Edukacja Filozoficzna 77/2024
ISSN 0860-3839, eISSN 2956-8269
DOI: 10.14394/edufil.2024.0001
ORCID: 0000-0003-1807-7631
ORCID: 0000-0002-3048-3002
ORCID: 0009-0006-1723-1130

Methods and Principles of Philosophical Education in the Lvov-Warsaw School: Introduction to the Special Issue

Anna Brożek
(University of Warsaw)
Ewelina Grądzka
(The Pontifical University of John Paul II in Krakow)
Krzysztof Nowicki
(University of Warsaw)

There are several reasons why the Lvov-Warsaw School (LWS)[1] is a unique component of the early analytic philosophy movement. Firstly, it was founded in Central-Eastern Europe, whereas the analytic movement is commonly stereotyped as an Anglo-Saxon endeavour (with a small continental "breach" in the form of the Vienna Circle). Secondly, the LWS used almost exclusively the Polish language

[1] The city that was the cradle of the school has had an extraordinarily turbulent history over the past 120 years. In 1900, it was a multiethnic capital of a part of the Eastern province of the Austro-Hungarian Empire (Galicia). The Polish majority in the city called it "Lwów," the Ukrainian minority "Lviv," the Austrian administration referred to it as "Lemberg," and the Latin-rooted name "Leopolis" was also in use. During World War I, the city was occupied by the Russians, returned to Austria a year later, and in the years 1918–1919 became the site of tragic fratricidal fighting between Poles and Ukrainians. From 1919 to 1939, it was part of the independent Republic of Poland. At the beginning of World War II, the city was occupied by Soviet Russia, in 1941 it was taken over by Germans, and in 1944, recaptured by the Red Army. As a result of the Yalta Conference, it became part of the USSR. Since 1991, it has been part of independent Ukraine. In this introduction, we use the term "Lvov-Warsaw School" as it is established in the scholarly literature. When referring to the city during the period 1895–1939, we use the Polish name "Lwów." The authors of individual articles employ various conventions regarding spelling, which we have not altered.

in its publications and philosophical discussions, even though English is considered the standard tool of the analytic tradition. Thirdly, thanks to its position of moderate reconstructionism – granting not radical but solid and universally respected criteria of scientific rigour – the LWS maintained a golden mean between two extremes: the scientism of logical empiricism and the traps of descriptivism in philosophy.

Another factor that distinguishes the LWS from other branches of the analytic movement is its nature as a structured *school* rather than a circle or a loose group of scholars. This didactic character is evident in the commonly accepted criterion for being considered a member: the school encompasses its founder, Kazimierz Twardowski, his students, and the students of his students. The defining interpersonal relationship among the members is that of teacher (mentor, master) and student.

Unlike traditional philosophical schools, members of the LWS were not bound by shared substantive views (metaphysical, ethical, political, etc.). The unifying factor between Twardowski and his students was methodological cohesion. Rather than providing his students with a ready-made set of views, Twardowski presented them with problems and methods through which these issues could be analysed and addressed. This methodological foundation is encapsulated in the slogan of "anti-irrationalism": adherence to the principles of clear expression of thought and rigorous justification of views. Contrary to appearances, this approach proved to be a strong unifying force, clearly distinguishing members of the School from obscure and speculative philosophy. However, the LWS imposed no restrictions on research topics and did not pre-emptively dismiss any problems as meaningless.

The LWS, understood as the realization of the didactic principles of its founder, Kazimierz Twardowski, was a great success. It produced dozens of outstanding scholars and provided hundreds of people with a "school of clear thinking." For this reason alone, the foundations of this school are worth reconstructing.

Philosophical education in the LWS, particularly its approach to the didactics of philosophy, has not yet been the subject of separate studies. This volume aims to partially fill this gap. The concept of "philosophical education in the LWS" may encompass several aspects. First, it may refer to how philosophical education was practised. Second, it may pertain to the implementation of practical educational methods. Additionally, it may involve explicit facts or directives expressed

by the School or implicit principles embedded in its activities. Furthermore, it can encompass the development of programmes for propaedeutics of philosophy, including textbooks and teacher training, which directly influenced precollege education and Polish culture. This volume will explore all these perspectives to some extent.

The School and Its Branches

A crucial factor enabling the formation of a philosophical school, understood as a system structured around the teacher–student relationship, is the existence of appropriate institutions where such relationships can develop. Let us thus recall some historical facts about the LWS.

Its origins date back to 1895, when the young philosopher Kazimierz Twardowski, recently habilitated at the University of Vienna, assumed the chair of philosophy in Lwów. Soon after, Twardowski began lecturing on all fundamental philosophical disciplines, as well as the philosophical organon, which he regarded as descriptive psychology and logic. He established the Institute (Seminar) of Philosophy in Lwów to train his more advanced students. Furthermore, Twardowski was instrumental in founding extramural philosophical institutions. In 1904, he established the Polish Philosophical Society as a forum for the exchange of philosophical ideas and discussions. Two periodicals, "Przegląd Filozoficzny" and "Ruch Filozoficzny," were also launched.

Twardowski worked in Lwów for 35 years, educating two generations of students. During this time, he supervised nearly 50 doctoral dissertations, a third of which were authored by women. Thousands of students attended his lectures, many of whom were talented philosophers who pursued academic research after earning their doctorates. Thanks to their excellent methodological training, they were well equipped to advance Twardowski's efforts in philosophy and related disciplines.

It is important to remember that Twardowski's early years in Lwów coincided with the period of partitions in Poland. At that time, universities with Polish as the language of instruction existed only in Lwów and Kraków. Thus, when the University of Warsaw was re-established in 1915, there arose a pressing need to revive philosophical research and studies. Twardowski's students were prepared

to take on this challenge. Jan Łukasiewicz was the first to assume a chair, followed by Władysław Tatarkiewicz, Tadeusz Kotarbiński, Stanisław Leśniewski, and Władysław Witwicki. The Warsaw branch of the philosophical school became exceptionally strong and maintained close ties with its Lwów counterpart. Twardowski's students also secured academic positions in other philosophical centres, including Poznań and Wilno, and after World War II, in Kraków, Toruń, Wrocław, and Lublin, as well as abroad (many members of the School were forced to emigrate). These developments contributed to the formation of several geographical branches of the LWS.

It is also worth noting that Twardowski's educational programme was interdisciplinary and extended beyond what is now strictly considered "philosophy." He incorporated psychology (both descriptive and experimental) within the scope of philosophical study, and his inquiries covered topics that today would be associated with cognitive science. Twardowski was also convinced that addressing any major philosophical problem required considering findings from non-philosophical research fields. He is rightly regarded not only as the father of contemporary Polish philosophy but also as a founding figure of several other disciplines that were emerging as independent fields at the time. Notably, he laid the groundwork for the Lwów School of Psychology and the renowned Polish School of Mathematical Logic.

In the case of psychology, it was Twardowski who instilled methodological rigour (opposing mere "testomania"), conceptual precision, and a humanistic approach. As for mathematical logic, while Twardowski himself did not practise it – focusing instead on philosophical logic – he lectured on the subject as early as 1899. This exposure inspired Jan Łukasiewicz, the discipline's true founder, to pursue this line of research.

The interdisciplinary nature of research and teaching in Twardowski's school enabled his students to develop his programme in various directions. This diversity serves as the basis for categorizing members of the LWS according to their respective disciplines. Furthermore, philosophy as such was practised in distinct ways despite the general methodological unity: logical, psychological, and semiotic branches emerged within the framework of LWS philosophy. Last but not least, let us emphasize that the LWS was a substantial phenomenon, comprising over 150 members within just its first two generations.

Twardowski as a Didactic Genius

Twardowski was undoubtedly a pedagogical genius, willing to devote himself entirely to teaching, even at the expense of his own academic career. He was a "soul hunter," adept at attracting – and more importantly, converting to philosophy – the most talented young minds.

The effectiveness of this "soul hunting" in the early years of Twardowski's career is evidenced by recollections of the Philosophical Circle. As a young professor, he began attending the Circle's meetings regularly and soon became its central figure. From this platform, he inspired others to engage with philosophy, including Łukasiewicz. However, attracting young talent was only the beginning. Every raw diamond needs polishing, and in Twardowski's school, refining young philosophy students was a long and painstaking process.

Twardowski sought to recognize his students' intellectual abilities and guide them in the right (from the methodological point of view) direction. Equally important in his educational approach was cultivating diligence, a passion for research, independent thinking, and determination to undertake tasks – both set by others and by oneself. He also aimed to instil in his students confidence in their abilities and the conviction that they could pursue philosophy without the stigma of provincialism. Finally, he emphasized the principles of rigorous scholarly work, both in conducting research and in evaluating the work of others.

This approach was particularly remarkable given Twardowski's strict discipline in his lectures, avoidance of popular topics, and consistently serious demeanour. He approached his lectures with exceptional dedication, meticulously preparing and refining them as if they were intended for publication. The first of Twardowski's manuscripts were edited and published by Izydora Dąmbska, while others have recently been made available by the continuators of the LWS tradition. Many of Twardowski's preserved lecture notes have been digitized, with the majority also published in the series "Inedita."[2] Though these notes were not prepared by the author with publication in mind and are written using numerous abbreviations, they offer valuable insights into his lecturing style. He began with precise definitions of basic terms, systematically distinguishing various meanings and examining problems from multiple perspectives. When discussing theses, he carefully formulated them and presented arguments both for and against different versions.

[2] K. Twardowski, "Inedita," 9 vols., Academicon, Lublin 2023–2024.

Following Franz Brentano's model, Twardowski sought to gather a close-knit group of students within his seminar. His seminar quickly gained renown, attracting more candidates than he could accommodate. To address this, he introduced a "proseminar," or introductory seminar, to select the most promising students. In this proseminar, participants were required to prepare and submit summaries of classical philosophical texts. These summaries had to be faithful to the original and written as clearly as possible. Selected summaries were read aloud and discussed during meetings. Admission to the main seminar depended on maintaining an excellent attendance record and punctuality, as well as preparing high-quality summaries and a preliminary paper. Twardowski personally read and corrected all summaries, closely monitoring each student's progress. The scale of this effort is evident when considering that the proseminar sometimes had nearly 100 participants. Students recalled that this rigorous training in comprehending philosophical issues and writing philosophical texts had numerous benefits. Firstly, it helped Twardowski identify those with the best understanding and writing skills. Secondly, it prepared students for participation in philosophical societies, particularly for work on the journal "Ruch Filozoficzny," and for careers as philosophy teachers.

Twardowski regarded the role of a philosophy teacher, not only at the academic level, as highly important and serious. He showed a keen interest in secondary-level philosophical education, contributing to the development of programmes for philosophical propaedeutics in Polish gymnasia. He advocated for the important role of philosophy in precollege education as a discipline which integrates and analyses the content of various disciplines, introduces the scientific method, fosters critical thinking, and promotes precision in reasoning. Moreover, he believed philosophy could influence the development of the so-called worldview, making it an essential component of the general education of any intellectual.

Twardowski understood that philosophy needed not only groundbreaking thinkers and brilliant innovators but also editors of philosophical journals, high school teachers, and individuals who could promote philosophical thinking within society. While he did discover a few geniuses, this was not his sole objective.

Members of Twardowski's advanced seminar could consider themselves "chosen." Participation came with both responsibilities and privileges: students had access to a reading room from 7 a.m. to 10 p.m., each entrusted with their own key. This room featured individual desks and housed a collection of books donated by Twardowski from his private library, which had grown to 8,000 volumes by

1930. Twardowski devoted eight to nine hours each day to the seminar, frequently visiting the reading room and engaging with students. A designated consultation hour between noon and 1 p.m. ensured that every seminar participant had direct access to him.

Twardowski educated his students not only through intellectual rigour but also through discipline and willpower. A key instrument of this discipline was the strict set of seminar regulations, which he enforced meticulously. For instance, removing a book from the seminar building was strictly forbidden, and even the slightest delay in submitting a paper was not tolerated. According to an anecdote, seminar participants once pleaded on behalf of a student whom Twardowski had expelled for violating the rules. Twardowski reportedly replied that there were only two possibilities: either the student had not understood the rules, in which case he lacked the necessary intellectual qualifications, or he had understood them and deliberately violated them, which indicated a lack of moral integrity. In either case, the student was unfit to be a philosopher.

The most frequently praised characteristic of Twardowski as a teacher was his fairness. He treated all students equally, regardless of their social or national background or gender. His open-minded approach was a hallmark of his didactic genius. Another defining feature of Twardowski's teaching was his tolerance for differing viewpoints. While it is often noted that he followed Brentano's example – something Twardowski himself frequently acknowledged – there was a crucial distinction between them. Brentano could not tolerate dissenting views, especially when his own ideas were challenged by his students. Twardowski, by contrast, welcomed criticism, provided it was clear and well reasoned. In this respect, he demonstrated far greater intellectual humility than his Viennese mentor. However, his tolerance had its limits: he had no patience for incoherent rambling or baseless speculation.

Didactic Tradition

Twardowski's pedagogical success was made possible by his extraordinary talents and determination, but also because he had the opportunity to teach philosophy in a centre he had built from scratch over nearly 35 years (with only one extended break during World War I, when he still sought to continue his didactic work in

Vienna while also serving as the rector of the Lwów University in exile). These internal and external conditions enabled the emergence of the LWS.

Did Twardowski's students have similar conditions? When it comes to pedagogical abilities and the willingness to dedicate themselves to teaching, the situation varied. Many outstanding educators emerged from Twardowski's school, including Jan Łukasiewicz, Tadeusz Kotarbiński, Tadeusz Czeżowski, Kazimierz Ajdukiewicz, and Izydora Dąmbska. In their academic centres, they sought to create environments similar to what Twardowski had established in Lwów. However, not all of Twardowski's students – despite being excellent scholars – had the necessary didactic skills or were willing to commit to teaching.

Even those who possessed teaching abilities and motivation similar to Twardowski did not always work in favourable external conditions. The years of the LWS activity coincided with turbulent times: two world wars, border changes, and ideological oppression. Such circumstances were not conducive to a stable academic environment. For instance, Ajdukiewicz worked in each of his academic centres for about a decade. When he was appointed to the philosophy chair in Lwów in 1928, remaining there until 1939, the prospects for the development of Lwów philosophy were excellent. However, the Soviet invasion, the closure of Jan Kazimierz University, and the establishment of an ideological parody of an academic institution meant the end of philosophy in Lwów for many decades. After the war, Ajdukiewicz worked for ten years in Poznań, significantly contributing to the development of logical and philosophical research. After a decade, he moved to Warsaw, where his intensive academic and didactic activity was cut short by his premature death.

Even more tragic was the fate of Izydora Dąmbska, for whom teaching philosophy was a life mission. Her habilitation was prepared in 1939 but postponed because of the war. She finally gained the right to lecture in 1946, only to be removed from the university twice – first in the 1950s and then in 1967 – accused by the communist party apparatus of "corrupting students." She was a university professor for only a few years in total, though she continued to hold private seminars for her closest students until the end of her life.

Despite these adversities, the tradition of teaching philosophy (and, let us add, logic) in Twardowski's spirit remains very much alive. Its influence endures in Polish academic centres, where his ideas have been passed down from generation to generation.

The value of the educators from the LWS is also evident in the textbooks they wrote. It is worth remembering that the first book Twardowski wrote in Polish (shortly after arriving in Lwów) was a textbook – *Zasadnicze pojęcia dydaktyki i logiki* [Basic Concepts of Didactics and Logic] (1901) – intended for elementary school teachers. Later, he also wrote a textbook on medieval philosophy. Many of Twardowski's students eagerly and successfully wrote textbooks as well. Ajdukiewicz authored several logic textbooks, as well as an excellent introduction to philosophy (*Zagadnienia i kierunki filozofii* published in English in 1975 as *Problems and Theories of Philosophy*), and a collection of philosophical readings. Kotarbiński is known as the author of *Elementy teorii poznania, logiki formalnej i metodologii nauk* (1929, translated into English as *Gnosiology: The Scientific Approach to the Theory of Knowledge*, 1965) which influenced hundreds of young students of philosophy and the humanities. Unquestionably masterful are Władysław Tatarkiewicz's *Historia filozofii* [History of Philosophy], in three volumes, and *Historia estetyki* [History of Aesthetics], also in three volumes. Numerous examples of such contributions can be found across all generations of the LWS. Twardowski was also the author of the philosophy propaedeutics programme for gymnasium and later high school, which was canonical for at least 15 years (1922–1937). Ajdukiewicz (possibly with the help of Twardowski) was the author of the reformed programme published two years before the war (1937).

Articles in the Present Volume

The present volume is composed of the following parts: original articles, translations of Twardowski's archival texts, a report on a discussion about the teaching of logic, and reminiscences on distinguished educators of the LWS.

In the opening article, *Kazimierz Twardowski on Teaching Philosophy and Philosophical Education*, Ryszard Kleszcz introduces the reader to the wide variety of Twardowski's efforts to improve philosophy teaching, especially at Lwów University (proseminar, seminar, Philosophy Club, library, Open Lectures series), which led to the programme's success and foundation of the LWS. Twardowski, regarded by his students as a figure akin to Socrates, viewed the role of a philosophy teacher not only as one of transmitting knowledge but, above all, one of shaping the students' character. The requirements for becoming a philosophy teacher

were considerably demanding ("be comprehensively trained in both the humanities and the mathematical and natural sciences"). Twardowski believed that propaedeutics of philosophy should focus not on the history of philosophy but rather on logic and psychology (particularly the approach represented by Brentano) to provide an introduction to the scientific method. Finally, Kleszcz acquaints the reader with the "subjects he taught and to which he paid the most attention," like psychology, logic, and medieval philosophy, between 1895 and 1931. Importantly, "for Twardowski, the very practice of philosophy also had a distinct moral dimension," and he was "keenly interested in the problems of pedagogy." Kleszcz concludes his article with an extended reflection on the contemporary relevance of Twardowski's programme for teaching philosophy and offers a choice of ideas worthy of further development.

The third article, written by Wojciech Rechlewicz, entitled *Basic Concepts and Principles of Didactics according to Kazimierz Twardowski*, focuses on the analysis of Twardowski's first publication in the Polish language, namely the handbook *Zasadnicze pojęcia dydaktyki i logiki do użytku w seminariach nauczycielskich i w nauce prywatnej* [Basic Concepts of Didactics and Logic for Use in Teachers' Seminars and Private Study]. Rechlewicz claims that the ideas on teaching and upbringing presented in the book and especially the fact that it is "written in clear and simple language that can serve as an example for contemporary publications in didactics" make the book inspiring even today. Although Twardowski's terminology may now be outdated (e.g., "material education" and "formal education" have been replaced by "knowledge" and "skills"), his approach remains closely aligned with contemporary approaches in Polish didactics. Moreover, Twardowski believed that formal education (skills) is superior to material education (knowledge). Rechlewicz claims that "Twardowski's didactics has features of objectivist paradigms, especially the normative paradigm." Perhaps most surprising to modern readers is Twardowski's belief that not only psychology but also logic serves as an auxiliary science of didactics. Finally, Rechlewicz compares Twardowski's didactics to the approaches of several Polish contemporary educators, such as Wincenty Okoń, Czesław Kupisiewicz, or Franciszek Bereźnicki, emphasizing that one still derives benefits from reading Twardowski's handbook.

The next article, by Anna Drabarek, is entitled *Moral Aspects of Instruction and Education in the Lvov-Warsaw School*. Although ethics was not the primary area of

research for the LWS members, they nonetheless contributed significantly to ethical reflection. Twardowski, a cognitivist in ethics, believed that "judgements and moral norms result from cognitive activity." He was regarded as a sage, akin to Socrates, who led by example and shaped the character of his students by developing moral principles in them. One of his students, Tadeusz Kotarbiński, was the originator of the concept of independent ethics. Another student, Tadeusz Czeżowski, supported this idea, asserting that "the art of skilful judgement should […] be practised and perfected, just like the art of observation." The LWS members also emphasized the need for integrity in scientific research, particularly the need to respect the limits of one's competence and to follow the principle of critical thinking. Additionally, an atmosphere of tolerance for diverse, and at times opposing, views (a "reasonable" tolerance) prevailed among LWS members, along with "the freedom to advocate for it." Such an approach also demanded specific conditions for research. Beyond the scholar's internal freedom (from dogmas, etc.), "the freedom of science as an institution" was necessary. This notion was explicitly emphasized in Twardowski's influential paper *O dostojeństwie uniwersytetu* [On the Dignity of the University]. Finally, Drabarek concludes that the principles of moral aspects of instruction and education are in line with Aristotle's virtue ethics represented nowadays by scholars such as Alasdair MacIntyre and Martha Nussbaum.

In his article titled *"The Most Important Task" and "Great Personal Value": The Role of Teaching and Upbringing in the Activities of Izydora Dąmbska*, Krzysztof Andrulonis offers a general characterization of Izydora Dąmbska's educational philosophy and pedagogical practices. He emphasizes her integration of teaching and upbringing, viewing education as a holistic process that shapes both intellect and character. In particular, the author describes Dąmbska's didactic approach as a blend of axiocentrism (value-centred education) and paidocentrism (student-centred education). This synthesis manifested in her ability to act as both an authoritative guide and egalitarian partner to students, fostering respect without subordination. The article divides Dąmbska's educational activities into three periods: high school teaching until 1939, secret instruction during Word War II, and university-level teaching post-1945. It explores her proposals for curricular reform alongside opinions from students and colleagues who praised her authenticity, moral integrity, reliability, precision of expression, and clarity of thought. The author also highlights Twardowski's influence on Dąmbska's didactic ideals and their Socratic origins.

Aleksandra Gomułczak's article, *Ingarden's Criticism of Twardowski's Philosophical Programme and the Reception of Phenomenology in the Lvov-Warsaw School*, offers a reconstruction of Roman Ingarden's critical attitude towards Twardowski's programme and examines the impact of Ingarden's reservations on the reception of phenomenology within the LWS. The author begins by characterizing the key elements of Twardowski's programme, distinguishing its concept of philosophy, philosophical style (including, among other things, postulates of clarity of speech and minimalism), as well as model of philosophical education. The next section discusses Ingarden's critique of absolute clarity as a valid methodological postulate, arguing that it leads to the neglect of genuine philosophical problems and the exclusion of other philosophical traditions, particularly phenomenology. Ingarden's accusations of Twardowski's lack of systematicity, which, in his view, prevented the formation of a true research community, is also discussed. However, as the author notes, it is doubtful whether fostering such a community, as Ingarden envisioned it, was Twardowski's goal at all. The third part of the paper examines the actual reception of phenomenology in the LWS. The author highlights thinkers such as Władysław Tatarkiewicz, Kazimierz Ajdukiewicz, Tadeusz Czeżowski, Leopold Blaustein, and Józef M. Bocheński, who, contrary to Ingarden's opinion, did not ignore phenomenology but engaged in a critical dialogue with it. Furthermore, Gomułczak points out that Edmund Husserl influenced the School on issues such as antipsychologism, the concept of semantic categories, the theory of signs, expressions, and meanings, the theory of parts and wholes, and the theory of the act, content, and object of representation. The article concludes that although the philosophers of the LWS did not disregard phenomenology, Twardowski's intellectual formation shaped their reception of it.

Another paper, authored by Ewelina Grądzka and Paweł Polak, *The Historical, Pedagogical, and Philosophical Background of Kazimierz Twardowski's Project of Teaching Philosophical Propaedeutics*, is a kind of an introduction to the publication of an English translation of two documents, *Draft of High School Curriculum for Teaching Propaedeutics of Philosophy* and *Memorial of the Polish Philosophical Society in Lvov on the Guidelines of the Curriculum of Propaedeutics of Philosophy in High Schools: Manuscript by Kazimierz Twardowski*, that also can be found in this volume. Twardowski, beyond his engagement at the university level, devoted considerable effort to improving precollege philosophical education, a field

that is often neglected. The authors focus on presenting the context for the three programmes of teaching the school subject of philosophical propaedeutics that were prepared (fully or partly) by Twardowski after Poland regained independence in 1918, and a new educational system had to be established. The authors decide to call the programmes "minimalistic" (1921/1922), "maximalist" (1935) and "pragmatic" (1937). They conclude that, for at least 15 years during the interwar period, Polish students were educated according to Twardowski's ideas (based on the programme from 1921/1922, which allotted three hours per week to philosophy). These ideas were rooted in his personal educational experience at the Austrian gymnasium Theresianum and his studies under the guidance of his influential teacher, Franz Brentano. Therefore, the subject was composed of two pillars: logic and psychology. However, the programme faced criticism and calls for reform. In response, Twardowski prepared an extended version in 1935, which introduced additional areas such as epistemology, ethical issues, aesthetical issues, metaphysical issues, and sociology, aiming to foster the development of the so-called worldview. This programme was eventually rejected and a shorter version, found in Kazimierz Ajdukiewicz's archive, was published as a temporary solution in 1937. Unfortunately, the outbreak of World War II hindered further development of the idea of propaedeutics of philosophy, and after the war, the communist regime eliminated this subject from school.

Additional Documents

The next section of the volume includes translations of Twardowski's two papers on the programme of philosophical education. The *Draft of High School Curriculum…*, prepared in two versions, was found unpublished in Twardowski's archive at the Kazimierz Twardowski Library in Warsaw. The document was originally sent to the Ministry of Religious Affairs and Public Education along with the *Memorial of the Polish Philosophical Society…* as a proposal for the reform and improvement of philosophy teaching in high schools in 1935. In 1932, Janusz Jędrzejewicz's reform had been introduced, and there was a demand for a new programme adjusted to the requirements of the New Education movement and civic upbringing that had inspired the reform. The *Memorial…*, while acknowledging the importance of other philosophical disciplines in shaping a worldview,

maintains that logic and psychology should remain at the core of the propaedeutics of philosophy programme, providing a list of reasons to support that claim. The *Memorial…* was first published in Polish by Ryszard Jadczak in "Edukacja Filozoficzna" in 1988. Since it represents Twardowski's perspective on the importance of teaching philosophy to young people, its translation into the English language was considered significant for this volume.

Another component of the volume is a report on the debate "How to Teach Logic? Diagnosis of the Current State and Prospects of Logical Education in Poland," which was held on 14 January 2024, and organized as part of the celebration of the Sixth World Logic Day at the Faculty of Philosophy, University of Warsaw. It aimed to present the problems associated with the teaching of logic in Poland and to inspire academics to take action to improve logical education. The report was edited by Marek Porwolik.

In the introduction to the discussion on logic, Anna Brożek, Dorota Leszczyńska, and Kordula Świętorzecka highlight the long tradition of teaching logic in Poland, which experienced its greatest flourishing in the 20th century, when Polish logic achieved international recognition. The authors present the institutional context in which mathematical logic was developed and taught in Poland, leading to the establishment of the Warsaw School of Logic. At the same time, they emphasize the role of Kazimierz Twardowski, under whose influence logic in Poland was not limited to mathematical logic, but was understood broadly, encompassing logical semiotics and the general methodology of sciences. Furthermore, the authors argue that the difference of opinion between Łukasiewicz and Ajdukiewicz, on whether to teach mathematical logic or practical logical skills, is not genuine, as both types of education are needed. In the end, they summarize the state of logic education in Poland.

The introduction is followed by eight short papers which focus on various aspects of logic education. Maria Manzano, representative of the Commission on Logic Education (CLE), emphasized in her talk the interdisciplinary nature of logic and its role in the creation and transmission of information. She described the CLE initiative and introduced the European ALFA project, which aims to share experiences among logic teachers. Andrzej Indrzejczak emphasised the importance of teaching logic in the modern world due to the flood of information of varying cognitive value. He argued that a logic course should be attractive, engaging, include numerous practical exercises, and be adapted to the needs of

students in particular disciplines. Tomasz Jarmużek emphasized that a prerequisite for the effective teaching of logic is addressing the question of why and for what purpose it should be taught. He listed both the hidden functions of teaching logic, such as providing employment and building the prestige of the discipline, and its overt functions, such as increasing logical knowledge and skills. Jerzy Pogonowski, in turn, observed that the same problems have persisted in the teaching of logic for years. He emphasized the crucial role of proof methods and metatheoretical issues in the didactics of formal logic. He also noted that the growing connection between logic and cognitive science could lead to an increased importance of logic in academic teaching. Irena Trzcieniecka-Schneider argued while the core curriculum provides for the teaching of logical culture, the necessary information is either absent from textbooks or is presented in a distorted way. In response to these problems, she postulated that texts should be written jointly with representatives of other disciplines to demonstrate the usefulness of logic in a given discipline and that logic education should be introduced as early as possible. Bartłomiej Skowron's paper took the form of a response to five criticisms made by students against formal logic – that it is useless, impractical, too abstract and formal, and that it is too difficult. He outlined several measures to respond to these objections, including the use of technological advances (such as large language models or YouTube) and the demonstration of the normative dimension of logic. Krzysztof A. Wieczorek, meanwhile, drew attention to the lack of modern textbooks on informal logic that offer sufficient examples and exercises. In response to this gap, he proposed creating an online database containing exercises and authentic statements illustrating logical fallacies, which could also serve to integrate the community of logicians. Finally, Marcin Koszowy observed that one of the key elements of teaching logic should be fostering an attitude of logical thinking, which manifests in an effort to improve logical knowledge and skills. He suggested that a list of typical logical attitudes and dispositions, which ought to be the outcome of logical education, should be explicitly stated in the logic curriculum, and he proposed methods for their implementation.

The discussion on logical education is further supplemented by an impressive list of Polish logical textbooks.

The final component of the volume consists of reminiscences of the teaching activities of three distinguished educators of the LWS: Kazimierz Twardowski,

Izydora Dąmbska, and Czesław Lejewski. The reminiscences of the first two coryphaei of the School are preceded by a separate introduction by Krzysztof Nowicki.

A memoir that stands out among the rest is Peter Simons's paper about Czesław Lejewski. While most of the collected reminiscences focus on figures active within the Polish scientific community and are presented from a Polish perspective, Simons's text offers a British perspective on Lejewski's teaching in exile. The author presents the context of Lejewski's work at the University of Manchester and the distinctive features of his teaching style. Simons recalls the content and form of Lejewski's lectures, both from direct experience and secondhand accounts. In the article, he presents a number of Lejewski's philosophical views and their influence on his own philosophical development.

***

Closing these introductory remarks, we would like to announce that the next issue of "Edukacja Filozoficzna" will also be devoted to philosophical education at the Lvov-Warsaw School – a topic that remains vast and far from exhausted.

In this issue, we have sought to explore the issue of philosophical education at the Lvov-Warsaw School from multiple perspectives. To complement this verbal outline, we include photographs of Twardowski among seminarians as well as images of Twardowski's students with their own students. After all, a picture can often convey more than a thousand words.