

Jerzy Kojkoł

ORCID: 0000-0003-1968-760X
(Naval Academy Gdynia, Poland)

Loving Galicia. The views and life of Stanislaw Garfein-Garski¹

This article presents the life and elements of the work of S. Garfein-Garski. One of the first Polish philosophers to recognise the peculiarities of the humanities. Thus, he appreciated the role of culture in the development of social reality and, at the same time, noticed its crisis and decline. He recognised that higher culture is a remedy for the crisis of modern civilisation. He made insightful and accurate analyses of the works by I. Kant, L. Feuerbach and F. Nietzsche.

Keywords: Polish philosophy, Garfein-Garski, historiosophy, Galicia, humanities

Salamon Garfein was born on the first of February 1867. His father was Leizerow Garfein; his mother – Illia, née Weisstein. His parents brought their son up in the spirit of both the religious values of Judaism and the Polish national tradition. The Polish part of his identity was cemented in the educational process. His education at the gymnasium in Tarnopol and his studies from 1884 to 1888 at the University of Lviv, from which he graduated on 31 July 1888, made him feel Polish and, in time, Catholic.²

¹ This text has been prepared to disseminate the views of S. Garfein-Garski on the basis of the monograph by J. Kojkoł entitled *Myśl filozoficzna Stanisława Garfeina-Garskiego*, Toruń 2001.

² See *Księgi metrykalne wyznania mojżeszowego z gminy Tarnopol, Archiwum Głównego Akt Dawnych w Warszawie*. [Metrical books of the Mosaic religion from the municipality of Tarnopol], in which there is a birth record in the name of Salamon Garfein, son of Leizer. The book containing this record is in the collection of the Central Archives of Historical Records in Warsaw. In later years of his life he mostly used the pseudonym Garski or a combination of his surname and the pseudonym Stanisław Garfein-Garski. In *Spis Ludności Miasta Krakowa z roku 1900 (Dz. II nr 437)* [Population Census of the City of Kraków (Dz. II. No. 437)] he is listed as Garfein Salomon, residing at 71 Grodzka Street, married, Jewish, Ph.D. in law, lawyer, born in 1867 in Tarnopol. In the remarks column – annotation: usucaption of the right of belonging. Resolution

In the following years, S. Garfein-Garski took steps to obtain a Ph.D. in law from the Jagiellonian University in Kraków. He took the *primum rigorosum* on 30 January 1889, the *secundo rigorosum* on 11 May 1889 and the *tertium rigorosum* on 30 January 1890. After passing these examinations – there was no obligation to write a dissertation – he became a Doctor of Laws on 1 February 1890.³

In order to understand the formation of S. Garfein-Garski's thought, it should be noted that a prominent figure with whom he collaborated was Maurycy Straszewski, a doctor of philosophy, professor of philosophy and pedagogy at the Faculty of Philosophy of the Jagiellonian University, member of the Central Government Examination Commission for teacher candidates. He lived from 1848 to 1921, and was a pupil of F. A. Lange and H. Lotze. His whole life was associated with Kraków, where he was given the chair of philosophy and pedagogy after J. Kremer. He is often regarded as a member of the group of Catholic philosophers at the University of Cracow. He was particularly interested in the history of philosophy, wrote about J. Śniadecki, J. S. Mill, and was passionate about the philosophy of the Ancient East.

In M. Straszewski's concepts, I see motifs close to positivism, especially close to those within the critical approach. As B. Skarga writes: "resolute empiricism, realism according to which consciousness is always the consciousness of an object, thus giving certainty not only to one's own existence but also to the existence of the surrounding world, criticism of the notion of causality in the style of Hume, the struggle against hypostases, and above all the recognition of the principle of economy as the basis for the creation of scientific theory, all these views allow us to place Straszewski in one line with thinkers typical of the positivist epoch".⁴

of the City Council of 1 December 1904. – L. 20483/04. On the other hand, in *Spis Ludności z 1910 roku (Dz. VII nr 2361)* [1910 Population Census (Dz. VII. No. 2361)] he is listed as Garfein Stanisław, residing at 27 Straszewskiego Street, Ph.D., lawyer, married, Roman Catholic, born 1 February 1867 in Tarnopol. In the 1921 Census, Garfein Stanisław does not appear.

³ These data are confirmed by S. Garfein-Garski's handwritten short biographical questionnaire of 1911 in the special collection of the library of the Polish Academy of Sciences. Rkps Fund. Mich. 365/22. *Garfeina-Garskiego S., Kwestionariusz biograficzny, Zbiory specjalne biblioteki PAN. Rkps Fund. Mich. 365/22*. See *Indeks ksiąg doktorskich UJ, t. II, litery D–J, rok 1890, pod numerem 1263* [Index of UJ doctoral books, vol. II, letters D–J, year 1890, under number 1263] and further: *Liber promotionum Universitatis Jagellonicae*, UJ Archive, S II 519, and *Liber Rigorosorum J. C. R. Facultatis Juridico politicae*, WP II 486, 520, UJ Archive, no. 235.

⁴ B. Skarga, *Antypozytywizm i obrona metafizyki [w:] Zarys dziejów filozofii polskiej 1815–1918*, red. A. Walicki, Warszawa 1983, s. 247. See Jagiellonian University Archives. Archiwum Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego. Protokoły posiedzeń Rady Wydziału Filozoficznego UJ od roku 1875 do 1885, Sygn. WF II 43. [Jagiellonian University Archives. Minutes of the meetings of the Council of the Faculty of Philosophy of the Jagiellonian University from 1875 to 1885], WF II 43] and C. Głąbik, *Ludzie, poglądy i idee w sporze o krakowską Katedrę filozofii (1875–1877)* „Studia Filozoficzne”, 1976, nr 4, s. 225–237. W. Tatarkiewicz, *Losy krakowskiej Katedry filozofii*

It seems that Garfein-Garski shared Straszewski's belief that it is possible to build a synthesis of knowledge. For him, man strives for it in a natural way. In his opinion the roots of philosophy lies in this process as philosophy, on the one hand, analyses the theoretical inspirations of science, its structure, the nature of concepts, their relation to reality, and, on the other hand, formulates a set of rational, supreme principles concerning existence and combines the results of detailed sciences, building a synthetic picture of the world.

It should also be noted that in 1890, when Garfein-Garski obtained his Ph.D., the vice-dean of the Faculty of Theology of the Jagiellonian University was Rev. Stefan Pawlicki (close to him in his later period), a doctor of theology and philosophy, who lived between 1839 and 1916, a lecturer at the Main School and then, from 1868, a member of the Order of the Resurrectionists, having obtained his Ph.D. in theology in Rome. From 1882 he taught philosophy at the Faculty of Theology of the Jagiellonian University and from 1892 at the Faculty of Philosophy.⁵

Garfein-Garski defined philosophy similarly to Fr. S. Pawlicki. He postulated the independence of philosophy from theology, on the one hand, and from the natural sciences, on the other. He posed the following questions: "what is philosophy?" and "can it be a science?". The answer – in his view – required a definition of the criteria of scientism. He believed that inductive sciences yield only approximate truths. In his view, scientific knowledge uses general laws, explaining unknown things by known things, appealing to a principle that would be self-evident in its truthfulness and allowing the construction of a deductive system that is unquestionable in its statements.

At the beginning of the last decade of the nineteenth century, Garfein-Garski met Malwina Posner, better known by her literary pseudonym Maria Zabojecka, daughter of Leon Posner and Maria Duszel a.k.a. Matylda née Bernstein. It is worth remembering that her uncle, Salomon Posner, was killed in the January Uprising. Her father, on the other hand, was one of the promoters of the assimilationist direction among Polish Jews, while her brother Stanisław Posner was one of the most prominent Polish Socialist Party activists, a senator (1822–1930) and deputy speaker of the senate.

w XIX wieku [w:] *Pisma zebrane*, vol. 1, *Droga do filozofii i inne rozprawy filozoficzne*, Warsaw 1971, s. 196–208.

⁵ See *Skład UJ za rok 1887/88* [the Composition of the UJ for the year 1887/88], *Skład UJ za rok 1889/90* [the Composition of the UJ for the year 1889/90]. See S. Garfein-Garski's letter to Rev. Pawlicki from 1913 and the handwritten note on the business card intended for this distinguished philosopher. It reads: "To the Reverend Rector I send my best wishes for Christmas and New Year with my deepest respect. A sincerely devoted servant". Korespondencja ks. dr. prof. Stefana Pawlickiego z lat 1872–1916. Rkps BJ 8697. [Correspondence of Rev. Dr. Prof. Stefan Pawlicki from 1872 to 1916; Rkps BJ 8697], Mf. 50096, k. 140–141].

On 1 March 1892, Garfein-Garski married Malwina Posner.⁶ The married couple had known each other for some time, but the path to continue their relationship proved to be complicated. A letter from Malwina to Garfein-Garski dated 23 December 1891 provides a proof: “Dear Salo! Your strange letter saddened me greatly. I do not understand your doubt. So what is terrible about this lack of a wedding date. You did not answer me to any of my enquiries, and I thought you would agree, willingly agree to my proposal, to my request. If you knew how little desire I have for this marriage, you would probably be happy to let me go. After all, we can remain in the most cordial relationship possible – as long as it is not a wedding! By the way, surely you know that one must be able to provide happiness, all the pleasures of marriage, only thanks to an inhuman first love for the person with whom one is united. I am incapable of such love, I like you very much, more than others whom I do not like, or whom I like – just so. I am sure that neither you nor I will find happiness in a closer relationship. It’s just that you know how to motivate yourself better, you know how to give yourself the conviction that you are fighting with yourself – I do not. I have spent a whole year trying, very hard, and the result is so miserable that woe betide you if you want to build your edifice of happiness on it. It will collapse soon. I have fought with myself to believe in a faith that I do not have. I cannot. I really can’t. I know well how disappointment hurts, I have certainly let you down, and you do not deserve to be let down. After all, you assure me that you love me and, in the name of this love, I ask you to calmly, reasonably weigh up what I am asking of you and to accede to my request – without the nervous attacks and despair I dread to think of. Apart from the fact that I myself will not go to the wedding without overcoming my fears, I have to take into account both my mother’s and my children’s existence. Our family relations, despite Mom’s assurances to the contrary, are so deplorable that not only must I not be a burden to her, but I should and must try to bring her relief against Mom’s wishes once again. However, we cannot do without Mum’s help at first – by working alone I mean only my care. Marriage in this situation is bitterness, and in you I want to find peace, not a struggle a hundred times harder than the one before. Please consider this and be guided not by feelings and not by an opinion that will condemn me or you, but by common sense. The common sense of a man who knows that we will not ride through life in a gilded coach, while we roll over the pavement in a bad, battered carriage – badly and sadly. I cannot tell you the other reasons which prompted me to write this letter today; in today’s confession you will recognise

⁶ See R. Loth, *Maria Zabojecka 1870–1932* [w:] *Obraz literatury polskiej w XIX i XX wieku*, Kraków 1973, vol. 3, s. 259–280. Also: Nuptial metrics found in *Listy i papiery osobiste Malwiny z Posnerów Garfeinowej-Garskiej*, Rkps BN 8990 [Letters and personal papers of Malwina Garfeinowa-Garska, Rkps BN 8990], Mf. 62449, k. 6–7.

nothing, and you will only lose yourself. Believe me, I write in blood, but I prefer today's situation to the wounds that would fester all my life. I beseech you, weigh once more wisely what I ask of you, do not tell me to withdraw my request and do not condemn me for it. I am still a burden – that's all the misery!"⁷

These doubts were caused by Malwina Posner's socio-political and literary activity and her material situation. From her youth, she had been associated with the socialist movement; when she settled in Kraków in 1892, she was already active in the women's emancipation movement as well; she collaborated with "Prawda", "Ogniwo" and "Krytyka". Ultimately, however, it was on her initiative that a marriage contract was concluded between the couple on 15 March 1892, guaranteeing their life in the form of conjugal property.⁸

In 1892–93, Garfein-Garski was a contributor to the journal "Ateneum" (Warsaw), in which he published his study *Psychada* on Kantianism. In it, the author discusses the views of Fritz Schultze contained in his 1892 work *Vergleichende Seelenkunde*. In it, he postulates a reconciliation of the results of theoretical-cognitive research with the achievements of the natural sciences. At the same time, he shows that empiricism in the form of the materialist absolutism of the philosophies of Vogot, Moleschott, Büchner and others was not able to resolve fundamental theoretical-cognitive questions in accordance with the natural sciences. He wrote: "In this confusion of concepts and thoughts, some point of support was sought, but since there was then no brilliant thinker to untangle the convoluted tangle of concepts of the new philosophy and to show the philosophers the tracks, they turned to the last great philosopher, Kant, whose teachings still shone indelibly in the memory of philosophers and were the starting point for all the philosophical systems of our century".⁹

These views corresponded with the anti-metaphysical programme of the Polish positivists of the 1880s, which a decade later found a new formulation in the formation known as criticism. One of its interpretations was to conceive of Kantianism as an expression of positivism in a modern form; this new positivism reformulated Kant's critical theory in the spirit of evolutionism and contemporary developments in psychology. This interpretation had many Polish representatives, including H. Goldberg, A. Mahrburg and M. Massonius. Criticism understood in this way, however, often supported a subjectivist-psychological interpretation of Kantianism, which was opposed by Garfein-Garski.

He also published in "Ateneum" "the first Polish work on Friedrich Nietzsche".¹⁰ In writing this sentence, the Galician philosopher forgot or omit-

⁷ Tamże, s. 4–9; original spelling.

⁸ Tamże, s. 28–29.

⁹ S. Garfein-Garski, *Psychada*, „Athenaeum” 1892, vol. 4, s. 490.

¹⁰ See S. Garfein-Garski's handwritten short biographical questionnaire of 1911 in the special collection of the library of the Polish Academy of Sciences. Rkps Fund. Mich. 365/22.

ted his review of "Myśl", which was in fact the first study on the philosophy of F. Nietzsche's philosophy in Poland. This was noticed by T. Weiss, who in his work *Fryderyk Nietzsche w piśmiennictwie polskim lata 1890–1914* [Friedrich Nietzsche in Polish writing 1890–1914] wrote: "the first informer who makes no secret of his sympathy for the teachings of Zarathustra is, on Polish soil, Stefan [error in name – J. K.] Garski, who published his studies of Nietzsche in >>Myśli<< Kraków (1892)". It should be stressed that these two studies were most likely inspired by the work of his wife Malwina as it was she who, in 1894, translated Jerzy Brandes's treatise on Friedrich Nietzsche entitled *Umysły współczesne. Portrety literackie XIX wieku* [Contemporary Minds. Literary Portraits of the 19th Century].

Garfein-Garski was a supporter of the philosophy of F. Nietzsche. He believed that he was the most powerful individual of the 19th century, one of the greatest individuals of the new era. He wrote: "With the eye of a genius, Nietzsche looked ahead and behind. Assuming that the human being of today is the product of the development of millennia, he began to reflect from an evolutionary standpoint on everything that modern people consider to be eternally given and unchangeable, he pointed out the sources unseen by anyone, the paths of continuous development revealed by no one, and the goals towards which these paths lead. Above all, he is concerned with the problem of decadence and morality. He is the first to grasp morality itself as an issue, investigating its origin and development, wishing to find new paths for it. Inspired by intuition, also the scalpel of criticism makes the cut, extracting the individual terms that we are used to consider as being derived from human nature and best suited to it, points out the origins of human nature, its twisting in the course of the centuries, the mutual adaptation of people and concepts, and finally marks the need to free ourselves from the bonds of the concepts, to accelerate the evolution of humanity and the need to adopt new, higher ideals".¹¹

The fact that Garfein-Garski was a follower of the philosophy of F. Nietzsche was noticed, in 1896, by Zofia Daszyńska in her book *Nietzsche-Zarathustra* writing: "Dr. Garfein, an absolute admirer, instead of clarifying the meaning of this meteor, which shines brightly on the horizon of modern German philosophy, has introduced a certain conceptual confusion".¹²

Garfein-Garski saw three phases in the development of F. Nietzsche's work. Each is conditioned by external influences and psychological transformations. The first phase is the Schopenhauer-Wagnerian period, the second is the positivist period and the third is the time of new ideals. In this conception, the ideal

¹¹ S. Garfein-Garski, *Fryderyk Nietzsche. Studium filozoficzne*, „Ateneum” 1893, vol. II, z. I, s. 109.

¹² Z. Daszyńska, *Nietzsche-Zarathustra*, Krakow 1896, s. 133.

of an aristocratic society plays a special role. Its members believe in the possibility of occupying social positions because of the differences that exist between the values that create the humanity of individual people. What is meant here is an aristocracy understood not as a monarchical or social function, but one that self-creates itself as the highest stage of the social spirit.

In the work presented here, Garfein-Garski signals his historiosophical views. In his view, F. Nietzsche distinguishes three epochs in history in which a decisive development of humanity took place: the epoch of classical antiquity, the Italian Renaissance and French aristocratism. In his view, the characteristic features of each golden age are a sincere belief in the temporal world and its life values, the hierarchical order of social positions, the difference between people and the cult of a powerful personality. The result of the decline of the age of development is the renewal of slave morality, the origin of which dates from the birth of the religion of the Jews and continues through the abstract religions up to its most general manifestation, Christianity.¹³

A positive assessment of F. Nietzsche's work was a relatively prominent philosophical option at the time, but there were others that Garfein-Garski encountered in the circle of contributors to "Ateneum". This scholarly and literary monthly magazine grouped people with liberal views, representing moderate positivism, rationalism and scientism. J. W. Dawid, W. Kozłowski, L. Krzywicki, J. Marchlewski, J. Ochorowicz, E. Orzeszkowa, B. Prus, I. Radliński, A. Świętochowski and many others published in this periodical. Z. Kmiecik is right in stating that in the period when P. Chmielewski was editor of the journal (1881–1897), the prevailing approach was positivism, a programme of social utilitarianism, opposition to the Romantic tradition and the apotheosis of the noble world, and anti-rationalist tendencies prevailed.¹⁴

Returning to F. Nietzsche in this letter, Aleksander Świętochowski criticised the Schopenhauerian attitude of alienation and passivity dictated by resignation. The alternative was to actively combat evil in existing social relations. He posited the Nietzschean superman as the opposite of the man ready for great sacrifice, self-sacrifice and altruism. A much more critical attitude to the philosophy of F. Nietzsche's philosophy was taken by another contributor to "Ateneum", B. Prus. He wrote: "the spread of Nietzsche's theories is only a proof of a morbid moral atmosphere, among which even the authors of masterpieces appoint themselves apostles of the unfortunate madman who lectures on the eth-

¹³ A. Wawrzynowicz writes more on this subject in: *Mesjanizm polski w recepcji historiozoficznej Stanisława Garfein-Garskiego*, „Przegląd Filozoficzny – Nowa Seria” 2021, nr 2, s. 281–293.

¹⁴ See Z. Kmiecik, *Prasa warszawska w okresie pozytywizmu 1864–1888*, Warsaw 1971, and B. Petzolin-Skowrońska, *Pozytywizm [w:] Literatura polska*, Warsaw 1987, vol. 1, s. 32.

ics of thieves and robbers".¹⁵ Criticism aimed at Garfein-Garski also stemmed from these claims.

Cooperation with the "Ateneum" allowed Garfein-Garski to become associated with the "Przegląd Poznański" [Poznań Review]. The weekly, published in Poznań in 1894–1896 under the editorship of W. Rabski, was the organ of a group of progressive intelligentsia, which operated under the name "Young Poland". It opposed Germanisation, conciliatoriness and clericalism. It promoted the latest European currents in science and art, disseminated the tenets of modernism, and familiarised readers with the work of writers of the so-called Young Scandinavia. The magazine's contributors included: A. Asnyk, P. Chmielewski, J. Kasproicz, K. Kelles-Krauz, M. Konopnicka, B. Krysiewicz, L. Krzywicki, A. Lange, J. Marchlewski, G. Zapolska, and S. Żeromski.

In "Przegląd Poznański", Garfein-Garski introduced readers to Martin Keibel's book *Uprawienie wierzeń wobec nowoczesnego realizmu* [The Entitlement of Beliefs in view of Modern Realism], in which the author presented the history of the drive to replace religion with morality. In his view, the ground for this movement was indirectly prepared by the liberation of philosophical thought from the bonds of medieval scholasticism. The works of Spinoza, Lock, Leibnitz, Hartman, Kant, Darwin are "at first small steps that later develop into milestones to an already defined moralism". The cradle of the movement – thanks to Helvetius – becomes France, when in 1789 States-General decides to abolish the privileges of the clerical state and to close the churches. According to Garfein-Garski, supporters of moralism also included French freemasons, such as F. M. Gambetta, P. Beut, P. Lasserre and P. Desjardins.

Later in his article, Garfein-Garski describes the history of the ethical movement in America and England. He concludes by stating that "the common interests of all the associations mentioned so far are guarded by the International Union of Freethinkers, founded on 30 August 1880 in Brussels by freethinkers of the old and new world. (...) At the congress of 1889 in Paris, 170 delegates represent about 240 associations and unions, 21 journals and 16 lodges. Among the associations there are 100 French, 17 Belgian, 15 English, 32 Spanish, 7 Portuguese, 3 Italian, as well as 20 free German municipalities".¹⁶

This material discusses the history of freemasonic organisations. It gives rise to the conviction that the author of the work belongs or is sympathetic to them, perhaps even to Freemasonry. This may be evidenced by L. Hass's linking Garfein-Garski (with a mistake in the name) with E. Abramowski, J. Hempel,

¹⁵ B. Prus, *Kronika tygodnia*, „Kurier Codzienny” 1893, nr 125.

¹⁶ S. Garfein-Garski, *O ruchu etycznym. Szkic historyczno-filozoficzny*, „Przegląd Poznański” 1895, nr 14.

R. Minkiewicz and H. Radlińska¹⁷ and the couple's friendship with S. Stempowski and A. Niemojewski.¹⁸ Garfein-Garski came into contact with the latter thanks to Malwina Posner in 1891, when A. Niemojewski spent the years 1890–1891 in Kraków, having then become close to the socialist movement organised in Galicia.

It can be assumed with a high degree of probability that the views of E. Abramowski, H. Radlińska, J. Hempel, A. Niemojewski on ethical issues and religion inspired Garfein-Garski's book *Etyka Ludwika Feuerbacha* [Ethics of Ludwik Feuerbach], published in Kraków in 1900. In Garfein-Garski's positive attitude to the positions accepting the thesis of biological conditioning of psychic phenomena, and in particular to the conditioning of religious experiences by elements of the subconscious, I see a strand of E. Abramowski's thought. The conviction that the study of religion must be multidisciplinary, and that religion should be studied in its sociological, psychological, historical and philosophical aspects can be traced back to J. Hempel.

An inspiring view of the author of the book on L. Feuerbach is the claim that the critique of religion shows the origin and groundlessness of anthropomorphic faith and speculative philosophy obscured by a theological layer. In his view, theology is only a hidden anthropology and, therefore, "true anthropology and a true world view" must be constructed. According to Garfein-Garski, it is L. Feuerbach who shows the way forward: an anthropological, social ethics. The beginning of the 20th century was to be the century of ethics. He wrote: "We live in times marked by ethics: the task of the new century will be to realise Feuerbach's ethical ideas. They are the necessary and vital basis for working in this direction. We demand education for the people: let the light of Feuerbach's teachings flow down to the people".¹⁹

When studying this book, attention must be paid to its publisher. "Krytyka", a social, literary and scientific monthly published in Kraków from 1896–97 and 1899–1914 under the editorship of W. Feldman, became one of the journals of Young Poland in 1900. Its contributors included: S. Brzozowski, J. W. Dawid, K. Kelles-Krauz, J. Lorentowicz, and S. Wyspiański. "Krytyka" was inspired by the ideology of the Polish Socialist Party (PPS), but at the same time supported

¹⁷ See L. Hass, *Ambicje, rachuby, rzeczywistość. Wolnomularstwo w Europie środkowo-wschodniej 1905–1928*, Warsaw 1984, s. 76. S. Garfein-Garski's membership in freemasonry is not confirmed in this book *Masoneria polska XX wieku. Losy, loże, ludzie*, Warsaw 1993, s. 360. See also A. Nowicki, *Filozofia masonerii*, Słupsk 1997.

¹⁸ See *Listy z Posnerów Garfeinowej do S. Stempowskiego 1899–1932*, Rkps BUW 1559 [Letters of Malwina née Posner Garfeinowa to S. Stempowski 1899–1932, Rkps BUW 1559] k. 184, 367, 368 and memoirs of S. Stempowski, *Wspomnienia S. Stempowskiego*, Rkps BUW 1532, k. 1–2.

¹⁹ S. Garfein-Garski, *Etyka Ludwika Feuerbacha*, Kraków 1900, s. 204.

actions aimed at regaining independence and activist politics. It printed materials of a socialist, anti-clerical and, later, pro-independence nature.

Once again, Garfein-Garski comes close to the circle of those representing left-wing circles. The influence of his wife, Malwina Posner, cannot be overestimated here. *Etyka Ludwika Feuerbacha* in a way expressed the views of these circles. It was, however, above all the only and to date one of the few monographs on the philosophy and especially the ethics of L. Feuerbach. This was pointed out by H. Jankowski: "in Poland it was dealt with by Stanisław Garski, who published a book entitled *Etyka Ludwika Feuerbacha*. Since then, however, much has changed in ethics itself, as well as in evaluations of Feuerbach's ethics. Moreover – as will be discussed in this paper – Garski's book, while giving a sound analysis of Feuerbach's ethics, contains some flaws".²⁰

Between 1903 and 1905, Garfein-Garski collaborated with the weekly magazine "Ogniwo". This periodical dealt with scientific, social, literary and political issues. It was published in Warsaw from December 1902 to the end of 1905. The founders and actual editors were L. Krzywicki, S. Posner and S. Stempowski. "Ogniwo" was a journal close to the Polish Socialist Party, bringing together prominent contributors such as W. Gumplowicz, J. Hempel, K. Kelles-Krauz, J. Kodisowa, A. Mahrburg, I. Radliński and many others. The influence of an intellectual formation close to the Polish Socialist Party can be seen in a book by S. Garfein-Garski entitled *Materialistyczne pojmowanie dziejów a etyka* [Materialist comprehension of history and ethics], published – already after the magazine was suspended by the authorities (December 1905).

This publication was discussed among others by K. Szczelik, L. Kluczyński, J. Lewkowicz, T. Grużewski and J. Bystron. The first reviewer stated that S. Garfein-Garski's arguments were similar to K. Marx's concept of the materialist understanding of history. He claimed that the author stands on the position of determinism and evolutionism of Darwin and Spencer. He levelled strong criticism at such a position. Ludwik Kluczyński, on the other hand, stated that the book *Materialistyczne pojmowanie dziejów a etyka* presents the basic theses of the materialist worldview supplemented by humanist values. At the same time, he wrote: "I agree with Dr. Garski as to the fact that economic relations by themselves cannot explain the whole ideology, but I think, on the other hand, that he is wrong in pronouncing the opinion that one can equally well explain the facts of history economically, as well as ethically, intellectually, and so on. Nor do I think that the question of historical materialism cannot be resolved by historical analysis".²¹ It is correct in this assessment to say that Garfein-Garski was an

²⁰ H. Jankowski, *Etyka Ludwika Feuerbacha*, Warszawa 1963, s. 12.

²¹ L. Kluczyński, review of the work of S. Garfein-Garski, published in the literary and scientific supplement „Tydzień” to the „Kurier Lwowski” 1906, no. 35, s. 295–296.

opponent of the mechanistic view of the unilateral dependence of consciousness on a social base. For him, consciousness was “not a meaningless addition to spontaneous, necessary and blind processes”.

The book by Garfein-Garski was also positively evaluated by J. Lewkowicz, who stated that “as a scientific presentation of a modified form of historical materialism, the work of Mr Garski makes a positive impression, as it contains numerous accurate remarks and testifies to his knowledge of the subject, as well as to the author’s high intelligence. The scientific modification of the extreme formula of the materialistic understanding of history is of great importance also from the standpoint of the theory of cognition”.²²

J. S. Bystroń, on the other hand, considered that the book contrasted the social world with the natural world, stating the inadmissibility of transferring natural laws into the realm of history. He wrote: “historical laws can only and exclusively have the character of probability, since social phenomena are born of human will, however internally and externally causally determined it may be.” Developing the fundamental problem of the book, he writes that “economic and ideological factors constitute an inseparable whole of social life. These factors condition and influence each other, one without the other cannot arise; and every social phenomenon is born by infinitely small transformations from diverse social factors”.²³

Already in this book one can discern an attempt to construct a new paradigm of philosophy. However, it is only the work *System filozofii. Zagadnienia wstępne* [System of Philosophy. Preliminary Issues], published in 1907, that directly indicates such an intention. In its introduction, the author refers to “the crisis of philosophy”. He notes that the 19th century brings a twofold collapse of the queen of sciences. First, the edifice of post-Kantian metaphysics collapsed, and then the usefulness of its materialist counterpart was called into question. The first cataclysm was caused by the departure of theoretical philosophical reflection from life and the natural sciences. The second cataclysm was caused by the representatives of the natural sciences, because they wanted to describe the totality of reality on the basis of their own research, using the specific methods of these sciences. Garfein-Garski sought to eliminate absolute determinism from materialist theoretical reflection. He wrote that “just as Hegel’s philosophy exerted an enormous influence on the social and historical sciences, so the shallowness and naivety of the materialist worldview became the cause of its popularity. Under its influence, in wide circles, the belief in a supernatural order

²² J. Levkovich, review of the work of S. Garfein-Garski, published in „Nauka i Życie”, nr 2, s. 3–4, supplement to „Ludzkość” 1907, nr 45.

²³ J.S. Bystroń, *Rozwój problemu socjologicznego* [w:] *Archiwum Komitetu Badania Historii Filozofii w Polsce*, t. 1, cz. 2, Kraków 1917, s. 231.

of the world gave way to the conviction that the course of nature takes place according to immutable laws".²⁴

I agree with S. Borzym's opinion that the creation of a worldview was for Garfein-Garski the main task of philosophy. Its subject became the world as a whole, distinct from its component parts.²⁵ This approach to philosophy was to help both to know the world and to creatively transform it. One hundred years earlier, however, the content of this book had been criticised by a reviewer from *Przegląd Kościelny* [Church Review] stating that Garfein-Garski's views were nothing new and that the author, by considering atheism to be "a sign of full light", discredited himself, since it had already been considered a sign of stupidity in the time of King David. An equally critical, though this time substantive, review was given by F. Gabryl in *Gazeta Kościelna* [Church Gazette] and by J. Lewkowicz in *Przegląd Filozoficzny* [Philosophical Review].

None of the reviewers recognised that the process of creating a worldview as a whole encompassing various areas of life, was the basis for certain educational activities and fostered epistemological considerations. Garfein-Garski, in formulating this postulate, opposed the positivist vision of science, emphasised the peculiarity of the humanities, giving special importance to the philosophy of values. This fact was noticed only by S. Borzym in his numerous publications on the history of Polish philosophy, e.g. in the book *Panorama polskiej myśli filozoficznej* [Panorama of Polish Philosophical Thought].

In Garfein-Garski's views, I see – like S. Borzym – a demand for a close connection between the issues of theoretical philosophy and practical philosophy, treating society as an important factor shaping knowledge, emphasising the importance of developing a new method of examining being, demanding a historiosophical view and rising above the scheme of opposition of idealism and materialism, above the related rigid division of phenomena into mental and physical.²⁶

In 1909, Garfein-Garski was the initiator and co-founder of the Philosophical Society in Kraków. The publications in the history of Polish philosophy (the ones I am familiar with) omit this fact. It is usually noted that it was founded by M. Straszewski. This is only partly true, since the first meeting actually took place at the invitation of M. Straszewski and K. Lubecki on 10 February 1909 at 12 Św. Anny Street in Kraków. However, in addition to those already mentioned, the organising committee consisted of M. Zdziechowski, W. M. Gielicki and S. Garfein-Garski. The last one presented the articles of association of the

²⁴ S. Garfein-Garski, *System filozofii*, vol. I: *Zagadnienia wstępne*, Warsaw–Lviv 1907, s. 207.

²⁵ See S. Borzym, *Poszukiwania nowej epistemologii [w:] Zarys dziejów...*, ed. A. Walicki, s. 333.

²⁶ See tamże, s. 324.

Society, the general meeting of which was held on 28 April 1909. M. Straszewski was elected President of the Society (later replaced by W. Rubczyński), M. Zdziechowski – Vice-President, K. Lubecki – Secretary, and W. M. Gielecki – Treasurer. F. Gabryl, S. Garfein-Garski and W. Heinrich, on the other hand, became members of the faculty.²⁷

The collected materials show that both M. Straszewski and W. Rubczyński knew Garfein-Garski well. Analysis of their works, however, indicates that this relationship had impact on the work of the Galician philosopher. This can be evidenced by works published in the same period. These are mainly Garfein-Garski's *System filozofii* and W. Rubczyński's *O stosunku filozofii do nauk szczegółowych* [On the Relation of Philosophy to the Detailed Sciences] and W. Straszewski's *Dążenie do syntezy* [Striving for Synthesis].

For example, M. Straszewski – like Garfein-Garski – takes as his starting point in cognition, on the one hand, experience and, on the other hand, data collected by the history of philosophy. He claimed that man only discovers and creates what he needs. Need, understood both in an economic-material and moral-spiritual way, is the main stimulus inspiring man to work. At this point, it should be emphasised that Garfein-Garski complemented this theory with curiosity as an independent factor that triggers in man the pursuit of truth.

Garfein-Garski's acquaintance with M. Straszewski resulted in a lecture entitled *Criticism*, delivered by the former in the assembly hall of the Jagiellonian University on 01.12.1909. It began a series of speeches by, among others, T. Grabowski, F. Gabryl, W. Gielecki and I. Wasserberg on scepticism, criticism and the value of cognition in the context of Kantianism. The whole work was published in the book *W poszukiwaniu prawdy, Wstęp do teorii poznania* [In search of truth. Introduction to the theory of cognition] edited by M. Straszewski in 1911. Reviews of this work appeared in the "Gazeta Wieczorna" [Evening Gazette] of 1912, in issues 616, 622, 624, 630, 633.

From this text and other contributions by Garfein-Garski, it can be inferred that he considered I. Kant as the greatest philosopher of the critical era, as the founder of critical philosophy, who overcame the age of enlightenment by making a distinction between sensory and intellectual cognition and the phenomenal and the real world.

²⁷ See „Przegląd Filozoficzny” 1909, issue 3, s. 444, „Ruch Filozoficzny” 1911, 1912, 1913 and later issues, where reports of the meetings of the Philosophical Society in Kraków were printed; „Czas” 1928, nr 26. Moreover, in the State Archives in Kraków, in: Grodzkie Krakowskie Starosty, 1919–1939, there are materials relating to the supervision of associations, exercised by the Starosty. They contain a folder containing data on the Philosophical Society in Kraków, founded in 1909. The statutes of the Society bear, among others, the signature of Stanislaw Garfein, as one of the founders of the Society – archival reference number St G Kr 215.

In the Polish philosophical tradition, Kantianism was viewed through the magnifying glass of its idealist interpretation. This was what modernism and other philosophical schools propagated. The philosophy of I. Kant was seen merely as a phenomenon, while the essence of the relationship between individual consciousness and empirical reality was sporadically considered. Garfein-Garski opposed this tradition, recognising the possibility of *a priori* cognition of both worlds by the formal principles of cognition inherent in the cognitive subject. In his opinion, in I. Kant's theory, one should distinguish between subjective content and consciousness, i.e. actual perceptions and images in individual consciousness and the real world of phenomena, i.e. the totality of all perceptions possible for a certain consciousness and reality existing "in itself", regardless of any cognitive subject.

Garfein-Garski was critical of the interpretation of Kantianism described as psychological. According to him, such an interpretation was proposed by Lange and Helmholtz, emphasising the phenomenalism and subjectivity of I. Kant. In this view, the mind of the cognitive subject became an instrument of cognition constructing everything in its own way. Thought, on the other hand, was as subjective as impressions. Psychological interpretation, in Garfein-Garski's view, introduced subjectivity into human cognition, which is why he considered it to be without a future. There was also another reason for this criticism. Garfein-Garski saw that the starting point of Kantianism could be ontology, since the legitimacy of science had to be sought in the overall structure of the empirical-rational world. Psychology in general offered this possibility, since reflection on cognition could be at the same time a reflection on the way of being and the basic forms of objectivity. Criticism would therefore pose questions about the conditions of our cognition in the context of the conditions of the subject-object world.

In this context, Garfein-Garski called for the results of theoretical-cognitive research to be reconciled with the achievements of the natural sciences. This view corresponded with the anti-metaphysical programme of the Polish positivists, and especially with its new formulation, called 'New Criticism' (*nowokrytycyzm*). This prompted a reformulation of the Kantian theory of cognition in the spirit of evolutionism and taking into account the achievements of psychology, but it did not authorise a subjectivist-psychological interpretation of Kantianism and the absolute unity of the philosophy of I. Kant with the natural sciences.

S. Garfein-Garski therefore regarded the philosophy of I. Kant as a kind of synthesis of rationalism and empiricism, of the world of phenomena and noumena. He saw in it an attempt to answer the question of how synthetic *a priori* judgements are possible. These judgements, in turn, are a function of the unity between the subject's ideas defining an object whether it is given in experience or conceived.

In 1910, the Philosophical Society in Kraków organised a series of lectures at the Jagiellonian University; the first one took place on 18 November and was entitled *Zagadnienie polskiej filozofii narodowej* [The Issue of Polish National Philosophy], delivered by Garfein-Garski. An article under the same title, with a handwritten dedication to M. Straszewski dated 17 May 1910 “with expressions of honour and true respect”, appeared in the “Biblioteka Warszawska” even before the Kraków lecture.²⁸

In the article – in line with the views of leading activists of the socialist movement – the author recognised the state as an important element in historical processes, but abandoned the issue of the nation almost entirely, replacing it with the category of ‘national philosophy’. This idea was opposed to the view of E. Abramowski, who postulated the abolition of the institution of the state. Garfein-Garski argued that a negative feature of every state, stemming from its very essence, was the bureaucratisation of power alienated from society and the absorption of a serious part of the effects of its work. An attribute of every state, he argued, is violence against its citizens, the state’s drive to subjugation of the whole of society, to uniformity and to limitation of the freedom of every individual, all of which has been intensifying throughout modern history. He criticised statehood of both capitalist and socialist type. He considered the ideal form of society of the future to be a cooperative republic, elements of which could be seen in the capitalist system in various types of social institutions and associations. He was convinced of the possibility of full national and social liberation with the development of co-operatism. He put forward a proposal for the creation of ethical organisations in the form of friendship associations, which were to facilitate the preparation of the Polish nation for life in the future.²⁹ This was to be the solution to the national question. In this context, E. Abramowski could not speak of any national philosophy.

Garfein-Garski, on the other hand, wondered about the possibility of combining philosophy or science, which is a large generalisation of reality, with such a subjective issue as nationality. He believed that even Romantic philosophy was not a national philosophy. He believed that the history of ‘Polish philosophy’ was not to be contrasted with universal philosophy; nor was it supposed to be a description of national characteristics. A similar position was held by A. Zieleńczyk, who wrote that philosophy had scientific ambitions, wished to

²⁸ S. Garfein-Garski, *Zagadnienie polskiej filozofii narodowej*, „Biblioteka Warszawska” 1910, vol. 2, s. 332–349. The same issues were extended in *Polska filozofia narodowa*, ed. by M. Straszewski, Krakow 1921, s. 1–29.

²⁹ See E. Abramowski, *Idee społeczne kooperatywności*, Warsaw 1907; and tenże, *Kooperatywa jako sprawa wyzwolenia ludu pracującego*, Warsaw 1912.

speak the language of ‘pure reason’,³⁰ wished to become a developed science, and did not want to reinforce exclusively national characteristics. S. As S. Borzym writes: “Zieleńczyk was strongly in favour of the study of national philosophy as a way to a deeper understanding of culture and to self-direct its development, (...) he found a concordance between the efforts of Polish philosophers and the pragmatist movement then developing exuberantly throughout the world”.³¹

Garfein-Garski treated the practice of national philosophy as work on the history of Polish philosophy, and not as the creation of a national messianic-romantic philosophy. Such an approach, moreover, corresponded to the conception of this reflection, in which it became a national historiosophy.³²

The year 1913 is significant for S. Garfein-Garski’s further work and family relations. His wife Malwina, an active activist in the feminist movement, also associated with the socialist movement, lead a very active lifestyle, travelling a lot (1908 Paris, 1912 Italy, 1913 Berlin). This affects her wellbeing as she complains of headaches. Financial matters deteriorated just like the relations between the spouses. In this situation, Garfein-Garski left for Lviv, where he resided at 17 Sykstinska Street, starting work at the Universal Credit Bank.

Garfein-Garski’s letter of 23 March 1913 to his wife reads as follows: “My dear Mother! First the finances. I am just sending you not 500 but 800 francs, so that you will have enough for a long time (...). I am sorry that you have been feeling unwell again the last few days and have stopped sleeping, may God grant that this passes as quickly as possible, and I believe that if it can pass somewhere, it will pass just there [on the Riviera – J.K.]. I was very worried (...). I also did some reading. By the way – I had a very cordial card from Rev. Pawlicki. I will probably be in Kraków on 3 April at a banking meeting – I want to visit

³⁰ It should be mentioned that A. Zieleńczyk made a positive reference to S. Garfein-Garski’s speech by publishing a review in 1911 in „Książka”, a monthly dedicated to Polish criticism and bibliography. It was published in Warsaw and Lviv from 1901 to 1914 and in 1922 in Warsaw. The publisher was E. Wende, and the editors: from 1901 – M. Massonius, from 1903 – A. Mahrburg, from 1905 – A. Turkul, from 1907 – J. K. Kochanowski, from 1913 – L. Bernacki and, after the reissue in 1922 – J. Muszkowski and M. Rulikowski. The aim of the journal was to create an objective and professional critical picture of current Polish writing. A. Zieleńczyk’s review corresponded to these criteria, hence the positive opinion of S. Garfein-Garski’s contribution testifies to its value. This was confirmed by the report in „Ruch Filozoficzny” of 1911, which reads: “the speaker clarified the fundamental question as to what extent and in what sense philosophy can be national”. See A. Zieleńczyk, *Recenzja artykułu Zagadnienie polskiej filozofii narodowej*, „Książka” 1911, nr 3, s. 103–104; *Sprawozdanie z odczytów na UJ*, „Ruch Filozoficzny” 1911, nr 3, s. 536–554.

³¹ S. Borzym, *Panorama polskiej myśli filozoficznej*, Warsaw 1993, s. 42. See A. Zieleńczyk, *Drogi i bezdroża filozofii*, Warsaw 1912, s. 178–222.

³² This issue is comprehensively presented by A. Warzynowicz, *Mesjanizm polski...*, s. 281–293.

him then and maybe we will talk about the Commission on the History of Philosophy, to which – as he told me himself – I was supposed to have been invited”.³³ By contrast, on 14 April 1913, Malwina wrote to her husband: “Dear husband, I have already sent my own letters four times. Tomorrow morning we are going to Berlin, where we will arrive at eight o’clock on Wednesday morning. We are just getting things ready, as the train leaves at 9.26, and it is still a whole trip from here. Weather beneath contempt. An abundance snow in the mountains. Like in Zakopane in January. A north wind has been blowing for 48 hours so that the whole hut is shivering and we are freezing to death. In Berlin one will at least have a comfortable room for 6–7 Marks a day. Here, the beast, Wagner has charged me 15 francs a day and claims he can’t get it any cheaper. I am already fed up with this constant yapping. I don’t feel a bit sorry for this south, where there is neither heat nor sun, if it shines for 2 weeks – that’s probably the maximum”.³⁴

After reading these manuscripts, there is no indication of an imminent separation of the spouses and their divorce. The end of May 1913, however, brings the first forebodings of this event. In a letter dated 26 May 1913, Garfein-Garski wrote to his wife: “My Mother! You have unfortunately left both my last two letters unanswered, although they really did not deserve it. Only today Herman showed me your last letter to him, and I see first of all that you evidently did not receive a letter, since you write that I did not answer it, and next I see that you have changed your conduct under the influence of lies and rumours. Do not write and think that what I have written to you is a lie, for in my father’s memory I swear that I have written only the truth. Where did you get the idea that I had made the arrangements since November, which is absolutely not true. Everything happened only in February. I swear to that. I never assured Przybyłowicz that you would willingly agree to a divorce and he never said that in view of your agreement he agreed. You were lied to shamefully. (...) Mother, do not judge me so harshly and unjustly, I know that I have written to you only the truth, believe me that it is really hard because of you (...). But I am waiting for some good word and I kiss your hands”.³⁵

Having received no reply, Garfein-Garski wrote again to his wife on 3 June: “My Mother! That you have not replied to any of my letters, and especially not

³³ *Korespondencja Malwiny z Posnerów Garfeinowej-Garskiej z lat 1887–1932*, t. 2, Rkps BN 8987 [Correspondence of Malwina Garfeinowa-Garska, née Posner, 1887–1932, vol. 2, Rkps BN 8987], Mf. 39757, k. 28–32.

³⁴ *Listy i papiery osobiste Malwiny z Posnerów Garfeinowej-Garskiej*, Rkps BN 8990. [Letters and personal papers of Malwina Garfeinowa-Garska, Rkps BN 8990], Mf. 62449, k. 6–7.

³⁵ *Korespondencja Malwiny z Posnerów Garfeinowej-Garskiej z lat 1887–1932*, t. 2, Rkps BN 8987 [Correspondence of Malwina Garfeinowa-Garska, née Posner, 1887–1932, vol. 2, Rkps BN 8987], Mf. 39757, k. 32–35.

to the last one, I really do not understand. But evidently it must be so, if that is what you want. And now I come with a request. The Przybyłowicz's divorce is already judicially finalised, so ours must be finalised too. You said you could not see me. So I have made it clear to the court that all you need is a notarised power of attorney signed by you and a medical certificate stating that you cannot travel or attend hearings for an extended period of time without harming your health (...). I apologise to you very much for the tone. I would still like to explain various things here, but I've had enough, I am helpless in the face of your behaviour and I therefore limit myself to kissing your hands".³⁶

Unexpectedly, however, the matter of divorce turned out to be much more difficult, and was concluded due to financial considerations. For in a letter to his wife dated 15 June, Garfein-Garski wrote: "thirdly: that I agreed to 600 francs and even wrote that it was not much. I was referring to Berlin and the journey. You know, after all, that nothing was ever too much for me. Don't you? I didn't think there could be disputes between us in any situation because of the issue of money and I am having a hard time understanding it at the moment. You see, for example, now I have to pay 825 francs for the flat and I can't send you more than 400 francs, because after paying the servants, the shops and the various instalments, I'll have almost nothing in a few days after the first day of the month".³⁷

In June 1913, Malwina commissioned her brother Stanislaw Posner to settle the disputes. Garfein-Garski was apprehensive about this meeting. Rightly so, for in a letter dated 16 June, S. Posner wrote to him: "liquidation in a manner used by bankrupts, by breaking off marital cohabitation with your wife at a time when my sister is laid up with severe infirmity – you are committing a crime for which you will answer before God".³⁸

Preferring therefore not to meet the author of this letter, Garfein-Garski wrote to his wife: "it is bad that Staś should come to settle the matter, for you know his impracticality as well as I do, and if he is yet, as you assure me, to be ruthless, he may, in spite of himself, do me much grievous annoyance". The fears proved unfounded and the divorce was carried out in the first days of July. In a letter dated 6 July, Garfein-Garski wrote to Malwina: "Staś has already left – the case is over – the one in court. The one in me is not finished and when it will end – it is impossible to say".

The author of the letter was right, the affair had taken a toll on his work; his second wife Paulina (née Świącicka) no longer inspired him to the same

³⁶ Tamże, s. 36–37.

³⁷ Tamże, s. 40.

³⁸ *Korespondencja S. Posnera z lat 1887–1929, list z 16 czerwca do Garfeina*, Rkps BN 8992 [Correspondence of S. Posner from 1887 to 1929, letter of 16 June to Garfein, Rkps BN 8992], s. 138–141.

extent as Malwina Zabojecka. In addition, his job as a bank director did not leave much room for philosophy either. He published only one book, *Uwagi nad zagadnieniem dziejów powszechnych i polskich* [Notes on the question of general and Polish history], which was published in 1924. It is an attempt to summarise his historiosophical research, displaying an effort to define a general theory of history. It reveals the possibility of discovering general paradigms indicating the direction of humanity's development, whose characteristic feature is the striving for a "progressive spiritualisation of history", i.e. an increase in the significance of conscious human activity. They are generalised by the theory of two tendencies, still present in the history of the world: the centrifugal – individualistic tendency and the centripetal – cooperative tendency. They form the overall paradigm of history.

To sum up, it can be said that Garfein-Garski can be regarded as a theoretician who favoured Polish modernism, as well as a certain variety of criticism and materialism (especially one that treated humanistic values as universal), promoted the cult of life, considered contemporary culture to be a deformation of authentic existence, and at the same time proposed higher culture as a remedy for the crisis of contemporary civilisation. Garfein-Garski's views were that culture should not be merely a decoration of life, a mask or a cover. He believed that in order to create it, one had to break out of the tight circle of pseudo-moral notions, one had to reject the "morality of the cattlemen", find strength and genius in oneself, break with "plebeian democratism", and develop individuality, even at the cost of its loneliness.

He also recognised the role and specificity of the humanities. This led to a rejection of the division of phenomena into physical and mental. In this conception, the domain of natural science became the world of passive, statically limited objects, while the domain of the humanities became the world of active subjects that evolve evolutionarily. However, their opposition is relativised by the necessity of human adaptation to external socio-natural conditions, which imply the purposiveness of human action. Causality as he understands it, however, is not a negation of intentionality but, on the contrary, constitutes a certain continuum arising from the diverse spheres of being.

Stanisław Garfein-Garski died on 4 November 1928. However, his work has been unjustly forgotten. The reason may be the presence of positivist, evolutionist, materialist and modernist influences, preventing it from being categorised into a single theoretical current.³⁹

³⁹ See *Korespondencja S. Zakrzewskiego lata 1899–1936*, t. III, Rkps Ossol. 7345/II [Correspondence of S. Zakrzewski 1899–1936, vol. III, Rkps Ossol. 7345/II], Mf. 30421, letter to S. Garfein-Garski and accompanying business card of the latter. See Obituary reproduced in „Ruch Filozoficzny” 1928, vol. 11, 219.

References

- Abramowski E., *Idee społeczne kooperatywizmu*, Warszawa 1907.
- Abramowski E., *Kooperatywa jako sprawa wyzwolenia ludu pracującego*, Warszawa 1912.
- Archiwum Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego. Protokoły posiedzeń Rady Wydziału Filozoficznego UJ od roku 1875 do 1885, Sygn. WF II 43. [Jagiellonian University Archives. Minutes of the meetings of the Council of the Faculty of Philosophy of the Jagiellonian University from 1875 to 1885, WF II 43].
- Borzym S., *Panorama polskiej myśli filozoficznej*, Warszawa 1993.
- Borzym S., *Poszukiwania nowej epistemologii* [w:] *Zarys dziejów filozofii polskiej w latach 1815–1918*, ed. A. Walicki, Warszawa 1983.
- Bystron J.S., *Rozwój problemu socjologicznego* [w:] *Archiwum Komitetu Badania Historii Filozofii w Polsce*, vol. 1, part 2, Kraków 1917.
- Daszyńska Z., *Nietzsche – Zarathustra*, Kraków 1896.
- Garfeina-Garskiego S., *Kwestionariusz biograficzny*, Zbiory specjalne biblioteki PAN. Rkps Fund. Mich. 365/22. [The special collection of the Library of the Polish Academy of Sciences. Rkps Fund. Mich. 365/22].
- Garfein-Garski S., *Psychada*, „Ateneum”, 1892, vol. 4.
- Garfein-Garski S., *Fryderyk Nietzsche. Studium filozoficzne*, „Ateneum” 1893, vol. II, issue I.
- Garfein-Garski S., *O ruchu etycznym. Szkic historyczno-filozoficzny*, „Przegląd Poznański” 1895, nr 14.
- Garfein-Garski S., *Etyka Ludwika Feuerbacha*, Kraków 1900.
- Garfein-Garski S., *System filozofii*, vol. I, *Zagadnienia wstępne*, Warszawa–Lwów 1907.
- Garfein-Garski S., *Zagadnienie polskiej filozofii narodowej*, „Biblioteka Warszawska”, 1910, vol. 2.
- Głąbik C., *Ludzie, poglądy i idee w sporze o krakowską katedrę filozofii (1875–1877)*, „Studia Filozoficzne” 1976, nr 4.
- Hass L., *Ambicje, rachuby, rzeczywistość. Wolnomularstwo w Europie środkowo-wschodniej 1905–1928*, Warszawa 1984.
- Hass L., *Masoneria polska XX wieku. Losy, loże, ludzie*, Warszawa 1993.
- Indeks ksiąg doktorskich UJ, t. II, litery D–J, rok 1890, pod numerem 1263 [Index of UJ doctoral books, vol. II, letters D–J, year 1890, under number 1263].
- Jankowski H., *Etyka Ludwika Feuerbacha*, Warszawa 1963.
- Kmieciak Z., *Prasa warszawska w okresie pozytywizmu 1864–1888*, Warszawa 1971.
- Księgi metrykalne wyznania mojżeszowego z gminy Tarnopol, Archiwum Głównego Akt Dawnych w Warszawie. [Metrical books of the Mosaic religion from the municipality of Tarnopol, The Central Archives of Historical Records in Warsaw].
- Kojkoł J., *Myśl filozoficzna Stanisława Garfeina-Garskiego*, Toruń 2001.
- Korespondencja ks. dr. prof. Stefana Pawlickiego z lat 1872–1916. Rkps BJ 8697 [Correspondence of Rev. Dr. Prof. Stefan Pawlicki from 1872 to 1916; Rkps BJ 8697].
- Korespondencja Malwiny z Posnerów Garfeinowej-Garskiej z lat 1887–1932, t. 2, Rkps BN 8987 [Correspondence of Malwina Garfeinowa-Garska, née Posner, 1887–1932, vol. 2, Rkps BN 8987].
- Korespondencja S. Posnera z lat 1887–1929, list z 16 czerwca do Garfeina, Rkps BN 8992 [Correspondence of S. Posner from 1887 to 1929, letter of 16 June to Garfein, Rkps BN 8992].
- Korespondencja S. Zakrzewskiego lata 1899–1936, t. III, Rkps Ossol. 7345/II [Correspondence of S. Zakrzewski, 1899–1936, vol. III, Rkps Ossol. 7345/II].
- Kluczyński L., *Recenzja pracy S. Garfeina-Garskiego*, „Dodatek literacko-naukowy Tydzień” do „Kuriera Lwowskiego” 1906, nr 35.

- Lewkowicz J., *Recenzja pracy S. Garfeina-Garskiego*, „Nauka i Życie”, nr 2, dodatek do „Ludzkości” 1907, nr 45.
- Liber promotionum Universitatis Jagellonicae, Archiwum UJ, S II 519.
- Liber Rigorosorum J. C. R. Facultatis Juridico politicae, WP II 486, 520, Archiwum UJ, nr 235.
- Listy z Posnerów Garfeinowej do S. Stempowskiego 1899–1932. Rkps BUW 1559 [Letters of Malwina née Posner Garfeinowa to S. Stempowski 1899–1932. Rkps BUW 1559].
- Listy i papiery osobiste Malwiny z Posnerów Garfeinowej-Garskiej, Rkps BN 8990 [Letters and personal papers of Malwina Garfeinowa-Garska, Rkps BN 8990].
- Loth R., *Maria Zabojecka 1870–1932* [w:] *Obraz literatury polskiej w XIX i XX wieku*, Kraków 1973, vol. 3.
- Nowicki A., *Filozofia masonerii*, Słupsk 1997.
- Petrozolin-Skowrońska B., *Pozytywizm* [w:] *Literatura polska*, Warszawa 1987, vol. 1.
- Polska filozofia narodowa*, ed. M. Straszewski, Kraków 1921.
- Prus B., *Kronika tygodnia*, „Kurier Codzienny”, 1893, no. 125.
- Skarga B., *Antypozytywizm i obrona metafizyki* [w:] *Zarys dziejów filozofii polskiej 1815–1918*, ed. A. Walicki, Warszawa 1983.
- Skład UJ za rok 1887/88 [the Composition of the UJ for the year 1887/88].
- Skład UJ za rok 1889/90 [the Composition of the UJ for the year 1889/90].
- Spis Ludności Miasta Krakowa z roku 1900 (Dz. II nr 437).
- Spis Ludności z 1910 roku (Dz. VII nr 2361) [1910 Population Census (Dz. VII nr 2361)].
- Sprawozdanie z odczytów na UJ*, „Ruch Filozoficzny” 1911, nr 3.
- Tatarkiewicz W., *Losy krakowskiej katedry filozofii w XIX wieku* [w:] *Pisma zebrane*, vol. 1.
- Tatarkiewicz W., *Droga do filozofii i inne rozprawy filozoficzne*, Warszawa 1971.
- Wawrzynowicz A., *Mesjanizm polski w recepcji historyzoficznej Stanisława Garfeina-Garskiego*, „Przegląd Filozoficzny – Nowa Seria” 2021, nr 2.
- Wspomnienia S. Stempowskiego, Rkps BUW 1532.
- Zieleńczyk A., *Drogi i bezdroża filozofii*, Warszawa 1912.
- Zieleńczyk A., *Recenzja artykułu „Zagadnienie polskiej filozofii narodowej”*, „Książka” 1911, nr 3.

Miłując Galicję. Poglądy i życie Stanisława Garfeina-Garskiego

Streszczenie

Artykuł przedstawia życie i elementy twórczości S. Garfeina-Garskiego, jednego z pierwszych polskich filozofów, który dostrzegł swoistość nauk humanistycznych. Tym samym docenił rolę kultury w rozwoju rzeczywistości społecznej, a zarazem zauważył jej kryzys i upadek. Uznał, że kultura wyższa stanowi remedium na kryzys współczesnej cywilizacji. Dokonał wnikliwej i trafnej analizy twórczości I. Kanta, L. Feuerbacha i F. Nietzschego.

Słowa kluczowe: filozofia polska, Garfein-Garski, historyzofia, Galicja, nauki humanistyczne