

 <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-2710-6521>

Olha Honcharenko

National Academy of the State Border Guard Service of Ukraine
named after Bohdan Khmelnytskyi

Philosophy of education in Lviv-Warsaw School. Twardowski's and his students' philosophical conceptions of education

Abstract

Filozofia edukacji w szkole lwowsko-warszawskiej. Filozoficzne koncepcje edukacji Twardowskiego i jego uczniów

Wspólnym elementem charakterystycznym dla filozofii uprawianej w ramach szkoły lwowsko-warszawskiej (dalej: SLW) było nie tylko wymaganie jasnego i ścisłego myślenia, ale również zespół przekonań na temat filozofii i jej roli w życiu człowieka i społeczeństwa. Oznacza to, że SLW wypracowała pewną filozoficzną koncepcję edukacji. Potwierdzenia takiego stanu rzeczy dostarczają efekty badań prowadzonych nad: (i) pedagogicznymi aspektami filozofii Kazimierza Twardowskiego, (ii) filozoficznymi aspektami pedagogiki jego uczniów – Bogdana Nawroczyńskiego i Kazimierza Sośnickiego, (iii) ideą uniwersytetu i edukacji filozoficznej w SLW. Niemniej nie są prowadzone badania nad jednolitym ujęciem filozofii edukacji w SLW. Celem tego artykułu jest próba rekonstrukcji filozofii edukacji w SLW. Osiągnięcie tego celu przewiduje wyjaśnienie roli Twardowskiego w rozbudowie filozofii edukacji w SLW i wyznaczenie filozoficznych koncepcji edukacji w pracach jego uczniów.

Słowa kluczowe: filozofia edukacji, szkoła lwowsko-warszawska, Kazimierz Twardowski, Aleksander Kulczycki, Bogdan Nawroczyński, Kazimierz Sośnicki, Jakim Jarema

Keywords: philosophy of education, Lviv-Warsaw School, Kazimierz Twardowski, Oleksandr Kulchytskyi, Bogdan Nawroczyński, Kazimierz Sośnicki, Yakym Yarema

Introduction

The researchers usually associate Lviv-Warsaw School (LWS) with analytic philosophy, comparing its achievements to those of the Vienna Circle or British Analytical School.¹ The representatives of LWS have recognized their affiliation with the analytical tradition in philosophy as well.²

However, along with the recognition of their belonging to analytical philosophy, LWS members mentioned another essential feature that united them. In particular, Izydora Dąmbska wrote that Twardowski's school was like ancient philosophy school, which not only exchanged ideas and formed the theoretical views, but raised character and left its mark on students' life attitude (Dąmbska, 1948, p. 17). Such a characteristic of the Polish LWS representative has been spread to the whole LWS by her student Jan Woleński. In his opinion, the main uniting issue in LWS was the set of beliefs on philosophy and its importance in human life and society (Woleński, 1986, p. 243). The founder of LWS himself pointed to this feature in his autobiography. As Kazimierz Twardowski admitted, his school was distinguished by the clearness and precision of its philosophical style. But more important in life he considered the behaviour relevant to this style, as dignity of actions is more obvious than dignity of thinking (Twardowski 2014, p. 46). That is why he "used to glorify philosophy not only as the queen of sciences, but also as a guide to human life" (Twardowski, 2014, p. 47).

The common for LWS demand of clear and precise thinking, as well as treating philosophy as a drill of forming a person and changing his/her way of life, indicates the presence in LWS its philosophical concept of education. This idea has evidence. In scientific discourse philosophical aspects of pedagogy by Kazimierz Twardowski (Kleszcz, 2015; Traczykowski, 2016) and his students – Bogdan Nawroczyński (Gajdamowicz, 2012; Nowakowska-Siuta, 2018), Kazimierz Sośnicki (Gajdamowicz, 2012; Leś, 2018), as well as LWS's works on the idea of the university (Dombrowskyi, 2006; Torczyńska, 2014) and philosophy education

¹ For example, the Ukrainian philosopher Yaroslav Shramko attributes LWS, including Kazimierz Twardowski, Jan Łukasiewicz and Alfred Tarski to analytical philosophers along with Gottlob Frege, George Moore, Ludwig Wittgenstein, leading representatives of the Vienna Circle, Oxford School of Language Analysis and most post-war American philosophers (Shramko, 2011, p. 11). This also see in: Brożek, Chybińska, Jadacki & Woleński, 2016; Jadacki, 2009; Skolimowski, 1967; Szaniawski, 1989; Woleński, 1989.

² For example, the LWS follower, especially of Kazimierz Ajdukiewicz ideas, Józef Maria Bocheński defined analytical philosophy as philosophy which was practiced by Karl Popper, Willard Van Orman Quine, Alfred Jules Ayer, Paul Weingarten and in Poland by Kazimierz Ajdukiewicz, Tadeusz Kotarbiński, Jan Łukasiewicz (Bocheński, 2008, p. 150). This also see in: Ajdukiewicz, 1985, pp. 252–253.

(Czarnota, 2015; Maciołek, 2015) have been examined. Yet, there is no integrated research on the philosophy of education in LWS. Although such study would have greatly expanded knowledge of LWS and initiated a new trend in philosophy of education – philosophy of education in LWS.

The aim of the article is reconstruction of the LWS philosophy of education. Achieving this aim involves:

- finding out Twardowski's role in the philosophy of education development in LWS;
- defining philosophical conceptions of education in his students' works.

There were several dozen scholars in LWS who worked at the intersection of philosophy and pedagogy. Therefore, one article can concentrate only on their most important achievements. Stepan Ivanyk's research "The Ukrainian Philosophers in Lviv-Warsaw School" (Ivanyk, 2014) determines examining philosophy of education in LWS in the light of achievements that were made by the representatives of two branches – Polish and Ukrainian.³

1. Philosophy and pedagogy of Kazimierz Twardowski

1.1. Philosophical foundations of pedagogy

At Philosophy Faculty of Lviv University, along with the philosophical sciences, Kazimierz Twardowski taught general didactics (Twardowski, 1902/1903).

He also worked for some time at the secondary school. The result of this work was the textbook "Basic concepts of didactics and logic for use in teacher seminaries and private teaching" (1901). Twardowski wrote this manual because students of pedagogical seminars needed such guidance in their future pedagogical work. This manual is clear and precise. It is serious attempt to make didactic scientific and review its main concepts, such as: "studying", "curriculum", "form of studying", "teaching method", "educational studying". In this manual, Twardowski defined psychology, logic, and ethics as an auxiliary science of didactics. According to the philosopher, psychology is the most important due to the laws of mental life which it studies. Awareness of these laws is required of the teacher to influence students' mental development. The

³ According to Jan Woleński's definition of "Lviv-Warsaw School" and Stefan Zamiezky's definitions of "Lviv-Warsaw School" and "Twardowski's student", Stepan Ivanyk has proven belonging to Lviv-Warsaw school of such Ukrainian philosophers as Stepan Baley, Havryil Kostelnyk, Myron Zarytskyi, Yaroslav Kuzmiv, Oleksandr Kulchytskyi, Stepan Oleksiuk, Milena Rudnytska, Ilarion Svientsitskyi, Volodymyr Yurynets, Yakym Yarema (Ivanyk, 2014).

value of ethics for didactics was explained by the scholar by the importance for the teacher of knowing moral principles and obeying them in students' moral education. He argued for the role of logic in didactics by the need to transfer to students only true knowledge and teach them to express their true judgments independently (Twardowski, 1901, p. 12). The main idea of Twardowski's didactic is that studying is not a passive reflection of reality but an active creation of knowledge. Therefore, first of all students need to become familiar with teaching methods, because they need tools for independent learning and knowledge construction. The philosopher was an advocate of educational studying (Twardowski, 1901, p. 214).

Twardowski outlined his views on education in the work "About the concept of education" (1911). The philosopher has defined psychology and ethics as an auxiliary science of education theory. According to him, psychology shows to theory of education a way of training the will by forming an ability to make the right decision, and ethics – indicates what the right decision depends on (Twardowski, 1992a, p. 417). Twardowski's idea that there is no moral system that would give a student universal recipes in his or her moral life has significant educational value. The only thing moral education can address is autonomous student's opinion.

It is necessary to pay attention to Twardowski's speech of 3 November 1901. In this speech, the philosopher says that education can and should become something greater for man than just a means of subsistence. Education can and should bring up a person to the highest level of intellectual and moral culture. Society must take care of it (Twardowski, 1992b, p. 402). Twardowski supported egalitarianism. He believed that education should be accessible to everyone and under any circumstances. Educational courses, libraries, theatres, popular science books, general university lectures should be at the service of all people. This Twardowski's speech goes back to Aristotle's idea of free time (comp. Aristotle, 1944, b. 7). Aristotle divided all human life into occupations and leisure, war and peace, and all human activities – necessary and useful and partly wonderful occupation. The philosopher believed, that preference can be given to war for peace, to occupation for leisure, to necessary and useful for beauty. However, Aristotle's leisure pedagogy was intended to teach spending free time only a small part of the policy population – those for whom the others worked. Twardowski's leisure pedagogy has acquired another aim – to teach everyone how to use their free time.

1.2. The idea of the university

Kazimierz Twardowski's speech "The Majesty of the University" is dedicated to the idea of the university (1933). The philosopher had concerns about society's depreciation of the role of higher education. In his opinion, the university should, under all circumstances, fulfil its direct function: teach to create, not to consume knowledge. Only under these circumstances the highest spiritual values can be achieved. Therefore, serving to the objective truth Twardowski attributed to the aim of the university and unity of research and learning – to its essential feature. The philosopher defined the aim of the university as teaching to scientific thinking. The university mission fulfilment Twardowski associated with spiritual autonomy as financially the university always depends on its funds. At the same time, the LWS founder did not deprive the university of influence on public life. He considered youth education and the publication of scientific works its manifestations. Thus, the philosopher denied university isolation from society. Twardowski attached great importance to the academic freedoms. He believed that only university's dedication to objective truth can develop the ability of young people to interact in such a way where mutual interest will prevail individual one. Lecturer's dignity Twardowski associated with serving to the objective truth and its dissemination among young people and society. According to the philosopher, lecturer's dignity involves high intellectual and moral culture. Twardowski could not imagine university dignity without philosophy, which played a unique role in university education. He called philosophy "the leading star of sciences" as it awakens criticism, teaches clarity and precision, protects from fictional myths and intoxicating nebulae (Twardowski, 1933).

1.3. Philosophy and its importance in human life and society

Kazimierz Twardowski considered philosophy education as a vital part of general human education (Twardowski, 1904, p. 241). He distinguished two stages in teaching philosophy: philosophy propaedeutic at the secondary school and philosophical studies at the high school. The aim of philosophy propaedeutic at the secondary school he defined as developing of logical thoroughness, critical thinking, learning precision of thinking, promoting self-cognition (Twardowski, 1927a, p. 178). Philosophical studies at the high school, according to the philosopher, involved the development of intellectual culture of society, especially those areas that required research. The aim of philosophical education in high school Twardowski defined as the development of scientific thinking, expanding scientific worldview, deepening understanding of the problems (Twardowski, 1935, p. 3). In studying philosophy, the scholar gave the impor-

tant role to history of philosophy. However, he did not consider it appropriate to begin studying philosophy with history of philosophy. The philosopher suggested only combining studying philosophy with history of philosophy (Twardowski, 1927b, p. 173). In studying philosophy, Twardowski emphasized the importance of classical and modern languages knowledge and the need for translations of philosophical works. The basis of philosophical education he defined as non-philosophical knowledge. The scholar suggested studying philosophy on the basis of the analytical method, because he believed that only knowledge of particular philosophical problems can help understand them in general. (Twardowski, 1927b, pp. 173–174). Twardowski put forward an extra requirement to the students of Philosophy Faculty: in addition to studying philosophy, they must also promote it: “They must be not only representatives of philosophy, but also its apostles!” (Twardowski, 1927c, p. 163). Teaching philosophy Twardowski reasoned as a certain way of thinking and a certain way of action formation.

2. Philosophical conceptions of education in Twardowski’s students’ works

2.1. Oleksandr Kulchytskyi

Oleksandr Kulchytskyi defined philosophical anthropology the basis of pedagogy. The philosopher reasoned this as follows: since philosophical anthropology in the process of personality cognition cannot skip the problem of worldview, and pedagogical anthropology in the process of worldview formation cannot skip the problem of personality, from this point of view philosophical anthropology makes the basis for educational studying (Kulchytskyi, 1973, p. 31).

In the context of justification of philosophical and anthropological grounds of pedagogy, Kulchytskyi made an analysis of concepts such as “worldview”, “personality”, “person”, “consciousness”, “I”. For example, philosopher considered the concepts “personality” and “person” identical. He opposed person to thing. He attributed such features as unity, quality, activity, teleology, self-preservation, self-development to person and totality, quantity, passivity, mechanistic nature, indifference – to thing. From this contrast the philosopher concluded that thing is a purely material reality space, while person is certain clarity, activity, expediency, self-worth. Thus, the concept “person” has more metaphysical than psychological content. Therefore, personality traits are both physical and mental. Kulchytskyi defined “I” as an axis of a person. He did not

treat “I” as a subject matter of psychology. He believed, that “I” can be only considered metaphysically (Kulchytskyi, 1949, p. 43). For this reason education requires an individual approach.⁴

The university mission Kulchytskyi associated with research activities, autonomy, academic freedoms, communication. In his opinion, the university should be independent from politics. Although university can influence changes in politics by its scientific progress (Kulchytskyi, 1965, p. 98). In university teaching Kulchytskyi focused on students’ interests and organized discussion seminars and studio groups. His image of the university was open for society and its needs (Kulchytskyi, 1970, p. 92).

The scholar examined leisure pedagogy through the prism of rethinking time in the era of machines. He believed, that for human time should not become only money. Time should be a means that will help a person not to lose oneself, and the best he or she has in himself or herself, “*that having time means more than making money, having time means having a culture in the proper sense of the word*” (Kulczycki, 1937, pp. 20–21). This means that it is vital in the contest between civilization and culture not to devastate man’s inner world.

2.2. Bogdan Nawroczyński

Bogdan Nawroczyński defined philosophy of culture as the basis of pedagogy. In his work “Spiritual life. Essay on philosophy of culture” (1947) the scholar defined a spiritual life as a subject matter of philosophy of culture. That is only the internal aspect of culture. According to Nawroczyński, the spiritual life develops between two poles: that which exists and which does not exist but must – a world of normative values. He closely associated spiritual life with education of a man through cultural actions and products. In his opinion, education as a product is human culture, while education as an action is introduction of a man into the world of absolute values (Nawroczyński, 1947). Therefore, Nawroczyński interpreted Twardowski’s pedagogical realism as the unity of real and ideal factors in education. “Spiritual life. Essay on philosophy of culture” by Nawroczyński marks a certain limit of his work: interwar period of autonomous development in pedagogy and postwar period of competition for one’s own views in terms of Soviet domination in Poland. This work is the key to understanding Nawroczyński’s philosophy of education.

⁴ This idea can also be observed in Kulchytskyi’s interpretation of “unequal equality” principle which was expressed by the Ukrainian philosopher Hryhorii Skovoroda as recognition of personality uniqueness and natural right to development. In such a way Kulchytskyi intended to prove that human conception by Skovoroda was antithesis to Marxism-Leninism human conception (Kulchytskyi, 1985, pp. 45–46).

In pedagogy of culture context, one should distinguish Nawroczyński's "Let's seek a human" (1964). In this work the scholar urged teachers to look at a person not from the position of an anthropologist, psychologist, sociologist, economist or lawyer, but a humanist. If an educator pays more attention to teaching methods than to the person, he or she begins to disappear, "he or she is replaced by some fragments, some schemes" (Nawroczyński, 1968, p. 186). To prevent this, Nawroczyński suggested teachers "meeting" with a person in the educational area. He perceived the meeting as a spiritual fact that cannot be organized or planned, but only found in the person and his or her cultural products (diaries, written works).

The scholar defined concepts analysis as a prerequisite for scientific pedagogy. In particular, in his paper "Do we lecture, teach or instruct?" (1920) he analysed such didactic concepts, as "lecturing", "teaching", "studying", "formative studying", "educational studying". Thus, he wanted to show how terminological inaccuracy affects teaching methods. According to the scholar, lecturing is expression of a certain spiritual content that requires a person capable of the abovementioned actions, however, does not provide the person to whom it is directed⁵; teaching is transfer of knowledge and skills, which requires a person capable of the abovementioned actions, and provides a person to whom it is directed; studying is teacher-student interaction; formative studying is teacher-student interaction that involves intellectual development of the latter; educational studying is teacher-student interaction that involves intellectual and moral development of the latter. Therefore, Nawroczyński defined lecturing only as one of the forms of teaching, teaching – only as a part of studying, formative studying – better than teaching and educational studying – the most perfect. Educational studying is school didactics reality and the prospect of university didactics (Nawroczyński, 1920).

Nawroczyński denied the view that coercion is exclusively sign of old education, and freedom – of new one. In his opinion, the concepts "freedom" and "coercion" are polysemic. There are positive and negative freedom, internal and external coercion. Positive freedom is internal mastering of a man by himself or herself, his or her temperament, nature. Negative freedom is depriving a person of self-control, such as discipline at school. Internal coercion

⁵ Bogdan Nawroczyński observed the tradition of defining didactic acts by lecturing only on the former Polish lands annexed to the Russian Empire. He reasoned such a tradition by treating lecturing as the only teaching method at school and by the spread of Russian terminology, according to which the verb "преподавать" meant the action as more important than the verb "to teach". Thus, Polish "wykładanie" is the closest translation of Russian "преподавать" (Nawroczyński, 1920, p. 54). It is worth noting, that in Ukraine teachers still use the concept "lecturing" to define the action of "reading a lecture".

is realized by a person himself or herself when he or she strives to achieve certain goals. External coercion is committed to a person by others that he or she has achieved certain goals. Since the aim of education is human becoming, it involves, according to Nawroczyński, both freedom and coercion (Nawroczyński, 1929).

Leisure education Nawroczyński considered an important task of society. He believed that one should be taught to use his or her free time. In this way, one will become a real person, not an idle lazybones. According to the scholar, the human world is created not only by knowledge and technology, but also by dreams – the beginnings of any activity. Nawroczyński considered mass society not as a society of utility and culture compromise, but as a democratic society in which everyone works and enjoys their free time (Nawroczyński, 1987).

2.3. Kazimierz Sośnicki

Kazimierz Sośnicki defined pedagogy as philosophical science. In his paper “How to understand philosophical pedagogy?” (1946) the scholar has proven the necessity of philosophical sciences for pedagogy, since he believed that its absolute autonomy leads to scepticism and dogmatism in the pedagogical researches.⁶ By the method of philosophical pedagogy, Sośnicki defined description and comparison. According to the philosopher, only through these methods pedagogical studies will rise above particular philosophical views and avoid the domination of any one of them. His idea of the philosophical pedagogy structure was similar to the pedagogy one. He covered individual issues of didactics and upbringing with the notion of “generality” in the meaning of metatheories concerning particular pedagogical systems (Sośnicki, 1998a).

Sośnicki significantly expanded the scientific basis of pedagogy. Metatheory of didactics he defined psychology, psychology of thinking, neurophysiology, logic, epistemology, cultural sciences, sociology (Sośnicki, 1959, pp. 29–30); and metatheory of education – anatomy, pathology, developmental psychology, psychology of education, general psychology (Sośnicki, 1964, p. 9). The scholar avoided a variety of “isms” in pedagogy in favour of building its system on the basis of the analytical method.

⁶ The period when this article was written – 1946 – suggests that Kazimierz Sośnicki tried to defend the auxiliary function of philosophical sciences for pedagogy as opposed to the intentions of Soviet ideologists to give it complete autonomy. Even in the interwar period, the scholar negatively evaluated the state of Soviet pedagogy. He wrote that “the cultural five-year plan” of communists in Russia had replaced the school’s content, spirit and reality with organization and statistics. Such a radical change in education he called a drama and “warning to history” (Sośnicki, 1934, p. 136).

It is important for didactics, in particular, Sośnicki's analysis of the concept "autonomy". According to the philosopher, in didactics this concept is used more intuitively than clearly defined. He agreed, that autonomy and thinking are interrelated. However, he considered this interrelation to be clarified. His clarifications were as follows: autonomy is the property of conscious activity, man-led; thinking is active if managed by a person; thinking is passive if it runs without human participation. Thus, "active" and "passive" can be substituted with "managed by me" or "not managed by me". Instead, the relation between creativity and autonomy Sośnicki considered false. In his opinion, lack of creativity would mean lack of autonomy. Although reproductive activity also requires autonomy, while originality does not always indicate it. Sośnicki has also distinguished quantitative and qualitative assessment of autonomy. He believed that the more points of autonomy are in the activity, the greater autonomy is. And he seemed unlikely to compare the quality of individual points of autonomy. This means that autonomous is one who does not need external guidance to carry out his or her actions. While the time spent on these actions cannot be considered a sign of autonomy. The quantitative definition of autonomy is an important shift for didactics. It reveals that the transfer of ready knowledge does not cause passivity of perception, since even reproductive learning itself requires the performance of independent mental actions. Therefore, one should not underestimate the importance of reproductive learning in didactics, as it also provides opportunities for autonomy (Sośnicki, 1937).

Sośnicki contributed significantly to the theory of education by defining the aim of state education. The scholar considered state education as the formation of readiness for a certain way of behaviour in situations of social collisions. The resolution of these conflicts is possible, according to Sośnicki due to respect for certain principles – ethos. Therefore, the aim of state education should be to develop such abilities that would make a person capable of mutual assistance, co-operation and positive coexistence with others. Thus, instead of the concept of one education for all Sośnicki formed the concept of different education, which common feature is socialization. In this way he overcame polysemy in defining the aim of state education, in particular its one-sided interpretations by pragmatism and psychologism (Sośnicki, 1933).

2.4. Yakym Yarema

The ability of studying and education Yarema associated with their psychological justification. The scholar was convinced that knowledge of mental life helps a teacher to create an image of student, which is close to his or her real "I", and helps the student to cognize himself or herself and realize in life. Therefore, the

philosopher emphasized the importance of the psychological basis for pedagogy. In particular, he defined pedagogical psychology as an auxiliary science of the theory of education. Educational psychology scholar understood as the science of spiritual life and its development of a child (Yarema, 1928, p. 1).

Yarema defined meeting the thirst for knowledge as the aim of studying. The scholar interpreted studying as providing knowledge and developing intellectual abilities. He wrote, that developing of logical thinking, a sense of beauty and good at school will help a person to learn throughout life and overcome any obstacles (Yarema, 2003a, pp. 113–114). Yarema's approach to studying is based on psychology of descriptive thinking. The simplest manifestations of mental life the scholar called impression – passive perception. Perception, he thought as receptive, reproductive and productive activity. With that in mind, Yarema denied the definition of learning as a passive reflection. He believed, that man does not reflect the world, but creates his own image (Yarema, 2003b, pp. 128–129). The scholar was an advocate of education through studying.

Yarema did not support the idea of national education and was critical of political interference in school education. He believed, that it narrows the worldview of a young person and quietly creates the sense of “superiority” against other nations and states. In contrast, the philosopher identified education with moral education. In his opinion, only moral education is the basis of any education, both national and state. Therefore, he defined character formation as the aim of education, and universal values – the educational ideal (Yarema, 1937, p. 7). Among the ethical values, Yarema distinguished honesty. He suggested training the pursuit of honesty by means of benevolent attitude of a teacher towards a student (Yarema, n.d., p. 16).

Yarema opposed transformation of school from an educational establishment to an institution of pragmatic satisfaction of human material needs. He was critical of a one-sided – instrumental – perception of the aim of education. The philosopher was an advocate of education, focused on meeting person's intellectual and moral needs and ensuring his or her individual autonomy.

Conclusion

The reconstruction of philosophical and educational ideas of the LWS representatives allows us to put forward the following inferences:

1. Kazimierz Twardowski considered philosophical sciences – psychology, logic and ethics – as auxiliary sciences of general pedagogy. A characteristic feature of the philosopher's approach to educational issues is the

analysis of concepts. By rethinking the idea of leisure in Aristotle's "Politics", Twardowski launched pedagogy of free time in LWS. The idea of the university, considered by the philosopher, was based on the analysis of the concept of "university dignity". Twardowski's model of philosophical education included the propaedeutics of philosophy and the study of philosophical sciences at the university. Philosophical education he regarded as an integral part of general education. Twardowski's philosophical and pedagogical views determined the trends in philosophy of education in LWS.

2. The LWS representatives strengthened the philosophical component of general pedagogy by such subdisciplines as philosophy of culture (Bogdan Nawroczyński), philosophical anthropology (Oleksandr Kulchytskyi), epistemology (Kazimierz Sośnicki), educational psychology (Yakym Yarema). The essential feature of philosophy of education in LWS is the precision and clarity of the analyzed concepts. The LWS scholars analyzed such concepts of pedagogy as "lecturing", "studying", "teaching", "formative studying", "educational studying", "state education", "freedom", "coercion", "autonomy", "person", "I", "free time".

The study allows us to reach a clear conclusion that LWS considered the main problems of philosophy of education, especially problems of didactics, as well as the idea of university and philosophical culture. Thus, LWS had a certain philosophical conception of education.

But can we call philosophy of education in LWS analytical? In my opinion, philosophy of education in LWS can be examined from an analytical perspective only conditionally. Indeed, the analytical method was an essential feature of philosophy of education in LWS, but along with the concern for the method, much more important for LWS was understanding the value of philosophy in the human and society life. As it is thanks to philosophy that man can achieve perfection. Therefore, the research of a place and significance of philosophy of education in LWS within the Western philosophical and educational tradition in general, and analytical in particular, is an interesting topic for a separate study.

I would like to thank two anonymous reviewers of this journal for their thoughtful remarks.

⁷ This question is quite rightly raised in the article "Ideas of Lviv-Warsaw school in pedagogy on the example of Kazimierz Sośnicki's view" (2018) by Tomasz Leś. The scholar appeals to study the pedagogical achievements of Lviv-Warsaw school, because he believes that they should take a worthy place along with the achievements of the analytical tradition in philosophy of education (Leś, 2018, p. 63).

References

- Ajdukiewicz K. (1985). Kierunki i prądy filozofii współczesnej [The directions and currents of modern philosophy]. In: K. Ajdukiewicz, *Język i poznanie* [Language and cognition], vol. I (pp. 175–195). Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.
- Aristotle (1944). Politics. In: *Aristotle in 23 Volumes*, vol. 21, transl. H. Rackham. Cambridge, MA and London: Harvard University Press; William Heinemann Ltd. Retrieved from: <https://catalog.perseus.org/catalog/urn:cts:greekLit:tlg0086.tlg035.perseus-eng1> (accessed: 4.04.2020).
- Bocheński J. M. (2008). O nawrocie w filozofii [About the turn in philosophy]. In: J. M. Bocheński, *Sens życia i inne eseje* [Life sense and other essays] (pp. 148–152). Komorów: Wydawnictwo Antyk – Marcin Dybowski.
- Brożek A., Chybińska A., Jadacki J. J. & Woleński J. (Eds.) (2016). *Tradition of the Lvov-Warsaw School: Ideas and Continuations*. Leiden and Boston: Brill-Rodopi.
- Dąmbska I. (1948). Czterdzieści lat filozofii we Lwowie 1898–1938 [Forty years of philosophy in Lviv, 1898–1938]. *Przegląd Filozoficzny*, vol. XLIV, no. 1–3, pp. 14–25.
- Dombrovskiy B. (2006). Shkola odnoho vchytelia [One teacher school]. *Filosofska dumka*, no. 5, pp. 67–78.
- Czarnota K. (2015). Jak uczyć logiki – postulaty Kazimierza Ajdukiewicza i ich realizacja [How to teach logic – Kazimierz Ajdukiewicz’s proposals and their implementation]. *Filo-Sofija*, vol. 15, no. 28, pp. 121–124.
- Gajdamowicz H. (2012). Bogdana Nawroczyńskiego świat wartości. Kontekst pedagogiczny [Bogdan Nawroczyński’s world of values. Pedagogical context]. In: S. Sztobryn, M. Wasilewski & M. Rojek (Eds.), *Pedagogika filozoficzna. Metamorfozy filozofii wychowania. Od antyku po współczesność* [Philosophical pedagogy. Metamorphoses of philosophy of education. From Antique to Modern Times], vol. IV (pp. 269–281). Łódź: Wydawnictwo UŁ.
- Gajdamowicz H. (1991). *Teoria wychowania i nauczania Kazimierza Sośnickiego w świetle założeń pedagogiki filozoficznej* [The theory of education and teaching by Kazimierz Sośnicki in the light of philosophical pedagogy assumptions]. Łódź: Wydawnictwo UŁ.
- Jadacki J. J. (2009). *Polish Analytical Philosophy*. Warszawa: Semper.
- Kleszcz R. (2015). Kazimierz Twardowski o kształceniu filozofów [Kazimierz Twardowski about the philosophers formation]. *Przegląd Filozoficzny. Nowa Seria*, ch. 24, no. 1 (93), pp. 53–71.
- Kulczycki A. (1937). *Pedagogika “wolnego czasu” a dom, szkoła i społeczeństwo* [“Free time” pedagogy and home, school and society]. Lwów: Nakładem “Lwowskiej Biblioteczki Pedagogicznej”.
- Kulchytskyi O. (1949). *Narys strukturalnoy psicholohii* [Essay on structural psychology]. Miunkhen: Ukrainkyi Vilnyi Universytet.

- Kulchytskyi O. (1965). Dvi kontseptsii maibutnosti Ukrainskoho Vilnoho Universytetu [Two conceptions for the future of the Ukrainian Free University]. *Suchasnist*, no. 6, pp. 98–103.
- Kulchytskyi O. (1970). U podolanni mezhovoi sytuatsii. Ukrainyski vilnyi universytet – yoho svoieridnist [Overcoming boundary situation. The Ukrainian Free University – its originality]. *Suchasnist*, no. 1, pp. 88–94.
- Kulchytskyi O. (1973). *Vvedennia u filosofichnu antropolohiiu* [Introduction to philosophical anthropology]. Miunchen: Ukrainyski Vilnyi Universytet.
- Kulchytskyi O. (1985). Liudyna za filosofieiu H. Skovorody antytezoiu marksystsko-leninskoj kontseptsii liudyny [A man according to H. Skovoroda's philosophy antithesis of the Marxist-Leninist concept of a man]. In: O. Kulchytskyi, *Ukrainskyi personalizm. Filozofska y etnopsycholohichna synteza* [Ukrainian personalism. Philosophical and ethnopsychological synthesis] (pp. 37–48). Miunkhen and Paryzh: Ukrainyski Vilnyi Universytet.
- Leś T. (2018). Idee Szkoły Lwowsko-Warszawskiej w pedagogice na przykładzie poglądów Kazimierza Sośnickiego [The ideas of the Polish Lviv-Warsaw School in educational research by the example of the Kazimierz Sośnicki's conception]. *Filozoficzne Problemy Edukacji*, vol. 1, pp. 55–64. doi: 10.4467/25450948FPE.18.005.8585.
- Maciołek R. (2015). Kazimierza Ajdukiewicza projekt nauczania logiki [Kazimierz Ajdukiewicz's project of teaching logic]. *Filo-Sofija*, no. 28, pp. 125–145.
- Nawroczyński B. (1920). Wykładamy, uczymy czy nauczamy? [Do we lecture, teach or instruct?]. *Przegląd Pedagogiczny*, vol. XXXIX, no. 1, pp. 49–63.
- Nawroczyński B. (1929). Swoboda i przymus w wychowaniu [Freedom and coercion in education]. In: B. Nawroczyński, *Swoboda i przymus w wychowaniu. Siedem rozpraw pedagogicznych* [Freedom and coercion in education. Seven pedagogical researches] (pp. 11–42). Warszawa: Nasza Księgarnia.
- Nawroczyński B. (1947). *Życie duchowe. Zarys filozofii kultury* [Spiritual life. Essay on philosophy of culture]. Kraków and Warszawa: Księgarnia wydawnicza F. Pieczętkowski i S-ka.
- Nawroczyński B. (1968). Szukajmy człowieka [Let's seek a human]. In: B. Nawroczyński, *O wychowaniu i wychowawcach. Dwanaście studiów pedagogicznych* [About education and educators. Twelve pedagogical studies] (pp. 181–207). Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.
- Nawroczyński B. (1987). Wychowanie do wczasów [Leisure education]. In: B. Nawroczyński, *Dzieła wybrane* [Selected works], vol. I (pp. 287–309). Warszawa: Wydawnictwa Szkolne i Pedagogiczne.
- Nowakowska-Siuta R. (2018). Bogdan Nawroczyński. Jasność i ścisłość myśli pedagogicznej [Clearness and preciseness of a pedagogical idea]. *Ruch Pedagogiczny*, no. 1, pp. 51–67.

- Shramko Y. (2011). Shcho take analitychna filozofia? [What is analytic philosophy?]. *Filosofska dumka*, no. 3, pp. 10–27.
- Skolimowski H. (1967). *Polish Analytical Philosophy*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Sośnicki K. (1933). *Podstawy wychowania państwowego* [Fundamentals of state education]. Lwów and Warszawa: Książnica-Atlas T.N.S.W.
- Sośnicki K. (1934). *Pedagogika i szkolnictwo w Rosji Sowieckiej* [Pedagogy and schooling in Soviet Russia]. *Przegląd Pedagogiczny*, vol. LIII, no. 8, pp. 135–136.
- Sośnicki K. (1937). *Samodzielność* [Autonomy]. *Muzeum*, vol. LII, no. 2, pp. 65–84.
- Sośnicki K. (1959). *Dydaktyka ogólna* [General didactics]. Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich.
- Sośnicki K. (1964). *Istota i cele wychowania* [The essence and objectives of education]. Warszawa: Nasza Księgarnia.
- Sośnicki K. (1998). Jak rozumieć pedagogikę filozoficzną? [How to understand philosophical pedagogy?]. In: S. Wołoszyn (Ed.), *Źródła do dziejów wychowania i myśli pedagogicznej. T. III. Księga druga. Myśl pedagogiczna w XX stuleciu* [Sources to history of education and pedagogical idea. Vol. III. Book Two. Pedagogical idea in XX century] (pp. 97–103). Kielce: Dom Wydawniczy “Strzelec”.
- Szaniawski K. (Ed.) (1989). *The Vienna Circle and the Lvov-Warsaw School*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Torczyńska M. (2014). O deontologii nauczyciela akademickiego w refleksji etycznej Tadeusza Czeżowskiego [About deontology of academic teacher in ethical reflection of Tadeusz Cheżowski]. *Pedagogika Katolicka*, no. 14, pp. 73–84.
- Traczykowski D. (2016). Cele nauczania w myśli Kazimierza Twardowskiego [The objectives of education in Kazimierz Twardowski’s opinion]. *Roczniki Pedagogiczne*, vol. 8 (44), pp. 9–22. doi: [http://dx.doi.org/10.18290/rped.2016.8\(44\).1-2](http://dx.doi.org/10.18290/rped.2016.8(44).1-2).
- Twardowski K. (1901). *Zasadnicze pojęcia dydaktyki i logiki* [The basic concepts in didactics and logic]. Lwów: Polskie Towarzystwo Pedagogiczne.
- Twardowski K. (1902/1903). *Dydaktyka ogólna. Półrocze letnie* [General didactics. Summer semester]. In: *Zbiory cyfrowe archiwum Połączonych Bibliotek Instytutu Filozofii i Socjologii Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego, Instytutu Filozofii i Socjologii Polskiej Akademii Nauk oraz Polskiego Towarzystwa Filozoficznego* [Digital collections of the archive of connected libraries of Institute of Philosophy and Sociology of the University of Warsaw, Institute of Philosophy and Sociology of the Polish Academy of Sciences and the Polish Philosophical Society], akt P-17-12.
- Twardowski K. (1904). *Otwarcie Polskiego Towarzystwa Filozoficznego we Lwowie* [Opening of the Polish Philosophical Society in Lviv]. *Przegląd Filozoficzny*, vol. VII, pp. 239–243.

- Twardowski K. (1927a). Filozofia w szkole [Philosophy at school]. In: K. Twardowski, *Rozprawy i artykuły filozoficzne* [Philosophical studies and articles] (pp. 177–184). Lwów: Księgarnia S.A. “Książnica-Atlas” T.N.S.W.
- Twardowski K. (1927b). Jak studyować filozofię? [How to study philosophy?]. In: K. Twardowski, *Rozprawy i artykuły filozoficzne* [Philosophical studies and articles] (pp. 172–176). Lwów: Księgarnia S.A. “Książnica-Atlas” T.N.S.W.
- Twardowski K. (1927c). O potrzebach filozofii polskiej [About the needs of Polish philosophy]. In: K. Twardowski, *Rozprawy i artykuły filozoficzne* [Philosophical studies and articles] (pp. 129–166). Lwów: Księgarnia S.A. “Książnica-Atlas” T.N.S.W.
- Twardowski K. (1935). Więcej filozofii! [More Philosophy!]. *Ruch Filozoficzny*, vol. 13, no. 1–4, pp. 1–5.
- Twardowski K. (1992a). O pojęciu wychowania [About the concept of education]. In: K. Twardowski, *Wybór pism psychologicznych i pedagogicznych* [Selected psychological and pedagogical works] (pp. 411–422). Warszawa: Wydawnictwa Szkolne i Pedagogiczne.
- Twardowski K. (1992b). Przemówienie prof. dra Kazimierza Twardowskiego, przewodniczącego Zarządu Powszechnych Wykładów Uniwersyteckich, urządzonych staraniem Uniwersytetu Lwowskiego, wygłoszone na inauguracji III roku wykładów w niedzielę dnia 3 listopada 1901 r. [The Speech of Prof. Dr. Kazimierz Twardowski, Head of General University Lectures organized by the efforts of Lviv University, delivered during the inauguration of the third year of lectures on Sunday, November 3, 1901]. In: K. Twardowski, *Wybór pism psychologicznych i pedagogicznych* [Selected Psychological and Pedagogical Works] (pp. 400–405). Warszawa: Wydawnictwa Szkolne i Pedagogiczne.
- Twardowski K. (1997). The Majesty of the University. *Poznań Studies in the Philosophy of the Sciences and the Humanities*, vol. 50, pp. 9–17.
- Twardowski K. (2014). *Autobiografia* [5] [Autobiography [5]]. In: K. Twardowski, *Mysł, mowa i czyn* (pp. II, 35–49). Kraków: Copernicus Center Press.
- Woleński J. (1986). Tadeusz Kotarbiński i szkoła lwowsko-warszawska [Tadeusz Kotarbiński and Lviv-Warsaw School]. *Ruch Filozoficzny*, vol. XLIII, no. 3–4, pp. 243–252.
- Woleński J. (1989). *Logic and Philosophy in the Lvov-Warsaw School*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Yarema Y. (n.d.). *Vykhovuvannia do pravdomovnosti* [Educating to veracity]. In: Arkhiv Yakyma Yaremy. Naukovyi arkhiv Naukovoï biblioteki Natsionalnogo universytetu “Kyievo-Mohylianska akademiia” [Kyiv: Yakyma Yarema’s archive. Scientific Archive of the Scientific Library of National University of “Kyiv-Mohyla Academy”], f 12/1/49, fol. 30 (manuscript).
- Yarema Y. (1928). *Pedagogichna psykholiogiia* [Pedagogical psychology]. Praha: Vydavnytstvo “Siiach”.

- Yarema Y. (1937). *Stupni moralnoho rozvytku* [Stages of moral development]. In: Arkhiv Yakyma Yaremy. Naukovyi arkhiv Naukovoï biblioteki Natsionalnogo universytetu "Kyievo-Mohylianska akademiia" [Kyiv: Yakyma Yarema's archive. Scientific Archive of the Scientific Library of National University of "Kyiv-Mohyla Academy"], f 12/1/48, fol. 19 (manuscript).
- Yarema Y. (2003a). Na pedahohichni temy [On pedagogical topics]. In: S. Yarema (Ed.), *Yakym Yarema* [Yakym Yarema] (pp. 109–117). Lviv: Vydavnychiy tsentr Lvivskoho Natsionalnogo Universytetu imeni Ivana Franka.
- Yarema Y. (2003b). Psykhohrafiia u shkoli [Psychography at school]. In: S. Yarema (Ed.), *Yakym Yarema* [Yakym Yarema] (pp. 118–152). Lviv: Vydavnychiy tsentr Lvivskoho natsionalnogo universytetu imeni Ivana Franka.