

ROCZNIK TOMISTYCZNY
8 (2019)

ROCZNIK TOMISTYCZNY
8 (2019)

ΘΩΜΙΣΜΟΣ ΤΑ ΧΡΟΝΙΚΑ
ANNARIUS THOMISTICUS
THOMISTIC YEARBOOK
THOMISTISCHES JAHRBUCH
ANNUAIRE THOMISTIQUE
ANNUARIO TOMISTICO
TOMISTICKÁ ROČENKA

ROCZNIK TOMISTYCZNY
8 (2019)

Naukowe Towarzystwo Tomistyczne
WARSZAWA

KOMITET REDAKCYJNY / EDITORIAL BOARD:

Michał Zembrzuski (sekretarz / secretary), Magdalena Płotka (zastępca redaktora naczelnego / deputy editor), Dawid Lipski, Natalia Herold (internet), Izabella Andrzejuk, Artur Andrzejuk (redaktor naczelny / editor-in-chief)

RADA NAUKOWA / SCIENTIFIC COUNCIL:

Adam Wielomski, Stanisław Wielgus, Antoni B. Stępień, Sławomir Sobczak, Arkady Rzegocki, Andrzej Maryniarczyk, Marcin Karas, Krzysztof Kalka, Mieczysław Gogacz, Pavol Dancák, Paul J. Cornish, Mehmet Zeki Aydin, Artur Andrzejuk, Anton Adam.

RECENZENCI / REVIEWERS

Antoni B. Stępień, Karolina Ćwik, Paul J. Cornish, Tomasz Pawlikowski, Marie-Dominique Goutierre, Piotr Mazur, Grzegorz Hołub, Andrzej Jonkisz, Marek Prokop, Mikołaj Krasnodębski, Piotr Roszak, Henryk Anzulewicz, Piotr Jaroszyński, Imelda Chłodna-Błach

REDAKCJA JĘZYKOWA / LANGUAGE EDITORS

Elżbieta Pachciarek (j. polski), Bernice McManus-Falkowska, Ewa A. Pichola, Magdalena Płotka (j. angielski), Christel Martin, Iwona Bartnicka (j. francuski), Adam M. Filipowicz, Michał Zembrzuski (greka, łacina)

PROJEKT OKŁADKI

Mieczysław Knut

OPRACOWANIE GRAFICZNE, SKŁAD I ŁAMANIE

Maciej Głowacki

© Artur Andrzejuk / Naukowe Towarzystwo Tomistyczne (wydawca / editor)

Warszawa 2019

ISSN 2300-1976

Rocznik Tomistyczny ukazuje się dzięki pomocy Jacka Sińskiego

Redakcja Rocznika Tomistycznego

ul. Klonowa 2/2

05-806 Komorów POLSKA

www.roczniktomistyczny.pl

e-mail: redakcja@roczniktomistyczny.pl

Druk i dystrybucja:

WYDAWNICTWO von borowiecky

05-250 Radzymin

ul. Korczaka 9E

tel./fax (0 22) 631 43 93,

tel. 0 501 102 977

www.vb.com.pl e-mail: ksiegaria@vb.com.pl

WYDAWNICTWO
von borowiecky

Spis treści

Od Redakcji.....	11
Richard Fafara Ideologia i filozofia arystotelesowska.....	13
Mieczysław Gogacz La vérité, fondement de l'éthique.....	23
Peter A. Redpath Why Western Catholic Higher Education Needs to Recover Its Soul.....	31
Dawid Lipski Nauczanie etyki w szkołach podstawowych – kilka uwag.....	37

Rozprawy i artykuły

Marek P. Prokop Wpływ filozofii Awicenny na metafizykę Tomasza z Akwinu. Przegląd źródeł i opracowań.....	47
Magdalena Płotka Hylemorficzna jedność radości: ujęcie Awicenny i św. Tomasza z Akwinu.....	61
Andrzej T. Kubanowski The Elements of Thomas Aquinas' Theology of the Church in his <i>Commentary on Letter to Ephesians</i>	73
Marian Kowalski Die Architektur der Summa theologiae des Thomas von Aquin.....	87
Marcin Trepczyński The Aquinas's paths of thinking about predestination in the <i>Summa Theologiae</i>	103
Michał Zembrzowski Poznanie Adama i wiedza Chrystusa a intelekt możliwościowy i czynny. Ujęcie Tomasza z Akwinu.....	123
Marcin Sieńkowski Koncepcja intelektu a rozumienie wiary. Zestawienie poglądów Tomasza z Akwinu, Immanuela Kanta i Augusta Comte'a.....	139
Artur Andrzejuk Antropologiczne podstawy etyki.....	157
Tomasz Ćwiertniak Tomizm egzystencjalny Mieczysława A. Krąpca a tomizm konsekwentny Mieczysława Gogacza. Ku analizie porównawczej.....	173
Marian Kryk Ojciec Jacek Woroniecki: Filozoficzne źródła i konsekwencje Rewolucji Francuskiej.....	197
Marcin Karas Filozofia tomistyczna w środowiskach integrizmu katolickiego w Polsce.....	215

Izabella Andrzejuk	
Patriotyzm w etyce tomistycznej	229
Marcin Worek	
Wyznaczniki realizmu filozoficznego w rozumieniu M.A. Krąpca i É. Gilsona	241
Kacper K. Sakowicz	
Spór o koncepcję życia. Polemika Mieczysława A. Krąpca z Kazimierzem Kłósakiem	257
Ewa Agnieszka Pichola	
Dietrich von Hildebrand's Correction of the Teaching on the End of Catholic Marriage	275

Edycje i tłumaczenia

Marek Prokop	
Al-Kindi, <i>Pismo o intelekcie</i>. Wprowadzenie do przekładu z języka arabskiego	297
Michał Zembrzusi	
Al-Kindi, <i>O intelekcie</i>. Wprowadzenie do przekładu z języka łacińskiego	301
Al-Kindi	
<i>Risala fīl-'Aql</i>	308
Al-Kindi	
<i>Pismo o intelekcie</i> (tłum. Marek P. Prokop)	308
Al-Kindi	
<i>De intellectu (et intellecto)</i> (tłum na łac. Dominik Gundissalvi?)	309
Al-Kindi	
<i>O intelekcie (i tym, co poznane intelektualnie)</i> (tłum. Michał Zembrzusi)	309

Sprawozdania i recenzje

Natalia Herold	
Działalność Naukowego Towarzystwa Tomistycznego w roku akademickim 2018-2019	323
Izabella Andrzejuk	
Konferencja „Tomizm konsekwentny” z okazji 92. urodzin prof. Mieczysława Gogacza 17 listopada 2018	339
Krzysztof Kalka	
Recenzja: Urszula Wolska, <i>Człowiek rzecz czy osoba?</i> Wydawnictwo von borowiecky, Radzymin 2017, stron 331	343
Maciej Nowak	
Recenzja: Paweł Rojek, <i>Tropy i uniwersalia. Badania ontologiczne</i>, Wydawnictwo Naukowe Semper Warszawa 2019, stron 296	347

Stanisław Janeczek Mieczysław Gogacz – filozof klasyczny. Recenzja: A. Andrzejuk, D. Lipski, M. Płotka, M. Zembrzuski, <i>Mieczysław Gogacz</i> , red. A. Andrzejuk, Kraków: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Akademii Ignatianum w Krakowie 2019, stron 236; toż w wersji angielskiej, tamże, stron 245	353
Jerzy Tupikowski Recenzja: M.T. Handzel, <i>Teoria poznania samego siebie Hryhorija Sawycza Skoworody</i> , Głogów-Kraków: Theos – Logos 2019, stron 200	361
Nota o autorach.....	365

Table of Contents

Editorial.....	11
Richard Fafara Ideology and Aristotelian philosophy.....	13
Mieczysław Gogacz The truth as a basis for ethics.....	23
Peter A. Redpath Why Western Catholic Higher Education Needs to Recover Its Soul.....	31
Dawid Lipski Teaching of ethics in primary schools – a few remarks.....	37

Dissertations and Articles

Marek P. Prokop Influence of Avicenna's philosophy on the metaphysics of Thomas Aquinas. Review of sources and studies.....	47
Magdalena Płotka Hylomorphic unity of joy: Avicenna's and Thomas Aquinas's accounts.....	61
Andrzej T. Kubanowski The Elements of Thomas Aquinas' Theology of the Church in his <i>Commentary on Letter to Ephesians</i>	73
Marian Kowalski The Architecture of Thomas Aquinas's <i>Summa theologiae</i>	87
Marcin Trepczyński The Aquinas's paths of thinking about predestination in the <i>Summa Theologiae</i>	103
Michał Zembrzuski The Cognition of Adam and Knowledge of Christ in the Context of Potential and Agent Intellect.....	123
Marcin Sieńkowski The conception of the intellect and the understanding of faith. A juxtaposition of the views of Thomas Aquinas, Immanuel Kant and Auguste Comte.....	139
Artur Andrzejuk Anthropological foundations of ethics.....	157
Tomasz Ćwiertniak The Existential Thomism of Mieczysław A. Krąpiec and Consequential Thomism of Mieczysław Gogacz. Perspectives for Comparative Analysis.....	173
Marian Kryk Father Jacek Woroniecki: Philosophical sources and consequences of the French Revolution.....	197
Marcin Karas Thomism in Polish Roman Catholic Integristic movement today.....	215

Izabella Andrzejuk	
Patriotism in thomistic ethics	229
Marcin Worek	
Determinants of philosophical realism according to Étienne Gilson and Mieczysław Albert Krąpiec	241
Kacper K. Sakowicz	
A dispute about the concept of life. Discussion of Mieczysław A. Krąpiec with Kazimierz Kłósak	257
Ewa Agnieszka Pichola	
Dietrich von Hildebrand's Correction of the Teaching on the End of Catholic Marriage	275

Editions and Translations

Marek Prokop	
Al-Kindi, <i>On intellect. Introduction to the Arabic translation</i>	297
Michał Zembrzuski	
Al-Kindi, <i>On intellect. Introduction to the Latin translation</i>	301
Al-Kindi	
<i>Risala fīl-'Aql</i>	308
Al-Kindi	
<i>On intellect</i> (trans. Marek P. Prokop)	308
Al-Kindi	
<i>De intellectu (et intellecto)</i> (trans. from Latin by Dominic Gundissalvi?)	309
Al-Kindi	
<i>On intellect (and what is intellectually cognized)</i> (trans. Michał Zembrzuski)	309

Reports and Reviews

Natalia Herold	
Activities of the Scientific Thomistic Society in the academic year 2018-2019	323
Izabella Andrzejuk	
„Consequential Tomism” conference on the occasion of the 92nd birthday of prof. Mieczysław Gogacz November 17, 2018	339
Krzysztof Kalka	
Rev.: Urszula Wolska, <i>Człowiek rzecz czy osoba?</i> Wydawnictwo von borowiecky, Radzymin 2017, pages 331	343
Maciej Nowak	
Rev.: Paweł Rojek, <i>Tropy i uniwersalia. Badania ontologiczne</i>, Wydawnictwo Naukowe Semper Warszawa 2019, pages 296	347

Stanisław Janeczek	
Mieczysław Gogacz – filozof klasyczny. Review: A. Andrzejuk, D. Lipski, M. Płotka, M. Zembrzuski, <i>Mieczysław Gogacz</i> , ed. A. Andrzejuk, Cracow: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Akademii Ignatianum in Cracow 2019, pages 236; English version, <i>ibidem</i> , pages 245	353
Jerzy Tupikowski	
Review: M.T. Handzel, <i>Teoria poznania samego siebie Hryhorija Sawycza Skoworody</i> , Głogów-Cracow: Theos – Logos 2019, pages 200	361
Note about authors	421

Dietrich von Hildebrand's Correction of the Teaching on the End of Catholic Marriage

Słowa kluczowe: D. von Hildebrand, purpose of marriage, offspring, love, correction.

In this paper we reconstruct Dietrich von Hildebrand's stance on the purpose of marriage. At first, we present the origin of his thought, then we show the major statements regarding the issue. Next we turn to interpretations. Shortly, we show these voices which situate von Hildebrand in the personalist movement whose origin can be traced back to the twenties and thirties of the twentieth century. The last step is to point out the chosen contemporary interpretations which posit von Hildebrand's proposal on the purpose of marriage amongst one of the major contributions to the new ap-

proach on the matter, the approach which became more visible in the sixties. The scope of our reflection is domain of Catholic teaching on marriage and its purpose defined in the Code of Canon Law 1917 as *proles, fides, sacramentum*. We refrain from comparative analysis of von Hildebrand's stance and that which we find in St. Thomas Aquinas. The aim of this paper is to focus on essentials which are the following: von Hildebrand's disagreement with Aquinas, *novum* in von Hildebrand's writings, reception of his thought.

Mgr Ewa Agnieszka Pichola, absolwentka Wydziału Filozofii Chrześcijańskiej UKSW. Obecnie doktorantka w Instytucie Filozofii Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego.

I. Origins of von Hildebrand's views on the purpose of marriage

Dissatisfaction, that was the result of von Hildebrand's initial acquaintance with the Catholic thought on the matter of marriage. On hearing lectures and sermons he came to the conclusion that there are lapses in the teaching on marriage. In his memoirs we read that he „lamented the fact that the meaning of marriage had been neglected in the past, if not in the official teaching of the Church, definitely in numerous homilies and then-current textbooks of Catholic moral teaching”¹. Hence, we notice that even though von Hildebrand refrains from rejecting the official stance on the matter, he was convinced that there might have been flaws in methods of introducing the teaching on marriage. The other influential factor in shaping his views was his overall interest in philosophical aspects of love. Strong conviction that love plays the primary role in human life was reflected in his stance on marriage. He speaks of the meaning, as he calls it, and the purpose of marriage.

His views had been known as early as in the twenties. He was a president of the foreign commission of the Association of Catholic Intellectuals (Katolische Akademikerverband), founded by prelate Franz Xavier Munch². He attended conferences throughout Germany what gave the opportunity to share his ideas with Catholic audience. Two works on the matter had their origin in papers delivered to those meetings. The first publication was *Reinheit and Jungfräulichkeit* (1927), was the result of lectures given in Innsbruck in 1925 at a session of the Federation of Catholic Students' Union. Its English version was available already in 1931, known as *In Defense of Purity. An Analysis of the Catholic Ideals of Purity and Virginity*. Then followed the book on marriage, published in 1929 under the title *Die Ehe*, translated into English as the *Marriage* in 1942³. This book has its origin in a talk given in 1922 at a conference organised by the Association of Catholic Intellectuals. In his speech, which is said to have received

¹ A. von Hildebrand, *The Soul of a Lion: Dietrich von Hildebrand*, San Francisco 2000, p. 212. Presumably, for the fact that his papers were published in 2012 there is a phrase „in the past” with regard to the period of our interest. To be more precise one should rather use „at that time”, then, if properly reasoning we may assume that the negligence was the situation von Hildebrand faced when joined the Church in 1914. But also he objects to „certain modern theories” which fail to admit deep significance of sex neglecting spritual aspect of personality and the nature of love. D. von Hildebrand, *In Defense of Purity, An Analysis of the Catholic Ideals of Purity and Virginity*, Baltimore 1962, p. 8-9.

² A. von Hildebrand, *The Soul...*, op. cit., p. 206.

³ Prior to English version there appeared the Italian and French translations. In this work we rely on the *Marriage: The Mystery of Faithful Love*, Manchester 1991. One should not mistake this book with the one by A. von Hildebrand titled *Marriage: A Divine Invention*. Polish translation of *Die Ehe* was published as late as in 2017, it is *Małżeństwo*, transl. J. Kubaszczyk, Poznań 2017, with a foreword by A. von Hildebrand.

a great deal of positive feedback, von Hildebrand noticed that Catholic teaching puts too much emphasis on procreation. Next, he presented his key insight on the topic, and suggested that there should be a distinction between the meaning of marriage, which is a union of love, and the purpose of marriage, procreation⁴. Aware that his views might be disturbing, for he was, as A. von Hildebrand puts it, breaking a new ground, he consulted his ideas with Nuncio Eugenio Pacelli. In doing so he intended to make sure that his ideas were in harmony with the Church teaching. Nuncio accepted his point of view and encouraged to publish. In the result, amongst many letters congratulating von Hildebrand on the publication there was a letter from E. Pacelli⁵. The treatment of the topic, initiated in the book *Die Ehe*, even though drawn much attention, had not been developed until sixties when the works on the heart and the nature of love were published.

In the course of his life von Hildebrand remained consequent, moreover, we may observe that he became even mo-

re radical in his opinions. In his late book, the *Trojan Horse in the City of God*, written in 1971, he openly says that „the traditional conception of marriage contains an incomplete truth”, and adds that the emphasis on procreation „led to a grave and almost total neglect of the role of mutual love”, further he admits that „theologians omitted any mention of the specific nature of spousal love and its profound importance for marriage”⁶. In the same work he also says that „although stress on procreation as a great and noble end was right, one can do justice to the nature of marriage only if one also grasps its significance and high value of as a love communion, as the ultimate union of two persons”⁷. Let us notice that the condition „only if, only against” is repeated: „The mystery of procreation itself can be adequately seen only against the background of the communion of love”⁸. He continues that „it is clear, therefore, that the doctrine stressing procreation exclusively is an incomplete truth. It needs completion with a doctrine that also calls attention to the value of human love”⁹. Hence, in these

⁴ „He always placed love at the centre of his life, regarding nothing- career, profession, research- to be more important than love and marriage. In reading Catholic literature and listening to homilies, however, Dietrich was struck by the fact that emphasis was usually on procreation, rarely if ever on the loving bond that should exist between spouses”, A. von Hildebrand, *The Soul, ...*, op. cit., p. 211.

⁵ A. von Hildebrand, introduction to: D. von Hildebrand, *Marriage: The Mystery of Faithful Love*, Manchester 1991. To be precise we need to point out that D. von Hildebrand consulted the content of his speech prior to public performance in 1922, than the success and the books followed. Congratulations on publication were sent with regard to the *Reinheit and Jungfräulichkeit*. [in]: A. von Hildebrand, *The Soul ...*, op. cit., p. 212.

⁶ In this place von Hildebrand points out that the exception is St. Francis de Sales and it is pope Pius XII who „found the most fitting words for the nature and value of this special kind of love”, D. von Hildebrand, *The Trojan Horse in the City of God*, Manchester-New Hampshire 1993, p. 29.

⁷ Ibidem., p. 29.

⁸ Ibidem., p. 29.

⁹ Ibidem., p. 29. Further, von Hildebrand points out that there are improper reactions to „the former

he attempts to question the very essence of the teaching on the purpose of marriage.

He admits after almost forty years of pending debate, which brought a significant number of controversies, and even papal interventions, that in his opinion the very doctrine is flawed. Secondly, procreation as the primary end can be acceptable only conditionally. Further, von Hildebrand points out that „the strange justification” of the primacy of marital love in St. Thomas¹⁰ contains „several weighty errors”. Thomas says that a husband should love his wife for the fact that she is a part of his body. At that point, von Hildebrand notices, Thomas ignores the classical motivation for marriage, because being a part of a husband’s body means the bond of love between the two. He claims that St. Thomas fails to understand that a requirement of primacy already lies in spousal love. Moreover, von Hildebrand does not agree with Thomas in saying that the primacy of love, expressed in the phrase „part of his body” begins in marriage, that me-

ans that the act of marriage is a motive for marital love than, as he perceives it, a consequence of spousal love. According to him, a consent and consummation flow from spousal love already existing and he argues that were it otherwise, there would be no reason to love prior to act of marriage had taken place. Additionally, he accuses Thomas of seeing marital love exclusively as a result of two, consent and bodily union. Here, according to von Hildebrand, the error lies in the reduction of the primacy of love over consent and consummation, the reduction of spousal love to the act marrying and diminishing the obligation for love. Love, is prior to the act of marriage, explains von Hildebrand, and the primacy of love cannot begin in marriage. In a proper *ordo amoris*, he says, love of spouses which is indicated by the primacy spouses have in each other’s heart, precedes the act of marriage¹¹. He also adds explanation we deal with here is the „confusion of cause and effect taken to an extreme”¹².

2. Von Hildebrand views on the meaning and the purpose of marriage

For the most part we draw on the chapter II of the work *Reinheit und Jun-*

gfräulichkeit (In Defense of Purity) entitled „Zusammenhang der Sinnlichen

exclusive stress on procreation”, having in mind that the book was written in 1972, the word former in this context that von Hildebrand was aware of the change of the stance on the purpose of marriage. There are flaws in the understanding of sexual sphere when reduced to biological sphere only. That, in his opinion, leads to flaws in the understanding of marriage as such rejection of its indissolubility. *Ibidem.*, p. 30.

¹⁰ *Idem, The Nature of Love*, South Bend, Indiana 2009, p. 365.

¹¹ D. von Hildebrand, *The Nature of Love*, *op. cit.*, p. 365.

¹² *Ibidem.*, p. 365.

Sphäre mit der Sphäre des Geistes" (*The Relation of Sex to the Spiritual Life*) dedicated to the issues of purity with regard to marriage. It presents the reflection on purity of the marital act, on the purpose of marriage, and on spousal love. The leading idea of the chapter is to show that bodily union is indispensable with love, and further, that the union of love and sex in marriage cannot be regarded only in terms of procreation¹³.

Von Hildebrand quotes both St. Augustine and St. Thomas, however, he limits their presence to introductory hints¹⁴. He says that „the Church assigns three ends (*Zwecke*) to marriage, which St. Augustine sums up by the words *proles, fides, sacramentum*— ofspring, fidelity, the sacrament”¹⁵, and points out that there is a profound relation between the bodily union and matrimonial love expressed in *mutuum adjutorium* and *fides* as one of these ends¹⁶.

Thus he admits that mutual help denotes love. In this point let us notice that indeed, the Church speaks of the *mutuum adjutorium*, however not as the primary end of marriage. We may see how von Hildebrand opens debate on two dimensions of marriage, mutual help and procreation. Both are treated in the Code of Canon Law 1917, nevertheless both represent different, ontological realities.

Further, von Hildebrand says that the sexual union is the „organic expression of wedded love”, and that it is precisely a „mutual gift of self”¹⁷. Further, von Hildebrand explains that the „threefold purpose of marriage (*dreifache Bedeutung*), *proles, fides, sacramentum* of which St. Thomas says: *Primus finis respondet matrimonio hominis, in quantum est animal; secundus, in quantum est homo, tertius in quantum est fidelis (...)*¹⁸, extends also to the act of marriage”¹⁹. Hence, von Hildebrand's intention is to show that each

¹³ „Die Zentralität und Intimität dieses Gebietes sowie sein Character als Geheimnis befähigen es auch in einem besonderen Zusammenhang mit der Liebe, dem Geistigen und Tiefsten aller Erlebnisse der Liebe und dieser Sphäre in der Ehe so aufzufassen, als sie sich ausschließlich durch den Zweck der Fortpflanzung konstituiert. Idem, *Reinheit und Jungfräulichkeit*, St. Ottilien 1981, p. 20.

¹⁴ The interpretation developed on the basis of two short remarks is representative for von Hildebrand's methodology employed in discussion not only on the purpose of marriage, this is also true with regard to polemic with Aquinas.

¹⁵ The first reference is to St. Augustine's *De bono coniugali*, to the passages expounding the doctrine of the three goods of marriage, *fides, proles, sacramentum*.

¹⁶ D. von Hildebrand, *In Defence of Purity...*, op. cit., p. 7. „Mit dem seelisch geistigen Moment der besonderen ehelichen Liebe, das in den Ausdrücken *mutuum adjutorium* (gegenseitige Hilfe) und *fides* als einer dieser Zwecke formuliert ist, steht die leibliche Vereinigung in einer engen qualitativen Beziehung”. Idem, *Reinheit...*, op. cit., p. 20.

¹⁷ *Ibidem*, p. 20.

¹⁸ The quotation comes from the *Summa Theologiae*, Suppl. Quaest. 65, art. 1, as informs the German version. The English one avoids to offer a bibliographical note to this passage. This is the fragment Aquinas adopted from Peter Lombard. Neither Lombard, nor Aquinas speak of the act of marriage in the context of quoted passage.

¹⁹ D. von Hildebrand, *In Defence...*, op. cit., p. 8. „Die dreifache Bedeutung der Ehe im Sinn von *proles, fides, sacramentum (...)* erstreckt sich auch auf den Akt eheliche Gemeinschaft. Dieser Akt hat nicht nur den Zweck”, Idem, *Reinheit...* op. cit., p. 23.

single end of marriage, not only proles, is involved in the understanding the act of marriage. The scope of the purpose of marriage signified by *fides* and *sacramentum* is extended to the act of marriage. In doing so he objects to consider the marital act as narrowed to procreative (which is functional) aspect only. Thus we read that the act of marriage has not only a function (*Zweck*) but it also possesses a significance (*Bedeutung*) in a sense of *quantum homo*, which is the expression and fulfilment of wedded love. Further, he adds that the marital act in the sacramental meaning of matrimony²⁰. Von Hildebrand explicitly says that the function (significance) of physical sex in relation to man in *quantum homo* „cannot be purely utilitarian, functional in the narrowest sense, like its significance to man in *quantum animal*, in which its function is to produce offspring”²¹. Hence, the presumption that the act of marriage is seen as „purely utilitarian” indicates the starting point of von Hildebrand’s analysis. He suggests that „we should rather speak of the meaning (*Sinn*) of sex than of its function (*Zweck*)”²². We notice that there is a word „me-

aning” introduced to denote the content of that, what is related to man in *quantum homo*, what is expression of mutual love.

Hence, let us reconstruct the above reasoning. It proceeds as follows: the starting point is the premise that a man in *quantum animal* with regard to act of marriage is understood purely utilitarian, functional. Further, such understanding of physical act in its pure function of end and means reduces this act to formal, mechanical (*mechanische Beziehung*) aspect only²³. Von Hildebrand explains that it would be materialistic to regard love as „exclusively an objective means to the union of wedlock, and the latter in turn as a means to procreation”, it would be a subordination of man in *quantum homo* to man in *quantum animal*²⁴. He continues that „to regard the marriage union as a means (*Mittel*) and wedded love as the end (*Zweck*) is equally impossible, because the marriage union already presupposes wedded love”²⁵. Further, he observes that indeed the act of marriage has the object (*Zweck*) in *quantum animal*, in its procreative sense, but also significance (*Sinn*) for man in

²⁰ Idem, *In Defence...*, op. cit., p. 10. „Dieser hat nicht nur den Zweck der Erzeugung von Nachkommenschaft, sondern auch eine Bedeutung für den Menschen in *quantum homo* als Ausdruck und Erfüllung der ehelichen Liebe und Lebensgemeinschaft. Ausserdem nimmt er in gewisser Weise an der sakramentalen Bedeutung die Ehe teil”, Idem, *Reinheit...*, op. cit., p. 23.

²¹ Idem, *In Defence...*, op. cit., p. 10-11.

²² D. von Hildebrand, *In Defence of...*, op. cit., 10-11. „Die Funktion der Sinnliche Sphäre für den Menschen in *quantum homo* kann jedoch nicht eine rein zweckhafte in der prägnanten Bedeutung des Wortes sein wie die der sinnlichen Sphäre für den Menschen in *quantum animal*, wobei die Nachkommenschaft den Zweck darstellt. Vielmehr muss eher von einem Sinn als von einem Zweck der sinnlichen Sphäre gesprochen werden”, Idem, *Reinheit...*, op. cit., p. 23.

²³ „Der Akt (...) kann nicht in die formale, mechanische Beziehung von Zweck und Mittel aufgelöst werden”. Ibidem, p. 24.

²⁴ Idem, *In Defence...*, op. cit., p. 10.

²⁵ Ibidem, p. 11-12.

quantum homo, that is a unique union of love. He says that the sexual act apart from its object (*Zweck*), which is procreation, is also an expression and fulfilment of wedded love²⁶.

The next step is to show that procreation is indispensable to love of man and woman. Von Hildebrand notices that wedded love and physical relation subsists in harmony. For him it is obvious that „apart from the relation of physical sex to procreation, there exists a relation arising out of their respective qualities between physical sex and wedded love”, what is „contrasted with the utilitarian relation of means and end”²⁷. Let us notice that relation of „means and end” according to which the end of marriage is defined canonically is seen by von Hildebrand as „the utilitarian”. Further, he says that physical sex is the expression of wedded love²⁸. When the union between the physical sex and love is neglected and when physical sex is recognised only in its „purely utilitarian” procreative aspect, we deal with the process of degradation of man and blindness to the meaning and value of the mysterious domain of marital act²⁹. Further, von Hildebrand says that the „will to procreation is incapable of introducing into the act of wedded union the requisite element of conscious experience, for it neglects entirely the significance (*Be-*

deutung) of the act for man in *quantum homo*- namely- *fides*”³⁰. In this point von Hildebrand's stance might be interpreted as diminishing an intention, an act of the will to procreate, the condition on the basis of which marriage is valid. He argues that the „exclusive insistence upon the function (*Zweckes*) of sex for man in *quantum animal* and the reduction of the connection between sex and spirit to a purely utilitarian relationship” a consequence of explaining everything by biological categories³¹. Further he insists on rejecting an emphasis on biological points of view and the phenomenon of life. He adds that emphasis of biological aspect is characteristic for the vital philosophy and in philosophy of modernism³². Thus he suggests that the stance exposing the function of sex in its procreative aspect borders on vitalism and modernism.

He affirms the priority of love between spouses when he says „even if the noble purpose of giving the Church new souls, that intention by itself, to the exclusion of specific wedded love, could not organically unite physical sex with the heart and spirit”³³. He says that „the ennobling power” of the act which brings into existence a new human soul „only becomes available and as a factor which intrinsically sublimates the act of marriage and transforms its quality, when it influ-

²⁶ Ibidem, p. 12. „Der Akt ehelicher Gemeinschaft hat einmal den Zweck der Fortpflanzung, ausserden aber den Sinn einer einzigartigen Liebesvereinigung”, Idem, *Reinheit...*, op. cit., p. 25.

²⁷ Ibidem, p. 13

²⁸ Ibidem, p. 13

²⁹ Ibidem, p. 13

³⁰ Ibidem, p. 13-14.

³¹ Ibidem, p. 14.

³² Ibidem, p. 14.

³³ Ibidem, p. 14.

ences physical sex through the medium of wedded love³⁴. Further, as says von Hildebrand, it is not procreative aspect that allows to speak about mystery of the sexual act, sex is „a mystery” even apart from the fact of coming into existence a new human being³⁵. The basis of employing the word „mystery” concerning sexual act lies in its character of „becoming one flesh”, the moment of which we may speak as an appeal to the depth, intimacy and the core of personality³⁶.

We may notice continuity of his stance. In his work on the essence of community von Hildebrand comes back to the topic. In marriage, he explains, the incorporation of spouses into community involves also a physical sphere. There, love and the *intentio unionis* is extended into corporeal domain. Further, he says that compared to other human communities marriage possess a unique characteristics, *sursum corda*, proper only to marriage. With regard to procreative aspect of marriage von Hildebrand says, that a creation of new human being cannot be understood

in terms of objectivity and causality only. It has a deeper sense because of the community of love built by spouses³⁷. In the other place he offers an introduction into the characteristic traits of various kinds of love, including spousal love. He points out that this love reveals the essential, the deepest word of a person (*tieftsten Wesenwortes*). Next, this particular kind of love is addressed to the entire person along with its physical sphere. Hence, a physical union can be a moment of expression and fulfillment of spousal love³⁸.

Sex has profound function in wedded love, von Hildebrand points out that sex is the „medium of the closest objective communion of two creatures”, and the „expression of wedded love”³⁹. Further, he says that the real nature of sex shows manifests in „the glorious qualities of intimacy, mystery, seriousness and union”, it is „the of wedded love”, the medium of the „most profound union with another”⁴⁰. Sex has its „peculiar mysterious and extraordinary character”⁴¹. Also in his next work, *Die Ehe*, he says that he union of

³⁴ Ibidem, p. 14.

³⁵ Ibidem, p. 15.

³⁶ Ibidem, p. 15. „Aber den Charakter des Mysteriums hat diese Sphäre auch abgesehen davon, dass hier die Urquelle der Entstehung neuer Menschen ist. Auch rein qualitativ haftet, wie wir sahen, dieser Sphäre ein geheimnisvoller Charakter an: ihre Tiefe, ihre Zentralität, ihre Intimität wiesen schon darauf hin”, Idem, *Reinheit...*, op. cit., p. 30.

³⁷ „Dazu kommt bei der Ehe, dass die beiden Personen auch als Leibwesen in einzigartiger Weise in die Gemeinschaft einbezogen werden bzw. Dass sich Liebe und intentio unionis auf diese Sphäre mit erstrecken. Aus ihnen erwächst die einzigartige gegenseitige Übergabe der Personen, die in der leiblichen Vereinigung enthalten ist”, Idem, *Metaphysik der Gemeinschaft*, Regensburg 1975, p. 299. „Die duopersonale Liebesgemeinschaft, die dazu bestimmt ist, einem neuen Menschen das Leben zu schenken, und zwar in tiefer organischer Verbindung mit dem Sinnbereich, den sie qua Liebesgemeinschaft hat, nimmt in dieser Hinsicht einen Rang ein, der sie uüber alle anderen natürlichen Gemeinschaften weit emporhebt. Ihre Frucht ist kostbarer als die irgendeiner anderen natürlichen Gemeinschaft”, Ibidem, p. 303.

³⁸ Ibidem, p. 56-7.

³⁹ Idem, *In Defence...*, op. cit., p. 16.

⁴⁰ Idem, *In Defence...*, op. cit., p. 18.

⁴¹ Ibidem, p. 28.

spouses is of spiritual character, even when sexual relations are considered. Von Hildebrand speaks of the function of physical act in marriage, that is the expression of „reverent and lawful wedded love”⁴², and also that creating a bond between persons, is a kind of self-devoting love⁴³.

Thus, von Hildebrand sees the primary meaning of marriage in spousal love, and a simple consequence of this fact is the understanding the sexual intercourse as expression of love as well. We may conclude that the reflection on the purpose of marriage accompanies rather the reflection on the physical union and love. What is in the centre of von Hildebrand's utmost concern, is love indispensably related to physical act.

This stance is maintained in his late essays, dated 1975 and 1977, published by William A. Marra. There von Hildebrand says that attitude toward sex is important from the point of view of morality and further, for the entire personality. This is so for two reasons, it is in sexual life that soul and body meet, represents a particular kind of intimacy. Additionally, sex can be expression of

spousal love, something which constitutes ultimate personal union. Von Hildebrand says that sexual act is linked and ordered to spousal love to such an extent that once this relation is neglected the real nature of sexual sphere would be neglected. Sex, as von Hildebrand explains, cannot be understood as a form of marital love, rather it is love that is a proper form of sexual act. In this point he adds that spousal love is not the only element to reveal the essence of sexuality. What is also needed is the act of the will, the act of consent through which a marriage comes into existence⁴⁴.

The second book, *Die Ehe*, continues to develop the thought. While in *Reinheit und Jungfräulichkeit* von Hildebrand focused on explaining the act of marriage as expression of spousal love, here he goes on to show that marriage itself is the union of love. The major concern of the book is the role of spousal love, however, this is not the point. What placed von Hildebrand's work in the context of the twentieth century debate, was the fact that the topic concerning the role of love was discussed in the context of the purpose of marriage.

3. Love as the core, theme, and the meaning of marriage

Von Hildebrand says that love is the core (*Kern*) of marriage.⁴⁵ Further, a mar-

riage is the „closest and the most intimate of all earthly unions”, where „mutual

⁴² Ibidem, p. 23.

⁴³ Ibidem, p. 46. He speaks of virtues which accompany sex in fulfilling its function, already in this early work we notice the beginning of the conception of love and *intentio benevolentia*, the topic developed in *The Nature of Love*.

⁴⁴ D. von Hildebrand, W. A. Marra, *Seksedukacja*, tłum. P. Długosz, Komorów 2011, p. 17-21.

⁴⁵ „Eben darum wird die Ehe als Vorbild für die höchste Form der Beziehung der Seele zu Gott gewählt, weil die Liebe den tiefsten und eigentlichsten Kern der Ehe ausmacht.”, D. von Hildebrand,

love is in a specific way the theme (*Thema*) of the relationship³⁶. Marriage, von Hildebrand points out, is constituted exclusively in its very substance by mutual love⁴⁷. Love is the topic (*Theme*) of the relation, love „enters exclusively into the essence of that relation”⁴⁸. The fragments gathered below allow to say that marriage is the union of love, and love in marriage is: the core, the theme, love enters into the essence of love, love constitutes marriage, mutual love is substance.

Von Hildebrand points out that marriage has its own importance (*Bedeutung*)

and it exists for its own sake, regardless its fruit⁴⁹. He agrees that the closest communion of love gives birth to a new human being, what mysteriously reflects the fruitfulness of love as such. He also explains that every true love possesses an intrinsic spiritual fruitful, spiritual fruitfulness of love is independent of procreation. Every marriage in which conjugal love is reached bears spiritual fruit, becomes *fruitful* - even though there are no children⁵⁰.

4. Purpose of marriage and meaning of marriage

We notice that von Hildebrand agrees that procreative function is the task of marriage but apart from that, spouses

has the task flowing from the divine plan⁵¹. In each marriage God gives the partners a particular task- (*Aufgabe*) -

Die Ehe,.... p. 6.

⁴⁶ „Weil die Ehe die engste aller irdischen menschlichen Gemeinschaften ist und die Beziehung, in der man sich am restlosesten hingibt, in der, wie sonst nirgends, die andere Person als Ganzes Gegenstand der Liebe ist, in der vor allem die gegenseitige Liebe selbst in einzigartiger Weise das Thema der Beziehung darstellt.”, Ibidem, p. 6. Polish translation uses the term „treść” which is closer to „content”.

⁴⁷ „Bei allen andern irdischen Gemeinschaften bildet die gegenseitige Liebe nicht so ausschließlich die Substanz der Beziehung”, Ibidem, p. 6.

⁴⁸ „Gewiß, auch diese Beziehungen werden nur durch die Liebe verklärt uns sollen mit Liebe durchsetzt sein. Auch sie können ihren Sinn nur entfalten auf dem Boden der Liebe- aber ihr Sinn und Thema ist nicht die gegenseitige Liebe selbst. Sie bestehen erstens nicht subjektiv so essentiell aus Liebe, die Liebe drückt nicht so ausschließlich das Verhältnis zueinander aus”. Ibidem, p. 7.

⁴⁹ „Daß die Ehe als Symbol der Vereinigung der Seele mit Gott gefaßt wird, deutlich aus, daß sie als Gemeinschaft in sich eine erhabene Bedeutung besitzt und schon um ihrer selbst willen da sein soll, nicht erst dank einer Frucht, die aus ihr erwachsen kann?”, Ibidem, p. 23.

⁵⁰ „In der Tatsache, daß aus der engsten Liebesvereinigung zweier Menschen ein neuer Mensch hervorgeht, spiegelt sich in geheimnisvoller Weise die Fruchtbarkeit der Liebe überhaupt. „Jede echte Liebe eine innere geistige Fruchtbarkeit besitzt, und das gerade der ehelichen Liebe, ganz unabhängig von der Fortpflanzung, diese geistige Fruchtbarkeit innewohnt”(…) „Jede Ehe, in der sich eine solche eheliche Liebe ganz erfüllt, bringt darum geistige Früchte, sie ist fruchtbar, selbst wenn sie kinderlos bleibt”. Ibidem, p. 23-4.

⁵¹ „Mann und Frau haben letztlich nur die eine Aufgabe, in Christus wiedergeboren zu werden und durch ihre Heiligung Gott zu verherrlichen – doch verkörpern Mann und Frau auch zwei verschiedene Typen des Menschseins, die je ihren besonderen Schöpfungssinn und ihren besonderen

apart from the obligation every marriage contains: mutual love and conjugal faithfulness (*Treue fides*)⁵². Von Hildebrand tends to widen the task of marriage by employing phrases „apart from”, „besides”, „but also” when speaking of procreation. The purpose of marriage is explained in the wider context of spousal love expressed by bodily union.

He proceeds as follows, he says that physical union is the „full realization of conjugal love”, and on that premise there comes the conclusion that „besides the primary end of procreation, the primary meaning of bodily union lies in the fulfillment of conjugal love”⁵³. Hence, when von Hildebrand acknowledges that procreation is the primary end, he adds that no less primary factor is primary meaning: „Marriage is in its nature, principally a communion of love, so the meaning of physical consummation is not restricted to its function as a means of procreation. This primary end is not the only meaning of the physical act. Subjectively speaking, it is not even its primary meaning. Its meaning is primarily the realization of the sublime communion of love”⁵⁴.

The word, „meaning” in the above fragment serves to clarify the relation of love in marriage and the purpose of marriage. Von Hildebrand employs the „meaning” (*Sinn, Schopfungssinn*) and points out that it should not be mistaken for the end of marriage. He says: „love is the primary *meaning* of marriage just as the birth of new human beings is its primary *end*”, and in comparison to love as primary meaning of marriage, its social function is rendered secondary. Hence, we may notice that „meaning” denotes that what does not replace the word „end” (purpose). Further, von Hildebrand says: „Besides the primary *end* of procreation, the primary *meaning* of bodily union lies in the fulfillment of conjugal love”. He says „besides”, what adds to the primary end also the meaning, which is love.

There are more statements which clearly exclude possibly to interpret von Hildebrand's stance as exchanging procreation into love in the position of the end of marriage. He says that it would be incomprehensible if procreation were also the sole meaning of the union not only its end. One would come into conclusion that children born out of the wedlock would make the union legitima-

Wert, noch unabhängig von aller Fortpflanzung, haben”. Ibidem, p. 12.

⁵² „In jeder Ehe stellt Gott den Eheleuten eine bestimmte Aufgabe, abgesehen von dem, was jede Ehe objectiv verlangt: die gegenseitige Liebe und die eheliche Treue”. Ibidem, p. 28-9.

⁵³ „Nur wenn man die Grooße und Erhabenheit dieser Verbindung als volle Realisierung der ehelichen Liebesgemeinschaft erfaßt hat und- neben dem primären Zweck der Fortpflanzung- ihren primären *Sinn* darin erblickt, kann man auch die Furchtbarkeit der Sünde der Unreinheit verstehen”, Ibidem, p. 24.

⁵⁴ „Wie die Ehe ihrem Sinn nach in erster Linie Liebesgemeinschaft ist, so hat auch die koorperliche Vereinigung nicht etwa nur den Sinn der Fortpflanzung. (...) Aber dieser primäre Zweck ist nicht der einzige Sinn der körperlichen Gemeinschaft und subjektiv nicht einmal ihr primärer Sinn: ihr Sinn ist in erster Linie die Realisierung dieser erhabenen Liebesgemeinschaft, in der zwei Menschen gemäss dem Wort des Heilandes „zu einem Fleisch werden”, Ibidem, p. 20- 21.

te⁵⁵. From the above we draw not only that procreation is the end of marriage but that meaning is constitutive for marriage. Hence, it is love that makes the union legitimate, according to von Hildebrand. Additionally, we might question the reasoning employed. By saying that children born out of wedlock cannot legitimate the union and for that children cannot be decisive factor for establishing marriage he seems to have overlooked the fact that the purpose of marriage is defined in the context of marriage. In the other place he says that when marriage is childless it serves only the communion of love, what, as we assume, does not render the marriage invalid. He also posits the rhetorical question whether childless marriage does not fulfill its task by mutual love, and in this point he also seems to omit the essence of the matter, as explained above⁵⁶. Von Hildebrand fails to see that the situation when a particular marriage is childless cannot alter the established rule that children are the purpose of marriage. The other point is the omission of

rather obvious teaching on the issue concerning the primary and secondary ends of marriage.

Further, he explains that there is a relationship between the mysterious procreation of a new human being and this most intimate communion of love. Possibility of procreation illuminates the grandeur and solemnity of this union, as von Hildebrand puts it. He agrees that in order to preserve the reverent attitude of the spouses toward the mystery in this union, the general connection between procreation and the communion of love must always be maintained even subjectively, at least as a general possibility of this act⁵⁷. We do not develop further interpretation of the term subjectivity in this context. There are authors who consider it as a mark of phenomenological theories and attempt to explain subjective purpose by employing differentiation between the objective purposes, ontological - *finis operis* - and *finis operandis*, subjective psychological purposes⁵⁸.

⁵⁵ „Wäre die Fortpflanzung nicht nur der Zweck, sondern auch der einzige *Sinn* dieser Gemeinschaft, so wäre es in letztem Grund unverständlich, warum diese Verbindung sündig bleibt, wenn aus ihr Kinder hervorgehen, und warum diese Verbindung rein und erhaben ist, wenn sie in kinderloser Ehe nur der Liebesgemeinschaft dient“, Ibidem, p. 25.

⁵⁶ „Steht aus irgendeinem Grunde, auf den man selbst keinerlei Einfluß hat, fest, daß keine Nachkommenschaft zu erwarten ist, so behält diese Verbindung doch ihre subjective Bedeutung und ihre innere Schönheit. Ist die eheliche Liebe etwa nicht so erhaben, daß sie für sich allein diese Gemeinschaft zu heiligen und zu rechtfertigen vermöchte?“ Ibidem, p. 23.

⁵⁷ „Es gehört zu der ganzen feierlichen Größe dieser intimsten, engsten Gemeinschaft, das aus ihr der neue Mensch hervorgeht. Die wunderbare, von Gott gesetzte Verbindung der engsten Liebesgemeinschaft, die in sich schon ihre volle Bedeutung hat, mit der geheimnisvollen Zeugung eines neuen Menschen beleuchtet die Größe dieser Vereinigung, so daß dieser generelle Zusammenhang auch subjektiv stets festgehalten werden muß, aber nur als prinzipielle Möglichkeit, damit die ehrfürchtige Haltung beider Gatten dieser Verbindung gegenüber als einem Mysterium stets gewahrt bleibe“. Ibidem, p. 22.

⁵⁸ A. Sarmiento, *Matżeństwo chrześcijańskie*, transl. P. Rak, Kraków 2002.

5. The nature of marital love

Comprehensive picture of von Hildebrand's views on the subject of marriage should be completed by signaling the major tenets of von Hildebrand's concept of love. Its fundamentals we find in phenomenological study on the affective value response. The stance on the purpose of marriage should not, therefore, be perceived as improvement of Aquinas' stance only, as if to the ends of marriage love, as neglected element, was added. Love is understood by von Hildebrand as the affective value response of the heart. There are discrepancies in both, defining the essence of the heart and the spiritual affectivity from the point of view of metaphysics. Von Hildebrand's understanding of love, has its

consequences on the understanding of the meaning of marriage and the purpose of marriage. Following his conception we may arrive to the conclusion that spousal love is the voice of the heart, in its shape of the affective value response. Von Hildebrand says that love is total when the heart is given⁵⁹. Hence, the affective voice of the heart is decisive for marriage in all its aspects concerning love. This issue deserves further study and is presented in this place to show to how extend von Hildebrand's ideas on marriage introduce the mode of thinking foreign to the classical thought of St. Thomas and the entire tradition on which the teaching on marriage was based.

6. Semantic aspects of von Hildebrand's writings

In analysing von Hildebrand's proposal we gather semantic aspects. In the *Purity* he speaks of the meaning (*Sinn, Bedeutung*) of sex, of function (*Zweck*), significance (*Zweck, Funktion*), object (*Zweck*) of sex. The *Marriage* employs similar vocabulary with regard to marriage. He speaks of the meaning (*Bedeutung*) of marriage. We attempt to explain von Hildebrand's notions by matching them to known Latin equivalents.

That what brings marriage into existence, efficient cause (*causa efficiens*) is that what we translate as the essence and what in von Hildebrand's writings is present as „Schopfungssinn”. The end

or purpose of marriage, *causa finalis*, is that what von Hildebrand calls the „Zweck” in German, what is rather directly adopted from traditional understanding. Than the procreation is the end, in sense of *causa finalis*. But he also employs the word „Bedeutung”, which is meaning, in the context of purpose of marriage, when he speaks of „dreifache Bedeutung”. Furthermore, the word „Bedeutung” is used in the context of the importance of marriage (*Bedeutung*).

When it comes to the term *causa efficiens*, we might say that according to von Hildebrand, it is love. But love is not only the act of the will but, as we says von

⁵⁹ D. von Hildebrand, *The Nature of Love*, op. cit., p. 321.

Hildebrand, the affective value response present prior to the moment the act of marriage takes place. That would be troubling if we understood love as the essence of marriage, the union of man and woman. There is also an utterance which shows that also in this point von Hildebrand suggests his own interpretation. According to him, the term „*finis*” is used univocally. If supposed to be understood as every meaningful direction toward something, it has to be distinguished from its original meaning, which is *causa finalis*, moreover, finality should not be understood as in the pattern of means-and end⁶⁰.

When we gather vocabulary regarding the spousal love we notice that while *Die Ehe* denotes love between spouses by the phrase „*eheliche Liebe*”, in English translation there are following: „conjugal love”, „spousal love”, „mutual love”

and „married love”. Some of these might be confusing. Especially when von Hildebrand says that spousal love is prior to the act of marriage. In that case spousal love denotes relation between a couple of people who are not yet married. If so, the spousal is not the same as married or conjugal. Presumably, there is a problem of the English translation.

Interpreters turn attention to the fact that von Hildebrandian terms, as Kevin Schemenauer points out, lack definite explanation. Von Hildebrand does not speak clearly enough of that what he calls a „primary meaning” of marriage. In his conclusion Schemenauer follows Ronaldo Arjonillo and adopts the stance that von Hildebrand implicitly meant that „conjugal love is the authentic motivation for and vitality of marriage”, in that sense love is the meaning of marriage⁶¹.

7. Interpretations of von Hildebrand's views

Even that the tradition was consistent, the issues concerning the purpose of marriage and love became the subject of

controversy at the beginning of the twentieth century⁶². Von Hildebrand was one of the thinkers who contributed to

⁶⁰ „We must realize the danger resulting from using certain terms we define them in a completely analogous sense but use them in a much more univocal sense as we apply them in *concreto*. Such is the use of the term *finis*. If we want to use it in a sense which it covers every meaningful direction toward something, we must not only clearly distinguish this general term from the original meaning of *causa finalis*, but also we must not allow the „means-end” relation to remain in our mind as the hidden pattern of finality”, Idem, *The New Tower of Babel*, New York 1953, p. 98-99.

⁶¹ K. Schemenauer, *Conjugal Love and Procreation: Dietrich von Hildebrand's Superabundant Integration*, Lexington Books, Lahnam-Plymouth, UK 2011, p. 16.

⁶² The Holy Office issued an official statement, and in the answer to the question: „Whether the opinions of some current authors is admissible which either denies that the primary end of marriage is the generation and the nurture of offspring, or teaches that the secondary end are not essentially subordinate to the primary, but are independent of it and equally primary?” – responded negatively. Decree of the Holy Office, April 1, 1944 (*Acta Apostolica Sedis*, 36 [1944], 103). H. Doms' *Vom Sinn und Zweck der Ehe* aroused considerable controversy, finally was placed on the *Index librorum prohibitorum*. (AAS 44 [1952], 879.

the pending debate. It is agreed that personalists' aim was to expose the role of love and what they sought was a personal, human dimension of marriage ends. In doing so they were openly critical to the hierarchy of marriage ends. The most significant writer was Herbert Doms, there were also other authors such as E. Michel, B. Krempel, N. Rochol. We notice that interpreters add von Hildebrand to the list⁶³. Early personalists emphasized the relation of love in marriage. H. Doms saw the essence⁶⁴ of marriage in the physical union of the spouses, and its end as their fulfillment and realization as persons. M. Waldstein observes that both, D. von Hildebrand and H. Doms took part in a „personalist revolution” when, as he puts it they „connected sexual intercourse with love, for the first time in the Catholic tradition”⁶⁵. We shortened the content of the debate, the essential points are that von Hildebrand's view were amongst voices who questioned the teaching on the purpose of marriage in its established

shape. In this point let us notice that von Hildebrand's works were never mentioned in the context of the papal interventions and never any penalty was imposed. Despite the fact that there was a noticeable opposition to personalist school, its proposals appeared influential and seems to be much more important than it was previously thought.

Interpreters agree that von Hildebrand made significant contribution to a new understanding of Catholic marriage. They suggest that beginnings of that what has been implemented in Church's documents after the Second Vatican Council we find in von Hildebrand's work relatively early. J. F. Crosby reminds that von Hildebrand already in 1920's had received a great deal of attention for his writings on man and woman, love and Christian marriage. He was, according to Crosby, one of the first Catholic writers to argue that the marital act has a dual meaning- not only a procreative but also a unitive which means that it expresses love. Von Hilde-

⁶³ B. Lonergan writes in a review of von Hildebrand's *Marriage* that „the movement originating with von Hildebrand not only has not been condemned but, in the opinion of perhaps all writers in theological reviews, contains elements that are destined to enrich Catholic thought. On the other hand, the most downright [sic] member of this school, Dr. Herbert Doms, whose *Von Sinn und Zweck der Ehe* was published incompletely in English as *The Meaning of Marriage* (Sheed and Ward), received a very deliberate though unofficial rebuke from the Master of the Holy Office; and while von Hildebrand carefully avoids not only the more venturesome formulae but even the very name of Doms, it remains that he shares in the latter's fundamental outlook”. In: K. Schemenauer, *Conjugal Love and Procreation: Dietrich von Hildebrand's Superabundant Integration*, Lexington Books, Lahnam-Plymouth, UK 2011, p. 19. The last sentence indicates that Lonergan failed to notice that original work *Die Ehe* had been published 6 years prior to that of Doms'.

⁶⁴ As observes Fr. F.J. Connel Doms distinguished between the meaning and the ends of marriage what, complicates the exact interpretation of what is the essence of marriage. F. J. Connell, *The Catholic doctrine on the ends of marriage*, <https://ejournals.bc.edu/ojs/index.php/ctsa/article/view/2244>, entry October 2018. This is the issue we meet also in von Hildebrand's work.

⁶⁵ M. Waldstein, *Three Kinds of Personalism: Kant, Scheler, and John Paul II*, Forum Teologiczne X, 2009, p. 151-171. Waldstein also suggests that von Hildebrand's ideas influenced the Catholic theology mainly through Doms' writings.

brand was a pioneer of the teaching on the dual meaning of the marital act that was articulated at Vatican II in the *Gaudium et spes*⁶⁶. On von Hildebrand's influence writes J. Seifert, he points out that among many religious books von Hildebrand wrote after 1914 those which deal with marriage and sexual ethics are amongst the most important ones, and that von Hildebrand „became one chief promotor of a new Catholic philosophy and theology of marriage in which the one-sided emphasis on procreation and education of children was broken and the central significance of personal love as key for understanding the value of sex was emphasized”⁶⁷. Seifert continues that von Hildebrand prepared a change in the previous teaching on the purpose of marriage⁶⁸.

Catholic terminology according to which procreation and offspring were the „first end” of marriage. Von Hildebrand distinguished „meaning” and „end” and established love to be the primary meaning of the sexual act distinct from „first end” understood as procreation. Seifert notices that „these contributions

led to a certain revolution in Catholic teaching on marriage during last decades, culminating in the theology of the human body presented by pope John II according to which the deepest essence of the human body consists in its becoming a gift and fulfilling a mutual gift of spousal love”⁶⁹. He also notices that von Hildebrand's positive vision of sexuality in marriage and his philosophy of love as the central meaning of love as the central meaning of marriage, were at first opposed by some Catholic circles. However, he adds, later they became influential for the thought of the popes from Pius XII to John Paul II. Seifert, similarly to J. Crosby, is convinced that it is von Hildebrand's thought that influenced the doctrine of marriage of the Second Vatican Council⁷⁰. He is convinced that von Hildebrand contributed to proper recognition of love in marriage⁷¹. This fact is also noticed by Andrzej Bohdanowicz who points out that von Hildebrand's positive understanding of love and sex illuminates the great virtue of purity and the greatness of marriage as a community of love⁷². There are also

⁶⁶ J.F. Crosby, Introductory Study, in: D. von Hildebrand, *The Nature of Love*, op. cit., p. 13.

⁶⁷ J. Seifert, *Introductory Study*, in: D. von Hildebrand, *What is Philosophy?*, Chicago 1960, p. 9.

⁶⁸ We quote „previous” strictly according to J. Seifert, however, at that time when von Hildebrand's works went public none part of the Catholic teaching on that issue could have been called „previous”.

⁶⁹ *Ibidem*, p. 10.

⁷⁰ *Ibidem*, p. 9.

⁷¹ „Seine großen und bahnbrechenden Entdeckungen des Wesens und der zentralen Rolle der Liebe in der Ehe, seine Analysen der Tugenden der Reinheit und christlicher Grundtugenden wie der Demut und der Caritas, sowie seine unermüdliche Verteidigung und philosophische Begründung kirchlicher Morallehren wie ‚Humanae vitae’, sowie vor allem die glühende Liebe zur katholischen Kirche, die ihn auszeichnete, verdienen ihm unzweifelhaft den Titel eines Kirchenlehrers der Moderne”, J. Seifert, „Die Tagespost”, January, 2002. [in:] Dietrich von Hildebrand zur schulischen „Sexualerziehung”, <https://www.freundeskreis-maria-goretti.de/fmg/menu2/text235.html>, entry October 2018.

⁷² A. Bohdanowicz, *Integrująca rola miłości w małżeństwie. Studium na podstawie myśli fenomenologicznej Dietricha von Hildebranda*, Wydawnictwo Naukowe UAM, Poznań 2007.

suggestions, like that of Geoffrey Grubb and Roland Arjonillo who claim that despite von Hildebrand's emphasis on conjugal love, he did not invert the traditional hierarchy of ends in marriage. K. Schemenauer, following them, proposes that von Hildebrand's treatment of love clarifies and enhances procreation's role in marriage⁷³. Another interpretation suggests that von Hilde-

brand's notion of the meaning of marriage developed with regard to the purpose of marriage serves to explain two natures of marriage, subjective and objective, as mutually linked⁷⁴. Interpreters, for the most part, appreciate that von Hildebrand worked out the stance which contributed to recognizing value of marital act.

8. Final remarks

The content of von Hildebrand's writings allows to say that indeed, he focused on love, both in marital and in marriage itself. He developed his reflection on love in the context of the purpose of marriage, what might suggest that his intention is to subvert the ends of marriage. However, source text show that he rather attempted to say that neither physical act nor offspring as the purpose of marriage, can be separated from love. There are questions that could be asked after the conducted research. The first, what is the scope of the word „meaning”

(*Bedeutung*), introduced as the element accompanying marriage. The second, to what extend can his reflection might be considered metodologically comparable to the stance consequently developed and established in various texts including that of St. Thomas. Von Hildebrand's texts are scarce in quotations and rather concise. This allows to interpret them widely or leave the interpretation open. Thus we may leave the aforementioned questions open. What we might decisively say is that von Hildebrand took part in a debate on the purpose of marriage.

⁷³ K. Schemenauer, op. cit., p. 19.

⁷⁴ „Hildebrand transformed discussion on marriage by introducing the language of meaning as distinct from that of ends. (...) In developing his understanding of marriage von Hildebrand stressed both its „subjective” and „objective” nature as existing together”, S. A. Ross, *Marriage, Readings in Moral Theology*, No. 15, ed. Ch. E. Curran, J. H. Rubio, New York 2009, p. 44.

Dietricha von Hildebranda korekta nauczania o celu katolickiego małżeństwa Streszczenie

Słowa kluczowe; D. von Hildebrand, cel małżeństwa, potomstwo, miłość, zmiana.

Artykuł prezentuje stanowisko, które D. von Hildebrand przedstawił już w latach dwudziestych ubiegłego wieku jako uzupełnienie czy korektę stanowiska dotyczącego celu małżeństwa. Zdecydował się zabrać głos, gdy zauważył, że tradycyjne nauczanie zawiera błędy. Punktem wyjścia jego analizy było stwierdzenie, że rola miłości jest pomijana. Na podstawie źródłowych tekstów pokazujemy, że von Hildebrand wprowadza nowe słowo, „znaczenie”, w kontekście znaczenia miłości w małżeństwie. Szczegółowo

analizujemy prace von Hildebranda i możemy stwierdzić, że słowo, którym próbuje on wyjaśnić rolę miłości w małżeństwie, jest trudne do jednoznacznego zdefiniowania. Jest ono również trudne do jednoznacznego wyjaśnienia za pomocą łacińskich terminów funkcjonujących w nauczaniu o małżeństwie. W ostatniej części artykułu prezentujemy wybrane głosy interpretatorów sytuujących von Hildebranda w myśli personalistycznej, której osiągnięciem jest dostrzeżenie roli miłości w małżeństwie.

Bibliography:

1. Bohdanowicz, A., *Integrująca rola miłości w małżeństwie. Studium na podstawie myśli fenomenologicznej Dietricha von Hildebranda*, Wydawnictwo Naukowe UAM, 2007.
2. Connel, F. J., *The Catholic doctrine on the ends of marriage*, <https://ejournals.bc.edu/ojs/index.php/ctsa/article/view/2244>, entry October 2018.
3. Sarmiento, A., *Małżeństwo chrześcijańskie*, tłum. P. Rak, Kraków 2002.
4. Hildebrand, A., von, *The Soul of a Lion: Dietrich von Hildebrand*, San Francisco 2000.
5. Hildebrand, D., von, Marra, W. A., *Seksedukacja*, tłum. P. Długosz, Komorów 2011.
6. Hildebrand, D., von, *What is Philosophy?*, Franciscan Herald Press, Chicago 1960.
7. Hildebrand, D., von, *Die Ehe*, Sankt Ottilien, EOS-Verlag, 1983.
8. Hildebrand, D., von, *Metaphysik der Gemeinschaft*, Regensburg 1975,
9. Hildebrand, D., von, *Marriage: the mystery of faithful love*, Sophia Institute Press, 1991.
10. Hildebrand, D., von, *Małżeństwo*, transl. J. Kubaszczyk, Poznań 2017.
11. Hildebrand, D., von, *In Defense of Purity, An Analysis of the Catholic Ideals of Purity and Virginity*, Baltimore 1962.
12. Hildebrand, D., von, *Reinheit und Jungfräulichkeit*, St. Ottilien 1981.
13. Hildebrand, D., von, *The New Tower of Babel*, P.J. Kennedy, New York 1953.
14. Hildebrand, D., von, *The Trojan Horse in the City of God*, Manchester-New Hampshire 1993.
15. Ross, S. A., *Marriage, Readings in Moral Theology*, No. 15, ed. Ch. E. Curran, J. H. Rubio, New York 2009.
16. Sarmiento, A., *Małżeństwo chrześcijańskie*, tłum. P. Rak, Kraków 2002.
17. Schemenauer, K., *Conjugal Love and Procreation: Dietrich von Hildebrand's Superabundant Integration*, Lexington Books, Lanham-Plymouth, UK 2011.
18. Waldstein, M., *Three Kinds of Personalism: Kant, Scheler, and John Paul II*, Forum Teologiczne X, 2009.

Nota o Autorach

Artur Andrzejuk – prof. dr hab., prof. zwyczaj. Uniwersytetu Kardynała Stefana Wyszyńskiego (UKSW), na którego Wydziale Filozofii Chrześcijańskiej kieruje Katedrą Historii Filozofii Starożytnej i Średniowiecznej oraz Sekcją Historii Filozofii. Autor szeregu publikacji z zakresu filozofii i teologii średniowiecznej, tomizmu, etyki i klasycznej filozofii człowieka. Interesuje się problematyką uczuć, sprawności i cnót moralnych, relacji osobowych. Jest uczniem Profesora Mieczysława Gogacza. Nr ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7926-4070>

Izabella Andrzejuk – dr, do roku 2017 wykładowca w Wyższej Szkole Stosunków Międzynarodowych i Amerykanistyki oraz Wyższej Szkole Komunikowania, Politologii i Stosunków Międzynarodowych w Warszawie. Jest autorką ponad sześćdziesięciu artykułów o tematyce filozoficznej. Zainteresowania naukowe: historia filozofii (arystotelizm, tomizm, filozofia polska); filozofia, etyka, klasyczna teoria człowieka, filozoficzne podstawy mistyki. Napisała książkę pt. *Filozofia przyjaźni. Tomasz z Akwinu* (Warszawa 2007). Nr ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4961-2580>

Tomasz Ćwiertniak – mgr filozofii i politologii, absolwent Wydziału Nauk Społecznych Uniwersytetu Śląskiego w Katowicach. Magisterium z politologii uzyskał w 2011 r. na podstawie pracy „Człowiek, społeczeństwo, państwo w myśli o. M.A. Krąpca” (promotor: prof. dr hab. Wojciech Kaute), zaś magisterium z filozofii w 2018 r. na podstawie pracy „Tomizm konsekwentny Mieczysława Gogacza na tle dziejów tomizmu” (promotor: prof. zw. dr hab. Andrzej Noras). Obecnie doktorant w Instytucie Filozofii Uniwersytetu Śląskiego w Katowicach, gdzie przygotowuje rozprawę poświęconą analizie porównawczej tomizmu egzystencjalnego M.A. Krąpca i tomizmu konsekwentnego M. Gogacza. Nr ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9515-6168>

Richard Fafara – dyplom magistra i doktora filozofii zrobił na Uniwersytecie w Toronto (Kanada). Studiował również na Sorbonie w Paryżu oraz Polskiej Akademii Nauk w Warszawie. Jest autorem, m.in., monografii *The*

Malebranche Moment: Selections from the Letters of Étienne Gilson & Henri Gouhier (1920-1936).

Mieczysław Gogacz – prof. zw. dr hab., emerytowany profesor Uniwersytetu Kardynała Stefana Wyszyńskiego (dawnej Akademii Teologii Katolickiej). Stworzył konsekwentną odmianę tomizmu egzystencjalnego. W jego ramach broni teorii aktu istnienia i zasady niesprzeczności, tezy o odrębności i wewnętrznej jedności jednostkowych bytów oraz wynikającego z tych twierdzeń realizmu i pluralizmu bytowego. Zaproponował szereg doprecyzowań w dyscyplinach filozoficznych, takich jak filozofia bytu, antropologia filozoficzna, etyka i pedagogika. Formułował podstawy etyki zawodowej lekarza, żołnierza, funkcjonariusza Straży Granicznej; wykładał te etyki na AM, WAT i UW. Uczestniczył w debatach publicznych na temat ochrony życia, etyki zawodowej, racji stanu, polityki kulturalnej i naukowej państwa. Wykaz publikacji M.Gogacza obejmuje prawie 1000 pozycji.
Nr ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0517-0781>

Natalia Herold – mgr, absolwentka prawa i administracji na Uniwersytecie Gdańskim (lic.) i Uniwersytecie Warszawskim (mgr). Jest sekretarzem Zarządu Naukowego Towarzystwa Tomistycznego. Interesuje się filozofią klasyczną, a w niej szczególnie etyką i pedagogiką. Publikuje w „Roczniku Tomistycznym”.
Nr ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4761-9495>

Stanisław Janeczek – ks. prof. dr hab. Profesor Wydziału Filozofii Katolickiego Uniwersytetu Lubelskiego. Swoje badania koncentruje przede wszystkim na historii filozofii nowożytnej, zwłaszcza wieku XVII i XVIII, historii filozofii polskiej XVIII i XX w. i historii oświaty. Zajmuje się też dziejami filozofii w środowisku KUL oraz redaguje monumentalną serię wydawniczą pt. *Dydaktyka Filozofii*.
Nr ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3458-8634>

Krzysztof Kalka – dr hab. prof. nadzwyczajny Państwowej Uczelni Stanisława Staszica w Pile. Zajmuje się badaniami dotyczącymi wzajemnych relacji wykształcenia i wychowania. Autor wielu publikacji z zakresu filozofii średniowiecznej, teologii, antropologii, etyki, etyki zawodowej. Interesuje się problematyką sprawności moralnych, etyką zawodową, relacjami. Jest uczniem Profesora Mieczysława Gogacza.

Marcin Karas – prof. dr hab., historyk filozofii - pracuje w Zakładzie Filozofii Polskiej Instytutu Filozofii UJ. Prowadzi badania z historii idei i z filozofii średniowiecznej, jest autorem ponad 180 publikacji. Ostatnio zajmuje się głównie kosmologią wczesnonowożytną i filozofią dziejów. Opublikował m.in. książki: *Koncepcja czasu w pismach Williama Ockhama* (Kraków 2003), *Natura i struktura wszechświata w kosmologii św. Tomasza z Akwinu* (Kraków 2007), a także prace: *Z dziejów Kościoła. Ciągłość i zmiana w Kościele rzymskokatolickim w XIX i XX wieku* (Sandomierz 2008), *Integryzm Bractwa Kapłańskiego św. Piusa X* (Kraków 2008), czy też *Historiozofia Teilharda de Chardin wobec tradycyjnej myśli chrześcijańskiej* (Kraków 2012), liczne artykuły (45) oraz przekłady (43).

Nr ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2288-9512>

Marian Kowalski – absolwent germanistyki w Instytucie Germanistyki Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego. Tam również kontynuuje studia jako doktorant. W kręgu jego zainteresowań badawczych są zagadnienia z pogranicza lingwistyki i filozofii, zwłaszcza z filozofii św. Tomasza z Akwinu. Podejmował studia porównawcze metafizyki Tomasza z fenomenologią Edyty Stein.

Nr ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3783-256X>

Marian Kryk – absolwent Wydziału Prawa i Administracji UMCS oraz Wydziału Filozofii KUL Jana Pawła II na kierunku Retoryka Stosowana. Doktorant na Wydziale Filozofii w Katedrze Filozofii Kultury i Sztuki KUL Jana Pawła II. Przygotowuje rozprawę pod kierunkiem prof. dra. hab. Piotra Jaroszyńskiego dotyczącą personalistycznej koncepcji kultury w ujęciu o. Jacka Woronieckiego. Interesuje się myślą o. J. Woronieckiego, metafizyką i antropologią filozoficzną.

Andrzej T. Kubanowski – doktor nauk teologicznych, specjalista z zakresu teologii moralnej i bioetyki, nauczyciel akademicki na Wydziale Teologicznym UMK w Toruniu, zawodowy copywriter. Członek Stowarzyszenia Teologów Moralistów, Polskiego Towarzystwa Teologicznego, Naukowego Towarzystwa Tomistycznego, Dobrzyńskiego Towarzystwa Naukowego i Pracowni Tomizmu Biblijnego UMK. Autor kilkunastu artykułów z zakresu teologii moralnej Tomasza z Akwinu i chrystianologii moralnej. Do jego zainteresowań badawczych należą tomizm biblijny, średniowieczna etyka i teologia moralna, antropologia teologiczna i filozoficzna, antropologiczne podstawy bioetyki.

Dawid Lipski – dr, stopień doktora nauk humanistycznych uzyskał w 2014 r. na podstawie rozprawy *Spór między Tomaszem z Akwinu i Janem Peckhamem o jedność formy substancjalnej w człowieku. Źródła i konsekwencje*. Stypendysta Funduszu Stypendialnego i Szkoleniowego (Liechtenstein), Fundacji Lanckorońskich z Brzezia (Londyn) oraz Deutscher Akademischer Austausch Dienst (Kolonja). Redaktor w czasopiśmie „Pro Fide, Rege et Lege”, oraz w „Roczniku Tomistycznym”. Adiunkt w Wyższej Szkole Kryminologii i Penitencjarystyki w Warszawie.
Nr ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2136-0622>

Maciej Nowak – urodzony 24 kwietnia 1997 roku, ukończył II Liceum Ogólnokształcące imienia Stefana Żeromskiego w Tomaszowie Mazowieckim. W 2016 roku rozpoczął studia na Politechnice Warszawskiej na kierunku Elektrotechnika. Później postanowił zrealizować swoje zainteresowania i został studentem filozofii na Wydziale Filozofii Chrześcijańskiej UKSW. Interesuje się filozofią analityczną, historią filozofii i muzyką.

Ewa Agnieszka Pichola – mgr, absolwentka Wydziału Filozofii Chrześcijańskiej UKSW. Obecnie doktorantka, kontynuuje badania w Instytucie Filozofii Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego. Przygotowuje rozprawę, w której analizuje dorobek Dietricha von Hildebranda z perspektywy obecności wątków modernistycznych w pismach niemieckiego fenomenologa. Interesuje się zagadnieniami z pogranicza metafizyki i psychologii, a dokładnie filozoficznych podstaw koncepcji psychologicznych i antropologicznych aspektów prawdy. Publikuje, uczestniczy w konferencjach, tłumaczy w j. angielskim.
Nr ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6078-7384>

Magdalena Płotka – dr hab, prof. Uniwersytetu Kardynała Stefana Wyszyńskiego w Warszawie. Kierownik (p/o) Katedry Historii Filozofii Polskiej. Z-ca redaktora naczelnego Rocznika Tomistycznego. Zainteresowania naukowe skupiają się wokół średniowiecznej filozofii praktycznej, historii filozofii polskiej w XV i XVI wieku, paleografii łacińskiej oraz filozofii współczesnej. Jest autorką książki *Metafizyka i semantyka. Filozofia Jana Wersora* (Warszawa, 2013) oraz *Filozofia jako praktyka. Myśl krakowskiego praktycyzmu w XV i XVI* (Warszawa 2016). Publikuje w „Rocznikach Filozoficznych”, „Edukacji filozoficznej”, „Filo-sofiji”, „Roczniku Tomistycznym” i in.
Nr ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6993-2178>

Marek Prokop – dr, historyk filozofii, bibliotekoznawca, arabista. Studiował historię filozofii w Akademii Teologii Katolickiej w Warszawie w latach 1969-1974, zakończone magisterium u prof. M. Gogacza. Doktoryzował się ze średniowiecznej filozofii arabskiej u prof. M.-T. d'Alverny na Uniwersytecie w Poitiers w 1978 roku. Po doktoracie kierował działem rękopisów Biblioteki Polskiej w Paryżu (do 1991). Od 1995 r. jest pracownikiem naukowym Zakładu Biografistyki Polonijnej PUNO. W 2009 r. opublikował zbeletryzowaną opowieść o filozofii, zbudowaną na kanwie podróży do różnych krajów, kultur i środowisk, zatytułowaną *Podróże z Awicenną*.

Peter Redpath – jest rektorem Adler-Aquinas Institute; jest również dyrektorem Aquinas School of Leadership, kierownikiem studiów tomistycznych w Holy Apostles College and Seminary (USA); a także aktywnym badaczem na Uniwersytecie Abat Oliba w Barcelonie (Hiszpanii).

Kacper K. Sakowicz – doktorant na Wydziale Filozofii Katolickiego Uniwersytetu Lubelskiego (KUL). Stypendysta Ministra Nauki i Szkolnictwa Wyższego (2015/2016), Laureat Złotej Nagrody im. Prof. Mieczysława Gogacza za pracę magisterską oraz laureat programu stypendialnego im. Prof. Stefana Swieżawskiego. Jego zainteresowania filozoficzne ogniskują się wokół metafizyki i filozofii społecznej. Jest uczniem księdza Profesora Andrzeja Maryniarczyka.
Nr ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4721-3762>

Marcin Sieńkowski – kapłan diecezji łękiej, doktor nauk humanistycznych w zakresie filozofii, prefekt i wykładowca przedmiotów filozoficznych w Wyższym Seminarium Duchownym Diecezji Łękiej, interesuje się metafizyką, filozofią religii, relacją wiara-rozum i problematyką powołania, jest uczniem prof. dra hab. Piotra Jaroszyńskiego i absolwentem Katolickiego Uniwersytetu Lubelskiego Jana Pawła II.
Nr ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0679-5006>

Marcin Trepczyński – dr, adiunkt w Zakładzie Historii Filozofii Starożytnej i Średniowiecznej Instytutu Filozofii Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego, członek zespołu dr Magdaleny Bieniak przygotowującego edycje krytyczne *Quaestiones Theologiae* Stefana Langtona i studia dot. twórczości tego myśliciela (<http://langton.uw.edu.pl>). Autor publikacji m.in. z zakresu XII- i XIII-wiecznej filozofii, logiki i teologii, w tym książki *Ścieżki myślenia Alberta Wielkiego i Tomasza z Akwinu*, a także edukacji filozoficznej. Od 2019 r.

redaktor naczelny Edukacji Filozoficznej. Uczeń prof. Mieczysława Boczara i dr. Adama Górniaka.

Nr ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0612-2597>

Jerzy Tupikowski – ks. dr hab., profesor Papieskiego Wydziału Teologicznego we Wrocławiu. Badania naukowe koncentruje na metafizyce, zwłaszcza w jej nurcie klasycznym (realistycznym) oraz na teologii naturalnej. Nr ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1086-5000>

Marcin Worek – absolwent studiów filozoficznych Katolickiego Uniwersytetu Lubelskiego. Współpracownik katolickiego czasopisma dla młodych „Adeste”, autor artykułów dotyczących problematyki filozoficznej, antropologicznej i teologicznej. Reprezentant lubelskiego oddziału fundacji „Deo et Patriae” im. o. prof. Mieczysława A. Krąpca. Swoje zainteresowania naukowe skupia wokół realizmu filozoficznego, tomizmu, zagadnień metafizycznych i metaprzmiotowych.

Michał Zembrzuski – dr, asystent w Katedrze Historii Filozofii Starożytnej i Średniowiecznej Wydziału Filozofii Chrześcijańskiej UKSW. Pracę doktorską poświęcił tematyce zmysłów wewnętrznych w koncepcji św. Tomasza z Akwinu. Interesuje się problematyką epistemologiczną w starożytności i średniowieczu, a szczególnie problematyką pamięci i teorią intelektu możliwościowego i czynnego. Jest współredaktorem książek w serii „Opera Philosophorum Medii Aevii”. W jej ramach w 2012 opublikował autorską monografię zatytułowaną: *Tomasz z Akwinu. Komentarz „O pamięci i przypominaniu”*. Najnowsza jego publikacja to: *Filozofia intelektu. Tomasz z Akwinu koncepcja intelektu możliwościowego i czynnego*, „Liberi libri”, Warszawa 2019, stron 404.

Nr ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4647-479X>