature and reveals its transcendence, as beauty is not just the property of some human products, but a general property of beings. The acknowledgement of the transcendental nature of beauty is what makes the aesthetical thought of Krąpiec consistent.¹¹

According to Krąpiec, a creative act includes the following: an idea, and its fulfillment (*techné*), i.e. something that requires knowledge and experience. That is why each act of art is, first of all, born in an artist's intellect, and later the idea is confronted with the external reality and technical abilities.¹² An aesthetical thought is loaded with a huge dose of uncertainty: “the existing world given to us through cognition, the artist's personal cognitive and volitional acts, acting and accompanying reflection, criteria, motives and impulses—they all overlap in the creative act to such an extent that precise cognition and analysis of a particular work of art is practically impossible.”¹³

Each act of art, as something individual and inimitable, escapes precise scientific generalizations. At the same time, each work of art, being the object of an artist's intentional acts, is the carrier of particular values. Krąpiec derives the origin of art from originally intentional contents created in the acts of an intellect, which are later transferred

¹¹ M.A. Krąpiec, *Metafizyka. Zarys teorii bytu* (Lublin: Redakcja Wydawnictw KUL, 1988), pp. 191–204.

¹² Idem, “Od pomysłu do wykonania – dzieło sztuki,” pp. 10–18.

¹³ Idem, *Człowiek jako osoba* (Lublin: Polskie Towarzystwo Tomasza z Akwinu, 2005), pp. 179–180.

outside the psychological area and materialized in creative acts.¹⁴ Such an act of transferring from the intellectual to the material area is not isomorphic in this sense that, during a creative act, ideas are corrected and improved. It is connected with acquiring the ability to produce under the supervision of the intellect. According to Krąpiec, the basic feature of the works of culture is their intentional nature.

Jaroszyński, just like Krąpiec, tries to analyze aesthetical issues (understanding art) in the context of metaphysics. For philosophical reflection, “metaphysics of art is even more basic than aesthetics or the philosophy of art.”¹⁵ Jaroszyński elicits the ideological contexts of pre-avant-garde art, indicating its transcendental foundations and influence on the general civilization profile. While investigating art, he focuses on imagination (its origin, function and objectives), *mimesis* (perceived as a form of creative imitation that cannot be reduced to copying the appearances of things) and figurativeness. The objective of Jaroszyński’s analyses is reaching the aesthetical roots of the theory of beauty, i.e. the origin of art. That is why he emphasizes that, from antiquity to the Middle Ages, the reflection on art was focused on the intellect. It was post-Cartesian aesthetics that reduced the knowledge of art to sensual qualities, reducing the role of the intellect at the same time to reacting to sensual impulses. Jaroszyński believes that the ultimate source of art is in the intellect, and aesthetical categories, such as beauty, only fall within the scope of intellectual cognition. An artist organizes matter according to a specific form existing in his/her mind. Imagination and the senses take part in a creative act, but it is the intellect that plays the superior role and is the causal reason for art. In his aesthetics, Jaroszyński is against the radical Cartesian dualism which separated consciousness (soul) from body and matter (extension). Jaroszyński believed that post-Baumgarten aesthetics limits the reflection on art to sensual cognition alone. Reducing the metaphysical issues, it rejects the analysis of beauty perceived as the property of being.

In the aesthetical investigations of Kiereś, apart from the considerations on the classical understanding of art, the dispute with the post-avant-garde theory of art which has dominated aesthetics plays

¹⁴ Ibidem, pp. 47–48.

¹⁵ P. Jaroszyński, *Sztuka i metafizyka* (Radom: Polskie Wydawnictwo Encyklopedyczne, 2002), p. 7.

an important role. Kiereś believes that modern artistic actions and the reflection on them constitute a return to the idea of skepticism. Limiting aesthetical analyses to the exploration of an artistic personality is the consequence of rejecting the ancient tradition, which used to be the foundation of Western culture. According to Kiereś, the analyses related to classical art (including the whole aesthetic context related to the issues connected with value, the creative act, the reception of a work of art, its ontology and relation with metaphysics) were taken over by the historians of art. Such an aesthetical capitulation is the result of the adopted research worldview and the research methods based on philosophy. Modern art, which is non-mimetic and rejects the ideal of beauty, is reluctant to comply with a priori principles followed by the classical art. Kiereś notes: “those principles have always been just an illustration of the philosophers’ opinions on beauty and art and, since these beliefs are alien to art, they reduce it to craft, or, at least, to some products made «according to someone’s order», through which they falsify the concept of art.”¹⁶ If art is closed to certain values, its essence is left outside the research area and what used to be its force, i.e. the idea of creative freedom, becomes marginalized. According to Kiereś, departing from aesthetics practiced in a traditional manner leads to closing that discipline in the circle of analyses related to anti-art, as a result of which we reject the original questions about the meaning of art, its genesis, function and social objectives, content and value of artifacts, etc. Kiereś claims that a theoretical reflection on anti-art goes beyond the research context of art itself and it is included in certain schemes of interpretation derived from outside science, which leads to a deadlock in the study of art. Moreover, aesthetics often leads to the role of an ideological justification of para-artistic actions. Kiereś believes that the reference to classical philosophy opens aesthetic studies to the relation of art with the real world, and that it presents a broader perspective of the relation between art and the ideas of truth, goodness and beauty.

In the philosophical analyses of Zdybicka we do not find separate monographs dedicated to aesthetics, but such issues do occur in her texts. In the monograph *Bóg czy sacrum? [God or sacrum?]*¹⁷ Zdybicka

¹⁶ H. Kiereś, *Spór o sztukę*, p. 8.

¹⁷ Z.J. Zdybicka, *Bóg czy sacrum?* (Lublin: Polskie Towarzystwo Tomasza z Akwinu, 2007).

notes that man, in his attempt to understand the surrounding reality, uses symbols, signs and artifacts. As a result of performing such cognitive actions, an aesthetic experience occurs that evokes a certain emotional state of the subject. Thus, an aesthetical experience is a specific cognitive act the objective of which may include, i.a., learning about the personal God. In the work: *Człowiek i religia [Man and Religion]*¹⁸ Zdybicka tries to specify the relation between a religious experience and an aesthetic experience. She emphasizes that a fundamental issue for an aesthetic experience is the category of beauty which, through its disinterested nature (it does not bring any material value), can emotionally enrich the cognizing subject, i.e. in some cases it can be the way to a religious experience (in the formal sense, as, in terms of the content, those two cognitive orders have different objectives: the act of a religious experience aims at holiness, while the act of an aesthetical experience aims at knowing beauty; aesthetical cognition separates us from daily practices, while the act of a religious experience is strongly rooted in them). However, beauty, as a religion-forming factor, may constitute a great strength of art.

Phenomenologizing and hermeneutizing Thomism

The aesthetic thought of Stępień is located within a version of existential Thomism enriched with Ingarden's phenomenology. In his analyses, Stępień very carefully and precisely approaches aesthetic problems, ordering various opinions and issues related to the theory of art and providing us with irreplaceable didactic material (*propedeutics of aesthetics*).¹⁹ His aesthetics goes beyond the scope of considerations concerning sensuality, encompassing metaphysical, phenomenological or axiological issues. He precedes his aesthetic investigations with remarks falling within the scope of meta-aesthetics, and he refers to the scientific nature of aesthetics itself (perceived in a historical and systemic perspective), to the correctness of adopted research methods, and to metaphysical issues that precede epistemological-methodological problems.

Taking his phenomenological ontology of art from Ingarden (the concept of layers), Stępień analyses film and music on its basis. Contrary to aesthetics practiced in the post-Cartesian tradition, he believes

¹⁸ Eadem, *Człowiek i religia* (Lublin: Redakcja Wydawnictw KUL, 2006).

¹⁹ A.B. Stępień, *Propedeutyka estetyki*, op. cit.

that we are able to obtain an objective knowledge of art and we are not doomed to aesthetical studies affected by extrarational, relativist and subjective factors. Such a research approach results from the previously adopted methodology of epistemological rationalism (the mind directs human cognition as it distinguishes what is important from what is accidental; moreover, it is self-reflexive, so it can make corrections) and metaphysical rationalism (the belief that art is available for rational cognition).

Stępień classifies aesthetics, especially the theory of aesthetical values, as the theory of beauty, which, in turn, can be treated as the philosophical theory of value, i.e. axiology. Contrary to neo-Kantians, he treats axiology as the theory of being, i.e. a fragment of metaphysics, perceiving the theory of beauty as a fragment of the general theory of being. Stępień, while adopting the arrangements of classical philosophy, sees aesthetics as a philosophical discipline that adopts certain arguments and conditions related to searching for ultimate explanations. Thus, aesthetics is transformed into the metaphysics and ontology of a work of art, the objective of which is analyzing a special kind of being: a being that is either beautiful or wants to be perceived as beautiful. According to Stępień, aesthetic values really exist and are characterized by a special type of property and relation. As a Thomist, he treats them as transcendentals that assign a being to the intellect.

With reference to the classical and phenomenological tradition understood more broadly than Thomism, Stróżewski also practices aesthetics. For him, Ingarden's aesthetics is the foundation of philosophical aesthetics.²⁰ At the same time, his aesthetics is inseparably related to the research in metaphysics, ontology, anthropology, and axiology. In Stróżewski's works we can see a strong predilection for combining aesthetics with axiology and metaphysical qualities. Focusing on the metaphysical context in art is the attempt to capture a special quality of the works of art that play the role of intermediaries between the experience of material reality and transcendence. That is why referring to the idea of Plotinus, Stróżewski believes that art is the enrichment of the world of ideas.²¹ Thus, in his opinion, the deepest argument of art is its metaphysical quality perceived as "its

²⁰ W. Stróżewski, P. Taranczewski, *Wykłady lubelskie o estetyce* (Kraków: Wydawnictwo UJ, 2016), p. 7.

²¹ W. Stróżewski, *Wokół piękna. Szkice z estetyki*, p. 111.

essential reference to transcendence which, out of necessity, is expressed in art.”²² According to Stróżewski, art that emphasizes its strong relation with metaphysics is able to express the deepest experience of transcendence in immanence; thus, it can, clearly and rightfully, speak about the man and his place in the world, as well as about the Absolute, the inevitability of death, being, and nothingness. Stróżewski does not treat aesthetics as the first philosophy, due to which it enables synthesizing ontological, hermeneutical and axiological foundations, as a result of which aesthetics becomes an integral philosophical discipline. The basic research problem for Stróżewski is the question of beauty: how do we experience it; in what way is it given to us; and what does it refer us to? He analyses aesthetic beauty in the relation and assignment to the transcendent beauty of a being. Stróżewski notices beauty in the transcendental structure of a being, paying attention to the difference between universalism and transcendentalism. If beauty is to fulfill the condition of transcendentalism, it has to be characterized by an important moment of constituting values, and the moment must be analyzed in the context of metaphysics.

While studying the issue of an aesthetic attitude, Stróżewski specifies it as “being open to the horizon of values circulating around beauty.”²³ The aesthetical thought of Stróżewski is not free from meta-aesthetic issues related to the crisis of this discipline. Stróżewski sees the weakness of the aesthetics of the 20th century, emphasizing that it is unable to define the subject of its analyses. If aesthetics does not precise the scope of its objective studies, it shall become the psychology of art or the sociology of art, analyzing what particular recipients treat as art. This way, the discipline shall remove valuing from its analyses, and it shall become relative. Being aware of the definition difficulties related to art, Stróżewski suggests the definition based on three aspects: ontological (intentional structure), semiotic (the possible subject of interpretation), and axiological (the carrier of values). In this definition, the axiological aspect is in the foreground, as Stróżewski believes that it is the most important for art. It is because the task of art is to reach for the highest values—in them we can fulfill the context of technical skillfulness, and the encounter of the matter and the spirit. According to Stróżewski, every time art escapes

²² Ibidem, p. 119.

²³ W. Stróżewski, P. Taranczewski, *Wykłady lubelskie o estetyce*, p. 179.

from values, it turns towards arbitrariness and superficiality through which it exposes itself to the vulgarity of tastes and temporary fashions. That is why three necessary factors appear in the definition of art: art as a disposition and subjective skill (*techné*), subjective actions aimed at creating the artistic effect (a work of art), and the artistic product itself.²⁴ The specific features of Stróżewski's aesthetics are expressed in his brief methodological declaration related to the very understanding of art which: "can provide us with the experience of beauty and the beauty of existence. Existence and values merge into a whole; metaphysics and axiology shake hands. Here is an experience we cannot compare to anything else."²⁵

Elżbieta Wolicka-Wolszleger (1937–2013) carried out research on the border of the philosophy of art, aesthetics and the theory of art—especially within the scope of the history of the theory of art, the methodology of the history of art, and the theory of value. In the perception of art or its various aspects, such as a myth, an image, a symbol, imagination, language, and a metaphor, she analyzed the views of, i.a. Plato, Kant, Ricoeur, and Gadamer. In her works, she aimed at the synthesis of classical philosophy, mainly metaphysics and anthropology, with modern theories of culture or art based on hermeneutics.

Sochoń, who combined the tradition of classical philosophy with the hermeneutic approach, in the research related to the philosophy of culture paid much attention to aesthetics, and especially to the philosophy of art. Primarily focusing on the question of a work of art itself and its existential structure, he considers—from the perspective of realistic metaphysics—the process of learning about and creating artistic works. Sochoń asks about the fundamental sources of a creative act, especially the poetic one, claiming that it is always connected with the actually existing reality, because, without such reality, in the human cognitive process there would not be any contents that could be the basis for any works of art. Sochoń is looking for the reasons for the "deconstruction" of beauty in the postmodern discourse, i.e. the placement of beauty outside nature, goodness and beauty. Also, he wonders why, in an age of mass reproduction, we only deal with the chiasmus of scattered meanings or why we treat everything we come across as beautiful (*pankalia*). Moreover, Sochoń discusses

²⁴ Ibidem, pp. 93–94.

²⁵ W. Stróżewski, *Wokół piękna. Szkice z estetyki*, p. 122.

the issues related to the connections of literature, poetry and painting with the area of what is sacred (*sacrum*). He searches for the lines connecting the indicated delivery forms with morality, and he traces the history of aesthetics assuming that, after a period of postmodern crisis, it shall return to the old positions worked out by the tradition.

Phenomenology, hermeneutics and theology

Aesthetics in the phenomenological approach inspired by Ingarden's thought was mainly practiced in the Kraków environment (Taranczewski, Tischner). In this trend, the emphasis is placed on the connection of aesthetics with axiology. In the theological approach, in turn, aesthetical problems are taken up with regard to religion.

Tischner is important among the Polish Christian philosophers who practiced aesthetics as an axiological discipline. His analyses related to the category of beauty deserve special attention. Tischner believes that beauty is not revealed in the act of learning an object by a subject, but in a purely subjective cognition. That is why he opposes the aesthetic viewpoint which aims at analyzing particular cognitive powers in the perception of beauty. Tischner claims that this process is so integral that it is impossible to separate particular elements of it. The experience of beauty is a holistic act, an inimitable experience, and it cannot be reduced to the acts of art because the idea of beauty can also be encountered in another man. For Tischner, beauty "is transcendental, as not only does it go beyond everything that is not beauty, but it is different than other kinds of beauty. It is unique."²⁶ Thus, a consequence of the aesthetic affirmation of beauty can also be the beauty of another person which is manifested in his/her personality, behavior or appearance. In the collection of essays: *Myślenie w żywiole piękna* [*Thinking in the Element of Beauty*]²⁷ Tischner analyses the approach of philosophical thinking to artistic thinking. While summarizing his considerations, he raises a strong theological thesis according to which aesthetics is reliable metaphysics.

Taranczewski is in the group of Polish aestheticians who, in their studies on art, adopt the classical concept of beauty as a starting point. His research interests, enriched with the artistic practice, contribute to the Polish aesthetics in a significant manner, linking theory with

²⁶ J. Tischner, *Filozofia dramatu* (Kraków: Znak, 1999), p. 123.

²⁷ Idem, *Myślenie w żywiole piękna* (Kraków: Znak, 2013).

praxis. The aesthetic reflections referring to Ingarden's tradition, in which Taranczewski develops his own concept of aesthetic experience, are particularly interesting. Focusing on painting, he notes that a picture is characterized by a kind of epistemic surplus, i.e. we see more than we discern with our eyes. In other words, while looking at a work of art, the very act of perception goes far beyond our sight, so it is not limited to sensual qualities (impressions). During the contact with the work of art, the aesthetical experience goes into the phase of the active connection between the recipient and the work and its creator, which has a form of a quasi-mystical experience as it engages the recipient not only on the sensual level, but also on the psychological, intellectual, emotional, and religious level.²⁸ Taranczewski emphasizes that the shape of the Polish art of the 20th century, and, indirectly, also the aesthetic thought, were influenced by the people that can be described as the representatives of the so-called Vistula mysticism (Adam Chmielowski, Karol Wojtyła, Jan Pietraszko, Faustyna Kowalska, and Józef Tischner).²⁹

Many aesthetic issues are also discussed by Podrez in her ethical studies. In broadly understood art, she searches for the inspirations for ethical analyses. She claims that art provides a much deeper insight into the man's moral condition than ethics. Aesthetic cognition broadens the hermeneutical and phenomenological basis of ethical cognition. In her studies, she uses art, and especially literature, to explain, e.g. different ethical dilemmas and axiological conflicts. According to Podrez, ethics is a kind of art of living which shapes our hermeneutical self-understanding.

In the review of aesthetic views in the Polish Christian philosophy of the 20th century we cannot omit the thought of Karol Wojtyła/John Paul II who perceived aesthetics (as a theoretical reflection on art) in the context of the theory of value. Wojtyła was, at the same time, an artist and a philosopher who did not avoid theoretical reflections on art. A certain interpretation and, at the same time, a summary of his views on aesthetics, was *List do artystów* [*Letter to Artists*] of 1999, in which he unequivocally indicates some methodological assumptions that link art with metaphysics and axiology. "In a certain sense,

²⁸ P. Taranczewski, "O sensie malarstwa w czasie 'sztuki po końcu sztuki,'" *Estetyka i Krytyka*, no. 1(12) (2007), pp. 163–170.

²⁹ Idem, "Mistyka nadwiślańska," *Znak*, no. 6(661) (2010), pp. 15–30.

beauty is the visible form of the good, just as the good is the metaphysical condition of beauty ... The artist has a special relationship to beauty. In a very true sense it can be said that beauty is the vocation bestowed on him.”³⁰ And, in paragraph 16, he adds: “Beauty is a key to the mystery and a call to transcendence. It is an invitation to savour life and to dream of the future.”³¹

Klauza deals with aesthetics practiced on the basis of theology. His considerations related to the beauty of God refer to scholastic analyses. According to Klauza, God not only reveals Himself to man in the cognitive aspect, but also as an ontic subject comprising all the aspects of perfection, i.e. also perfect beauty. Klauza believes that discovering, learning about and analyzing the emanation of God’s beauty is the domain of dogmatic aesthetics.³² In the context of such aesthetics, he studies works of art as a reproduction or indirect reference to absolute beauty (the works of iconology deserve special attention in this respect). This form of a reflection on art adopts particular definitions of beauty, mainly emphasizing its spiritual nature. It is worth noting that such considerations are not only limited to sacred or ecclesial art. Klauza’s methodological originality consists in the attempt to specify the beauty of the Absolute treated as a research problem based on ontology and axiology. He perceives beauty, being the superior value of art, as an epistemological category enriched with the contents flowing from faith. Such a methodology, apart from the studies focused on subjective cognitive conditions, enriches aesthetic thought with the category of experiencing and contemplating the beauty of God.

CHRISTIAN AESTHETICS AT THE BEGINNING OF THE 21ST CENTURY

Reflections on art have been taken up in Christian philosophy for centuries. In a multitude of directions, trends and traditions, various concepts and aesthetical views have been shaped. In the context of such

³⁰ John Paul II, *Letter to Artists* (Vatican City: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1999), no. 3.

³¹ *Ibidem*, no. 16.

³² K. Klauza, *Teokalia. Piękno Boga. Prolegomena do estetyki dogmatycznej* (Lublin: Redakcja Wydawnictw KUL, 2008).

historical diversity, it is difficult to separate a consistent, *stricte* Christian aesthetic thought, but it is justified to distinguish a certain way of understanding art that may be perceived as Christian. What Christian aestheticians have in common is philosophical speculation that is not closed in the subjective analyses of cognitive conditions, but aims at a broad, non-reductionist approach to art which encompasses its ontic, axiological and ethical aspects. This is the nature of Polish Christian aesthetics of the beginning of the 21st century which carries out systematic analyses, reaches for the rich philosophical tradition and various ways of philosophizing, and, at the same time, critically analyses the contemporary phenomena and tendencies in art and aesthetics.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Chałupniak, R. "Fides ex visu' we współczesnej teologii piękna," *Colloquia Theologica Ottoniana*, no. 1 (2014), pp. 151–175.
- Dzidek, T. *Funkcje sztuki w teologii*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo WAM, 2013.
- Ingarden, R. *O budowie obrazu. Szkic z teorii sztuki* (Rozprawy Wydziału Filologicznego PAU, vol. 67, no. 1). Kraków: Polska Akademia Umiejętności, 1946.
- . *Studia z estetyki*, vol. 1–3. Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1957–1970.
- Jan Paweł II. *Wiara i kultura. Dokumenty, przemówienia, homilie*. Rzym–Lublin: Polski Instytut Kultury Chrześcijańskiej. Fundacja Jana Pawła II; Redakcja Wydawnictw KUL, 1988.
- John Paul II. *Letter to Artists*. Vatican City: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1999.
- Jaroszyński, P. *Metafizyka czy ontologia?* Lublin: Polskie Towarzystwo Tomasz z Akwinu, 2011.
- . *Metafizyka i sztuka*. Radom: Polskie Wydawnictwo Encyklopedyczne, 2002.
- . *Metafizyka piękna. Próba rekonstrukcji teorii piękna w filozofii klasycznej*. Lublin: Redakcja Wydawnictw KUL, 1986.
- . "Między pięknem transcendentnym a estetycznym. Doskonaląca rola piękna," *Cywilizacja*, no. 11 (2004), pp. 18–25.
- . "O realistyczną filozofię kultury," *Zeszyty Naukowe KUL* 52, no. 2 (2006), pp. 61–69.

- . “Piękno czy wartość?” in *Zadania współczesnej metafizyki. Poznanie bytu czy ustalanie sensów*, eds. A. Maryniarczyk, M.J. Gondek, pp. 183–188. Lublin: Polskie Towarzystwo Tomasza z Akwinu, Lublin 1999.
- Kiereś, H. *Człowiek i sztuka. Antropologiczne wątki problemu sztuki*. Lublin: Polskie Towarzystwo Tomasza z Akwinu, 2006.
- . *Spór o sztukę*. Lublin: Redakcja Wydawnictw KUL, 1996.
- Klauza, K. *Teokalia. Piękno Boga. Prolegomena do estetyki dogmatycznej*. Lublin: Redakcja Wydawnictw KUL, 2008.
- “Kondycja estetyki polskiej,” *Biuletyn Polskiego Towarzystwa Estetycznego*, no. 10(2) (2007), Spring–Summer.
- Kostyrko, T. “Estetyka polska XX wieku. Historia – problemy – perspektywy,” *Kultura Współczesna*, no. 1 (1999), pp. 115–127.
- Krąpiec, M.A. *Człowiek i kultura*. Lublin: Polskie Towarzystwo Tomasza z Akwinu, 2008.
- . *Człowiek jako osoba*. Lublin: Polskie Towarzystwo Tomasza z Akwinu, Lublin 2005.
- . “Od pomysłu do wykonania – dzieło sztuki,” *Cywilizacja*, no. 11 (2004), pp. 10–18.
- . *Realizm ludzkiego poznania*. Lublin: Redakcja Wydawnictw KUL, 1995.
- . *U podstaw rozumienia kultury*. Lublin: Redakcja Wydawnictw KUL, 1991.
- Morawski, S. “Estetyka polska w okresie dwudziestolecia powojennego,” *Studia Filozoficzne* 39, no. 4 (1964), pp. 16–19.
- Pękała, T. “Tradycja i innowacja w estetyce polskiej,” *Sztuka i Filozofia*, no. 36 (2010), pp. 5–20.
- Skwarczyńska, S. “Adama Chmielowskiego rozprawa ‘O istocie sztuki,’” in eadem, *Studia i szkice literackie*, pp. 507–525. Warszawa: Instytut Wydawniczy Pax, 1953.
- Stępień, A.B. *Propedeutyka estetyki*. Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL, 1986.
- Stróżewski, W. *Dialektyka twórczości*. Kraków: Znak, 2007.
- . *W kręgu wartości*. Kraków: Znak, 1992.
- . *Wokół piękna. Szkice z estetyki*. Kraków: Universitas, 2002.
- Stróżewski, W., Taranczewski, P. *Wykłady lubelskie o estetyce*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo UJ, 2016.
- Studia o współczesnej estetyce polskiej*, ed. S. Krzemień-Ojak. Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1977.
- Studia z dziejów estetyki polskiej 1918–1939*, eds. S. Krzemień-Ojak, W. Kalinowski. Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1975.
- Taranczewski, P. “Mistyka nadwiślańska,” *Znak*, no. 6(661) (2010), pp. 15–30.
- . “O sensie malarstwa w czasie ‘sztuki po końcu sztuki,’” *Estetyka i Krytyka*, no. 1(12) (2007), pp. 163–170.

- Tatarkiewicz, W. *Dzieje sześciu pojęć*. Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1976.
- . *Historia estetyki*, vol. 1–3. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, 2006.
- Tischner, J. *Filozofia dramatu*. Kraków: Znak, 1999.
- . *Myślenie w żywiole piękna*. Kraków: Znak, 2013.
- Witkiewicz, S. *Listy do syna*, eds. B. Danek-Wojnowska, A. Micińska. Warszawa: Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy, 1969.
- . *Myśli*. Warszawa: Towarzystwo Wydawnicze "Ignis", 1923.
- . *Sztuka i krytyka u nas (1884–1898)*. Lwów: Towarzystwo Naukowe we Lwowie, 1889.
- Wojtyła, K. *Ewangelia a sztuka. Rekolekcje dla artystów*. Kraków–Rzym: Instytut Dialogu Międzykulturowego im. Jana Pawła II; Fundacja Jana Pawła II Ośrodek Dokumentacji i Studium Pontyfikatu, 2011.
- Wójtowicz, R. *Człowiek i kultura. Prolegomena do Wojtyłańskiej myśli antropologicznej*. Rzeszów: Wydawnictwo UR, 2010.
- Zarębianka, Z. "Sztuka nadziei. Nadzieja w sztuce. Powołanie artysty i misja sztuki w refleksji Karola Wojtyły – Jana Pawła II," *Topos* 21 (2016), pp. 70–78.
- Zdybicka, Z.J. *Bóg czy sacrum?* Lublin: Polskie Towarzystwo Tomasza z Akwinu, 2007.
- . *Człowiek i religia*. Lublin: Redakcja Wydawnictw KUL, 2006.

9.

PHILOSOPHY OF GOD AND RELIGION

In the Polish philosophy of the 20th century, the subject of God and religion was taken up in the Thomist approach, in the philosophy practiced within the context of science, and in the phenomenological-hermeneutic approach. The first of them included the philosophers who practiced various kinds of Thomism: traditional, Louvain, existential, consequent, transcendental, phenomenologizing (including Augustinian Thomism), analytic, and scientizing. The analytic tradition was developed by various supporters of exact thinking in philosophy: neo-Thomists, logicians, and philosophers who referred to the Anglo-Saxon philosophy of language, and to the methodology of sciences and cosmology. The third tradition of the 20th century Polish Christian philosophy of religion appeared along with the reception of phenomenology, hermeneutics and philosophy of dialogue.

THE MOST IMPORTANT REPRESENTATIVES

Before World War II, theodical studies were carried out by Fr. Franciszek Gabryl (1866–1914), a representative of traditional Thomism who analyzed the Polish 19th century religious philosophy. Fr. Idzi Radziszewski (1871–1922), a supporter of Louvain Thomism, studied religion in the context of natural sciences and cultural studies. This tradition was also developed by Fr. Kazimierz Wais (1865–1934) and Fr. Jan Stepa (1892–1959) who combined Thomism with Kantianism.

After 1945, traditional Thomism was practiced by Fr. Stanisław Adamczyk (1900–1971). Fr. Franciszek Sawicki (1877–1952) and Fr. Stanisław Kowalczyk (1932–) combined the thought of St. Thomas and St. Augustine. In a similar manner, connecting Thomism with Augustinianism, psychological studies on religion were carried out by Fr. Józef Pastuszka (1897–1989). Psychology and the philosophy of religion in the scholastic spirit was also practiced by Fr. Aleksander Usowicz CM (1912–2002). However, after World War II, existential Thomism predominated in Polish Christian philosophy, and its centers were the Catholic University of Lublin (KUL) and the Academy of Catholic Theology in Warsaw. In this approach, the issues of the philosophy of God and religion were analyzed from the perspective of the metaphysics of existence. Its representatives include: a logician and ethicist Jerzy Kalinowski (1916–2000),¹ an epistemological-methodological scholar—Fr. Stanisław Kamiński (1919–1986), and a historian of philosophy—Stefan Swieżawski (1907–2004). This approach was significantly developed by a metaphysicist—Fr. Mieczysław Albert Krąpiec OP (1921–2008), and, in the scope of the philosophy of God and religion—Zofia Józefa Zdybicka USJK (1928–). Their cooperators included: Fr. Bronisław Dembowski (1927–2019), Fr. Bohdan Bejze (1929–2005), Edmund Morawiec CSsR (1930–2019), and Stanisław Ziemiański SJ (1931–), who, on the basis of existential Thomism, worked out his own concept of theodicy, sometimes specified as scientizing Thomism. Mieczysław Gogacz (1926–) practiced theodicy within consequent Thomism he elaborated. And Fr. Marian Jaworski (1926–) and Antoni Bazyli Stępień (1931–), in their analyses concerning theodicy and the philosophy of religion, referred to phenomenology. The early scientific work of Fr. Karol Wojtyła/John Paul II can also be classified as the expression of traditional Thomism. Wojtyła discussed faith in the books by St. John of the Cross, and then he gave lectures on the cognition of God.

In the Thomistic tradition, a new approach referring to religion was marked by the activity of the Lviv-Warsaw School of Kazimierz Twardowski (1866–1938). The thinkers who analyzed the issues of God and religion in the spirit of that school, referred to the modern

¹ J. Kalinowski, “Doświadczenie wiary a istnienie Boga,” in *Studia z filozofii Boga*, vol. 2, ed. B. Bejze (Warszawa: Akademia Teologii Katolickiej, 1973), pp. 323–338.

logic and to the analytic philosophy of language. In this approach, the members of the Kraków Circle were very active, as they postulated the renewal of the Christian thought through logic. The members of the Kraków Circle included Jan Franciszek Drewnowski (1896–1978), Józef Maria Bocheński OP (1902–1995), Fr. Jan Salamucha (1903–1944), and Bolesław Sobociński (1906–1980). Salamucha and Bocheński belonged to the scholastic tradition, which was also joined by Drewnowski. The activity of the Kraków Circle—apart from Jan Łukasiewicz (1878–1956), a student of Twardowski—was supported by Konstanty Michalski CM (1879–1947), a Louvain Thomist influenced by Augustinianism, who combined the knowledge of modern science (Ernst Mach and Pierre Duhem) with the analysis of contemporary philosophy (doctoral dissertation on Husserl's criticism of psychologism). In the second half of the 20th century, Edward Nieznański (1938–)² dealt with the formalization of the proofs for the existence of God. In the analytic approach of the Christian philosophy of God and religion, the scholars also referred to exact sciences. After World War II, that approach was represented by, i.a. Fr. Kazimierz Kłósak (1911–1982), to whom, in their research on the relation between religion and science, Fr. Michał Heller (1936–) and Fr. Józef Życiński (1948–2011) referred. This tradition also includes: Fr. Ludwik Wciórka (1928–2000), Józef Bremer SJ (1953–), Stanisław Judycki (1954–), Piotr Gutowski (1961–), Ireneusz Ziemiński (1965–), and Jacek Wojtysiak (1967–), who, despite different philosophical approaches, share an interest in the methodological analysis of the philosophy of religion.

The third tradition of philosophical studies on religion was suggested by the phenomenologists who aimed at the new approach to the subject of religion and God. The phenomenological movement in Poland was initiated by a student of Edmund Husserl—Roman Ingarden (1893–1970). Husserl himself did not discuss religious issues, but they were investigated by Max Scheler and Husserl's students, e.g. Ingarden who wrote about the Absolute within ontology perceived as the analysis of pure opportunities. Fr. Józef Tischner (1931–2000),

² E. Nieznański, "Formalizacyjne próby ustalenia logiko-formalnych podstaw stwierdzenia pierwszych elementów relacji rozważanych w tomistycznej teodycei," in *W kierunku formalizacji tomistycznej teodycei*, ed. E. Nieznański (Warszawa: Akademia Teologii Katolickiej, 1980), pp. 7–194; idem, *Sformalizowana ontologia orientacji klasycznej* (Warszawa: Wydawnictwo UKSW, 2007).

who was a student of Ingarden, presented an interesting solution to the problem of God and religion. This tradition was also created by: Władysław Stróżewski (1933–), Stanisław Grygiel (1934–), Jan Andrzej Kłoczowski OP (1937–), Karol Tarnowski (1937–), and Fr. Andrzej Bronk SVD (1938–)—the latter, in particular, through developing the research in meta-religious studies and religious studies. In the phenomenological-dialogic approach, the philosophy of God and religion has also been developed by Fr. Marek Jędraszewski (1949–), Tadeusz Gadacz (1955–), and Fr. Joachim Piecuch (1956–).

THE PHILOSOPHY OF GOD AND RELIGION IN THE THOMIST TRADITION

Essentially, the philosophy of religion was not practiced in the interwar period. Theodical issues were mainly discussed and developed, according to the approach of Louvain Thomism, by Stepa, Radziżewski, Gabryl and Wais; and, according to the approach of traditional Thomism—also until 1960s—by Adamczyk. It was handbook Thomism in which the thought of St. Thomas was not very precisely distinguished from the philosophy of Aristotle. Those approaches lacked the methodological elaboration of the foundations of theodicy; moreover, the problems of the philosophy of religion were not very well specified and emphasized in them. The key role in the development of the Thomist philosophy of God and religion was played by existential Thomism practiced in the Lublin School of Philosophy (KUL) after 1946. The most important representatives of that school included: Mieczysław Albert Krąpiec OP (1921–2008), Fr. Stanisław Kamiński (1919–1986), Zofia Józefa Zdybicka USJK (1928–), Fr. Stanisław Kowalczyk (1932–), Fr. Bohdan Bejze (1929–2005), Andrzej Maryniarczyk SDB (1950–), Włodzimierz Dłubacz (1952), and Fr. Piotr Moskal (1955–). Occasionally, theodical issues appeared in the works of Piotr Jaroszyński (1955–), Henryk Kiereś (1943–), and Fr. Józef Herbut (1933–2018)—especially with reference to transcendental Thomism. In existential Thomism, the studies concerning God and religion were first named: “theodicy”; then—“the philosophy of God,” and—since 1970s—“the philosophy of religion.” Also, the research on modern religious studies was taken up (Zdybicka, Moskal). Methodological foundations for the Thomist philosophy of God and

religion were basically worked out by Kamiński. Others, like Zdybicka, Edmund Morawiec CSsR (1930–2019), Ziemiański, and Kowalczyk, precised and detailed those issues.

Existential Thomism perceived God in a metaphysical manner, within the philosophy of being analyzed in the aspect of existence. The question about the existence of God appears along with the attempt to rationally explain the objective reality. The background of the question is the experience of the randomness of human existence and the world. As a philosophical problem, God emerges in the context of practicing metaphysics, which is why He is not the subject of a separate discipline (Krapiec). The philosophy of God (theodicy) differs from the philosophy of religion because of another objective starting point. However, both of them are placed within metaphysics: the former within general metaphysics; the latter within detailed metaphysics. And, while in theodicy God is perceived as the ultimate reason for the existence of an accidental being, in the philosophy of religion God is a part of religious relation. The issue of God connects theodicy and the philosophy of religion, but He is analyzed in them in a different aspect. Learning about God in general metaphysics is the condition for explaining the fact of religion in detailed metaphysics (Kamiński). The philosophy of religion assumes the philosophy of God including the whole classical metaphysical cognition, and it aims at specifying the nature of religion and indicating the ultimate ontic reasons for the existence of a religious relation. This is a cognition that starts from an experience which interprets the essence of religious facts in a metaphysical manner. In such a cognition, the reason for the existence of religion is in a being and not in a logical order, and the argumentation is reductive (Zdybicka).³

While looking for the ultimate explanation of the reality, Thomist metaphysics asks about the existence of God which is not something external as compared with philosophy, because it is created on the

³ Cf. Z.J. Zdybicka, *Partycypacja bytu. Próba wyjaśnienia relacji między światem a Bogiem* (Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL, 1972); eadem, *Człowiek i religia. Zarys filozofii religii* (Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL, 1977); eadem, *Religia i religioznawstwo* (Lublin: Redakcja Wydawnictw KUL, 1988); idem, *Bóg czy sacrum* (Lublin: Polskie Towarzystwo Tomasza z Akwinu, 2007); eadem, "Drogi afirmacji Boga," in *W kierunku Boga*, ed. B. Bejze (Warszawa: Akademia Teologii Katolickiej, 1982), pp. 108–166; eadem, "Klasyczna realistyczna filozofia religii," in *Filozofia religii*, ed. S. Janeczek (Lublin: Wydawnictwo KUL, 2012), pp. 139–161.

basis of a philosophical analysis of the structure of the experienced being. An accidental being exists in an unnecessary manner and, threatened by the contradiction with the principles of being and thought, demands the adoption of a Necessary Being. Metaphysical cognition does not assume any statements “for” or “against” theism; its starting point is neutral as for the existence or non-existence of God (Kamiński, Zdybicka). God is Pure and Necessary Existence that rationally and ultimately explains the accidentality of the world and the man. The thesis on the existence of God, considered in the philosophy of being that analyses the internal structure of being as a being, is justified in the analysis of internal relations occurring among the elements of a being. These relations are the only reason for the necessary relation between an accidental being and the Absolute which makes the former non-contradicting. The conclusion on the necessity of the existence of God is reached at the end of the process of intuitive-reductive argumentation. The process does not lead to the conclusion that God exists, but that His existence is necessary (Kamiński, Zdybicka, Kowalczyk and others). In this approach, the scholars emphasized the necessity to work out the proper concept of analogy that would make it possible to speak about God in a meaningful and rational manner. The philosophers who contributed to the elaboration of such a concept included Krąpiec, as well as Bejze, Maryniarczyk and others. The development of the philosophy of God and religion within existential Thomism was also facilitated by Kowalczyk who carried out methodological, historical and objective research on the classical and modern philosophy of God. He combined Thomism with such approaches as Augustinianism or phenomenology, avoiding the blurring of methodological and epistemological differences among those approaches. He appreciated the role of subjective and cultural factors in a religious experience. He is the author of one of the most characteristic handbooks of the philosophy of God in existential Thomism, in which he demonstrated, in quite a comprehensive manner, theodical issues that take into account the classical and modern shape of the issue.

The Thomists (Krąpiec, Kamiński, Kowalczyk, Zdybicka, Bejze, and others) paid considerable attention to the proofs for the existence of God. Their analyses took two directions: (1) historical, which consisted of the correct interpretation of the thought of St. Thomas, free from essentialism and physicalist interpretations (e.g. Kłósak),

(2) methodological, based on working out the structure of argumentation according to the requirements of the contemporary methodology of sciences, and (3) objective, which focuses on the ultimate explanation (understanding) of an accidental being in the perspective of separating it from nothingness (non-existence). This can be done through referring the accidental being to the ultimate reason, i.e. the highest Being (Krapiec). The meaning of ways treated as the proofs for the existence of God resulted in the fact that scholars dealt with them as theodicy, perceiving it as a separate discipline. However, if the problem of the existence of God is a metaphysical issue, separating it from general metaphysics leads to misunderstandings related to the nature and function of proofs. Thus, they must be treated as the development of the metaphysical cognition of being that assumes the knowledge of metaphysics. The difficulty with understanding the proofs results from not taking into account the differences between the thought of St. Thomas Aquinas and Aristotle. St. Thomas emphasizes the metaphysical nature of the ways. They are argumentations that respect Thomas' principle of the difference between rational and supernatural cognition (Kamiński, Zdybicka, Dłubacz).⁴

In its content, the argumentation from the ways is a kind of reasoning that proves the way in which existential states, available in an experience, are understandable and non-contradictory when we adopt the necessity of the existence of God as a being understandable in itself. Thomas formulated the ways while analyzing the structure of a real being: a compound of a particular being and the existence of that being. While analyzing the accidental being in the perspective of existence, we determine (in the First Way) its existence in the order of beings that adopts the features of motion, i.e. actualization of the potentiality of becoming of an unnecessary being. Then (in the Second Way), we indicate the First Cause of both the motion and the accidental being. The Third Way discusses the Necessary Being which is to be affirmed by the analysis of the relation of existence to the being in the accidental being. The non-identicalness of a being and existence in unnecessary beings results in the fact that they do not have reasons

⁴ Cf. S. Kamiński, "Epistemologiczno-metodologiczne problemy filozoficznego poznania Boga," in *W kierunku Boga*, pp. 82–107; idem, "Zagadnienia metodologiczne związane z filozofią Boga," in *Studia z filozofii Boga*, pp. 380–403; idem, *Światopogląd, religia, teologia. Zagadnienia filozoficzne i metodologiczne*, eds. A. Bronk, M. Walczak (Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL, 1998).

for being as such, which indicates the necessity of the existence of the Necessary Being, the essence of which is existence. The description of the perfection of beings in relation to the act of existence indicates full Existence identical with the essence (the Fourth Way). The analysis of the ordered and purposeful action of a non-reasonable being in the world sends us to its purposeful reason (the Fifth Way). The ways, starting from the experience of the real world, lead to justifying the necessity for the existence of a personal Absolute. This is the acknowledgement of the necessity for the existence of God without whom the world would be absurd. Without the reason for being inside or outside itself, the world would not differ from nothingness. Determining the necessity for the existence of God—Pure Actual Existence, Efficient Cause, the First Being, Pure Intellect—makes it possible to separate existence from non-existence. Existing beings derive their existence from God who constitutes the only being existing by the power of its essence (Krapiec, Zdybicka).⁵ Within existential Thomism, the studies in the philosophy of God were carried out by Dłubacz, and Moskal dealt with the so-called Catholic philosophy of religion and epistemology of religious beliefs, critically approaching some solutions suggested by the main representatives of the Lublin School of Philosophy. He is also the author of the works on the apologetics of Catholic faith. Existential Thomists also take up historical and objective studies in the issue of secularization—Paweł Mazanka CSsR (1960–), as well as atheism and its influence on the transformations of religion and modern culture—Fr. Jan Sochoń (1953–). Thomist authors also criticized the deconstruction of religion carried out by postmodernists (Kiereś). Within existential Thomism theodical analyses are also conducted by: Fr. Sławomir Szczyrba (1955–) and Fr. Tomasz Stępień (1969–).

In consequent Thomism (Gogacz), existential Thomism was precised through, i.a. further “cleaning” of Aquinas’ thought off foreign influences (Avicenna and neo-Platonism), and through taking into account the theory of the “speech of the heart” and a clear distinction

⁵ Cf. M.A. Krapiec, “Poznawalność Boga w naukach szczegółowych i w filozofii,” *Znak*, no. 5(59) (1959), pp. 564–577; idem, “Filozofia i Bóg,” in *O Bogu i człowieku*, vol. 1: *Problemy filozoficzne*, ed. B. Bejze (Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Sióstr Loretanek-Benedyktynek, 1968), pp. 11–55; idem, “Metafizyka i problem Boga,” in *Studia z filozofii Boga*, pp. 347–379; idem, “O rozumienie dróg poznania Boga,” in *W kierunku Boga*, pp. 50–58.

between the metaphysics of Aristotle and Thomas. In theodicy, consequent Thomism differs from existential Thomism. In the former, the basis includes the causal reference between individual beings and the Spontaneous Being, and among the created beings themselves. In consequent Thomism, the relation between God and created beings is discovered through the analysis of causal references. It is not participation which, however, constitutes the principle of the reality of being, resulting from the connection between a being and existence.⁶

Another approach to the issue of God within the Thomist research tradition developed in Poland in the 20th century is scientist theodicy. Its representative is Ziemiański. At first, he supported metaphysics in the version based on existential Thomism. Later, under the influence of Louvain Thomism (Kłósak), he started to assimilate the data of exact sciences. According to Ziemiański, in the philosophical analysis we have to take into account scientific data, but we should not treat thought constructions or hypotheses as facts. The facts taken into account in the starting point of the proofs for the existence of God must be certain, obvious and real, and they should not include the sufficient reason for being in themselves. Natural sciences offer quite a precise image of the world, they unmask prejudices and misunderstandings, and they provide us with certainty. As they develop, we gain more and more knowledge of what cannot be explained by facts and natural laws, and what needs to be explained by metaphysics.⁷ In this concept, in the starting point for the philosophy of God, we use facts described in scientific language in which a given theory is formulated. Then, these facts are subject to philosophical interpretation in the light of the principles of Thomist metaphysics. Basically, this form of theodicy is not continued in Poland.

Fr. Karol Wojtyła (1920–2005) developed phenomenologizing Thomism in Poland from the 1950s—both with reference to ethics and axiology, and to the cognition of God, especially with reference to the experience of a religious act. Although, until the end of 1940s,

⁶ Cf. M. Gogacz, *Poszukiwanie Boga. Wykłady z metafizyki Absolutnego Istnienia* (Warszawa: Akademia Teologii Katolickiej, 1976); idem, *Filozoficzne aspekty mistyki. Materiały do filozofii mistyki* (Warszawa: Akademia Teologii Katolickiej, 1985).

⁷ Cf. S. Ziemiański, *Teologia naturalna. Filozoficzna problematyka Boga* (Kraków: Fakultet Filozoficzny Towarzystwa Jezusowego, 1995); idem, *Filozoficzne poznanie Boga* (Kraków: Petrus, 2011).

he remained under the influence of traditional Thomism, especially that of Réginald Marie Garrigou-Lagrange, in time he started to appreciate phenomenological description and intuition in religious experience which always occurs in the interior of a personal being. The problem of the cognition of God as a personal and absolute being with reference to, i.a. Ingarden's ontology that described opportunities and preceded metaphysics, was discussed by Stępień.⁸ Ontology, as a discipline about possibilities, analyses the content of the idea of God as an Absolute, but it does not speak about His actual existence. Metaphysics, in turn, is the area of the analysis of the existence of a necessary and personal Absolute being the ultimate reason for the accidental world. In phenomenologizing Thomism, the theory of being is preceded with the description of what is given directly as the essence. Thus, metaphysics cannot function without phenomenology. It was the attempt to renew the philosophy of religion by connecting it with a particular human experience open to the signs directing us towards God, who, in this approach, is not perceived in objective but subjective categories as You, the Other, the Person (Jaworski). Such a phenomenology of existence, which investigates religious consciousness, was connected with metaphysics as an uninvolved knowledge obtained though the argumentation (of the proofs) for the existence of God. As a result, the proofs are based on direct religious experience and they are a critical reflection on that experience. In metaphysics, the cognition of God assumes intuitive religious experience described by phenomenology, the explanation of which is carried out by metaphysics. These are methodologically different stages, but they complement one another in the structure of argumentation. In the philosophy of religion, phenomenologizing Thomism differs from existential Thomism with the starting point. The former starts from a subjective experience, to reach the acknowledgement of the man's dependence on the divine person as a certain You. The latter starts from the experience of the accident of things and people, to reach God as the First Cause (Jaworski).⁹

⁸ Cf. A. Stępień, "Filozofia poznania a filozofia Boga," in *Studia z filozofii Boga*, pp. 404–418; idem, "Zagadnienie Boga w fenomenologii. Kilka uwag wstępnych," in *Aby poznać Boga i człowieka*, part 1: *O Bogu dziś*, ed. B. Bejze (Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Sióstr Loretanek-Benedyktyniek, 1974), pp. 85–94.

⁹ Cf. M. Jaworski, *Pisma z filozofii religii* (*Studia z filozofii Boga, religii i człowieka*, vol. 2), selected and edited by S. Szczepaniak (Warszawa: Wydawnictwo UKSW, 2002), pp. 79–318.

Within Louvain Thomism, the analysis of the proofs for the existence of God was carried out with the use of the theses of natural sciences (Kłósak), which were reductively connected with metaphysical theses (Michalski).¹⁰ The ways of Thomas—which, just like in the Kraków Circle (Drewnowski), were not treated as logical deductive proofs—were an important subject of studies and scholars perceived them as explanatory argumentation. They were presented in the context of the contemporary achievements of natural sciences used to support or revise the arguments of the tradition. The philosophy of God separated from metaphysics discussed the issues related to God. Even as an independent discipline, it uses the conclusions of metaphysics according to the same principle on the basis of which it uses the data from the philosophy of man (Kłósak).

Scholars believed that the argument from accidentality was the most valid, because other ways led to that argument (Kłósak). The existence of accidental beings was perceived as understandable provided that the existence of a necessary being is assumed (Kłósak). This made it possible to move from the indicated assumption to the conviction about the real existence of a necessary being. Within Louvain Thomism, the philosophers formulated the arguments referring to the accidentality of existence and taking into account physical and biological data, as well as the arguments from the temporal beginning of the universe or the beginning of organic life.¹¹

In 20th century Poland, in analytical Thomism, the issue of God and religion with the application of modern logic was taken up by the members of the so-called Kraków Circle who believed that each philosopher, in order to think responsibly, must use mathematical logic. Rejecting “minimalist philosophies,” including the worldview of neo-positivism (Salamucha), the Kraków Circle recognized exact thinking based on mathematical logic as a method of philosophy and theology. Since logic does not have metaphysical assumptions, it should be applied, inter alia, in the proofs for the existence of God and in other scientific proofs (Sobociński). The Kraków Circle aimed

¹⁰ Cf. K. Michalski, *Nieznanej Bogu* (Warszawa: Koło Studiów Katolickich; Naukowy Instytut Katolicki, 1936).

¹¹ Cf. K. Kłósak, *W poszukiwaniu Pierwszej Przyczyny*, vol. 1–2 (Warszawa: Instytut Wydawniczy Pax, 1955–1957); idem, *Z zagadnień filozoficznego poznania Boga* (Kraków: Polskie Towarzystwo Teologiczne, 1979).

at improving Christian theology and philosophy based on the teaching of Aquinas in such a way that these disciplines could become modern sciences practiced in such an exact manner as theoretical physics (Drewnowski). The members of the Kraków Circle formalized the proofs of St. Thomas, tried to explain the main scholastic concepts (e.g. the concept of analogy) through logic, and postulated the revision of other concepts (Drewnowski suggested a logical precision of the statements on the Holy Trinity).¹² According to the representatives of the Kraków Circle, philosophy is a discipline that uses strict methods of logical argumentation and proving of statements, which introduces clarity because of the analysis of ideas and methods. The Kraków Circle separated worldview and philosophy, as well as faith and knowledge (Bocheński, Drewnowski).

According to the supporters of the Circle, religion is the sum of scientific knowledge, faith and rituals. For example, Catholicism is a subjective approach to life that contains ceremonial, emotional and rational elements. Its core is an objective constituent (doctrine) which is to be interpreted as a collection of axioms (Salamucha) although the collection cannot be sufficient enough to logically prove all the truths of faith (Drewnowski). The most important were the dogmas that are unchanging but subject to interpretation. They constitute the basis for a system developed from doctrinal axioms and that system creates possibly the most complete but never total “theory of Catholic life.” The development of the doctrinal system of axioms is the task of theology the subject of which is God in relation to the world, including the whole non-empirical reality. Theology excludes philosophy which deals with the whole reality. Completely axiomized systems of theology and philosophy would be different in that the axioms of theology are adopted on the basis of the revelation, and philosophical axioms are adopted on one’s own responsibility. The theses of the systems are different, but some theses of philosophy may be identical with theological ones (Salamucha).¹³ In terms of the truthfulness of religion,

¹² Cf. J.F. Drewnowski, “Neoscholastyka wobec nowoczesnych wymagań nauki,” in *Mysł katolicka wobec logiki współczesnej* (Studia Gnesnensia, vol. 15) (Poznań: Księgarnia św. Wojciecha, 1937), pp. 49–57; idem, “Czy metafizyka i religia wytrzymują krytykę naukową?” in idem, *Filozofia i precyzja. Zarys programu filozoficznego i inne pisma* (Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL, 1996), pp. 181–191.

¹³ Cf. J. Salamucha, “Dowód ‘Ex motu’ na istnienie Boga. Analiza logiczna argumentacji św. Tomasza z Akwinu,” *Collectanea Theologica* 15, no. 1 (1934),

the Kraków Circle concluded that it is logical to argue that Catholicism does not contradict common sense, and that it is the only religion that endures scientific criticism. Religion can be treated as seriously as any other objective knowledge provided that we acknowledge the transcendence of the Absolute and make it easier for the faithful to contact the supernatural area (it has to be an “institution available to everyone” and “easy to use”). The transcendence of the Absolute is proclaimed by three monotheisms (Judaism, Christianity and Islam), but only the Catholic Church claims to be a “device” originating from God’s revelation and functioning as an intermediary between people and God (Drewnowski).

In the spirit of logical precision, in the analytic tradition scholars developed the philosophy of religion that was identified with the logic of religion, indifferent to religious and worldview issues (i.e. it can be practiced both by believers and non-believers). It deals with the biggest religions and only those that can be analyzed with the use of modern logic. The logic of religion studies the structure of religious language, justifies religious statements, semantically analyses the language of religion, is neither the surrogate of religion nor its philosophical basis, and it cannot be a theodicy providing the proofs for the existence of God. Its subject is specific, general and complex; in order to avoid reductionism, a researcher of religion must acknowledge that religion has its principles of truthfulness and meaning. The postulate of the pluralism of the rules of meaning and truthfulness limit, also in the analysis of religion, the general rules of deduction and semiotics. We should avoid the reductionism of being oriented at one of the dimensions of religion, e.g. the cognitive or emotional one. The logic of religion analyses reality and avoids speculation (Bocheński).¹⁴

In the approach of analytical Thomism, Nieznański (UKSW) carried out research in theodicy in 1980s and 1990s, formalizing significant parts of Thomist theodicy. Also, he disputed with some utterances of the members of the Kraków Circle, related to the ways of formalizing the arguments for the existence of God. Nieznański’s research in formalizing theodicy (especially the analytical one) has

pp. 53–92; idem, *Wiedza i wiara. Wybrane pisma filozoficzne*, eds. J.J. Jadacki, K. Świętorzecka (Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL, 1997).

¹⁴ Cf. J.M. Bocheński, *Logika i filozofia. Wybór pism*, trans. T. Baszniak et al., ed. J. Parys (Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, 1993).

been continued by Fr. Roman Tomanek (1956–). In the Lublin School of Philosophy, a similar research (but with a moderate approach to formalization) is carried out by Wojtysiak who elaborated the issue of the principle of sufficient reason among analysts, and who is the author of the modern handbook in natural theology based on the tradition of analytic theism. Herbut (the formalization of analogy) and Moskal (the formalization of theodical arguments) also approached the use of formalization activities in theodical issues in a moderately critical manner. At the University of Opole, theodical issues in the spirit of transcendental Thomism are developed by Fr. Kazimierz Wolsza (1960–).

PHILOSOPHY OF GOD AND RELIGION IN THE CONTEXT OF SCIENCE

Philosophy in the context of science emerges from the idea of open epistemology in which—by avoiding the mistakes of the past in the form of radical separatism (isolationism) or unificationism dominating in the circles close to positivism—the scholars try to work out the relations between science and philosophy anew.¹⁵ According to the supporter of that concept, Fr. Józef Życiński (1948–2011)—“the context of science” is a constant consideration of new scientific discoveries to provide the answers to those representatives of the scientific-technical civilization who have not shaped their basic intellectual concepts in the school of metaphysicians, but who are looking for the ontological interpretation of the world taking into account the natural knowledge.¹⁶ Such views are called theist naturalism or theological naturalism, like in the concept of Życiński.¹⁷ Some philosophers, such as Wojtysiak, call that concept scientific panentheism. The supporters of that concept believe that the issues related to the philosophy of God

¹⁵ See P. Duchliński, *W stronę aporetycznej filozofii klasycznej. Konfrontacja tomizmu egzystencjalnego z wybranymi koncepcjami filozofii współczesnej* (Kraków: Akademia Ignatianum, Wydawnictwo WAM, 2014), pp. 310–311.

¹⁶ J. Życiński, “Filozofować w kontekście nauki,” in *Rozmowy o filozofii*, eds. A. Zieliński, J. Wojtysiak, M. Bagiński (Lublin: Redakcja Wydawnictw KUL, 1996), p. 192.

¹⁷ M. Heller, “Naturalizm teologiczny Józefa Życińskiego,” in J. Życiński, *Transcendencja i naturalizm* (Kraków: Copernicus Center Press, 2014), p. 12.

and religion should be developed in strict connection with the development of natural sciences that influence shaping the so-called scientific image of the world, which, in turn, significantly influences the way God and religion are perceived. They critically approach neo-Thomist theodicy which consciously separates itself from exact sciences. That is why the supporters of that concept claim that theodical problems should be solved in the context of the scientific image of the world. Obviously, science cannot solve the question of God's existence or non-existence. However, scientific data interpreted in a philosophical manner may be used to creatively support some theist theses, e.g. the existence of soul, its connection with the brain, etc. This way, reinterpretation of traditional theodical categories has been carried out which, however, has not questioned the basic assumptions of the Christian theism. Instead, it led to the so-called panentheistic concept of God and His relation to the world. The researchers who philosophized in the context of science took up various theodical issues. They form a certain philosophical system in the views of Życiński, and in the texts of Heller they mainly occur in the considerations related to the so-called theology of science.

The most important issues discussed within this approach included the temporal beginning of the world and the beginning of life on Earth analyzed by Heller and Życiński who developed the achievements of Louvain Thomists (Radziszewski, Kłósak) by reaching to the newest achievements of exact sciences. They worked out the program of the so-called philosophy in the context of science which included the idea of a new concept of natural theology practiced in a strict connection with the data of natural sciences. The research included a broad scope of issues related to sciences: from the question on the creation of the world and the appearance of the man, through the idea of God, up to Christian eschatology. An important research question was the theory of biological and cosmic evolution, with the beginning (the theory of the Big Bang) and the possible end (the Big Crunch) of the universe. As opposed to the neopositivist methodology of sciences, the philosophers of this approach aimed at the synthesis of sciences and theology. New physics, which was created after the revolution of Einstein-Planck, made it possible to better explain the conflict of sciences and religion (Heller).

The main issues concerning the relation: science-faith in the 20th century include: the dispute over the beginning or eternity of the world

(the creation of the world by God *vs* the eternity of the world/its emergence after the Big Bang), the dispute over the origin of life and self-consciousness (the creation of the man by God *vs* biological-cosmic evolution), the dispute over God's interference with the world (interventionism *vs* the non-interventionist approach). In these disputes, the theologians of science supported the solutions based on the synthesis of the results of modern science and the theses of Christian philosophy and theology. That approach opposed both religious fundamentalism and atheist fundamentalism. In the dispute on the temporal beginning of the world, the theologians of science returned to the theory proclaiming that the essence of the act of creation included making of the world and maintaining its existence by God (*continua creatio*), which implies the constant dependence of the world on God. We do not have to look for God in particular points of cosmic evolution (the Big Bang) because He is present in everything that exists at each stage of the evolving universe (Heller, Życiński).

In the dispute between the materialist interpretation of natural evolution and theist creationism, the philosophers aimed at the synthesis of scientific data with theological theses on the creation of the man by God. It was possible because of the idea *continua creatio* and the idea of God's immanence in nature, which had been neglected by Christian theology by emphasizing the divine transcendence as compared to the creations such as the world and the man. In order to make it clearly different from pantheism, the scholars termed such an idea panentheism ("God's presence in everything"). The adoption of the theist interpretation of biological evolution (Christian evolutionism) was connected with the rejection of ideological interpretations of evolution that agreed as to the impossibility to reconcile the theory of evolution with Christianity. According to Christian evolutionism, the philosophers supporting the theology of science proclaimed that God is the direct cause of everything that exists in the world, but He does not destroy the natural causality which is the subject of the theory of evolution. Also, the attempt to combine the results of empirical sciences and theological-philosophical theses on God's immanence in nature, reflects the approach of the above-mentioned philosophers to God's action in the world. They did not believe that God influences the world through interferences that suspend the existing laws of nature (Życiński). They did not resign from the purposeful description of the evolution and, in its context, God's action, but they

referred to the presence of Logos inscribed in the work of creation because such a presence is rational and expressed in the “mathematical quality of nature.” If God is present in each element of creation, He can use many strategies to influence the world in a “non-interventionist” manner (Heller). It is because God is immanent in the laws of nature and their limitations. While perceiving God’s action this way, in nature we can see cosmos (order) and chaos which complement each other, enabling us to understand cosmic evolution (and natural evolution) as the rational process directed by the Divine Logos. As for God who acts in the world, we can only claim that He is more willing to act through the laws of nature, in hiding, than through suspending those laws in a spectacular manner. This is a kind of God’s *kenosis* in the world. Hidden God permeates the metaphysical foundations of existence understood as the existence of the natural world and the man living in this world (Heller, Życiński).¹⁸ Theodicy and the philosophy of religion matching this approach is developed by Fr. Stanisław Wszolek (1958–), who worked out the notion of the rationality of faith. Fr. Tadeusz Pabjan (1972–) continues some ideas of Życiński’s theist emergentism. Also (together with Heller), he deals with the creation of the world from the theological and natural point of view, and with the issue of evil and God’s omnipotence. Fr. Miłosz Hołda (1983–) is interested in epistemological foundations of science. While studying them, he analyzed the issue of theist foundations of science. Fr. Wojciech Grygiel (1969–) develops the idea of evolutionary theology, reinterpreting classical theological categories in the context of the scientific image of the world. A similar approach is also taken by a student of Życiński’s—Bogdan Lisiak SJ (1958–) from AIK, who deals with the problem of God in the philosophy of a process and with the relations between science and religion. The studies initiated by Życiński, especially those related to God’s acting in the world, are carried out by Fr. Marek Słomka (1971–) from KUL. This way of practicing natural theology is criticized by Thomists from the Lublin School of Philosophy and, on the other hand, by, e.g. Kazimierz Jodkowski (1950–) and the Zielona

¹⁸ Cf. M. Heller, *Wszczęświat i Słowo* (Kraków: Znak, 1981); idem, *Nowa fizyka i nowa teologia* (Kraków: Copernicus Center Press, 2017); J. Życiński, *Teizm i filozofia analityczna*, vol. 1–2 (Kraków: Znak, 1985–1988); idem, *Bóg Abrahama i Whiteheada* (Tarnów: Biblos, 1992); idem, *Bóg i ewolucja. Podstawowe pytania ewolucjonizmu chrześcijańskiego* (Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL, 2002).

Góra group connected with him. At UPJPII, which is the center of philosophizing in the context of science, independent research in the philosophy of religion (especially Russian) is also carried out by Teresa Obolevitch SBDNP (1974–).

PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION IN THE PHENOMENOLOGICAL-HERMENEUTIC TRADITION

The phenomenological-hermeneutic tradition of the Christian philosophy of religion, which includes the philosophy of dialogue, was created in the group of Ingarden's students (i.a.: Tischner, Stróżewski) supported by people from outside that group (e.g. Grygiel, Kłoczowski). In this tradition, the issue of God and religion has been discussed in various phenomenological approaches that cannot be separated from one another, just like they cannot be separated from hermeneutics or the philosophy of dialogue. It is because, in the views of many phenomenologists, those approaches overlap. The phenomenological-hermeneutic tradition is characterized by an attachment to a phenomenology of a certain type and to phenomenological hermeneutics. Also, it demonstrates the tendency to dialogic thinking, and, in some cases, to referring to metaphysics in order to transform or question it. The representatives of this tradition are rooted in Husserl's phenomenology and its derivatives (e.g. Ingarden, Sartre, Lévinas, etc.) or in the phenomenology of religion worked out by Rudolf Otto and Mircea Eliade.

According to the phenomenology (and hermeneutics) of religion (Kłoczowski, Bronk), both religion itself and the man who is the subject of religion are immersed in the culture of their time. Religion is not just a human (cultural), but also a divine (transcendent) element. Thus, the phenomenology of religion describes it as a phenomenon situated on the border of human and divine world, but fulfilled in the acts of *homo religiosus*. However, the subject of a religious experience is not fully constituted by the man, which is why the theory of a religious experience goes beyond anthropology. It is because religious consciousness is intentionally directed at God perceived as the Absolute. The subject is directed towards a living presence which he/she experiences as *sacrum*. This concept describes the inter-mediation in divine revelation or sends us to it, without interpreting

divinity as such (Kłoczowski).¹⁹ Such a situation takes place, e.g. in art, where *sacrum* is the phenomenon occurring within the area of an intentional products, i.e. a work of art (Stróżewski). The opposition *sacrum–profanum* was sometimes replaced with the triad: *divinum (Deus)—sacrum—profanum* (Kłoczowski). Also, *sacrum* was distinguished from *sanctum*, where the former had a purely phenomenological status, and the latter—a metaphysical one (Stróżewski); or, the former was identified with archaic religions, and the latter—with God of Judaism and Christianity (Tischner). In this approach, the philosophers often moved from the phenomenology of religion to the hermeneutics of religion (according to Ricoeur), accepting the necessity of phenomenology or hermeneutics in studying religion which is a certain whole that merges *sacrum* and *profanum*. It is because, as the man's action in the world, religion provides us with a holistic view which does not allow for merging those areas (Kłoczowski).

The phenomenological perspective assumes that a researcher describes a phenomenon that has an essential content. The task of a researcher who faces religion is to describe it in a reliable manner, without trying to make that description exhaustive. It is because no phenomenology of religion shall fully express the man's experience of, e.g. religious faith. That is why a philosopher of religion can only describe the essence of the experience encountered by a religious person (Tischner).²⁰ Referring to Ingarden, the philosophers within this approach often created the ontology of God or religious experience, perceived as the description of pure possibilities that is independent of their occurrence (Tischner, Stróżewski, Tarnowski). Also, they investigated, i.a. the metaphysical concept of Logos as something that describes the Absolute in close connection with reasonableness. Logos was perceived as a mysterious yet reasonable frame of reality,

¹⁹ Cf. J.A. Kłoczowski, *Między samotnością a wspólnotą. Wstęp do filozofii religii* (Tarnów: Biblos, 1994); idem, *Drogi człowieka mistycznego* (Kraków: Wydawnictwo Literackie, 2001).

²⁰ Cf. J. Tischner, "Wokół spraw wiary i rozumu," in *Filozofować w kontekście nauki*, eds. M. Heller, A. Michalik, J. Życiński (Kraków: Polskie Towarzystwo Teologiczne, 1987), pp. 35–45; idem, "W poszukiwaniu doświadczenia Boga," in idem, *Świat ludzkiej nadziei* (Kraków: Znak, 1992), pp. 227–247; idem, "Schyłek chrześcijaństwa tomistycznego," in idem, *Myślenie według wartości* (Kraków: Znak, 1993), pp. 215–238; idem, "Myślenie religijne," in idem, *Myślenie według wartości*, pp. 357–379; idem, *Filozofia dramatu* (Paris: Éditions du Dialogue, 1990); idem, *Spór o istnienie człowieka* (Kraków: Znak, 1999).

from which all meaning is derived. Important aspects of Logos included the religious dimension that made it possible for them to identify Him with God. The synthesis of the Greek logos (reason) with the divine Logos of Christianity was interpreted in metaphysical thinking about God, however, with the emphasis on the description of the essence of God, and not on proving that He exists (Stróżewski).²¹ With regard to the Christian approach to religion, the philosophers discussed the relation between reason and faith or science and faith. The reflection on “faith seeking understanding” or “reason seeking faith” was taken up by Polish phenomenologists in many different contexts, but it has always been the reflection on the essence of faith which cannot be separated from reason (Tischner, Stróżewski, Tarnowski).

Within this approach, scholars not only developed the philosophy of religious faith, but also philosophical faith. Philosophical faith was the basis for the openness of thinking focused on divinity understood in different ways (in particular doctrines). Religious and philosophical faith opened thinking to the Mystery, going beyond factuality and discovering its meaning. While philosophical faith showed the possibility to discover the hope for finite goodness, religious faith made it possible to think about the hope for absolute Goodness. Thinking about the latter cannot be uninvolved, but it is the decision of faith that enables our openness to the Goodness that saves. That philosophy grew from the Christian experience of faith expressed in religious thinking aiming at universality (Tarnowski).²² Within this trend, the philosophers often did not separate religion (theology) from science (philosophy), because they treated both philosophy and theology as the explication of what was more original than them, i.e. the Mystery in which they both participate. It is because religious faith was perceived as the reference to the reality, and not to speculative concepts in

²¹ Cf. W. Stróżewski, “Bóg i świat w myśli św. Tomasza z Akwinu,” in idem, *Istnienie i sens* (Kraków: Znak, 1994), pp. 73–120; idem, “Logos i mythos,” in idem, *Logos, wartość, miłość* (Kraków: Znak, 2013), pp. 129–149; idem, “Bogactwo Logosu,” in idem, *Logos, wartość, miłość*, pp. 150–159; idem, “O możliwości ‘sacrum’ w sztuce,” in *Fenomenologia polska a chrześcijaństwo*, eds. J. Gomułka, K. Tarnowski, A. Workowski (Kraków: Wydawnictwo Naukowe UPJPII, 2014), pp. 161–182.

²² Cf. K. Tarnowski, *Ku absolutnej ucieczce. Bóg i wiara w filozofii Gabriela Marcela* (Kraków: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PAT, 1993); idem, *Ustyszeć niewidzialne. Zarys filozofii wiary* (Kraków: Instytut Myśli Józefa Tischnera, 2005); idem, *Tropy myślenia religijnego* (Kraków: Instytut Myśli Józefa Tischnera, 2009).

which Transcendence cannot be contained. The event of faith was perceived as the event of capturing and calling by the Mystery, which does not leave us existentially indifferent but calls us for change and *metanoia*. Thus, within this trend, the point was not to theoretically accept the truths of faith analyzed philosophically for the sake of the responsibility for truth, but faith was perceived as an existential decision. In this approach, not only the reason, but also religious faith was the source of truth. Religious faith came to the fore when Transcendence was understood as God named as the absolute You. It is the God of dialogue who can be called and who calls us by the name. In religious faith, we refer to God who is close and involved in human affairs—God who waits for our existential involvement and our reply to what He calls us for (Tischner, Tarnowski). In this approach, religious experience is often described as the experience of dialogue or/and drama between the man and God. That is why we should speak about a God who is calling or appealing to man. The philosophers supporting this approach claimed that we learn about God not from rational speculations, but from His revelation (an appeal or call addressed to the man) in which He shows Himself to us as a Person to whom we should open and reply. Such a relation with God has often been described as a bond of love combined with choosing and trusting each other. In this interpretation, the knowledge of God is a divine initiative and not human achievement, because no rational argumentation leads to such knowledge. It is because the divine reasonableness is identified with the act of the freedom of God who is rational with the “rationality” of love and goodness (Tischner, Grygiel, Tarnowski).

Phenomenological reflection on religion was, in this approach, carried out in the opposition to classical interpretations. The Thomist interpretation was particularly rejected, although sometimes Augustinianism was approved. At that time, phenomenology was treated as the only possible reflection on religion because of the intellectual atmosphere that rejected classical metaphysics as inadequate for the current cultural situation. The Christian phenomenologists of religion rejected the idea of God perceived as a substance *per se* the essence of which is identical with existence (Tischner, Grygiel, Tarnowski). Referring to Descartes, they often emphasized that God is unlimited freedom that exists in person, and His relation with the world is not based on the classical participation in Existence, but on

the interpersonal bond. The representatives of this approach did not acknowledge the classical proofs for the existence of God, and St. Anselm's argument or ontological proof was treated as the description of the experience of God which man can discover in himself. The rationalistic concept of God-reason was replaced with the idea of God defined by freedom and goodness or/and gift (Tischner, Grygiel).²³ Younger representatives of the phenomenological-hermeneutic approach work in various scientific environments. Fr. Maciej Bała (1966–) from UKSW deals with the hermeneutic philosophy of religion, especially in the interpretation of Ricoeur. At the Jesuit University Ignatianum in Krakow, Andrzej Gielarowski (1969–) studies problems from the border of religion and culture; also, he deals with the crisis of the contemporary culture and the role of religion in overcoming that crisis. Krzysztof Pawłowski (1952–) analyses the aspects of philosophy related to wisdom, carrying out multifaceted criticism of the contemporary culture, and suggesting the restoration of the idea of Logos Incarnate as an antidote for the crisis of culture. In the same environment, Fr. Robert Grzywacz SJ (1978–) deals with the hermeneutics and phenomenology of religion in the context of the reception of the French phenomenology. Joanna Barcik (1974–), connected with UPJPII, studies the contemporary feminist theology and philosophy of religion, and Fr. Mirosław Pawliszyn (1967–) from the University of Warmia and Mazury investigates the existential philosophy of religion, especially the issue of death; also, he carries out the reception of Russian philosophy. Fr. Krzysztof Śnieżyński (1972–) develops his own project of cultural criticism perceived as a religious philosophy of religion.

DISCUSSIONS AND DISPUTES

Traditions and trends of the Christian philosophy of religion in Poland in the 20th century often discussed and disputed with one another. Some of these controversies are worth noting.

In Thomism, there was a dispute on the possibility of referring to the results of exact sciences in the argumentation for the existence

²³ Cf. S. Grygiel, "Człowiek i Bóg w metafizyce," in *Fenomenologia polska a chrześcijaństwo*, pp. 85–115; idem, "Od Pierwszej Przyczyny do Boga nadziei," in idem, *Kimże jest człowiek?* (Kielce: Wydawnictwo Jedność, 1995), pp. 93–107.

of God. Louvain Thomism and scientist theodicy believed that it was necessary to use the results of modern sciences in proving the existence of God. Existential Thomists, in turn, claimed that such references are methodologically incorrect because they did not connect the ways of St. Thomas with any physics. They believed that it is impossible to answer the question about the existence of God using scientific data. That is why metaphysical explanations of existence, including the proofs for the existence of God, have to be independent of physical interpretations.

In the context of the philosophy of God there was a dispute between existential Thomism and Louvain Thomism on the way of understanding existence. The representatives of existential Thomism criticized Louvain Thomism (Kłósak) for the way of interpreting being as what is real and also includes God. That concept referred to what exists in any manner, including purely intentional one. In Louvain Thomism, the philosophers claimed that what is real is possible to be learnt, which, however, was not interpreted as existing in the mind but as existing in relation to the mind. According to existential Thomists, such a concept of being was erroneous as a repetition of the mistake made by St. Anselm who deduced the real existence of the Absolute from its concept. Kłósak, in turn, criticized the idea of a being adopted in existential Thomism (Krapiec) as a concept full of contradictions, especially in terms of proving the existence of God. Krapiec did not acknowledge the existence of intentional beings and he claimed that only real beings exist (in particular, the existing world, which Kłósak refuted as existential monism). According to his opponents, Krapiec did not express enough criticism as to the argumentation *ex gubernationae rerum* because of the voluntarist interpretation of purposefulness. Kłósak believed that the solution to those problems should be found in the concept of being which includes the existence of real and intentional beings.

The dispute over the application of modern logic in Christian theodicy and philosophy was conducted in the context of the works of the Kraków Circle. Traditional neo-Thomism was criticized for abandoning valuable elements present in the medieval logic and ignoring the modern logic that could reinforce and develop the argumentation for the existence of God. The supporters of traditional Thomism criticized the Kraków Circle for using modern mathematical logic which, due to its alleged conventionalism, was to lead to the

relativisation of the concept of truth. This would have a negative influence on practicing Christian philosophy, especially theodicy, as a discipline that would not prove any necessity, including the necessity for the existence of God.

Also, within the Christian philosophy the scholars became involved in the dispute over the idea of a proof in the context of the argumentation for the existence of God. The structure of Thomas' proofs was the source of misunderstandings, which was connected with, e.g. the way of understanding the concept of a proof. The modern meaning of the concept refers to deductive argumentation the essence of which is justifying statements through proper logical rules. Such a justification takes place on the basis of the very form of expressions. Such a proof was confronted with the interpretation of Thomas, which resulted in controversy and criticism of the philosophy of God in existential Thomism. Such a criticism was mainly typical of Louvain Thomism (Kłósak), but it was also present in the works of Heller and Życiński.

Heller questioned the worldview meaning of the question about the absolute temporal beginning of the universe, the solution of which was to reinforce (weaken) the argumentation for the existence of God that referred to that question. Taking into account the development of scientific theories, we can only speak about a "beginning" in simplified cosmological models. In reply to this opinion, Kłósak claimed that this question is important, but not for a cosmologist dealing with empirical issues, but rather for a philosopher of nature who asks about the existence of God.

The concept of God suggested in existential Thomism was criticized by phenomenologists. Opposing the perception of God in the categories that objectified Him (the First Cause, Pure Existence, the Necessary Being), they refused to interpret the relation between God and the man in the category of cause and effect. They described God and His relation with man in the categories of freedom and gift (Grygiel, Tischner). The criticism of Christian theology and philosophy announced the dawn of Thomist Christianity and the fall of Augustinian Christianity. Such criticism referred to the Thomistic philosophy (the decline of Thomistic Christianity), it being, throughout the ages, a tool for the interpretation of the Christian teaching. Existential Thomism was accused of being a system in which the structure prevails over religious experience: although metaphysics

allowed for the experience of *sacrum*, it focused on the proofs for the existence of God deduced from accidentality (Tischner). Those theses aroused the disputes initiated by other philosophers (Swieżawski, Krąpiec, Stępień, Gogacz, Jerzy Turowicz; 1912–1999).

A similar criticism of existential Thomism was taken up by the representatives of phenomenologizing Thomism, who believed that we cannot recognize the proper relation between the man and God starting from the analysis of what is finite, i.e. the accidentality of the world and the man. The way to recognize that relation is starting from the analysis of personal reality the essence of which is freedom. The metaphysical point of view falsifies the relation between the man and God which is the relation between human “I” and the absolute “You” of God (Jaworski).

In turn, phenomenology (Tischner, Grygiel) was criticized by existential Thomists (Stępień, Krąpiec, Gogacz, Kalinowski) and analysts (Bocheński). They focused on the methodological aspects of phenomenology, especially in its existential version, which, as thinking from within the metaphor (Tischner), was far from scientific exactness. The basis was the starting point for the philosophy of religion and the perspective of studies which, for Thomists, had a systemic nature. The objections against phenomenologists (Tischner, Grygiel) related to their practical analyses. The dispute over the starting point of philosophy referred to philosophizing in the light of the ethos of thinking or in the light of the logos (theoretical approach oriented at rationality that searches for reasons and dominates what is ethical and practical).

Some scholars disputed with phenomenology (Ingarden, Tischner) about the ontological approach to the issue of God. Ontology as the analysis of possibilities was not sufficient for them, as it did not consider the existence of God, which existential Thomism (Stępień, Krąpiec) indicated as the error of phenomenology. Within this approach, the concept of *sacrum*, typical of the phenomenology of religion, was also criticized. It is because *sacrum* was to replace God as the one who exists actually and independently of the man’s conscience (Zdybicka).

Also, there was a dispute over the cognition of God between phenomenology (Tischner, Grygiel) and existential Thomism (Kalinowski, Stępień). The critics focused on the existential cognition of God taking place through love and faith (Kalinowski). According to

phenomenologists, the existence of God cannot be proved, but it is discovered through love, because God cannot be the subject of theoretical cognition based on reason. Rather, He is the subject of the cognition in which the mind cooperates with the heart. The latter, however, does not mean irrationalism, but a conclusion that the man learns things using the whole of himself (Grygiel). A similar dispute took place between existential Thomism and phenomenologizing Thomism. It referred to the cognition of God that cannot only be rational, but must take into account existential factors (Jaworski). Phenomenologizing Thomists also criticized existential Thomism, postulating the perception of God also as the highest value (Jaworski). Identifying God with a value or *sacrum* was, in turn, criticized by existential Thomists, e.g. Zdybicka.

The so-called Open Lectures on Natural Theology, given by Józef Maria Bocheński and organized by the Dominican Order in Kraków, became an important forum for the exchange of the views on God and religion. The participants of those lectures often discussed the issues worked out in the analytic natural theology and the philosophy of religion. The group of participants included: Stanisław Judycki (1954–), Ireneusz Ziemiński (1965–), Wojtysiak, Fr. Adam Świeżyński (1974–), Dariusz Łukasiewicz (1965–), Jacek Juliusz Jadacki (1946–), Gutowski, and other thinkers. Religious issues make the Polish philosophical environment dynamic, which is illustrated by the book edited by Jacek Hołówka and Bogdan Dziobkowski: *Filozofia religii. Kontrowersje [The Philosophy of Religion: Controversies]*.²⁴ In the book, philosophers with differing worldviews discuss and exchange their arguments on 13 important problems, such as the existence and nature of God, religious beliefs, the psychophysical problem, morality and religion, science and religion, and, finally, the issue of miracles, salvation, etc. The Christian philosophers who took part in those debates include Wojtysiak, Tomasz Homa SJ (1958–), Józef Bremer SJ (1953–), Barbara Chyrowicz SSpS (1960–), Świeżyński, and others. At present, interesting theodical disputes are being carried out by anti-naturalists (Wojtysiak) and naturalists (Jan Woleński).

²⁴ J. Hołówka, B. Dziobkowski, *Filozofia religii. Kontrowersje* (Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, 2018).

PHILOSOPHY OF GOD AND RELIGION AT THE BEGINNING OF THE 21ST CENTURY

At present, the philosophy of God and religion is being developed in the centers for Christian philosophy in Poland which include the John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin, the Cardinal Stefan Wyszyński University in Warsaw, the Pontifical University of John Paul II and the Jesuit University Ignatianum in Krakow, but it is also practiced in other environments. Despite the pluralism which is a characteristic feature of that philosophy, it is possible to indicate some tendencies which, in the near future, may significantly dominate the discourse on God and religion in the Polish philosophical culture. Pluralism in the approach to the research on God and religion is reflected in the monographs: *Filozofia religii* [*Philosophy of Religion*] and *Filozofia Boga* [*Philosophy of God*] by Fr. Stanisław Janeczek (1951–).²⁵ Neo-Thomist opinions are still influential due to ideological and institutional reasons, which can be confirmed by, e.g. the recently published lectures of Fr. Krąpiec on theodicy.²⁶ However, the analytic approach, which expresses a positive approach towards the phenomenon of religion, is becoming more and more popular. It is connected with the increasingly stronger reception of the analytic philosophy of religion in the Polish environment. Since the 1990s, those receptions have been carried out by: Andrzej Bronk SVD (1938–), Herbut, Tadeusz Szubka (1958–), Gutowski, Judycki, Wojtysiak, Ryszard Mordarski (1965–), Dariusz Łukasiewicz (1965–), Marcin Tkaczyk OFMConv (1976–), and Janusz Salamon (1971–). A good example is *Przewodnik po filozofii religii* [*A Guide to the Philosophy of Religion*]²⁷ edited by Salamon, in which particular issues were elaborated in the spirit of analytic philosophy. Also, the anthology: *Teizm, ateizm i religia. Najnowsze spory w anglosaskiej filozofii analitycznej* [*Theism, Atheism and Religion: The Newest Disputes in the Anglo-Saxon Analytic Philosophy*] edited by Gutowski and Marcin Iwanicki (1974–), confirms the scholars' interest in the

²⁵ *Filozofia religii*, ed. S. Janeczek (Lublin: Wydawnictwo KUL, 2012); *Filozofia Boga*, part 1–2, eds. S. Janeczek, A. Starościc (Lublin: Wydawnictwo KUL, 2017).

²⁶ M.A. Krąpiec, *Teodycea. Problem poznawalności istnienia Boga* (Lublin: Wydawnictwo KUL, 2017).

²⁷ *Przewodnik po filozofii religii. Nurt analityczny*, ed. J. Salamon (Kraków: Wydawnictwo WAM, 2016).

disputes carried out by analysts around the philosophy of religion. The anthology includes the review (37 texts which had not yet been published) of the most important debates concerning the nature of religion, the argumentation for the existence of God, the role of science in theist argumentation, etc.²⁸ The reception and development of the phenomenological philosophy of religion is constantly taking place. An example of such development is the anthology, published by the scholars connected with the Pontifical University of John Paul II in Kraków, entitled *Fenomenologia polska a chrześcijaństwo* [*Polish Phenomenology and Christianity*] (2014) edited by Jakub Gomułka (1977–), Karol Tarnowski, Adam Workowski (1962–), which included the review of the most important studies and dissertations on Christianity analyzed from the phenomenological perspective.²⁹ The issue of the philosophy of religion is also developing under the influence of interdisciplinary cognitive science. The reception of the research from the area of the neurosciences in which the scholars are trying to answer the question on, e.g. the role of brain in shaping religious experience, prayer, etc., is getting more and more intensive. Such a reception is accompanied by a metasubjective analysis of the limitations connected with searching for God in neurons (Bremer). Also, it is worth noting the modern attempts of a synthetic and more holistic elaboration of the issues concerning the philosophy of God and religion. Such theodical analyses, based on the phenomenology and analytic philosophy of religion, has been developed in recent years by Judycki at the University of Gdańsk. Using the tools worked out by analytic philosophers, in his research he uses a whole range of classical theodical problems, such as the existence and nature of God, eternal life or philosophical Christology.³⁰ For several years the scholars have been discussing the condition of Christian theodicy and the philosophy of religion—e.g. Ziemiński, as well as the meaningfulness of practicing them.

²⁸ *Teizm, ateizm i religia. Najnowsze spory w anglosaskiej filozofii analitycznej*, eds. P. Gutowski, M. Iwanicki (Lublin: Wydawnictwo KUL, 2019).

²⁹ *Fenomenologia polska a chrześcijaństwo*, eds. J. Gomułka, K. Tarnowski, A. Workowski (Kraków: Wydawnictwo Naukowe UPJPII, 2014).

³⁰ S. Judycki, *Książeczka o człowieku wierzącym* (Kraków: Dominikańskie Studium Filozofii i Teologii; Kolegium Filozoficzno-Teologiczne Polskiej Prowincji Dominikanów, 2014); idem, *Bóg i inne osoby. Próba z zakresu teologii filozoficznej* (Poznań: Dominikańskie Studium Filozofii i Teologii; W drodze, 2010).

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bocheński, J.M. *Logika i filozofia. Wybór pism*, trans. T. Baszniak i in., ed. J. Parys. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, 1993.
- Drewnowski, J.F. "Czy metafizyka i religia wytrzymują krytykę naukową?" in *Filozofia i precyzja. Zarys programu filozoficznego i inne pisma*, pp. 181–191. Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL, Lublin 1996.
- . "Neoscholastyka wobec nowoczesnych wymagań nauki," in *Mysł katolicka wobec logiki współczesnej* (Studia Gnesnensia, vol. 15), pp. 49–57. Poznań: Księgarnia św. Wojciecha, 1937.
- Gogacz, M. *Filozoficzne aspekty mistyki. Materiały do filozofii mistyki*. Warszawa: Akademia Teologii Katolickiej, 1985.
- . *Poszukiwanie Boga. Wykłady z metafizyki Absolutnego Istnienia*. Warszawa: Akademia Teologii Katolickiej, 1976.
- Grygiel, S. "Człowiek i Bóg w metafizyce," in *Fenomenologia polska a chrześcijaństwo*, eds. J. Gomułka, K. Tarnowski, A. Workowski, pp. 85–115. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Naukowe UPJPII, 2014.
- . "Od Pierwszej Przyczyny do Boga nadziei," in *Kimże jest człowiek?*, pp. 93–107. Kielce: Wydawnictwo Jedność, 1995.
- Heller, M. *Nowa fizyka i nowa teologia*. Kraków: Copernicus Center Press, 2017.
- . *Wszeczeńświat i Słowo*. Kraków: Znak, 1981.
- Jaworski, M. *Pisma z filozofii religii* (Studia z filozofii Boga, religii i człowieka, vol. 2), selected and edited by S. Szczepaniak. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo UKSW, 2002.
- Judycki, S. *Bóg i inne osoby. Próba z zakresu teologii filozoficznej*. Poznań: W drodze, 2010.
- . *Książeczka o człowieku wierzącym*. Kraków: Fundacja "Dominikańskie Studium Filozofii i Teologii", 2014.
- Kalinowski, J. "Doświadczenie wiary a istnienie Boga," in *Studia z filozofii Boga*, vol. 2, ed. B. Bejze, pp. 323–338. Warszawa: Akademia Teologii Katolickiej, 1973.
- Kamiński, S. "Epistemologiczno-metodologiczne problemy filozoficznego poznania Boga," in *W kierunku Boga*, ed. B. Bejze, pp. 82–107. Warszawa: Akademia Teologii Katolickiej, 1982.
- . "Zagadnienia metodologiczne związane z filozofią Boga," in *Studia z filozofii Boga*, vol. 1, ed. B. Bejze, pp. 380–403. Warszawa: Akademia Teologii Katolickiej, 1968.
- . *Światopogląd, religia, teologia. Zagadnienia filozoficzne i metodologiczne*, eds. A. Bronk, M. Walczak. Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL, 1998.
- Kłoczowski, J.A. *Drogi człowieka mistycznego*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Literackie, 2001.

- . *Między samotnością a wspólnotą. Wstęp do filozofii religii*. Tarnów: Biblos, 1994.
- Kłósak, K. *W poszukiwaniu Pierwszej Przyczyny*, vol. 1–2. Warszawa: Instytut Wydawniczy Pax, 1955–1957.
- . *Z zagadnień filozoficznego poznania Boga*. Kraków: Polskie Towarzystwo Teologiczne, 1979.
- Krąpiec, M.A. “Filozofia i Bóg,” in *O Bogu i człowieku*, vol. 1: *Problemy filozoficzne*, ed. B. Bejze, pp. 11–55. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Sióstr Loretanek-Benedyktynek, 1968.
- . “Metafizyka i problem Boga,” in *Studia z filozofii Boga*, vol. 1, ed. B. Bejze, pp. 347–379. Warszawa: Akademia Teologii Katolickiej, 1968.
- . “O rozumienie dróg poznania Boga,” in *W kierunku Boga*, ed. B. Bejze, pp. 50–58. Warszawa: Akademia Teologii Katolickiej, 1982.
- . “Poznawalność Boga w naukach szczegółowych i w filozofii,” *Znak*, no. 5(59) (1959), pp. 564–577.
- Michalski, K. *Nieznanemu Bogu*. Warszawa: Koło Studjów Katolickich; Naukowy Instytut Katolicki, 1936.
- Nieznański, E. “Formalizacyjne próby ustalenia logiko-formalnych podstaw stwierdzenia pierwszych elementów relacji rozważanych w tomistycznej teodycei,” in *W kierunku formalizacji tomistycznej teodycei*, ed. E. Nieznański, pp. 7–194. Warszawa: Akademia Teologii Katolickiej, 1980.
- . *Sformalizowana ontologia orientacji klasycznej*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo UKSW, 2007.
- Salamucha, J. “Dowód ‘Ex motu’ na istnienie Boga. Analiza logiczna argumentacji św. Tomasza z Akwinu,” *Collectanea Theologica* 15, no. 1–2 (1934), pp. 53–92.
- . *Wiedza i wiara. Wybrane pisma filozoficzne*, eds. J.J. Jadacki, K. Świątorzecka. Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL, 1997.
- Stępień, A.B. “Filozofia poznania a filozofia Boga,” in *Studia z filozofii Boga*, vol. 1, ed. B. Bejze, pp. 404–418. Warszawa: Akademia Teologii Katolickiej, 1968.
- . “Zagadnienie Boga w fenomenologii. Kilka uwag wstępnych,” in *Aby poznać Boga i człowieka*, part 1: *O Bogu dziś*, ed. B. Bejze, pp. 85–94. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Sióstr Loretanek-Benedyktynek, 1974.
- Stróżewski, W. “Bogactwo Logosu,” in idem, *Logos, wartość, miłość*, pp. 150–159. Kraków: Znak, 2013.
- . “Bóg i świat w myśli św. Tomasza z Akwinu,” in idem, *Istnienie i sens*, pp. 73–120. Kraków: Znak, 1994.
- . “Logos i mythos,” in idem, *Logos, wartość, miłość*, pp. 129–149. Kraków: Znak, 2013.
- . “O możliwości ‘sacrum’ w sztuce,” in *Fenomenologia polska a chrześcijaństwo*, eds. J. Gomułka, K. Tarnowski, A. Workowski, pp. 161–182. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Naukowe UPJPII, 2014.

- Tarnowski, K. *Ku absolutnej ucieczce. Bóg i wiara w filozofii Gabriela Marcela*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PAT, 1993.
- . *Tropy myślenia religijnego*. Kraków: Instytut Myśli Józefa Tischnera, 2009.
- . *Usłyszeć niewidzialne. Zarys filozofii wiary*. Kraków: Instytut Myśli Józefa Tischnera, 2005.
- Tischner, J. *Filozofia dramatu*. Paris: Éditions du Dialogue, 1990.
- . “Myślenie religijne,” in idem, *Myślenie według wartości*, pp. 357–379. Kraków: Znak, 1993.
- . “Schyłek chrześcijaństwa tomistycznego,” in idem, *Myślenie według wartości*, pp. 215–238. Kraków: Znak, 1993.
- . *Spór o istnienie człowieka*. Kraków: Znak, 1999.
- . “W poszukiwaniu doświadczenia Boga,” in idem, *Świat ludzkiej nadziei*, pp. 227–247. Kraków: Znak, 1992.
- . “Wokół spraw wiary i rozumu,” in *Filozofować w kontekście nauki*, eds. M. Heller, A. Michalik, J. Życiński, pp. 35–45. Kraków: Polskie Towarzystwo Teologiczne, 1987.
- Zdybicka, Z.J. *Bóg czy sacrum*. Lublin: Polskie Towarzystwo Tomasza z Akwinu, 2007.
- . *Człowiek i religia. Zarys filozofii religii*. Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL, 1977.
- . “Drogi afirmacji Boga,” in *W kierunku Boga*, ed. B. Bejze, pp. 108–166. Warszawa: Akademia Teologii Katolickiej, 1982.
- . “Klasyczna realistyczna filozofia religii,” in *Filozofia religii*, ed. S. Janeczek, pp. 139–161. Lublin: Wydawnictwo KUL, 2012.
- . *Partycypacja bytu. Próba wyjaśnienia relacji między światem a Bogiem*. Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL, 1972.
- . *Religia i religioznawstwo*. Lublin: Redakcja Wydawnictw KUL, 1988.
- Ziemiański, S. *Filozoficzne poznanie Boga*. Kraków: Petrus, 2011.
- . *Teologia naturalna. Filozoficzna problematyka Boga*. Kraków: Fakultet Filozoficzny Towarzystwa Jezusowego, 1995.
- Życiński, J. *Bóg Abrahama i Whiteheada*. Tarnów: Biblos, 1992.
- . *Bóg i ewolucja. Podstawowe pytania ewolucjonizmu chrześcijańskiego*. Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL, 2002.
- . *Teizm i filozofia analityczna*, vol. 1–2. Kraków: Znak, 1985–1988.

Paweł Skrzydlewski
State School of Higher Education in Chełm
Piotr S. Mazur
Jesuit University Ignatianum in Krakow

10.

SOCIAL PHILOSOPHY

At the heart of theoretical reflections on the specific features and various forms of the organization of social life, Christian social philosophy places the objective good of a person as the ultimate goal and standard of shaping and improving social life. The issues falling within the scope of interest of social philosophy include: law, politics, economy, ethics, and the whole of social pedagogy. The scope of the discussed problems and specific conditions in which the 20th century Polish philosophy was shaped, resulted in the fact that, apart from philosophers, representatives of other disciplines discussed social issues as well. The group of those representatives included theologians, lawyers, political scientists, sociologists, economists, as well as the people of culture and the hierarchs of the Catholic Church. As a consequence, social philosophy developed in many different approaches, resulting in a set of doctrines and opinions that affirmed man's dignity and subjectivity in social life (personalism).¹ Its supporters emphasized the necessary connection between the human being and natural communities, as well as the inalienability of a person's right to live and develop, expressed in the person's sovereignty in culture and politics.

¹ This philosophy is present in the theory of the law, the concepts of social life, the theory of the country and politics, social ethics, economic thought, pedagogical and educational thought, religious and theological reflection, as well as cultural and civilization considerations. See C. Strzeszewski, *Katolicka nauka społeczna* (Lublin: Redakcja Wydawnictw KUL, 1994), pp. 365–378.

HISTORICAL AND IDEOLOGICAL CONTEXT

At the turn of the 19th and 20th century, Polish social thought was influenced by the Catholic Church, and, in particular, by the teachings of the popes: Pius IX, Leo XIII, Pius X, and Pius XI. Essentially, they referred to the thought of St. Thomas Aquinas who emphasized the personal dignity of the human being as the subject that has inalienable rights and obligations related to other people. According to Aquinas, the form of life that is proper for man requires the existence and respect for the family based on an unbreakable and voluntary marriage of a woman and man who possess and freely use private property they had worked for. Also, he claimed that it is necessary to complement human life with various forms of social life, ultimately reinforced with a sovereign country and educational influence of the Church in which freedom and the right to religious life is respected.

Twentieth century Christian social philosophy in Poland was also influenced by the social concepts that criticized it. Such concepts took the form of ideologies, utopias or mythological thinking. They expressed attempts to change the previous way of social and political life. They criticized and rejected Christianity and the whole civilizational heritage of the West shaped under the influence of Christian religion.² Their supporters attacked the tradition because they believed that removing it would improve human life. They claimed that in creating the new social order we should only refer to natural factors and principles.³ Some aspects of this approach began to appear in Catholicism itself in the form of modernism.⁴ These threats were diagnosed and criticized already in the 19th century by Pope Pius IX in the encyclical *Quanta cura* (1864), and then in different encyclicals of the popes Leo XIII and Pius XI.

² H. Kiereś, *Trzy socjalizmy. Tradycja łacińska wobec modernizmu i postmodernizmu* (Lublin: Lubelska Szkoła Filozofii Chrześcijańskiej, 2000).

³ Leo XIII, *Humanum genus*, 1884; B. Wald, "Błąd antropologiczny i jego konsekwencje we współczesnej filozofii," in *Błąd antropologiczny*, eds. A. Maryniarczyk, K. Stepien (Lublin: Polskie Towarzystwo Tomasza z Akwinu, 2003), pp. 123–138; E. Voegelin, *Od Oświecenia do rewolucji*, trans. Ł. Pawłowski (Warszawa: Wydawnictwa UW, 2011).

⁴ Pius X, *Pascendi dominici gregis*, 1907.

The basis for the postulates of the reorganization of social life was anthropological naturalism. Its supporters denied the vision of a human being as a sovereign, thinking and free personal subject, who ultimately lives for eternal happiness (God). Also, the concepts of organizing social life in the form of individualism and collectivism were clearly anti-personalist. Individualism questioned and marginalized the meaning of the existence of natural forms of human life—family, nation and state—in the name of the individual's rights and freedoms perceived in an absolutistic manner. This meant the acceptance of social antagonism and questioning the natural social order, and ultimately led to the enslavement of the weaker units, and difficulties to communities fulfill their specific tasks. Collectivism, in turn, aimed at creating such a social order that subordinates human sovereignty to a larger and "better" whole personified either by a class (Bolshevism), race (racism, Nazism), or by the state itself (Fascism). This resulted in the negation of human personal sovereignty expressed in the right to decide about themselves, and, at the same time, it facilitated totalitarianism in the formation of social life.

Both in individualism and in collectivism, thinkers referred to materialism and utilitarianism. In the area of the law and power, voluntarism was emphasized, in which moral principles were determined by politics, economy, immediate benefit, pleasure, and the desire for power. It all aimed at the creation of a social reality that would make it possible for the human to achieve self-fulfillment. The idea of the existence of a transcendental goal of human life was rejected. Religion, and all forms of social and cultural practices produced under the influence of religion, were to be removed from human life and the social space. The element that was constitutive for the new social order included the postulates of laicism, secularism and atheism as the ideological foundations for social, political, educational and legal actions. In this situation, the specific features of the Christian concept of social life in the philosophical aspect were determined by the necessity to protect the personal status of the human existence, and to acknowledge the necessity of man's relation with natural communities, and, at the same time, their transcendence within those communities.

POPULARIZATION AND INFLUENCE

At the beginning of the 20th century, the following journals exerted the greatest influence on the popularization of Christian social philosophy in Poland: *Przegląd Powszechny* (1884–1953), *Pro Christo. Wiara i Czyn. Organ Młodych Katolików* (1925–1939), *Ateneum Kapłańskie* (1909–), *Ruch Chrześcijańsko-Społeczny* (1903–1909), and *Przegląd Katolicki* (1863–1939). Also, the following series of books were important: “Biblioteka Dzieł Chrześcijańskich,” “Prąd,” and “Wydawnictwo Towarzystwa Wiedzy Chrześcijańskiej.” The latter, related with the Catholic University of Lublin, through its numerous publications significantly contributed to the development of Christian social philosophy and to the reinforcement of the general scientific culture. The following professors of KUL played a particularly important role in creating it: Jacek Woroniecki OP (1878–1949), Fr. Antoni Szymański (1881–1942), Fr. Józef Pastuszka (1897–1989), Fr. Józef Kruszyński (1877–1953), Ludwik Górski (1899–1945), and Ignacy Czuma (1891–1963).

After World War II, the whole of Polish culture and society was subject to brutal Marxist indoctrination imposed by the communist authorities. After closing the departments and faculties of the philosophy of law and the philosophy of politics at state universities, and following the dismissal of many scholars as enemies of the new political system, the authorities tried to introduce Marxism and its interpretation of politics, law, social life and pedagogy.⁵ The communist ideology was adopted as the only correct interpretation of the scientific image of the world. It dominated historical and sociological investigations, pedagogical and economic thought, the considerations on law, administration, administration of justice, education and information. At the same time, the new government made every effort to fight with the philosophy inspired by Christianity, perceiving it as the threat to its own influences.⁶ The philosophical thought that was independent of Marxism and that

⁵ *Nauka a polityka. Działanie losy filozofii prawa w Polsce*, ed. M. Szyszkowska (Warszawa: Dom Wydawniczy “Elipsa”, 2010).

⁶ P. Dutkiewicz, *Problem aksjologicznych podstaw prawa we współczesnej polskiej filozofii i teorii prawa* (Kraków: Wydawnictwo UJ, 1996).

referred to politics and social life, could not, *ex definitione*, appear in the public space.⁷

The actions of communists were opposed by the representatives of the Catholic Church, especially its Primates: August Hlond (1881–1948) and Stefan Wyszyński (1901–1981), as well as cardinal Karol Wojtyła, later John Paul II (1920–2005). Also, intellectual environments related to the Church or functioning outside the Church, but rejecting Marxism, played an important role in fighting with the communist ideology. The representatives of such environments included Władysław Konopczyński (1880–1952), Władysław Tatarkiewicz (1886–1980), Henryk Elzenberg (1887–1967), Izydora Dąmbska (1904–1983), and Zbigniew Herbert (1924–1998). Apart from scientists, they included artists. Also, the effort to shape the Polish culture independent of the communist ideology was made by the intellectuals functioning abroad.⁸

Up to 1989, the problems typical of the Christian philosophy of politics and social life were taken up while carrying out historical analyses, as well as theological, moral, sociological and legal reflections.⁹ An independent social thought survived thanks to several scientific journals published in a few Church and Catholic academic institutions: *Roczniki Filozoficzne*, *Collectanea Theologica*, *Studia Philosophiae Christianae*, *Analecta Cracoviensia*, *Przegląd Tomistyczny*, *Ethos*. Some of its aspects were discussed in a hidden manner, in legal, but censored social and religious journals: *Chrześcijańin w Świecie*, *Znak*, *Powściągliwość i Praca*, *Przegląd Powszechny*.¹⁰

In the second half of the 20th century, Christian social philosophy developed in very difficult political conditions. Finally, it turned out that its creators worked out a consistent concept of social life, emphasizing its personalist nature. Also, they carefully analyzed Marxism

⁷ A. Szymaniak, "Czasopisma filozoficzne w Polsce," in *Encyklopedia filozofii polskiej*, vol. 1, ed. A. Maryniarczyk (Lublin: Polskie Towarzystwo Tomasza z Akwinu, 2011), pp. 223–250.

⁸ *Chrześcijańska myśl społeczna na emigracji*, ed. Z. Tkocz (Londyn–Lublin: Odnowa; Norbertinum, 1991).

⁹ W.B. Skrzydlewski, "Wpływ katolickiej nauki społecznej na przemiany społeczne i polityczne w Polsce i w innych krajach bloku komunistycznego," *Ethos*, no. 2–3 (1992), pp. 182–190.

¹⁰ P. Szydłowski, *Kryzys kultury w polskiej myśli katolickiej 1918–1939* (Warszawa–Kraków: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1984).

as an ideology and a political system. Nevertheless, the influence of Christian social philosophy was only limited to the discussions carried out in Poland. The situation changed after Karol Wojtyła was elected as a pope (1978). During his pontificate, the social teaching of the Church was complemented with the Polish experience and research.¹¹ In Poland, practicing and presenting the results of philosophical studies free from ideological influences and dedicated to social life was not possible until 1989.

THE MAIN APPROACHES AND REPRESENTATIVES

Despite the difficulties experienced by Christian social and political philosophy in the 20th century Poland, its heritage is rich and varied. Taking into account the context of its development, we can distinguish the following approaches in it: legal, social-religious, ethical-educational, economic, cultural-civilizational, and anthropological-metaphysical.¹²

In the legal approach, the scholars aimed at demonstrating human rights, as well as protecting and fulfilling them in the area of social life with the national and international scope. They emphasized the role of private property in improving the human and the family, showing the moral and anthropological foundation of the positive law. This approach is represented by philosophers and lawyers such as: Jerzy Matulewicz MIC (1871–1927), Eugeniusz Jarra (1881–1973), Fr. Stanisław Zegarliński (1882–1918), Ignacy Czuma (1891–1963), Ludwik Ehrlich (1889–1968), Czesław Martyniak (1906–1939), Henryk Dembiński (1900–1949), Andrzej Mycielski (1900–1993), Jerzy Kalinowski (1916–2000), Hanna Waśkiewicz (1919–1993), and Fr. Franciszek Mazurek (1933–2009).

¹¹ R. Buttiglione, *Mysł Karola Wojtyły*, trans. J. Merecki (Lublin: Instytut Jana Pawła II KUL, 2010); B. Szlachta, *Wokół katolickiej myśli politycznej* (Kraków: Wydawnictwo WAM, 2007); J. Majka, *Filozofia społeczna* (Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Wrocławskiej Księgarni Archidiecezjalnej, 1982); idem, *Katolicka nauka społeczna* (Warszawa: Ośrodek Dokumentacji i Studiów Społecznych, 1988); W. Chudy, "Filozofia personalistyczna Jana Pawła II (Karola Wojtyły)," *Teologia Polityczna*, no. 3 (2005–2006), pp. 247–250.

¹² The suggested division has only been made to order the notions and it does not reflect the whole complexity of opinions and views.

Martyniak contributed considerably to the development of social-legal thought, especially that which promoted the concept of Thomas Aquinas. In his works, Martyniak analyzed the issue of the natural law, perceiving it as the normative (moral) basis for the positive law, which is rooted in human nature. At the same time, he denied the possibility to include it into the formal structures of that law.¹³ He criticized the concept of legal positivism (Kelsen). Jarra, a lecturer at Oxford, tried to combine the elements of the psychological theory of the law (Petrażycki) with legal positivism. Mycielski criticized both the concept of Kelsen and of Petrażycki, supporting the transcendental and objective understanding of the natural law. With reference to the thought of Thomas Aquinas, Waśkiewicz also studied the relation between the natural and the positive law. She claimed that, because of its rooting in human nature, the natural law is common and superior to the positive law.

Social philosophy, along with the legal system it assumed, was also studied by Kalinowski—a great ethicist, logician and theoretician of the law who, since 1958, had been working abroad. Czuma, as a theoretician of the law and politics, took up the research on various concepts of power and mutual relations between the state and the nation. He criticized totalitarian systems: both the Soviet and the Nazi ones.¹⁴ Ehrlich, in turn, contributed to the development of the theory of international law, emphasizing especially the Polish contribution to understanding the rights of nations. Dembiński analyzed international relations from the perspective of Christian ethics. Finally, Mazurek dealt with the defense of human dignity, especially within the context of the threats of law and modern politics. Also, he developed the social teaching of the Church.

At present, the issue of the rights of the nations is being developed by Fr. Stanisław Wielgus (1939–). Social order and the threats related to human rights are discussed by Marek Piechowiak (1962–). Bogdan Szlachta (1959–), Krzysztof Wroczyński (1950–) and Krzysztof Motyka (1956–) combine the philosophical-legal reflection with social issues, and Katarzyna Stępień (1971–), in her texts, analyses

¹³ K. Motyka, “Martyniak Czesław,” in *Encyklopedia filozofii polskiej*, vol. 2, ed. A. Maryniarczyk (Lublin: Polskie Towarzystwo Tomasza z Akwinu, 2011), p. 74.

¹⁴ I. Czuma, *Polityka ludnościowa III Rzeszy* (Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL, 1939).

the connection of the positive law, in general, with human rights and, in particular, with children's rights.

The social-religious approach focused on analyzing social, economic and political life in the context of the principles rooted in the social teaching of the Church. This approach was based on the theological thought and social personalism rooted in Aristotelian-Thomist philosophy. This trend is represented by a group of prominent theologians and philosophers, such as: Fr. Józef Sebastian Pelczar (1842–1924), Fr. Józef Teodorowicz (1864–1938), Edward Jaroszyński (1865–1907), Fr. Kazimierz Zimmerman (1867–1925), Fr. Stanisław Adamski (1875–1967), Fr. Aleksander Wóycicki (1878–1954), Fr. Kazimierz Lutosławski (1880–1924), Fr. August Hlond (1881–1948), Fr. Antoni Szymański (1881–1942), Fr. Walerian Adamski (1885–1965), Fr. Jan Stepa (1892–1959), Fr. Stefan Wyszynski, Czesław Strzeszewski (1903–1999), Fr. Jan Krucina (1928–), Fr. Czesław Bartnik (1929–2020), Fr. Joachim Kondziela (1932–1992), Fr. Stanisław Kowalczyk (1932–), Helmut Juros SDS (1933–), Leon Dyczewski OFMConv (1936–2016), Aniela Dylus (1948–), Fr. Marek Jędraszewski (1949–), Henryk Skorowski SDB (1950–), Fr. Andrzej Zwoliński (1952–), Fr. Tadeusz Borutka (1953–), Krzysztof Wielecki (1954–), Stanisław Pyszka SJ (1951–), Tomasz Homa SJ (1958–), and Dariusz Dańkowski SJ (1967–).

Pelczar studied the influence of the teaching of the Catholic Church on social life, and the threats of the Mason ideology brings into the lives of various communities. Teodorowicz, Stanisław Adamski and Hlond, on the basis of neo-Thomism, dealt with the foundations of the Christian theory of social order and their relation with national culture and religious life. In his works, Jaroszyński promoted, justified and developed the main theses of *Rerum novarum* by Leo XIII. Social issues related to the problems of workers and work were developed by: Zimmerman—the initiator and editor of the journal *Ruch Chrześcijańsko-Społeczny* and Wóycicki—the author of texts combining philosophical reflection with sociological-economic considerations. Walerian Adamski combined the reflection on social life with pedagogical aspects, the philosophy of culture and sociological considerations. Just like Lutosławski, Stepa analyzed both communist and German totalitarianism.

The environment of KUL played an important role in the general reflection on social issues and on the Catholic social teaching rooted

in philosophy. Before World War II, the studies concerning those subjects were carried out by Szymański who has put a lot of effort into analyzing the threats flowing from individualism and collectivism. He emphasized the validity of the Catholic social teaching encompassing the whole social and economic life. Wyszyński played an important role in developing this approach after the war. As the Primate of Poland, in his texts and teachings he discussed fundamental social issues such as the dignity of a human beings and their rights, family, nation, state, and work. In the strictly scientific aspect, Strzeszewski contributed a lot to the development of this approach. He was a teacher of many generations of scholars, and an author of numerous works on the theory and history of social philosophy, in which, based on personalism and the concept of the common good, he defended the superiority of a person, especially in the area of economic life. The group of his students included: Kondziela, Krucina, Mazurek, and Dyczewski. Kondziela connected social philosophy with sociological and political science research, and Dyczewski combined the philosophical and sociological approach in analyzing social issues and means of social communication. Krucina discusses the common good as the factor that determines social order. In the environment of KUL, the philosophy of politics, social life, state and nation, as well as the philosophy of Europeaness, is practiced from the personalist point of view by Bartnik and Kowalczyk.

The social-religious approach has also developed in the environment of UKSW (former ATK) in which Juros plays a very important role. He develops the Catholic social teaching, and discusses various issues related to religion, culture, morality, and social life. Dylus combines the Catholic social teaching, especially religious and moral problems in the area of social life, with economic aspects. Skorowski, in the context of the Catholic social teaching, discussed ethics and human rights. Wielecki analyses anthropological and religious aspects of social life.

Also, the research on social problems in the light of the teaching of the Church is carried out in Kraków. Zwoliński and Borutka (UPJPII) analyze many-sided and varied problems appearing on the border of religion, culture and social life. Pyszka studies the social teaching of the Church, Homa—the issue of citizenship and the feeling of community, and Dańkowski—American political philosophy (AIK). Also, Jędraszewski discusses social life in, i.a. the area of respecting the man's dignity and freedom.

Within the ethical-educational approach, the scholars pay attention to the moral dimension of politics itself and to the necessity of shaping the human as a being who is morally good and able to achieve complete goodness in the public space. Within this approach, politics was defined as a prudent fulfillment of the common good, and the emphasis was put on the meaning of the civil formation of the human related to the acquisition of social virtues. The representatives of this trend include: Jacek Woroniecki OP, Fr. Józef Pastuszka, Józef Maria Bocheński OP (1902–1995), Stanisław Podoleński SJ (1887–1945), Fr. Franciszek Sawicki (1877–1952), Karol Górski (1903–1988), Tadeusz Ślipko SJ (1918–2015), Karol Wojtyła/John Paul II (1920–2005), Fr. Antoni Siemianowski (1930–), Fr. Józef Tischner (1931–2000), Tadeusz Styczeń SDS (1931–2010), Jerzy Gałkowski (1937–), Fr. Alfred Marek Wierzbicki (1957–), Zbigniew Stawrowski (1958–), Aleksander Bobko (1960–), and Krzysztof Stachewicz (1966–).

Woroniecki raised the issue of the inalienability of natural communities—the family, the nation and the state—for the actualization of human personal life, which takes the form of moral upbringing. He emphasized the importance of the virtue of justice in individual and social life. He believed that the foundations for the proper formation of social life include ethics, culture and schooling. He was interested in the specific features of ruling and in various social-political systems. He analyzed different issues related to work and patriotism. References to Thomism are also visible in the analyses conducted by Pastuszka (the criticism of Nazism and Bolshevism) and Bocheński who was interested, i.a., in the ethics of war, including the issue of shaping a soldier's honesty, courage and obedience. He wrote extensively on the problem of patriotism and patriotic upbringing and criticized both communism and pacifism. Podoleński considered social consequences of divorces and erroneous forms of social pedagogy. As a historian, Górski focused on the personalist approach to ethical-educational and social-political issues. The relations among ethics, religion and social life were also discussed by Sawicki and Fr. Ślipko.

Karol Wojtyła/John Paul II¹⁵ played a special role in creating and propagating the Christian philosophical thought related to social life,

¹⁵ K.L. Schmitz, "The Personalist Philosophy of Karol Wojtyła," in *New Catholic Encyclopedia. Jubilee Volume (The Wojtyła Years)*, vol. 20 (Washington: The Catholic University of America, 2001), p. 31.

politics and law. As an ethicist and anthropologist working in the environment of KUL, he presented the human subjectivity in social life, as well as the transcendence, freedom and dignity of a person. He developed a theory of the human participation in social life, which was expressed in his books: *Osoba i czyn* [*The Acting Person*] (1969) and *Człowiek w polu odpowiedzialności* [*Man in the Field of Responsibility*] (1991).¹⁶ As pope, he took up these issues in many of his speeches and documents. Also, he issued three encyclicals directly discussing social issues: *Laborem exercens* (1981), *Sollicitudo rei socialis* (1987) and *Centesimus annus* (1991). In these encyclicals he discussed the issue of work in human development and social life, the Christian way of shaping social relations in the modern world, as well as freedom and property. He criticized socialism and consumerism, emphasizing that an anthropological error (socialism) is the basis for the incorrect way of building social relations. The basic part of his teachings includes the primacy of a person over a thing, of moral life over technology, of being over having, and of mercy over legalism. Maintaining these principles facilitates the creation of the “civilization of life,” while rejecting them leads to the “civilization of death.”

Wojtyła's student, Tadeusz Styczeń, proclaimed the need to build a social order affirming natural and inalienable rights of human beings, their dignity and freedom. In this context, he claimed that the degree of the development of democracy depends on our attitude towards the weakest, especially to unborn children.¹⁷ Another student of Wojtyła's, Jerzy Gałkowski, while referring to the works of his teacher, discussed the philosophy of politics, the ethics of public life and work. In the same ethical circle, social issues, especially those related to the philosophical reflection on totalitarianism, were discussed by Wierzbicki.

The views of Tischner are also important for the ethical-educational approach. In his concept, the way of shaping social life depends on anthropological-ethical conditions: the human relation with goodness and the world of values, freedom, as well as the dialogic and

¹⁶ K. Wojtyła, *The Acting Person*, trans. A. Potocki, ed. A.-Th. Tymieniecka (Boston: D. Rediel Publishing Company, 1979); idem, *Człowiek w polu odpowiedzialności* (Lublin-Rzym: Instytut Jana Pawła II KUL; Ośrodek Dokumentacji Pontyfikatu Fundacji Jana Pawła II, 1991).

¹⁷ T. Styczeń, *Nienarodzony miarą demokracji* (Lublin: Instytut Jana Pawła II KUL, 1991).

dramatic nature of human existence. On these bases, Tischner carried out an ethical reflection on the condition of the human overwhelmed with an ideology (*homo sovieticus*) and on what threatens the human from the side of collectivist totalitarianisms. As one of the priests of the social movement of Solidarność [Solidarity] emerging in the 1980s, he carried out a religious-ethical interpretation of the phenomenon of the solidarity of people.¹⁸ In a later period, he dealt with various aspects of the relation of freedom and morality of the human living in the conditions of liberal democracy. Tischner's students, Stawrowski and Bobko, are now studying social issues with reference to the thought of Tischner.

In the Poznań environment (UAM), the research carried out by Siemianowski is worth noting. From the perspective of realistic phenomenology, he is trying to describe the most important forms and the problem of the contemporary social life. Another representative of UAM, Stachewicz, also discusses social issues, especially from the perspective of the ethics and law.

In the economic approach, the scholars emphasized the primacy of moral good over the utilitarian interest, and the necessity to secure human rights against the threats related to economy. At the same time, they emphasized the moral and human dimension of work related to manufacturing goods. The representatives of this approach include: Józef Milewski (1859–1916), Włodzimierz Czerkawski (1868–1913), Henryk Romanowski, Jan Piwowarczyk (1889–1959), Ludwik Górski (1894–1945), Fr. Antoni Roszkowski (1894–1939), Leopold Caro (1899–1945), Fr. Józef Majka (1918–1983), Jerzy Chodorowski (1920–2011), Władysław Bernard Skrzydlewski OP (1925–2004), and Mirosław Dzielski (1941–1989).

The creators of the economic approach in the 20th century are Milewski and Czerkawski, the authors of *Polityka ekonomiczna* [*Economic Politics*].¹⁹ As lawyers and economists, they discussed progress and prosperity (agriculture, trade, industry), taking into account the objectives of the whole community (political and national one) and groups (elites—intelligentsia, workers, peasants) and individual people. At the same time, they opposed both socialism (Czerkawski) and

¹⁸ J. Tischner, *Etyka solidarności* (Kraków: Znak, 1981).

¹⁹ J. Milewski, W. Czerkawski, *Polityka ekonomiczna*, vol. 1–2 (Kraków: Księgarnia Spółki Wydawniczej Polskiej, 1905).

individualism (Milewski). Romanowski showed the anthropological errors of a Protestant economy which refers to the naturalist vision of man and makes the person subject to material factors. Caro combined economic considerations with Catholic social teachings. He emphasized the meaning of national community and he claimed that the basis for the political society is the law. He believed that politics must be connected with morality. He criticized liberalism and Marxism, noticing their common features: the negation of Christianity and the nation. He was in favor of respecting private property, but he claimed it should be used in a way that takes into account the common good. Górski and Szymański were the Polish representatives of the so-called Mechlin Union and Social Code specifying the foundations for the social order based on the Catholic tradition. Using the thought of St. Thomas Aquinas, Górski analyzed the foundations of property and the way of using it in an honest manner. Piwowarczyk, as a personalist and representative of the Catholic social thought, emphasized the connection between economy and ethics. He promoted far-reaching social reforms, starting from the agricultural reform. Referring to corporatism, he criticized capitalist liberalism and Marxism. He emphasized the need for the personalist shaping of public life. Roszkowski, in turn, with reference to the social teaching of the Church, discussed the issue of property and its circulation.

After World War II, apart from Strzeszewski, Majka (working in the environments of KUL, PAT, the Theological Institute of Tarnów, and the Pontifical Faculty of Theology in Wrocław) exerted a great influence on the development of the Catholic social teaching. His broad scientific interests (Catholic social teaching, sociology, philosophy, theology) also included economy. Majka's personalist approach to economic issues was particularly visible in his works on the ethics of work, profit and usury, and, in a later period—in *Etyka życia gospodarczego* [*Ethics of Economy*].²⁰ Chodorowski, as an expert in the theory of economy and economic doctrines, active in the Wrocław scientific environment, discussed the problem of the human in the context of changes taking place in economy and international law. Skrzydlewski, while working in the Kraków environment, analyzed economic issues with reference to the teachings of St. Thomas Aquinas. Dziński, in turn,

²⁰ J. Majka, *Etyka życia gospodarczego* (Warszawa: Ośrodek Dokumentacji i Studiów Społecznych, 1980).

who called himself a “Christian liberal,” believed that social and economic order are the foundations of human freedom.

The cultural-civilization approach considered social issues in light of a specific theory of culture and civilization, or in light of cultural and civilization changes. The representatives of this approach include: Feliks Koneczny (1862–1949), Fr. Józef Kruszyński, Fr. Andrzej Krzesiński (1884–1964), Michał Pawlikowski (1887–1970), Fr. Jan Stepa, Fr. Michał Poradowski (1913–2003), Jacek Bartyzel (1956–), Paweł Witold Bortkiewicz TChr (1958), Fr. Tadeusz Guz (1959–), Andrzej Nowak (1960–), Fr. Dariusz Oko (1960–), Fr. Andrzej Kobyliński (1965–), Mieczysław Ryba (1969–), Grzegorz Kucharczyk (1969–), and Adam Wielomski (1972–).

The most famous representative of the cultural-civilization approach is Koneczny, a historian and a philosopher of history. On the basis of historical studies, he worked out an original philosophy of culture and civilization. In the modern world, he enumerated seven civilizations (Latin, Byzantine, Turanian, Jewish, Arabic, Brahmin, Chinese), most of which are of collective nature. In his analyses, he emphasized the personalist nature of the Latin civilization. The nature of a given civilization as the “method of the collective life system” is determined by the arrangement of relations that specify the man’s understanding, i.e. *quincunx* (morality, knowledge, health, property, beauty) and three kinds of law (related to the family, property and inheritance) that determine the human place in the community. Kruszyński took up the reflection on culture, civilization and politics of the western world in the context of Christian religion. Krzesiński analyzed the clash of the Christian concept of the human beings and culture with the challenges of modernity that shapes their external life (e.g. progress and mechanization), as well as internal life (e.g. the attitude towards oneself and the world).

Pawlikowski, who lived in Great Britain from the end of World War II, distinguished between two basic types of civilization based on the culture of a person (family, house, homeland, freedom) or on the nomadic culture of a herd (despotism, tyranny, violence, mechanical philosophy).²¹ Those two types of civilization—personal (Latin) and mechanist (Asian civilization), which clash in the territory of Europe,

²¹ M. Pawlikowski, *Dwa światy* (Londyn: Komitet Wydawniczy “Dwa Światy”, 1952).

generate tensions and conflicts. That is why, because of the civilizational conditions of social life, Pawlikowski saw the necessity to adjust politics to the type of civilization. Stepa, who represented Louvain Thomism, emphasized the crisis of culture which he associated with rejecting its theocentric orientation and focusing on anthropocentrism and atheism. In social life, that crisis is reflected in the dominance of individualism and collectivism. The reply to that crisis is personalist education oriented at searching for truth and making good. Poradowski discussed issues from the border of social, theological and civilization areas. He was the author of numerous works showing the civilizational and cultural effects of Marxism, modernism, liberalism, multilateralism, as well as approaches which eliminate Catholicism from social life.

Scientifically active representatives of this approach also include Bartyzel, who combines the philosophical thought related to public life with political and historical considerations referring to conservatism, monarchism and the classical Catholic tradition. Wielomski approaches the analysis of social issues in a similar manner. Also, the combination of social issues with historical and civilization conditions appears in the works of contemporary historians: the representatives of the conservative movement—Nowak and Kucharczyk, and the national movement—Ryba, who refers to Thomism.

Social issues analyzed in the perspective of culture, as well as the defense of moral order in the public space, especially in the context of ideological threats, are discussed by the following philosophers and theologians: Bortkiewicz (UAM), Guz (KUL), Oko (UPJPII), and Kobyliński (UKSW). The latter discusses the presence of values in public life, the philosophical foundations of human rights, and religious freedom in the contemporary state.

The anthropological-metaphysical approach developed a philosophical (independent of the faith) understanding of politics, law and social order in the context of the truth about the human which is presented in a systemic manner and takes into account the ultimate understanding of the whole of reality provided by Thomist metaphysics. This approach is represented by: Mieczysław Albert Krąpiec OP (1921–2008), Mieczysław Gogacz (1926–), Henryk Kiereś, (1943–), Piotr Jaroszyński, Andrzej Maryniarczyk SDB (1950–), Włodzimierz Dłubacz (1952–), Wojciech Chudy, Marek Czachorowski (1956–), Paweł Milcarek (1966–), Piotr Stanisław Mazur (1968–),

Fr. Paweł Tarasiewicz (1968–), Paweł Skrzydlewski (1970–), Katarzyna Stępień, and Michał Gierycz (1978–).

Krąpiec, who worked in the Lublin environment (KUL), as the most characteristic representative of this trend, emphasized the role of family, state and nation in human personal development. In the good of a person he saw the basic, non-antagonistic understanding of the common good, which is the subject of our concern for “humane politics.” In his studies, he developed the Thomist concept of natural law. Also, he paid attention to the protection of human rights in the modern world, showing various kinds of threats in the light of the basic rights recorded in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. He completed the concept of understanding social life with the elements of the theory of civilization derived from Koneczny.

According to Gogacz (UKSW), politics being the extension of ethics of protecting people is oriented at the fulfillment of justice and common good understood as the system of real interpersonal relations based on love, faith and hope, as opposed to intellectual relations (institutions, ideologies). Such a concept of goodness results from the recognition of the structure of people’s existence, so it should not be ignored by political authorities. The dominance of intellectual relations over real relations leads to an idealistic formation of social life in which the state and its structures are above the human personal life. Gogacz emphasizes the meaning of natural communities: family, nation and the state. He derives the concept of law from ontic conditions, proclaiming the primacy of natural law over positive law.

Considerations concerning the society, based on Thomist metaphysics, appear in the texts of the students of Krąpiec: Kiereś, Jaroszyński, Maryniarczyk and Dłubacz. While Kiereś focuses on culture, society and ideology, Jaroszyński mainly analyses the issues of culture and civilization.²² They evaluate social phenomena on the basis of personalism rooted in Thomist existential metaphysics. In the Lublin School of Philosophy, other students of Krąpiec also referred to metaphysics in their research concerning social issues—especially the protection of a person, family and nation: Chudy, Czachorowski and Skrzydlewski, the analyst of Koneczny’s thought and the author of numerous texts on the society and civilization. The representatives

²² P. Jaroszyński, *Spór o Europę. Zderzenia cywilizacji* (Lublin: Polskie Towarzystwo Tomasza z Akwinu; Katedra Metafizyki KUL, 2017).

of many other scientific centers take up similar issues: Milcarek and Gierycz (UKSW), and researchers from the Lublin School of Philosophy: Tarasiewicz (Diocesan Seminary in Ełk), who studied the specific features of a national community, and Mazur (AIK), who interpreted politics and ruling, developing the concept of human providence in the perception of Aquinas.

DISCUSSIONS AND DISPUTES

In the 20th century, the philosophical and social thought inspired by Christianity faced the emergence of numerous philosophical concepts (materialism, liberalism, positivism, scientism), as well as ideologies that questioned both the civilization-cultural and social meaning of Christianity, and the basic rights of a person. In the second half of the 20th century, the communist political system was the main challenge for Polish thinkers. The intellectual basis of this system was Marxism. After the fall of communism in the late 1980s and early 1990s, and after tearing down the iron curtain that divided Europe, the Christian thought had to face completely new challenges: utilitarianism, consumerism, moral relativism and rejection of Christianity by liberal democracies. In order to reply to those challenges, in each of the periods the Christian social thought had to evolve. However, such evolution did not mean the departure from the previous views, but the elaboration of one's opinion in the perspective of the diagnosed social threats and the criticism of the concepts being the bases of such threats.

At first, the discourse focused on defending the personalist concept of the human and organization of social life, as opposed to individualist and collectivist concepts. It was reflected in radical opinions on the theory and philosophy of the law in the political science and sociological discourse, in general political considerations, economic considerations, and in the whole social pedagogy. Such a view of personalism emphasized human subjectivity and sovereignty in collective life, as well as the necessity to participate in the community along with other people.²³ At the same time, it was different from other types of personalism as it specified its identity in the context of the

²³ C. Bartnik, *Personalizm* (Lublin: Wydawnictwo KUL, 2008).

Christian vision of the human and social order, as well as philosophical analyses based on the experience of being human.²⁴

In the face of the threat to a person's sovereignty, the theory of the common good was elaborated, and in reply to the threat to the society's freedom, the philosophers emphasized human rights and the nations' right to sovereign existence.²⁵ In the theory of the common good, contrary to individualism, the philosophers emphasized its non-antagonistic nature and the fact that, being the objective of politics and the system of positive law, it is, at the same time, the good of a person.²⁶ It is the good, and not the society (as suggested by collectivism) that is the reason for being of the whole social life. Politics was defined as a rational fulfilment of the common good, and law—as the principle oriented at the fulfilment of the common good.

In the area of the natural laws of the human and the nations' right to exist and make independent decisions, the philosophers emphasized that the human natural, common and inalienable personal dignity is the basis of such rights.²⁷ Such a dignity results from the very fact that the human exists.²⁸ Thus, the philosophers expressed the conviction that the basis for social and legal order and politics is the natural order of good and its principles rooted in the reality.²⁹ They believed that, for social life, the political system or the way of administering power is of secondary importance, because what is crucial is whether politics aims at the common good and

²⁴ K. Wojtyła, *Miłość i odpowiedzialność. Studium etyczne* (Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL, 1960); idem, *Człowiek w polu odpowiedzialności*, op. cit.

²⁵ M.A. Krąpiec, *Suverenność czyja?* (Lublin: Redakcja Wydawnictw KUL, 1996).

²⁶ M. Piechowiak *Dobro wspólne jako fundament polskiego porządku konstytucyjnego* (Warszawa: Biuro Trybunału Konstytucyjnego, 2012).

²⁷ S. Wielgus, "Ius gentium," in *Powszechna encyklopedia filozofii*, vol. 5, ed. A. Maryniarczyk (Lublin: Polskie Towarzystwo Tomasza z Akwinu, 2004), pp. 126–134; idem, *The Medieval Polish Doctrine of the Law of Nation: Ius gentium* (Lublin: Redakcja Wydawnictw KUL, 1998).

²⁸ T. Styczeń, "Normatywna moc prawdy czyli być sobą to przekraczać siebie. W nawiązaniu do Karola Wojtyły etyki jako antropologii normatywnej," *Ethos*, no. 4 (2006), pp. 24–36.

²⁹ M.A. Krąpiec, "Polityka," in *Powszechna encyklopedia filozofii*, vol. 8, ed. A. Maryniarczyk (Lublin: Polskie Towarzystwo Tomasza z Akwinu, 2007), p. 343; idem, "Porządek prawny ('Ordo Iuris') – rzeczywistość czy fikcja?" *Ius et Lex*, no. 1 (2002), pp. 135–144.

whether the social, cultural and legal order actually leads to human perfection.³⁰

Contrary to legal positivism, Christian social philosophy in Poland perceived positive law as the way to fulfill the common good, which, in its functioning or interpretation, cannot be artificially separated from the reality and the order existing before positive law (i.e. natural law).³¹ It was emphasized that the essence of law includes its rationality and the necessary connection with the real good, and, ultimately, the human personal good.³² Law perceived this way, as the rule and principle of human action, should be treated not as a threat to human freedom and sovereignty, but as something that actually serves human freedom and sovereignty.³³ The content of law does not depend on the will of the law-giver, but on the objective order of the reality which—recognized by the authorities—becomes the formal-model reason for positive law, just like the common good is its objective reason. Positive law needs to be rooted in the reality and moral principles, but also in the human way of acting which is connected with the need to promulgate it in the human conscience—the subject and objective of a legal norm.³⁴ Such law is the factor that shapes the holistic way of social life, i.e. civilization.

SOCIAL PHILOSOPHY AT THE BEGINNING OF THE 21ST CENTURY

At the beginning of the 21st century, Christian social thought is being developed in a multifaceted manner within different areas of scientific cognition: philosophy, theology, political science, law, sociology, economy, history and media studies. That is why it takes into account a wide range of problems and opinions focused both on the

³⁰ M. Gogacz, *Mądrość buduje państwo. Człowiek i polityka. Rozważania filozoficzne i religijne* (Niepokalanów: Wydawnictwo Ojców Franciszkanów, 1993).

³¹ *Obiektywna podstawa prawa. Wybór pism Czesława Martyniaka, Antoniego Szymańskiego i Ignacego Czumy*, ed. B. Szlachta (Kraków: Ośrodek Myśli Politycznej, 2001).

³² M.A. Krąpiec, *O ludzką politykę!* (Katowice: Wydawnictwo “Tolek”, 1993).

³³ Idem, “Filozofia prawa,” in *Powszechna encyklopedia filozofii*, vol. 3, ed. A. Maryniarczyk (Lublin: Polskie Towarzystwo Tomasza z Akwinu, 2002), pp. 500–512.

³⁴ P. Skrzydlewski, *Antropologiczne i społeczne determinanty prawa. Studium z filozofii prawa* (Lublin: Wydawnictwo KUL, 2013).

critical analysis of social phenomena and theories that explain them, and—in their context—on detailing and developing its own approach. In philosophy, the scholars more and more often go beyond the scope of the Thomist tradition which prevailed in the 21st century. However, the main features of Christian social philosophy are still personalism, which affirms human subjectivity, and the positive approach to religion in social life.

At the Jesuit University Ignatianum, social thought is being developed from the point of view of philosophy, political science, sociology, cultural studies and pedagogy. The philosophers who develop it include Stanisław Pyszka SJ (1951–), Tomasz Homa SJ (1958–), Dariusz Dańkowski SJ (1967–), and Piotr Stanisław Mazur. From the perspective of cultural studies it is analyzed by Andrzej Sarnacki SJ (1966–); from the perspective of philosophy combined with the political science or with sociology by Wojciech Buchner (1956–), Bogdan Szlachta (1959–), Artur Wołek (1971–), Piotr Świercz (1969–), Rafał Lis, Jarosław Charchuła SJ (1977–) and Krzysztof Matuszek (1976–). The research of the issues from the border of social philosophy and pedagogy is being carried out by Stanisław Gałkowski (1965–).

At UKSW, the following philosophers analyze the problems on the boundary between ethics and social philosophy: Ewa Podrez (1952–), Fr. Andrzej Kobylński and Fr. Jacek Grzybowski (1973–). Political science and social issues related to philosophy, religion and culture are discussed at the Institute of Political Science—by Krzysztof Wielecki, and, at the Department of the Theory of Politics and Political Thought—by Fr. Piotr Mazurkiewicz (1960–), Paweł Kaczorowski (1957–), Janusz Węgrzecki (1957–), Zbigniew Stawrowski (1958–), Sławomir Sowiński (1968–), Michał Gierycz and Mariusz Sulkowski (1981–).

At KUL, social philosophy in various aspects is developed by the following philosophers: Kiereś, Maryniarczyk, Wroczyński, Jaroszyński, Kłos, Dłubacz, Stępień, Guz; theologians: Fr. Janusz Nagórny (1950–2006) and Jerzy Gocko SDB (1965–); and sociologists: Fr. Stanisław Fel (1960–), the student of Mazurek. At UPJPII, social philosophy is practiced by Fr. Władysław Zuziak and Joanna Mysona Byrska (1974–). It is also analyzed from the theological perspective by Borutka, and from the perspective of social sciences—by Fr. Stanisław Pamuła (1940–), Fr. Andrzej Zwoliński, Fr. Michał Drózdź (1958–), and Fr. Grzegorz Godawa (1975–). In the Poznań environment (UAM)

the achievements of Fr. Antoni Siemianowski and Krzysztof Stachewicz are worth mentioning, and in Rzeszów (UR)—the work of Aleksander Bobko. Apart from the traditional centers of Christian philosophy, social thought is being developed at the faculties of theology affiliated to universities and higher education institutions in: Warsaw (ChAT), Poznań (UAM), Toruń (UMK), Opole (UO), Szczecin (US), Katowice (UŚ), Olsztyn (UWM), and in the seminaries of different religious orders.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Andrzejuk, A. *Problem filozoficznych podstaw etyki tomistycznej*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo UKSW, 2000.
- Bochenek, K., Gawor, L., Jedynak, S. *Filozofia polska okresu międzywojennego: zarys problematyki*. Gdynia: Wydawnictwo Akademickie AMW, 2013.
- Buttiglione, R. *Mysł Karola Wojtyły*, trans. J. Merecki. Lublin: Instytut Jana Pawła II KUL, 1996.
- Carlyle, A.J. *The Christian Church and Liberty*. London: J. Clark, 1924.
- Gogacz, M. *Mądrość buduje państwo. Człowiek i polityka – Rozważania filozoficzne i religijne*. Niepokalanów: Wydawnictwo Ojców Franciszkanów, 1993.
- Kiereś, H. *Osoba a społeczność*. Lublin: Polskie Towarzystwo Tomasza z Akwinu, 2013.
- Kornat, M. *Bolszewizm, totalitaryzm, rewolucja, Rosja: początki sowietologii i studiów nad systemami totalitarnymi w Polsce (1918–1939)*, vol. 1–2. Kraków: Księgarnia Akademicka, 2003–2004.
- Kowalczyk, S. *Człowiek a społeczność: zarys filozofii społecznej*. Lublin: Redakcja Wydawnictw KUL, 2005.
- Krajski, S. *Filozofia społeczna w "Przeglądzie Powszechnym" w latach 1884–1939*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo św. Tomasza z Akwinu, 2003.
- Krąpiec, M.A. *O ludzką politykę!* Katowice: Wydawnictwo "Tolek", 1993.
- . *Suwerenność czyja?* Lublin: Redakcja Wydawnictw KUL, 1996.
- Kucharczyk, G. *Polska Myśl polityczna do roku 1939*. Dębogóra: Wydawnictwo Dębogóra, 2011.
- Łętocha, R. *Katolicyzm a idea narodowa*. Lublin: Fundacja Servire Veritati Instytut Edukacji Narodowej, 2002.
- . *O dobro wspólne. Szkice z katolicyzmu społecznego*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Libron, 2010.

- Majka, J. *Filozofia społeczna*. Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Wrocławskiej Księgarni Archidiecezjalnej, 1982.
- . *Katolicka nauka społeczna*. Warszawa: Ośrodek Dokumentacji i Studiów Społecznych, 1988.
- Nauka a polityka. Dziwne losy filozofii prawa w Polsce*, ed. M. Szyszkowska. Warszawa: Dom Wydawniczy "Elipsa", 2010.
- Possenti, V. *Katolicka nauka społeczna wobec dziedzictwa oświecenia*, trans. Ł. Skuza, S. Pyszka, T. Żeleźnik. Kraków: Wydawnictwo WAM, 2000.
- Spór o osobę w świetle klasycznej koncepcji człowieka. Studia i rozprawy*, ed. P.S. Mazur. Kraków: Akademia Ignatianum, Wydawnictwo WAM, 2012.
- Strzeszewski, C. *Katolicka nauka społeczna*. Lublin: Redakcja Wydawnictw KUL, 1994.
- Szczęsny, M. *Personalistyczna filozofia społeczna Antoniego Szymańskiego*. Olsztyn: Wydawnictwo UWM, 2005.
- Szlachta, B. *Wokół katolickiej myśli politycznej*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo WAM, 2007.
- Szydłowski, P. *Kryzys kultury w polskiej myśli katolickiej 1918–1939*. Warszawa–Kraków: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1984.
- Voegelin, E. *Od Oświecenia do rewolucji*, trans. Ł. Pawłowski. Warszawa: Wydawnictwa UW, 2011.
- Wyszyński, S. *Z rozważań nad kulturą ojczystą*. Poznań–Warszawa: Pallottinum, 1979.

Tomasz Homa SJ
Jesuit University Ignatianum in Krakow
Urszula Tes
Jesuit University Ignatianum in Krakow

11.

PHILOSOPHY OF CULTURE

The philosophy of culture began to emerge as an independent field of study in the 1920s. Such an emergence was accompanied by the shaping of the Christian or—more precisely—the Catholic philosophy of culture. In the West, it took place thanks to the efforts of philosophers such as Alois Dempf, Jacques Maritain and Martin Grabmann, and in Poland—mainly due to the works of neo-Thomist thinkers.¹ At first, the subject of interest included the specification of the terms: “culture” and “civilization.” Later, the representatives of this approach started to deal with specifying the subject of the research and shape the most important opinions.

In the variety of approaches and views included in the Christian philosophy of culture, their common basis is the personalist concept of the man. According to such a concept, a person, as the most perfect being (created by God) and the highest value, constitutes the basic subject and objective of culture, and, at the same time, the approach to his or her personal development determines the standard of culture. The culture itself, which is reflected both in the acts (of intellectual cognition, moral action and creative activity) and in cultural products (science, morality, art, religion) fulfilled by individuals and whole societies, is considered to be the expression of man’s personal status.

¹ C. Głombik, *Metafizyka kultury. Grabmann – Maritain – neoscholastyka polska* (Warszawa: Książka i Wiedza, 1982), pp. 12–15.

HISTORICAL AND IDEOLOGICAL CONTEXT

Twentieth century Christian philosophy of culture developed within the context of the renewal of scholasticism. The historical-genetic studies on the Middle Ages, which were being carried out at that time, revealed not only the works of particular thinkers, but also the nature of the medieval culture which was very “Christian.” This raised numerous questions about the contemporary culture and the role of Christianity in social and cultural life. The analysis of culture and cultural phenomena was often oriented at keeping or acquiring the Christian image.

The experience related to the role of the Catholic Church in maintaining national identity was a typically Polish context of approaching the studies on culture, especially at the beginning of the 20th century. Between 1795–1918 Poland had been deprived of its political sovereignty. The country had been partitioned by three occupying powers and, from the second half of the 19th century in particular, there had been a growing resistance to these authorities which had wanted to destroy Polish culture. Bismarck’s program of *Kulturkampf* directed against the Catholic Church became synonymous with such destruction. The campaign to destroy the people’s sense of national identity, which was particularly intensive in the Prussian and Russian partitions, included the formal prohibition of speaking Polish in schools and offices. In such conditions, the only area of life in which language and culture could be cultivated was religion. Maintaining national identity and culture depended on staying within the Church and Catholicism which expressed the opposition against the occupants who represented Protestantism (the Germans) and the Orthodox Church (Russia).² In the first half of the 19th century, national culture was supported by the works of many great Romantic poets living abroad (Adam Mickiewicz, Juliusz Słowacki, Cyprian Kamil Norwid, Zygmunt Krasiński, Fryderyk Chopin). In the second half of the century, Polish culture was developed due to the relative degree autonomy enjoyed by Poles within Galicia,

² The relation between Polish culture and Christianity is much earlier and deeper, as the Polish state entered the arena of the history of Europe in 966, when it was baptized.

i.e. the area under Austro-Hungarian rule. As a result, Polish culture in the 19th century experienced tremendous growth that made it possible for the Poles to retain their national identity despite a total lack of political freedom.

After a brief period of independence (1918–1939), Poland experienced a similar cultural challenge—the years of World War II (1939–1945) and nearly half of a century of Soviet occupation (1945–1989). During the war, the occupants, i.e. Germany and the Soviet Union, tried to destroy Polish culture by killing the intelligentsia. A symbol of such an attempt were the mass murders in Katyń and other camps, where almost 20,000 officers were killed. Most of these officers were also teachers, doctors, lawyers and engineers who were mobilized for the time of the war. In another action carried out by the Germans in 1940, called AB (*Außerordentliche Befriedungsaktion*), where approximately 6,500 educated Poles were murdered. Since 1945, the Poles had to cope with the Marxist ideology which tried to exert its influence on creating, functioning and studying culture.

The Christian philosophy of culture was shaped in 20th century Poland in an atmosphere of oppression and with the awareness of a strong connection between that culture with the Catholic religion and the Church. As a result, the reflection of Christian thinkers on culture was, at that time, a natural extension of what was happening in culture itself. The Christianity of culture in its most important aspects indicates a certain worldview identification, but it also expresses various concepts and forms of cultural activity accepted by the communist authorities. It was also reflected in the way it was studied from the philosophical point of view, which is characterized by the pluralism of trends and concepts, including philosophical ones.

MAIN APPROACHES AND REPRESENTATIVES

The philosophical reflections on culture carried out in the 20th century were focused on the three main problems: a better understanding of the fact of culture in the individual and social dimension (the ontic aspect); the analysis and explanation of contemporary social-cultural phenomena (the civilization aspect); and the influence of culture on our individual and social life (the ethical-educational

aspect), especially within the context of giving culture a Christian image. Although the Christian philosophy of culture was born within neo-scholasticism, it is not only limited to the neo-Thomist approach. Its representatives refer to phenomenology and hermeneutics, and to humanist, social and theological sciences. Basically, in the development of the Christian philosophy of the 20th century we can distinguish three periods: (1) from the beginning of the 20th century up to 1945, with special emphasis on the interwar period (1918–1939), (2) the period of the occupation (1939–1945) and the dependence on the Soviet Union (1944–1989), (3) the time after 1989. One of the most important events that influenced the Christian reflections on culture was the Second Vatican Council which opened it to philosophical approaches other than neo-Thomism. The new approach to analyzing culture was marked by, i.a. the dispute between the personalists and the representatives of the metaphysical trend (neo-Thomists). The latter connected understanding culture with axiology in which a person is the highest value. As a result, culture was primarily perceived as a “set of values and models of action.”³ The post-conciliar thought on culture in various approaches (metaphysical, personalist, phenomenological, hermeneutic, dialogic) was developed in the Lublin environment (KUL), in Warsaw (ATK) and Kraków (PAT). Gradually, the scholars were shaping the concepts of culture which did not derive much from the traditional neo-scholastic interpretations. This trend was already visible in 1960s in the works by Józef Tischner (1931–2000) and Stanisław Grygiel (1934–); and later in the texts of Władysław Stróżewski (1933–), Karol Tarnowski (1937–), and in the Kraków environment of *Znak*.

NEO-SCHOLASTICISM IN THE FIRST HALF OF THE 20TH CENTURY

In the first half of the 20th century, the neo-Thomist approach dominated in the considerations on culture, although the concepts based on other approaches also appeared. The problem of culture was mainly discussed in the context of analyzing various philosophical issues by, e.g.: Fr. Aleksander Pechnik (1854–1935), Fr. Franciszek

³ A. Rodziński, *Osoba, moralność, kultura* (Lublin: Redakcja Wydawnictw KUL, 1989), p. 232.

Sawicki (1877–1952), Jacek Woroniecki OP (1878–1949), Fr. Konstanty Michalski (1879–1947), Fr. Antoni Szymański (1881–1942), Fr. Jan Stepa (1892–1959), Fr. Michał Klepacz (1893–1967), and Fr. Józef Pastuszka (1897–1989).

Pechnik focused on studying the Church's approach to culture, emphasizing not only her historical achievements but also related tasks to be fulfilled by the clergy.⁴ Sawicki, in turn, included the reflection on culture in the broadly understood philosophy of history. In his opinion, the ideal of the man's perfection is fulfilled in history which, through culture, reaches the top of its developmental abilities, and finds its ultimate fulfillment in God.⁵

According to Sawicki, culture includes everything that is created by the human spirit: knowledge and art, moral and religious life, technology, industry and agriculture. It also comprises work that the man performs to shape nature. Because of the man's intellectual effort, a new, original world of human culture is being created.⁶ Sawicki paid special attention to internal life and shaping the culture of the spirit. In his later works, he distinguished three aspects of culture: ideal culture (spiritual life which includes religion, morality, art, science), material culture (it satisfies man's bodily needs) and social structures (the Church and the state). All these aspects of culture aim at the fulfillment of the man's ideal and material life.

Woroniecki discussed culture in the ethical-educational context, focusing in its role in shaping the man's moral, religious and social life.⁷ He diagnosed the condition of modern culture through analyzing the intellect of Polish intelligentsia whom he accused of fideism, sentimentalism and individualism that involved cognitive particularism, intellectualism and moral probabilism, as well as social indifference. These phenomena result from the ignorance of or reluctance to Christianity and Christian culture. At the same time, he appreciated the attempts to improve intellectual culture and shape social virtues as the symptoms of religious revival.

⁴ A. Pechnik, *Kościół i kultura* (Lwów: Nakładem Autora, 1914).

⁵ F. Sawicki, *Życie ludzkie* (Poznań: Naczelny Instytut Akcji Katolickiej, 1936), p. 50.

⁶ Idem, *Kryzys kultury a religia chrześcijańska* (Poznań: Naczelny Instytut Akcji Katolickiej, 1937), p. 9.

⁷ J. Woroniecki, *U podstaw kultury katolickiej* (Poznań, Naczelny Instytut Akcji Katolickiej, 1935).

The connections between culture and the specific features of social life were also analyzed by Stepa. He associated social universalism with the theocentric, Christian culture of the Middle Ages which was rooted in the intellectual heritage of antiquity. He believed that the foundation of Christian culture is the classical metaphysics in the cognition of truth and personalism in social relations. At the same time, he criticized the anthropocentric culture of modernity, based on the medieval nominalism and Renaissance individualism, which led to dechristianization as well as moral and social liberalism. Klepacz had a similar opinion on the problem of crisis of the contemporary culture. The Renaissance, which rejected the theocentric culture of the Middle Ages, brought individualism, criticism and naturalism and, apart from good phenomena (determining the borders of human cognition, the development of exact sciences and technology, specialization and scientific progress), it also had negative consequences. They could be noticed in the form of a naturalist anthropology which directs the man's attention to what is external and not internal. He believed that we could avoid these negative consequences by making the contemporary culture personalist and theocentric.

Michalski emphasized that only man creates and absorbs culture.⁸ In the world of culture, he distinguished two most important areas. The first one comprises knowledge, art and technology; the second—organization and social arrangements. He paid attention to the spiritual assimilation of the products of culture. A deeply absorbed cultural product enriches man, satisfying his spiritual needs and facilitating the inspiration of his own creativity. Only a Christian culture in which the element of supernatural grace and spirit is present gives man the fullness of life and leads him to interpersonal and interracial agreement, and motivates him to heroism.

Szymański distinguished religious and moral culture, as well as lay culture and civilization.⁹ He perceived culture and civilization in a broad manner, as peace, safety and wealth. He claimed that everything that makes the man wiser and better is cultural and civilization

⁸ K. Michalski, *Między heroizmem a bestialstwem* (Kraków: Wydawnictwo Mariackie, 1949).

⁹ A. Szymański, "Katolicyzm a kultura i cywilizacja," in *Kultura i cywilizacja*, collective work, vol. 1 (Lublin: Wydawnictwo Wiedzy Chrześcijańskiej, 1937), pp. 17–46.

work. Also, he emphasized the culture-forming abilities of the Church which, showing the man moral and religious principles, influences the man's upbringing.

Pastuszka claims that culture and religion are rooted in the deepest needs of human nature and aim at satisfying them.¹⁰ The objective of culture is man's spiritual development. Pastuszka separated Christian religion from culture, but he believed that they do not contradict each other. Culture and religion have different tasks. The starting point and objective of cultural activity is the man who is improving himself, while the starting point and objective of religion is God. Each culture is relative and dependent on historical conditions. European culture is largely areligious and anti-Christian, but the nature of religion is transcendental. The divergence between Christianity and culture stems from the fact that culture, focused on transforming material reality through technology and inventions, improved the quality and dynamics of human life, but the man's spiritual development did not keep up with it.

Pastuszka claimed that Christianity and culture should be harmonized in recognizing the separateness and superiority of the spiritual world, unchangeable moral truths, and in subjecting all activities to spiritual ideals.

NON-SCHOLASTIC CONCEPTS IN THE FIRST HALF OF THE 20TH CENTURY

The scholastic considerations on culture which, in the first half of the 20th century were mainly taken up by priests, were completed with the works of independent scholars: the philosopher Witold Rubczyński (1864–1938), the historians—Feliks Koneczny (1869–1949) and Karol Górski (1903–1988), as well as the educator—Bogdan Nawroczyński (1882–1974).

Rubczyński emphasized the meaning of man's creative activity. He believed that Christianity is the factor that preserves Western culture and improves humanity, helping man get closer to God. He emphasized the culture-forming meaning of the idea of God, and he criticized

¹⁰ J. Pastuszka, "Chrześcijaństwo a kultura," in *Kultura i cywilizacja*, collective work, vol. 1 (Lublin: Towarzystwo Wiedzy Chrześcijańskiej, 1937), pp. 1–16.

what he considered harmful for improving human life, like secularization, anthropocentrism or hedonism.¹¹

Koneczny was indubitably the most original and, at the same time, the best-known thinker who analyzed the issue of culture and civilization in the first half of the 20th century. As a historian and philosopher of history, he suggested his own theory of understanding civilization as the method of collective life in which three aspects of law play the crucial role (the family, property and inheritance law). Civilizations are created in a particular geographical territory, but biological and geographical conditions do not determine their nature.¹² Their nature results from the attitude towards the basic aspects of human existence: knowledge and morality—with reference to spiritual life, health and property—with reference to the human body and their mutual relations (beauty). Different civilizations may occur in one territory. Koneczny listed twenty civilizations, seven of which have survived until now: Latin, Byzantine, Turanian, Jewish, Arabic, Brahmin and Chinese. While characterizing them, he emphasized that only the Latin civilization is of personalist nature. Also, he indicated some civilization laws promoting inequality, inability to be synthesized (man cannot be civilized in two different manners), antagonism and harmfulness of civilizations mixes which ultimately lead to the primacy of lower civilizations. Within each civilization, he acknowledged the possibility of the occurrence of many cultures which complement one another. This also refers to the Latin civilization in which various national cultures were shaped.

Górski was the closest to scholastic concepts and he referred to Maritain's heritage. He believed that culture is what man adds to nature in the form of a material, intellectual, artistic and moral heritage.¹³ In his opinion, the characteristic feature of the creators of culture is purposefulness oriented at the man's personal development. Górski emphasized that the man and culture serve each other: culture needs man and man needs culture.¹⁴ However, culture does

¹¹ W. Rubczyński, *O warunkach przybliżania się do ideałów kultury* (Warszawa: Stowarzyszenie Chrześcijańsko-Narodowe Nauczycielstwa Szkół Powszechnych, 1931).

¹² F. Koneczny, *O wielości cywilizacji* (Kraków: Gebethner i Wolff, 1935).

¹³ K. Górski, *Umysłowość średniowiecza* (Toruń: Akademicka Księgarnia Spółdzielcza "Skrypt", 1947).

¹⁴ Idem, *Wychowanie personalistyczne* (Poznań: Naczelny Instytut Akcji Katolickiej, 1936).

not exhaust the entirety of man's personal life as the completion of this life includes the relation with God. Thus, to give man the sense of ultimate fulfillment, culture must be connected with religion. Górski claimed that the crisis of culture is rooted in individualism in which anthropocentric humanism is reflected that treats the entire culture as a tool of one's pleasure. He also criticized collectivism for subjecting culture to practical life which leads to losing the principles that direct human existence. He believed that personalism is what ensures the proper shaping of culture.

Nawroczyński was interested in the internal aspect of culture, i.e. man's spiritual life.¹⁵ While emphasizing the meaning of the purposefulness of action oriented at values (its telehormic quality), Nawroczyński distinguished cultural facts and culture facts. Cultural facts, which constitute spiritual life, are focused on objectives—(positive) values valid in a given culture. Culture facts include all purposeful actions of the man, irrespective of their value. Their nature is social as they are transformed into tradition. Also, he distinguished a living culture (activities and processes) from a dead culture (products and ponderables). Spiritual life is related to aiming at a particular objective until the achievement of absolute values that make the spiritual culture meaningful. In its development, culture adopts various forms, starting from the lowest material culture, through civilization, up to spiritual culture which occupies the highest position in the hierarchy.

Metaphysical approach

In the metaphysical approach which, in the most general sense, can be identified with Thomism, the issue of culture is discussed in light of the philosophy of being and the classical philosophy of man. The Lublin School of Philosophy is particularly important in the development of this approach, and especially the following authors: Stefan Swieżawski (1907–2004), Mieczysław Albert Krąpiec OP (1921–2008) and Fr. Karol Wojtyła/John Paul II (1920–2005) who combined Thomism with phenomenology. Those who developed Krąpiec's approach to culture included, i.a.: Zofia Józefa Zdybicka USJK (1928–), Piotr Jaroszyński (1955–) and Henryk Kiereś (1943–).

¹⁵ B. Nawroczyński, *Życie duchowe. Zarys filozofii kultury* (Kraków–Warszawa: Księgarnia Wydawnicza F. Pieczętkowski i Ska, 1947).

In the KUL environment, studies on culture were also carried out by Czesław Strzeszewski (1903–1999), who discussed the problem of culture in the context of social sciences inspired by Thomism, Fr. Stanisław Kowalczyk (1932–), who combined Thomism with Augustinianism, and Antoni Bazyli Stępień (1931–), who completes Thomism with Ingarden’s phenomenology. In the Warsaw environment, the Thomist reflection on culture was developed by Mieczysław Gogacz (1926–), and at present is being done by Fr. Jan Sochoń (1953–).

Swieżawski perceived culture as *cultus animi*—the cultivation of spirit which consists of developing and harmonizing the action of man’s intellect and will.¹⁶ In intellectual life, he emphasized the role of contemplation and wisdom. Culture and (wisdom) philosophy are strictly connected with each other. Maintaining the wisdom of culture is good for both man and for culture itself, otherwise culture becomes dehumanized. Dehumanization also results from separating culture from Christian principles, especially from the commandment of love. The principal task of actions carried out within the area of culture is upbringing which develops man’s wisdom. Universities should be particularly involved in shaping such wisdom.

According to Krąpiec, the task of the philosophy of culture is explaining the fact of culture. Culture is created by man on the basis of his personal experiences and actions—both individual and social ones. Each cultural fact is the image of human knowledge of the world and the expression of the man’s will to improve the world. “The first and foremost cultural act is cognition in which we acquire (interiorize) and intellectualize the existing reality (nature).”¹⁷ Culture consists of the acts of cognition, moral action and production, the result of which includes three basic areas of culture: science, morality and art. They are complemented by personal acts oriented at God, the expression of which is religion being the “focus of culture.” Each cultural activity is oriented at a particular objective. Truth is the objective of cognition (science); goodness—of action (morality); beauty—of production (art), and holiness is the objective of religion. These “values” also become the standards of culture because, through the acts, the

¹⁶ S. Swieżawski, *Istnienie i tajemnica* (Lublin: Redakcja Wydawnictw KUL, 1993).

¹⁷ M.A. Krąpiec, *U podstaw rozumienia kultury* (Lublin: Redakcja Wydawnictw KUL, 1991), pp. 15–16.

man creates a good or bad culture.¹⁸ Krąpiec dedicated much of his work to the metaphysics of culture, disputing with Kantian personalism that emphasized the role of subjective values; the anthropology of culture, by discussing the subjectivity and rationality of man's various activities which include religious acts; Christian culture, by emphasizing the relation with God which improves the man, the ideal of life in the person of Jesus Christ and the meaning of suffering; Latin civilization and its personalist concept of collective life; the specific features of Polish culture which include religiousness, the love of freedom and "emotional rationality"; and the perception of a creative act and the intentionality of a work of art—also in an eschatic dimension.

Zdybicka discusses culture mainly in the context of her studies on religion. In her opinion, there is no culture without religion. Culture based on the divine-human truth about the man and love, which is rooted in Christ, is the culture of cognition, love and goodness.¹⁹ The nature of Christianity is culture-forming and the property of culture inspired by Christianity is acknowledging truth as the basic value. Christianity emphasizes man's personal status, his value and dignity, placing—at the same time—God in the center of creation and culture (Christological anthropocentrism). The objective of culture and religion perceived this way is man's personal development.

Gogacz, who represented consequent Thomism, believed that "culture is what was made by humanity and what particular people acquired as the shape of their spiritual life."²⁰ We can look at culture from within and from without. In the first case, culture is a set of man's internal improvements; in the second case—it is a set of his products. From the objective point of view, culture precedes the existence of a particular man; it is something that the man encounters and something that helps him understand the world. In a genetic sense, culture is similar to man and aims at his good. That is why there is a correlation between man's personal life and culture: man creates

¹⁸ Idem, *Człowiek w kulturze* (Lublin: Redakcja Wydawnictw KUL, 1999), p. 35.

¹⁹ Z.J. Zdybicka, "Chrześcijaństwo w kulturze Zachodu," in *Przyszłość cywilizacji Zachodu. Materiały z sympozjum zorganizowanego przez Katedrę Filozofii Kultury KUL*, eds. A. Brzózka, M.J. Gondek (Lublin: Oficyna Hieronima; Fundacja Rozwoju Kultury Polskiej, 2003).

²⁰ M. Gogacz, *Szkice o kulturze* (Kraków–Warszawa: Michalineum, 1985), p. 11.

culture and, at the same time, in the process of education he is shaped by culture. Every man, according to his individual abilities, is the creator of culture in the aspect of cognition (contemplation), decision-making (wisdom) and creation (art, technology, social relations). The ability to shape culture includes man's responsibility for culture, and, at the same time, his responsibility for himself and other people. The basic threat to culture is its incommensurability with the world of natural beings which leads to the separation of man from the real world of people and things.

Referring to Krąpiec, Jaroszyński studied the metaphysical foundations of culture, emphasizing the necessity to direct human cognition to actually existing beings (metaphysics) instead of to what is possible (ontology).²¹ According to the classical approach, he perceives culture as the complementation of the shortages (improving) of nature (the actual being) directed by the action of human intellect. Culture makes it possible for man to do good and man is the subject and objective of culture.²² Jaroszyński compares his concept of culture with culture in the post-Kantian sense which is not the completion of nature but an area of independent creation of values by man. The reduction of nature, including human nature, to matter that is void of any value and susceptible to processing, is dangerous for the man. Jaroszyński postulates that, for the good of man, culture should be rationally related with nature. In his research, he also analyses the issue of understanding art—especially beauty and the role of science in culture. Jaroszyński also studied the problem of civilization and its threats, especially in the context of the concept of civilization worked out by Koneczny.

According to Kiereś, culture is related to man's personal life. The principal aspects of such life—cognition, love, freedom, are to be fulfilled by man. Thus, “culture is the actualization of the man's personal life against the background of the world's experience, and, at the same time, it is the fruit of that rationalization, the quality (perfection) of a human being, and its products are images and expressions of such perfection—they are the external sign and, simultaneously,

²¹ P. Jaroszyński, *Metafizyka czy ontologia?* (Lublin: Polskie Towarzystwo Tomasza z Akwinu, 2011).

²² Idem, *Nauka w kulturze* (Radom: Polskie Wydawnictwo Encyklopedyczne, 2002), pp. 321–337.

the characteristic feature of culture.”²³ Kiereś systematized the problem of the realistic perception of art and the relation between art and religion. He also discussed the crisis of modern culture, especially that related to postmodernism and the presence of ideologies in forming social life.

Within phenomenologizing neo-Thomism, the philosophy of culture was developed by Stępień. He treats it as a part of the philosophy of man, strictly connected with other areas such as social philosophy or the philosophy of religion. The philosophy of culture asks about the essence of culture and the way it exists. It is methodologically independent of naturalistic and humanistic theories of culture. In analyzing culture, Stępień used phenomenological description, interpretation and metaphysical explanation. He specifies culture as human activity the task of which is improving the condition of nature. Culture includes everything that the man, in a conscious manner, adds to what he sees in nature.²⁴ While analyzing culture, Stępień took into account cultural activities and their products in which various values are reflected. He distinguished culture into material, social and spiritual one. Referring to Ingarden’s phenomenology, he emphasized that culture is an intentional being that depends on awareness, but it is also concretized in material things. In the area of studies on culture, he particularly developed aesthetics.

Kowalczyk aims at synthesizing the Thomist interpretation of culture with its modern concepts. He emphasizes the personalist nature of culture. While analyzing the way of understanding culture and its dimensions—phenomenological, ontological, anthropological and axiological—he indicates the man as its basic subject and objective.²⁵ He believes that the development of the man determines the quality of culture, and he emphasized the primacy of spiritual culture over technological-material culture.²⁶ He underlines the interdependence of culture and religion, especially Christianity, indicating its culture-forming role. According to Kowalczyk, Christian culture is characterized by the acceptance of the commandment of love and the related

²³ H. Kiereś, *Człowiek i cywilizacja* (Lublin: Fundacja Servire Veritati Instytut Edukacji Narodowej, 2007), p. 160.

²⁴ A.B. Stępień, *Wstęp do filozofii* (Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL, 1995).

²⁵ S. Kowalczyk, *Filozofia kultury* (Lublin: Redakcja Wydawnictw KUL, 1996).

²⁶ Idem, “Religia a kultura,” *Studia Płockie*, no. 8 (1980), pp. 263–277.

system of ethical norms and values. Such culture takes into account supernatural factors in shaping the spiritual culture of a Christian. While indicating the existence of the Absolute, it justifies the personalist and axiological perception of culture.

Sochoń treats the philosophy of culture as an independent philosophical discipline which, in its final shape, depends on the previously adopted philosophical vision. The main task of the philosophy of culture is the metaphysical explanation of the phenomenon of culture connected—through various bonds—with typically human activity of the man. Such an explanation does not consist in describing those various forms of expressing oneself, which are the subject of exact sciences analyzing culture. It consists of capturing the constitutive elements that shape the phenomenon of culture in general. Asking about culture is, ultimately, asking about the man—about what really actualizes his potential, i.e. improves him and helps him live a truly human life. Sochoń emphasizes the need to work out such a philosophy of culture in which the point of reference is metaphysics and anthropology that make it possible to answer the basic questions concerning the human way of existing.²⁷

Strzeszewski, as a representative of social sciences who refers to the Thomist concept of the society, emphasized the social aspect of culture, because culture cannot be created outside the society—without the cooperation of particular people. He also developed the concept of Christian culture based on the moral and religious principles of Catholic teaching.²⁸

Personalist-axiological approach

Within the personalist-axiological approach, which usually refers to philosophical concepts other than Thomism (mainly to phenomenology), the scholars emphasize the meaning of culture, and especially the world of values, for the fulfillment of the man's personal life. The representatives of this approach include Adam Rodziński (1920–2014), Fr. Karol Wojtyła, Halina Wistuba (1920–2013), Andrzej Póttawski (1923–), Tadeusz Styczeń SDS (1931–2010), and Wojciech Chudy (1947–2007).

²⁷ J. Sochoń, *Człowiek i twórczość. Szkice z filozofii kultury* (Lublin: Polskie Towarzystwo Tomasza z Akwinu; Katedra Metafizyki KUL, 2016).

²⁸ S. Kowalczyk, *Filozofia kultury*, p. 175.

For Rodziński, culture includes all the attempts of man to improve nature, both in himself and outside, the result of which is the appearance of the community among people.²⁹ Within the ontological dimension, culture is the expression of human nature, a part of which is spiritual development. He distinguishes culture in a dynamic and objectivized sense, as well individual-personal culture and social culture. There are many types and kinds of culture. The pluralism of cultures results from the multitude and variety of values and models of human thinking and acting. Rodziński indicates the necessity to personalize culture, as its task it to humanize the man himself. He particularly emphasizes the axiology of culture. He underlines the necessity to evaluate human actions and works in the light of the man's personal dignity.

In Wojtyła's personalism, culture is perceived as the way of man's existence. Man is the subject of culture, its proper object and objective, and culture is both the way and the expression of the actualization of the man's potentiality.³⁰ Culture should be first interpreted in the aspect of its connection with man, and only then—in the aspect of his products. Culture reflects the existential integrity of man as a spiritual-material subject. Thus, culture “spiritualizes” matter and “materializes the spirit.” The culture-forming nature of culture depends on respecting the existential integrity of the man as a spiritual-material subject, and, at the same time, his dignity of a person. Thus, a person determines the standard of culture. The objective of culture is teaching man to make personal relations with other people. Wojtyła thoroughly analyzed the most important areas of culture: science, morality, art and religion, discussing the role of truth in intellectual life, moral good in individual and social action, beauty in art, as well as holiness in religion and in relation to the Transcendence. He paid attention to the connection between culture and Christianity. He emphasized the role of culture in shaping various forms of the life of national societies. A nation is a society existing “from culture” and “for culture.” Through culture, particular people are included into the national community. At the same time, culture expressed the sovereignty of a nation and the sovereignty of a person. Wojtyła reflected on the specific features

²⁹ A. Rodziński, *Osoba, moralność, kultura*, p. 208.

³⁰ John Paul II, *In the Name of the Future of Culture*, address to UNESCO, 2.06.1980.

of modern culture, paying attention to its threats. In this context, he distinguished the culture and civilization of life from the culture and civilization of death.

With reference to the concept of Wojtyła, the issue of culture was developed by Wistuba who paid attention to man's subjectivity as a personal and rational being. Culture is oriented at man's development mainly in the spiritual aspect.³¹ That is why Wistuba emphasized the necessity to care about the shape of culture which has a moral (responsibility) and pedagogical (upbringing) dimension. In this context, she discussed modern culture in which technology dominates ethics, which is dangerous for man. Apart from the theoretical reflection on culture, she also dealt with "applied culturology," emphasizing the role of culture in education.³²

Wojtyła's personalist concept of culture was developed by Styczeń. The axiological foundation of culture is the principle of the dignity of a person. The philosophy of culture is a part of the normative ethics in which we discover an objective order of morality based on a person's dignity. Man is the creator of culture, and cultural products are evaluated according to the axiological order rooted in personal dignity. Ultimately, culture is the expression of the order established by the personal Absolute. A form of Christian culture is the civilization of love which opposes the civilization of death. The quality of culture and democracy is determined by the respect for the dignity of people, especially unborn ones.³³

Chudy, as a neo-Thomist personalist, referred both to Krąpiec and to Wojtyła in his concept of culture. He associated culture with the actualization of the potentialized nature of a person. Objectively, culture is the transformation of nature; subjectively—it is the expression of the intellect and freedom of man as the author and objective of culture. Culture shapes the basic forms of social life, such as the family and the nation. Only in culture is the development of man reflected,³⁴

³¹ H. Wistuba, *Świat jest Boży i nasz, czyli jak korzystać z rozumnej wolności* (Olsztyn: [n.p.], 1992).

³² B. Rozen, "W służbie Kościoła i nauki. Filozofia kultury była jej pasją – Halina Wistuba (1920–2013)," *Studia Warmińskie* 54 (2017), pp. 21–42.

³³ T. Styczeń, *W drodze do etyki* (Lublin: Redakcja Wydawnictw KUL, 1995).

³⁴ W. Chudy, "Kultura jako ucłowieczanie rzeczywistości," *Kwartalnik Filozoficzny* 23, no. 4 (2005), pp. 247–261.

and such development is authentic when the truth about the reality and man (as a personal being) is respected. Also, this development facilitates the growth of culture.

From the phenomenological point of view, Póltawski supports the personalist interpretation of culture. In his texts he refers to Wojtyła and Spaemann. He connects the philosophy of culture with anthropology in which he elaborated a dynamic concept of the man who experiences morality and is open to God—the ultimate objective of his life. In his opinion, it is only possible to explain particular aspects of human life, including culture, within the context of a person as a “whole.”³⁵

Religious-cultural approach

In the personalist-religious approach reaching various philosophical trends (phenomenology, hermeneutics, philosophy of dialogue), while analyzing culture, the scholars emphasize religious threads (experience, facts, cultural importance or influence) or directly discuss the problem of Christian culture. This approach is represented by: Fr. Antoni Siemianowski (1930–), Karol Tarnowski (1937–), Jan Andrzej Kłoczowski OP (1937–), Fr. Marek Jędraszewski (1949–), and Anna Grzegorzcyk (1949–).

Siemianowski studied the essence of culture using realistic phenomenology and metaphysics worked out on its basis. He notices the creative role of the Bible, Judeo-Christian faith and Greek philosophy in shaping the Christian culture. Culture is man’s product which makes it possible for him to experience aesthetic and moral values. Values determine the humanization of the world and man. In his works, Siemianowski also discussed the crisis of contemporary culture and showed how we can overcome it on the basis of original cultural experiences revealed by phenomenology.

Tarnowski opts for the phenomenological and hermeneutic approach to Christian culture. Phenomenology allows us to capture the specific features of the cognition of culture, and hermeneutics makes it possible for us to understand it. Tarnowski discussed the essence of Christian culture, its modern crisis and the challenges it faces.

³⁵ M. Maciejczak, “O dziele i postawie filozoficznej profesora Póltawskiego,” *Studia Philosophiae Christianae* 39, no. 2 (2003), pp. 11–27.

He believed that Christian culture is characterized by transcendence and agathology. In the metaphysical sense, the sources of culture include “metaphysical desire”—the desire for transcendence which constitutes the area of the ultimate meaning. Tarnowski claimed that Christian culture must be open to other cultures. He pays attention to the creative role of cultural conditions of a religious experience.³⁶

Kłoczowski believes that the word “culture” refers to human activity and production which facilitate peoples’ communication. Culture is the condition for man’s existence; destroying culture means destroying humanity. He perceives culture in a broad manner—it includes language, science, art, technology, and religion. Without culture there are no bonds among people; culture is the articulation of the interpersonal space. Making true contact with God is only possible within culture. A religious experience always occurs in culture which influences its interpretation.³⁷

Jędraszewski develops the personalist concept of culture with reference to hermeneutics, phenomenology, and the philosophy of dialogue. He supports the theist concept of culture in which God’s natural law specifies the order of individual, social and political life. He emphasizes Biblical and philosophical roots of the European culture. He criticizes the modern culture, especially various forms of ideologies that are dangerous for Christian culture, and, ultimately, for man himself. Jędraszewski emphasizes the culture-forming nature of Christianity, indicating its role in overcoming the modern secularization and various kinds of ideologies.

Grzegorzczyk uses phenomenology and hermeneutics to build the integral concept of Christian culture and humanities (*perennis*). Thus, she formulates the postulate for renewing the meaning of culture which was subject to postmodern deconstruction. She believes that we can witness the “return of the betrayed Absolute” and the need for different kinds of spirituality which is the expression of this return.³⁸ Humanities *perennis* restore the true face and value to people. The justification of this concept assumes referring to the phenomenological method which allows for experiencing the direct data. This

³⁶ K. Tarnowski, *Człowiek i transcendencja* (Kraków: Znak, 1996).

³⁷ J.A. Kłoczowski, *A myśmy się spodziewali...* (Poznań: W drodze, 1990).

³⁸ A. Grzegorzczyk, *Humanistyka i obecność* (Poznań: Wydawnictwo Nauka i Innowacje, 2014).

method, “through the clear access to the essence of phenomena, opens to the realities hidden from another cognitive penetration. The essential cognition based on this method is a process in which the meeting, closeness, affirmation, revealing, resulting (permeating), unification (adhesion), and the desire for transcendence, mark its phases.”³⁹ Humanities *perennis* consists of: participation, experience, personification, witness, transcendental values, spiritual values, universalism, and intercultural philosophy of global importance.

PHILOSOPHY OF CULTURE IN THE CONTEXT OF SCIENCE

The issues of the philosophy of culture are also taken up in the philosophy practiced in the context of science, which is represented by Fr. Michał Heller (1936–) and Fr. Józef Życiński (1948–2011).

Within the philosophy in the context of science, Heller and Życiński reflected on the essence of Christian culture in the context of the development of natural sciences. In their opinion, Christian culture significantly influenced the development of modern empirical disciplines. They emphasized the necessity to build the contemporary Christian and humanist culture in the context of the scientific image of the world. Indicating the revolutionary nature of the changes that, under the influence of science, occurred in understanding culture, they saw the need to integrally elaborate the Christian concept of culture. Science and culture are integrally connected with each other—there is a feedback between them. Science facilitates shaping the cultural image of the world which specifies the mentality of modern man. At present, the scholars who practice philosophy in the context of science pay attention to the role cognitive science plays in shaping modern Christian culture. The evolutionary approach to culture is getting more and more popular, as it is perceived as an element that integrates its different aspectual approaches.⁴⁰

³⁹ Eadem, “Humanistyka jako obecność,” *Prace Kulturoznawcze* 12 (2011), p. 26.

⁴⁰ M. Heller, *Sens życia i sens Wszechświata* (Tarnów: Biblos, 2001); J. Życiński, *Trzy kultury* (Poznań: W drodze, 1990).

DISCUSSIONS AND DISPUTES

In the first half of the 20th century, Christian thinkers, as personalists, disputed with the individualist and collectivist concept of the man and social life. It also included the problem of culture and civilization. They criticized the contemporary cultural phenomena related to secularization processes. After 1945, the communist government forced people to adopt Marxism which tried to control scientific research in terms of the ideology, forced artists to practice socialist realism, and set religion against culture, which was a serious threat to the Christian thought. At the same time, because of the censorship, the scholars could not carry out an open discussion with that ideology.⁴¹ That is why they mainly focused on defending society's cultural identity through expressing their own opinion on culture and the way of understanding it. In time, a discussion with Marxism developed, but its nature and course depended not only on the development of both philosophical approaches, but also on the factors that were not related to philosophy. The main subject of the disputes included the attitude towards man and social life, and to work and religion.⁴² The problem of culture was discussed with reference to those disputes. Christian philosophers emphasized the fact that culture is derived from a personal subject, that its spiritual (intellectual and moral) aspect is more important than its practical-technical aspect (processing the world), and that cultural acts and products should aim at man's personal good (development).

Within the Thomist concept of culture, the scholars discussed the ontic status of culture (Krapiec, Stępień). The supporters of phenomenological Thomism accused the existential Thomists of promoting the psychologist concept of culture. At the same time, in the post-conciliar period, the Thomist approach to culture was criticized by the representatives of axiological personalism. The latter wanted the description of a person and culture to include the issue of values

⁴¹ The first disputes with Marxism appeared soon after the war. One of the philosophers who participated in them was Kazimierz Kłósak who conducted them in 1949–1951.

⁴² *Wobec filozofii marksistowskiej. Polskie doświadczenia*, ed. A.B. Stępień (Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL, 1990).

(Rodziński), and some of them even wanted to reject the Thomist interpretation of values (Tischner). Meanwhile, the representatives of Thomism indicated the problem of subjectivism and the a priori nature of values, as well as their nonidentity with the order of being.

At the beginning of the 1990s, when communism collapsed in the countries of Central-Eastern Europe, state universities rejected Marxism and turned towards broadly understood liberalism, relativism and social concepts of the so-called new left which were focused around the problem of culture. At the same time, the economy, which used to be centrally managed and characterized by an insufficiency of consumer goods, was changed into a market economy that affirmed the consumer model of culture. Christian philosophers focused on the threats resulting both from the new concepts of culture and the forms of culture. They criticized negative processes taking place in various areas of modern culture: science, morality, art and religion. They discussed the reasons for and the ways of overcoming the contemporary secularism. Some Christian thinkers emphasized the necessity to dialogue with the new concepts of culture (Tischner, Życiński), hoping that they shall help to overcome those trends in Christian culture which—in their opinion—did not match the contemporary cultural and civilization conditions. Because of the social and moral changes, the scholars also started to discuss the crisis of the family and the society as natural foundations of culture. A separate issue was the criticism of postmodernism and post-truth in shaping the contemporary cultural mentality (Kierś).

At present, Christian thinkers dispute with those philosophical concepts which question the order of cultural norms and principles reinforced by Christianity, or which try to impose new models of social life and culture on the society. Christian scholars, such as Piotr Jaroszyński, Marek Czachorowski (1956–), Fr. Tadeusz Guz (1959–), and Fr. Dariusz Oko (1960–), criticize both the ideas aiming at revolutionizing culture (gender, ecologism, LGBT), and the concepts which are their theoretical basis, such as neo-Marxism. In these disputes, they indicate the theoretical and practical consequences of questioning the axiological foundations of Christian culture. Also, there is a debate on the transhumanist vision of culture based on the anthropology of an improved man. Some scholars, e.g. Fr. Andrzej Kobyliński (1965–), take up critical analyses of cultural phenomena taking place within Christianity and its institutions. Also, the concept

of the so-called open Christian culture is being developed—Piotr Sikora (1971–).

PHILOSOPHY OF CULTURE AT THE BEGINNING OF THE 21ST CENTURY

At the moment, the Christian philosophy of culture is being developed in the most important centers of Christian thought: KUL, UKSW, UPJPII, and AIK. At KUL, mainly within the Thomist paradigm, this issue is studied—apart from Kiereś and Jaroszyński—by Imelda Chłodna-Błach (1978–), Fr. Paweł Tarasiewicz (1968–), Robert Ptaszek (1961–), Paweł Gondek (1966), Anna Kawalec (1968–), and Wojciech Daszkiewicz (1977–). In the environment of UKSW, the philosophical studies on culture are more varied. Apart from the Thomist approach, the phenomenological and hermeneutic trend is also visible—Fr. Jan Sochoń, Ewa Podrez (1952–), Fr. Jacek Grzybowski (1973–). At UPJPII, various aspects of contemporary culture are discussed within ethics—Fr. Władysław Zuziak (1952–); social philosophy—Joanna Mysona Byrska (1974–); or bioethics—Tadeusz Biesaga SDB (1950–), Fr. Grzegorz Hołub (1969–). In the research carried out at AIK we can see the most varied approach to culture: Thomist—Piotr Stanisław Mazur (1968–), Thomist-comparatist—Piotr Duchliński (1978–), phenomenological-hermeneutic—Andrzej Gielarowski (1969–), critical-cultural—Krzysztof Jan Pawłowski (1952–), social-cultural—Tomasz Homa SJ (1958–), pedagogical-cultural—Stanisław Gałkowski (1965–).

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Dobrowolski, Z. “Katolicka filozofia kultury w Polsce po Soborze Watykańskim II,” *Studia Religioznawcze* 21 (1987), pp. 121–149.
- Głombik, C. *Metafizyka kultury. Grabmann – Maritain – neoscholastyka polska*. Warszawa: Książka i Wiedza, 1982.
- Gogacz, M. *Szkice o kulturze*. Kraków–Warszawa: Michalineum, 1985.
- Grzegorzczyk, A. *Humanistyka i obecność*. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Nauka i Innowacje, 2014.

- Jan Paweł II, *Wiara i kultura. Dokumenty, przemówienia, homilie*. Rzym–Lublin: Polski Instytut Kultury Chrześcijańskiej. Fundacja Jana Pawła II; Redakcja Wydawnictw KUL, 1988.
- Kowalczyk, S. *Filozofia kultury*. Lublin: Redakcja Wydawnictw KUL, 1996.
- Krapiec, M.A. *Człowiek w kulturze*. Lublin: Redakcja Wydawnictw KUL, 1999.
- . *U podstaw rozumienia kultury*. Lublin: Redakcja Wydawnictw KUL, 1991.
- Michalski, K. *Między heroizmem a bestialstwem*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Mariackie, 1949.
- Rodziński, A. *Osoba, moralność, kultura*. Lublin: Redakcja Wydawnictw KUL, 1989.
- Sawicki, F. *Kryzys kultury a religia chrześcijańska*. Poznań: Naczelny Instytut Akcji Katolickiej, 1937.
- Szymański, A. "Katolicyzm a kultura i cywilizacja," in *Kultura i cywilizacja*, praca zbiorowa, vol. 1, pp. 17–46. Lublin: Wydawnictwo Wiedzy Chrześcijańskiej, Lublin 1937.
- Truchlińska, B. *Od Witelona do Wojtyły*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS, 2016.
- Woroniecki, J. *U podstaw kultury katolickiej*. Poznań: Naczelny Instytut Akcji Katolickiej, 1935.
- Zdybicka, Z.J. "Chrześcijaństwo w kulturze Zachodu," in *Przyszłość cywilizacji Zachodu. Materiały z sympozjum zorganizowanego przez Katedrę Filozofii Kultury KUL*, eds. A. Brzózka, M.J. Gondek, pp. 27–42. Lublin: Oficyna Hieronima, Fundacja Rozwoju Kultury Polskiej, 2003.
- Życiński, J. *Trzy kultury*. Poznań: W drodze, 1990.

HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY

The “history of philosophy” is a metaphilosophical discipline that presents the history of philosophy in an ordered manner. It takes various forms, depending on the assumed concept of understanding both history and philosophy. It can be perceived as a documentary-interpretative presentation of the achievements of particular authors, directions and schools, or as a presentation of the historical development of problems and of understanding philosophical concepts. It can be the element that participates in creating systematic philosophy through raising discussed philosophical issues, and, finally, it can be identified with the analysis of the history of philosophical concepts and the history of culture.¹

The history of philosophy can be practiced in different manners. If it is done in a rational manner, reconstructing the achievements of the past and the history of philosophical problems, we are given the so-called intellectual history which includes the history of philosophy (philosophy) in the world of ideas proclaimed by intellectualists at a given historical and social moment. In the discussion on the method of the Polish history of philosophy, we can see the attempts to perceive it as the history of philosophical culture rooted in the role of that intellectual history the subject of which is social awareness.

The history of philosophy in Poland focuses not only on the history of philosophical doctrines, but also on the history of philosophical

¹ *Powszechna encyklopedia filozofii*, vol. 6, ed. A. Maryniarczyk (Lublin: Polskie Towarzystwo Tomasza z Akwinu, 2005), p. 500.

culture or the philosophical history of philosophy.² The latter is represented by Stefan Swieżawski's idea of the philosophically perceived history of philosophy which is an important form of practicing philosophy itself. Swieżawski distinguished several ways of practicing the history of philosophy: positivist, idealistic, Gouhier's and Gilson's. Swieżawski himself developed and precised Gilson's concept of the history of philosophy understood as the study of philosophical ideas that occurred in the past.³ Gilson paid attention to the fact that, in the historical research, we have to distinguish the history of historically changeable philosophical views from the history of philosophy itself, i.e. *philosophia perennis*. The history of philosophy understood this way is, first of all, the study of the history of the philosophy of a being. Thus, Swieżawski suggests two-stage historical and philosophical research activities. At the first stage, the researcher reconstructs historically occurring philosophical views and problems, taking into account a broad (cultural and social) context of their appearance. At the second stage, we should focus on the so-called universal philosophy which is reflected in various particular philosophical views.⁴ This way, the unity of a philosophical experience described by Gilson is revealed. The first stage of the research is more pluralistic, while the second one is dogmatic. In his concept, Swieżawski also opposed all forms of eruditionism, compilationism or uncritical philosophical historiography that would be focused only on recording the fact of the multitude of different particular ways of philosophizing. In the analysis of philosophical problems, he suggested the use of a philosophical questionnaire that consists of a set of questions that make it possible to identify and reconstruct the views of a given author. The questionnaire was developed by the students of Swieżawski.

² Studies in the history of Polish philosophy included the national issues (Andrzej Walicki), the worldview or ideology (Barbara Skarga), or the rationalization of an idea (Zbigniew Kuderowicz). Cf. S. Janeczek, "Między filozoficzną historią filozofii a historią kultury. Z rozważań nad metodą historii filozofii w Polsce," *Roczniki Filozoficzne* 55, no. 1 (2007), pp. 91–92.

³ S. Swieżawski, *Zagadnienie historii filozofii* (Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1966).

⁴ A. Andrzejuk, "Filozoficzna koncepcja historii filozofii," in *Z metodologii historii filozofii*, eds. M. Zembrzuski, M. Płotka, A.M. Nowik, A.M. Filipowicz, I. Andrzejuk, A. Andrzejuk (Warszawa: Wydawnictwo UKSW, 2015), pp. 15–16.

HISTORICAL AND IDEOLOGICAL CONTEXT

Before 1918, in unfavorable conditions created by the occupants, Polish Christian philosophy constantly attempted to enter the European and the world philosophy of history. We should remember that in the European culture it was the time of modernism which was related to breaking the philosophical positivism with its scientism and reluctance to metaphysics. Modernism suggested the revival of idealism and metaphysics, often referred to imagination, intuition and emotions, acknowledged the relativity of cognition and knowledge, and referred to the ideals and concepts of Romanticism. In Poland, modernism had its own characteristic features. It was related to another attempt to modernize Polish thinking and introduce worldview changes through creating new concepts in the philosophy of history and the theory of civilization.⁵

Christian thought, with its religious intuitions, had to match that historical space in a clear and decisive manner. Władysław Weryho (1868–1916),⁶ who organized the philosophical life of Warsaw during the time of partitions, was aware of the weakness of the Polish Christian thought of the time, which is why he decided to publish—in *Przegląd Filozoficzny* (published since 1897)—the texts of Désiré-Joseph Mercier. Weryho hoped that they would revive Polish Christian philosophy, just like they had inspired the philosophers at the Louvain University in Belgium. Under the influence of that university environment, Christian philosophy was already then named “neo-scholasticism.” Thomism, which was revived there, started to get closer to the achievements of various philosophical directions and natural sciences.⁷

⁵ J. Skoczyński, J. Woleński, *Historia filozofii polskiej* (Kraków: Wydawnictwo M, 2010), pp. 354–355.

⁶ Weryho’s main areas of philosophical interest included epistemology and the methodology of sciences, but his activity also included the history of philosophy. He was a member of the Commission for Analyzing the History of Polish Philosophy (1913). Cf. *Encyklopedia filozofii polskiej*, vol. 2, ed. A. Maryniarczyk (Lublin: Polskie Towarzystwo Tomasza z Akwinu, 2011), pp. 796–797.

⁷ M. Gogacz, “Filozofia chrześcijańska w Polsce Odrodzonej (1918–1968),” *Studia Philosophiae Christianae* 5, no. 2 (1969), p. 52.

Christian philosophy particularly developed after the publication of the encyclical letter *Aeterni Patris* in 1879. Pope Leo XIII encouraged the philosophers to renew the philosophical heritage of St. Thomas Aquinas “for the defense and beauty of the Catholic faith, for the good of society, and for the advantage of all the sciences.”⁸ In 1882, the Department of Christian Philosophy was created at the Faculty of Theology of the Jagiellonian University. Stefan Pawlicki CR (1839–1916) was its director. Thomism was the basic source for Polish Christian philosophy, specifying the perspective of solving various philosophical problems. According to Fr. Józef Iwanicki (1902–1995), “the Polish scholastics had to confront Thomism, which appeals to experience, with the achievements of exact sciences and concepts formulated by other directions. The fulfillment of that task required referring to holistic interpretations in a handbook form so that the Christian thought could develop in a monographic form the subject of which were particular sections and issues.”⁹

At the turn of the 19th and 20th century, the first dissertations on the theory and methodology of the history of philosophy were written, e.g. by Wincenty Lutosławski (1863–1954) *O znaczeniu i zadaniach historii filozofii* [*On the Meaning and Tasks of the History of Philosophy*].¹⁰ Kraków was a dynamic environment of studies on the history of philosophy, especially on Polish and medieval philosophy. In 1911, in the Polish Academy of Arts and Sciences in Kraków, the Commission for Analyzing the History of Polish Philosophy was created, and, since 1915, the Commission published its journal entitled: *Archiwum Komisji do Badania Historii Filozofii w Polsce* [*Archive of the Commission for Analyzing the History of Polish Philosophy*]. Dissertations on the history of philosophy were published in *Przegląd Filozoficzny* established in 1897 in Warsaw by Weryho.

Polish Christian philosophy from the first years of the 20th century was inspired by, on the one hand, various scientific environments in Europe (like the universities in Louvain or Vienna¹¹) and,

⁸ Leo XIII, *Encyclical Aeterni Patris*, no. 31.

⁹ J. Iwanicki, “Problematyka filozoficzna w ciągu ostatniego 50-lecia w Polsce,” *Ateneum Kapłańskie* 58, no. 1–3 (1959), p. 258.

¹⁰ W. Lutosławski, “O znaczeniu i zadaniach historii filozofii,” *Ateneum* 66, no. 2 (1892), pp. 407–421.

¹¹ The influence of the Vienna environment is particularly visible in the activity of Kazimierz Twardowski connected with the philosophical and logical

on the other hand, by the works of Polish thinkers living in Rome, Saint Petersburg, Fribourg or Innsbruck. However, Polish academic centers were also functioning. In the Kraków environment, Christian philosophy was practiced by Fr. Franciszek Gabryl (1866–1914) who was inspired by the neo-scholastic thought that was being developed in the West.¹² Apart from Fr. Kazimierz Wais (1865–1934), Fr. Idzi Radziszewski (1871–1922) and Bohdan Rutkiewicz (1887–1933), Gabryl was one of the first scholars in Poland who implemented the idea of returning to the thought of St. Thomas Aquinas. While interpreting his philosophy, Gabryl combined it with the views of John Duns Scotus, Francis Suárez and George Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel. He is considered to be the author of the first modern handbook of Thomist metaphysics, and the creator of the Krakow academic circle. His works present the whole neo-scholastic philosophy, as well as the solutions of many philosophical issues from the perspective of Thomism. They aim at the synthesis of various philosophical and modern trends. His philosophy of nature, which is under a clear influence of Louvain neo-Thomism, is considered to be very interesting.

In Lviv, Christian philosophy was represented by Fr. Kazimierz Wais who, like Gabryl, referred in his works to scholasticism and Thomism. Wais mainly focused on cosmological and psychological issues, but the circle of his interests included inorganic and organic nature. He was interested in theodicy and metaphysics focused on the most important problem of Thomist philosophy which became the inspiration for the historical elaborations of the reception of scholastic and neo-scholastic thought in Poland. At that time, Konstanty Michalski CM (1879–1947) was also starting his scientific activity in Kraków. Soon he became one of the most important authors of books on the history of Polish Christian thought.

thought of Franz Brentano. Upon the initiative of Twardowski, in 1911 the second Polish-language philosophical journal: *Ruch Filozoficzny* was created. It was published since 1948 by the Polish Philosophical Society.

¹² In Poland, Fr. Stanisław Pawlicki and Fr. Mieczysław Morawski worked at the Jagiellonian University.

THE HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY IN THE HISTORY OF POLISH CHRISTIAN PHILOSOPHY¹³

The history of the Polish Christian thought of the 20th century can be systematized by dividing it into two main periods: the interwar period (1918–1939) and the time after 1944. The years of World War II (1939–1944) were specific due to the fact that academic research could not be carried out and it was impossible for scholars to prepare systematic elaborations.¹⁴

The interwar period (1918–1939)

Most philosophical approaches in Poland which regained independence were the continuation of what was initiated at the turn of the 19th and 20th century. A new, powerful impulse for the development of philosophical thought appeared during the interwar period. From the historical point of view, that period was marked by two world wars with their significant social-political phenomena and cultural changes.¹⁵ For Poland, it was the time of new historical-political opportunities which resulted in deep cultural, scientific and philosophical changes. According to Jan Skoczynski,

... institutional changes were of primary importance because they significantly extended the frames of philosophical education and

¹³ The image of Polish Christian philosophy, the way of understanding, presenting and teaching it, was being shaped along with the philosophy practiced by particular people. It is difficult to find all those who can be named historians of philosophy, because, as a matter of fact, each scholar who reflects on philosophy becomes, in a way, a historian of an idea. Those who worked on preparing historical monographs or those who taught the history of philosophy to new generations—which ones were the historians of philosophy? Probably all of them. That is why it seems justified to adopt such a way of interpreting the problem in which, on the one hand, we can describe historical facts and people who dealt with the history of philosophy in the history of the Polish Christian philosophy of the 20th century, and, on the other hand, we can present the methods of practicing the history of philosophy in the area of broadly understood Christian philosophy.

¹⁴ However, some works of the following philosophers were created in this period: Stefan Swieżawski, Fr. Konstanty Michalski or Władysław Tatarkiewicz, Roman Ingarden and Wiktor Wąsik. See M. Gogacz, “Filozofia chrześcijańska w Polsce Odrodzonej (1918–1968),” p. 2.

¹⁵ *Zarys historii filozofii polskiej*, ed. L. Gawor (Rzeszów: Uniwersytet Rzeszowski, 2013), pp. 240–241.

of what we call philosophical life. We used to have two universities and now we have six. There are new journals, societies of philosophers, philosophical conferences, and the style of philosophizing has changed as it is now subject to academic requirements.¹⁶

The text of Ignacy Mysłicki (Halpern) (1874–1935) on the method of practicing the history of philosophy¹⁷ was published at that time. Also, Władysław Tatarkiewicz wrote a handbook for the history of philosophy entitled *Historia filozofii* [*The History of Philosophy*].¹⁸

The philosophical approach of the interwar period was shaped by two environments: the Lviv and Warsaw School and the representatives of Christian philosophy, sometimes called confessional philosophy by some historians. Through the research on the logical foundations of mathematics and deductive systems, the Lviv and Warsaw School referred, on the one hand, to the works of the Vienna Circle, and—on the other hand—to English analytic philosophy. It is certainly worth asking to what extent the School broke with speculative modern thinking and Romantic heritage, and how it approached other trends, e.g. neo-Thomism rooted in scholasticism. Also, philosophizing within Christian philosophy included the philosophy of culture, the philosophy of history, ethics, and social philosophy.

The so-called Kraków Circle also referred to the Vienna Circle which was very influential at that time. The members of the Kraków Circle: Drewnowski (1896–1978), Józef Maria Bocheński OP (1902–1995), Fr. Jan Salamucha (1903–1944) and Bolesław Sobociński (1906–1980) attempted to “renew Thomist philosophy (and theology) and give it a scientific quality through cognitive tools worked out by the contemporary logic and through opposing the current expansive attitude of neo-positivism.”¹⁹ Contrary to the representatives

¹⁶ J. Skocznyński, J. Woleński, *Historia filozofii polskiej*, p. 489; cf. also: W. Tatarkiewicz, *Zarys dziejów filozofii w Polsce* (Kraków: Polska Akademia Umiejętności, 1948).

¹⁷ I. Halpern, “O metodach historii filozofii,” *Przegląd Filozoficzny* 37 (1934), pp. 343–346.

¹⁸ W. Tatarkiewicz, *Historia filozofii*, vol. 1–2 (Lwów: Wydawnictwo Zakładu Narodowego im. Ossolińskich, 1931).

¹⁹ M. Gogacz, “Filozofia chrześcijańska w Polsce Odrodzonej (1918–1968),” p. 58; see also: A.B. Stępień, “O stanie filozofii tomistycznej w Polsce,” in *W nurcie zagadnień posoborowych*, vol. 2, ed. B. Bejze (Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Sióstr Loretanek-Benedyktynek, 1968), pp. 97–126. The fruit of the research by Bocheński,

of the Vienna Circle, Poles did not fight with metaphysics and faith. Their ambitious objective was to create a new, logicized Christian philosophy.²⁰

In 1918, the Catholic University of Lublin (KUL) was opened, which was a very important moment for Christian philosophical thought in Poland. From the beginning, the university has been a strong center for Thomist philosophy in its new approach (neo-Thomism), and an important place for the development of neo-Augustinian philosophy. The Faculty of Philosophy was opened at KUL almost 30 years later (1946), due to which the university could fulfill the tasks Leo XIII specified for Catholic schools in the encyclical *Aeterni Patris* of 1879. Nevertheless, the awareness of free scientific activity appeared already at the moment of the creation of the university. Mieczysław Gogacz emphasizes that, in this environment, “in 1918–1939, the history of ancient philosophy was analyzed the most thoroughly. First, prof. Jasinowski, then prof. Straszewski and prof. Jakubanis discuss the history of Greek philosophy in uninterrupted lectures. ... The history of medieval philosophy is lectured by prof. W. Gielecki and prof. Z. Ogarek, only in 1921–1925.”²¹

Apart from the renowned, old universities, such as the Jagiellonian University in Kraków, the University of Jan Kazimierz in Lviv and the above-mentioned Catholic University of Lublin, other important schools were created: the private Free Polish University in Warsaw (1918) and the University of Poznań (1919). The Warsaw University was opened in the capital of Poland, and the University of Vilnius was reactivated under the name: The University of Stefan Batory. A number of important philosophers were connected with these schools.²²

Drewnowski and Salamucha was the book: *Rola logistyki w filozofii chrześcijańskiej*, published in Warsaw in 1936.

²⁰ On the philosophy of the Kraków Circle, see: Z. Wolak, “Naukowa filozofia Koła Krakowskiego,” *Zagadnienia Filozoficzne w Nauce* 36 (2005), pp. 97–122.

²¹ M. Gogacz, “Z dziejów historii filozofii na Katolickim Uniwersytecie Lubelskim 1918–1966,” *Roczniki Filozoficzne* 16, no. 1 (1968), pp. 177–190.

²² After Mieczysław Gogacz, we can list the following names here: “Fr. K. Wais at the Faculty of Theology of the University in Lviv (1909–1927) and his successor—Fr. J. Stepa (1927–1939); Fr. S. Kobyłecki at the Faculty of Theology in Warsaw (1918–1929) and Fr. P. Chojnacki (the Department of Christian Philosophy at the Faculty of Theology in 1927–1954), Fr. M. Klepacz in Vilnius (1937–1939), Fr. K. Kowalski in Poznań (1937–1939), Fr. I. Radziszewski (1918–1922), Fr. J. Woroniecki (1919–1929) and Fr. J. Pastuszka (1922–1946)

Historians agree that significant thinkers and historians of the time who ensured a high scientific quality of Polish Christian philosophy (neo-Thomism), were two prominent scholars from Kraków: Konstanty Michalski CM, a professor of the Jagiellonian University, and Jacek Woroniecki OP (1878–1949). Michalski dedicated most of his works to medieval philosophy. The dissertations on the philosophy in the 14th century were the most appreciated among them. Michalski was a pioneer and the main promoter of this discipline in Poland. He was a scholar whose studies in philosophy were on a European level. His texts were admired by many philosophers, such as Étienne Gilson, Bernhard Geyer, and Friedrich Ueberweg. It is due to the work of Michalski that Polish research in the 1920s and 1930s on the history of philosophy existed. His activity in analyzing the history of philosophy was strictly related to the popes' encyclicals. In reply to the call of Leo XIII and Pius XI, he tried to present the value of scholastic philosophy, especially Thomism.²³

Also, source analyses of the European philosophy of the 14th century made it possible for Michalski to work out scholastic philosophy in Poland, and the discovery of numerous, previously unknown, medieval manuscripts in the West and in Poland enabled him to join the group of experts in the philosophy of Late Middle Ages. Later in his life, Michalski's worsening eyesight made it impossible for him to continue his work. Then, he focused on the problems of the philosophy of history.²⁴ Social changes and his own experience of World War II (1939–1945) helped him with this work. In the context of collapsing ideologies and uncertain future, the question about the

in the philosophical section of the Faculty of Humanities of KUL (Fr. J. Pastuszka, since 1946, at the Faculty of Philosophy of KUL). In 1930s, new Thomists appear: Fr. S. Adamczyk, Fr. K. Kłósak, S. Swieżawski." See M. Gogacz, "Filozofia chrześcijańska w Polsce Odrodzonej (1918–1968)," pp. 55–56.

²³ M. Kurdziałek, "Trwałość osiągnięć Ks. Prof. K. Michalskiego," *Analecta Cracoviensia* 12 (1980), pp. 45–55; cf. also: R. Ingarden, "Ks. Konstanty Michalski. Uczony – filozof – człowiek," *Tygodnik Powszechny*, no. 34 (1947), pp. 1–2; cf. also: J. Turowicz, "Testament Ks. K. Michalskiego," *Znak*, no. 2(9) (1948), pp. 131–132; cf. also: M. Gogacz, "Tomizm w polskim środowisku uniwersyteckim XX wieku," in *Studia z dziejów myśli św. Tomasza z Akwinu*, eds. J. Czerkawski, S. Swieżawski (Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL, 1978), p. 346.

²⁴ K. Michalski, *Dokąd idziemy. Pisma wybrane* (Kraków: Znak, 1964), p. 5; cf. also: K. Kłósak, "Twórczość naukowa Ks. K. Michalskiego," *Tygodnik Powszechny*, no. 44 (1947), pp. 4–5.

meaning of human history was being formed. “What can a man do,” asked Michalski, “when what was praised yesterday, today is falling apart?”²⁵ His thoughts were rooted in a realistic view on the reality and aroused important questions about the meaning of human actions. Michalski’s replies, formulated on the basis of actions that evaluated man, taking into account God’s presence in his life, specified the basic tasks of a person. Searching for God and imitating Him turned out to be necessary. The image of the man’s development and emphasizing creativity as the basic feature of the man dynamized Michalski’s activity in the process of broadly understood culture. In 1947, Roman Ingarden wrote that Michalski was “until now, the greatest Polish historian of philosophy, and the first Polish scholar who set the Polish history of philosophy on a European level, reaching the sources directly and studying things that were either unknown, or little known before. Also, he was the first Polish scholar who, while working on explaining the main trends in the philosophy of Late Middle Ages in France and England of the 14th century, significantly contributed to the European science within this area.”²⁶ From 1914 Michalski was a member of the Polish Academy of Arts and Sciences (PAU), and, from 1918—he was a secretary of the Commission of PAU for Analyzing the History of Philosophy in Poland.

Although Jacek Woroniecki did not deal directly with the history of philosophy, his works dedicated to the philosophical, theological and literary thought were very important for the perception of the Polish history of Christian philosophy. They discussed theological and pedagogical issues, and they were rooted in a deep knowledge of the history of both ancient or medieval philosophy and modern philosophy. Woroniecki used the achievements of other areas of science: pedagogy, psychology, social philosophy, and theology. His knowledge was also based on the perfect knowledge of belles-lettres. He opposed modern individualism and cognitive subjectivism, and he saw the necessity to refer to the Christian concept of the cooperation of people in the society for the fulfillment of the common good. He was convinced that man, as a person, has great developmental opportunities in various areas of life, and that we can use both the will and

²⁵ K. Michalski, *Między heroizmem a bestialstwem* (Częstochowa: Regina Poloniae, 1984), p. 25.

²⁶ R. Ingarden, *Ks. Konstanty Michalski. Uczony – filozof – człowiek*, pp. 1–2.

the intellect while evaluating people's actions in terms of morality. He opposed naturalism which had a negative influence on modern pedagogical and psychological concepts.

Apart from Michalski and Woroniecki, it is worth mentioning the group gathered around Fr. Władysław Kornilowicz (1884–1946) and the journal *Verbum*. The members of the group, who worked in Warsaw and Łaski, considered Thomism as a very important element of the Catholic formation of the man. The group, open to new philosophical directions, wanted, at the same time, to present the philosophy of St. Thomas as a fascinating version of understanding the reality. The discussed religious, literary, social and philosophical issues were to shape man's life outside the university environment. The leitmotiv of philosophical analyses included the texts of Maritain who was treated by the group as a thinker faithful to the realism and objectivism of the philosophy of St. Thomas.²⁷

Although the time of the Second Polish Republic was short, it was a fruitful period in the history of Polish philosophy. No synthesis of the history of Polish philosophy was created, but a lot of detailed works (published up to 1939) were published concerning various receptions of philosophical thoughts. Some of them were very innovative, like those of Konstanty Michalski, Wiktor Waśnik, Sebastian Petrycy, or Aleksander Birkenmajer. Let us remember that, since 1911, the Polish Academy of Arts and Sciences had a special commission for analyzing the history of Polish philosophy. The commission issued the journal entitled *Archiwum Komisji do Badania Historii Filozofii w Polsce* [*Archive of the Commission for Analyzing the History of Philosophy in Poland*].

The period after 1945

After 1945, a new political context led to the dominance of Marxism that was introduced with the use of administrative and political tools. It also exerted an influence on the Christian thought. At first, it was not only present at Catholic universities (KUL) and in diocesan and monastic seminaries for priests. It was also developed at the faculties of theology of the Warsaw University and the Jagiellonian University. According to the decision of the communist authorities, these

²⁷ M. Gogacz, "Filozofia chrześcijańska w Polsce Odrodzonej (1918–1968)," pp. 59–60.

faculties were closed in 1954. To replace the Faculty of Theology of the Jagiellonian University, the Faculty of Theology was opened in Kraków (1959), which was later transformed into the Pontifical Academy of Theology (1981), and finally—into the Pontifical University of John Paul II (2009). In Warsaw, the continuation of the Faculty of Theology of the Warsaw University was the Academy of Catholic Theology which was later changed into Cardinal Stefan Wyszyński University in Warsaw (1999). The universities in Lublin, Warsaw and Kraków became the main centers for Christian philosophy in Poland.

Despite the fact that at almost all state universities the history of philosophy was developed after World War II (1939–1945), according to the requirements of the Marxist methodology, which claims that the history of philosophy is just a period of the maturation of the “true philosophy” identified with dialectical and historical materialism, Christian philosophy was still able to find its place both in teaching philosophy and in the discussions carried out in various scientific environments. On the one hand, it was inspired by different scientific environments of Europe—mainly by neo-Thomist philosophy which was close to the existential approach, and, on the other hand, it analyzed and developed the history of Polish philosophical thought. Jan Skoczyński and Jan Woleński emphasize that “although the situation in 1945–1989 did not facilitate the assimilation of the ideas worked out in the West, the philosophers’ contact with the world was maintained ... It is due to such coexistence of all the approaches of scholasticism that Polish philosophy became pluralistic from the beginning, and kept such a nature until now.”²⁸ The Polish political breakthrough of 1989 resulted in removing political limitations that had hindered the free development of philosophical and scientific thought.

It seems that Kazimierz Mikucki property described the situation of the Polish post-war philosophy:

... after World War II, four directions of philosophical thought played the most important role in Poland. The first one was analytic philosophy represented by numerous students of Kazimierz Twardowski, the founder of the Lviv-Warsaw School which focused on historical analyses, especially logical and methodological ones ... The second direction was Marxist philosophy which was

²⁸ J. Skoczyński, J. Woleński, *Historia filozofii polskiej*, p. 10.

slightly varied, first of all because of its relations with other philosophical trends. For almost fifty years, Marxism played the role of an official and institutionalized philosophy of the socialist Polish state—a philosophy that served the communist ideology which fought with any forms of the so-called idealistic philosophy ... The third direction was phenomenology, treated as a variant of classical philosophy, represented by Roman Ingarden and his students who not only popularized some ideas of Edmund Husserl or Max cepts related to ontology and other philosophical disciplines. The fourth direction was Thomism (neo-scholasticism, neo-Thomism), which, directly and in the broadest scope, referred to the classical Greek philosophy (mainly Aristotle) and to the thought of St. Thomas Aquinas.²⁹

Each of those directions was thoroughly described, also from the point of view of the history of philosophy.³⁰ In each of them we can

²⁹ K. Mikucki, *Tomizm w Polsce po II wojnie światowej* (Kraków: Księgarnia Akademicka, 2015), p. 9.

³⁰ The pioneers of contemporary analyses of the history of Polish philosophy were: Władysław Tatarakiewicz, Juliusz Domański, Mieczysław Markowski, Zbigniew Ogonowski, Władysław Seńko, Barbara Skarga, Lech Szczucki, Andrzej Walicki, and Zofia Włodek.

Also, it is worth mentioning Zbigniew Kuderowicz and Tadeusz Gadacz. Among the books on the history of Polish philosophy, it is worth noting *Zarys dziejów filozofii w Polsce* (Kraków: Polska Akademia Umiejętności, 1948) by Władysław Tatarakiewicz, and the publication of the two-volume *Historia filozofii polskiej* by Wiktor Wąsik (vol. 1: *Scholastyka, renesans, oświecenie*, Warszawa: Instytut Wydawniczy Pax, 1959; vol. 2: *Romantyzm*, Warszawa: Instytut Wydawniczy Pax, 1966), which included the times until 1863. A thorough elaboration of the history of Polish philosophy is included in: *Zarys dziejów filozofii polskiej. 1815–1918*, eds. S. Borzym, H. Floryńska, B. Skarga, A. Walicki (Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1983) as well as J. Domański, Z. Ogonowski, L. Szczucki, *Zarys dziejów filozofii w Polsce. Wieki XIII–XVII* (Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1989). The most important source publication of the after-war period is the multivolume work series titled: *700 lat myśli polskiej*. See: *Filozofia i myśl społeczna w latach 1831–1864*, eds. A. Walicki, A. Sikora, J. Garewicz (Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1977); *Filozofia i myśl społeczna XIII–XV wieku*, ed. J. Domański (Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1978); *Filozofia i myśl społeczna XVI wieku*, ed. L. Szczucki (Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1978); *Filozofia i myśl społeczna XVII wieku*, part I and II, ed. Z. Ogonowski (Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1979); *Filozofia i myśl społeczna w latach 1865–1895*, eds. A. Hochfeldowa, B. Skarga (Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1980); *Filozofia i myśl społeczna w latach 1700–1830*, ed. M. Skrzypek (Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Instytutu Filozofii i Socjologii PAN, 2000).

see some elements of Christian thought that contributed to understanding the entire role of the history of Christian philosophy in Poland after the war. Nevertheless, there were some environments in which the reflection on the history of Christian philosophy was more intensive and fruitful than anywhere else.

THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF LUBLIN

There is no doubt that the greatest development of Christian philosophy has been taking place at the Faculty of Christian Philosophy of KUL opened in 1946. Thomism is not the only direction of Christian philosophy, but it constitutes its significant part. The concept of Thomist philosophy (also known as Thomism, classical philosophy, existential Thomism, Thomist realism, neo-Thomism, Aristotelian-Thomist philosophy)³¹ referred to the philosophical thought of St. Thomas Aquinas. Characteristic features of Thomist philosophy were revealed in relation to other philosophical trends and ways of philosophizing. In the Catholic scientific environments of post-war Poland, the representatives of various kinds of Thomism worked. Such approaches included traditional, Louvain and existential Thomism.³² Existential Thomism quickly dominated the Lublin environment. In the first years after the war (1944–1945) lectures on the history of philosophy were given by Henryk Jakubanis (1879–1949), and in the following years (1945–1950)—i.e. Stefan Harassek (1890–1952).³³

Also, translation activity was significant for shaping the history of philosophy in Poland. Since 1953, the series of the Library of the Classical Authors of Philosophy was published. It included more than 170 volumes. Another work translated from the original language was the Library of Modern Philosophers which included several volumes. Moreover, some publishing houses (mainly Instytut Wydawniczy Pax) published selected translations of source texts and works of great historians of Christian philosophy, such as Étienne Gilson.

³¹ A. Bronk, S. Majdański, "Filozofia klasyczna," in *Leksykon filozofii klasycznej*, ed. J. Herbut (Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL, 1997), p. 224.

³² A. Maryniarczyk, apart from existential and Louvain Thomism, enumerated phenomenologizing, precisizing and conservative Thomism. Cf. A. Maryniarczyk, "Tomizm egzystencjalny a dziś filozofii," in *Filozofować dziś. Z badań nad filozofią najnowszą*, ed. A. Bronk (Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL, 1995), pp. 296–297.

³³ M. Gogacz, "Z dziejów historii filozofii na Katolickim Uniwersytecie Lubelskim 1918–1966," p. 178.

However, it was the employment of Stefan Swieżawski as a teacher of the history of ancient and medieval philosophy at the philosophical section of the Faculty of Humanities (1946/47), and as the director of the Department of the History of Medieval and Modern Philosophy (1948), which played an important role in the development of the concept of the history of philosophy in existential Thomism. Stefan Swieżawski (1907–2004) was one of the creators of the Lublin Philosophical School which contributed to the development of the research on the history of philosophy. According to his vision of history,

... historians of philosophy should study the history of philosophical problems that have a timeless value ... He believed that the basis for spiritual culture includes philosophy perceived as a natural contemplation of the reality. The core of philosophy perceived this way is ... the love of wisdom. Thus, historians of philosophy should be philosophers, and they should practice the history of philosophical problems that often have a timeless value.³⁴

Swieżawski's studies included the history of medieval philosophy, philosophy at the Kraków University in the 15th century, and European philosophy from the 14th to 16th century.

Under the influence of the school we call French, and under the influence of the method of analysis typical of Gilson and Chenu, the seminary team of professor Swieżawski noticed the necessity not to practice the history of philosophical problems of particular schools, but the history of problems worked out by particular schools and philosophers. Also, they saw the need to implement new methods of interpretation, i.e. the methods of the proper interpretation of problems—the interpretation that would be free from the speculating historiosophy.³⁵

In 1957–1990, Fr. Marian Kurdziałek (1920–1997) was the director of the Department of the History of Ancient and Medieval Philosophy. From the beginning, he participated in shaping the Lublin

³⁴ M. Markowski, "Swieżawski Stefan," w: *Encyklopedia filozofii polskiej*, vol. 2, ed. A. Maryniarczyk (Lublin: Polskie Towarzystwo Tomasza z Akwinu, 2011), p. 647.

³⁵ M. Gogacz, "Z dziejów historii filozofii na Katolickim Uniwersytecie Lubelskim 1918–1966," p. 179.

Philosophical School in which the history of philosophy played an important role. His scientific interests mainly included medieval philosophy, analyzed from the perspective of the philosophy of Plato and Aristotle, as well as the reception of their philosophies in the Middle Ages, which was done by Boethius and St. Augustine. Just like his predecessor, Michalski, Kurdziałek referred in his works to the analysis of source philosophical texts and reconstructed the thoughts included in them. "As a historian of philosophy, Kurdziałek started from the analysis of the philosophical views included in the works of natural scientists and doctors, emphasizing their pioneering role in the reception of Aristotelianism at the beginning of the 13th century."³⁶ In medieval thought, Kurdziałek particularly appreciated Albert the Great and Thomas Aquinas who combined Aristotelianism with the Christian thought, and who noticed the connections among science, theology and philosophy. Kurdziałek directed the department until 1990. Working at the Faculty of Christian Philosophy for 40 years, he educated a team of medievalists who have carried out research on the philosophy of Plato and Aristotle (and their commentators), ancient and medieval neo-Platonism, Byzantine philosophy, and the philosophy of Late Middle Ages. Such medievalists include: Kazimierz Wójcik (1932–), Fr. Roman Andrzejewski (1938–2003), Fr. Stanisław Wielgus (1939–), Edward Iwo Zieliński OFMConv (1939–2010), Stanisław Bafia CSsR (1945–), Fr. Henryk Tomasik (1946–), Wanda Bajor (1960–), Joanna Judycka (1953–), Agnieszka Kijewska (1961–), Roman Majeran (1962–), and Wiesława Sajdek (1957–). It is especially worth emphasizing the work of Fr. Zieliński who was a great expert in Franciscan scholasticism, especially in the thought of John Duns Scotus. Also, he investigated the Augustinian tradition and the views of Anselm of Canterbury whom Zieliński appreciated for their harmonious combination of faith and reason. Also, Zieliński was famous for translating the works on the history of philosophy: Fernand van Steenberghe's *Filozofia w wieku XIII* [*Philosophy in the 13th Century*] and the monumental, five-volume book on the history of ancient philosophy by Giovanni Reale. Also, from van Steenberghe Zieliński took over the method of interpretation and periodization of the history of scholastic philosophy of the 12th century.

³⁶ K. Wójcik, E.I. Zieliński, "Kurdziałek Marian," in *Encyklopedia filozofii polskiej*, vol. 1, ed. A. Maryniarczyk (Lublin: Polskie Towarzystwo Tomasza z Akwinu, 2011), p. 818.

From 2008 Agnieszka Kijewska (1961–) has been the director of the Department of the History of Ancient and Medieval Philosophy at KUL. She has been developing research on the philosophy of Middle Ages (mainly Early Middle Ages and neo-Platonism), and her co-operators include Monika Komsta (1976–), Anna Palusińska (1972–) and Andrzej Stefańczyk. The historical analyses conducted in the environment of KUL were also used by Krąpiec, Kamiński and their students in working out a new concept of the Thomist philosophy of a being. It is related to the so-called historicism. It is “a feature of an evidential way of argumentation in the area of the philosophy of a being ... Then, from history, we obtain the additional confirmation of the correctness or incorrectness of philosophical theses.”³⁷ It is because the history of philosophy provides us with the data needed to justify particular philosophical theses. Moreover, it is a negative criterion that selects erroneous solutions, i.e. prevents the researcher from making the same mistakes again.

Fr. Franciszek Tokarz (1897–1973) studied the history of Eastern philosophy. His interest in Indian philosophy was shaped under the influence of the works of Jesuits such as Władysław Zaborski SJ (1830–1900) and Franciszek Kwiatkowski SJ (1888–1949). In particular, he focused on the reception of Chinese and Indian philosophy. He started these studies in the interwar period (1918–1939), and already in 1930s he published his first texts comparing Christian and Buddhist thought, as well as research concerning broadly understood epistemology in the Upanishads.³⁸ After the war, he continued the reception and the research on, i.a. the thought of Confucius and the mysticism present in the Upanishads. At present, at KUL research on the philosophy of the East is being carried out by Maciej Stanisław Ziemia (1957–).

Since 1977, apart from the Department of the History of Ancient and Medieval Philosophy, the Department of the History of Modern and Contemporary Philosophy has been functioning at KUL. After Swieżawski retired, the department was taken over by Jan Czerkawski (1939–2007) who directed it for 30 years—until his death.

³⁷ M.A. Krąpiec, *Metafizyka. Zarys teorii bytu* (Lublin: Redakcja Wydawnictw KUL, 1988), p. 63.

³⁸ F. Tokarz, *Źródło i cel zakonności chrześcijańskiej w porównaniu z buddyjską* (Lwów, 1932), manuscript, p. 66; idem, *Poznanie wyzwalające w Upaniszadach* (Kraków, 1939), typescript, p. 25.

From 2007, Gutowski (1961–) has been working as the director of the Department of the History of Modern and Contemporary Philosophy. Other scholars working within the department include Anna Głąb (1979–), Przemysław Gut (1970–), Marcin Iwanicki, Maksymilian Roszyk (1983–), and Piotr K. Szałek (1977–). They carry out thorough historical, methodological and objective studies, combining traditional and contemporary approaches. They continue the research of Swieżawski and Czerkawski, but they complete them with new approaches and ways of analyzing especially the modern philosophical problems. These studies include methodological issues related to the ways of practicing the history of philosophy. The scope of the research also encompasses scholasticism, the philosophy of Renaissance, the philosophy of the 17th century (Descartes, Malebranche, Leibniz, Spinoza, Berkeley, Locke), modern philosophy of the English-speaking circle—mainly pragmatism and neopragmatism, process philosophy, analytic philosophy and, so-called post-analytic philosophy, as well as the philosophy of religion and the philosophy of the mind.

At KUL, the Department of the History of Philosophy in Poland has been functioning since 1989. The department was separated from the Department of the History of Ancient and Medieval Philosophy. The first director of the Department of the History of Philosophy in Poland was Fr. Stanisław Wielgus, and since 2006 it has been directed by Fr. Stanisław Janeczek (1951–) who carried out his research together with Fr. Rafał Charzyński (1969–), Fr. Piotr Pasterczyk (1968–) and Anna Starościc. Janeczek treats the history of philosophy as a metaphilosophical discipline. Its understanding always depends on a specific philosophical concept with its method and objective aim. He perceives the history of philosophy as the history of a past or existing philosophical culture, e.g. the history of philosophy in Poland reconstructs a type of philosophical culture present in our country. Janeczek distinguishes several ways of practicing the history of philosophy: (1) a documentative-interpretative one, (2) the systemic analysis of the solutions found by particular schools and their representatives, (3) the analysis of historical changes in the development of philosophical problems, (4) the element that contributes the creation of systematic philosophy, (5) the history of philosophy as a philosophy identified with analyzing the history of historically changeable philosophical concepts, (6) the area of the

history of culture perceived as a branch of literature.³⁹ The history of philosophy plays a very important role in systematic reflection that is focused on analyzing and solving philosophical problems from the point of view of different systemic assumptions. Since 2010, the department has been publishing volumes of the series: “Dydaktyka Filozofii” [“Didactics of Philosophy”]. This project appeared within the cyclical meetings of the Philosophical Section of the Lecturers of Catholic Universities during which the scholars discussed problems related to teaching philosophy at Church and Catholic universities. The project is managed by Fr. Stanisław Janeczek (1951–). The initiators of this project emphasize that

... it is to facilitate and deepen the didactics of philosophy, especially during the two-year course of philosophy within theological studies. It refers to great editing achievements of Bishop Bohdan Bejze, because it notices the need to take into account, in the teaching practice, the multifacetedness, as well as the philosophical and ideological variety of the modern philosophical culture. Caring about the revival of the culture-forming role of theological and philosophical education, it believes that reliable practicing and teaching of philosophy must be based on a good-quality philosophical discourse. Reflecting the philosophical richness and variety of modern culture, it does not avoid indicating its threats.⁴⁰

To date, 9 volumes have been published, and within the next few years new volumes dedicated to the history of philosophy, the philosophy of culture and social philosophy will be issued.

Within the Department of the History of Ancient and Medieval Philosophy, the scholars carry out the research on the history of philosophy in Poland against the background of philosophy developed in Europe. The studies include: editing medieval and modern manuscripts concerning philosophy and theology; the research on philosophical culture in Poland, especially in the periods: the Middle Ages, Enlightenment and the contemporary period; methodological issues related to practicing the history of philosophy. Also, the scholars

³⁹ S. Janeczek, “Między filozoficzną historią filozofii a historią kultury. Z rozważań nad metodą historii filozofii w Polsce,” *Roczniki Filozoficzne KUL* 55, no. 1 (2007), pp. 103–105.

⁴⁰ See more in the website: https://www.kul.pl/dydaktyka-filozofii,art_73662.html [access: 4.09.2019].

analyze medieval philosophy, as well as its cultural and historical conditions. Moreover, they analyze upbringing and educational aspects of practicing philosophy, and its influence on the development and shape of culture and worldview.

THE CARDINAL WYSZYŃSKI UNIVERSITY IN WARSAW

Mieczysław Gogacz (1926–) was first connected with the Faculty of Christian Philosophy at KUL. He perceives his scientific activity as the defense of Christian culture. In 1966, he moved to the Faculty of Christian Philosophy at the Academy of Catholic Theology in Warsaw (later transformed into the Cardinal Stefan Wyszyński University in Warsaw) where, in 1954–1956, Fr. Kazimierz Kłósak (1911–1982) directed the Department of the History of World Philosophy (in 1957 the former name was changed to the Department of the History of Philosophy). Kłósak was mainly interested in the philosophy of nature. As a historian of philosophy, Gogacz developed Gilson's concept of the history of philosophy. His attempt to define Christian philosophy and show an extensive research on the history of the Polish Christian philosophy deserves a honorable mention.⁴¹ According to Gogacz, the basic task of a historian of philosophy is revealing the consequences of the adopted philosophical theses. The history of philosophy is a sub-discipline of philosophy—an auxiliary discipline. This is because we cannot practice systematic philosophy without a good knowledge of the history of the shaping of philosophical problems. The history of philosophy is a part of a specific intellectual culture. That is why a historian of philosophy does not analyze the truthfulness of philosophical views, but only the fact of their occurrence in history and their consequences.⁴² The material object (*obiectum materiale*) of the history of philosophy includes philosophical texts, and the formal objects includes the identification of philosophical problems which are reconstructed through the proper techniques of analysis and inter-

⁴¹ M. Gogacz, "Filozofia chrześcijańska w Polsce Odrodzonej (1918–1968)," pp. 49–79; idem, "Tomizm w polskim środowisku uniwersyteckim XX wieku," in *Studia z dziejów myśli św. Tomasza z Akwinu*, eds. J. Czerkawski, S. Swieżawski (Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL, 1978), p. 346.

⁴² M. Gogacz, *Historia filozofii w poszukiwaniu realizmu* (Warszawa: Wydawnictwo UKSW, 2011).

pretation (the formal object *quo*) of texts. Gogacz believes that the history of philosophy is specified by its formal object (*quod*), i.e. philosophical problems and their consequences—historical, methodological and subjective ones. In order to analyze various philosophical texts, especially medieval ones, Gogacz prepared the so-called questionnaire of the principles of the analysis of a philosophical text.⁴³ The key questions included in this questionnaire refer to the theory of being and the theory of science. Through the questionnaire, we can identify the theory of being expressed in the text in a direct or indirect manner. All philosophical problems occurring in the text should be identified and analyzed in the perspective of the assumed philosophy of being. This questionnaire was the basic method of analyzing texts by Gogacz's students at the Department of the History of Ancient and Medieval Philosophy at UKSW.

In 1933, Tadeusz Klimski (1948–2013) was made director of the Department of the History of Modern and Contemporary Philosophy, and in 1997 Stanisław Andrzej Porębski (1939–) became the director of the Department of the History of Polish Philosophy. Within the specialization of the history of philosophy, the scholars presented the views of philosophers, focusing on the history of the philosophy of being, philosophical anthropology, the theory of cognition, ethics, and the philosophy of culture. Their characteristic feature was referring all of the analyzed approaches to the classical concept of truth.

At present, the Department of the History of Ancient and Medieval Philosophy is directed by Artur Andrzejuk (1965–), who, developing the approach of Gilson and Gogacz, focuses on the scientific competences that a historian of philosophy should have.⁴⁴ First of all, a historian of philosophy is a philosopher, and not just a philologist or a paleographer. Practicing the history of philosophy is determined by the vision of philosophy assumed by a historian in which the basic role is played by the concept of a being. That is why reducing the way of practicing the history of philosophy to philology or historicism is erroneous. In philosophical texts, philosophical problems and their consequences are analyzed. Thus, the role of the starting point and

⁴³ Ibidem, pp. 151–154. The questionnaire was prepared and completed by the Department of the History of Ancient and Medieval Philosophy at UKSW in Warsaw.

⁴⁴ A. Andrzejuk, "Filozoficzna koncepcja historii filozofii," in *Z metodologii historii filozofii*, pp. 20–21.

of the adopted assumptions is important. Like Gogacz, Andrzejuk is for using the so-called metaphysical questionnaire through which a given author's concept of being is identified in order to explain, in its light, all the formulated detailed philosophical problems. Thus, the analysis of a philosophical text would have two stages: (1) specifying how a given philosopher understands the structure of a being, (2) reading all the author's philosophical ideas in the perspective of this concept.

Andrzejuk and his colleagues from the Department of the History of Modern and Contemporary Philosophy and the Department of the History of Polish Philosophy: Magdalena Płotka (1982–), Witold Płotka (1983–) and Michał Zembrzuski (1982–) carry out scientific research on the texts of St. Thomas Aquinas. Their studies are related to metaphysical issues (the act of existence), cognitive science (intellect and mind), ethics (ability, virtues and will), anthropology (personal relations, substantial form), phenomenology (Husserl's phenomenology and the reception of phenomenology in Poland at the turn of the 19th and 20th century). They are also interested in the medieval Arabic philosophy, as well as the medieval Polish (practical) philosophy. Moreover, they carry out methodological analyses on various ways of practicing the history of philosophy. They continue the research on classical philosophy perceived in the spirit of consequent Thomism. Moreover, they are searching for philosophical (anthropological) foundations for disciplines such as, e.g. pedagogy.

THE PONTIFICAL UNIVERSITY OF JOHN PAUL II IN KRAKOW

The history of philosophy was also developed at the Pontifical Faculty of Theology/the Pontifical University of John Paul II in Krakow, at the Department of the History of Ancient and Medieval Philosophy and the Department of the History of Modern and Contemporary Philosophy. In the former department Stanisław Bafia CSsR (1945–) and Kleofas Wojciech Gródek OFM (1963–) carried out their research, showing the validity of the philosophical heritage of Greek and Latin thinkers. They analyzed in detail the views of the following Greek philosophers: Parmenides, Protagoras and Gorgias. Also, the problem of goodness in Aristotle's approach was thoroughly studied. In the history of the medieval thought, they analyzed, i.e.

the philosophical traditions initiated by Boethius, Theodoric of Chartres and Thomas Aquinas.

In the 1990s, the Department of the History of Modern and Contemporary Philosophy gathered such philosophers as Tadeusz Gadacz (1955–) and Roman Darowski SJ (1935–2017). Now, Aleksander Bobko (1960–) and Marek Urban CSsR (1964–) are the main scholars of this department. All of them have aimed, first of all, at presenting the crucial issues and problems of the philosophical directions and views which appeared from the 16th to the beginning of the 19th century. In particular, they studied the philosophy of Descartes and his followers, English and French Enlightenment, and the philosophy of Kant and German idealism. In the research of the 20th century, special attention was paid to positivism, phenomenology, existentialism, spiritualism, neo-Thomism, analytic philosophy, the philosophy of dialogue, and postmodernism. The clash of modern philosophical approaches, rooted in Christian thinking trends, with the philosophy of postmodern attitudes towards the man and culture as not being rooted in metaphysical references, creates an interesting area of reflection located between philosophy and religion.

JESUIT UNIVERSITY IGNATIANUM IN KRAKOW

In the panorama of the 20th century Christian philosophy, Roman Darowski, a Jesuit, occupies an important place. He was first connected with the Pontifical Academy of Theology, and then—with the Jesuit University Ignatianum in Krakow. In the work: *Filozofia jezuitów w Polsce w XX w.* [*The Philosophy of Jesuits in Poland in the 20th Century*], he presented the history of Polish Jesuits who taught philosophy at the Faculty of Philosophy of the Society of Jesus in Kraków, analyzing both the content and the nature of the philosophy practiced by those professors.⁴⁵ Most of his publications on the history of philosophy included the analysis and presentation of the philosophical heritage of Jesuit thinkers, especially Polish ones. The history of Jesuits, not only with philosophical aspects, was also studied by: Franciszek Bargieł SJ (1918–2009) and, partially, Bogdan

⁴⁵ R. Darowski R., *Filozofia jezuitów w Polsce w XX w. Próba syntezy. Słownik autorów* (Kraków: Wydawnictwo WAM, 2001).

Lisiak SJ (1958–), Stanisław Obirek (1956–) and Stanisław Pyszka SJ (1951–). At the Jesuit University Ignatianum, the research on the history of philosophy is carried out by: Anna Zhyrkova (Byzantine and patristic philosophy) and Marcin Podbielski (1970–) (Neoplatonism, early Christian philosophy) and Jacek Surzyn (1968–) (ontology and metaphysics of the medieval scholasticism). The thought of St. Thomas and Thomism is analyzed, in the historical and subjective aspect, by Piotr Stanisław Mazur (1968–). Bogdan Lisiak is conducting research on modern philosophy.

THE HISTORY OF CHRISTIAN PHILOSOPHY AT THE BEGINNING OF THE 21ST CENTURY

At present, the Christian history of philosophy and its methodology is developed in more than a dozen scientific-research environments in Poland. However, the previously crucial centers of this thought still play the most important role. They include KUL, UKSW, UPJPII and AIK. The most advanced studies in the history of philosophy are carried out at KUL and UKSW. At these universities, the reflection on the history of philosophy is the oldest and the most thoroughly elaborated in terms of methodology. This reflection has shaped the culture of the philosophical practice of the history of Christian philosophy in Poland. Also, it is worth emphasizing that the approaches to practicing the history of philosophy are varied because it has developed via the dialogue with other traditions (e.g. German or Anglo-Saxon) which, however, can be reduced to two basic models determined by the subject of analysis, i.e. the history of philosophical culture or the philosophical history of philosophy.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Borzym, S. *Filozofia polska 1900–1950*. Wrocław–Warszawa–Kraków: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, 1991.
- . *Panorama polskiej myśli filozoficznej*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, 1993.

- Chudy, W. "Filozofia polska po II wojnie światowej," *Studia Philosophiae Christianae* 26, no. 1 (1990), pp. 129–141.
- Czerkawski, J. "Gilsonowska koncepcja historii filozofii," *Roczniki Filozoficzne* 13, no. 1 (1965), pp. 61–72.
- Darowski, R. *Filozofia jezuitów w Polsce w XX w. Próba syntezy. Słownik autorów*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo WAM, 2001.
- Gogacz, M. "Filozofia chrześcijańska w Polsce Odrodzonej (1918–1968)," *Studia Philosophiae Christianae* 5, no. 2 (1969), pp. 49–79.
- . "Tomizm w polskim środowisku uniwersyteckim XX wieku," in *Studia z dziejów myśli św. Tomasza z Akwinu*, eds. J. Czerkawski, S. Swieżawski, pp. 335–350. Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL, 1978.
- Ingarden, R. "Ks. Konstanty Michalski uczony – filozof – człowiek," *Tygodnik Powszechny*, no. 32 (1947), pp. 1–2.
- Iwanicki, J. "Problematyka filozoficzna w ciągu ostatniego 50-lecia w Polsce," *Ateneum Kapłańskie* 58, no. 1–3 (1959), pp. 255–293.
- Kłósak, K. "Twórczość naukowa ks. K. Michalskiego," *Tygodnik Powszechny*, no. 44 (1947), pp. 4–5.
- Krąpiec, M.A. *Metafizyka. Zarys teorii bytu*. Lublin: Redakcja Wydawnictw KUL, 1988.
- Kurdziałek, M. "Trwałość osiągnięć Ks. Prof. K. Michalskiego," *Analecta Cracoviensia* 12 (1980), pp. 45–55.
- . "Udział ks. Konstantego Michalskiego i Aleksandra Birkenmajera w odkrywaniu filozofii średniowiecznej," *Studia Philosophiae Christianae* 2, no. 1 (1966), pp. 83–105.
- Michalski, K. *Dokąd idziemy. Pisma wybrane*. Kraków: Znak, 1964.
- . *Między heroizmem a bestialstwem*. Częstochowa: Regina Poloniae, 1984.
- Mikucki, K. *Tomizm w Polsce po II wojnie światowej*. Kraków: Księgarnia Akademicka, 2015.
- Morawiec, E. *Podstawowe zagadnienia metafizyki klasycznej*. Warszawa: Akademia Teologii Katolickiej, 1998.
- Skoczylski, J., Woleński, J. *Historia filozofii polskiej*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo M, 2010.
- Słownik filozofów polskich*, eds. B. Andrzejewski i R. Kozłowski. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Naukowe UAM, 2006.
- Słownik polskich teologów katolickich*, vol. 1–8, eds. H. Wyczakowski, L. Grzebień, J. Mandziuk. Warszawa: Akademia Teologii Katolickiej, 1981–1995.
- Stępień, A.B. "Filozofia na Katolickim Uniwersytecie Lubelskim (1918–1968)," *Znak*, no. 9(171) (1968), pp. 1195–1213.
- . "O stanie filozofii tomistycznej w Polsce," in *W nurcie zagadnień posoborowych*, vol. 2, ed. B. Bejze, pp. 97–126. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Sióstr Loretanek-Benedyktynek, 1968.

- . “Stan filozofii we współczesnej Polsce,” in *Filozofować dziś. Z badań nad filozofią najnowszą*, ed. A. Bronk, pp. 313–326. Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL, 1995.
- Swieżawski, S. *Istnienie i tajemnica*. Lublin: Redakcja Wydawnictw KUL, 1993.
- Tatarkiewicz, W. *Zarys dziejów filozofii w Polsce*. Kraków: Polska Akademia Umiejętności, 1948.
- Turowicz, J. “Testament ks. K. Michalskiego,” *Znak*, no. 2(9) (1948), pp. 131–132.
- Wolak, Z. “Naukowa filozofia Koła Krakowskiego,” *Zagadnienia Filozoficzne w Nauce* 36 (2005), pp. 97–122.
- Woleński, J. *Filozoficzna szkoła lwowsko-warszawska*. Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1985.
- Woroniecki, J. “Lubelskie środowisko filozoficzne,” *Przegląd Filozoficzny* 44, no. 1–3 (1948), pp. 50–56.
- Zarys historii filozofii polskiej*, ed. L. Gawor. Rzeszów: Uniwersytet Rzeszowski, 2013.

Index of names

- Abelard, Peter 35
Adamczyk, Stanisław, Fr. 54, 63, 79,
90, 111, 218, 220, 303
Adamski, Stanisław, Fr. 256
Adamski, Walerian, Fr. 256
Adorno, Theodor 195
Ajdukiewicz, Kazimierz 20, 29
Albert the Great 310
Andrzejewski, Roman, Fr. 310
Andrzejuk, Artur 68, 84, 296, 315–316
Andrzejuk, Izabella 296
Anselm of Canterbury 34, 43, 238–239,
310
Apuleius 35
Aristotle 24, 26, 28, 32, 34, 52, 70, 79,
134, 201, 220, 223, 225, 307, 310,
316
Aszyk, Piotr, SJ 148, 179
Augustine of Hippo 129, 172, 218, 310
Avicenna 224

Bagiński, Maciej 230
Bajor, Wanda 310
Bakies, Bogdan, Fr. 55
Bała, Maciej, Fr. 67, 238
Bańka, Aleksander R. 53, 69
Bańkowski, Krzysztof 55

Barcik, Joanna 238
Bargieł, Franciszek, SJ 317
Bartel, Tomasz 68
Bartnik, Czesław Stanisław, Fr. 129,
256–257, 265
Bartyzel, Jacek 262–263
Bastide, Georges 95, 162
Baumgarten, Alexander 195, 200, 205
Bednarski, Feliks, OP 146–148, 176
Bednarski, Stanisław, SJ 33–34
Bejze, Bohdan, Fr. 21, 42, 54, 61–63,
152, 218, 220–222, 224, 226, 301,
313
Bendiek, Johannes, OFM 36
Beniamin, Walter 195
Bergson, Henri 10, 106
Berkeley, George 312
Besler, Gabriel 69
Białostocki, Jan 199
Biegański, Władysław 20, 26, 103
Biela, Adam 38
Bielecki, Jan 31
Biesaga, Tadeusz, SDB 69, 82, 142, 161,
163, 175, 292
Birkenmajer, Aleksander 305
Bismarck, Otto, von 272
Błachowicz, Krystyna 36

- Blaustein, Leopold 198
 Bobko, Aleksander 140, 163, 258, 260, 269, 317
 Bocheński, Józef (Innocenty) Maria, OP 23–26, 35–38, 41–42, 53, 59, 84, 107, 126, 148–149, 151, 178, 219, 228–229, 241–242, 258, 301
 Boethius 35, 310, 317
 Bolzano, Bernard 25, 35
 Bombik, Mieczysław, Fr. 32, 38
 Borkowska-Nowak, Małgorzata 161
 Borkowski, Ludwik 20, 27, 41
 Bortkiewicz, Paweł Witold, TChr 262–263
 Borutka, Tadeusz, Fr. 256–257, 268
 Borzym, Stanisław 170–171, 307
 Bremer, Józef, SJ 34, 44, 57, 93–94, 142, 219, 242, 244
 Brentano, Franz 299
 Bronk, Andrzej, SVD 30–31, 39, 61, 81, 92, 183, 220, 223, 234, 243, 308
 Brożek, Bartosz 40, 88
 Brzózka, Alina 281
 Buchner, Wojciech 268
 Bugajak, Grzegorz, Fr. 89, 118
 Bugajska, Anna 142
 Burkhardt, Hans 34
 Buttiglione, Rocco 157–158, 254
 Bylica, Piotr 40
 Cajetan (Tomasso de Vio) 52
 Caro, Leopold 260–261
 Charchuła, Jarosław, SJ 268
 Chardin, Teilhard, de, SJ 111, 129, 134–135
 Charzyński, Rafał, Fr. 312
 Chełmicki, Zygmunt, Fr. 14
 Chenu, Marie-Dominique, OP 309
 Chlewiński, Zdzisław, Fr. 38
 Chłodna-Błach, Imelda 69, 292
 Chmielowski, Adam, CFA 196, 212
 Chodkowski, Tomasz 31
 Chodorowski, Jerzy 260–261
 Chojnacki, Piotr, Fr. 11, 23, 29, 31–32, 41–42, 53, 60, 62, 77, 102, 302
 Chopin, Fryderyk 272
 Chudy, Wojciech 11, 29, 81–82, 128, 138, 158, 161, 254, 263–264, 284, 286
 Chyrowicz, Barbara, SSpS 161, 163, 242
 Clarke, Bowman L. 36
 Confucius 311
 Crosby, John 157
 Czachorowski, Marek 82, 142, 162, 263–264, 291
 Czerkawski, Jan 28–29, 260, 303, 311–312, 314
 Czernecka-Rej, Bożena 27, 43
 Czeżowski, Tadeusz 20, 159
 Czuma, Ignacy 252, 254–255, 267
 Czupryn, Bogdan, Fr. 56
 Dąbek, Dariusz, Fr. 117
 Dąbrowska, Maria 197
 Dadaczyński Jerzy, Fr. 33, 43
 Dąmbska, Izydora 253
 Danek-Wojnowska, Bożena 197
 Dańkowski, Dariusz, SJ 256–257, 268
 Darowski, Roman, SJ 79, 126, 130, 179–180, 191, 317
 Darwin, Charles 100, 124
 Daszkiewicz, Wojciech 43, 68, 292
 Dec, Ignacy, Fr. 56, 63, 128
 Del Noce, August 158
 Dembiński, Henryk 254–255
 Dembowski, Bronisław, Fr. 55, 218
 Dempf, Alois 271
 Derrida, Jacques 195
 Descartes, René 34, 63, 135, 237, 312, 317
 Dewey, John 195

- Dłubacz, Włodzimierz 56, 64, 220,
223–224, 263–264, 268
- Długosz, Jan, SJ 34
- Dołęga, Józef Marcei, Fr. 118
- Domański, Juliusz 307
- Domńczak, Stanisław, Fr. 26
- Drewnowski, Jan Franciszek 24–25,
30, 35, 38, 42, 53, 59, 84, 92, 107,
148, 219, 227–229, 301–302
- Driesch, Hans 106
- Drózdź, Michał, Fr. 268
- Duch, Włodzisław 142
- Duchliński, Piotr 9, 11, 44, 69, 75, 92,
94, 142, 145, 161–162, 178, 230,
292
- Duhem, Pierre 219
- Duma, Tomasz, Fr. 51, 68, 81
- Duns Scotus 52, 177, 299, 310
- Dutkiewicz, Paweł 252
- Dybowski, Benedykt 103
- Dyczewski, Leon, OFMConv 190,
256–257
- Dyk, Wiesław, Fr. 119
- Dylus, Aniela 256–257
- Dywan, Zdzisław 27
- Dziedzic, Anna 21
- Dzielski, Mirosław 260–261
- Dziewiecki, Marek, Fr. 190
- Dziobkowski, Bogdan 242
- Eco, Umberto 195
- Ehrenfels, Christian, von 169
- Ehrlich, Ludwik 254–255
- Einstein, Albert 111, 231
- Eliade, Mircea 234
- Elzenberg, Henryk 198, 253
- Essler, Wilhelm Karl 37
- Ey, Henri 85, 91
- Fąfara, Richard J. 10
- Falkowski, Andrzej 38
- Fel, Stanisław, Fr. 268
- Fenrychowa, Janina 10
- Ferdynus, Marcin, Fr. 161
- Filipowicz, Adam M. 296
- Floryńska, Halina 307
- Fritzhand, Marek 126
- Fydrych, Jacek 161
- Gabryl, Franciszek, Fr. 23, 26, 53, 58,
76, 102–103, 125, 217, 220, 299
- Gadacz, Tadeusz 57, 126–127, 136,
140, 163, 187, 220, 307, 317
- Gadamer, Hans-Georg 210
- Galarowicz, Jan 138, 151–152, 185
- Gałęcki, Sebastian 11
- Galenos 35
- Gałkowski, Jerzy 138, 158, 161, 177,
258–259
- Gałkowski, Stanisław 268, 292
- Garbacz, Paweł 27, 43
- Garbowski, Tadeusz 107
- Garewicz, Jan 307
- Garrigou-Lagrange, Réginald Marie,
OP 226
- Gawecki, Bolesław 107–108, 113, 189
- Gawor, Leszek 300
- Geyer, Bernhard 303
- Gielarowski, Andrzej 69, 163, 217,
238, 292
- Gielecki, Wojciech 302
- Gierycz, Michał 264–265, 268
- Gilson, Étienne 10–11, 60, 65, 127,
202, 296, 303, 308–309, 314–315
- Głąb, Anna 312
- Glinkowski, Witold 157
- Głombik, Czesław 170, 271
- Głowala, Michał 68
- Gocko, Jerzy, SDB 268
- Godawa, Grzegorz, Fr. 268
- Gogacz, Mieczysław 11, 28, 42, 55,
59, 61–63, 84, 91, 102, 130, 159,

- 180–181, 218, 224–225, 241,
263–264, 267, 280–281, 297,
300–303, 305, 308–309, 314–316
- Gołaszewska, Maria 198
- Golbiak, Jacek, Fr. 117
- Gombrowicz, Witold 197
- Gomułka, Jakub 236, 244
- Gondek, Maria Joanna 183, 281
- Gondek, Paweł 43, 69, 292
- Goodman, Nelson 195
- Gorczyca, Jakub, SJ 148, 186
- Gorgias 201, 316
- Górski, Karol 258, 277–279
- Górski, Ludwik 252, 260–261
- Gouhier, Henri 10, 296
- Grabińska, Teresa 161
- Grabmann, Martin, Fr. 271
- Grabowski, Marian 10–11, 185
- Gretka, Wojciech 58
- Gródek, Kleofas Wojciech OFM 316
- Gruszka, Franciszek, Fr. 55–56
- Grygiel, Stanisław 220, 234, 237–238,
240–242, 274
- Grygiel, Wojciech, Fr. 88, 233
- Grzebień, Ludwik SJ 34
- Grzegorzczak, Andrzej 25, 189
- Grzegorzczak, Anna 287–288
- Grzeszczak, Jan 11
- Grzybowski, Jacek, Fr. 67, 69, 268, 292
- Grzywacz, Robert, SJ 238
- Gudaniec, Arkadiusz 68, 128, 142
- Gumański, Leon 21
- Gut, Arkadiusz 27, 43, 94, 136, 177
- Gut, Przemysław 312
- Gutowski, Piotr 57, 219, 242–244, 312
- Guz, Tadeusz, Fr. 69, 262–263, 268,
291
- Habermas, Jürgen 195
- Hajduk, Zygmunt, SDS 27, 29, 39, 81,
116–117, 189
- Hałaczek, Bernard, Fr. 118, 135
- Haldane, John 106
- Halpern, Izydor (*See* Mysłicki, Ignacy)
- Harassek, Stefan 308
- Hartmann, Eduard, von 169, 185
- Hartshorne, Charles 34
- Hegel, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich 129,
140, 299
- Heidegger, Martin 85, 86, 138–139
- Heinrich, Władysław 107
- Heller, Michał, Fr. 22, 29, 33, 39, 57,
66, 87–89, 91, 95, 110, 115–118,
135, 142, 158, 190, 219, 230–233,
235, 240, 289
- Herbert, Zbigniew 253
- Herbut, Józef, Fr. 27, 30–31, 38–39,
55–56, 81, 94, 220, 230, 243, 308
- Herda, Justyna 136, 142
- Hildebrand, Dietrich, von 86–87, 175,
185–188
- Hiż, Henryk 25
- Hlond, August, Fr. 253, 256
- Hochfeld, Anna 307
- Hohol, Mateusz 40, 88
- Hołda, Miłosz, Fr. 69, 86, 233
- Hołowiński, Ignacy, Fr. 76
- Hołówka, Jacek 242
- Hołub, Grzegorz, Fr. 69, 142, 161,
163, 292
- Homa, Tomasz, SJ 242, 256–257,
268, 292
- Hortyński, Feliks, SJ 135
- Hume, David 158
- Husserl, Edmund 77, 85–86, 91, 136,
138, 171, 186, 219, 234, 307, 316
- Ingarden, Roman 81–82, 85, 86,
90–91, 124, 138, 184–187, 190,
196, 198, 207–208, 211–212,
219–220, 226, 234–235, 241, 280,
283, 300, 303–304, 307

- Iwanicki, Józef, Fr. 22, 26–27, 31–32, 35, 41, 54, 62–63, 102, 298
 Iwanicki, Marcin 243–244, 312
- Jadacki, Jacek Juliusz 20–21, 24, 35, 229, 242
- Jagiełło, Jarosław, Fr. 140, 163
- Jakubanis, Henryk, Fr. 26, 41, 302, 308
- Jakubisiak, Augustyn, Fr. 41
- Janeczek, Stanisław, Fr. 16, 26, 37, 70, 77, 221, 243, 296, 312–313
- Janiak, Edward 161
- Janik, Jerzy 118
- Jankowski, Henryk 126
- Janusz, Robert, SJ 119, 178
- Jarnuszkiewicz, Antoni, SJ 57, 148
- Jaroszyński, Edward 256
- Jaroszyński, Piotr 56, 64, 67, 80, 128, 161, 182–183, 203, 205, 220, 263–264, 268, 279, 282, 291–292
- Jarra, Eugeniusz 254–255
- Jasinowski, Bogumił 302
- Jaśkowski, Stanisław 21
- Jaworski, Marian, Fr. 55, 128, 218, 226, 241–242
- Jędraszewski, Marek, Fr. 57, 126, 136, 220, 256–257, 287–288
- Jodkowski, Kazimierz 29, 40, 233
- John of St. Thomas 35, 52
- John of the Cross 136, 218
- John Paul II (*See also* Wojtyła, Karol) 65, 157–158, 160, 203, 212–213, 218, 253, 258, 279, 285
- Jonkisz, Adam 19, 29, 44
- Judycka, Joanna 310
- Judycki, Stanisław 26, 57, 64, 67–68, 83, 92, 94, 142, 162, 219, 242–244
- Juros, Helmut, SDS 159, 256–257
- Kaczorowski, Paweł 268
- Kaczyński, Edward, OP 159
- Kalinowski, Jerzy 21, 27–28, 41, 54, 59–60, 65, 109, 127, 151, 177, 218, 241, 254–255
- Kamiński, Stanisław, Fr. 11, 21–22, 27–28, 30, 35, 38–39, 41–42, 51, 54–55, 59–60, 62–63, 65–66, 81, 90, 92, 94, 109, 127, 176, 218, 220–223, 311
- Kant, Immanuel 77, 88, 134, 151–152, 154–155, 168, 181–182, 191, 210, 317
- Kawalec, Anna 292
- Kawalec, Paweł 30, 43
- Keller, Józef 151
- Kelsen, Hans 255
- Kiczuk, Stanisław 27, 42
- Kiereś, Henryk 56, 63, 67, 81, 128, 183–184, 200–201, 203, 205–206, 220, 224, 250, 263–264, 268, 279, 282–283, 291–292
- Kierkegaard, Søren 138
- Kieroń, Zuzanna 117
- Kijewska, Agnieszka 310–311
- Kijowski, Ryszard, Fr. 113
- Klaus, Georg 36
- Klauza, Karol 203, 213
- Klepacz, Michał, Fr. 53, 275–276, 302
- Kleszcz, Ryszard 40
- Klimski, Tadeusz 56, 64, 315
- Kłoczowski, Jan Andrzej, OP 10–11, 57, 94, 126, 188, 220, 234–235, 287–288
- Kłós, Jan 161, 163, 268
- Kłósak, Kazimierz, Fr. 33, 39, 54, 62–63, 78, 88–89, 107, 110–112, 114–115, 117, 124, 126, 131–132, 140–141, 219, 222, 225, 227, 231, 239–240, 290, 303, 314
- Kloskowski, Kazimierz, Fr. 112, 117
- Kmiecikowski, Waldemar 86, 94

- Kobyłecki, Stanisław, Fr. 23–24, 28, 52–53, 58, 302
 Kobyliński, Andrzej, Fr. 11, 145, 162, 262–263, 268, 291
 Koj, Leon 28–30, 36
 Kołakowski, Andrzej 21
 Komsta, Monika 70, 311
 Kondziela, Joachim, Fr. 256–257
 Koneczny, Feliks 170–171, 262, 264, 277–278, 282
 Konik, Roman 195
 Konopczyński, Władysław 253
 Kopania, Jerzy 30
 Korcik, Antoni, Fr. 26–28, 35
 Kornilowicz, Władysław, Fr. 197, 305
 Kostyrko, Teresa 199
 Kotarbiński, Tadeusz 20, 24–25, 159
 Kowalczyk, Stanisław, Fr. 55, 63, 83, 127, 129, 141–142, 178, 218, 220–222, 256–257, 280, 283–284
 Kowalewski, Marian, Fr. 54
 Kowalska, Faustyna 212
 Kowalski, Kazimierz, Fr. 53, 59, 302
 Kozak, Magdalena 69
 Krajewski, Kazimierz 160–161, 176
 Krąpiec, Mieczysław Albert, OP 21, 30, 38, 42, 54–55, 59–63, 65–66, 70, 79–80, 89–94, 109, 126–128, 140–141, 159, 181–182, 184, 191, 198–199, 201, 203–205, 218, 220–224, 239, 241, 243, 263–264, 266–267, 279–282, 286, 290, 311
 Krasiński, Zygmunt 272
 Kraus, Oskar 169
 Krokos, Jan, Fr. 31, 56, 64, 83, 94
 Krucina, Jan, Fr. 256–257
 Kruszyński, Józef, Fr. 252, 262
 Krzesiński, Andrzej, Fr. 262
 Kubiak, Władysław, FDP 56, 64
 Kublikowski, Robert, Fr. 30, 43
 Kucharczyk, Grzegorz 262–263
 Kucharski, Jarosław 75, 163
 Kuczyńska, Alicja 199
 Kuderowicz, Zbigniew 296, 307
 Kukowski, Jarosław 89
 Kulicki, Piotr 27, 43
 Kupczak, Jarosław, OP 138
 Kurdziałek, Marian, Fr. 65, 303, 309–310
 Kwiatkowski, Franciszek, SJ 33–34, 105, 170, 311
 Kwiatkowski, Tadeusz 28, 30, 36
 Landy, Teresa 197
 Lapie, Paul 169
 Larouche, Laurent 36
 Latawiec, Anna 44, 88–89, 117
 Laudan, Larry 13
 Lavelle, Louis 162, 187
 Lechniak, Marek 27, 43
 Leibniz, Gottfried Wilhelm 32, 34, 37, 63, 312
 Lekka-Kowalik, Agnieszka 30, 43, 81, 142, 189
 Lemańska, Anna 44, 88–89, 116, 118
 Lenartowicz, Piotr, SJ 78, 94, 113, 135
 Leo XIII 102, 123, 250, 256, 298, 302–303
 Leśniewski, Stanisław 20, 24–25, 28, 35
 Lévinas, Emmanuel 136, 138–139, 162, 188, 234
 Lewandowski, Wojciech 163
 Liana, Zbigniew, Fr. 88
 Lichacz, Piotr 162
 Lis, Rafał 268
 Lisiak, Bogdan, SJ 119, 233, 318
 Lisowski, Aleksander 68
 Lizut, Rafał 10
 Locke, John 312
 Lonergan, Bernard, SJ 94

- Lorenz, Konrad 91
 Lubański, Mieczysław, Fr. 29, 31, 33, 88–89, 114, 117, 135
 Lutosławski, Kazimierz, Fr. 256
 Lutosławski, Wincenty 298
 Lyotarad, Jean-François 196
- Łepko, Zbigniew, SDB 118
 Łoś, Jerzy 20
 Ługowska, Danuta 89
 Łukasiewicz, Dariusz 40, 242–243
 Łukasiewicz, Jan 20, 23–25, 28, 35, 41–42, 219
- Mach, Ernst 219
 Maciejczak, Marek 85, 95, 287
 Mączka, Janusz, SDB 33, 88, 118
 Maier, Henryk 172
 Majdański, Stanisław 21, 25–26, 28, 30–31, 35, 42, 60, 81, 308
 Majeran, Roman 310
 Majka, Józef, Fr. 254, 260–261
 Makota, Janina 198
 Malebranche, Nicolas 312
 Malinowski, Krzysztof 147–148
 Mamcarz, Piotr 190
 Marcel, Gabriel 136, 138, 236
 Marciszewski, Witold 28–30, 36
 Mariański, Janusz, Fr. 190
 Maritain, Jacques 10, 60, 65, 78, 110–111, 129, 197, 201, 271, 278, 305
 Markowski, Mieczysław 307, 309
 Martyniak, Czesław 254–255, 267
 Marx, Karl 168
 Maryniarczyk, Andrzej, SDB 11, 20, 56, 58, 61, 63, 80–81, 128, 147, 153, 162, 183, 220, 222, 250, 253, 255, 263–264, 266–268, 295, 297, 308–310
 Matulewicz, Jerzy, MIC 254
- Matuszek, Krzysztof 268
 Mazanka, Paweł, CSsR 55–56, 67, 69, 224
 Mazierski, Stanisław, Fr. 27, 29, 39, 54, 62, 110–111, 114–115, 117
 Mazur, Piotr Stanisław 9, 44, 61, 68, 81, 94, 128, 142, 162, 203, 249, 263, 265, 268, 292, 318
 Mazurek, Franciszek, Fr. 254–255, 257, 268
 Mazurkiewicz, Piotr, Fr. 268
 McLuhan, Marshall 195
 Mercier, Désiré-Joseph, Fr. 21, 77, 123–124, 297
 Merecki, Jarosław, SDS 162, 254
 Merleau-Ponty, Maurice 95
 Metallmann, Joachim 107
 Michalik, Alicja 87, 235
 Michałowski, Witold, Fr. 27–28, 35
 Michalski, Konstanty CM 24–25, 102, 124–125, 171, 219, 227, 275–276, 299–300, 303–305, 310
 Michalunio, Czesław, SJ 34
 Micińska, Anna 197
 Mickiewicz, Adam 272
 Mijalska, Magdalena 11
 Mikucki, Kazimierz, CR 56, 119, 306, 307
 Mikulska, Patrycja 158
 Milcarek, Paweł 68, 263, 265
 Milewski, Józef 260–261
 Moles, Abraham 195
 Molski, Marcelli, Fr. 31
 Moń, Ryszard, Fr. 11, 131, 136, 145, 162
 Morawiec, Edmund, CSsR 39, 55, 63, 218, 221
 Morawski, Mieczysław, Fr. 299
 Morawski, Stefan 199
 Mordarski, Ryszard 243
 Morin, Jean-Baptiste 32

- Moskal, Piotr, Fr. 56, 64, 220, 224, 230
 Motyka, Krzysztof 255
 Mrzygłód, Piotr R., Fr. 69
 Murawski, Roman 24, 35
 Mycielski, Andrzej 254–255
 Mysłicki, Ignacy 14, 301
 Mysona Byrska, Joanna 268, 292
- Nabert, Jean 95, 162
 Nagórny, Janusz, Fr. 268
 Nałkowska, Zofia 197
 Natanson, Władysław 107
 Nawroczyński, Bogdan 277, 279
 Newton, Isaac 99
 Nietzsche, Friedrich 168, 170, 172, 191
 Nieznański, Edward 31–32, 35–38, 42, 63, 219, 229
 Norwid, Cyprian Kamil 272
 Nowak, Andrzej 262–263
 Nowak, Marian, Fr. 190
 Nowik, Andrzej Marek 296
 Nowodworski, Michał, Fr. 14
 Nuckowski, Jan, SJ 33
 Nusbaum-Hilarowicz, Józef 103
- Obirek, Stanisław 318
 Obolevitch, Teresa, SBDNP 234
 Ogarek, Zygmunt 302
 Ogonowski, Zbigniew 307
 Oko, Dariusz, Fr. 69, 262–263, 291
 Oleksy, Czesław 37
 Olszewski, Adam, Fr. 33, 40, 43
 Omyła, Mieczysław 32
 Ossowski, Stanisław 199
 Otto, Rudolf 234
- Pabjan, Tadeusz, Fr. 69, 88, 118, 233
 Palusińska, Anna 311
 Pamuła, Stanisław, Fr. 268
 Pańpuch, Zbigniew 68, 128
 Parmenides 316
- Parys, Jan 25, 229
 Pasterczyk, Piotr, Fr. 312
 Pastuszka, Józef, Fr. 42, 171, 218, 252, 258, 275, 277, 302–303
 Paszyński, Jarosław, SJ 69
 Paul Apostle, St. 189
 Pawlicki, Stanisław, Fr. 299
 Pawlicki, Stefan CR 125, 298
 Pawlikowski, Michał 262–263
 Pawlikowski, Tomasz 68
 Pawliszyn, Mirosław, Fr. 238
 Pawłowski, Krzysztof Jan 238, 292
 Pawłowski, Łukasz 250
 Pechnik, Aleksander, Fr. 274–275
 Pelczar, Józef Sebastian, Fr. 256
 Perzanowski, Jerzy 34, 89
 Petrażycki, Leon 255
 Petrycy, Sebastian 305
 Piechowiak, Marek 69, 255, 266
 Piechowicz, Robert 43
 Piecuch, Joachim, Fr. 220
 Pieróg, Stanisław 21
 Piętka, Dariusz 56, 69
 Pietraszko, Jan 212
 Pietruszczak, Andrzej 89
 Piłat, Robert 85, 95
 Pius IX 250
 Pius X 57, 250
 Pius XI 250, 303
 Piwowarczyk, Jan 260–261
 Piwowarczyk, Marek 68
 Planck, Max 231
 Plato 56, 135, 152, 172, 201, 210, 310
 Plotinus 208
 Płotka, Magdalena 84, 296, 316
 Płotka, Witold 316
 Podbielski, Marcin 318
 Podoleński, Stanisław SJ 258
 Podrez, Ewa 11, 69, 131, 145, 162, 177, 203, 212, 268, 292
 Pokulniewicz, Andrzej 70

- Polak, Paweł 33, 43
 Polak, Ryszard 147
 Policki, Korneliusz, SDS 36
 Póltawski, Andrzej 85, 91, 95, 162, 186, 284, 287
 Popielski, Kazimierz, Fr. 190–191
 Popper, Karl 88
 Poradowski, Michał, Fr. 262–263
 Porebski, Mieczysław 198, 199
 Porebski, Stanisław Andrzej 315
 Porwolik, Marek, Fr. 43
 Poznański, Jacek, SJ 19, 44, 119
 Protagoras 316
 Ptaszek, Robert 292
 Pyszka, Stanisław, SJ 256–257, 268, 318

 Radziszewski, Idzi, Fr. 53, 58, 76–77, 124, 217, 220, 231, 299, 302
 Ratzinger, Joseph, Fr. 11
 Reale, Giovanni 310
 Regner, Leopold, Fr. 22, 27–28, 35
 Rickert, Heinrich 172
 Ricoeur, Paul 11, 136, 138–139, 210, 235, 238
 Rignano, Eugenio 106
 Rivetti Barbó, Francesca 36
 Rodziński, Adam 138, 177, 274, 284–285, 291
 Romanowski, Henryk 52–53, 58, 260–261
 Roskal, Zenon 69, 117
 Rosłan, Adam 68
 Rosmini, Antonio 158
 Rosner, Katarzyna 198
 Rospond, Stanisław 171
 Roszkowski, Antoni, Fr. 260–261
 Roszyk, Maksymilian 312
 Rożdżeński, Roman, Fr. 57, 86, 91, 94, 140
 Rozen, Barbara 286

 Rubczyński, Witold 170, 277–278
 Russell, Bertrand 36
 Rutkiewicz, Bohdan, Fr. 76, 105–107, 299
 Rutowski, Tadeusz, Fr. 105, 113
 Ryba, Mieczysław 262–263

 Sajdek, Wiesława 310
 Salamon, Janusz 243
 Salamucha, Jan, Fr. 22, 24–25, 35–36, 38, 41–42, 53, 59, 84, 107, 149, 219, 227–228, 301–302
 Sandok, Theresa 65
 Sarnacki, Andrzej, SJ 268
 Sartre, Jean-Paul 136, 234
 Sawicki, Franciszek, Fr. 84, 125, 171–173, 218, 258, 275
 Scheler, Max 84, 123, 136–138, 151–153, 171–172, 174–175, 185, 192, 219
 Schmitz, Kenneth L. 258
 Sedlak, Włodzimierz, Fr. 111, 117
 Seifert, Josef 157
 Semenenko, Piotr 76
 Seńko, Władysław 307
 Siemianowski, Andrzej 31
 Siemianowski, Antoni, Fr. 86, 94, 126, 162, 186, 192, 258, 260, 269, 287
 Sikora, Adam 307
 Sikora, Piotr 292
 Siwek, Paweł SJ 173–174
 Skarga, Barbara 296, 307
 Skoczny, Włodzimierz, Fr. 118
 Skoczyński, Jan 9, 21, 171, 297, 300–301, 306
 Skorowski, Henryk, SDB 256–257
 Skrzydlewski, Paweł 9, 69, 81, 142, 249, 264, 267
 Skrzydlewski, Władysław Bernard, OP 253, 260–261,
 Skrzypek, Marian 307

- Skubała-Tokarska, Zofia 20 202–203, 208–210, 220, 234–236, 274
- Skwarczyńska, Stefania 196
- Słomka, Marek, Fr. 233 Struve, Henryk 20, 170
- Słowacki, Juliusz 272 Strzemiński, Władysław 199
- Słupecki, Jerzy 20 Strzeszewski, Czesław 249, 256–257, 261, 280, 284
- Smith, Adam 168 261, 280, 284
- Smith, Barry 34 Styczeń, Tadeusz, SDS 27, 39, 82, 90, 138, 153–155, 157–161, 175–176, 258–259, 266, 284, 286
- Smoluchowski, Marian 103
- Sobociński, Bolesław 24, 53, 107, 219, 227, 301 Suárez, Francis, SJ 52, 148, 299
- Sochoń, Jan, Fr. 56, 64, 67, 131, 203, 210, 224, 280, 284, 292
- Sołtys, Andrzej, Fr. 68
- Sołtysiak, Marek, Fr. 86, 94
- Sowiński, Sławomir 268
- Spaemann, Robert 157, 169, 287
- Spencer, Herbert 124
- Spinoza, Baruch 312
- Srzednicki, Jan 32
- Stachewicz, Krzysztof 11, 69, 87, 162, 167–168, 187, 189, 258, 260, 269
- Stawrowski, Zbigniew 140, 163, 258, 260, 268
- Steenberghen, Fernand, van 310
- Stefańczyk, Andrzej 311
- Stepa, Jan, Fr. 53, 59, 102, 104–105, 217, 220, 256, 262–263, 275–276, 302
- Stępień, Antoni Bazyli 21, 27–29, 39, 54–55, 60, 65–66, 76, 81–83, 90–91, 94, 126–127, 139–141, 177, 198, 203, 207–208, 218, 226, 241, 280, 283, 290, 301
- Stępień, Katarzyna 69, 81, 250, 255, 264, 268
- Stępień, Tomasz, Fr. 69, 224
- Stonert, Henryk 32
- Straszewski, Maurycy 302
- Strauss, Erwin 85, 91
- Stróżewski, Władysław 28–29, 55, 62, 126–127, 152, 162, 184, 192, 198, 202–203, 208–210, 220, 234–236, 274
- Sułkowski, Mariusz 268
- Surowiecki, Wawrzyniec 76
- Surzyn, Jacek 318
- Swieżawski, Stefan 10, 16, 21, 27–29, 54–55, 59–61, 65, 127, 198, 218, 241, 279–280, 296, 300, 303, 309, 311–312, 314
- Szałata, Kazimierz 11, 53
- Szałek, Piotr K. 312
- Szczerbińska-Polak, Małgorzata 190
- Szczucki, Lech 307
- Szczyrba, Sławomir, Fr. 224
- Szlachta, Bogdan 254–255, 267–268
- Szostek, Andrzej, MIC 27, 39, 82, 138, 153, 155, 158–159, 161, 176
- Szubka, Tadeusz 30–31, 39, 43, 69, 176, 243
- Szuman, Stefan 199
- Szumera, Grzegorz, Fr. 68
- Szydłowski, Marek 30
- Szydłowski, Piotr 253
- Szymaniak, Agata 253
- Szymańska, Maria 65
- Szymański, Antoni, Fr. 252, 256–257, 261, 267, 275–276
- Szymeczko, Jan, Fr. 170
- Szyszkowska, Maria 11, 252
- Ślaga, Szczepan Witold, Fr. 89, 114, 117
- Śleziński, Krzysztof 33

- Ślipko, Tadeusz, SJ 15, 39, 126, 131, 141, 148–151, 157, 160–162, 174, 178–181, 191, 258
- Śniadecki, Jan 102
- Śniadecki, Jędrzej 102
- Śnieżyński, Krzysztof, Fr. 69, 238
- Świercz, Piotr 268
- Świętorzecka, Kordula 24, 31–32, 35, 43, 229
- Świeżyński, Adam, Fr. 69, 89, 118, 242
- Taranczewski, Paweł 203, 208–209, 211–212
- Tarasiewicz, Paweł, Fr. 69, 264–265, 292
- Tarnogórski, Czesław 11
- Tarnowski, Karol 57, 94, 126, 136, 163, 185, 192, 220, 235–237, 244, 274, 287–288
- Tarski, Alfred 20, 28
- Tatarkiewicz, Władysław 51, 196, 198, 253, 300–301, 307
- Temistios 70
- Teodorowicz, Józef, Fr. 256
- Tes, Urszula 271
- Theodoric of Chartres 317
- Thomas Aquinas 15, 24, 29, 35–37, 52–53, 55–56, 58–61, 65–66, 70, 77, 79, 84, 90, 92, 94, 102, 117, 123, 125, 127, 135, 137, 147–148, 162, 182, 197, 218, 220, 222–225, 227–228, 236, 239–240, 250, 255, 261, 265, 298–299, 303, 305, 307–308, 310, 314, 316–318
- Tischner, Józef, Fr. 15, 57, 66–67, 85–86, 91, 94, 126–127, 136, 138–141, 155–157, 160–161, 163, 187–189, 192, 203, 211–212, 219, 234–238, 240–241, 258–260, 274, 291
- Tkaczyk, Marcin, OFMConv 20, 27, 43, 243
- Tkocz, Zygmunt 253
- Tokarz, Franciszek, Fr. 311
- Tomanek, Roman, Fr. 31, 43, 230
- Tomasik, Henryk, Fr. 310
- Trypuz, Robert 43
- Trzęsicki, Kazimierz 30
- Tupikowski, Jerzy, CFM 69
- Turek, Józef, Fr. 29, 39–40, 116–117
- Turowicz, Jerzy 241, 303
- Twardowski, Kazimierz 20, 127, 218–219, 298–299, 306
- Tyszczyk, Andrzej 190
- Ueberweg, Friedrich 303
- Urban, Marek, CSsR 295, 317
- Usowicz, Aleksander, CM 218
- Vattimo, Gianni 196
- Virilio, Paul 196
- Voegelin, Eric 250
- Wais, Kazimierz, Fr. 53, 58, 76, 102–105, 108, 125, 217, 220, 299, 302
- Walczak, Monika 30, 43, 69, 94, 223
- Wald, Berthold 250
- Walicki, Andrzej 296, 307
- Wallis, Mieczysław 199
- Wąsik, Wiktor 300, 305, 307
- Waśkiewicz, Hanna 254–255
- Wawrzyniak, Andrzej, Fr. 55, 159, 182
- Wciórka, Ludwik, Fr. 113, 134–135, 140, 219
- Węgrzecki, Janusz 138, 268
- Weingartner, Paul 37
- Weryho, Władysław 297–298
- Whitehead, Alfred North 36
- Wicher, Władysław, Fr. 174

- Więcowski, Andrzej 10
Wielecki, Krzysztof 256–257, 268
Wielgus, Stanisław, Fr. 255, 266, 310, 312
Wielomski, Adam 262–263
Wierzbiński, Alfred Marek, Fr. 82, 158, 161, 258–259
Wierzchosławski, Rafał 30, 43
Windelband, Wilhelm 172
Wistuba, Halina 284, 286
Witkiewicz, Stanisław 196–197
Witkiewicz, Stanisław Ignacy (Witkacy, pseud.) 197
Witwicki, Władysław 199
Włodek, Zofia 307
Wojciechowski, Tadeusz, Fr. 112, 132–134, 136, 140
Wojcieszek, Krzysztof Andrzej 68
Wójcik, Kazimierz 310
Wójcik, Wiesław 33
Wojtkiewicz, Czesław, MIC 26, 35
Wojtyła Karol, Fr. (*See also* John Paul II) 55, 59, 63, 65, 82, 85, 109, 118, 126–127, 129, 136–142, 151–153, 156–159, 162–163, 174–176, 185–186, 192, 203, 212, 218, 225, 253–254, 258–259, 266, 279, 284–287
Wojtysiak, Jacek 27, 57, 64, 67–68, 83, 92–94, 142, 161–162, 219, 230, 242–243
Wolak, Zbigniew, Fr. 24–25, 33, 35–36, 38, 41, 43, 92, 302
Wołek, Artur 268
Woleński, Jan 9, 20–21, 24, 35, 40–41, 93, 242, 297, 301, 306
Wolicka (Wolicka-Wolszleger), Elżbieta 81, 210
Wolsza, Kazimierz, Fr. 31, 37, 69, 94, 230
Workowski, Adam 236, 244
Woroniecki, Jacek, OP 52–53, 58, 125, 146–148, 157, 170, 252, 258, 275, 302–305
Wóycicki, Aleksander, Fr. 256
Wright, Georg Henrik, von 28
Wróblewski, Zbigniew 43, 69, 117, 136
Wroczyński, Krzysztof 56, 64, 255, 268
Wrzeszcz, Zofia 11
Wszółek, Stanisław, Fr. 68–69, 88, 233
Wybraniec-Skardowska, Urszula 20
Wyszyński, Stefan, Fr. 126, 253, 256, 257
Zaborski, Władysław, SJ 311
Zalewski, Sylwester 25, 35, 42
Zawirski, Zygmunt 20, 25, 107
Zdybicka, Zofia Józefa, USJK 11, 42, 55, 63, 65, 80, 92, 127–128, 184, 203, 206–207, 218, 220–224, 241–242, 279, 281
Zegarliński, Stanisław, Fr. 254
Zembrzuski, Michał 69, 84, 296, 316
Zhyrkova, Anna 318
Zieliński, Andrzej 230
Zieliński, Edward Iwo, OFMConv 11, 310
Ziemba, Maciej Stanisław 311
Ziemiański, Stanisław, SJ 55, 58, 62, 78, 90, 92, 113, 218, 221, 225
Ziemiński, Ireneusz 68, 142, 219, 242, 244
Ziemski, Piotr 21
Zimmerman, Kazimierz, Fr. 256
Znamierowski, Czesław 25
Znaniński, Florian 25
Zon, Józef 117
Zuziak, Władysław, Fr. 95, 123, 126, 136, 140, 162, 186–187, 268, 292

INDEX OF NAMES

Zwoliński, Andrzej, Fr. 256–257, 268	Żółkiewski, Stefan 199
Zykubek, Andrzej 117	Żychliński, Aleksander, Fr. 52, 58
Żegleń, Urszula 30–31, 57, 81	Życiński, Józef, Fr. 22, 33, 39, 57, 66, 87–88, 92, 95, 118, 135, 142, 158, 219, 230–233, 235, 240, 289, 291
Żeleźnik, Tadeusz 70	

