

I. Passive acceptance of Plato's image

1.1 *A.I. Zabellewicz, J.K. Szaniawski, and Polish Kantianism in relation to Plato*

In 1817 Adam Ignacy Zabellewicz¹ (1784–1831) took the post of Professor of Philosophy at the University of Warsaw, having already established a name for himself at the University as a lecturer of philosophy in the Faculty of Medicine. He headed the Chair of Philosophy from 1818 to 1823 and his works on ancient philosophy, mainly on Socrates and Plato, date from this period. The works of Zabellewicz which are discussed below are not frequently quoted in the literature on the subject. Researchers usually focus on his dissertation, in which he articulated his own philosophical and metaphysical views, while his works on ancient philosophy are often neglected.

Before its publication, Zabellewicz's study on Socrates was reported on at the meeting of the Warsaw Society of Friends of Learning in November 1819. In the report the speaker listed Socrates' merits and drew attention to the fact that a large number of studies had been devoted to the Athenian. He also remarked that the author of the work had emphasised Socrates' significance in philosophy rather than merely presenting his biography.² Zabellewicz's study on Socrates was also mentioned by Stanisław Staszic (1755–1826) in his speech at the opening of the Society's public meeting, in which he described Socrates as a symbol of sacrifice for the sake of truth and as a philosopher who had opposed the unenlightened powers in Athens, but had lost the struggle against them.³

1 Among the various versions of the spelling of the philosopher's name (including Zubelewicz, Zubellewicz) the form 'Zabellewicz' will be used. This is how he signed his most important works, and this form was also used by Władysław Tatarkiewicz. According to Józef Bieliński, in 1821 Zabellewicz began to sign his name as 'Zubelewicz' (Bieliński, 1907: 99). On Zabellewicz's works on ancient philosophy *cf.*: Mróz, 2009a, 2010c.

2 Kraushar, 1902: 318.

3 Kraushar, 1902: 329. Staszic referred once again to Zabellewicz's study on Socrates during another public meeting of the Society when they met to sum up its four-year period of activity. Staszic presented Socrates, as he had been portrayed by Zabellewicz, as a man who had tried to counteract corruption and injustice. This

Zabellewicz used the works by Plato and Xenophon as the most important primary sources for his presentation of Socrates' biography and philosophy. He informed his readers that Socrates had initially been interested in the 'natural sciences', or the philosophy of nature and the 'cosmophysics of Anaxagoras'. Zabellewicz therefore regarded the *Phaedo* as a credible source for Socrates' intellectual biography. He also considered Diotima to be a historical figure on the basis of her speech quoted by Socrates in the *Symposium*.

Socrates, as portrayed by Plato, believed that his way of doing philosophy was under the guidance and protection of God. He was not a sophist, and although he was not even a philosopher in the strict sense of the word, his influence on the history of philosophy should not be underestimated. In characterising Socratic philosophy, Zabellewicz attempted to apply Kantian terminology, writing: "it is not a question of what we can know, but what we should do, and what we should expect: in other words, questions relating to human destiny, to our obligations to ourselves and to others, and our relation to God were his main research subject."⁴ Again, it was to Kantian philosophy that Zabellewicz turned for a criterion for evaluating Socrates: "he very rightly held in contempt all speculation that led into the dark labyrinth, disrupting human comprehension and distracting man from the more important engagements of practical reason."⁵ Thus empty metaphysical speculations were alien to Socrates. In true Kantian spirit, Zabellewicz argued that some metaphysical questions could not be answered in the domain of experience, and therefore the search for them was futile: "all speculations on the origin and laws of the universe (that is on the heavenly beings, as he called them) were considered by him to be without purpose, because they aimed at things which could not be fathomed."⁶ Among these unfathomable matters Socrates included the existence of God and human immortality, which for him could not become objects of knowledge but remained objects of faith.

was, in fact, a criticism of contemporary times, which Staszic believed to be immoral, for the ethical rules given by the Creator had ceased to be observed, and people ignored their duties and rights. It seems that Staszic, a voice of the then vanishing Enlightenment, was calling for a new Socrates who could remind the moderns about „the doctrine of the eternal relations between Man and Man, between Man and external beings and the one Supreme Being, God" (Kraushar, 1902: 173).

4 Zabellewicz, 1820: 492.

5 Zabellewicz, 1820: 494.

6 Zabellewicz, 1820: 494.

For Zabellewicz, Plato was a much more important subject of research than Socrates. He reconstructed Plato's views on upbringing and education on the basis of the *Republic* and the *Laws*. Leaving aside the well-known details of Plato's educational project, let us focus on his evaluation of the project. He considered that the most important aim of Platonic pedagogy was "to arouse in children the sentiments that they would demand of themselves as adults, so that before the development of their own reasoning, children should have become accustomed to love and praise or to hate and reject that which should be loved and hated."⁷ Thus, from their earliest years, children were to form moral habits while the justification for these habits could be taught at a more mature age. This was all the more important for Plato because of his awareness that "the first impressions are the most vital and the longest-lasting, and they often affect the entire human life."⁸ The second aim postulated by Plato was to form the development of the whole person through combining the spiritual and physical elements on which human perfection was dependent. Both in his outline of Plato's pedagogy and in his dissertation directly devoted to Plato Zabellewicz passed over the details of Plato's philosophical education.

Although Zabellewicz had not succeeded in presenting Socrates' philosophical views in a systematic form, he was more successful in this respect with Plato. Surprisingly, he started his paper on Plato with laudatory remarks about those Poles whose research in philosophy had won them rank and recognition, though he did not actually use the word 'philosophy' but referred to it with the terms of Kant's transcendental philosophy, as "the ability to show the limits and conditions of [...] cognition, the discovery of laws with which the intellect complies in all its actions, and the strong conviction of what we are able to know and how we should act."⁹ The outstanding Poles in this field included Gregory of Sanok (Gregorius Sanocensis, Sanocetus), John of Głogów (Glogoviensis, Gloger), Adam Burski (Bursius). The dissertation set out to evaluate the greatness of Polish thinkers, but in order to present them in the right light, Zabellewicz felt it necessary to establish some standard measure for evaluation that could be turned into a model, an ideal of philosophical perfection on a human scale. The question of who was to occupy this honorary position was answered by Zabellewicz as follows: "When carefully analysing the history of Philosophy, which represents the most faithful image of man, when pon-

7 Zabellewicz, 1821: 328.

8 Zabellewicz, 1821: 330.

9 Zabellewicz, 1821a: 51.

dering deeply on the development and education of the intellect, which is the supreme power of the human mind, we will discover that nowhere is it higher or more efficient than in Plato himself, and today I will speak of him in the first place, in order to prepare a model with which, in the course of time, I hope to compare my compatriots, the proud followers of Plato, and I also intend to assess their merits in Philosophy, once convinced that they are not unworthy to occupy a place beside him.”¹⁰ Despite Zabellewicz's declarations, the measure he applied to evaluate individual philosophers was not in fact Plato, but Kant. As for the task of presenting and evaluating the philosophical views of selected Polish philosophers, Zabellewicz unfortunately did not live to fulfil this.

According to Zabellewicz, the key stage in Plato's life is marked by the founding of the Academy, where philosophy was taught on two levels, “higher or academic philosophy for the education of future philosophers, and popular philosophy for general intellectual and moral development, which was accessible to students of all levels.”¹¹ By higher philosophy Zabellewicz did not mean Plato's esoteric teaching, but only that he took into account two types of philosophical audience and various levels of teaching philosophy. Everyone could take advantage of Plato's dialogues, “but not everyone had the spirit of Plato. His mental acumen and his extraordinary ability to pursue profound intellectual questions, his moral purity and unrestrained pursuit of what is good and true, beautiful and noble, placed him high above all the philosophers of the ancient world.”¹²

After a critical assessment of the philosophy of his time, Plato developed the next level of his own system by undertaking epistemological issues. The power of reasoning that had its source in sensory images and, indirectly, in changeable things was the kind of ‘intelligence’ that was unable to develop unchanging notions, hence it was forced to draw on thinking itself, which was independent of the world of objects. Plato's conception of inborn concepts, said Zabellewicz, resulted from the fact that Plato could not explain the origin of concepts that did not stem from experience, adding that “Plato accepted still higher general concepts or thoughts on which all our comprehension was dependent.”¹³ These ‘thoughts’ were, of course, the ideas, which Zabellewicz goes on to explain further in an important passage articulating his interpretation of the theory of ideas: “Such

10 Zabellewicz, 1821a: 51.

11 Zabellewicz, 1821a: 52.

12 Zabellewicz, 1821a: 53.

13 Zabellewicz, 1821a: 54.

things, namely the objects corresponding to general or generic concepts, are only mental, existing not outside the intellect but within it [...]. General concepts then, [...] Plato took for the essence in things [...]. They are not objects of experience and can only be revealed by reason. In the language of Plato they are general concepts or thoughts (*ideae*), they are models according to which the things of the senses were formed. Without these ideas, neither thinking nor recognising empirical objects would be possible. In this way Plato's *ideae*, apart from their logical meaning, also had metaphysical significance, which seems to have arisen from the confusion of the logical or mental being of things with the actual or real."¹⁴ This metaphysical meaning of the idea – “the things that are considered in an absolute sense, unchangeable, necessary, not occupying space, in a word, in complete opposition to things that can be known by the senses”¹⁵ – forms Platonic ‘ideology’.

According to Zabellewicz, the unity of human cognition was guaranteed in Plato's thought by the introduction into his philosophy of God, the Supreme Mind, who formed the material world according to ideas, and granted them to the human intellect. It is in this way that human beings can get to know the world: “These very concepts were poured by God into the human souls that had been created by him, that is, he transferred to human souls the form by which the world of the senses was moulded.”¹⁶ These concepts become the objects of knowledge, when they are ‘awakened’ by sensual impressions, and then by associations, knowledge is built. Cognition of the concepts is, of course, much more important because this allows the essence of things to be learned and is independent of the senses. Of most value to Plato was the kind of cognition in which reason itself is the source of the material or content that forms knowledge. Zabellewicz, however, was doubtful about accepting reason as the sole source of general concepts, and in this regard he believed that Aristotle, who acknowledged that “by our receptiveness we are capable of creating general concepts”,¹⁷ not only differed from Plato, but even surpassed him.

Although Zabellewicz states that the division of philosophy into specific branches is to be credited to the works of later philosophers, he sees the beginnings of this in Plato's work, such as the evident germs of logic in Platonic dialectics. Going even further, Zabellewicz adds: “Plato in his the-

14 Zabellewicz, 1821a: 55–56.

15 Zabellewicz, 1821a: 55.

16 Zabellewicz, 1821a: 56.

17 Zabellewicz, 1821a: 55.

oretical philosophy intended to demonstrate *what we can know*, and in his practical philosophy the focus was on *what we should do*,¹⁸ therefore he partially even concurred with Kant with regard to the division into philosophical branches. As for the very concept of philosophy, its meaning and scope, Plato, along with Pythagoras and Aristotle, could be counted among the philosophers who contributed most significantly to this subject, but the differences among these philosophers on this point accounted for the fact that the dispute over the understanding of philosophy had continued – according to Zabellewicz – to his very times.¹⁹

Plato's ethics followed from the knowledge of the ultimate goal of philosophical cognition, from the knowledge of God and from theology, because for Plato, particular branches of philosophy were closely interwoven. In this respect Plato's philosophy seemed to the Polish scholar surprisingly up-to-date: "The notion of philosophy that Plato had may differ only in words from that of present day philosophers, and this clearly proves its great impact not only on the arts and sciences but also on practical life, on making humanity more righteous and happy."²⁰ To support the claim concerning the connection between philosophical theory and practice, Zabellewicz quoted an excerpt from the work of Wilhelm Gottlieb Tennemann (1761–1819), in which he presents the image of true philosophers, who probe the knowledge of the unchanging and eternal object, and this comes to be reflected in their high moral standards, thus distinguishing them from the majority of people.²¹

Zabellewicz then went on to justify the thesis put forward at the beginning of his study that "in no one had the human intellect proved to be higher, and in no one more efficient than in Plato."²² Among his merits, Zabellewicz mentioned the distinction between two sources of cognition, the senses and reason, drawing attention to the components of the cognition process: the subject, the object, and cognition itself. To manage the power of reasoning Plato discovered a method and rules for thinking. He also laid the foundations for metaphysics, providing its most important concepts, which were later organised by subsequent philosophers.

18 Zabellewicz, 1821a: 58. Józef Jankowski similarly assessed Plato's contribution to logic, emphasising the polemical function of dialectics: "[Socrates and Plato] contributed more to logic by criticising the Sophists, who were therefore encouraged to teach their Dialectics better" (Jankowski, 1822: 154).

19 Zabellewicz, 1970: 75.

20 Zabellewicz, 1821a: 59.

21 Zabellewicz, 1821a: 59–60; Tennemann, 1799: 279–280.

22 Zabellewicz, 1821a: 60.

Zabellewicz again referred to Kant, when describing Plato's metaphysics, stating that it "depended on [...] the strict definition of the objects of the intellect (*noumena*), distinguishing them from the things of the senses (*phaenomena*)."²³ Plato's further merits included the initiation of theodicy by recognising that the evil in the world could not have resulted from the perfection of its creator, whose actions were guided by eternal ideas. Evil, then, must have been a consequence of the existence of eternal matter and human actions. Zabellewicz related the concepts of the world, the human soul and God to the rational cosmology, psychology and theology, which were all criticised by Kant.

Although Zabellewicz believed that it was only religion as revelation that possessed the true image of God, he nevertheless appreciated that, out of all the ancient philosophers, it was Plato, who, by drawing on Anaxagoras in the field of theoretical philosophy and Socrates in the field of practical philosophy, understood God's essence in its loftiest form. "He regarded God as the most perfect and supreme being, as an unlimited and infinite being, as good and just, in a word, as the holiest Being."²⁴ His arguments in favour of the immateriality and immortality of the soul "persuade us to adore Plato, who attempted to use all his strength to shed light on the conditions on which the safety of our present life's journey and our future happiness depend."²⁵

According to Zabellewicz, aestheticians could find much of value in the dialogues. In Kantian spirit he remarked that the concept of beauty "serves us only as a precept for our aesthetic judgments,"²⁶ which should be disinterested. Plato's reflection on beauty remained closely related to ethics, for – according to Zabellewicz – this resulted from the very use of the word 'beauty', which is used to describe what is good – 'morally beautiful'. Love of beauty and the pursuit of good are therefore closely intertwined. Plato, however, put too little emphasis on the distinction between freedom of will and human rationality.

Very little space is devoted in the Warsaw professor's work to Plato's political thought, which was restricted to the statement that the unity of the state consists in subordination of all the classes to the laws and that Plato considered proper education to be the most important means of fulfilling his political ideal.

23 Zabellewicz, 1821a: 61.

24 Zabellewicz, 1821a: 62–63.

25 Zabellewicz, 1821a: 65.

26 Zabellewicz, 1821a: 65.

All things considered, Plato, as Zabellewicz concluded, turned out to have been and to remain the father and king of all philosophers, unmatched in antiquity or in later centuries. The beauty of Plato's philosophy must have reflected the beauty of Plato's soul, and therefore all research on Plato's philosophy should be source-based, selecting only those dialogues which represent it in its pure form, unchanged by later Platonists. Of his research method, Zabellewicz writes: "We have tried to present Plato's philosophy in all its purity, and that is why we have refrained from all comparisons and applications. Any desire to rectify his thoughts according to one's own views is insolent; and to distort them or to implant them with alien ideas is a crime, whereas to understand him and to know how to make use of him is true praise."²⁷ To see the extent to which this naive declaration fails to stand up to confrontation with the author's text it is sufficient to examine the Kantian terminology applied by Zabellewicz to divide Plato's philosophy into branches, not to mention the separate issue of the actual possibility of fulfilling the requirement of presenting a philosophical system from the distant past in its pure form. Zabellewicz, however, seems to have been oblivious to this.

The final assessment of Plato against the background of the history of philosophy resulted from Zabellewicz's concept of how historiography of philosophy should be pursued. In this respect the following remark by Zabellewicz is of significance: "It is not to deride the weaknesses of human reason that we study the history of philosophy, but to be able to progress more confidently by avoiding the mistakes of our predecessors. Moreover, the history of philosophy is not just a set of errors, but it also provides us with examples of exact reasoning which is worth imitating."²⁸ Thus, the history of philosophy provides the philosopher, above all, with knowledge on methods of doing philosophy itself. The history of philosophy teaches how to pursue philosophy – and how not to pursue it. "Even in Plato we can point out some deficiencies, we can regard his research as merely beautiful dreaming, but beside this dreaming we find thoughts which, in the following centuries and even in our times, have led to important discoveries in the field of human cognition and activity."²⁹

On the one hand, then, Zabellewicz's contemporaries could learn a great deal about philosophy from Plato, for he continued to inspire successive generations of philosophers, on the other hand, in assessing his great-

27 Zabellewicz, 1821a: 68.

28 Zabellewicz, 1821a: 67–68.

29 Zabellewicz, 1821a: 69.

ness, it is also necessary to make comparisons related to his own epoch, for it was the historical context that conditioned, among other things, the form of his work. In making an assessment of his work, then, both topicality and historical significance must be taken into account. On both grounds Plato was a philosophical genius. Indirectly, from the general statements outlined above in which Zabellewicz emphasises the continuing influence of Plato, a view emerges concerning the continuity of the development of philosophy.

It is worth drawing attention to the fact that, according to Zabellewicz, the Platonic ideas had, above all, epistemological significance while their metaphysical function was considered to be secondary. For the Warsaw professor, by concentrating both these functions in the ideas, Plato merely made his system more obscure.

Zabellewicz was not the only Pole to take up the problem of the theory of ideas in relation to Kant and Plato. Józef Kalasanty Szaniawski (1764–1843) stated that the very word *idea* comes from Plato. Without specifying essentially what the idea was, about the genesis of the idea he wrote that “it was a fruit of great premonitions, and it enlivened the entire philosophy of this truly heavenly genius.”³⁰ Later, however, modern philosophers ascribed to this notion the meaning of sensory images. It was Kant, Szaniawski argued, who “restored its original meaning, and brought the moderns many steps closer to the denoted object.”³¹ Later Szaniawski’s reading of Kant suggests a normative understanding of the idea, which was to serve ‘rational comprehension’ as “*indicative* and *directional* norms.”³² In another fragment describing the ideas, Szaniawski distinguishes ‘beauty’ (*pięknota*) from ‘beautiful’ (*piękność*) as an attribute, and characterises the former as follows: “it is to denote the Idea in which we can find a norm to judge *every* beauty of any kind. This distinction applies to the other words used to denote ideas.”³³

Szaniawski’s readers might have been under the misleading impression that Kant had restored the original meaning of the idea, that is the Platonic, and therefore metaphysical, meaning. This is how Szaniawski was understood by Stefan Harassek (1890–1952), who referred to him critically as

30 Szaniawski, 1823: 236, footnote ee.

31 Szaniawski, 1823: 236, footnote ee.

32 Szaniawski, 1823: 236.

33 Szaniawski, 1823: 237–238, footnote gg; on the basis of the above quotations, Wojciechowski regards ideas as instruments for constructing science (Wojciechowski, 1947: 117–118).

follows: "once, when referring to Kant, he ascribes to ideas the value of normative ideas only, then, he says that Kant has restored the original meaning that they had in Plato. It is obvious that these views can in no way be reconciled."³⁴

Likewise, Ludwik Kasiński attributed to Szaniawski the "indecisiveness of his opinions"³⁵ on the interpretation of Kantian ideas. He did not actually compare Szaniawski's views on the ideas in Plato and in Kant, but he pointed out that Szaniawski significantly extended the scope of the notion of the idea in critical philosophy. For according to Kasiński, Szaniawski ascribed to the ideas the possibility of their being the object of cognition, from which he concluded that Szaniawski considered them to be real beings. It is nevertheless true to say that "his views in this regard were not clearly specified: Szaniawski was undecided about the answer to the question of whether ideas have real existence or should only be attributed a normative character – as a means of systematising and bringing about closure of experience as a whole."³⁶ Szaniawski, indeed, did not take a clear and unambiguous stand in this regard. However, it is worth drawing attention to a certain degree of one-sidedness in the way he was treated by Kasiński. To support his opinion that Szaniawski lacked stability in his views and that he had attributed real being to the idea the following fragment from his *Friendly Advice (Rady przyjacielskie, 1823)* was quoted by Kasiński: "the intellectual *Ideas* should not *rest* in your mind, as if they were just general and *empty forms*."³⁷ In interpreting this statement Kasiński argued as follows: if ideas should not rest in the mind, they must be placed elsewhere. He did not, however, pay sufficient attention to the fact that in this advice it is the word *rest* which is underlined by Szaniawski, and not the phrase *in the mind*. And Szaniawski continues his reasoning in the following sentence: "They are to be the force that organises everything that you acquire from external sources or from your own inner sources; therefore, they should be constantly provided with elements to organise."³⁸ Kasiński overlooked this fragment. Szaniawski did not emphasise the 'place' of the idea, but the dynamic character of cognition. The normativity of the idea was underlined even more strongly in this sentence

34 Harassek, 1916: 104. It should be remarked that among his contemporaries Szaniawski was held in such high esteem that he was sometimes called "the Polish Plato", which was also noted by Harassek (Harassek, 1916: 112–113).

35 Kasiński, 1939: 74.

36 Kasiński, 1939: 74.

37 Szaniawski, 1823: 241.

38 Szaniawski, 1823: 241.

because of the emphasis on continuous intellectual exercise in order to reach autonomy of thinking, for which the ideas were the organising instruments.

The same fragment on the understanding of the ideas in Plato and in Kant that was referred to by Harassek was also commented on by Stefan Kaczmarek: “Obviously, the belief in the real existence of the idea cannot be reconciled with Kant’s views on this question.”³⁹ Kaczmarek, however, unlike Harassek, attempted to explain the underlying intention of Szaniawski’s words. According to Kaczmarek, Szaniawski had deliberately interpreted – though it would perhaps be more accurate to say that he had modified – the ideas of the soul and God metaphysically. The reasons for this were twofold. On the one hand, Szaniawski – as a critic of the materialistic aspirations of the Enlightenment – appeared to be attempting to show that critical philosophy, which had a generally unfavourable reception in Poland, was opposed to the ideas of the Enlightenment, or at least to some of them. On the other hand, he was trying to strengthen the image of critical philosophy. His statement that in Kantianism the ideas of God and the soul possess real existence was formulated in order to “make it more digestible for the reactionary masses of the Catholic nobility.”⁴⁰

Given the epoch and other works by Szaniawski, the motives ascribed to him by Kaczmarek are by all means probable, but they do not touch upon the essence of the problem because the context of Szaniawski’s comment on the ideas in Plato and Kant does not in fact require additional motives to justify it. Similarly, Harassek’s criticism of this fragment from *Friendly Advice* also misses the target. Admittedly, Szaniawski did not make himself clear, but he rather intended that Kant’s understanding of the idea restored it to the sphere of the intellect, and thus it ceased to belong to the sensory domain, where it had been located thanks to – or perhaps rather because of – the empiricists and sensualists.⁴¹ Certainly, the understanding of the *idea* in the philosophy of British empiricism was remote from its Platonic original, being merely the same word, but with a different meaning. Kant, therefore, did not so much return to the metaphysical understanding of

39 Kaczmarek, 1983: 146–147.

40 Kaczmarek, 1983: 147.

41 In one of his earlier works, where Kaczmarek discussed Szaniawski’s views somewhat more extensively, he mentioned the British empiricists in the context of the *idea* (Kaczmarek, 1961: 41), but he did not draw the present conclusions, but only emphasised the indecisiveness and ambiguity of Szaniawski’s interpretation of the theory of ideas in the philosophy of Plato and Kant (Kaczmarek, 1961: 42–43).

the idea, but rather, like Plato, he made ideas the objects of intellectual cognition, while maintaining his own position on the real existence of ideas.

Setting aside the question of whether or not Harassek was right in his criticism, Szaniawski did in fact make a connection between the understandings of the idea in Plato and Kant. On the basis of his study, *What is philosophy?*, it can be presumed that it was Szaniawski, who, prior to Zabellewicz, noticed the continuity of philosophy leading from Plato – through Descartes, Leibniz, and others – to Kant.⁴² Harassek's opinion about Szaniawski was, nevertheless, quite harsh: "he was not quite aware of the fundamental differences between Kant and his predecessors."⁴³

Zabellewicz was aware of Szaniawski's views, and considered his works to be valuable for philosophy students, for he set *Friendly Advice* as recommended reading. Szaniawski can, therefore, be considered a potential inspiration for Zabellewicz's epistemological understanding of Platonic ideas. A similar opinion to that expressed by Harassek about Szaniawski was articulated by Maurycy Straszewski (1848–1921) about Zabellewicz, whose philosophical attitude he described as essentially eclectic: "The following factors contributed to the formation of his philosophical views: Greek philosophy, Kant and English philosophy. So here again in Polish intellectual life we have a new combination of Kantianism and English influences, but on the ground gathered from the history of ancient philosophy."⁴⁴ Zabellewicz noticed, then, that in general, these philosophical positions had more in common than differences between them.

Szaniawski concerned himself with the practical philosophy of Plato, which he reconstructed, as he himself reported, on the basis of the work of Christian Garve (1742–1798). He raised Plato's political ideas to the rank of a system because "a *system* is understood as a structure in which various individual parts of any knowledge are drawn together and unified in terms of perspectives, means and rules, and only when they are accurately connected do they represent a whole."⁴⁵ Szaniawski emphasised the continuity of philosophical views from Socrates, through Plato, to Aristotle. Plato was an idealist, and as a result of his particular type of intellect: "his intellectual efficiency led him to a supreme position where he seemed somehow to see

42 Szaniawski, 1970: 59–60.

43 Harassek, 1916: 95.

44 Straszewski, 1912: 433.

45 Szaniawski, 1803: 197.

the harmony of the Creator's work."⁴⁶ That is why Plato was the author of one of the most important, or in Szaniawski's words, the most beautiful, of ethical systems that was to inspire subsequent generations. Human happiness and perfection in life could be achieved if harmony, resulting from unified goals and actions, was established in human life. Plato tried to put this perfect image into practice. His magnificent image of the state was intended to be attractive to his contemporaries since it resulted from profound knowledge of the laws of nature and its harmony, which was reflected in the structural correspondence between the human being and the state. Happiness and perfection, both for individuals and the state, lies therefore, in the same harmony of their individual parts. Like Szaniawski, Zabellewicz also expressed similar ideas about human aspirations towards perfection through harmony.

The charges of political day-dreaming which were levied by posterity against Plato's project were rejected by Szaniawski. He believed that these charges resulted from the fact that Plato "goes beyond [...] the thin sphere of the common moral and political imagination."⁴⁷ Plato acted comprehensively, or even totally. "He himself warns that this model is not to be found anywhere in reality, that it is, in fact, only an intellectual creation, comprising all the hallmarks of moral and political perfection, and indicating a great, though distant goal, the constant pursuit of which marks real progress towards perfection."⁴⁸ Szaniawski did not specify which particular aspects of the project were still valid, but recommended that single aspects of Plato's overall vision should not be assessed in isolation from each other. Instead, the spirit of Plato's politics should be analysed rather than focusing on those details which were, inevitably, offensive to readers at the beginning of the 19th century. Despite the fact that the *Republic* of Plato was "the most precious ancient gift for elevated souls",⁴⁹ it was not flawless, as had already been pointed out by Aristotle, who condemned its aristocracy and the lack of clear instructions in Plato's ethics.

The author of another study, written in the spirit of Kantianism and eclecticism and aimed at evaluating and comparing ancient and modern philosophies, was Józef Emanuel Jankowski (1790–1847), professor at the Jagiellonian University. In his references to Plato, Jankowski probably took advantage of the earlier works by Zabellewicz, and perhaps also by

46 Szaniawski, 1803: 206.

47 Szaniawski, 1803: 214.

48 Szaniawski, 1803: 214.

49 Szaniawski, 1803: 216.

Szaniawski. The goal that Jankowski set himself in his *Thesis about some Differences Appearing between Ancient Philosophy and the Philosophy of Later Centuries* was to oppose both the uncritical apologists of Greek antiquity and their opponents who glorified contemporary philosophy. He intended to compare critically both philosophical epochs and make a balanced assessment of them. Plato was, of course, included among the eminent ancient philosophers, in between Socrates and Aristotle.

Jankowski's material for comparison in contemporary philosophy was Kant's critical philosophy, though it was poorly comprehended by him and mixed with other inspirations. Jankowski believed that both ancient and modern philosophies constituted the same field of knowledge because their main subjects were Man, the world and God, though variously conceived. Pointing to the similarities between Kant's philosophy and that of ancient philosophers, Jankowski mentioned the opinion that "human reason is occupied with two kinds of objects, those that are conceived by themselves and those conceived with the aid of the senses; from the first type of action results knowledge, and from the latter opinion".⁵⁰ According to Jankowski, this distinction corresponded to *a priori* and *a posteriori* knowledge.

The most important difference between ancient philosophies and critical philosophy was, for Jankowski, the fact that the latter made the theory of cognition its starting point, whereas this was not true even of those Greek philosophers who dealt extensively with cognitive issues, such as Aristotle. Moreover, the Greek thinkers lacked "architectural structure and systematic coherence".⁵¹ However, the greatest difference results from the progress that has been made in the history of philosophy because "the Greeks are fortunate and original inventors; they made discoveries in all areas of Philosophy and provided a wealth of materials for all the sciences. [...] But they did not bring much to a closure, and they did not exhaust anything".⁵² On the subject of aesthetics, Jankowski merely repeated Zabellewicz's opinion. In his final remarks Jankowski fulfilled his goal and stated that: "We are indebted to the Ancient Authors for the collection of materials, whereas to the Moderns for the organisation and distribution of philosophical truths".⁵³

50 Jankowski, 1825: 253; cf. Harassek, 1916: 153.

51 Jankowski, 1825: 259.

52 Jankowski, 1825: 260.

53 Jankowski, 1825: 271.

In his thesis Jankowski repeated some opinions about Greek philosophy and about Plato that may have been partially based on Zabellewicz's earlier studies. Given the general lack of other studies on Plato in Polish, it is unlikely that Jankowski did not know the papers by the Warsaw professor. Jankowski's work, however, due to its superficial character, falls short of the standard set by Zabellewicz's studies. This may have resulted from the generally lower standards at the Jagiellonian University at that time. Straszewski claimed that, on the one hand, Jankowski was a good expert on the history of philosophy, and this opinion was articulated on the basis of his imitative work *Short Outline of Logic* (Kraków 1822); on the other hand, that his *Thesis about some Differences...* was a piece of little value.⁵⁴

Jankowski repeated some of Zabellewicz's deliberations on Greek thought, while Szaniawski, in turn, was one of the inspirations, though not the most important, for Zabellewicz's interpretations of ancient philosophy. Knowing Zabellewicz's philosophical views – as far as they can be known from his modest literary output – and the literature he read, including, the historical-philosophical work by Tennemann,⁵⁵ one can assume that, if Plato had confined himself to his conception of the ideas as “the principles of thinking which consist in combining and inferring, in other words, combining the notions which constitute the material of thinking”,⁵⁶ the final assessment of his ‘ideology’ would certainly have been much higher.

It was alleged that Tennemann assessed philosophical works in the following way: the nearer a philosophical system approached to critical philosophy, that is Kantianism, the closer it was to the truth.⁵⁷ Nevertheless, he was aware of the continuity and evolution of philosophical positions,⁵⁸ and this should be taken into account in connection with the evaluations he made. Zabellewicz also emphasised the continuity of the problems undertaken by the three most important philosophers of antiquity, Socrates –

54 Straszewski, 1912: 355–356.

55 His work is included as the last item in a list compiled by Zabellewicz “for better acquaintance with Plato's philosophy, among many others, the following works will be useful”, which was placed in a footnote (Zabellewicz, 1821a: 68, footnote 3).

56 Zabellewicz, 1821a: 55.

57 Novotný, 1977: 506.

58 Kaczmarek, 1968: 82.

Plato – Aristotle, philosophers from three different generations.⁵⁹ What is equally important, with regard to the sources for reconstructing Plato's philosophy, Zabellewicz argued that the only reliable sources were the dialogues, which he then treated uncritically. Interestingly, both Zabellewicz and Tennemann shared the view that a philosophical system is an indispensable result of doing philosophy – one cannot philosophise properly without a system, despite the difficulties entailed in this premise because of the dialogical form of Platonic writing.⁶⁰

Although Tennemann's method of examining philosophical systems from the Kantian point of view is said to have had very little influence on subsequent historians,⁶¹ its impact on the interpretation of Plato's philosophy in Poland can be observed in the studies by Zabellewicz, who is counted among the supporters and representatives of Kantianism in the history of Polish philosophy. Zabellewicz referred to his philosophical approach as 'synthetism.'⁶² This approach, articulated in the *Dissertation on Philosophy*, was, according to Harassek, essentially a repetition of the works by the German Kantian, Wilhelm Traugott Krug (1770–1842).⁶³ Earlier, Henryk Struve (1840–1912) presented Zabellewicz in a similar light, though without considering his works on ancient philosophy.⁶⁴ Zabellewicz himself emphasised the influence of Krug on his work, but remarked that in his *Dissertation* he had adopted only those thoughts of Krug which "had seemed convincing."⁶⁵ Krug was, therefore, the source of Zabellewicz's views on philosophy and his lectures. If we consider Zabellewicz's understanding of the history of philosophy and his attempt to interpret Platon-

59 It is characteristic that Polish philosophers, both those inclined towards the philosophy of Kant (like Szaniawski or Zabellewicz) and those dealing with Kant's philosophy from a historical perspective, tended to link it with the philosophy of Plato and its subsequent transformations. A century later, when Polish research on Plato flourished and when Marburg neo-Kantianism and its interpretation of Platonism were known in Poland, Adam Żółtowski wrote: "critical philosophy is not at all new, but in fact very old; it is the resounding echo of Platonism after centuries and long journeys of thought" (Żółtowski, 1924: 157).

60 Tigerstedt, 1974: 65–66.

61 Tigerstedt, 1974: 68.

62 Zabellewicz, 1970: 84.

63 Harassek, 1916: 154–155; Chmielowski, 2005: 43.

64 Struve, 1911: 233; cf. Kaczmarek, 1961: 56.

65 Zabellewicz, 1821a: 57, footnote 2. In the *Dissertation* he referred to himself as a supporter of synthetism: "following the guidance of my teachers and according to my conviction – I willingly subscribe to it" (Zabellewicz, 1970: 84). This teacher must have been Krug himself, who was lecturing in Leipzig when Zabellewicz was there on a study trip.

ism, however, another author should be added as an inspiration, namely Tennemann, who also belonged to the circle of philosophers influenced by critical philosophy. The evaluation of Zabellewicz's philosophical position in the above light must result in regarding him as a Kantian and an eclectic, who drew on contemporary philosophers influenced by Kant, combining this with inspirations from ancient thought.

Zabellewicz's work is not considered to have been particularly influential and his works are evaluated as reliable rather than outstanding.⁶⁶ It is acknowledged that Józef Gołuchowski (1797–1858) made use of Zabellewicz's lectures and drew the fundamentals of his knowledge on Plato from them.⁶⁷ Straszewski, however, did not think highly of Zabellewicz's works in the history of philosophy, including, therefore, his study on Plato. He passed judgement on their value without any arguments to support his assessment, dismissing them shortly: "well-written in Polish, but in terms of content, there is nothing in them worthy of note."⁶⁸ It is interesting to consider the reasons for and validity of such harsh assessment. It may be significant that Straszewski examined Zabellewicz's works almost a century after they had been published when he had already become acquainted with the studies on Plato by Stefan Pawlicki (1839–1916) and by Lutosławski. In comparison to them, Zabellewicz's works must have seemed poor in Straszewski's eyes. Nevertheless, when the then current state of Polish philosophy, and Platonic studies (or, in fact, their absence) is taken into account as a background for the assessment of Zabellewicz's study on Plato, it turns out that it is unique for several reasons. The author provided readers with a synthetic outline of the whole of Plato's philosophy and, while interpreting Plato, he did not disguise his own philosophical views, based on Kantian philosophy. In presenting ancient material, he analysed it with the conceptual apparatus of Kantianism and assessed Plato's philosophy from the viewpoint of a historian of philosophy and a philosopher who was well-disposed to critical philosophy. All things considered, his dissertation on Plato, against the background of

66 Bieliński, 1912: 110, *cf.*: 68; Tatkiewicz, 1971a: 147.

67 Palacz, 1999: 238. On the basis of archival sources and earlier studies on Gołuchowski, Harassek noted: "in 1817 Gołuchowski wrote an extensive thesis *On Moral Philosophy* in German, which 4 years later, in 1821, was to serve as a dissertation to obtain the degree of doctor of philosophy in Heidelberg, together with the Latin thesis *On the Republic of Plato*. Neither of these theses appeared in print" (Harassek, 1924: 6, footnote 1); then he added: "about these dissertations, we can only speculate" (Harassek, 1924: 15, footnote 3).

68 Straszewski, 1912: 435.

Polish philosophy of that time, occupies a special place. Władysław Tatarkiewicz even claimed that among Polish philosophers in the period 1800–1830 it was Zabellewicz who displayed the best skills and techniques as a historiographer of philosophy.⁶⁹

Following Andrzej Walicki, the reception of Kant in Polish philosophy can be divided into five trends: post-Enlightenment, Catholic, within the framework of political romanticism, by representatives of philosophical maximalism and, as a separate phenomenon, in the philosophy of Józef Maria Hoene-Wroński (1776–1853).⁷⁰ The representatives of the first trend, the post-Enlightenment thinkers, displayed the clearest tendency to connect Kant with Plato. Zabellewicz and Jankowski can be counted among them, although “they did not have much impact on the intellectual life of their time.”⁷¹

In assessing the problematic content of Zabellewicz's work, attention has been drawn to the application of critical philosophy as a measure for ancient philosophy. Importantly, Zabellewicz did not directly touch upon methodological issues and was uncritical of his sources, namely Plato's dialogues, accepting all the information about Socrates as reliable. The subsequent development of Polish research on Plato would not have rejected such an approach outright, but the acceptance of Plato's account of Socrates as reliable would be the result of a justified decision on the part of the researchers rather than an uncritical acceptance. The examples of Socrates and Plato were used by Zabellewicz to support the view that development in philosophy is the development of philosophical problems. This development was defined by Kant's questions, which determined the spheres of interest of reason.⁷² Socrates raised only the question: what should I do? Plato raised the remaining two.

Szaniawski and Zabellewicz, thinkers who belong to the circle of Kant's adherents in Poland,⁷³ display a tendency to connect Plato with Kant, to point out similarities between their views, or to translate Plato's ideas into

69 Tatarkiewicz, 1970a: XXI.

70 Walicki, 1976: 140.

71 Walicki, 1976: 142.

72 Kant, 1998: 677.

73 There is no room here to consider and decide whether and to what extent Szaniawski was a Kantian or an eclectic. Mirosław Żelazny opposed the views of Chmielowski, Harassek, Kasiński and Kaczmarek, who had included Szaniawski in the circle influenced by Kantianism or had accepted such a probability with certain reservations (Tatarkiewicz; Wiator, 1987: 120–121). Żelazny argued that the opinion about Szaniawski's alleged Kantianism resulted, on the one hand,

Kantian terminology.⁷⁴ Szaniawski's reflections on the very term 'idea' induced him to refer to the ideas in the philosophies of Plato and Kant. Harassek reproached him with a metaphysical interpretation of Kantian ideas of God and the soul, and this, most probably, resulted from a misunderstanding. There was also no need to justify this misunderstanding by suggesting that it was Szaniawski's desire to make critical philosophy more accessible to Catholic thinkers, as Kaczmarek did. Let us repeat, Szaniawski considered the ideas to be objects of the intellect, and not of the senses, and this – in his opinion – suffices to link the meaning of ideas in Platonism and Kantianism.

Zabellewicz acknowledged the fundamental function played by Plato's ideas in the theory of cognition. He could not reject the metaphysical aspect of the theory of ideas in the light of Plato's dialogues, but he attached much smaller significance to this aspect. Our understanding of the world is first and foremost conditioned by the ideas. He was, certainly, remote from the later neo-Kantian interpretations of Plato, but against the background of the Polish literature on Plato at that time, Zabellewicz's most significant achievement was to interpret the ideas in the sphere of epistemology, though this was most probably inspired by Krug and Tennemann.

from a falsehood he disseminated about himself, and on the other hand, from the fact that he was indeed an eclectic, whose few mentions of Kant do not permit any conclusions to be drawn about his reception of Kant. Moreover, Szaniawski had not read the original works of the Königsberg philosopher (Żelazny, 2005: 56–57). Nevertheless, he is also believed to have been the inspirer for the Polish discussion about Kant (Hinz, 1976: 128). It should also be noted that earlier authors (apart from Chmielowski) accepted Szaniawski's Kantian inspirations (or even *expressis verbis* confirmed that he had been a first-hand student of Kant, cf. Zieleniarczyk, 1924: 163), but in their works one can find lists of problematic issues on which the Pole differed from the sage of Königsberg. Szaniawski himself, however, recollected his impressions from reading Kant's works, though it is difficult to determine how credible this was (Szaniawski, 1823: 134–136; cf.: Bednarski, 1929: 16–19; Wojciechowski, 1947: 91–93). Regarding his reception of Platonism, however, it is important to note that it was in the context of Kant that Szaniawski, whose works were appreciated by Zabellewicz, mentioned Plato. In his eclecticism, therefore, there was a place for Kantianism.

74 The leading thinkers of the Polish Enlightenment also combined Kant with Plato, but their goal was to discredit both. Hugo Kołłątaj (1750–1812) wrote in a letter: "Kant is not as obscure as I was led to fear, but one cannot read him for long because he has crammed his teaching with terms from Plato, and even more, from the Alexandrian Platonists. [...] For Kant's teaching is an altered Platonism. Anyone who knows the views of the Academics and the Alexandrian Platonists, knows Kant, even though he awkwardly splatters mathematical arguments here and there" (Hinz, 1976: 131–132).

It can certainly be argued that Zabellewicz's study on Plato is the most important Polish work on Plato of its time. Along with his other works on ancient philosophy, it also contributes to a softening of his image as a Kantian philosopher, especially when one remembers that his most frequently read work on philosophy, which clearly shows his Kantian inspirations, was in fact a summary of a study by Krug.⁷⁵ It seems important, therefore, to highlight his ambitions in the history of philosophy, dedicated to the field of ancient philosophy, rather than his imitative *Dissertation on Philosophy*.

1.2 F. A. Kozłowski and Hegelianism

Bronisław Trentowski (1808–1869) frequently wrote about the need to create a national Polish philosophy, acknowledging that the Germans had such a philosophy. He believed that national philosophies could be created by, for example, drawing on the achievements of antiquity, 'feeding the spirit' with Greek food for thought, and producing studies in the history of philosophy. When, in 1845, Felicjan Antoni Kozłowski (1805–1870), a friend of Trentowski,⁷⁶ published his translation of three of Plato's dialogues, Trentowski made the following note: "Anyone who translates foreign philosophy into Polish is making that philosophy national. Even if we can read Greek, Latin, French and German without difficulty, nonetheless we think and feel in Polish only. Foreign thoughts clothed in Polish robes find their way more easily to the Polish soul, and they are available to the entire nation, bringing about a disconcerting reaction which unleashes our native thoughts. [...] It is English porter in Polish veins. But of course we should have Polish porter and our own champagne as well."⁷⁷

Undoubtedly the most significant achievement in the field of Plato studies in the inter-uprising period (1831–1863) – the foreign liquor for the Polish soul – was the translation and publication of the *Apology*, *Crito* and *Phaedo*, preceded by a general introduction to the whole book and by introductions to particular dialogues. In his introduction Kozłowski rightly

75 Although Wiktor Wąsik noticed the unoriginal character of the *Dissertation*, he discussed its content. He dismissed, however, the historical works by Zabellewicz in one short sentence: "therefore, he showed some interest in the history of Greek philosophy" (Wąsik, 1966: 61).

76 Wójcicki, 1871: 234; cf.: Wójcicki, 1864; Mróz, 2011a.

77 Trentowski, 1977: 279.

remarks: “Especially in philosophical works, it is the thoughts that should be translated, not the words.”⁷⁸ In justifying his choice of dialogues for translation, he underlined the importance of the *Phaedo* out of all of Plato’s legacy as the real beginning of Plato’s philosophy, for in the *Apology* and in the *Crito*, it is the original thoughts of Socrates that mostly came to the fore; these two dialogues also constituted an introduction to the most important work, that is, the *Phaedo*. All three dialogues, along with the *Euthyphro*, belonged to the first tetralogy, and were important not so much as the presentation of Plato’s own philosophy, but rather because they depicted the final dramatic moments of Socrates’ life. Following Friedrich Schleiermacher (1768–1834), Kozłowski regarded the *Apology* as having been written by Plato from memory and based on Socrates’ speech at his defence. “Nothing could be nearer to the truth than the fact that in this speech we have a faithful depiction of the defence as delivered by Socrates himself, at least insofar as the skilful memory of Plato was able to retain it, and taking into account the differences that might have occurred between the verbally improvised speech and that which was later put down in writing.”⁷⁹ The *Crito* complemented the *Apology*, and their genesis, according to Kozłowski, was identical, the *Crito* being based on Socrates’ real conversation with a friend, who advised the philosopher to take advantage of the possibility of escaping from prison.⁸⁰

The *Phaedo* was different in character. The essence of this dialogue consisted in “the strict distinction between the prevalence of reason over faith, and certainty over hope.”⁸¹ The dialogue was therefore divided into two parts. The first, which occupies about three-quarters of the dialogue, and “presents a chain of analyses and reasonings which would not be rejected

78 Kozłowski, 1845: 2. Cf. Majorkiewicz, 1852c: 121. Majorkiewicz himself raised the problem of Plato’s logic, when he was writing *A Sketch on the History of Logic* (Majorkiewicz, 1852a). It is, however, touched upon too briefly and superficially to determine Majorkiewicz’s acquaintance with Plato’s philosophy. All Kozłowski’s remarks in the few pages of the introduction, *On Translating Plato*, seem to prove that he had read the work by Józef Jeżowski (1793–1855) on the Russian translation of the *Laws*, in which Jeżowski accused the translator, В. Оболенский, of not having taken the trouble to introduce to the audience the source editions, the translations he had consulted, the criterion of selecting the dialogue to be translated *etc.* (Jeżowski, 1829). Jeżowski’s essay also contains a critical evaluation of the edition of the *Laws* (Plato, 1827), based on the first lines of the translation.

79 Kozłowski, 1845b: 185.

80 Kozłowski, 1845c.

81 Kozłowski, 1845d: 250.

even by the exactness of contemporary philosophy”⁸² while the second part, which discusses the issue of the immortality of the soul, resorts to symbols and conjectures. Both parts were enclosed within the dramatic brackets of the last moments of Socrates' life. The second part of the dialogue “is more like a hymn, a fragment of an epic poem; it is a kind of beautiful and pleasant supplement to highlight the effect of the previous arguments and to amuse the heart and imagination after reason has already been satisfied.”⁸³ Finally, Kozłowski acknowledged that, to a large extent, the *Phaedo* reflected Socrates' views.

Kozłowski's contemporaries regarded his translation as among “the best in our language, with its fluent and clear style, faithfully rendering not only the words, but reproducing all the shades of Plato's thought.”⁸⁴ It was justly evaluated as a pioneering undertaking, and the translator was regarded as deserving great credit for his translation of classical literature that had long been present in the cultures and languages of Western Europe. Kozłowski had selected dialogues which were useful from a didactic point of view, as a historical source of knowledge about Socrates. Though the actual choice was not considered by critics to be the most felicitous,⁸⁵ the translation itself stood the test of time because even at the end of the 19th century, when a larger number of translations were available, it was still commented upon as “a serious work, with a smooth style, providing a good image of the Greek original.”⁸⁶ Even today, Kozłowski's output as a translator is still considered to be valuable.⁸⁷

In 1841, when Karol Libelt (1807–1875) expressed his regret that Polish culture was somewhat impaired in comparison to German or French, he wrote: “during the Hegelian epoch the largest number of editions and translations of Plato was produced.”⁸⁸ This impairment was partially amended by Kozłowski, who was directly inspired by Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel (1770–1831) in his analysis of Plato's philosophy. It could even be said that he almost restricted himself to Hegel. Kozłowski declared that in reconstructing Plato's philosophy, apart from the works of Hegel and Tennemann, he would also make use of Plato's dialogues. This was probably the case, but it is difficult to establish unequivocally the extent to

82 Kozłowski, 1845d: 250.

83 Kozłowski, 1845d: 257.

84 Wójcicki, 1871a: 250.

85 Majorkiewicz, 1852c: 122.

86 Pawlicki, 1903–1917: 280, footnote.

87 Błaszczuk, 1995: 151.

88 Libelt, 1851a: 276.

which Kozłowski was familiar with Plato's works because when referring to particular issues in specific dialogues in his bibliographic footnotes, he provided only their titles, with the exception of the *Republic* and the *Laws*, where the book numbers were added. There are also frequent instances of several dialogues being listed in a footnote to a particular sentence. His writing skills also left much to be desired, his texts lacking division into paragraphs and containing frequent repetitions.

Kozłowski's general introduction to the dialogues was, at that time, the most comprehensive Polish presentation of Plato's philosophy. Kozłowski based it on German literature, taking advantage, in particular, of Hegel's *Lectures on the History of Philosophy*. The very beginning of the *Introduction* indicates its Hegelian inspiration: "One of the most beautiful relics from the ancient world that fate has preserved for us is undoubtedly the work of Plato. The fruit of this Greek philosopher's ingenious talent, the treasure of the wisdom of the Greeks of that time, so much worshipped by all the ancients and subsequently avidly sought after, is deservedly valued even today."⁸⁹

Kozłowski went on to discuss the history of the dialogues from the times of antiquity, mentioning several modern editions, and neo-Platonism. He used Hegelian views on Platonism, and openly stated that Plato's philosophy represented a system, thus revealing himself to be a follower of Hegel, who was a more popular and influential proponent of the view on the systematic character of Plato's philosophy than Tennemann was.⁹⁰ Moreover, on the very first pages of Kozłowski's *Introduction*, one can find entire sentences borrowed, or even copied, from Jeżowski's study, with almost identical wording, although no reference to Jeżowski's work is given.⁹¹

Kozłowski reported on the achievements of philological text criticism, brought up the didactic advantages of the dialogue form, and then, like Hegel, rejected the view on the existence of esoteric and exoteric philosophy in Platonism. Following Hegel, he argued that the fact that Plato put

89 Kozłowski, 1845a: 4. The first sentence of the above quotation in Polish sounds almost identical to that translated more than one and a half century later by Światosław Florian Nowicki (Hegel, 1996: 4). This entire paragraph on the gift of fortune which preserved Plato's dialogues and on the difficulties in comprehending them (Hegel, 1982: 5–6) was removed from its original position in the English edition of Hegel's *Lectures* (Hegel, 1894: 2) and was introduced after the presentation of Plato's biography (Hegel, 1894: 9).

90 Tigerstedt, 1974: 68; Browning, 1988: 476, 483.

91 E.g. some opinions on the genius of Schleiermacher: cf. Kozłowski, 1845a: 9, and Jeżowski, 1829: 11.

his views in the mouths of the persona in the dialogues could not be regarded as a hindrance to understanding Plato.⁹²

Kozłowski started his presentation of Plato's philosophy by praising its perfection. Plato's contribution to philosophy was briefly expressed as follows: "he was the first to define the notion, subject, scope and branches of philosophy, and their relations to each other. He was also the first to ponder on the form of philosophy. He processed specific parts of philosophy, developing many new concepts and statements, as well as evaluating those that had preceded them."⁹³ He believed that the goal of Plato's philosophy was the improvement of moral standards, which had declined in the Athens of Plato's times, as described in the subsequent pages of Kozłowski's text. He likened the significance of Platonism to the critical philosophy of Kant, and emphasised the similarities between Plato's philosophy and Christianity. He wrote: "Platonism was the point from which Hellenic wisdom began to approach the teachings of Christ, and the pagan Polytheism was purified and distilled into the teaching on the Christian Trinity."⁹⁴

Focusing primarily on Hegel and Tennemann, Kozłowski briefly compared their methodologies and the results of their research in the history of philosophy. Among the merits that stemmed from Hegel's philosophical genius, he mentioned the distinction Hegel made between the imaginative form and the essential philosophical content of the dialogues.⁹⁵ Tennemann, on the other hand, presented Plato's philosophy as a 'perfect system', which, though counter to the spirit of Platonism, nevertheless facilitated the understanding of Plato's views. Following his German exemplars, Kozłowski stated that Plato "was convinced that knowledge cannot be de-

92 Kozłowski, 1845a: 22–28; cf.: Hegel, 1894: 10 *ssq.* According to Findlay, in Hegel every philosophy, including Plato's, necessarily has an element of esotericism, and this does not result from the secret transfer of knowledge, but from the limitations of the average recipient, for whom the dialectics in the *Sophist*, *Parmenides* or *Philebus*, which is deprived of graphic elements, is essentially esoteric because of its difficulty (Findlay, 1974: 65–66).

93 Kozłowski, 1845a: 40.

94 Kozłowski, 1845a: 30. Kozłowski's considerations on the influence exerted by Platonism on the philosophy of subsequent centuries are partly a paraphrase and partly a translation from Tennemann's book (cf. Tennemann, 1799: VI–VII).

95 Nowadays, however, it is claimed that Hegel unduly separated the form from the content of Plato's philosophy in order to adapt it to the requirements of presentation based on his own system. By doing so, he overlooked the artistry of Plato's writings and thus the differences between particular dialogues (Browning, 1988: 482); Hegel was simply disturbed by what was mythical and pictorial in Plato (Gaiser, 2004a: 117).

rived from any other source than from our internal consciousness, and it is that which is unchangeable in us that should be sought after.”⁹⁶ Associated with this was the concept of learning as rediscovery as well as the view on the pre-existence of the soul. In a similar vein, Kozłowski articulated the essence of Plato’s philosophy: “it can be expressed as follows: that which is in and of itself can be learned only by pure reason, whereas by means of the senses and empirical intellect only external phenomena can be represented.”⁹⁷

Plato’s ideas were interpreted by Kozłowski transcendently as “separate from all existence; they are a reality which, being independent of anything else, is completely similar to itself, and can therefore only be comprehended by thought.”⁹⁸ The ideas were something objective, and, at the same time, specific concepts and forms of things: “human intellect, being itself a divine gift, possesses them as models of all things created by God and as the ideas of divine intellect; in other words, human souls received them from God when they were created, when they were still pure intelligences devoid of bodies.”⁹⁹ Kozłowski goes on to demonstrate the Kantian understanding of ideas as notions conditioning empirical cognition and judgments about reality: “Ideas, which give rise to the objective phenomenal being by serving them as principles, are models for all things in cognition.”¹⁰⁰ Thus the ideas are not only the formal cause of the world but they also shape cognition.

In the chapter devoted to Plato’s dialectics, Kozłowski, following Hegel, distinguished its two meanings: the Socratic ‘art of refuting the opinions of others’ and a method for discovering unity in opposite concepts. The dialectical studies, such as those on being and non-being or on pure notions, are difficult, and therefore do not always make captivating reading. They seem to be at odds with the beautiful form of the dialogues, as can be seen, for example, in the *Phaedo*, in which “the beginning and the end are very elevated, but the middle plunges into the dialectics. Just as the beautiful scenes uplift us, so the other part takes us through the thorns and thistles of metaphysics.”¹⁰¹ The dialogues are therefore demanding material for the reader. The difficulties of Plato’s dialectics, especially in the *Parmenides*, are

96 Kozłowski, 1845a: 49.

97 Kozłowski, 1845a: 49–50.

98 Kozłowski, 1845a: 52.

99 Kozłowski, 1845a: 52.

100 Kozłowski, 1845a: 53–54.

101 Kozłowski, 1845a: 57. The chapters of the *Introduction* entitled *The Dialectics* and *Philosophy of Spirit* have been recently reprinted (Mróz, 2010: 43–59). In regard

related to the accumulation of abstract metaphysical content, neologisms, lack of plot and the emphasis on the identity of all opposites, the most abstract of which is the hypothesis that unity contains multiplicity, and multiplicity contains unity.

In Kozłowski's *Introduction* a shift occurred between the titles and content of Hegel's original chapters on Plato. While the chapter on the dialectics corresponds to the content of a similar chapter in the *Lectures on the History of Philosophy*, the subsequent chapter, entitled *Philosophy of Spirit*, contains the material from Hegel's chapter entitled *Philosophy of Nature* whereas Hegel's chapter *Philosophy of Spirit* contains an interpretation of Plato's ethics and his political philosophy.¹⁰² Kozłowski regarded the subject of the nature of God, Plato's theology, as belonging to Plato's philosophy of spirit. He stated that Plato, without negating traditional religion, gave voice to a form of monotheism.

The view of Christian writers that knowledge about the Trinity can be found in Plato's philosophy was regarded by Kozłowski to be false and founded on a misunderstanding. He did, however, acknowledge some kind of exemplarism in Plato: "the model of the world exists in God, and [...] in him is the inner image of his intellectual ideas."¹⁰³ This view was recognised by Kozłowski as natural and strikes the mind with such force that there was no need to discuss or prove it. The work of God, the perfect being, must also be perfect, even more so because He watches over it in His providence. This providence, however, does not force people to do good because they are endowed with free will. Considering the above, it is evident that Kozłowski interpreted Plato partly through the prism of Augustinianism.

Plato's concept of the soul differed fundamentally from the dominant views of his times. Following Tennemann and Hegel, Kozłowski assessed Plato's concept of the immortality of the soul as an assumption rather than an exact scientific truth, an assumption expressing the eternal working of the mind and its freedom, rather than a religious dogma. Finally, inspired by Kant, Kozłowski stated that "Plato regarded the soul's further existence as a moral state. Thus, immortality is for him the task of practical reason; and hence the great interest Plato shows in this subject, an interest which

to these 'thistles of metaphysics', it can be added that Hegel's interpretation of Plato is distinguished by making speculative thinking the focal point, as the neo-Platonists did before him (Halfwassen, 1997: 209).

102 Cf.: Hegel, 1894: 113–117.

103 Kozłowski, 1845a: 68.

could not have come from speculation alone.”¹⁰⁴ To finalise the considerations on the soul, Kozłowski summarised the arguments from the *Phaedo* for the immortality of the soul, singling out six arguments. He assessed them as having the ‘great semblance of thoroughness’, adding that, most likely, Plato himself treated them as hypotheses.

As a starting point for his reflections on Plato’s philosophy of nature, Kozłowski thought it necessary to distinguish between what Plato considered to be certain in this field and what was only probable. The view that the world originated from the free action of the highest wisdom was thought by Kozłowski to belong to the first category, whereas all the other specific issues connected with it were only probable. On the physical causes of the world in Plato’s cosmology, Kozłowski wrote: “Plato wanted to have them subjected to the highest reason so that the world as a whole could be explained as having been created purposefully. The natural causes, he says, stand beneath the highest rational cause, which acts according to notions and purposes, and which only uses these natural causes in cooperation so that the world could be assembled as a proper whole.”¹⁰⁵ The fact that Plato introduced the soul of the world and the rational cause, God, into his cosmology signifies that his focus was on purpose and harmony rather than on physical details. Kozłowski went on to summarise the story of the creation of the world from the *Timaeus*, adding, after Hegel, that this story does not contribute much to our understanding of the idea. Additionally, it represented only some probable details.

Plato’s ethics was intended as a polemic against the proponents of moral relativism and of the law of nature, the law of the stronger. Similarly, neither constituted law nor religious commandments could form the basis for a philosophically based morality. Moral law should be a natural consequence of human nature. “And since getting to know oneself is the main condition of humanity’s moral culture, then the result of this should be: what is actually proper for man as a human being? and what should man considered in this way do? and what is man capable of? This is the main goal of Philosophy.”¹⁰⁶

The form of Plato’s ethics, as Kozłowski insisted, stemmed from its close relation to politics. On the basis of the *Philebus*, the best way to live turned out to be the life which is mixed and combined, for pleasure is also a kind of good. Morality, then, is “the highest form of human perfection, that is,

104 Kozłowski, 1845a: 79.

105 Kozłowski, 1845a: 87.

106 Kozłowski, 1845a: 104.

the greatest good for humans: this truth is frequently revealed by Plato with zeal and dignity."¹⁰⁷ Let us add that Kozłowski often interpreted the Greek δικαιοσύνη as morality.¹⁰⁸ It is the highest good. Human happiness and dignity are founded on this good and on human 'well-being'. Regarding ethical considerations, Kozłowski also mentioned the issue of the immortality of the soul, adding the statement that immortality should be an additional moral impulse for man. In this context, he treated the immortality of the soul as beyond doubt, thus contradicting his own previous statements, articulated on the basis of the *Phaedo*, that it was only Plato's hypothesis.

"Morality, Plato says, has its foundation in the highest perfection of human beings as rational beings, that is, the most complete unity and harmony of all their powers under the rule of reason. This perfection is therefore named a virtue. A virtuous man behaves perfectly in every situation as he should."¹⁰⁹ Deriving from ethics, politics, that is, practical or applied morality as the chapter is entitled, is the transfer of ethical principles to the organisation and government of the state. Plato's political philosophy was assessed by Kozłowski on the one hand, following Hegel, as an expression of the Greek spirit¹¹⁰ in its rejection of individualism, and on the other, following Tennemann, as the most explicitly presented moral ideal of humanity, in which it was the very idea of the state that was important, and not the details of its construction. Kozłowski was inclined to stress the analogy between man and the state, and remarked that even Plato had doubts about the possibility of fulfilling this ideal.¹¹¹ He underlined Pla-

107 Kozłowski, 1845a: 117.

108 Kozłowski further writes: "Justice (δικαιοσύνη) has a wider meaning in Plato, firstly, as morality in its entire scope; secondly, more precisely as only certain of its aspects revealed in deeds" (Kozłowski, 1845a: 131). Justice and morality are therefore inseparable from each other, and moreover, the most important message of the *Republic*, according to Hegel, is that they are also inseparable from state institutions (Findlay, 1974: 67). It is no accident that, as Gaiser remarked, Plato and Hegel faced similar accusations in this regard (Gaiser, 2004: 118).

109 Kozłowski, 1845a: 127–128.

110 Cf. Browning, 1988: 479, 484; M. J. Inwood points out that Hegel's interpretation of Plato's political philosophy consists in reading it as an exercise in description rather than in prescription (Inwood, 1984: 47–48); cf. Torzewski, 1999: 92–96.

111 One of the most important aspects of the Hegel's interpretation of the *Republic* is his objection to recognising it only as an ideal that is impossible to fulfil. Hegel believed that it expressed the perfect beauty of ethical life (Inwood, 1984: 47–48).

to's emphasis on the unity of the state and the correspondence of its virtues to those which constitute the human ideal. He also referred to several details concerning the organisation of the state, which, together with Hegel, he criticised on several counts: the individuals' inability to select the class most suited to them, the abolition of private property, the issue of marriage and the family.¹¹² Kozłowski then outlined Plato's educational system, whose goal "consists in bringing about the desire to become a good citizen of the state, able to rule according to the laws of justice and also to obey them."¹¹³ Education, 'Greek pedagogy', as Kozłowski referred to *paideia*, was therefore intended to ennoble man in body and spirit.

As a direct result of the nature of the main sources of Kozłowski's text, the image of Plato presented in his *Introduction* is the image of a systematic thinker. It is also an inconsistent image, for Kozłowski sometimes contradicted his own previous statements (such as the status of the immortality of the soul, considered to be a hypothesis at one moment and a certainty at another). This might suggest that Kozłowski did not have a single, well-thought out image of Plato's philosophy, or, on the other hand, it might demonstrate that Plato's philosophy cannot easily be subjected to systematisation and presentation.

One of Kozłowski's critics, J. Majorkiewicz, though concerned about the lack of Polish studies on Platonism, nevertheless took issue with the Hegelian image of Plato transplanted onto Polish soil by Kozłowski, arguing that Hegel "does not always justly appreciate Plato, and above all, he muddles up the threads of thought which are themselves so difficult to grasp in Plato. Instead of building a system, Plato portrayed a picture of life, which is clearly shown in the dramatic form of his writing."¹¹⁴ Hegel, according to Majorkiewicz, could not be regarded as an authority on Plato studies because his own philosophy did not allow him to comprehend the Greek thinker. Hegel's attitude to Plato is similar to that of Plato's student, Aristotle, whose interpretation of Plato was one-sided and did not attach proper significance to the emotive element in the dialogues.

In later decades, when Plato came to be studied more intensively in Poland, the work of Kozłowski was barely mentioned by, for example, Pawlicki, but it should be added that Pawlicki was not greatly interested in Polish literary output in this field. All he had to say about Kozłowski was that he "lectures on Plato's philosophy according to Hegelian concepts and

112 Cf. Inwood, 1984: 51–52.

113 Kozłowski, 1845a: 157.

114 Majorkiewicz, 1852c: 124.

categories.”¹¹⁵ Contemporary Polish translators of Plato, recalling Kozłowski's edition, ascribe to him translations of dialogues that were not included there.¹¹⁶ This shows that Kozłowski's translation has been largely forgotten, reduced to the role of an antiquarian relic, only worthy of a brief mention in the literature on Plato.

The fact that Kozłowski made use of Jeżowski's study and did not restrict himself to German authors should be positively evaluated. The way he used Jeżowski's study should, however, be condemned, for he copied a number of Jeżowski's opinions, some almost literally, without directly referring to the author¹¹⁷ although the initial parts of his *Introduction* owed much to Jeżowski's study. Despite its imitative character, the *Introduction* itself is the first such extensive and comprehensive presentation of Plato's philosophy in Polish literature. In order to provide the reader with the most essential philosophical substance of Platonism, Kozłowski based his work on the most important philosopher of that time, often referred to as philosopher *par excellence*. Nevertheless, Kozłowski cannot be counted among the group of Polish Hegelians, for he did not participate in Polish discussions about Hegel's ideas. Although Kozłowski's work was almost entirely based on Hegel, his reception of Hegel's reading of Plato was selective. One might even venture to say that philosophical issues were of little interest to Kozłowski, but he rightly felt obliged to provide his translation with a philosophical introduction. He was not, however, competent to write it himself. He therefore did so mainly on the basis of the chapter on Plato in Hegel's *Lectures on the History of Philosophy*, which he supplemented with the work of Tennemann. Kozłowski's work, then, was not an original text, but rather a compilation and paraphrase.

1.3 W. Tatarkiewicz and the Marburg neo-Kantianism

In 1911 Władysław Tatarkiewicz (1886–1980) published a short paper entitled *Controversy over Plato*, which, though it does not occupy a prominent

115 Pawlicki, 1903–1917: 280, footnote.

116 Leopold Regner, a translator of the *Phaedrus*, states that there were three Polish translations of this dialogue, by Kozłowski, Bronikowski, and Witwicki (Regner, 2004: XXV).

117 Perhaps Majorkiewicz noticed some similarities, because in the review of Kozłowski's work he considered it appropriate to mention the study by Jeżowski, whom he considered to be an 'eminent Professor' (Majorkiewicz, 1852c: 124, footnote).

place in his legacy, cannot be overlooked in the reception of Plato in Poland. This paper indicates that Tatarkiewicz was still under the influence of the neo-Kantians after returning from Marburg, where, as he himself recalled, he had found himself quite by accident. During his studies in Berlin Tatarkiewicz attended a lecture given by Hermann Cohen (1842–1918), then a visiting lecturer, and this encouraged the young student to transfer to the *alma mater* of this professor, where he eventually wrote a doctoral thesis on Aristotle.¹¹⁸ At the time of writing his *Controversy over Plato*, he was clearly still an adherent of Marburg’s interpretation of Plato, and even accepted it as his own, as witnessed by the enthusiastic statements from the final paragraph of the paper: “So we claim that, in the Platonism which is found in Plato himself, the idea is always a conceptual relation, a method, a principle. And Plato comprehended in this way is the great precursor of contemporary knowledge and philosophy; and that is why it is not only historical but also systematic interests that make us turn to him, for we can learn many lessons for today and tomorrow from Plato’s works”.¹¹⁹ Thus, Tatarkiewicz declared that his approach to Plato was in the spirit of Marburg neo-Kantianism. The plural form (“we”) in this final paragraph of Tatarkiewicz’s paper denotes the author and his Marburg teachers.

Tatarkiewicz started his paper with a critique of the Aristotelian interpretation of Plato’s theory of ideas because this theory constituted the most important issue in the title controversy over Plato. Tatarkiewicz had already made a defence of Plato in his thesis on Aristotle, in which Plato was also presented through the prism of his Marburg studies. Scholars for centuries had had confidence in Aristotle’s presentation of the theory of ideas, and the reason for this, as Tatarkiewicz explained, was the systematic character and precise terminology of Aristotle’s exposition, “whereas in Plato the thought is scattered over a whole series of dialogues; everything here is just coming to life, sprouting, thoughts searching for expression,

118 Tatarkiewicz, 1999–2001: 186. The most comprehensive presentation of Tatarkiewicz’s connections to Marburg philosophy, its professors and university can be found in chapter one of the book by Czesław Głombik (Głombik, 2005: 11–90). The problems important for the present study were also raised by that author in his previous paper (Głombik, 2001). A comparison of the two interpretations of Plato in Tatarkiewicz, in the paper *Controversy over Plato*, and in his *History of Philosophy* can be found in Mróz, 2011b.

119 Tatarkiewicz, 2010a: 156.

words multiplying and changing, and next to a precisely formulated statement there is a metaphor or a poetic image.”¹²⁰

The main body of Tatarkiewicz's text consists of a concise reconstruction of the Marburg interpretation of Plato's theory of ideas and the epistemological issues related to it, for this school's transcendental interpretation of the theory of ideas could be regarded as a transfer of the problem of ideas from the sphere of metaphysics to the theory of knowledge. Tatarkiewicz began with an assessment of the role of experience in scientific cognition, claiming it to be a necessary but insufficient condition for science. He based his reflection in this regard on Plato's *Phaedo*, without yet directly referring to this dialogue.

A correct interpretation of the *Phaedo*, as Tatarkiewicz continued, may be hindered by the Polish word 'hipoteza' which differs from the Greek ὑπόθεσις, and is therefore misleading. In Greek and in Plato's philosophy "it is a logical claim that is set as the principle of the research. [...] It does not denote: hypothesis, assumption, but on the contrary: the greatest certainty. The Polish word *foundation* [*podstawa*] is the most accurate translation of the Greek «ὑπόθεσις», having the same function and exactly the same meaning as the Greek: the basic or the most certain.”¹²¹ Tatarkiewicz goes on to add: "This is Plato's fundamental method of cognition: seeking solutions to problems on the basis of logical foundations. These foundations, ideas, are in modern language the rules of logic, the basic methods of the sciences; they are the means by which regularity and reason can be rooted in the world of phenomena; they are means of cognition; we acquire knowledge in and through them – they form, then, knowledge κατ' ἐξοχήν.”¹²² In another fragment, in Kantian spirit, Tatarkiewicz came to the rescue of the Parmenidean principle of identity of thought and being: "Knowledge is, after all, knowledge about that which exists, cognition is

120 Tatarkiewicz, 2010a: 147. In this defence of Plato against Aristotle, Jacek Hołowka discerned Tatarkiewicz's youthful enthusiasm (Hołowka, 2000: 301–302). The paper by Hołowka, based on the text of the *Controversy over Plato*, is not a historical-philosophical attempt to comprehend it. Hołowka rather suggests reading it in the context of the literature and works on Plato by Thomas A. Szlezák and Władysław Stróżewski, and paying less attention to Marburg neo-Kantianism. He discusses the topicality of the *Controversy over Plato* and the adequacy of the ideas presented there.

121 Tatarkiewicz, 2010a: 150–151. Hołowka regards these considerations as a light-handed treatment of the issue of *koinonia*, which is, according to Hołowka, the 'privilege of youth' (Hołowka, 2000: 311).

122 Tatarkiewicz, 2010a: 151.

the cognition of being. Therefore the idea is *being*, idea as the source and essence of knowledge, its unchanging foundation, or even as knowledge itself, because the edifice of knowledge consists of a structure of logical statements and relations, *i.e.* ideas, hence the idea.”¹²³ Only in this meaning can one legitimately state that the idea is being. Later, however, in the *Parmenides* and *Sophist*, Plato provided a subjective understanding of the idea. Nevertheless, Tatarkiewicz’s statement, which sums up current considerations well, has not lost its significance: “Phaenomena are the problem of philosophy, not transcendent entities; however, they are only the problem, not the solution; the ideas are needed for the solution.”¹²⁴

The value of Plato’s theory of ideas does not, therefore, lie in this or that ontic status. In fact, whether the idea exists as a transcendent being or as a concept in the intellect of the subject which cognises does not essentially matter: “the idea is valued [...] by the services it renders when the phaenomena are grasped; its value is determined by its consequences: does it correspond to the problem posed by the phaenomena and is it sufficient to solve the problem?”¹²⁵

The main basis for Tatarkiewicz’s paper was the book by Paul Natorp (1854–1924), *Platos Ideenlehre* (1903), which was the only neo-Kantian work referred to in the main text of *Controversy over Plato*. Tatarkiewicz’s argument brings out the central issues of Natorp’s book. As Tatarkiewicz himself recalled, during his stay in Marburg he had not only devoted a year to reading the dialogues but had, for some time, also attended Natorp’s lectures. However, – as he wrote – “Natorp’s lectures bored me as they were monotonous and badly presented. I preferred reading this eminent scholar than listening to him.”¹²⁶ Unlike Natorp, Cohen lectured brilliantly and it was said that he even conversed with Plato during his lectures.

Tatarkiewicz referred to the problems raised by Natorp and to the dialogues which were essential for his interpretation of Plato, whose image from the pages of *Platos Ideenlehre* was nicknamed ‘Platorp’ by ‘unkind tongues’.¹²⁷ It is worth drawing attention to one or two details to convince ourselves of the careful reading and the time that the author of the *Contro-*

123 Tatarkiewicz, 2010a: 151.

124 Tatarkiewicz, 2010a: 152.

125 Tatarkiewicz, 2010a: 153.

126 Tatarkiewicz, 1988: 34; elsewhere about Natorp: “he used to read out his lectures in a monotonous and uninviting manner” (Tatarkiewicz, 1999–2001: 188).

127 Laks, 2004: 453.

versy over Plato must have devoted to the work *Platos Ideenlehre*, which he regarded as a great and famous book.¹²⁸

Readers of the *Phaedo* must remember the famous excerpt in which Socrates speaks about the second voyage to seek causes (δεύτερος πλοῦς, 99 d). In Tatariewicz's paper, however, when referring to Plato's shift to the laws of logic as the basis for knowledge, he wrote about the third journey for the truth. This inaccuracy can easily be explained by confronting this text with Natorp's book. When the Marburg philosopher discusses the disappointment with the philosophy of nature and with the theory of Anaxagoras that Plato's Socrates, or Plato himself, experienced, he enumerates the stages of Plato's research development. The first point is "the struggle with the analogies of experience, or materialism, the simplest of theories, which does not perceive any questions anywhere, considering all that is given and known as comprehensible, and all that is not given as similar to the given."¹²⁹ The philosophy of Anaxagoras and his teleologism constitute the second point. In Natorp's book point three is the proper 'second voyage'. Why does point three mark the second voyage? Natorp explained that Anaxagoras' instructions did not, in fact, provide any method, or route.¹³⁰ Tatariewicz, then, accepted the enumeration by Natorp, and took the number of the research stage for the number denoting the voyage.

Tatariewicz's paper must have been very informative for Polish readers. Very few of them knew about the neo-Kantian interpretation of Plato at that time. As a means of bringing this interpretation closer to Polish read-

128 Tatariewicz, 1999–2001: 187. The most comprehensive presentation in Polish literature of the interpretation of Plato in the spirit of Marburg neo-Kantianism is: Czarnawska, 1988. A synthetic comparison of the Aristotelian and Marburg interpretations can be found there in the form of a table (Czarnawska, 1988: 190–193). The topicality of the Marburg approach to Plato is articulated by Czarnawska as follows: "The difference between Aristotle's and Marburg Plato is like the difference between »to know« and »to question«" (Czarnawska, 1997: 105), Marburg approach is open and seeking.

129 Tatariewicz, 2010a: 150; cf.: "Erklärung nach den Analogien des Sinnlichen, als des gegebenen, vermeintlich verstandenen. Man meint, das gegebene zu verstehen, weil es in der Erfahrung uns geläufig ist, und denkt sich das nicht gegebene gleichartig diesem gegebenen" (Natorp, 1903: 147; cf.: Natorp, 2004: 164–165).

130 "3. Nachdem also diese große Aussicht sich – für jetzt – zerschlagen hatte, begab sich Plato auf die »zweite Ausfahrt« zur Erforschung des Grundes des Werdens (99 D). Wieso ist es die zweite? Nun, der Wink des Anaxagoras hatte ihm keinen wirklichen »Weg«, keine Methode eröffnet" (Natorp, 1903: 149).

ers, Tatarkiewicz chose *Platos Ideenlehre* as the most important work presenting the transcendental interpretation of the theory of ideas.

Controversy over Plato was considered to be a study for wider audiences that “reveals [...] Tatarkiewicz’s temperament and strong personal commitment to reconstructing the great philosophical theories.”¹³¹ Yet far from being a popularising work, this paper seems more suited to specialists who knew the problems of Platonic and Kantian philosophy. It has also been assessed as a historical-philosophical presentation of the title controversy, without providing ready-made solutions: “above all, he provided information about the Marburg school of philosophy, [...] without going beyond the limits of reporting his own Marburg experience.”¹³² Apart from providing information, however, Tatarkiewicz, adopted a particular stance on the subject by accepting the interpretation of Plato produced by his Marburg teachers. He is believed to have been virtually the first Polish author to inform the general public in Poland about the works of the Marburg philosophy centre.¹³³ It has already been remarked about the *Controversy over Plato* that “this essay is the first Polish report on the groundbreaking and large-scale research on Plato’s writings which were conducted at the turn of the 20th century in Marburg.”¹³⁴ Yet it is the chapter on Plato in Tatarkiewicz’s *History of Philosophy*, rather than the *Controversy over Plato*, that should be regarded as a work for wider audiences, for here the professional terminology has been limited to the necessary minimum and extreme interpretations moderated. In the *History of Philosophy*, a text written for a completely different purpose, Tatarkiewicz did not articulate his opinion on the topicality or anachronism of Platonism as he had done in the *Controversy over Plato*. He also refrained from judgments and confined himself to orderly, systematic presentation whereas in the *Controversy over Plato* the reader has to reckon with the theory of ideas and with a report on a new interpretation of this theory to which the author adhered. For a complete presentation of Plato’s philosophy in its entirety the chapter on Plato in Tatarkiewicz’s *History of Philosophy* is much more suited to general audiences as the aim of this text was to familiarise the reader with the most important problems of Platonism and to facilitate their comprehension.

131 Hołówka, 2000: 301.

132 Głombik, 2005: 56.

133 Głombik, 2005: 48. Prior to Tatarkiewicz, Stanisław Brzozowski (1878–1911) wrote about Cohen (Głombik, 2005: 47).

134 Parszutowicz, 2010: 14.

The opinions about the pioneering character of the *Controversy over Plato* should also be reassessed and supplemented. Though it was indeed the first Polish text to discuss the Marburg interpretation of Platonism, there were Polish researchers of Plato who were aware of this interpretation and even had their share in its origins. Natorp knew Lutosławski's monumental book, and he discussed the stylometric method and its chronological results in a series of papers. Did Natorp talk about Lutosławski's research with his young compatriot, Tatarkiewicz? This is quite possible, but nothing of this is mentioned in the memoirs of Tatarkiewicz, who in subsequent decades was not exactly one of Lutosławski's well-wishers.

Though not explicitly articulated, Tatarkiewicz's paper can be regarded as an appeal for the intensification of research on the philosophy of Plato in Poland.¹³⁵ This postulate, however, did not fall on stony ground. In a footnote Tatarkiewicz referred to Lutosławski's research, which he described as thorough, though its results did not go far enough. Lutosławski did, in fact, depart from the Aristotelian interpretation of the theory of ideas, but he did not venture as far as the neo-Kantian interpretation. It could even be said that, for linguistic reasons, the formulation of the transcendental interpretation of the theory of ideas was an easier task for Poles because "in Polish, idea does not mean, as in other languages, something involving imagination, nor is it an ordinary concept, but a directing concept, not a specific thought, but a tendency, a direction of thought, a direction that is both independent and creative. Through ideas, the notional world becomes an active factor that has its source in spiritual activity. Every concept, anything that we know, is the product or activation of an idea."¹³⁶

Treating Natorp's work as a study in the history of philosophy was considered by Bogumił Jasinowski (1883–1969) to be a methodological error. According to Jasinowski, the Marburg philosopher may have aspired to producing a historical reconstruction of Plato's work, but he also sought "for a »proper comprehension« of the central point in Plato's system, [...] for the construction of a certain whole, which, though often digressing from the »fact«, from the real thought, though sometimes spoken loudly

135 Trojanowski, 2006: 211. One cannot, however, after Trojanowski, consider the paper (Kozłowski, 2010) by Władysław Mieczysław Kozłowski (1858–1935), which was originally published two years prior to that of Tatarkiewicz, as a possible response to Tatarkiewicz's appeal (Trojanowski, 2006: 211, and in footnote 19).

136 Tatarkiewicz, 2010: 148–149.

and at other times only in a whisper, still claims its right to greater »significance«, to a »deeper« understanding of the thought.”¹³⁷ Natorp, then, did not merely reconstruct Plato’s work but corrected it according to an idealised and consistent image of his philosophy.

Tatarkiewicz’s paper is still popular today, and is sometimes regarded as a proposal for a methodological alternative to the paradigm of the Tübingen school since it does not make use of references to unspecific, unwritten doctrines, nor does it adhere to Aristotle’s metaphysical interpretation.¹³⁸

To sum up Tatarkiewicz’s position, it is evident that in his text, *Controversy over Plato*, he expressed great enthusiasm for Natorp’s work. But it should be remembered that he prepared and delivered his paper at a meeting of the Warsaw Psychological Society as early as 1910.¹³⁹ His initial enthusiasm for his Marburg teachers was, however, quite quickly abandoned, though even after four decades Tatarkiewicz recognised their work as progress: “The part played by eminent historians of philosophy consists, to a large extent, in adjusting or refuting traditional interpretations. Historians at the turn of the 20th century broke away from the metaphysical interpretation of Plato’s ideas that had been maintained for centuries.”¹⁴⁰ Even earlier, in the 1930’s, when lecturing and conducting seminars at the University of Warsaw, he recommended a more thorough acquaintance with Greek philosophy, and advised students to study Natorp’s interpretation.¹⁴¹

As for the question of defining Tatarkiewicz’s relation to the Marburg school, the prevailing opinion states that, despite his studies in Marburg and the defence of his doctoral thesis there, he was never a neo-Kantian philosopher.¹⁴² It seems, however, that this opinion needs to be re-assessed. Marburg neo-Kantians influenced Tatarkiewicz’s view on ancient philoso-

137 Jasinowski, 1929: 154.

138 Sarnowski, 2007: 29–30.

139 It took place on May 5th, 1910 (Tatarkiewicz, 2010: 147, footnote). This presentation was given a few weeks after his arrival in Warsaw with a doctoral diploma and his already dissertation published. This event was reported on in the Warsaw daily papers (Głombik, 2005: 48, footnote 103).

140 Tatarkiewicz, 1971b: 71.

141 Nowicki, 1981: 143–144, cf.: Nowicki, 1976.

142 E.g.: Palacz, 1999: 392; Głombik, 2005: 56; Głombik, 2005a: 49. There are also opinions which unfairly diminish the influence of the Marburg philosophers on Tatarkiewicz. E.g. Jacek Jadacki mentions them together with Henri Bergson, and remarks that the influence of foreign scholars on Tatarkiewicz was slight and short-lived, and Jadacki lists eight Polish philosophers as the most impor-

phy, especially on Plato, and evidence of this can be found in his thesis about Aristotle – irrespective of the reasons for which this topic was suggested to him – and in the *Controversy over Plato*. These works demonstrate that the young Tatarkiewicz assimilated the assessments and interpretations produced in Marburg. He may not have entirely adhered to these views, but he felt a close affinity to them.¹⁴³ In other words, the Marburg interpretation of Plato was, at least for some time, also Tatarkiewicz's interpretation. It can be concluded, therefore, that Tatarkiewicz did not limit himself to reporting what he had learned in the West, but he also identified with it at least to some extent.

On his return to Poland his encounter with Twardowski and the circle of his students did not affect Tatarkiewicz's image of Plato; it was only his interests that changed, for Tatarkiewicz shifted from ancient philosophy to axiology. It was not until the first volume of the *History of Philosophy* (1931) that he returned to the historiography of ancient philosophy, and thus to Plato. Marburg, however, forms the beginning of the process of Tatarkiewicz's development as a historian of philosophy: "The Marburg philosophers, rather than contributing to Tatarkiewicz's adoption of their school of philosophy, influenced the formation of Tatarkiewicz's interests in the history of philosophy and of his first research implementations in this area of philosophical studies."¹⁴⁴ Let us add that, by directing

tant philosophical inspirations for Tatarkiewicz (Jadacki, 2009: 213–214). This issue is connected with the dispute over Tatarkiewicz's alleged affiliation to the Lvov-Warsaw school. Stefan Zamecki classifies Tatarkiewicz as belonging to the school, but not as a student of Twardowski, only as an exceptional figure (Zamecki, 1977: 55). Jan Woleński (Woleński, 1985: 9) and Jadacki (Jadacki, 1998: 85–87) consider Tatarkiewicz to be a representative of the school. The arguments of this dispute have recently been compiled by Joanna Zegzuła-Nowak (Zegzuła-Nowak, 2010). Perhaps Jerzy Pelc (1924–2017) is closest to the truth, claiming that Tatarkiewicz did not belong to the school, but many of his postulates connected him to its representatives (Pelc: 1981: 7–8). The postulates were therefore similar, although their sources and areas of interest of Tatarkiewicz and the representatives of the Lvov-Warsaw school were different.

143 Hołówka, 2000: 305. Hołówka adds that despite this closeness, Tatarkiewicz "demands something more from the idea" (Hołówka, 200: 305), he continues, however, to discuss this interpretation attributing it to Tatarkiewicz, he considers it 'daring' and 'ingenious', though perhaps – off the mark. Hołówka regards this paper as articulating the original research of Tatarkiewicz in the field of ancient philosophy. It has to be borne in mind, however, that Tatarkiewicz in the *Controversy over Plato* did not present his own original interpretation of Platonism, but reported on and largely adhered to the views of other scholars.

144 Głombik, 2005: 57.

Tatarkiewicz's research in the history of philosophy, his Marburg teachers were to have a lasting effect on him. Perhaps his turn to antiquity, which started in Marburg, may even have affected Tatarkiewicz's way of thinking and evaluating, as well as his method of researching the history of philosophy, a method which involved the application of the dialectical method in its Platonic sense, by categorising philosophical positions and attempting to define and analyse them critically.¹⁴⁵

145 Popiel, 1960: 8.