

The Book of Abstracts

Philosophical Schools After 1950

International conference
University of Warsaw Library (BUW), May 9–10, 2022

May 9

(room 315)

10:00

OPENING

Franca d'Agostini
Piotr Gutowski

11:45

Max Urchs, Klaus Wuttich
Anna Brożek
Wojciech Gasparski, Marcin Bukala

14:30

Itala Maria Loffredo D'Ottaviano
Raoni Wohnrath Arroyo
Jean-Yves Beziau

16:15

Ricardo Nicolás-Francisco
Paweł Polak, Kamil Trombik
Decio Krause

May 10

(room 254)

10:00

Agnieszka Lekka-Kowalik
John Grumley
Peter Murphy

11:45

John Rundell
Peter Beilharz
Agnieszka Kozyra

14:30

Krzysztof Nowak-Posadzy
Gerhard Preyer
Nevena Jevtić, Mina Đikanović

16:15

Katia Parshina
DEBATE: *Academic Schools
and the Future of University*

COME AND DISCUSS

See more at: edukacja-filozoficzna.uw.edu.pl/philosophical-schools

Organised by the
Faculty of Philosophy



Under the patronage
of the Committee on
Philosophical Sciences



Table of Contents

(in the order of the programme)

Monday (May 9, 2022)

Franca d’Agostini

Is There Still (If There Was) an Analytic-Continental Dualism in Philosophy? 4

Piotr Gutowski

Movements, Schools and Sects. A Few Remarks on the Way of Describing the Different Kinds of Philosophy 5

Max Urchs, Klaus Wuttich

„Complex Logic” in Berlin — The Becoming of a Scientific School and its Premature End 6

Anna Brożek

The Lvov-Warsaw School After 1950 7

Wojciech Gasparski, Marcin Bukała

Tadeusz Kotarbiński and the Polish School of Praxiology 8

Itala Maria Loffredo D’Ottaviano

The Brazilian School of Paraconsistent Logic 9

Raoni Wohnrath Arroyo (co-author: Itala D’Ottaviano)

Looking Back, Going Forward: Towards a “da Costa” School of Philosophy 10

Jean-Yves Beziau

30 Years of Experience with the Brazilian School of Logic 11

Ricardo Nicolás-Francisco

On Polish ‚Via Modalisation’ Approach to Paraconsistency 12

Paweł Polak, Kamil Trombik

The Cracow School of Philosophy in Science 13

Decio Krause

Logic and Empirical Sciences in the South of Brazil 14

Tuesday (May 10, 2022)

Agnieszka Lekka-Kowalik

The Lublin Philosophical School – An Answer to the Contemporary Challenges 15

John Grumley

Contemporary Critical Theory: the Budapest School in Australia 16

Peter Murphy

Being Oneself: Encountering Agnes Heller and the Budapest School 17

John Rundell	
After School – From Political and Critical Affinities to the Paradigm of Friendship	18
Peter Beilharz	
From Capitalism to Modernity, and Back. Adventures with the Budapest School.....	19
Agnieszka Kozyra	
The Kyoto School After 1950 – The Problem of Its Unity and Methodology	20
Krzysztof Nowak-Posadzy	
Poznań Methodology – Group, Approach or School?.....	21
Gerhard Preyer	
Heidelberg School: Continuation and Innovation	23
Nevena Jevtić, Mina Đikanović	
Praxis School and Philosophical Endeavor of Milan Kangrga	24
Katia Parshina	
Philosophical Schools as Corpora: a Method of Tracing Ideas	25

Franca d'Agostini

University of Milan

Is There Still (If There Was) an Analytic-Continental Dualism in Philosophy?

My paper is mainly about the rebirth of metaphysics in the analytic philosophy of the last two decades of the century (neo-descriptivism in Soames' account). It will address the following issues: 1) distinction "analytic" and "continental" philosophy and its validity; 2) Glock's threefold distinction: analytic, continental and traditional philosophy (with a map); 3) Tugendhat's hypothesis (formal semantics as ontology); 4) the rebirth of metaphysics (the "two Davids", Lewis and Armstrong).

Piotr Gutowski

John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin

Movements, Schools and Sects. A Few Remarks on the Way of Describing the Different Kinds of Philosophy

In order to organize the richness of the content that we associate with the word "philosophy", we use such notions as traditions of philosophy, philosophical movements or currents, and also philosophical schools. Most often, the term "philosophical movement" or "current" refers to ideas repeated over long periods of time, which constitute creative solution to the main metaphilosophical and philosophical problems or to some specific problems within great variety of philosophical disciplines. The term "philosophical school" adds to that stronger association with the space and/or time factor and with specific group of people. In the activity of philosophical schools, certain phases can usually be distinguished. One of them requires some degree of group isolation in order to develop their own position, and the other requires confronting opposition ideas. However, if the isolation of the group is too strong, and the opposing ideas are confronted by straw man arguments, the school may turn into a kind of sect. If so, a difficult question arises about the criteria for distinguishing philosophical schools from philosophical sects, which will not destroy the natural pluralism of philosophical positions.

Max Urchs, Klaus Wuttich

University of Berlin

„Complex Logic” in Berlin — The Becoming of a Scientific School and its Premature End

Building on ideas of Alexander Zinowjew, which he had become acquainted with during his doctorate in the 1960s, Horst Wessel further developed a conception of so-called complex logic in his research group at the Humboldt University Berlin. This new orientation within philosophical logic included a theory of logical consequences, a non-traditional theory of predication and a logical theory of terms.

Berlin logicians from Wessel's environment focused their research on topics of complex logic and advocated this conception emphatically and consistently within the academic community. They attracted increasing attention in the international logic scene. Logicians from other research institutions in, e.g., Germany, Russia, Poland, Australia, Ukraine, USA, Austria not only took note of the recognizable way of presentation of the Berlin research topics, but also participated in the further development of the conception with their own contributions.

Several postdoctoral theses (habilitations) and a number of doctoral dissertations were written. The logic group at HUB disintegrated in the course of the reorientation of higher education policy in the wake of German unification. By this time, it had educated a number of highly talented young researchers among graduate students.

In our paper we try to answer the question whether the Berlin group would have had the potential to become a scientific school under more favorable circumstances. The term "scientific school" is widely used in the history and philosophy of science as a self-description as well as an external description, but it is hardly ever clearly explicated. Moreover, it is characterized by its Janus-facedness: on the one hand, schools serve the emergence and assertion of scientific aspirations, on the other hand, they serve their prevention and partialization.

In what follows, we will understand a scientific school as a creative collective of researchers characterized by certain shared scientific beliefs and behaviors. These beliefs and behaviors are recognizable and have the potential for replication. There is a close kinship with memes in Dawkin's sense. Despite all the well-known problems with this conception, it seems to offer interesting perspectives for the description of scientific schools as collective organisms with certain goals and behavioral patterns.

The Lvov-Warsaw School After 1950

Although most of the historians of philosophy agree about the date of the Lvov-Warsaw School's beginning (it is year 1895 when Kazimierz Twardowski got chair of philosophy in Lwów), the question of the end of the School's activities is the object of controversies. A few decades ago, the prevailing view was that the School ceased to exist between 1939 and 1950 as a result of World War II and its aftermath. Today, it is more and more common to say that the School also existed in the second half of the 20th century, although in a slightly different form than before.

The latter position, with some reservations, is the assumption of the paper in which the School's centers, forms of its activity and the work of its main representatives after 1950 will be characterized.

In particular, the following claims will be justified. Firstly, compared to the pre-war period, the School lost its centers in Lwów and Wilno, but gained new centers in Poland (Wrocław, Poznań, Toruń, Łódź, Kraków, Lublin), as well as significant influence abroad. Secondly, despite the ideological attacks on LWS representatives at the beginning of the second half of the twentieth century, post-war departments of philosophy and logic were possessed by more LWS representatives than before the war (what is important to stress, women from the LWS got chairs only after the WWII). Thirdly, the period of disintegration of the School was followed by a period of integration, or even a certain intellectual expansion of philosophers who admit being a part of its tradition.

These claims remain valid even if we interpret them as a testimony of the continuity of not the School itself, but only of its heritage.

Wojciech Gasparski, Marcin Bukala

Polish Academy of Science

Tadeusz Kotarbiński and the Polish School of Praxiology

The text presents essential features of the Polish Praxiology School, founded by Tadeusz Kotarbiński. The school joins praxiology (theory of action) and ethics, together with felicillology, within the framework of practical philosophy. In the approach of the presented School, praxiology can be described as philosophy of practicality or “small philosophy” (in contradistinction to many 19th century all-encompassing synthesis, which were often substitutes of worldviews).

Itala Maria Loffredo D'Ottaviano

University of Campinas

The Brazilian School of Paraconsistent Logic

In this presentation, after a brief introduction recounting the development of logic within the Luso-Brazilian academic milieu, we will mention the work of the first Brazilian authors and groups of scholars who may be considered logicians. We will highlight the establishment of the *Centre for Logic, Epistemology and History of Science* (CLE) at the State University of Campinas (Unicamp), the creation of the *Brazilian Logic Society* (SBL), the realization of the *Brazilian Logic Conferences* (EBLs), and Brazilian participation in the *Latin American Symposia on Mathematical Logic* (SLALMs).

Special emphasis will be given to the emergence of original research in logic in Brazil with the pioneering work of Newton Carneiro Affonso da Costa, the creation of paraconsistent logic and the rising of the Brazilian School of Paraconsistent Logic.

Raoni Wohnrath Arroyo (co-author: Itala D’Ottaviano)

University of Campinas

Looking Back, Going Forward: Towards a “da Costa” School of Philosophy

It is often very hard to precisely Pinpoint the essential features of a philosophical school, and what determines its unity and identity. This is not our case. As we shall argue, several research programs have their origin in the work put forth by the Brazilian philosopher and mathematician Newton C. A. da Costa. Below we mention a non-exhaustive list of the topics in which he worked/works, just as a brief showcase of their impact on the 20th and 21st-century philosophy.

His importance in non-classical logics is straightforward: he is the creator (or at least one of the creators) of an area of knowledge in logic, paraconsistent logic, *viz.* logical systems in which the principle of contradiction does not have unrestricted validity, nowadays usually considered as the logics in which the principle of explosion (Latin: *ex falso sequitur quodlibet*) does not apply in general. His work on this area not only created a whole new area of philosophical investigation but paved the way to several developments in computer science and explanation in general, the scientific endeavor, and on the interpretation of quantum superpositions. In this way, in addition to be irresponsible for a Philosophical school in Brazil, he is also characterized as the creator of the Brazilian School of Paraconsistency.

Still on non-classical logics, his developments in non-reflexive logics, *e.g.* Schrödinger logics, on the other hand, gave rise to a now-standard way of understanding the debate concerning the metaphysical profile of quantum particles in the context of individuality. It led the way for the development of quasi-set theory, a non-classical set theory in which identity is not valid right from the start; this enabled the so-called “non-individuality” horn in the metaphysics of the interpretation of quantum mechanics. Such horn of the debate traces back to the founding fathers of quantum theory.

His work on the notion of *partial truth*—which, in its earliest formulations, was named after “pragmatic truth”— has led to several developments in the mainstream philosophy of science as well. Partial truth was developed to give logical rigor to the notion of “approximate truth”, an epistemological concept often employed in debates concerning scientific realism. By doing so, it paved the way to the so-called “structural” alternatives to scientific realism, such as structural realism and structural empiricism.

Finally, it is worth mentioning that his work in the axiomatization of science shed new light on further developments on the axiomatization of quantum mechanics.

Of course not all such further developments are in agreement with da Costa’s own opinions; nevertheless, it is clear that all of them trace back to him: his seminars, texts, and academic orientation. That’s why we would like to coin the term “da Costa School” in philosophy: for the mentor of such philosophical school is widely acknowledged among its members, but the school itself is only tacitly considered.

Jean-Yves Beziau

Federal University of Rio de Janeiro

30 Years of Experience with the Brazilian School of Logic

I discovered the work of the Brazilian logician Newton da Costa at the end of the 1980s, when I was a student in Paris. Da Costa came to Paris in January 1991. We soon developed a close friendship and invited me to work with him at the University of São Paulo for one year. In August 1991, I visited Brazil for the first time.

I didn't stay continuously in Brazil, but have spent most of my time in Brazil since 1991, in different locations, having visited the whole country. Since 2010, I have a permanent position as Professor of Logic at the Department of Philosophy of the *University of Brazil, Rio de Janeiro* (UFRJ), the first and oldest university in Brazil. I have been secretary and vice-president of the *Brazilian Society of Logic*, Coordinator of *Graduate Studies in Philosophy at UFRJ* and President of the *Brazilian Academy of Philosophy*. I have organized many big international events in Brazil: the 4th UNILOG (*World Congress and School on Universal Logic*) in 2013, the first WoCoLoR (*World Congress on Logic and Religion*) in 2015, joint project with Ricardo Silvestre, L'IMAGINATION in 2018 (37th edition of the ASPLF congress), CREATIVITY in 2019 (*First World Congress of the Brazilian Academy of Philosophy*). In 2004, I created the *Newton da Costa Prize of Logic*, the first of a series of logic prizes leading to the organization of the *World Logic Prizes Contest*. In 2019, I launched the 1st edition of the *World Logic Day* in Brazil and in 60 locations in the world, and then submitted the project to the Brazilian Ambassador at UNESCO, Maria Edileuza Fontenele Reis, in order to have it included in the calendar of the international days of UNESCO. She succeeded to get the approval at unanimity of the UNESCO assembly in november 2019.

In this talk I will highlight the interest of the Brazilian School of Logic emphasizing its diversity and interdisciplinarity.

On Polish ‚Via Modalisation’ Approach to Paraconsistency

This paper is devoted to revisiting the Polish school of paraconsistent logic started by the Polish logician Stanisław Jaśkowski. In 1948 (74 years to the present day), Jaśkowski published his revolutionary paper “A propositional calculus for inconsistent deductive systems”, dealing with the problem of:

- 1) providing a calculus for inconsistent systems that do not entail its triviality (or overfilling),
- 2) that it were rich enough to allow for practical inferences, and
- 3) that it had intuitive justification.

After critical examination of several options to solve this problem, Jaśkowski proposed a logical system named D_2 after *two-valued discussive sentential calculus*. Part of its motivation was to allow for models of a discussion in which one participant contradicts another one, but triviality does not follow. For now on assume a propositional language with standard truth-functional connectives expanded with the unary connective \diamond . According to Jaśkowski, each formula A is to be read as “ A is asserted in a discussion”. We can formalize this idea as follows: $\diamond A$, meaning that in a discussion someone has asserted A . According to such a conception, someone in a discussion can assert A , someone else can assert $\sim A$ but no one needs to assert any B .

Jaśkowski’s solution opened new lines of research, including an approach of thought focusing on various aspects of discussive logic and connections with its modal counterparts. There were also investigations on variants of discussive logics and other systems.

Jaśkowski’s work influenced research on other paraconsistent logics. In Beziau’s *The paraconsistent logic Z. A possible solution to Jaśkowski’s problem. Logic and Logical Philosophy* one can find direct inspiration from Jaśkowski. The idea to modalise negation was generalized in a series of papers.

The discussive logic has been receiving attention from international scholars, particularly from Brazil. As a matter of fact, the encounter of N. da Costa and Dubikajtis in 1967 and later made possible the development of the logic D_2 , as well as to transport some share ideas to Brazil. Various references of Jaśkowski’s logic are still alive.

In this paper I reflect on the tradition developed from Jaśkowski’s seminal paper, and answer the following questions:

- What determines the unity and identity of the Polish approach to paraconsistency?
- Is it possible to present a model for the Polish approach to paraconsistency?
- What happened with international connections between schools working on paraconsistent logic about the same period?

Paweł Polak, Kamil Trombik

The Pontifical University of John Paul II in Krakow

The Cracow School of Philosophy in Science

Since the end of the nineteenth century, Krakow has intensively developed a philosophical reflection strongly connected to the natural sciences, called the Krakow philosophy of nature. The tradition of philosophical deliberations conducted in the context of interdisciplinary discussions in Krakow goes back to the beginning of the 19th century. These traditions have a strong institutional basis, as they are connected to the activity of the Krakow Scientific Society (later transformed into the Polish Academy of Arts and Sciences, which is still active today).

Since the 1970s on the basis of these traditions Michał Heller together with Józef Życiński created an important center of philosophical reflection on science referring to the idea of interdisciplinary research. The reflection developed there has been described by the concept of 'philosophy in science'.

Over forty years of activity by Michał Heller and his collaborators grouped in the Centre for Interdisciplinary Research (later the Copernicus Centre) created a strong milieu, which, interestingly enough, was almost never described by its members as a philosophical school. The latest historical research, however, indicates that we are dealing with a specific philosophical school.

This school intentionally refers to the model of the Lvov-Warsaw School (LWS), inspired by some methodological and metaphilosophical positions of the LWS (esp. Zawirski's analytical philosophy of nature) as well as referring to the traditions of the Krakow Circle (a specific branch of the LWS, forerunners of analytical Thomism). However, its embeddedness in the local Krakow traditions determined that the Krakow school is not simply a continuation of the LWS model.

In our paper we would like to make a comparative analysis of the basic determinants of the specificity of the LWS and the equivalents in the Kraków school. Then we want to show the Krakow school of philosophy in science as an adaptation of Twardowski's school model. We will sketch the philosophy of the Krakow school, and then we will indicate contemporary perspectives for its development. In conclusion, we will consider the question of the relevance of the model of the LWS school today. Additionally, the importance of philosophical schools from the perspective of current needs of philosophy in Poland will be examined.

Decio Krause

Federal University of Santa Catarina

Logic and Empirical Sciences in the South of Brazil

In this talk, I make reference to some works in logic and the foundations of science, mainly quantum theories, which have been developed in the South of Brazil with special emphasis on non-reflexive logics and quasi-set theory.

Agnieszka Lekka-Kowalik

John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin

The Lublin Philosophical School – An Answer to the Contemporary Challenges

Against the background of the history and structure of the Lublin Philosophical School, the paper presents its methodological characteristics (realism, empiricism, cognitive maximalism, historicism, autonomy, diversity and unity of disciplines, wisdom-directedness,) and roles it ascribes to philosophy in personal and social. I argue that the Lublin School has developed a paradigm of philosophizing that can provide a framework for posing and answering some burning questions of our contemporary world (such as AI or the value-ladenness of science and technology).

John Grumley
University of Sydney

Contemporary Critical Theory: the Budapest School in Australia

This paper employs the work of Agnes Heller and Ferenc Fehér as a characterization of a contemporary critical theory. This type of theory is not “an argument across the ages” nor another attempt at traditional metaphysics. Like those modern thinkers Hegel and Marx influenced by the French Revolution, the critical theory tradition endeavors to make a practical engagement with the present and inches towards an undetermined. Agnes Heller and György Márkus, fuse knowledge of the modern sciences with a historical anthropology that becomes an agent of practical transformation. These emigres from Budapest took the opportunities of the capitalist West against modern societies fault lines to theorize a better future. They marshal modern knowledge against itself towards a present, still typically irrational society. Contemporary critical theory occupies this space and intent.

Peter Murphy

La Trobe University

Being Oneself: Encountering Agnes Heller and the Budapest School

The Budapest School of philosophers and sociologists formed around the Hungarian philosopher Georg Lukács and dissipated when many of its members went into exile from Hungary in the late 1970s, early 1980s. A number went to Australia, and the last collective works of the Budapest School were produced in Australia just as the collective intellectual impetus of the group dissipated. One of the Budapest School philosophers, Agnes Heller, took up a lecturing post at La Trobe University where she supervised the PhD of the author of this paper, Peter Murphy. The paper explores Heller's trajectory out of group philosophy into an existential view of philosophy as a "truth for me", and Murphy's own philosophical relationship with Heller, with the idea of a school of philosophy, and with the notion of a personal philosophy.

John Rundell

University of Melbourne

After School – From Political and Critical Affinities to the Paradigm of Friendship

TBA

Peter Beilharz

Curtin University

From Capitalism to Modernity, and Back. Adventures with the Budapest School

The moment of the Budapest School in Australia was vital, for them and for us. Was it still then a School? This is an open question. Here I focus on Melbourne, Feher and Heller. I will use two essays to focus on the mutual interaction: “Class , Democracy, Modernity” (1983), and “Why We Should Maintain the Socialist Objective” (1984). Under the reciprocal influence of David Roberts, Feher and Heller made the decisive, in effect Weberian move away from the category capitalism to that of modernity as the overarching horizon. At the same time, Agnes offered a forgotten political intervention into the discourse of the Australian Labor Party, on the necessity of socialism. Four decades years on, the latter seems arcane, while the former retains its potency, but is also pressured by the revived centrality of capitalism. In both cases, the core value given to democracy might also come under question, forty years on.

The Kyoto School After 1950 – The Problem of Its Unity and Methodology

The Kyoto School (*Kyōto gakuha*) is a group of Japanese thinkers who developed original philosophies being inspired both by Western philosophy and the philosophy of East Asia, especially by Mahāyāna Buddhism and Daoism. As is reflected in the name of the School, its founding members were associated with Kyoto University. The Kyoto school originator was Nishida Kitarō (1870-1945) who did not think of himself as a founder of any school and always encouraged independent thinking in his students. In the beginning, the so-called Kyoto school philosophers studied and taught at Kyoto University and developed their thinking under the influence of Nishida as well as in dialogue and debate with him and with one another. However, after 1964 when Nishitani Keiji who was one of Nishida's disciples retired from the Chair of Philosophy of Religion Kyoto University is not any longer the main place of the Kyoto School philosophers' activity.

One can say that there is no more specific place associated with Kyoto School although in 2002 Nishida Kitarō Museum of Philosophy and its Research Center (Kahoku, Ishikawa prefecture) was established and in 2003 The Nishida Philosophy Association was founded. The Self Kokoro Research Center at Kyoto University can also be regarded in some aspects as inspired by the Kyoto School of Philosophy but its methodology is more diverse.

The aim of this presentation is to prove that after 1950 one should understand the Kyoto School mainly as a specific theoretical frame and methodological approach. All thinkers branded as "Kyoto School philosophers" Mahāyāna Buddhism, especially Zen and Shin (True Pure Land) schools, in a non-dogmatic and non-sectarian manner. They apparently have tried to reveal what they regard as potential hidden in traditional Buddhist philosophy. The influence of Nishida Kitarō is also essential because many of them use their own philosophical terms and elaborate their theories as to the further answers to philosophical questions Nishida has asked (For example Nishitani Keiji' theory of Nothingness or Abe Masao' theory of interreligious dialogue (mainly Buddhism and Christianity). In my opinion, one of the characteristic methodologies of Kyoto School is "a selective identification", by which I mean explaining Buddhist concepts using "similar/close" Western terms or in the context of "similar/close" Western philosophical theories. (For instance, Nishida has used the concept of Pure Experience from William James' philosophy, taking it out of its original context to explain the Buddhist concept of 'non-dualism'). Another method is to develop Western theories in a new direction (sometimes quite unexpected by Western philosophers) by confronting their concepts with the Buddhist worldview.

Poznań Methodology – Group, Approach or School?

Genesis, functioning and heritage of the Poznań methodology's phenomenon is a complex issue. Set up by a group of Poznań-based scholars such as Jerzy Kmita (1931-2012), Leszek Nowak (1943-2009) and Jerzy Topolski (1928-1998); each with a different disciplinary background (respectively, Polish philology, law, and history) but sharing the following common stylistic features:

- 1) semiotic craftsmanship and logical toolkit inherited from Kazimierz Ajdukiewicz's pragmatic logic;
- 2) methodological anti-positivistic attitude adapted from Karl Popper's methodological naturalism;
- 3) epistemological and methodological insights stemming from Karl Marx's critique of political economy.

The ideas of Kazimierz Ajdukiewicz and Karl Popper were inculcated on the Poznań ground by logician and philosopher Jerzy Giedymin. On the other hand, the turn to Marx as a methodologist is believed to have been inspired by Jerzy Topolski and by Adam Wiegner's semantic analysis of the concepts of abstraction and concretization.

The works of Kmita, Nowak, and Topolski from ca. 1968 to ca. 1975 triggered animated interdisciplinary discussions on numerous issues such as the status of methodology as a discipline, the problem of rationality of science, the question of explanation and interpretation in social sciences and humanities, the epistemological and methodological foundations of Marx's "Kapital", or the methodological individualism/anti-individualism and naturalism/anti-naturalism controversies.

While the activity of those Poznań-based scholars has been described relatively thoroughly, no attention has been put to the semantic issue of how they were referred to. Some referred to them as «a group» (e.g. Jerzy Giedymin, Tadeusz Kotarbiński), others as «an approach» (e.g. The Handbook of Economic Methodology), and finally, some scholars named it «a school» (e.g. Edward Świdorski, Francesco Coniglione). Each usage of these names seems to have its own justification:

- 1) «a group» refers to scholars interested in a common problem best expressed by Ajdukiewicz, namely that the methodology of humanities is largely neglected;
- 2) «an approach» enhances the general method used in their methodological investigations, namely logical reconstruction;
- 3) «a school» emphasizes mainly the idea of social methodological awareness as the main unit of analysis of science for them.

This semantic heterogeneity seems sound and coherent as each name covers a different aspect of their activity in the 1968-1975 period – Poznań-based scholars were trying to remedy the methodological negligence of humanities by applying the semiotic tools to reconstruct the social methodological awareness of researchers. Since the mid-70s Poznań-based methodological investigations developed in three parallel ways:

- 1) Leszek Nowak further explored his idealizational theory of science, non-Marxian historical materialism, and negativist unitarian metaphysics;
- 2) Jerzy Kmita elaborated his historical epistemology and socio-regulative theory of culture;

- 3) Jerzy Topolski developed further his theory of non-source-based knowledge and theory of historical narrative.

The intellectual journeys of these scholars can be best described as a sequence of problem-shifts: converting philosophical problems into culturalistic ones (Kmita), moving from focusing on knowing about history to focusing on creating history (Topolski), passing from exploring the methodology of idealization to establishing the metaphysics for idealization (Nowak). Although it is quite common to consider those late works also as part of the "Poznań Methodological School," more adequate is to limit the usage of such a name to the period 1968-1975 set by the publication of "Studies on methodological foundations of humanities" (1968) and "Against the false alternatives" (1975).

Heidelberg School: Continuation and Innovation

Dieter Henrich is one of the philosophers since the 1950s who conceived an independent philosophical approach. Ernst Tugendhat speaks of the Heidelberg School with regard to his criticism of modern reflection philosophy. The talk of a Heidelberg School is justified by the fact that several generations have been involved in its continuation since 1970. These colleagues are united by the processing of a uniform problem reference from different perspectives. It is the problem reference of the pre-reflexive consciousness. In the meantime, another generation has established itself, which calls itself the Heidelbergers who have been continued and innovated what is called "Dieter Henrich's original insight". It is instructive that there are no deviants in the Heidelberg School, but different treatments of the same problem reference.

First, Henrich's insight is discussed, which is the common philosophical basis of the new Heidelberg. However, the present exchange among them and American colleagues does not have as its theme a simple continuation and past orientation, but a re-systematization and a coordination with the currents in the philosophy of the mental (mind), epistemology and language theory of internalism and externalism. In the re-systematization a completely new point of view is added. It is a recollection of the early philosophy of Sartre. But this requires a special treatment of Sartre's approach, Sartre's "reflect reflétant" can be recalled as a mediation between internalism and externalism. From this, conclusions for epistemology and ontology are to be drawn. They are to be submitted to a further analysis. Without the extended treatment of "Henrich's original insight", the Heidelberg School cannot be adequately grasped as an intergenerational research program.

Nevena Jevtić, Mina Đikanović

University of Novi Sad

Praxis School and Philosophical Endeavor of Milan Kangrga

Milan Kangrga was one of the foremost members of Yugoslavian Praxis School (Praxis Group or Praxis Philosophy), school of philosophy active in the 60s and 70s of 20th century. This period is generally concerned as a period of „relative political liberalization“ in the history of Yugoslavian socialism, which proved fruitful for the development of humanistic alternative to the official interpretation of Marxist doctrine. Shared interest for the development of this alternative interpretation through reconstruction of Marx’s original thought, rather than a single philosophical conception, presented the mobilizing force behind the School. Kangrga’s work *Ethical Problem in the Works of Karl Marx*, published in 1963, was in a sense a groundbreaking text, almost a manifesto or an outline of a program for the School’s alternative reading of Marx. He related Marx to the philosophical tradition of German idealism, mainly Hegel’s philosophy, and devoted a large part of his outstanding philosophical carrier on developing the complex critical relation of Marx to Hegel’s philosophical project. 20 years later, Kangrga published *Ethics or Revolution*, further arguing in favor of the fundamental significance of German idealist thinkers to the Marx’s understanding of revolution, self-liberation, alienation and much more (practically being the first who brought Fichte’s practical philosophy to the Yugoslavian public). Kangrga’s legacy does not have one dimension. However, his arguments in maintaining a critical but close connection between Marx and Hegel remains to this day a part of living identity of the philosophy “school” at University of Novi Sad.

Katia Parshina

University of Amsterdam

Philosophical Schools as Corpora: a Method of Tracing Ideas

I am presenting a method to treat philosophical schools and ideas corresponding to them as corpora and models, respectively. Plain corpora of text and bibliography do not contribute to the assimilation of the very core of a philosophical school - the philosophical ideas behind it. Therefore, I am arguing that the most scientifically-useful way to engage with data related to specific schools of thought is to trace and model the notions and ideas related to a school. The method consists of two steps: a) to build a corpus based on the texts, authors, time periods, and any related specifications; b) to trace a specific notion within the text to build its model.

The example I am presenting the method is the semantic notion of truth. The frameworks I work in are the Vienna Circle and the Lvov–Warsaw School. Suppose, I want to trace the semantic notion of truth within the two schools. First, I need to build two different corpora of texts: the Vienna Circle corpus and the Lvov–Warsaw corpus. I do so accordingly to the method of corpus building presented by A. Betti et al.: for the Lvov–Warsaw corpus I search for texts: of the period 1913–1944 (the generally accepted years of the existence of the school plus additional 5 years on each side); in English, Polish, and German languages (however, to be simple and short in this example, we will only trace English publications, which include translation of Polish and German articles/books); books or articles; related to either 'logic' or 'philosophy' topics, since the semantic theory of truth can be presented both formally and informally. The same method of search is applied to the Vienna Circle texts. Suppose, we now have the corpora. How do we trace a specific idea within?

The first thing to do is to divide the idea we are trying to trace into notions, or components of the idea, which are related to specific notions. Some of the notions corresponding to the semantic notion of truth are: *semantic and syntactic differentiation, metalanguage, object language, truth*. Here I should point out that we are considering a specific notion which we *are able to* define, therefore we can name its components. If we were trying to *find the content* of the notion itself and not *trace* it within a specific philosophical school, we would have to undergo a different and more difficult path.

Now, if we trace the specified notions in both corpora we have built (I do not specify the process here, since it is a long and many-layer work), we would get a lot of texts about the Tarskian theory of truth (either written *by* Tarski or *about* Tarski) from the Lvov–Warsaw corpus. At the same time, we find, by using the corresponding notions, R. Carnap's work on the notion of truth in the Vienna corpus. Carnap's notion is also semantic (at least the notion he is trying to find), and the author is still working in a frame of division into a metalanguage and an object language, however, neither Tarski nor Carnap do not refer to each other (and come to completely different conclusions) in their work. Therefore, now we have at least *a part* of the history of an idea of the semantic notion of truth, which we could not find by using a traditional method, since there are no clear references between Tarski and Carnap.

I shortly presented a way to treat and model the heritage of philosophical schools based on the text corpora we want to use and the constituents of a notion we want to trace. My suggestion is to treat bibliographical and text data not like a repository of philosophical ideas but as a *method* for tracing these ideas into history.