

Bronisław Dembowski

Reception of the Encyclical "Aeterni Patris" in Poland

Collectanea Theologica 46/Fasciculus specialis, 187-203

1976

Artykuł został zdigitalizowany i opracowany do udostępnienia w internecie przez Muzeum Historii Polski w ramach prac podejmowanych na rzecz zapewnienia otwartego, powszechnego i trwałego dostępu do polskiego dorobku naukowego i kulturalnego. Artykuł jest umieszczony w kolekcji cyfrowej bazhum.muzhp.pl, gromadzącej zawartość polskich czasopism humanistycznych i społecznych.

Tekst jest udostępniony do wykorzystania w ramach dozwolonego użytku.

BRONISŁAW DEMBOWSKI, WARSZAWA

RECEPTION OF THE ENCYCLICAL "AETERNI PATRIS" IN POLAND

The encyclical *Aeterni Patris* of Pope Leo XIII promulgated on August 4, 1879, had exercised an enormous influence on the revival of scholastic thinking which began a few decades before and is known as the neoscholastic movement, for short neoscholasticism¹. The present study aims to fill the gap in the history of philosophical thinking in Poland, and to show the bearing of the encyclical in the Polish philosophical centers and the reception it met with.

The whole study can be divided into four groups of problems: 1) Christian philosophizing in Poland before the encyclical, 2) the main points of teaching in the encyclical, 3) the evaluation of the encyclical in Poland, 4) the response of the philosophers to the recommendations of the encyclical.

1. Christian Philosophical Thinking in Poland before the Encyclical

We can say, in a general way, that the main issue of Christian philosophy in Poland, in the middle of 19th century, was the defence of faith threatened by the rationalistic attitude. The attacks of reasoning were seemingly twofold: on the one hand from the already in decay, nevertheless still fascinating idealistic philosophy

¹ Cf. van Riet, *L'Épistémologie thomiste*, Louvain 1946 (on neoscholasticism before the encyclical *Aeterni Patris*, pp. 1—114); cf. also E. Gilson, *French and Italian Philosophy*, in: *A History of Philosophy*, E. Gilson gen. editor, vol. IV: *Recent philosophy*, N. York 1966, especially pp. 330—354.

of a post-hegelian type, with its pantheistic conclusions not compatible with faith in a Personal God and the personal human soul. On the other hand the threat was brought by the new philosophy of scientists i.e. positivism which had all the fascination of novelty and was also attractive by its optimistic and uncommensurable faith in scientific approach to knowledge which had to solve all problems with the certitude of exact sciences without any need of religious interpretation of the world, and sometimes against that interpretation.

In this situation Christian philosophers adopted three positions which can be labelled, respectively: catholic philosophers, positivistic philosophers and scholasticists.

a) **Catholic Philosophers.** This name was given to those scholars who represented the view that rational thinking could not disagree with religion. They wanted to rationalize faith and tried to interpret its mysteries in such manner that it would be compatible with still influential idealism of Hegel. Their re-interpretation of dogmas had to conform with the achievements of the "great philosophy". This attitude often resulted practically in a subordination of faith and revealed truth to idealistic philosophical principles. Polish catholic philosophers developed, therefore, a kind of 'philosophical fideism' resembling that of Günther and Baader in Germany, and partly probably under their influence. They, however, saw the danger of pantheism, and rejected it as unable to save the idea of Personal God and individual, personal human soul. Then they would adopt the standpoint of French traditionalists like Bautain, de Bonald and de Lamennais.

In this way they have become fideistic in their approach to religion. The catholic philosophers were between Scylla and Charybdis: either they changed religion into philosophy and accepted the latter in a specific act of faith; or they changed knowledge into belief. They were not yet able to find such a solution of the problem of relationship between knowledge and faith which would accept and respect the autonomy of philosophy as a science, and of religion in which the reason would have its share and proper place, it means the role of philosophy in a faith-act².

The representatives of catholic philosophers were, among others, E. Ziemięcka (she called hers and similar position —

² Cf. B. Dembowski, *Spór o metafizykę* (The Dispute on Metaphysics), Warszawa 1969, 25 (further called: *The Dispute*).

catholic philosophizing)³, F. Bochwic⁴, J. Majorckiewicz⁵, M. Jakubowicz⁶, Father F. Kozłowski⁷, Father W. Serwatowski⁸. Their writings reflect the above mentioned attitudes

³ Eleonora Gagatkiewicz-Ziemiecka (1814 or 1819—1869) in her early period follower of the Hegelian idealism. She believed — under the influence of Günther and Baader — that this system was a stronghold of religious truth. She saw the danger of pantheism and started publishing a periodical „Pielgrzym” (The Pilgrim) 1842—46. In it she fostered traditionalism against pantheism. She cooperated with J. J. Kraszewski (a contemporary writer of renown) who held a high opinion of her. She exchanged sharp polemical views with B. Trentowski. She formed around her a circle of Christian thinkers who tried to solve the problem of relationship between faith and knowledge in the light of the Church's teaching. Main works: *Myśli o filozofii*, Biblioteka Warszawska 1841; *Kilka słów o Schellingu*, Atheneum 1844; *Zarys filozofii katolickiej*, Warszawa 1857.

⁴ Florian Bochwic (1799—1856) landlord, fervent advocate of peasants' enfranchisement; in his endeavours to reconcile faith and philosophy, he united catholic dogmas with the attitude of French traditionalists in an awkward combination, making Revelation the pivot of all cognition. He wanted to reconcile his views with the idealistic philosophy of religion of Schelling and with theological thinking of Baader and Günther. Main works: *Obraz myśli mojej na pamiątkę egzystencji mojej żonie i dzieciom*, Wilno 1838; *Obraz myśli mojej na pamiątkę żonie i dzieciom*, Wilno 1839; *Obraz myśli mojej o celu człowieka*, Wilno 1841; *Zasady myśli i uczuć moich*, Wilno 1842.

⁵ Jan Majorckiewicz (1820—1847) collaborator of E. Dembowski, young philosopher follower of Hegel. Similarly to Günther and Baader he tried to reconcile philosophy with faith and feelings but proposed the leading role to reason and, therefore, subordinated theology to idealistic philosophy. However, he claimed immortality of the soul and the existence of a personal God. Main works: *Historia serca i rozumu (uczucia i wiedzy)* published posthumously in 1851.

⁶ Maksymilian Jakubowicz (1785—1853), classical philologist, professor of Liceum Krzemienieckie (High School of great renown) up to 1832, from 1834 professor in Kiev and Moscow (till 1842). Aware of the danger of pantheism in Hegel's philosophy, his position was that of traditionalism. He was a radical fideist and claimed that philosophy could not consider God and nature without the light of Revelation. But it could deal with issues pertinent to man's problems, and all human problems. It has to be done in close unity with religion to which philosophy ought to be subordinated. Main work: *Chrześcijańska filozofia życia w porównaniu z filozofią naszego wieku panteistycznego*, Wilno 1853.

⁷ Feliks Kozłowski (1803—1872) insurgent of 1831 (Great Uprising of Polish regular Army against the czarist Russia), emigrant, lawyer, 1859 returned to Poland and was ordained priest in Gniezno in 1861. He had a dispute with Trentowski about pantheistic elements in his philosophy. Himself a traditionalist subordinated philosophy to Revelation and saw the criterion of truth in common consent. Main work: *Stosunek wiary umysłowej do wiary objawionej*, 1843; *Początki filozofii chrześcijańskiej włącznie z krytyką filozofii B. F. Trentowskiego*, vol. 1—2, 1845.

⁸ Walerian Serwatowski (1810—1891) ordained priest in Lwów 1836. A theologian whose philosophizing was a defence of catholicism against the errors of Hegel and his followers. He tries to give rigorous precision to the term "Catholic Philosophy". He had a polemic with Trentowski. He completely subordinated philosophy to theology and faith thus representing the fideistic attitude. Main works: *Pierworys systemu filozofii ze stanowiska chrześcijańskiego*

of the French traditionalists and of German idealists and sometimes, a characteristic for Polish thinkers, Messianism. The works of Günther and Baader exercised strong influence on Boch-wic and Majorkiewicz. The French scholars influenced Kozłowski and Jakubowicz, the latter propagated the most radical fideism. Ziemiecka at the beginning of her career, was impressed by Hegel's philosophy, later she adopted the attitude of the French traditionalists. She believed with Kozłowski and Jakubowicz that Scripture and the Church's teaching are the unique sources of philosophy.

After 1863, the year of the Polish Uprising against the czarist Russia, the new trends of positivistic philosophy developed: their aims were practical, they declared the necessity of hard and well organized work. This practical attitude, stressing the necessity of development of living standards by hard work, was shared by all catholic philosophers. It was combined with a most radical fideism, even in questions regarding the solution of social welfare⁹. The gap between knowledge and faith was increasing. And neither fideistic French traditionalism, nor German "philosophical fideism", nor Polish Messianistic philosophy could furnish a remedy in this situation¹⁰.

The educated people of the time (for instance biologists) were all followers of fideism in their religious beliefs. Those who wanted to be faithful catholics did not see any way out of the dilemma i.e. the relationship between faith and knowledge, unless they were fideistic¹¹. This situation was prevailing for a long time. However some predictments of a change which was to follow after the pronouncement of the encyclical *Aeterni Patris* were visible even before 1863.

b) **Positivistic Philosophers.** This name was given to those Christian philosophers who in the same way as the older

pojętej, Kraków 1852; *Pogląd na dzieje rodu ludzkiego ze stanowiska chrześcijańskiego*, Roczn. TN Krak. vol. 22 (1852); *Listy otwarte do pani E. Ziemieckiej z powodu dzieła „Zarysy filozofii katolickiej”* Warszawa 1857, Pam. relig.-moral. vol. 32 (1857) and vol. 33 (1857).

⁹ Fideistic attitude in social problems without rational foundation was characteristic not only to Polish catholic thinkers. No wonder that, as we shall see later, Leo XIII saw in the renewal of Thomism, advocated in his encyclical *Aeterni Patris*, a rational base for the establishment of social order, too.

¹⁰ Cf. *The Dispute*, 25—6.

¹¹ Adam Mahrburg (1855—1913) the most outstanding Polish positivist. In 1887 he wrote — and never changed his opinions that christianity expressed the opinion *credo quia absurdum* on the problem of relationship between reason and faith. He saw the only possibility of religion in agnosticism based on feelings and moral consciousness resulting from fideism. Cf. *Teoria celowości ze stanowiska naukowego*, in: *Pisma filozoficzne Adama Mahrburga*, Vol. I, Warszawa 1914, p. 120.

generation of catholic philosophers wanted to make a proper appraisal of modern philosophy, and discarded from posthegelian idealism. There were many a reason for their giving up of Hegelianism. They rejected idealism not because it was incompatible with religion but because it was in disagreement with scientific facts. In their positivism, they did not deny the necessity of metaphysics. Some of them even tried to build up a realistic metaphysics compatible with scientific facts. They assumed that metaphysics would answer the question of the relationship between faith and reason. They believed that the present teaching of philosophy in Catholic Academies should be modified because of the development of modern sciences and philosophy. And they were afraid that the renewal of scholasticism meant a return to the old and out-dated philosophical thinking. It was the position of Fr. F. Krupiński¹² and Fr. S. Pawlicki¹³.

Fr. Krupiński expressed his views in his first book, it was a translation of Schwegler's *The History of Philosophy*¹⁴. Schwegler was a follower of Hegel. The translator added an Appendix: *On Polish Philosophy*¹⁵. That he followed Hegelian views it was visible in the notes¹⁶. He agreed with Schwegler in his critical evaluation of scholasticism. It was to him a degeneration of sound thinking, not even worth mentioning in a history of philosophy, especially as its problems were rather

¹² Father Franciszek Salezy Krupiński (1836—1898) a religious of School Brothers (pijar), ordained in Warsaw in 1858, licence in theology in 1858 then studied biology and philosophy with H. Struve (1863—66). Since 1866 Rector of the post-jesuit Church in Warsaw in Świętojańska St. An orator of renown. Since 1859 taught religion in IVth High School in Warsaw. He abandoned Hegel's philosophy and was the first to teach on Comte and J. S. Mill and Spencer. Main works: *Filozofia w Polsce*. Appendix to: A. Schwegler, *Historia filozofii w zarysie*, Warszawa 1863; *Przyszłość filozofii*, Bibl. Warsz. vol. 1, 1864; *Szkoła pozytywna*, Bibl. Warsz. Vol. 3, 1868; *Nasza historiozofia*, Ateneum Vol. 3, 1876; *Filozofia dziejów i jej historia*, Ateneum Vol. 4, 1878.

¹³ Father Stefan Pawlicki (1839—1916), a religious of the Congregation of Resurrection of Our Lord. Studied philology and philosophy in Wrocław (Breslau) up to 1858. Ph.D. in 1865. Then "habilitation script" and professorship in Szkoła Główna in Warsaw where he lectured in history of philosophy for two years since 1866. In December 1868 entered the noviciate of the Fathers of Resurrection. Ordained priest in Rome in 1872. Since 1882 professor in philosophy in Jagellon University in Cracow in Theology Dept., since 1895 also professor in philosophy in Philosophy Dept. Main works: *Materializm wobec nauki*, Prz. pol. 4(1869)70; *Kilka uwag o podstawie i granicach filozofii*, Kraków 1878; *Historia filozofii greckiej od Talesa do śmierci Arystotelesa* (unfinished) Kraków, Vol. 1, 1890; Vol. 2, part 1, 1903; Vol. 2 part 2, 1903—1917.

¹⁴ A. Schwegler, *Historia filozofii w zarysie*, translated into Polish by F. K. Warszawa 1863.

¹⁵ *Ibid.* 381—479.

¹⁶ Cf. J. J. Sawicki, *Ks. Krupiński jako historyk filozofii*, St. Phil. Chr. 2(1966)1, 281—96.

theological¹⁷. This strong criticism was changed by Krupiński a few years later, before the promulgation of the encyclical *Aeterni Patris*, when the author adopted the positivist attitude of Comte. He was influenced by Comte's historiosophy. Then Krupiński assumed that scholasticism was a necessary step in the development of knowledge which could not be neglected by a historian. He should avoid being biased against it and investigate this period of European thinking and even correct the current false opinions entirely negative¹⁸. We can make a hypothesis which needs further investigation that Krupiński followed Comte's views because he saw in them genuine scientific attitude and bold historiosophical assumptions. He accepted Comte's philosophical ideas more as a complement to Hegel than as his radical rejection.

Father Stefan Pawlicki met with German idealism during his studies in Wrocław lasting from 1858—1865. His major was classical philology but he also became interested in philosophy and received his Ph.D. with a dissertation *De Schopenhaueri doctrina et philosophandi ratione* which was the first doctoral dissertation on Schopenhauer. The influence of German idealism was shown in the theses he had to defend, the sixth of which read: *Omnis philosophia nova ab Schellingio proficisci debet*¹⁹. He was interested in idealistic philosophy and attended lectures of professor J. Ch. Braniss, the Wrocław professor in Philosophy, for a whole year before his Ph.D. (Fr. S. Pawlicki was to a certain degree a self-made philosopher). Braniss was a follower of idealistic metaphysics combined with theology and inspired by the work of Schelling (hence that sixth thesis) and Schleiermacher.

Soon Pawlicki changed his view to a more realistic philosophy, as a philologist he always showed appraisal to historical knowledge based on facts. He was then regarded by his contemporaries as a positivist who inconsistently became a fervent catholic one day, (in 1868)²⁰. At that time catholicism was believed to be incompatible with positivism. Pawlicki learned to apply rigorous scientific data in his studies of philology and archeology and the same principles were applied in his philosophical thinking. We have to stress that when Pawlicki became a fervent catholic under the influence of P. Semenenko²¹ and

¹⁷ Cf. *ibid.*, 282.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*

¹⁹ Quoted from H. Struve, *Historia logiki jako teorii poznania w Polsce*, Warszawa 1911, 360 (further quoted: Struve, HL).

²⁰ This opinion of Pawlicki is actual up to now cf.e.g. Cz. Głombik, *Człowiek i historia. Studium koncepcji filozoficznej Stefana Pawlickiego*, Warszawa 1973, 298.

²¹ Father Piotr Semenenko (1814—1886) co-founder with B. Jański

changed his life radically becoming a religious, it was not a change in his *Weltanschauung* from positivism to catholicism or from indifference to catholicism, because if we accept that positivism means negation of metaphysics and religion then Pawlicki had never been a positivist^{21a}. Just the reverse, already in his Inaugural Lecture on Nov. 1, 1866 (two years before the seemingly inconsistent conversion) when he started lecturing in history of philosophy in the Warsaw Szkoła Główna (Academic School) he exposed a program of realistic metaphysics. He proposed for the starting-point in philosophy the Cartesian fact of self-awareness in which human reason is in real contact with reality and not only with notions about it.

To avoid Cartesian dualism and Kantian phenomenalism, he underlined that the object of direct knowledge given in self-awareness is the reality of the *ego* which is thinking and corporal. As a historian of philosophy he stressed the importance of christian thinking in this field which was able to create a bond of unity among people²². Already at that time he mentioned the values of scholastic thinking, then neglected because it was wrapped in confused formulations difficult to understand²³. But seeing the worth of scholastic system he warned against its indiscriminate worship. He saw a danger in the renewal of neo-scholasticism. He was afraid of the "biased group-spirit" which could lead to unscientific argumentation in a scientific discussion. Such was the reason of his

and A. Celiński of the Congregation of Fathers of Resurrection, Father General of the Congregation since 1842, then again since 1873 until his death. Consultant of the Roman Congregation in the Curia, highly valued by Popes Pius IX and Leo XIII. Not himself Thomist but stimulator of the revival of Christian philosophy by profound historical studies on Scholasticism. It is possible that he sponsored the encyclical *Aeterni Patris*. Main works: *Credo. Chrześcijańskie prawdy wiary*, 1885; *Ojczce nasz*, 1896; *Biesiady Filozoficzne*, Przegląd Poznański 1859—60—61—62.

^{21a} My assumptions were confirmed recently by A. Przymusiąła, *Stefan Pawlicki a pozytywizm*, w: *Polska myśl filozoficzna i społeczna*, t. 2, Warszawa 1975, 231—65.

²² „...Nowa ta jedność będzie większą i wspanialszą niż miniona grecka, gdy do niej dodane będą tysiącletnie zdobycze chrześcijaństwa. Pod ożywczym tchnieniem ducha chrześcijańskiego wykończy się gmach nowy z olbrzymią kopułą, w której cieniu spoczną wszystkie narody, a kopułą tą... będzie nowa filozofia". Pawlicki, *Lekcja wstępna* (Inaugural Lecture) *Gazeta Warsz.* 1866, No. 175.

²³ „...W dziełach (myślicieli średniowiecznych) pełno rzeczy niezwykłych, niezrozumiałych... pełno tam dowodów więcej zawieszonych w powietrzu, niż gotyckich wieżyc ostrołuki, o których także nie sposób czasem wykazać na czym one zawisły... (a jednak) ...uważnie wpatrując się w ten świat dziwny gotyckich wieków, czujemy jak uprzedzenia nasze zwolna znikają... Łatwo nareszcie byłoby nam wykazać, iż mądrość średnich wieków nie jest ani zatrzymaniem się, ani cofnięciem w tył ducha ludzkiego, lecz postępem i że temu postępowi zawdzięczamy więcej niż w dumie naszej przyznać chcemy". Pawlicki, *Abelard i Hegloiza*, Warszawa 1867, 13—4. Could it be a trace of the polemic with Schweigger's *History of Philosophy* translated recently by Krupiński?

sharp polemic with Morawski in 1877/8 and of the opinion of other philosophers who believed that after the encyclical *Aeterni Patris*, Pawlicki propagated its teaching not out of conviction but *ex officio*²⁴.

His later proposals of building up metaphysics were included in a book: *Kilka uwag o podstawie i granicach filozofii* (Some Remarks on the Foundation and Boundaries of Philosophy), published in Cracow in 1878, before the encyclical. His starting-point for metaphysics remained the fact of selfawareness, and besides, the distinction between direct and indirect knowledge. Pawlicki proved the reality of causative relations and delineated the theory of independent being, in this way he gave rational foundation to a recognition of the existence of God. He also laid foundation to a metaphysical system which could be formulated scientifically in a logical sequence and could solve the problem of the relationship between knowledge and faith. Pawlicki already had then an intuition that metaphysics ought to expose a theory of a concrete reality of being in its existential aspect. However, he could not liberate himself from the language of essentialist ontology of the type of Wolff and Hegel. Hence we can find in his work a surprising statement about the reality of general being, formulated in such strong words that they resemble the most extreme national realism of Plato²⁵.

c) Scholasticism. Scholastic philosophy before the encyclical *Aeterni Patris* was taught only in Jesuit colleges. They followed the tradition of Aristotelian and Thomistic *Ratio Studiorum*, i.e. the so-called christian Aristotelism. In other environments even before 1863 some philosophers sought a solution to the problem of relationship between faith and knowledge in such a way that would respect both elements; they also tried to see the role of reason in the faith-act. In pioneer endeavours of Father S. Chołoniowski²⁶ and Father J. Hołwiński²⁷ some elements of scholastic thinking can already be traced back.

²⁴ The dispute between Pawlicki and Morawski is presented in an exhaustive way in *The Dispute*, 59—81.

²⁵ The trials of Pawlicki in building up metaphysics are described in *The Dispute*, 28—38 and 49—59.

²⁶ Fr. Stanisław Chołoniowski (1792—1846), well known preacher in the cathedral of Kamieniec Podolski, not a professional philosopher, he understood the danger of traditionalism which subordinated knowledge to faith and another danger of theology based on German idealism. He tried to give a definition of the relationship between knowledge and faith and tried to show the role of reason in a faith-act. Main works: *Sen w Podhorcach*, Wilno 1842; *Kazania*, 2 volumes, editor J. Badeni, Kraków 1888.

²⁷ Fr. Ignacy Hołwiński (1800—1855), Chairman of Catholic Academy in Petersburg since 1842, archbishop of Mohylów since 1851. Translator of Sha-

Some deeper insights into Jesuit teaching of scholasticism were presented in a book of Father M. Morawski²⁸ already mentioned *Filozofia i jej zadania* (Philosophy and its Purpose — first edition 1877) in which the author makes references to Balmes and A. Dmowski SJ²⁹, thus he suggested where to look for his neoscholastic inspiration. Due to his book Morawski was regarded by Struve as "the first outstanding Polish representative of scientific trends in neoscholasticism"³⁰.

He was unquestionably one of the leaders of neoscholasticism in Europe; had a vast historical knowledge and was conscious that general metaphysics had to be the knowledge of reality and not an *a priori* notional scheme. He, too, was not able to liberate himself from the language of essentialists in philosophy. His object of general metaphysics was "being in general", the most general idea, and not all concrete being from the point of view of its existence. Moreover, we can see in his writings the wolffian division of metaphysics into general and specific, the last divided into theodicy, psychology (pneumatology) and cosmology. Morawski adopted this school-manual scheme, although he was aware that the main issues of theodicy are included into ontology (general metaphysics), he also perceived that methodologically the four philosophical disciplines could be divided into two groups: ontology with theodicy in one, and psychology and cosmology in the other.

He had the possibility to create a more original classification of philosophy into general metaphysics, i.e. theory of necessary being (*ens a se*) and theory of dependent being (*ens ab alio*); they

kespeare and Petrarch appreciated by his contemporaries, great orator. In a polemic with Trentowski tried to establish the relationship between knowledge and faith and the role of reason in a faithact. He showed the distinction between philosophy and theology recognising the scientific character of both disciplines. Main works: *O metodzie filozofii*, Tyg. Peters. 1842; *O stosunku bezpośredniej filozofii do religii i cywilizacji naszej*, Tyg. Peters. 1846; *Homiletyka*, Kraków 1859; *Kazania niedzielne i świąteczne*, Kraków 1857.

²⁸ Fr. Marian Morawski SJ (1845—1901) student in the Jesuit College in Metz, joined the Jesuits, ordained in 1870. Since 1873 professor in philosophy in the Jesuit College Starawieś — there he wrote his principal philosophical work *Philosophy and its Purpose* (first edition 1877). Since 1884 chief editor of „Przegląd Powszechny" where he published his popular book *The Evenings at the Lake Lemna* (1883—1896) and *Celowość w naturze* (from 1886). Since 1887 professor in dogmatic theology at Jagellon University in Cracow. Full professorship in 1891. Because of bad health resigned from lecturing in 1899. His last book, *The Communion of Saints* unfinished, was written until his death.

²⁹ Fr. Alojzy Dmowski SJ (1799—1879) Born in the district of Podole. When 19 year old entered the jesuits. Professor of Collegium Romanum in the 40-ies of XIX century. There he introduced scholasticism in philosophical curriculum. Treated by Morawski as a predecessor of neoscholasticism equal to Balmes. Author of a famous work *Institutiones Philosophicae* (five successive editions).

³⁰ Struve, HL, 481.

both embraced treaties on the existence and nature of God when psychology and cosmology were more related in their object for research and methodology³¹.

We can also speak of some elements of scholastic teaching in Diocesan Seminaries but the character and content of this teaching has to be investigated more adequately.

2. The Main Issues of the Encyclical „Aeterni Patris”

Pope Leo XIII promulgated the encyclical *Aeterni Patris* on August 4th, 1879³² which he described in such words: „our encyclical letter on the restoring in Catholic Schools the teaching of Christian philosophy, according to the mind of the angelic doctor St. Thomas Aquinas” (*De philosophia christiana ad mentem S. Thomae Aquinatis Doctoris Angelici in scholis catholicis instauranda*). Leo XIII considered a sound philosophical education the basis for a future restoration of the social order. He assumed that the best way of defending the Church and society itself against the dangers impending them “is the restoration of the right principles of thought and action by the teaching of philosophy” (A.S.S., 12,225). To consider the papal postulate on teaching philosophy as a mere intellectual luxury, or as an unpractical method to reform the society, would therefore be a complete misinterpretation of the Leonine doctrine.

What is “a christian philosophy” recommended by the pope? It has to be a philosophizing according to the best tradition of Christian academies, especially the doctrine of St. Thomas. It consists in uniting the study of philosophy with a christian docility to accept the Divine Revelation. It does not mean enslaving reason but a “bond of friendship” between reason and faith which serves them both as a source of many benefits (A.S.S., 13,57—58).

The best way to cleanse the Schools from false philosophy threatening the order of the Church and society is to restore the right philosophy in the Schools and through them into public consciousness. Leo XIII wanted to lay a doctrinal base of philosophical and social order, i.e. the right thinking and right acting as the two cannot be divided. The above thoughts express Gilson’s opinion and we can add that the purpose of the encyclical was the defence of faith, the social welfare and order and the

³¹ The endeavours of Morawski in building up metaphysics in comparison with similar Pawlicki’s work are compared in *The Dispute*, 38—59.

³² The doctrine of the encyclical *Aeterni Patris* is described according to the book: *The Church speaks to the Modern World. The social teachings of Leo XIII*. Edited, annotated and with an introduction by E. Gilson, Doubleday 1954; Texts of the encyclical: *ibid.* 31—51.

development of knowledge. It can be fulfilled when order is established in philosophical thinking; the order resulting from the study of philosophy correlated with the obedience to the Church's teaching (Christian faith). The Fathers of the Ancient Church are here our guides together with medieval Doctors and especially Thomas Aquinas. The study of his doctrine will bring a renewal of the modern philosophical and theological thinking. This practical attitude of the encyclical is not a result of shallow practicicism, but it reminds the reader that a theory is always at the base of all practical human activity. The recommendation to teach *ad mentem Thomae* does not make of Thomistic doctrine a weapon to withhold the investigation on truth. It was an encouragement to continue creative philosophical thinking according to historical lines as the guiding stimulus, and with appraisal of the tradition of "philosophizing in faith" — *ad mentem Thomae* and not *secundum Thomam*. Many a Christian philosopher was puzzled by the encyclical, and only saw its practical, ideological implications. The aspect *secundum Thomam* often prevailed. It did not, however, stop the development of historical investigation on genuine texts of Aquinas, fostered by the encyclical. This scholarly work flourished several decades later and guarded against mere practicicism and ideological disputes. It is possible that some scholars proclaimed Thomism because that was the wish of the Holy See, and obviously such attitude was not right. However, the historical study on Aquinas proved the great wisdom of Leo XIII to shift the attention of the scholars on Great Scholasticism. Therefore we ought to study the teaching of Thomas not because the encyclical proposed it, but the encyclical encourages the study because we can learn from Thomas the right principles of reasoning and acting, with him we enter the path leading to truth in philosophy and find the right solution of the problem of the relationship between faith and reason.

3. Polish Opinions on the Encyclical „Aeterni Patris"

The Polish opinions were divergent, and resulted from different philosophical orientations. Among thinkers who did not represent catholic schools was Henryk Struve³³, a follower of "realistic

³³ Henryk Struve (1840—1912) studied in Tübingen, Erlangen, Göttingen, Halle, Leipzig and Jena. Since 1863 professor in logics in Szkoła Główna in Warsaw. Since 1864 professor in philosophy in Szkoła Główna. In 1871—1905 professor in philosophy in the University of Warsaw. Great merits as historian of Polish philosophy. Erudite giving exhaustive information in his work. His philosophical concepts called "realistic idealism" expressed post-Kantian criticism and were of little influence. Main works: *Synteza dwóch światów*, 1876; *Wstęp krytyczny do filozofii*, 3rd edition 1903; *Historia logiki jako teorii poznania w Polsce*, 2 ed. 1911.

idealism" combined with post-Kantian criticism, who saw in the encyclical only mystical elements in the theory of cognition³⁴.

Adam Mahrburg³⁵ was a radical positivist and believed only in empirical data in Kantian sense of empirism, and he opposed to call metaphysics a science. He believed that the promulgation of Thomism was harmful, authoritarian and limited the liberty of philosophizing. Together with L. M. Billia, an adherent of the Augustinian tradition, he called Thomism "philosophy by decree", he saw, however, the positive aspects in historical research on Thomas³⁶. We have to remember that Mahrburg treated in the same manner as Thomism any attempt of turning back to old philosophical systems³⁷, for instance also the Augustinian trend of Billia.

The philosophers of Catholic Schools saw in the encyclical

³⁴ „W świecie katolickim pierwiastki mistyczne teorii poznania łączą się ze wznowieniem filozofii św. Tomasza głównie wskutek encykliki *Aeterni Patris* Leona XIII z r. 1879... Teoryą... poznania św. Tomasza, a w szczególności jego naukę o dwóch źródłach poznania prawdy, rozumu i objawienia, oraz o zmyśle wewnętrznym, dochodzącym do wiary w objawienie, dzięki zachęcie ze strony Boga, rozwijają liczni zwolennicy tak zwanej neoscholastycznej filozofii. Ma ona charakter mistycyzmu religijnego o ile się powołuje na objawienie Boskie, jako źródło poznania prawdy najwyższej". Struve, HL, 126.

³⁵ Adam Mahrburg (1855—1913) philosophical studies in Petersburg (under direction of Władisławlew) and in Leipzig (under Wundt). Organiser and leading professor of clandestine University teaching in Warsaw since 1891. Coeditor of „Poradnik dla Samouków” and „Przegląd Filozoficzny”. Main works: *Teorya celowości ze stanowiska naukowego*, Kraków 1888; many publications, most important articles printed in: *Pisma Filozoficzne* A. Mahrburga, Vol. I and II, Warszawa 1914.

³⁶ About the encyclical *Aeterni Patris* Mahrburg wrote: „Z jednej strony wzięto się gorliwie do badań historycznych nad scholastyką, a nade wszystko nad Tomaszem z Akwinu, i to jest najlepszy owoc tego kierunku; z drugiej strony zaczęto komentować i przystosowywać filozofię Tomasza do wymagań nauki współczesnej, ale i odwrotnie, co jest z góry poronionym owocem tego kierunku. Tak powstała filozofia z dekretu. („Przegl. Fil.” 3,1900, no 1,95 in the review of L. M. Billia, *L'esiglio di sant' Agostino. Note sulle contraddizioni di un sistema di filosofia per decreto*, Torino 1899). I. Radziszewski (*Odrodzenie filozofii scholastycznej*, „Przegl. Fil.” 4,1901), 465) questions the term "philosophy by decree" and writes about the review itself: "There are so many errors in the review, we want to believe that committed involuntarily, that we won't give the name of its author".

³⁷ Cf. the irony of the text: „nie brak i za naszych czasów prób wskrzeszenia starych systemów, ich odświeżenia i inkrustowania materiałem z nauki współczesnej czerpanym. Ta jednak metoda nie zapewni im wartości naukowej, jak pozłota lichego materiału nie przekształca w złoto. Stąd to cały legion neo, czy nowosokratyzmów, nowoarystotelizmów, nowotomizmów, nowokartezjanizmów itp., cała fabryka odnawiania zabytków kopalnych i zakładania szkół i koterii dla miłośników klubowej polityki w filozofii. Wszakże te nowoprzeżytki nie zostają w żywych stosunkach z nauką i żadnego na nią wpływu nie wywierają, pomimo zalotnych do niej umizgów; pływają tak na powierzchni życia, jak łódki rzucone na fale burzliwego morza, póki się nie rozbiją o pierwszy lepszy szkopuł”. *Filozofia społeczna*, in: *Pisma Filozof.* A. Mahrburga, Warszawa 1914, Vol. II, 165.

a promotion of the neoscholastic movement of recent years. Idzi Radziszewski³⁸ in a polemic on the use of the term „philosophy by decree", explained that it was not the encyclical which brought about the revival of Scholasticism, but it was a response to already existing return-movement to medievals. The encyclical gave its support to this revival and deepened and approved some forms of neoscholastics. It gave principles to be followed by Catholic Schools and corrected some errors and pointed to possible dangers. It is not plausible to state that it was a cause or even the cause of the "return" movement, still more that it imposed neoscholasticism³⁹. Thomism was in renaissance because of its own intrinsic values. To support his views Idzi Radziszewski mentioned the book of Morawski *Philosophy and its Purpose* whose first edition (1877) preceded the encyclical (1879) by two years and was the result of the renewal of scholastic thinking.

We adopt the thesis of Radziszewski that the encyclical *Aeterni Patris* modified the neoscholastic movement, and will now envisage its influence on the views of Pawlicki and Morawski. Although it seems paradoxical but it impressed more Morawski who defended neoscholasticism, than Pawlicki who warned against the abuses of the movement and therefore was regarded as its enemy. Morawski under the influence of the encyclical abandoned his treatise on the philosophy of nature in which he followed atomistic approach as the encyclical rather promulgated hylomorphysm and warned against dynamic-atomistic theories in the philosophy of nature⁴⁰. He never returned to that work.

Pawlicki saw in the encyclical a modification of the "return" movement and it appeased his doubts regarding the "biased group spirit" in neoscholasticism. What is more important, he saw in it a confirmation of his conviction about the necessity of historical studies on philosophical past. It is possible that the encyclical

³⁸ Fr. Idzi Benedykt Radziszewski (1871—1922) graduated from Catholic Academy in Petersburg, in 1899—1900 studied philosophy in Louvain under professor Mercier (future cardinal, ordinary bishop of Malines—Brussels). Expert and propagator of neoscholasticism in Poland. Creator and first editor of the periodical „Ateneum Kapłańskie" in 1909 in Włocławek; 1914—1918 Chairman of Catholic Academy in Petersburg, first Chairman and founder of the Catholic University of Lublin, Poland. Main works: *Odrodzenie filozofii scholastycznej*, „Przeł. Fil." 1901; *Teologia a nauki przyrodnicze*, Włocławek 1910.

³⁹ I. Radziszewski, *Odrodzenie filozofii scholastycznej*, „Przeł. Fil." 4 (1901) 488. Polemics with an article: *Our Philosophy* in „Głos" (1900) no 17 whose author believed that Thomism was automatically introduced by the papal decree. He also had a polemic with Mahrburg about the same issue. cf. note 36.

⁴⁰ Cf. J. Tuszowski SJ, *O. Marian Morawski TJ*, Kraków 1932, 182.

together with the dispute with Morawski⁴¹, made Pawlicki aware of the stability of Scholastic system as a true continuation in philosophical thinking of the Ancient. He probably then perceived the consistency of philosophical issues, methods and essential problems which had to be reconsidered in a new manner. In the preface to his monumental work *Historia filozofii greckiej* (The History of Greek Philosophy) unfortunately unfinished, some of his formulations resemble the remarks of Morawski⁴². We have therefore good reason to suppose that the polemic with Morawski had a bearing on him. In his historical studies he would look then for stable values and organic unity. In the papal „decree” he would stress the benefits of united efforts of catholic scholars in their investigation of the heritage of Middle Ages, mostly Thomas Aquinas⁴³. The study on the latter — he believed — would become more profound with the knowledge of ancient Greek philosophers and especially Aristotle⁴⁴.

Pawlicki understood better the necessity of closer examination of the continuity in philosophical development and in the formation of the right philosophical thinking and sound reasoning. In his work on Renan⁴⁵ he criticised the fact that in the French Diocesan Seminaries in the middle of the 19th century, philosophy was taught disregarding its history. It obviously had a harmful influence on clerics, on Renan himself among others. They were taught that the right philosophical thinking started with Descartes. Pope Leo XIII showed a remedy in this situation. In his encyclical he taught to introduce the study of history of philosophy in all Church Schools. In that way the great ancient and medieval thinkers became known widely and the students were given genuine texts of Thomas Aquinas and not mere compilations⁴⁶.

The encyclical did not, however, change the Jesuits' study and investigations in philosophical issues, except for Morawski's withdrawal of his research in philosophy of nature. It seems that

⁴¹ Cf. note 24.

⁴² Cf. Pawlicki, *Historia filozofii greckiej od Talesa do śmierci Arystotelesa*, Vol. I, Kraków 1890, 6—7; cf. also Morawski, *Kilka słów o książce „Filozofia i jej zadania”*, „Przeł. Lw.” 15/1878/618—9.

⁴³ Pawlicki, *ibid.*, 7—8.

⁴⁴ Pawlicki, *ibid.*, 8.

⁴⁵ St. Pawlicki, *Zywot i dzieło Ernesta Renana*, Kraków 1896. Quotations from the 3rd edition — Warszawa 1905.

⁴⁶ Cf. Pawlicki, *Zywot i dzieła Ernesta Renana*, Vol. I, 27—28. The opinion of Pawlicki (*ibid.* 26) on the manual *Philosophia Lugdunensis* used then in France, coincides with the formulations of Gilson: “What surprises us most in it today is that such a mixture of Aristotelianism, of Cartesianism, and of ontologism was imposed by the Catholic hierarchy, in more than one French diocese, as the standard work to be used in classes of philosophy” (E. Gilson, *French and Italian philosophy*, in: *A History of Philosophy*, E. Gilson gen. editor, vol. IV, N. York 1966, 208).

Jesuit professors were convinced that they follow the encyclical when they followed their traditional curricula called *Ratio Studiorum*.

4. Introduction of Leonine Teaching

The first catholic information on the encyclical in Poland is its analysis done by Father Antoni Langer⁴⁷ *Św. Tomasz i dzisiejsza filozofia* (St. Thomas and the modern Philosophy). This article (and some others of the same author), show clearly that Thomism of the Schoolmen was very different from the teaching of St. Thomas. There is the characteristic description of "five ways" which shows that Langer knows the scheme of Thomas⁴⁸ but when he describes the "fifth way", he introduces moral argumentation calling it the „fifth way" of Thomas. He probably wanted to unite the "five ways" of Thomas with the traditional argumentation in Jesuit schools: metaphysical, physical and moral arguments⁴⁹. He framed the five Thomistic arguments into the Jesuit framework. The three first Thomist "ways" were shown as metaphysical, the content of the fourth and fifth was presented as a physical argument. Finally he gave the name of the „fifth way" to the moral argumentation omitted by Thomas⁵⁰. The loyalty towards Jesuit School tradition combined with loyalty towards Pope Leo XIII's instructions resulted in an unfortunate hybrid.

About 1900 Polish thinkers already instructed by the encyclical entered the field. Those scholars who taught Thomism in University Chairs are worth mentioning. They were Father Idzi Radziszewski (professor in the Catholic Academy in Petersburg and the first Chairman of the Catholic University in Lublin, Poland); Father F. Gabryl⁵¹ (professor in Jagellon University, Cracow), Fr. K.

⁴⁷ Fr. Antoni Langer SJ (1833—1902) entered the Jesuit noviciate in Starawieś in 1852. Studied philosophy and theology in Rome (1856—1863), ordained priest in Rome 1860. Professor in philosophy in Starawieś (noviciate house) (1863—68). Professor in theology in Jesuit Convent in Cracow (1867—1893). Main works: *Św. Tomasz i dzisiejsza filozofia*, „Przeł. Pow." 1884; *Pojęcie o Bogu w chrześcijaństwie i u filozofów*, „Przeł. Pow." 1884—5. In the presentation of Langer's opinions I have used the analysis of Fr. R. Wesołowski from his unpublished Master Paper: *Philosophy of Antoni Langer*, Warszawa 1973.

⁴⁸ A. Langer, *Pojęcie o Bogu w chrześcijaństwie i u filozofów*, „Przeł. Pow." 6/1885/240, 344, 351—3.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, 8/1885/60.

⁵⁰ Stating that he will now present the "fifth" way *ex gubernatione rerum* Langer writes: „Prawo moralności, niezatartymi zgłoskami w sercach ludzkich wyryte, naprowadza nas także na istnienie Boga, jako Najświętszego Prawodawcy" — *ibid.*, 8/1885/60.

⁵¹ Fr. Franciszek Gabryl (1866—1914) studied in the Jagellon Academy in 1886—1900. Attended the lectures of M. Morawski and S. Pawlicki.

Wais⁵² (professor in Lwów-Lemberg). They published mostly school manuals which were one of the first Polish University Reading-books in philosophy in which Polish philosophical terminology was coined (not only scholastic terminology). What they presented was mostly a systematization of Christian Aristotelianism — sometimes in post-Wolffian shape rather than true Thomistic reasoning.

Not enough consideration was given to genuine texts of Aquinas and the originality of his metaphysics. The same situation prevailed in all Europe at that time. The manuals of Gabryl Wais and D. Mercier — the last translated into Polish on Radziszewski's recommendation and published in 1900—2 by "Przegląd Filozoficzny" — were highly estimated by Polish intellectuals and had exercised a strong bearing on spiritual formation of Christian clergy and laity. They prepared the way to the future interest in Thomistic thinking and the intellectual depth of Polish Catholicism. The next generation of Thomists were taught from these manuals.

All philosophical orientations in the second part of the 19th century were characterized by their practical attitude in philosophical thinking. The scholars were interested in philosophy not only as a tool to cognize of reality but also as a tool in the development of social standards. The catchword of "organic hard labor" was accepted both by idealists and positivists and by the catholic thinkers as well. Christian philosophers were moreover seeking in philosophy argumentation for apologetics and defence of faith. This practical attitude is also characteristic to the encyclical *Aeterni Patris*. The aim and purpose of the renewal of philosophy in *Aeterni Patris* are: the defence of faith, the social welfare and the development of knowledge. The wisdom of the Pope Leo XIII stressed the importance of the theory as a prerequisite to any practical scheme in view of restoring the social order. It preserved the christian thinkers from shallow practical concerns and oriented them to theoretical research in philosophy of being

Further studied in Louvain with D. Mercier. Professor in Christian Philosophy in Jagellon University since 1902. Main works: *Nieśmiertelność duszy ludzkiej, w świetle rozumu i nowoczesnej nauki*, Kraków 1895; *Polska filozofia religijna w wieku XIX*, Vol. 1—2, 1913—14. A series of university manuals, e.g. *Logika formalna*, Kraków 1899; *Logika ogólna*, Kraków, 1912; *Noetyka*, Kraków, 1900; *Metafizyka ogólna, czyli nauka o bycie*, 1903; *Psychologia*, Kraków 1906; *Filozofia przyrody*, Kraków, 1910.

⁵² Fr. Kazimierz Wais (1865—1934) ordained priest in Przemyśl 1889. Studied in Innsbruck and Rome. Ph. D. 1894, Professor in philosophy in the Diocesan Seminary in Przemyśl 1904/5. Attended lectures of D. Mercier in Louvain. Professor in philosophy in the University of Lwów since 1909. His Thomism included elements of Scotism, of Suarez and Descartes. In the customary way of the Louvain School he tried to base the subject of philosophy on specific sciences resembling in it the positivists. Author of manuals in psychology (1902—3), cosmology (1931—2) and ontology (1926).

and towards historical approach of philosophizing. Therefore it is understandable that Pawlicki, the most theoretically-minded of Polish christian philosophers, saw and appreciated the encouragement of the encyclical to deepen theoretical study in the history of philosophy. Although in his writings there are also evident apologetic instances. The encouragements of the encyclical were soon to flourish also in Poland in the development and renewal of neo-scholastic philosophy.