

 <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-6855-1517>

Dariusz Stępkowski

Wydział Nauk Pedagogicznych
Uniwersytet Kardynała Stefana Wyszyńskiego
d.stepkowski@uksw.edu.pl

Archaeology of the term “kształcenie”. On the history of the 20th century Polish systematic educational science

Abstract

Archeologia terminu „kształcenie”. W sprawie historii polskiej pedagogiki ogólnej w XX wieku

Celem artykułu jest przeanalizowanie znaczenia i zastosowania terminu „kształcenie” w koncepcjach pedagogiki ogólnej w Polsce w XX wieku. W badaniu posłużono się systematyczną analizą historyczno-problemową i metodę archeologiczną M. Foucaulta. W rezultacie stwierdzono, że we wskazanym okresie nastąpiła zmiana w przyporządkowaniu dyscyplinowym terminu „kształcenie” z pedagogiki ogólnej do dydaktyki, czemu towarzyszyło przesunięcie znaczeniowe w stronę instrumentalnie pojętego modelowania jednostki przez nauczanie szkolne. Rozpoznanie i rewizja tego faktu otwierają możliwość przywrócenia terminu i pojęcia kształcenia do polskiej pedagogiki ogólnej jako jednej z jej dwóch podstawowych kategorii, obok „wychowania”.

Keywords: systematic educational science, “kształcenie” (education), M. Foucault’s archaeological method

Słowa kluczowe: pedagogika ogólna, kształcenie, Foucaulta metoda archeologiczna

Introduction

The title of this article uses the term “kształcenie” in reference to systematic educational science as one of the subdisciplines of modern sciences of education. Such a move may seem baffling mainly due to the fact that according to widespread among educators and educational scientists conviction this term refers to didactics, in which it represents (1) the combined activities of teaching and learning and (2) gradual and final effects of these activities (Kupisiewicz, 2005, pp. 24–26; Niemierko, 2007, pp. 34–36; Okoń, 1998, p. 9). This is eloquent proof of how much the term “kształcenie” alienated from the systematic educational nomenclature. Even taking a very cursory look into the past leads to the surprising conclusion that some time ago the narrowly understood didactic status of the term “kształcenie” was not an undeniable axiom (Maliszewski et al., 2019, pp. 36–56). Thus, the following questions can be formulated: (1) are we dealing with didactisation of this term, or with another process, and if so, what is its purpose, and (2) what consequences in systematic educational science has the appropriation of the concept of education by didactics entailed?

I will try to answer these questions by tracking the history of systematic educational science in Poland in the 20th century with the help of the term “kształcenie”. Of course, in this article it is not possible to exhaustively present the origin, reorientation and final deconstruction of systematic educational science. Therefore, I have focused on the concepts of four prominent representatives of Polish educational sciences of the last century in order to trace in an exemplary way the meaning (connotation) and use (denotation) of the term “kształcenie”. However, this will not be a logical and semantic study, but a systematic problem-historical analysis, because I consider the term “kształcenie” as an indication of an important educational question, and not just a word for the purpose of a linguistic breakdown.

In my opinion, researching the 20th-century history of Polish systematic educational science and tracking the word “kształcenie” resemble archaeological searching. This is due to the fact that in the 1970s systematic educational science ceased to exist at all – both as an academic subject and as a research field, becoming a relic of the past. For this reason, in this study, I will additionally use the archaeological method (Scheurich & McKenzie, 2008; see also: Kendall & Wickham, 2003). This method refers to Michel Foucault’s (1972) concept of archaeology of knowledge and enables the study of elusive thought structures – *savoir*, which serve as the foundation of practical-operational and theoretical knowledge, as its epistemological predispositions. In order to designate these structures, M. Foucault uses the French term *connaissance*.

The article consists of three parts. The first will demonstrate the distinctiveness between the Polish term “kształcenie” and the German term *Bildung*. Although this introduction may seem somewhat circuitous, in my opinion, Polish educational sciences cultivate an unjustified belief in the resemblance of these terms, which should be clarified. Resolving this problem would allow to recognise the distinctiveness of both terms. The second part involves a semantic analysis of the term “kształcenie” according to four selected educational concepts by Sergei Hessen, Bogdan Nawroczyński, Bogdan Suchodolski and Wincenty Okoń. With the help of this analysis, the nodal points of involution of systematic educational thinking in the 20th century will be reconstructed. In the third part, the data obtained from the systematic historical and problem analysis will be interpreted through the prism of Foucaultian archaeology of knowledge in order to give a closer look into the changes which occurred in educational thinking in the past period and which still determine the practice of systematic educational science in Poland.

“Kształcenie” is not *Bildung*!

Until around the middle of the 20th century, the term “kształcenie” played an important role in educational nomenclature in Poland. It was one of the two fundamental concepts with the help of which educational interactions were interpreted. The second term was the term “wychowanie”. In the past, both these terms served to convey a complex character that distinguishes a educational activity from other types of human activities, e.g. political, economic, artistic. This complexity is due to the fact that there are always two subjects involved in the implementation of educational interaction, i.e.: a parent/educator/teacher on the one hand, and a child/pupil/student on the other. Each of them performs their own activities, designated namely with the aforementioned pair of terms – “wychowanie” and “kształcenie”.

In this regard the German language is considered classical, in which two separate terms are used to express the complexity of a educational interaction – *Bildung* and *Erziehung*. Apart from Polish, similar pairs occur in many other European languages, although not all, for example: *výchova* and *vzdělávání* (Czech), *výchova* and *vzdelávanie* (Slovak), *воспитание* [vospitanie] and *образование* [obrasovanie] (Russian), *odgoj* and *obrazovanje* (Croatian), *възпитание* [vspitanie] and *образование* [obrasovanie] (Bulgarian), *vaspitanje* and *obrazovanje* (Serbian). Of course, this doubleness has often caused difficulties in determining clear-cut denotation ranges and meanings of both terms and their mutual dependencies.

There are also languages that reflect the complexity of subjects and activities involved in educational interactions through only one term. In Europe, the term is usually derived from the Latin *educatio*. This is the case, for example, of the English *education*, Romanian *educație* or Belarussian *адукацыя* [adu-katsia].

The above does not exclude one more possibility, when in a given language there is both a pair of terms expressing a two-subject and two-activity educational interaction, as well as the equivalent of the Latin *educatio*. Then, however, the above-indicated delimitation and semantic difficulties are even more prominent. This is the state of affairs in the Polish language, in which, apart from the already mentioned terms of “kształcenie” and “wychowanie”, there is also a third term – “edukacja”. I hope that the fact that three terms are available in Polish makes aware of the complexity of the subject we are dealing with, also for other languages.

In Polish, the term “kształcenie” is a neologism, just like *Bildung* in German. This Polish term emerged in the first half of the 19th century. Until recently, it was considered a calque of the German *Bildung*. It seems to me that there were at least two reasons for that: firstly, both terms have similar meanings, and secondly, German Pädagogik (educational sciences) originated earlier than Polish, and from the mid-nineteenth century to the second decade of the twentieth century it dominated in Eastern and Central Europe. The terminology established therein was applied in the field of education in this region of the continent and shaped the current structure of educational scientific thinking (Kultaieva, 2017, pp. 250–260).

The term *Bildung* still constitutes the foundation of German Pädagogik, which raises great difficulties in its assimilation. Until recently, our native subject literature – despite frequent references to the German idea of *Bildung* and emphasising its incompatibility with the Polish “kształcenie” – lacked elaborations of this problem. Recently, Marek Kościelniak (2019, pp. 251–350) studied German source texts dealing with *Bildung* and *Bildsamkeit*. Nevertheless, he left possible connotations with the Polish term “kształcenie” out of the scope of his interest.

A slightly different approach can be seen in English-language publications. However, also in these publications, some authors limit themselves to provide the Anglo-Saxon culture only with the meaning of the term *Bildung*, which incorporates rich content (Koselleck, 2002; Horlacher, 2016). Nonetheless, there are also researchers who undertake a bolder challenge of critical verification of the *Bildung* concept, its relevance and usefulness outside Germany (Masschelein & Ricken, 2003; Masschelein & Ricken, 2010).

Delving into the alleged connection between the Polish term “kształcenie” and the German *Bildung*, it is worth referring to the analysis by Zvonimir Komar (2019), who claims that it was not the German idea of *Bildung*, originated in the mid-eighteenth century, which gave birth to the discipline known as *Pädagogik*, but the Ancient Greek term *paideia* and the resulting characteristic way of thinking, which in modern times has been acclaimed as pedagogical or educational, as is customary in Anglo-Saxon tradition. Transferring it to the modern way of thinking about educational interactions, it can be said that the characteristic feature of this Ancient Greek way is the connection of two reference points. One point is external educational activities carried out by parents/educators/teachers, while the other one is the internal transformation process taking place in the addressee of these activities, i.e. a child/pupil/student.

The correctness of Z. Komar’s observations has been confirmed by some German researchers of the history of educational sciences, who believe that the formation of the German term *Bildung* made it possible to express in words the doubleness of educational interaction (Benner & Brüggem, 2004; Benner, 2017; Rucker, 2019). In that context, treating the term *Bildung* as a specifically German “national construct” (Horlacher, 2016, p. 54) seems at least questionable, if not entirely doubtful. Although it is unquestionably true that the term *Bildung* is a German word and that it “is a specifically German coinage for which it is extraordinarily difficult to find equivalents in other languages” (Koselleck, 2002, p. 173). The translation problems cannot be denied, but they affect the Polish terms “wychowanie” and “kształcenie”, and in another way also the Ancient Greek term *paideia*. In educational contexts, the distinctions between the two Polish and German terms characterize a way of thinking that is far more universal than previously assumed and must never be reduced to a particular-national structure. This way of thinking is also present in other languages, both European and non-European. It expresses the inherent own logic of systematic educational thinking and acting (Benner, 2015, p. 21), which is created by the irreducible doubleness of subjects and activities involved in a educational interaction.

If we assume Z. Komar’s perspective, the above-cited R. Koselleck’s sentence shall also apply to other languages. A necessary and sufficient condition is that a given language should be capable of expressing the dual thought structure reflecting the Greek *paideia*. On the other hand, whether one expands this structure with two terms or just one should be considered marginal. The second term, i.e. “kształcenie”, came into existence in the Polish language in the first half of the 19th century. The explanation of this concept constitutes the next stage of the analysis presented in this section.

The language study demonstrated (Maliszewski et al., 2019, pp. 22–31) that the Polish word “kształcenie” derives from the word “kstałt”, which was borrowed in the 16th century from the German *Gestalt*, meaning a ‘form’ or ‘contour’. The word “kstałt” became a common root of a large group of derivative terms in the Old Polish, e.g. “kstałtcić”, “kstałtować”, “kstałtowanie”, “kstałtowny”, “kstałtność”, “kstałtciel”. It is noteworthy, however, that until the second decade of the 19th century, the term “kształcenie” (*sic!*) was not among them. It appeared only a little later in articles on educational topics in literary and socio-cultural journals of that time as *terminus technicus*.

Due to the introduction of the term “kształcenie”, it became possible to perceive the activities undertaken by parents/educators/teachers from a perspective which was recognised, but deemed rather insignificant. Nowadays, this perspective is considered fundamental for educational thinking. It is about looking through the eyes of a child/pupil/student on the actions taken towards them by their parents/educators/teachers. It should be considered which goals are being achieved towards them and whether they are correct from the educational point of view. Recognition and appreciation of knowledge evolving from reflection on these matters gave impetus to the creation of a new term – “kształcenie”, which today is still functioning in the Polish language only as a scientific educational term.

At this point, I would like to draw attention to the relationship between inventing the word “kształcenie” in the Polish educational terminology and the new approach to educational issues – first in theory and then in practice (*praxis*). This can be explained by the example of the Ancient Greek concept of *paideia*, if we take into account the thought structure contained in it. In its centre there is an individual who is not only passively affected by external educational actions, but by referring to them, undertakes their own activity whereby improves/perfects/develops themselves. This is what the Polish noun “kształcenie” expresses, and even better does it the derivative form of that – “wy-kształcenie”. As linguist Wiesław Boryś explains (2005, p. 716), the prefix “wy-” is commonly found in Slavic languages and carries a double meaning: ‘upwards, outwards’ and ‘development’. Thus, “wy-kształcenie” should be interpreted as an action aimed at upgrading and refining the subject performing the activity of “kształcenie”.

We encounter the above-mentioned understanding of the term “wy-kształcenie” in the first academic dissertation written in Polish on education, aspiring to be scientific. It was a monograph entitled *Chowanna*, published in 1842 by Bronisław F. Trentowski (1808–1869). In the subtitle, the author used both terms relevant for this analysis: “wykształcenie” and “system pedagogiki” (system of educational sciences). The latter should, in my opinion, be equated

with systematic educational science as a holistic approach to educational interactions.

The term “wy-kształcenie” was labelled by B. F. Trentowski in *Chowanna* (1842–1970) as transformation that takes place in a subject the recipient of the interaction of parents/educators/teachers within family upbringing, school teaching and social accommodation. B. F. Trentowski assigned a separate term to each of these three spheres – respectively: “wychowanie” (upbringing), “nauka” (teaching) and “oświata” (enlightenment). With their help he named the educational interventions provided to a child/pupil/student, i.e. “wychowanie” (upbringing), “nauczanie” (teaching) and “oświecanie” (enlightening). He described these activities as “an old educational trinity” (Trentowski, 1842/1970, vol. 1, p. 51). The new term is “wykształcenie”, in which, according to B. F. Trentowski, the educational activities mentioned so far “merge into one” (Trentowski, 1970, vol. 1, p. 51).

The word “kształcenie” does not refer to parents/educators/teachers as its implementers, but to a child/pupil/student. By this action it transcends himself, becoming “an earthly god.” The only purpose of the actions denoted as “wychowanie” (upbringing), “nauczanie” (teaching) and “oświecanie” (enlightening) B. F. Trentowski (1970, vol. 1, p. 71) sees in awakening a “deity sleeping in man”, and not in transforming the man into a deity. This transformation depends entirely on the child/pupil/student themselves and lies in their abilities.

Apart from the provocative tone of the expression “earthly god”, which B. F. Trentowski used to convey the effect of the internal transformation taking place in a child/pupil/student through their own activity and the theosophical subtext of this transformation (Stępkowski, 2020), *Chowanna* constitutes a milestone in the development of educational terminology in the Polish language and testifies to the emergence in the first half of the 19th century of a thought pattern designed to consider educational issues. This scheme uses two terms: “wychowanie” and “kształcenie”, and the purpose of systematic educational reflection is to study the relationships between subjects and activities assigned to these terms.

The easily discernible parallelism between the Polish and German patterns of educational thinking cannot be considered as confirmation of the thesis that the sense of the Polish term “kształcenie” should be derived from the German *Bildung*. It is the opposite, as it seems that the two terms emerged independently of each other, and their use in each of the educational sciences marked separate lines, which are characterised by a certain analogy. The analogy between these lines does not mean that one term imitates the other, but that each of them serves as a reference point to the other, in Polish it is the term “wychowanie”, in German – *Erziehung*. This fact constitutes a source of

similarity in terms of the meaning and application of both terms – the Polish “kształcenie” and the German *Bildung*. However, the discrepancies result from a different way of interpreting the thought pattern enabled by the terminological doubleness. It is worth recalling that this is a scheme referring to the Ancient Greek *paideia*.

In the next part, I shall reconstruct the changes that took place in Polish systematic educational science in the 20th century regarding the comprehension of the term “kształcenie” and its relation to the term “wychowanie”. To this end, I will refer to four leading Polish educational scientists who have had a significant contribution to shaping the picture of Polish educational thinking in the past century. The first three are considered representatives of systematic educational science, while the fourth is widely regarded as a didactician.

Involution of systematic educational thinking in 20th-century Poland¹

At the beginning of this section, I would like to remind that I am primarily concerned with bringing to light the structure of educational thinking present in the 20th-century Polish systematic educational science, and not tracking its historical development. This gives me the right – I suppose – to select theories/concepts from the nearly 80 years of the institutionalised Polish educational sciences authored only by certain authors.² On their basis, I will portray the gradual disappearance of the term “kształcenie” in systematic educational science and its transposition into didactics. This process was accompanied by a successive deconstruction and marginalisation of systematic educational science as a separate subdiscipline of the educational sciences, which in the 1970s led to its complete replacement by the socialist theory of education, whose ideals, goals and tasks were determined by the politics.

¹ This section uses the results of analyses conducted by the author in another of his publications (Stępkowski, 2019, p. 12–21).

² The first Department of Pedagogy and Didactics was founded in Poland at the University of Poznań in 1919. The very name of it signals the splitting of the structure/pattern of pedagogical thinking into two areas – pedagogy and didactics.

Sergei Hessen – term “kształcenie” as the creation of personality

S. Hessen (1887–1950) has a unique place in the history of the 20th-century Polish educational sciences. He came to Poland as a refugee. A few years after the Bolshevik Revolution, he managed to escape from Soviet Russia. First, he took refuge in Berlin, and then moved to Prague. In the mid-1930s he arrived in Poland, which became his second home.

S. Hessen made a unique contribution to Polish educational thinking. This applies especially to the concept of “kształcenie”, which can be considered a common denominator for all his works. Thanks to his philosophical studies with Heinrich Rickert in Heidelberg (Germany), which he completed by defending his doctoral thesis in 1908, S. Hessen was familiar with the German term *Bildung* and its rich tradition. Undoubtedly, this had an impact on his educational thinking, which can be seen, among others in that S. Hessen sometimes accompanied the term “kształcenie” with the German word *Bildung* put in parentheses. He nowise meant to indicate the source which, in his opinion, the Polish “kształcenie” draws its meaning from the German *Bildung*, but to demonstrate the conceptual disproportion between the two terms. S. Hessen did not assess this disproportion on a better–worse basis, but he drew attention to the semantic nuances of both terms with regard to the Ancient Greek *paideia*, and to the complementarity of the concepts signified by these terms.

One of the most important S. Hessen’s educational works was his first monograph entitled *Osnovy pedagogiki*. He wrote it yet in Soviet Russia in 1923, in the Russian language. This work was soon translated and published in several European languages: Bulgarian (1931), Czech (1936) and Italian (1936). *Osnovy pedagogiki* was published in Polish for the first time in 1931 under the title *Podstawy pedagogiki* (*The Basics of Educational Sciences*).

In the Polish version, the above-explained noun “wykształcenie” was used. S. Hessen refers it to the process of personality formation (1997, pp. 236–348; see also Stępkowski, 2017). The course of this process can be briefly described as the interaction of various external factors on the subject. The subject receives and incorporates some of these interactions, and some rejects. What has been accepted and incorporated by the subject shall form an inner space which S. Hessen calls a “personality”. This is not something given in advance or ready-made, but it must be created, which does not happen unknowingly or beyond the subject’s will, but on the contrary – it requires the subject to take conscious activity. S. Hessen denoted these activities with the term “wykształcenie”. Actions taken by the subject should lead to the desired effect, i.e. to create their own personality, however, they must meet two conditions: first, the subject

must come into contact with the relevant cultural content – preferably through school education, and secondly, the subject should be able to use this content and the values it contains to ennoble (“wy-kształcenie” or “wz-noszenie”) their personality.³

S. Hessen’s term “(wy)kształcenie” was (and is still) seen through the prism of the so-called pedagogy of culture, which is considered in Polish educational sciences as a derivative of the German *Kulturpädagogik*. However, I believe that in this case a mental shortcut has been used, which deprives S. Hessen’s concept of originality. In addition to the two terms mentioned so far – i.e. “(wy)kształcenie” and “cultural content” – the concept involves one more term – “wychowanie” (upbringing/education). The word “wychowanie” denotes the activities of parents/educators/teachers, through which the cultural content – containing personogenic values – is selected, advocated and made available to children/pupils/students. This, in fact, is determined by the right “(wy)kształcenie”. Nevertheless, the purpose of educational interventions called “wychowanie” is not to transmit cultural texts, but to inspire recipients of these interventions to undertake the activity of “kształcenie”, which will lead them to “wy-kształcenie” of their personality. The purpose of educational reflection presented in *Podstawy pedagogiki (The Basics of Educational Sciences)* is to show the dialectical connection within the triad: “kształcenie” – “cultural texts” – “wychowanie”.

Bogdan Nawroczyński – the term “kształcenie” in the domain of didactics

B. Nawroczyński’s (1882–1972) views were in many aspects convergent with S. Hessen’s views. It is worth noting that B. Nawroczyński presented his interpretation of the term “kształcenie” in his monograph *Zasady nauczania (Principles of Teaching)*, published for the first time in 1930, whose main subject was teaching and learning in school, and thus the domain of didactics. Of course, this was not an unprecedented case, because in that period the Polish term “kształcenie” was increasingly associated with school education and didactics. The significance of B. Nawroczyński’s concept is rather due to the fact that, unlike S. Hessen, his work was repeatedly resumed after World War II and

³ By separating the prefixes “wy-” and “wz-” in both words, I would like to once again emphasise the thought contained in the Polish term “wykształcenie”, standing for “educating oneself up”, in other words: improving oneself.

had a significant impact on educational thinking and scientific terminology in Poland.

B. Nawroczyński developed a subtle concept the term “kształcenie”. He distinguished three areas in it. The first involves teaching and learning at school, which he divided into three levels: (1) informative and introductory instruction, (2) practice instruction and (3) educating instruction (Nawroczyński, 1930/1957, pp. 41–43). At each of these levels, a correlated component of the learning subject’s spiritual structure is formed, i.e.: (1) education, (2) character and (3) personality (Nawroczyński, 1930/1957, p. 83). This very structure, with its components, constitutes the second area of the term “kształcenie”. It is worth noting that the first area encompasses educational activities of the teacher, while the second reflects them in the student.

The third and last area serves, according to B. Nawroczyński, as the mediator between the levels of school education and the components of the subject’s spiritual structure. In the mediation function, the term “kształcenie” is “neither a set of knowledge, nor even a training of the mind, but satiating the entire individual – and thus both their intellect, feelings and ability to act – with culture” (Nawroczyński, 1930/1957, p. 43). This satiety has been portrayed by the author with the metaphor of a ship “which sets its course to the North Star, but will never reach it” (Nawroczyński, 1930/1957, p. 102). According to this picture, the author sees the term “kształcenie” as a educational ideal, which sets the goal of school education at all levels, but only the educating instruction may approach this goal, although it cannot fully achieve it. The two lower levels of school education are intended to achieve the “minimum goals”, which, according to B. Nawroczyński, consists in transmitting basic knowledge and exercising abilities and skills indispensable in life.

In *Zasady nauczania (Principles of Teaching)*, the privileged group of education recipients is formed by the “layer called intelligentsia” (Nawroczyński, 1930/1957, p. 111). B. Nawroczyński’s view is not about intelligentsia as a social group, but about the spiritual community of people who have achieved the highest level of school education – educating instruction. Admittedly, representatives of the intelligentsia also may and should have professional qualifications that will guarantee them funds for the living, but their basic purpose is something else. B. Nawroczyński writes (1930/1957, pp. 140–141) about this purpose as follows:

These people [...] are the right carriers of a living, developing culture. [...] In order for cultural goods to be understood, and moreover, for culture to transform, deepen and grow, it must be pursued again and again by everyday effort. [...] The work needed to keep culture alive and move it forward is done by educating and educated people.

The presented structure of educational thinking of B. Nawroczyński points up not only the oligarchic order among learners, but also the phenomenon of dividing education into lower and higher segments. This contradicts the basic idea which gave birth to the term “kształcenie” in the Polish language. Let me remind that in F. Trentowski’s publication it meant unlimited development potential, which enables each person to become a “God-man”, or more educationally speaking: to develop their individuality and personality.

Bogdan Suchodolski – cassation of the term “kształcenie”

In the 1950s and 1960s, B. Suchodolski (1903–1992) was considered Poland’s most influential and prolific researcher, theoretician not only in the field of educational sciences, but also in the field of broadly understood humanities. At the peak of his career he controlled the entire Polish educational thinking. Zbigniew Kwieciński (2003, p. 23), when assessing his activities, stated that they led to three cassations within the main dispute in Polish educational sciences. Skipping the explanation of this allegation, I would like to use the term “cassation” in order to uniformise the term “kształcenie” by B. Suchodolski, which further led to the ousting of systematic educational science as an academic and scientific subdiscipline in Poland, and its total destruction in the 1970s.

To explain the essence of uniformisation of the term “kształcenie”, we have to refer to the work published and edited by B. Suchodolski in 1959. It was a two-volume compendium of the then educational knowledge entitled *Zarys pedagogiki (An Outline of Pedagogy)*. In the preface to the first volume, the editor presented three theses adopted by his team. The first referred to the term “kształcenie”. The authors of *Zarys pedagogiki (An Outline of Pedagogy)* decided to oppose the existing practice of dividing educational sciences into two types of theory. The first is dominated by the concept of “wychowanie” – the theory of education, while in the second the term “kształcenie” – theory of didactics – prevails. Therefore, it was agreed that the term “kształcenie” should be subordinated to the term “wychowanie” as its sub-scope (Suchodolski, 1959, p. 15). As a result, the unity of educational thinking was to be accentuated. According to B. Suchodolski and his colleagues, it is not at all complex and dual, but on the contrary – uniform and indivisible.

In accordance with the reconstructed way of comprehending the terms “wychowanie” and “kształcenie” in previous Polish educational sciences, the first of them involves the activities performed by parents/educators/teachers who influence children/pupils/students in order to stimulate them to perform

their own activities. Thus, when the term “kształcenie” has been subordinated to the term “wychowanie”, children/pupils/students have been deprived of the spontaneous freedom of their own activities, reducing them to the level of reactions to external educational interventions. This, in my opinion, was the essence of B. Suchodolski’s cassation of the term “kształcenie”. This in turn prepared the ground for the expansion of a educational theory based on the socialist doctrine of the early 1970s. In addition to bringing the doubleness of the structure of educational thinking down to the term “wychowanie”, the development of this theory has been enhanced by marginalisation of systematic educational science.

In the later period, i.e. in the 1980s, the term “wychowanie” grew in Poland to the scientific-educational term *par excellence*. At that time, its understanding underwent symptomatic changes. It absorbed features attributable so far to the term “kształcenie”. How is it possible to associate “wychowanie” with “kształcenie”?

The answer to the above question is found in the concept of the last of the authors discussed – W. Okoń, who cooperated closely with B. Suchodolski and contributed to the introduction of the term “kształcenie” in the field of didactics. This term was blatantly captured by the politics.

Wincenty Okoń – about the new term “kształcenie–wychowanie”

The reason for subordinating the term “kształcenie” to the term “wychowanie” was explained by W. Okoń (1914–2011) in the introduction to one of his late publications. It is a collection released in 1999, which consists of texts selected from author’s all academic achievements regarding the term “wychowanie” and its peculiarities. This collection has the intriguing title *Wszystko o wychowaniu* (*All about ‘wychowanie’*). W. Okoń (1999, p. 7) explains that:

the title *Wszystko o wychowaniu* (*All about ‘wychowanie’*) does not mean that the book includes full knowledge about the diversely-understood “wychowanie”. It is only meant to suggest that all the texts contained in it will concern or refer to “wychowanie”.

It would not be anything unusual in it if it was not for the fact that these words are written by an author, who was widely regarded as “someone solely dealing with general didactics, and teaching and ‘kształcenie’ as part of it” (Okoń, 1999, p. 7). The above quote is not only valid because of the matter it relates to. It clearly shows that the term “kształcenie” became permanently established in didactics. Coming back to the term “wychowanie” and its pecu-

liarities, does the author want to prove with his publication that it was a term he was familiar with?

Nevertheless, this supposition does not get to the heart of the matter. In the next sentence of the described introduction, W. Okoń states that readers of his didactic publications have not noticed that “the concept superior to them [teaching and ‘kształcenie’ – D. S.’s note] is the concept of ‘wychowanie’, and that as such it serves as the main subject of [his] research” (1999, p. 7). This sentence clearly echoes the memorable decision of 1959, which led B. Suchodolski’s team – whose W. Okoń was a member of – to establishing the supremacy of the term “wychowanie” over the term “kształcenie”. It is worth taking a closer look at how W. Okoń understood this finding when it comes to didactics.

The explanation of the above matter can be found in the next part of the introduction to *Wszystko o wychowaniu* (*All about ‘wychowanie’*). The course of W. Okoń’s argumentation begins with the presentation of the conclusion resulting from the assumed supremacy of the term “wychowanie” in school education. He writes:

‘Wychowanie’ includes [...] everything that concerns the educational relationship between the pupil (student) and the educator (teacher), which leads to the assumed desired changes in the pupil (Okoń, 1999, p. 7).

In the light of these words, educational activities performed by the educator/teacher are intended to transform the pupil/student, so that these “changes” occur correspondingly with the assumptions adopted by the former. In another his work W. Okoń precisely described the areas of these transformations. They are expected to take place in the intellectual, emotional and practical spheres (Okoń, 1998, pp. 196–198). Together, they form the “idea of multilateralism” (Okoń, 1999, p. 8), which combines the concepts of “kształcenie” and “wychowanie” into one. To give a tangible expression to this merger, W. Okoń proposes a new term: “kształcenie–wychowanie” (1999, p. 8). This term should not be read as a combination of two separate words joined by a hyphen, but as a completely new educational term. It denotes the integral unity of both activities and their performing subjects, e.g.: “wychowanie” and “kształcenie” and respectively pupil/student and educator/teacher. According to this model, the educational activities carried out by the educator/teacher correspond to the pupils’/students/ noneducational activities which expresses the term “kształcenie”. Thus, educational interventions achieve their intended goal absolutely certain. Their interdependency can be illustrated by a mirror image in which both subjects of educational and noneducational interactions are guided by one and the same goal – multilateralism. Thanks to this, there is no split or dissonance between “wychowanie” and “kształcenie” and between

the goals of a parent/educator/teacher and the goals of a child/pupil/student. Everything and everyone form an organic unity – “kształcenie–wychowanie”.

W. Okoń underscores that the sketched pattern – perfect integration of both types of activities and subjects – should not be treated as an educational utopia, but as a real goal set by the socialist educational system. In the monograph of 1967, he wrote that it eliminates the contradiction “between knowledge offered to students by school and the feelings and actual behaviour of students” (Okoń, 1967, p. 41). In other words, educational activities of educators/teachers lead linearly to the planned effects in the intellectual, emotional and practical spheres of pupils/students. In school education defined in this way, adolescents cannot choose, decide about or evaluate things differently than it was assumed by adults in advance. So, essentially, the idea of multilateral development means establishing a hegemony of educators/teachers who not only play the role of educational specialists in a given field of knowledge, but are also to be expected as „life guides for young people” (Okoń, 1967, p. 42). In these circumstances, it is not surprising that the socialist theory of education replaced systematic educational science. Its task, based on the concept of “kształcenie–wychowanie”, was to forge socialist ideals and values into practical educational goals.

Doubleness or unitarisation?

To interpret the above-outlined change, which took place in the meaning and application of the term “kształcenie” in the 20th-century Polish systematic educational science, M. Foucault’s archaeological method will now be used. Based on two types of knowledge: *connaissance* and *savoir*, which are distinguished in this method, we can clearly see two processes combined closely with each other. The first concerns *connaissance* knowledge, i.e. transparent practical and operational knowledge and theoretical knowledge, which can be easily encompassed by the term “wychowanie”. The second process takes place on the level of *savoir* knowledge, which is characterised by secrecy and presumptiveness. To determine this knowledge, I will use two mental patterns that came to light when reconstructing the changes concerning the term “kształcenie”. Let me remind that we were talking about a double pattern, in which the term we are interested in correlates with the term “wychowanie”, and a unitarist (unification) scheme, which reflects the term “kształcenie–wychowanie” discussed in the previous section.

Comparing the four ways of interpreting the above-discussed term “kształcenie”, both continuity and discontinuity can be seen. According to

S. Hessen and B. Suchodolski, the term “kształcenie” belongs to the same educational subdiscipline, systematic pedagogy, but the authors read it quite the opposite. In S. Hessen’s approach, the noun “kształcenie” refers to subject’s own activity through which they create their personality. For B. Suchodolski, it is not about a nuance in meaning, but a radical severance from such understanding of the term “kształcenie”. It is also a break with the whole tradition, which had developed up to his time in Polish systematic educational science. According to the purpose imposed by B. Suchodolski, “kształcenie” has become a subset of the term “wychowanie” – as far as denotation is concerned, and its derivative – as regards the rank among educational activities.

The new meaning of the term “kształcenie” coined by B. Suchodolski was practically implemented into didactics by W. Okoń. As it was demonstrated by the case of B. Nawroczyński’s concept, the term “kształcenie” had already been present in this field. Undoubtedly, W. Okoń contributed to further strengthening this *status quo*. Apparently, this was done so effectively that the present-day Polish educational scientists consider didactics to be the only appropriate area for the term “kształcenie”. The most important, however, was combining the term “kształcenie” with the term “wychowanie” – into “kształcenie–wychowanie”, which W. Okoń did. Assuming that the new term is not a hybrid or a cluster of two separate concepts, but a new educational concept, one should ask about its content.

Due to the absolute unity of the concept of “kształcenie–wychowanie”, we cannot speak about splitting the contribution into educational and noneducational activities between the two participating subjects. W. Okoń assigned all of this activity to the teacher/educator, limiting the role of the pupil/student to resonating the activity of the former. In this scheme, participation can only consist in the obedient (mannerly) compliance of the student/pupil with the directives set out by the teacher/educator, and not in partner-like cooperation with him/her.

Admittedly, W. Okoń deduces the concept of “kształcenie–wychowanie” from the idea of multilateral development of personality, but this does not mean that he gives the learner the right to set goals themselves. On the contrary, this task belongs to the prerogatives of the school system entrusted with the implementation of political goals. Ultimately, it turns out that the content of the concept of „kształcenie–wychowanie” is not dependent on systematic educational science, but on socialist ideology. This is confirmed by W. Okoń, who pointed to two pillars of the unitarist structure of educational thinking. The first pillar involves didactic theories, while the second is the socialist project of comprehensive development of personality (Okoń, 1967, p. 11). In my opinion, they should not be too lightly separated from each other, because it poses

a risk of destroying the entire structure. This proves that the term “kształcenie” has lost its autonomous status and has become an “empty concept” that can be filled with any content, as is unfortunately done in didactics.

From the perspective of the second type of knowledge indicated by M. Foucault – *savoir*, another bottom of the transposition and transformation of the term “kształcenie” outlined above was the replacement of the dual thought pattern by a unitarist (uniform) one. In the first activity expressed by the term “kształcenie” and its subject, it has the role of co-constituting an educational interaction (next to “wychowanie” and its subject). It looks entirely different in the second scheme. Here, both the activity of “kształcenie” and its subject are pushed to the margins of educational (and didactic) reflection, as well as objectified or depersonalised. In this light, it can be understood why in the socialist theory of education, the act of education was interpreted not as an autonomous action of the subject, but as exerting influence by the school, as one of the socialist system’s agencies, on the formation of personality according to ideological goals. It seems that in Poland during the socialist dictatorship, the ideological appropriation of the concept of “kształcenie” and didactic objectification of activities marked by the same term progressed in parallel with the ordered unitarisation of educational thinking (Stępkowski, 2018).

Conclusions

The past casts a long shadow over the contemporary understanding of the phenomenon of “kształcenie” and its relationship with the phenomenon of “wychowanie” in Polish educational sciences. I think that realising this fact opens the way to a critical look not only on historical concepts, but also on contemporary positions and views on the subject. In this context, in my opinion, we should be cautious about the proposal to reform scientific educational thinking in Poland with the help of “edukacja”, a term which is very similar to the English concept of *education*. Apart from the semantic difficulties related to the Polish understanding of the word “edukacja” – not new at all, but on the contrary – which has a long history in the Polish language – the appearance of the unitarist (unification) structure clearly visible in this proposal may be considered alarming. The first conclusion that emerges from the presented study is the need to further explore the issues related to the term “kształcenie”, as it determines the preservation of the doubleness of thought in educational sciences.

The second conclusion, worth formulating, refers to the repeated disappearance in Poland of systematic educational science as a subdiscipline and its

replacement with “metapedagogika” (educational meta-science). The moment of this disappearance is significant. It took place 30 years after the revitalization of systematic educational science in 1989. A symbolic expression of the event is the lack of a separate chapter on systematic educational science in the latest compendium of Polish educational knowledge (Kwieciński & Śliwerski, 2019). After the study, there is a reflection that the fate of systematic educational science in Poland was closely linked to issues designated by the term “kształcenie”. Therefore, since in the past this term did not only lose its relevance in systematic educational science, but was completely removed from it, in the attempts to restore systematic educational science we cannot leave this fact out and treat it as a starting point for further development.

The third and final conclusion resulting from the research concerns the revitalisation of Polish systematic educational science. The success of this process depends to a large extent on the revision of the past. Based on the research, it can be concluded that the modern state is determined by past development and as long as the paths of this development remain beyond awareness, the further journey seems vague and unclear.

References

- Benner, D. (2015). *Allgemeine Pädagogik. Eine systematisch-problemgeschichtliche Einführung in die Grundstruktur pädagogischen Denkens und Handelns*. Weinheim–München: Beltz Juventa.
- Benner, D. (2017). John Dewey. A modern thinker: On Education (as Bildung and Erziehung) and Democracy (as a political system and a mode of associated living). In: L. J. Waks & A. R. English (Eds.), *John Dewey's Democracy and Education: A Centennial Handbook* (pp. 262–278). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Benner, D. & Brüggem, F. (2004). Bildung/Bildsamkeit. In: D. Benner & J. Oelkers (Eds.), *Historisches Wörterbuch der Pädagogik* (pp. 174–215). Weinheim and Basel: Beltz Verlag.
- Boryś, W. (2005). *Słownik etymologiczny języka polskiego*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Literackie.
- Foucault, M. (1972). *The Archaeology of Knowledge*, transl. A. M. Sheridan Smith. London and New York: Routledge.
- Hessen, S. (1997). *Podstawy pedagogiki*, transl. A. Zieleńczyk. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo “Żak”.
- Horlacher, R. (2016). *The Educated Subject and the German Concept of Bildung: A Comparative Cultural History*. New York and London: Routledge.

- Kendall, G. & Wickham, G. (2003). *Using Foucault's Methods*. London, Thousand Oaks and New Delhi: Sage Publications.
- Komar, Z. (2019). The Idea of Continental Pädagogik. In: B. Kudláčová & A. Rajskey (Eds.), *Education and “Pädagogik” – Philosophical and Historical Reflection (Central, Southern and South-Eastern Europe)* (pp. 41–55). Berlin: Peter Lang.
- Koselleck, R. (2002). On the Anthropological and Semantic Structure of *Bildung*. In: R. Koselleck, *The Practice of Conceptual History: Timing History, Spacing Concepts* (pp. 170–207). Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Koselleck, R. (2018). *Sediments of Time: On Possible Histories*, transl. S. Franzel, S.-L. Hoffmann. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Kościelniak, M. (2019). *Pedagogiczna teoria szkoły. Studium na podstawie niemieckich teorii szkoły*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo UJ.
- Kultaieva, M. (2017). Recepcja idei pedagogicznych klasycznego niemieckiego idealizmu w ukraińskiej i polskiej tradycji filozofii edukacji. In: S. Sztobryn & D. Stępkowski (Eds.), *Uniwersalizm i regionalizm pedagogiki filozoficznej* (pp. 247–264). Łódź: Wydawnictwo Naukowe “Chowanna”.
- Kupisiewicz, C. (2005). *Podstawy dydaktyki*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwa Szkolne i Pedagogiczne.
- Kwieciński, Z. (2003). Pedagogia totalna Bogdana Suchodolskiego. *Teraźniejszość – Człowiek – Edukacja*, 4 (24), pp. 17–41.
- Kwieciński, Z. & Śliwerski, B. (Eds.) (2019). *Pedagogika. Podręcznik akademicki*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- Maliszewski, K., Stępkowski, D. & Śliwerski, B. (2019). *Istota, sens i uwarunkowania (wy)kształcenia*. Kraków: Oficyna Wydawnicza “Impuls”.
- Masschelein, J. & Ricken, N. (2003). Do We (Still) Need the Concept of Bildung? *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 35 (2), pp. 139–154.
- Masschelein, J. & Ricken, N. (2010). Bildung. In: P. Peterson, E. Baker & B. McGaw (Eds.), *International Encyclopedia of Education*, 3rd edition, vol. 6 (pp. 127–132). Oxford: Academic Press.
- Nawroczyński, B. (1930/1957). *Zasady nauczania*. Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich.
- Niemierko, B. (2007). *Kształcenie szkolne. Podręcznik skutecznej dydaktyki*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwa Akademickie i Profesjonalne.
- Okoń, W. (1967). *Podstawy wykształcenia ogólnego*. Warszawa: Nasza Księgarnia.
- Okoń, W. (1998). *Wprowadzenie do dydaktyki ogólnej*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Akademickie “Żak”.
- Okoń W. (1999). *Wszystko o wychowaniu*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Akademickie “Żak”.

- Rucker, T. (2019). Teaching and the Claim of Bildung: The View from General Didactics. *Studies in Philosophy and Education*. Retrieved from: <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11217-019-09673-0> (accessed: 4.11.2019).
- Scheurich, J. J. & McKenzie, K. B. (2008). Foucault's methodologies: Archaeology and genealogy. In: N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Collecting and Interpreting Qualitative Materials* (pp. 313–349). Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Stępkowski, D. (2017). Unique and universal: the 'Bildung' process of personality by Sergei Hessen. In: A. Hogenová, N. Pelcová & D. Rybák (Eds.), *Contingency in the Education, Art and Sport: International Multidisciplinary Conference* (pp. 70–82). Prague: Charles University, Faculty of Education.
- Stępkowski, D. (2018). Kształcenie ogólne – wizja pedagogiczna czy utopia? W sprawie translokacji teorii kształcenia ogólnego w powojennym dyskursie pedagogicznym w Polsce. *Polska Myśl Pedagogiczna*, 1 (4), pp. 31–58. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.4467/24504564PMP.18.002.8641>.
- Stępkowski, D. (2019). Integralna czy komplementarna? "Archeologia" transformacji polskiej pedagogiki ogólnej w XX wieku. *Teraźniejszość – Człowiek – Edukacja*, 3 (87), pp. 7–26. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.34862/tce.2019.3.1>.
- Stępkowski, D. (2020). Teozoficzna idea (wy)kształcenia w pedagogice Bronisława F. Trentowskiego. *Przegląd Religioznawczy* (in print).
- Suchodolski, B. (1959). Przedmowa. In: B. Suchodolski (Ed.), *Zarys pedagogiki*, vol. 1 (pp. 5–8). Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.
- Trentowski, B. F. (1842/1970). *Chowanna, czyli system pedagogiki narodowej jako umiejętności wychowania, nauki i oświaty, słowem wykształcenia naszej młodzieży*, vol. 1–2. Wrocław, Warszawa and Kraków: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich and Wydawnictwo PAN.