

## POPULAR SCIENCE SUMMARY

The aim of my project is to analyse the relationships between the two key traditions of twentieth-century philosophy, analytic philosophy and phenomenology, from the perspective of the Lviv-Warsaw School (LWS). The school is one of the highest achievements of Polish thought. To clarify the meaning of this project, it must be embedded in the context of a wider discussion.

In the philosophy of the twentieth century we deal with the unprecedented pluralism of concepts, methods and currents of thought. While this diversity can be treated as a positive phenomenon, the attitudes of some philosophers are worrying. The split that occurred in twentieth-century philosophy and which is the cause of the mentioned pluralism is associated with the emergence of strong currents of thought in which attempts were made to redefine the role and tasks of philosophy. I am talking here about the analytic philosophy on the one hand, and phenomenology on the other. Today we talk about the analytic-continental divide in contemporary philosophy. From the textbooks one will learn that analytic philosophers are resigning from building large systems, in lieu they study specific issues, they are sceptical toward metaphysics, they postulate clarity and precision of expression, they focus on the study of language, they use logic as a tool of philosophical analysis, and they ignore the history of philosophy. In turn, continental philosophy is a name covering a number of diverse philosophical concepts that more or less directly derive from phenomenology, e.g. critical theory, hermeneutics, postmodernism. They are put in opposition to analytic philosophy. Continental philosophy is more focused on the study of the human condition, the importance of history and art, critical of the Enlightenment ideas (the extension of which is analytic philosophy), applies psychoanalysis, often uses a language that is difficult to understand and intricate.

The split between these two "camps" of contemporary philosophy is deeply entrenched institutionally, sociologically and now also historically. To the extent that even university study programmes reflect the divide. It is enough to compare subjects taught in France (dominance of the continental current) and in the United States (dominance of the analytic current). The division is so strong that often philosophers identifying with one can be even hostile to the other. For example, analytic philosophers accuse postmodernists of using meaningless language, which is only intended to cover the emptiness of thought. In turn, continental philosophers accuse analytics that their analyses are so trivial that even the simplest robots could study and create them. Even if it does not reach such an extreme, there is a tendency to lock oneself in her or his "philosophical bubble."

However, it turns out that the closer one looks at what lies behind the meaning of terms "analytic philosophy", "continental philosophy", one begins to see that their unambiguous definition entails problems that show that these two, seemingly mutually exclusive thought currents, overlap in many respects. For several decades, interest in the studies that have been aimed at seeking connections between these traditions has been systematically growing. Philosophers such as Dagfinn Føllesdal, Jitendra Nath Mohanty, David Woodruff Smith, Dermot Moran, Dan Zahavi, Guillermo Rosado Haddock, Claire Ortiz Hill, Leila Haaparanta, to name a few, show different ways of studying the relationship between analytic philosophy and the branches of continental philosophy. The relationships between analytic philosophy and phenomenology are mainly studied. This may be due to the fact that, as Michael Dummett proclaimed, studying the sources of this split may help to understand not only its genesis, but also the current situation of philosophy.

Against this background, the specificity of the Lviv-Warsaw School presents itself in an extremely interesting way. LWS is known and studied mainly as an analytic formation, which was also established independently of the dominant British centre. By studying the history of LWS, one can easily see that its founder, Kazimierz Twardowski, released at least three phenomenologists: Eugenia Ginsberg-Blaustein, Leopold Blaustein and Walter Auerbach. There are also premises to the influence of the founder of the phenomenological school, Edmund Husserl, on the concepts of the leading representatives of LWS, Kazimierz Ajdukiewicz, Stanisław Leśniewski and Alfred Tarski. In addition, it turns out that Ajdukiewicz's paraphrase method, which involved the translation of concepts and theses present in the language of a given philosophical conception within the language of another conception, can be used to adapt certain concepts belonging e.g. to phenomenology in the language of analytic philosophy. This method can be very useful because it will allow to point to and create new connections between the two seemingly oppositional philosophical traditions. Thus, it will open a space for dialogue and fruitful exchange, thanks to which the arsenal of research tools of both traditions will expand.

On one hand, the significance of this project is of historical value: it will present a less known and less appreciated branch of the Lviv-Warsaw School. On the other hand, it has methodological value: it will show how the method formulated by one of the members of LWS can be used to create relationships between analytic and continental philosophy, and enable fruitful exchange between them.