HISTORIOGRAPHY OF PHILOSOPHY AND NATIONAL TRADITION. SOME REFLECTIONS ON THE BASIS OF DISCUSSIONS ON THE HISTORY OF POLISH PHILOSOPHY*

The basis of paper consists of decades long discussion of Polish philosophers and historians of philosophy who touched upon the issue of national Polish philosophy and upon the problems of researching the history of Polish philosophy. The discussion led to numerous interesting conclusions which appear to be still valid for researchers of national philosophical traditions and also for philosophers who intend to contribute to philosophical tradition of their nation. Topical conclusions of their considerations can be formulated as methodological instructions for researching history of nation's philosophy and as advice for building philosophical tradition of the given nation.
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This paper aims to provide some hopefully useful thoughts and instructions touching upon the problem of national traditions in philosophy (or in philosophies). It is impossible to address this issue regarding the entire history of philosophy in a short paper, and even the history of European philosophy doesn’t fall within the focus of present considerations. For every single European tradition in philosophy experienced its own unique historical, social, political, and linguistic conditions and limitations which influenced the origins, developments, meanders, backward steps and declines of the considered tradition. The basis of the present paper consists of philosophical discussion on the methodology of the history of Polish philosophy. Starting from the turn of the 20th century Polish researchers aimed to address some questions concerning various aspects of the history of Polish philosophy and en passant they touched upon the term of tradition in philosophy and of tradition in the historiography of philosophy. These reflections on tradition in philosophy, on forming such a national tradition, on the causes of the lack of tradition etc., will be emphasized in this paper because many conclusions drawn by researchers of the past generations still remain relevant today and they may be useful in discussions and in pursuing research on the histories of national philosophies.

Philosophical questions are generally thought to be universal and equally inspiring irrespective of the cultural environment of the philosophers who

* This paper refers to the same discussions as one of the author’s previous work in English [Mróz, 2016: 14–38; Ch. 1: “Polish Philosophy” or “Philosophy in Poland”?], but this one focuses on other aspects of this discussion which still appear to be valid and point to some conclusions of lasting value concerning national traditions in philosophy.
undertake them. Universal questions are, notwithstanding, answered by philosophers who are of this or that nationality, who use this or that language, who belong to this or that cultural tradition. Philosophy, then, combines universality of problems which torment human beings the world over, with particular solutions provided by particular philosophers. Philosophy is not a creation unrelated to the cultural element, the philosophical content cannot be abstracted from its context, whether geographical, linguistic or national. In consequence, philosophy cannot be considered as isolated from any changing circumstances, cannot be abstracted from the philosophers who asked themselves philosophical questions and answered them.

Certainly, social and political philosophy, ethics, philosophy of history, philosophy of language are more influenced by cultural, national factors, than, for example, logic or methodology of science. Philosophy in general, by its very nature, is one of the components of culture, namely intellectual culture. Since one may indicate cultural differences between peoples and nations in different areas of cultural traditions, then one can also observe them in philosophy. The cultural differences between nations, however, should not lead us to believe that national cultural and philosophical traditions were, are, or will be insulated. Nevertheless, there are some differences which allow historians of philosophy to point out some distinctive features of English, German, American, Polish, and many other philosophical traditions.

If ancient philosophy falls out of current research, then it was not until the Renaissance that philosophers intentionally started to use their national languages for doing philosophy, and then they coined the first philosophical terms in these languages. Consequently, it was from this time that European philosophical traditions started to undergo a process of divergence. If history of philosophy may be presented as a fully-grown, healthy oak-tree, then it has its roots which still feed it, has its firm trunk and numerous fresh, green branches growing out in all directions. Philosophy has its Greek origins, this is an indisputable fact, and contemporary philosophy is still deeply rooted in ancient ideas. If philosophy has its roots in antiquity, then the medieval Latin philosophical culture of Western Europe is certainly the heavy trunk drawing its substance from the strong ancient radices. Many different branches stem from the trunk, they grow and develop close to each other, but also independently. Modern philosophy splits the apparently homogeneous medieval heritage; philosophy is transformed from the relative uniformity of scholastic thought and splits into schools, trends and directions. At the dawn of the modern era strong national cultures emerged, and national languages overcame the essential unity of medieval philosophical culture, which was based on its linguistic unity. The national traditions in philosophy were born then. It was not until the beginning of modernity that philosophy came to be systematized in national terms.

Polish thinkers of the Enlightenment and Romanticism presented their ideas of what philosophy in general and Polish philosophy in particular should be like. Their projects, however, being strongly rooted in their epochs
and linked to the then political situation of the Polish people in a
dismembered country will not be considered here. Serious and still topical
discussion on the very concept of Polish philosophy, on the methods and
problems of the history of Polish philosophy and on its tradition could not
have emerged earlier than the first generation of modern historians of
philosophy – and historians of Polish philosophy – appeared. Some names
and opinions will be presented below, their purpose being to offer some
conclusions, which – again – might be found useful for application in studies
of the minor philosophical traditions.

We should begin with Henryk Struve (1840–1912), who was a
philosopher, logician and historian of philosophy and logic. For over 40 years
he lectured at the Imperial (Russian) University of Warsaw. In 1900 he
published a book entitled *The History of Philosophy in Poland against a
Background of the Universal Development of Intellectual Life*. Since Struve
decided to write the history of philosophy in Poland, it must have meant that
Polish philosophers had already made some progress in this field, especially,
as Struve argued, in the 19th century.

The very title of Struve's book suggests the term 'history of philosophy in
Poland', but the author admitted his doubts about its validity. He argued for
the aptness of this term, rather than the 'history of Polish philosophy', as
follows: "*Polish philosophy*, as well as the *Polish* language and *Polish*
literature, indicates that we are referring to the direct product of the Polish
nation, which is owned by its spirit, originated and developed by intellects
born from its bosom. *Polish philosophy* means the same as the *philosophy
of the Poles*. Well, there is no doubt that in some ways we can talk about the
philosophy of the Poles, as well as that every individual and every nation has
its own philosophy, if we mean by it [=philosophy] an overall view of the world
and life" [8, p. 7]. Struve concluded that such a broad concept of philosophy
could in fact be replaced by the concept of Polish culture. He argued against
equating philosophy with culture, though philosophy is the highest
manifestation of culture. It is only philosophy, in the strictest sense of the
word, however, that results from critical thought and scientific tendencies.

Struve, however, mentioned English, French or German philosophies
after the Greek and Indian. So, the question arises, what is different in the
works of Polish philosophers, since they did not contribute to Polish
philosophy, they did not produce the tradition of Polish philosophy, whereas
English philosophers were capable of producing the tradition of English
philosophy, not only 'philosophy in England'? Struve's answer goes as
follows: the national philosophy's genesis must result from the national
culture. If it does not, then it is just a philosophy in the given country, and not
the philosophy of the nation dwelling in this country, not to mention national
tradition in philosophy.

Struve associated philosophy with national character, and he stated that
the original English philosophy began with Francis Bacon (1561–1626),
before him only philosophy in England existed. Along with Bacon English
philosophy started in England, and its orientation remains essentially
empirical. The same applies to French philosophy, which starts with Rene Descartes (1596–1650), who gave it a rationalist character. German philosophy did not exist before G. W. Leibniz (1646–1716), and its main area of interest is metaphysics. And what about Polish philosophy? Struve argued that the term 'Polish philosophy' is justified only from the nineteenth century, when Polish thought gained independence, became autonomous. Struve continued: "philosophy, as a self-sufficient science, fought with many difficulties in our land, until it took roots and acclimatized here; therefore it will be undoubtedly more accurate to call its development *history of philosophy in Poland*, than *history of Polish philosophy*" [8, p. 10]. To conclude Struve's argumentation: 'Polish philosophy' is a particular part of 'philosophy in Poland' which is qualitatively original and does not consist only of a mixture of foreign and indigenous elements, but is an original and distinct combination of both. To produce a national tradition in philosophy thinkers cannot limit their inspirations to one source only, indigenous or foreign.

Struve's considerations were continued by Stanisław Garfein-Garski (1867–1928) in his lecture on the issue of Polish national philosophy. He grappled with the same problem as Struve: "The matter which is under our consideration seems at first glance to be paradoxical. For how can one combine philosophy or science, probably the most universal manifestation of culture, with something *par excellence* totally particular, with something negatively expressing itself in particularism, with *nationality*?" [3, p. 3]. Garfein-Garski attempted to search for potential features of the special character of Polish philosophy, but one by one he rejected them. Consequently, Garfein-Garski arrived at a conclusion concerning all of the areas of philosophy: "truths valid for one nation only cannot exist" [3, p. 23]. According to Garfein-Garski, there is, however, one field of philosophical reflection which has a significant national character; it is the philosophy of history, historiosophy, which is not limited to the explanation of the past, but also determines the future, goals and objectives for the nation. Only historiosophy, then, can be truly national as referring to the culture, tradition and history of a particular nation. Let us conclude with Garski's opinion on the Polish philosophy of his times: "We are intensively occupied with philosophy from all around the world and our own philosophy is almost a barren land. One of the major reasons for that fact is the lack of primary sources for our philosophy. We are like the rich, who have lost the key to their treasures. We have great philosophical traditions, but we have almost no access to them. Source texts of our national philosophy require publication without delay [...]. *We need primary sources*" [3, p. 28–29]. This conclusion still appears reasonable and is still repeated and taken up by historians of philosophy. According to Garfein-Garski, historiosophy is the only area of philosophical investigations which can be useful for producing a truly national tradition in philosophy. For the source material for historiosophy consists of the particular national history and history is a unique component of every national identity and national tradition.
Struve returned to the topic of Polish philosophy a decade later. He formulated some requirements to be met in order for philosophy to become essentially national, for Polish philosophical tradition to stand along with German, French and English. According to him philosophy should have a certain continuity of tradition and development: "continuity mostly consists in taking into account the predecessors in Polish literature by each new student of it" [9, p. 2]. In other words, Struve's argument is: quote your predecessors, refer to them! Otherwise, Polish tradition in philosophy will never come into being.

Struve's opinion was endorsed by Kazimierz Twardowski (1866–1938), one of the most important figures in Polish philosophy. He observed that native, local philosophical aspirations, though they appeared weak, could be reconciled and combined with foreign influences. Foreign inspirations should, however, be drawn from diverse traditions, in order not to become one-sided: "Then none of the foreign philosophies will be able to invade the area of native philosophy, [...] but all of them [=foreign philosophies] will fertilize the soil on which the native philosophy will grow up luxuriantly" [10, p. 114]. In other texts Twardowski voiced the need to organise a bibliographical listing of Polish philosophical works and to set up one central catalogue of philosophical works available in Polish libraries. Such a catalogue and bibliography would be essential to fulfil the idea of philosophy built on Polish tradition. He expressed a similar opinion to that of Garfein-Garski: "We have, in fact, much richer philosophical achievements than one might think. We neither use them properly in philosophical research, nor in teaching philosophy. And we do not use them, because we do not know them" [10, p. 138].

Another philosopher and historian of philosophy, Adam Zieleńczyk (1880–1943), pointed out the double genealogy of the concept of 'Polish philosophy'. On one hand Polish philosophy is in fact philosophy as such, philosophy in general. Nevertheless, Polish philosophy is also Polish, local, so to a certain extent it has some specific features. Zieleńczyk argued, however, that it is better for every science when generality, versatility and universality prevail. He continued: "[philosophy] should strive to present the truth as objectively as possible, and to reject any ties which restrain it. Philosophy has to strive for the truth and must not abandon this path once chosen for any national reasons. It would be better for philosophy not to be national, rather than to become false" [16, p. 278–279]. In short, according to Zieleńczyk, the scientific character of philosophy is the foundation on which its national variant and national tradition can be built. One of the famous Polish philosophers, Edmund Husserl's disciple, Roman Ingarden (1893–1970), also expressed his views on national philosophy. Ingarden's opinion was brief, yet clear. First, he criticized the popular, unprofessional meaning of philosophy: "philosophy is considered as something significantly associated with one mental structure or another, as an expression of this or that individual attitude towards the "world", some even talk of "national philosophy", they call to establish it; just like with
equal rightness one could speak of 'national mathematics' or 'national zoology!' [6, p. 162]. According to Zielińczyk and Ingarden national tradition in philosophy is almost equalled to national tradition in science. Both should be done carefully to meet all the highest scientific standards, without considering much national, domestic, local conditions.

These arguments were not widely accepted due to the non-scientific character of the most of philosophical considerations and strong links between philosophy and culture. In response to Ingarden's allegations Bolesław Gawęcki (1889–1984) took the floor. He argued in favour of the use of the term 'Polish philosophy'. According to Gawęcki, the term is justified by the fact that Poles have "rendered considerable services to this field, and they applied unique, original methods to this science, and lastly, they have given it a distinct character and form, with Polish national characteristics. In any case, on account of its content, 'Polish philosophy' would still be universal philosophy". [5, p. 374; cf.: 4, p. 7] Ingarden's attempts to ridicule national traditions in philosophy could have been effective provided that philosophy was just a regular science like all others. According to Gawęcki, however, philosophy is not an ordinary science, for philosophical theses are not usually intersubjectively verifiable, and their synthetic nature provides philosophy with a unique place among sciences and culture in general.

So much then for the period before the Second World War. All of the above opinions originated in the period when Polish philosophers were attempting to free themselves from the influence of decades of Messianic and Romantic philosophy. Most of them, especially the younger generation, were trying to step out of the shadows of 19th century thought and to produce modern tradition of doing philosophy in Poland. The situation slightly changed after the war, when historians of philosophy systematically attempted to research their own philosophical, intellectual tradition. One of the most important events in this development was the publication of a two-volume *History of Polish Philosophy* (vol. I: 1958, vol. II: posthumously 1966) by Wiktor Wąsik (1883-1963). He argued that if the whole history of philosophy can be described as the history of the reception of the Greek invention, then the history of Polish philosophy can be considered as the Polish variant of this reception. Reception in each of the European philosophies carried with it some clear national intellectual features. Wąsik claimed that 'national colour' had existed in Polish philosophy since the Middle Ages, although he acknowledged that it had not been too clear then, but in the course of time it had grown stronger [15, p. 9–16].

The framework for the more recent debate was then set, and the issue has been deliberately transformed into a historical and methodological problem. The starting point for the new stage in this ongoing discussion was set by Józef Bańka (1934-), who called for a search in the history of Polish philosophy for those features which were distinct from the European tradition. The unique and specific features of Polish philosophy, according to Bańka, had come to light in Poland during the Renaissance, for it was then
that 'national colour' came to the fore and culminated in Romantic and pre-
positivist thought, which essentially were Polish philosophy. An additional
remark made by Bańka, sounds like a signum temporis. He stated that it was
to be regretted that there was no printed and available study on the history
of Polish national philosophy presenting it as national and progressive at the
same time, and not as backward, reactionary and fideist. Bańka stressed the
relationship between national pride and the history of philosophy, and the
importance of research in the field of the history of philosophy in the
formation of national identity. Bańka’s text thus became a starting point for
the discussion on the merits of methodology in the study of the history of
Polish philosophy [2, p. 9].

The discussion on Polish philosophy was deliberately directed to
methodological issues by Andrzej Walicki (1930), one of the historians of
Polish and Russian philosophies most recognized in Poland and abroad. He
defended the validity of presenting historical studies on Polish philosophy in
a way that does not disregard its relations with European culture, but at the
same time, avoids reducing Polish philosophy to a mere series of
philosophical influences.

Although Bańka and Walicki differed with regard to methodological
issues, they both saw the need for intensification of research and teaching.
They both had a deep respect for the area of study under discussion, Walicki
wrote: "The history of Polish philosophy should not be studied on the margins
of the general history of philosophy; the methods applied by a historian to
investigate philosophy as an intellectual biography of a nation differ from the
methods applied by a researcher of the universal history of philosophical
problems" [12, p. 2]. Thus the demands to construct the tradition of historical
research in the nation's philosophy were set.

The discussion between the two scholars was continued by some as a
dispute on the form of future patriotism, but the most interesting voices spoke
on methods and their results in the study of the history of Polish philosophy.
Discussion moved to the columns of "Philosophical Studies", the most
important philosophical journal of that time. Walicki intended to revise the
opinion on the non-autonomous character of the history of Polish philosophy
and its dependence on Western thought: "history of Polish philosophy should
be distinguished from the general history of philosophy and should be
established as an independent discipline, not as a subordinate to the general
history of philosophy, but its coordinate" [13, p. 108]. This could be achieved
only by separating the history of Polish philosophy from the general history
of philosophy in terms of scope and method. For on the one hand, the history
of Polish philosophy is a part of the global history of philosophy, but on the
other – it constitutes a part of the history of Polish culture, of Polish
intellectual history and tradition. Let us quote a longer part of his
argumentation: "to study Polish philosophy (regardless of what was or what
may be contributed by foreign researchers) all the responsibility lies with us,
this is our duty to take care of the regularity of these studies, their
completeness and balance. We can meet our needs in the field of the
[general] history of philosophy with suitably selected translations (since we lack our own studies), but the gaps in our knowledge of Polish philosophy can be filled up only by our own research" [13, p. 108–109].

The history of Polish philosophy, according to Walicki, had a dual affiliation; it was a sub-field of both history of general philosophy and of Polish culture. This provided a great opportunity for this branch of study, as an interdisciplinary area, often leading to valuable results. Although research on the history of Polish philosophy may not contribute significantly to the history of philosophy in general, its contribution to the history of Polish culture would be invaluable. When evaluating a specific philosophical phenomenon, its significance in the context of Polish philosophy and culture is disproportionate to its significance in the context of universal philosophy. Additionally, the history of Polish philosophy can improve self-knowledge and the historical consciousness of the nation. However, the key to successful research was considered to be the ability to strike a reasonable balance between the two contexts of Polish philosophy so that affirmation of the native tradition should not imply losing contact with general philosophy.

The subsequent issues of "Philosophical Studies" were inundated with opinions on the subject. Most panellists considered Walicki’s proposition to be valuable in many respects, as an accurate diagnosis of the condition and needs of research on the history of Polish philosophy. Jan Legowicz (1909–1992), a famous medievalist, confirmed the validity of the methodological demands made by Walicki, especially on the interdisciplinary nature of research on the history of Polish philosophy. Legowicz, as a specialist in the history of medieval philosophy, insisted on taking the initial steps by undertaking rudimentary archival and library queries [1, p. 123–125]. Władysław Tatarkiewicz (1886–1980) tried to calm the initial enthusiasm. He considered a number of demands to be exaggerated; for example, he did not believe that the demand to treat the history of Polish philosophy as a separate field of research was sufficiently justified [81, p. 125–127]. Tadeusz Kotarbiński (1886–1981), a student of Twardowski in Lvov, a philosopher and a logician, and one of the most representative figures of the Lvov-Warsaw school, responded positively to the idea of treating the history of Polish philosophy as a part of Polish history, and Polish intellectual culture with a single exception for formal logic [1, p. 128]. Stefan Świężawski (1907–2004), another medievalist, and the author of studies on the methods of the history of philosophy, came up with an important methodological pointer which was not quite in line with Walicki’s thesis. Świężawski focused on the concept of philosophy itself and on the fact that throughout the centuries its content had been changing, therefore he regarded the proposal to integrate research on the history of Polish philosophy and on the history of Polish national culture as risky. He said: "it seems to be dangerous and methodologically incorrect to mix the two different and distinct types of historical sciences" [1, p. 128]. The threat for historical research, according to Świężawski, was that the combination of strictly philosophical issues with these belonging to a broader
philosophical cultural and social background might result in a redefinition of the scope of the history of philosophy.

Barbara Skarga (1909–2009) developed some of Walicki’s initial theses. She was a historian of philosophy, a philosopher and ethicist. She stressed, in particular, the need to bond the history of Polish philosophy with Polish culture, and subsequently, with the universal history of philosophy. Since such a history of Polish philosophy constituted a field of study which was distinct in scope and method, Skarga suggested a new term for it: "the history of philosophical culture in Poland" or "Polish intellectual history". The rationale for this methodological approach was, first of all, the scope of the research field: "This discipline is rather interested in what can be called 'philosophical thinking' or an 'outlook on life', that is, a structure which consists of ethical and religious values as well as social and political beliefs, and philosophical views, but the latter do not play the autonomous role; they are a sort of a cement that holds the varied content in a reasonable unity" [1, p. 129]. Such a redefinition of the scope of historical research in philosophy, and thus, the redefinition of philosophy itself, resulted from tying up all the philosophical phenomena with the social context, and the phenomena could be then described as 'philosophical culture'. And this philosophical culture is expressed not only in philosophical treatises, but also, and perhaps above all, in journalism, literature, and also in economical works. Therefore the historian of Polish philosophy, as defined by Skarga, would be required to take into account a number of historical, social and economic phenomena, not to mention Polish literature. According to Skarga, the Marxist method of historiography rendered services to the history of Polish philosophy because "even little known phenomena not arousing any curiosity, appeared in a different light. Human thoughts ceased to be suspended in a social void; thus apparently trivial world-views, when considered today with their social functions, have taken on new and unexpected values" [1, p. 130].

Zbigniew Kuderowicz (1931–2015), another historian of German and Polish philosophies, raised two objections of a methodological nature. He pointed to the difficulty of separating philosophical phenomena from other spheres of culture. Since philosophical culture is manifested also in literature, this should also be included in the area of research, as well as historical works which are deeply permeated with their authors' world-views. One danger which emerges from this approach is that the historian of philosophy would become just a historian of culture and would lose all the specificity of the original object of study. That is why Kuderowicz argued that the history of Polish philosophy "has to remain the history of philosophy, but has to use material not only of a philosophical nature" [1, p. 133]. The most important task of a historian of Polish philosophy is then to extract the philosophical content from the material under examination. The literary texts are interesting for a historian of Polish philosophy only "to the degree and extent to which they meet ideological functions and provide statements on the meaning of human life" [1, p. 133–134].
After a long discussion, a summary and final conclusions were presented by its initiator, Walicki. The most certain conclusion was a confirmation of the need to strengthen and deepen the research on the history of Polish philosophy because much still remained to be done in this field. Most of the participants in the discussion agreed that, on methodological and material grounds, the history of Polish philosophy was a subject distinct from the general history of philosophy. Walicki acknowledged that the history of Polish philosophy is a special sub-area of the general history of philosophy: "I believe, however, that for the sake of the history of Polish philosophy, it was worth putting the emphasis on the fact that [...] this is a typical "interdisciplinary" area and not just a part of any of the existing and institutionalized disciplines. Moreover, it appears to me that the specific developments in the history of Polish philosophy can only be recognized when we consider them as a branch of the history of Polish culture and a particular aspect of the intellectual history of the Polish nation. Such a treatment brings to light the significance of a number of phenomena which are of little importance, if any, from the point of view of the general history of philosophical problems. [...] It may also be worth noting that with the appropriate approach to such research, the danger of "closing within one's own fences" does not appear – after all, Polish culture and what is called the intellectual history of Poland, must also be considered in a broad, international comparative context. Personally, I think that this context would have to include much more than just philosophy, but the whole of the essential ideological phenomena in the culture of every era, so that the field of comparative research would be much wider than that of the universal history of philosophy in the traditional sense" [14, p. 190].

The above outline of the century-long discussion covers areas that may still be valid and applicable. Some could be implemented into the research practice of historians of domestic philosophies, of minor philosophical traditions, but are of more universal nature. Among the methodological instructions there is an important piece of advice to search for philosophical material outside the works traditionally considered to be philosophical and academic; studying literature and poetry could be fruitful. History of the nation's philosophy is a separate research field and it should not be researched as a margin of the general history of philosophy but it should rather be treated as an autonomous subject. Moreover, research in history of the nation's philosophy can render interdisciplinary results which are valid not in philosophy only, but they can contribute to other fields of national culture and tradition. It is not really important if subject of such a study is calle "philosophical culture" or "intellectual culture" of the given nation, what is, however, essential is that national tradition and its philosophical factors should not be diminished in comparison to the general history of philosophy. Even if the national, local tradition of philosophy doesn't exert universal impact, it is still important to research it, because its influence in the given country could be of more importance than the influence of other philosophical traditions. Fundamental research work of a historian of domestic
philosophical tradition should consist of extracting and emphasizing philosophical factors in national culture and history, of informing the general audience about their own traditions of philosophy, and of bringing to light apparently forgotten or underestimated texts and authors. In this way an intellectual debt to previous generations can be paid off.

An interesting remark which appeared in the above discussion is the emphasis put on historiosophy as a branch of philosophy strongly connected to the nation's history. Since historiosophy can't be produced without taking into account particular national factors then in historiosophy nation's history and tradition are combined essentially with philosophical thought. They are both united to produce historiosophy, and historiosophy itself as a branch of philosophy aims towards shaping nation's future, pointing national aims, and thus drawing from nation's tradition and at the same time contributing to it.

There's no future of philosophy without proper knowledge of the nation's tradition in philosophical research. In order to produce a strong national tradition in philosophy which wouldn't become a dwarfed creation of awkward and isolated individuals, some requirements must be met: there must be a strong connection between national culture and research in philosophy, philosophical element in national culture has to contribute more to the development of national culture, has to reflect on it, and form it, to become an inseparable element in the nation's cultural tradition. Research in philosophy cannot be insulated from foreign inspirations, it has to adopt them reasonably and combine them together with original national ideas, provided that no foreign element prevails but various inspirations feed the nation's philosophy equally.

The demand for continuity has to be accepted as well, namely to take into account all the researchers who in the given country investigated this or that philosophical question. To put it as an instruction: quote and refer to your predecessors, use their works, enliven their ideas! In order to do so, however, it is indispensable to produce comprehensive bibliographies, to edit and publish hardly available texts by domestic thinkers. This basic informative works have to be undertaken at first, without them it is still possible to do philosophy; national tradition in philosophy will not, however, come to existence.

Philosophers by their very nature tend to take up universal problems, but they shouldn't avoid dealing with domestic issues, e. g.: with national history, culture, and philosophical tradition. There are two central areas of philosophical investigations contributing to national tradition. Historiosophy is the first one, conceived as philosophical reflection on national history and culture. Historiography of philosophy is the second one. These two, apart from contributing to deeper understanding of national culture and tradition, introduce philosophy into culture and tradition, and at the same time they create tight bonds between philosophy and culture, in order to enliven traditions of doing philosophy and strenghten philosophical factor in national culture. Philosophers should not avoid investigating history of any given philosophical tradition, studying local, national histories of philosophy,
because in this way one still does research in philosophy and thus contributes to its tradition.
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ИСТОРИОГРАФИЯ ФИЛОСОФИИ И НАЦИОНАЛЬНОЙ ТРАДИЦИИ.
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ПО ИСТОРИИ ПОЛЬСКОЙ ФИЛОСОФИИ

Представлены многолетние дискуссии польских философов и историков философии, которые затронули проблему национальной польской философии и проблемы исследования истории польской философии. Обсуждение привело к многочисленным интересным выводам, которые, по-видимому, все еще актуальны для исследователей национальных философских традиций, а также для философов, которые намереваются внести вклад в философские традиции своего народа. Актуальные выводы из их соображений могут быть сформулированы как методические указания для изучения истории философии нации и как совет для построения философской традиции данной нации.
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